OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

DEBATES

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF THE

DOMINION OF CANADA

THIRD SESSION—EIGHTH PARLIAMENT

---

61 VICTORIA, 1898

VOL. XLVI.

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE THIRD DAY OF FEBRUARY TO THE TWENTY-FIRST DAY OF APRIL INCLUSIVE

OTTAWA
PRINTED BY S. E. DAWSON, PRINTER TO THE QUEEN'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY
1898

House of Commons Debates

THIRD SESSION—EIGHTH PARLIAMENT

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 22nd April, 1898.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 122) to incorporate the Supreme Grand Lodge of the Sons of England Benefit Society.—(Mr. Landerkin.)

MANITOBA SCHOOL FUND.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved that on Tuesday next the House resolve itself into committee to consider the following resolution :—

That it is expedient to provide that the Governor in Council may, from the moneys invested under the provisions of subsection three of section twenty-five of chapter fifty-four of the Revised Statutes of Canada, forming the School Fund for the province of Manitoba, pay from time to time to the Government of Manitoba, on the request of the said Government, such sum or sums as the said Governor in Council thinks proper, not exceeding in the whole the sum of three hundred thousand dollars, the sum or sums so paid over to be expended by the said Government of Manitoba in the support and maintenance of the public schools in that province ; provided always that not more than two hundred thousand dollars shall be so paid to the said Government for the purpose aforesaid during he present calendar year.

Motion agreed to.

IMPORTATION OF ALIEN WORKMEN.

Mr. CLARKE. Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I desire to draw the attention of the Government to an article which appeared in the Toronto "Evening Star" of Thursday, April 21. I may say that the "Star" gives an independent support to hon. gentlemen opposite. The article to which I desire to draw their attention is one having reference to a strike which unfortunately exists at the present time amongst the employees of the well-known firm of Messrs. J. D. King & Co. I do not propose to enter into the merits or demerits of the dispute beyond expressing the hope, which I believe is entertained by hon. gentlemen on both sides of this House, that this unfortunate strike may be speedily and satisfactorily adjusted. I desire to draw attention to this article particularly because it conveys the intimation that in endeavouring to overcome the strikers, the employers are reported to have sent agents to the other side of the line for the purpose of obtaining alien and foreign labour to introduce into their factory. I contend that that is contrary to the spirit of the legislation enacted at the last session of this Parliament.

Mr. SPEAKER. I wish to draw the hon. gentleman's attention to the practice, that unless he is going to move a substantive motion, he can only state such facts as are necessary to found a question upon ; he cannot make comments.

Mr. CLARKE. If it is necessary, in order to keep myself in order, to move the adjournment of the House at this stage, I shall be very glad to do it ; but I understood that the custom was for the person who made that motion, to propose it after having concluded his remarks.

Mr. SPEAKER. It is customary to make the motion at the close of the remarks, but it is customary for the hon. member to intimate to the Speaker that he intends to do so, in order to put himself in order.

Mr. CLARKE. I would be sorry to put myself out of order, Mr. Speaker, and at the close of my remarks, I intend to propose the motion that the House do now adjourn. I draw attention to this article because it states that the employers of these men, members of the firm of Messrs. J. D. King & Co., have sent their agents and representatives to the other side of the line for the purpose of securing the aid and assistance of foreigners and aliens to help them to crush their employees ; and, in view of the legislation that was passed at the last session of this House, I think that at least the attention of the Government ought to be drawn to the action of the employers. The article in the "Star" reads as follows :—

They want a DeBarry.—Strikers at King's object to United States Workmen being brought here. —Alien Labour now en route.—Mr. King's View of the Matter.—He wants Men and will take the First that Come.

The striking shoemakers received a telegram this morning from the president of the International Union at Lynn, Mass., saying that Mr. Brown, the foreman at J. D. King's, was there engaging men to come to Toronto, and that Mr. Brown and his men would probably reach Toronto to-day.

The strikers were early down at the Union Station, but the expected visitors have not yet arrived. The strikers' committee will to-day seek legal advice as to the alien labour law, and what action they can take, if any.

Mr. J. D. King, when asked this morning if it was correct that Mr. Brown was away seeking for men from the other side, replied that even if it were correct, he did not know that the public had anything to do with it.

"All I will say about it," said Mr. King, "is that we are looking for men. It does not matter to us where they come from. Our factory is open, and, of course, we want men to fill it. I think I am within my rights there, am I not? We are getting men. And we are teaching them, and so far we are getting along very comfortably," said Mr. King, who takes the matter coolly, and went on to speak rather sarcastically of the "sympathetic cutters," as he called them, who went out to stand in the rain "from sympathy."

"We are the best of friends, all of us. They are good boys. I think they were foolish for going out, but we shall fix it up again in time. It may take three months, perhaps, but we shall fix it up as we did before. As for bringing men here from the States, if they come I shall have to pay them, and not the public."

Now, Mr. Speaker, it strikes me that this dispute between Messrs. J. D. King & Co. and their employees, is a domestic dispute, not an international one; and that it can best be settled without the aid or intervention of these aliens and foreigners. My opinion is that their importation and their being placed at work in the factory from which these men have struck, will cause a great deal more friction than would otherwise arise, will delay rather than hasten an amicable and satisfactory readjustment of this dispute; and will create a more bitter feeling between the employee and the employer than would otherwise be the case. The first section of the Alien Labour Law, which was passed at the last session of this Parliament, provided:

From and after the passing of this Act it shall be unlawful for any person, company, partnership or corporation, in any way to prepay the transportation, or in any way to assist or encourage the importation of any alien or foreigner into Canada, under contract or agreement, parole or special, express or implied, made previous to the importation or immigration of such alien or foreigner, to perform labour or service of any kind in Canada.

This Act was placed on the Statute-book, I understand, to provide against the importation of foreigners or aliens into Canada under contract when conditions were normal or ordinary, but there is not a normal conditions of things existing now in connection with the firm of J. D. King & Co., and their employees. There is an extraordinary and unfortunate condition of things existing there; and if this Parliament thought it wise and prudent and just to enact that, in ordinary conditions, if the Governor in Council so decided, a proclamation should issue prohibiting the importation of alien labourers into Canada to take the place of Canadians, surely it is all the more incumbent upon us that on such an occasion as I allude to, the aid or assistance of aliens and foreigners should not be tolerated in the settlement of this dispute. The eighth section of the Alien Labour Act of last session provides that:

No proceedings under this Act or prosecutions for violations thereof, shall be instituted without the consent of the Attorney General of Canada, or some person duly authorized by him.

I do not wish to go further than to draw the attention of the Government to this unfortunate condition of things which now exists, and to enter my protest against permission being given J. D. King & Co., or any person else, under such circumstances, to call to their aid foreigners and aliens in order to crush out their own men who have faithfully worked for them for years. Knowing the character of many of the employees of that firm as well as I do, and knowing also, the high character of their employers, I am satisfied that a very wide divergence of opinion must exist between them, and I repeat that the bringing in of these aliens will intensify and embitter the relations that exist, not only between that firm and its employees, but between employers and employees generally. If this alien labour law is to be of any value, it should be put into operation on an occasion of this kind, and the employer and employees in this dispute at any rate, should be permitted to settle their grievances amongst themselves. Those who are out on strike, fighting for what they believe to be justice, should not be handicapped, as they undoubtedly will be, by our allowing the importation of men who probably cannot speak the language which is spoken here, in order that the employees may be able to crush out their operatives. I move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. WALLACE. Some time ago, during the present session, the question was asked of the Government whether any steps had been taken to bring this law into force, which requires, as the previous speaker has said, that no proceedings under this Act or prosecution for violation thereof shall be instituted without the consent of the Attorney General of Canada or some person duly authorized by him. The question was asked of the Government, and the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries told the House that steps had been taken in accordance with that provision. Now we are brought face to face with the facts as detailed by the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Clarke), and which we find in all the papers. I read in the Toronto "Evening Telegram" of yesterday the following:—

The position of affairs between J. D. King & Co. and the locked-out shoemakers is becoming more serious. This morning the executive committee of the men received a telegram from their chief officers in Boston to the effect that Superintend-

ent Brown had engaged a number of American workmen, who are leaving for Toronto to-day.

This is evidently in direct violation of this Act. We would like to know from the Government what steps they have taken to bring this Act into force, or whether proceedings will be taken. The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies), when making the statement he did to the House, gave us no particulars, but said that proceedings were being taken and that the Government were doing something. We want to know now what they have done or, in the circumstances as detailed in the press in the case of the lock-out or the strike against J. D. King & Co., what the Government propose to do. I think this importation of alien labour, under the circumstances, is an outrage. The condition has been accepted by the House, the Government and the country, that while the United States Government raises the highest barrier against Canadians going into the United States, even when no such circumstances such as those existing in Toronto, prevail, even when no strike is taking place, but it is the case simply of people passing backwards and forwards in search of employment—while such Canadians are met by the officers of the United States Government and not permitted to remain in the United States, we prohibit the employment of aliens here. In this instance, a flagrant violation of our Act occurs. Superintendent Brown of J. D. King & Co., goes to Boston, because there is a strike on in Toronto, and engages a lot of American workmen to take the place of Canadians. What is the result? Those Canadians are thrown out of employment, they cannot go to the United States, because the American laws prohibit them even to seek employment there, and yet despite the law upon our Statute-book, those things are allowed to take place. I am sorry to say that I think the Government have been negligent in their duty. I know that last year members of the Government expressed their hostility to this Act. I know that some of them said they would take good care it was not carried into effect, so far at least as some portions of the Dominion were concerned, perhaps their own provinces. But this is the law that Parliament placed upon the Statute-book, and the Government is bound to name those officers who are empowered to prosecute under this Act. I would like to know who the officer having such power is, whether he has been instructed to carry out this law, and whether the law is being enforced to-day, when all the circumstances demand its rigid and proper enforcement.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). My hon. friend seems to think that a proclamation is necessary or some action on the part of the Government in order to give vitality to the Act of last session, which seeks to prohibit the importation, under contract, of foreign labour. Permit me, then, to say that there is no such provision as that in the Act, but on the contrary, when the Act was passed on the 29th June, 1897, it then became in full force and spoke at that moment in every part of Canada. That Act is in force in Toronto to-day and it is quite competent for any citizen to call the attention of the Minister of Justice to any supposed violation of its principles, and thereupon it will be his duty, either to institute proceedings or give consent to proceedings being instituted by a private citizen. I am told that in all cases where any alleged violation of the Act has been brought to the attention of the Minister of Justice, steps have been taken to apply the Act.

An hon. MEMBER. Where?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. At Windsor and along the frontier. At all events, I am told that all cases brought to the attention of the Minister of Justice have been dealt with according to the spirit of this Act, and if my hon. friend finds that the charge in the "Star" newspaper and others are well founded, I assure him the department will, as in the past, be equal to the occasion and apply the Act according to its intent.

Mr. MacLAREN. I have had a great many communications from Stratford and different points complaining about the non-enforcement of the alien labour law. People of my riding have asked me frequently to urge upon the House the enforcement of that law. In Stratford, which is a very large railway centre, a great number of the railway men have been dismissed and their places filled by Americans, and they cannot say a word about it. There is no law to protect such men. These men, who have their homes and their wives and families there, and who have spent their lives in the employ of these large corporations, should have more protection. They urge upon me every time I go home to do something to have this law enforced. I agree with everything the hon. gentleman for West Toronto (Mr. Clarke) has said, and I would like to see something done whereby Canadian workmen could be protected, and I shall be pleased to do everything in my power to assert in passing a law of this kind.

Mr. COWAN. As I was the party who introduced this Bill last session, I desire to say a word. Clause 8 of this Act reads:

No proceeding under this Act or prosecution for violation thereof shall be instituted without the consent of the Attorney General or of some person duly authorized by him.

Residing, as I do, in the city of Windsor, immediately on the American frontier I applied after the close of last session of Parliament to the Minister of Justice to authorize some person in that city who could give consent for prosecutions under the Act,

and thus save the inconvenience, if inconvenience it might be, of applying to the Minister of Justice for a special permit, I must say that the Department of Justice immediately responded to that request, and Mr. Kenning, the collector of inland revenue at Windsor, was duly appointed. And, from the time the Act came into force, at all events since the close of last session, there has not been in the county of Essex one single Canadian citizen turned back from the city of Detroit. So far as the locality I represent and the locality I live in is concerned, the Act has been a decided success. And, no doubt, if the hon. member for Perth (Mr. MacLaren) and other hon. gentlemen opposite who are so anxious to find fault with the Bill, had made application to have a person appointed, I have no doubt they would have met with the same kind consideration at the hands of the Government as I have met with.

Mr. CLANCY. It is a well known fact that one member of the Government was hostile to this Bill when it was before the House. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) took very strong ground against it, and, in order that it should not apply generally he tied it up with so many restrictions so as to make it almost inoperative. Now, it seems to me that it was the duty of the Government to appoint officers to put the law in force in those localities, at least, where there was not a Minister opposing it. As it has not been done, however, it has been almost a dead letter on the Statute-books. Why should there be this restriction in regard to an Act which may need to be put in force every day, almost every hour, particularly on the frontier? The hon. member for Essex (Mr. Cowan), it appears, succeeded in getting the consent of the Government to the enforcement of the law. I do not say that that consent would have been denied in any case, but I say it should not be placed under such restrictions as to require the assent of the Minister of Justice. If the Act is to have any force, let us not have all this machinery of applying to the Minister of Justice, and so on, but let officers be appointed to carry out the law. I say without hesitation that if this law is not to be a sham and mockery so far as it affects the working people of Canada, these restrictions upon its operation must be removed. I say that the Government are at fault and must stand convicted of having hampered the Act, so long as it stands in the present position.

Mr. McGREGOR. In answer to the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy), I will just say that, in my opinion, it is very well that the Government should keep their hands on this law, and that their appointments under it should be made with great care. The appointment made in our city has given satisfaction. It is not the desire of this country to trouble our neighbours across the border more than we can help. We want to deal with them much as they deal with us. Now, they happen to have a man acting for them at Buffalo who acts very meanly with some of our people crossing at that particular point, but, at Windsor, where we have the honour of living, our people go to Detroit and work all day, some 600 or 700 of them, and return at night. These people spend their money in our country. And we allow the American people to come over to our side. They have about 150 or 160 coming over daily to Windsor to work. And so, we have reciprocity in this matter. There is no trouble at our point. If our interests were entrusted to a person who would nag at the Americans there is no doubt the day would not be far distant when our people working in the States would be deprived of that privilege. Our young men cross to the United States and work in any portion of it and come back when they see fit. There are isolated cases concerning which some complaint could be made, but, as a general thing, we have reciprocity in reference to labour at the particular point where we live, and we should be the losers and not the gainers if the law were carried out to the very letter. The appointment made by the Government is well made, the gentleman who has been appointed is a prudent man, a careful man, and one holding a high position; and he would not do anything that is not fair and just to the other country.

Mr. McCLEARY. I do not think it can be pretended that the half-hearted manner in which this law was placed on the Statute-book, though with the consent of the Government last year, has met the expectations, much less gained the approbation, of the people who are directly interested in this matter. Yesterday I gave notice of some questions relative to this very subject, which questions, I presume, will come up on Monday or Tuesday. The hon. member for North Essex (Mr. McGregor) has told us that at the city of Buffalo the Americans have appointed a man who does not do the right thing by Canadians. We have very great complaint to make against the enforcement of the alien labour law against Canadians on the frontier in my riding. I have here a letter which I received yesterday, part of which I will read:

> Ask the Government again what their intentions are in regard to the Alien Labour law. It is reported here that Mr. Spain, of Bridgeburgh, has been appointed as an officer to enforce the law, to take effect on the first of April, but nothing has been done up to the present. Men are coming here every day from Buffalo, and doing little jobs of work, while our men are left idle. Italians are coming over every day in squads to work in the stone quarries at Ridgeway, while hardly a Canadian can get work there. The American foreman informed Mr. Rathbun they can get plenty of their own men to look after without employing any Canadians.

This exists with us as a grievance, not only with reference to labour generally, but also in connection with the railway employees, as referred to by the hon. member for Perth (Mr. MacLaren). Our Canadians are sent back from Buffalo unless they move their families over and become citizens. They cannot go over there and work and still live in Canada, while men come over every day from Buffalo to get work that should be given to the Canadian people. Surely, if the law is worth putting on the Statute-book, it is worth carrying out. Take a little village like Fort Erie, where I do not believe they have a single lawyer—somebody should be there to look after the matter and see that the law is enforced. I have never asked the Minister of Justice to take action in this regard, because I never felt that there was any need of it——

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Hear, hear.

Mr. McCLEARY. I never felt there was any need of it, so far as I was concerned. I fully expected that the law would be enforced just as other laws are enforced by officials appointed for that purpose. It should not be incumbent upon the representatives of the people to see to the enforcement of such a law as this, it should be enforced in its entirety without the need of action on our part. I trust that the discussion brought on by the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Clarke) will be productive of good, and that the Government will see that it is their duty to carry out the law properly and effectively.

Mr. TAYLOR. I would like to ask the representative of the Attorney General, whom I am pleased to see in his place, to inform the House how many prosecutions have taken place under the Act that was placed on the Statute-book last year. It is well known we have read it in the papers, that Canadians have been daily deported from the United States, though it may not take place where the hon. member for Essex (Mr. Cowan) resides. Even Canadian nurses in the hospitals over in the United States, during the past year, have been deported from that country. We know also that many cases have happened in Canada where Americans were brought in to take the place of Canadians, concerning which complaints have been long and loud in the press, but no heed has been taken to them, so far as I know, by the Attorney General, or any other person for him. For some years I have had something to do with drawing the attention of the House and country to this matter, and two sessions ago I received a promise that at the ensuing session I would have an opportunity of introducing a Bill, and that such Bill would be passed word for word like the American Bill. We all know that when the session was called together, another Bill was put in ahead of mine on the Order paper; it was read and referred to a sub-committee of the House, which was controlled by the Government having a majority on that committee. They reported the Bill to the House, a Bill that I did not agree to, because I said then, as I say now, that it was practically unworkable. It was not what the Prime Minister promised this country, a copy of the American Bill. I have introduced this year, and I hope to reach it next Monday night, a copy of the American Bill, word for word, containing some eighteen clauses, a duplicate of all the American laws. The first Bill that was introduced was the American law then, which has, however, been amended by two or three Bills since. These amendments I have consolidated in the Bill which is now on the Order Paper. I have here a copy of the American Acts, which was sent to the manager of the Canada Carriage Company, at Brockville, who wrote to the Treasury Department at Washington to know whether, if they established a factory on the American side of the river and employed American labour to run it there, it would be lawful for them to send their superintendent over the river from Brockville one day in the week, or occasionally, to superintend the work there. This is the reply they received from the Treasury Department at Washington:

> I am in receipt of your communication of the 23rd instant, addressed to the Honourable the Secretary of the Treasury, in which you state your firm is considering the matter of establishing a branch in Morristown, a small place directly opposite Brockville, in the United States, and requesting to be advised whether it would be in violation of our laws for the department to accord you the privilege of sending at certain times your superintendent and foreman, and occasionally some skilled workmen across the river daily to perform service in this country.
>
> In reply, I call your attention to the Acts approved February 26, 1885, February 23, 1887, and March 3, 1891, inclosed herewith, from which it appears that this department cannot grant the privilege desired, and that the action as contemplated by you, if carried out, would be in violation of the law.

They inclosed copy of the Act of February 26th, 1885. The Act on the Statute-book in Canada is simply a copy of that Act, but it was amended so as to make it unworkable except by the action of the Attorney General. Then the Americans amended their Act in 1887, and again in 1891. The Act now on the Canadian statutes does not include the amendment of 1887, nor the amendments of 1891, copies of which I hold in my hand. Upon reading them it will be seen that a Canadian cannot possibly go over there to work, as the letter from the department says it would be a violation of the law; but there is nothing in the Canadian law to prevent an American from coming over here to work. The hon. member for Essex says that they do come, because they have reciprocity up there where he lives. Last year the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries took a very active part when the Bill was before the Committee, having it

so modified as to make it practically unworkable. On that occasion, when the hon. member for Essex stated that 160 went over from Canada and about 600 came in from the United States to work here——

Some hon. MEMBERS. The other way.

Mr. TAYLOR. Well, reverse that—600 Canadians went over to work in the United States, and 160 came from the United States to work in Canada, and that statement appeared to meet with the approval of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, because he asked my hon. friend to repeat it the second time so that the House and the galleries might hear it; and he winked at the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) as if to say: I made a point in bringing that out. However, I want the Prime Minister now to redeem his pledge that he gave to this House and to this country that he would place on our Statute-book a duplicate of the American law that I hold in my hand. Such a Bill is now before the House, and I hope that before the session is closed the Prime Minister will take it up and place it on the Government Orders, and see that it becomes law.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member must not take advantage of this motion to discuss an order which he has himself on the paper.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I am through now. I only ask that that pledge be redeemed and that the Bill now before the House may become law, but not such a law as we have now, which has been complained of by my hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Clarke, a law that is being violated in his city, in the case of the strikes now taking place, by J. D. King & Co.

The PRIME MINISTER. I have only to say to my hon. friend, in answer to the latter part of his remarks, although they were out of order, that I expect this Bill of his will come up for discussion on Monday, and then we will have an opportunity of discussing the subject.

Mr. BRITTON. According to the statements of the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Clarke), it would seem clear that a violation of the law has been committed, apparently by one of our Canadians, who is perfectly responsible and able to pay the penalty that the statute imposes for such violation. Now, this is not a question of the Government's policy at all. Therefore, there seems hardly any reason why the hon. gentleman should have brought this question up on a motion to adjourn, when the Orders of the Day were called, unless, apparently, he desired to make a point against the Government, that they were in some way remiss in enforcing the legislation that is on the Statute-book. Now, if this firm has violated the law in question, a simple remedy seems open to the hon. member, or to any one else, to secure redress. All he had to do was to apply to the Attorney General to put the law in motion, and if he declined to take action, either the hon. member himself or any one else who is interested in having the law enforced, is entitled to start a prosecution. There is a plain law on the Statute-book that would cover what my hon. friend says has been done in Toronto, a heavy penalty is attached to the violation of that law. The Attorney General on his own motion might enforce the remedy, or he might authorize the hon. member for Toronto, or any other person interested in the enforcement of labour laws in Toronto or elsewhere, to take action and sue for a penalty. I submit, that the hon. gentleman has not any grievance, nor is there any grievance because of what has been done. If there is a violation, a plain remedy is provided, a remedy within the reach of any person. He may apply to the Attorney General to act in his own name, or if the Attorney General declines, then such person may institute proceedings on his own behalf.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. member who has just spoken (Mr. Britton) thinks it is competent for any one to commence an action under this Act, but he evidently overlooks clause 8, which says:

> No proceedings under this Act, or prosecutions for violation thereof, shall be instituted without the consent of the Attorney General or some person duly authorized by him.

If I am correctly informed, and I think I am, the labour unions protested against that clause of the Act, and claimed that in the event of its passing, it would make the Act inoperative. As evidence of that it need only be mentioned that the labour unions of Toronto have already consulted counsel as to how far they can proceed under the Act. If it was clear to them, they would not take the trouble to do so, but it is claimed they feel unable to take the action they think they should adopt in defence of their own interest on account of this obnoxious clause. If the Act was intended to be operative, why should not the position be the same as that under any other Act, and any citizen be able to avail himself of it and institute proceedings under it. In order to put the law in motion, why should it be necessary to obtain leave from the Attorney General? The Attorney General does not give his consent in advance to the law being applied in any part of the country, and so the hon. member for Essex (Mr. McGregor) applied to have some person appointed to carry out the Act, but it turned out that it was merely to wink at violations of the law. I thought it was a very strange position for the representative of the Attorney General to occupy, to know the law was violated and not interfere. A similar position is occupied by the hon. member for Toronto, who justifies this law, if I understand him correctly. I take it that the aim is to appoint some few officers favourable to their views and who will

wink at violations of the law. This law should be made applicable to every part of the country, and any citizen be able to take proceedings under it.

Mr. McGREGOR. So they can.

Mr. SPROULE. They cannot without the permission of the Attorney General has been obtained.

Motion to adjourn, negatived.

SUPPLIES FOR THE NORTH-WEST MOUNTED POLICE.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Yesterday my hon. friend from Montreal Centre (Mr. Quinn), who is not in his seat, put a question with respect to a letter he had received from a friend with respect to a contract which had been given to a Chicago firm for supplies for the Mounted Police. The hon. gentleman read a newspaper extract to this effect: "A big contract for feeding the North-west Mounted Police has been awarded to Libbey, McNeill & Libbey, canners and packers." I asked the hon. gentleman to send me the extract so that I might be able to make inquiries, and I am now in position to tell him that there is not a word of foundation for this paragraph.

POSTAGE BILL.

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to ask the Postmaster General whether, in view of the discussion that will ensue on the Bill to amend the Post Office Act, hon. members might be furnished, so that the question might be intelligently discussed, with the names of all publications enjoying free transmission throughout the country, their weights and the nature of such publications. I strongly favour the Bill reimposing postage on these papers, and I think it would be well if the Postmaster General, prior to the discussion, would lay this information on the Table, so that we may thoroughly understand what we are doing in discussing the Bill.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). I will endeavour to meet the hon. gentleman's wishes at the earliest possible moment. I think it is proper that the information should be furnished in reasonable time before the Bill is discussed, and, therefore, I promise not to bring on the Bill for second reading until I have had an opportunity of meeting the hon. gentleman's wishes, or if I am not able to do so, of informing the House of that fact. I am not able to say whether all the information desired is procurable in the department, but all there is will be placed within the reach of hon. members.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The other day, when the hon. Postmaster General introduced the Bill, I suggested to him that it would be convenient if he submitted the financial scheme so far as he could obtain it from the department in order that we might be able to ascertain what his officials consider would be the gain to the department from the re-imposition of stamps on newspapers, and also in regard to the change with respect to stamps on foreign letters. The hon. Postmaster General will remember that we spoke about foreign letters, and it would be a very great convenience to members to know exactly the hon. gentleman's estimate of the amount that will have to be made up by charging 5 cents instead of 3 cents.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman has asked for information on two points. One is strictly applicable to the Bill to which he alludes, and that information I will endeavour to furnish to him in ample time before the discussion of the Bill. The other refers to information, which I fail to see has any connection with the Bill itself. In case the hon. gentleman thinks it has any connection, I will endeavour to meet his view on that point.

ELECTORAL FRANCHISE ACT.

The House again resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 16) to repeal the Electoral Franchise Act and to further amend the Dominion Elections Act.

(In the Committee.)

On section 5,

Mr. McDOUGALL. Before you left the Chair last evening, Mr. Chairman, I met the argument made by the hon. members from Nova Scotia on the other side of the House with respect to what they contended was the universal practice under the Act there with respect to the preparation of the lists, and in support of the explanation I made to the House. I will now take the liberty of quoting the Act. There were two sets of lists prepared by the revisors under the old Act before 1885, namely, for provincial and Dominion elections. In 1871 the local legislature passed a disqualifying Act. That Act was read to the committee by the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Gillies) yesterday. In 1871, this Parliament passed what was called an interim election Act and clause 4 of that Act provides as follows:—

4. All persons nominated as revisers, under chapter 28 of the Acts of the legislature of Nova Scotia, passed in the year 1863, intituled: "An Act to regulate the Elections of Members to serve in the General Assembly," shall, in the present year, 1871, within three months after the passing of this Act, and in any future year at the time of their preparing the annual list of electors qualified to vote at elections of members of the General Assembly, prepare also and file with the clerk of the peace, a like alphabetical list of electors qualified to vote at elections of members to serve in the House of Commons of

Canada, by adding to the lists of voters for members of the General Assembly the names of all officials and employees of the Dominion Government qualified to vote at elections of members of the General Assembly under the laws in force in Nova Scotia on the 1st day of July, 1867, but who may have been disqualified by any Act of the legislature of the province passed after the said day. The lists first made shall form the register of electors of members of the House of Commons until the next year's lists shall be made and perfected and the provisions of sections 25, 26 and 27, respectively, of the said chapter shall be held applicable to such future lists. For any neglect or wilful breach of duty under this section the revisers shall be subject to the like penalties prescribed in section 24 of the said chapter.

Now, Mr. Chairman, when I spoke last night, it was from memory, because I had sent to the Library for the Act of 1871, but could not get in. The hon. member from Yarmouth (Mr. Flint), the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Russell), and, if I mistake not, the hon. member for Inverness (Mr. McLennan) made the statement to the House last night, that there was only one set of lists made out, and that one set of lists made out by the revisers was used for Dominion elections and for provincial elections alike. My object is simply to call the attention of the House to the fact which I have mentioned, and to show that I was speaking from the authority of the Act. Before taking my seat, I wish to call the attention of the Solicitor General and the other lawyers in the House to section 41 of the British North America Act. It reads as follows :—

41. Until the Parliament of Canada otherwise provides all laws in force in the several provinces at the union relative to the following matters, or any of them, namely : the qualifications and disqualifications of persons to be elected or to sit or vote as members of the House of Assembly or Legislative Assembly in the several provinces, the voters at elections of such members, the oaths to be taken by voters, the returning officers, their powers and duties, the proceedings at elections, the periods during which elections may be continued, the trial of controverted elections, and proceedings incident thereto, the vacating of seats of members, and the execution of new writs in case of seats vacated otherwise than by dissolution, shall respectively apply to elections of members to serve in the House of Commons for the same several provinces.

I am not a lawyer, and it is hardly necessary for me to say so, but I would like to get the opinion of the hon. the Solicitor General and other hon. members who are lawyers, on this point : As to whether this Parliament has the power now, after having in the year 1885 adopted a law of this Parliament for the purpose of governing all the federal elections throughout Canada, and which took the place of the then existing provincial laws; I ask now, whether this Parliament has the power to go back again to the provincial laws for the purpose of elections to this House ? Can this Parliament now saddle on the provincial authorities the obligations to take any part in the preparation or the carrying out of the laws which appertain to the election of members to this House ? Section 41 of the British North America Act, it will be remembered, distinctly says :

Until the Parliament of Canada otherwise provides.

I take it, from that section, that after the Parliament of Canada did provide, then the Parliament of Canada, if it complies with the provisions of section 41 of the British North America Act, cannot go back and exact from the provincial or municipal authorities the service in regard to Dominion elections which this Bill casts upon them.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). That is a question of very considerable importance, and I expected to hear it asked in the course of this debate. At the proper time, I will be prepared to discuss it at greater length ; but for the time being I may say, that, after having considered that question, I believe that we can adopt the provincial franchises. Of course, under our view of the case, we are not giving the local legislatures the power to make our franchises ; we are simply adopting for our purposes the franchise they use for theirs. In that view, we do not, in my judgment, come into contact with this section of the British North America Act. The position, as I view it, is absolutely the same as if we took the provincial franchises and incorporated them in our Bill.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). If my hon. friend (Mr. Fitzpatrick) did that, then he would make the creation of this new part of our constitution fixed and permanent. The question put by my hon. friend (Mr. McDougall) is this : That, inasmuch as the British North America Act, which is our written constitution, provided that we should, at a certain time, create a law in accordance with the 41st section of the British North America Act, and that, as we have created that law, then it is part of our written constitution, and cannot be changed. I understood the hon. Solicitor General to say, that he anticipated that question would arise in the debate. If you adopt the provincial franchises, as they are to-day, you make them a part of our constitution, so far as that section is concerned.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I would like to call the attention of the hon. Solicitor General to another section of the Act which it might be important for him to consider in conjunction with the one I have already indicated. I refer to section 92, on exclusive powers of the provincial legislatures. These include : "direct taxation within the province in order to the raising of a revenue for provincial purposes," "the establishment and tenure of provincial officers, and the appointment and payment of provincial officers." They are provincial officers who have

the obligation now of preparing the local lists; and the question in my mind is, what right has this Parliament to direct the work of these provincial officers? There is no provision for their payment by this Parliament, and there is no provision for a separate and distinct appointment. They are only referred to as officers of the provincial legislature, whether appointed by the provincial legislature or by the municipalities acting under an Act of the provincial legislature. Then, there is: "the imposition of punishment by fine, penalty or imprisonment for enforcing any law of the province made in relation to any matter coming within any of the classes of subjects enumerated in this section." The provincial Act provides for the punishment of any local official for refusing or neglecting to perform any of the duties this Parliament is placing upon him. I would like the hon. Solicitor General to consider this section of the Act in conjunction with the other one to which I referred.

Mr. KAULBACH. I feel it my duty as a Nova Scotian and representing a constituency in that province, to offer a remark or two. I have no hesitation in stating that this Franchise Bill is most unpopular, as it does not meet the wishes of the honest, unbiased, and intelligent electorate of this country, inasmuch as it does not grant to every elector of the Dominion, at least so far as Nova Scotia is concerned, that freedom of thought and action, that right of citizenship, that freedom of loyalty and devotion to national sentiment and feeling that should possess an independent spirit, when it rejects, restricts, or rather deprives a voter of his right of franchise so dear to him, because, forsooth, he is the incumbent of a certain office under the Crown,

The most disgraceful part is that appended to this Bill as a memorandum to provincial laws, in which Nova Scotia is coupled under the heading of "Disqualification of Voters," which reads as follows:—

Revised Statutes chap. 4, sec. 67.

Any one who within fifteen days before the election was an employee, or in the receipt of wages or emoluments of any kind as such employee, in the post office, the customs-house, the Inland Revenue Department, the lighthouse service, on the Government railroads, in the Crown lands office or the local public works and mines, but nothing in section to extend to contractors to furnish materials for Government railroads, or to perform any other specific contract in respect of the same or to any person who may have been employed by the day temporarily to repair railroads, or to any postmaster, post office keeper, way office keeper or mail courier.

Is it fair or just to discriminate in this way, and thereby deprive a class of voters of their just franchise, of their right of citizenship, and their freedom to exercise their views as they consider in the best interests of the country? It certainly is not, and the intelligent electorate will decide against it. This class of men as a rule are more intelligent and better capable of discriminating between right and wrong than most others. I say to allow this clause 67 of chap. 4 of the Revised Statutes of Nova Scotia to remain on the statute-books, is an insult to the intelligent electorate, a menace upon the civil rights of the people of the country, more particularly upon Nova Scotia, an exhibition of cowardice, a legacy of lasting disgrace to the legislature of Nova Scotia, and a stain on the pages of history. The hon. Minister of Finance will surely not say that this section as referred to does not disfranchise this class of people who should be voters. They have been disfranchised since 1871, and this Act has operated against them in Nova Scotia ever since, so far as the provincial elections are concerned, and to repeal the present Franchise Act of 1885 and adopt the present provincial Act will be infamous, and an outrage upon this class of people, numbering about one thousand.

Now, I ask, is it fair to still continue this clause in the Nova Scotia Act and make it operative against this class of intelligent and valuable citizens, depriving white men of their rights of citizenship and giving it to Indians? Whilst I do not object to the latter, I certainly do consider the white men should be placed on an equal footing. The hon. Minister of Finance says these officers as named in the clause of the Act referred to will appear in the revised list as voters as well as others, which may be true, or it may not, but so long as this clause which I have referred to should remain unrepealed, their names if on the voters' list can be expunged, and will be before the list passes into the returning officer's hands, and if not then, they certainly will be when the elector appears at the polls, as the agent or inspector of a candidate will require each person so registered to take the oath. I do urge and am most sincere in my request that the Government adopt manhood suffrage, and the infliction of a heavy penalty upon any person offering or receiving a bribe to vote, and I particularly ask that the Government will see proper to inflict a heavier penalty on officials found mutilating or manipulating ballots, or caught at any other infringement of the election law. Dismissal from office would be too trivial. I would say they be disfranchised, and imprisoned for a period not exceeding five years.

Amendment (Mr. Heyd) re Indians, negatived.

Mr. RUSSELL. I wish to move an amendment for the purpose of removing any doubt that may exist regarding the qualification of Dominion officials in the province of Nova Scotia or any of the other provinces. There is no doubt that persons who may not be qualified to vote in provincial elections, for reasons which do not and ought not to apply to their qualification to vote in a Dominion election, should not, on account of their provincial disqualification, be deprived

from voting in the Dominion elections. I wish to move an amendment that will remove any doubts that may exist in this respect. I am not at all sure that, as regards the province of Nova Scotia such an amendment is necessary at all. It certainly was not supposed that such amendment would be required. It was certainly explained by the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), the other night, in the course of the debate on the main question, that it was not the intention—and nobody assumed that it was—of this Bill that officials of the Dominion Government should not be qualified to vote at an election for members of the Dominion Parliament. But, at the same time, it is quite possible that, in the terms in which the Bill is drafted, it might have the effect of throwing a doubt, at all events, upon the qualification of that class of persons to vote. I do not for a moment think that the general principle upon which this Bill is founded will be at all affected by the amendment I intend to move. The general principle of the Bill is that it is desirable that we should adopt, in a general way and for general purposes, the same kinds of franchise as exist in the various provinces. The general principle is that the various provinces are better qualified to pass general judgments in respect of the classes of persons who should exercise the franchise than this Parliament is. For instance, in some of the provinces a woman-rights movement might have acquired a momentum which it had not in the others. In some particular province, the general feeling might be that it was an injustice that women should not have the right to vote, whereas in the other provinces an entirely opposite opinion might prevail, and it might be very repulsive to the general sentiment of those other provinces that women should be enfranchised. The principle of the Bill is that if there should exist those large divergences of opinion amongst the different provinces, we should respect them and adopt the general doctrines and principles which underlie the provisions of the franchise Acts in those various provinces. But if you find exceptional cases, like this which has existed in Nova Scotia since 1871, if you find that for certain reasons it has seemed good to the people of that province that certain particular classes of voters, who would be perfectly competent and ought to vote in Dominion elections, were, for some special reasons, not qualified and could not safely be trusted with the franchise in the provincial elections, it is not at all against the general principle of this Bill that we should provide for those exceptions and not disfranchise for Dominion purposes those who for good reasons might be disfranchised for local purposes. A similar condition might exist in the provinces of Quebec, British Columbia, Manitoba or elsewhere. The sole purpose of the amendment is to provide for those exceptional cases, which can be consistently provided for, even assuming the general principle to remain intact in the large, namely, that we are adopting for the purpose of our Dominion franchise the general principles and sentiments with reference to the right to vote which are entertained in the various provinces. This is not time to expatiate on that general principle. We are supposed to have got past it, and therefore I think it was entirely out of place, at this stage of the Bill, in committee, to make orations on constitutional questions such as we were entertained with by members on the other side of the House. I thought we had discussed all that before we got into committee. We are now discussing simply the dull prosaic but necessary questions of detail for the working out of the general principle which this House resolved upon when we went into committee on this Bill.

Mr. McINERNEY. Whom does the hon. gentleman blame for the constitutional disquisitions that took place ? His hon. leader began the discussion.

Mr. RUSSELL. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. He simply made a reply to the hon. gentleman's disquisition and paid much more attention to it than I thought it was worthy of.

Mr. McINERNEY. He spoke before I did.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, in reply to other disquisitions we previously had from an hon. gentleman on that side, and which, I think, were entirely inopportune, and which we ought to have been favoured with when the principle of the measure was under discussion. It was the misfortune of the promoters and advocates, of the Bill on this side that they were obliged to answer to the same objections in committee which they had answered on the second reading.

Mr. McINERNEY. The property qualification of the voter was under discussion, and that was what we spoke on.

Mr. RUSSELL. We could have discussed that without bringing in the Federalist, and the letters of Plubius and the Brazilian constitution and the South American republics, and the Swiss constitution, and the distinctions of Staatenbund and the Bundesstaat, and all that sort of thing. I do not think it was necessary to bring in the Encyclopedia Britannica on the question whether or not it was advisable to change this provision in its details as to the qualifications of voters.

I do not wish to dwell upon this amendment at any length, as I may have occasion to revert to it later, but I wish to say that whatever may be the reasons which did and do exist for the disfranchisement of Dominion officials in any province, or whatever may be the reasons which any province may conceive, at all events, to exist why Dominion officials of certain classes should be disfranchised for provincial purposes, we

do not want that disfranchisement to continue for the purposes of the Dominion elections. I do not think anybody has asked for it. On the contrary the hon. Minister of Finance, when the principle of the Bill was under discussion, clearly intimated that there was no such intention on the part of the Government. That clearly was not their intention; and if this Bill, as it stands, without any amendment, should have the effect of disqualifying any Dominion officials from voting in Dominion elections, that is a pure accident and is not of the essence of the Bill and never was its intention. That was made so abundantly clear in the remarks of the Minister of Finance, when the principle of the measure was under discussion, that it is not necessary for me to enlarge on it now. At the same time I take this opportunity of calling the attention of the committee to the remarks of the hon. Minister of Finance on this branch of the question. They will be found on page 2869 of "Hansard." He said:

The disqualification which was created by that provincial franchise law of Nova Scotia does not touch the voters' lists at all.

Of course in that he was absolutely correct, and I do not think we ought to be compelled to argue that point for the fourth or fifth time. I was rather complained of by the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) last night for having referred to it as frequently as I did, but I never did refer to it except when the argument was repeated. The hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Mills) interrupted the hon. Minister of Finance and agreed with him. He said:

I never heard any one say to the contrary in this House.

The hon. member for Annapolis agreed that he had never heard anybody say that it was intended that the disqualification created by the provincial franchise touched the voters' lists. The hon. Minister of Finance then said:

Then, if the names of the Dominion officials have always been on the lists used in the Dominion elections, what is all this fuss about?

Mr. MILLS. Because there was an Act passed disfranchising them from voting and that is engrafted in this Bill.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. What right has this House to say to any independent legislature of any province how it shall deal with its own provincial franchise, so long as it does not touch the franchise of this House?

Mr. MILLS. It is going to do that.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is not, and never did.

Mr. MILLS. But that is the intention now.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, there never was any intention of doing that; it did not do it, and will not do it. I want it clearly understood, that, while there were good reasons—which I do not wish to enter into now, because that is a provincial question—for disqualifying the Dominion officials for provincial purposes, that disqualification never touched the voters' lists at all.

Now, that is the position we are in—that this qualification does not touch the voters' lists, and has not touched the voters' lists since 1885—if it did before—when the Act which instructed the revisers to strike off the lists the names of Dominion officials, was explicitly and absolutely repealed. It was discovered, as any one could see—and I wonder that the contention opposed to this has been so often repeated—that you could not strike the names off the lists because it was impossible to tell that these parties would not be properly qualified to vote when an election came on. This shows that they were not disqualified as Dominion officials, but only as being Dominion officials up to within a short time of the election. Ever since that Act was repealed these names have been on the lists, and all I seek by this amendment is to remove any doubt as to the right of these people to vote. I beg to move an amendment to subsection "a" of section 5. Subsection "a" which reads as follows:—

The qualifications necessary to entitle any person to vote thereat shall be those established by the laws of that province as necessary to entitle such person to vote in the same part of the province at a provincial election.

I move that to this subsection the following words be added:—

Provided that any person whose name appears as a voter on any voters' list, and who would be qualified to vote at a provincial election, but from the fact of his being or having been an employee or in receipt of wages or emolument as an employee of any department of the Dominion or provincial government, shall be qualified to vote at an election of a member of the House of Commons, notwithstanding the provisions of any Act disqualifying him from voting at a provincial election.

Mr. McDOUGALL. With the hon. gentleman's permission, I would like to ask him a question. When was that Act repealed?

Mr. RUSSELL. In 1885, when the revised statutes of Nova Scotia were proclaimed.

Mr. McDOUGALL. The Act of 1871 was then repealed?

Mr. RUSSELL. The clause which directed the revisers to strike off the lists all those that were disqualified as officials, was repealed, I say, by the Act of 1885.

Mr. MONK. I do not think that the amendment of the hon. member (Mr. Russell) goes quite far enough, and I intend to propose an amendment covering the employees, both Dominion and provincial, whether they be on the list or not. It seems to me that the hon. gentleman is mistaken in saying that we on this side entered upon long disquisitions on constitutional law. I do not agree with him as to the scope of the discussion on this section. We have, by the second reading of this Bill, adopted the

principle of the repeal of the Franchise Act, but we are now discussing who shall be qualified to vote, and upon that point, it seems to me, the discussion has not wandered in any way beyond legitimate bounds. There is this also to be remembered—and it may be an excuse for any disquisitions, as the hon. member calls them, that they may be entered upon—we find the members of the Government themselves differing as to the scope of the question. Before we had sacrificed the rights of the poor Indian, I understood the Solicitor General to say that he intended to provide for the maintenance of the Indian franchise.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. No, I positively deny that I said anything of the kind, but I said I would provide for the case of public employees.

Mr. MONK. At any rate, after the House took recess, and we met again at eight o'clock, the Prime Minister laid down, as I understood it, as an absolute principle, that we must keep the local lists and not vary them, that we were not going into the details of the local lists to save some voters of a particular class, but we are going to adopt a principle, and would not vary from it in any way. The scope of the amendment which I now propose is to preserve the right of officials, Dominion or provincial, whether their names be on the list or not, whereas the amendment of my hon. friend (Mr. Russell) covers only those officials whose names may be on the list:

> Notwithstanding anything in the law of any province, no official of the Federal Government of the provincial government, regular soldiers or persons enrolled in military schools, shall be disqualified to vote as an elector at any future election of a member or members to serve in the House of Commons.

It seems to me that we cannot be taxed, as I deem it unfairly, with undue zeal to maintain the rights of the voters. It is a well-known principle of the political institutions under which we live, that the franchise, once given, shall not be taken away from the voter, and it is also well known that the greatest ignominy that can be inflicted on any class of men who have enjoyed the franchise is, for some fault they have committed, to withdraw that franchise.

Sir, I approach the discussion of this clause in as judicial a temper as possible. That was insisted upon last night by the leader of the House, and I do not find it a difficult task, because I think we have all agreed as to the necessity of the repeal of the Franchise Act. But what I would draw the attention of the committee to is this: Not once, in the discussion which has taken place, and which has been somewhat protracted already, has any fault been found with the substance of the Franchise Act, as it exists. The fault found with that Act is, that it is too costly and burdensome. What we claim, on this side of the House, is, that it would have been possible to have removed these deficiencies in the previous legislation—deficiencies which are of an accidental nature, if I may use that expression—without making such a drastic change as is proposed by the present Bill. Two or three times already, we have been solicited by the Prime Minister to look for an example to the condition of things that exists in the United States, where the franchise for the election of the members of Congress is the franchise of the different states. But it seems to me, that the United States is the last country to which we should look for an example with regard to our franchise. As we all know, the political conditions there are totally different from our own. They have a presidential government, while we have a parliamentary government, and members of the committee know how very different these two forms of government are. They have, as has been pointed out, a central power which derives its existence from the states forming the confederacy, whereas here we have a power existing in our central body which power owes its existence, not to the provinces that form the Dominion, but to a higher and independent power. And whereas, in the United States, any attempt on the part of the federal power to control the franchise would be resented by the states, here it has always been contemplated that we, in this Parliament, should control our electoral franchise.

Even the 15th amendment to the American constitution, passed after the war of secession, which provided that no person's right to vote should be impaired by reason of colour or any previous condition of servitude, is an amendment which met with much opposition in the states. Even at the present time, in some of those states where that disposition of the constitution has been directly frustrated, attempts are already on foot to have that disposition changed, and the right of the state to control the franchise remains intact as it was before. It seems to me that the conditions here are entirely different. When the neighbouring states formed themselves into a federated power they merely coalesced in order to protect themselves from what they deemed a common enemy; whereas here the reason of our confederation was the prospect of welding together the different parts then divided, of British North America, and of forming one homogeneous community, one great dependency of the British Empire. In our case, the major part of the power was reserved for the Federal Government, whereas in the United States the contrary rule exists, as we all know, and there it is only the enumerated and stated powers which belong to the central government. Therefore, I consider that this measure, as has already been stated, of returning to the provincial franchise, is a retrograde step, if my conception of what was intended at the time of confederation is correct. Now, in regard to the remarks of the right hon.

the Prime Minister concerning universal suffrage in certain provinces, there is much to be said. We all know that in the province of Quebec the words "universal suffrage" brought to our minds for a long time, and they do to-day, the tendencies of revolutionary France, for which tendencies a very large part of our population had no sympathy, indeed I may say the whole of our population, with very few exceptions. But when it comes to extending the suffrage in other provinces, which will take place as an effect of this Bill, then we claim for the province of Quebec the same privileges as those which are enjoyed in the other provinces. It is well known that universal suffrage as it exists in France is removed in a very small degree indeed from what we have here, under the Franchise Act which we are about to repeal. It is well known that the suffrage as it exists in England is removed in an imperceptible degree from the suffrage as it exists in France. If my right hon. friend will consult with those French authors who have written, and some of them have written admirable works, upon the suffrage as it exists in England, he will find that they all agree that it differs very slightly from the universal suffrage of France. Franqueville, for instance, who has devoted a great deal of time to the study of the British constitution, and who has made a careful examination of the electoral franchise in England, declares in his work on the British constitution that the difference is imperceptible. As a matter of fact, it is a more difficult matter to be inscribed on the lists in France and to secure the right to vote, than it is in England. Now, if the result of this legislation is going to be the admission to the suffrage in the other provinces of persons who will be unrepresented in our province, I, for my part, think that the province of Quebec will be unjustly treated. We will have this anomaly, for instance, as regards the province of Quebec, that there will be in this House a set of men who, when a certain class of legislation would come up, will have the right to claim that they represent an electorate far more extensive than we do, and that in regard to certain laws they have a right to speak with more authority than we have. In other words, we will find here representatives elected by a different set of 'mandataires' in every province of the Dominion, which I think would be a step backwards, as was stated here yesterday. But when we come to the details of this legislation, the anomaly comes out still more strongly. Now, with regard to the province of Quebec, what did the right hon. the Prime Minister say? He argued that the provinces formed distinct and separate communities, and to those communities should be left the right to fix the way in which they should choose representatives to this Parliament. Proceeding upon that principle, what do we find as regards the province of Quebec? In 1892, the franchise law of that province excluded the following persons from the right to vote: Judges of superior courts, judges of sessions, district magistrates and recorders, all customs officers, clerks of the Crown and clerks of the peace, registrars, sheriffs, deputy sheriffs, deputy clerks of the Crown, officers of the provincial and municipal police, all agents for the sale of Crown lands, all officials employed to collect dues belonging to Her Majesty, all excise officers, and all collectors of revenue, whether provincial or federal. That was the condition of the provincial law in 1892, it excluded a number of officers, both federal and provincial. In 1897 that law was altered, a change evidently had come over public opinion in the province of Quebec, and by a statute passed in 1897, it was decided that disability as regards public officers should be confined to public officers of the province only. Now, what was the proposition laid down in this extension of the franchise which obtained in 1897? It was the principle that the province considered that federal officials, not being in any way dependent upon the local power, should be admitted to the franchise. Therefore, there was an extension of the franchise. What is the effect of this section as we find it now? It is to establish an absolutely different principle. If this section were passed in its present form, we would disfranchise the officials of the local government; contrary to the principle laid down by the province in 1897, these officials would not be admitted to vote. In this respect, therefore, the Bill in its present shape militates against parts of our population in the province of Quebec who were enfranchised by the enactment of 1897. There is, therefore, in this Bill a violation of the principle which obtained in our province by the law of 1897. Here is another anomaly. Under the laws of our province the official who prepares the electoral lists is obliged to omit from those lists two classes of voters who would be otherwise qualified, that is to say, those who have been found guilty of corrupt practices under the Quebec election law, and also candidates who, in the conduct of an election, have been found guilty of violation of the electoral law.

The law as we have it before us would have for an effect to give those parties found guilty and deemed incompetent and unworthy to vote under the provincial laws the right to vote under the federal statute, they would be admitted to vote for representatives in this House; whereas, as the committee will readily perceive, those found guilty of a breach of one of our own privileges, of the privileges of this House, if found guilty of corrupt practices under our own legislative enactment as to the conduct of elections, would be admitted to vote freely, There is nothing under the law to prevent their names being placed on the electoral

list, because the legislation of our province has said we will omit from the list any person found guilty of violating the local election law, but it does not go the length of saying that those who have violated the electoral law of the Dominion, which the province has not enacted, shall not be admitted to exercise the franchise. This is another anomaly which I think it is our duty to correct by the legislation under discussion.

There is also a class of persons against whom a disability has been provided by our provincial law, and it is an extensive class. I want to call the attention of the Solicitor General to this matter. Section 14 of the Provincial Act of 1897 provides that all those who agree and contract with the Government of Canada or the Government of the province of Quebec, shall not be entitled to vote and have no right to be placed on the electoral list. There is a special provision further by which it is provided that those names must be omitted from the electoral lists by the officers in charge. All those employed during the election are prohibited, under subsection 2 of section 14, from voting during the local election, and they will be prohibited from voting at federal elections. Also those who have been found guilty of offences against the electoral law. So, although the sub-amendment, which I have submitted, does not cover the cases of those which have been found guilty of infractions of the election law, still the fact exists there that if this law is passed without providing against that anomaly, we shall have the prospect of parties who have infringed the provincial electoral law being prevented from voting at our own elections, whereas those who have been found guilty of a breach of our own privileges will be placed on the electoral lists, and, being on those lists, will have the right to vote. I think that at all events we should meet the views expressed by the legislature of Quebec in 1897 and not deny the right to vote to provincial employees. My own idea, and I express it with all due deference, is that this law will be found unworkable and before very long will have to be changed. The right hon. Prime Minister wishes hon. members on this side of the House to suggest some expedient by which, while repealing the Franchise Act of 1885, some different provisions might be found from those which are submitted in this Bill. I think it would have been possible to frame a law by which we would not have been dependent upon the provincial franchises entirely for the elections of members of this House. It must not be forgotten that their revising barrister under the old Franchise Act was a very expensive official, and it would be quite possible to reduce those expenses without making such a drastic change as is proposed. For instance, I can easily imagine that an official entirely and all the time under the control of this Government might proceed to prepare an election list, which would be a Dominion list based on the provincial lists, and thereby two-thirds or three-fourths of the original work would be taken off his shoulders, and he might add to that basis or skeleton of a list such names as he might consider entitled to be placed on a Dominion list, and we would in that manner provide a uniform franchise throughout the Dominion. But there is, it seems to me, a difficulty that we shall always meet in connection with a scheme of this kind. The provincial legislature, when it comes to define a provincial franchise, must always have before its eyes the matters on which the legislature is called to legislate, the subjects which are within the provincial sphere. When the provincial legislature prepares a Franchise Act it must take as its guiding star, if I might use that expression, section 92 of the Consolidated Act, wherein are enumerated the classes of matters which come within the jurisdiction of the provinces; whereas, when we come to frame a Franchise Act for the Dominion we must have before us such a class of subjects as are enumerated in section 91, and we must see that all those members of the community who are interested in the matwithin the power of the province under those fixed in section 92, enumerated in section 91, shall be amply represented here. I will give an example. Education is a subject exclusively relegated to the provinces, and it was within the power of the province under those circumstances to give representation, as was done in England, to the teaching body, the University. But when we come to the subject of coast and inland fisheries in section 91 of British North America Act of 1867, that is a matter relegated to the Dominion Parliament exclusively, and it is our duty to see that all interested classes are represented here. In consequence of this division of the sphere of action, of the powers conferred we will always find the provincial franchise defective to some extent, that it does not give the people of the Dominion the representation to which the people are entitled in view of the class of subjects over which we possess jurisdiction here. That is one of the reasons why before many years we shall be obliged to revert to the system, which I consider is the proper one, under which we control our own franchise, and that was the principle laid down by our constitutional Act. I do not go the length of saying, as my hon. friend from Cape Breton (Mr. McDougall) did, that under the terms of section 41 of the British North America Act we cannot now revert to the provincial franchises. I believe that is certainly the spirit of section 41, and there is a good deal to be said in defence of that proposition of my hon. friend (Mr. McDougall). But this much I do contend: that it was intended by the framers of our constitution that as soon as possible after confederation, with a view of welding the people together, with a view of making one people of all those who inhabited Brit-

ish North America, we should control our own franchise, establish exactly how it should be exercised, and not relinquish that franchise to the provinces, thus producing conditions of inequality, as we are now doing by this Bill. I, therefore, Sir, beg to move my amendment.

Mr. HAGGART. I did not clearly understand the answer given by the hon. the Solicitor General in answer to the hon. member from Cape Breton (Mr. McDougall). Clause "a" of section 5 of this Bill says:

(a) The qualifications necessary to entitle any person to vote thereat shall be those established by the laws of that province as necessary to entitle such person to vote in the same part of the province at a provincial election.

Now, my hon. friend (Mr. McDougall) drew the attention of the Solicitor General to clause 41 of the British North America Act which provides for the using of the provincial franchises for a certain period, and then the establishment of a Dominion franchise. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fitzpatrick) answered that we were adopting a Dominion franchise by this Bill. I could understand that contention if he were adopting the existing provincial franchises for the Dominion Parliament, but he goes a great deal further than that, and I want to know his authority for it. He does not make the existing provincial franchises permanent for this Dominion, but he delegates the power to the provincial legislatures to alter our Dominion franchise from time to time. I want to know if the law officers of the Crown are of opinion that this can be done.

Mr. BELCOURT. I do not rise for the purpose of making a speech, but simply to call the attention of the committee to what I consider a very recent and a very striking endorsement of the principles for which members on this side of the House are contending. I find that in the draft Bill of the constitution for the federation of the Australian colonies, the very principle which was propounded yesterday by the right hon. the Prime Minister, has been approved of. In the report of the proceedings of the conference held for the purpose of determining a constitution for the federated Australian colonies, there is the consecration of the principle for which members on this side of the House are contending. Section 25 of the draft Bill of this constitution reads as follows:—

The qualification of electors of members of the House of Representatives shall be in each state that which is prescribed by the law of the state as the qualification for electors of the more numerous house of parliament of the state.

From that we see that it has been left entirely to the various colonies to determine the nature, quality, and extent of the franchise upon which the members of the House of Representatives of the new federation shall be elected. The enactment goes even further than that, because the effect of it is that for all time to come, the determination of the federal franchise in Australia shall be left entirely to the different colonies. It seems to me that this is a very strong example of the soundness of the theory for which we are contending. Here are a number of colonies enjoying British institutions and which have advanced as much as we have in the way of progress and constitutional government.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, no.

Mr. BELCOURT. Here are colonies which are known the world over for their advanced ideas, both in political and social matters; people who are known for their disdain for the customs and traditions of the old world, and they adopt a franchise provision similar to that which we on this side of the House are contending for. The Australians are a people with whom we have great similarity in our public life, and it seems to me that if the various statesmen of these colonies in conference assembled, after mature deliberation thought proper to accept a franchise principle such as that, it ought to commend itself strongly in support of the point we on this side are contending for.

Mr. MONK. Is that the law, or is it a proposed law?

Mr. BELCOURT. It is a draft Bill adopted by the representatives of all the Australian colonies at a conference held in 1891.

Mr. MONK. It was merely submitted to the conference.

Mr. BELCOURT. It was adopted by the conference as the draft Bill for the new federation.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not agree with the hon. gentleman (Mr. Belcourt) that the Australian colonies have at all reached the position that the Dominion of Canada has reached. They are endeavouring to move in that direction now, and one of the strongest inducements that has operated upon the Australian colonies has been the advanced position that Canada has attained in consequence of her federation. I may say further, that I regret extremely that the Australian colonies have decided to adopt the form of constitution indicated by the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt.) I regret it for the reason that, in my judgment, had the Australian colonies occupied the same position as Canada; had they had the great republic of the United States of America alongside of them, where they could see plainly not only the advantages and the benefits of the constitution of the United States, but also the defects of that constitution, I believe the result in the Australian colonies would be the same as it was in the confederation of Canada. The constitution which the Australian colonies propose to adopt in that regard, is of

the same character as that which was adopted in the United States of America. I believe that if the United States of America were to-day forming their constitution, in the light of a century of experience, they would adopt the Canadian constitution, and not that which they now possess. Every person knows that an internecine struggle, which cost an enormous sacrifice of human life and an untold amount of public money, arose precisely from that feature of their constitution which, unfortunately, our friends in the Australian colonies are now copying. The federal constitution of the United States was formed under the most tremendous stress of absolute necessity in connection with their foreign relations. That constitution was adopted by the sovereign states, retaining the power and position of sovereign states; but, being compelled to surrender a certain portion of their power for the purpose of having a federal government, they formed it on the basis of surrendering as little as possible and keeping in the hands of the sovereign states as much as possible. I am very sorry to find the Australian confederation pursuing the same policy, and I feel that the time is not remote when it will find that the adoption of the Canadian constitution would have been infinitely preferable. When the representative of the various Canadian governments met at Quebec in 1864 to lay the foundation of the federation of Canada, they had before them the example of what had occurred in the United States, and they adopted precisely the opposite principle to that which the United States had adopted. Instead of treating the various provinces of the Dominion as sovereign states, and surrendering a small portion of the power they possessed for the purpose of forming a confederated government, we took the opposite course of giving to the federal power everything that was not specifically defined by a written constitution as appertaining to the local legislatures, and I have no hesitation in saying that, after more than thirty years' experience, the policy that commended itself to the founders of the confederation of Canada, is endorsed to-day by the public sentiment and intelligence of Canada from end to end. Therefore, I do not attach much importance to what the hon. gentleman has drawn the attention of the House to. But, Sir, while I am on my feet, I may as well say that I am extremely glad to find that my hon. friend the Solicitor General stated to the House yesterday that, while he could not entertain the proposal to extend the franchise to the Indians, he was prepared to consider the question of restoring the franchise for this House to a large number of officials throughout the Dominion who, under the local Acts, are disfranchised. My hon. friend saw the impropriety of adopting without qualification the franchise of the various provinces; because, having very considerately supplied the members of the House with a rescript of those franchises, and also a statement of the persons who are disqualified from voting in the various provinces, he saw that, if this Act were not amended as proposed by the hon. member for Halifax, many persons would be disqualified from voting at a federal election. Therefore, the hon. gentleman has consented—I think, most wisely, and in conformity with the pledge given by the leader of the House last night—to give full consideration to any important modifications of this Act that may be shown to be necessary for its improvement or for its more effective working. Now, Sir, I was astonished that a learned professor of law, the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Russell) should still go over the story of the Nova Scotian law. I will not appeal to him, because his mind seems to be closed, and absolutely incapable of appreciating anything which, to my mind, the plainest principles of law show. I am not a lawyer; but they say that common law is common sense; and if so, I will appeal to my hon. friend the Solicitor General on this point, which is a very important one. I will give my hon. friend the position of the question as exactly and as concisely as possible. The Bill now before us provides that the qualification of voters shall be the qualifications that entitle persons to vote for members of the local legislatures in the different provinces. Well, Sir, what is the position in Nova Scotia? The hon. gentleman has only to turn to the papers put in the hands of the members of this House, to find that it is here stated that, by the law of Nova Scotia, persons entitled to vote in that province are those whose names are on the voters' lists; and the statutes of Nova Scotia contain this clause, which has been read again and again, disqualifying a large number of persons, specifically named, from voting at an election for the legislature of the province. Now, I ask the Solicitor General's attention to this clause, which is to be found on the Statute-book of Nova Scotia to-day:

> The following persons, being of the full age of twenty-one years and subjects of Her Majesty by birth or naturalization, and not disqualified by any section of the Act,——

And I have directed your attention to the section of the Act that disqualifies a large number of persons:

> ——or otherwise by law prevented from voting, shall be entitled to have their names entered on the list.

Mr. RUSSELL. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him one question: Whether there is anything in that Act saying that a person shall not have his name placed on the list, simply because at the time the list is made up he is a Dominion official?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I told my hon. friend I had given him up, and I do not intend to appeal to him again, but I shall

appeal to the Solicitor General, and I am prepared—I do not hesitate to say—to accept the Solicitor General's ruling. If he says that I am wrong and that the hon. member for Halifax is right, I shall begin to doubt the strength of the position I occupy. But what are the facts? Those revisers are sworn to put only the names on the voters' lists of those entitled to vote, and they perjure themselves if they do what the hon. gentleman says they ought to do and what they have done.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the hon. gentleman will allow me——

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am not surprised that my hon. friend is so very restive because I have appealed from Pilate to Cæsar, and therefore he has grown a little restless. If that very election law declares that A, B and C shall not be entitled to have their names on the list, then the revisers, who are sworn to put only the names on the list of those who are not disqualified by any clause of this Act, will have perjured themselves if they put those names on.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. But if the Act does not say so.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The Act does.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The legal gentlemen say it does not.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not wonder that the hon. Minister of Finance is glad to crawl under the cloak of the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Russell) in a question of this kind. If common law is common sense, and the Act declares that a certain number of persons shall be disqualified and instructs the revisers not to put their names on the list, there is an end to the question, and it is waste of time discussing it further. I might tell my hon. friend who has moved this amendment that evidently the Government have become awake to the fact that this measure which they have proposed would, in its present form, be most improper, and that the adoption, pure and simple, of the voters' list prepared for the local elections, would disfranchise thousands of men throughout this Dominion, and the very best men qualified to exercise the franchise. I therefore am glad to find that my hon. friend the Solicitor General is willing to meet the difficulty by some such amendment as is proposed by the hon. member for Halifax, but I shall tell him wherein that amendment fails entirely to accomplish its object. It contains the same vice that is contained in the provincial law. Under that law, we cannot get these names on the voters' lists, and therefore this amendment fails entirely to meet the case. This amendment provides that any person whose name appears as a voter on any voters' list, and because he is disqualified to vote at the provincial election, from the fact of his being an employee of the Dominion or provincial government, shall be qualified to vote at a Dominion election. But that will not enable us to get the names of these persons put on the list. As the law stands, it is impossible to get their names on, and therefore, even with this amendment, they will be disfranchised all the same. I draw the attention of the hon. Solicitor General to this, and ask him that this amendment should be amended as is proposed by the amendment of my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk):

> Provided that notwithstanding anything in any law of any province no official or employee of the Federal Government or of the provincial or local governments, regular soldiers, or persons enrolled in the military schools or in receipt of wages from either of the governments, shall be disqualified from voting as an elector at any future election for the House of Commons.

That will cover the case.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I am obliged to say that neither amendment will meet the case. The amendment of my hon. friend from Halifax would, in my judgment, meet the case of Nova Scotia, but these amendments are not sufficient, because they do not provide the machinery. I have an amendment which, I think, will go further than either.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Then perhaps it would be as well if my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) would withdraw his amendment to the amendment so that we might hear the amendment of the Solicitor General.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The motion has not been put to it.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not wish to weary the House with the contention that has been raised between the hon. leader of the Opposition and myself, but I do feel that, in justice to myself, I should explain the reason why I think he did not do full justice to even my very poor and humble merits as an expositor of the construction of a statute. I pointed out to the House that there was an Act passed in Nova Scotia in the year 1871 or 1872, which continued to exist for some years, under which it was improperly made the duty of the revisers to leave off from the lists the names of persons whom they supposed to be disqualified by virtue of their holding Dominion offices up to with fifteen or thirty days, as the case might be, of the holding of a Dominion election. I pointed out further that very soon it was discovered that the Act required the revisers to have some process of divination by which, months or years before an election, they could discover what Dominion officials would and would not be disqualified at the time an election happened to be pending. My hon. friend has entirely overlooked the fact that it is not Dominion officials, as such, who are disqualified from

voting in Nova Scotia, but only those who have been in receipt of wages or emoluments within fifteen or thirty days of a Dominion election. If the hon. gentleman will do me the justice to apply his strong, vigorous intellect to this question, he will see in a moment that I am right, and there is no need for an appeal from Pilate to Cæsar. In fact, I did not suppose there was any appeal from Pilate to Cæsar, but there was an appeal from another functionary to Cæsar. However, I am not going to discuss Scripture with my hon. friend, because on that subject he would be the better authority. But I wish to point out again that it was impossible for the revisers, in making up their lists in February, March or April, to decide that any given official of the Dominion Government would be disqualified or not at the next provincial election in which those lists would be used.

For he would not be disqualified unless he continued to be a Dominion official up to 15 days before the time when the election was held. Therefore, it was discovered that it was an absurd thing to have that statute striking the names off the lists or preventing them going on the lists, and the clause of the statute which contained that enactment was, therefore, very properly repealed, and ever since 1885, if not before, the names of these Dominion officials who possessed the qualifications for voting have always been placed upon the lists. They are placed upon the list at this day, and very properly so, and the revisers, so far from perjuring themselves by putting them on the lists, would perjure themselves if they did not do so—they are bound to put them on the lists, it is their legal duty, and they know their duty so well that they always put them on the lists. I think that is a fair and square statement of the case under the statute and under the existing state of affairs in Nova Scotia.

Now, seeing that a discursive debate is to be held, that hon. gentlemen opposite insist that we shall not be confined to the matters immediately under the attention of the committee, I wish to call the attention of my hon. friend, and of other gentlemen on the other side who are so passionately devoted to the rights of the independent electors of the Dominion, to the way in which the supposed evil inflicted on the country by the Nova Scotia statute of 1871 was remedied by the Dominion Act passed in 1882. They were very anxious about the rights of voters about that time. They discovered that if they adopted the franchise law of the province of Nova Scotia, a number of Dominion officials of various kinds would be disfranchised, officials in the post office, in the custom-house, in the inland revenue department, in the lighthouse service, on Government railroads, in the Crown lands office and in the local public works and mines. These men are entitled to their votes. We say they are entitled to their votes as electors of members for the Dominion Parliament, and we intend to see that their votes shall be preserved them by an Act of this Parliament. Well, what did these hon. gentlemen do to give these men the franchise and remove that mischief? So far as I can understand, and unless something can be pointed out to me to justify a different conclusion, I say that what they did was to take one favoured class out of these proscribed classes and give the vote to that class and to no other.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Is that the subject before the Chair?

Mr. RUSSELL. The hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) is very sensitive now about wandering from the subject before the Chair. We are discussing the law of Nova Scotia and it is necessary for us to go into the history of the enactments in that connection. I propose to read an amendment put upon the Statute-book of the Dominion on a similar line to the one which we propose to-day, to show how much more restricted it is. Here is the amendment:

> Notwithstanding anything in the law of the province of Nova Scotia or of the Dominion of Canada, no employee of the Intercolonial Railway in that province shall be disqualified to vote as an elector at any future election of a member or members to serve in the House of Commons of Canada, if he shall have the necessary property and other qualifications therefor required by law. In the event of the name of any such elector being an employee of the Intercolonial Railway, having been omitted by the revisers from the lists of qualified voters for a member of the General Assembly of Nova Scotia under the laws in force in that province, or to be returned to the county clerks or clerks of the peace, or omitted from the lists of voters deposited by the sheriff with the county clerks or clerks of the peace or obtained by the returning officer, or furnished to the deputy returning officer, it shall be lawful for such employee to vote as an elector at any future election of a member or members to serve in the House of Commons of Canada, on his taking or offering to take before the sheriff or returning officer the following oath:—

Now, were there no other persons than employees of the Intercolonial Railway disfranchised by the Act which the hon. gentleman characterized as so iniquitous and unjust? What about those in the post office, in the custom-house, in the Inland Revenue Department, in the lighthouse, on Government railroads, and in the Crown lands office, and in the local public works and mines? If I am right—and I am ready to receive light on the subject, and will be glad to receive it at this moment, if the hon. gentleman can show me that I am mistaken—if I am right, they left out all these disfranchised people except those on the Intercolonial Railway. Those they could take, I suppose, on trolleys and vote them where they wanted to, and those who would not vote for them they could conveniently ar-

range to have trollied away on railway service somewhere else. They could do as has been explained by the Minister of Railways, who gave us an exposition on the subject of shingles a year ago.——

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. All of which was false.

Mr. RUSSELL. But this was not false, because it remains on the permanent records of Parliament. These gentlemen enfranchised those officials whom they could control and make use of in elections, and left out the others. They remind one of the humour of Artemus Ward who used to amuse us years ago with the recital of an effort to arouse indignation on the subject of the wrongs and agonies of the slave. Doesn't your blood bile when you hear their chains clank ?" he asks, and the answer is "Nary a bile ; let 'em clank." Their blood did not bile for these men in the post office, the lighthouse service, the Crown Law Office, the Public Works and Mines. The fine dramatic frenzy of the hon. leader of the Opposition and the hon. gentleman who sits beside him was restricted exclusively to the case of the Intercolonial Railway officials. There is another hon. gentleman here who grows very fervent, he has extreme passionate fervors of moral indignation about things that are improper and unjust. I refer to the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill). I am always glad to hear him, for I believe his fervors are genuine, every thrill and every tremor is genuine and sincere. I listen to him always with the greatest interest. I regard him almost as a means of grace, it is the next thing to going to church to listen to him. I want to know if he is aware of what a vast field there is here for the exercise of these holy emotions that kindle and warm the heart and illumine the conscience. I present this case to him, because I know that when he has looked into it and sees the wrong done to so many people under the guise of a remedy for a wrong inflicted by a provincial statute, he will one day indulge us with an exhibition of this fervor of moral enthusiasm with which he so often moves and thrills the House.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, we who desire to go on with the discussion of the matter before the Chair must protest——

The DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Mills) has the floor.

Mr. MILLS. I have listened with pleasure to the hon. member for Halifax telling us of the Act which restored the votes of these Dominion officials in Nova Scotia. But the hon. gentleman should have gone a little further. He should have told this House how it was that that clause came to be upon the Statute-book. It was not on a general discussion of the Franchise Act or of the franchise of Nova Scotia or of the different provinces, but it came up exceptionally in connection with another Act that was being put through this House, which Act was called the Representation Act—"An Act to readjust the representation in the House of Commons, and for other purposes." When that Act was put through this House, there was nothing at all said with reference to restoring the franchise to these disfranchised people in Nova Scotia. But when it came to the Senate, the senators, who were more thoroughly imbued than any other representatives of Nova Scotia, with the iniquity of this disfranchisement of the people employed in the Intercolonial Railway, introduced an amendment, and when the Bill came back to this House, the amended Bill was put through in the form in which it stands at the present time. So, it was not upon a general discussion of the franchise as worked in Nova Scotia that that clause was put upon the Statute-book, it was put there incidentally.

If you were to look at the discussion which took place, you will see that even that was opposed by the Hon. Edward Blake, and by other members on the Liberal side of the House. There was not any motion made by the Liberals of that day that the lighthouse keepers or other Dominion officials in Nova Scotia should be restored to the list. But this Act was put there incidentally to the general Act which I have recited. Now I want to speak with reference to the amendment that is now before the House. I congratulate the promoter of the Bill upon the attempt that he has made to restore the franchise to those officials in Nova Scotia and throughout Canada, for that is the object of the amendment which he is about to propose, I believe. But I desire emphatically to point this out to him, and I point it out with a good deal of modesty, not that I am entirely certain, but simply because I have a desire that there should be no misunderstanding in these matters. If this Act is to be placed upon the Statute-book we will find, in Nova Scotia particularly, that the lists will be prepared by men who can be confused by every lawyer that might come up, on one side or the other ; and we want the law made so plain that they will not be confused, that they will know what they are doing. What is the law now with reference to this matter in Nova Scotia ? With the permission of the House I will read it :

The following persons, if of the full age of twenty-one years and subjects of Her Majesty by birth or naturalization, and not disqualified by any section of this Act, or otherwise by law prevented from voting, should be entitled to have their names entered upon the list of electors provided for by the sections of this Act, and if so entered, shall be entitled to vote at elections of members to serve in the House of Assembly.

Then it goes on to give us the different clauses of the enfranchisement Act. Now how are "they otherwise prevented from voting?" That is the point to which I wish to draw particular attention. I do it in all modesty, not being absolutely sure of my contention, but I think I am right. How are they otherwise prevented from voting? I say they are otherwise prevented from voting by an affidavit presented to them as they enter the polls, and by which they will have to swear before they can vote, that they have not been for the last 15 days—I think it is 15—in receipt of pay or emolument as a Dominion official. If that is not "otherwise preventing them from voting," I should like to know what is. If that is so, then they are not entitled to go on the list. At all events, if that is not so, I take this ground, that it is very easy to convince a reviser who is not a lawyer, a partisan reviser, who wants to give all the doubts in favour of his own party, it is easy to make him believe it is so. When a Dominion official, who happens to be a Tory voter, comes up, they will say: This man is otherwise prevented from voting, he cannot get on this reviser's list. Therefore his name is dropped, and not being on the list, he cannot vote for a member of this House. Now, I put that before the Solicitor General. It may not be the law, but I say the effect is precisely the same as if it were the law, the effect is the same upon the revisers, who are not learned in the law, and who, if they have any doubt, and being partisans, will always give the benefit of the doubt to their own side, and they will do what partisan lawyers or partisan heelers will attempt and coerce them to do. Therefore, I ask the Solicitor General to make it absolutely sure that there can be no mistake with reference to this matter.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The Solicitor General stated that he did not approve either of the amendment of my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), nor of the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Russell). I think it would be a great convenience to the committee if the hon. gentleman would move his amendment now, or else let us know what its terms are to be.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I am not prepared to move an amendment at the present time, but I will draft an amendment and submit it to the Government, and bring it down at a future day. But I am prepared now to state the lines upon which we intend to go. I am of the opinion that the amendment of my hon. friend from Halifax does not go quite far enough, because there are some provinces, particularly Manitoba and British Columbia, in which a public official would not be on the list at all; therefore his amendment would not apply to cases arising in those provinces. In my amendment I propose to provide for two different cases, the case of a province, for instance, in which a Dominion official would be on the list, but who would not have the right to vote; then I also endeavour to provide for those cases which may arise in provinces where the Dominion official would not be on the list at all. I do not think I could accept the amendment of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, because it does not provide for any machinery. In the case of a man not being on the list of voters for a Dominion election, something must be done to enable him to exercise the right to vote. I think we would have some difficulty in passing a law here which would oblige local officials to put upon their lists Dominion Government officials who would not have a right to vote in local elections. We have to protect ourselves against that also.

Mr. MONK. I merely wanted the House to sanction the principle, and leave it to the Solicitor General to provide the machinery.

Mr. BENNETT. I wish to call attention to the fact that in the province of Ontario it is an utter impossibility for Dominion officials who are proscribed by the Act from voting, to appear on a local list at all. The list is first prepared and printed, and after it is exhibited, appeals may be made against it. Upon showing to the county court judge that these parties are prevented by the Act from voting, he strikes them off that list.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I do not think he has any right to do that. I take it that there is a vast distinction between the voters' lists and an election Act. In Ontario a man who is a Dominion official has a right to be on the list, but when he goes to exercise his right to vote, then he is met with the disqualification of section 4, the disqualification of the Election Act, but up to that time he cannot be dealt with. He must remain on the list, and being on the list, for instance, on the eve of an election, surely he cannot be cut out of his right to vote.

Mr. BENNETT. I submit according to the Act, which clearly says he shall not vote, that on appeal being made to the county court judge, who is the official that presides at these trials, he would have a perfect right to say that the party being then such Government official, had not a right to vote. Let me point out this fact, that there is nothing in the Election Act—and I am distinguishing that now from the voters' list—which prevents a man from voting if he presents himself to vote, if he is able to take the oath, upon being objected to.

But there is nothing in that Act which has reference to the fact that a custom-house officer, or excise officer, or any of the class is proscribed. So it must necessarily follow that, as regards Ontario, some clause must be framed to meet the class of voters which will be struck from the voters' lists.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. My intention is to meet that point.

Mr. McINERNEY. When do you propose to submit the amendment ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. On Monday.

Mr. BENNETT. When the debate commenced, the right hon. First Minister denounced the last Franchise Act, but last night he changed the tune of his remarks and apologized for the difficulties that confronted the House. The hon. gentleman stated that, if amendments were submitted from this side of the House he was prepared to discuss them, with a view to arriving at a mutual understanding and concurrence in the measure. It must be plain, from the discussion on what is only a slight defect, as compared with other defects that will be pointed out, that the Act cannot by any possibility go into effect. I would suggest that, as Saturday intervenes, a committee might be appointed from both sides of the House to see if it is not possible to arrive at a basis with respect to this Bill. It is obvious at the present time that the discussion may go on indefinitely on this line.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I can quite understand the desire of the hon. Solicitor General to have time to consider this question, in regard to which we have had a most interesting discussion, and he can obtain that time between now and Monday. But I might suggest, that it is impossible to proceed, in the absence of the clause or amendment which the hon. gentleman proposes to submit. I ask the leader of the House and the Solicitor General, whether it would not be the wisest course to adjourn the debate until Monday, because I am afraid, otherwise, we shall lose the entire evening. We are, in fact, beating the wind, when we are discussing a clause in the Bill in regard to which the Solicitor General proposes to submit an amendment, especially in view of the fact that it deals with a vital question. I think we would really promote the business of the House by adjourning the debate until Tuesday.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. It is not my intention to move an amendment to the section under discussion, but to introduce a substantive clause to relieve the particular condition pointed out.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It amounts to the same thing. We cannot continue the discussion in the face of the communication made by the Solicitor General. We have now two amendments before the committee. I suggested to my hon. friend (Mr. Bennett) to withdraw his amendment—the amendment was not submitted, but the hon. gentleman stated what he proposed to move—and to deal with the matter at a later period of the debate. The leader of the House must see the necessity, under the circumstances, of adjourning the debate.

The PRIME MINISTER. I think the answer given by the Solicitor General is conclusive. I understand, from the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, that he only wanted to affirm a certain principle and to leave the Solicitor General to provide the machinery, and he would not press his amendment. I understand, the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Russell) will not press his amendment. The section can, therefore, be carried, the Solicitor General having promised to introduce an amendment at the next sitting. I suggest to proceed with the consideration of the Bill, which will not go through committee until the Solicitor General has brought in his amendment. There is no reason, at all events, why we should not consider other sections, leaving this clause, with the understanding that it will be supplemented by another one, which will be drafted in the direction suggested by the amendments submitted by the hon. members for Jacques Cartier and Halifax.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. It would be a matter of great convenience to myself to have certain other clauses discussed. I will require the assistance of the members of the committee as regards section "c," which provides the date within which the election lists cannot be attacked by any action of a local legislature, and the committee could very well spend an hour in discussing that point.

Mr. TAYLOR. Have a conference.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. My hon. friend the Solicitor General will see, on a little reflection, that what he proposes is absolutely impracticable. We have reached a cardinal point in the Bill. Not only the Opposition, but a large number of prominent members on the other side of the House supporting the Government, do not agree with this clause, as proposed. Two amendments have been moved by hon. members supporting the Government. No progress can be made under the circumstances, and the evening sitting will be entirely wasted, if the clause as suggested is not adopted and the debate adjourned. My hon. friend behind me (Mr. Bennett) also moved an amendment, but it cannot be discussed until the Solicitor General has submitted his proposition to the committee. If the Solicitor General had been prepared to submit his amendment at once, it could have been considered during the recess and discussed at the evening sitting, but he was not prepared to do so, and, no doubt, he acted wisely in taking further time to prepare it. I cannot understand why the Government should hesitate, anxious as we all are to deal in a business-like way with this measure and pass it as promptly as possible, to adopt my suggestion and adjourn the debate.

The PRIME MINISTER. I must confess, that I cannot understand why my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition insists so strongly upon having the de-

bate adjourned, for difficulties arise on every Bill, and sometimes, when amendments are proposed, a clause is allowed to stand, and the committee proceeds to consider the other sections. That happens on nearly every occasion.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If you allow this clause to stand, then we may take up other portions of the Bill; I do not object to that.

The PRIME MINISTER. I am quite willing to do either one or the other, but not to adjourn the debate. The amendments do not propose to vary the texts, but they propose to make an addition to the Bill. My hon. friend the Solicitor General proposes to have the section carried, and he pledged himself that he would bring in an amendment. If it be more acceptable to my hon. friend, the clause can stand and we could proceed with the Bill this evening.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have no objection to that.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Paragraph "a" of this clause can stand and we can discuss the other clauses.

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

After Recess.

NICKEL STEEL COMPANY OF CANADA.

On the Order,

House in Committee on Bill (No. 96) to incorporate the Nickel Steel Company of Canada.—(Mr. Wood, Hamilton.)

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). I would ask the House, if possible, to allow this Bill to go through to-night, as I am not well, and would like to get away to catch the train to go home. It has been through two committees, and I would feel obliged if the House would grant me this indulgence.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not think any person will be disposed to object to that. This Bill, which was referred to the Railway Committee, has received careful consideration of that committee and has met with its approval, and I should imagine that there can be no objection to the measure being passed under the circumstances.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. It may be done, with the unanimous consent of the House.

Bill considered in committee, reported and read the third time and passed.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 92) to incorporate the Canada Atlantic Transit Company.—(Mr. Belcourt.)

Bill (No. 50) to incorporate the Ottawa, Montreal and James Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. Fraser, Guysborough.)

Bill (No. 56) respecting the Montreal and Province Line Railway Company.—(Mr. Penny.)

Bill (No. 62) to incorporate the Tamagamingue Railway Company.—(Mr. McHugh.)

Bill (No. 78) respecting the St. John Bridge and Railway Extension Company.—(Mr. Ellis.)

Bill (No. 80) respecting the Ottawa and New York Railway Company.—(Mr. Belcourt.)

Bill (No. 86) respecting the Brockville and St. Lawrence Bridge Company.—(Mr. Wood, Brockville.)

LONDON AND LAKE HURON RAILWAY.

The House resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 67) to incorporate the London and Lake Huron Railway.—(Mr. Lister.)

(In the Committee.)

Mr. LISTER. I want to re-insert section 14 which was struck out by the Railway Committee, and I move an amendment to that effect.

Mr. BERGERON. Has notice been given of it?

Mr. LISTER. No.

Mr. BERGERON. You cannot do it.

Mr. LISTER. Then I ask that the Bill stand over.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Will the hon. gentleman read the section he proposes to insert?

Mr. LISTER. It is as follows:—

Provided that, with the assent of the municipal council or other authority having jurisdiction over highways, the company may go on putting up telegraph and electric poles.

The chairman of the Railway Committee said that this was provided for in the general Railway Act, and, therefore, this section, which was in the Bill, was entirely unnecessary; but I find, on looking over the Railway Act, that it does authorize the erection of telegraph and electric poles for the purpose of carrying electricity and so on, but not for the purpose of motive power, and that was the purpose of this section.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Under those circumstances, I think that notice is not required.

Mr. FOSTER. Does not the clause in the general Bill cover the case? These poles are for carrying electricity.

Mr. LISTER. It covers the case of electric poles for lighting purposes, and to make the Act perfectly clear I propose to insert this section.

Mr. BERGERON. The objection I have is this. This Bill was before the Railway Committee and there thoroughly discussed, and now the House is asked to revise what was done by the Railway Committee and make an amendment without notice having been given of it. I do not want my hon. friend to imagine that I desire to prevent him putting the clause, but the reason a notice is required is that every hon. member should have an opportunity of seeing what the amendment is like. When anything is passed upon by the Railway Committee, it is a serious matter to change it.

Mr. LISTER. If the committee knew that we had not this power in the general Railway Act, they would have passed section 14, because there was no objection whatever to it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman states that there was no objection to this clause, but that it was merely stricken out in consequence of the belief that the power asked for is authorized by the general Railway Act. After careful examination, the hon. gentleman finds that, at all events, there is a doubt, and I may say that what he has stated is my recollection of what took place in the committtee. I think, therefore, this is a case in which we need not insist on a notice.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. The only objection is that you will thereby establish a precedent which may be a dangerous one.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It does not establish any precedent.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). No doubt my hon. friend has correctly stated the circumstances under which the section was stricken out. The chairman of the Railway Committee stated quite positively that it was not necessary to incorporate this 14th clause in the Bill, because it would be found in the general Act. I was aware myself that the Railway Act did provide for the use of electricity as a motive power in the propulsion of railway cars, and I thought, therefore, that the chairman might be correct in the statement he made. But in strictness I think that perhaps he was in error, and as there is a doubt, I hope there will be no objection to this amendment, any more than there usually is to our agreeing to a good many things which are clearly right and undisputed.

Mr. BERGERON. With these explanations, I withdraw my objection.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

ELECTORAL FRANCHISE ACT.

The House again resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 16) to repeal the Electoral Franchise Act, and to further amend the Dominion Elections Act.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Clause 5 will stand. Clause 6.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It was agreed that we should allow the clause we were discussing to stand.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Clause 5 is to stand.

Mr. McINERNEY. The whole clause, or only subsection "a"?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Why should we not take up subsection "b" of clause 5?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. And merely allow subsection "a" to stand over? Yes, I think that would answer the purpose.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Then, we go on with subsection "b."

(b) The polling divisions shall be those established or under the laws of that province for the purposes of provincial elections within the territory comprised in the electoral district for which such election is held.

Mr. McINERNEY. I wish to move an amendment to that clause, in line with the remarks that I made yesterday evening. The hon. Solicitor General will remember that I brought up a few cases in which it would be perfectly impossible to apply the Dominion Procedure Act in elections to the local districts. I named some cases in which in the local subdivisions for local elections there were from 800 to 1,000 names on the local list.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. That would be in New Brunswick?

Mr. McINERNEY. Yes. It is very easy to poll these votes in the local elections, because the ballot is entirely different. In our local election, the canvassers have the ballots outside the polling booth, the names of the candidates being written or printed on the ballot. A man may leave home with the name of the candidate he wishes to vote for written on a ballot, and this he hands to the returning officer, and, if he has the right to vote, the ballot is put in the box. Our elections are held sometimes in the summer time, and very often an open window in some public building, a schoolhouse or something of that kind is taken; the ballot-box is in the window, and the returning officer sitting immediately behind it, with the representatives of the different candidates. The voter comes up to the window and gives his name; the returning officer takes the ballot and puts it in the box. And so it is easy to poll from 800 to 1,000 votes a day. The Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr.

Blair) will bear me out in saying that in some parishes in the county of Kent in the elections in which he took part, we poll as high as 600 and 700, and even 800 votes, but that cannot be done with the Dominion Elections Act, the Dominion ballot or the Procedure Act with regard to the federal election. Therefore, I submit, this clause cannot apply. The clause taking the local subdivisions and applying the Dominion Act to them would bring about a deadlock, it seems to me, on the day of election. I, therefore, move in amendment:

Provided there shall not be more than 300 voters in any subdivision.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). Perhaps, my hon. and learned friend would permit me to make an observation which may get over the difficulty. Under the election law of the province of New Brunswick, I find that the whole province is divided up into subdistricts, and the statute fixes the polling places in such subdistricts. It is provided, by amendment to the statute, that:

When the number of voters on the list in any one polling subdistrict exceeds four hundred, it shall be lawful for the returning officer to provide two boxes for such subdistrict, dividing the registered list of the voters alphabetically, so as to allow as nearly as may be an equal number of voters to deposit their ballots in each box, and for that purpose the returning officer may employ such additional clerks or deputies as may be required, and a separate check list, statement and return shall be kept and made for and in respect of each division of any such polling subdistrict.

I apprehend that what my hon. friend would like is some such provision for the Dominion elections, in order to avoid the difficulty he points out. In view of what has been said in the course of the debate, and seeing the force of the objections raised by the hon. gentleman and others on the other side of the House, the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals prepared an amendment which, I think, will meet the difficulty.

Where a polling division has more than 250 qualified voters, according to the voters' list, the returning officer shall provide separate and additional polling stations or rooms, according to the total number of qualified voters on the voters' list, near to one another for the polling of the votes in such polling division, and so that no more than 250, nor when practicable not less than 200, qualified voters' names shall be on the list for each polling station or room.

(2) The returning officer in such cases shall prepare, or cause to be prepared from the voters' list for the polling division a separate list for each polling station or room, made up in alphabetical order according to the initial letter of the surname of each voter. Each separate polling station or room shall be designated with the initial letters of the voters on the lists who are to vote in such station or room in the following manner, that is to say: from A to K, and from L to R, and from S to Z, or as the case may be.

(3) Every voter, the initial of whose name shall be included within the letters of the alphabet designating a polling station or room, and contained in such list shall vote in the station or room so designated. The returning officer shall appoint a deputy returning officer for each station or room, and shall deliver to such deputy in due time a list certified by him to be a correct list of all voters on the voters' list whose surnames commence with the letters of the alphabet included within the letters by which such polling stations or rooms are designated.

That will provide for each congested district, such as that referred to by my learned and hon. friend, so that each polling station shall not have more than 250 qualified voters.

Mr. McINERNEY. I would propose an amendment that there shall not be more than 400 voters on any list for any polling subdivision.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Let me point out that the polling subdivisions are under the control of the local legislature in New Brunswick, and when that legislature says that they shall extend over a certain territorial area, we must make some provision for polling the votes in that area. Then we want to adopt the very same system they have in New Brunswick for local elections.

Mr. McINERNEY. I do not think it is absolutely necessary to cut down the number to 250, or 200. My hon. friend from Cape Breton (Mr. McDougall) shows me a subdivision in his county in which there are 398 names on the list under the old Franchise Act we have repealed. In many subdivisions there are over 300 votes. It does not necessarily follow that because there are 300 votes on the list, we are going to poll 300 on election day. If you poll 240, you poll a very large average. It is easy to poll close on 300 votes, even under the Dominion Election Procedure Act. Therefore, I think that 250 is rather a low figure. But the amendment which is to be proposed by the Solicitor General is one that must meet with considerable opposition, I think, because it gives such tremendous powers, immediately preceding an election, into the hands of a man who is a political nominee. A returning officer is a political nominee, he is a man named by the party in power for the purpose of conducting the election, and he is named from the ranks of the party in power. He is always a man who sides with them in politics. It would be foolish, according to the prevailing ideas, for any administration to put into the hands of the returning officer these tremendous powers unless he was a man belonging to their side of politics, because in certain cases he might have a casting vote. Besides, you give the returning officer the power to subdivide a large district into subdivisions, and to subdivide the lists alphabetically, for instance, one from A to K, one from K to N, and so on. Then you give him in addition the power of saying who shall preside over the

subdivisions as deputy returning officers, which is also clothing him with great power. It is one of the difficulties of the Act, I admit, it is one of the difficulties of applying a federal law to a local Franchise Act, it is one of the difficulties that must stare hon. gentlemen opposite in the face. This is a tremendous power to put into the hands of a political nominee. Then, again, I do not think it would meet the case entirely. I will again appeal for corroboration to the Minister of Railways and Canals. He knows the constituency I represent almost as well as I do myself. Take, for instance, the parishes of Dundas and Wellington, large French parishes in the county of Kent. In those parishes a large number of the electors are of one name. Take, for instance, the Leblancs in the parish of Wellington. I do not say that half the electorate of that large parish are of that name, but a very large proportion of them are of that name. And so it is with a number of other family names in those parishes. I, therefore, think that this plan, even of subdividing the names alphabetically from A to E, from E to K, and so on, would not meet the case in such circumstances. I admit the difficulty in a case of this kind, but I must protest putting in the hands of the returning officer, nominated in the heat of an election strife from the ranks of the ruling political party, such tremendous powers as are here given him, and opening up the door to fraud on his part, as such machinery as this would necessarily do. It would be an extremely dangerous thing.

Mr. ELLIS. In the city of St. John we vote precisely in that way under the present law.

Mr. McINERNEY. Does the returning officer on the day of election appoint the deputy returning officers?

Mr. ELLIS. Take, for instance, Prince or Queen's Ward in the city of St. John, in which there are a large number of electors. The returning officer, not on the day of election but some days before, selects his deputies for all the various divisions of that ward. Then he provides them with all the necessary paraphernalia for carrying on the elections on the different lists. I vote in one particular place in my ward on the list of which I find my name. Another elector whose name appears alphabetically below mine, goes to another poll.

Mr. McINERNEY. The hon. gentleman does not see the difficulty we are now dealing with. That is all right, because a ward is divided into subdivisions, but it is not divided into subdivisions alphabetically, the alphabet is not divided up among wards.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, it is.

Mr. McINERNEY. I cannot agree with the hon. gentleman, that the whole list for each subdivision is not an alphabetical list beginning with A and ending with Z. The hon. gentleman will not tell me that the alphabet from A to Z is divided into different parts or subdivisions. Take King's Ward, for instance. The elector whose name might begin with A would go to one poll, and in the same ward an elector whose name would begin with B, would necessarily have to go to another poll.

Mr. ELLIS. That is just what I told my hon. friend.

Mr. McINERNEY. I do not think that is the law.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The mode of overcoming the difficulty which would necessarily arise where there is a larger number of names on the list than could possibly vote within the hours of polling at one poll, is a matter with which we in New Brunswick are very familiar. We have made provision for it exactly in the way in which this proposed amendment will make such provision. We are familiar with it, not only in our municipal and provincial elections, but also in our Dominion elections. I remember that in the city of St. John I voted at one polling booth because the initial letter of my name was such as it is; and another gentleman who lived alongside of me, whose name comes a little lower down in the alphabet, has a vote at another polling booth within the same polling division. I am speaking at this moment of Dominion elections.

With respect to local elections I do not recollect the particular circumstances. It is a very common practice in the county the hon. gentleman represents. We have found it necessary in one or two of the parishes, probably in two or three parishes more populous than others, to divide up the list exactly in the same way as is proposed in this Bill. I am quite at a loss to understand why the hon. gentleman thinks an opportunity will be afforded for fraud or wrong-doing. No one has suggested fraud or wrong-doing under the operation of our provincial Act. When this plan was devised in connection with the provincial election law, as it was under the provincial Act of 1891, no one suggested any possibility of wrong-doing occurring, and from that year down to the present day I have never heard of any returning officer of any of the districts doing wrong, either in omitting names or placing names on the lists that should not appear there. I think there is no foundation for the fears the hon. gentleman entertains. The amendment which he has prepared, but which he has not moved, would be found very faulty when it came to be worked out. He has not gone far enough to provide for conditions which will certainly arise and which are fundamental, which would, however, be fully dealt with in the clause submitted by the Solicitor General. This matter has not been entirely

overlooked, because when the Franchise Act was introduced last session it contained a similar clause to the amendment framed with a view to meeting the conditions which arise in New Brunswick at least. I do not think they are likely to arise elsewhere. In other provinces, except perhaps Prince Edward Island, they have been using practically the Australian ballot, whereas in New Brunswick our elections have been conducted under the old system, under which a man writes his name on the ballot and deposits it, and under which system more persons can register their votes than under the more complicated methods provided under the Dominion Elections Act. But I cannot see where the trouble will arise in the working out of the clause as proposed.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. So far as my recollection goes, there is no such thing done in Dominion elections as writing out the lists alphabetically. My recollection is that they are arranged territorially. When the voters are so numerous as to require a division of the list, the division is made territorially and the voters go to the most convenient place to vote.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). The hon. gentleman is not correct. Section 23 of the Electoral Franchise Act is framed on the same principle and mode suggested by the Minister of Railways, with this one exception, that it is done by the revising officer instead of by the returning officer.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Notice is given by the revising officer.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Subsection 5 provides that immediately after such revision the revising officer shall prepare a list for each polling district, containing alphabetically the names of all voters residing in such polling district. The same principle of alphabetical order is prescribed by the Electoral Franchise Act of 1885 as is suggested here.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We provided in this amendment against the possibility of a person being deprived of his vote by having to go to another place different from where he supposed he was entitled to vote, and in case of subdivision of the list providing two polling booths close together. If a man found that he could not vote in section "a," he would find the polling booth for section "b" only a short distance away.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I have here a copy of the polling list for a number of the districts in my county, and the voters' lists for two or three incorporated towns as arranged under the Dominion Franchise Act. The subdivisions are made territorially and the list alphabetically. I will read a description of a polling district:

Beginning at a point on the Cow Bay road where the same is intersected by the eastern boundary of the town of Sydney; thence northerly, following the boundary of the said town of Sydney, to the junction of the Low Point Road with a road leading to the shore near the International pier; thence following said road to the shore; thence west into the harbour to the centre thereof; thence following up the centre of the harbour to a point opposite the street known as Prince William Henry Street; thence easterly to and along Prince William Henry Street and the old Cow Bay Road, to the place of commencement.

That is a territorial description of the district. The voters' names are put down in alphabetical order within those boundaries. It does not require, as the Minister of Railways stated, a man to go out of his territorial subdivision to vote in another territorial subdivision.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is so in all provincial elections.

Mr. McDOUGALL. But we are dealing with Dominion elections and Dominion voters' lists.

Mr. McINERNEY. The hon. Minister made a statement with respect to the Dominion election law in which he was quite wrong. Both Ministers were mistaken as to what the law is, and yet he endeavoured to put me down because I stated the opposite view. One of those hon. gentlemen stated that at St. John he voted at a poll because the initial letter of his was "b," while another gentleman voted at another subdivision because his name began with another letter. The hon. gentleman must be mistaken, because there is no Dominion law that enables him to do so, or to authorize a returning officer to divide a list in two parts and proceed alphabetically. He must divide it territorially and then proceed with the names from "a" to "z." When the hon. Minister of Railway tells me that at the local elections in Kent we have done so, he is wrong, and the hon. gentleman will admit I know something about those elections. The only instance in which there was a subdivision was when the hon. gentleman himself divided Dundas, as the delimiting line was so indefinite that it was easily overlooked. The delimiting line made by the legislature of New Brunswick, in the parish of Dundas in that election, was so indefinite that the sheriff, who was returning officer, did not know how to make up the list at that time, But it never happened in the county of Kent, or in the province of New Brunswick, as far as I know, that the list was divided by cutting the alphabet into pieces. In the Dominion law there cannot be any mistake about it, because the law has never given any such power, and therefore the two hon. gentlemen were absolutely mistaken.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I was proceeding to show that under the present franchise law the practice has been to put on the list for each subdivision a much larger number of voters' names than is proposed by the amendment now submitted to the House. I have here the list for nine subdivisions within the county I have the honour to represent, and if I had all the lists, I think I would have three or four more which show the names of over 300 voters and up to nearly 400 in a polling subdivision.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Two hundred is the limit.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I cannot understand how that can be. I am going by what has been done by the revising barrister, who is a lawyer, and no fault was found with his action, either by the voters or by anybody connected with the exercise of the franchise in respect to the number of votes on each list.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Under the local law the limit is 400, but in the federal law the limit varies from 200 to 300.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Be that as it may, I have here one polling subdivision with 348 names, another with 357, another with 391 names, another with 358 names, another with 346 names, another with 359 names, another with 386 names, another with 344 names.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Then the revising barrister was not doing his duty.

The PRIME MINISTER. All that is illegal.

Mr. McDOUGALL. There must be something in the Act which permits it being done, or otherwise I imagine this revising officer would not do it.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There is nothing in the Act to permit it.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I have here another list with 333 names, and among those I find 153 of the same name—McNeills. I would like to know how a returning officer appointed by the Government, a man who may live twenty or thirty miles away and who does not know half a dozen men in the district, could go to work at short notice and subdivide that district and select the names that are going into each subdivision of that district, which may be some seven or eight miles in extent. It is not going to add to the convenience of the people to subdivide that district into two subdivisions for polling purposes, and especially so if it is done under the plan proposed by the Minister of Railways. If the subdivision of the district takes place, I am satisfied that the people of the district will insist that the polling booth would be put at a convenient part of the district, say one booth in the centre of each subdivision. Now for a returning officer to go to work and be able to make up a proper intelligent and practical list at short notice and he a perfect stranger, would be an utter impossibility, and would lead to confusion and dissatisfaction. In my experience in running elections since the Act came into operation, and before the present Act came into operation under our local Acts, people voted in a subdivision to the number of 300 and over 300. The hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries shakes his head.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not dispute what the hon. gentleman (Mr. McDougall) says, but I say the law does not provide for it.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I never saw any difficulty arising because of the number of names on the list. I know that in my own particular subdivision it never took us more than one-half the time allotted for voting to vote the 300 names. There is another objection which will arise in multiplying the number of subdivisions. The Government must see that by this Act they do not provide for the expenses of any work connected with the making of the list or the arrangement of subdivisions, and if they increase the number of subdivisions they increase the expenses proportionately. They not only increase the expenses for returning officers, but they put an increased expense upon the municipalities by creating these subdivisions.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. No.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Yes, you do.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Perhaps the hon. gentleman has not listened to the suggestions made in the proposed amendment. It is not that the municipality should subdivide the list, but that the returning officer should do it. He is an officer of the Dominion Government, and any expense he incurs must be paid by the Dominion Government. It would not throw the expense upon the municipality.

Mr. McDOUGALL. The Minister will find that in a subsequent clause of this Bill the officer of the municipality is obliged to furnish copies of the lists and of the subdivisions.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The proposal made by the Solicitor General was that in cases where the returning officer found the names on the list exceeded a certain number, the returning officer should himself divide them into subdivisions and provide different polls in these subdivisions. The expense of that would fall upon the Dominion.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Then this work would have to be done within a few days of the election, and my experience is that even at present it frequently occurs that

up to perhaps a day or two before the election we cannot get the necessary information from the officers in regard to where the voters shall vote. Under this provision the returning officer will subdivide the district within a few days of polling day, and one-half the people of that district will not know where to vote. In a sparsely settled district, perhaps ten miles in length and seven or eight miles in depth, the people will not know where to vote, and it will cause great inconvenience.

Mr. BENNETT. Should not this proviso be added: That in this alphabetical distribution of the lists, it should be provided that there shall be under each of the subdivisions at least 350 names on the list. It is quite possible to poll 300 votes in a division, and I know it is done in our riding. The reason of that is quite plain. If it were left to the discretion of every returning officer to allot the polling divisions as he pleases, there would be no end of expense, because one returning officer might have the idea that there should be only 100 names in a polling division, and another might think there should be 400.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I would like to point out to my hon. friend, that, by this Act, we are adopting the polling subdivisions fixed by the local legislature. The difficulty suggested here arises from the law of the province of New Brunswick. There, the whole province is divided into subdistricts by the statute, not by the returning officer. The result is, that there may be as many as 500, 600 or 700 voters in one district. By the local law it is provided that, when the number of voters on the list in one polling subdistrict exceeds 400, it shall be lawful for the returning officer to provide two polling boxes in such subdistrict; so that, though all the electors may come to one central spot to vote, the returning officer shall have two boxes where the number of votes exceeds 400.

Mr. GILLIES. In fact, two separate booths at the one place.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes, or both boxes may be in one booth. The intention is, that under the federal law, where a polling subdivision is created by the provincial law in which the number of voters exceeds 250, there shall be a separate polling booth or a separate box for each 250 voters.

Mr. BENNETT. That is the point I was calling attention to—that 250 names in one polling division is too small a number, because it is possible to poll 300 votes in one division; and I suggest that the number of names should not be less than 350.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. As I know nothing of the local conditions in New Brunswick, I cannot say whether there would be any objection to fixing the number at 350 or not. At first sight, I do not see that there would be any objection. In the Dominion Franchise Act the number is put at 300.

Mr. FOSTER. For subdivision territorially.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes, but in the way that I read the Act, there would not be more than 200 votes.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. This may be all right for the provinces where the density of the population will permit such an arrangement, and in the cities and towns, where the alphabetical lists can be used. But in the western provinces, where the population is sparse, it would not work at all. In fact, in such cases, I believe there should be a proviso for a poll to be held in certain places where the number of voters would not reach 300 or 250. We have in Manitoba and the North-west small settlements at great distances from the towns, and it would be unfair to expect those people to travel 50, 60 or 80 miles, as the case might be, sometimes where there are no roads at all, to reach the polling place to record their votes. I hope the Solicitor General will see his way to insert a proviso, that, where a settlement would be so small and so far from the polling place, a poll might be held at a more central point. The Minister of the Interior knows that there are settlements along our northern lakes in Manitoba—Lake Winnipeg, Lake Dauphin, Lake Manitoba and Shoal Lake—where there are not more than 50, 60 or perhaps 100 votes. These people would be compelled to go to the more thickly settled portions of the province to record their votes, because they are not sufficiently numerous to have a polling division by themselves. I would, therefore, ask that in Manitoba, and perhaps the Territories as well, the subdivisions be made, not alphabetically, but according to the territory, and that in special cases distance should be taken into consideration, in order to facilitate the voters in small settlements recording their votes.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Has my hon. friend had his attention called to subsection "e" of section 5?

Mr. McDOUGALL. I would like to ask the hon. Solicitor General's opinion with respect to districts that are less than 200 or less than 150. What would he propose to do under this Act? Suppose there were two districts sparsely settled, in which there are only perhaps 100 or 150 voters, what are we to do in that case?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. It is only in the case of such an emergency as that which the hon. member for Kent has pointed out, that this section will be put into operation.

Mr. McINERNEY. What I protest against is, not so much the proposed meeting of the difficulty, because about the only way in which it can be met is that which my hon.

friend proposes, namely, the subdivision of the districts alphabetically, but against the tremendous power you are putting into the hands of a nominee, just before an election, to divide the lists and make three or four subdivisions in a general division. Before whom is this to be done? There is no date fixed on which it is to be done. It may be done the night before the election or the morning of the election. It may be done in the dark. It is a dangerous power to give to any man who is a political nominee, just on the eve of an election, and in the heat of an election. I protest against it on that ground, and I would call the Solicitor General's attention to this fact. I may be mistaken in regard to this, but I think there was an amendment to the Electoral Franchise Act previous to the last revision which gave the revising officer power to do just what was done in the county of Cape Breton. If my hon. friend will turn to the Franchise Act of 1885, he will find that section 41 does restrict the number of voters in each polling district to 200, but, if he will turn to the amending Act of 1886, he will find that the words "two hundred" in that section are changed to three hundred. It says:

Section 41 is hereby amended by striking out the words "two hundred" in the second line thereof and inserting the words "three hundred."

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. If my hon. friend will look at the Consolidated Statutes, he will see that the limit is two hundred.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. What my hon. friend from Kent (Mr. McInerney) says is correct, but it applies only to the first paragraph of the section.

Mr. McINERNEY. What I was calling attention to was, that section 41 of the Act of 1885 limited the revising officer to putting 200 names on the list, but that that section 41 was repealed by section 11 of the Act of 1886——

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Forty-one Victoria, chapter 3.

Mr. McINERNEY—which gave him the power of putting three hundred, instead of two——

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I beg my hon. friend's pardon.

Mr. McINERNEY—By striking out the words "two hundred," in the third line thereof, and inserting "three hundred."

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That is the first part of the section.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. In order to avoid difficulty, I think I can give a history of the legislation. The first law is 48-49 Vic., chapter 40, section 41, which fixed the number at two hundred, in the third line of the section. Then, by 48-49 Vic., chapter 3, section 11, "two hundred," in the third line is changed to "three hundred," but the words "two hundred," in the concluding portion of the first paragraph of that section are not touched.

Mr. McINERNEY. That is perfectly true, and that is the right history of the law, as far as the hon. gentleman has gone. But section 41 provides that, whenever the number of voters in any polling district, as constituted under section 21, shall increase so as to exceed two hundred, they shall be divided. That was amended so as to provide that whenever the voters shall increase so as to exceed three hundred, then the returning officer shall have the power to divide.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. That is right.

Mr. McINERNEY. But if my hon. friend will turn to section 18 of the amending Act of 1886, he will find it provides:

In the present year, 1886, it shall not be necessary, in any case in which the preliminary list of voters has been made for a polling district constituted under the laws enforced at the time of the passing of the said Act, and which does not contain the names of more than 300 voters.

That provides that in that year, in case it does not exceed three hundred, there shall be no division.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. That is right.

Mr. McINERNEY. I am of the opinion, that in that way, and previous to the revision of 1894—the last revision, I think—there was an Act passed by this Parliament, giving revising officers the power of extending the list even beyond three hundred for subdivisions, and that, in accordance with that, the revising officer in the county of Cape Breton acted, and put this large number upon the list. I believe that to be the law.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. You will find it is not the law.

Mr. McINERNEY. Does my hon. friend think that these legal gentlemen in the different provinces, county court judges and others who make a study of these things, do not know the law?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am perfectly satisfied that, if the hon. gentleman will look at it, he will see what the law is.

Mr. McINERNEY. The point I make is, that shortly before 1894, there was an amending Act, authorizing the revising officers to put a larger number on the list than three hundred without subdividing. That appears to have been done under the amending Act of 1886. They were not bound to be divided when they found not more than three hundred on the list, and I believe it was done again, previous to 1894, by an Act of this Parliament giving the revising offi-

cers power, where the number did exceed three hundred, to put that number or more on the list without dividing the district, and that was done in accordance with that amending Act, which the revising officer of Cape Breton and other counties acted upon. I have been attending closely to the revision of the lists, and I do not think it would have escaped me, if such had not been the law. I believe that the Solicitor General will find there was an Act passed giving that power to the revising officer. What I protest against is, giving power to a political appointee, such as a returning officer, to divide a large district into divisions and say that from A to B shall vote here, and from B to L somewhere else, and so on, and not state on what day it shall be done or before whom it shall be done, but allow it to be done by himself, perhaps the night before the election. You are opening wide the door to fraud.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. What kind of fraud ?

Mr. McINERNEY. I shall tell the hon. gentleman. The returning officer might, the night before, or two or three days before, an election, in his own office, take the lists of the district No. 1 and cut up that district, and leave off the lists a certain number of names, either intentionally or unintentionally. He may make a mistake, if he will, or leave them off maliciously. In any case, you are putting tremendous power into his hands. There is no revision over that power which he exercises. It is done before nobody ; it is done in no court ; no one need be present to see what he does and you give him the power to wipe off the list names of men who may be opposed to him in politics. That is what it means. This man is not a judicial officer, he need not have any great standing in the community. He is appointed by a political party sometimes to do their party work, and you say you are going to give such an individual the power to divide up the votes of the district and cut the alphabet into pieces in the way I have mentioned, and leave off hundreds of men who are entitled to vote.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. No.

Mr. McINERNEY. What is going to stop him ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. It is not to be assumed that we are all blackguards.

Mr. McINERNEY. In making laws, you are not supposed to make any such assumption, but you are not estopped from making it. You are supposed to make laws that will not permit any actions of this kind. You are to guard the public interest. This is not an ordinary law ; you are dealing with the rights and privileges of men—you are dealing with the franchise.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman will please address the Chair.

Mr. McINERNEY. I mean, of course, the House is dealing with the franchise. The sense in which I used the word, I think, was quite parliamentary. You are dealing with the rights and privileges of men, and yet you allow a third party named for political purposes, to take away——

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Nothing of the sort.

Mr. McINERNEY. This law permits him.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. No, it does not.

Mr. McINERNEY. Well, it gives him the chance.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. No, not at all.

Mr. McINERNEY. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fitzpatrick) tell me how this law prevents it ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Here is a polling subdivision in which a certain number of men are entitled to vote. These men know that they have a right to go to a certain locality and there they will find a polling booth and all the paraphernalia for the exercise of that right. When they reach there, instead of having to deal with one ballot box and one returning officer, they will find they are to deal with two, three or four, and they record their vote in one box or the other, according to the subdivision of the list.

Mr. McINERNEY. But that is not the point.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. That is the very point.

Mr. McINERNEY. I have certainly not made myself plain to the hon. gentleman.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McInerney) must remember that we are dealing with a serious matter.

Mr. McINERNEY. I am serious. I do not think that the Solicitor General should cast such an insinuation across the floor. I am speaking seriously and I sincerely believe that what I say is true.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The returning officer has not discretion except to subdivide the existing list.

Mr. McINERNEY. Does that prevent him from leaving off half the names ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Why should we make separate lists ?

Mr. McINERNEY. That is what is proposed.

The PRIME MINISTER. Not at all, he subdivided the existing list.

Mr. McINERNEY. But the existing list cannot be in four places at once.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. But it is only one place.

Mr. McINERNEY. It is at four places.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. At four booths.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. If I understand the matter the local law provides that the polling shall take place at or near a certain place in the subdivision. This does not interfere with that, but, instead of having one polling booth in the place you will have two, three or four, as the number of voters on the lists may require. Therefore, the power of the returning officer, to which the hon. gentleman takes exception, is so limited that it is not possible to carry on the fraud that the hon. gentleman suggests.

Mr. McINERNEY. There has never been an election held under this law.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. What law? Why, surely the hon. gentleman is mistaken.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. This law was passed in 1891.

Mr. McINERNEY. I say there never was an election held in the province of New Brunswick under that Act.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. McINERNEY. I am not mistaken. I know what I am talking about——

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Have you never had an election since 1891?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I was going to say that I have run two or three elections under it myself.

Mr. McINERNEY. Does the hon. Minister mean to tell me that in the local by-election in 1892 in which he came into Kent County, and in which his candidate alone received in the one parish of Wellington over 400 votes, and there were 900 votes on the list——

The PRIME MINISTER. What would the hon. Minister (Mr. Blair) have to do with that?

Mr. McINERNEY. He was the Attorney General of the province, and it was his business to see that the election was run according to the law.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This became law in April, 1891.

Mr. McINERNEY. Yes, but when was it put in force, and what general election was ever run under it?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. It was passed, and the elections must have been run under it.

Mr. McINERNEY. Not necessarily.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes, necessarily.

Mr. McINERNEY. The law need not come into operation as soon as it is passed.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It came into operation at once.

Mr. McINERNEY. In many cases laws do not come into operation as soon as they are passed. I have stated the case with regard to the election of 1892, and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) cannot deny it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I certainly have no knowledge of the circumstances——

Mr. McINERNEY. The hon. gentleman ought to know when he was there in Kent County and knew that 400 votes were cast for his one candidate in the parish of Wellington.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not remember whether anyone got that particular number of votes.

Mr. McINERNEY. You ought to remember it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Perhaps you may remember.

Mr. McINERNEY. I do remember it perfectly well; it was a matter of very considerable importance, and I do not know how it can have escaped the memory of the hon. gentleman. But I am not concerned with outrages in the province of New Brunswick against what ought to be the law. What I want is to try to make a law for the Dominion that will be in the interests of the people. If I were in the local legislature of New Brunswick, I would protest against such a law, and so far as I know it never was brought into force in the carrying on of any election.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman is absolutely in error.

Mr. McINERNEY. I am not in error. I was not in error a few moments ago when I stated a thing in contradiction to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair), and I am not in error now. He told me that he voted in the Dominion elections at a poll in the city of St. John because his name began with B and a gentleman whose name began with another letter voted in the same subdivision, and I have shown him that it could not be done under the Dominion law, and the Solicitor General substantiates what I say. Now, the hon. gentleman may contradict the statement that I make, and I say that my recollection on the subject is as clear as his and I am as likely to be right as he is. What I protest against in this provision is the tremendous power you are seeking to give to a political nominee just before an election, unrestricted by any person, to cut the list in

pieces and leave hundreds of names off the list, intentionally or unintentionally.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I must say that I am very much surprised at the mode in which the hon. gentleman is discussing this question. It does not appear to me that whether his recollection as to how many votes were polled and whether one candidate got 400 or more or less at one polling booth is correct or not ought to finally determine a question of this description. I tell the hon. gentleman that the law which was passed in 1891 went into effect when it was assented on the 16th April, 1891, and it declared:

> When the number of voters on the list in any one polling subdistrict exceeds 400 it shall be lawful for the returning officer to provide two boxes for such subdistricts, dividing the registered list of voters alphabetically, so as to allow as nearly as may be an equal number of voters to deposit their ballots in each box, and for that purpose the returning officer may employ such additional clerks or deputies as may be required, and a separate check list, statement and return shall be kept and made for and in respect of each division of any such polling subdistrict.

That is the law passed in 1891. The hon. member may remember just what took place on some one or more of the polling subdivisions in his county, I cannot do so.

I was taking an active part in the contest on the occasion which he refers to, but I cannot possibly recollect what votes were polled for the respective candidates at the various polling subdivisions. I much regret that the hon. gentleman thinks I ought to have remembered those important particulars, and that I am not entitled to speak as to whether this Act was in operation, because I cannot at once call to mind the number of votes that were polled. It may have occurred to the hon. gentleman as a remarkable fact worthy of recollection, but I must confess my inability to carry matters of that importance in my mind. The hon. gentleman is not only in error as a matter of recollection, but I should think he would be a little reluctant to make so positive a statement as he has made in face of the existing law. It may be possible that the returning officer did not feel compelled under the statute to make the division in any particular district, because the statute says that when the number of votes exceeds a certain figure it shall be lawful for the returning officer to provide two boxes. There may have been 300, or 450, or 500 in a district, and it may be that the returning officer felt he had the right to exercise a discretion in providing for a subdivision of the poll in the district he refers to. But it nevertheless remains a fact that two elections have been held in the province of New Brunswick since this law passed, and in my own county I know polling districts where there were, side by side, two different polling booths, divided because of the number of votes which were on the list in that polling district. Take, for instance, the city of Fredericton where I myself ordinarily vote. In that city the number of electors is some 1,300 or 1,400, there are no less than four different polling boxes in the town. I may almost say they are within a stone's throw of one another, two in one building and two in another building, two in the court-house—the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) knows where it is—and the other two in the city hall. Those were divided according to the alphabet. That occurred all over the province of New Brunswick, I am sure, though I cannot speak from personal knowledge and say it occurred here or occurred there. I know it must have occurred in Westmoreland, and I think if the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Powell) were here, he would admit at once that in every large parish and polling division in that county there must have been a number of polling divisions in which this alphabetical break-up of the electoral lists took place. It is not open to question that this was the law, and it has been working without any complaint from any quarter, nor until the present moment have I ever heard suggested that there was any possibility of any wrong being done by the operation of that law. The Act I am now reading from was passed at my own instance. I think this very section of the statute which I have read was introduced into the provincial legislature by myself, and no one ever suggested that it would open the door to fraud of any kind. During these two elections I have yet to hear any person suggest that any fraud had taken place under it. Here a list is made up under the provincial law covering a whole polling district, according to the territorial limits laid down in the Act. The returning officer has that list before him, and he knows that every person can have access to that list who desires. For the convenience of the voters, and in compliance with such a provision as this, if it should become law, he divides that list up. If it should happen that a name is left off, it could only occur by accident, I am not willing to suppose the possibility of a man entrusted with a duty of that kind, who had taken his oath to perform his duty faithfully, would willingly omit a name. But should it occur by accident that a name was left off, there would be no difficulty in the voter getting his name put on again. If his name had been left off in the splitting up of that list, he would go to the place where, according to the initial of his name, he would expect to find his name, and if he did not find it there, he would call the attention of the returning officer at the poll to the fact that his name had been dropped, and it could be and would be put on. It would be put on because it is the original list which is the governing list, and which is only divided up for the convenience of

the voters alphabetically. This list would be there, open for reference, and accessible to anybody who desired to see it. I cannot understand why my hon. friend should think it necessary to raise such a purely fanciful objection to a reasonable proposition such as is contained in this amendment.

Mr. BENNETT. If my recollection serves me right, the polling places are all stated in the printed proclamation which announces the polling day. But to my mind it seems clear that if a polling division is divided in that way, it would be announced in the proclamation that the voters' named from A to M, for instance, would vote at John Smith's shop, and those from M to Z would vote at Tom Brown's shop. In that way no trouble could arise, such as the hon. member for Kent (Mr. McInerney) anticipates. That is on the assumption that the polling places are named before the polling day, in the Dominion Act, and that they are also stated publicly in the proclamation issued by the returning officer prior to the election day. But I submit for the consideration of the Solicitor General that the number of voters in each division should at least be 300. I have been referring to the voters' lists in my own riding, and I find that in one polling division there are 514 names on the list, there were 302 votes polled in that division. If this law goes into effect, as at present anticipated, there being 514 names on the list, there would be three polling divisions in that one district. Now, let it be fixed at the number of 300, then there will be two in that division. I notice in the lists of that riding that there are a number of polling divisions having over 250 names, but not 300. Now, if you restrict it to 250, the result will be that in rural districts you will have to split the division, so to speak, and as two houses may not be close together for the purpose of polling, then a man, not finding his name at one polling place, and not knowing the proclamation and the change, he would be forced perhaps to go a mile or half a mile further to the other place. I trust the Government will see their way clear to allowing 300 names to be on one list, because if there are 300 names on the list, I am sure there will not be over 260 polled.

The PRIME MINISTER. I find by looking at the local Acts that the average number is 200, the limit under the provincial law in Ontario is 200, in Quebec it is 200, in Manitoba 200, in Prince Edward Island 200. But I recognize there is some force in the argument of the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Bennett). For my part I would have no objection to making the number 300 instead of 200.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. The objection I raised a little while ago would still stand, so far as Manitoba is concerned, where the population is not so dense as it is in the eastern provinces. The Solicitor General, when I called his attention to that fact, referred me to subsection "e," which says:

> It shall be the duty of the returning officer appointed by the Governor in Council to constitute polling divisions, and to appoint and fix polling places and polling stations in all cases where, under the laws of the province, it is the duty of the returning officer at provincial elections to do so, and he shall to that end have the same powers as are vested by such laws in such returning officer.

On turning to the election law of Manitoba, sections 86, 87 and 88, I fail to find that the returning officer in that province has any such power. In regard to the establishment of polls, the returning officer, upon the receipt of the writ of the election, shall "forthwith thereafter" fix a poll in and for each of the polling divisions provided by the list of electors in a central and convenient place therein."

The next section provides that the building in which the poll is held shall not be a tavern or place of public entertainment, and there shall be access to the poll for every elector. Section 88 provides that the polls shall be established "in central and commodious localities, in such manner as to be at distances not less than 100 yards apart from each other in any city, town or village, or one mile apart in any rural municipality or unorganized territory." These are all the powers the returning officer possesses with respect to the establishment of the polls, and, therefore, subsection "e" in this Bill does not confer any power on the returning officer, who will be appointed by the Governor in Council. In some parts of our province, where the population is very sparse, it would be unfair and unjust to compel people to travel a long distance in order to record their votes. I hope the Solicitor General will allow the returning officer—and I will trust the returning officer in this case—to make a special polling division under such circumstances.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. From what is the hon. gentleman reading?

Mr. LaRIVIERE. From subsection "e" of the present Bill, and sections 86, 87 and 88 of the Revised Statutes of Manitoba.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Chapter 49 has been supplemented by the Act of 1892, chapter 12, and also by the Act of 1894, chapter 9.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. I stuck to that Act, because it was my own Act, and I did not think it could be improved.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Chapter 25 provides that the registration clerk shall divide the district for which he is acting into polling divisions containing not more than 250 voters. That, no doubt, meets the difficulty.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. That is the old provision.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. That is the new law.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. The hon. gentleman will notice, that in subsection "e" he refers to the powers of the returning officer appointed under the local Act, not to a registration clerk. The Bill speaks of the returning officer appointed under the local Act, while in the clause from which the hon. gentleman has quoted, the officer is spoken of as the registration clerk.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The hon. gentleman will notice, that, under subsection "d":

Where, for any part of a province, polling divisions are not established by or under the laws of the province, but by or under such laws places are fixed where polls shall be opened and held at provincial elections and lists of the voters entitled to vote at such places at such elections have been prepared and are or have been in force polls shall be opened.

Therefore, under section "e," the registration clerk shall make the subdivision by polling divisions.

Mr. BRITTON. This is not a wholly untried experiment. The law in respect to polling subdivisions has been in force in Ontario for the last ten years. I know that the power has not been exercised many times, because it was not necessary, but it has been exercised on several occasions, and never yet has there been any complaint, either on the part of the returning officer or on the part of the voter, in regard to the convenient means provided for registering their votes. In Ontario, the municipality has to divide the wards into polling divisions, and the returning officer has not to register more than 200 votes for each subdivision; but sometimes there are more than 200 voters in one subdivision, and in such case, where there 200, but not more than 300, they are allowed to go to the polling booth. If there are more than 300, he is bound to subdivide the district, and he must do it before nomination day, so as to ensure its announcement at that time, and also at the time notice of election is given. There are cases in which no subdivision has been made, and then the returning officer has not to poll more than 200 voters in any one polling place. That has been the practice, and no fault has been found with it by the returning officer, and no complaint has been made in regard to names being put on or taken off, any more than at an ordinary subdivision. I know that the people of Ontario are pretty good people, and those in New Brunswick are not any worse than in Ontario, and the returning officer, although the nominee of the head of the Liberal party, is there to do his duty, and generally does it. The Liberals have not great reason to complain of returning officers, and I am still more satisfied that the Conservatives have no reason to complain of the Liberal returning officers. The experiment has been tried, and has been found not open to the objection which has been urged against it to-night.

Mr. BENNETT. I call the attention of the Solicitor General to the fact that the polling division shall be established by and under the laws of the province. Ontario polling divisions are not established by the province, but by each municipality. So it might happen that the returning officer, after the writ was placed in his hands, with this Act in front of him, might argue that under the present law of Ontario there are no arrangements for polling divisions, and not having the power to carry out this provision, he might arrange to have all the polling divisions in one place. It should be amended by inserting the word "municipality."

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The same condition which prevails in Ontario is likewise found in Quebec, that the polling subdivisions are established by the municipality. We find the words are, "shall be established by or under the laws of the province." The municipal authorities appoint the polling division under the provincial law in both provinces. Therefore, the subdivision is created by the municipality, under the law of the province, and it will come under section "d." That was the object, at all events, of putting in the words "by or under the law." My object was to make that section so as to apply to the polling subdivisions established under the municipal by-law, which by-law might be passed by the municipality under the authority of an Act of the local legislature.

Mr. CLANCY. If the hon. gentleman said "by and under," it would make it clearer. The word "or" is alternative, either under the law of the province or under a municipal Act by the authority of the province.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I would like to hear from my hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) on that. As I understand it, the polling subdivisions would be those established by the law of the province, or the polling subdivisions would be those established under the law of the province; that is to say, by the municipality acting under the authority of a statute of the local legislature. It seems to me that meets the difficulty exactly.

Mr. BENNETT. How would it be to insert the word "municipal" and make it read "by or under the municipal law of the province." If some one were to so advise the returning officer he might say there is no arrangement of the divisions by any law of the province.

Mr. LISTER. There is.

Mr. BENNETT. True, there is in the sense pointed out by the Solicitor General, but the returning officer might not take that view.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. In Ontario and Quebec the polling divisions are established by the municipalities; in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia they are established by the statute, and in British Columbia by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, under the authority of the law. If I inserted the word "municipal" it would not meet the case of British Columbia.

Mr. BENNETT. It would conflict there.

Mr. SPROULE. There is no doubt whatever that the suggestion of the Solicitor General would meet the case exactly, because the municipal councils make the divisions and they do it under the municipal law.

Mr. McINERNEY. Before the subsection passes, I wish to say that when the Minister of Railways read the New Brunswick Act of 1891, he must have seen that it is only an enabling Act, and it does not compel the returning officer to divide the district into two parts. The Act says it shall be lawful for him to do it, but he need not do it unless he likes. Therefore, I still maintain that in the elections held in that province subsequent to the Act of 1891, which came under my notice, there were no such divisions made by the returning officer. Notwithstanding all that has been said by the hon. Solicitor General, the difficulty which first occurred to my mind in regard to this clause still remains, and nothing which has been urged removes that difficulty. I refer to the danger of giving the power to divide up the districts, under this section, to a political appointee in the heat of an election. There is no date fixed for him; he does it before nobody but himself, and what is to prevent him in that case from leaving the names of many of the electors off the list?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. We had better leave that until we come to an amendment which I propose to section 6.

Mr. FOSTER. I have been trying to listen to the discussion, but not being a lawyer, of course it is difficult for me to get all the points in my mind, and it is still more difficult because of the differences between lawyers themselves. I have studied the Bill as put before me, but my hon. friend (Mr. Fitzpatrick) has now moved a long and involved amendment, and I have not had an opportunity of studying it. I should think the same difficulty occurs to nine-tenths of the members of this House who are trying to follow this legislation.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I do not intend to move that amendment at the present time, but in view of the discussion I thought it fair to state that I would move it.

Mr. FOSTER. That meets my difficulty. I do not want to vote on that amendment until it is printed, and I presume my hon. friend intends to print it.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. the Solicitor General has, I think, shown a very strong desire to meet the views of those taking an interest in this measure, and I would ask him if it is not practicable to devise some means to meet the objection urged by the hon. member for Kent (Mr. McInerney). It occurs to me that my hon. friend (Mr. Fitzpatrick) might be able to meet the difficulty by providing that some responsible officer should do the work of arranging the polling districts. It will be known long before the election takes place what the numbers of the voters are in the various districts, and therefore it would be perfectly competent for a responsible party who would be entrusted with that duty, to know what districts will require to be subdivided.

My hon. friend has already conceded to the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) that there shall be not less than 300 names on the list in each subdivision. That meets that point. I want to see if he cannot go a little further and provide two things to meet the objections of my hon. friend from Kent (Mr. McInerney): first, that the limits of the subdivision shall be fixed, not by the returning officer, but by some one more directly responsible to the Government, whether by the revising officer or some one else; and, secondly, that it shall not be done on the spur of the moment, with every person left in doubt where he is to vote until he actually goes to the polls, but that it shall be done in the mode provided in the present Franchise Act, by which voters shall all know from the proclamation where they are to go to vote. It appears to me that the hon. Solicitor General, with the ingenuity he has shown in overcoming other difficulties, might find a means of meeting the objections of my hon. friend from Kent, if he would turn his attention to them.

The PRIME MINISTER. It has seemed to me all along that my hon. friends are really suggesting difficulties where no difficulties exist. There must be some officer to fix the places for polling. Under the existing law, which we are repealing, this duty is performed by the revising officer. Before we had the revising officer it was performed by the returning officer, and now when we are going back to the old system we propose that that duty shall again be performed by the returning officer.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. What do you say as to the publication without due notice?

The PRIME MINISTER. At the present time, if the returning officer finds that there is a polling station which has more than 200 names, he divides it at once, and pub-

lishes it, in his proclamation, before the election day.

Mr. McINERNEY. That is not in the amendment.

The PRIME MINISTER. That will be provided for. With regard to the names, the amendment that has been prepared by my colleague, the hon. Minister of Railways, provides that the list shall be made up in such a way that the voters whose names are, for example, from A to K or from M to R would vote at such or such a place, so that there is no necessity of subdividing the list to avoid possible errors. What is done—I have seen it in my own province—is to give the returning officer as many copies of the whole list as there are polling stations, and it can be seen exactly where a man is to vote. My hon. friend the Solicitor General will, I am sure, see that these points are provided for.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I want to say to the leader of the Opposition that by subsection "b" it is provided that "the polling subdivisions shall be those established by or under the laws of that province for the purposes of provincial elections." In the province of Ontario, for instance, the polling subdivisions are fixed long in advance by the municipal authorities, not by the returning officer at all. In the province of Quebec the polling subdivisions are also established by the municipal authorities. In Nova Scotia and New Brunswick they are fixed by statute, of course long in advance of any election. In Manitoba and British Columbia they are fixed by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council. The only case in which the returning officer can be called upon the scene at all is such a case as may occur in the province of New Brunswick. In all the other provinces I venture to say that the limit of voters in any subdivision is 200; but in the province of New Brunswick it may happen, because of the polling subdivisions being fixed by statute, that there may be 400 or 500 or 600 voters in a polling subdivision.

Mr. McINERNEY. Or 900.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Or 900; and in that case we provide that the returning officer shall subdivide the list alphabetically, so that there will be three polling booths at the same place, 300 voters being assigned to each polling booth. The function of the returning officer does not consist in subdividing the polling subdivisions, but in arranging the list alphabetically; and that would apply exclusively to the case pointed out by the hon. member for Kent as possible to occur in New Brunswick, and nowhere else. The returning officer has absolutely nothing to do with fixing the limits of the polling subdivision.

Mr. CLANCY. Is it provided for in the unorganized districts of the province of Ontario?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I have provided for them also.

Mr. CLANCY. The returning officer has power to fix the polling subdivisions there.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. He will find that in the unorganized territory there are no polling subdivisions under the provincial statute, but polling places; and the only duty of the revising officer is to fix the territorial area within which the voters will be found to come to each polling place.

Mr. CLANCY. That is equivalent after all to the power of fixing the limits of the divisions. It is true, the polling divisions are not fixed by statute, but they may be fixed by the will of the returning officer.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I ask my hon. friend to look at section 61 of the Ontario Election Act, where he will find it provided that in the unorganized territory a poll shall be opened and held at certain places specified. These places are fixed by the statute, not by the returning officer.

Mr. McINERNEY. I do not think that the remark that fell from the Prime Minister will at all do away with the difficulty in this case. The right hon. gentleman dealt with a number of things which it would be more satisfactory to find in the amendment which the Solicitor General read; but they are not there. He meets some objections if the amendment he spoke of were proposed, but the amendment prepared by the hon. Minister of Railways and put in the hands of the Solicitor General, to meet the case of New Brunswick, does not meet it. Does the amendment which the Solicitor General read to the House and which we may have proposed here—but we have no declaration that it is to be proposed at all—state that all these polling booths shall be in the one place in the district. It states nothing of the kind; and in so far as the province of Ontario is concerned, we have many instances of how the law worked in the late election in the city of Ottawa. Why, at that election some of the leading citizens of this city came to me and said they had travelled from one poll to another looking for their names until they got tired and disgusted, and did not believe they would vote at all. The ex-Minister of Marine (Mr. Costigan) told me that he had been to several polls on that day without success, and did not know that he was bound to go round the city in order to find where his name was entered. If there is such difficulty in a city, how great must be the difficulty in a country place?

Mr. LANDERKIN. The list is hung up in specified central public places. Any gentleman can look at that list and find where he has to vote.

Mr. McINERNEY. I understand that in the local election in Ontario there is no

proclamation of the voting places. The deputy returning officer in the city of Ottawa divided up his district the night before the election. How, then, could any elector in Ottawa know early in the morning where he was to vote?

Mr. LANDERKIN. At the nominations in Ontario, every polling place is announced in the hustings. Every place is to be put in the proclamation, and every elector can see exactly where he has to vote.

Mr. McINERNEY. All I know is that a gentleman belonging to this city has put in my hand a note contradicting that statement, and stating that the division was made by the returning officer the night before the election.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Nothing of the sort.

Mr. McINERNEY. I am satisfied that this is a fact. I know that several gentlemen came to the Russel House, and said that they could not find the poll where they had to vote, and I have mentioned the case of the ex-Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who told me that he travelled round several polls trying to find where his name was entered.

The PRIME MINISTER. He was not anxious to vote.

Mr. McINERNEY. The fact that he went to several places showed his anxiety to vote, and the fact that he appeared here in public meetings, showed his anxiety.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Perhaps he was not twenty-one years of age.

Mr. McINERNEY. Why, he has been in this House longer than that. If there is this difficulty in a city, how much greater difficulty must there be in a country district twenty or thirty miles in length. To tell a man that he shall go to the end of a parish to see if his name is on the list, and if it is not there, send him to the other end of the district, perhaps twenty miles distant, is an absurdity. The amendment proposed does not state that all the polls shall be in the one place, and even if it did, it proposes that an official nominee, the returning officer may, on the eve of an election, in the heat of a contest, divide the list. And that need not be printed, but be a written list. There is no obligation to have the list printed, and as a matter of fact they are not printed, unless at the expense of the candidate. This officer may divide the list to suit himself, and intentionally or unintentionally, leave a number of voters off in any one or more sections. How are you going to get the names he leaves off put on? The hon. gentleman will see what a dangerous power he is placing in the hands of these men. If the dividing of the list were left to the revisers in the province of New Brunswick, to be done by them in the month of October, when they make the lists up, and then be sent by them to the county clerk before the month of November, the work would be done more fairly. Their lists are posted subject to correction, and you can ask to have names put on or struck off. But I protest against a political nominee, such as a revising officer, being given the power of dividing the list in the heat of election, and leaving off names, intentionally or unintentionally, so that on the day of the election, when an elector finds his name has been left off, he has no means of having it put on and is deprived of his vote.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I would like to point out to the hon. gentleman that the polling subdivisions are fixed by statute. The subdivided lists are not the authentic list, but the authentic list is that which is made by the reviser, and it is that which is subdivided. A man whose name in on the authentic list would have the right to vote, whether his name is on the subdivided list or not. The hon. gentleman knows that under a law in New Brunswick, the authentic list must be in the hands of the returning officer.

Mr. McINERNEY. How can four returning officers have the one list?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. You can have four authentic copies of the one list.

Mr. McINERNEY. I know more about the law in New Brunswick than does the hon. gentleman. It provides that there shall be only one list handed to the returning officer, and not several. He makes his copy of that list and puts it in the ballot box and gives it to the deputy returning officer.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Can he not make three copies just as well as one?

Mr. McINERNEY. No, because he must divide the list up.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. He need not divide it at all, but give three full copies.

Mr. McINERNEY. Well, I cannot understand how you can have four polling booths and have the list in every polling booth. Suppose these polls were ten miles apart.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. But they cannot be. What is the use of talking such nonsense?

Mr. McINERNEY. Does that amendment say so?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The hon. gentleman has never read it.

Mr. McINERNEY. Well, I heard the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fitzpatrick) read it.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Then, the hon. gentleman (Mr. McInerney) did not understand it.

Mr. McINERNEY. Then I protest against it being proceeded with in that way. It should be printed so that we may have it before us.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I think perhaps that I said what I ought not to have said, and I apologize to my hon. friend.

Mr. McINERNEY. The hon. gentleman cannot expect me to remember every word merely from his reading of it.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Then the hon. member for Kent should accept my statement of it.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It is not to be proceeded with now; it will come up on the discussion of a subsequent part of the Bill.

Mr. McINERNEY. Then what is the use of discussing it?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Who is discussing it?

Mr. McINERNEY. We are all discussing it. If it is not to be proceeded with now what is the use of discussing it at the present time? This amendment was read by the Solicitor General after it had been put in his hands by the Minister of Railways. I want him to understand that I do not want to blame him for the absurdities of it which are apparent to me. But I do blame the Minister of Railways who, with his local knowledge of the province of New Brunswick ought to know better, for proposing any such amendment as this. I cannot understand him, if you are going to have three or four polling booths and you are going to allow your returning officer to put up your lists in three or four different parts, how you are going to have the same list in every polling booth. It has not been made plain to me yet. And, in allowing the returning officer to revise the list, I say you give him a power which is very dangerous, you give him the power, intentionally or unintentionally to leave names of electors off the lists. Hon. gentlemen may claim that I am not discussing this seriously, and they may say I do not want to make this Act as perfect as possible, but I say it is my desire to do so, and to help the Solicitor General to the best of my poor ability. But I see grave difficulties and tremendous danger in this section as proposed, therefore I protest against it, and if I cannot make this committee see that I have good reason to do so, it is because I have not the power to make them understand me.

Mr. McDOUGALL. There is no qualification provided in the Act for the returning officer, there is no qualification provided now that the revisers shall be competent to revise the list. We have officers among whom are included farmers, blacksmiths, carpenters and all kinds of tradesmen to constitute our board of revisers who make up these lists, none of these men, possibly, with the necessary qualifications to understand the law and make up a proper list. In the next place, we run great risk of having people go to the Government and recommend the appointment of men as returning officers who are not competent to carry out an election under the statute. What may the returning officer do? He may take the list, leave as many names off as he likes, substitute one for another, take down a name in a wrong way or in such a way that it cannot be read, and there is no way by which a man can examine the list except on polling day in the polling booth. A candidate or his agent may not be able to see the list before election day. The First Minister said there was no difficulty in dividing a list and subdividing a polling district and getting a proper and suitable list for the voters to poll their votes. I have been connected with elections and voters' lists in my own constituency for thirty years and I am pretty familiar with the boundaries of the subdivisions in my district. And yet I would not, as returning officer, undertake to subdivide the polling districts in my county without the aid of some local people from these districts. I could not do it properly otherwise. But we are going to provide by this Act, that a man living, perhaps twenty or thirty miles away from the polling subdivisions, is to subdivide it into one or more subdivisions. It may be that this will be done by a man who has never set foot in the district. Why, it is utterly impossible. That being so, I will make a suggestion to the hon. Solicitor General, and it is this: In order to enable the returning officer to do it intelligently and without mistakes, when he happens to be unfamiliar with the district, I would suggest that provision should be made that the local revisers who made up the former lists or are, in the meantime, in authority to provide lists for the coming year, be called to the aid of the returning officer, to assist him in the subdivision of the district. It is asked by hon. gentlemen on the Government side of the House, if, in making the subdivision, the two polling booths cannot be placed closely together, and in that way there will be no serious misunderstanding as to where the people are to pull their votes. I feel positive that when the attempt is made to subdivide the polling district, and especially when the polling district is perhaps ten miles in length—we have many that are fifteen miles in length and proportionately broad—when the people find that the district is divided, they will be absolutely opposed to coming from the distant parts of the division to poll their votes at two polls held at one place. From the time of passing this Act they will press to have a polling booth for each subdivision at a central point within the subdivision. So, it is well for the House to understand the trouble they will have to face and that the returning officer will have to face in the unpopularity of such

a provision. Of course such a question does not make much difference to people in cities, towns or villages, but it will make a great difference to people who have to travel seven or eight miles, when they find the polling division is divided and that the polling places are not more convenient places than before it was divided. It is an utter impossibility to have this Act properly carried out unless means are taken to satisfy the people who have every reason to complain in this respect.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Carried.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. What does the hon. gentleman propose to carry, the section to which he proposes to make an amendment?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I want to carry subsection "b" of section 5.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Incomplete.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The amendment will come in after section 5.

Mr. FOSTER. The amendment is not to be an amendment of subsection "b."

Mr. McINERNEY. Would not the amendment completely contradict this subsection "b"?

Mr. MONK. Would the hon. gentleman please read that amendment once more?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I tried to be civil once, and it cost me so much time that I think I won't try it again. The best thing I can do is to read that section when I intend to move it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Does not my hon. friend think it is just as well to let this clause stand? I do not think we can make any progress until we have that amendment. It appears to me a very irrational mode to pass a clause that requires to be amended, and then deal with the amendment afterwards.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I do not intend to amend section "b" at all. I intend to introduce a clause which will have for its effect, to remedy the difficulty pointed out by the hon. member for Kent in so far as certain polling subdivisions in New Brunswick are concerned, an additional section. We have discussed this amendment over and over again to-night, when it was simply put by me before the House for the information of the committee so they might know what would be done when we reached section 6.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I understood the leader of the House to say a little while ago that in addition to the amendment which the hon. gentleman has suggested, there would be due notice that these things would not be sprung in a night upon the electors who would be in the morning unable to find where they would have to go to vote.

The PRIME MINISTER. I understand all this is provided for by my hon. friend's amendment. The hon. gentleman knows that under the law the returning officer is bound, before the election, to give notice to the public of the polling day. He issues his proclamation that there will be a nomination at such a place, and polling at various places mentioned. He has to give the notice, therefore all this is provided for already, but it will be supplemented by the amendment of my hon. friend. I have no objection at all to reserving one of these subsections upon which we can discuss the amendment when it is introduced.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is for that reason that subsection "a" has been reserved, we reserved it because the Solicitor General informed us that he had an amendment that would affect it. We are now discussing section "b," and the Solicitor General informs us he has an important amendment that will bear upon that section. Why should we pass section "b" any more than section "a" until we get that amendment before us? My hon. friend the right hon. gentleman says the amendment will be there, but it is not there now. If my right hon. friend will read the amendment of the Solicitor General, who I am sorry to see, has had his temper a little ruffled—though I am not very much surprised at that—if he would read that amendment he will find that what he has assured this committee was there, is not there at all.

The PRIME MINISTER. That is a question which we will determine when we discuss the amendment. At present it is quite sufficient to reserve section "b," which the Solicitor General does not propose to alter. If we reserve section "b" as a peg on which to hang the amendment, we have carried everything that ought to be necessary for the proper understanding of this section.

Mr. FOSTER. I think the suggestion of my right hon. friend at first is the one that had better be carried out now. Let this whole section 5 stand until we have the amendment.

The PRIME MINISTER. After having lost the whole of this sitting.

Mr. FOSTER. The amendment which is proposed, together with the addition that my right hon. friend has promised, and with what might be contributed by some hon. gentlemen on this side, once the amendment is printed and is before us, so that we can see how far it does go, generically affects this whole clause. How can you go to work and pass one subsection and another subsection which are to be affected by an amendment which is not yet before us? The Solicitor General did not do himself justice when an hon. gentleman having asked him courteously to read that the second time, he remarked that he had been civil once and he would not read it again.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. If I had not read the proposed new section, we would not have had the idle discussion we have had to-night. In answer to the remark of the leader of the Opposition a moment ago, I may say that subsection "b" provides for the adoption, for the purposes of an election to the Dominion House of Commons, of the provincial polling divisions. That is the whole purpose and object of this section. Now, it has been pointed out to us that the polling divisions as they exist in the province of New Brunswick, created by the statute of New Brunswick, would have the effect of preventing a large proportion of the electors in the polling subdivisions, from exercising their franchise, that is to say, that under the laws of the province of New Brunswick there may be in a polling subdivison of 700, 800 or 900 electors. Under the provincial law of New Brunswick, if in any polling subdivision there are more than 400 electors, there are two booths or two ballot boxes at the one place, so as to enable all to vote. Now, we want to provide to meet the difficulty that has been suggested, and we propose to do so by this amendment, that if in any polling subdivision—and this can only apply to New Brunswick—there are more than 300 votes, there shall be for each additional 300 an additional ballot box or polling booth. I hope I have not been discourteous, it was not my intention to be so.

Mr. FOSTER. The privilege of an Irishman.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The privilege of any nationality. I would like to remind the leader of the Opposition that it is not open to the returning officer to make any subdivision on the eve of an election or to do anything of that sort under our Election Act, which we do not hand over to the control of the local legislature, which they cannot deal with, and which we are not amending in any particular. For instance, section 16 provides that in the proclamation the polling subdivisions must be mentioned. After the nomination, the returning officer must post up a notice containing the polling subdivisions. I am always trying to make clear the difference between a voters' list and the Dominion Election Act. That is a matter that comes under the Dominion Election Act, and we do not touch that in this Act.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The Solicitor General has made it exceedingly clear to me that he ought not to ask the committee to carry this clause, and I will tell the committee why. The clause says:

(b) The polling divisions shall be those established by or under the laws of that province for the purposes of provincial elections within the territory comprised in the electoral district for which such election is held.

He has explained that he has an amendment prepared, to do something which the clause does not do. How is it possible to ask the committee to pass a clause, when the Solicitor General tells us he does not intend the clause to become law? He is going to qualify it. He finds that, owing to the condition of the election law of New Brunswick, it would involve inconvenience, and, therefore, he explains to the committee—and I entirely agree with him—that it is necessary to provide some means for not doing what the law says should be done, by adopting the laws of the province in respect to polling subdivisions. The hon. gentleman is going to qualify the clause; he is going to offer an important and substantial qualification of it, and he is asking the committee to stultify itself by passing a clause which he proposes on Tuesday to amend.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. We do not intend to amend a word or syllable in this subsection "b," but that it shall go through in its present form. As certain inconveniences have been pointed out as likely to result in New Brunswick from the adoption of this clause, I frankly told the committee that those inconveniences would be remedied at a future stage by an amendment. What is the reason for asking that this clause be held over, when I say that, under no condition, do I intend to change it?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman is going to change it by the amendmen which he will propose.

The PRIME MINISTER. Evidently, the leader of the Opposition has not caught the meaning of the Solicitor General. My hon. friend explained that——

The polling subdivisions shall be those established by or under the laws of that province for the purposes of provincial elections within the territory comprised in the electoral districts over which such election is held.

My hon. friend, in answer to an objection, pointed out that the hon. member for Kent (Mr. McInerney) said he was prepared to amend the clause by providing that, in a polling division where there are more than a certain number of voters, provision shall be made to have two or three polling booths instead of one. That amendment is quite consistent with the section, as now drawn. There is no object in opposing the section, and no reason why we should not make some progress.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Does the hon. gentleman intend to amend the clause?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. No.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. But the hon. gentleman has said he will do so. It appears to be a perfect contradiction of terms. The hon. gentleman has already proposed to amend the clause.

Mr. FOSTER. I think I can put the matter in a nutshell. Suppose we pass all the

clauses in section 5, and harsh Providence removes the Solicitor General from this House or the Government, or the Government changes its mind, which it is pretty apt to do, and does not bring in an amendment, we have made the law such as have all agreed should not be the law.

The PRIME MINISTER. It seems to me a very fair proposal to keep the last section open for discussion, and I shall have no objection that the discussion upon the section shall be general; but let us make some progress.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think the way to make progress is for the Government to be in a position to submit to this committee what they propose we should pass. Why was clause "a" left over? It was left over because, upon consideration and discussion, the Solicitor General concluded to amend it. Why was objection taken to clause "b"? It was because, on discussion and examination, the Solicitor General decided to amend it.

Mr. LISTER. To supplement it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I want to know whether the clause will be the law, taken in connection with the supplementary clause to be provided by the Solicitor General? It would be infinitely better to modify this clause by embodying the principles of the supplementary amendment which the Solicitor General has prepared, and offer that to the committee; and then the committee would not be asked to pass a clause which the Solicitor General does not intend to remain, but which he proposes to change on Tuesday next.

Mr. McINERNEY. Before dineer, when the leader of the Opposition proposed that the debate should be adjourned, the Solicitor General distinctly stated that he would like the discussion to go on as to the different subsections of clause 5 for the purpose of getting the views of the House on those subsections, not for the purpos eof passing the clause. The hon. gentleman wanted to get the views of the House on those subsubsections, not for the purpose of passing them, but in order to prepare amendments that would meet with the general view of the House. This was what the Solicitor General stated. The section was not to be rushed through.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman stated that there was a blank in subsection "c," and he desired to invite the views of hon. gentlemen from the different provinces. On subsection "b," which had been proposed to the House, he explained it was his intention to move an amendment. Hon. gentlemen opposite know that the election law must be read in connection with this law, and that law expressly meets the case. In section 16 it is provided that the revising officer, within eight days after receiving the writ, shall issue his proclamation, and shall declare the polling divisions and subdivisions.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Will those subdivisions be made and embodied in that proclamation?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. They must be. The law says, "the several polling divisions fixed by him." That is the election law, which we are not departing from. All the Solicitor General informs the committee is, that, in order to meet an objection in the case of New Brunswick, when there are more than 200 or 300 voters in one division, it is intended to provide two or three polling subdivisions. The election law comes in and says, that, when you do that, you shall give notice in your proclamation eight days after you receive the writ, where these polling stations are to be held. There is no discrepancy between the amendment and the clause, but provision is made for an exceptional state of affairs in New Brunswick.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Two hours ago the hon. member for Kent (Mr. McInerney) urged upon the Government not to entrust the returning officer with power to subdivide the polling districts the night before the election, and leave the electors without information as to where they were to vote, and two hours afterwards we are told that the election law provides for all that.

The PRIME MINISTER. That was told two hours ago also.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. It was told by the Prime Minister, and I also told it myself.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. On the contrary, when this objection was urged recently by myself, the Prime Minister said that care would be taken to provide for that

The PRIME MINISTER. Pardon me, I said that by the existing law and the amendment, the objection would be met.

Mr. TAYLOR. Before six o'clock, the leader of the Opposition made a proposition to allow this matter to stand over until Tuesday, and in the meantime to try and come to some arrangement. In my opinion that proposition should have been accepted. This Bill is simply following out the policy of the late Conservative Government under Sir John Thompson, who undertook to repeal the old franchise law, which was said to be so obnoxious. Before Sir John Thompson introduced that Bill, he had conferences with the Hon. David Mills, now Minister of Justice, and that Bill practically met the views of both sides of the House. Sir John Thompson conferred with the Hon. David Mills about his Bill, but the Government to-day want to force this Bill through without consulting the Opposition. If this Bill stands over until Tuesday, there

could be conferences between the leader of the Government and his friends and some hon. members of the Opposition from each of the provinces, and the Bill could be whipped into shape to pass in a night or two, whereas otherwise it will take a month if we are to haggle over one clause as we have been for two days. The present Government say they were pledged to repeal the franchise law; but Sir John Thompson adopted that policy before them and undertook to provide a cheaper and a more workable Bill than that of 1885. Sir John Thompson and the Hon. David Mills practically agreed upon all the points, and when that Bill would come before the House there would have been but little opposition to it.

The PRIME MINISTER. Sir John Thompson introduced the Bill but his party would not let him pass it.

Mr. TAYLOR. Nothing of the kind. Sir John Thompson was called away, and the Bill was allowed to stand over, but it was printed and would have become the law in the next session. If you are to adopt the provincial franchises, adopt them; have a revision previous to every general election, and if a by-election is to take place, revise the lists in that constituency only. Have a revision of the provincial lists only previous to every general election; have registration in every constituency; have the registration plain and simple before the clerk of the municipality, by issuing a proclamation that every person twenty-one years of age and over entitled to a vote may simply file a declaration and his name will be added to the list that is being made up by the court of revision of the municipality. Have the new list printed and then you have a list ready to vote on. Adopt the provincial lists as the basis, but let this Government work out the machinery for having the registration take place before a proper officer, and then you will have a fair and inexpensive franchise law. Hon. gentlemen opposite have said that the old franchise law worked injuriously to their party, but none of them can say truthfully that the franchise law was more injurious to them than to the Conservative party. It was expensive to the members representing a constituency, but that expense fell on both parties alike.

Mr. BENNETT. The local lists will be more expensive.

Mr. TAYLOR. Too honest, indeed. That probably will be the case. Why not have a conference between the two parties on this Bill, and that will simplify the whole matter. If hon. gentlemen opposite believe that the old franshise law was favourable to the Government in power, why do they not keep it in force?

An hon. MEMBER. Too honest.

Mr. BRITTON. Too honest.

Mr. TAYLOR. Too honest, indeed. The loudest denunciation of the Liberals was that the old law enfranchised the Indians, and that the Indians were wards of the Government in power and would support them. Well, the Indians are wards of the Government to-day, as they were then. These hon. gentlemen all are now disfranchising the Indians, but I believe if the Minister of Customs spoke his mind, he would agree with the hon. gentleman from Brantford (Mr. Heyd) and the hon. gentleman from Lambton (Mr. Lister), that the Indians ought to have the right to vote. I trust that the leader of the Government will follow the example of Sir John Thompson and have a conference on this Bill, but if not, clause after clause has to be threshed out in the House, it is going to be some weeks before the Bill will be put through.

Mr. FOSTER. Hon. gentlemen opposite need not think that they can bring in a Franchise Bill which takes up matters of such great importance, and put it through in a day or two. That is perfectly impossible, because legitimate discussion will carry the matter very much longer than that. The action of the Solicitor General to-night shows that the Government acknowledge that their Bill is not at all perfect, and they are going to make important amendments to it. If the Government had drawn up these amendments and had them printed so that they would be before the House, then the members would be advertised of the whole question which would be before them, and the discussion would be much more limited and progress more rapid.

Mr. LISTER. Is that ever done?

Mr. FOSTER. In the case of every important measure, if the Government propose to make important amendments, they certainly should have them printed in the records of the House, so that we may know what we are going to be asked to legislate upon; and I should think that would be a procedure of prudence in a matter of this importance. I thought I caught a note of defiance in my hon. friend's remark when he spoke of sticking to it. I hope he will not allow the atmosphere of war which is enveloping us to-day to affect his mind on this franchise business? The history of 1885 ought to show him that nothing is gained by an attempt to rush through a Franchise Bill. So far as this side of the House is concerned, there is no disposition to do more than to perfect this Bill as far as we can. The Government have by superior force gained their point so far as they have repealed the old Act; but they make a great mistake if they think that because of that we are going to let every part of the Bill go through as the Government framed it. Every section of the Bill shall be carefully reviewed in order that we may make it as

good an Act as we possibly can. We want to do that in good part; but it will necessarily take some time, and I should hope the Solicitor General would not let the prevalent war feeling obtrude itself into the discussion of this Bill, because it will not advance things; on the contrary, it may retard them.

The PRIME MINISTER. I quite recognize that the Opposition have very serious interests to protect, from their point of view, and that this Bill shall require some days of discussion. But I think we have some reason for complaint that after two days of discussion on this section, we have not been able to carry a single paragraph of it.

Mr. FOSTER. The most important, in some respect, in the Bill.

The PRIME MINISTER. That may be. But all we can do is to read the Bill, paragraph by paragraph, and settle on the language of each paragraph. There may be two ways of doing that. You may find that the language is not sufficient, and has to be altered; or you may find that it is right as far as it goes, but has to be supplemented. Now, the Solicitor General, who has given every attention to this Bill, and who, I am sure, in the opinion of the House, has been most considerate of every suggestion made by him and has endeavoured to meet every objection——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend, in regard to this very paragraph "b," says: "I am willing to meet the objection raised by the hon. member for Kent. This must be done, not by altering the language of the paragraph at all; it will remain as it is; but by supplementing it by a further subsection that will be submitted afterwards.

Mr. FOSTER. But it is not decided.

The PRIME MINISTER. The paragraph is all right as far as it goes, and therefore he proposes that it be adopted. We cannot make progress otherwise. Under such circumstances I ask my hon. friend to have this paragraph carried, and have the further subsection discussed, and leave one subsection open for discussion when the amendment is proposed. It seems to me that would be reasonable. Of course, if we have to meet obstruction, we cannot avoid it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am sorry my hon. friend used that word before sitting down, because I can assure him, speaking for myself, and so far as I am aware, there is not the slightest desire to obstruct this Bill. I do not know any member on either side of the House who wants to stay here one hour longer than is necessary to do the public business. My hon. friend is an old parliamentarian, and I would ask him if he has ever seen a committee asked to pass a clause which those who offered it declared was to be modified. Now, my hon. friend says that this clause is to remain as it is. He objects even to the word "modify." I ask him what the meaning of the English language is. Will there be no modification in the clause when the Solicitor General has said, again and again, that in order to meet the objection raised by the hon. member for Kent, he finds that it is necessary to modify the law of New Brunswick? If that is not to modify this clause, then I certainly have no conception of the construction of the English language. There is no other part of this Bill to which the modification proposed by the Solicitor General can apply. Then why should we be asked to pass this clause until we have the modification to be proposed by the Solicitor General put before us? Is anything gained by it? Would there be one moment's more discussion? I say there would be a good deal less. If the modification had been presented in the form which it is to take, this clause would probably have been passed long ago. I challenge the hon. gentleman to show a single case, certainly in the history of this Parliament since confederation, of a clause being pressed upon a committee when those who proposed the clause had given notice of a proposition to modify it. I regard it as an absolute waste of time to press the adoption of a clause with the announcement put before the committee that an important modification is to be made to it. It does not touch the admitted principle of the clause, but it is an admission that the clause itself is not perfect for the purpose, for which it was intended, and that if the Bill remains with that clause as it is, it will be open to the objection which has been pressed by my hon. friend from Kent (Mr. McInerney) and admitted by the Solicitor General. Why should we waste words, when nothing is gained, when we have not advanced this Bill one jot or title, and, when it we were to pass the clause as it is, a modification is to be presented for our consideration. It would not take half the time, if we had that before us now.

The PRIME MINISTER. I shall try once more to appeal to my hon. friend's reason. He will admit that in a Bill of this kind, it is absolutely indispensable that we should, at the outset, determine what is to be a polling division. Here is the section which defines what a polling division shall be:

> The polling divisions shall be those established by or under the laws of that province for the purposes of provincial elections within the territory comprised in the electoral district for which such election is held.

This will suit convenience, so far as Ontario, Quebec and Nova Scotia, and so on, are concerned, but my hon. friend from Kent says that in New Brunswick there are polling divisions in which you have 900 electors. The Solicitor General very well says that these shall continue to be polling divisions. But

as in them a condition of things exists which does not exist in the other provinces, he proposes to make a subsequent supplementary provision to meet that condition of things. He proposes to introduce a new clause which shall not in any way modify the definition here given, but will meet the objection raised. What must be settled at once is that the polling divisions shall be those determined by each province. Why not agree to this at once ?

Mr. CLANCY. There are cases that are not met which exist in Ontario and require to be provided for.

The PRIME MINISTER. I make to the hon. gentleman the same reply. The polling divisions in each province are those recognized in the Bill, but if there are conditions such as have been mentioned by the hon. member for Kent, it is evident that you must provide for more than one polling station, and the clause which the hon. Solicitor General proposes to introduce will provide for this very contingency, namely, for the three or four polling stations in each such polling division. Therefore the language of this section cannot be modified by any subsequent clause intended to meet the particular condition of things I have alluded to.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. In Manitoba, the local electoral divisions are not coterminous with the federal divisions. In fact, they are laid down regardless of the limits of the municipalities and it will so happen that one of these polling divisions will be partly in one federal district and partly in another, and I believe that, under such circumstances, this section will have to be modified or another subsection inserted in the Bill, in order to cover those cases.

The PRIME MINISTER. I do not say yes or no. We have to consider each case by itself. We are now dealing with a special feature of the Bill, and if my hon. friend thinks that another section may be necessary to meet his own case, he will have to show a cause for it. Of course every hon. gentleman here from the different provinces speaks from the view of his own province. We have been dealing with the case of New Brunswick alone up to the present, but I repeat this is simply to determine what is a polling division, and nothing that can be done afterwards can modify it. How can we go on unless we study out, section by section, what is to be the language of the Bill, but this section must be accepted as the basis of every other provision to be made afterwards.

Mr. McINERNEY. We stand here in perfect ignorance now as to what amendment will be submitted on Monday or Tuesday of next week.

The PRIME MINISTER. Then propose your amendment.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

Mr. McINERNEY. Therefore I cannot consent to allowing this clause to go as it is, and I propose to add therefore to section 5 subsection "b," a clause providing that there shall not be more than three hundred voters for any polling subdivision.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman cannot move that now, because we have not reached the end of section 5.

Mr. TAYLOR. Add it to subsection "b."

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. That does not meet the difficulty.

The PRIME MINISTER. At all events, my hon. friend has moved an amendment which shows that the language of the section is all right as it is.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment of the hon. member for Kent, to add to subsection "b" of section 5 the following words :—

Provided that there shall not be more than 300 voters on any list for any polling subdivision.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The amendment is not germane to the subsection before the committee.

Mr. CLANCY. The right hon. First Minister urged very strongly that there was no necessity for changing the wording of subsection "b" of section 5, because there are no cases which it does not cover, but there are cases in Ontario that are not already provided for by law, either by statute or under the municipal law.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Name one.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. Solicitor General pointed out that where they were not named by statute or fixed under the authority of a statute by the municipalities, they were named in the other cases, and he pointed me to section 2 of the Ontario election law.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. No, section 61 of the Ontario Election Act.

Mr. CLANCY. That is quite right. Now, the hon. gentleman will find that that covers the electoral district of West Algoma ; but, if he follows it to the electoral district of East Algoma, he will see there how the subdivisions are named, and let him read subsection 3, and he will find the following :—

The Lieutenant-Governor in Council may from time to time add other polling divisions.

And there is this, further :

The returning officer shall establish as many polling places at the places before mentioned as he may consider requisite, and may appoint other places in addition to those in this section.

Then, we will take the electoral district of Nipissing. We find there that, in the unorganized district, the Lieutenant-Governor

may from time to time also appoint places.

Now, the hon. gentleman, I understand, in subsection "d" makes provision for that. I call his attention to that, because I think the intention there was, to make provision to meet these cases. If I am not right, I hope the hon. gentleman will set me right. Now, that only provides for cases where there are not polling subdivisions fixed by law, but by law there are polling places that may be opened for provincial elections, and in such cases, where the provincial lists have been prepared and in force, the Dominion elections are to take place on these lists. I think that is the provision of the section he is drafting. I desire to point out that there are places not named, as fixed by statute or by the municipality, and, therefore, this section does not apply in such cases.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. TAYLOR. I would suggest—I do not move, but I will send the memo. I have to the Solicitor General—that subsection "b" be amended by adding these words:

Except in case there are polling subdivisions which contain over 300 voters' names on the lists and in that case a polling station shall be fixed for each 300 voters or fraction thereof.

I do not insist upon these words, but this will cover the idea.

The PRIME MINISTER. I understood my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) wanted to make a suggestion to the Solicitor General. I would suggest to my hon. friend, that the Solicitor General has an amendment which, I think, proceeds on these lines.

Mr. TAYLOR. His amendment is a subsection.

The PRIME MINISTER. Does the hon. gentleman object that it should be done in that way?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I cannot quite understand the voting down of the amendment by hon. gentlemen opposite, because I thought they had agreed to it, in so many words. I thought the Solicitor General stated that he was quite prepared to conform to exactly what this amendment states.

The PRIME MINISTER. The idea was accepted; but surely my hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) will not pretend that the amendment, as it was written, carried out the idea. There was no machinery in it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There is no machinery in this clause.

The PRIME MINISTER. There is to be machinery in the amendment to be moved by the Solicitor General.

Mr. MILLS. Why do we not have a Bill we can understand?

The PRIME MINISTER. Because you will not apply your minds to it.

Mr. SPROULE. Looking over the Ontario Act, it seems plain that this does not cover the cases of Algoma and Nipissing. It says:

The returning officer shall establish as many polling places at the places before mentioned——

That is, named places.

——as he shall consider requisite, and may appoint other places in addition to those named in this section.

The returning officer, in the provincial election, sometimes establishes polling places sometimes 50 or even 100 miles away from places where polls were held before, because of the opening of some new section or the establishment of mining camps. There is no provision of the law for establishing these, except the power given to the returning officer, and I do not think that this subsection covers such cases.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I think, if my hon. friend will consider subsection "d," he will find that it meets the difficulty. You will notice that in Ontario the polling subdivisions are fixed by the municipal councils—that is the general rule. The exception is created under section 60 and section 61 and section 62, referring to the electoral districts of West Algoma and the unorganized territory of Algoma East and Nipissing. Under subsection 3, it is provided that the Lieutenant-Governor may, from time to time, add other polling places, or the returning officer shall establish them where it is found necessary. Now, under subsection "d," it is provided:

Where, for any part of the province, polling divisions are not established by or under the laws of the province——

That is the case here.

——but by or under such laws places are fixed where polls shall be opened.

That is the case under section 62.

Mr. CLANCY. Not at all.

Mr. SPROULE. Some are fixed, but some are not fixed.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. In Algoma West, in the unorganized territory of Algoma East, and in Nipissing, the places are fixed. Here is what section 62 says:

Polls shall be opened and held for an election in the electoral district of Nipissing, in each of the unorganized municipalities in accordance with the provisions of this Act and in such municipalities one such poll shall be opened at or near the place where the last municipal election was held.

There the polling places are fixed. Then it proceeds to say that where no such places are fixed, polls shall be opened and held where the lists of voters entitled to vote at such an election have been prepared. Now all the machinery which the provincial law of Ontario provides for the local elections, is incorporated under this section into our

law; that is to say that the Ontario Act provides that in the case of a provincial election, polling places shall be fixed in these particular localities at certain places.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the Minister proceeds on the assumption that these places are fixed; but there are a number of places that are not fixed, new places established in every election.

The PRIME MINISTER. In all these places in which there is no provision made for the election, what takes place in the provincial election will prevail.

Mr. SPROULE. The returning officer is instructed to fix the polling stations himself.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Then subsection "e" provides for that.

Mr. TAYLOR. I move that the following words be added to subsection "b" of section 5:

Except in case there are in any province polling subdivisions which contain over 300 voters' names on the list, then in that case a polling station shall be fixed for each 300 voters or fraction thereof.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. BENNETT. Perhaps the difficulty could be got over by the Solicitor General taking clause "b" as it stands and adding the very words of his amendment providing for places where there are over 300 names.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The object my hon. friend suggests will be reached by the amendment which we are pledged to introduce. It is because of the objection of my hon. friend that I have changed the terms of the suggested section I intend to introduce. We had it fixed at 250, we have increased it to 300. But I cannot see why we should not introduce that as a substantive section immediately after this.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. I have ascertained that in my own electoral district there are polling divisions established under the local Act which are running into the next district, that is to say, they are covering ground in both districts. I want to know from the Solicitor General whether this should not be provided for in that subsection, when he says that the polling divisions:

Shall be those established by and under the laws of that province for the purpose of a provincial election within the territory comprising the electoral district for which such election is held.

I would suggest "partly or wholly within."

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I understand my hon. friend to mean that the territorial limits of an electoral division for the federal may not agree with the territorial limits for the local.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. They do not.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I foresaw that difficulty, which will occur in the province of Quebec in a good many counties; therefore, I put section 7 into the Act, to which I refer my hon. friend, and which I think meets what he suggests.

Subsection "b" agreed to.

On subsection "c,"

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I call attention to this, because I think it meets a real difficulty that we ought to guard against. It has been suggested in the course of this debate that in view of the fact that the provincial franchise is adopted for our federal elections, it might be possible for an evil intentioned local legislature so to alter the provincial franchise as to make it practically impossible for us to carry on our federal election, or so to alter the basis of the franchise that if it were known to us, we would not have an election on such a franchise. Now, I want to guard against that, and for that purpose I want to provide so far as possible that we should take the election lists which have been in force a sufficient length of time previous to the Dominion elections as to ensure a reasonable probability that the local legislature would not have been able to foresee a Dominion election and alter the law for the purpose of defeating our purpose. That is the object. I have left a blank that I would like my hon. friends to help me in filling up. Under Sir John Thompson's Bill of 1894, it was provided that we should have as the basis of the franchise, just as in this case, the provincial franchise, and to meet the difficulty that I now see, he provided that the provincial franchise should be that in force in the province on the 1st day of June of the year in which the election took place. That is the way he guarded against the possible difficulty. But to my mind that is not sufficient, because it might be possible that we would have an election very close to the 1st of June. I would, therefore, ask whether we should take the electoral lists sixty days before the proclamation of the election, whether that would be sufficient to protect us against any change in the local franchise.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We have heard a good deal of objection to the Bill which has been brought in by the Solicitor General, but we have heard no speech showing so clearly the monstrous character of the legislation proposed.

Mr. LISTER. It is Sir John Thompson's Bill.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It does not require a word from me to emphasize the emphatic condemnation of the whole of this legislation, because the Solicitor General has put the whole matter in a nutshell, and showed that we are exposed to such a

monstrous Act on the part of the local legislature as to absolutely compel him to ask this Parliament to take effective means to protect us from the conduct to which we are exposed. I do not rise, however, for the purpose of adding anything to the hon. gentleman's remarks; in fact, they could hardly be added to. But we have now reached the cardinal point of the Bill, which, in my judgment, is of graver importance than anything else connected with it, namely, the voters' lists. This demands the most careful consideration of the committee, and I propose to offer an amendment which embodies in a few words the grave objection entertained on this side of the House to this measure, and the principal objection.

The PRIME MINISTER. Then we have not yet heard what the principal objection is?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Hon. gentlemen have heard a good deal about it, but it has not been presented in a concentrated form. Dealing with such an important feature of the Bill as is covered by my amendment, I may say that when disposed of it will, to a very large extent, decide the controversy between the two sides of the House. I move in amendment to subsection "e" of section 5, as follows:—

Provided that if in any electoral district a dispute shall arise as to the qualification to entitle any person to vote therein, an appeal shall lie to the county court judge having jurisdiction in that electoral district, and in provinces where there are no county court judges, then to the superior court of the district having jurisdiction in that electoral district.

I move this amendment now because we are dealing with the voters' lists, and as to how they shall be prepared. I ask my hon. friend the First Minister not to oblige me to go on with the debate on this amendment until the next sitting of the committee.

The PRIME MINISTER. If I properly apprehend the tenor of the amendment of my hon. friend it is to reserve to an individual voter the right of appeal against the decision of the party who prepares the list. Is that the object?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is the object.

The PRIME MINISTER. That is not germane to subsection "c." Moreover, in all the provinces, I believe, at all events in the province of Quebec, there is such an appeal already, and I believe such an appeal also exists in Ontario and Nova Scotia.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

The PRIME MINISTER. I cannot dispute as to Nova Scotia, but I am informed by those who are competent to speak that in Ontario and Nova Scotia there may be an appeal to the judicial authority by any voter whose name is not on the list. I do not know the state of the law in New Brunswick. But I submit that the amendment is not germane to the section now under consideration. The section is to determine what class of lists is prepared and what they are to be. The polling lists,

Shall be those prepared for the several polling divisions so established and which on the..... day next preceding the day fixed for the nomination of candidates for such Dominion election were in force or were last in force under the laws of that province for the purposes of provincial elections.

My hon. friend says that the list here intended to apply are the lists of the provinces of Quebec or Ontario. But my hon. friend wants this list, as a whole, to hinge an amendment which shall apply, not to the list as a whole, but to independent electors whose names may figure on the list. When the lists upon which we are to vote are prepared, whether federal or provincial lists, the right of the elector to question his status has been determined by the courts. I therefore submit that this is not the proper time for the hon. gentleman to move his amendment.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It appears to me from the form of the amendment that the hon. gentleman cannot have carefully considered the clause, and I am afraid he has not very much appreciated what it means. The amendment was typewritten and, therefore, I presume, was got up with a little care; but really it is meaningless, utterly unworkable, can scarcely be said to be sensible, and if incorporated in the Bill would have about the same effect as chips in porridge. Does the hon. gentleman mean that a couple of gentlemen passing on the street some day, having a controversy as to whether a certain property qualification would entitle a man to vote or not, would have the right to proceed to the county court judge, knock at his door and ask him to determine the question? Or does it mean that on the morning of the election, a question arising upon a person having presented himself and claimed the right to vote, and being refused, a dispute occurred, the election must be postponed until some later date, and the parties must drive to the county court judge and ascertain what he thinks? Or what is really the meaning of this amendment? I must confess I think it would be impossible to put a reasonable interpretation on it. If the hon. gentleman's suggestion that the committee rise and the debate be adjourned be agreed to, perhaps on consideration, he may find it would be possible to frame something that, at all events, if put in the Bill, would not be a reproach to everybody who has anything to do with it, as I fear would be the effect of this amendment, if it were seriously considered.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am very grateful to my hon. friend (Mr. Blair) for

the very flattering and complimentary terms in which he has referred to this resolution, and I should feel very seriously injured and very much hurt if that had come from an authority for which I had a higher respect. I may say to him (Mr. Blair), that I have had an opinion upon this amendment from gentlemen whose legal standing and ability entitle them to very much greater respect than I entertain for the opinion of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) himself. All I wish to do by this amendment is to guard against the frightful fraud that underlies this Bill, by means of which the electors of this country are to be cheated, deliberately cheated, by Act of Parliament, out of the right to exercise an independent franchise. I can quite understand that is not exactly the kind of thing that will commend itself to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair); that is not the kind of view that he feels disposed to take in these matters. Sir, the law put upon the Statute-books by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) in the province of New Brunswick is a law calculated to defraud the electors of the right of their independent franchise.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Nobody has discovered that yet.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. In many instances where there is a close election, to whom does the law of New Brunswick confide the power of returning the candidate he wishes to return. A partisan officer, the sheriff, who is appointed by the Government of the day is the person who, in the province of New Brunswick, has the power of nullifying the sacred trust of the franchise. If in a polling district there are half a dozen persons of the same name, the sheriff has the power to strike them all off but one, and if there are five of the same name Conservatives and one a Liberal, the law of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) enables the sheriff to strike off the five Conservatives and to leave the Liberal on. That is the kind of law which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) manufactures for his own purpose in his own province. I can quite understand that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) would feel the utmost indignation at any attempt to protect the honest and independent voter. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) not know, that under the law in New Brunswick the sheriff, and the sheriff alone, is in a position to go to the reviser and put names on the list or strike names off the list at his own sweet will. Under the law in New Brunswick, passed by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair), the most monstrous frauds are invited and encouraged and made possible. He is the last man in this House to whom I would look for any aid in appointing a judicial officer to protect the right of the voter. It would not suit him, and I do not look for his assistance in any honest effort to protect the honest elector of this country. In view of the hon. gentleman's record in his own province, he is the last man in this House I would look to for anything except an attempt to deprive the electorate of the protection that this amendment will give them. Does the hon. gentleman not know what we are contending against? The Manitoba "Free Press," which I read last night told him that the franchise law of Manitoba was a law to enable the Government of the day to elect whom they please, and a law under which the most frightful frauds may be permitted. Under this amendment which I have proposed, a judicial officer could stand between the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) and his minions and protect the honest voter. The hon. the mover of this Bill (Mr. Fitzpatrick), has borne testimony here as to his opinion of what the local legislatures may do. He tells us that having studied this subject he proposes to introduce an important amendment in order to prevent the legislature of any province from creating a franchise for the purpose of serving their party in this House, when they themselves have no intention of using that franchise. That proposal of the Solicitor General shows something of what we have to guard against and therefore am I not warranted in asking support for this amendment from every honest man in this House, every man who wants to see justice and fair-play shown to the electorate. I will tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) that the organ of his own party, the Manitoba "Free Press," has shown that under the law in Manitoba the Government appoint a man of no standing, a man of no character, a man who has nothing to lose; they appoint him as revising officer, and when the parties go before him, they get just such justice as you would expect from the New Brunswick sheriff appointed by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) to carry out the law he has put on the Statute-books of that province.

Mr. KAULBACH. Or the county of Lunenburg.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). Lunenburg is all right.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Lunenburg is all right, so long as it obeys the behest of the Finance Minister, but it is all wrong when it does anything else. I drew the attention of the House, last night, to what took place in the province of Manitoba. In a close constituency, where some fifteen votes would turn the election, what did the Government do? They sent a characterless. miserable creature to act as revising officer.

The PRIME MINISTER. And subsequently a returning officer of the same character.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am speaking of the action of the Government of Manitoba.

The PRIME MINISTER. I am speaking of the action of the late Federal Government.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman has endorsed and intensified the charge I make against them. He says that, not satisfied with sending a miserable, characterless revising officer, they sent a miserable, characterless returning officer there to do their work. That makes the matter very much worse. In that constituency, where there was a majority of about fifteen Conservatives, as has been established by the affidavit of the most respectable people in the country, fifteen names were put upon the list of persons who had no existence, who could not be found in the district or in the province, although the country was searched far and wide. Respectable people gave him the proof that they had searched the country far and wide, and that there were no such men in the district, and they asked him to strike these names off the list. Did this miserable, characterless creature, sent to do the infamous work by the Government of Manitoba do it? No. He said, "I cannot strike their names off the list, unless you can prove to me that you have served them with a notice." Does not even the sense of justice of the Minister of Railways and Canals revolt against such a frightful act of injustice as that? I hope he is not so far gone as to be incapable of appreciating such a condition of things; and it is for the purpose of interposing a judge, such as is enjoyed by the province of Ontario, the province of Quebec, and every other province of this Dominion should enjoy, that is not intended to be used to prostitute everything like honesty, and fair-play, and justice between the political parties of this country that I propose this amendment. Is there a man in this House who will say, in the face of such transactions as this, and in the face of the law of New Brunswick to-day, that it is not a just and proper demand I make, that in this law some means shall be provided whereby the names of honest, intelligent electors that have been left off the list, shall be put on, without going to such characterless creatures as the one I have referred to, who disgraced himself and the country and the Government under whom he served, by his conduct? Is that the purpose of adopting the local franchises and shifting on the local legislatures the responsibilities that would otherwise rest on the Government themselves? Under the law, as it stood, you had the recourse that the Government of the day were held responsible on the floor of this House for the character of the men they employed to carry out the legislation of the country; and every honest, independent elector throughout this wide Dominion, if he was entitled to go on the list, and was kept off by wrong-doing, had the right and opportunity of appealing to a judge; and that is what this amendment, which is so spurned and despised by the Minister of Railways and Canals, proposes. It is not the want of legal phraseology in the amendment that troubles the hon. gentleman. It is because it is proposed to defeat the nefarious attempt that underlies this legislation that is being forced through this House and upon the people of this country. That is what troubles the brilliant intelligence and acumen of the Minister of Railways and Canals. It is not the verbiage of the amendment; it is the principle; and I appeal to the right hon. gentleman at the head of the Government, whether he does not owe it to his own character and to the reputation of the Government to give the honest, independent electorate of this country the protection this amendment provides against such nefarious, such disreputable trampling of all law and justice under their feet as the Government of Manitoba practiced in regard to the most sacred right which any free man can be called upon to exercise, that is, the franchise. I did not intend at this late hour of the night, to go into a discussion of this cardinal feature of the Bill, on which every friend of justice and fair-play ought to take his stand; but I felt it right to place in the hands of the Chairman of the Committee, and on the Table of the House, the mode I proposed, with the great aid and wonderful legal acumen of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, to put into such legal phraseology as would come up to the high standard of that hon. gentleman's legal standing and position.

Mr. ELLIS. I am sorry the hon. gentleman has given the committee such a poor impression of the electoral law of New Brunswick. I would like to point out to the House, in the first place, that in our provincial politics, the question of Liberal and Conservative has not been an element at all in the framing of laws of that character. Then, it is only fair to the Minister of Railways to say, that for a great many years, I think, nearly forty years, there was no change whatever made in the electoral law, until 1889, when the hon. gentleman gave legislation to the country which enlarged the franchise very considerably indeed, and gave entire satisfaction, I think, to the great bulk of the people. With reference to the sheriffs of New Brunswick, I do not know much of their politics—some are Liberal and some Conservative—but they are all men of high character, any one of whom could be trusted to perform any duty fairly and justly. With regard to the lists, every provincial list is first prepared by the assessors, and then revised by the revising officers, chosen by the municipal authorities, and chosen generally without the slightest regard to their political standing. The question of Liberal and Conservative does not enter into municipal discussion, and I know that in the city of St. John these revisers are chosen by the city government without regard to their politics. Further than that, it would not be in the interests of the municipal councillors that the lists should be managed in such a way as to dissatisfy either political party,

because these councillors have to stand before the people for election on their own merits and acts as aldermen. All that the sheriff has to do is to not, as my hon. friend intimates, to reject five Conservatives and leave one Liberal on the list, but in preparing the lists to see that the same name does not appear in five or six different places. I do not know that it is necessary to say anything further than that the hon. Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair), so far as New Brunswick is concerned, stands high in the estimation of the people for the electoral law he has placed on the Statute-book.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). I do not think that the hon. leader of the Opposition need apologize for the warmth of his address, because the committee will perfectly understand that the hon. gentleman's righteous indignation at anything in the shape of fraud in connection with an election would naturally lead him to a very strong expression of opinion. As the hon. gentleman, however, has more than once repeated a fairy tale which he heard somewhere with regard to some proceedings in Manitoba, I wish to say that I have lived in that province for a good many years, and have sat in its legislature for many years—in fact during all the time in which the Act complained of was in operation—and I have never heard of any proceedings such as those he has mentioned. I shall not enter at this late hour into a discussion of the matter, as I may possibly have an opportunity of doing so before the Bill becomes law, but I wish to say that this is the first time I have heard the statement which he has made with regard to fraudulent actions on the part of revising officers. The people of Manitoba never heard anything of the kind while I was there. And I have this to say further, that the Act which came into force in 1891, under which revising officers are appointed, as they are appointed under the Dominion Franchise Act—and who are sometimes judges and sometimes not—has worked satisfactorily. There has not been to my knowledge, and there never was while I sat in the legislature, any complaint made against the conduct of these revising officers. Not a single complaint was made during the five years that I was a member of the Government of Manitoba, during which that Act was in force, against the conduct of any revising officer. Not only was no complaint ever proven, but none was ever made. I do not believe that the Opposition press, which has often violently attacked the conduct of the registration clerks and the officers who made up the lists in the first instance, ever attacked the conduct or character of the revising officers. I think it is generally admitted that every revising officer appointed under that Act has acted fairly, and I do not believe now that anybody can prove that on any possible occasion, when the question of the revision of the lists under the Manitoba Franchise Act was under consideration, the revising officers acted otherwise than properly. I make this statement because I am perfectly satisfied that no such charge was ever made or could be proven. I believe it was alleged last session in the discussion which took place on the Act introduced then, that there was some misconduct, but I do not believe that such charge was ever established or can be proven. I might further refer to my hon. friends remark that the Manitoba "Free Press," from which he quoted an article the other day, is one of the papers supporting the Government. I have not had heretofore any knowledge of that fact. On the contrary, the most virulent opposition which the Government of Manitoba received for many years came from the Manitoba "Free Press," and I would almost as soon accept a citation from one of the hon. gentleman's own speeches as evidence of a matter of fact as a citation from that newspaper.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I must confess if I had anticipated that the very mild criticism which I ventured to pass on the proposed amendment of the hon. gentleman would have, at this late hour, exercised his wrath to such an extent and lead to his losing his temper and worked him up to that condition of impotent rage and fury into which he fell, I should have hesitated before making any comments on that proposed amendment at all. I feel bound to respect that hon. gentleman's years. I am not going to say that there is very much else in connection with him that I feel bound to respect, but I do feel that he is entitled to consideration at the hands of hon. gentlemen here on that account, and I am filled with regret that we should have had so many exhibitions lately of fury and indignation to which the hon. gentleman has treated us during the present session. I can assure the hon. gentleman that in the statement which he has made to-night with regard to the electoral legislation for which I was, perhaps, in a large measure, responsible in the province of New Brunswick, he has made a discovery which I will venture to say has not been made by any other individual resident in that province. I venture to say that if there is one thing which cannot be said with regard to any legislation that I promoted in that province, it is that I discriminated or sought to discriminate, in any shape or form, between the two political parties in that province. I had the pleasure during fourteen years of my term in that province of enjoying the support of a very large number of Conservatives there, and sitting behind the hon. gentleman now, there are three of these gentlemen, two of whom were my supporters during the whole of that period; and I am willing to submit the legislation for which I admit I am responsible to be passed upon by either of those, confident that whatever else may be said with regard to it they will not confirm the statement which

the hon. gentleman, with that extravagance of language which characterises him, has so recklessly made to-night. I say that I forgive the hon. gentleman. He has some title to forgiveness. I make all allowance for the weakness he has displayed here, and I acquit him of any deliberate intentions, and I believe that when he comes to his sober moments—I mean when he comes to a more sedate and calm frame of mind—he will himself admit that he has entirely misrepresented the legislation of the province of New Brunswick and my conduct in connection with it in every way. Let me tell my hon. friend that the statutes of New Brunswick with regard to elections, if he will only read them, will satisfy him that there is no such power conferred upon the sheriffs as he says is conferred upon them. There is no section of that law from beginning to end which can justify his censure. The hon. gentleman will accept, I am sure, my humble acknowledgment for having spoken in such terms of his amendment and made him feel so heartily ashamed of it as to have led him to indulge in the wild and furious declamation he has taken us through to-night.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am not surprised to see the hon. gentlemen sitting cheek by jowl. They are 'arcades ambo.' But I am a little surprised that they have both attempted to deal with the statements I have made here, when neither of them was able to controvert a single word I have said in reference to the legislation of New Brunswick and the legislation of Manitoba. I will deal with that paragon of purity and honesty, the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton), first. And when he repudiates the Manitoba "Free Press" as the organ of the Liberal party in that country, I can only say that I have regarded the Manitoba "Free Press" as one of the ablest exponents of the Liberal policy, not only in the province of Manitoba, but in this country, and it has been invariably found giving the heartiest support, whenever it could give it with any kind of regard for self-respect, to gentlemen who sit opposite. Now, what does the "Free Press" say? It says that the Government intends to wipe out the electoral law and "substitute the provincial lists, without any federal interference." That is correct, I suppose, that states the policy of the Government. It is to leave the provinces to work their own sweet will, which is the policy of all except the Solicitor General, who has come to the rescue, and has intimated that there is such a danger of their attempting one of the most frightful acts of fraud and dishonesty that it is possible to conceive that he proposes to provide for it. The "Free Press" says:

> In one province, Manitoba, the principle of government control of the lists is the very foundation of the law——

Whose law? The law of the Minister of the Interior. And what do they say about it after their experience. It says that in its operation an election is assured in every doubtful constituency by the dishonest practises of registration clerks. What does the hon. gentleman say?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I say it is not so. The hon. gentleman might just as well quote one of his own speeches as quote the Manitoba "Free Press."

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Very well, I am quoting one of the ablest journals in support of the Liberal party in Canada, published where they know the hon. gentleman better than he is yet known here. The "Free Press" says:

> The law could not contribute more effectively to the stuffing of the lists in the interest of the ruling party if it had been specially and avowedly designed for that purpose. * * * We need not inquire whether the Liberals have forgotten or swallowed their scruples of 1885; it is sufficient to know that by the Bill now before the House a federal election law will be imposed on this province and other provinces that will be infinitely worse than the existing Dominion law was ever claimed to be. Our only hope of escape from a measure in which the electorate will be left at the mercy of Government agents, and the free expression of the popular will need not be permitted, lies in the Senate.

I tell the hon. gentleman further that the newspapers of to-day report that the leader of the Opposition in the legislature of Manitoba, Mr. Roblin, has just been invited to become a member of Mr. Greenway's Government.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Is that the hon. gentleman's proof that the Manitoba Franchise Act of the Manitoba Government is a bad Act? Does he prove it by citing a telegraph report that Mr. Roblin is going into the government?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. What I intend to prove the hon. gentleman will find it difficult to disprove. He challenged the statements I have made, and I reply that a gentleman who, we are informed, is about to become a member of the government, Mr. Roblin, on the floor of the legislature of Manitoba, made the same statements in regard to this matter that I have made here to-night. Therefore, when he pretends that he has half a dozen times heard this apocryphal story——

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The hon. gentleman has it right now.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Then the hon. gentleman pretends that this story is not well-founded; he forgets that on the floor of this Parliament affidavits were read from some of the most respectable men in the province to prove the statements I have made, and they are confirmed by the paper I have quoted, and which, as I have said,

is one of the ablest papers supporting the Liberal party in this country.

And the hon. gentleman is aware—he cannot be ignorant of the fact—that a gentleman whom we have all learned to respect for his independent and able conduct in regard to public business, the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Roche), has made, in a most clear and emphatic terms, the very statements that the hon. gentleman takes exception and pretends he has never heard before. Did he not know that these statements were made in the House that they had been extended in "Hansard" and down to this hour the hon. gentleman has never ventured to rise and, in the presence of the House, contradict a single word. I leave the hon. gentleman's statement that he has never heard it except from myself, with the fact that these statements have been made on the floor of the legislature, where they have been proved by the most indisputable evidence, and they have been made on the floor of this Parliament, supported by men of the highest character. It is too late in the day for the hon. gentleman to seek to disclaim them. I am not surprised he should do so. What does this legislation prove? The hon. gentleman is a member of the Government which is pressing forward this Bill to subvert the franchise of the electorate of this country by handing us over to the tender mercies of such infamous frauds and transactions as have been practiced under the Bill of the Manitoba legislature, and under the action of the miserable, characterless creatures he, as a member of the Manitoba Government, appointed to carry that law into effect. The facts are sufficient to destroy the reputation and character of any man in this House or elsewhere.

Now, with reference to the apologetic tone adopted by the Minister of Railways and Canals, I think he concluded that he had been a little too hasty with his sneer at this amendment. But I tell him that in every statement I have made with reference to the province of New Brunswick, I have simply repeated what was declared to me by one of the most independent members of this House, the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Powell). He told me that under the law as it stands in New Brunswick to-day, the sheriffs have extraordinary powers. I am not saying one word touching the character or standing of the sheriffs of New Brunswick.

I say it is an infamous law to give to any man the power to seat or unseat men that have a right to be elected as members of this House, to give him power to put names on the voters' list and take them off. Does the Minister of Railways and Canals venture to say that any man with any sense of fairness should be clothed with such power as the legislation of New Brunswick clothes the sheriff, enabling him to take off names from electoral lists at pleasure and put names on at pleasure, and preventing any other person from dealing with it in the same way? If half a dozen persons of the same name are on the list, he is able to run his pen through the franchise, and leave only one of them remaining. The hon. gentleman has failed to meet a single point of my charge; and I am not surprised to see these two gentlemen sitting there united in forcing this obnoxious measure through the Parliament of this country, which will strike down everything like independent action on the part of the great electorate of Canada.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman one question. I presume that before he would make so grave a statement, or such a series of statements, he would have informed himself pretty thoroughly as to the accuracy of his facts.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have the highest authority I could possibly have.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman, of course, always deals in superlatives. I am not going to say that the authority which he quotes, so far as matter of law is concerned, may not be fairly respectable; but did the hon. gentleman take the trouble to ascertain, or did he inquire of this highest authority, how many years before I ever had a seat in the provincial legislature, the same authority which is now possessed by the sheriffs of counties, was possessed by them under provincial legislation.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It was sufficient for me to know that the hon. gentleman, as Attorney General, maintained and carried out that legislation.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Then I think the hon. gentleman is scarcely capable of acting in a judicial way, or of forming a reliable opinion upon a question where a political opponent is concerned, because if he had taken the trouble to assure himself that he had some shadow of foundation for the charges he has made, and if he had looked at the electoral legislation in New Brunswick, he would have found that, as I have said, before I came into power, before I had a seat in the provincial legislature, before I was responsible for provincial legislation.

An hon. MEMBER. Before you were born.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, perhaps even before I was born, as an hon. gentleman says, the sheriffs had conferred upon them exactly the same power. I appeal to hon. gentlemen who are sitting behind the leader of the Opposition to say whether they ever heard in all their lives such a suggestion made, or such a charge preferred, as that which has been preferred by the leader of the Opposition to-night that the law was so framed as to per-

mit the sheriffs to do these things, or that the sheriffs had ever done these things. I say without fear of contradiction that such a statement has never been made in the province of New Brunswick, that no such view has ever been entertained in the province of New Brunswick. When the hon. member quotes the authority of Mr. Powell, I want to say that, if my memory serves me, Mr. Powell was a member of the legislature when the electoral law was revised in 1889, and Mr. Powell never thought that the law which had been on the Statute-book previously and gave the sheriff these powers, had been wrongly used or had been abused by the sheriffs, or that it was a proper thing to amend it. Mr. Powell himself has never stated in any public way, never in the legislature, that there was any call for any change in that regard. I am perfectly astounded to hear the hon. gentleman. I can scarcely give him credit for seriousness. I can scarcely conceive that the hon. gentleman would have hazarded such utterly foundationless statements in a deliberate way before this legislature, with the view of having them put upon record, as they will be, and without having taken some little pains to ascertain for himself that there was any warrant for these statements.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. The Minister of Interior stated to-night that to his knowledge there never were any complaints about the working of the present law in the province of Manitoba.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. About the revisers.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. The revisers, and especially the clerks that are appointed to prepare the lists.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No, I did not say that. I said there hed been no complaints against the registration clerks; I said there never had been to my knowledge a complaint made against a reviser.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. The hon. gentleman appointed registration clerks, and if they have not performed their duty to the satisfaction of the public, it is because they were appointed by the Government to prepare the lists. The moment he admits that he made bad appointments, I shall be satisfied.

Mr. McINERNEY. While I do not wish to interfere in the discussion that has taken place between the leader of the Opposition and the Minister of Railways and Canals, I think it is nothing but right that I should call the Minister's attention to the fact that there is a law on the Statute-book of New Brunswick giving the sheriff very large and dangerous powers with regard to striking off and putting names upon the list.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. How long has this law been upon the Statute-book?

Mr. McINERNEY. I will show the hon. gentleman the law to-morrow.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. How long do you say it has been on the Statute-book?

Mr. McINERNEY. I do not believe the hon. gentleman knows the existence of the law himself. I have proved to-night twice that the hon. gentleman has been ignorant of the laws of this country. I have shown distinctly the ignorance of the hon. gentleman when he stated in this House that he voted at a Dominion election at a poll in the city of St. John, where, because his name began with B, and another man's name began with some other letter, in the same subdivision, they went to different poll boxes to poll their votes.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Well, that is a fact.

Mr. McINERNEY. Does the hon. gentleman still persist in that statement, in face of the statement made by the Solicitor General that such could not be done under the Dominion Franchise Act, in face of the fact known to every lawyer in this House, that it is perfectly absurd for the hon. gentleman to say so? He must be entirely mistaken, putting it on the best possible ground, when he says that such a thing ever took place. It must have been at some civic election in the city, or some local election. It could not have been under the Dominion Franchise laws, and it could not have taken place at a Dominion election.

The hon. gentleman is mistaken again with respect to the law of New Brunswick, because there is a very dangerous law on the Statute-book with respect to the power of the sheriff in putting on and taking off names from the lists. I am not prepared to state, and I am not here to state, that the hon. Minister of Railways placed a law on the Statute-book for the benefit of the Liberal or the Conservative party, because the hon. gentleman was not supported either by the Liberals or the Conservatives, as a party. The hon. gentleman's government was a composite government, and it was not to his interest to put a law on the Statute-book, either for the purposes of the Liberal or the Conservative party, or to do anything against the interests of one party or the other.

The PRIME MINISTER. You are destroying the speech of your leader.

Mr. McINERNEY. I maintain that the law on the Statute-book of New Brunswick is dangerous to the rights and liberties of the citizens, and that under it the sheriff has great powers, which he may use for the benefit of the Government that appointed him, not of the Liberal or the Conservative party, but of the government in power for the time being.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Can the hon. gentleman remember the time when the sheriff did not have the power to prepare the lists to the extent to which he has the power referred to ?

Mr. McINERNEY. He has different powers to-day to what he had then.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Does not the hon. gentleman know, so far his memory will carry him back, that the sheriff exercised the power of making the lists just preparatory to the final preparation of the lists, as he would receive them from the county clerk, and when the name of the same party appeared in several places, he struck off the name in all except one parish ?

Mr. McINERNEY. I cannot answer that question, yes or no.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Can the hon. gentleman remember a time when that was not the law ?

Mr. McINERNEY. In New Brunswick, for many years, the sheriff has had certain powers in that regard, but later the sheriff has been given additional and far more dangerous powers, and the hon. gentleman should know it. I should be glad to show the hon. gentleman the statute to-morrow.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The charge made by the leader of the Opposition was, that the sheriff, under the provincial law, had the power of striking off names.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. And of keeping names on.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I ask the hon. member for Kent, if he can remember the time when the sheriff had not the power of striking off names, so that the name of an elector appeared only once on the electoral list ?

Mr. McINERNEY. I am here to state that far greater power is possessed by the sheriff than was formerly possessed by him, and much more dangerous power. The hon. gentleman also stated that the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Powell) was in the local House in 1889, and did not object when the Act was placed on the Statute-book. The hon. member for Westmoreland was first elected to the New Brunswick legislature in 1890.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I said that was my recollection. If the hon. gentleman was not in the legislature when the original Act of 1889 was discussed, he was there in 1891, when the amending Act was passed. That was a very important law, and it was passed by that hon. gentleman, as a member of the legislature, though I safeguarded my statement by saying that I thought he was there in 1889.

Mr. McINERNEY. All I desire to do is, to corroborate the statement made that the sheriffs of New Brunswick have very dangerous powers given to them by the government of the province, whose officers they are, and which powers can be exercised for the benefit of the party that maintains them in office.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. FOSTER. I hope it is not the intention of the leader of the House to press hon. members to do any further work. The question brought up in the amendment submitted by the leader of the Opposition is one that will be thoroughly discussed, and we should not be asked to enter upon the discussion to-night.

The PRIME MINISTER. It would be perfectly fair to carry all the subsections except "e."

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman is doing something that he is apt to do in considering the Estimates, where an hon. member wants to say something on a particular item, but does not wish the whole block of items appearing under the vote to stand. He treats the subclauses in that way. We, however, want to make some amendments to these subclauses. An amendment has been proposed by the leader of the Opposition, which involves the vital principle, as hon. gentlemen must admit. We stand here to say, that, if these provincial lists are to be taken, with all their mutations and all the existing powers of the local legislature over them, and which we cannot curb, then between the electors of the Dominion and those partisan officers we want the interposition of the courts of law. That is a reasonable proposition to be made, and it is not one to be sneered at by the Minister of Railways ; neither is it a proposition which the leader of the Government can afford to negative or put an affimative in at this time of night, and after the weary work of the week. If the hon. gentleman proposes that we shall go on with the Bill, we shall proceed, but we shall not go on without discussing the matter and discussing it at length.

Mr. BRITTON. What does the hon. gentleman mean by partisan officers ?

Mr. FOSTER. I will tell the hon. gentleman exactly, and it is no use chopping words about it. Does not the hon. gentleman know that the Government of Manitoba is in deadly opposition to the Liberal-Conservative party, and that they are cheek by jowl with the leader of the Government ? And are we not justified, believing that, as we do believe it, in asking that the judges shall at least intervene between us and partisan opponents ? You may talk about the "Free Press" of Manitoba being Liberal or Conservative, but it is an organ that every man who reads it and tells the truth, will say has been supporting the Liberal party, and this

grave statement was made by that representative paper in the very centre of the province where this state of things is going on. No sneer that it is a Tory sheet, will alter the facts of the case. That is what I mean by a partisan officer and a partisan government, and that is my answer to the hon. gentleman. Is it not a fact that the Manitoba Government has carried partisanship so far that it has practically dismissed every Liberal-Conservative magistrate in Manitoba and replaced them by Grit magistrates ?

Is that a fact or is it not ? Is that a partisan Government which would do a thing like that, or is it not ? The Minister of the Interior, has not ventured to-night to defend the partisan registration of Manitoba, and when he was pinned to it by my hon. friend (Mr. LaRivière) he was very quick to rise and say that the persons he was defending were the revising officers, and that he did not put in a defence for the registering clerks. Well, Sir, it is the registering clerks that do the work, and are hon. gentlemen—well, I really cannot bring myself to think that there is any necessity for argument. What the Solicitor General has advertised this House that he proposes to do is argument enough. The right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) starts out by saying that the franchise should be in the power of the local legislatures, because they are the people who know best, but the Solicitor General says : I do not subscribe to that doctrine ; it is true that my leader has laid down that doctrine, but I have so litte faith in it that I am going to forge a chain which will restrain these legislatures from possibilities which they may perform. The right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) declares that the right of the franchise should belong to the local community and that in this case the local legislatures are the community, and he says that they should not be interfered with. There is no logical ground for him saying that the franchise can be best carried out by the local community, if he is going to interfere with that local community. I voice the protest of the Liberal-Conservatives against a list made by a Government like that in Manitoba at the present time partisan as we have shown it to be—even if there is no other partisan Government. We have the right as Liberal-Conservatives to ask, not that another partisan should be put in to help us, but that in the last resort we should have the courts of the country to prove our claim, whether it is right or not, that we have been kept off the voters' list and should be put on. Nobody should object to that. It is that important principle (which I suppose will not be taken objection to by my hon. friend) which we want to discuss, and we do not want to discuss it at this hour in the morning.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I rather admire the assurance of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) and of the leader of the Opposition, when with that supreme confidence with which they make their statements in this House, they see fit to declare that the Government of Manitoba have been guilty of a large number of sins of omission and sins of commission. I admire their assurance when they assume, that because they have said a thing, therefore they have proven it. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) would do better, in making a statement of that kind, to confine himself to subjects upon which he at least has an elementary knowledge, and so far as the affairs of the province of Manitoba are concerned, I am satisfied from the manner in which the hon. gentleman strayed from the facts, that he has not even an elementary knowledge. Let me first say in regard to the remarks of my hon. friend from Provencher (Mr. LaRivière), that I did not admit, that I had no intention of admitting, and that I do not now admit, that the appointments which were made by the Government of Manitoba of registration clerks to record the names of voters in that province, were bad appointments. I am a little careful, very careful, I may say, in regard to statements which I make in this House or elsewhere, and when I said in my former few remarks that no complaints had been made against revising officers, I said that because I thought it was rather a remarkable thing. I thought it was a rather remarkable thing that officers discharging a duty in which they would necessarily come in adverse contact with the political parties, should have so acted for years in that province without a complaint ever having been made. I repeat now, that until the time I left Manitoba, and during the five years I sat in the legislature as a member of the Government, no complaint was ever made against any revising officer appointed by the Government of the province of Manitoba. When my hon. friend (Mr. LaRivière) addressed the committee, he said that I stated that no complaint was made against a registration clerk, and as I had not said that I corrected him. Complaints have been made against registration clerks, not all of them, not many of them but some of them, and it therefore would not have been correct for me to have said that no complaint had ever been made against a registration clerk. But, Sir, because a complaint has been made against a registration clerk, does it prove that therefore the appointment is a bad one? There have been complaints made against revising officers appointed by the Conservative Government of this Dominion, but do these gentlemen opposite admit that the appointments were bad. They have appointed county judges in some places to act as revising officers ; the conduct of these judges has been complained of, and do these hon. gentlemen therefore admit that the appointments were bad because complaints were made. I hardly think they do. It takes more than a complaint to prove that an ap-

pointment was bad ; it takes proof that the complaint was a good complaint, and no such complaint as far as I have been aware has been made and proven in the province of Manitoba, even against a registration clerk.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. Do I understand that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) says that some of the judges appointed in Manitoba have been complained of ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I never said anything of the kind. I said nothing that any one could possibly imagine sounded like that. My hon. friends opposite seem to take a great deal of pleasure in the attacks which they make upon the Franchise Act of Manitoba, and the hon. the leader of the Opposition seems to have taken a considerable amount of comfort out of the fact that I have allowed them to go on making ridiculous statements about things they knew nothing of, owing to the fact that I did not wish to interfere and to inflict further useless discussion upon this House. It seemed to me that the discussion was pointless, and it seemed to me further to be perfectly evident from the manner in which these hon. gentlemen spoke, that they knew they were making charges that were groundless. I shall not place myself outside the rules of Parliament by saying that they did know it, but I say it had that appearance to me, and consequently it did not seem to me to be necessary to rise in my place at every stage of the discussion, and to say that the statements they were making were utterly and entirely untrue. I apprehend that the purpose of a franchise Act is to provide a voters' list upon which the electors will have the opportunity of registering their votes ; such a list as will give the people an opportunity of exercising their franchise. Now, I happen to have here the figures in regard to the registration of the electors in the province of Manitoba, both under the Provincial Franchise Act and under the Dominion Franchise Act. The figures are rather suggestive. In 1891, under the franchise provided by the Dominion Parliament, there were 18,352 persons voted in the election in the province of Manitoba, and one year later, in 1892, under the provincial Act there were 31,101 people who voted. I would like to know which Act disfranchised them. There were 12,000 men, all of whom, within a hundred or two, were qualified and entitled to vote, out of 31,000, that were not on the voters' list at all. This is the kind of Act these hon. gentlemen want to keep in force in the province of Manitoba.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. Does the hon. gentleman take into account the fact that there was no vote at all in Provencher at that time—that I was elected by acclamation ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I am speaking of votes that were cast, not of votes that were not cast. I venture to say the proportion of elections by acclamation was about the same in both cases. That was in 1891. In the Dominion elections of 1896, there were 32,884 votes cast, while in the provincial election held a few months before there were 38,073 votes cast. Now, let me give you an idea of the kind of franchise we have had for the Dominion, which hon. gentlemen forced us to hold our elections under for some years past. At the last election in my own constituency, where the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) was the successful candidate, 10,666 people were on the list, and only 6,913 voted. In the electoral district of Lisgar there were 14,842 on the list, and only 5,260 votes. In Macdonald there were 9,352 on the list, and 5,733 actual voters. So that my hon. friends will see that under the operation of the Dominion Franchise Act in the province of Manitoba, in addition to the possible voters who could be got to the polls, there were thousands of men on the list not within reach. Take the last revision that took place. In the city of Winnipeg the list was brought to the county judge for revision. He looked into it, and he said, "This is such a monstrous list that it is utterly impossible for me to revise it." That was not the list prepared under the provincial law ; that was the list prepared under this Dominion law we are trying to repeal.

Mr. GILLIES. When was the Dominion list prepared ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The Dominion list was revised in 1894.

Mr. GILLIES. When was the local list revised ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. In the fall of 1895.

Mr. GILLIES. There was over a year of time between the two.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. And so under the provincial list the vote is enormously larger than it is under the other, while the list under the Dominion law is enormously larger than that under the provincial law. There seems to be no consideration for the voter. I will give some other figures. In 1896, while there were only 32,884 actual voters in the Dominion election, there were 68,685 on the list. The actual vote that was polled was only about 50 per cent of those on the list. On the provincial list there were 49,305 names and 38,073 votes were polled, or 77 per cent. That is the positive proof of which is the more accurate list. The proportion of the voters who go to the poll is in every case the best index of the correctness of the list.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. The hon. gentleman will admit that the basis of the franchise is not the same in both cases. In one case, it is one man one vote, while in the other

every one who owns property, whether he lives there or in England or anywhere else, is on the list.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. That is quite correct, and therefore as under the Franchise Act men may vote in different places, that makes my argument all the stronger. My hon. friend the leader of the Opposition last night, I see by the report of his remarks, took a great deal of comfort out of this fact. He said that in 1896 the present Government of Manitoba swept the country—that there were only four or five men returned in favour of the Opposition; that was under their own voters' list. Then, he said, a few months later, the Dominion Government went to the country, and the Liberals of Manitoba elected only one man. This, he said, proved that the electoral list of the province was an outrageous list. I might put the argument the other way and say that because in 1896 we were hardly able to elect anybody, while a few months before we elected nearly all the members from that province, that proved that the hon. gentleman's list was an outrageous list. Does not my hon. friend see that that argument proves nothing at all? But I will tell the hon. gentleman why it was that in the election of 1896 the Liberals of the province of Manitoba did not succeed in electing the members to whom they were entitled, and whom the public opinion of the province, being strongly in favour of my right hon. friend the leader of the Government, would have justified them in expecting. My hon. friend from Macdonald (Mr. Rutherford) was the candidate in that election, and he had against him a Conservative and a Patron. The Patron and my hon. friend were both running as candidates opposed to the hon. gentleman. The Patrons got a large number of votes of persons who were opposed to the Government, but notwithstanding that, my hon. friend was properly elected as member for that constituency over both the others, if it had not been for the most nefarious system of ballot frauds and ballot stuffing that ever was known to be perpetrated in any civilized country.

Mr. BENNETT. There have been worse in Ontario.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend is getting restless now and I am not surprised.

Mr. BENNETT. I can tell the hon. gentleman——

Some hon. GENTLEMEN. Order.

Mr. BENNETT. Now let my open faced watch keep quiet.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Does the hon. gentleman who has the floor give way to the hon. member?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I have no objection to his putting a question.

Mr. BENNETT. I have this to say, that there have been equally as nefarious cases in the province of Ontario in support of the Mowat administration, and not only one but a great many more.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The hon. gentleman is just doing what all the rest of his friends are doing. He is making a statement which cannot be proved. But the statement I make has been proved in a court of justice by a large number of witnesses under oath, and the ballots which were stolen by these returning officers, appointees of hon. gentlemen opposite, and secretly put into the ballot boxes, were produced in court. That is the reason why my hon. friend was able to say so boastingly last night that he, the leader of the Conservative party, had carried the province of Manitoba. He would have equally carried the whole Dominion by similar means. I fancy that the hon. gentleman's memory must have been failing him a little when he referred to a subject, which is so fraught with discredit to the party he represents. In the other constituencies, what happened? In Brandon, my hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) was elected by a large majority, and alongside of him another gentleman, running as a patron, in opposition to the hon. gentleman, polled 1,200 votes, or 1,600 votes of a majority over the hon. gentleman were polled in that constituency. In Winnipeg, where Mr. Hugh J. Macdonald was a candidate, it was notorious that Mr. Martin, the Liberal candidate, had a large majority of the electors in his favour, and it was only by a most outrageous and unblushing system of bribery bringing in voters from all over creation and voting them on these stuffed voters' lists, on which there were thousands of names of people whom nobody knew, kept there from year to year, in spite of all the efforts of the Liberal party to purge these lists—it was only by bringing in a large number of these voters, whose names had been kept from year to year on the list, although not entitled to vote, that Mr. Martin was defeated. What is the proof? It is that when a petition was filed against Mr. Hugh John Macdonald, he did not allow it to go to trial. What is the position of the Conservative party in that constituency which they had carried a few months before? It was such th whenn the present member for Winnipeg (Mr. Jameson) presented himself as a candidate, the hon. genteman did not venture to offer any opposition. The same thing occurred in my own constituency. I say that by the nefarious system practiced in Manitoba with regard to the voters' lists, prepared under the Dominion Franchise Act, the people of the province have never yet had a fair opportunity to express their opinion. I marvel at any man having the assurance to talk

about the position of Manitoba in connection with the provisions of the Dominion Franchise Act. What are the provisions, so far as the province is concerned. I will tell my hon. friend from Minnedosa (Mr. Roche), who has embalmed on the "Hansard" complaints against the Manitoba Franchise Act, that I will take the list under which he was elected, and the local list for the same territory, and will show him five mistakes in the Dominion lists for every one that occurred in the provincial lists. I will make the same comparison between the Dominion and local lists for any electoral division in Manitoba, and I will show five mistakes in the Dominion for every one mistake in the provincial lists. I have full knowledge of all the circumstances and I say that the statement made with regard to frauds in connection with the Manitoba Act are absolutely destitute of foundation; and to-day I venture to say that there can be no means devised whereby more accurate, complete and proper lists in every respect can be prepared for electoral purposes than are prepared at present under the Manitoba Act. There can be no further proof required than the figures I have given and which show that thousands of men at present are disfranchised under the nefarious Dominion Act, which now governs us.

Just one other point I wish to refer to. Hon. gentlemen opposite seem to think that there is some enormous difference between a revising officer appointed by the Dominion Government and a revising officer appointed by the local Government. I would like to know wherein that difference consists.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. The federal Government always appointed county court judges.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. Wherever there were county court judges.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. They appointed political heelers in the Maritime Provinces.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. In Manitoba they appointed county court judges in every electoral division where county court judges were to be had.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I would recommend the hon. gentleman to sit down, because he has put his foot into it and is talking about a subject he has not even an elementary knowledge of. I would take the division of Marquette, the lists upon which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Roche) was elected, were not prepared by the county court judge, but by the revising officer, who was a young barrister of the town of Carberry—a very decent fellow, I believe—but who occupies no position at the bar, and who never would have been thought of as a county court judge or for any other judicial position. What did this gentleman do? He prepared the lists in the first place, and then he revised and certified them. He made the lists just as he saw fit, and I would like some body to explain how it is that when this young gentleman was appointed as revising officer by the Dominion Government, he became so superior in every moral quality and every other quality that goes to make a perfect revising officer, over gentlemen appointed by the provincial Government. I do not accuse the gentleman who prepared the lists of any fraudulent or improper conduct in my hon. friend's constituency. I do not know anything about the preparation of the lists there, but I know that if a member of the legal profession were asked to compare the gentleman who prepared the lists, professionally, with the gentlemen who acted as revising officers under the local Act, they would simply smile and say he was not in the same class professionally. Under the Dominion Act, the revising officer prepares the lists and then revises the list which he has prepared. When you come to a revision, and ask to have names taken off or put on, you have to make your appeal to the officer who made up the lists in the first instance, and are appealing to him against his own judgment, if he exercised it. But under the Manitoba Act complained of, you have merely a ministerial officer, in the first place, who makes up the list, then you have the revising officer who hears complaint and acts in a judicial capacity to correct any mistakes made by the registration clerk. Therefore if there is to be a fatal objection to the operation of the Manitoba Act, it must be in the conduct of the revising officer, because he is the officer who is there for the purpose of correcting the mistakes made by the registration clerk. And if no complaint has been made against the revising officer—and none ever was—then the complaint about frauds perpetrated under the Manitoba Act falls at once to the ground. I do not know that there is anything further that I desire to say in connection with the subject. It just occurred to me that my hon. friends who have been letting themselves loose on the Manitoba franchise Act, about which they know very little, said sufficient to justify me in offering these few words of explanation to the committee.

Mr. ROCHE. If I did not know any more about the election Act than the hon. Minister of the Interior, I would not attempt to get on my feet to make any accusation against it to-night. That hon. gentleman, in his remarks, has either displayed a lamentable amount of ignorance in regard to it, or what is equally as bad, an utter recklessness in his statements. So much recklessness that it puts me in mind of the speech he delivered upon a notable occasion in the earlier part of this session and which made very little impression, evidently, upon the country, by the reports we have been hearing since the defeat of his famous Bill. Now, the hon. gentleman has touched upon several questions

and touched upon them in the most reckless manner. He has claimed, in the first place, that the lists prepared in Manitoba for the provincial elections are very much better than those prepared for the Dominion. He knows that the local lists are prepared on an entirely different franchise—manhood suffrage.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. But the hon. gentleman (Mr. Roche) knows that almost every man who is qualified to vote under the Manitoba Act can qualify under the Dominion Franchise Act. The different franchise under the Dominion Act permits almost every man to qualify who can qualify as a resident under the Manitoba Act. I have compared them time and again in different parts of the province, and what I say can be shown almost without any exception.

Mr. ROCHE. I will let the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) settle that with his leader, who spoke of the disfranchisement of manhood suffrage voters in British Columbia. As one of the best evidences I can give in support of my contention, I would refer to the "Free Press." The hon. gentleman would not have the "Free Press" quoted as a Liberal organ. I do not know that he accused the "Free Press" of being a Tory paper. I am sure he will not go so far as that. The editors of the independent press accuse the "Free Press" of being exactly what they accuse the hon. Minister of the Interior of being—a tool of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The "Free Press" calls itself an independent paper but its independence is much of the same stripe as that of the Montreal "Witness"—it can generally be relied upon to support the Ministry. If the hon. gentleman is not satisfied with that authority, I will give him a better. When the Manitoba Election Act was being placed on the Statute-books, it was condemned by the Toronto "Globe." The hon. gentleman will not take exception to my statement when I refer to that as an organ of the Liberal party. The "Globe" warned the Liberals of Manitoba that they were planting a stumbling block in the way of the Liberals in this House in adopting the present Franchise Act in that province. If the hon. gentleman is not satisfied with the "Globe" as an authority I can give him another, one that I have already quoted in this House, and that is Mr. Fisher of the provincial legislature, representative of the province of Manitoba on the late Hudson Bay expedition. Mr. Fisher is an old-time Liberal and ex-president of the Provincial Liberal Association, and he has called and still calls the Act a monstrosity of monstrosities. I am sure that the hon. gentleman will give some weight to what Mr. Fisher says. The hon. gentleman claims that nothing has been said against the revising officers in Manitoba. Surely, he does not mean that. I can give him not hearsay-evidence, but something within my own experience on that subject. The constituency in which I reside is 48 miles in length, and we formerly had three courts of revision, one in the western extremity, one in the eastern extremity and one in the central part of the riding, the work being thus divided so as to accommodate the electors. But the Liberal party of Manitoba are growing more reckless with each election, and, at the last election, they gave us only one court of revision, and that at the extreme eastern end of the riding, where the Liberal candidate himself resided. It was held to suit his convenience and not the convenience of the electors. As the hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) has pointed out when a wrong name was put on the lists it was almost impossible for us to get it off. The party might be living many miles away, or the name might be merely fictitious. This was a direct incentive to personation where the party was not found and was in direct contravention of the principle of the Manhood Suffrage Act. The names put on in this way it was almost impossible for us to have struck off. And it was equally hard for us to get names on that had been left off. I am well acquainted with the electorate of my riding, owing to my profession as a physician and I gave evidence in a number of cases, and found it exceedingly difficult to satisfy the revising officer. Men who had voted in municipal, Dominion and provincial elections for years, and who were forty or fifty years of age were challenged. The Liberal candidate took exception on the ground of every legal technicality. He wanted to know if I could swear to the age of the party. He asked me how I knew the man's age. I might answer: I am morally certain, or some one told me so, but it was almost impossible to satisfy the revising officer. A brother-in-law giving evidence for his brother-in-law beside whom he had lived for fifteen years had his evidence thrown out. Unless one was in a position to swear that he was present at a mans' birth, it was almost impossible for him to satisfy the revising officer. The travelling to the court of revision entailed a good deal of hardship. In the constituency of Dauphin the revising officer was supplied with 165 names, and he refused to say to the Conservatives whether he would or would not put these names on the voters' lists. In the constituency of Emerson, to which the hon. leader of the Opposition referred some thirteen or fourteen names were put upon the lists, and the revising barrister refused to strike the names off because it could not be proved that the parties had been subpœnaed. Some of them were known to be non-existent perhaps, and none of them within reach. Again with reference to the registration clerks. The great plea of the Liberal party against the Dominion Franchise Act was the system of revising barristers. The leader of the Government himself said: We are going to legislate out of existence these revising

officers. As has been pointed out, we are to have the revising barristers in their worst form under this Bill if it becomes law. The revising barrister of the Dominion both made and revised the list, but in the province of Manitoba the revising barristers are lawyers, barristers of three years standing, sent out from the city of Winnipeg to do duty at the several courts of revision. So we are merely exchanging Conservative revising barristers for Liberal ones.

We have a double set of officials in Manitoba. These revisers are not permitted to compile the list, they are compiled by laymen who have no standing in the community, men who are not selected because they were thought worthy of the positions, but because they were likely to be the tools of the Liberal candidate. It is undeniable that in every constituency of that province the lists are prepared under the direct supervision of the Liberal candidate. I am personally aware of this, I am not talking from hearsay. I have myself sent in affidavits to get parties on the list, and they have been ignored, the parties were left off the list at the instigation of the Liberal candidate. The conduct of some of those officials were so bad that in one constituency where Judge Ryan, of Portage la Prairie, a very fair officer, was revising barrister, he condemned the action of the registration clerk, and declared that if he had known he was going to have so much trouble, he would not have accepted the position of reviser. The hon. gentleman has also remarked that the by-elections in Manitoba have shown how unfair the lists were ; he says that were they free from all those undue influences that were exercised by the Conservative party they would have swept the province as they did at the by-elections. But the hon. gentleman knows perfectly well that no matter what Government is in power the by-elections nearly always go with the Government of the day. That occurred in 1891, after Conservatives were returned to power.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The hon. gentleman misses the point I made. I was answering the statement made by the leader of the Opposition, that they had swept the country in 1896, and I was pointing out that the reason why we lost Macdonald was that the ballot-boxes were stuffed by the friends of the hon. gentleman and by his candidate in the next constituency.

Mr. ROCHE. The hon. Minister of the Interior trys to leave the impression upon this House that it was owing to ballot stuffing. Well, in the provincial House the other day the government was asked for a return of all the expenses in connection with this prosecution, and the Attorney General of Manitoba did not give a detailed expenditure, but referred his questioner to the Dominion Government. Over $10,000 were expended on this line, and here is what the "Nor'-Wester" says in a leader of the 4th of April :

Had there been really any election frauds, or had there been any reasonable probability of such having been committed, the expenditure, assuming to have been properly applied, would, perhaps, have been justifiable. But the results of the trials of the large number of deputy returning officers arrested established the fact that all, except one were innocent of any such fraud. In connection with the Macdonald election, for instance, eighteen men were placed under arrest.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. That statement is entirely untrue. The trial did not establish anything of the kind. The result of the trial proved conclusively that in a considerable number of the polling subdivisions the polls were stolen, the ballots were fraudulently marked, and were fraudulently put in the ballot-boxes.

Mr. ROCHE. Well, I will give the details of that prosecution as stated by this newspaper :

In connection with the Macdonald election, for instance, eighteen men were placed under arrest, viz. : Messrs. Parker, Mawhinney, McDonald, Dennison, Orr, Roberts, Saunders, Hamilton, Brown, James Waller, Brooks, Finklestine, H. E. Waller, Clark, Herriman, McFadden, Renwick and Anderson. Of these Parker, Dennison, Roberts, Brown, James Waller Herriman and McFadden were acquitted on the preliminary investigation before the magistrates. The Crown had not even a prima facie case against them to warrant them being put on trial. The case of H. E Waller was thrown out by the grand jury. The Crown ultimately dropped proceedings against McDonald, Orr, Hamilton, Brooks, Finklestine and Renwick, thus admitting it had no case against them. Mawhinney, when put on trial, was triumphantly acquitted. The jury refused to convict Anderson and Clark. Upon a new trial, fresh juries in each case again refused to convict them. The only conviction the Crown secured was in the case of Saunders, who was a tool of its own. He is the man for whom Dr. Rutherford, the Liberal candidate, went surety. He it was who confessed that he had been a party to violating the law, not for the benefit of the Conservative party, but to help the Crown's wretched informer, Freeborn, to extort money from the Conservative party for their joint profit. And this man Saunders, it may be remarked, has just been honoured by the Attorney General who prosecuted him by being given Her Majesty's commission to take affidavits in the courts of this province. The arrest of these men, innocent of the charge laid against them, was made the pretext for treating them with singular harshness. For instance, Brown, who was acquitted even on the preliminary investigation before the magistrate, was put in jail for thirty-six hours, and before he was let out had to provide the enormous bail of $6,000. Mawhinney was likewise in jail for thirty-six hours, and was fed on bread and water, besides being subjected to other indignities. These men also were each put to enormous expense in order to establish their innocence. The prosecutions, in short were the most disgraceful prostitution of the forms of justice in the service of political rancour which has ever occurred in a free country. The cases were

trumped up upon the evidence of the wretch, Freeborn—a creature known by the Attorney General to be an informer of the stamp of Titus Oates and Dangerfield, who only went to the Attorney General with his lying tale after trying to bleed the Conservative party on the strength of it, and who, before the trials were over, had involved himself in innumerable perjuries. What this man's share of the $10,964.41 was, the public is particularly anxious to know. It is, perhaps, no wonder, in view of all the circumstances connected with these prosecutions that both governments are ashamed of them and are taking such extraordinary measures to keep the details of their expenditure on them from the knowledge of the public.

Now, the hon. gentleman may have heard each case I have read in detail as these men were tried. They were acquitted in each instance, except Saunders, who was convicted on his own testimony, as he admitted that he had taken certain ballots that were marked and given them to this man Freeborn, who was to go snooks with him in levying blackmail on the Conservative party. Failing that, he took the ballots to the Liberal committee, and they took them, and hence this prosecution. The hon. gentlemen can judge for themselves as to the reliability of the statement of the Minister of the Interior, after hearing these facts I have read. Now, there is another phase of that Macdonald election case which I might refer to. It had reference more particularly to the by-election that took place since, but I do not mean to touch upon that feature of the case at all. But I will just say this to the Solicitor General, that in enacting such a law as this Franchise Act, he should at least make some provision to meet the very peculiar state of affairs that exists in the province of Manitoba. There we have those officers who are appointed as registration clerks, men of no weight in the community, men who do exactly as the Liberal candidate instructs them to do. These men stuff the lists in the interest of their own party, they ignore affidavits being sent in by Conservatives. At the last debate the member for Macdonald declared that he knew a certain case where false affidavits were sent in, and known to be so to the registration clerk; and I have cited a particular instance where I myself sent in those affidavits, and they were ignored. I do not think in the district where I reside, that I have the reputation of making false affidavits. I have, on more than one occasion, sent in affidavits that have been ignored, and at the Court of Revision, the Liberal candidate has admitted that they were left off at his instigation. I do not know what further proof is required to show the character of the provincial Election Act of Manitoba. We are not doing away by this Act with the revising barristers, we still have them, and we have these laymen besides to stuff the lists. So I think it is only right that the Solicitor General should make some provision that we would have an opportunity of having a revision, before each Dominion election, by a judge of the province. We have in that province six county court judges, and four judges of the Queen's Bench. There are seven electoral divisions, so we have plenty of judges to do this duty. In view of the facts I have laid before the House on more than one occasion, I think Manitoba deserves special recognition at the hands of this Government until we have a better and fairer Election Act on the statutes of that province. I see that some mention has been made in the local legislature this year of the fact, that Mr. Roblin brought in some amendments, and Mr. Geeenway asked him to leave them aside until the Federal Government had brought in their Franchise Bill, after which he promised to pass some legislation. But we cannot place much reliance in Mr. Greenway fulfilling his promises, in view of his record in that respect in the past. Before this Bill is allowed to become law the Solicitor General should introduce a clause that will mitigate the evil effects of the Provincial Franchise Act to a considerable extent by allowing us to have a revision before one of the judges of the province.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I would remind the hon. gentleman that under the law of Manitoba, as it stands, there is provision for establishing a court of revision by one of the county court judges of the province, or by a barrister of at least three years standing in that province. The hon. gentleman referred a moment ago to a revision that took place before Judge Ryan.

Mr. ROCHE. At that time we only had five county court judges in the province, and the excuse was made by the provincial Government that they had not enough judges. We have forty constituencies in Manitoba, and where the judges act we have no fault to find.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. If there were so many judges in Manitoba, why was it that in the hon. gentleman's constituency, under the Dominion Act, a judge was not employed?

Mr. ROCHE. Revising barristers both prepared and revised the lists. Mr. Barrett is a lawyer of more than five years' standing. He occupies a high standing in the community, and also in his profession. As regards professional attainments, he will compare favourably with the Minister of the Interior.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I desire to draw attention to the amendment moved by the leader of the Opposition.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. In looking back, I see my amendment will be equally applicable to clause "a," and I propose not to move it to the present clause, but to bring it up when clause "a" is adopted.

Subsection agreed to.

Mr. FOSTER. I ask the hon. gentleman, if he will now agree to adjourn ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Let us take down to clause "d."

Mr. MONK. I am not disposed to allow clause "c" to pass without moving an amendment. I am sorry to move it at this late hour, but the Minister of the Interior occupied nearly three-quarters of an hour in speaking on totally irrelevant matters, and, as a member of the Government, whatever error we may commit on this side of the House, he and his colleagues should set a good example. We are not so much interested in filling up this blank ; the important point is to guard against the danger of interference with the franchise by the local authorities in time to affect a general Dominion election. I, therefore, move to add these words to clause "c" :

Provided, however, in the case of a general federal election the provincial authorities shall not have altered the law relating to the provincial franchise within the year next preceding the day fixed for the nomination of the candidates. In case such alteration shall have been made within said year, then the list in force before such alteration of the law relating to the provincial franchise, shall be employed.

We guard against the danger of interference by the local legislature by filling the time as one year, and during the interval it is possible for this House to interfere and remedy the grievance. This is a late hour for hon. members to express their opinions on this amendment, without feeling, as I do, that they are trespassing on the good will of members.

The PRIME MINISTER. We should pass the clauses down to "d."

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Clause "c" has not received any consideration.

The PRIME MINISTER. The question has been well considered by the Solicitor General, and he suggested a different period. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) suggested a delay of twelve months.

Mr. MONK. No.

The PRIME MINISTER. The hon. gentleman says we should not take a list unless twelve months old.

Mr. MONK. I do not interfere with the sixty days mentioned, but I am providing for a special case, when, shortly before the general elections, the local legislature may change the franchise law.

The PRIME MINISTER. The Solicitor General provided sixty days, and the hon. member for Jacques Cartier wishes to provide twelve months.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. This is a special case.

The PRIME MINISTER. The suggestion of the Solicitor General was, that the list should not be altered by the province later than two months before the elections. The member for Jacques Cartier seeks to provide that it should not be altered for twelve months. We have already provided that the voters' lists shall be those prepared for the several polling divisions so established, and which, on the sixtieth day next preceding the day fixed for the nomination of candidates for such Dominion elections, were in force. The amendment provides that no alteration shall take place in the lists for twelve months. And now the hon. member for Jacques Cartier proposes that, in order to be effective, the time must be extended to twelve months.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. That is, the franchise.

The PRIME MINISTER. What is the difference ?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Then, I understand the Prime Minister declines to allow the committee to rise at 2 o'clock in the morning, and is determined to force the most important part of the Bill through the House, when hon. gentlemen wish to discuss it fully. I think my right hon. friend is making a great mistake, so far as the progress of this Bill is concerned. I do not intend to remain here any longer to-night, but I will say to the right hon. gentleman that he is making a serious mistake from his own standpoint, in pressing anything so unreasonable on this House.

Mr. FOSTER. I move that the committee do rise.

Mr. BENNETT. This Bill demands from gentlemen on this side of the House a great degree of attention, not only on account of the duty they owe to themselves as representatives of the different constituencis, but more particularly by reason of the fact that we, the Conservative members, represent a large section of the community, and a section of the community which has at least done equally as much as the section represented by hon. gentlemen opposite to build up what to-day is the Dominion of Canada. The Government brought down this Bill to the House some time ago, and to-day they have to admit it is full of defects, and at the very outset they have been compelled to amend it. I believe that had the First Minister been present when the matter was originally suggested, he would have agreed to a conference between the two parties so that some respectable franchise law might be arrived at. Speaking for myself, I am prepared to wait here until the snow comes next fall before I will see this infamous Bill as it stands to-day passed through Parliament.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. BENNETT. Let me tell the hon. member for Bellechasse, who interrupts, that he always proves the truth of the saying, that the loud laugh bespeaks the vacant mind.

Had I the amount of vacancy his mind possesses, I fancy I could roam to the uttermost ends of the world. I certainly shall not attempt the task of enlightening him, and especially not at this hour of 2 o'clock in the morning. I admire that hon. gentleman's convivial temperament, and when I recall that about this time a week ago he was even a little more convivial than he is at the present time. I can assure the right hon. leader of the House that brilliant as his follower is to-night, he was perfectly refulgent a week ago. Coming back to the Bill, what do we find? We find that the further we go the more objectionable are its provisions. I will deal with clause 6 now for a little while and point out some of its defects.

The PRIME MINISTER. Order.

Mr. BENNETT. I am speaking on the motion to adjourn.

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend is aware that he cannot discuss a different clause than that before the House, on a motion to adjourn.

Mr. BENNETT. With all due deference to the First Minister there is a motion to adjourn.

The PRIME MINISTER. There is a motion to adjourn, but the hon. gentleman must confine himself to the subject.

Mr. BENNETT. Very well. There are some wonderful propositions in this Bill, and the proposition with reference to the voters' lists is one that must strike the right hon. gentleman as one very unfair and wholly improper. The Solicitor General has been handicapped in the preparation of this Bill owing to the fact that he cannot be expected to know the law of all the different provinces, and while I congratulate the Solicitor General on having mastered the law to a considerable extent, it is very true that one cannot learn all by simply reading; a great deal more is to be learned by actual experience in the working out of the law, and so there are a great many defects in this Bill which probably did not occur to the mind of the Solicitor General. When this Bill was first placed before the House, the right hon. the Premier told us that we were to have a voters' list which would not cost a cent to the provincial treasury. The right hon. gentleman was misinformed when he said that the preparation of the lists in the province of Ontario would not occasion any cost to the province. Last year when an election was approaching in Ontario, the cost was forced upon the province of about $7,700. which is a very considerable amount, and which will be increased in a year before the Dominion election. Then the right hon. the Prime Minister promised us that the preparation of the lists under this Bill would be absolutely without the cost of a single cent to members of this House. Let me tell the right hon. gentleman that instead of that being the case, we in Ontario know to our cost that the revision under the local Franchise Act occasions a great deal more worry and expenditure to the candidate than it does under the existing Dominion franchise. In the province of Ontario, after the assessor makes his return to the clerk, the clerk's duty is to prepare from the assessment roll the names of all those who are entitled to vote. After the list has been printed and posted up for thirty days, appeals are entered with the clerk and then comes the work of the court of revision, and that is where the heavy work is done. We were told on the introduction of this Bill that it was the duty of the assessor to go around the country and hunt up the names of persons to be placed on the voters' lists, but that is not so. The duty of the assessor is simply to value the properties so that municipal rates may be imposed. True, if he chances to find a man who is 21 years of age and a British subject he can place him on what is called the manhood suffrage list. But there is no duty imposed on the assessor to go about the riding, and chase up and down the concession lines, to find every person who is entitled to go on the list. What follows? After the assessor has completed his list, and after it has been printed and displayed, then comes the season of appeals. In the riding of East Simcoe, which is much smaller for local purposes than it is for federal purposes, there were no less than 1,500 appeals. Surely the First Minister does not imagine that candidates can prosecute 1,500 appeals without the cost of a single dollar. In the other two ridings of Simcoe, there were also a great number of appeals. According to the public accounts of Ontario, the county judge of Simcoe was paid $214 for hearing appeals in the three ridings of that county; in two of those ridings there must have been upwards of 2,500 appeals. In the county of Ontario, $200 was paid, and in the county of Huron $204 was paid for the same purpose; and so on through the list. It is quite plain from these payments that there must have been in the different ridings a very large number of appeals. So that it is altogether a delusion and a snare to say that the candidate finds in the provincial list a list already made to his hand. Under the local act the revision of the list is a most expensive proceeding to the candidate, for this reason, that if he objects to a person's name appearing on the list, he is driven to the necessity of finding witnesses to give oral evidence, while under the Dominion law all he is required to do to secure the attendance of the party at court is simply to mail him a notice. It turns out, then, that while you are going to accept the local lists, the first thing you are going to do is to impose on the provincial treasury a large expenditure whenever a revision takes place; and in the next place you are going to force on the candidate a larger expense than he is now subject to under the Dominion Act. At

the same time you are imposng a very heavy expenditure on the municipalities. The revision in East Simcoe last year cost the different municipalities $50, $60, $80 or $100 each. The law provides that certain fees are payable to the municipal officers, and the Government is simply transferring the cost of the revision from the Government to the municipalities. The revision held before the last local elections cost the municipalities in East Simcoe $700 or $800. If in anticipation of a Dominion election, we had another revision this year, you would be forcing on these municipalities a repetition of that expenditure. The First Minister stated that all the municipalities got off scot-free, with the exception of the cities. Let me tell him that he was altogether in error in that, because, as I showed the other night, it entailed a cost of perhaps $50 or $75 upon each of the townships. In one township, Medonte, I showed that the revision of the local list had cost $80. Although the Government are not any too popular in the country, they are going to fling a taunt of defiance at these municipalities. They are going to say to them, "We do not care whether you object to high taxes or not; one thing we are going to do is to cut down the expense for the Dominion voters' list, but we are going to make you pay through the nose for it." The revision of the local lists to-day is most unpopular in the province of Ontario, because the municipalities say, and properly say, "We are not interested in the elections for the legislature; what we are interested in is the proper conduct of our municipal affairs; but it is owing to these politicians that so much cost for these revisions is imposed upon us." What does it mean? It means that upon an average riding of about eight municipalities, you are going to impose a cost municipally of about $800 for the revision of the local franchise list. The whole trouble with the old franchise law was that the burden of expense was too great; and if the Government would consent to a conference on this Bill, between half a dozen men on either side of the House, I believe it would not take them over two hours to come to an understanding with regard to it. This Bill could then be brought down and passed in its entirety and hundreds of dollars would be saved to the country. Why should we not do that. The question of expense is a great question with hon. gentlemen opposite, and with us it is a question of principal which is at stake. We are fairly entitled to ask that there should be fair elections throughout the country, and surely no man will contend that in the province of Ontario there is a shadow of a chance for fair and honest elections, on the voters' lists as they are now made up. I have one of the voters' lists here which we used in the last local elections in the province of Ontario.

Mr. McMULLEN. Give us a rest.

Mr. BENNETT. I hear a plaintive wail from my hon. friend from North Wellington (Mr. McMullen). I envy that hon. gentleman because I have seen him safe in the arms of Morpheus, under the gallery over there for at least the last two hours; and if he is now awake, he should not object at all to giving me his attention for a little while. I have had the pleasure of being in this House the past five years, and have heard no voice oftener than that of the hon. gentleman, and I cannot say it is a musical one. The hon. gentleman was always ready to speak, in season and out of season. If some question of constitutional law were at issue, if great lawyers on either side were endeavouring to give the country the benefit of their opinion on constitutional questions, no decision could be arrived at until we had the conclusive opinion—conclusive in his own mind—of the hon. gentleman. I do not care what question is raised, significant or insignificant, the hon. gentleman always gave us the benefit of his oracular utterances; and he who flourished so often before us the Auditor General's report, which was a much more formidable looking document than the one I have in my hand, should not object to my displaying a provincial voters' list. I was about to say that in Ontario we are not afforded, in the preparation of the voters' lists any guarantee of honesty or straightforwardness. When hon. gentlemen contemplate the list which I hold in my hand they cannot fail to admit that it is not such a list on which any man desiring a fair and honest election would care to go to the country. The deputy returning officer may have been an honest man, but in order to do the party a service, he may have permitted that list to lie around loose for a few hours or for a day, and some obliging friend may have struck out some of the names and added others. Here is page after page with names written in which were probably inserted in the way I mention. It was amusing to hear the Minister of the Interior wax so indignant over the idea of anything wrong being done under the local Acts. I am sorry he is not present, because I know that if I were to appeal to him, he would protest, in the name of everything honest, against the adopting of voters' lists fashioned after the style of this one. What are we to have? We are to have these voters' lists as they are prepared in the province of Ontario. So the Solicitor General told us the other night, but I think he could not have understood the law as it stands in Ontario. In Ontario, after the lists have been printed, and a court has been held, the judge makes the corrections, and the corrected list is then placed in the hands of the Clerk of the Peace for the county. I am very sorry that the right hon. First Minister has gone away, because I hoped to make him a convert to a plan by which we could have very cheap voters' lists in the Dominion and which would give us a most creditable Act. But as he is absent, I

assume I have to ask the hon. Solicitor General to lend his ear to my prayer, and I know he will do it.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Why, I would prefer doing it on Tuesday.

Mr. BENNETT. I can assure the hon. gentleman that it is not a matter of choice on my part.

Mr. TAYLOR. Move that the committee rise.

Mr. BENNETT. I would do so only the Chairman is asleep and I hate to disturb him; I think it most unkind that hon. gentlemen should laugh, because I am sure we should not find fault with the Deputy Speaker for taking a snooze, under the circumstances. The list which is placed in the hands of the clerk of the peace in the printed list with the corrections made by the judge, and then the returning officer has the right to apply for copies, and is furnished, not with printed lists already corrected, but with a written list, and the result is that whole pages may be left out. There may be dozens of names left out and others wrongfully added. If it is proven that some other person did that, the clerk of the peace for the county is not to blame, and it was a matter of comment that in the late provincial elections in Ontario a large number of names were dropped from the voters' lists. In fact, in one of the ridings I referred to, the riding of Monck, one of the complaints was that a large number of names had been left off the list.

Now contrast the preparation of that voters' list with the voters' list we have in the Dominion election. I have both a Dominion and a provincial list here, and I ask hon. gentlemen to contrast them. Suppose that a local election is going on. A man comes to vote. Probably he has driven 12 or 15 miles to record his vote. He may be the owner of a farm and a valuable farm and may have voted for years in this municipality. But when he gets to the poll, by reason of the fact that some persons have conspired against his right to vote, a line has been drawn through his name on the voters' list, and he is not entitled to vote. I know that hon. gentlemen opposite would be loath to see placed on the Statute-book——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. BENNETT. I have to thank the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) for trying to quell the insurrection at the back of this Chamber. With the influence he has in this House he will surely be able to quell it, and I feel certain that he will strive to maintain the most perfect order. I am sorry that I do not secure the closer attention of some of these hon. gentlemen that they may learn how the voters' lists in Ontario are made.

Mr. GILLIES. How are they prepared?

Mr. BENNETT. They are so iniquitous-looking that one would almost believe that His Satanic Majesty had had a hand in preparing them. But as a matter of fact, they are simply the outcome of the pernicious system that prevails in the province of Ontario. I am more anxious to impress the iniquity of these voters' lists upon hon. gentlemen opposite because among them are gentlemen who expect to adorn the judicial bench. It may be that they will be called upon to discharge their judicial functions in the far-off province of British Columbia. If they will give me their attention they will learn many facts with regard to the voters' list of Ontario that will be interesting to them now and valuable when they undertake the discharge of their duties upon the Bench. They will be able to say: When I was in the House of Commons on one occasion I saw a voters' list of Ontario. It was prepared under a vicious system and was a very bad list, we in this favoured province have a much better list, a much purer list than they had in the province of Ontario. I believe that some hon. gentlemen are asking me questions, but as they all speak at once, I cannot understand what is said.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. BENNETT. It seems that I misunderstood. I thought these hon. gentlemen were thirsting for information. And, Mr. Chairman, I am appealed to by a gentleman from the gallery. At least, he is addressing somebody; I do not know whether he is addressing me or some other hon. gentleman.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I must ask hon. gentlemen to keep order. And there are strangers in the House who must maintain the most perfect order.

Mr. BENNETT. I have pointed out how these voters' lists, being in the hands of the deputy returning officers for three or four days prior to the election, no care can be thrown about them, and names may be struck out or names inserted. Well, Mr. Chairman, I fear that these hon. gentlemen on the back benches are incurable, I fear that they do not wish to be convinced.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order, order.

Mr. BENNETT. A number of these hon. gentlemen are from Ontario, and I can easily understand that they feel they are sufficiently informed on this subject. But there are hon. gentlemen from other provinces also, and I think that if these hon. gentlemen would pay closer attention to my humble remarks they would be considerably benefited, and I can assure them that I should consider it an honour to have the attention of such distinguished, honoured and highly-respected members of the House. I did not catch the remarks of my hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Fraser).

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I made no remark at all.

Mr. BENNETT. I regret that the hon. gentleman did not make a remark? Because I know if he had made a remark it would have been a most sagacious one. I do not say that in the spirit of jest, but in the most sober and serious sense. Now, Mr. Chairman, let me say that under the old Dominion Franchise Act the lists were displayed in every part of the riding, and the voter knew exactly what the list was.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I must ask hon. gentlemen to keep order.

Mr. BENNETT. I think, Mr. Chairman, you should rather say disorder. It is running rampant.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I must appeal to hon. members of the committee to keep order. We remember the disgraceful scenes which occurred, I am told, last week, and I hope they will not be repeated to-night.

Mr. BENNETT. You know, Mr. Chairman, that order is heaven's first law. It is confessed that some must be mightier than the rest. I do not know which of those hon. gentlemen is endeavouring to be more mightier than the rest in their unrest.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman must confine himself to the question which is now before the Chair.

Mr. BENNETT. Very well, Sir, I was going on say that under the old Dominion Franchise Act the voters had perfect confidence in the voters' lists. But when an election comes on for the local legislature, such is not the case. When an elector presents himself to vote he finds that by some means unknown to himself, a pen has been run through his name and he has the humiliation of being told that he has no right to the franchise. The result is that we have to-day in the province of Ontario a feeling among the public that the voters' lists are not what they should be, and that they should be remedied. Let me show where we have made mistakes in the old voters' lists and in the revision under the franchise laws. In the first place, there was altogether too much money expended, I have always contended, by way of payment of fees to the judges. In the riding of East Simcoe, I think the judge was paid an amount aggregating $1,100 or $1,200 for the revision of the voters' list of one single riding. In North Simcoe the cost, I think, was about $1,000, while in South Simcoe, a much smaller riding, it only amounted to about $800. There was about $3,000 paid to judges in those three ridings. Under the local franchise the judge of the County Court revises the local list for $300, and much money might be saved in judges' fees. Large sums are expended in printing and a saving could be made in that direction. My proposition to the Government is chiefly as follows: First, let us adopt in its entirety, the voters' lists in each province. Take the voters' list of 1897, which by reason of the large expenditure last year is in fairly good condition in Ontario. Let that be taken as a basis. Let the County Court judge be appointed as revising barrister and be furnished with copies of the lists. Let him announce by notice, published in the newspapers during one month, that he will receive appeals to add or remove names. When the month is up let the judge make copies of all names asked to be added or removed. When those two lists are prepared let the judge have copies made. In each municipality let the names be sent to the clerk. Let a copy of the appeals be sent to the defeated candidate, and another to the member for the riding. Up to this point no expenditure has been imposed either on the Dominion or the candidates. Then let the judge proceed with the revision of the lists and hold court. The result will be that in every riding a voters' list will be prepared and revised at an expense of about $150. Surely that sum is not too much for a revised list. But you say who will prepare the list? In any event, the candidates have to bear the expense of bringing appeals before the courts. This reduced expenditure should catch the ear of the Minister of Finance, and it is sufficient to send the member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) into a state of ecstacy. The judge will be amply paid at $150 for each riding. It will be asked how the expenditure can be so little for the judge when he was formerly paid $1,000 a year? Under the old Franchise Act, however, the judge not only acted in the courts, but he also collected the names. He had placed in his hands the assessment rolls, all applications were sent to him and the lists were prepared by him. We have now, however, reached a point when the work can be done for a trifling expenditure of $150 for each riding. At the printing bureau the type of the last Dominion lists is still standing. Proofs could be struck off and these sent to the judges and corrections made. I would like to ask the Government how the voters' lists were formerly obtained? I ask the Minister of the Interior. As I receive no reply from the hon. gentleman I now put the question to the Minister of Agriculture. As a last resort may I ask the Minister of Finance, how it is proposed under this Act to furnish members with voters' lists in the event of elections coming off? Then, if the Minister of Finance does not answer, I will have to trespass upon the good nature of the hon. gentleman from Quebec West (Mr. Dobell), who is in the Cabinet without portfolio. I may tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. Dobell), who has just come into the House that every candidate at the next general election would be delighted to know how the Government expect to provide candidates for these voters' lists. Well, I had almost despaired of getting an answer, but I see

the Solicitor General has come back to the Chamber, and I am sure that hon. gentleman will agree with me that I have grave cause of complaint.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Your time is up, I think.

Mr. BENNETT. The Solicitor General intimates that my hour has come. Not at all. I only trust that we may have many hours together here. I have asked all the Ministers, with and without portfolio, how candidates are to get these voters' lists, but they have all turned a deaf ear to me, and so I am glad the Solicitor General has come back to answer. Where is the man who, most unfortunately for himself, and fortunately for the country, is a candidate, where is he to get these voters' lists in Ontario? If the Solicitor General will not answer, I will have to inform my unfortunate fellow-members myself, even at the risk of hon. gentlemen opposite being let into the secret. First and foremost, if they are millionaires they can get the lists printed.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Who; millionaires?

Mr. BENNETT. If the candidates are millionaires they can get the lists printed.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. And if they are not?

Mr. BENNETT. Then they can toil through the long hours of the night and the long hours of the day copying out these lists and distributing them around among their friends. The Solicitor General must feel that it would be an outrage on my Gaelic friend from Cape Breton (Mr. McDougall) and my Scotch friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. McDonald) if they were forced to copy out the names of some of the voters I have in my riding. Instead of having a long list of Macdonalds, McTavishes and McNeills, names dear to his heart, the hon. gentleman would have a long list of names of very respectable French voters, which would be extremely difficult for him to copy. How he would curse the evil spirit that ever tempted him in an insane moment to become a Parliamentary candidate, and how he would feel chagrined at being driven to that work by a relentless Government.

Mr. GILLIES. A taskmaster.

Mr. BENNETT. Why, Sir, the taskmaster in the old days of bondage that are recorded in scripture, never would impose upon a parliamentary candidate the task that this Government imposes upon him. And suppose the unfortunate candidate may not be able to write, because I know one hon. gentleman in this House who, they say, always signs his name "Bill Somebody, his mark."; what is that hon. gentleman to do when he comes to write out the list? How will that unfortunate candidate get along? Why should this Government handicap a candidate in that respect because he cannot write? This Government proposes that because a man has not the advantage of being a wealthy man, or of having the early education which fits him to write; they propose to tell that candidate that he cannot have the voters' lists. Are we going to frown down laudable ambition in Canada in that manner? The times and the methods have changed. We know that it is the guiding star—to use an expression I have heard nine thousand and niney-nine times in this House—we know it is the guiding star of every male child born in the States, that sooner or later he is going to be President.

Fancy how many young Canadians to-day, burning with enthusiasm to bleed for their country on their country's altar, are fitting themselves to be members of Parliament, while this hard-hearted Government, because they have among them millionaires, and are the friends of millionaires, say, "We care not, we have the wealth of the Yukon, with Mann & Mackenzie thrown in; we have our voters' lists printed; but you poor people, if you cannot afford that, can write them out for yourselves." As for Bill Blank, that unfortunate member who cannot write and makes his mark, he has a task imposed upon him that Lord Macaulay, in his palmiest days could not hope to emulate. We are told that Lord Macaulay could pick up a book, and on reading a page could immediately repeat it. But we are not all Lord Macaulays; if we were, we would not be here; we would be employed perhaps in a more pleasant and profitable occupation. You ask the Canadian youth who cannot write to write out his own voters' list. You select a candidate by reason of his great personal popularity, and after he has been selected by the party caucus, they find that he is not a man of means. They ask him for the voters' list. He says, "I have no money and I cannot furnish you with a voters' list." Filled with the bright inspiration of hope, a kind friend suggests to him that he can copy the voters' list. During this time he should be addressing public meetings and conducting his campaign, but they say, "we must have voters' lists; and, as you are able to write, you had better sit down and make out copies of it." But, horror of horrors, the unfortunate candidate has to make the confession that he is not able to write. What is the result? The committee meet and take the situation into their serious consideration. Then, in his desperation the bright idea strikes the candidate that if the worst comes to the worst, he can commit the voters' list to memory. Fancy the feelings of a candidate, at the time he attempts to address an audience, and to fill himself and his audience with indignation at all the iniquities perpetrated by some bad government, he finds himself prevented from doing that by reason of the fact that the names on the voters' lists are continually revolving in his head, the Smiths, the Browns and the

Robinsons following each other in rapid succession. But if he were a candidate in Cape Breton, imagine the dilemma he would be placed in. I have here a list of about 70 names of McNeils. I notice there are about 15 John McNeils. In the first place, he would have to recall to his recollection that there was plain John McNeil. With that as a starting point, he could recall that there was a red John McNeil, a black John McNeil, a gray John McNeil; then he could recall that there was a lame John McNeil, and so he could go on all through the list. Surely the Minister of Railways and Canals, with that unlimited fund of good nature that he possesses, is not going to ask an unfortunate candidate to pay for these voters' lists out of his own pocket. I for one am prepared to see the duty increased on some of my favourite beverages—on tea, for instance—in order that we may have free voters' lists. I wish the Government to make the duties on whisky and ale, and other excise duties as high as they like, in order that we may have free voters' lists for the unfortunate candidates. I do not care if they increase the customs duties for the same purpose. If any hon. gentleman opposite can suggest any better way of getting them, I shall be delighted to listen to him, because I regard with horror the thought of writing out these voters' lists or learning them by heart. Certainly I do object to paying a large sum for voters' lists, more particularly when we have been educated to the custom of having these lists furnished by the country. But there are other matters of objection in connection with the local lists. If we knew that the local legislatures would not commit any iniquities, but would give us the voters' lists, as they stand to-day in the different provinces, and would not change or tamper with them, we might have some little feeling of security. But we can have no certainty of that, and hon. gentlemen opposite should bear in mind that this Bill may prove a boomerang. There is nothing certain about elections any more than about a horse race, and the whirligig of time brings its revenges. True, it took a long time for the whirligig to come around to hon. gentlemen opposite, but they did at last find themselves in power, and we may be in their place in a couple of years. I do not say it in a spirit of defiance, but we are very sorry that they did not go to the country on the Yukon Bill. While we are not ourselves treading on the tails of their coats so to speak, I can tell hon. gentlemen opposite, that we are not afraid of a general election, and should the next general election result in our return to power, it is just possible that we might also have the local legislatures on our side. There have been signs in the mulberry tree. There has been rather an earthquake in the province of Ontario, and the battle is not over there yet. There are signs of a speedy dissolution of the Liberal party in that province, and if the Conservative party should be restored to the Treasury benches of Toronto, they might prepare for hon. gentlemen opposite most iniquitous lists, if they were to be led away by the example set them. I can, however, promise these hon. gentlemen that we shall not subject them to the indignity of copying out the voters' lists themselves or to such a tax on their memory as to memorize these lists. I know what a tax that would be. I have seen hon. gentlemen opposite, with most beautifully prepared perorations, which they endeavoured to commit to memory, fail ignobly in the attempt, and they can realize therefore how much more difficult it would be to commit to memory a voters' list.

I am sorry that the hon. Solicitor General is not present, because I intended to revise all these strong points in my argument for his benefit. I find that he is open to reason. He does not stand up in the House and say, Look at this beautiful handiwork. He has not stated that this Franchise Act is something perfect in all its parts. On the contrary, he has been one of the first to, Cassius-like, stab it here and there, and I think if he has his way, by the time it gets out of Committee, we will have a very presentable Bill.

The cheapness of revision, under the Dominion Act, as against revision under the local Act, appeals to us very strongly. These are times when we have to practise economy and retrenchment, when the wolf is at the door, when we see a great deal of poverty stalking around, and for that reason we want to practise all the retrenchment possible. The course of the Government in depriving us of the interest that we were wont to draw on our deposits in the savings bank has struck a most vital blow, and I can see the eyes of so many hon. gentlemen dim with tears, as they think of the decreased rate of interest on their savings. Let me draw attention to this very strong point in favour of the Dominion Act as against the local laws. If, perchance, there are names on the voters' lists in the province of Ontario which are objected to, you have to employ a bailiff to serve these persons, whose names are open to objection, and bring them before the court, and bailiffs, like most other people, prefer ready money to promises. The result is you have to pay your bailiff, and then have to incur additional expense to bring forward your witnesses. But under the Dominion Act, you have simply to mail a registered notice. I was going to suggest that we should dispense with the registered notice, and simply be put to the expense of a three cent stamp, but I know that that would cause the Postmaster General to enter into an elaborate calculation to ascertain how much loss there would be to the public exchequer by this remission of the five cents registration stamp, and he would never consent to it. I might, however, appeal to the Finance Minister to come to our aid

and succour on this occasion, because he has deprived us, in the most ruthless way, of the interest on our hard earned dollars, which we have in the savings bank, and can, therefore, appreciate how utterly unable we are to pay this extra five cents for a registered notice.

Let me tell the hon. gentleman that there is no finality in the local voters' lists. Then the judge goes on and revises the voters' list and everybody goes home assured, in the innocence of his heart, that there is nothing more to do. Let me call this to the particular attention of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries—and he will be thankful that such iniquities are not possible in Prince Edward Island. And now I am delighted with the presence of the Solicitor General once more. I had reserved this argument for him particularly. Let me point out now to the joint attention of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries and the Solicitor General that there is a power in the local legislature in Toronto that perverts the ends of justice. In the constituency of North Renfrew there was, as expected to be, a close contest. The candidates on either side had been named, and had stripped for the fray, and it was supposed that the voters' list which had been revised would be used. But what do you think, Mr. Chairman, happened ? I know you will be shocked at this iniquity. Why, the local legislature passed an Act that permitted a new revision of the voters' list.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Cut it short.

Mr. BENNETT. Do I understand that it is because the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries is so disgusted with the unfairness of the thing that he looks so fierce.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am very sleepy.

Mr. BENNETT. I knew the hon. gentleman would be disgusted and shocked. I know he thanks God that in the island of Prince Edward they do not have such shocking iniquities.

Mr. TAYLOR. Perhaps the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) who has just come in, could give you some information about that.

Mr. BENNETT. I am afraid if I were to ask the Minister of Customs he would charge me duty on the article. I do not think he would even give me the preference. And when I think that this cold-hearted, this relentless Government is not only going to deprive me of the half of one per cent on my hard-earned savings in the Post Office Savings Bank— I regret they are not more— but drive me to pay for voters' lists, how can I be expected to pay duty on anything I get from the Minister of Customs ? Therefore, I refrain from asking him. And yet I know that the hon. Minister of Customs, if he had it in his power would give us a Franchise Act that would provide us with a good voters' list. When we have a Ministry who are so anxious to do what is right——

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. To go home.

Mr. BENNETT. I can tell the hon. gentleman that if they wish to go home, I will not detain them.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Give us the section and keep the other, and let us go.

Mr. BENNETT. I can tell the hon. gentlemen that if they would permit me to emulate their example, that is, if they set the example of going home, I should be very glad to do so. Now, I have to thank the House for listening to my few imperfect remarks on this occasion. I do ask in all fairness, seeing the spirit of friendliness that is being manifested here this evening, or I should say this morning, that there should be a conference of the representatives of the two sides. And I will say that, so far as I am concerned, I am honestly of the opinion that, if four or five of the hon. gentlemen opposite and four or five on this side were to sit down and discuss this matter, the result would be a Bill that could be passed in the House in three or four hours at the outside.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not feel very much like speaking for an hour or two on this most important question. But I wish to say, before we go any further in the debate, that this side of the House makes its protest as strongly as it possibly can, in opposition to the word flung out by the leader of the Government, in an unguarded moment, I think, that we were determined to obstruct or desirous of obstructing. Now, I say for the Opposition that we have not proceeded on that basis ; we have not done it ; we do not now have any intention of doing it. But we do claim for ourselves the right to discuss and discuss fully the principal sections of this Bill, of which there are two or three of great importance. We were proceeding in that line, we worked earnestly and hard all day to-day and all day yesterday, and when at one o'clock this morning we asked that the committee should rise and report progress, we thought we were not asking anything that should not fairly be given. We were met by the assertion by the leader of the Government that we must pass clause (c) and clause (d) and it was simply because of our own feeling that we had not unduly prolonged the discussion that we could not bring ourselves at that time to submit to what we thought was a harsh demand upon us. Now, it is an extremely foolish thing for the two sides of the House to sit opposite each other and waste their physical and mental strength in combat like this to see which shall be the gainers. We of the Opposition

knew exactly what the outcome would be. The Opposition always has staying powers that the Government cannot have. The members of the Government have their own day work as well as night work to take into account, and they are not fitted for their responsibilities by being kept up to all hours. The hon. gentlemen have suggested that we ought, as sensible people, to come to an arrangement. I am willing, and I think our friends are willing to allow section (c) to be taken, but not to pass section (d), and after section (c) is passed to rise.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am perfectly willing that that arrangement should be carried out; I think it is in the interest of both parties.

Committee rose and reported progress.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 3.45 a.m. (Saturday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 25th April, 1898.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

RESIGNATION OF THE MAJOR GENERAL COMMANDING.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I should like to ask the Government whether or not the rumour which has been published in the press at the capital and elsewhere, in reference to the resignation of the Major General Commanding the Canadian forces, is true; and, if the resignation has been presented, whether or not it has been accepted? I think it would be unfortunate at this particular moment if the Major General Commanding the forces should leave his post, or if we should be left for any time without one to replace him.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I am sorry that the Minister of Militia is not in his seat to-day; but I can tell my hon. friend that General Gascoigne has offered his resignation, and it has been accepted; but he remains in command until his successor is appointed.

PREFERENTIAL TRADE.

Mr. McNEILL. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I should like to ask my right hon. friend if he has been able to come to any determination as to whether he can allow me a day for the discussion of the motion on preferential trade which I have placed on the paper, and which I spoke to my right hon. friend about?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I am not in a position to give an answer to my hon. friend to-day. His motion may be called up at this very sitting.

Mr. McNEILL. I may say to my right hon. friend that from what passed between us, I was not thinking of taking up the motion to-day; I have not my notes in shape to do so. Then, we have only until six o'clock to-day for notices of motion.

The PRIME MINISTER. I will ask that the motion of my hon. friend be allowed to stand, if my hon. friend is not ready.

THE KLONDIKE AND PEACE RIVER GOLD MINING, LAND AND TRANSPORTATION COMPANY (LIMITED).

The House resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 91) to incorporate the Klondike and Peace River Gold Mining, Land and Transportation Company (Limited).—(Mr. Davis.)

(In the Committee.)

Mr. FOSTER. I do not rise to make any remark with reference to this Bill, as far as it individually is concerned, but not being a member of the Private Bills Committee, I wish to ask if any investigation is made or any information obtained in that committee, before a company like this is incorporated, as to the bona fides of the company and the actual capital it has in sight or anything of that kind. This is a Bill, like others we have had, of wide extent. If a set of men wish to become a mining company and apply for a British Columbia charter, it will cost them to obtain powers like these somewhere between $500 and $800, yet simply, by an Act of incorporation in this Parliament, this company obtains power as wide, and wider in some respects, than it could get from the province; and such Bills are oftentimes put through the House, I am afraid, although I do not say that it is the case with this Bill, without any assurance that there is a dollar of capital in sight or that the applicants are not simply getting a valuable franchise to dispose of in the market. What I wish to know is whether or not the Private Bills Committee take any steps to inform them-

selves as to whether the company is a bona fide company, with capital behind it proportionate to the undertaking, or whether these incorporators simply get their charter as a matter of course.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). The Private Bills Committee this session give exceptional time and care to the scrutiny and examination of the various Bills before them. This particular Bill was before it two or three times. In its first shape, it called for various very extreme and extensive powers. Many objections were taken to the powers asked for and also to the manner in which they were sought to be exercised, and after we discussed in the committee the lines on which we thought these powers might be granted, the promoter was asked to withdraw the Bill and to consult with the officers of the Finance Department, Mr. Courtney and Mr. Fitzgerald, so as to have the Bill recast in the shape in which the committee desired it should be. The Bill was recast and sent to the committee, and is now entirely altered from what it was in the first instance. $250,000 stock must be subscribed, and 20 per cent of that must be paid up and deposited in a chartered bank before the company can exercise any of the special powers granted to them. We cannot, of course, make particular inquiry as to the standing of the parties. Hon. members must judge for themselves whether Smith, Brown or Robinson are responsible men or not. But the powers these companies ask for are not to be exercised until there is some public guarantee of the bona fides of the company in the subscription of stock and the percentage of capital stock paid in before it can exercise any of its powers. In the Bill as it is, a great many of the powers the company sought to get are eliminated, and the Bill has been reduced to a shape which will meet the wishes of hon. gentlemen, and is certainly in conformity with the practice of the Private Bills Committee. The hon. member for Three Rivers (Sir Adolphe Caron), who was present, and a number of other gentlemen, know that that section received a very thorough threshing out.

Mr. FOSTER. The Bill is now free from the very apparent objections that there were to it as introduced, and everything is more satisfactory, so far as the limitation of those two wide powers is concerned, and I admit that when you compel the company to have $250,000 of the million capital stock subscribed and a certain amount paid up and deposited in banks before the company can exercise its power, you provide some safeguard. Still, that does not prevent the franchise being a most valuable one, which people who have no capital might get through Parliament and sell at a very great advantage. I am not making any objection to this Bill particularly. My hon. friend knows that I talked with him about the matter on previous occasions, and I do not think Parliament can err on the side of strictness in giving these wide franchises in a new country like this with such great possibilities. If men with capital want to invest in this country, Parliament should give them all the facilities possible, but Parliament should not go out of its way to facilitate the operation of that class of men who are traders in franchises.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I should like to add to what the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) has said, that no committee is more particular in looking into the matters submitted to its consideration than the Committee on Private Bills. I say so from a knowledge of the fact, having been one of its members for years. The present Bill, it must be remembered, could not come before any other Parliament than that of Canada, because no provincial Parliament could grant what its promoters ask. In so far as the standing of the incorporators is concerned, the only means we have of ascertaining that is from the gentlemen who took charge of the Bill before the committee. That is the case with every Bill which comes before any committee. These gentlemen are supposed to know the people seeking incorporation. This Bill came, on several different occasions, before the committee, and was almost completely recast, and in its present condition I do not think there can be any possible objection to it.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not know the exact changes made in section 2, paragraphs "a" and "b." But that section contains objections which have been raised before and are very serious. We are giving one company power over several lines. The section provides, first, to operate mines in the Klondike district and other districts in the North-west Territories and British Columbia; also, acquire lands in the Peace River and other districts in the said territories and province, and improve and dispose of the same, and operate farms and ranches, and buy, sell, own and raise cattle, horses and sheep.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That was entirely recast.

Mr. SPROULE. The company may locate, buy, sell, develop and operate mines in the Klondike and other districts in the North-west Territories and British Columbia.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The next three lines are struck out.

Mr. SPROULE. And operate farms and ranches and buy and sell, own and raise cattle, horses and sheep, and acquire, oper-

ate and dispose of steam and other vessels, and carry on transportation and trading business.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. It seems to me to have this objection still—it includes several distinct and separate lines of business under one charter, lines of business that have no natural connection. If a Bill is wanted to incorporate a company for one line, it is all right to pass it., but this, in my opinion, involves a bad principle.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. What the hon. gentleman says is perfectly true, and the committee tried to bear it in mind. The official advisers, if I may say so, of the committee, the Deputy Finance Minister and the Inspector of Insurance, carefully go over these Bills with their officers, and where there are different powers asked by one company, these Bills are all the more closely scrutinized. In this case the powers asked—to mine and ship—are cognate powers. The hon. gentleman knows that in the Nickel Company Bill, for instance, similar powers were given, because the promoters said it was no use to give the power to mine unless we gave the power to transport also. I do not suppose that there would be any objection, that, beyond this, they should be given power to buy and sell horses and cattle.

Mr. SPROULE. They have power, under this, to run ranches.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend (Sir Louis Davies) knows very well the Companies' Act under which we grant powers to companies to do business. I know that in the administration of that Act, the Finance Department, when I was in control of it, and the Government afterward, were very careful not to join different businesses under one incorporation. A company comes and, on the face of it, wants to be incorporated as a certain kind of company; but when you look at the powers it asks which are not well set forth by the company, you find that they are complex, covering two or more lines of business. In granting powers under the Companies' Act it is always the rule to confine the company to one main business, but to give whatever other powers might be necessary to carry on that business. If, for instance, a company is carrying on a mining business, it may be necessary for it to be able to own and manage vessels to carry its ore, and, under the Companies' Act, you would give them powers in this respect sufficient for the purposes of the company, that is to bring in supplies, take out ore, and do whatever else of that kind may be necessary to the work of the company itself. But this is an entirely different case. Under this charter, the company can mine anywhere throughout a wide area—they are a mining company. They can do a transportation business entirely apart from their mines—they are a transportation company. They can trade throughout the district—they are a trading company. And outside of all that, they can buy and own ranches and become a ranching company. Thus there are four actually different businesses, not necessarily connected, and not all appearing in the title of this Bill. The question arises: Why do these gentlemen come here for an Act of Parliament? Why do they not seek for powers under the Companies' Act? There can be but one reason, I fancy, and that is that the Companies' Act will not give them as wide powers as they desire. I will not say dogmatically—the Minister of Finance would know better if he were here—but I do not think they would be given such powers under the Companies' Act. The gentleman who brings the Bill to the committee vouches for the promoters, and the committee does not go behind that. Nobody is saying anything against the respectability of the gentlemen who are seeking this incorporation. But there ought to be some machinery by which the committee could satisfy itself, before it gives the franchise, that the promoters are men of responsibility and have control of capital to put into the company, so that, before they get their franchise, it may have all the elements of a going concern. This question of the bona fides and money power of the parties should be one of the primary elements considered in the question of incorporation. I do not say that this Bill is worse than others that have gone through, but it is a Bill of tremendously wide powers, although it is greatly improved—it could not help being improved in that committee, because it asked for so much that no committee would pass it as it first appeared, I imagine. That does not say that it was not well scrutinized by the committee. But the powers proposed to be granted here are wide and there is not a scintilla of evidence that the gentlemen who are promoting the company intend to put a dollar bill into it.

Mr. SPROULE. I take it that the Deputy Minister of Finance, who went over the Bill, went over it with a view to giving the company the wide corporate powers that they desired, and tried to make the Act passable while still taking from it as little as possible. Only one of the powers asked for has been cut off, I believe. But it seems to me that we should go much further than that, and compel those who want incorporation to confine themselves to one line, granting them powers in other lines only so far as may be necessary as to enable them to carry on their main business. There is no connection necessarily between trading, transportation and ranching and no connection necessarily between any of these and min-

ing. And yet these are all included. Where parties come before us seeking an Act of incorporation, the sooner we adopt the principle of confining them as much as possible to one line of business the better it will be.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am well satisfied that this conversation has come up in the House, because there is a constantly recurring struggle in the committeee between promoters and those who attend the committee, on the one hand to get increased powers, and, on the other hand, to keep them down to the limits that the committee think advisable. There are in this Bill controlling words in the clause granting the powers which have the effect of limiting the exercise of those powers to the purposes for which the company is incorporated. So, when they are authorized to go into ranching and also into transportation, they are limited to the transportation of the products of the ranch—they cannot go into general transportation. This was the way that this was amended in the committee. I am glad this has come up, because it will strengthen the hands of the committee.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. In view of the remarks of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) and as silence might be said to give consent, I rise to say that, so far as I am concerned, and I think that so far as the majority of the members are concerned, there is no sympatthy with the criticisms that have been offered. It appears to me that what we want above all in this country is capital to carry on just such enterprises as this. The hon. ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) raises the question whether the bona fides of the capitalists can be vouched for, just as if the people who are in this, even if they were millionaires, could not be changed.

Mr. FOSTER. But, in the first place, you have the millionaires.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I do not see that that would make any practical difference. I think that the majority in this House is not in sympathy with the line of criticism that has been followed, except so far as shows a desire to protect the public interest. As there are no special privileges or monopolies given to the company, and as any other company might come and get the same privileges, I do not think that the public interest could suffer. I do not think that any legislation could be passed to make money for people or protect people from losing money without giving special privileges, any more than you can make people moral by legislation. What we want is to pursue the contrary course to that suggested by the ex-Finance Minister and give every encouragement for the investment of capital in the country and every encouragement to people to engage in the lines of business proposed by this company, mining, trading, transportation, &c, How it can injure the public interest, is beyond my conception; on the contrary, I cannot understand why it is not in the public interest that large companies, with large capital, should be encouraged to do business in this country.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman may not understand it so far as he is concerned himself, but I think those who are giving attention to legislation have some understanding of it, and they have never recognized in this House, nor in the committee, the wisdom of tacking together three or four or five lines that are naturally separated from each other when incorporating a company, and giving them more lines than are necessary to carry on a distinct business. You take ranching, you take mining, you take trading and transportation, you take buying lands, or cultivating and improving lands, and all those lines that have no natural connection with each other. I respectfully submit, and I think I am safe in saying, that a large number of members in this House hold the same views, that it is a bad principle to incorporate any company and give them the power of controlling half a dozen lines, when in reality they ought to be confined to one.

Bill reported, and read the third time, and passed.

MONTMORENCY COTTON MILLS.

The House resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 102) to incorporate the Montmorency Cotton Mills Company.—(Mr. Penny.)

(In the Committee.)

On section 3,

Mr. FOSTER. This is an apt illustration of what we were discussing a moment ago. Here is a company which is incorporated to do one particular business, and it is practically given whatever it wants for the proper conduct of that business, and that is what they would get under the Companies' Act. This company does not come, in the first place, wanting to do a woollen business with all the powers necessary and subsidiary to that, then wanting to do a mining business, with all the powers necessary and subsidiary to that, then wanting to do a transportation business all over the habitable globe. Why one company should get but one business and the other powers for equipping itself to do it, whilst another gets powers to carry on three separate and distinct lines of business, outside of the line of the Companies' Act, is what no fellow can understand.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

RELIEF OF EDWIN HEYWARD.

Bill (No. 112) for the relief of Edwin Heyward (from the Senate)—(Mr. Belcourt)—was considered in committee, reported, read the third time, and passed, on a division.

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 122) to incorporate the Supreme Grand Lodge of the Sons of England Benefit Society.—(Mr. Bertram.)

THE RECIPROCAL CLAUSE OF THE TARIFF OF 1897.

Mr. FOSTER asked,

What was the amount paid in refunds of customs distributed as to nationality of goods in respect of these imports affected by the so-called reciprocal clause of the tariff of 1897 ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). It is practically impossible to give the required information for the reason that the certificates of origin which accompany shipments of goods imported from England, which are the growth, produce or manufacture of other countries entitled to the benefits of the preferential tariff, do not give specific information as to the country of origin of each particular item of goods mentioned in the shipment, it being merely set forth in such certificate that the goods in the shipment are the growth, produce or manufacture of certain countries which are entitled to the benefits of the reciprocal tariff.

Mr. FOSTER. Can the hon. gentleman give me the total amount of the refund ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I think I shall be able to do so.

GOVERNMENT LANDS IN TROIS PISTOLES, P.Q.

Mr. GAUVREAU asked,

Whether the Department of Railways and Canals possesses in the parish of Trois Pistoles, in the county of Temiscouata, a piece of land of irregular dimensions near the station and restaurant of the Intercolonial Railway ?

If so, to whom is it rented, and what is the yearly rent paid by the tenant ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). Yes, the Railway Department owns a piece of land of irregular dimensions in the parish of Trois Pistoles, next the station and restaurant of the Intercolonial Railway. About one-quarter of this piece of land, comprising a little over an acre was leased to Madame Lavigne in January, 1886, at a nominal rental of $1 per year. The rent was paid up to 1st January, 1898.

SOULANGES CANAL—ADVERTISING FOR TENDERS.

Mr. BERGERON asked,

In what newspapers did the Department of Public Works publish the last call for tenders for furnishing the cement required for the works on the Soulanges Canal ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). The Department of Railways and Canals advertised for tenders for the cement required for the works on the Soulanges Canal in the following papers in the province of Quebec :—Montreal, the "Herald," "La Patrie," the "Shareholder." Quebec, "Le Soleil," the "Telegraph." St. Hyacinthe, "L'Union." Sherbrooke, "Le Progrès de l'Est."

IMMIGRATION DEPARTMENT—LIVERY HIRE.

Mr. DAVIS asked,

What amount has been paid to S. J. Donaldson, of Prince Albert, for livery hire in connection with immigrants and delegates from 1st January, 1888, to August, 1894 ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). From April, 1892, when the Department of the Interior took charge of immigration, to August, 1894, $715.50 was paid to J. S. Donaldson, of Prince Albert, for livery hire in connection with immigrants and delegates. There is no record here of any payments which may have been previously made to him.

TIMBER DUES IN NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES.

Mr. DAVIS asked,

What amount is due by Thomas McKay, of Prince Albert, Saskatchewan, on account of timber dues ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). The amount due by Thomas McKay, of Prince Albert, Saskatchewan, on account of timber dues, is : principal, $486.13 ; interest to 21st April, 1898, $278.97 ; total, $765.10.

MR. THOMAS COTE.

Mr. ROCHE asked,

1. Is Mr. Thomas Coté, correspondent of "La Patrie" during the present session, in the employ of the House or of the Department of Public Works, either directly or indirectly ?

2. If so employed, what remuneration has Mr. Coté received or is he to receive ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). Mr. Coté is not in the employment of the House or of the Department of Public Works, either directly or indirectly.

INSPECTOR AT ARNPRIOR POST OFFICE BUILDING.

Mr. TAYLOR (by Mr. Sproule) asked,

1. Who is the inspector of the post office building now being erected at Arnprior, Ont. ?
2. When was he appointed ?
3. Is he a practical mechanic ?
4. What salary is he being paid per day ?
5. How many days has he been paid for services since his appointment to the 1st April, 1897 ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). 1. J. W. Tierney. 2. 15th October, 1896. 3. The inspector has proved to be a capable officer and has given satisfaction. 4. $2 per day. 5. He has been paid for each day.

LOAN OF 1897.

Mr. CLARKE asked,

1. What was the total amount of the Dominion of Canada loan of 1897 applied for by the banks of Canada ?
2. What was the amount applied by each such bank, the rate offered and the amount allotted ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). The information necessary to answer these questions has not been furnished to the Government.

DEER ISLAND TELEGRAPH CABLE.

Mr. GANONG asked,

1. Have the Government engineers made a survey between Deer Island, Charlotte county, New Brunswick, and a point on the mainland near Eastport, in the United States, with a view to ascertain the cost of establishing communication by telegraphic cable between the island and the mainland
2. When was this survey made ?
3. What was the estimated cost of establishing such communication ?
4. Was any estimate made by the engineers as to the cost of telephonic connection between the several fishing villages on the island and the landing place of such cable ? If so, what was the estimated cost ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). 1. Yes ; a cursory survey was made with the steamer "Newfield," when she was on the ground engaged on cable repairs. 2. June, 1897. 3. The approximate cost was placed at $3,500. 4. The sum of $3,500 above given covers the cost of the work mentioned.

CAMPOBELLO ISLAND—TELEPHONE CONNECTION.

Mr. GANONG asked,

1. Have the Government engineers made any estimate of the cost of telephone connection between Head Harbour light and Welshpool, on the island of Campobello, in New Brunswick ?
2. If so, what was the estimated cost ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). 1. Yes. 2. $880.

ALIEN LABOUR LAW.

Mr. McCLEARY (by Mr. Sproule) asked,

1. Has there been any request made upon the Government for the appointment of a special officer to enforce the Alien Labour Law along the frontier at Fort Erie ?
2. Has the Government made such appointment ?
3. If so, who is the person so appointed, and what is the remuneration for such services ?
4. What instructions were given such officer ?
5. If such officer has been appointed, is he enforcing the law satisfactorily to the Government ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). 1. Yes. 2. Yes. 3. James Lawson, collector of customs at Fort Erie ; no extra remuneration. 4. He was instructed to enforce the Canadian Act wherever the Americans on their side of the adjoining frontier were enforcing the United States Act against Canadians. 5. The officer has carried out his instructions, so far as the Government is aware.

DISMISSAL OF JOHN T. JOHNSON.

Mr. McCLEARY asked,

1. Why was John T. Johnson dismissed from his position of customs officer at Fort Erie ?
2. Were any charges made against him ?
3. If so, were they investigated ?
4. Was Mr. Johnson furnished with a copy of any charges which may have been made against him ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). Mr. John T. Johnson was dismissed from his position of customs officer at Fort Erie for the following reasons :—1st. For having caused vexatious trouble and expease to the department. He entered suit against Mr. Brookfield, ex-collector of customs at Fort Erie, for the recovery of certain sums which he alleged to be due him as extra pay received from railway companies for extra services rendered. The collector received the moneys for extra service from the railways, and distributed the same ratably among the officers to the best of his judgment, according to the amount of work performed by each officer. His distribution had the approval of the department, and gave satisfaction to all the officers at the port with the exception of Johnson. The dispute was considered one for determination by the department, not by the courts. The department defended the suit. Judgment was given against Mr. Johnson, the action being dismissed with costs. The costs have not been paid by Johnson, as ordered by the judgment, and the department has had to pay the same, including the

costs of the solicitors for Mr. Brookfield. 2nd. For having been unwilling to perform the duties required of him under the same conditions as performed by other officers of the same rank at Fort Erie. This has reference to extra service required to be rendered to railway companies, &c. As a result of Johnson's conduct, he could not be assigned to the performance of any extra duties at the port, and the staff, consequently, was in a state of disorganization, it not being possible to distribute the work of the port evenly under the circumstances. In view of all the circumstances, the department felt that to continue Johnson in office would be inconsistent with a proper regard for discipline in the service.

BREAKWATER AT GABAROUSE.

Mr. McDOUGALL asked,

Is it the intention of the Government to provide in the Supplementary Estimates this session a grant for the building of a pier or breakwater at Gabarouse, in the county of Cape Breton ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). The information will be supplied when the Supplementary Estimates are brought down.

BREAKWATER AT PORT MORIEN.

Mr. McDOUGALL asked,

Is it the intention of the Government to provide in the Supplementary Estimates this session for further repairs to the breakwater at Port Morien (Cow Bay), Cape Breton ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). I suppose, the same answer will satisfy my hon. friend.

Mr. McDOUGALL. That is very doubtful.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The information will be supplied when the Supplementary Estimates are brought down.

CHAMBORD JUNCTION CUSTOM-HOUSE.

Mr. MARCOTTE asked,

1. Whether there is a custom-house at Chambord, Lake St. John ?
2. When was it established by the Government ?
3. By what contractor was it constructed ?
4. How much did it cost ?
5. What amount of money have the Government received for duties at that point since the establishment of the warehouse ?
6. Who is the customs officer at that place ?
7. How much has the said officer received for his salary since the establishment of the warehouse?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). 1. There is a customs office at Chambord Junction, Lake St. John, Que. 2. 1st May, 1897. 3 and 4. The Government has not erected a customs building there. 5. From the time of the establishment of the office up to the 31st March, 1898, $756.05 were received for duties there. 6. Auguste Gagné. 7. $235 up to the 31st March, 1898.

WHARF AT CHICOUTIMI.

Mr. MARCOTTE asked,

1. What amount has been expended on the wharf at Chicoutimi since 23rd June, 1896 ?
2. What amount has been spent on the wharf at Ste. Anne, county of Chicoutimi, since the said date ?
3. Who has had charge of the public works in the county of Chicoutimi since the said date ?
4. What travelling expenses and living expenses have been paid to the engineers in charge of the said works since 23rd June, 1896 ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). 1. $6,605.61. 2. $7,571.80. 3. J. C. Blais, engineer. 4. The amount paid to the engineer for travelling expenses has been $664.05 and for living expenses, $663.85, but it must not be forgotten that, in addition to the works at Chicoutimi and Ste. Anne, the engineer has also had charge of, and has superintended the works at the following places :—Tadousac, Anse St. Jean, St. Alphonse, Roberval, Ticouabé, Mistassini, Rivière à la Pipe, St. Fulgence, &c.

CONTRACTOR FOR PLACING BUOYS.

Mr. MARCOTTE asked,

1. What is the name of the contractor for the placing of the buoys in the St. Lawrence, between Montreal and Quebec ?
2. What price is he to get ?
3. For how many years ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). 1. John C. Kaine, of Quebec. 2. Ten thousand dollars per annum. 3. Five years.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS AT CHETICAMP.

Mr. GILLIES asked,

1. Who is sub-collector of customs at the present time at the port of Cheticamp, Inverness county, Cape Breton ?
2. When was the present incumbent appointed?
3. Why and when was his predecessor, Sévérin Aucoin, removed from office ?
4. Were any complaints lodged against Mr. Aucoin, and if so, what were they, and by whom were they lodged ?
5. Were these complaints investigated, and if so, where, when and before whom ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). 1. Charles E. Aucoin. 2. 1st January, 1897. 3. Sévérin Aucoin, the former incumbent of the position, was removed from office on the 1st January, 1897, for inefficiency and neglect of duty. 4 and 5. No complaints were lodged against Mr. Sévérin Aucoin. Action was taken on the report of Mr. Inspector Bremner.

SUB-COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS AT MARGAREE.

Mr. GILLIES asked,

1. When was Miles Dunn appointed sub-collector of customs at Margaree, Inverness county?
2. Was Mr. Dunn dismissed from his position? If so, when, why and at whose request was he dismissed?
3. Were complaints laid against him? If so, of what character, by or through whom were they lodged? Was an investigation held in this matter, and if so, by whom, and what report was made by him to the department?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). 1. November 1st, 1883. 2 and 3. Mr. Dunn was dismissed from his position by Order in Council, dated the 16th December, 1897, for having taken an active political partisan part at the last Dominion general election. The charges against Mr. Dunn were preferred by Dr. A. McLennan, M.P., on his personal knowledge and on his responsibility as a member of Parliament. The charges were coupled with a request for Mr. Dunn's dismissal. No investigation was held.

COUNTY OF LEEDS—POSTAL SERVICE.

Mr. TAYLOR (by Mr. Sproule) asked,

1. Has a petition been presented to the Government from some of the residents of rear of Leeds and Lansdowne, praying that a daily mail service be given to the post offices of Ellesville, Long Point and Sweet's Corners, in the county of Leeds, Ont.?
2. Is it the intention of the Government to comply with the prayer of said petition?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). The answer to the first question is, yes. The answer to the second question is, that the matter is under consideration.

DISMISSAL OF MR. M. G. McLEOD.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER moved for:

Copies of all Orders in Council, reports of the inspector or other officers of the Post Office Department, and correspondence respecting the dismissal of Mr. M. G. McLeod from the postal mail service in Nova Scotia.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). I think my hon. friend has been misinformed as to there having been any such dismissal. My recollection is that, in going over these motions with the various officers, when I came to this motion the officer told me that no such dismissal had taken place. I may be in error on that point, however, and I have no objection to the order being made.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman may be right, but I understand that he will not take the technical objection in complying with the order, if the withdrawal from the service was in some other way. What is wanted is the correspondence in connection with the withdrawal of Mr. McLeod from the service.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have no objection to the form of the motion, and will make the return cover anything in connection with the officer.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I would ask that the motion be made to read "dismissal or retirement."

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

DISMISSAL OF JOHN F. TENNANT.

Mr. QUINN moved for:

Copies of all papers in connection with the dismissal of John F. Tennant, late collector of customs at Gretna, Manitoba.

He said: When I had the pleasure, last Monday, of speaking on this motion, it was my misfortune that neither the right hon. First Minister or the hon. Minister of Public Works was in the House. I welcome, however, their presence here to-day, and I hope that they will remain until I have had the opportunity of pointing out some matters which I think will interest and reward them for the time they may spend in the House. In order that they may understand the motion which I have made, even at the cost of repetition, I will go over some of the facts. Mr. Tennant is the son of a British soldier, and in 1870 went to the North-west on what is known as the Wolseley expedition. He was engaged for some time afterwards on the boundary survey, and occupied some minor positions in the Government service until he was appointed collector of customs at Gretna, Man. This position he held for nine years. He is the father of eight children, enjoys a splendid reputation, is beloved by the people of his district, and looked upon as a model citizen. Great then was his astonishment when, in May, 1897, he received a notice informing him that His Excellency the Governor General in Council had been pleased to dispense with his services as collector at Gretna. When Mr. Tennant received this notice, he naturally complained and asked for reasons. Different reasons were given. It will be remembered that there is no cause mentioned in the notice of dismissal. Correspondence took place between him and the Minister, and then, not one, but two or three causes were given, each one of which was properly answered by Mr. Tennant, either in the form of proof of the inaccuracy of the charges, or by his own statutory declaration. Before going into the merits of this matter, I would like to draw the attention of the House to the statement which the right hon. First Minister made on September 1st, 1896, concerning the dismissal of Government officials. On page 506 of "Hansard," second session, the right hon. gentleman is reported as saying:

No Minister would pretend to dismiss any official unless he had an opportunity to defend himself but when the case is in the personal knowledge of the Minister himself, under such circumstances, there is no case for inquiry. When the Minister is not cognizant of the facts himself, whenever the case is brought to him by extraneous evidence, those statements must be substantiated, and every man must be given an opportunity to defend himself. I do not want, for my part, and I am sure the Government does not desire—and I can speak for the Government in this matter—to act arbitrarily on this or any other subject; every one must be given a fair opportunity to be heard before he is dealt with; but when the facts are substantiated against him, and are of the character I have indicated, he must be given every opportunity to become a politician in the full sense of the term.

That is the language of the right hon. First Minister on the question. Now I turn to page 523, and I find a statement of the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) on the very same day. He said:

I do not desire that any man should be condemned without a hearing. On that point we are all in accord. Unless the case is one absolutely and perfectly evident to the Minister's own senses, as in the case referred to by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, it is our duty to see that men have an opportunity to repel the charge, or confess the charge, as the case may be.

I think that both these hon. gentlemen laid down, on that occasion, a very wholesome and fair rule for the guidance of Ministers as regards their employees. Was this rule followed in the case of Mr. Tennant? No, Mr. Speaker, it was not. Instead of any opportunity having been given Mr. Tennant to defend himself, instead of his having been made aware that there existed any charge whatever against him, he was ruthlessly dismissed, on the mere letter which I read to the House last Monday evening. Mr. Tennant, of course, would not let the matter rest there but petitioned the department to give him some reason for his dismissal. The first answer which he received was in the form of a letter. His own letter to the Minister of Customs, I think, is sufficiently interesting, and I shall trouble the House to listen while I read. It is as follows:—

In reply to your letter dated from Ottawa, 17th instant, re charges laid against me, that one Patrick Harrigan, of the staff of the United States customs office at Neche, North Dakota, was in charge of my office for some time during the 23rd of June, 1896, I herewith forward to you a statutory declaration in rebuttal of said charges, of Mr. Patrick Horgan, whom I presume to be the official brought in question. If you consider it necessary I should more fully exonerate myself from active and offensive partisanship during the late general election, I can do so on my own declaration, and would respectfully ask the fullest investigation as to my conduct and the work of this office at any time during the late campaign. With full confidence that you will see justice done me in this most important matter to myself, I remain, dear sir,

Yours obediently,
(Sgd.) J. F. TENNANT,
Sub-Collector.

The declaration which he sent to the Department of Customs, with this letter, is in the following terms:—

Dominion of Canada,
Province of Manitoba.

In the matter of J. F. Tennant, and his dismissal from the service of the Canadian Department of Customs:

I, Patrick Horgan, of Neche, North Dakota, in the United States, do solemnly declare that I am an officer of the United States customs at Neche, in North Dakota, and I am well acquainted with J. F. Tennant, ex-sub-collector of customs at Gretna, Man. In the performance of my duties I visit Gretna almost daily. I was in the office of Mr. Tennant on the 23rd June, 1896, as I usually wait there when meeting the train going south on the Great Northern Railway. I was no longer there on that date than on other occasions. I was not in charge of said customs office at Gretna on the occasion nor at any other time. I was never requested by Mr. Tennant or any other Canadian customs official to look after said office on the 23rd June, 1896, or any other date whatever. I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing the same to be true, and by virtue of the Canada Evidence Act, 1893.

(Sgd.) P. J. HORGAN.

Declared before me at Gretna, Man., in the county of Manchester, this 28th day of December, A.D. 1897.

M. LONG,
A Commissioner in B. R.

Now this affidavit Mr. Tennant forwarded to the Department of Customs in answer to the charge which was made against him by the letter of the Minister, dated February 17th, 1897, which letter is in the following terms:—

Ottawa, 17th February, 1897.

Jos. Tennant, Esq.,
Customs Officer, Gretna, Man.

Dear Sir,—I beg to inform you that I have received a statutory declaration in which the charge is made that one Patrick Harrigan, a member of the staff of the United States customs at Neche, in the state of North Dakota, was in charge of your office for some time during the 23rd of June, 1896. Please let me have your reply to this charge at your earliest convenience.

Yours truly,
WM. PATERSON.

It was in answer to this that Mr. Tennant sent the declaration I have read. Now, other charges were made against Mr. Tennant and answered by him, but in every case in which he asked for an investigation, an investigation was absolutely refused him, or at any rate, no offer was made on the part of the Minister to give Mr. Tennant an investigation of any kind. He was dismissed, and that was the end of it. Not only was he dismissed, and dismissed at very short notice, but he was dismissed losing all the benefits he might have had from the pay-

ments made by him under the rules of the civil service. I understand that since that time, a paltry sum of money has been sent to him, in order, I suppose, in some way, to try and square the department with Mr. Tennant for the amount of money he has contributed to the Civil Service Superannuation Fund. But that is not only very tardy payment, but it is a very insignificant amount and not at all equal to the amount that he would be entitled to claim, if he had resigned his position, or if in any way, he had been given the benefit of the Superannuation Act. Now, the first charge that was made against him was that he interfered in the election of the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson). I may say that that charge was entirely disproven by Mr. Tennant, although he was never given the benefit of an investigation into the matter. It was not pretended that the Minister was present during that election. It was not pretended and cannot be advanced as an argument that he knew personally anything connected with Mr. Tennant's conduct on that occasion. It would be utterly impossible for him, therefore, if he coupled the opinion given and the rule laid down by the hon. leader of the Government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright), to dismiss this public officer from his position. It was then said that he had neglected his duty on the 23rd June, 1896. I have read the affidavit which Mr. Tennant forwarded to the Department of Customs, and not only did he forward this affidavit, but he sent two others. One of these is the affidavit of J. Franklin Irving, which reads as follows :—

Dominion of Canada,
Province of Manitoba,
Town of Gretna.

In the matter of the dismissal of J. F. Tennant from the sub-collectorship of customs for the outport of Gretna, Man.

I, J. Frankin Irving, medical student, of the town of Gretna, in the province of Manitoba, do solemnly declare that :

1. I was the poll clerk for Gretna polling booth for the general Dominion elections held on the 23rd day of June, 1896, for the electoral division of Lisgar, being sworn in as such by the deputy returning officer, H. G. Bean, and was present at the opening and holding of the poll to its close on the said election day.

2. The other officials present in the polling booth on the said election day were : H. G. Bean, deputy returning officer ; R. B. Fisher, agent and scrutineer on behalf of the Liberal candidate, Mr. L. R. Richardson ; and J. Pearson, agent and scrutineer for the Conservative candidate, Mr. R. Rogers.

3. The said R. B. Fisher and J. Pearson presented properly executed agents' papers on behalf of their respective candidates, which were received by the deputy returning officer, who authorized them to act in the said polling booth as scrutineers or agents for their respective candidates in the said poll.

4. J. F. Tennant first entered Gretna poll in the afternoon. He recorded his vote and was requested to act as scrutineer or agent for R. Rogers. J. Pearson, scrutineer for R. Rogers, left the polling booth. J. F. Tennant refused to act in any official capacity in connection with the said election, and rejected the papers presented to him by the deputy returning officer appointing him agent and scrutineer for R. Rogers, but consented to remain as an ordinary elector if there was no question raised, and to this R. B. Fisher, scrutineer for R. L. Richardson, made no objection.

And I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing the same to be true, and by virtue of the Act respecting Extra-judicial Oaths.

(Sgd.) J. FRANKLIN IRVING.

Declared before me at Gretna, in the town of Gretna, this 28th day of September, 1897.

M. LONG,
A Commissioner in B. R.

The second is the affidavit of Henry G. Bean, and is as follows :—

Dominion of Canada,
Province of Manitoba,
County of Manchester.
To wit :

In the matter of the dismissal of J. F. Tennant from the sub-collectorship of customs for the outport of Gretna, Man.

I, Henry G. Bean, machine agent, of the town of Gretna, in the province of Manitoba, do solemnly declare that :

1st. I was deputy returning officer in charge of Gretna polling booth at the late general elections for the Dominion of Canada holding, held on the 23rd of June, 1896, for the electoral division of Lisgar, in the province of Manitoba.

2nd. Mr. R. L. Richardson, Liberal, and Mr. R. Rogers, Conservative, were the only candidates to contest the said election for the said electoral division of Lisgar.

3rd. Two scrutineers were appointed to act officially at the said polling booth, one on behalf of each of the said candidates. R. B. Fisher was scrutineer or agent on behalf of R. L. Richardson, and J. Pearson was scrutineer or agent on behalf of R. Rogers. The said scrutineers received and presented agents' papers, properly signed, and were authorized to act and did so act, as scrutineers and agents for their respective candidates, in the said polling booth on the said election day. The said papers authorizing them, the said R. B. Fisher and J. Pearson to act as scrutineers and agents were deposited by me in the ballot-box at the close of the poll, together with all other papers concerning the election, in the said polling booth, and the said ballot-box sealed by me for delivery to the returning officer, and said ballot-box was so delivered.

4th. No other scrutineer or agent than Mr. Pearson was appointed to act for or on behalf of Mr. R. Rogers at the said poll on the said election day. In the afternoon of the said election day, the said J. R. Pearson left the said polling booth, and Mr. J. F. Tennant, who was in the said polling booth recording his vote, was requested to act as scrutineer for Mr. Rogers. Scrutineer's papers were offered to Mr. J. F. Tennant : he refused them, and declined to act, but consented to remain under the clause in the Dominion Election Act permitting an elector to be present in the absence of agent or scrutineer, provided there was no objection raised to

his presence by any person. R. B. Fisher, the agent and scrutineer for R. L. Richardson, stated there was no objection, and J. F. Tennant remained, but refused to act in an official capacity or receive an appointment of any kind in connection with the said election.

And I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing the same to be true, and by virtue of the Act respecting Extra-judicial Oaths.

(Sgd.) H. G. BEAN.

Declared before me at Gretna, in the town of Gretna, this 28th day of September, 1897.

M. LONG,
A Commissioner in B. R.

So that we have, so far as the desertion of his office is concerned, ample proof that the statement made in the letter of the 17th of February, by the Minister, was absolutely unfounded. We have the statement of the man who is supposed to have been in the office, and we have the statements of the deputy returning officer and his clerk, that Mr. Tennant did not act in any official capacity whatever on the 23rd day of June, but that he merely acted as any other elector had a right to act. Then came the charge that he had grossly insulted the Attorney General of Manitoba. I had the honour to refer to this question the other day, and I think I proved to the satisfaction of any honourable man, not only of any hon. member of the House, but of any honourable man either in public or private life, that under the circumstances no other act would have been becoming a man than that of Mr. Tennant on the occasion spoken of, when, insulted grossly, personally, not only in his own person but in a manner reflecting upon his nationality and religion, he stood upon the platform to defend his civil rights, his rights as a Canadian, and to defend the rights of his fellow-Canadians who were Catholics. I say that he was not only perfectly justified, but he would have been less than a man if he had not taken the stand he did on that occasion. Now, I do not wish to introduce into this debate, or into any other debate, any question of religion or nationality; but I expect that certain members on the other side, possibly the Minister who was guilty of this act of injustice—because I say it is an act of injustice, and I charge the Minister with having been guilty of it—possibly the Minister who was guilty of this act of injustice will repudiate the statements that are made concerning it, repudiate what has appeared in the public press, and will say that there was no question of religion or nationality in the matter at all. I do not know Mr. Tennant. I am not acquainted with him, I have never seen him in my life, to my knowledge; but I take the records of his case which are put before me. I take the expressions of public opinion in the province in which he resides, I take the expressions of public opinion in the Liberal newspapers of the province of Manitoba, and I say that all these disclose one of the greatest outrages that could be perpetrated upon a public officer. I wish now to read an article taken from a Liberal newspaper called the Qu'Appelle "Progress," and headed, "Surprise and Sorrow":

"To the victor belongs the spoil" may doubtless have been deemed a very excellent sentiment in the days of heathen Rome, and the lex talionis have commended itself to the dominant party in that ancient empire; but we of the nineteenth century look for Christianity in our mottoes, and an enlightened policy in our rulers. Even in those stern old times, when chivalry was yet unborn, the laurel was ever ready for the soldier and high places for the grave. It is with feelings of surprise and sorrow that we hear of the dismissal by the Customs Department of an efficient and courteous officer, a brave soldier and an esteemed citizen, in the person of Sub-Collector Tennant, of Gretna, Manitoba. When the first expedition was started to Manitoba, Mr. Tennant was one of the earliest to join the party, and when the mounted police was in its infancy he was an upholder of peace within our boundaries and a maintainer of law and order upon our frontiers. At great personal risk he saved a whole boat's crew from destruction, and was the recipient of the most marked approval of Lord Wolseley for the promptness of his actions and the gallantry of his conduct. Can, we ask, the Liberal or any other Government afford to lose the services of such a man for the mere fact that he was a little too outspoken in his political sentiments—a little too open and candid in his expression of his feelings? Had he been less of a man and more of a trimmer, would he still not have been in the enjoyment of his office? We know that we voice the feelings of the business men of Winnipeg and Manitoba in saying that it would be a graceful action on the part of the Government to reinstate this gentleman in this or some similar position. A large-hearted, whole-souled policy of this kind begets confidence in our leaders and adds lustre to our administration.

This was the first article written by the Qu'Appelle "Progress." But when they found that it was all too true that Mr. Tennant had been dismissed, and that no other office was to be given him, that there was nothing for him but utter neglect, inattention to his demands, even a refusal of a fair, open and honest investigation, the Qu'Appelle 'Progress" again writes, under the title of "British Justice":

For the cause that lacks assistance,
For the wrong that needs resistance,
For the future in the distance,
And the good that we can do.

In again referring to the dismissal of Mr. J. F. Tennant, late sub-collector of customs at Gretna, Man. we wish it to be distinctly understood that "The Progress" is perfectly independent, not being beholden to either the Conservative or Liberal parties in the smallest degree, expecting no favours from either party, but endeavouring to see that simple justice, and British justice at that, is done to all; and we think that the case of Mr. Tennant is certainly a case in point, as in this instance, judging from our information, which we believe to be reliable, a most flagrant injustice has been done Mr. Tennant. Believing such to be the case, we would indeed prove false to

our mission did we not endeavour to the best of our ability to see the wrong righted, and we call upon Mr. Laurier to see that justice be done What are the facts of the case? On the 11th inst., Mr. Tennant received through the collector of customs, Winnipeg, a letter from Mr. J. McDougall, commissioner of customs, Ottawa, stating that an Order in Council had been passed on the 9th of April, 1897, dispensing with his services as sub-collector at Gretna. The cause assigned for such Order in Council was that Mr. Tennant had been absent from his post, spending the whole of his time canvassing for votes during the late Dominion election, and framing voters' lists, and being an agent and scrutineer. All this, Mr. Tennant states, is false, saying that he has never been absent from a train during his whole stay at Gretna, now nine years; that he cannot speak a word of German and is foreign to the community he lives among in religion and nationality. Here we have the case of a charge being laid and a straight denial thereto. Which is correct? How can the question be answered without an investigation? which Mr. Tennant has asked for and been refused.

British law holds a man innocent until proven guilty. British law and honour demands that an investigation held in this case as do the Canadian public. The methods adopted by our politicians at Ottawa, be they Liberal or Conservative, are not so clean as to be entirely above suspicion. Ministers are after all but the servants of the people, and their actions should all be able to withstand the light of day. If an investigation is to be still refused it will be to the everlasting disgrace of our fair Dominion that Mr. Tennant, the father of a large family, who has served his country faithfully for twenty years in both a military and civil capacity, on the Lake of the Woods road, Boundary Commission, Dominion land guide service, as well as the customs, should lose his means of livelihood for himself and family on such questionable grounds. We feel quite certain that the true facts of the case have never been brought to Mr. Laurier's notice, otherwise justice would be done. The shame of it that such mean, petty tricks should be resorted to to suit political exigencies. We call upon Mr. Laurier, as head of the executive of our fair Dominion, to see that justice be done.

I regret exceedingly that the right hon. Premier has not thought fit to remain in the Chamber until I read the letter, which I would have taken the liberty of reading, which was sent to him, in accordance with the expression of opinion of Liberal newspapers, asking that an investigation be given Mr. Tennant. The only answer he received was a note from the right hon. gentleman's secretary, stating that the hon. gentleman had gone to Europe, but, on his return, he would take the matter up, since which time nothing more has been done.

I do not wish to introduce either religion, politics or nationality into this matter, but it seems to me, where such statements of innocence are made, where there is not one charge substantiated against the man accused, where he has repeatedly demanded an investigation, not only from his own Minister, but from the right hon. Prime Minister, there must be something more than neglect of office, which could have been proven at once, or interference in elections. And to show that I am not alone in this opinion, but that it is an opinion entertained by a large portion of the community, that the conduct of the Government in a matter of this kind may not totally cause a great deal of injustice to individulas, but raise strife between one class of the community and another, I will now refer to criticisms made by other papers on Mr. Tennant's dismissal. First, I should like to read an article from the Winnipeg "Free Press," headed "Civil Service Dismissals," as follows:—

The removal of the office of Commissioner of Dominion Lands to Ottawa involves the dismissal of a number of officers, the reason for which is only to be found in their places being rendered unnecessary in the new arrangement. No question of irregularity against any of them has arisen, and it is not a case of turning out in order to replace them by others. It is a state of affairs brought about in the course of the reorganization of his department by the Hon. Mr. Sifton, for which we cannot find fault with him. It may be a mistaken policy for him to remove this office to Ottawa; and we think it is, but we are bound to allow time to determine that.

But it does appear that there is a little more hardship involved to the individuals than there need be. They have been years in the service, have performed their duties faithfully and abstained from active participation in politics. The business methods of the office have not trained them easily to adapt themselves to ordinary commercial situations; and a little time should be given to enable them to do so. Three or six months' notice would not be unreasonable under the circumstances, or its equivalent in salary. Mr. Sifton's advisers in this city would do an act of justice, to say nothing of good-will, by recommending that those officials receive upon their retirement a gratuity of at least three months' pay. One of them is a man who lost an arm in the rebellion of 1885; and it would be an act of patriotism to stretch a point by keeping him in the service, as a recognition of what the country owes him.

The dismissal of Collector Tennant, of Gretna, is a case of a different kind. The action taken in this case was for active interference in politics. It may or may not have been justifiable. There was a charge made but it was not investigated, and the accused had no opportunity to put in a defence. This will seem to most people rather high-handed; but the principal hardship is involved in the fact that he has paid and would be entitled to nine years' superannuation allowance, except for his dismissal. It would be only fair, seeing that he was deprived of any chance of answering his accuser, that this superannuation allowance should be paid to him. A government cannot afford, any more than a private individual, to do an injustice. From a party standpoint the advisers of the Government may serve their party by preventing unnecessarily harsh measures.

When newspapers of the province on both sides of politics attack the action of the Government in this way, and when we have before us the positive proof of non-interference in politics, in fact, when we have a refutal of every charge that has been made against a man, it is natural we should look somewhere else

for the cause of his dismissal. I shall read from the "Catholic Register," of Toronto, of date 2nd September, 1897, and I shall read it for the purpose of bearing out what I said a few moments ago, that in an action of this kind it is not only an injustice to the individual who is dismissed, but it may result in much more serious consequences than could be foreseen by the Minister who was guilty of the act of injustice. While on this subject I wish to refer to other dismissals to show that if the "Catholic Register" takes the view that it does in this particular case, it is not because it has gone off at a tangent, as the saying is, on one particular case, but because its opinion is based upon numerous dismissals from the public service, and it seems as if some of the Ministers had determined to make a dead set upon the Roman Catholic population of the provinces of Ontario, Quebec and Manitoba. I do not wish to say that such is the case: I would not like to believe it possible that such a motive could actuate any hon. Minister or any man worthy of a seat in a legislature of the Dominion, but these dismissals have occurred in so many instances and with such even regularity that it is not to be wondered at that people should remark it. Sir, not only have they occurred in numerous instances and with great regularity, but they have occurred in such a way as to nullify the tacit understanding arrived at between the different peoples who go to make up the Dominion: that where a person belonging to one particular religion or nationality was dismissed or has left the public service, he should be replaced by one belonging to the same nationality. I say that these dismissals have infringed this tacit understanding to such an extraordinary degree, that the newspapers representing the Roman Catholic people, or speaking on behalf of that minority in this country, entertain the belief to a very great extent, that there is a dead set by the present Government upon officials of that religion. That is not to be wondered at, particularly in the case of Irish Catholics, when we see the newspaper of the Minister of Public Works speaking in the manner it did a short time ago about Irish Catholics in this Dominion. Now, Sir, I do not know if I have defined this paper properly when I speak of it as the organ of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte). I know that there is some difference of opinion between the hon. Minister and members of this House as to the manner in which this paper came into existence under its present management. I know there is a certain cloud about the history of its origin. I know there is a certain difference of opinion—to put it in the mildest form—between the statement made by the Minister of Public Works as to the purchase of that paper, and the statement made by the gentleman who actually furnished the cash for its purchase. Probably it would be better for me to amend my statement, by not qualifying it altogether as the newspaper of the Minister of Public Works, but rather as the newspaper which was bought with money furnished by Mr. Greenshields, at the request of the Minister of Public Works, on the understanding that the money would be returned at some time or other by somebody else; with the idea in the mind of the Minister of Public Works, that the funds of the Liberal party should be used for the purpose of purchasing the paper, and that Mr. Greenshields was acting as treasurer for that fund. I know this statement is a little clouded, but as you know, it is very difficult to make the statements of the interested parties agree. Whatever may be the paper, it is generally credited as the newspaper of the Minister of Public Works. If I am mistaken in so characterizing it, I only fall into the same error as most of the newspapers in this Dominion do. Translated into English the statement which "La Patrie" made, was:

> The Irish, in their clergy as well as in their politics, are the worst enemies of our beautiful French language and our national influence in the American Republic, and it is probably the same elsewhere.

Commenting on this article, one of the Irish Catholic papers of this Dominion, on 31st March, 1898, gave expression to the following, under the heading "'La Patrie' on Irish priests and people":

> The Dominion Minister of Public Works would be entirely unworthy of notice if he did not occupy a Cabinet position, and "La Patrie," of Montreal, would be less entitled to attention if it did not speak through him as a Ministerial organ. Through that sheet the spray of his bile is constantly directed against all who come within range of attack, whether individuals or classes in the community. It is a most extraordinary thing that Sir Wilfrid Laurier should have chosen him as a personal pet and thrown the mantle of his protection around him when the Liberal party was prepared to squelch him as an insufferable nuisance. He besmirched the French Canadian people of Manitoba over his own name when he had reason to fear them; and since the Irish Catholics are said to have turned away from the strange habits which Liberals have contracted since coming into office, it is perhaps but natural that they also should get an evil dose through the columns of "La Patrie." That malodorous organ finds an opportunity for treating them to its peculiar style of attack in connection with some mention of the name of Mr. William Redmond, an irresponsible young member of his brother's entirely irresponsible band. We have not seen the whole of the article, but the Montreal "Star" copies an extract from it, which has likewise been telegraphed to all the newspapers of the country. This is what "La Patrie" says:
>
> "The Irish, in their clergy, as well as in their politics, are the worst enemies of our beautiful French language, and our national influence in the American Republic, and it is probably the same elsewhere."
>
> When the French or Irish people in Canada find it necessary to discuss the position they stand in, one to the other, "La Patrie," its pub-

lishers and editors are not likely to be the authorities they will refer to. It is only a week ago since the brilliant Archbishop of Montreal spoke upon this subject with an eloquence not soon to be forgotten. The venom of "La Patrie" smells vilely; but that is all the harm it can do.

Again, this matter was referred to by the "True Witness," of Montreal, an organ of the Irish Catholic people of this Dominion, on 2nd April, 1898, in the following terms:—

"LA PATRIE'S" INSULTS.

The historical associations which bind Ireland with her stronger Celtic sister, France, in sincerest affection, are well known to students of history of both. With many an Irish family it is a proud recollection that one of their sons died under the French flag fighting against "la perfide Albion." At Fontenoy the Irish brigade turned the tide of battle and routed the English invaders of France. As the orator of the evening at St. Patrick's annual concert, held in St. Mary's Hall, Bleury street, on the evening of the 17th of March, pointed out, the last struggle of the Bourbons was led by an Irish Count, and the last great battle of France against the Prussians was led by an Irish General. That great soldier—of "J'y suis j'y reste" fame—was afterwards elected President of the present French Republic. And on the other side we like to recall that Napoleon the Great sent both ships and men to help the Irish heroes of '98 in their struggle to free themselves from the galling yoke of their English oppressors.

Mr. Tarte, the Minister of Public Works, is evidently innocent of any knowledge of these events, else he would not have allowed to be published in "La Patrie," on Saturday last, the wanton insult to Irishmen which appeared in it on that day. It was a comment on a speech recently delivered by Mr. William Redmond, M.P., from which it reproduced the following extract:—"The ardent desire of Irishmen at home and in the United States is to see France and America, those two great Republics which we love so much march hand in hand towards their glorious destinies. If the French people take an interest in the Irish question they will be glad to know that the Irish nation, while struggling for independence, earnestly desires the prosperity of France, her great Celtic sister, who has always borne aloft the torch of liberty. Between France and Ireland there are bonds stronger than British intrigues. The tri-coloured flag and the green flag may yet float over civilization and freedom, when the Union Jack will be trodden under foot by indignant peoples." "La Patrie's" comment on this is as follows:—"Now, we deem it our duty to put the newspapers of France on their guard against the Irish element and its tendencies, especially in the United States. For the Irish, both priests and politicians, are the worst enemies of our beautiful French language, and of our national influence in the American Republic. And the same thing must occur elsewhere."

We do not, of course, attach as much importance to the editorial utterances of "La Patrie" as we should if it were the recognized organ of the Liberal party instead of being, as it is, merely the personal organ of Mr. Tarte. "La Patrie's" opinions on religious questions have been repudiated by both Premier Laurier and Premier Marchand. Its political opinions, as expressed by Mr. Tarte and his sons, have recently been repudiated by Mr. Préfontaine, M.P., and a score of other Liberal members of Parliament from this province, who actually went so far as to request Premier Laurier asking for Mr. Tarte's expulsion from the Cabinet. A recreant to the party which he deserted. Mr. Tarte is denounced by the leading members of the other party which he joined after his desertion. The opinions of his journalistic organ, then, have little weight, as they do not reflect those of the Liberal party.

We should not, however, have been surprised at the gratuitous attack upon Irishmen even if "La Patrie" were a recognized official mouthpiece; for the degree of ingratitude with which Irish Liberals—men who have worked hard and loyally for the party through long years of defeat and discouragement—have been treated in regard to vacant positions in the civil service, by the Laurier Government is such as to merit denunciation in no unmeasured terms. We say this with all the more frankness since we are, as our readers are now well aware, absolutely neutral in politics. Nor are our remarks in this connection confined to Irishmen in the civil service. For our part, we should prefer not to see them in there. We should like to see them in less subordinate walks of life, where they could forge ahead with the exceptional abilities which they undoubtedly possess.

Mr. Tarte is a born mischief-maker. He is never happy unless he is sowing dissension and strife somewhere. He has been remarkably quiet for the past few months—since the Liberal members from the Montreal and Quebec districts demanded his expulsion from the Cabinet. Afraid to meddle with Liberal politics, he has broken his long silence by an attempt to stir up ill feeling between French Canadians and the Irish. But his reprehensible effort will fail. Irishmen and French Canadians have too much in common—there is no reason why they should not have everything in common—to allow Mr. Tarte to antagonize them. When Mr. Dalton McCarthy tried to abolish the French language in the Northwest, the Irish Catholic members of Parliament gave practical proof of their friendship for their French Canadian fellow-citizens by voting against his motion. The presence of Mayor Préfontaine, M.P., the leading Liberal member of the Montreal district, in the Irish procession on St. Patrick's Day and at the concert given under the auspices of St. Patrick's Society of the evening of that day, is a far truer index to the fraternal relations existing between Irishmen and French Canadians than the spiteful article in Mr. Tarte's personal organ.

If I have referred to this incident at all, Mr. Speaker, it is with regret at either the ignorance or the malignity of the writer of that article in "La Patrie." If he be a Frenchman, is he altogether ignorant of the history of France? Must he not be so if he forgets the many bloody fields upon which Irish soldiers and Irish officers shed their blood for the protection of France? Can he have forgotten the names of Sheldon's, Galway's, Clare's and Kilmallock's Irish cavalry regiments? Can he have forgotten the regiments of Dublin, Charlemont, Limerick and Athlone? Has he forgotten the battles of Fontenoy, Namur, Enghien and Landon? Is it possible that he has forgotten the names of such men as Sarsfield, Count Dillon, MacMahon and the O'Briens? Either he must have been guilty of the greatest ignorance of the history of France or he must have been guilty of the greatest malignity to have written such a

scurrilous article concerning the Irish people of this country and the French people of this country. What I am saying indicates something of the opinion of the Government as regards Irish Catholics. I would hate to charge the Minister of Public Works with being the instigator of this crusade against the Irish Catholics of this country; but it seems to me, from the expression of his newspaper, that I would not be far wrong. and the Irish Catholic newspapers of this country are not far wrong when they charge him with being the principal offender in this particular, and the leader in the onslaught on their people. I say I would hate to charge either the Minister of Public Works or any other member of the Government, much less the Government itself, with having made such a distinction between the races, the nationalities and the religions of the people of this country. But when I see respectable journalists, men of education and experience, in the public newspapers of this country, boldly charging that in such cases as the one of which I am speaking, the dismissal was made, not because the man was guilty of any infraction of the law, or of neglecting his duties, but solely because he was an Irish Catholic, I must confess that it raises a doubt in my mind as to the sincerity or the honesty of the gentleman who operated for his dismissal. There is another peculiarity about this matter, Sir. In all Governments that have existed in the Dominion of Canada since 1867, the English-speaking Catholic people of this country have been represented, at least by one member, very often two, sometimes by as many as four. The reason of that is not far to seek. It has been debated in this House before. It has been spoken of by such men as McGee, Devlin, Curran and Ryan, my predecessors in the constituency which I have the honour to represent. But what do we see in this Government? It is true, there is an English-speaking Catholic there, a very respectable octogenarian; but I do not think he would be called a man possessing the vigour necessary to defend the rights of his people, or to stand up for their cause when attacked. We have not anybody except the Secretary of State (Mr. Scott) in this Government. We have had two hon. gentlemen sitting on the door-mat, outside the Cabinet, for some time, in company with the Solicitor General, but the door was opened for these two hon. gentlemen, and they were let in, while the Irish Catholic representative is still standing on the mat outside and very likely to stand there so long as this Liberal Government continues in office. Is it to be wondered at that wholesale dismissals of Irish Catholics should take place, when the door of the Cabinet is closed in the face of the Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick), who would be able to defend his compatriots and co-religionists if he were in the Cabinet. I wish to read for the benefit of the House an article from the "Catholic Register," dated 2nd of September, 1897. It is headed:

THE CAMPAIGN AGAINST CATHOLIC OFFICE HOLDERS.

Last week we gave a long list of the names of Catholics in the Kingston district who have been driven out of Government employment by the Liberals. The "Globe" had been denying only a few days before that Catholics have any grievance against the new Administration; but the chief Government organ prudently abstains from offering any defence of the dismissals enumerated. We had hoped to induce the organ to descend from virtuous and patriotic generalities and come down to plain facts and particular instances. But we may have been at fault ourselves in not offering direct proof that religious opinion was the evident "crime" of the Catholic office-holder in any stated case of dismissal.

The circumstances surrounding the removal of Mr. McAllister, of Cobourg, by Hon. Mr. Paterson leave no room for supposing anything else than politico-religious persecution. This week we propose to take up another case in Mr. Paterson's department, in which we are prepared to demonstrate a religious persecution beyond aye or nay.

The Government campaign against Catholics is not confined to one district or province. It is so widespread and intense that we fully anticipate all the time from now to the opening of Parliament will be required to give an outline in "The Register" of the entire bill of particulars, to which we earnestly invite the attention of the Catholic electors of the Dominion, and particularly the Irish Catholic members of the House of Commons and Senate, to whom our people must look for a vigorous protest at the earliest possible opportunity.

The case of Mr. J. F. Tennant, of Gretna, Manitoba, is one of the worst instances of religious persecutions that has ever come to light under a supposed civilized government. The facts are plainly set forth in the following communication from a correspondent, whose name we suppress, believing that to divulge it would quickly be followed by the infliction of injury upon him by partisans holding positions of influence:—

"To the Editor of the 'Catholic Register':

"Dear Sir,—As you have always shown a disposition to defend the rights of Roman Catholics, I wish to give you the facts relative to a very coarse piece of persecution in the Dominion civil service of Manitoba.

"Joseph Tennant, an Irish Catholic, has been for many years collector of customs at the port of Gretna. During the last provincial campaign, when the Catholic religion and Catholics were maligned and slandered off every platform by the henchmen of the Greenway Government, Tennant attended a public meeting held in Gretna. One of the speakers, the Hon. J. D. Cameron, a member of the Greenway Government, was most bitter in his language towards the church and people of our creed. One of his remarks was to the effect that any man who was a separate school supporter must necessarily be a disloyal man.

"Tennant, who has been a British soldier, as well as his father before him, hotly resented this slander, and consequently incurred the enmity not only of Cameron but of the whole Greenway Government.

"Tennant came to this country on the Wolseley expedition in 1870. He has been mayor of West Lynne, councillor in the town of Emerson, and a temperate and capable man in every respect. In April of this year he was dismissed, not allowed one dollar of superannuation, although he had paid nine years into the fund, and his last month's wages were withheld.

"The inspector of customs of this district always considered Mr. Tennant one of the most able men in his department, and he, Captain Young, has given Tennant letters to that effect.

"Mr. Tennant has a family of eight children, and is very conscientious on the matter of giving his children a Catholic education. He has carried this principle to the extent of sending all his children to Winnipeg, where they could get the education desired.

"No one who has not lived in this province can be cognizant of the spirit of persecution that has been engendered towards men of the Roman Catholic creed; and Tennant lost his position and is penniless because he would not permit a vile slander to go unanswered.

"The Hon. Mr. Laurier, as well as the Hon. Mr. Paterson, were made aware of all the facts concerning this case, but the Greenway Government and R. L. Richardson, M.P., publisher of a rabid anti-Catholic sheet in this city, demanded Tennant's head.

"Signed,

———"

The article then goes on:

Mr. Tennant, by publicly refuting the slanderous assertion of Cameron, did nothing more than any honest man is bound to do in honour and conscience. He defended his personal loyalty, a thing which his career in the military service of Canada, and the career of his father as a British soldier, demanded of him. He defended his religion and the religion of his children, which was an obligation laid upon him by his conscience. For doing these things so becoming in an honest and an honourable man, a partisan agent was set upon his track, and to-day the man is at the mercy of the world. He has not only been unjustly treated, but he has been defrauded and robbed. Had he paid into an insurance company the proportion of his wages that went into the Civil Service Superannuation Fund, the common law would have protected those savings, and the insurance company would be compelled to refund. Can a government legally do that which in a business corporation is pronounced dishonest and illegal? Furthermore, a month's salary was withheld from Mr. Tennant; and very likely if he prosecuted by law to recover the money his poverty would defeat his legal right when pitted against the wealth of the state.

Our readers may reasonably ask themselves when reading these facts: Is partisanship essentially so blind and heartless as to isolate a man like Mr. Tennant from the sympathy of his neighbours, no matter what their politics may be? It is not. It is not partisanship in itself that has crushed Mr. Tennant. The "offence" which he committed was not against the Dominion Government, but against the Government of Manitoba. The malice of Greenway's confrere, Cameron, would have been powerless in itself, and if publicly displayed would have injured Cameron alone. But Cameron could avoid public criticism and carry his influence into the Dominion Government by hiring the politician Richardson to use the knife. We are inclined to think that a very little "knifing" indeed was needed when the victim was a Catholic, and Mr. Paterson, the politician, who must pronounce the sentence of capital punishment.

The quick success of Richardson after he had been set on the trail by Cameron, of course, shocked every one who had known Mr. Tennant, or was aware of the circumstances of his dismissal. A Liberal newspaper, "The Qu'Appelle Progress," voiced the better partisan sentiment when it said:

This is the article which I read on Monday last. The article then continues:

Newspaper protests against Bossism of this sort carry little weight. The better way is to protest on the floor of Parliament, the protest being made in the name of religious conscience by all the Catholics in the House of Commons and Senate, without distinction of party. "The Register" does not wish to promote political feeling among Catholics or to advocate a politico-religious combination without cause. We shall look to our representatives until their influence has been proved powerless. These articles will be continued. There is a great deal yet to come.

Now, I do not wish to excite any religious feeling in this House. Rather do I wish to prevent any such feeling either entering this House or spreading throughout the country. But I deem it my duty, as an independent member of this House, I deem it my duty, as a citizen of Canada, as one loving his country and wishing to see that cordial feeling existing between the different races which will one day make up a glorious nationality, to protest in the strongest terms against this act—this act which has no other excuse than such as can be given for a political-religious dismissal. There is no single item of proof against Mr. Tennant in connection with this matter; there is not a tittle of evidence against him that he was either guilty of active or inactive partisanship. There is nothing to prove that he did more than any man of honour would do, his religion and nationality being attacked by the Attorney General of Manitoba on that occasion referred to in these newspapers. There is not a particle of proof against this man in any way. Are we not, then, forced to the conclusion that it was not because he had neglected his office, it was not because he had been guilty of partisanship, it was not because he had used intemperate language that he was dismissed, but it was because he was an Irish Catholic and his place was wanted by some political heeler in that particular constituency. In entering the protest I do upon this question—and I do not limit this appeal, thank God, to the Irish Catholics of this House; I do not limit it to the Catholics of this House—I call upon every man who has the true interest of his country at heart, whatever his nationality, whatever his religion, to join with me and to protest by his vote, which I shall ask later, against this dismissal of a man because he was an Irish Catholic.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Inasmuch as this dismissal occurred in my constituency, Mr.

Speaker, I claim the right to be heard on this question. I shall endeavour to make my remarks as brief as possible. I would begin by deprecating the example the hon. gentleman (Mr. Quinn) has set in this House, in arrogating to himself the special right to defend any particular nationality when the rights of that nationality seem to him to be assailed. Now, it seems to me, that, if the hon. gentleman desires to make a success in the line he has taken up, and to become the Daniel O'Connell of the Canadian Parliament, he had better select cases more heroic than those in which he has appeared so far. He pleaded the case of Mrs. McManus here last session, although it was proved that she delivered mail through the wicket at the point of a shot-gun. He has now taken up the case of Mr. Tennant. Now, let me tell the House briefly the facts in connection with this dismissal. I may say that, though I recommended the dismissal of this gentleman, I did not know at the time that he was Irish and a Roman Catholic. I may say, that, though I had known, it would not have made the slightest difference, as I do not believe that because a man is an Irishman and a Roman Catholic, he is entitled to any special treatment at the hands of this House because of that fact. Nor do I think that he should be singled out for attack because he happens to be an Irishman and a Roman Catholic. Mr. Tennant was subcollector of customs at the port of Gretna, in my constituency. He took an active part in organizing for the election in question, and has always been known in that constituency as one of the most active organizers in that province, so far as I could learn. In the case in question, Mr. Tennant came to the Gretna poll and acted for a time as scrutineer on behalf of Mr. Rogers, my opponent. In a letter, which is on file in the Department of Customs, Mr. Tennant himself practically admits that, but seeks to excuse himself on the ground that is was a job put up on him by the Liberals. I do not think there exists any doubt in the minds of the people of Gretna that Mr. Tennant acted as scrutineer for my opponent on that day, at least for a portion of the time. I may say that, to my own knowledge, Mr. Tennant came to a meeting held at the town hall of Gretna, held in my interest, and addressed by the Hon. Mr. Greenway, Premier of Manitoba, and myself, as well as by some representatives of the Conservative party. Mr. Tennant appeared in the body of the hall, in the midst of a gang, and was most offensive in his interruptions; in fact, because of his interruptions, we had a very difficult time conducting the meeting. We felt at the time, by reason of his conduct, that if any civil servant deserved dismissal, Mr. Tennant was the man. His assistant in the custom-house at Gretna, Mr. James Bryans, devoted his entire time, I think, for a month or six weeks, to the work of organization on behalf of the Conservative party. But Mr. Bryans had the grace, the moment the elections were over, and he found the Liberals were successful, to send in his resignation, and many of us thought that if Mr. Tennant had imitated his example, his conduct would have been, in that respect, commendable, for there is no doubt in that part of the country that Mr. Tennant had been most officious in organizing on behalf of the Conservatives, and richly deserved dismissal. Now, I was at the Department of Customs, and I failed to learn that Mr. Tennant had reported his assistant as going about the country and spending week after week organizing for the elections, instead of attending to his duty. I am sure that members will agree with me, that if Mr. Tennant had been a man who did his duty as he should, he would have reported the conduct of this man Bryans for leaving his office and devoting his entire time to the contest. In addition to that, a statutory declaration was forwarded to the department from one R. Bryans, of Morden, in which he charged that on the day of the election, the 23rd June, 1896, he found the Canadian customs office at Gretna in charge of one Patrick Horrigan, an American customs official. Now, about that time, Mr. Tennant was attending to the duties of scrutineer at the Gretna polling booth, and for this purpose he seems to have left his office in charge of an officer of an alien country.

I may say that, so far as my own personal opinion is concerned, I did not think that any investigation was needed in this case. The man's conduct had been so open and flagrant that I thought he richly deserved to be dismissed under the circumstances. So far as concerns the charge that a campaign is being organized against the Irish Roman Catholics, I may say that because I recommended the dismissal of an Orangeman who was postmaster in another part of the constituency, the charge was made that a campaign had been organized against the Orangemen, and the "Orange Sentinel" contained a number of articles on the question, and, in fact, it was intimated that the Orangemen would make it very hot for us because of this campaign against the members of their order. To demonstrate the entire absence of prejudice against Irishmen and Catholics on my part, I may say that in one case, where, after investigation, an Orangeman was dismissed, I recommended and succeeded in having an Irish Catholic appointed.

I think you will find, Mr. Speaker, that when charges are made on one side that a campaign existed against Roman Catholics, on the other hand that a campaign existed against Orangemen, I think if you take a middle course you will arrive at a proper conclusion; neither side has much to complain of. Now, my hon. and distinguished-looking friend, the member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Quinn) rings the changes on the statement that this man

was a British soldier and bled for his country, but I notice that he forgot to mention the name of the battle in which he participated. I would like to know if because a man may happen to have been a soldier or may happen to have been a volunteer in his early days, he is entitled to any special treatment on that account. Then the hon. member goes on to dwell on the fact that he had eight children. Sir, many men have had infinitely more than eight children and yet have lost their jobs into the bargain. I fail entirely to see the force of that kind of logic on the part of my hon. and distinguished-looking friend. Now, I doubt very much whether this officer ever bled for his country, or even that he was ever wounded; and I fancy that if he was, it would be in the same locality that my hon. friend is sure to be wounded in, if ever he changes his plan of campaign and fights with his arms instead of with his tongue. If Mr. Tennant was so averse to acting as a scrutineer on that occasion as represented by the numerous affidavits that the hon. gentleman read to this House, why did he remain in the polling booth? What kept him there? It is shown that the scrutineer of my opponent, the moment Mr. Tennant went in there to vote, asked him to look after the duties of scrutineer and then left the booth. Then, if this great soldier who has fought and bled for his country, desired to act in such a way as to avoid the suspicion of being a partisan official, why did he remain in that booth for the balance of the afternoon? If he had wished to imitate Cæsar's wife, he should have avoided the appearance of evil, and fled from the polling booth, as it was his duty to do under the circumstances. Now, Sir, in this matter there is no question of religion or nationality so far as I am concerned. I am sure that the House will bear me out in these statements that in any dismissals that have occurred, there has been no indication whatever of a desire to discriminate against Roman Catholics or against the Irish. On the contrary, I can mention to my hon. friend a number of cases that have occurred in Manitoba and in the city of Winnipeg, pointing in the opposite direction. I would refer to the case of Mr. J. K. Barrett, Inspector of Inland Revenue for Manitoba and the North-west Territories, with headquarters in Winnipeg. For years that gentleman edited a newspaper and attacked most violently almost every Liberal politician who happened to differ from his views. He is the Barrett whose name appears as the plaintiff in the celebrated school case. It was felt, and very strongly felt, that if there was a man in that entire country who deserved to be dismissed, it was this Mr. J. K. Barrett; and I am led to believe that the Government did not like to take that extreme step in his case for the reason that their action might be attributed to a desire to punish him for the part he took in that school case.

Mr. QUINN. Hear, hear.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Will the hon. gentleman pretend to say that a man, an officer of this Government who acted as editor of a violently partisan newspaper, attacking Liberals indiscriminately throughout the entire fight, doubtless to the neglect of his official duties, should be allowed to remain in office.

Mr. QUINN. If my hon. friend will permit me—a Government actuated by motives such as I have shown, would not select a man so dangerous as Mr. Barrett was, because their object would be too easily seen through.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Well, let us take the case of Mr. Costigan, the late Collector of Inland Revenue at Winnipeg. He was a political opponent, and he might easily have been retired, but he was permitted to remain in office. I am sure I have heard very kindly expressions in regard to the action of the Government towards Mr. Costigan. I could mention many other cases, but I do not care to bring them before the attention of the House, because of unpleasant feelings a discussion of their cases might give rise to.

Mr. QUINN. I never said the Government had dismissed every Irish Catholic; I said they had shown partiality in the dismissals, while they have been in power.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Has my hon. friend ever looked into the percentage of Irishmen or of Catholics that have been dismissed, and has he compared it with the percentage of other nationalities dismissed? In my constituency, I think some fifteen or sixteen were dismissed, and among them there was only one Irish Catholic; and I have been attacked most strongly because one of the men dismissed happened to be an Orangeman. Would my hon. friend say that because a man happens to be an Irishman or a Roman Catholic he should be protected no matter what his conduct may be?

Mr. QUINN. Do not argue such a ridiculous proposition.

Mr. RICHARDSON. The position the hon. gentleman took this afternoon would certainly lead to that belief. It seems to me under the circumstances—I do not know, Mr. Speaker, whether the word would be parliamentary—but it seems to me that an enormous amount of gall has been exhibited by the hon. gentleman in bringing a case like this before the House at all. I think if he had known the facts, if he had been wise enough to have gone to the department and looked up the papers for himself, I am sure he never would have brought this case before the House at all.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). I desire to say a few words in reference to the motion of the hon. gentleman from Montreal (Mr. Quinn) for papers in connection with the dismissal of Mr. Tennant, of Gretna, Man. In this connection he has seen fit to make certain regrettable remarks and statements. I may say at the commencement, that there can be no objection on my part to bringing down the papers as speedily as possible. The only possible regret I have is that they will show to the House that it contains a member who has not hesitated to rise in his place and to place upon the "Hansard" statements that are absolutely and wholly without foundation. Having been nearly twenty-four years in this House, I think I cannot remember a case where a gentleman has so evidently been the means of proving his own humiliation and shame. The papers will come down. The hon. gentleman says there was no charge against Mr. Tennant, that no chance was given him to defend himself, that he was dismissed because he was an Irishman and a Roman Catholic, and for no other reason. In the same breath he asserts that he is the last man in the world who would raise such an issue, or mention such a thing. His whole speech seems to have no other object, and could have had no other object; and I think when the papers come down and he sees that the charges he has made are wholly disproved, he will then realize that he has placed himself in a position which it will take him some little time to regain in this House.

The hon. gentleman has read from a newspaper, from the "Catholic Register," an article respecting the dismissal of Mr. Tennant from the Customs Department. The hon. gentleman has charged myself and the right hon. Prime Minister with having acted with prejudice against the Irish Roman Catholics on this occasion, and yet the hon. gentleman is well aware that I have no desire in the least to raise such a question, and that I am the last man likely to do so. Will the hon. gentleman move for the papers in connection with Mr. McAllister? I should like him to do so in this case also. I promise the papers will be brought down, and I trust that, if the hon. gentleman will not do so, some other hon. gentleman will. The hon. gentleman found that those gentlemen belonged to a certain nationality, but their nationality I did not even know at the time, and if I had done so, it would have made no difference, for I deem it would not be right to be so influenced in the discharge of my public duties. When the hon. gentleman says that I am actuated by prejudice in dismissing two members of that nationality, and when he makes this charge against us, and, at the same time, against the whole Government, he should endeavour to ascertain the facts before attributing motives so unworthy. How I could possibly be prejudiced against two officers because of their nationality, when, in the discharge of my public duties, I endeavoured to act as a judge and discharge my duties faithfully, I am at loss to know, especially in view of the fact that I have nominated ten times the number of men of the same nationality and faith as officers of my department, and some to very high positions. In nominating those officers, I did not do so because they belonged to that nationality or that faith, but I nominated them because I believed they would prove good officers to Her Majesty, and they obtained their offices by virtue of that consideration. When those officers in question had to be dismissed—and it is not a pleasant duty for me to dismiss any man in the public service—it was only done because I believed I would not have been performing my duty, if I had failed to do so. The hon. member for Montreal (Mr. Quinn) stated that Mr. Tennant had no opportunity to defend himself. When charges were preferred, they were sent him, and he was asked to reply to them, and in his reply he practically confessed that he was guilty of the very offence—political partisanship. The very affidavit the hon. gentleman read showed that Mr. Tennant was in the polling booth, taking the place of the Tory scrutineer; that, while he was in the polling booth taking the place of the Tory scrutineer, the American customs officer was sitting in the Canadian customs office.

Mr. QUINN. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will permit me to interrupt him, because I know he would not wish to make a misstatement. I read no such affidavit as he has mentioned. The affidavit of Mr. Ford denies in toto that he was in the office of the customs office that day any longer than on any other day, or that he was in charge of the office other than at any other time. The affidavit of the deputy returning officer is to the effect that Mr. Tennant was not in the polling booth otherwise than as an elector.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The affidavit of the American customs officer denies that he was given charge of the office, but he admits that he was in the office. I have a statutory declaration from another gentleman, who found the American officer in the Canadian office, and he was alone; and we have the statement that Mr. Tennant was in the polling booth and had taken the place of the Tory scrutineer, although he had declined to make himself responsible in any way by the taking the papers. He might have been asked why he came in the polling booth as an elector, what right he had to be there as an elector, except he was remaining there as a scrutineer. I do not want to press the matter unduly. I want to let hon. members peruse the papers and decide for themselves; but I could not allow the statement of the hon. member for Montreal to pass uncontradicted, especially in the face of his statement made at a previous sitting of the House, that the Minister had been

driven to his last ditch and was compelled to fall back upon what had transpired in the provincial election of 1896, when, as the hon. gentleman alleges, Mr. Cameron, Attorney General of Manitoba, in the provincial elections had used terms that were derogatory to Irish Roman Catholics; and if language was used at that time that might have been considered offensive, it does not concern me, and I would approve Mr. Tennant making a denial. But no such facts are before me. It is true, Attorney General Cameron has filed a letter with me, a charge that he was grossly insulted by this officer during the provincial elections, when he stigmatized Mr. Greenway as a liar; but this letter does not enter into the consideration of the case, because it has to do with the provincial elections, and no charge is dealt with by me against officers except in regard to the last general Dominion elections. And, as I have said, it does not come into consideration. But there are declarations made over the signatures of two responsible men. The hon. member has said no responsible men have made complaints. The hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson), on his own responsibility, makes that statement; Mr. Greenway also makes that statement, and against those statements there is the letter of Mr. Tennant, which admits he was at the meeting in question—at the meeting where he was described as acting in a most offensive and partisan manner. There is also his statement that there is a shadow of truth in the charge in regard to acting as a scrutineer, that he simply happened to be in the polling booth, but did not accept the papers in connection with the position of scrutineer. I should be very glad, as I have said, to bring down the papers. The animus of the speech of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Quinn) was very evident; he based his charges on newspaper statements; he occupied a long time in endeavouring to prove that this Government were actuated with a feeling of hostility to a certain portion of the community, and all I wish to say, so far as regards the hon. gentleman's reference to myself, is, that those statements cannot be established. I do not desire to enter into those questions at all, or to recognize any preference, but to treat all as Canadians, and I believe my action will justify the course I have followed to all honourable and fair-minded members of this House. It is a pity, as regards the hon. gentleman himself, that he has adopted the present course. He has placed himself in a very humiliating position; he has made absolute statements, not inferences, not assertions which he would be willing to change, if the papers showed the facts to be different, but statements based on newspaper reports, in fact, on the reports of Tory newspapers, and the hon. gentleman has, no doubt, had sufficient experience of Tory reports to know they are not always accurate. He should never have committed himself to such a statement, for example, as that this officer was not dismissed for any reason except for a political-religious reason, simply on account of his trouble with Attorney General Cameron. That matter did not enter into the question. Charges were made against him in writing, charges of violent partisanship. He did not deny that he attended the meetings; he acknowledged he was in the polling booth, and the statutory declaration received proved he was there, and proved that he was there for a period of time, and in the place of the Tory scrutineer, who had gone out; and another affidavit proved that the American customs officer was in the Canadian customs office at that time. He may have been there on other days, but probably on such occasions Mr. Tennant was there also; but Mr. Tennant was in the polling booth while the American officer was in the Canadian customs office.

I trust that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Quinn), in view of what has been said, in view of his placing upon the "Hansard" that extract from a Tory paper in reference to Mr. McAllister, I wish now that he would move for the papers in connection with that case that they may come down, and that he may have a correct answer from the official documents. I venture to say the papers will show that when I recommended the superannuation of Mr. McAllister, I might be liable to censure by members of this House, for not having dismissed him, liable to censure because in view of his being an efficient officer for many years, I recommended that he should be superannuated, and he is superannuated. The charge that Mr. Tennant was robbed, which charge the hon. gentleman read from a Tory newspaper, and was deprived by the Minister of what he paid into the superannuation fund——

Mr. DAVIN. The Qu'Appelle "Progress" is a Liberal paper.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. He was not reading from the Qu'Appelle "Progress."

Mr. DAVIN. Yes.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Quinn) read from the "Progress," and he said it was a Liberal paper, but he immediately proceeded to read an article from that paper in which the editor or the writer declared, that it was neither a Liberal nor a Conservative paper, but an independent paper. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Quinn) read an article from the "Catholic Register," I think, which charged that Mr. Tennant was robbed. As a matter of fact Mr. Tennant, I believe, has received the full amount of the moneys he paid into the superannuation fund with 5 per cent interest added to the amount.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I speak from memory and subject to correction;

but at all events that is the manner in which we are dealing with the cases of these men.

Mr. ROCHE. That letter was written before the Minister sent the cheque to Mr. Tennant for $221.60.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Which letter ?

Mr. ROCHE. The article quoted from the newspaper by the hon. member from Montreal (Mr. Quinn).

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. And the hon. member for Montreal (Mr. Quinn) knew that Tennant had got his money back, and yet the hon. member from Montreal (Mr. Quinn) wants to embalm on "Hansard"——

Mr. QUINN. Will the hon. Minister allow me.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. QUINN. I want to correct the hon. gentleman's statement.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. member (Mr. Quinn) cannot speak except with the permission of the hon. gentleman who has the floor.

Mr. QUINN. But the hon. Minister does not say that he will not permit me to speak.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. QUINN. The back benches seem to refuse me permission to make a correction.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. QUINN. I would like the hon. Minister to say, whether he did not hear that I admitted that this money had been paid. Does he wish now to embalm on "Hansard" what he knows to be not true by saying that I did not mention that ?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order ; chair.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Then, what was the object of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Quinn) reading from the "Catholic Register" the statement that Tennant had been robbed——

Mr. QUINN. I read it——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order ; sit down.

Mr. QUINN. The Minister is asking me a question.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I do not understand that the hon. Minister gives away to the hon. member (Mr. Quinn).

Mr. QUINN. The hon. Minister asked me a question, and I am going to answer it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order ; chair.

Mr. QUINN. The hon. Minister is asking me——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order. Let the hon. member (Mr. Quinn) take his seat.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The hon. member (Mr. Quinn) has had his full time to address the House. If I said anything that is not correct "Hansard" will reveal it, and "Hansard" will remove all doubts in reference to it. I speak subject to correction when I say that I believe Mr. Tennant has had his superannuation moneys returned.

Mr. ROCHE. In February of this year.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Yes, and in April of this year an article in a newspaper is read in this House to be embalmed in "Hansard," in which the statement is made that Tennant has been robbed and cheated out of his superannuation money. That is what I object to.

Mr. QUINN. He received the money after the notice of motion was given.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. There was no necessity for reading that article from the "Catholic Register" when it was known that the superannuation moneys had been returned. I have but a few words more that I would like to say in reference to this matter.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Six o'clock.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. In order that the motion to bring down the papers may carry, I will now desist from speaking——

Mr. ROCHE. Mr. Speaker——

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. If the hon. member (Mr. Roche) wants to continue the debate I wish, Mr. Speaker, to retain my own right to the floor.

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

After Recess.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 61) in further amendment of the Trade Mark and Design Act.—(Mr. Bertram.)

SAFETY OF RAILWAY EMPLOYEES AND PASSENGERS.

The House again resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 4) further to secure the safety of railway employees and passengers. —(Mr. Casey.)

(In the Committee.)

On section 6,

Mr. SPROULE. Why do you make the Minister of Railways and Canals the special prosecutor ?

Mr. CASEY. I thought my hon. friend was present the other night when I gave the reason for this—that what is everybody's business is nobody's business, and that it was thought advisable by myself and by the committee who considered this Bill last year to place upon somebody the responsibility of instituting these proceedings. It was suggested this night week that the Solicitor General would be the proper person to take charge of this duty. I have no objection to inserting the name of the Minister of Justice or the Solicitor General. The Solicitor General is, I think, capable of discharging this duty in addition to the others which rest upon his shoulders; or, if the Government have any objection to placing any further duties upon the members of the Government, I am willing to leave it so that any one can institute proceedings to recover penalties under this Act.

Mr. SPROULE. I think it would be better to do that—make it the same as any ordinary Act.

Mr. DAVIN. Would it not be the fit thing to put in the name of the Attorney General of Canada, and then the Solicitor General would act as a matter of course under him. I move that this clause be amended by striking out in the first line the words "Minister of Railways and Canals," and replacing them by the words "Attorney General of Canada."

Mr. SPROULE. I think it would be better to leave it without any such name, so that the Act would be enforced the same as any other Act.

Mr. CASEY. I am quite willing to do that. I beg leave to move that all the words in the section up to the words "any other person," and that also the word "other" be struck out, leaving the clause as follows:

Any person may institute any proceedings for the recovery of any penalties provided by this Act.

Mr. DAVIN. Then I withdraw my amendment.

Mr. SPROULE. Why say "any proceedings." It seems to me that "proceedings" alone will be quite sufficient.

Mr. ELLIS. I would like to know positively whether this Bill applies to railways that are not prepared to be railways for the benefit of Canada.

Mr. CASEY. That, I suppose, would give rise to a question of law. This is not intended to apply to any railways not Dominion lines, and I do not think it should be held to apply to them because they are the only ones over which we have authority to legislate.

Mr. LISTER. If you create an offence, no doubt you have a perfect right to legislate concerning it, and the legislation can only be made here. You do not state in your Bill the form in which the prosecution is to be commenced. Is it to be by civil actions or summary proceedings before a justice of the peace or by indictment before any court of session or assizes? It seems to me the Bill is defectively drawn. Is the penalty to be recovered in the civil courts or by criminal proceedings? If by criminal proceedings, the Bill should state that it can be enforced on information before any justice of the peace. If there is to be a civil remedy, then that should be stated. I do not think the civil courts would have any jurisdiction unless it was conferred upon them. There would be no way of collecting the penalty and enforcing the Act, and it would be nugatory. The hon. Minister of Railways says we might bring a quitam action, but that would be a very expensive proceeding to recover a penalty of $5.

Mr. ELLIS. I am safe in saying that it was distinctly understood in the committee that this Bill was not to apply to small railways which scarcely earn enough to pay their employees, and that these small railways were not to be required in two years to adopt these appliances, desirable as their adoption might be in the interest of the public. If the Bill is intended to apply to small lines of railway, it would be a burden on them, and there ought to be some provision exempting them or extending the time.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I promised my hon. friend who is promoting the Bill that I would, by the time the Bill came up again before the committee, have an amendment prepared touching those sections, and I have done so. I may say to my hon. friend that I did not adopt the idea of imposing upon the Minister of Railways the duty of inciting or taking charge of these prosecutions. I think it would be proper to leave the enforcement of the remedy and the recovery of penalties to the ordinary tribunal, to be moved in the ordinary way. The amendment I am prepared to suggest to the committee in substitution for clauses 3, 4, 5 and 6 would read in this way:

Clauses substituted for clauses 3, 4, 5 and 6.

3. Every person who

(a) after the expiration of the period of two years mentioned in section one of this Act builds any car fitted with air brakes which is not provided with an automatic device, such as is required by that section, or

(b) who, after the passing of this Act builds for use on a Canadian railway a box freight car which does not comply in all respects with the requirements of section two of this Act is guilty of an offence and liable on summary conviction to a penalty of (not more than) twenty-five dollars for each car so built.

4. Every railway company or person who

(a) after the expiration of the said period of two years uses any car fitted with air brakes and

not provided with an automatic device such as is required by section one of this Act, or

(b) after the passing of this Act uses any box freight car which does not comply in all respects with the requirements of section two of this Act is guilty of an offence and liable upon summary conviction to a penalty of (not more than) five dollars a day for every day, or five dollars for every trip lasting less than a day, during which such car is so used.

Mr. CASEY. I would like to ask my hon. friend (Mr. Blair) how that would leave the procedure for enforcing the law?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This provides that the summary Conviction Act shall apply, and that provides the machinery and renders all other unnecessary.

Mr. CASEY. I do not know how we are to proceed to amend sections 4 and 5. I think they were passed.

Mr. LISTER. Go back to them.

Mr. CASEY. We could go back to these sections by motion, I suppose, if my hon. friend (Mr. Blair) would move——

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I move reconsideration of sections 3, 4 and 5.

Mr. CASEY. Not 3.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, this covers section 3 also.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Do I understand the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Casey) to withdraw his amendment to clause 6?

Mr. CASEY. Yes, I move for leave to withdraw that amendment.

Motion agreed to.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I move that the sections I have just read be substituted for sections 3, 4, 5 and 6 of the Bill.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. ELLIS. Before you proceed further, I would like to propose that the foregoing provisions of this Act shall apply only to railways which have been declared to be works for the general benefit of Canada. The other sections of the Act are of an entirely different character, and the proposal to limit the operations of the first six sections of the Bill should come in now.

Mr. SPROULE. It seems to me that that would make the Bill very anomalous for cars on these different railways will be mixed in with others in the trains, and how are you going to distinguish a car belonging to one railway from a car belonging to another when you commence an action? The Act would be worthless if this proposition were accepted. The small railways are continually running cars over the great lines, and if an accident occurs, how is it to be known whether it occurred on one car or on another?

Mr. CASEY. It seems to me my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Ellis) is unduly anxious about the little railways.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order; there is no motion before the Chair.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood the hon. member for St. John to move an amendment.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. If it is a new section, it will have to be put at the end of the Bill.

On section 7,

Mr. LISTER. I would ask my hon. friend (Mr. Casey) whether he has considered the question whether this legislature has power to legislate in the direction covered by these provisions. It seems to me that the right to legislate in this direction belongs entirely to the local legislatures and not to this Parliament. We could create an offence as we have done by this Bill, we could declare that it shall be the duty of a railway company to do certain things for the better protection of life, but I doubt if we can create a civil liability upon the company for neglect. My hon. friend knows, of course, that there is in Ontario an Act called the Workmen's Compensation Act, which provides for the compensation of employees injured through neglect on the part of a railway company, giving them the right to recover an amount equal to three years' arrears of wages. It seems to me that that covers all that my hon. friend wants to cover by this Act. The Ontario legislature has legislated in that direction, and the legislation has been upheld by the courts. I think this gives the employee quite as much as he would be entitled to recover here.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). The Grand Trunk Railway case to which my hon. and learned friend refers, was a case where a question arose as to the compensation to be given a railway employee, and it was there held by Chancellor Spragge that the statute was ultra vires in so far as it was made to apply to railways under the control of the Dominion of Canada, but his opinion was not concurred in by the other judges. I think that on the whole, in view of the divergence that exists, and in view of the seriousness of this matter, we ought carefully to consider the legislation before we pass it. If we pass legislation that is ultra vires of the power of this Parliament, it will be a reflection upon the whole of us. For my part I am not prepared to express any opinion on this legislation at the present time; but at all events, I would be disposed to think that this legislation would be effective only in so far as Dominion railways are concerned,

but would not apply to railways not under the control of the Dominion Parliament.

Mr. LISTER. I would make this suggestion to my hon. friend. The Act creates an offence for the protection of the servant, and I suppose that he would have a civil remedy without any statute at all.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not think we can at present come to any very sound conclusion as to whether section 7 would be within our legislative competency. When this question was before the committee I expressed doubt as to whether we could properly legislate in this direction, and I am not sufficiently clear about it to be willing to take any responsibility for the legislation at the present moment. I was obliged to leave before the committee rose, but I gathered that the hon. gentleman intended, if possible, to ascertain the opinion of the Minister of Justice upon the subject, so that when the committee met again we might know what his view upon it was. I think the Solicitor General has not by any means overstated the undesirable consequences which would flow from our passing this section if we have not power to do so. It is quite true, as he said, that it would reflect unfavourably upon Parliament if we were to legislate in this direction and it should ultimately be decided that we had no power to legislate. But I think an even more serious reason which should influence us, is that if we pass this Bill without having power to do so we would be setting in motion litigation of all kinds and proceedings on the part of those people who are in the employ of the railway companies and they would be led to incur a good deal of expense in obtaining what they supposed to be their rights, when it might possibly be adjudicated that we had not power to pass the legislation. I think the hon. gentleman would do well not to press this 7th clause until we have some authoritative expression of opinion as to whether it would be within our competency.

Mr. CASEY. I would rather take the other end of the argument. It seems to me I am doing quite right to press these clauses until we have an authoritative expression of opinion against them.

Mr. LISTER. Don't you think we should have that first ?

Mr. CASEY. The Bill has been under discussion for three years, and we have had no authoritative expression of opinion against it in all that time. It has three times received a second reading in this House, it has been before a Select Committee on which there were lawyers, and this point has never been raised. I think I am justified in pressing these clauses in the absence of any authoritative opinion against their constitutionality brought by those who are opposed to them. I suggested on the last occasion, that the Minister of Railways and Canals should secure the opinion of the Minister of Justice, or should have some official opinion from him, before he objected to the clauses on that ground. I have since seen the Minister of Justice casually, and asked him to look into it, and he said he was going to look into it, but it does not seem he has given the Minister of Railways and Canals any opinion yet as to his views on that point. My ground for urging these clauses is simply this : they have been demanded by the organized railway men of Canada. The clauses have been endorsed by successive meetings of large bodies of railway men in which all organizations were represented. These clauses are in accordance with the legislation of the mother country, and I think I have shown grounds of fairness which cannot be objected to. The hon. member for Lambton seems to think that there is sufficient remedy already as between the railway employer and the railway employee. It does not seem to the employee to be so, and it does not seem to me to be so. It did not seem to the Imperial Parliament that existing laws in that country which were of the same nature as the Employers' Liability Act in the province of Ontario is now, were sufficient. The Act which was passed in England at the last session referred only to certain specified occupations amongst which were railways and other dangerous occupations, such as those of builders, engineers and others. It was concluded by the Imperial legislators that the employee in peculiarly dangerous trades did require greater protection than was given him by the ordinary Employers' Liability Act. It has been my endeavour to try to secure that same sort of protection for the employees in Canada. The Employers' Liability Act, of course, turns upon the question of negligence on the part of the employer. But it has been admitted in England and here, that the whole question turns upon the fact, that in especially risky trades the man who is employed is entitled to compensation even where his employer has not been negligent, the compensation arising out of the peculiarly risky nature of the employment itself in which he is engaged. That is what has led to the passing of this Act in England, and what I think should lead to the passing of a similar Act here. I am sure that my hon. friend from Lambton has heard me in this House before, and has heard other members, refer many times to a case where a certain Canadian railway objected to paying damages to one of its employees, or rather to his representatives, because he had met his death through the negligence of a fellow employee ; therefore they claimed they were not liable for the injury.

Mr. LISTER. That has all been got rid of.

Mr. CASEY. Where ?

Mr. LISTER. By legislation.

Mr. CASEY. In what province ?

Mr. LISTER. In Ontario.

Mr. CASEY. The legislation of Ontario may be very good, but it does not apply to the other provinces. It turned out, however, that under the laws of Quebec the railway was liable for this man's death, but the suit had to be taken to the Supreme Court of the province, then to the Supreme Court of Canada, and thence to the Privy Council, before justice could be obtained, and before that man's widow obtained the damages to which she was entitled, and which were adjudged to her by the first court that tried the case. The point is that an employee cannot stand such litigation as a railway company can, and unless there is some law plain and clear under which an injured man or his representatives can get compensation quite apart from the question of negligence altogether, there are many cases where justice will not be done, and cannot be had. I urge strongly upon the Government and the House that this is most important. It is a matter on which the railway men have informed themselves as to legislation elsewhere, and in regard to which they will demand their rights, and their demands will have to be listened to. If therefore the Minister of Railways has not even now any authoritative opinion to lay before the House from the Minister of Justice or any other legal authority to impeach the constitutionality of these clauses, I feel it to be the duty of those whom I may consider as my clients in this matter, to press these clauses to a vote in the committee, or possibly in the House afterwards. My hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals thinks it would be doing discredit to the House if we passed legislation that is ultra vires. I cannot see it in that light. If any proposition is glaringly ultra vires it is a discredit to pass it, but where there is no authoritative decision—for an opinion does not count—it is open to each hon. member to form an opinion as to whether a Bill is ultra vires or not, and vote according to his personal opinion. A great many Acts have been passed that have been declared ultra vires by the courts, and that is the only way in which their constitutionality can be raised and finally decided. A case must arise with respect to an Act before the question can be finally determined. All the railway men ask is to have an opportunity, if necessary, at a subsequent period of settling the question whether the law is constitutional or not.

In regard to the constitutionality of it, I have merely to say that it is analogous to our dealing with real estate in connection with railway matters. Real estate is one of the subjects given particularly to the provincial legislatures by the British North America Act, as no doubt is the subject of the relations of employer and employees. But everybody knows that it has been held to be a necessary incident to our power over railways, which have been declared to be for the benefit of Canada, that we should be able to deal with the question of real estate. It has been held even by the courts that the provincial legislatures cannot authorize a man to cut a drain across part of a railway company's property, if it is a Dominion railway. In regard to real estate in connection with railways, there is concurrent jurisdiction. The provincial legislature can grant power to cross railways chartered by themselves, and this House has power over railways under its control. I claim that in the relationship of employer and employee, when the railway is a Dominion railway, an analogy exists, and this House has a concurrent right with the provincial legislatures, as we possess a concurrent right in dealing with the real estate of those companies. I think a prima facie case has been made out, and unless some decision to the contrary is advanced, I must press these clauses on the House. The case quoted by the hon. Solicitor General appeared to strengthen my contention. One of the Ontario judges decided, as regards an employee's liability, that it did not apply to railways under the control of the Dominion. He was, however, only one of the judges, and the court gave an opinion contrary to my contention. It is only because I believe our jurisdiction over the relation of employer and employee is incident to our jurisdiction over Dominion railways that I have not suggested the extension of the provision to all men in hazardous employment as well as those on the railways.

Mr. ELLIS. No doubt the propositions involved in the Bill are of a most unusual character. I do not say there should not be such legislation but the legal members of the House should thoroughly understand what is proposed. The English compensation Act, passed last year, will come into effect on 1st of July of the present year, and it is one of the most radical measures passed since the Reform Bill, but it is not quite so radical as the proposal of the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey). The English Act was thoroughly discussed in Great Britain. It met with a great deal of opposition, but it became the law eventually, and will go into operation on 1st July. It provides that a man may obtain compensation from his employer whether he suffered injury through the employer's negligence or not, the liability being due to the mere fact that the employee was in the employer's service. The English law, however, is very much guarded. In England there is a regular system of friendly societies and organizations of one kind or another for the protection of workingmen, and they are looked after both by the law and by these organizations. I call attention to this provision of the English Act :

If any question arises in any proceedings under this Act as to liability to pay compensation under this Act (including any question as to whether the employment is one to which this Act applies) or as to the amount or duration of compensation under this Act, the question, if not settled by agreement shall subject to the provisions of the first schedule of this Act, be settled by arbitration, in accordance with the second schedule of this Act.

So hon. members will see that the plan of settlement is entirely different from that proposed in the Bill now before the committee. There could be no doubt as to the general sentiment of the workingmen who came before the committee.

Mr. CASEY. The point to be settled by arbitration was one as to the scope of the Act and not as to the amount of compensation. I will read from the Act.

Mr. ELLIS. I have the English Act here and I read the clause from it. The section seemed to cover both points.

Mr. CASEY. The whole question is whether the liability will arise under that Act or under the general law of England.

Mr. ELLIS. I desire that hon. members interested in legal questions shall understand that this Act will make employers liable to pay compensation whether they have in any way contributed to the injuries received by the employee or not. The English Act is very full and complete. It provides a whole system of machinery by which the Act will be carried into force, and any one reading the newspapers will have observed telegraphic despatches published in the public press within the last fortnight announcing that there has been a great deal of agitation in England, especially among the officers of the friendly societies as to the principle on which the Act will be applied. I am, on the whole, rather friendly to the proposition itself, but, at the same time, it is of such great importance that it ought to be thoroughly understood. The English Act should be examined by the gentlemen who are interested in law-making, and it should be thoroughly understood by the legislators of this country. It is a question to consider, whether, under the conditions existing in Canada and in view of the difficulty we have in carrying on many operations, we all ought not to take a certain amount of risk. In other words, whether this country is in a condition to apply to its legislation an Act of such a radical character.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Casey) has no reason to complain of the spirit with which the Bill has been approached in this House.

Mr. CASEY. Certainly not.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am satisfied there is only one feeling, and that is, to meet the wishes, so far as possible, of the people who are employed upon railways.

Mr. CASEY. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I believe we are anxious to meet those people as far as we can without injuring the others interested, and without making a grave mistake in the legislation which we are placing upon the Statute-book. Outside of the question as to whether or not we are competent to legislate in this form, it appears to me to be quite clear that the subject is approached in a different spirit in the English legislation from that in which it is approached by my hon. friend (Mr. Casey). These different sections of my hon. friend's Bill rather place upon the railway company the obligation of proving, and of relieving itself of the onus of the presumption that the person suffering injury is entitled to recover.

Mr. CASEY. Quite so.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. In the English Act, the question is left absolutely open, and neither party approaches it with any presumption for or against him. It is necessary that it shall be established before this tribunal which is set up in the English Act, first: as to whether the question arises properly under the Act, and then as to whether or not——

The employment is one to which the Act applies, and as to the amount of duration of compensation under the Act.

And, as I take it, also, as to whether the injury was caused by the personal negligence or wilful act of the employer.

Mr. CASEY. I do not think the hon. Minister will find any clause in the English Act which exempts the employer on the mere ground that the injury was not caused by any act of his.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I will read the first section.

Mr. CASEY. Has the hon. Minister read the Act?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, I have read it. I cannot say that I have studied it; I cannot say that I have read the Act before this moment, but from a hasty reading of the Act I rather draw the conclusion which I have stated. I will read the Act to the House:

Sec. 1. If, in any employment to which this Act applies, personal injury by accident arising out of and in the course of the employment is caused to a workman, his employer shall, subject as is hereafter mentioned, be liable to pay compensation in accordance with the first schedule to this Act; provided that the employer shall not be liable under this Act in respect to an injury which does not disable the workman for a period of at least two weeks.

(b) When the injury was caused by the personal negligence or wilful act of the employers, or of some person for whose act or default the

employer is responsible, nothing in this Act shall affect any civil liability of the employer, but in that case the workman may, at his option, either name compensation under this Act or take the same proceedings as were open to him before the commencement of this Act.

Mr. CASEY. It imposes a liability under this Act, whether the workman has another remedy or not.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That I am not discussing. I am discussing whether or not the English Act places the railway companies in the position of having to disburden itself of the responsibility and accept the onus of proof, that they are not culpable, and that this injury was attributable to the personal negligence of the individual making the claim. The Act provides, as I understand it, that this remedy can only be enforced when the injury was caused by the personal negligence or wilful act of the employer.

Mr. CASEY. No. The hon. Minister has not carefully read the Act, or he would not say that.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Perhaps I have not read it sufficiently carefully, but at all events that is the way it strikes me. It all goes to show that we ought not to be over hasty in the legislation in regard to this, and the discussions which are taking place are all calculated to throw additional light on the subject, and probably at the time we are in committee again the hon. gentleman (Mr. Casey) will have an opinion with regard to the question I raised a while ago.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. Minister will permit me to say that, as he has only read this Act now for the first time, he has evidently misconceived the drift of this English Act. The whole drift of that Act is to impose a statutory liability on the employer. No matter whether he is guilty of culpable neglect or not. Whenever a man or employee is injured, the English law provides that the man so injured, if he thinks he is entitled to a larger verdict at law, can forego the compensation given him by this Bill and enter a suit at law. That is the meaning of the English Act. At the same time the English Act and my Bill provide that, if the injury can be put down to the wilful neglect of the man injured, then the company shall be free. But the English Act does place the onus of proof distinctly upon the employer, and he can only get himself out of the responsibility by proving that the employee was the cause of his own injury. I have several times this session urged my hon. friend the Minister of Railways to look into this English Act and to make himself familiar with it, but we have had so many other railway matters that were very engrossing, that I cannot blame him for not having had the time. As the hon. Minister requests further time to consider it, I will agree, if he asks, to postpone it until this night week. On that occasion, I give notice now that I will take the sense of the committee on this measure, and, if necessary, take a vote of the House with the names taken down. What I urge is that before the hon. Minister raises any more objections to the constitutionality of this clause, he would secure some decision which shows that we are ultra vires in this legislation or some thoroughly competent opinion as to the effect of the law. Might I ask the hon. Minister if he will be ready to bring the matter to a close when the House next goes into committee on the Bill?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I trust the hon. member (Mr. Casey) will not impose any serious obligation on me in that direction. I certainly will place no obstacles in the way of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. CASEY. If the hon. Minister of Railways is as ready now as he expects to be a week from now, I may as well take the vote on the question now.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am getting a little readier all the time.

Mr. BERGERON. He will be more ready next year.

Mr. BRITTON. If the hon. Minister of Railways is as ready now as he will be at any other time, there are some members of the House who are not yet ready. There are some who were expecting that the report of the Special Committee to whom this Bill and another Bill were referred, would have been distributed by this time.

Mr. BERGERON. It was distributed about three weeks ago.

Mr. BRITTON. I have not seen it.

Mr. CASEY. The report in question was distributed some months ago, before the House met. But if hon. members want to study this question for another week, I move that the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. BERGERON. Killed again.

Mr. LISTER. Oh, no; it is not killed.

Mr. McNEILL. Before the committee rise, I want to call the attention of the hon. Minister of Railways for a moment to a matter which, I think, is of very great public importance. It is to some extent connected with the matter now under discussion. I understand—and I make the statement upon very reliable authority—that at the present time employees on the two great systems of railway which we have, the Grand Trunk and the Canadian Pacific Railway, are working a number of hours in the day which is almost incredible. If so, this is something deserving of the closest attention, not only on account of the employees them-

selves, but on account of the very great peril to the public safety which it involves. I was told upon what I believe is good authority that engineers are working such long hours that it is with the very greatest difficulty that they are able to keep awake. I was told that one engineer was actually seen asleep on his engine recently. It is a matter which I think is deserving of the very closest attention, and is, as I have said, perilous to the public safety.

Motion agreed to, and committee rose and reported progress.

PUNISHMENT OF SEDUCTION AND ABDUCTION.

On the order,

Resuming adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Charlton for the second reading of Bill (No. 3) an Act to amend the Criminal Code, 1892, so as to make effectual provision for the punishment of Seduction and Abduction.

Mr. CHARLTON. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the hon. gentleman has spoken in this debate.

Mr. CHARLTON. I have, Mr. Speaker.

The question being put, Mr. Speaker said: "I think the noes have it."

Mr. CHARLTON. Yeas and nays.

Mr. SPEAKER. There are not five members. I declare the motion lost.

Mr. CHARLTON. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. SPEAKER. I declared the motion for the second reading lost.

Mr. CHARLTON. Before you declared it lost, I had risen.

Mr. SPEAKER. No, I declared it lost before I sat down.

Order for second reading negatived.

THE CIVIL SERVICE OF CANADA.

Mr. McMULLEN moved second reading of Bill (No. 17) to amend the Act respecting the civil service of Canada. He said: Mr. Speaker, for several sessions I have brought the question of a board of civil service supervisors before this House. My reason for doing so is that, after careful investigation for many years, I have come to the conclusion that we have in this country more civil servants than we require, and that the work in the service is not equally distributed. This is largely due, no doubt, to the fact that Ministers have not time to thoroughly look into the work performed, both in the inside and in the outside service. Any person who takes up the report which sets out the salaries paid at the different ports and outports of this country, both customs and inland revenue, must come to the conclusion that a recasting of the entire service would be a decided advantage. I have given considerable attention to this question for years, and it will be in the recollection of many members of this House that no fewer than three civil service commissions have investigated the condition of our civil service: one, in 1870 or 1871, another some years later, and the last in 1885 or 1886. All these commissions, in their reports, made several recommendations, the adoption of which they considered would be of decided advantage in the handling of the civil service. In some cases changes were made, but nine-tenths of the recommendations contained in the different reports have never been carried out. The last commission recommended the appointment of a civil service board, and on a previous occasion I drew attention to this question, and I now would ask the attention of the House while I present some reasons which are sufficiently important, in my opinion, to require that some change should be made. I have made a list showing the receipts from customs at the various ports and how much it cost to collect these receipts.

CUSTOMS BRANCH—Receipts and Expenditures by Ports. Number of Employees and Percentage of Cost.

ONTARIO.

Ports.	Folio in Auditor General's Report.	Amount Collected.	Folio in Auditor General's Report.	Salaries Paid and Contingencies.	No. of Hands employed.	Cost per cent.
		$ cts.		$ cts.		
Amherstburg	T—48	13,828 29	T—17	4,727 42	12	34·02
Belleville	" 48	50,615 85	" 17	3,753 74	5	7·41
Berlin	" 48	57,429 81	" 18	1,745 23	7	3·03
Bowmanville	" 48	5,657 87	" 18	1,430 27	3	25·25
Brantford	" 48	130,980 88	" 18	3,526 29	5	2·69
Brockville	" 48	109,453 23	" 18	5 193 79	9	4·74

ONTARIO—*Concluded.*

Ports.	Folio in Auditor General's Report.	Amount Collected.	Folio in Auditor General's Report.	Salaries Paid and Contingencies.	No. of Hands employed.	Cost per cent.
		$ cts.		$ cts.		
Chatham	T—48	47,150 16	T—18	4,472 42	7	9·48
Cobourg	" 48	6,879 02	" 18	4,029 27	8	58·57
Collingwood	" 48	12,380 09	" 18	2,873 86	6	23·21
Cornwall	" 48	18,094 20	" 19	2,622 88	4	14·49
Deseronto	" 48	10,491 22	" 19	909 80	3	8·67
Fort Erie	" 48	217,413 76	" 19	7,234 20	19	3·32
Fort William	" 48	55,261 66	" 19	1,099 93	2	1·99
Galt	" 48	37,001 63	" 19	1,792 32	3	4·84
Gananoque	" 48	16,454 31	" 19	1,857 82	5	11·29
Goderich	" 48	25,327 60	" 19	4,352 86	9	17·18
Guelph	" 48	65,674 21	" 20	3,402 91	6	5·18
Hamilton	" 48	555,144 61	" 20	29,338 27	40	5·28
*Hope	" 48	12,970 07	" 20	2,545 76	3	19·62
Kingston	" 43	92,046 39	" 20	13,748 36	23	14·93
Lindsay	" 48	11,766 10	" 21	1,018 23	2	8·65
London	" 48	448,155 54	" 21	14,284 03	20	3·18
Morrisburg	" 48	4,191 22	" 21	1,353 99	4	32·30
Napanee	" 48	9,857 04	" 21	1,462 63	4	15·04
Niagara Falls	" 48	88,187 16	" 21	16,095 47	26	18·26
Oshawa	" 48	20,378 47	" 22	885 38	1	4·34
Ottawa	" 48	334,898 28	" 22	17,459 42	25	5·21
Owen Sound	" 48	16,583 53	" 22	2,400 80	5	14·47
Paris	" 48	8,093 27	" 22	1,677 20	2	20·72
Peterboro'	" 48	52,245 40	" 22	1,892 44	2	3·62
Picton	" 48	11,576 60	" 22	1,980 90	6	17·11
Port Arthur	" 48	66,711 74	" 23	3,017 53	7	4·58
Prescott	" 48	66,514 93	" 23	6,091 45	10	9·15
St. Catharines	" 48	111,045 31	" 23	5,889 40	11	5·32
St. Thomas	" 48	114,678 76	" 23	4,130 02	7	3·60
Sarnia	" 48	118,947 57	" 24	9,453 04	13	7·84
Sault St. Marie	" 48	52,332 69	" 24	9,170 09	15	17·50
Simcoe	" 48	86,707 63	" 24	3,219 97	6	3·71
Stratford	" 48	47,619 25	" 24	4,836 06	7	10·15
Toronto	" 48	3,623,420 98	" 24	71,191 84	94	1·96
Trenton	" 48	5,393 65	" 25	629 16	2	11·66
Wallaceburg	" 48	4,051 64	" 25	1,719 30	5	42·44
Whitby	" 48	4,831 44	" 25	1,606 81	3	33·26
Windsor	" 48	192,289 00	" 25	13,700 32	21	7·12
Woodstock	" 48	66,603 95	" 26	4,645 27	6	6·97
	.....	7,107,336 01	.....	300,467 17	483	.....

*No account of any expenses, but for Port Hope.

Now, Mr. Speaker, these are all the ports of the province of Ontario. Then we will take some of the ports in the other provinces. For instance, take the following ports in Quebec :—

QUEBEC.

Coaticook	T—48	9,761 35	T—26	4,377 36	8	44·84
Cookshire	" 48	5,273 04	" 26	2,430 92	6	46·10
Gaspé	" 48	902 15	" 26	1,263 01	2	146·00
Hemmingford	" 48	6,701 61	" 26	2,678 69	5	39·97
Montreal	" 48	6,771,908 62	" 27	143,934 07	195	2·12
New Carlisle	" 48	4,730 66	" 28	1,894 33	3	40·05
Percé	" 48	559 00	" 28	1,081 13	2	193·40
Potton	" 48	1,356 59	" 28	2,249 92	5	165·92
Quebec	" 48	768,915 46	" 29	36,045 58	46	4·66
Rimouski	" 48	1,295 57	" 29	719 92	3	55·58
St. Armand	" 48	4,028 76	" 29	2,221 92	4	55·16
St. Hyacinthe	" 48	48,157 46	" 29	791 50	1	1·64
St. Johns	" 48	87,070 95	" 30	6,306 62	11	7·35

QUEBEC—*Concluded.*

Ports.	Folio in Auditor General's Report.	Amount Collected.	Folio in Auditor General's Report.	Salaries Paid and Contingencies.	No. of Hands employed.	Cost per cent.
		$ cts.		$ cts.		
Sherbrooke	T—48	86,751 12	T—30	3,791 38	6	4·37
Sorel	" 48	9,212 12	" 30	625 00	1	6·78
Stanstead	" 48	19,404 34	" 30	4,447 44	7	22·92
Sutton	" 48	5,668 49	" 30	1,198 71	3	21·15
Three Rivers	" 48	22,686 59	" 30	1,610 75	2	7·10
		7,854,383 88		217,668 25	310	

NOVA SCOTIA.

Amherst	T—48	31,021 40	T—33	3,918 68	8	12·63
Annapolis	" 48	7,645 09	" 33	2,215 85	4	28·97
Antigonish	" 48	8,488 03	" 33	1,451 32	4	17·09
Arichat	" 48	1,788 47	" 33	2,538 77	9	141·98
Baddeck	" 48	1,263 86	" 34	2,057 09	5	162·86
Barrington	" 48	331 44	" 34	1,341 15	4	405·18
Bridgetown	" 48	1,169 34	" 34	430 00	2	36·78
Canso	" 48	1,881 83	" 34	2,027 15	6	107·76
Digby	" 48	2,865 71	" 34	2,302 46	7	80 36
Halifax	" 48	1,291,870 64	" 34	49,595 95	72	3·83
Kentville	" 48	23,417 71	" 35	3,077 98	8	13·14
Liverpool	" 48	4,931 23	" 35	2,169 45	4	44·00
Lockeport	" 48	1,219 74	" 35	611 45	1	50·16
Lunenburg	" 48	13,206 96	" 35	3,776 66	14	28·59
Margaretsville	" 48	159 08	" 36	350 00	2	220·12
Middleton	" 48	1,389 79	" 36	658 70	3	47·42
North Sydney	" 48	13,340 82	" 36	2,261 33	5	16·95
Parrsboro'	" 48	3,659 37	" 36	1,579 60	6	43·17
Pictou	" 48	35,979 22	" 36	6,700 35	13	18·62
Port Hawkesbury	" 48	654 73	" 36	1,643 71	5	251·33
Port Hood	" 48	2,805 18	" 36	985 52	5	35·13
Shelburne	" 48	1,668 43	" 37	983 65	3	58·97
Sydney	" 48	17,096 70	" 37	3,016 70	9	17·64
Truro	" 48	80,284 01	" 37	3,702 12	8	4·61
Weymouth	" 48	3,066 36	" 37	2,025 06	5	66·04
Windsor	" 48	8,759 27	" 37	2,649 99	6	30·25
Yarmouth	" 48	54,362 88	" 37	5,627 58	10	10·35
		1,614,327 29		109,698 27	228	

NEW BRUNSWICK.

Bathurst	T—48	2,741 04	T—30	3,309 70	6	120·74
Chatham	" 48	16,504 14	" 30	4,845 84	9	29·36
Dalhousie	" 48	9,481 99	" 31	1,746 53	3	18·42
Fredericton	" 48	39,234 94	" 31	3,885 05	4	9·90
Moncton	" 48	74,278 86	" 31	6,152 26	13	8·28
Newcastle	" 48	9,975 59	" 31	2,024 69	3	20·29
Sackville	" 48	2,689 43	" 32	1,567 80	4	58·30
St. Andrews	" 48	3,426 27	" 31	2,684 82	9	78·36
St. John	" 48	748,712 58	" 32	47,126 75	67	6·29
St. Stephen	" 48	43,142 22	" 32	9,532 13	19	22·09
Woodstock	" 48	18,649 40	" 33	7,971 44	16	42·74
		968,836 46		90,847 01	153	

It cost $90,847.01 in New Brunswick to collect $968,836.46 or 9·37 per cent.

That is the condition in New Brunswick. Now we come to British Columbia, as follows :—

BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Ports.	Folio in Auditor General's Report.	Amount Collected.	Folio in Auditor General's Report.	Salaries Paid and Contingencies.	No. of Hands employed.	Cost per cent.
		$ cts.		$ cts.		
Nanaimo	T—48	46,537 37	T—40	4,448 88	5	9·56
Nelson	" 48	349,283 10	" 40	11,950 00	17	3·38
New Westminster	" 48	110,798 22	" 40	12,780 75	24	11·53
Vancouver	" 48	391,713 63	" 41	14,706 42	20	3·75
Victoria	" 48	662,878 50	" 41	23,044 10	25	3·47
	.....	1,561,210 82	.....	66,790 31	91	.....

It cost $66,770.31 in British Columbia to collect $1,561,210.82, or 4·27 p.c.

These figures show, with the exception of Prince Edward Island, Manitoba and the North-west Territories, the entire collection of customs revenue for the whole Dominion, and I contend any one going over the list must come to the conclusion that the cost is considerably more in proportion at some ports than at others. At some ports we are paying double, and in one or two cases four times the amount by way of salaries and contingencies than is collected. It is utterly impossible for the Minister and the deputy in Ottawa to give time and attention to such an extent to the outside service as to be able to remodel and recast the system so as to bring it within proper, frugal limits, so that the people of the country will get fair value for the money paid in salaries and contingencies. What I say in regard to the Department of Customs, I repeat in regard to the other departments. So long as civil servants are entirely dependent on the Minister and Deputy Minister at Ottawa, it will be found impossible to dispense with their services, and those who are inefficient and incompetent, or are not required cannot be got rid of, because influences are brought to bear in favour of those who now hold positions. So soon as it is proposed to remove an official, immediately united action is taken by Conservatives and Reformers, application is made to the Minister and the Deputy Minister for the officer's retention on the ground that his removal would be inflicting a hardship and cruelty, in view of the number of children the officer has and that he is poor, all these are mentioned, and every effort is made to keep the man in his position. His religious views are also used for that purpose. We know this from the short experience we have had on this side of the House. I contend that in order to place the outside service on a proper, efficient and economical basis, it is absolutely necessary that some change should be made, and I know no better way of proceeding than by appointing a civil service board of supervisors. Hon. members who have given some attention to the question may possibly want to know what power could be conferred on such a board. Their power would be this: they would have the right to enter every office in the outside service in Canada, inspect the work performed there, recast and remodel the work of the office, and if there are useless, incompetent or unnecessary men, dispense with their services. In doing so the board would have to give notice within fifteen days of the fact that they had to dispense with an officer's services, stating the reasons. If hon. members will glance over the figures connected with the different ports and make comparisons, they will find great disparity existing, and will see that it is absolutely necessary that something should be done. Take the following figures:—

CUSTOMS BRANCH.

Port.	Amount Collected.	No. of Ports.	No. of Hands.	Salaries and Contingencies.	Percentage of cost for Collection.
	$ cts.			$ cts.	
Cobourg	6,879 02	4	8	4,029 27	58·6
Port Hope	12,970 07	1	2	2,545 76	19·63
Peterborough	52,245 40	1	2	1,892 44	3·62
Guelph	65,674 21	2	6	3,402 91	5·18
Simcoe	86,707 63	4	6	3,219 77	3·71
Stratford	47,619 25	5	7	4,836 03	10·57

In Cobourg there are three subports; in Port Hope none. The salaries in Peterborough are $1,800 and the contingencies $92.44, while in Guelph the salaries amounted to $2,583.81 and the contingencies to $819.10, while the amount collected in Guelph over Peterborough would apparently not justify any such difference in the cost.

I contend there is ample room for bringing the entire civil service down to proper proportions, and the only possible way you can do it is by constituting this Board of Civil Service Supervisors. They will carefully go to every port, investigate the work performed by the civil servants there, and be able to report whether the number of officials are absolutely necessary or not. If by doing this they reduce the cost to the country, as I believe they will, it will be a step in the right direction. I have under my hand a compiled statement with regard to the Inland Revenue Department, but I will not detain the House by reading it now. I have taken only the Customs Department as an example, and I frankly admit that, in my opinion, the Customs Department is not worse, and perhaps not quite so bad as some of the others. This Bill provides that this Board of Civil Service Supervisors will inspect closely the work done in every office and report within fifteen days to the head of the department. In my opinion, it will require at least three commissioners, and their appointment will entail some expense, but the benefits they can confer in the interests of the country and the reductions they can make in the civil service will, I believe, far more than compensate for the cost. This Act is permissive, not compulsory. It provides that the Government shall have the right, if they deem prudent, to appoint this Board of Civil Service Supervisors. It will enable the Ministers to get out of the difficulties which now surround them when they try to make reductions in the staff. We have seen in this House that when absolutely unnecessary officials were removed, the Ministers have been persistently and viciously assailed, it being declared that the services of these men were dispensed with for political purposes. The Ministers have been openly and determinedly and discourteously assailed for making honest efforts to reduce the public expenditure. If this Bill becomes law, the responsibility will be removed from the Ministers, and we would look to the Civil Service Board for a proper and efficient civil service. Of course, the Government would retain the power to appoint the civil servants, and if this board reported that a man was inefficient, that man would be removed, and on report to the Minister he would appoint another man. The supervisors would afterwards see how the new man was doing his work, and if he was not earning his salary, they could report that he be dismissed. We know that whether Conservatives or Reformers are in office, the services of certain men are pressed upon the consideration of Ministers and they are urged to appoint them. I know men now in the civil service who have tried their hands at a great many undertakings. I know some who have been commission merchants, wholesale merchants, retail merchants, insurance agents, and who at last secured enough influence to get a place in the service. These men in all the callings they adopted previously had never been able to succeed at any of them, but strange to say, when they get into the service, they seem to merit high salaries. I hold that a man with ten or fifteen years' record in the struggles of life, who has become a burden on his relatives, and is eventually driven to the necessity of urging upon his political friends to get him into office, that man is in a great many cases not fit for his position, and very often he renders but little return for the money he draws.

The people of this country should not be called upon to keep a lot of inefficient men in the service. We build poor-houses in this country, and if these men are too indolent to earn an honest living or to make their lives a success, they have no right to be put in the civil service and to be kept there at the country's expense; and the sooner the Government get rid of these men the better, and that cannot be done without a board of supervisors. Then, considerable expense will be saved by getting rid of some of the inspectors. There are inspectors in every department. I do not know that you could part with them all, but you could dispense with some of them, and in this way you would make up for the money that the country would have to expend in paying the salaries of the supervisors. I know myself that there are some men working in the service to-day for very much less than they ought to get. I believe there are men in the service working for a mere scanty pittance, which is hardly enough to live on; and I would be glad to see these men, if they are doing valuable work, getting a fair return for their work. But, on the other hand, there are a great many men in the service, I have reason to believe, who are not paying the country ten cents in work for every dollar they draw. I believe there should be a readjustment of the service by a board such as I propose, and I am quite willing that the Government should take the matter into their consideration. As I said before, the Bill is not compulsory; it is only permissive; it gives the Government the power to do it or not, as they please. That is a question they can decide for themselves. I could not introduce the measure in any other way. If put in another shape, it would have to originate with the Cabinet. It is a measure which the Government can take advantage of if they think it would improve the service, but if they think it would not, they may decline to take advantage of it, and it may remain on the Statute-book a dead let-

ter. With these remarks, I beg to move the second reading of the Bill.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a good deal of attention to the argument which has been adduced by my hon. friend in favour of the measure which he has placed before the House. As usual, he has given to the subject a great deal of minute attention and careful research. I am not prepared, however, to say, that at this moment I would be disposed, for my part, to accept the Bill as it is framed. Though it is a permissive Bill, if it were adopted by the House, the House would expect the Government to act upon it. My hon. friend has given us a good many grave considerations; but I have not noticed that he has brought to our attention any precedent in favour of such a measure. If there are any precedents in parliamentary countries for a measure of this kind, for my part I am not aware of it. I do not say that in the way of disparagement of this Bill. It may be effective in many ways; but my hon. friend will agree with me that in a House so thin as this House is at present, it might perhaps be advisable not to carry this discussion any further, but to postpone it to another day, when we may expect to have the benefit of the views of some of the leading members of the House on both sides. I do not say that the Government will not be prepared to give its consideration to this measure at a future day; but I would simply advise my hon. friend not to press his measure to a second reading to-night, but to allow the House to have the benefit of digesting for some days the views he has given the House, before they come to a conclusion on the measure. Therefore I move that the debate be now adjourned.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). Just a word or two, Mr. Speaker, before you put the motion. The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) has brought an important subject before the House, a subject to which he has given a good deal of attention, and in illustration of his views, he has mentioned the Department of Customs over which I have the honour for the time being to preside. The table he has given is one that will be scanned with a good deal of interest. I was not able to follow all his figures. I thought as he proceeded that in some of them he was hardly correct, though, in the main, I dare say he was correct. My only object in rising now is to point out to the House, when considering these figures, as they will not doubt do, that in the various departments, especially in the Department of Customs—and I presume the remark will also apply to the Department of Inland Revenue, though, perhaps, not to so great an extent—you cannot be guided by percentages. For instance, in the maritime provinces, where there are small receipts comparatively, compared with the number of men employed, there is an absolute necessity, if you guard the revenue, of having officers at the different stations where they are at present. I am not contending that all the economy that may be found practicable has been exercised; but I think my predecessors as well as myself have found by actual experience that if you guard the revenue, the expenses at some of the ports must necessarily be very large in proportion to the income derived from them. I may mention to my hon. friend and to the members of the House generally, what is well known to those who preceded me in the office, that there are places where we have officers employed who collect no revenue at all; yet, they are absolutely necessary if we are to guard the revenue. Of course, if the hon. gentleman were prepared to say that all those officers in which the percentage of cost of collection is so very large should be abolished, you would effect a saving in that direction; but the question is whether your revenue would be benefited thereby. Then, there are ports which can hardly be compared with each other without a full knowledge of their circumstances and conditions. Take the two ports which my hon. friend said were inland ports in Ontario—Simcoe and Stratford—the cost of collection at the former being about five per cent and at the latter about ten per cent. I may say that there is one officer at Simcoe; but Port Dover is an outport of Simcoe, and to this outport the Grand Trunk Railway brings very large cargoes of coal, and a very large revenue is collected there, with scarcely any entries or clerical work; yet these swell the receipts of Simcoe, while the receipts of Simcoe itself would be small. I just give this as an illustration of the fact that you cannot be guided wholly by comparisons of cost for collecting in the different ports. I do not wish to minimize the value of the criticisms of my hon. friend in the least, but I think it is well, as his speech will go out to the country, that I should just point out one or two matters of that kind, in order that we might have some explanation of what, on the face of it, would seem almost inexplicable to one not conversant with the subject. My hon. friend does not recognize the work that would devolve on his board of civil service supervisors. That board is to be composed of three men, capable of course, and no doubt in the receipt of good salaries. One of the duties he would impose upon them is the inspection of the books in all the different ports. I venture to say that even if they divided the work and each member of that board went on a tour of inspection separately, the work would be considerably more than they could perform, even limiting their inspection to the books of the Customs Department alone. My hon. friend does not realize the amount of work to be done. When I came into office and took charge of it, I found that my predecessor, no doubt

actuated by a desire for economy, had not appointed sufficient inspectors, and the consequence was that some ports had not been inspected for years. When they were inspected, irregularities were discovered, and many of them to such an extent that I felt it incumbent on me, in the public interest, much as I disliked to increase the staff, to appoint more inspectors. I have named in Ontario two inspectors, termed assistants, in addition to what we had before. These gentlemen are engaged all the time in the work assigned to them. In the province of Quebec, I thought it desirable also, where we had one inspector, to appoint an assistant, a gentleman long in the department, who is promoted, as was one of the gentlemen I appointed in Ontario. I do not believe that it would be possible for a board of three inspectors to make a thorough supervision of the customs ports of this Dominion alone, leaving aside the Inland Revenue and the Post Office Department and all the others. When one has charge of a department, he feels the responsibility of it and gets to know its working and requirements, and his views with reference to the duties devolving upon the different officers become enlarged. He sees what he did not see before he had intimate knowledge of it. I am sure my hon. friend will not construe my remarks, as showing a desire to find the slightest fault with the criticisms he has made. He has given much labour and attention to the subject, and his motives are the best, and he will not misinterpret my remarks when I point out to him these facts.

Mr. SPROULE. I have no doubt whatever that the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) aims at doing good work, when attempting to provide some other machinery for controlling the civil service, but a cursory examination of this proposed law will convince almost any one that it is so crude and so brief as to be practically worthless. There are only three things proposed in it. First, the appointment of a board of supervisors. Second, the duty of that board to inspect the books of the various departments. And third, its power to suspend and dismiss employees. I need not repeat what the hon. Minister of Customs has said, but I may add, there are about 1,300 employees in the inside service and perhaps as many more in the outside, and one sees at a glance how utterly impossible it would be for any board to go around once a year and inspect the books in all these departments. It would take three boards to do it with any intelligence or satisfaction. Then what insight would this board have by each inquiry into the conduct of the civil service by inspection of the books? There are many duties which these civil servants are required to perform which could not be determined from an inspection of the books. If the board went no further than the inspection of the books, it would know very little about the work of the civil service. The hon. member seemed to give his attention particularly to the outside service of the Customs Department, and proceeded to show that there was a great difference in the cost of collections in the different ports. To any one who knows anything about the duties of a collector of customs, it must be apparent at a glance that there would be great diversity, and that if we were to collect, on a basis of percentage, the collections would not be done as well as they are to-day. Take a small port, the collector is obliged to keep his office open all through the summer and winter as well. Though there is not much brought in there, vessels come in every day or two and have to be attended to. The collections there are very small, but the collector has to keep an office, and supply wood and light and pay rent and spend his whole time looking after the business. If he were paid by a percentage, the percentage which would be required to pay for his time would have to be very large indeed, much larger than it would be, on an average, all over the country. The hon. member's criticisms were directed to the Customs Department alone and the outside service in that department, and he does not seem to have dealt with the inside service at all. What standard does he provide for testing the efficiency or ability of these men in the service? He has laid down no rule. There is no examination. I presume, he contemplates, in the event of this board of supervisors being appointed, that no doubt the civil service examination will be taken as a standard. But after that examination is done, there must be promotions from time to time, and what test does this board require to decide what promotions should be made. It would be utterly impossible to expect this board to acquire any information which would enable them to determine the wisdom or otherwise of promotion in the service or of appointments to it. Then, again, I thought that one of the virtues of this board would be that it would take the civil service out of politics, making it independent of political parties. But it does not do anything of the kind, for it is as much under the control of the politician as ever, because the appointments are to be made, as heretofore, by the heads of the departments, that is to say, through political influence. As long as that continues, I do not care what supervision you have of the civil service, it will be found very imperfect, and very unlikely to accomplish what the hon. gentleman aims at accomplishing by this Bill. And, as I said before, if it is intended to apply both to the inside and outside service, I think the Bill, if passed in its present shape, and with the few provisions it possesses, would be practically useless. To make it of any value, you would have to go a great deal further than this Bill proposes to go.

Mr. WALLACE. I think that the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. Mc-

Mullen) has begun to feel that this is a very cold and heartless world, that the sympathy of the human race, and of his colleagues particularly, is vanishing. I remember some years ago, when the hon. member for North Wellington spoke in the strain he spoke in to-night, his remarks were received with the most enthusiastic applause by the gentlemen who surrounded him. But to-night, as he read these interesting figures and recited these important facts and made his comments upon them, dead silence greeted him from every part of that side of the House. And then, Sir, as if to add to his misery, and to make clearer the base ingratitude of his leaders, the leader of the Government gets up and moves that the debate be adjourned before it had commenced. There was no debate, the hon. member had made his remarks upon the motion and that was all. And the Prime Minister immediately moves the adjournment of the debate, so that we may consider the interesting facts that the hon. member for North Wellington has presented. I know that the Prime Minister is a very busy man, and so are all the Ministers during the session. If they have not given attention to the subject the hon. member for North Wellington has brought up, it is impossible for them to do so now, with all the business of the session heaping up, as it were. I am sure that, notwithstanding their disposition to give careful and close study to the facts presented by the hon. member, they will all be dismissed from the minds not only of the Prime Minister himself, but of his colleagues in the Government. I say it was a cruel and heartless act of the Prime Minister to propose the adjournment of the debate. It was something that the hon. member for North Wellington, I am sure, had not expected. No doubt, he thought that this subject, which has engrossed his attention both when he was on this side and since he has taken his seat on the ministerial benches, would have received the careful and immediate attention of the leaders and members of the Government.

Now, there is another feature of it, it looked to me just like this: The hon. member for North Wellington is informing this House that the present Government, having been nearly two years in power, have not been doing their duty, that if the hon. member for North Wellington had been on the Treasury benches, if he had been Minister of Customs or had occupied one of these other positions that he has criticised, there would not have been these incongruities and discrepancies that appear by the statement he has made to-night, and that one of the losses to the country and to the Government is the fact that the hon. member for North Wellington has not been entrusted with one of those portfolios. He tells us, Mr. Speaker, about these percentages. And the Minister of Customs tells us that we must not give attention to them, because, he said, percentages in customs matters are very misleading. That is what we thought the other night when we heard the Minister of Customs making some remarks on percentages. But, though he finds fault with the course of the hon. member for North Wellington, he formerly, yes, no later than last year, brought up the same argument himself to show that the Customs Department in the past had not been conducted with the close economy that should characterize that department. And he quoted certain ports, which I can recall from memory, just as the hon. member for North Wellington quoted certain ports, to prove his contention. Again the Minister of Customs tells us that if this Bill were carried, this board of supervisors would not be able to do nearly the work of going over the Department of Customs alone, not to speak of the other departments of the Government. For, he tells us, there are numerous inspectors, and he has largely increased the number, and the officers are not able to overtake the work, or, at all events, they are all required. But, if he had read the Bill, knowing the duties of the inspectors, he would have seen that the duties of these supervisors are not the duties of the inspectors, and that these duties would not conflict, but would be quite independent. As I understand from the Bill and the explanation of the hon. member for North Wellington, this Bill is not for the auditing of accounts of collectors of different ports, which is the principal duty of the inspectors, but the duty of those supervisors would be to make a general inspection, for the purpose of finding out what are the necessities of the public service in every town in the customs, post office, inland revenue and other departments. I think that the idea of the hon. member for North Wellington is a good one. Whether his Bill would carry out the provision that I see ought to be carried out, I cannot say; but a Bill in the direction I have indicated would be very desirable. The hon. member for North Wellington should present it to the House, and the House should give it its serious consideration, for this matter is not a new one in this regard, and with the hon. member's suggestion before us we can make a Bill out of it with what ever amendment may be found necessary, which, I am sure, the hon. member for North Wellington would be willing to have made to improve its efficiency.

The principle upon which the Bill starts out, I think, is a very good one. As has been pointed out in this House and in committee the other day, but to which I will not refer, a Minister is a very busy man in his department, particularly the head of the Customs Department, and before a Minister can economically administer the affairs of his department throughout this broad Dominion, he will require assistance. Now,

in the Post Office Department I presume the business is largely regulated by the population of the place. In the customs there are so many other considerations, there are so many other things to be considered, that the expense may or may not bear a ratio to the population of the place or to the general business of the place; so that the same rule that would apply in one would not apply in the other. In this case I think the hon. member for North Wellington has struck a good idea. I think it is the duty of Parliament to give it prompt and careful consideration so as to assist the Government by some such method in regulating the expenses of the Government, in economizing where economy is necessary, and in recommending increased expenditure where such would promote the efficiency of the public service.

Mr. McMULLEN. I wish to say only a few words in reply. I think the definition of the Bill given by my hon. friend from York (Mr. Wallace) is the correct one, so far as I intended. A civil service commission that sat in the year 1885 made a very exhaustive investigation into the civil service system of this country, and they reported recommending a board of civil service inspectors. Of course, the recommendation they made did not go the length that my Bill would propose to go; they simply proposed that a civil service board of inspectors, with a chief executive as chairman, and deputy heads as members of that board, should make a kind of inspection of the civil service and report to the different heads the changes that they thought should be made in the interests of economy and of the efficiency of the civil service. They did not go the length of recommending that the board should have the power to remove those that were considered inefficient or those whose services were not necessary. In consulting with some of the most experienced civil servants in the city of Ottawa, men that have served for twenty-five years in this city, I can honestly say that I had their ideas with regard to this Bill before I introduced it last year, and their opinion was that the appointment of a board of inspectors without the power to remove unnecessary or incompetent servants would not accomplish what would be accomplished if you appointed a civil service board of supervisors, giving them the power I propose in this Bill, because, they said, they would only recommend to the department the changes which should be made. As soon as they did that, the servant to be removed in all probability would get to know that the board had made the inspection and had reported that his services should be dispensed with at the end of the month. Immediately a united effort would be made, petitions would be got up, representations to the head and to the deputy head would be made, setting forth that he was perhaps the son of a widow or that many relatives were depending upon him for existence and that it would be the worst kind of inhumanity to turn him out of office into the street. They said that unless these men were clothed with power to make the changes that they felt to be necessary, they did not think it would be any use to appoint a civil service board of inspection. Therefore, in preparing this Bill and bringing it forward in its present shape, my only object is to secure a better and more efficient civil service than we have got. As I said before, I believe the records clearly show that we have more servants than are absolutely necessary. Now, with regard to the remarks of the Minister of Customs as to the percentages. I quite admit that in some places it might be necessary to retain men that were not perhaps in receipt of very large amounts in the way of customs, but I think that where the offices have got to the point that it takes over 50 per cent, in some places more than 100 per cent of the entire receipts to pay those men, it would be better to dispense with the services of a collector of customs and appoint some men to act as preventive officers, men that would look after the interests of the country and see that smuggling was prevented, if there are places where smuggling might possibly take place. Then again, we know that the trade of this country is changing considerably; we know very well that we are not taking the amount of dutiable goods in some lines from the United States that we did a year ago. We know that there are ports in this country where there were very numerous entries made, and these have dwindled down considerably. Now, has the staff been reduced in those ports? I contend that the staff is kept there at just the same number, with the same salaries as before. I contend that there should be a recast of the service, even from that standpoint, and in view of the anticipated increase of imports from Great Britain as compared with those from the United States under the preferential clause in the new tariff, as I believe and hope that an increased proportion of our goods will come from the mother country. Well, if that be the case, the receipts at our ports along the American border will be still further reduced. The hon. gentleman may say that it is necessary to prevent waste along that border. No doubt it is; I admit that willingly. But I contend that in place of establishing outports and customhouses where men sit and virtually do nothing, we should establish a board of preventive officers, which could be conducted for very much less with fewer numbers. Now, with regard to postponing further consideration of this question, I have no desire at all to press the Bill upon the House with unreasonable haste. I am desirous that it should get the consideration of the House and that the Government should take notice of it. It is not because I wish in any way to

force its consideration that I moved the second reading, but simply because I believe that improvements can be made, and that is my sole motive in bringing the Bill before the House. I am quite willing that every opportunity should be given to the Government to give it their serious consideration. I dare say the leader of the Government has been overburdened with the enormous amount of work that he has had to do, and if he cannot devote the time that is necessary to consider this Bill during the present session, I earnestly hope that during the recess the Government will consider it and bring in an amendment to our Civil Service Act. I believe it requires amendments, and I am satisfied that in its crude and unacceptable state at the present moment, it can be very much improved by amendments. I could suggest amendments myself, and I hope that some amendments will be made, amongst others that we should adopt the principle that I have outlined in this Bill. My object is to serve the best interests of my country, my object is to serve the constituency that I represent to the best of my ability, and I do it conscientiously. I have given a good deal of consideration to the whole question of civil service expenditure, while I sat on the other side of the House. It was my privilege for twelve or fifteen years to investigate this expenditure, and I have come to the conscientious conviction that in the hands of no Government, whether Conservative or Reform, will the civil service of this country ever be brought to a satisfactory basis in the matter of expenditure, unless some system of this kind is adopted. That is my view, and believing that, I have asked the consideration of the House to this Bill. I am quite willing that the Government should have all reasonable time in coming to a conclusion on the whole question.

Mr. SPROULE. Do you not think it would have been more likely to be carried if it had provided to take the service out of political control?

Motion to adjourn debate, agreed to.

NORTH-WEST MOUNTED POLICE PENSIONS.

Mr. DAVIN moved second reading of Bill (No. 15) further to amend the Mounted Police Pensions Act, 1889. He said: This Bill I put on the paper the first day of the session, and the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis), a few days afterwards put a notice on the paper of a similar Bill, and when my Bill was called, being busy with other matters, I did not move for leave to introduce it, and so my hon. friend got precedence. I need hardly say that, provided the end is gained, I do not care who passes the Bill, and the only reason I move the second reading now is not only to carry out my own intention but the intention of the hon. member for Saskatchewan and the intention of the hon. Prime Minister, who in the absence of the hon. member for Saskatchewan, I think—I do not know whether the hon. gentleman was in the House or not—took charge of the Bill and pushed it through. We have, therefore, adopted a principle. Not only has the Bill passed the second reading, gone through committee and passed its third reading, but if I am right it has gone to the Senate and been passed. This is the Bill that has been passed:

Her Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and House of Commons of Canada, enacts as follows:—

1. The Mounted Police Pension Act, 1889, is hereby amended by striking out the words "twenty-five" wherever they occur in sections three, seven and eight thereof, and inserting instead the words "twenty."

In drafting that Bill, if one thing more had been done it would have in great part fulfilled the object I had in view in placing my Bill on the paper, that is to say if it had been moved to repeal section 4 and substitute a section carrying out an amendment that had been made in sections 3, 7 and 8. But I need hardly inform the right hon. leader of the House that the Bill as passed is not worth the paper on which it is written. There should have been, in order to carry out the object—and my Bill was on the paper and of course was perfectly at the service of the hon. member for Saskatchewan—the insertion of the second clause. My main object is to carry out the aim of the Prime Minister and the member for Saskatchewan. In my Bill the first section provides:

1. Section three of The Mounted Police Pension Act, 1898, is hereby repealed and the following substituted therefor:—

"3 Subject to the provisions of this Act, every constable who became a member of the force on or after the twenty-third day of May, one thousand eight hundred and seventy-three, or who becomes a member of the force after the passing of this Act,—

"(a) If he has completed not less than twenty years' service, shall be entitled to retire and receive a pension for life; and—

"(b) If he has completed not less than ten years' service, and is incapacitated for the performance of his duty by infirmity of mind or body, shall be entitled to retire and receive a pension.

Section 2 provides as follows:—

2. Section four of the said Act is hereby repealed and the following substituted therefor:—

"4. The pension to a constable on retirement shall be according to the following scale, that is to say:—

"(a) If he has completed ten but less than sixteen years' service, an annual sum equal to one-fiftieth of his annual pay for every completed year of service;

"(b) If he has completed sixteen but less than twenty years' service, an annual sum equal to twenty-fiftieths of his annual pay, with an addition of two-fiftieths of his annual pay for every completed year of service above sixteen years;

"(c) If he has completed twenty years' service, an annual sum equal to thirty-fiftieths of his annual pay with an addition of one-fiftieth of his annual pay for every completed year of service above twenty years, so, however, that the pension shall not exceed two-thirds of his annual pay at his retirement."

Let me point out to the leader of the House the present position of the law. You have sections 3, 7 and 8 changed from 25 to 20 years, and yet section 4 reads as follows:—

The pension to a constable on retirement shall be according to the following scale, that is to say.

(a) If he has completed fifteen but less than twenty-one years' service, an annual sum equal to one-fiftieth of his annual pay for every completed year of service;

(b) If he has completed twenty-one but less than twenty-five years' service, an annual sum equal to twenty-fiftieths of his annual pay, with an addition of two-fiftieths of his annual pay for every completed year of service above twenty years; if he has completed twenty-five years, service, an annual sum equal to thirty-fiftieths of his annual pay with an addition of one-fiftieth of his annual pay for every completed year of service above twenty-five years, so, however, that the pension shall not exceed two-thirds of his annual pay at his retirement.

So here you have clauses—sections 3, 7 and 8 amended, and still you have clause 4, which is the operative clause, providing for the old term of service. The Bill which was passed with the best intentions, is therefore not worth the paper on which it is written. I know the member for Saskatchewan has no desire other than that we should be able to get pensions for these men that we believe entitled to them, and I am sure the right hon. Prime Minister would not, when they ask from him bread, give them in the most formal manner a stone.

Mr. FLINT. Before the debate proceeds I should like to raise what I consider a rather important question of order, as to whether this Bill can be properly moved or not. It appears on the surface at any rate to contravene one of the rules of the House. I do not know whether my hon. friend has considered the matter in that light or not, but it might be important not only in regard to this Bill but possibly in regard to other Bills. The well known clause of the British North America Act says:

It shall not be lawful for the House of Commons to adopt or pass any vote, resolution, address or Bill for the appropriation of any part of the public revenue or of any tax or impost to any purpose that has not been first recommended to that House by Message of the Governor General in the session in which such vote, resolution, address or Bill is proposed.

The effect of this Bill is to impose increased liability upon the treasury of the country, and, if passed, one of the first duties of Parliament would be to provide funds for the increase that must necessarily arise from the putting into effect of this law. That is a matter of considerable importance, which ought to be decided before we proceed to the consideration of the merits of the question itself. The North-west Mounted Police Act, of 1889, provides certain pensions for the police under certain circumstances. The first clause of the amending proposal of the hon. member for Assiniboia reduces the number of years necessary for obtaining this pension from 25 years. Consequently all those who are in a position to obtain the pension after 25 years' service would have the right to obtain it after 20 years' service, and with a force of 700 or 800 men that would impose a large additional cost to the country.

Mr. DAVIN. That clause has been passed already by the other Bill.

The PRIME MINISTER. But you say it is not worth the paper on which it is written.

Mr. FLINT. The first three clauses of the Bill reduce the years by five, necessary to entitle him to a pension, and the next three clauses of the Bill reduce the number of years for each of these classes by six years. There can be no doubt that the passage of this will immediately affect the treasury of the country, because provision must immediately be made for carrying it out. Therefore, I contend that under the customary interpretation of the rule of Parliament under the British North America Act, the Bill of my hon. friend (Mr. Davin) would be out of order. I raise the point, Mr. Speaker, in order that it may be settled here.

Mr. SPEAKER (Mr. Brodeur). The point of order raised by the hon. member (Mr. Flint) is very important, and before being decided, I think it should be well considered. I have not had occasion to consider the Bill before this, and so I would suggest to the hon member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) that he should allow the order to stand so that Mr. Speaker may consider his decision upon the Bill.

Mr. DAVIS (Saskatchewan). I am very thankful for the kind manner in which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) has referred to me. He paid me the compliment of telling me that I had taken the wind out of his sails, or in other words, that I had got my Bill in ahead of him. Now, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) must remember that I had a somewhat similar Bill before the House last session, and as I was unable to get it through then, I took the first opportunity on my arriving in Ottawa this session to introduce this Bill. I did not do it with an intention of interfering with the hon. member (Mr. Davin).

Mr. DAVIN. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIS (Saskatchewan). My hon. friend (Mr. Davin) says that the Bill I have

had passed through the House is useless, but I can tell him that if he had considered that Bill carefully he would have come to an entirely contrary opinion. At all events, the Bill fulfils the want that I desired it should. It does not in any manner interfere with the scale of pensions under the North-west Mounted Police Pension Act, but it does confer a very great boon on the men of the force and one to which they are justly entitled. Under the Pension Act a constable or non-commissioned officer would have to serve twenty-five years to entitle him to draw a pension for life, and my Bill reduces the time of service from twenty-five to twenty years. At the present time, therefore, a constable or non-commissioned officer when he has served twenty years can retire and receive a pension for life. There is a provision in the present Pension Act whereby a constable, if he has served fifteen years in the force and becomes incapacitated may be retired on pension, but the moment the medical officer in charge considers that he is sufficiently recovered to return to his duties, he is compelled to return and to serve the unexpired term of twenty-five years. The Bill which I had passed through the House merely reduces the term from twenty-five to twenty years, and it does not interfere with the money question one way or the other. It was not necessary to introduce a long Bill like that introduced by my hon. friend (Mr. Davin); the mere changing of the words "twenty-five years" to "twenty years" accomplished the end in view. The Bill of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) is merely a rehash of the North-west Mounted Police Pension Act; it is almost word for word with that Act, with the exception that in section 4, subsection "a," he says:

If he has completed ten but less than sixteen years' service, an annual sum equal to one-fiftieth of his annual pay for every completed year of service.

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) has reduced the scale from fifteen years to ten years, and in doing so his Bill doubtless comes under the point of order raised by the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint).

Mr. DAVIN. I understand from what my hon. friend (Mr. Davis) has just stated, that he is opposed to enabling members of the North-west Mounted Police force who have completed ten, but less than sixteen years' service—because it is on that he is supporting the point of order against me—he is opposed to these gentlemen getting a pension.

Mr. DAVIS (Saskatchewan). I am not opposed to that, but I did not wish to undertake to do something which I know I could not do. I am a new member of this House, and I am not supposed to know as much of these matters as the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), but I am under the impression that when the hon. gentleman introduced his Bill he must have known it was out of order.

Mr. DAVIN. If the Bill I have before the House is out of order, so was the Bill of my hon. friend (Mr. Davis), and that was no doubt the reason why the Prime Minister took charge of it in the kindly way he did, and I was glad to see him do it. Now, as the Prime Minister did take charge of that Bill and gave it his sanction, he must have meant it to do something for the mounted police. However, I will show my hon. friend (Mr. Davis) that he is quite mistaken in supposing that this Bill of his accomplishes anything, or if it is to be construed as worth anything, then it does something that those who will be affected will certainly not welcome. Here is the position: Under his Bill wherever the words "twenty-five years" occur, "twenty years" are read in, and the third clause of the Act of 1889 says:

If he has completed not less than twenty-five years' service he shall be entitled to retire and receive a pension for life.

Or according to the amended Act:

If he has completed not less than twenty years' service he shall be entitled to retire and receive a pension for life.

Then, when you come to section 7, it would read:

When any constable who became a member of the force on or after the 23rd day of May, 1873, or who becomes a member of the force after the passing of this Act, has completed a service of twenty years, the commissioner may, with the approval of the Governor in Council, require him to retire upon the terms as to pensions prescribed in this Act.

Mr. DAVIS (Saskatchewan). I find it twenty-five years in this Act.

Mr. DAVIN. But the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davis) forgets that he has amended it.

Mr. DAVIS (Saskatchewan). You are reading it as amended?

Mr. DAVIN. Yes. I want to show how the Act of 1889 is amended by the hon. gentleman's own Act. Section 8 says:

Before a pension is granted to a constable, who, after having served for less than twenty-five years, retires on the ground of his being incapacitated by infirmity of mind or body for the discharge of his duty, a medical board composed of the senior surgeon of the force and two other legally qualified medical practitioners shall certify that such constable is so incapacitated, and that the incapacity is likely to be permanent,——

And so on. The only clause in section 4 that can be read with that is this:

The pension to a constable on retirement shall be according to the following scale, that is to say:—

(a) If he has completed fifteen but less than twenty-one years' service, an annual sum equal

to one-fiftieth of his annual pay for every completed year of service.

So that, whereas under the old Act, if he has completed twenty-five years service, he gets a pension equal to thirty-fiftieths of his annual pay, now he can only come under "a" and get one-fiftieth of his annual pay. I do not think those constables who will be affected by the amendment made by my hon. friend will thank him for giving them only one-fiftieth, whereas they should have got thirty-fiftieths. I do not care to pin on primal grounds or from the purview of personal credit whether the Government take the matter up or not; I do not care a pin, so far as any honour or glory is concerned. I am only interested in the police. I am only interested that this Act which was passed shall not be a mere mockery to them. And if my argument is a sound one, I think my right hon. friend is bound to amend the Act, so that it will be consistent and will accomplish the purpose which I have no doubt he had in view. As I have shown, it cannot possibly in its present form do any good; in fact, it can only do harm at present. As to the point of order, I think it is worth considering whether a private member can introduce and carry through the House a Bill like this; but when one Bill has already been passed by the House, and has also received the constructive sanction of the Government, with the direct and spoken approval of the Prime Minister himself, I think the Government and the Prime Minister are bound to see that the other amendment does not fall through.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend has brought forward this Bill upon considerations which have not been at all anticipated, and, therefore, I must say to him candidly that I am not prepared at this moment to deal with it. The point of order which has been taken may or may not be well taken. At first blush it seems to me to be well taken; and I must say, to my regret, that my conclusion is that if the point is well taken with regard to this Bill, it would have been just as well taken with regard to the Bill of my hon. friend from Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis); but the point had escaped my attention at the moment. But, as the Speaker has suggested that the matter be deferred for investigation, I will move the adjournment of the debate, with the view of having the point of order investigated, and with the view, moreover, of having the views advanced by my hon. friend (Mr. Davin) referred to the officers of my department for a report, for I am not prepared to deal with them at this moment.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

RETURNS ORDERED.

Return of all papers, receipts and documents in possession of the Government relating in any way to a claim presented to the Government by Hugh Richardson, Esq., the justice of the Supreme Court, North-west Territories, for losses sustained at Battleford during the North-west rebellion of 1885.—(Mr. Davis, Saskatchewan.)

Return giving: (a.) The names and offices or employment of all persons employed temporarily or permanently in the various departments in and about the Parliamentary and all Governmental buildings at the city of Ottawa, relieved from duty by the Government, by dismissal or otherwise, from the 17th day of October, 1878, to the 1st day of November, 1879; (b.) The cause of dismissal, if any; (c.) The names of all new employees appointed, whether permanently or temporarily, between the same dates.—(Mr. Belcourt.)

1. Copies of all tenders in 1897 for the supply of drugs to the North-west Mounted Police at Prince Albert and Battleford, and the name of the successful tenderer, and a copy of the contract.

2. Copies of all tenders for the supply of drugs to the Mounted Police at Prince Albert and Battleford, for the year 1898; the name of the successful tenderer, and a copy of the contract.—(Mr. Davin.)

Return showing: 1. The names of all persons who, having been in the employ of the Government in the North-west Territories, have ceased to be in that employ since June, 1896.

2. The date at which their services were dispensed with, and the reasons for their dismissals in each case.—(Mr. Davin.)

Copies of all complaints or charges made against Mr. J. T. Dagneau, postmaster of Robitaille, in the county of Bonaventure, Quebec; also, papers concerning the investigation into the charges and his dismissal from his office, including the report of the commissioner, Mr. Bolduc; also, any communications protesting against the manner in which the investigation was conducted.—(Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper.)

Copies of all correspondence, papers, telegrams, &c., in possession of the Government, or any member or official of the Government, in reference to closing the post office at St. Mary's Road East, in Prince Edward Island.—(Mr. Martin.)

Copies of all reports, papers and correspondence relating to the removal of postal mail clerks from their former places of residence in the province of Nova Scotia in 1897 and 1898.—(Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper.)

The PRIME MINISTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.05 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 26th April, 1898.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

OFFICIAL REPORT OF DEBATES.

Mr. CHOQUETTE moved that the second report of the committee appointed to super-

vise the official report of the debates be now concurred in. He said: In presenting this motion, I merely wish to call special attention to a recommendation contained in the report. Last session, Mr. Speaker, I had the honour of waiting on you, as a member of the sub-committee on debates, composed, I think, of Messrs. LaRivière and Somerville, and of pointing out the inadequacy of the accommodation furnished the "Hansard" reporters. I think that you, yourself, Mr. Speaker, went to see the place where they have to work, and agreed with us that they ought to have better quarters, and my impression is that at the time you promised to do your very best to obtain for them better accommodation, so that they might be in a better position to do their duties than they are at present. I do not know the reason why, but nothing was done, and we had a special meeting of the committee this session in order to press the matter once more upon you, Mr. Speaker, and the House. We recognize the inadequacy of the present accommodation. The whole staff, English and French, are in one small room, and consequently their work is done under extremely unsanitary and unsatisfactory conditions. This, of course, tends to interfere considerably with the accuracy of the work done. I beg, therefore, to call your special attention, Mr. Speaker, once more to this matter and to this report which deals with it.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. While I had the honour of being chairman of the Debates Committee in the past, this question came before us, and we did the best we could to secure better quarters for our official reporters. There are twenty-one men working in that room, set apart for them, which is a very small room indeed. It would be very small for half that number, and it is certainly extraordinary that, packed together as they are, they can give the correct reports they do. I had occasion to speak to your predecessor, Sir, with regard to this matter, and it was then proposed to give them the room above the present one, but that, I understand, has been since secured for other purposes. I hope, therefore, Mr. Speaker, that other quarters will be provided for our reporters, so that they may be in a better position to do their work and perhaps do it still better to the satisfaction of the House Because if, on certain occasions, we have to regret mistakes or inaccuracies, we cannot charge our reporters with being mainly at fault, for it is an impossibility for them to do their work properly in the quarters we have provided for them. I hope, with the authority you have, Mr. Speaker, you will see that better quarters are provided for these officials.

Motion agreed to.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 123) respecting the Dawson City Electric Company.—(Mr. McInnes.)

REPORT.

Report of the Civil Service Examiners for the year ended 31st December, 1897.—(The Prime Minister, Sir Wilfrid Laurier.)

INQUIRY FOR RETURN.

Mr. DAVIN. I wish to ask the Minister of Public Works when we may expect a return in regard to the Edmonton Bridge.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). It was sent to the Department of State, and may be here in a minute or two. It was sent yesterday, I may explain.

QU'APPELLE, LONG LAKE AND SASKATCHEWAN RAILWAY.

Mr. DAVIS (Saskatchewan). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I have something of great importance to the constituency I represent to bring before the House. To place myself in order I intend to conclude with a motion to adjourn the House. The subject I refer to is the manner in which the Prince Albert and Saskatchewan Railway Company are operating the road running between Regina and the town of Prince Albert, in the constituency I represent. I may say that within the last two months we have had only about three trains from Regina into the town of Prince Albert, and people are beginning to think that it is a rather serious matter if we cannot get more than that. Let me read one clause of the agreement between this company and the Government:

> That the company hereby bind and oblige themselves to complete the said railway to a point on the Saskatchewan River near Saskatoon by the first day of November, 1890, and to Prince Albert within two years after the completion of the railway to South Saskatchewan, as aforesaid, and carry by their regular trains for the Government for a period of twenty years, all mails, men, supplies and materials of every description and kind required for the public service from any point on the said projected railway to any other point thereon without delay, such carriage to be upon such requisition or instruction from the Government or from any officer thereof as shall hereafter from time to time be designated by the Government.

Now, under that contract they are supposed to run regular trains at least twice a week, and, for that, they receive $80,000 a year. I applied to the Canadian Pacific Railway on this subject and the vice-president told me they are operating the road, but they are getting nothing out of it but the actual railway expenses, and were not responsible. Now, about ten days ago a portion of the bridge at Saskatoon was washed away. They tell me by telegram that the Canadian Pacific Railway people say that it will take two or three weeks, perhaps a month, to repair that bridge.

I ask if there is any other portion of the Dominion where such a thing would be tolerated? If it were on the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway or on any road here in the east, the line would be open in forty-eight hours. I wish to read a telegram I have received from a prominent citizen of Prince Albert. It is dated 22nd April, 1898, and is as follows:—

Last report Saskatoon says train with workmen to repair bridge arrived Saskatoon, but workmen can do nothing until arrival of material, these to be brought from British Columbia. Now I ask for what company gets so much land for? I think to keep railroad in running order. It is proved bridge was rotten for years. No repairs made. If bridge kept in good state each year ice could not take it off. All people for the Klondike go over Edmonton and Vancouver routes.

(Sgd.) WITTEMAN.

Now, I have another telegram signed by the mayor and the president of the board of trade on behalf of that body. It is as follows:—

Railway company positively refuses to deliver freight and passengers to Prince Albert for six or eight weeks.

That is, they refuse for two months to deliver any passengers or freight.

Such delay altogether unnecessary. Would any other part of Dominion stand similar treatment? On main line traffic would be running within forty-eight hours. Immediate action will alone save money already expended in advertising district. Government urged to intervene and compel company to carry through all passengers and freight offering. Government must come to relief of people. Wire answer.

(Sgd.) D. C. McLENNAN,
Pres., Board of Trade.
(Sgd.) F. C. BAKER,
Mayor.

Now, as I said, I applied to the Canadian Pacific Railway, and they claimed that they were not responsible. But some one is responsible, and I should like to know who it is. This company receives 6,200 acres of land a mile for the construction of this road between Regina and Prince Albert. They also receive $80,000 for operating the road. And besides all this, they were given about the half the town site of Prince Albert for coming into the town, and this they insisted upon before they would come in. When we apply to them, they send us to the Canadian Pacific Railway, and when we apply to the Canadian Pacific Railway they send us to this company. I think it is time something was done to find out who is responsible. Now this company got 6,280 acres a mile for constructing this road. The road is 252 miles long, it cost about two millions and a half to build it, and it is bonded for $3,800,000. We find, therefore, after figuring the thing up, that after paying for the construction of the road, and taking out the amount of the bonds and the cost of the road, $2,539,600, the balance left to the contractors is $1,269,540, which evidently went into the pockets of the contractors. Now, it is very evident that if a man was to build a house costing him $1,000, and if he were to mortgage that house for $2,000, he would not be likely to keep it in repair. That is just the case with this road. They have built this road, and they have mortgaged it for double what it is worth, and now they fail to keep it in repair. I should like to find out whether the Government have not some means in their power by which they can, after giving away all these public lands, compel this company to keep the road in repair. The road is a disgrace, the track is sunk into the mud. They have only got enough section men on it to look after about 50 miles. The stations are going to rack, the bridge is rotten, and has not been repaired since it was built, six or seven years ago. I believe the statement I have made here before about the bonded indebtedness by this road, and the amount it cost, was contradicted by the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler) in reply to a question I put to him when he was making a speech in this House. He said the road was not bonded for that amount; he also said this matter had been brought up several times and he was now going to contradict it. He said also that Mr. Willison, editor of the Toronto "Globe," had published a pamphlet on the railways of Canada, in which he had mentioned something about the manner in which this company had been formed, and this road had been built. He stated that when he saw Mr. Willison about his statement in this pamphlet, Mr. Willison took it back, and apologized for it. Well, if Mr. Willison took that back and apologized for it, I have failed ever to see the apology in print. I think if Mr. Willison ever made such an apology, he would have published it in the "Globe." But, Mr. Speaker, there was another gentleman who published something in connection with this company, and although it was scattered broadcast over Canada, I do not know that up to this date the hon. member for West Toronto ever did anything to contradict it. The letter I refer to, I now have in my hand, it was written to the "Globe" three years ago by Mr. Hugh Sutherland, of Winnipeg, a gentleman who is connected with the Hudson Bay Railway Company. This letter was written in answer to a letter of the hon. member for West Toronto in the "Globe," about Mr. Sutherland. It appears Mr. Sutherland was trying to float some bonds in connection with the Hudson's Bay Railway, and the member for West Toronto came out with a letter in the "Globe," trying to throw cold water on it. That brought out this letter from Mr. Sutherland which, up to the present time, has never been contradicted. The letter is somewhat long, but still I am going to read it:

In the first place, the company was conceived in deception.

He is speaking now of the Qu'Appelle, Saskatchewan and Long Lake Railway—

It professed to be an independent company, whereas in truth it was a mere Canadian Pacific snare to catch the guileless investor. Look at the names of the directors: H. C. Hammond, partner of Mr. Osler, president; E. B. Osler, director of the C.P.R.; Senator McInnis, director of the C.P.R.; R. B. Angus, director of the C.P.R.; J. G. Ogden, comptroller of the C.P.R.; W. Sutherland Taylor, treasurer of the C.P.R.; and Charles Drinkwater, secretary of the C.P.R. This company issued a prospectus through Morton, Rose & Co., of London, on July 18, 1889, asking the public to subscribe for $3,809,140 of its bonds at 6 per cent. The following misleading paragraph appears in the prospectus:—

"On February 1, 1896, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company will, on giving six months' notice, have the power of calling in and paying off the above bonds at 110."

The "Canadian Gazette," edited by Mr. Thomas Skinner, a London director of the Canadian Pacific Railway, a supposed authority on Canadian investments, published the prospectus, with the following editorial note (see page 376): "It is taken for granted that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company will, at the end of six years, exercise its power to absorb the road, and in that case the payment of the bonds at 110 would, as a matter of course, follow."

Mark you, 6 per cent at par, redeemable by the C. P. R. in six years at 110, took the investing public by storm. The bonds were readily sold, and were soon quoted on the London market at an advanced price. The prospectus also stated that the company had obtained from the Government a cash subsidy of $80,000 a year for twenty years, and a land grant of 1,400,000 acres, to show that, independent of the railway, the company possessed large substantial assets.

It leaked out some time afterwards that the C. P. R. did not intend to redeem the bonds at 110, and therefore "would not exercise its power to absorb the road"; that the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Company had disposed of its land grant to another company, represented by Mr. Osler, under another corporate name; that, in fact, the bondholders had nothing to fall back upon for their investment of $15,000 a mile but the road itself, without rolling stock or terminals; that the actual cost of constructing the road was about $1,500,000 less than the bondholders had advanced upon it, and down went the bonds on the London market from 110 to 30.

The C. P. R.'s Intention.

Does the Canadian Pacific Railway now intend, or did it ever intend, to "exercise its power to absorb the bonds at 110"? It has a lease of the road from this generous Qu'Appelle Railway Company for six years without rental. If it never intended to redeem at 110, it could afford to run the road in such a manner, for that period, that net earnings would be nil. As a matter of fact, the service was so bad and rates so high that in some cases the people of Prince Albert have had to resort to the old-time "ox cart" method of transportation. The settlement of the Prince Albert district has been seriously retarded in consequence, and the present settlers disheartened. The fact is, this roundabout road should never have been built, but instead thereof sufficient aid should have been given the Manitoba North-western Railway to extend its line to Prince Albert. This, however, would not have suited the "stock-jobbing" propensities of Mr. Osler and his associates. No, the idea appears to be to wreck the Qu'Appelle Railway at the end of the six years' lease by ceasing operation, followed, in all probability, by default in payment of interest on the bonds, and the difference between "exercising its power to absorb the road at 110" and what the road might bring under the hammer, which would probably be 10 minus the 100. For fear it may be said that there is no authority for the assumption that it is proposed to cease operation of the road next year, I may say that I am credibly informed that the Government has already received such an intimation, and I believe it is the first case of the kind on record in Canada. In view of the foregoing, is it not refreshing to listen to the virtuous indignation of Mr. Osler, when he says:—"I say without hesitation that I consider the result of the operation of this road for the last five or six years should of itself be a sufficient reason why the Government should make no such grant to the Hudson's Bay Railway Company."

Conception of the Company.

I have said that the company was conceived in deception. I say further, that it was born in sin, and has successfully carried out the object of its being. I ask any business man to read from the company's prospectus the clause I have quoted, accompanied by the editorial note of Mr. Skinner, the financial director of the C. P. R. in London, and say if it is not a deception and a snare to catch the unwary investor. If read in the light of subsequent events there can be no doubt about it. All the directors were ear-marked by the C. P. R Everything was made to appear that the scheme was part and parcel of the C. P. R., because the credit of the C. P. R. stood high in London at that time.

A correct statement of accounts between Mr. Osler and his associates on the one side, and the Government and the bondholders on the other side, showing net profits on the whole transaction, including "construction account" and other expert methods of book-keeping so well known to these gentlemen, would be interesting to the public, but as this would be impossible at the present time, I will venture an approximate statement, which I think will be found to be fairly within the mark.

* * * * * *

I have little doubt but Mr. Osler can manipulate the land account so as to apparently disprove any statement regarding it I may make. Nothing but a rigorous inquiry would reveal the true inwardness of the whole transaction. One thing is certain, however, all land grants, as well as subsidies, are given by Parliament "to aid in the construction of the railway," and, if they are diverted for private speculation, it is a fraud upon the country. But with or without the land grant, I have shown that out of the sale of the bonds alone $1,314,683 or thereabouts has been "knocked down" by somebody, and, if so, it is a fraud upon the British investor. No wonder certain individuals went to the "front rank of provincial capitalists" with a bound. This is not all.

HUGH SUTHERLAND.

Winnipeg, August 10.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that letter was published in the Toronto "Globe," that paper is circulated all over the Dominion of Canada,

and it was impossible for that letter to appear without the hon. member for West Toronto having noticed it; and if he took the pains to go to Mr. Willison and get an apology from Mr. Willison, which never appeared in the "Globe," I do not understand why he did not take some action to compel the writer of this letter to take his statement back. Strong statements are made in this letter that, up to the present time, have never been contradicted by the hon. member for West Toronto.

Mr. CLARKE Will the hon. gentleman allow me to interrupt him for a moment? I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if he gave any information to my hon. friend and colleague (Mr. Osler) that he intended to bring this matter up in the House this afternoon, so that he might be present and hear what the hon. gentleman had to say?

Mr. DAVIS. I did not give him any intimation at all. I have received telegrams from the mayor and other parties of the town in which I live, asking me to bring this matter before the House, and I am going to do so. The hon. member for West Toronto should be in his place in this House. When he brought this matter up before the House, he did not consult me or notify me. Now, I say here are some strong statements directed against the member for West Toronto in this letter, and if they are not true, he should have taken some means of contradicting them. If a letter of that kind was published about myself or any other hon. gentleman, we would have taken steps to contradict it. I may say that Mr. Sutherland, towards the end of his letter says: This is not all, you will hear from me again. Evidently the hon. member for West Toronto is afraid of hearing from Mr. Sutherland again. Now, Mr. Speaker, the people in my district have come to the conclusion there is a lot of truth in this letter. We hoped that this road when it was incorporated would be operated in the interest of the district. But we were mistaken. We have the fact that the railway has not been operated in the manner in which it should have been operated. The freight rates are so high that produce and stock can scarcely be sent over it. The passenger rate, 5 cents per mile, a prohibitory rate, has the effect of preventing people coming into the town. Everything goes to show that the road has been operated in such a way that the bonds would be down to about the lowest possible point within a year or two, especially unless they repair the bridges. I wish especially to point out that we have coming into the district of Saskatchewan at the present time between 900 and 1,000 immigrants; but they will have to go by some other routes and to some other district. We are losing to our district this large amount of producers on account of the way in which the railway is operated, and it is time some action was taken by the Government to make them do what is right in the matter. If the Government has power to force the road to adopt proper measures, they should do so. The Opposition has spoken a lot about the large land grant given by this Government for the construction of a tramway or of a narrow-gauge road. But one million and a half acres of the best and most fertile lands in the district of Saskatchewan were given to this company as a bonus for the purpose of building this railway, which is at the present time nothing but a mud road, mud in places being over the rails. Apparently measures were not taken by the late Dominion Government to compel the company to properly operate the road in return for the lands and money they had. Under present conditions there should not be given Government aid to the extent of $80,000 a year, and if possible their land grant should be cancelled. I call the attention of the Minister of Railways to these facts, and I hope he will take the necessary action.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). If the hon. member will furnish me with the papers and telegrams and correspondence he has received, I shall be very glad to look into the matter and give it my best attention.

Motion to adjourn negatived.

ALIEN LABOUR LAW.

Mr. CLARKE. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I should like to ask the Solicitor General if any officer has been appointed for the city or district of Toronto to enforce the Alien Labour Law there?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). It is impossible to answer that question off-hand, but I shall be prepared to answer it to-morrow afternoon.

THE FRANCHISE BILL.

The House again resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 16) to repeal the Electoral Franchise Act and to further amend the Dominion Elections Act.

(In the Committee.)

On subsection "a" of paragraph 8,

Mr. BENNETT. This clause was to be amended so as to prevent the possibility of officials prescribed by Act of the local legislature voting at Dominion elections.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). Perhaps the hon. member will allow the clause to pass in its present condition, and immediately afterwards I will insert a section on the line that I will communicate to the House.

Mr. McINERNEY. It was to this subsection the leader of the Opposition spoke the

other evening in proposing an amendment, and in his absence I propose the amendment. He moved it as an amendment to subsection "c," but afterwards he thought it would apply more directly to subsection "a." I, therefore, move as follows :—

Provided if in any electoral district a dispute shall arise as to the qualification of any person to vote therein, an appeal shall lie to the county court judge having jurisdiction in that electoral district, and in provinces where there is no county court judges, then to the superior court having jurisdiction in that electoral district.

I do not intend to offer any remarks on this amendment, because it was very fully dealt with by the leader of the Opposition the other evening.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I do not think we can adopt the amendment in its present form. The object of this amendment, as I take it, is to have a revision by a county court judge or a superior court judge, as the case may be, for the electoral district. Hon. members from Quebec and Ontario will realize how illogical it would be to adopt this amendment, because in Ontario the electoral list is revised by the county court judge and in the province of Quebec by a superior court judge. The object of the appeal therefore is to give the same judges on a dispute arising the right to give a further decision. I do not think we can adopt any such amendment as that proposed. In the province of Ontario the lists are made out by the revisers, and then they are revised by the county court judge who finally settles the list. It would be illogical in the extreme to have an appeal over to the same judge who finally revises the list, in the case of a dispute under this subsection.

Mr. MILLS. Why not have the amendment apply to these provinces that have not that appeal to the county court judges ?

Mr. FOSTER. I was about to make that suggestion. Will the Solicitor General say whether or not the Government will provide for an appeal in cases where the lists are not revised by a county court judge or superior court judge ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. No.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, the technical objection raised by the Solicitor General having been removed, it does not follow apparently that he will admit the principle.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. There is another objection, and that is that there is no machinery provided for the appeal. Take the case of the maritime provinces, where the final appeal is to the sheriff. There, I do not see why we should substitute new machinery for the machinery which in New Brunswick, I am informed, has been in existence since 1854, and to which there never has been any objection made. In Manitoba the revising officers are county court judges as far as it is possible to get them, but there being only five county court judges revising barristers have to be appointed in some instances. So far as Quebec and Ontario are concerned, this amendment is inapplicable.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The Solicitor General says that even if the amendment were limited to the provinces where no appeal exists to a county court judge, still the amendment is inoperative because the Bill does not provide the necessary machinery for an appeal. That is an objection which can be very readily got over later on in the Bill. Am I right in supposing that even if this objection were removed, the Solicitor General would still insist that in Nova Scotia or New Brunswick we must have the machinery as it exists, and leave it with the decision of the sheriff, who is a creature of the local government ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. My hon. friend (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) has rightly understood the position I take. This appeal can only be effective in so far as New Brunswick and Nova Scotia are concerned, and in my opinion no reason has been given to justify us in interfering with the machinery existing in these two provinces. I have not heard of any serious grievance being explained to the committee which would justify us in adopting this innovation. I may be inaccurate, but my information is that the procedure now adopted in the maritime provinces, especially in New Brunswick, so far as the electoral lists are concerned, is the same procedure which has been in force without objection since 1854.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I cannot speak with any confidence as to the other maritime provinces, but in the case of New Brunswick I must say that I am quite surprised to hear the views which have been expressed this afternoon, as well as the other evening, with regard to the unsatisfactory condition of the law in that province. I stated the other night, and I repeat it, that I have yet to hear any complaint whatever with regard to the operation of the New Brunswick law. As my hon. friend the Solicitor General has very correctly said, the present system operating in New Brunswick was first introduced in 1855, and when that Act was passed it made no provision for the revision of the lists as made up by the revisers in the different parishes of the province. From that time down to the present there never has been a proposal in the legislature that we should constitute any tribunal to revise the work done by the revisers, except in this one particular : that after the lists are made up by the revisers in the various parishes they are sent in to the county secretary, and before the 1st of January in each year the law imposes upon the sheriff the duty of going over the lists which have been

filed by the various revisers; not for the purpose of striking off or adding names, but for the purpose of ascertaining sumply who are the non-resident electors. The sheriff is then authorized to select these names and to put them on an independent non-resident list, upon which the non-resident electors vote. These are required by law to vote at the shire town ordinarily, but in one or two counties there are exceptional provisions. The duty of the sheriff is to prepare the list of non-resident electors, and where the name of a non-resident appears in more than one of the parish lists, he leaves off the name from the other parish lists. He leaves the name off except as to the list he is making up for election purposes, the one general non-resident list. The sheriff's other duty is to ascertain if there are any persons whose names are on more than one list, as it very often happens that persons are qualified by property to have their names on the list of different parishes in the county. He strikes off the name of any such elector except from the list of the parish where that elector is a resident. The sheriff has no jurisdiction—as has been suggested by the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper)—to make a general revision of the list. No general revision of the reviser's list is made and there never has been any such general revision made, and I am glad to be able to say, more than that, I am proud to be able to say, that in the province of New Brunswick the duties which have been placed upon the revisers in the various parishes have been so well discharged, and the duties devolving upon the sheriffs in this matter of selecting the non-resident names have been so well discharged, that I have never yet heard one syllable of complaint against the way in which these duties have been performed. Of course, it will happen that now and then, through mistake, a name has been left off by the parish reviser, but it has never been attributed to any malicious or wilful purpose, or through any political prejudice, and it has always been acknowledged to be the result of accident. Therefore, it is a matter of congratulation to us in New Brunswick that we have never needed all this machinery of revision; and if we had needed it, there is no doubt that long ago, on the various occasions since 1855, when the electoral law came up for amendment, there would have been a movement in the legislature for something of the kind. But no such suggestion was ever made; and I take this opportunity of again expressing my surprise that the hon. member for Kent (Mr. McInerney), who must have known how satisfactory the law in these particulars has worked, and how free from complaint it has been, should have imagined that there was something open to question in the amendment which my hon. friend the Solicitor General has moved. I want to say further that we have in New Brunswick the best guarantee that you can have that the lists will be well revised. They are revised as a general rule by the councillors of the various parishes. The name of a person outside of the council board may be added; but ordinarily the councillors of the different parishes are the revisers, and their disposition naturally is to put on the list all the names that are entitled to go on. They are not elected upon any political basis; they are not elected because they belong to this political party or that; but as a general rule they are chosen quite irrespective of their political leanings. So that they have no impulse to make other than a full and proper revision of the lists for elections for the provincial House. On the whole, I do not see that we could better the conditions that exist in the province of New Brunswick by making any provision for a further revision of the lists.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I hope I did not understand the Solicitor General to say that this Government is supported by its followers in the House upon a proposition not to allow a revision of the lists by the county judges on appeal from the revisers, as he has termed them. I confess that I never expected to hear such a proposition from a Liberal Government, more especially after having become acquainted with all the strong epithets and all the tirade of attack that was made upon revising barristers in the old days of the present Franchise Act. If I may be allowed freely to express my opinion as to the course of the Government, I may say that I do not believe that the Solicitor General and his colleagues are supported by hon. gentlemen opposite who usually support them, in making such an extraordinary proposition as this. We have in Canada a genuine respect for the members of the bench, whether in the county court or in the superior court. It is an unwritten part of the Canadian constitution, strongly ingrained in the feelings of every Canadian elector, whether of one party or another, that in this matter of the creation of the electoral lists there should be an appeal to a man who in every county is held to be above party. I must express my surprise again that such a proposition comes from a Liberal Government, and that it is supported by hon. gentlemen who in other days made a very vigorous fight upon this very question of the franchise. What has been the admission made by the Solicitor General this afternoon? The admission that there was no machinery under the provincial Acts in some cases for an appeal to the county court or district court judge, is to my mind an admission that this whole Bill is weak from beginning to end; and it only shows the difficulties into which these hon. gentlemen have got by adopting this strange medley of the various provincial franchises, instead of one uniform franchise under one uniform system for the whole Dominion. Suppose there

is no machinery ; surely it is extremely easy, as has been suggested by the hon. member fo Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper), to make this machinery in future clauses of the Bill. For my part, I cannot see on what principle hon. gentlemen opposite are acting in refusing the suggestion for an appeal to the county judge, or for some sort of judicial revision. Is it because they fear unfairness on the part of the county judge ? There is not an hon. gentleman on the other side of the House who says he fears any such thing. Is it because of the great expense connected with any such revision ? The cost would be exceedingly small. Then, a very large portion of the people of this country have not that abundant and self-satisfied faith in the sheriffs of New Brunswick or of any other province, who happen to be appointed by a partisan Administration for partisan acts ; and, if only to satisfy pretty nearly half—we think a good deal more than half just now—of the people of Canada, the hon. gentleman in charge of this Bill should accede to the request of gentlemen on this side of the House, to have an appeal to a county court judge or a high court judge, as the case may be. So far as I am concerned, I have no hesitation in saying that I believe that party workers should be rewarded—that they should be given those plums which are in the hands of their party to bestow. I have no objection to that whatever ; I like to see them get their reward. In the province of Ontario this does not affect us so much as it does the people in other provinces. But in the province of Ontario we have an illustration of what I fear may also exist in other provinces. The Liberal Government of Ontario rewards its friends with offices. I have no objection to that. Among the offices they usually bestow are the shrievalties of the various counties of Ontario, and I feel that I can appeal to the hon. gentlemen who come from the province of Ontario when I say that the sheriffs of that province, outside of the duties which they perform in connection with the law courts, are among the strongest partisans in the province ; and if that is the case in the province of Ontario, I see no reason why it should not also be the case in the province of New Brunswick. And, Sir, has it come to this in this Parliament, that a Liberal Government, who have always pretended when in Opposition to fight for the rights and liberties of the people on every occasion, shall deny that fundamental right of Canadians, of an appeal in this matter to the courts of the country, in the very first Franchise Act which they have submitted to the House of Commons of Canada ? I hope that the Solicitor Genera will see that a change is made. Knowing as he does, how these things are conducted in the various provinces, he must believe that he is asking Parliament to adopt an Act which is not in accordance with the true sentiment of the people, upon either side of politics, in the various constituencies of this country. I have discussed this measure with many Liberals and Conservatives in the various parts of Ontario, and I say to the honour of the Liberals in the country that I have not yet heard one outside of this Parliament who did not say that it was the duty of the Government to grant, in every case, an appeal to a county court judge, in order that, as far as possible, every class of citizens might be satisfied as regards the fairness and justice of the lists.

Mr. MILLS. I think, with the hon. gentleman who has just spoken (Mr. Montague), that we should have an appeal to some judicial authority other than a man of political extraction. The arguments adduced against such an appeal are simply that the procedure in the maritime provinces has been of long standing and has worked well. In the province of New Brunswick, the procedure may have been of long standing—since 1854, some hon. gentlemen have said—but in Nova Scotia it has only existed since 1889, and has been the cause of a great many complaints. The appeal in Nova Scotia is to the sheriffs. When those sheriffs were appointed, the Attorney General of Nova Scotia spoke of them in a very significant manner, as eighteen good men and true. So significant was his manner, that it became a scandal and has been considered such from the day he uttered those words. Eighteen good men and true—what does that expression mean, spoken in the significant manner in which it was, by the Attorney General of Nova Scotia when making the appointments. The appeals are to those eighteen good men and true. The revisions, in the majority of cases, in Nova Scotia, under the Dominion Franchise Act, were made by the county court judges, and no complaints have been heard with regard to those gentlemen. There is not a man in this House or out of it who will dare say that there has been any complaint regarding the decisions of the county court judges under the Dominion Franchise Act.

In order to show the House that I spoke from the book, I did refer to some of the complaints concerning the appeals to the sheriffs, the other day, and I have here some more of these complaints. I have here the solemn declarations of respectable gentlemen in the county of Annapolis, which I shall read to the House :

Canada,
Province of Nova Scotia,
County of Annapolis.

I, Arthur T. Morse, of West Paradise, in the county of Annapolis and province of Nova Scotia, farmer, do solemnly declare as follows :—

1. I am an elector of the county of Annapolis and reside in the said county.

2. I say that T. Troop Messenger is a reviser for revisal section No. 6 in the county of Annapolis, which includes ward No. 11, appointed by the municipal council of the county of Annapolis.

3. By the assessment made up in pursuance of the statute in that behalf in the autumn of the year A. D. 1897, a number of persons were assessed for more than enough to entitle them to be on the list of voters qualified to vote at a local election for the province of Nova Scotia, and their names appeared on the assessment roll. All of these persons were well known to be supporters of the Liberal-Conservative party. The said T. Troop Messenger, in making up the revisal list to be posted pursuant to the statute, left the names of all said persons off the said list. I prepared a notice of application to add the names of said persons and the names of certain other persons duly qualified to vote, though their names did not appear in the assessment roll; the number of names in my said notice was fourteen. On the 18th day of February, 1898, I handed the said notice of application to one Wilfrid Hopkins to hand to the said T. Troop Messenger, and he did so hand it to him on the morning of the 19th of February, A. D. 1898, as I verily believe. The said Hopkins at the revisers' court, holden on the 5th day of March, A. D. 1898, swore that he handed the said notice of application to the said T. Troop Messenger on the morning of the said 19th day of February, A. D. 1898. At the said revisers' court the fact that the persons handed in said application were qualified to vote was not disputed. The revisal board for said revisal section, which included said board No. 11, consists of two other members besides the said T. Troop Messenger, to wit: John Hoyt and Thomas Devaney. The court holden on the said 5th day of March, A. D. 1898 was adjourned to the 12th day of March, A. D. 1898. On said 12th day of March, the revisers' court was again opened pursuant to the said adjournment, when only two of said revisers, to wit, the said Hoyt and Devaney, attended, who then upon the sworn evidence of Hopkins, decided that the said notice of application to add the said names had been handed to the said T. Troop Messenger pursuant to the statute, and that the said names should be added, and gave me the said list of names so to be added, with instructions to hand the same to the said T. Troop Messenger, to be by him put on the said original voters' list, which was in his possession. I took the list containing the names so to be added to the said T. Troop Messenger, and told him that the two revisers had decided to add these names, and asked me to hand them in to him so that he might put them on the voters' list. He replied that he would not do it, and that the said Hoyt and Devaney might go to hell. Application was made by me to the sheriff at his court, holden on the 21st day of March, A. D. 1898, to add the said names, and the said sheriff refused to do so on the ground that they had not been posted by the revisers.

4. The names of Albert McCormick and Edward Bauchman were on the electoral list for ward No. 11 for the previous year, and they had not in any way since become disqualified, but were not posted by the said revisers. They were and are electors of said ward No. 11. The said Messenger resides in said ward No. 11, and the other revisers reside in other wards of the said revisal section. For a number of years it has been the custom for the reviser who resides in a ward to post the list for that ward, and in accordance with this custom the duty of posting the list for ward No. 11 was left to the said Messenger. The said Bauchman and McCormick are both well known to be supporters of the Liberal-Conservative party. And I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing the same to be true, and by virtue of the Act respecting Extra-judicial Oaths.

(Sgd.) ARTHUR T. MORSE.

Signed and declared to before me by the said Arthur T. Morse at Bridgetown, in the county of Annapolis, this 20th day of April, A.D. 1898.

JAMES J. RITCHIE,
A Notary Public
in and for the province of Nova Scotia.

Canada,
Province of Nova Scotia,
County of Annapolis.

I, Frank L. Milner, of Bridgetown, in the county of Annapolis, barrister-at-law, do solemnly declare as follows:—

1. I am an elector of the county of Annapolis and reside in the said county.

2. Wallace Young, of Upper Granville, in the said county of Annapolis, was a reviser of the local electoral lists for ward No. 4 in the said county of Annapolis during the year one thousand eight hundred and ninety-seven, and was duly appointed as such reviser by the municipal council of the municipality of the said county of Annapolis.

3. The names of Wallace Fowler, William Howse and J. P. Cunningham, all of Bridgetown aforesaid, appeared on the list of qualified electors of said ward No. 4 that was posted as a preliminary list in accordance with the requirements of section 22 of chapter 1 of the Acts of the legislature of Nova Scotia passed in the year one thousand eight hundred and eighty-nine, known as the Nova Scotia Franchise Act of 1889.

I am advised and verily believe that no notice in writing or at all was ever given to have either of the aforesaid names struck off the said list, and when the revisers posted a list of names to be struck off the list in said ward No. 4, in accordance with section 23 of the said Act, the said names of the said Wallace Fowler, William Howse and J. P. Cunningham were not on the said list of names to be struck off.

When the said revisers met to correct the said list for ward No. 4 aforesaid, in accordance with section 25 of the said Act, the said names of Wallace Fowler, William Howse and J. P. Cunningham were not before the said revisers to be adjudicated upon respecting their right to be struck off the said list, nor was any evidence offered in relation to the qualification or disqualification of the said Wallace Fowler, William Howse or J. P. Cunningham, or either of them, and their names were not struck off the said list in court, but afterwards the said Wallace Young prepared a copy, or pretended copy, of the said list for said ward No. 4, to be handed to the clerk of the said municipality, as required by section 25 of the said Act, and on the day that the said list was handed to the said clerk I attended at the office of the said clerk and inspected the said pretended copy of the said list as corrected by the revisers, and discovered that the names of the said Wallace Fowler, William Howse and J. P. Cunningham were omitted from the said list. I at once requested that the said names should be restored to the said list, but the said Wallace Young refused to add them, and said: "There are a lot more of them damned Tories that have got to come off."

I caused an appeal to be taken to the sheriff's court, to have the said names restored, and attended before the court to have the said names restored but the sheriff refused to restore the

said names, because the said names had not been adjudicated upon by the revisers in open court, and, therefore, were not the subject of appeal. And the said Wallace Fowler, William Howse and J. P. Cunningham were not on the list of electors for the year 1897 in any part of the county of Annapolis. I complained to the municipal councillor for said ward No. 4 concerning the aforesaid conduct of the said Wallace Young, but the said Wallace Young was again appointed reviser of the said ward No. 4 by said municipal council for the present year.

The said Wallace Young is a well-known supporter of the Liberals, and the said Wallace Fowler, William Howse and J. P. Cunningham are well-known supporters of the Liberal-Conservatives.

The said Wallace Young is, as I am informed, and verily believe, a man of no property of any considerable value. And I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing it to be true, and knowing that it is of the same force and effect as if made under oath and by virtue of the Canada Evidence Act, 1893.

(Sgd.) F. L. MILNER.

Declared before me at Bridgetown, in the said county of Annapolis, this 22nd day of April, A. D. 1898.

(Sgd.) HARRY RUGGLES,
A Notary Public
in and for the province of Nova Scotia.

Now, it seems to be a merit in the eyes of some people to have these transactions performed. There was the case of Daniel J. Riordan, which I cited to the House the other day, a notorious matter that occurred in the county of Annapolis. Mr. Riordan was not only reappointed reviser of that ward, but he has been honoured by the Postmaster General with the appointment of postmaster in the county of Annapolis, and appointed although in order to appoint him it was necessary to dismiss two very respectable men. One of these is a well known gentleman, an ex-warden of the county, Mr. J. H. Thorne, and the other a very worthy sea captain, Capt. Covert. They found that they had no charges to bring against these men, but to get this man Riordan appointed, they abolished two offices and made a new one and appointed him postmaster of that. So they reward these men instead of punishing them. And these men are nothing more or less than political partisans, regular ward heelers who will do almost anything that their political party will ask them to do, and they are kept in office for that purpose and for that purpose alone. Now, the Nova Scotia Franchise Act is not an Act that can be decided upon by a layman. It requires the adjudication of a judge, more even than the old Dominion Franchise Act of 1885. There is no more intricate law of the kind in the Dominion of Canada than the Franchise Act of Nova Scotia, a great many law points arising under it. These sheriffs are not capable of performing these duties, they are not men learned in the law, they are eighteen good men and true who will do what they think is right, and they can be made to think a good many things are right, particularly if a partisan lawyer shows them some excuse for viewing it in that way. Now, the appointment of a judge or a legal man to hear these appeals—let him be a Liberal if you like, of course he will be a Liberal—will give us at least the satisfaction of knowing that we have a man of knowledge, a man of responsibility who will decide these matters. I have recited three very flagrant cases. There is not a ward in Annapolis county from which I could not give other just such cases as I have cited, because they make it a point to act in this way. There are twenty-eight wards, polling districts, in Annapolis county. If the Liberals can get the names of five or six good solid Conservatives off the list in each—and here we have fourteen in one case and five in another—why, there is a victory at once. And this is done by whom? Not by the electorate, not by the free and independent votes of the electors. But by these eighteen good men and true, and by these partisan revisers. Now, if hon. gentlemen opposite wish this thing to go on, why, let them have it so. We shall do our best to fight these revisers; we will see that every court is attended properly, there is not the slightest doubt about that, and we will see that, so far as we can do it, the sheriffs shall do their duty. But the Liberals of this House are not putting up the safeguards that they might against fraud. I have often heard it said that the proud boast of the Liberals is that they will guard against fraud and corruption as much as they can. But, if they go on with this Bill as it is, they are throwing down the guards against fraud and opening the gates and inviting fraud to enter. Now, they say that there is no complaint. Why, it has been a scandal in Nova Scotia for years that the revisers' lists have to be legalized year after year. I have looked into this matter thoroughly, and will give you the years in which a special Act of this kind has had to be passed. That Act, as a rule, is entitled as follows:—

An Act to legalize jury lists and panels, assessment rolls and revisers' lists for the present year.

This goes on the Statute-book year after year, so many times in the province of Nova Scotia that it has become a burning scandal, and it is simply because these revisers do not do their duty properly and place a proper list before the people. The Act usually declares that, notwithstanding any omission, errors or irregularities in any such rolls or lists or in any proceedings in connection therewith, these shall be legal lists, and so on. So, in order to get legal lists in the province of Nova Scotia they have to enact a special law in a great many cases. These special Acts were passed in the years 1875, 1876, 1877, 1878, 1879, 1880, 1881, 1883, 1884, 1885, 1886, 1887.

We had to have these special Acts passed in order to make legal the electoral

lists in the province of Nova Scotia. Now, if this House is going to take such a retrograde step as to adopt machinery like that, I think the Liberals will thereby place another nail in their coffin.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I do not rise to controvert anything said by the last two speakers, but in this discussion I am sorry to have noticed that reference is made to the sheriffs of New Brunswick, not of a complimentary character. They have been charged with being partial, with being partisans. Now, I will not give my own testimony to controvert that, because I can give stronger testimony on that point. I will only say that the charge of partisanship against the sheriffs of New Brunswick is utterly unfounded; and I think it my duty to rise here and say so as a matter of justice to that class of gentlemen.

Mr. McINERNEY. Nobody ever made a charge against the sheriffs. The hon. gentleman was not here, and therefore I think it is right that I should correct him in that respect. What we charged was that dangerous powers were being placed in the hands of the sheriffs of New Brunswick.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Well, I do not rise to answer anything that was said when I was not here; I rise to answer something that was said when I was in my place, not by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat. The Minister of Railways and Canals undertook to explain, and did explain very satisfactorily and clearly, the jurisdiction of the sheriff in connection with these lists, showing that he has no power to add to or strike from these lists; he simply has to classify the list and to say who are and who are not resident voters. Then an hon. gentleman near me wanted to know whether this House was going to give this power to the sheriffs of New Brunswick, who were as strongly partisan as any class of men in the Dominion?

Mr. MONTAGUE. I may be allowed to explain. I am sure that my hon. friend misunderstood my statement altogether. What I did say was this: That my knowledge of the gentlemen who were appointed in the province of Ontario to shrievalties, led me to believe that in most cases they were appointed for their partisan services. I said, and I think hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House will bear me out in the statement. What I said was that if partisans were appointed in the province of Ontario, I supposed the sheriffs were appointed for their partisan services in other constituencies, and in other provinces of the Dominion. But as for New Brunswick, I do not know a single sheriff in that province, and consequently could not have made any such statement.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I stated in the outset that I had no objections personally to the remarks made by either of the speakers with regard to their own provinces. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat did not mean to make a personal reflection perhaps, but the reflection was made, and the explanation given by the hon. gentleman shows how easily he might have fallen into error. I want to say there is a difference, at any rate, by which this charge cannot apply to the province of New Brunswick, for many reasons. As I said before, I do not ask the House to accept my authority, but I ask the House to consider this fact: That during the whole time the late Conservative Government was in power, its policy was to send the writs for election to the Dominion Parliament, to the sheriffs all through our province. The Government was not compelled by law to send the writs to these gentlemen, and if they had been partisans or looked upon as such, I think we would not have done that. Now, with very few exceptions, during the regime of the Conservative Government, the writs were sent to the sheriffs as a matter of policy, on the ground that they were considered capable of conducting the elections honourably and fairly, and in every case, to my knowledge, they have done so. I rise simply to say this, in justice to those gentlemen.

Mr. McINERNEY. I do not intend just now to discuss the question with the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Costigan) as to the fairness or impartiality of the sheriffs. As to the hon. gentleman's argument that the late Government considered all the sheriffs of New Brunswick strictly straight and honest, why did the late Government not send the writs to all of them? If the Conservative Government thought the sheriffs of New Brunswick were not partisans, why did they not send the writ for the federal election to Sheriff McQueen of Westmoreland, if they considered him strictly impartial and non-partisan? I could name other instances also. I am glad the hon. gentleman did not refer to me when he said that a charge had been made against the sheriffs of New Brunswick on account of their partiality. I am sure I never made any such charge, and up to this date I have heard no man in this House make any such charge.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They were described as the minions of the Minister of Railways and Canals by the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. McDougall).

Mr. McINERNEY. I never heard that expression used. They are the nominees of the Government of New Brunswick, but that they are the minions of the Government of New Brunswick, I am not prepared to say. But what I wished particularly to protest against the other evening was the dangerous power that was being lodged in the hands of the sheriffs of the province of New Brunswick. It is perfectly beside the

point for the Minister of Railways and Canals to say that up to this date the sheriffs of New Brunswick have been strictly non-partisan. Let me point out that their duties in regard to the elections, have been in reference to the local elections alone, and in the local elections of New Brunswick there have been no party politics. But this Bill now proposes to make the sheriffs and their officers in the province of New Brunswick, partisans; it proposes to throw into the political arena of the Dominion the sheriffs of New Brunswick; it proposes to make these officials partisans in the strictest sense of the word. It would be all right enough to say that the sheriffs of New Brunswick were kept out of the arena of Dominion politics, but this Act proposes to make them partisans by throwing them into that arena; and it will not only make partisans of the sheriffs, but it will make partisans of the revisers in the different districts of the province. Hitherto they have not been partisans because their duties have not referred to the federal elections. But when hon. gentlemen tell me that the sheriffs in the province of New Brunswick have not very much power in making up the electoral lists, I simply quote the law against them. The sheriff in New Brunswick makes the electoral lists. That statement will not be controverted.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Certainly it will.

Mr. McINERNEY. Let me read the law to the hon. gentleman, section 37 of his own Act, 1889:

> The secretary shall, under his direction, make copy of each poll.

Make up the whole list, he makes up the electoral lists under the direction of the sheriff of the county. There is no doubt about that. The sheriff directs the secretary as to how the list should be made up, therefore the sheriff in that province is the final authority.

An hon. MEMBER. Is not that the list of the residents and non-residents? As you read it seems so to me.

Mr. McINERNEY. The sheriff makes up the list, and there is no appeal from the list so prepared.

> He shall also make an alphabetical list of the electors of the district. If it appears that a registered elector of any division is returned as qualified to vote in any other polling subdivision his name shall only be inserted in the list of poll where he resides.

This is the law in New Brunswick. There are more dangerous provisions in the New Brunswick law, because section 40 of the Act of 1889, the very Act of which the hon. Minister of Railways is proud, provides:

> If from any cause voters' lists for any polling subdivision is not made up and sent to the county secretary within the time mentioned in this Act, the county secretary makes up lists for each such polling subdivision, using the assessment list, putting on such lists names, &c. (if in doubt put on name rather than leave it off), and shall notify sheriff after list is completed, and the sheriff shall act as above.

This is the proceeding followed in case the lists are not sent in by the reviser to the county secretary's office in time, and that often happens. We have had in New Brunswick elections held under lists which, not being sent in time by the revisers, were prepared by the county secretary, who was able to put on the names he pleased and omit such names as he pleased, and there was no appeal. I desire to call the attention of the Minister of Railways to a late Act passed in New Brunswick.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Read section 29.

Mr. McINERNEY. I have not brought the Acts into the House, and I have simply excerpta from them. The hon. gentleman can read the section to which he refers. The power given to the county secretaries is a very dangerous one, especially to a man with political leanings, and I do not know any of those secretaries who has not very strong political leanings. I desire to call attention to the Act passed in New Brunswick in 1897.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I was not there then.

Mr. McINERNEY. I am aware of the fact, but the hon. gentleman's successors thought fit to give under that Act an appeal to county court judges in certain cases. It is provided:

> 1. The sheriff, if satisfied that names are omitted through a mistake in copying, or any other error or oversight, shall make application to county court judge for order authorizing him to add such names, whereupon the judge shall, after notice to assessors and revisers, and the judge may order such names added and sheriff shall thereupon add them.

Does not the hon. gentleman see that in the province of New Brunswick power has been given in some instances to appeal to a county court judge? But if the sheriff is satisfied that names have been omitted through oversight or omission in copying, he will make the application. No other person in a constituency in New Brunswick has the right to make the application but the sheriff: the candidate or an elector has no such right, but the sheriff possesses that power. The citation I have made, however, shows that progress has been made in that province, and that the opinion prevails that it is not right to have the final lists prepared by a county secretary. The Government in the Bill now under consideration propose to leave in the hands of these hitherto non-partisan officers certain powers—these officers who have not been engaged in federal affairs, but who are now to be

called upon to enter federal politics and be clothed with the powers of federal officials and it is proposed to make partisans of them, and not only of them but of the different revisers in the parishes of New Brunswick. In the past, when there were not any federal politics in our New Brunswick affairs, the charge could not be made that the sheriffs were actuated by partisan opinions, and their action in the past is the basis of the argument of hon. gentlemen opposite. Their position was due to the fact that up to this day it has not been deemed desirable that they should enter into federal politics. Now, however, it is proposed to give them partisan powers, and no doubt they will exercise them. It has been stated by the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Mills) that the preparation of the lists should be hedged around with all possible safeguards. The other evening I called the attention of the Solicitor General to the fact that this Bill would be unworkable in New Brunswick when 900 or 1,000 names were on the list for one subdivision, and it was only after that the Solicitor General stated that he had received an amendment from the hon. Minister of Railways dealing with that objection. After the amendment had been read I criticised it on the line of its giving such tremendous power to the sheriff. I did not say that the sheriffs in New Brunswick had hitherto acted in an improper manner. I had not charged them with any wrong-doing against the electors of New Brunswick, nor up to the present have I done so: but to make them final authorities in making up the lists, or to designate, as was done in the New Brunswick Act of 1889, the county secretary as final authority to make up the list is to place in the hands of these officials dangerous powers which may be exercised against the rights, liberties and franchises of the electors, and, therefore, I object to this clause on the strongest ground. With respect to my amendment, I admit there is considerable point in the objection raised by the Solicitor General, and I would ask to have this safeguard included only in the case of provinces where there is no judicial revision of the electoral lists provided for.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The Minister of Railways stated a moment ago that the member for Cape Breton (Sir Charles Tupper) had referred several times to the sheriffs of New Brunswick as minions, and to show that is not a true representation of the line that was adopted in the debate by that hon. member, who is not in his seat, I should like to call the attention of the committee to what he said. He said:

> A partisan officer, the sheriff, who is appointed by the Government of the day, is the person who in the province of New Brunswick has the power of nullifying the sacred trust of the franchise.

And again:

> I am not saying one word touching the character or standing of the sheriffs of New Brunswick.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). Except they were partisans.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Those sentences are not inconsistent. Only once did the hon. gentleman apply the term minion to them, but it was not in an offensive sense. In column 4236 of the Debates, he is reported to have said:

> Under this amendment which I have proposed, a judicial officer should stand between the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) and his minions and protect the honest voter.

That is one reference, and is the only reference I can find to account for the statement of the hon. Minister that the hon. gentleman referred over and over again to the sheriffs of New Brunswick as minions. But the hon. gentleman has not charged any particular sheriff with any wrong, nor did he say a word against the character of any one of them.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Now that everything said by way of reflection on the sheriffs of New Brunswick, and in regard to their action, has been withdrawn, not as gracefully as we would have wished, it seems to me now that all that remains to restore harmony and serenity is——

Mr. McDOUGALL. There was nothing taken back of what has been said; nothing has been taken back of what is on record in "Hansard."

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Well, perhaps, I do not understand the ordinary meaning of the English language, but I have taken it that hon. gentlemen opposite, both this afternoon and throughout this debate, have been contending that we should not take the lists of the province of New Brunswick, because they were prepared in an outrageous manner by partisan officers.

Mr. McDOUGALL. No; no such charge was made.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If that is not what these hon. gentlemen meant, then what is their ground of objection to the New Brunswick Act? My hon. friend (Mr. McDougall) is mistaken in saying that that charge has not been taken back. I have done those hon. gentleman the justice of saying that they have taken back that wrongful charge, and in the light of the remarks of the hon. member from Victoria (Mr. Costigan) I am justified in saying that.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Whoever made any such statement, or is the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) building up a beautiful little man of straw, that even he can knock down.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend (Mr. Montague) has not been as regular in his attendance on the House as would enable him to vouch for all that has been said, but I am in the hearing of hon. gentlemen on both sides when I say——

Mr. MONTAGUE. You stated the charge was made this afternoon.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I say it was undoubtedly continued this afternoon. The general drift of the whole discussion by gentlemen opposite has been that in the maritime provinces, and especially in New Brunswick, the voters' lists should not be taken for the Dominion elections, because they have been made out by partisans, particularly the sheriffs, who did not do their duty faithfully. If that is not what hon. gentlemen opposite have been arguing for some days, then we on this side do not understand what they mean. I am doing them the justice of saying that they have undoubtedly, although ungraciously, taken all that back, and now, if my hon. friend from Annapolis (Mr. Mills) would take back all the discreditable things he said about his province of Nova Scotia, we will be able to get along very harmoniously. My hon. friend (Mr. Mills) shakes his head. Then he is not willing to do as much justice to Nova Scotia as his friend from New Brunswick (Mr. Costigan) did to his province. I hope, Sir, that the members of this House will not fall into the mistake of supposing that the county of Annapolis is as disreputable a place as has been described by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mills) who represents it in this House.

Mr. MILLS. One of the finest counties in the Dominion.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If we were to assume that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mills) is correct in his description of the manner in which the public affairs of the county of Annapolis are conducted, we would believe that there is a wild lawlessness prevailing there which is not even found in the wild and woolly west. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Mills) has repeatedly attacked the administrators of municipal affairs in his county, for their conduct in connection with the revision. Now the revisers in Annapolis are appointed by the municipal councils; the local government has nothing to do with them, and I venture to believe that the municipal councillors are not all Conservatives, nor all Liberals. I think that sometimes there may be found a majority of Conservatives in the municipal councils of Annapolis, but if my hon. friend (Mr. Mills) wishes to imply that there is always a majority of Liberals in that county, some of us would be very anxious to know how in the world the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mills) found his way up in this Parliament. I am afraid we would have to come to the conclusion that he did not come here by fair and proper means. But, if the hon. gentleman comes here properly as the representative of Annapolis, then I presume that occasionally there will be found a majority of Conservatives in the municipal councils. I am bound to say in favour of Annapolis, which is so unfairly misrepresented by its member here, that it is a very intelligent and a very beautiful county, and I have no reason to believe that its municipal affairs are conducted in any worse manner than they are in the excellent counties of Queen's and Shelburne, which I have the honour to represent. My hon. friend from Haldimand (Mr. Montague), who was so sensitive about being misrepresented, wasted some tears in defence of what he called the fundamental right of the people of the maritime provinces to have an appeal to the courts in this matter. He need not squander sympathy in this direction, because I am bound to tell him that there never was in Nova Scotia, within the memory of the present generation, such a right. The system of revising the lists in Nova Scotia is in all material points the same to-day that it has been for thirty or forty years, and it has never been called seriously in question. If changes have been made they have in every case been changes for the better, but in all essential particulars the method of revising the electoral lists is about the same to-day as it was thirty years ago when a Conservative government was in power in that province. I think I am correct in saying that the Act which enlarged the franchise was passed in 1885 and re-enacted and revised in 1889, and in one of these years, I forget which just now, the clause was inserted giving the right of appeal to the sheriff. Up to that time there was no appeal at all and these revisers—partisan revisers, we are led to believe they are—were the final court of appeal; and even then I must say there was not very much complaint. Of course, with a large number of revisers, subject to all the weaknesses of humanity, now and then in the keenness of a party fight it would be said that the revisers had not done right, but in the main it was accepted as the best system available. However, when the law was revised in one of the years to which I have referred, a clause was inserted giving the right of appeal to the sheriff. I am willing to father that particular baby, because I put that clause in myself, just to meet such few difficulties—and they were very few—as were occasionally mentioned. That right of appeal to the sheriff has been used in a very limited degree. I am strongly of the opinion that it is a check upon the revisers, and the very knowledge that the right of appeal exists leads them, I believe, to proceed more cautiously. If the public documents are examined it will be found that the number of appeals to the sheriff is not very great. But hon. gentlemen opposite say that the sheriff is a partisan.

Mr. KAULBACH. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend from Lunenburg (Mr. Kaulbach) says "hear, hear," but let us see. The sheriffs of Nova Scotia are described by hon. gentlemen opposite as the creatures of the local

government. Will some one tell me wherein that is a more justifiable description of them, than if I were to say that the county court judges are the creatures of the Conservative Government that appointed them ? They are appointed by the local government in the one case and by the Dominion Government in the other case, and unless some evidence can be shown that the sheriffs are in the habit of violating their oath of office, I do not see that we should describe them in an offensive sense as the creatures of the local government. These sheriffs are not all Liberals, although they might well be, considering that the Liberal party has been in power for so long a time in that province, and judging from the signs of the times, is apparently likely to continue in power for a very long time to come. As a matter of fact these sheriffs are not all Liberals. The sheriffs in Nova Scotia were appointed in a peculiar old-fashioned manner down to the year 1883, when there was a revision of the law respecting sheriffs, and they were taken directly under the control of the government, but, if my memory serves me, they were appointed during good behaviour. They could only be removed for a specific cause, and I believe I am correct in stating that no sheriff was ever removed under that Act, and consequently good behaviour gave the sheriff almost the tenure of office that is possessed by a judge. That has been the practical effect of the law. When these sheriffs were appointed at that time, a very considerable number of them were Conservatives and they remained in office to the day of their death. Very few changes were made and at this moment, after the lapse of all these years, there are several sheriffs in Nova Scotia who are Conservatives. When this Bill has passed, as I have no doubt it will pass this House, and when it becomes law ; if at the next Dominion election I shall have the honour of being a candidate in the county of Shelburne, which is a part of my constituency, I shall have the lists in their final stage made up by a Conservative sheriff, who has been continued in office by the Liberal Government, who is sheriff to-day, and who I hope may long continue, for he is a faithful and good official. There are other Conservative sheriffs in the province of Nova Scotia and the idea that these sheriffs are partisans and that the system is bad is all a delusion of hon. gentlemen opposite. My hon. friend from Annapolis (Mr. Mills) says that there is a perfect scandal in these matters, and that the Nova Scotia legislature has occasionally to pass Acts to legalize the lists. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Mills) need not have selected these particular years, for if he goes back still further he will find that it has been the practice to bring in an Act of Parliament almost every session to legalize jury panels and revisers' lists. So much depends on the legality of your jury panels and revisers' lists, that it was thought well year after year to introduce an Act legalizing them, not that it was necessary on account of any exceptional conditions, but as an extra precaution. I venture to say that while in some years the thing may have been overlooked, yet the hon. gentleman will find a great many of these Acts on the statute-books of Nova Scotia. The idea that they were passed to cure any serious defect is a mistake, but it was found that where a reviser was called upon to hold his court on a certain day, and from some exceptional cause, it might not be held on the particular day, or at the particular hour appointed, or some other technical difficulty might arise, it was thought well to adopt the practice which has prevailed in Nova Scotia for many years, of legalizing the jury panels and revisers' lists. But it will be news to the people of Nova Scotia to hear that that was done in order to legalize partisanship in any way. I venture to say that the system of revising the lists which exists in Nova Scotia to-day is as good as the system of any other province of the Dominion ; and in Halifax an extra precaution was taken by the municipal council appointing one of its own officers to do the work. I believe that there and throughout the province generally, subject to the possibility of getting a reviser here and there not as intelligent as he might be, or one who imparts a little partisanship into his work, still I say the system is a sound system, and the people recognize it as a sound system ; and the objections raised against it in this House will be a surprise to the people of Nova Scotia, who are not aware that there is any difficulty in working out that system satisfactorily.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). Undoubtedly, it may be said that the sheriffs of the province of Nova Scotia never have been, that I know of, accused of wrong-doing ; still, when my hon. friend says that the people of Nova Scotia are quite satisfied with our revising system, he must be aware that there was a great deal of dissatisfaction with the law passed in 1883, by which the sheriffs were made the appointees of the local government.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There was no sheriff then who acted as reviser. The revision of the lists did not enter into the question at all.

Mr. BELL (Pictou.) That is true ; but the law changed the appointment of the sheriff from one of a judicial character under the judges, and made him an appointee of the local government ; and, more than that, he was appointed by the local government practically at pleasure.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. During good behaviour.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). It would not be exceedingly difficult for the local govern-

ment of Nova Scotia to dismiss a sheriff. In fact, they have dismissed a sheriff within a comparatively short time.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Where ?

Mr. BELL (Pictou). I think there was one dismissed in Cape Breton within a year or so. While the sheriffs did not, as the hon. gentleman says, have anything to do with the revision of the electoral lists when the change was made in the law of 1883, the hon. gentleman subsequently, in 1889, provided for an appeal to the sheriffs while they were the appointees of the local government. While I am anxious to say everything I can for the honour of my province, and while I do not wish to anticipate any wrong-doing in that province, still I must say that in the province of Nova Scotia the making up of the electoral lists for this House, will, if this Bill passes, be practically under the control of the local government. In the first place, the revisers are selected by the county councils; and, in the case of a county having a majority of Liberals, it will be possible that they will appoint all the revisers of that county of that party stripe. I do not say that they have done it or that they will do it, but it is within their power to do it. In that case, you would have nothing but partisan revisers throughout the county, and the only appeal for the people, if they were dissatisfied with the making up of the list, would be to the sheriff of the county, the appointee of the local government. To show how easily the local government of Nova Scotia might control the majority in a municipal council, let me recall to my hon. friend some Acts which were passed in the legislature of that province when he was the leader of the government there. For instance, a polling district was created in the county of Annapolis without any good reason being assigned, the result of which was to affect the balance of parties in that county. The same thing has been done, if I am not mistaken, in the session just passed. The districts for the election of municipal councillors in the various counties have been gerrymandered, and they may be again. Therefore, it must be evident that while we may, and I hope can, expect nothing but good conduct on the part of the sheriffs and municipal councils of Nova Scotia, still the whole control of the preparation of the electoral lists for the election of members of this House is in the hands of a legislature which is, of course, quite as partisan a body as any that you can find anywhere else in Canada; and it seems to me that it would be a very satisfactory thing if we could have substituted for the sheriff, or have an appeal from the sheriff, to a judicial officer. So far as we know, the judges of our country have never been guilty of any partisan conduct. They are removed from party politics. I am very happy, in my place in this House, to state that, so far as my own county of Pictou is concerned, we have a sheriff who, I believe, is quite incapable of doing anything wrong. We have never had any reason to doubt the fairness of Sheriff Harris, in the county of Pictou, and, so far as I am concerned, I would be quite willing to accept him as referee in these matters. But I am only speaking for myself; and some other counties may not be so favourably situated. I see no reason why, in this matter, we should not refer what are somewhat difficult questions, such as questions of interpretation, which could not be readily solved by a sheriff, to some gentleman learned in the law, like a county judge or a Supreme Court judge. While there may be in small electoral divisions and small counties, in a bitter fight, an intensity of party feeling which you would not expect to find in this House. I am assuming that in the Parliament of Canada the Government are putting such a franchise Act on the Statute-book as will enable the country to ascertain, when the votes are polled, what is the will and the decision of the great mass of the people. I cannot believe that the Government, or the great party by which they are supported, would lend themselves to any small dishonesty in politics or in manipulating the electoral lists. I am not assuming anything of the kind. I think I am warranted in assuming the opposite; and therefore I maintain that the Government, when it is asked to make such amendments to this Bill as will make it satisfactory to those on this side of the House, who represent that other great portion of the people, the Conservative party, should endeavour to meet that demand. In a great many of the provinces, as has been pointed out, there exists already this judicial appeal. In the province of Nova Scotia we do not have it; and there, as I have explained, it would be quite possible to have lists prepared with a partisan purpose if the local legislature should choose to lend themselves to any such purpose. It would be within the range of possibility that a large portion of the municipal councils of Nova Scotia could be elected in a few years of a certain political stripe. If those municipal councils were prepared to go to the last limit and devote themselves entirely to the purpose of securing an electorate of their own, it would certainly be very easy for them to appoint such revisers for the county that it would be almost impossible for their opponents to get lists that would fairly represent the electorate. It is not necessary that the reviser should be actually dishonest or put names on the list wantonly, but they could throw such difficulties in the way of their opponents getting names on or striking names off and make it so easy for their friends to do so, that the result would be a great advantage to the party controlling the appointments of the revisers. The municipal councils might

devote themselves to this evil work, and the Government ought to be glad to accept any suggestion from this side which would prevent the possibility of such a thing being done.

Mr. CHARLTON. It seems to me that in discussing the character of the Bill before the House, we are losing sight of the fact that the platform of the Liberal party calls for the enactment of a law which would divest the Dominion Government, if not exactly of all right, divest it practically of the function of interfering in the making of the voters' lists. From 1867 to 1885, the elections of this Dominion were conducted on the principle that it is now proposed we should revert to—the principle of provincial control of the lists. If during those years there had existed any reason for a change, such reason has certainly never been apparent to me, and I am not aware that any serious objection to the principle of the law, as it existed or the practice as it existed, from 1867 to 1885 was ever made. I believe that the practical operation of that system was satisfactory to the country, and that it actually did secure elections that expressed the will of the people to a much greater extent than did the succeeding franchise law. During the three months discussion, when the Dominion franchise law was under consideration in this House in 1885, the Liberal party took the ground squarely against interference by the Dominion Government in the formation of the voters' list at all, and asserted that the system under which we had been working was satisfactory and ought not to be meddled with. It was well known to those who participated in that debate and to those who were connected with public affairs in Canada at that time, and previous to and subsequent to that time, that the Bill was not introduced in answer to any popular demand for a change. It was not even introduced because Parliament believed that a change was necessary, but as a sequel to the Gerrymander Act of 1882, one of the most outrageous acts of political dishonesty that ever disgraced the annals of a political party in any commonwealth of the world. That Gerrymander Act, of 1882, was intended to give unjust and unfair advantages to the Government in power, and it admirably carried out the purpose for which it was intended. Following the Gerrymander Act of 1882, came the provincial Franchise Act of 1885, conceived in the same spirit and passed with the same purpose, and put into operation, not because a change was asked for or was necessary, but for the purpose of conferring additional and unjust political advantages on the party in power. The Liberals fought that Franchise Act for three months. They made a death struggle upon it. They realized perfectly its purpose and character, and never hesitated to denounce it as a political infamy. The operation of that Act has warranted that denunciation. The Government never dared to inflict upon the country the expense of the annual revision which it called for. They never gave to this country yearly voters' lists. They gave to us only four revisions in the long period during which that Act was in force. They went to the country, in the last two elections, on lists two years old. They debarred from participation in the franchise every man under the age of twenty-three, and this huge political infamy is now brought to the door of justice, and this Government, in pursuance of its pledges to the people in accord with its policy and principles, propose to remove this Act and revert to the provincial franchises. As I said briefly, a day or two ago, there is no middle ground between the opponents of the policy to revert to the provincial franchises pure and simple, and ourselves. What is the language of the declaration of principles by this party ?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CHARLTON. It was given by that great convention of 3,000 delegates from all parts of the Dominion, that met in this city in June, 1893. Here is the enunciation of the principles by which this party is bound to be governed.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CHARLTON. I shall read to you the resolution dealing with the Dominion Franchise Act :

Resolved,—That the Franchise Act, since its introduction, has cost the Dominion treasury over a million dollars, besides entailing a heavy expenditure to both political parties. That each revision involves an additional expenditure of a further quarter of a million dollars. That this expenditure has prevented an annual revision, as originally intended, in the absence of which young voters entitled to the franchise have, in numerous instances, been prevented from exercising their natural rights. That it has failed to secure uniformity, which was the principal reason assigned for its introduction. That it has produced gross abuses by partisan revising barristers appointed by the Government of the day. That its provisions are less liberal than those already existing in many provinces of the Dominion, and that, in the opinion of this convention, the Act should be repealed and we should revert to the provincial franchise.

There is no qualification. There is no provision to revert to the provincial franchises, only partially. No, we are to revert to them pure and simple, and we are bound, as a party, by this enunciation of principles made by the great Liberal convention in 1883.

Mr. DAVIN. Are you bound by that ?

Mr. CHARLTON. I am, and I think the Government intends to be. Now, hon. gentlemen opposite who were engaged in discussing this Bill and who are asking the Government to put on Indians and to keep off Indians, to put on Dominion officials and to keep them off, to make this and that provision for curtailing or guiding the pro-

vinces in the exercise of their rights—the object of these gentlemen, in my opinion, is to get as many things as possible done to complicate and embarrass the Act and render it a kind of hermaphrodite nondescript, and I would advise my hon. friend, the Solitor General, to adhere strictly to the original declaration of the party and to the plain, simple and straight line of duty of adopting the provincial franchises, pure and simple.

When the United States constitutional convention was deliberating as to the character of the institutions of that country, after the experiment of a confederation which had lasted ten years, naturally the character of the franchise secured a very large amount of attention from that body. The result of its deliberations was alluded to a few days ago by the right hon. First Minister in his remarks on this matter. I remember having read up very carefully, during the discussion in 1885, "Elliot's Debates," which give a full account of the deliberations of the convention. And that portion of these debates relating to the various schemes proposed for the franchise which should be used for the election for President and Vice-President of the United States and members of Congress is one of the most interesting portions. It was proposed by one party that the States should be permitted, each for itself, to fix the franchise. It was proposed by another party that Congress should fix the franchise. After full discussion upon this matter, it was finally decided that the voters' list in each state used for the purpose of electing the most numerous branch of the State Legislature, which would be the most popular form of franchise, should be the franchise used in elections of members of Congress, and of the President and Vice-President of the United States. Now, this left the matter in a position where Congress was not called upon to interfere, and Congress never did interfere; and that provision, made in 1787, has continued down to the present day without question, without any party ever having even mooted the necessity of making a change.

Mr. DAVIN. Without amendment.

Mr. CHARLTON. There was the case, after the rebellion when Congress did interfere to secure to the freedmen the right of suffrage, an interference which proved in its results to have been a mischievous one and one that Congress would better have refrained from making. It was made under peculiar and exceptional circumstances, under the impression that it was necessary to invest the black men with a franchise in order to secure them the continuance of their liberty. But this did not interfere with the principle laid down as to the franchise controlled by the state.

Mr. WILSON. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. CHARLTON. Certainly.

Mr. WILSON. Are you opposed to the coloured men having a vote?

Mr. CHARLTON. Not at all.

Mr. WILSON. That is what I understood.

Mr. CHARLTON. On the contrary, I am in favour of the coloured men having votes.

Mr. BENNETT. What about the red man?

Mr. CHARLTON. If he is a citizen or chooses to become a citizen, I believe he should have a vote. But if he chooses to remain in the tribal relationship and refuses citizenship with us, let him have all the rights and advantages of tribal relationship and not the privileges of the citizen.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I adverted to this case of the United States for the purpose of showing that we have an example lasting now for 111 years in the case of a great nation, which has worked uniformly to the satisfaction of all the states of the nation, and of all classes of people, insomuch that nobody in that country would think for a moment of changing to a system which would lead to the anomalous condition of affairs we had here, where we required two sets of machinery, two voters' lists, and all the complications that followed it from 1885. We should seek to simplfy this matter and for that reason, should return to the condition of affairs that worked so satisfactorily for the first 18 years of our life as a Dominion, to the condition of affairs which we know, as a matter of experience, is a proper and good one. We should revert to that condition of affairs and throw overboard the condition that has existed since 1885, which has taught the people by the natural results of that system, that it is a bad one and not desirable in the interests of the country.

With regard to this question of the preparation of voters' lists and appeals, and this thing and that thing and the other—what interest have we to meddle with these matters? The various provinces have the franchise by which their representatives in their own local legislatures are elected. These franchises are satisfactory to these provinces. Why should we feel called upon to interfere with these franchises in relation to representatives from the several provinces to sit in this House. The franchises are satisfactory to the provinces that enacted them, or, if not, they can change them, making such modifications as they please. But we are not called upon to interfere or make modifications, and we cannot attempt it without mischievous conse-

quences. We cannot exercise our power in this matter without overriding the rights of the provinces or rather without interfering with their domestic affairs in a way that is entirely unnecessary and prejudicial. In the province of Ontario, for instance, the voters' lists are prepared by municipal officers, elected by the people, the township councils. These voters' lists are revised by the the township councils, and the final revision is made by the county judge of the county. This is almost identical with the system adopted in England. If the province of Ontario chooses to adopt some other method, that is the business of the province and not ours. If we allow the province of Ontario or any other province to have elections for its representatives in the Dominion House of Commons upon the lists prepared by its own officers under its own direction and supervision, why should anything more be required. Talk about partisan revising officers, about partisan sheriffs, about partisan influences in an election—why, I would like to know, Mr. Chairman, if we did not see party influences in the elections held under the Dominion franchise law? I would like to know what was the character of the revising officers, what was the character of the returning officers? And who were they appointed by? They were appointed by the Government in power. They were creatures of the Government; they were partisan officers as much as they would be if appointed by the province. I believe that we can leave this matter safely to the provinces. They understand their peculiar wants better than we do, and we cannot interfere without mischievous results, and for that reason, I am in favour of seeing this House proceed to the enactment of a Bill which will repeal the Franchise Act of 1885 and substitute the provincial franchises, and abstain, for our part, from all interference with them, as it will only complicate matters and make matters worse. If we interfere, we shall be dealing with matters the circumstances governing which we do not understand as well as do the people directly interested. I deprecate, Mr. Chairman, the line of attack that has been followed in this matter. It is irrelevant and foreign to the plain principle laid down. Do we want a Dominion franchise law? If we do, let us consider what is the best method by which to secure it. If we do not want a Dominion franchise law, but want the provincial lists, we have only to turn to the provinces and say: You form the lists and we will hold the elections upon them. And, just as surely as we interfere with these lists to a greater or less extent, we are going outside the line that should govern our conduct in this matter, outside the line that we have laid down in the platform of the party by which we pledged ourselves to be guided. I think we had better proceed to decide whether we will take the provincial franchise or whether we will not. That is the question. This proposal is a good proposal, or it is a bad one. If we are in favour of the provincial franchises, let us take them, if we do not want them, let us so decide. But if we accept the principle of provincial lists, let us refrain from a discussion which would be proper only if we decided that we must have a Dominion franchise.

Mr. DAVIN. I have listened with great interest to the backhanded attack of my hon. friend (Mr. Charlton) upon the Government. The emphatic way in which the hon. gentleman, in the close of his speech, laid down his principles is most admirable, and I admire him for it. He says: Let us have the provincial lists or, let us have Dominion lists, if we take the former let us not attempt to interfere or regulate in any way or assume to regulate the franchises as arranged by the local legislatures. Well, Sir, the hon. gentleman is a very able man, and he could not be ignorant of the fact that he was planting his clenched fist right between the eyes of the Solicitor General. The suggestion is made here about me, but I will not believe it—that it is because the Solicitor General knocked out the Bill of my hon. friend from Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) last night that the hon. gentleman has made this speech to-day. But I will not accept that, for this reason, that I know the hon. member for North Norfolk to be a Christian politician who could not possibly harbour a revengeful thought. I know him to be an Israelite indeed in whom there is no guile, or anger, nor retaliation. Now here is what the Solicitor General said on the 21st:

> But if at any time the provinces should do anything that we considered detrimental to the interests of the Dominion, we are entirely free—we do not tie our hands for all time—to make any change that we think proper.

But the hon. gentleman who has just spoken, at an earlier period on that same day, said:

> This Bill merely proposes to abdicate the exercise of a power to the provincial government.

So that he laid down the same principle then as he lays down now. But it is quite contrary to the principle laid down by the Prime Minister and to that laid down by the Solicitor General. Now in view of the Solicitor General's statement regarding a state of things detrimental and undesirable, surely the Governor will accept amendments that will get rid of those detrimental conditions. One of the positions taken by hon. gentlemen from the lower provinces, is that in the hands of sheriffs, who certainly are appointed, as a rule, because of their political proclivities, and whose office does not entail on them the duty of assuming a position of judicial impartiality they are not safe.

Mr. McINERNEY. They are appointed every year.

Mr. DAVIN. Then surely that is not a desirable tribunal in the last resort to decide one of the most important questions that can be decided, namely, a man's right to vote. But, Sir, let me take my hon. friend to Manitoba, about which I know a little more than I know about New Brunswick.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Did I understand my hon. friend to say that the sheriffs are appointed every year in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia?

Mr. McINERNEY. Yes, the Act simply says so, in the month of April. I do not speak for Nova Scotia.

Mr. DAVIN. Now if you go to Manitoba you have the registration clerks appointed under conditions that enable them to act in a partisan manner. As I understand the Act, there is no provision that the registration clerk shall have any defined place where the public may go and find him. He may compile the list secretly under the Act as it is at present, and of course if secretly, under the influence of a Government candidate or agent. Under this Act he could run in men upon that list five minutes before 12 o'clock on the last day before the day of polling.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. That state of things does not exist in fact, as the hon. gentleman will find on referring to section 22. He will find that section 22 requires the registration clerk to forthwith insert in a newspaper published in the electoral division, or if there is none such, in a newspaper which circulates in the electoral division in every issue prior to the date of closing the list, a notice calling upon persons wishing to be registered to put in their application. The notice gives the date when the lists will be closed; states where the office of the registration clerk is, and that he or a substitute can be found there every day except holidays, between 9 and 12 a.m., and 1 and 4 p.m.

Mr. DAVIN. Do I understand that clause was amended?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The Manitoba Election Act, Revised Statutes, 1891, is the first. The amending Acts are 55 Vic., Chap. 12, 57 Vict., Chap. 9, 55 Vict., Chap. 11. The section to which I refer my hon. friend is section 22. It fixes a place, and everything you can possibly expect to have.

Mr. DAVIN. That may provide for the locality, but as I understand, there is no amendment providing for closing the lists. The section the hon. gentleman read does not prevent the registration clerk from stating that the day on which the list was closed, would be the very last before the day of polling.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The preceding section on the other page will show in reference to that.

Mr. DAVIN. Now, the grossest abuses have undoubtedly taken place in Manitoba because of the very thing that the amendment before us seeks to provide against, namely, because of having no appeals before an impartial tribunal. The amendment before us provides for an appeal to a county court judge, or where there is no county court judge, then to a judge of the Superior Court. Why should the hon. gentleman object to that amendment?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The appeal in Manitoba is before a county court judge, but in default of a county court judge, then before the revising barrister. That is the case under the Franchise Act.

Mr. DAVIN. The way the amendment would come would be this, that where, as is usually the case in Manitoba, a young barrister was appointed as returning officer, then if an elector or any friend of an elector felt aggrieved as to anything which the revising officer, not a judge, had done, there would be an appeal to a judge. Why should the hon. gentleman who sees the importance, as he emphasized it a moment ago, of having a county court judge as revising officer, object to make provision that where a county court judge has not been revising officer, there should be an appeal to an impartial man occupying a position removed from the passions of party. The correction made by my hon. friend who moved the amendment qualifies it so that it should only apply to provinces where there is not a provision that a county court judge shall be the revising officer, as is the case in Manitoba. In that province you may have a judge as revising officer, but it is usual to have a person who is not a judge. Under the circumstances, bearing in mind what the hon. member himself has laid down, that if we found there is a state of things in a province detrimental to the public interest, we should deal with it in the future, under that argument why should we, having found a state of things not desirable, not deal with it? I hope the hon. Minister will accept the amendment.

Mr. McNEILL. I would venture to say to the Solicitor General that I hope he will take seriously into consideration the arguments from this side of the House in favour of this amendment. I gather from what my hon. friend said earlier in the afternoon that the reason why he objected to a judge being appointed as reviser in the maritime provinces was that really there had been no evidence of any complaint as to the fairness with which the work had been done up to the present time. Surely the affidavits read by the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Mills) were a crushing reply as regards the province of Nova Scotia. I listened to what the

hon. Finance Minister said in answer, but no one knows better than the Solicitor General that the Finance Minister did not attempt to reply to what the hon. member for Annapolis had advanced. He simply in a good-natured way made a joke as to the condition of the hon. member's county; but that was not a reply to a serious argument with respect to a serious subject. If no better reply can be made than that to the very reasonable proposition, that such important and valuable rights should be safeguarded in this manner, the Government, if they want to do what is right, and I am inclined to think they wish to do so, should accept a proposition of this kind. The only argument advanced with respect to New Brunswick was the argument that heretofore there had been no complaints. But, as has been pointed out, that is no argument with regard to the future, because the conditions then would be quite different. Now a political consideration of a much more important nature is to be introduced than any political consideration that had existed in the local election. Why should we run the risk, why should we leave everything wide open to any abuse that unscrupulous people may choose to be guilty of, or errors that people may unintentionally commit? I have listened very carefully to the discussion, and I have heard no argument to meet that which I thought was very reasonable pressure brought to bear from this side of the House on the Government in this matter, and unless they can adduce some arguments better than those already submitted, I think the country will hold them responsible for introducing a measure and forcing it through this House which cannot be defended on its merits. I am open to conviction, but I have heard nothing to convince me, no argument, so far as my mind is capable of weighing matters, in answer to the fair statement that the electors should be protected by an impartial tribunal in the last resort. I do not know whether my hon. friend (Mr. Russell) is deriving benefit—I hope he is deriving benefit from this discussion. I listened with some attention to the friendly and good-humoured criticism he made as to my remarks the other day, and I have not much to complain of except in one respect, and I was sorry when I heard the remark. He said that when he listened to me he sometimes felt as if he were in church. I say I was sorry to hear him make that remark, because I can only accept it as evidence that the hon. gentleman is not in church as often as he ought to be.

Mr. RUSSELL. I would be obliged to go more frequently if I had not these occasional opportunities of listening to lectures from my hon. friend.

Mr. McNEILL. I should be very glad if my remarks in this House had a beneficial effect on the hon. gentleman. I may say to him in that context that while I am glad to learn that what I say in this House has a beneficial effect upon him, his speeches have also a beneficial effect on me, because when I listen to my hon. friend, as I always do, and endeavour to follow the very clever, ingenious and subtle threads of his finely spun arguments, my dull brain endures torment which bring up before me a vision not of a church, but of a very different place. If, as is sometimes said, our sins here are used as whips to scourge us in another world, I ask myself if it is possible that in the hereafter my hon. friend, as a punishment for what he has done here amiss, will be condemned to continue to strain his intellect in endeavours to make the worse appear the better cause throughout the ages; and that I for my offences (which I fear are much more grievous than those of my hon. friend) shall be condemned, still for ever and ever, to strive to follow his arguments.

Mr. Chairman, that would be a terrible eternity. The thought is altogether too painful, but it has this in it that is good: it has a fine deterrent effect upon me. And when I see my hon. friend rise, as I do see him rise often in this House, and with that splendid chivalrous spirit he evinces, fling himself into the breach in defence of his party—and always when his party needs his help most; that is, when their cause is worst—when I see him do that, I think of this fearful future that may be in store for us, and I determine upon a less heroic course: I determine to do as I have done in the past, and sometimes—only sometimes—to allow my conscience to make a coward of me.

Mr. QUINN. Without wishing to draw the attention of the House away from the amendment, I would ask the Solicitor General if he has made any provision for overcoming the difficulties which present themselves under sections 13 and 14 of the Quebec Election Act. While these disabilities may not come under section 5 of the present Bill, there seems to be great doubt about it at any rate. I would ask the Solicitor General if he has given these two sections consideration, and to explain the manner in which he intends to get over the difficulty there.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I may say at once that the provisions for disqualifications shall be amended in such a way as to cover the sections which my hon. friend (Mr. Quinn) refers to. Now, it seems to me that a great deal of evil has been spoken of the New Brunswick law—I will not say because those who spoke it were unfamiliar with the law—but because probably they have overlooked some of its dispositions. Let me show the safeguards which surround the making of the lists in New Brunswick. The first thing that is done, is that the assessor of the municipality in each year makes a list of the names of all male persons, and enters them upon

the assessors' list for the parish, stating opposite each name the amount of real estate, personal property, income, and so forth. The assessors then deliver these lists to the revisers. Now, these revisers are the county councillors selected by the municipal electors to conduct their municipal affairs. You have in the first instance the list prepared by the assessor under the sanction of his oath, and his obligation to the municipality. He takes that list to the revisers or to the municipal councillors, and they revise it a second time, and these men after all are not political partisans. They are men who are selected by the ratepayers to conduct their municipal affairs, and they are supposed to represent both political parties. Speaking from my knowledge of my own province, it is very rare that politics enter into the choice of municipal councillors in the rural municipalities. They are selected to a large extent because of their position in the community, and because of their capacity to render good and faithful service to the ratepayers. You have therefore in New Brunswick the draft of the lists prepared by the assessors, and after these lists have passed from their hands——

Mr. McINERNEY. The assessors do not make the electoral lists at all; they simply make the assessment list.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Section 28 of the New Brunswick Act concludes by saying that the persons on the list shall be those who are entitled to register their vote. Of course I have only the law to guide me, but that appears to be the law. When these municipal revisers revise the list, then it goes to the sheriff of the county, who makes the distribution pointed out by the Minister of Railways. But that is not all. If the attention of the sheriff is drawn to the fact that the name of a person entitled to be on that list has been omitted, then it is the duty of the sheriff to apply to the county court judge and have the name put on the list. Now, after you have all these precautions, what more guarantee do you want.

Mr. McALISTER. You cannot take any name off after it has been put on.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Quite true, but that list has been already revised by the assessors and by the revisers, and the defect likely to occur in any list is that a name may be omitted, not that one is put wrongfully on. I would like to point out to my hon. friend that it seems to me that this procedure under the New Brunswick Act compares very favourably with the procedure adopted under the Dominion Franchise Act.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Under the Dominion Franchise Act there is a right of appeal to both parties.

Mr. FITZPATRICK.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes, where the revising officer is not a judge.

Mr. MONTAGUE. My hon. friend surely does not mean to say that under the Dominion Act the list would then be complete?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I say that under the Act the list is complete without appeal. The revising barrister is the complete master of the situation, except where he is not a county court judge, in which case there is an appeal.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The revising officer makes his list up from the assessment roll—

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Or from any other memorandum he can put his hands on.

Mr. MONTAGUE—Or from any other memorandum he can put his hands on, as the hon. gentleman says. That list is then posted up in a public place where all parties can see it, and then all parties have a right to appeal as to names that have been improperly left off, in their opinion, and as to names that have been improperly added, in their opinion. Even when the revising officer is a judge, there is the same appeal.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. My statement is based on section 33, which provides that in any case in which the revising officer is not also a judge, there shall be the right of appeal.

Mr. MONTAGUE. That is from the final list, but there is always the right of appeal in the case of the list as prepared by the revising barrister, to have names taken off or put on, and there is a court held in every district or municipality where the parties have an opportunity to bring their evidence.

Mr. HUGHES. And I may add that there is a final court, in which the reviser is not a judge, where appeals may be taken.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I am talking of appeals and my hon. friend is talking of revisions; that is the difference between us.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Suppose the attention of the sheriff is called to the fact that certain names are left off the list that should be on, or certain names have been put on the list that should not be on, and the sheriff is not inclined to lay the matter before a judge, is any means being now provided for forcing the sheriff to bring the matter before a judge? Suppose it happens that the sheriff himself is charged with having put names on the list that should not be there, and the man aggrieved goes to the sheriff and asks that the matter be referred to the county court judge, is there any provision to compel the sheriff to lay the matter before the county court judge?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I assume that in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, as elsewhere, public officers will do their duty; I do not want to make any exception with regard to these provinces, or to assume that public officers there will not do what they do elsewhere.

Mr. HAGGART. The other evening I put a question to my hon. friend the Solicitor General, but I have not seen it answered yet, and I would like, if possible, to get an answer from him. In subsection "a" it is provided:

The qualifications necessary to entitle any person to vote thereat shall be those established by the laws of that province as necessary to entitle such person to vote in the same part of the province at a provincial election.

Now, I think there is no doubt that that is a power delegated by the Dominion Parliament to the provincial legislature, to determine the qualifications of a voter from time to time. One of my hon. friends the other evening quoted section 41 of the British North America Act with reference to the jurisdiction of the Parliament of Canada on the subject of the franchise, as follows:—

Until the Parliament of Canada otherwise provides, all laws in force in the several provinces at the union relative to the following matters, or any of them, namely: the qualifications and disqualifications of persons to be elected or to sit or vote as members of the House of Assembly or Legislative Assembly in the several provinces, the voters at elections of such members, the oaths to be taken by voters, the returning officers,——

And so on—

——shall respectively apply to elections of members to serve in the House of Commons for the same several provinces.

To my mind, that gives to the Dominion Parliament, after a certain event, the exclusive jurisdiction over legislation in reference to the qualifications of voters for the election of members of this House. There is no dispute about that. But under this Bill you propose to delegate that power to the provincial legislatures, and I ask the Solicitor General whether, in his opinion, the Parliament of Canada can delegate to a provincial parliament a power which is conferred upon it in express terms, to alter the qualifications of voters from time to time. I am aware of the powers of delegation. I am aware that a provincial legislature can delegate to a municipality the power of making by-laws for certain purposes, with pains and penalties attached. But my contention is that a power so explicitly given to the Dominion Parliament as this is cannot be delegated to a provincial legislature. The contention of the hon. gentleman, as I heard him the other evening, was that we were fixing the franchise. We are doing no such thing. If we adopt the franchise of a provincial legislature, whatever that franchise is at the time, there is no doubt about our power to do so. But that is not what the hon. gentleman does in this Bill. The logical inference from the clause I have read is that the Bill gives the provincial authority power from time to time to fix what shall be the qualifications of an elector for the Dominion House of Commons. If you can delegate that, why can you not go further and let the provincial legislature fix the oath to be taken by the voter, appoint the returning officers, fix their powers and duties, and fix the proceedings at the elections?

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

After Recess.

The House again resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 16) to repeal the Electoral Franchise Act and amend the Dominion Elections Act.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. HAGGART. At six o'clock, Mr. Chairman, I was addressing a few words on the question of jurisdiction, as to whether the Dominion Parliament could legally delegate its powers to the provincial legislatures. I was about to quote from Todd on Dominion control in matters of legislation, Vol. 2, in which, speaking on the subject of the delegation of federal powers, he says:

In any case where, in the distribution of powers in the British North America Act, certain matters are assigned to the legislative authority of the Dominion Parliament, it is not competent for that body to delegate its functions to the local legislature, so as by an absolute grant of discretionary powers to enable the local authority to deal with the matter itself. It is otherwise, however, if the Dominion Parliament merely accepts and ratifies arrangements made or to be made in accordance with its own legislation on the subject. Where plenary powers of legislation exist as to particular subjects, whether in an Imperial or in a provincial legislature, they may be well exercised, either absolutely or conditionally.

I notice that the question has never been decided by the Imperial Privy Council. It arose in several cases which were argued before that council, but they avoid that point altogether and decided on other issues. They carefully avoid giving any special opinion as to whether the powers of the Dominion Government could be delegated to a local legislature. There can be no doubt as to the delegation of certain powers. I would just draw the attention of the hon. Solicitor General again to what the Parliament of Canada has jurisdiction over, as regards matters of election and franchise:

The qualifications and disqualifications of persons to be elected, or sit, or vote as members of the House of Assembly in the several provinces, the voters at elections of such members, the oaths to be taken by voters, the returning offi-

cers, their powers and duties, the proceedings at elections, the periods during which elections may be continued, the trial of controverted elections and proceedings.

If you can delegate this power to provincial legislatures, you could also delegate the power of regulating proceedings at elections, the period during which elections may continue, the trial of controverted elections, &c. I cannot find any express decisions upon the matter as I have already stated. There are a few cases in which some of the judges of the provincial courts have held one way and some the other. Some have gone so far as to say—although their decision has been overruled—that we could not delegate the power of trying controverted elections to the provincial courts. I think it has been firmly established that we can. I can understand the delegation of a power like that because it is a conditional power, but an absolute power such as we propose to delegate under this Bill—the power to fix from time to time the franchise of a province—I doubt whether we have the authority under the constitution to do it. It is a question of course on which the courts may hold a different opinion, and I think we are entitled to have the opinion of the Minister of Justice and the Solicitor General. I suppose my hon. friend the Solicitor General has entered into the question thoroughly. There is another reason why I do not think this power can be delegated. The confederation of the provinces was the result of a compromise, to which every province was a party as well as the Dominion and the Imperial authorities. If we can delegate powers to the different provinces why can we not delegate them to a separate province? Why could we not divest ourselves of all the powers we are possessed of and give them to one particular province? That would be entirely contrary to the spirit of the British North America Act, because that Act was a contract entered into by the different provinces, the Dominion Government and the Imperial Government, and you could not divest yourself of your powers and delegate them to one or two provinces without consulting the others. That never was intended by the British North America Act. I may be entirely mistaken, but I think that this delegating by one legislature of its powers to another or others is not correct in principle. I am aware that in India the question arose, in the celebrated case of the Queen vs. Burah, of the delegation of power, but it has no application to this case. That was a case in which the authority in England, as constituted by the Act, delegated power to a Governor General, I think it was.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. To the lieutenant-governor of a province.

Mr. HAGGART. I can understand a legislature delegating some of its powers to one of its own executive for the purpose of carrying out a particular object, but a power which is vested so peremptorily in ourselves as that of fixing our own franchise and the regulation of the machinery of elections, I doubt whether that can be delegated to a provincial authority.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I am sure that I have no fault to find with my hon. friend (Mr. Haggart) for raising this question, because it is really the important question in the whole of this matter; and I am prepared to admit now that if this were a case in which we were attempting to delegate to the provincial legislatures powers that we are called upon to exercise, there would be a very serious question as to our right to do so. My argument has been—I think I have stated it before—that we are not delegating our powers. I may say in this connection that I do not wish to make any cheap display of knowledge on the question, nor to affect to know more than the majority of other hon. gentlemen. My argument is, in substance, that we are adopting the provincial franchises, and there is the difference between my position and that of my hon. friend. He says that we are delegating to the local legislatures the power to regulate our franchise. I say we are adopting the franchises that the local legislatures have adopted for themselves.

Mr. HAGGART. They may change it.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes, but the hon. gentleman must remember that an Act of Parliament speaks at the time it is brought into application. This Act of Parliament, for instance, will speak when the election is held, and it will say that the election is held on the provincial list, and these are the lists we now adopt. There is nothing new about this. The leading case on this subject—and it is a great pleasure to me, if I may be permitted to say so, that a layman is willing to discuss the matter from the standpoint of a lawyer—is that of the Queen vs. Burah, L. R. 3 Ap. Cas., which arose under an Act passed by the Governor General of India, but that is not our case. And I want to draw my hon. friend's attention to this, that in the Franchise Act of 1894, prepared by Sir John Thompson, he will find that the same principle that I seek to apply in this Act is adopted. Section 4 of that Act reads in this way:

> Except as herein afterwards otherwise provided, the qualification of voters at a Dominion election shall, in any province of Canada, be that established by the laws in force in such province——

Exactly the words I have adopted here. Sir John Thompson's Act goes on to say:

> ——that shall be that established by the laws in force in such province on the first day of June in the year during which the lists for use in such election were prepared for qualification of voters at a provincial election.

That is to say, the principle adopted is that we make our own Act the Act of the

provincial legislature absolutely, as if we were to provide that a man who had the qualification necessary to enable him to vote in the provincial election would have the right to vote at a Dominion election. That is not delegating power to make our franchise, but it is a declaration, on the part of this Parliament, that the qualification of a voter in an election to this Parliament shall be the same as for a provincial election. Whether my contention is right or wrong, I trust, at least, I have made it clear. It is just as though we were to say that a man possessed of so much property or of such an income should have the right to vote. We say that if the provincial legislature selects a man as qualified to vote at a provincial election, that man shall have the right to vote at a Dominion election. I must confess that I can see but little comfort to be drawn from the constitution of the United States. Under that constitution the power to fix the franchise of electors for the House of Representatives was delegated at the outset, or rather it was given to the states. There is no recalling that, any more than there is a right in our Parliament, as long as the Confederation Act remains as it is, to give to the local legislature the right to make the federal franchise. The principles to be applied in interpreting the United States constitution are entirely different, in my opinion, from those to be applied in reading our own constitution. I may say, without taking up unnecessary time, if those interested in this question will look up the case of the Queen vs. Rorke, 32 Upper Canada Common Pleas, they will find there that the local laws as to the making of jury lists in criminal trials were declared to be constitutional. Allow me to proceed further and draw your attention to 35 Vic., chap 14. You will see that it is there enacted that voters' lists in Ontario for the Dominion election shall be the same as for election in the Ontario legislature. So far back as 35 Vic., we adopted for Ontario the lists in force for the general election. And the point has never been raised that this was ultra vires.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman this question: Suppose that this law is passed now, in the province of Nova Scotia the qualification for a voter is $300 of real estate and personal property, or $150 of real estate alone. Suppose that a year hence the legislature of Nova Scotia changes that law and makes the qualification $100 or $50, or even adopts universal suffrage, would not that change the franchise which we are now adopting? If the election for the Dominion Parliament is held subsequent to that change by the local legislature, should we not then be adopting a franchise that does not now exist, and would not that change in the franchise be brought about by the interference of a local legislature?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The theory of the legislation is that the statute speaks at the time it is put into operation, and if such a change takes place, this would speak after the change had taken place, and the intention of this legislature would be to accept the franchise as arranged at the time the statute was brought into operation.

Mr. MONTAGUE. It seems to me that all the danger of delegating our power in that regard exists notwithstanding the fine distinction which has been drawn by my hon. friend the Solicitor General. Supposing this Parliament to-day adopts this measure, and suppose that between now and the time the next Dominion election takes place, one of the provinces of the Dominion places the qualification so high that three-fourths of the former electorate would be disqualified in that province, if I understand correctly the argument of the Solicitor General, it would be quite outside the function of this Parliament, I mean, so far as the disfranchisement of electors is concerned, and the disfranchisement would be operative in our elections also. That is to say, the intention of this Parliament would not be carried out by reason of the fact that the powers we undoubtedly have under the constitution were, in practice, delegated to the provincial legislatures and exercised by them.

It appears to me that it opens the door to great abuse. All the argument this afternoon has been as regards what has been done in the provinces and what has not been done in the provinces. I take it that what this Parliament ought to do is to safeguard the future, and not to place in the hands of a provincial authority a power which may be exercised in such a way as to do the very opposite thing to that which this Parliament intends now to do as regards the franchise upon which voters shall be qualified to vote for elections to the House of Commons. As I understand the Solicitor General, he says that no matter what change is made in the franchise law of the provinces between now and an election for the House of Commons, no matter how radical the change may be, in the way in which he puts it, this Act is for that legislation as well as for what exists at the present time. Therefore this Parliament is in the strange position of being asked to express its opinion favourably as regards legislation which does not exist now, perhaps not even in the imagination of the provincial authorities, but which may be called into existence and may be injurious to the very existence of this Parliament. We are ratifying in advance legislation of which we know nothing, and of which we will not know anything perhaps until just on the eve of a general election in this country. That undoubtedly seems to me the trend of the argument of the Solicitor General, it is an absurd position, he is asking this Parliament to pass an Act which is extraordinary in its

nature, and which may work very great injury to the Parliament of Canada.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. If any such absurd change were to be made by a local legislature, necessarily, if we did not intend to be accomplices in it, we would require to change our legislation accordingly. But if a change ever takes place, and we allow it to go into operation without interfering with it, then we will have to be responsible for it, by saying that we adopt that provision of the local legislature. But any such change as my hon. friend points out, must be made with our knowledge and with our approval, if we do not interfere with it.

Mr. MONTAGUE. But my hon. friend sees that the change may be made at a date when it is impossible for us to remedy it, but we will have to go to the country on it.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. That is one of the disadvantages of not being here all the time. We tried to remedy that by the amending clause "c" so as to take the list in force six days before the election.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. My hon. friend the Solicitor General has given us to-night his views about this Bill. He thinks we are not delegating our powers to the local legislature to determine upon what franchise we should sit in this House. I may say that while I am inclined to agree with him, I cannot understand how his opinion on this question should be so diametrically opposed to that expressed by the leader of this House when discussing this very same question the other evening. Now, here is what the right hon. gentleman said, in answer to a remark of Sir Charles Tupper :—

> The question is whether this franchise is to be regulated by this Parliament or by the local legislatures, and upon that question we differ. The hon. gentlemen opposite have taken the ground that this Parliament should regulate the franchise, while we have taken the ground that the best method of dealing with it, in view of our complicated government under a federated system, is to have one uniform franchise for each province and for the Dominion, that is to say, that the same authority which regulates the franchise for the local legislature should also regulate it for the Dominion Parliament. Now this is the principle upon which this Bill is based, and I claim that it is the correct one.

This is the principle upon which the right hon. gentleman states that this Bill is based in establishing the franchise upon which we are to sit in this House. I say that when the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) who has just spoken states that we have not the power to delegate our authority to any local legislature, his objection is well taken. Still, the opinion of the Solicitor General to the contrary notwithstanding, we have it from the lips of the right hon. Premier that the very principle we are fighting against is the principle upon which the Bill we are now discussing is based. I hope that the hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House will find a way to agree amongst themselves before they attempt to enlighten us.

Mr. HUGHES. I would like to ask the Solicitor General a question as to the names of electors who are omitted from the list, even the list finally revised by the judge or other authority. Is there to be any mode by which these electors are to have an opportunity of getting on ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Not on the list upon which they vote.

Mr. HUGHES. By tendered ballot ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Not by tendered ballot as you have it in Ontario. If I may be permitted to criticise anything that is done in Ontario, I would not say that is a good system. I intend that a man should be able to vote on tendering his affidavit, and I have a form of affidavit here that will come up immediately after this section. I have communicated it to some of my friends on the other side of the House.

Mr. HAGGART. I cannot at all agree with the argument of the Solicitor General in answer to the position I took. I have no doubt we have the power to enact a law of the Ontario Government, or of any other provincial government, without specifying what is in the Act, we can adopt the Act in extenso. The Solicitor General says that we are not delegating powers here, that we are only adopting an Act which may be, as he says, changed from time to time by the provincial authorities. Surely that is delegating power. I admit that we can adopt an Act of the provincial authorities in extenso and say that that shall be the law of the country. But when we say whatever law you pass from time to time shall be the law of the country, although we have power and jurisdiction over the matter, we delegate that power to the provincial legislature. I cannot understand it in any other light than that. It is clear as can be under the clause which he proposes under the Act, that whatever the franchise may be, and however it may be changed from time to time by the provincial authorities, it becomes the law of this Dominion. If that is not delegating power to the provincial authorities to fix our franchise from time to time as they think proper, then I do not understand the meaning of words.

Mr. FOSTER. I have listened in vain for any attempt by any hon. gentleman opposite to answer the question which has been pointedly and repeatedly put as to what earthly objection there can be to allowing a voter recourse to the courts of law if, in any instance, he considers that he is aggrieved by not being placed upon the voters' list. The Solicitor General and other speakers have argued all around that question. In the first place it is said that most of the revising officers are county court judges. That argument evidently does not meet the case. It does not meet the case in Manitoba, about which the argument has been grouped mainly with respect to that matter, because in Manitoba numbers of the revising

officers are not county court judges. We have been met by another argument that in making a demand for this we are raising imaginary difficulties, and that has been supported by reference to New Brunswick, where the sheriffs are said to have performed their duties in a non-partisan way and where, as some members have expressed it, no difficulty has been met and no complaint has been heard. That, however, does not meet the argument at all. What has been is not a good guide as to what will be, especially as to what will be under changed conditions. And in all legislation, and more especially legislation that touches the rights of voters and the franchise, you are not simply to take things as they exist, but to frame your legislation in view of what is possible, not even as to what is probable, in the way of any successful attempt to either defraud a bona fide voter of his right to vote or place a voter on the list who has not right to vote, and in so far trench on the right of the franchise and the results of the franchise. So having listened to all the speakers, I think there has not been a single member, even the Solicitor General, who is evidently disposed to meet the matter fairly, who has made a reply to that question, viz., what objection there is to interpose the courts between the elector and any invasion of his rights in any way. Who is to be injured by having that safeguard? That is a plain question, then if there is any possibility—and legislation provides for possibilities, if there are 99 revising officers who do right and one in whom there is a possibility of doing wrong, the legislature provides for the one-hundreth individual and does not take account of the 99. All legislation proceeds on that basis, and the pertinent question that is put and to which an answer should be given in regard to such a possibility is, what is the objection to legislating for that case? That a question like that should be put to hon. gentlemen opposite and there should be a single moment's hesitancy for an answer in the affirmative is, as has been expressed on this side of the House, more than surprising. Sir, in 1885, in that long franchise debate that took place here, what was the burden of the then Opposition, the present Government party? It was that we were invading the rights of the electors. How? By putting their destiny in the hands of the revising barrister. But that revising barrister must be a barrister of five years' standing, was the reply. That did not satisfy hon. gentlemen opposite. They were contending for a principle; this was an arbitrary revision. It was placed in the hands of an officer appointed by whom? By the Dominion Government. That statement was too narrow on which to base a principle. The principle was the burden of the argument advanced; it should not be within the power of the appointer, at that time being the Government, no matter what Government it was, to deliver over the preparation and revision of the lists to any appointee of its own. That was the broad ground on which the principle was based. Then came an answer which was thought to be a complete one: Your liberties and rights are not left to the sole will and arbitrary whim of the revising officer. He has to hold open court, he is subject to the criticism of the press, subject to public opinion, he must come out before the constituency and at this place and the other place, after having posted up his lists, he must face public opinion, the legal light that may be brought to bear, and he must put on and take off names according to the arguments presented. That did not satisfy hon. gentlemen opposite. Then there was to be a final court of revision held by the revising barrister, and there was a second guarantee provided. That did not satisfy hon. gentlemen opposite. Then as a final and conclusive answer, it was pointed out that there were the courts of law, that an appeal can be had to an impartial tribunal, that the courts are open to the electors, and after the revising officer has done everything within his power, he not being a county court judge, an appeal can be taken to a county court judge or a superior court judge. That was not even satisfactory to hon. gentlemen opposite. But the Act of 1885 embodied that provision and embodied that principle, and the Liberal-Conservatives held that everything had been done to satisfy any reasonable demand, that every voter had an opportunity in every case as the final court of appeal to take his case before the county court judge, who was the revising barrister, or if the revising barrister was not a judge, then at all events to a county court judge. No less than the sanction and the legal tradition embodied in a bona fide judge were to constitute in any case the final tribunal that stood between the individual elector and any invasion of his rights. Even with all those safeguards and all those provisions in the Act of 1885, every succeeding year the Liberals, calling themselves so, and priding themselves upon the name and the traditions which mingled with that name and the principles upon which that party rested, have not ceased to decry the Act, both on that ground and on the other ground of expense. But let me call your attention, Mr. Chairman, and the attention of the House to the fact that the hon. gentlemen opposite have never ceased from 1885 to the present time to decry the Act on the ground of revision of the lists. Now the tables are turned, and a change has taken place; those hon. gentlemen are enacting legislation and Liberal-Conservatives are on the Opposition benches. Now, when an attempt is made to put a franchise Bill in the shape of law, who is it that declares it to be dangerous to give the right of appeal to the electors to go before a judge and the courts of the land? Those same Liberals who in 1885, and from that year up, have declared that that was

a cardinal principle and they stood by it, that the appointee of any partisan Government should never have the power of revising the lists. Where are we to-day? We are relegating to the tender mercies of the appointees of seven local partisan governments, this power. They are partisans one way or the other. On principle it makes not a bit of difference to which party they belong, and I suppose it was on principle the declarations from 1885 up were made by the Liberal party of this country. Now the electors are relegated to the tender mercies of a partisan Government in Manitoba and in every other province. Statements have been made, and I take them up here for the sake of the argument, that matters are not so bad, that we must not lose faith in human nature, and that we must believe that gentlemen when they are appointed to office, remain gentlemen still with the instincts of fair-play even towards party opponents. And so it is declared that the sheriffs in the province of New Brunswick, to wit, have always performed their duties in a fair and gentlemanly way.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They are not revisers.

Mr. FOSTER. Who said they were? If my hon. friend would interrupt pertinently he might put his interruptions into shape. I was not talking about revisers, I was talking about the sheriffs of the province of New Brunswick, and I was going on to state that it had been said in this House that the sheriffs of the province of New Brunswick had always performed their duties well, and that there had been no complaint against them. I am here to say that is true; I am not here to declare want of confidence in the sheriffs that have been, or even in the sheriffs that are now in the province of New Brunswick. In my political fortunes, so far as franchise lists are concerned, I have in the province of New Brunswick trusted my fate to the sheriffs of the different counties, one a Conservative and the other a Liberal, and I have never had any cause of complaint against them, neither have I had any favours from either. But I want to say this to the Solicitor General: That he cannot argue as to the sheriffs of New Brunswick of the future, from the action of the sheriffs of New Brunswick in the past, nor from the revisers of the past to the revisers of the future, because he is now importing different conditions. What has been the state of things in the province of New Brunswick? So far as municipal contests are concerned, we have been practically free from anything like partisan strife. I make that statement advisedly. I say that in the province of New Brunswick up to the present time, so far as municipal affairs are concerned, they have been practically free from partisan strife on the lines of either the local government or the Dominion Government. There have been good causes for that. Partisanship has not taken the immense strides in the province of New Brunswick that it has in the province of Ontario or in the province of Manitoba for instance. And why? Because in Ontario and Manitoba gradually the line of differences between the public men, and between the electors from the very top down to the very bottom, has taken cleavage on Dominion lines, and in Ontario to-day it is a departure from the rule when you find anywhere in municipal contests the line not practically set as between Liberals and Conservatives. From the very commencement of the process which afterwards results in the completed franchise lists, you have the dividing line of Liberal and Conservative, of Grit and of Tory. That is why in the province of Ontario, partisanship—and I am not speaking of partisanship in an offensive sense—rules right down to the very beginnings of the municipal revision; down to the very list which was made by the assessors. It has not been so in the province of New Brunswick: and why? It is because of the fact that for a number of years the Government of New Brunswick has been called a coalition government where Liberals and Conservatives, where Grits and Tories, if you call them so, have made up the elements of a government that has worked in common, if not always in harmony; and with a coalition government of that kind, it has been practically impossible to draw the lines on Dominion issues. Now, you are going to change all that in New Brunswick, and the first step in that change will be irrevocably taken when the Solicitor General's Bill becomes law. You will then have the highest contest of all, the contest for the Dominion representative, the contest for Dominion patronage, the contest for Dominion policies. You will have that laid upon the shoulders of the assessors, from that to the revisers, and from that to the sheriffs, who put the lists in their completed shape. You are importing the idea by this very legislation which will find its way into the province of New Brunswick, and which will change in my opinion the trend of New Brunswick politics as regards the lines that separate the electors on the great public issues. Then you will have the sheriffs the appointees of a partisan government, after the coalition government has passed away, and a partisan government takes its place at Fredericton. You will then have Dominion patronage hanging from the top and Dominion issues impending, and you will have the line of cleavage with advance in greater degree from year to year. I submit to the Solicitor General that you will then have in New Brunswick a very different state of things from that which you have now. The process may be gradual, but the process will be certain, and the ultimate result will some day or other be

reached. Therefore the argument you can make from past conditions in New Brunswick is not an argument that will apply to the future. The sheriff is the appointee of the Government, an appointee from year to year. At the present time a sheriff feels that if his behaviour is good he will be continued in office from year to year, no matter though he be a Liberal or a Conservative. That is because the appointing power is a coalition government, and no matter what stripe of politics the sheriff belongs to, he has political friends in the appointing power, and so the rule has been that the sheriffs have not been arbitrarily disturbed. Change this condition of things; make a partisan government there: and does any one doubt for a single moment whether a Liberal Government in the province of New Brunswick would appoint Liberal or Conservative sheriffs? Not at all. Does any one believe that a Liberal-Conservative Government in New Brunswick, under these conditions would appoint a Liberal as a sheriff? Not at all. The appointment will go to what are considered the best men in the party which rules in the appointing power. Then what will you have? You will have in the province of New Brunswick a partisan government appointing a partisan sheriff, and giving into that sheriff's hands large powers with reference to the final revision of the lists. You give no authority or power by which a partisan on the other side who is aggrieved, whether he is rightly or wrongly aggrieved, and wishes to test his right, can get it before the courts of the country. I ask whether that is fair or not. I have gone thus lengthily into the New Brunswick matter to show you what has been the state of things, to show you what will probably be the state of things when you inject an altogether new element in the province of New Brunswick. Now let us go upon the general principle, and I come back to the point I was at when I made the divergence with reference to New Brunswick. I ask again, if it is not surprising that we, as Liberal-Conservatives, have to wait a single moment for an answer from a Liberal Government and a Liberal party when we simply ask that the courts of law be open to us if we are aggrieved in the matter of our franchise? What good reason is there that this should not be granted to us? We on this side might say: Now, you have taken away the Dominion Franchise Act, to which your great objection was that the lists were made by appointees of a partisan government. That is your cause of grievance, your cause of complaint against the old franchise law; are we better under the new? That is the question. If you had any principle in the matter, and you were protesting on the ground of principle against a partisan appointee making up the list for you, does not the same grievance exist to-day? Who are the registration clerks in the province of Manitoba? The appointees of a partisan government. Who are the revisers in the province of Manitoba? The appointees of a partisan government. Who are the revisers in the province of Ontario? The appointees of a partisan government.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The county court judges.

Mr. FOSTER. Always?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Invariably, in Ontario.

Mr. FOSTER. Granted, then, that they are in Ontario. Ontario is not the only province of the Dominion. My hon. friend stands on a very slim footing if, when I am arguing for a general principle, and I carry it out in concrete instances, in one province after another, and I name one province in seven, he feels justified in saying that there are county court judges there.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). We ought to deal with facts.

Mr. FOSTER. Am I not dealing in facts?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. You just made the statement that Ontario had partisan revisers.

Mr. McINERNEY. I wish to say that they are partisan. The county court judges only act on appeal.

Mr. FOSTER. And the county court judge and the reviser are the same man?

Mr. McINERNEY. Not the same man.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The county court judge revises finally.

Mr. FOSTER. When the charge of dishonesty in argument is bandied from one side of the House to the other by the right hon. gentleman who leads the Government, we had better take a little time and find out where we are at.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Better read the Act.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend is making an impertinent interruption again.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I deny the charge.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, after we have disposed of this weightier matter, my hon. friend and myself will take up that little matter and try it out. My hon. friend is pretty well tired out.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I think you are dried out more than I am.

Mr. FOSTER. There is a possibility that, not taking as much to keep myself moist as my hon. friend, I may be.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I think you take more in proportion to your avoirdupois.

Mr. FOSTER. I will also state that it is my deliberate conviction that I am not so often dry as my hon. friend.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Yes, but you don't listen to so many dry speeches.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend has no recollection of the inimitable speeches he made three nights ago, when he three times repeated the same identical speech, in which he demanded from his friend the Minister of Inland Revenue that he would immediately take the tax off tobacco, because he, an ardent supporter, asked him. A little while afterwards he changed, because some one whispered that it was the Minister of Finance and not the Minister of Inland Revenue; so he made three identical speeches with reference to the tax on tobacco; and, when some good friend handed him the cigars, he stopped all the talk about taking the duty off tobacco, and left the room with the cigars in his pocket, and enjoyed them better than we did the speeches.

Mr. LANDERKIN. When I am wrong, I admit it, but you will go on and stick to it, wrong or right.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend is in such good nature, that I will not discuss that question any longer. What I want to get at is this. It is said that I was dishonest in making my argument. I want to know from the Solicitor General, who is my guide in this respect——

The PRIME MINISTER. Follow him, then.

Mr. FOSTER. I will follow him as far as he is right, and I will tell my right hon. friend that I would follow him and could follow him with a great deal more equanimity and good-will if my right hon. friend would just allow the Solicitor General to do what in his heart he is minded to do. But the trouble is that when the Solicitor General is warped from his straightforward view of what he wants to do by the pedantic theories of my right hon. friend who leads the Government, then I find it impossible to follow exactly in the footsteps of the Solicitor General. In the province of Ontario, I want to ask the Solicitor General who it is that appoints the revising officer?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Here is what the statute says:

The list shall be subject to revision by the county judge.

Mr. CLANCY. That is on appeal.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Call it what you like.

Mr. FOSTER. Practically, may I ask my hon. friend, who are the revising officers?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The county judge in the last instance.

Mr. FOSTER. Who are the revising officers up to the point of appeal?

Mr. CHARLTON. The municipal councils.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The county judge is the last to touch the list.

Mr. FOSTER. I think I have got enough to make the argument plain.

Mr. LANDERKIN. You have got the rudiments.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, and I have a rude reminder of the rudiments over there.

Mr. LANDERKIN. You will understand anything rude.

Mr. FOSTER. I was going on to say that if the Liberals made their plea on anything, they made it on the principle of being freed from the activity of a partisan government in making up their lists, and I began to quote instances of where under this Bill, if it became law, we would be landed in exactly the same predicament. The appointing power, under this Bill, will be different. It will no longer be the Dominion Government but the appointing power in each case will be the local governments. The point I drove home to the hon. gentlemen opposite was this, that whereas they cried out against this thing for years, to-day, when they come into office and have the enacting power in their own hands, they are throwing the electoral lists back into the management of persons who are appointed by governments equally partisan as the Government of the Dominion, and consequently there is no betterment in that particular. I cited the instances of certain provinces in which this is undoubtedly true. I had begun to speak of the province of Ontario. In Ontario the revision of the lists is conducted by or under the supervision of the municipal councils, and municipal matters being run upon the same partisan lines as Dominion matters in that province, in a large degree, if not wholly, you are brought face to face with the same thing, namely, that a partisan body is conducting the revision of the lists, and that partisan body controls the lists up to the time of final appeal, when the list goes to a county court judge. That brings me to the very principle I am contending for, namely, that we should provide in this Bill, that in all the provinces as well as in the province of Ontario, before any list is perfect, it must go through the hands of a county court judge.

Now, I want to put this question to my hon. friend the Solicitor General. If he appeals to that as a right thing, if he cites, almost as destructive of my whole argument, the fact that in Ontario things are all right because a county court judge ultimately has the power of revision, what ground has he for refusing to make the same state of affairs the law in the other provinces of the Dominion which do not have it now. If he cites that as a protection against wrongdoing, and as something that ought to satisfy us, then we say to him: be so kind as to

put the same protection and guarantee into your Bill to take effect in those provinces where the voters' list are not subject to the final revision of a county court judge. What reason in the world is there that our request should not be granted except the one the right hon. leader of the Government gives and the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), namely, that we ought to give this whole thing over to the provincial authorities and not meddle with the methods or basis of the provincial franchises? Am I stating too much when I make that statement? I listened very attentively to the speech of the right hon. gentleman the other night, when he came into this House and suddenly extinguished two such bright and shining lights as the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Heyd) and the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister), both of whom had been vociferating, at the top of their voices, a determined protest against the iniquity of taking off from the present franchise list any class of people who had a franchise hitherto conferred upon them, and, in the individual case, against taking the Indian from the voters' list. My right hon. friend came in at that juncture, when things seemed to be going along very well for that idea, when the Solicitor General had risen in his place, and in answer to repeated protests from this side that Dominion officials would be disfranchised under this proposed law, who enjoyed the franchise under the Dominion Act, declared that he appreciated the difficulty and was going to propose an amendment to meet it. When the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister) had made his plea that the Indians should be kept on, when the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Heyd) had recanted all his former opinions and declared for the continuance of the Indian vote, and when things appeared to be swimming along in the direction of having these bald and glaring evils in the Bill remedied my right hon. freind came in and laid down the law. Since then we have not heard a squeak from the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister) or a word from the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Heyd). Both of them had the courage of their convictions to such an extent that they were conveniently absent, if I mistake not, when the vote was taken on the very amendment which the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister) put before the House. What was the cap which the right hon. gentleman placed over these bright and shining lights. He took the ground, squarely and distinctly, that you could not have any half way measures, that you must either have a Dominion franchise framed by this House on independent lines, or leave altogether in the hands of the provinces. Let me quote what he said:

> The question is whether this franchise is to be regulated by this Parliament or by the local legislatures, and upon that question we differ.

That puts the question fairly. Shall the franchise be made by this Parliament, or shall it be made by the local authorities? No half way ground. We differ on this, he said. Your side is in favour of the franchise being made by the Dominion Parliament; I am in favour of its being made by the local legislature:

> Hon. gentlemen opposite have taken the ground that this Parliament should regulate the franchise, while we have taken the ground that the best method of dealing with it, in view of our complicated government under a federative system, is to have one uniform franchise for each province and for the Dominion, that is to say, that the same authority which regulates the franchise for the local legislature should also regulate it for the Dominion Parliament. Now this is the principle upon which this Bill is based, and I claim that it is the correct one.

There could be no clearer statement than that. There is to be no interference of the federal power with the local power. Reasoning down, the hon. gentleman came to the conclusion that the local legislature was the best judge, and, therefore, should fix the franchise. Reasoning logically upon that, he must deny the right of the federal power to interfere in the least with the acts upon this subject of the local legislature. There can be no half way ground here; it must be the one thing or the other. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) spoke to-day and took the same ground. And he brought forward a tremendous authority. He read from a pamphlet which he held in his hands, which he declared, was the declaration of principles of the Liberal party issued and promulgated in 1893. And he turned to those recreant members, as some of them are, and declared that he was bound and the Liberal party should be bound by the party declaration. He went further and said that those hon. gentlemen who proposed to graft upon the local legislation little twigs of amendment by this Parliament were interfering with the principle which was laid down by the party in 1893, and with the principle on which the leader of the Government had declared that this Bill was based. He declared that if they persisted in this, instead of having a well defined and soundly based Bill, they would create some sort of a political hermaphrodite, so to speak. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) was exactly at one with the leader of the Government. Where does the leader of the Government stand now with regard to this matter? Just a few moments ago we heard from the Solicitor General that he proposed to add to what the provincial legislatures had done. The local legislatures, being the proper authority to fix the franchise in the mind of my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) have fixed the franchise. The Solicitor General proposes to enlarge the franchise fixed by the provincial legislature. Is my right hon. friend going to allow that? Where, then, is the con-

sistency with what he lays down as the basic principle of this Bill, that it is the local legislatures that should do this thing? My right hon. friend is inconsistent and he is weak. He is inconsistent in that he allows a principle which he declares to be the principle of the Bill to be violated by the Solicitor General in the amendments he has given notice of, and he is weak because, having asserted a principle in this House, he is not strong enough to have it carried out but must give way to the Solicitor General and to opposing opinons on that side of the House with reference to this matter. On both these points my hon. friend has not solid ground to stand upon. If he takes the ground held from 1885 up, that you should not allow these lists to be made under the influence of partisan appointees, then I reply that he is running us into the hands of partisan appointees in almost every province. If he says that the legislatures and they alone should fix the franchises, he is inconsistent in allowing this body that he says is not the proper body to amend, to amplify and extend the lists which the local legislatures in their plenitude of knowledge and power in this matter have declared to be proper lists and lists that should be used. My right hon. friend cannot get out of that dilemma. Now, Sir, if he allows this God-given principle that the local legislatures and they alone should fix the franchise for this Dominion Parliament, to be extended in one instance, how can he object in another direction which simply gives to the individual voter the right of appealing to the courts of law to have his grievance heard and his franchise rights respected if they have been violated by a partisan appointee of a partisan Government in some one of the seven provinces of the Dominion? I want that view to go as strongly as possible before this committee and I believe it will go strongly before the country, and I believe that the good, sound, fair-play-loving common sense of this country will be with the Liberal-Conservatives in their demand—a demand that is not extreme in any way—that if in any province of Canada the courts are not open to the aggrieved elector, they shall be opened by the general enactment of this law so as to prevent, as far as possible, the invasion of the rights of a citizen to his vote.

Now, Sir, you may talk about the political millenium and as long and as earnestly as you please, but there is no political millenium in the province of Manitoba so far as the freedom from partisan spirit is concerned, and if that is true in the province of Manitoba I think I may say that it is true in most, if not all the provinces of the Dominion. There is just a possibility that partisan spirit, with its whole long line of spoils and patronage which depend upon it may influence the partisan registry clerk or revising officer, if not to put names on the list that should not be there, at least to avoid putting names on the lists which should be there. If there is the slightest possibility of this taking place in any one single province of the Dominion, it is the right of the prudent and careful legislature to see that these rights are guarded and that restraining enactments are passed to prevent the denial of right and the abuse of power.

Now, Sir, I have confined my argument to these points entirely. I do not go further. I might go further and ask why this Parliament should delegate the basis of its existence to other and lesser and various legislatures with powers that are generically different from those that we exercise. I have heard it stated this afternoon in the course of debate that the local legislature should make the franchise, that it was the best judge, that we in this Dominion House had nothing to say as to what they have made the franchise. The Solicitor General will not go so far as that, the Solicitor General could not so abnegate the functions of this high court of Parliament of Canada, and he is safeguarding the people against certain gross abuses, perhaps not actual but possible abuses, because he feels it possible that the local legislatures might go so far as to frame the franchise list in such a way as would make this Parliament a spectacle of contempt to the civilized world. And so he keeps his hand on the power that, in case of grave wrongs of that kind, Parliament may be able to defend itself and abolish the abuse.

But the very fact that he does that, is an incontestable argument to the deep-seated conviction in my hon. friend's mind that after all this is a sovereign legislature, and that it comports with its dignity and with its rights that it should have the unrestricted formation of the franchise upon which it exists, and to which it must go back for the vindication of its acts after its four or five years of existence. It is my deliberate conviction that if this enactment is made, and this is delegated to the local authorities, history will point out that it was an act not conceived in prudent statesmanship, an act from which evils have arisen in the course of the history of Canada; and I make the prophecy, although prophecy is dangerous, that the time will come when a Government and a Parliament sitting in these halls will go back to the principle that every great self-respecting Parliament must be the master of its own franchise, and must be able to say that the vital sources from which it draws its life shall be under its own protection, and not at the will or whim of a body which in its powers is different, and in its aims may be to a certain extent alien from the aims and aspirations of this Parliament.

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend, in the course of his long and diffuse speech, has not scrupled to say that he had con-

fined himself simply to the one proposition with which he set out. I will not controvert that assertion, because it would lead to no good end. I will simply endeavour to address myself to the one proposition which my hon. friend has endeavoured to establish before this House, namely, that in all the provinces where it is not provided by a local law that there hall be an appeal open to the elector after the formation of the lists, then this Parliament should provide for such an appeal. This is the proposition which my hon. friend has endeavoured to establish in a long and discursive speech of more than an hour's duration. Now, before I proceed any further, having, as I think, fairly stated my hon. friend's proposition, let us see where we stand. We are now upon subsection "a" of section 5 of this Act, which reads as follows :—

The qualifications necessary to entitle any person to vote thereat shall be those established by the laws of that province as necessary to entitle such persons to vote in the same part of the province at a provincial election.

We have reached this point after many long and weary debates, that at last the principle of a provincial franchise is admitted. But whilst it is admitted by hon. gentlemen on the other side, admitted, I may say, not willingly but by force of circumstances, my hon. friend wants to have that principle supplemented by this other proposition contained in this amendment :

Provided that if any electoral district in provinces where there is no judicial revision of the electoral lists provided for, a dispute should arise as to the qualification to entitle any person to vote thereon, an appeal thereon shall lie to a county court judge having jurisdiction in that electoral district, but in any province where there are no county court judges, then to a judge of the superior court of the district having jurisdiction in said electoral district.

This amendment means, disentangled from the verbiage in which it is stated, that in any province where the lists are prepared by an authority which is not judicial, there shall lie an appeal to the judicial authority upon the preparation of the lists. This seems to be reasonable enough at first sight, and I would be disposed to adopt as abstract principles many of the reasons which were adduced by the hon. gentleman. I would to a large extent adopt also the many eloquent periods which he devoted to a vindication of Liberal principles. But, Sir, my hon. friend has confirmed once more the truth, that when a dyed in the wool Tory attempts to speak of Liberal principles, he is always apt to make very sad mistakes. Now, let us see the foundation on which we stand. It is that in every province we shall have the provincial franchise as the basis of the franchise upon which the members of this House are to be elected.

Mr. FOSTER. Let us understand each other. Is it my hon. friend's contention that we shall have the lists as they are provided for by the local legislature as the basis of our franchise, or as our franchise ? There is a great distinction.

The PRIME MINISTER. I say that the principle laid down in this section does not admit of any discussion :

The qualifications necessary to entitle any person to vote thereat shall be those established by the laws of that province as necessary to entitle such person to vote in the same part of the province at a provincial election.

Now, my hon. friend wants me to supplement that language in the manner which I have already indicated. Well, it is a matter of record that there are no two provinces in which the franchises are absolutely alike. They are alike in all provinces, in principle, they are alike mostly in the nature of the qualification of the electors, but they are not absolutely identical in their respective provisions. What does this prove ? It proves the principle which my hon. friend has refused to admit up to this moment that the local franchise is necessarily, from its very nature, a local question to be determined by the local circumstances of the community in each province. My hon. friend will at least have to recognize this. The amendment which we have now before us has been considerably changed from what it was the other day when it was first presented. When it was first presented it did not contain a provision that this should apply only to certain provinces ; it was to apply to all the provinces in which there exists an appeal as well as to provinces in which an appeal does not exist. Since that time the amendment has been restricted only to apply to those provinces in which there is no judicial appeal. Take the case of each province. Take the case of the province of Ontario and the province of Quebec. They are provinces where an appeal lies to the judicial authority. In those provinces the lists are prepared by the municipal authorities. In the province of Ontario the lists are prepared by the municipal bodies, and in the province of Quebec the lists are prepared by the municipal bodies. If any elector is not satisfied with the lists so prepared, if he feels aggrieved, he has an appeal to the judicial authority. In the province of New Brunswick there is nothing of the kind, there is no appeal to a judicial authority. In the province of Nova Scotia there is no appeal, either, to the judicial authority. My hon. friend says : Why should there not be an appeal to the judicial authority ? The reason is very obvious, it is that in those provinces no want is felt for such an appeal.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

The PRIME MINISTER. Why, Sir, do not hon. gentlemen admit that statement ?

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

The PRIME MINISTER. Well, I have only to say this to my hon. friends on the other side of the House, that the people of New Brunswick are no greater fools than they are, and if they are satisfied with their franchise, it is because it has worked satisfactorily. So we have it in evidence, after this discussion which has taken place for two or three days, that for almost forty years the system which now prevails of preparing the lists in the province of New Brunswick, has not been altered. It is practically prepared by the municipal authorities themselves. There is an appeal, not as we understand an appeal, but a final revision by the sheriff. Will any man tell me that in the great province of New Brunswick, governed as it is by a system of representative government, governed as it is by party, by a ministry one side, whether it be a party ministry or a coalition ministry, and an opposition on the other side, if the people of that province had not been satisfied with their franchise there would not have been a member of the opposition so recreant to his duty as not to have introduced a Bill to reform it. But it has not been reformed. My hon. friend stated that the municipal authority which prepares the list is not biassed by party politics, is not influenced by party spirit. In Ontario, though the lists are prepared by the municipal authority, in Quebec, though the lists are prepared by the municipal authority likewise, the people are not satisfied to allow the matter to rest there, and so it has been thought advisable to give an appeal to judicial authority.

Mr. FOSTER. Why?

The PRIME MINISTER. Because the people of those provinces were not satisfied with the system; and it has not been done in New Brunswick because the people of that province were satisfied with a different system. When I say that we have given the right of appeal to a judicial authority, what do I mean by that? That an appeal has been given to this Parliament. Certainly not. But that in the province of Ontario an appeal has been given to a judicial authority by the people themselves; and in respect to the province of Quebec an appeal likewise has been given by the people themselves. The people of Quebec, represented in their legislature, and the people of Ontario represented in their legislature, were not satisfied to leave the preparation of the lists to the municipal bodies alone. They preferred an appeal to the judicial authority. Here are the people of New Brunswick, represented in the very same manner, living under the same system of government, not providing for the same appeal because they are up to this moment satisfied with their present system. But the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) says the time may come when the municipal bodies which prepare the lists may be influenced by party politics and by party spirit. Certainly the time may come. But if the time ever comes when the people of New Brunswick feel that the system which has worked satisfactorily for forty years is no longer satisfactory, then they will do as the people of Ontario and Quebec have done, provide for a judicial appeal. But so long as the people of New Brunswick are satisfied with the system, why should not my hon. friend, who is a New Brunswicker himself, be satisfied? Does he claim more wisdom than all the men of the province, has he more wisdom than the whole electoral body of the province?

Mr. LANDERKIN. He thinks so.

The PRIME MINISTER. I do not believe he thinks so. The hon. gentleman has undoubtedly been more theoretical than practical. We are legislating for practical men. I must say at once, with a great deal of humility, that when we prepared this measure it was with the idea that it would be in all respects perfect, not that it would be absolutely perfect. We knew that on the other side of the House there were angels, who were far and above all human imperfections, and we could not expect to satisfy them; but we will be able to satisfy every reasonable man in the House or out of it. Hon. gentlemen opposite say: Are you going to violate the great principle for which you have been contending, the right of the people to be protected by judicial authority? My answer to that statement is that this might be a good argument perhaps in the legislature of New Brunswick or Nova Scotia, but so far as this Parliament is concerned it is no argument, because it is not in our province to look after that part of the case.

Mr. FOSTER. Hear, hear.

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes. I say that if the people of New Brunswick, who understand their business and have representatives under their free parliamentary institutions, are satisfied to have elections carried on under a certain system, I am satisfied to adopt that same system for elections to this House, and to carry it out under the same principle and under the same franchise and by the same mode as that by which the people are satisfied to be represented in their own legislature. Who are the people of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia? They are only part and parcel of the great Canadian body, and it is idle to suppose that those men will be recreant to their duty and fail to understand their business. The whole argument advanced by the hon. gentleman is beside the question. The hon. gentleman has said that we would have under the present system, if this appeal was not granted, lists prepared by the appointees of a partisan government. I want to discuss the matter for a moment. I shall be glad to learn

of any system under which lists are not prepared by appointees of a partisan government, whether federal, provincial or municipal; and I defy the hon. gentleman to give me such a system. It is natural for governments to have lists prepared by appointees of their own. It would be natural, since we are now undertaking to reform the present system, which is so bad that even hon. gentlemen opposite who have maintained it for twelve years, do not now defend it, to have the lists prepared by appointees of our own. We do not submit such a proposition; we do not want the lists prepared by our appointees. We are satisfied to have them prepared by either the provincial or municipal authorities. I am quite aware that hon. gentlemen opposite may say that the appointees of a provincial government are appointees of a partisan government. I want to put this question to my hon. friend: would he be more satisfied to have the lists prepared by the appointees of this Government? No, he would not. But whether the lists are prepared by appointees of this Government or appointees of the provincial government or the municipal authorities, in each case the appointees are more or less those of a partisan government. What we want is a system that has in it least of the partisan spirit, and I appeal to hon. gentlemen opposite, and I submit that there is no system we can devise that will possess less of a partisan spirit as regards the preparation of the lists than the system which prevails in Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, where the lists are prepared by the municipal authorities. This is the answer I give to the question asked by my hon. friend. Let him get away from those high-sounding principles and phrases in which he has indulged, and if he will return to practical and common sense notions he will come to this view, that the amendment moved is not tenable in any way.

Mr. MILLS. I have listened with a great deal of pleasure to the remarks of the right hon. the leader of the House, but when he tells us that the franchise laws of the different provinces are the least open to fraud I beg leave to take exception to his statement. I assert that no franchise law ever placed on the Statute-book has its gates thrown so wide open to fraud, as has the Franchise Act of Nova Scotia, notwithstanding that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) told us this afternoon that it was his little child and that he was proud of it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I did not say that.

Mr. MILLS. You said it was your own little child.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. On the contrary. I said that the substance of the Act had been the law of Nova Scotia for thirty-five years and that the particular feature as to the appeal to the sheriff was my my own child.

Mr. MILLS. The sheriff's appeal was put into the Act in 1889, and consequently part of the child was his.

The PRIME MINISTER. A promising boy.

Mr. MILLS. The Nova Scotia Franchise Act virtually amounts to universal suffrage. Any male voter who has attained the age of 21 years can have a vote under that Act, provided that the partisans allow him to get the full benefit of the law. But at the same time the Act is so framed that the revisers can have objections thrown in the way to such an extent that voters can be kept off, and particularly Liberal-Conservative voters. I will read some portions of that Act to show that it amounts to universal suffrage:

> The following persons, of the full age of twenty-one years, and subjects of Her Majesty by birth or naturalization, and not disqualified by any section of this Act, or otherwise by law prevented from voting, shall be entitled to have their names entered upon the list of electors provided for by the section of this Act, and if so entered shall be entitled to vote at the election of members to serve in the House of Assembly. That is to say.

The Act recites the persons, namely: Those assessed for real property to the value of $150; of personal and real property to the value of $300, those persons exempted from taxation, yearly tenants of real property to the value of $150, the sons of persons in possession, the sons of widows, persons having a yearly income of $250, fishermen who at the time of the last assessment—not that they were assessed, but who at the time of the last assessment—were owners of boats, nets, fishing gear, tackle, or of boats, nets, fishing gear, tackle and real estate of the value of $150, if such property was within the county of which the polling district in which he claims a vote forms a part; workmen, tenants of companies and partners and joint tenants of certain real estate.

Those who have experience of the different franchise Acts of this country know well that in order to decide whom it is proper to place on the list, the reviser must have a legal training and a legal knowledge. Under the Nova Scotia law, courts are provided for, and revisers are provided to preside over these courts, but to a large extent these revisers are partisan heelers. As proof of their partisanship, their fradulent partisanship, I have given instances to this House on more than one occasion. The Nova Scotia Act was passed after the Dominion Franchise Act, and to a certain extent it follows some of the qualifications of the Dominion law, but extended the franchise so far as income voters are concerned. It is more difficult to understand than the Dominion law, and consequently more difficult, particularly for laymen, to administer and

interpret it. The sheriff was introduced into this Nova Scotia Act of 1889. Before 1883 the sheriffs were largely under the control of the judiciary of the province, but in that year, which was about the time the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) came upon the political arena, the Government thought they desired an extension of their patronage and so they passed the Act making eighteen sheriffs, "good men and true," appointees of the local Government. It has been stated here that some of these sheriffs are Conservatives. There is, I believe, one who has been a Conservative in the province of Nova Scotia, namely, Sheriff McLean, of Shelburne, but I do not think there is another.

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). What about the sheriff of Inverness ?

Mr. MILLS. The people of Inverness change so much, sometimes they are Tory one year and Grit the next according to circumstances, and as I know little about them, I can only judge of whether they are Tory or Grit from the people whom I meet belonging to that county.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. What about the sheriff of King's county ?

Mr. MILLS. Sheriff Belcher——

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. MILLS. I rather think Sheriff Belcher supported the Minister of Militia last election ; at least I am so informed.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). Oh, no.

Mr. MILLS. At all events if he did not support him he was a very quiet opponent, and whether or not, the sheriffs know perfectly well that they are in the hands of the local Government of Nova Scotia, and they dare not do anything else than the bidding of that Government. They are appointed during good behaviour, and their good behaviour amounts to their doing the bidding of the local Government or else get out. As regards the county of Annapolis, I have nothing to say against Sheriff Gates. Sheriff Gates in business is a good, thorough, honest and consistent man, but Sheriff Gates is a partisan. He is not a trained lawyer, and I defy him to take the Franchise Act of 1889, and interpret it correctly from beginning to end with the different cases that may arise. It takes a lawyer to do it and a very good lawyer at that. It is impossible for Sheriff Gates to do it. He is frequently in doubt with reference to the cases that come before him, and being in doubt his partisan proclivities step in and he always gives his party the benefit of the doubt. The Liberals consequently get the benefit of it in that way. Now, the county of Annapolis is something like sixty miles in one direction and forty or fifty miles in another direction, and there is only one court, so that if there is an appeal from Springfield or from Margaretsville, or from Bear River, or from Victoria Beach, or from any of these remoter districts in the county, to the sheriff's court the parties must travel thirty, forty, or fifty miles to the sheriff's court, and bring their witnesses ; entailing great expense on the electorate in order to get their rights ; whereas, if a judge was appointed, as under the old Dominion Franchise Act, there would be six or seven courts held in a county. Under that Act the courts sought the people, instead of the people seeking the courts, and thereby greater justice was done. The sheriff's court is a farce, a complete farce. It rests in the hands of these partisan laymen, the revisers, and I have given you a sample of what they will do. One reviser consigns a person to a hot climate when he goes to him for justice ; another says, "I am going to take these fourteen Tories off, and there are a lot more of the damned Tories that ought to come off." I have that stated in a solemn declaration which I have read to the House. This is a sample of the partisan revisers.

Now, the hon. Finance Minister has jokingly said—jokingly, I presume, for surely he does not mean this for argument—that I am here to run down the county of Annapolis and the province of Nova Scotia. Let me tell the hon. gentleman and this House that the county of Annapolis and the province of Nova Scotia know me too well for that. I have never yet run down my country ; I have never yet been a traitor to my country ; I have never yet stood on the stump or anywhere else in Nova Scotia and advocated the repeal of Nova Scotia from the Union. I have never yet told the people of Nova Scotia that now was the time to strike for their liberties, that now was the time to break away from Canada, that now was the time to come out and be a nation of ourselves, a little Nova Scotia. I have not done that sort of thing, and that is one of the reasons why I have been returned to this House from the county of Annapolis which ever since I have represented it, has returned a municipal council largely Liberal. The people of that county know perfectly well that what I tell them I believe in. I know of persons who have gone to that county and preached repeal. I have met those persons, and they are not very far from this Chamber. One of those persons is the hon. Finance Minister, who is now before me in this House. I have told the people of Annapolis to regard the sayings of those persons as sayings of political demagogues, of charlatans, who wanted to befool the people, who wanted to trade on their prejudices and their passions ; and the people of Annapolis county, knowing that I have been honest in these things—honest to the county, to the province and to Canada—have returned me three times to this Parliament—in 1887, in 1891, and 1896 Notwithstanding that, the hon. Finance Minister coquetted with that county. He was

down there in 1896; and, if rumour is right, he sent a telegram to the clerk of the county saying that he would accept a nomination to contest the county in the election of 1896. But he dare not come into that county. You have heard of the little story of the 'cute man who wanted to pull some nuts out of the fire, and who sent a monkey to get the nuts. The Finance Minister was that 'cute man, and the monkey was the Attorney General of Nova Scotia. The monkey sought to get the nuts, but he got his fingers burnt. The hon. Finance Minister sought a reason this afternoon why I have been returned by Annapolis county. He thought it very strange that the municipality of Annapolis, being largely Liberal, should return me. Let me tell the hon. Minister that I was born and brought up in the county of Annapolis. The people of that county know me, and when I go to them, they believe what I say. They believe that I do not go there to fool them with catch cries to capture their votes for the time being. Now, the people of Annapolis county are very much interested in the hon. Finance Minister at the present time. As was stated here some time ago, he not only came down to that country and preached repeal in 1886 and 1887, but he also came down in 1896 and preached free trade—told the people about the duties on flour and cotton and other things that were being foisted on the country by the obnoxious Liberal-Conservative Government and its National Policy. The people of Annapolis county are very anxious that the hon. gentleman shall do something for them, now that he is in a position to do so; that is, some of them are. The Liberal-Conservatives and the people who believe in protection are not very anxious about it. I do not care a snap of my finger about the duty on flour. I had the temerity in 1887 to tell the people that if I were sent to Parliament I would advocate a duty of $2.50 a barrel on flour, which would not raise the price in Nova Scotia one cent. I had the temerity to do the same thing in 1891 and also in 1896. It is one thing to talk to the people and another thing to do something for them, as the hon. Finance Minister now thinks.

With reference to the Franchise Act of Nova Scotia, which is sought to be incorporated in the Bill before the House, it is as I have said before, the worst Franchise Act in the Dominion, in which the gates are opened for the perpetration of fraud. I listened with some amusement this afternoon to the remarks of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) with reference to this matter. He was advocating the leaving of these matters entirely to the provinces, claiming that we had nothing to do with them. I was thinking of other speeches which the hon. member for North Norfolk had made in this House not very long ago, when he was advocating exactly the opposite—when he was advocating that this House should take cognizance of matters on which the provinces had already passed laws, such as Sunday Observance. But what is law with the hon. member for North Norfolk in the forenoon is not law in the afternoon. He is not consistent, by any means, in his views regarding the franchise. For party purposes, I dare say the hon. member for North Norfolk desires that the franchise for this Dominion should be made up of those of the different provinces. For his own purposes, he believes that this Dominion should take charge of certain other matters which the provinces have already taken charge of. What we ask must commend itself to the mind of every well advised man as being nothing more nor less than what is right, namely, that the courts should intervene. Why are hon. gentlemen opposite so afraid of the judges? Why are they so afraid to have the revision go on before the judges? Judges may be partisans if you like, appointed by the different Governments. I know of partisans who are to be appointed judges, and who now have their seats on the Government benches. They are ardent partisans, they would do anything for this Government at present, but I believe that being relatively trained men, they will, when appointed judges, rise above partisan feeling. Some judges, perhaps, may allow their partisan feelings to warp their judgment, but the nearest approach to perfection in that regard that we can possibly have is to have trained men put in such positions. Does it appeal to the sense of right of any hon. member to have such men as Daniel J. Riordan or T. Troop Messenger, whose deeds I have detailed here in solemn declarations, made judges in these matters? Are these men to decide who shall and who shall not go upon those electoral lists. In the one case, no less than fourteen men were left off in a batch, and in the other some three or four, and these men hold courts for twenty-eight different districts in the county. If they leave off three or four men in each district, that would give a majority in a close county at once. You are simply giving universal suffrage to the Liberals and not even a franchise to the Conservatives, if this is adopted. In all candour, I think it is only proper that these appeals should be allowed to the judges and not to partisan sheriffs. I have all my life, as a lawyer, done business with the sheriffs all over Nova Scotia, and we have always had a Liberal sheriff in Annapolis, and I have always found them in the main honest in their business, but when they become interpreters of the law, about which they know nothing, they are influenced by party men who can twist and turn them just as their own party inclinations dictate.

Mr. WALLACE. Before the question is put, I desire to make a few remarks on this

most important measure, by which we are to decide who shall have the right to vote in the Dominion elections. A matter so important calls for the most serious consideration, and all the time that is spent in discussing it is exceedingly well spent.

I listened to the very violent language this afternoon of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). That hon. gentleman indulged in his old time vigour of language, and I was reminded by the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) that the hon. gentleman was very angry yesterday because a certain Bill of his did not pass the House, or because certain of his old time friends did not stand up to give him the opportunity of dividing the House upon it. I was told the story about a certain distinguished Canadian, or a Canadian of prominence, at any rate, who went over to the States during the past year, and the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) reminded me of him very much by the vigorous way in which he used his vocabulary this afternoon. It was stated that a citizen of Canada who has made frequent trips across the line, and is sometimes known as a Canadian and sometimes as a party working in the interest of the United States, went over accompanied by one of our Canadians, as quasi ambassadors, and tried to have certain reciprocal arrangements made for the extension of trade between the two countries. But it seems they did not get a very warm reception on the other side. In fact, their reception was decidedly cool, and the Canadian legislator who accompanied this person got very angry, as they went from one office to another and saw the distinguished American citizens and members of the Cabinet and received very cold comfort from them, and finally were practically shoved out upon the sidewalk or very nearly shoved out. This Canadian got very angry and he said: There will be hell to pay in Israel for this. I thought that his language very much resembled that of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) this afternoon when he indulged in a violent attack on the franchise law of the Dominion. He said that that law was put into operation to gain political advantage. Now, I do not think that that is a correct representation of it, because there was no political advantage to gain. Under that Bill, the voters' lists were those prepared by the revising officers. Who were those revising officers? In almost every instance, they were county court judges. There were some exceptions, in cases where the county court judges were old men and could not undertake additional duties, but throughout the province of Ontario, at any rate, the revising officers were, in almost every instance, county court judges or junior judges. In the county of York and in the city of Toronto, we had two judges—the county court judges who took two constituencies and a junior judge who took two more, and a retired judge, Judge Boyd, a man of the highest and most estimable character, a man who enjoyed high reputation as a county court judge and as junior county court judge for many years.

These were the three gentlemen who were the revising officers for the three ridings of the city of Toronto and the three ridings for the county of York. And they did their work, as acknowledged by both sides of politics, with fairness and honesty. They started, as the law directs them, from the assessment rolls of the municipalities. They hung up these lists and invited inspection of them so that names might be left off or put on and every opportunity was given to have the lists perfected, being in striking contrast, in this respect, with the provincial voters' lists. From the very outset these lists seemed to be made up with a different principle in view from those of the province. In the Dominion list there was every facility for one entitled to vote and have his name entered, but in the case of the provincial list there are many difficulties put in the way, so that some are disfranchised in every locality. We have never pretended that this Dominion franchise law is perfect. A great deal is made of the contention that it is expensive. Well, I have had a good deal of experience in revising the provincial list, and revising the Dominion list, and I have no hesitation in saying that there is more expense in the revision of the provincial than of the Dominion list. And one great disadvantage in the case of the provincial list is that, with all the expense, you cannot make a perfect list. For various causes, a number of men are disfranchised. When I was Controller of Customs in 1894, I was disfranchised. I do not know what wrong I had done or what crime I had committed that I should be disfranchised as a voter of the province of Ontario. We are told that some remedy will be found for that and that the present Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) will be entitled to vote. I hope so. He will not be entitled to vote under this Act as submitted, but I understood from some one that the Bill would be changed and the hon. Minister would be entitled to vote. If not, then, the Minister of Customs is assisting to pass a law that will disfranchise himself. Why should he not have a vote. I pause for a reply, but I suppose I may pause for a long time, because the hon. Minister could not give a reason. Another defect of this Bill and one that affects thousands, and I might say tens of thousands of the voters of Ontario, is that when a man gets his name on the list as living in one electoral district, and before the election moves to another electoral district, he is no longer entitled to vote in the locality on the list for which his name appears, on the ground that he does not reside there, and, of course, he cannot vote in the locality in which he lives because his name is not on the list.

Now, how do hon. gentlemen opposite justify this disfranchisement of tens of thousands of citizens. I have known hundreds of people disfranchised in provincial elections in this way. And how can they justify adopting provincial lists when they are defective in this regard. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) tells us that we must make our choice and either have a Dominion list and control the Dominion franchise, or leave the power in this matter with the provincial authorities. For my part, I decidedly object to give it to the provincial authorities, for, so far as Ontario is concerned, the provincial law is full of anamolies and imperfections. And when we ask hon. gentlemen what they intend to do about such cases as that I have mentioned of men who remove from the district to another, we get no satisfactory answer. I do not see the Solicitor General here——

An hon. MEMBER. He is here.

Mr. WALLACE. I am glad to see that the hon. gentleman has arrived. I have asked a number of questions, but none of the hon. gentlemen on that side seem to know how to answer me. No Minister was able to give us any opinion on the point we raised. Now we have the Solicitor General here who has charge of the Bill, and I will repeat the question I asked. I was stating that many people change their residence, and if they change their residence in certain portions of the year they cannot have their names put on the electoral list in the district to which they have removed, at any rate until after a certain time ; they cannot at all in certain cases, if the revision of the lists is finished. Now does the Solicitor General propose to make a remedy for those cases ? Let me take the case of Mr. John Abell, who removed from the electoral constituency of West York to another part. But it happened that the local Government had gerrymandered that other part out of West York for the local legislature. When the election came on, Mr. Abell, who is the owner of hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of property, who had resided for more than 40 years in Canada, found himself disfranchised. He had no vote in West York that he had left, and he had no vote in the district to which he had removed because his name was not on that list in class 1 or class 3. What remedy does the Solicitor General propose for that unjustifiable state of affairs ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. If he has resided in the municipality for three months previous to making the lists, he is entitled to vote.

Mr. WALLACE. The Minister does not understand the distinction between a municipality and an electoral district. An electoral district is made up of several municipalities. If he moves out of an electoral district he loses his vote, if he moves out of a municipality he also loses his vote, even though he still remains in the electoral district.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The case that the hon. gentleman states is not founded in law. No such case exists.

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. gentleman is referring to the Registration Act, I fear.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. No, I am referring to those who are entitled to be entered in the revised voters' list of the municipality.

Mr. WALLACE. I do not think the hon. gentleman knows exactly what he is talking about. I will state the case again. If a citizen having a vote in an electoral district moves away from that electoral district after the revision has taken place, and goes into another electoral district, he has no vote in the new electoral district because his name is not there, and there is no means by which his name can be put there, because the revision is over. How does the Solicitor General propose to remedy that wrong ? Then I stated the case of Mr. John Abell, who resided in Woodbridge, and who removed to Parkdale. He had large properties in both places, but his name was not on the Parkdale list. His name was on part 2, as we call it in Ontario, which gives a man a right of municipal vote, but does not give him a vote for the local legislature. Another instance is that of Dr. Orr, who was our candidate for the local legislature. He removed from the township of Vaughan into Parkdale. He had property in Vaughan. When the next election came on he found himself disfranchised because he had no vote in Vaughan. He could not go back and take the oath of residence, therefore he was disfranchised. These are only specimens out of thousands in the province of Ontario. Now, what answer does the Solicitor General give to this question when I ask him what he proposes to do ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The law proposes to take the local list.

Mr. WALLACE. So this injustice will be perpetuated. Well, Sir, I am opposed to the Bill for that reason. No supporter of the Government can say that a citizen of Canada ought to be disfranchised because he removes from one place to another. It is no crime to remove from one constituency to another.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). How many are disfranchised under the Act this is repealing ? Hundreds of thousands in the last election. How many were there in your own county who could not vote last time ?

Mr. WALLACE. I do not know one entitled to vote who was deprived of his right of voting, except myself. I went to the

polling division and the returning officer pretended that he did not know me. I think we had a very good list.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. How about all those that come of age after the revision of the list ?

Mr. WALLACE. The list was revised up to about the 1st of January, 1895, and the election was held in June, 1896. Of course those who had come of age after the revision of the list could not vote.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. How many lived in the riding all their lives and could not vote ?

Mr. WALLACE. That was not due to any fault of the Franchise Bill. It was due to the fact that the Parliament of Canada by a unanimous vote decided not to have a revision of the lists in 1895. I am quite satisfied that the Minister was in favour of that proposal, indeed an Act was necessary and it received the approval of the Minister, and I challenge him to disprove it.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Did that Act permit all Canadians over 21 years to vote, irrespective of their wage earnings or anything else ?

Mr. WALLACE. The qualification mentioned in the Franchise Act of the Dominion prevailed everywhere.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. How about residence ?

Mr. WALLACE. If a man's name was on the list there was nothing to prevent him voting.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. He could not be on the list unless he resided here.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. He must be on the list and a resident of Canada. He must also have a certain income, as an income voter.

Mr. WALLACE. He can vote if he lived in Canada.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Not unless he earned a sufficient income.

Mr. WALLACE. There are very few people, under the various franchises, who cannot have their names placed on the lists. I have had great experience before judges, and I am rather in favour of universal suffrage, and adopting a Dominion universal suffrage. I suppose the Solicitor General would do the same.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Not a bit of it.

Mr. WALLACE. Then the hon. gentleman is more restrictive in his views than I am.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes.

Mr. WALLACE. The Solicitor General and the Minister of Customs are evidently quite apart in their views, because, judging from the Minister's remarks, it might be thought he was in favour of universal suffrage.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I simply wanted to point out the classes of people that were enfranchised under the Ontario Act, and compare them with those under the Dominion Act.

Mr. WALLACE. There were more votes polled under the Dominion Act than under the Provincial Act of Ontario, showing that the former is the more liberal measure. Under the Dominion Act facilities are provided for voters placing their names on the lists, while the Ontario Act presented obstacles in the way. When the names were on the provincial lists it did not follow that the people were entitled to votes. There were half a dozen oaths to be taken, and they were so complicated and misleading that the ordinary elector found it difficult to understand them, and consequently he often refused to take the oath. The Minister of Customs seems to wish to taunt us with the fact that under the Dominion Franchise we did not provide universal suffrage. Is the hon. Minister in favour of universal suffrage ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I am telling the hon. gentleman that I prefer the Ontario lists to the Dominion voters' lists.

Mr. WALLACE. The Minister of Customs evidently will not reply to my question, and of course he has a right not to do so unless he chooses. I ask him whether he is in favour of universal suffrage, because his colleague, the Solicitor General, who is in charge of the Bill, has been very emphatic in his opposition to universal suffrage. That is no doubt one of the reasons why we have this nondescript Bill presented, containing half a dozen different franchises, a system which might be appropriate for the provinces, but is not such a system as should be used in the election of members to the Dominion Parliament. I doubt the constitutionality of the present Bill. The Confederation Act says that " until otherwise provided " the franchises of the provinces shall be used. We did provide otherwise in 1885, and I do not think we can go back to the franchises of the different provinces. The provisions of that Franchise Act were vigorously opposed in 1885, and the section which evoked most discussion and opposition was the one providing for the enfranchisement of the Indians. The Indians have been entitled to vote since that time, and I am not aware that a violent wrench has been given to the constitution. I was amazed to see gentlemen opposite, who were most vigorous in denouncing the proposal to give Indians votes propose to the Government that they should permit the people now enfranchised to retain their franchise. There is some force in the argument that because a man has received

a privilege he should not be deprived of it without cause, but hon. gentlemen opposite have strongly urged that the Indians should have the right to vote, and that was a complete answer to all statements made by them in 1885. They predicted all sorts of calamities, and I think the hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) said at that time that if the Indians abandoned their tribal relations he would not object to their having a vote. What had that to do with it? They and their ancestors were in Canada long before we or our ancestors were, and their adopting or abandoning tribal relations had nothing to do with their right to vote. They were not the wards of the nation. They received a sum of money from the Government of Canada, but that money was not given as a charity, but as a compensation to them for their property. They were the original owners of the soil, and the Canadian Government, in a spirit of fair-play, differing from that practiced by the Government of the United States towards their Indians, gave them the right to retain their homesteads, but purchased their other land, and instead of giving them a lump sum for it, gave them an annual payment. I am glad to see to-day that these gentlemen who so violently opposed this part of the Dominion Franchise Act thirteen years ago, have seen the error of their ways, and have endorsed the course taken by the Government in allowing the Indians to vote. All the predictions made about the injustice of the Dominion Franchise Act of 1885 by these gentlemen opposite have been falsified by experience. They said they would not get fair-play, but to-day they are in power under the Dominion Franchise Act. It has done so well for them that they should continue it for ever.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. We got there in spite of it.

Mr. WALLACE. No, Sir, you got there in consequence of it; you got there because the voters' lists under the Dominion Franchise Act were fair.

The PRIME MINISTER. Hear, hear.

Mr. WALLACE. You got there because a man who had the right to vote was retained on the list, and he could come from Manitoba or Quebec or elsewhere and vote in his home in Ontario.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. That is one of the bad features of it.

Mr. WALLACE. That is one of the good features of it, for I do not think that election day is the right time to hold an election court.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. One man one vote.

Mr. WALLACE. If that principle is to prevail, the principle should accompany it that one vote should have one value.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I do not know what you pay for your votes.

Mr. WALLACE. I do not think the hon. gentleman has intelligence enough to understand my statement, but he appears to be going backwards. One vote one value means what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Somerville) many years ago stoutly contended for, namely, representation by population. Is it fair that in the West Riding of York, as constituted for the local legislature, there should be 20,000 people, and that in West Toronto, alongside of it, there should be more than three times 20,000 people. I believe that the principle of representation by population should be largely adhered to, but the practice of the local government, under this iniquitous Franchise Act of theirs, has been the very opposite.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Under whose administration was that evil brought about?

Mr. WALLACE. Oliver Mowat's.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. And the former Conservative Government here.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. gentleman ought to know by this time that the Dominion Government has nothing to do with the limits of the constituencies in the local legislature.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Are you not aware that your riding has 60,000 or 70,000 population, and the gentleman who sits next to you (Mr. Wood, Brockville) has a riding of about 15,000. That is under the Dominion law.

Mr. WALLACE. I am not aware of it, and it is not so.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. You ought to be.

Mr. WALLACE. My constituency is a large one, but it has not 60,000 or 70,000 population. You may take 30,000 off.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Well, say 40,000, and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wood, Brockville) beside you has 15,000.

Mr. WALLACE. I think we ought to have a more even distribution. If the hon. gentleman with 15,000 constituents thinks they are more intelligent than mine, I can tell him they are not by a good deal. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) said that we did not dare to have an annual revision of the lists. Well, I presume that we did not want to be put to the trouble, as candidates, of an annual revision. There is no use in having an annual revision of the lists. The revision of the lists should take place only before an election. If we have an election every five years, in my opinion, we should have a revision of the lists every five years.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. What about a by-election?

Mr. WALLACE. Before a by-election I would give enough time to have a revision or a registration, so as to have an expression of the views of the people of the constituency up to date. Some maintain that those who elected the members at the general election should be the only ones to have a voice in the election of a member to succeed him; but I am in favour of having a revision for a by-election; and there are going to be half a dozen by-elections, or perhaps more, if all the members who are going to be made judges, lieutenant-governors, postmasters, and so forth, are going to vacate their seats. I have a long list here, but I will not make the members on the other side blush by a recital of their names.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Give us the names.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. member for North Brant (Mr. Somerville) is not there. The hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Choquette) is to be made a judge, acording to report.

Mr. LANDERKIN. He would make a good one, too.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. member for Kamouraska (Mr. Carroll) is also to be made a judge.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Another good one.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) is to be made a Senator.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Now you are talking.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan) is, I am told, looking for a senatorship too, but he cannot get it just now; he will have to wait till his turn comes later on. That will be better than $2.50 for lecturing throughout the country. Then, there is our friend the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) with the governorship looming up before him; and we look with a great deal of interest to see how economically affairs will be managed at that magnificent government house away out at Regina when the hon. gentleman goes there. With these vacancies looming up, almost like a general election, it might be justifiable to have a general revision of the voters' lists. The next session will be just like this—it will take us two or three months to get acquainted with the new members. Every year, with a lot of new members on that side of the House——

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. None on the other side.

Mr. WALLACE. They are not promoted to any positions; they are elected, and they have to stay here for their term.

Mr. LANDERKIN. For ever.

Mr. WALLACE. Some of us would like to stay, not for ever, but for a good number of years; but our constituents have to be consulted about that every four or five years. I say we ought to have a revision, not every year, because an annual revision is unnecessary expense, both to the candidate and to the country. Preparing a perfect or a nearly perfect list requires a great deal of labour, and governmental and municipal machinery.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Your Franchise Act provides that that must be done every year.

Mr. WALLACE. The law is that it must be done every year; but Parliament has passed an Act every year suspending the operation of that law, because it is an unnecessary work, and costs so much time, trouble and expense. It is said that the list in the last general election was a little old. It was, but that can be provided for very easily by having a revision before an election. If the Government should decide to dissolve the House before their term of five years has expired, there should be sufficient time allowed for a revision or registration, so that all those entitled to vote should be able to get their names put on the list. That would not be expensive, and it would be very easily done, because when an election is looming up within a few weeks, the political spirit of the people is aroused, and there is no difficulty in getting their names put on the list. But under the provincial franchise of Ontario there is a difficulty.

An election seems a long way off, you do not know that an election will take place on that list, and yet you ask a man to lose his day by travelling eight or ten miles to a court of revision and spending the whole day there waiting for his turn to have his name put on the list, when you do not know that an election will take place on that list at all. That is very unsatisfactory, yet that is the character of the procedure you propose to impose on the people of Ontario. You should instead provide something like what we have in the Dominion Franchise Act, namely, that a man need not lose his day by going before the judge, but simply makes an affidavit, which is read to the judge, and on the strength of which the judge puts his name on the list. That list is hung up, and if any fraud is perpetrated, there is the further opportunity of having the name struck off at a later period. In many cases, the court has the last revision, because the sifting process has been going on, the parties agreed that certain names should remain, and when they came to disputed names, they went before the judge, and in that way a satisfactory list was made out. The cost is but a secondary consideration, and it would be greatly diminished if the proposal I made were adopted, namely, to have a revision only as often as there is an election. There would then be very little expense, although I think it is

perfectly justifiable to spend money in order to obtain a nearly perfect list. Beyond general vituperation and condemnation of the Dominion list, I have heard very few particulars from hon. gentlemen opposite. The hon. member for North Norfolk said that the last two elections were held on lists over two years old. That was not true or anything near the truth. The House by unanimous consent passed an Act of Parliament to suspend the operation of the law providing for an annual revision.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Why did you do that ?

Mr. WALLACE. Why did the hon. Minister of Customs vote for it ? It was to save money and trouble to the candidates, but I think we made a mistake. However, the mistake was made by every member of the House.

Another objection which has been called attention to by the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) is that you have a list that is not satisfactory. It is partly written and partly printed. A reputable citizen told me yesterday that in our last election, a very large number of persons whose names were on the printed lists were not allowed to vote because their names were not on the lists in the hands of the deputy returning officer. These were men who had property, who had resided there all their lives in the locality, whose names were on the printed list of voters as published by the municipal council but were not on the list furnished to the deputy returning officer. This was under the local Act. Under the Dominion Act, however, the list is hung up, and every man whose name is on it is entitled to vote if he takes the oath that he is a British subject and 21 years of age and has not bribed anybody or received a bribe from anybody. That is all that is required. His name being on the list hung up all over the riding, no one can deprive him of his vote. But in the provincial lists, the opposite is the case. Many reputable citizens, who have property and have resided in the locality all their lives, were deprived of their votes at the last election and had no remedy. Yet the Parliament of Canada is handing over all its powers to these provincial legislatures. That is utterly unjustifiable. We should retain the power in our own hands, we should be able to say : here is a grievance which we have the power to remedy and which we will remedy. But the Solicitor General says : No ; I have no answer to make, we have handed everything over to the local legislatures. Well, if you do that and permit them to work their own sweet will, we know that the ballot will no longer be a guarantee of secrecy, because in the province of Ontario the ballot used is such that, when examined, you can find out how every man has voted. By this Bill, therefore, a door is at once open to the worst kind of intimidation, and we can easily understand how these local legislatures will exercise the power that is given them, in the use of hotelkeepers and others, who are completely within their control. I hope that the Parliament of Canada will resist the imposition of such an unjust franchise law as this on the country, and not stultify itself by admitting that we are incompetent to make a law which will do justice to all parties and keep the control of the franchise in our own hands. It is a serious reflection on a Government, which claims to be a Government of business men and to be a progressive Government, and to have an active interest in the welfare of the people, that it should abdicate its functions and hand over the powers that properly belong to it, to the local legislatures. We are in that respect making a very great mistake. I am quite sure that if the Conservative party comes into power—and it is probable that one political party will not remain in power for ever—they will be pretty sure to repeal any Act, if one has been passed handing back to the provinces the power to fix the franchise for Dominion elections. I think it would be a mistake to have any Government pass such a law and the next repeal it, and thus make these successive changes. But I do not apprehend that this would in practice occur, because, the experience we have had with the Dominion Franchise Act would disabuse the minds of hon. members and of the people generally of many false impressions and would show the practical necessity for such a law. Some of the hon. gentlemen opposite who were loudest in their opposition to the Franchise Bill of 1885 now rise and practically confess that they have made a mistake.

Mr. LISTER. What has been said on the subject so far does not prove what you say.

Mr. WALLACE. I have the debates of 1885 here, and I think I could quote eloquent speeches of the member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) opposing the granting of franchise to Canadians ; and yet he has risen here within the last few days and asked that the votes be not taken away from the Indians.

Mr. LISTER. Those speeches referred to Big Bear, Sitting Bull, Slap-him-on-the back and others of that kind.

Mr. WALLACE. I do not think the hon. member for West Lambton confined his objection to the constituents of the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) but included those who are now his own constituents. Now, the hon. member for North Brant (Mr. Somerville) said that he was in favour of one man one vote. If that is a good principle, let it be applied all round. But one man in Quebec has six votes, and the same is true in other provinces. I suppose we shall have the hon. member for North Brant proposing here to apply this

principle that he says he believes in and I think he does believe in.

Mr. LISTER. We could have ten votes to one man in Ontario if we chose to make the law that way.

Mr. WALLACE. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lister) want the law that way ?

Mr. LISTER. No, I am not asking for it.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. You said it was a good law.

Mr. WALLACE. No, I did not say that.

Mr. LISTER. The Toronto votes are a good thing for you.

Mr. WALLACE. I am glad to say that citizens of Toronto who have votes in West York have been cordial in their support of me, and the same is true of the citizens of West York also.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Give us a rest.

Mr. WALLACE. Whenever the hon. member from North Brant or any one on that side gets into a little dilemma he says "Give us a rest." I ask the hon. member about this principle of one man one vote, and he says "Give us a rest." That is not an answer to the question. Now, I think we are entitled to an answer from the hon. member for North Brant. Will he favour one man one vote in Ontario and one man six votes in Quebec.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Yes, it is in the Bill.

Mr. WALLACE. Now we know the principle on which the hon. gentleman goes. Whatever is in the Bill, he supports.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I am willing to leave it to the provinces.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Somerville) is something like the Government. They find they have here a rather difficult task and they say : We will hand it over to the provinces. They have the Yukon Railway to build, the Drummond County business is not quite settled, then there is the Kettle River Valley Railway and the division in the Cabinet about it——

Mr. SOMERVILLE. What clause of the Bill is the hon. gentleman discussing ?

Mr. WALLACE. I am discussing the preamble. As I was saying, it is evident the Government have difficult matters before them for consideration. We know that the hon. the Prime Minister himself has his difficulties.

Mr. LISTER. Not of the kind you have.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. He has not a nest of traitors.

Mr. WALLACE. I had not anything to do with any of them. We know that the Prime Minister went down to Quebec on one occasion when Mr. Langelier, then a member of this House was kicking up a little bit of a row. There was a question of the Lieutenant-Governorship, and a member of the Prime Minister's Government, it is said, was bound that Mr. Chapleau should be continued as Lieutenant-Governor. It was rumoured that the Prime Minister himself was not adverse——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. WALLACE. I am giving resons why the Government cannot undertake to put this Bill through this session but hands the difficulties over to the provinces. I have been attacking them so far, and I am trying now to see if I cannot find some justification for them. I was going to say——

The PRIME MINISTER. Are you in favour of the Bill ?

Mr. WALLACE. I have expressed my hostility to the Bill.

Mr. LISTER. Not yet.

Mr. WALLACE. But, Mr. Chairman, I was pointing out that there were some difficulties in the province of Quebec. A member of this House produced a document signed by the Prime Minister himself, in which a certain gentleman was promised to be made Lieutenant-Governor of the province of Quebec. That promise was long unfulfilled.

Mr. BELCOURT. Was it anonymous ?

Mr. WALLACE. It was signed by Mr. Langelier.

Mr. MILLS. Was he a member sitting in this House ?

Mr. WALLACE. Yes, in violation of the laws of Parliament and of the independence of Parliament. But the Prime Minister was in a dilemma. What was he to do ? Here was Mr. Chapleau. If he were permitted to go out of the Governorship he might want to get into the Government. Well, there was no room perhaps in the Government just at that time, because the province of Quebec, I think, has about seven members in the Government, while the province of Ontario has five. If the province of Ontario had her share, in proportion to her population and representation in Parliament, she would have ten members in the Government. Supposing that she had ten members in the Government, you see what the possibilities are. We could then give a seat in the Government to the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister) ; we could give a seat in the Government to the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) ; we could give a seat in the Government to the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Somerville), who would do his duty faithfully and well, I have no doubt. Now, it is evident that the reason of the Government in wishing to hand this

franchise over to the provinces is because they have encountered difficulties in governing the country. There are franchise Bills to pass, and there are promises made which the Government find it difficult to fulfil. One of their promises was that Mr. Langelier, a member of the House of Commons, should be made Lieutenant-Governor of Quebec. But the Minister of Public Works said tha Mr. Chapleau should remain Governor, because if he came back to this House he would be a thorn in the side of the Prime Minister, if he were made a member of the Government, and he would be still worse if he came to this side of the House. In the province of Quebec, to give him a free rein, might be disastrous to the Prime Minister; and for all these reasons they decided it was better to keep him in his place. But the row got so large that the promissory note had to be met, and the result was that a shuffle of the cards was made. The Lieutenant-Governor published what was considered quite an injudicious letter, I believe.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Bain). I shall have to ask the hon. gentleman to discuss the question before the House. While I am willing to give him any amount of latitude to discuss incidental questions, I think the committee will agree with me that he has gone far enough.

Mr. WALLACE. I shall with great pleasure bow to your decision. But when members on the opposite side ask me questions, am I to be refused the privilege of answering them? I say that this Bill contains so many unjust provisions that the Government should not attempt to force it through the House.

Mr. BERGERON. Who did the Governor write the letter to?

Mr. WALLACE. To the Minister of Public Works.

Mr. BERGERON. Was the letter lost?

Mr. WALLACE. I would like to see the whole letter. We have only been given snatches of it. But I think the whole letter would be a very interesting document, and I would ask the Minister of Public Works to lay it on the Table of the House.

The PRIME MINISTER. Question.

Mr. WALLACE. I say, Mr. Chairman, that this Bill should not become law, when it is pointed out that there are injustices and anamolies in it, and that it does not give a fair representation of the opinions of the people. I, therefore, am opposed to the enactment of the proposed legislation.

Mr. McDOUGALL. There is one feature of this Bill that is sure to be very objectionable and very unpopular. The system under which our voters' lists are made up in the province of Nova Scotia has been referred to on several occasions. The revisers meet in some four or five different places within a county. At the sitting of the revisers it will be necessary for people who are interested in getting their names on the voters' list, and also for the candidates who are interested in seeing a proper list made, to attend a meeting of those revisers. Under the present Dominion law the court held by the revising barrister is held at several particular places at different dates. That affords an opportunity to have a man look after the revision of the lists on behalf of either party and be able to meet with the revising barrister at each of his meetings within the county. Under this law, if it goes into operation, it will be impossible for any one particular person to attend the meeting of the revisers with the same object. At present the cost of the revision of the lists in the provinces is borne by the municipalities, and is a tax upon the people of the municipalities direct, and I take it that when the interest in the preparation of the voters' lists for Dominion elections is added to the interest now involved in the preparation of the municipal and provincial voters' lists a much longer time will be necessarily occupied by the revisers in their preparation of the lists, and it will necessitate also the attendance of a great many more people at the sittings of the revisers while preparing those lists. In my county I know that under the present system the cost of the preparation of the municipal and provincial voters' lists is between $300 and $400 a year, and I feel satisfied that if we add the cost of the reviser hearing Dominion appeals, for adding names and keeping them off the lists, a heavy additional cost, probably double the present amount, will be placed on the taxpayers of each constituency. What the result will be in my own particular constituency will follow in most of the other constituencies of the Dominion, and as a probable result of the adoption of such a measure as is now before the House, which requires the same expense on the basis to be made annually, if we figure the expense on the basis of the cost in my constituency, there will be a charge to the taxpayers direct of not less than $200,000 or $300,000 in the five years. I cannot see the necessity of providing for a revision of the voters' lists annually, because as was explained by the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace), the necessity of holding an election only arises once every five years, except in the case of by-elections. I think the argument made by that hon. gentleman, which was to the effect that in the case of a by-election it would be quite proper to use the lists used at the general election preceding the by-election, and in that way avoid the cost of annual revisions of the voters' lists for the purpose of Dominion elections, was sound. There are other causes that would lead to a heavy expenditure on the part of the different parties who may be interested in the preparation of a good list.

The better the voters' list is made under the law the more costly it will be, and I cannot allow a measure of this kind to pass without uttering my strongest protest against its adoption. I cannot agree to the passage of a measure which will add, as I feel confident the effect of the Bill will be, to the burdens of the already overburdened taxpayers of the country, because this additional taxation will be placed not on our people who are in most comfortable circumstances, but on the poor man, the man with one hundred acres of land, with small buildings, whose property will be assessed at its full value, because there are circumstances which lead an assessor to place a higher valuation on the property of a poor man than as a rule is placed on the property of a man more wealthy. For example, in the country a poor man with 100 acres of land and a small personal property, with the land perhaps not in good condition, and two or three sons living on the farm with him, will aim to secure votes for himself and his sons. The result will be that the valuation of the property will be placed probably at more than the property would bring in the market. The more wealthy man, with thousands of dollars in the banks, and one or two hundred acres of land in good condition, with other property, will be assessed at a lower valuation in proportion by the assessor than he finds himself compelled to make on the property of the poor man. For this reason when the tax-collector comes around and collects the taxes, it will be found that the poor man pays the larger sum in proportion to his means to the cost of the preparation of the voters' lists That is one of the reasons why I protest in the strongest terms at my command against the imposition of this tax on the people of the country directly. The taxation involved in the preparation of the voters' lists under the law now in force comes more largely out of the pockets of the people who consume the articles that pay the higher rates of duty, and in that way the poorer classes are not to the same extent the taxpayers in that particular instance. If this Parliament is going to impose the cost of the revision of the list on the municipal treasuries, they will impose that cost on a class more heavily that do not bear a fraction of the expense under the present law. That is the difference in my opinion between the law proposed and that which is now in existence. That is a difference of great importance to the people, and especially to those who feel they cannot bear increased burdens. I cannot understand that any good reason has been advanced for the introduction of this measure under such circumstances. By this Bill, it is alleged that a change is to be made which is greatly to the advantage of the country. We are not giving any relief by the proposed Act as regards the causes of the complaint that exists with respect to the present law.

The chief complaint against the present law, as I understand it, is the expense; but by this Bill we are unloading that expense from the Dominion treasury and putting it upon the poor taxpayers of the country, to be taken out of their pockets by the direct tax collector who goes once a year to their doors to collect from them sums sufficient for the maintenance of the local institutions within their respective counties. That is one reason why I feel in duty bound to add my protest against this measure. Neither will this Bill lessen the cost to those who are interested in looking after the lists ; not by any means. It will on the contrary increase the cost, because we have to get more people within the counties interested in looking after these lists, and as in most cases the revisers appointed are not competent to interpret the law, we cannot have a list that can be used. In many of these districts the revisers are at the mercy of anybody who chooses to press them for a decision in one direction or another, and those interested in having a good list made will in consequence be put to great expense. The candidates cannot get people to look after their lists, day after day and week after week, without paying them for it. I cannot understand the reason for this change. The Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) has in the past given us evidence of a strong regard for repealing measures. We were accustomed in Nova Scotia to hearing the expression "Liberalism and Repeal," and now we are getting it. We have Liberalism, and Liberalism is going to be followed by repeal. I would like to know what is going to be repealed next. My hon. friend from Annapolis (Mr. Mills) referred to the question of repeal, and I have here a statement made by the Finance Minister on that subject, and I will take the trouble of reading it in order to see whether it does not bear upon the measure before the House, and the necessity of repealing the Dominion Franchise Act.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I appeal to you, Mr. Chairman, to compel the hon. member (Mr. McDougall) to confine himself to the question. What has repeal to do with this ?

Mr. McDOUGALL. We are dealing with the repeal of the Franchise Act, and I am about to give the House an illustration of the means used by the Finance Minister in past years for bringing about repeal in respect to another important measure.

Mr. POWELL. That is quite in order.

An hon. MEMBER. It is as near as the hon. member can come to it, I suppose.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Here is what the Finance Minister said :

> The interests of New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island and Nova Scotia are alike in this matter. I trust this question of separation from Canada will be brought up by independent members in both provinces (New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island) and fairly discussed. Bad

as is the position of the two provinces in this union, it will become worse if Nova Scotia secedes. Maritime interests will become weaker than ever at Ottawa, and there will be little chance for the New Brunswickers and the Islanders to obtain justice. They have everything to gain by joining Nova Scotia, and I am satisfied that if the movement be taken up with vigour in our sister provinces the demand for separation from Canada will be made, not from Nova Scotia alone, but by the three maritime provinces. But if New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island are content to occupy their present position, or the weaker one which they would occupy after the withdrawal of Nova Scotia, they must be permitted, of course, to take their own way. We shall take our way, and demand for Nova Scotia alone separation from the Dominion, though we would much prefer joint action, because we have always felt that the provinces down by the sea have a unity of interest, and that in co-operation we might bring about results which would go far to make the people of our country prosperous and happy. The people are in earnest in this matter, and the politician who fails to keep faith with them will have reason to regret that he ever came forward to take part in the agitation. I believe the people of Nova Scotia, and from sea to sea, will, at the approaching elections, throw off the yoke of Toryism, and that, in our own province particularly, we shall have a grand victory for Liberalism and repeal.

I would like to know if the measure now before the House is a back door dodge for the purpose of bringing about that repeal. Can the Minister of Finance assure me that it is not ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not think I could assure my hon. friend of anything at this hour of the night.

Mr. McDOUGALL. It is the duty of the Finance Minister to assure us of any definite result that will follow from the passage of the measure now before the House. It occurs to me that in the preparation of the voters' lists it will confuse matters very much between the Dominion and the local authorities. It appears to me that it will be quite impossible to get the local officials to provide the lists and all the other information necessary to the returning officers appointed under authority of this Parliament unless provision is made in the Bill to pay the local officers for their work. It will be necessary, in my opinion, to insert a clause providing that the local officers engaged in the preparation of the voters' lists should be considered as if appointed as officers of the Dominion Government some such section as this : "All officers of the province to whom duties are assigned by this Act are considered officers of the Government of Canada, notwithstanding anything in the British North America Act. I tried to explain to the House a few evenings ago my opinion with regard to the difficulty in the way of compelling these officers to perform work under the direction of the Government of Canada ; and I am still strongly of the opinion that that will lead to great difficulty, especially unless the Government provide in this Bill for paying for any service they require these officers to render. As hon. members know, there is a provision in the local Act for imposing penalties on sheriffs, revisers and other officers who have to do with the lists ; and this Bill provides penalties likewise. I cannot see how these people will be liable to penalties under two Acts, an Act of the provincial legislature and an Act of this Parliament, in connection with the same service. I would like very much to know the opinion of the hon. Solicitor General in regard to that, and how he proposes that these two sets of penalties can be imposed upon one official, particularly an official who is not an official of the Government or Parliament of Canada.

Mr. CLANCY. I do not feel disposed to weary the House, and I desire to be entirely serious in discussing this question, because it does not seem to me that there are wide and important differences between the two political parties with regard to it. Hon. gentlemen cannot conceal from themselves that they cut a very strange figure before the country in dealing with this franchise Bill. We know that during the twelve or fourteen years of the existence of the Franchise Act which was introduced and carried through by the Conservative party, hon. gentlemen opposite contended that it disfranchised Liberals from one end of Canada to the other, and that the Liberal party were put at a disadvantage at the hands of a set of partisan officers who were the mere creatures and tools of the Conservative party. I challenge hon. gentlemen opposite to say if that in substance was not what was stated on every public platform in Canada. Now, the principal reason advanced for this Bill is that by introducing it the Liberal party are redeeming one of their pledges. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) this afternoon read the platform of the Liberal party on this subject, as adopted in 1893, to show that they were pledged to certain measures, among others the repeal of the Dominion Franchise Act. I do not know whether hon. gentlemen intend to redeem all their pledges by the mere repeal of that Act, because they have not redeemed their other pledges, although they have made some sham attempts to do so. But, in no honest sense have they redeemed a single pledge which they made before the elections. With regard to their pledge to repeal the Franchise Act, I do not believe the people care a whit for that pledge. It does not involve anything ; it is based on a mere false cry. Hon. gentlemen know that when they are telling the people that that Act disfranchised the Liberal party, that statement did not contain a single element of truth. But suppose it had some element of truth in it, what have hon. gentlemen done ? I challenge any hon. gentleman from the province of Ontario to show that the Bill now

proposed is one particle less partisan in its character than the Act which is to be repealed. No one will pretend to say that in the province of Ontario the assessors have not their political leanings and do not to some extent act on those political leanings. No one will pretend to say that the same thing is not true of the municipal clerks and all other municipal officers. No person will so far take leave of his senses as to say that the municipal officers are not partisans. There is not an hon. gentleman from the province of Ontario who has had any experience of municipal elections but will say that there is a strife to-day to elect municipal councillors favourable to one party or the other—why? Because the municipal council will constitute a court of revision, at which those lists will largely take the political colour, first, of the assessors, next to the clerk, and next of the court of revision. We are told that the lists are prepared by a set of revisers appointed by the municipal council. I think the hon. gentleman who said that had in his mind the machinery employed in some of the other provinces. He knows that the council itself constitutes the revising body, and that the appeal is made to the county judge only in case there are complaints with regard to the action of the court of revision. To whom does the list go on appeal? To the very set of persons whom hon. gentlemen opposite blackened in this country as tools of the Conservative party—the same tribunal and the same men in many instances who revised the Dominion lists under the old Act. Therefore, so far as partisanship is concerned, hon. gentlemen opposite stand exactly where we did. But let us come to the list in the province of Ontario. I give the hon. Solicitor General credit for showing a great deal of good temper in dealing with a difficult question; but I am still convinced that he fails to realize the consequences of the change he is making in this Act with regard to disfranchising voters in the province of Ontario. Let hon. members remember that under this Bill the revision does not take place under the control of the Dominion; it takes place under the control of the province. Now, I will take an instance of three townships adjoining each other, but in three separate electoral districts. If a man moves from one township to another, which is in a different constituency, and a court of revision sits there the next day, he cannot get his name put on the list. Has the hon. Solicitor General considered the fact that he will disfranchise a number of voters from one end of Ontario to another under our system of one man one vote. The hon. gentleman says that if a man resides three months in a municipality he can get on the list, but the hon. gentleman is entirely wrong. He is speaking of the qualification under what is known as the Ontario Elections Act, which requires registration and no more. Let me read the affidavit that a man will have to take, who moves from one municipality to another, and from one provincial electoral district to another. I am not referring to the oath under the registration system:

> That I am a British subject by birth or naturalization; that I have resided in the province nine months next preceding the 15th February;——

That is the date fixed by statute for commencing to make the assessment rolls.

> ——that I was at the said date in good faith a resident of and domiciled in the municipality in the list of which I was entered; that I have resided therein continuously from the said date;——

That is, the 15th February, although this might be away on in June or July.

> ——that I am actually residing and domiciled therein.

Nothing can be clearer than that if a voter goes from one municipality into another and from one electoral district into another, he cannot get upon the list.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. How does my hon. friend make that affidavit agree with this? Section 9 of the Election Act of Ontario of 1897, provides:

> Subject to the provision of this Act, every male person of the full age of twenty-one years, a subject of Her Majesty by birth or naturalization, and not disqualified under this Act, and not otherwise by law prohibited from voting, shall, if duly entered in the list of voters prepared under the Manhood Suffrage Registration Act proper to be used, also be entitled to vote at such elections;
>
> Provided that such person has resided within the province for the twelve months next preceding the day on which the first sitting of the registrars of manhood suffrage voters was held for the preparation of the lists of voters under the Manhood Suffrage Registraion Act;
>
> And provided that such person was in good faith, on the said last mentioned day, and for the three calendar months next preceding the same, a resident of and domiciled in the city on the list of which he is entered; and was in good faith on the said day and for the next preceding thirty days a resident of and domiciled within the territory comprising the electoral district on the list of which he is entered.

Mr. CLANCY. That refers entirely to voters placed upon the list under the manhood Suffrage Registration Act and not by virtue of the Voters' List Act, which is an entirely different matter. The hon. gentleman will know that manhood suffrage voters are placed on the voters' lists under two circumstances—one on the Ontario Election Act, and the other on the provincial voters' lists. The case I am referring to is the latter.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. They are all the same.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman is mistaken. We have had some experience in matters of that kind, and if the hon. gentle-

man will turn up the Voters' List Act he will find he is mistaken. What is the oath, under the Voters' List Act, which a voter would have to take when he went up to give his vote. It is as follows :—

> You are the person named in the list of voters now shown you in the poll-book ; that you are a British subject by birth or naturalization ; that you have resided within this province for nine months before.....day of.....being the day fixed by statute or by law for beginning to make the assessment roll in which you were entitled to be entered as a person qualified to vote ; that you were at the date aforesaid in good faith a resident of and domiciled in the municipality in the list of which you were entered ; that you have resided in this electoral district continuously from the said date (February 15) and are now actually residing and domiciled therein.

That is the oath that must be taken under the Voters' List Act, and the other is the oath that a voter must take in order to be placed on the list, as manhood suffrage voter, under the Ontario Voters' List Act. The hon. gentleman has referred entirely to the names of voters placed upon the list under the Ontario Elections Act, by virtue of the system of registration, and not the case to which I will now call his attention. That applies, as my hon. friend sees, to cities, towns and county towns, and how far it may be extended is a question hereafter to be decided by the provinces, and one that is entirely handed over to the provinces by hon. gentlemen opposite. If I am right—and I am sure the hon. gentleman will see that I am—what will follow ? First, the voter must have resided within the municipality on the 15th February preceding the time when he makes application to have his name placed on the list, unless that is varied by by-law—and if it is, it is only shifting the dates because the same length of residence will be required in both cases. The manhood suffrage voter in the rural municipality where there is no system or registration, if a man left township A and went into another township which was not in the electoral district for provincial purposes, there is no possibility of his getting upon that list during that whole year. Then, under the system of one man one vote in the province of Ontario, residence in the province is considered necessary. Now, why do not hon. gentlemen opposite enlarge that to Dominion residence and not allow a man to be disfranchised simply because he happens to live across the border in another province ? Will the hon. Prime Minister think it a fair thing that a man living in Quebec, just across the river from Ottawa, could not be placed upon the list for a whole year ? Why, if the whole city of Hull were to be transferred from that side to this, and if they owned half the city of Ottawa it would be impossible to place a man of them on the voters' list unless he had been a resident of the province of Ontario twelve months. I believe that hon. gentlemen opposite have not considered the effects of the system in force in the province of Ontario. We heard the Prime Minister make a very eloquent speech declaring that the old system of franchise in the several provinces had been in use for Dominion purposes from 1867 to 1885, and there has been no complaints. Surely hon. gentlemen opposite cannot have forgotten that there have been vast changes since then. Hon. members must remember, and those who live in the province of Ontario must know, that the franchise of 1885 in that province was quite as liberal as the Dominion franchise passed in the same year. The fact that this franchise was satisfactory from 1867 to 1885, does not prove that it is satisfactory to-day. We had not the one man one vote system then, and if we had had it, some Dominion franchise law would have been necessary to avoid confusion, which confusion will arise under the Bill that hon. gentlemen propose. These are grave reasons against the Bill and such as cannot be passed over hurriedly.

Another important point besides those I have already pointed out is suggested by the Prime Minister's statement that the franchise is a matter of a domestic character and that the people in the different localities are the best judges of the local circumstances. In the first place, this is not always true. Take, for instance, the voting on the plebiscite. There can be no doubt at all that this vote will be taken on a question that is within the scope of Dominion politics. Does that not prove the soundness of the contention that we should have a Dominion franchise ? I am not arguing now that it should or should not be based upon the principle of adopting the franchises of the provinces. That may be a very good thing to do. Hon. gentlemen may argue with some force that the franchises in the different provinces have the sanction of experience and should be accepted. I am quite prepared to say that there is something in the contention that the people of a province are peculiarly well fitted to fix their own franchise. It may be well to adopt the existing franchises of the different provinces ; but let us not give up the right of this House to make its own franchise or commit it to the acceptance of what the provincial legislatures may do in the future. I have no hesitation in saying that I am prepared to adopt the franchise that obtains in the province of Ontario if it is made a Dominion franchise. I have no hesitation in saying that time has shown us that it is probably the cheaper system, and I have no objection to the length we go in the direction of universal suffrage. But we should not be asked to accept blindly what the changes that may be made in the future by bodies over which we have no control. What do hon. gentlemen tell us ? They say that if there is any enactment that we do not approve, we can recall our action and establish a franchise of our own. Is not that a childish argument to

put forth ? I do not wish to be offensive, but I would ask if that puts forward any sound principle of legislation for this House. I challenge the hon. gentleman to select any other question in regard to which they would be prepared to say : We will hand over to some person, to some company, to some great corporation, to some province, certain powers, and if they abuse those powers, we will take them back. Is that a sound principle of legislation ? We have heard a very extraordinary declaration from the Solicitor General that the presumption should be that public officials would not do any wrong. Why, Sir, you might as well go into the streets of Ottawa and pick out the honest men and, upon their declaration that it was a sound principle to have no law against wrong-doing, to repeal all your laws against wrong-doing, because these gentlemen were satisfied they would not steal themselves, and no body else would. It seems to me that we should not proceed upon similar lines in regard to this Bill. The Government are asking us to depart from sound principles of legislation in order that they may make a compromise in fulfilling some of the pledges that they have made to the people of this country. Hon. gentlemen have not hitherto been such sticklers about their pledges. If the First Minister intends to fulfil all the pledges that he has made, he will require to be a long time in power.

The PRIME MINISTER. We are bound to stick to one until it is finished.

Mr. CLANCY. I am afraid they have singled out this one as a sacrifice to the others.

The PRIME MINISTER. Do I understand that the pile of papers I see on the desk of the hon. gentleman is his brief for this speech ?

Mr. CLANCY. I may say to the hon. gentleman that it is a small portion.

The PRIME MINISTER. Then I would suggest that he move the adjournment of this debate.

Mr. CLANCY. I move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. FOSTER. Might I suggest to the Solicitor General that he would in some way put this amendment so that it can be printed.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I will have several copies struck off to-morrow.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Committee rose and reported progress.

The PRIME MINISTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 12.25 a.m. (Wednesday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 27th April, 1898.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

MR. H. A. ROBERTS.

Mr. MacLAREN asked,

Why was the care of the post office clock at Stratford, Ont., taken from H. A. Roberts ? Who asked for his dismissal ? Who received the appointment in place of Roberts ? What salary does the present caretaker receive ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). In answer to the hon. gentleman, I beg to state that the care of the post office clock at Stratford was taken from Mr. Roberts partly because he was not quite up to the times, and because his time was up. The care of the clock was given to Mr. John Welsh. Mr. Welsh has been appointed to the place at the same salary as Mr. Roberts—$50 per annum.

POSTMASTER AT PEAKE'S STATION, P.E.I.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's) asked,

Has Allan Macdonald, postmaster at Peake Station, Prince Edward Island, been removed from office ? What are the grounds of removal ? Who is appointed his successor ? By whom was he recommended ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). In answer to the hon. gentleman's question I beg to state that, Mr. Allan Macdonald, formerly postmaster at Peake Station, P.E.I., was removed from office because of his having taken an active part in the last general Dominion election. An investigation was held and Mr. Macdonald, the then postmaster, under oath, admitted that during that election he went around canvassing with Mr. A. Macdonald, the Conservative candidate ; that he drove around with his own horse calling upon some thirty people, speaking to them on politics ; that he attended public meetings ; that he was appointed to call a meeting to select delegates for a convention ; that he acted as chairman at this meeting ; that he was also selected as delegate to the convention ; that he attended the convention and voted for a candidate ; that his political friends were accustomed to meet at his residence in regard to politics ; that about a dozen attended there the night before the election ; that he attended the court of revision and took part in the revision of the list on behalf of the Conservative candidate ; that he may have allowed his name to be attached to notices to be given to parties to have their names struck off. Beyond these exceptions he does not admit having acted as an offen-

sive political partisan. Mr. Benjamin Hayden was appointed to Mr. Macdonald's place on the recommendation of Mr. Robertson.

DEAF AND DUMB MUTES.

Mr. DOUGLAS asked,

Is it the intention of the Government to place a sum in the Supplementary Estimates sufficient to erect a building to be used for the education of the deaf and dumb mutes of the North-west Territories? If not, why not?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). I am not able at the present time to give the hon. gentleman the information he asks for.

WILFRID MERCIER, COMMISSIONER.

Mr. MONK asked,

1. What claim was made by Wilfrid Mercier, of Montreal, for his services and expenses as a commissioner to investigate the conduct of employees at St. Ann Lock, in Jacques Cartier county?

2. What amount has been paid on account of such claim?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). 1. The account of Mr. Wilfrid Mercier, for his services and expenses as a commissioner to investigate the conduct of employees at Ste Anne's Lock in Jacques Cartier County amounted to $136.65. 2. He was paid the full amount, viz., $136.65.

DEPARTMENTAL NOTICE.

Mr. GILLIES (by Mr. McDougall) asked,

1. By virtue of what authority did the Postmaster General issue the following notice and publish the same in the "Canada Gazette":—

NOTICE.

"Whereas the Post Office Act provides that the Postmaster General may, subject to the provisions of the Act, establish the rates of postage on all mailable matter not being letters, newspapers or other things therein specially provided for: And whereas, the rates of postage upon letters from Canada to the United Kingdom or to any British possession is not specially provided for by the Post Office Act or any amendments thereof, now therfore, I, William Mulock, Postmaster General of Canada, under and by virtue of authority vested in me, do hereby establish the rate of postage upon all letters aforesaid transmitted by post from any point in Canada to the United Kingdom or to any of the British possessions as follows:—There shall be charged and paid one uniform rate of three cents per ounce weight, a fraction of an ounce being chargeable as an ounce, upon all letters as aforesaid transmitted from any point in Canada to any point in the United Kingdom or British possessions. That this regulation shall come into force and take effect on, from and after the first day of January, one thousand eight-hundred and ninety-eight. Dated at Ottawa this twenty-third day of November, 1897.

"W. MULOCK,
"Postmaster General."

2. At the time the Postmaster General issued the notice and reduced the postage upon letters between Canada and the United Kingdom from five cents to three cents for every ounce, was he aware that Canada had been since 1st July, 1878, a member of the Universal Postal Union?

3. Was it competent for Canada, as a member of the Universal Postal Union, to make the reduction mentioned in the manner proposed in the notice given by the Postmaster General?

4. If not so competent, why was this notice given by the Postmaster General?

5. If it was so competent for Canada, as a member of the Universal Postal Union, to give the notice mentioned, why were not the terms of the reduction mentioned in the Postmaster General's notice adhered to and carried into effect?

6. For what length of time after the first day of January, 1898, did the following paragraph of the Postmaster General's notice continue operative:—

"There shall be charged and paid one uniform rate of three cents per ounce weight, a fraction of an ounce being chargeable as an ounce, upon all letters as aforesaid transmitted from any point in Canada to any point in the United Kingdom or British possessions."

7. Was the postage reduced to three cents per ounce in consequence of this notice? If so, why was not this rate continued, and why and when was a return to the old rate ordered?

8. What amount was lost to the postal revenue of Canada during the currency of the period that letters were being carried under the reduced rate in consequence of the order issued by the Postmaster General and dated 23rd November, 1897?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). 1. Notice was issued on the authority stated in the notice. 2. Yes. 3. This is a question of law. 4. The answer is covered by the previous answer. 5. The proposed reduction was suspended at the request of the Imperial authorities in order that an opportunity might be afforded for representatives of all parts of the Empire to meet and discuss the question of Inter-Imperial Postage. 6, 7, 8. The proposed reduction never went into operation, it having been withdrawn prior to the date fixed for its going into effect, but lest any of the public, not knowing of its withdrawal, might have insufficiently prepaid their letters, authority was given to the Exchange Post Offices to add any shortage. This was done and the total amount of stamps so added was $91.95, but payment of this sum will not embarrass the finances of the department, as, owing to the cancellation of a certain contract, which had been kept on foot unnecessarily for several years at the urgent instance of the member for Richmond, N.S., for mail service between McIntyre's Lake and Sidney, and the service being re-arranged and let to the lowest tenderers, there was effected for the four years of the contract, commencing with the first of July last, a saving of $20,728.

BREAKWATER, CHAPEL COVE.

Mr. GILLIES (by Mr. McDougall) asked,

Is it the intention of the Government to provide a sum in the Supplementary Estimates dur-

ing the present session for the construction of a breakwater at Chapel Cove, county of Richmond, Cape Breton, a survey plan and report of which were made in 1895, and are now in the Department of Public Works ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). The information will be given to the hon. gentleman when the Supplementary Estimates are brought down.

OLIVER EQUIPMENT.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON asked,

Has the Government adopted the Oliver equipment, and if it has does it comprise the valise and other articles as originally designed ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). 1. It has adopted the Oliver equipment. 2. It is difficult to know exactly what is meant by the expression "as originally designed." Surgeon General Oliver gives in his Handbook of his Equipment several "orders" or varieties of that equipment. Of these we have adopted one in its entirety, which conforms, except for difference in pattern, very closely to the British equipment, known as "Light Service Order," which is the recognized equipment for the British army for home defence. There is no article known as the "valise" in Surgeon General Oliver's Handbook of his Equipment. If the "Magazine Bag" is what is meant, this does not form a portion of the Light Service Order, referred to. But a certain number of these have been ordered for use on barrack duty in time of peace.

REPORTED DEATH OF THE RIGHT HON. W. E. GLADSTONE.

Mr. GIBSON. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to ask the Prime Minister if he is in receipt of any information as to the reported death of the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The Government has no information whatever with regard to this report. A cable despatch has been sent to the press to the effect that Mr. Gladstone is dead, but it is impossible to verify the sad news.

NEW MEMBER.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that the Clerk of the House has received from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, a certificate of the election and return of Barnard D. McLellan, Esq., for the electoral district of Prince West, P.E.I.

MEMBER INTRODUCED.

Barnard D. McLellan, Esq., member for the electoral district of Prince West, Prince Edward Island ; introduced by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) and Mr. Yeo.

Mr. GILLIES.

INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I would like to call the attention of the Treasury benches to some returns that have been ordered and that are found on page 158 of the Votes and Proceedings. There is one relating to the Railway Department, the case of D. Bain, Esq., concerning whom an order of the House was adopted. On the same day, and relating to the same department, an order was adopted respecting the appointment of R. S. Thompson. In connection with the Customs Department, an order of the House was adopted for a return in connection with the United States steamship "Yantic." Again in regard to the Railway Department, a return was ordered in the case of Chas. Hoar. An Address was also carried for correspondence respecting the enforcement of the coasting laws on the Pacific and Atlantic coast. I draw the attention of the Minister of Customs to this matter. I also desire to call the attention of the Minister of Railways to an order passed for correspondence respecting the dismissal of Wm. Sutherland, car inspector, Stellarton, N.S. Also to another order in connection with the same department for correspondence regarding the letting of a contract for farm gates on the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. BERGERON. I should like to call the attention of the Minister of Railways to an Order of the House passed on the 30th March asking for papers and correspondence respecting the dismissal of François Corbeil, wharfinger on Lachine Canal. Also an order for correspondence between the Public Works Department and L. H. Masson. I do not see the Minister in his place, but I hope my inquiry will be mentioned to him.

FIRST READING.

Mr. CASEY. I ask permission to make a formal motion. I move the first reading of Bill (No. 124) (from the Senate) to incorporate the Alberta and Yukon Navigation and Mining Company.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the motion is not in order.

Mr. CASEY. I ask the unanimous consent of the House to this motion. Of course, if any objection is taken, it will have to stand.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. DAVIN. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to make a statement. On the 13th of this month while the hon. Minister of Customs was speaking, he

referred to my speech, saying that I had not given any evidence that promises had been made in the North-west Territories respecting duties on agricultural implements. I thereupon expressed my surprise, and the hon. Minister very courteously gave way while I asked permission to read what I had already brought before the House, and I read a statement made by the Minister of Agriculture at Moosomin. The correspondent of the Manitoba "Free Press" gives this account of it:

He, Mr. Paterson, has based the Government policy on the tariff platform of the convention of 1893, and declared that no Minister ever gave a pledge to place agricultural implements on the free list. Mr. Davin interrupted that he had Hon. Sydney Fisher's words before him, but Mr. Paterson said he did not apprehend that Mr. Davin contradicted his assertion.

Mr. Davin said, "Oh, but I do."

Mr. Paterson—Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that he can quote utterances of the Minister who pledged to place agricultural implements on the free list?

Mr. Davin—I certainly do.

Mr. Paterson then sat down to allow Mr. Davin to read a speech made by Hon. Sydney Fisher at Moosomin in 1894, but the extract contained not a single word of any such pledge, and when Mr. Davin sat down, Mr. Paterson said, "I declare, Mr. Speaker, if it is not a piece of impertinence on the part of the member for West Assiniboia to contradict me, and when I gave him an opportunity to read what he says he has before him he utterly fails to do so."

I do not think it is necessary that I should read again what the Minister of Agriculture said. It is enough for me to brand that account as untrue. Another writer said a western member had a conversation with the hon. member for West Durham:

An hon. member for the North-west told me that he did not want free binding twine, because, as he said, he believed the farmers should pay their fair proportion of the taxation and expenses of the country.

Thereupon the writer goes on for half a column to say that I am the person. I never had a word of conversation with the hon. member for Durham on the subject of binding twine, therefore I could not have said this. I need hardly say that my opinions are well known on that question, and therefore if any members from the North-west had any conversation with the member for Durham it was not I, and it will be in order if any hon. member from the North-west, whether Liberal or Conservative, had such a conversation now to rise and make a statement.

ALIEN LABOUR LAW.

Mr. CLARKE. I desire to repeat a question which I understood the hon. Solicitor General promised to reply to this afternoon, namely, whether the Government have appointed an inspector or officer to enforce the provisions of the Alien Labour Law.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). The Attorney General of Canada has not authorized any one in Toronto to enforce the Alien Labour Law.

THE REPRESENTATION OF BAGOT.

Mr. FOSTER. I desire to ask the Prime Minister if the writ for the election of a member to represent the electoral district of Bagot has been issued and the returning officer appointed.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The writ has not been issued or the returning officer appointed.

PASSAGE OF UNITED STATES WAR VESSELS THROUGH CANADIAN CANALS.

Mr. WALLACE. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I should like to ask the Government if they are aware that the United States warship "Gresham" has passed through the Welland Canal, and whether the United States Government received permission from this Government to pass a vessel of that kind through the canal.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The Government are aware that the "Gresham" has passed through the canal. The United States Government received authority on 6th April.

THE YUKON DISTRICT.

Mr. WALLACE. The House passed a resolution some days ago asking that the accounts of the Yukon district be sent to the Public Accounts Committee. That resolution was, in fact, passed nearly a week ago, and the accounts have not yet been produced, and the Order of the House has not been obeyed. I ask the Minister of the Interior why those accounts have not been produced in compliance with the Order of the House.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). The matter has not been brought to my attention. Now that it has been brought to my attention, and in view of the remarks made by the hon. gentleman, these accounts will be brought down.

Mr. WALLACE. Under a resolution moved by the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) last week, those accounts were ordered to be produced, but to-day the Minister says he knows nothing about the matter. This is a most extraordinary state of affairs.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I should say, Mr. Speaker, that the matter has not been brought to my attention before. I will immediately attend to it now that it has been brought to my attention.

Mr. WALLACE. These are not papers to be copied; they are the original documents that are to be presented, and ten minutes should be sufficient to do that. They have not to be copied and there is no excuse for the delay.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I did not say that they had to be copied. I said the matter was not brought to my attention until now. I did not say there was any difficulty about producing them, and I should think there is no difficulty.

Mr. WALLACE. The Public Accounts Committee ought to have these documents right now; to-day.

TOLLS ON GOVERNMENT WHARFS.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to call the attention of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) to a matter of the utmost importance and as to which I have previously communicated with him. I presume this is a favourable opportunity for appealing to the hon. gentleman and pressing upon him the consideration of our claims, in the interest of the country, seeing that he has just shown, by introducing to the House the newly selected member for West Prince (Mr. McLellan) that the Government still enjoys the confidence of the province of Prince Edward Island. In bringing up this matter before the House, I wish to know whether it is the intention to amend the Act respecting the collection of tolls and dues on Government wharfs? As everybody knows, and more particularly the hon. gentlemen who represent here the constituencies in which are found those Government wharfs, the farmers are subjected to a great deal of vexation and annoyance, when they use those wharfs, as tolls have to be paid for every bag of potatoes or of oats landed or shipped on or from off those wharfs. I have for a long time endeavoured to induce the Government to do away with all those vexatious proceedings by making free the use of those public wharfs, chiefly where the dues collected amount only to a few dollars every year. The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries told me with good reason that he was bound, by the law, to have those tolls levied and collected and that, unless the Act were amended, he could not make free the use of the Government wharfs nor enter into any arrangement with the municipalities concerned, by which they would pay every year a certain amount, respecting the value of the tolls collected by the Government. As a matter of fact, if you refer to the Revised Statutes of Canada, you will find that in virtue of chapter 84, section 2 of the Act concerning the Government harbours and wharfs, &c., those tolls and dues, however small they may be are to be collected by the Government officers, under the control and management of the Minister.

As the shipping season is about to open, I would beg the hon. gentleman to have the Act amended as I have just mentioned. In order to show him that there is a very substantial ground of complaint, let me take the case of the wharf in the parish of Berthier, in the county of Montmagny. From a report issued by the department of the hon. gentleman, I find that, for the last decade, a yearly revenue of $22 has been collected on that wharf. Now, I know that the farmers of my constituency would by far prefer paying that sum every year, provided they were given the free use of the wharf. With a view to remedying those grievances, I laid before the Minister a proposal of the municipal council of Berthier, by which they declare themselves ready to pay every year a sum of $35, on condition that the Government make the use of the wharf free, such sum being sufficient to indemnify the Government, leaving even a small surplus every year. The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries informed me, however, that, as the Act stood, he could not see his way to accept that offer. Well, I appeal to him now to have the Act so amended as to be authorized in the case of all wharfs yielding not more than one hundred dollars every year to enter into arrangements with the municipalities concerned and to accept a fixed sum, should he find himself unable to make the use of those wharfs free. I could point out here the case of the Post Office Department where the Minister is allowed to give a contract without tender for the conveyance of mails whenever the cost involved is not more than two hundred dollars. I think the Minister of Marine should also be empowered to make certain arrangements in the interest of the people. In the present case, if the Minister could accept the offer made by the Berthier municipality, the Government would receive thirteen dollars more every year. But, as the Minister stated that he could not accede to that request, I appeal to him again to have the Act so amended as to be enabled to make those arrangements, and thus the municipal council of Berthier, although they may have to pay a little more, will willingly pay the sum mentioned in their resolution, because it is calculated to bring about an improvement in the local trade. I hope the hon. Minister will take the matter into his serious consideration, as it is of the utmost importance to those counties where there are Government wharfs, and should he still be of opinion that he cannot enter into any such arrangements, I ask him to have the law so amended as to be given the necessary power to do so.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). I may state to the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Choquette) that the matter which he

has brought to the attention of the House has been under the consideration of the Department of Marine and Fisheries for some time past. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Choquette) brought the matter to my notice and pressed very strongly upon the department, that if we had the power to hand over to the municipalities certain of the small public wharfs from which very small sums of money are yearly received; the municipality would undertake to pay in advance to the department an amount equal to the average of the receipts received from these wharfs for say the past few years. The municipality would then manage the wharf in the best interests of the locality. The idea is that in cases where the public treasury is only receiving $25 or $30 or $40 a year from a wharf, it would be preferable to hand that wharf over to the municipality which would manage it and charge such fees as they thought proper. The treasury would lose nothing by this, because we would receive an amount equivalent to the average receipts in the past.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That has been done in some instances already.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes, but on looking at the statute I found that it was necessary to ask power from Parliament to do that. I propose to introduce a short amendment to the Act, and if the House approves it will give me the necessary power to carry out what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Choquette) wishes.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. Hear, hear.

GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY AND CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY—CONNECTION AT NORTH BAY.

Mr. MACLEAN. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to ask the Minister of Railways whether he can tell the people of Ontario and especially of Toronto, if he has succeeded in making any progress in settling the difficulties between the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway in connection with the service to North Bay?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I have been in communication with both the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway Company, and perhaps I may even go so far as to say frequent communication with them. They have come together and I think there is a disposition on the part of each of the companies to arrive at a common understanding which will be satisfactory to the public. I doubt whether they have yet reached that point, but I am not without hopes that they will succeed ultimately in reaching it and perhaps at no very distant date. I can make no definite announcement further on the subject.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

Mr. SPEAKER. With reference to the question asked by the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) as to the papers in reference to the Yukon which were recommended to be sent to the Committee on Public Accounts, I have made inquiries since the question of the hon. member (Mr. Foster) was put, and I find that the clerk of the Committee on Public Accounts promptly communicated that recommendation to the Department of the Interior. I have no doubt it is being complied with.

ELECTORAL FRANCHISE ACT.

The House again resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 16) to repeal the Electoral Franchise Act and to further amend the Dominion Elections Act.

(In the Committee.)

On section 5,

And the amendment thereto moved by the hon. member for Kent (Mr. McInerney).

Mr. DAVIN. Mr. Chairman, last night on this subject we heard from the right hon. gentleman who leads the House an argument against the one that had been addressed to the committee by the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster). The right hon. gentleman said, in the first place: "There is no want felt for such an appeal;" that is to say, an appeal to the county court judge. He then laid down the proposition that "it is not our province to look after that part of the case." Further, he stated that "the Franchise Act passed by this Parliament is so bad that no one will defend it;" and "the reason this Bill was being pressed through the House was that it was believed that it was the least partisan way of getting lists." As regards the statement that no want is felt for such an appeal, I have here a triumphant answer. A short time ago, in the legislature of Manitoba, Mr. Roblin, the leader of the Opposition, introduced a Bill to amend the electoral law of Manitoba; and, as bearing on the very point now before the House, the following clause is full of interest. Section 40 it was proposed to amend thus:

The decision of the revising officer under this Act in regard to the right of any person to be an elector shall be subject to appeal as provided by the following subsection:—

"Any person dissatisfied with the decision of the revising officer may have the same reviewed before the judge of the county court having jurisdiction over such electoral district, or part of the same (or, in the event of the county court judge being the revising officer, then to a judge of the superior court of the province of Manitoba), by giving to the registration clerk and revising officer a notice of appeal, which may be in form No. 9 to schedule 'B' of this Act, within six days after such decision shall have been rendered. Such notice shall also be

sent by mail, prepaid and registered, to the elector objecting, or the person whose claim to vote shall have been allowed, as the case may be, and addressed to the post office set opposite his name on the voters' list.

"And such notice shall state the day, hour, place where such review shall be heard, and shall also be served upon the registration clerk and mailed as aforesaid at least ten days before the hearing of such appeal. The judge shall have power to dispose of said review in chambers, and have power to take evidence either viva voce or by affidavit concerning such appeal, and shall either affirm or dismiss the same, and make such order as to costs thereof and generally as to the premises as he shall deem just, and may enforce the same in the same way as a judgment of the court is usually enforced; and the revising officer on any appeal shall regard and be governed, as to placing, retaining or removing any name on or from the voters' list, by the decision of such appeal, and for that purpose shall alter and vary his statement and certificates in order to make the same conform with the decision or decisions of such judge."

That is a conclusive answer to the universal allegation of the Premier that no want was felt for such an appeal; for here we have the leader of a party in the Chamber of the province bringing in a Bill for the purpose of providing amongst other things for such an appeal. And what more happened? Why, the Prime Minister, Mr. Greenway, rose and promised that next session he would introduce a Bill somewhat in the same line, and therefore it was not necessary for Mr. Roblin to go on. Here we find, in one of the provinces most affected by this legislation, the expression of the want taking the most formal shape it could. The next allegation of the Prime Minister to which I wish to direct attention is that it is not our province to look after that part of the case. That, of course, is utterly inconsistent with much that fell at an early stage from the Prime Minister himself, and entirely inconsistent with some of the propositions which have been laid down by the Solicitor General. The only proposition with which that statement is consistent is the proposition laid down by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) that this Parliament has nothing whatever to do with fixing its lists. But what do we find the Solicitor General doing? I merely refer to it now for the purpose of the argument, not to discuss it. He has given notice that he will move an amendment providing that certain Dominion office-holders and provincial office-holders, who may have been disfranchised by provincial legislation, shall be enabled to vote. So that we have not merely the statement of the Solicitor General in some of his speeches that we were not surrendering the control of our franchise, but we have, in the most formal way, namely, by a notice of a motion, and by his ultimately moving it, as he will of course do, the proposition to take this power out of the hands of the local legislature, wherein, according to the hon. member for North Norfolk and according to the proposition of the Prime Minister, it should be left undisturbed. What is to be thought of a piece of legislation like this? Here you have an utter inconsistency, not merely in the arguments that were put forward in support of the legislation, but in the legislation itself. The hon. Prime Minister went further, and said that the Dominion Franchise Act was so bad that no one would defend it. What has been done on this side of the House ever since this question came before it? Not an argument has been put forward by a member on this side of the House that was not an implied or direct defence of the Dominion Franchise Act. Only one blot has been admitted to exist in regard to that Act, that is its expensiveness. But prominent Liberals have admitted to me in private conversation that if the costliness of that Act could be got rid of, it would be unassailable. What argument have we heard against it other than the assertion that it is expensive? We have heard from my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) the wild statement that it was unfair and led to untold corruption, but he did not point out how that corruption was practiced, he did not give a single fact, but confined himself to the bare statement, and he added that simply because the men who were in Opposition when our Dominion franchise law was passed are now in power, we should abolish the present law and revert to the provincial franchises. The bare fact that the only argument against the present law is its expense is the best proof we could have that it does not conduce to corruption. I admit that it is costly, but the proposal of my hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) to reduce the expenditure attaching to the revision of the lists, by providing that the judges shall not be paid fees but be given a small salary, sweeps away the only argument against the Dominion franchise law. When you find the right hon. leader of the House laying down propositions that will not bear examination in support of a Bill which takes away from this House one of its rights and functions, given to it under the British North America Act, it is evident that the Bill before us is one which cannot be defended, and that the only thing which can operate to convert it into law is the fact, not that it carries with it the conviction and conscience of the country or the conviction and conscience of this House, but that there is a cast iron majority, or, if you prefer it, an obedient majority, on that side determined to railroad it through. But when you find the statements made by the right hon. First Minister in support of the Bill contradicted, in the most emphatic way, by the action, first, of the leader of the Government in that province, agreeing to bring in an amending Bill, can it be supposed, for one minute, that we, or this side, can sit tamely by and allow legislation like this to go through?

Let me refer to what was said last year by a leading organ of the Liberal party in that province—then, and still more a leading organ of the Liberal party to-day—for I think it, and has come almost flat-footed as a supporter of the present Administration. The Manitoba "Free Press" last year, when we were sitting in this House, and when the hon. Solicitor General presented a Bill more or less on the same lines as the one we are now discussing—the "Free Press" which knows well the condition of things in Manitoba—came out and said that such a machine as the Manitoba Act never before existed for enabling the lists to be stuffed, and it added that the Dominion Parliament was about to pass legislation which would make that machine, not merely a corrupt agent for stuffing the lists of that province, but a corrupt agent for stuffing the lists for the Dominion Parliament. And that very paper the Winnipeg "Free Press," which differed from the Senate in its action recently with regard to the Klondike deal, ended its article by saying that the people of Manitoba would look to the Senate of Canada to prevent such a monstrous piece of legislation going into effect as that which the Solicitor General then placed before this House and which is similar to the Bill we have now before us

I want to call attention to the words used by the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) with regard to this measure a few evenings ago; and these words are still more applicable to the measure now, in the face of the fact that I have brought before the House that the right hon. leader of the Government has been contradicted by the Prime Minister of one of the provinces. The hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister), speaking of this proposed legislation, said: "It is an arbitrary measure." But, Sir, if it is an arbitrary measure, is it one that we should be asked to pass? What is an arbitrary measure? It is one that does not consider justice, that does not consider equity, but simply the irresponsible will of some person or body, pressed upon unwilling recipients, so that, Mr. Speaker, I consider that I have overturned the main proposition laid down by my hon. friend, and I do not think that we ought to be asked to go further with this Bill. What I would suggest is that the Bill be dropped, and that next session the right hon. gentleman should bring in a Bill amending the Dominion franchise law. In the face of the fact that we have an undoubted right, sanctioned by reason as well as by law—a right which is not only ours, constitutionally, but which is obviously the right of every assembly, that of fixing its own franchise—I ask him to drop this Bill, and next session bring in a measure to amend the Dominion Franchise Act in the way I have suggested. There is no necessity for haste, and if we only are given such plans as have been advanced in favour of this measure, how can we be expected to be satisfied with it?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I am very sorry that the hon. Solicitor General yesterday intimated that, no matter how the proposed amendment was drafted, the Government could not entertain any suggestion looking to the adoption of the principle of a judicial revision of these lists or a judicial revision on appeal. I was led to believe by some hints that the hon. Solicitor General threw out at an earlier stage, that amendments, which on their face were reasonable and devoid of party interest, would be very gladly received by him. It seems to me that there could be no more reasonable proposition submitted than that of providing safeguards in all the provinces for the securing of a fair and proper list, such as are provided by the laws of Ontario and Quebec. The hon. gentleman, in pointing out that the particular phraseology of this amendment was faulty and would have to be improved in any event, stated the great advantages that obtained in the legislation of these two provinces over, as I believe nearly every province in Canada, and certainly over the province of Nova Scotia, where the most slipshod system has prevailed for some time—a system so abominable that there is not the counterpart of it in any part of the world. It is the handiwork of the Finance Minister largely, as that hon. gentleman himself explained yesterday; and any one who examines its features will, I think, accept the statement that he is, to a large extent, the parent of it. He endeavoured to shelter himself from a part of the responsibility by using an argument—a strange one in the mouth of a professed Liberal—that one of the features to which we have objected was evolved as far back as 1856; and he denied that the fundamental principle for which my hon. friend from Haldimand (Mr. Montague) contended had ever been enjoyed in the province of Nova Scotia, overlooking entirely, in his zeal for this provincial Act the fact that the Dominion franchise law of 1885 had come into force in Nova Scotia, as in the rest of the Dominion, and had brought out in strong contrast, in strong relief, at any rate, the very unsatisfactory system existing under the local law. These local laws, as the hon. Finance Minister will admit, are strangely amended from time to time, and, as I shall show, for rather extraordinary purposes, and to gain extraordinary objects. I think that the Solicitor General would do well to revert to the spirit which seemed to move him at the earlier stage of this discussion. He could shorten the debate a great deal by agreeing to such improvements as will give the rest of the provinces the advantages that he, I am sure—differing from the Finance Minister in this—agrees do exist in this judicial revision that obtains under the legis-

lation of Ontario and Quebec. Speaking on that point, I feel satisfied that I and the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Mills), who went into this subject so fully, will have the sympathy of representatives of these provinces in claiming that we should, at least, enjoy the advantages their people enjoy in connection with the preparation of these electoral lists.

Mr. Chairman, to come more to details, let me call your attention to several unsatisfactory conditions that exist in the province of Nova Scotia. Without reflecting upon the sheriffs of the province, who are the revisers, that is, constitute the appellant courts in the different counties, without taking up the time of the committee with any question of improper conduct or saying a single word on that score, it is known that these gentlemen, who, in respect of the electoral lists, occupy the positions that the county court judges occupy in Ontario and the judges of the superior court occupy in the province of Quebec, are laymen. Thus these lists, the prepartion of which involves questions of law and the interpretation of many Acts of Parliament, involves questions regarding the right of voters, are all decided by revisers who are laymen, and ultimately, in the case of appeal, by the sheriffs appointed by the Government of the day, who are also laymen. There are other grave dangers in connection with the system, which, as I have said, is slipshod throughout. It is cheap, indeed, and it is nasty. The municipal councils appoint three revisers for each district. Three polling districts comprise a revising district. The appeal from the three laymen is, as I have said, to the sheriff, who is appointed by the provincial Government. In passing, I may note the fact that one of the great objections raised to the Dominion Franchise Act of 1885 was that the revising officers under that Act were appointed by the Government of the day. But there was this difference, that in the case of the appointments under the Dominion Act the majority were county court judges, and those who were not judges were lawyers of a certain number of years' standing, and were, therefore, qualified to deal with these questions that come up far better than laymen would be. Now, the sheriff holding these great powers in the province of Nova Scotia and without even that responsibility that would attach to a man who was of the legal profession (the pride of his profession and his position restraining him, even where nothing of that kind would check the sheriff) has opportunities to do wrong and to permit gross irregularities. Under the Nova Scotia system, that publicity that obtains in the present system under the Dominion Franchise Act, is wanting. Time and place for hearing applications are publicly advertised in the one case, while in the other the difficulty is great to ascertain either the time or place when this appellate court is to work. Under the Dominion Franchise Act, all the work must be done in public. In the case of the sheriff's appeal court, in the first place, there is a most extraordinary arrangement limiting the period, the limit being, I think, ten days. They are often embarrassed with a host of names, and names can be added and have been added, without the opportunity for examination and discussion and consideration which was necessary and required in the case of the Dominion law. To give an example, for instance, I would mention what has happened in the county of Guysborough, as I am informed. The Minister of Finance asked for information or challenged the statement of any irregularity occurring under the Nova Scotia Act. I believe that if the consideration of this Bill were suspended and an opportunity given to collect testimony, we could take up a month or two months with the examination of witnesses from the province of Nova Scotia that would answer the challenge of the Minister of Finance completely.

Mr. MILLS. I could occupy a month with my county alone.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. member for Annapolis has already, I think, given some evidence that he could take up a good deal of time giving valuable information on that score. I desire to state the case of one district in the county of Guysborough, not from my own knowledge, but from information that I considered reliable. In this case, the names were crowded on in a most extraordinary fashion. Out of the 204 names that appear on the local list in a certain section of Guysborough only seven appear on the assessment roll as possessing property to entitle the parties to vote. How are such things brought about? I am informed that, in the year 1890 and 1891, the Liberal party in Nova Scotia were most active and energetic. Without warning being given to either side, they went to work and put on any number of names all through the province of Nova Scotia.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. What does my hon. friend mean by "without warning"? Does not the law give warning to everybody?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I said without warning. For instance, the Liberals were more active, and in that no one would blame them.

The FINANCE MINISTER. That would be because there are more of them, like the white sheep and the black ones.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman is entitled to make his boast for the time being in connection with one or two elections. But for eighteen years the hon. gentleman was not able to make

that boast, and it is only right that he should enjoy the present moment to boast as much as he pleases over the subject. But that does not affect my argument. Whether there are more of them or not, I will show the manner by which, in the local elections at any rate, they have been able to make such boasts, and throw such taunts to their political enemies as the Minister of Finance now indulges in. It is not merely because of their activity, but because of their activity supported and aided by their political friends who held power in the province of Nova Scotia, and by such means as these have continued for a long time to enjoy power by cooking the lists and then confirming the lists by their partisan majority in the local legislature, having by great activity secured the lists and heaped on name after name of men that were not qualified to vote under the laws of Nova Scotia—as I am informed, and I speak entirely on information. These lists were of such a character as to give great satisfaction to the Liberal party; and in 1891 legislation was adopted which made those lists the basis for revisions and for the electoral lists in future, putting on the Conservative party, so to speak in this connection, very heavy and awkward burdens if they wished to make the lists proper before the tribunals as they existed in Nova Scotia. They were under the burden of proving a negative, and showing in each case the reason for the want of qualification of men whose names were on the list. Behind this Act these names were enabled to remain on the list until evidence was given under which a reviser, appointed as I have mentioned, or an appellant court consisting of the sheriff appointed by the local Government, felt warranted in throwing them off. There has been given information from other provinces. It has not borne much fruit, and I am afraid if we take the trouble now to put in definite shape the evidence of the irregularities existing under the local Act in Nova Scotia, we would not be rewarded much by the Government in their future treatment of this Bill. Take, for instance, information put before this House last year in connection with the province of Manitoba, and Manitoba is one of the provinces not enjoying the system that obtains in these two larger provinces. Take, for instance, the statement made by Mr. Roblin in the legislature of Manitoba in connection with the working of the local Act. He says:

> By it at the last provincial election above 100,000 men have been robbed of their franchise, and now Mr. Laurier, seeing how much it has helped his friends in this province, now proposes to give it wider scope and adopt it for the Dominion.

And again, speaking of the right hon. leader of the Government, he says in this connection:

> He intends, if he can, to have the provincial and infamous law imposed upon the whole Dominion. This Act was introduced in 1890 or 1892. He had fought this Bill at every stage, because he knew that the Government intended by it to legislate away the rights of a large number of voters. As it was first introduced, it would give power to an agent to prepare the voters' list without any one knowing who was on it. He had, however, succeeded in having this clause struck out. As it now reads, the Lieutenant-Governor can appoint a registration clerk, who is not bound by time, so that a court of revision can, and often is, appointed and sitting before the list is completed. It can be easily seen what an opportunity this affords to a man who is blinded by party ties and interests.
>
> There is a case which is well known, where a clerk so appointed admitted that he had prepared his list from that of a Liberal scrutineer, used in previous elections, and this is the Act which Mr. Laurier intends foisting upon the Dominion. Another thing that has been done is to place bogus names on the list after it was declared completed. This was done to his friend from Emerson, who, when he heard of it, had subpœnas issued and given to the constable to serve, but the constable made a return that he could not find these men, for the very good reason that they never existed. Yet some of these names were retained on the list. * * * The Act says the clerk shall post up, thirty days before the court of revision is held, the list of voters. Is this ever done? No, it is not. The speaker then read a correspondence between Mr. McDonald, president of the Conservative Association, and the registrar of Brandon, Mr. Maclean, to show that in the case of the election held at Brandon, the court of revision was held before the list was completed. Mr. Macdonald asked that the court should adjourn until the list was completed, but this Mr. Maclean refused. It is to avoid a repetition of such infamous conduct that he is now addressing the House. His friends opposite are opposed to the Dominion Act on account of its cost, but more particularly because it works out against them. Under the provincial Act there is no appeal from the revising barrister, while under the Dominion Act there is an appeal to a judge.
>
> He had in his possession the names of 200 voters which were given to Albert Monkman to place on the voters' list for Dauphin, yet this Monkman refused to say whether he would or would not place them on the list. From this it can be seen that all that was required were seven Albert Monkmans, and where would be the votes opposed to the present Government? This was no hearsay story, for he had in his hand a sworn statement to this effect. In the little town of Morris, in 1892, there were 108 names of French Canadians kept off the list, but, fortunately, they were righted by the court of revision; yet it was through no fault of Dr. McTavish that these Frenchmen were not disfranchised. Again this McTavish, in a small settlement, left off the list 55 names of men well known to him. Later on, however, thanks to the returning officer, Mr. Dawson, these names were added. The same state of affairs obtained in many other districts, such as Hamiota. It is only in constituencies where it is known the Conservative vote will not affect the result that this is not tampered with.
>
> Right here, in Winnipeg, in 1896, 800 names were omitted from the voters' lists so as to ensure the election of a supporter of the Government. The Greenway Government owes its return to power more to revising officers than to the votes of the people. In North Winnipeg

400 names were left off the list at the last provincial election.

Then without reading further from that speech, I would venture to put again before the House in this connection an important statement. The hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Mills) I think was right in producing these solemn declarations in answer to a challenge so often thrown across the House for information as to gross irregularities or improper working under these local systems. Here is a declaration from Emerson, Manitoba, of D. H. McFadden who, in his solemn declaration, says:

1. I was first elected to the provincial legislature of Manitoba in the year 1892, by a majority of fourteen votes, as representative of the electoral division of Emerson.

2. The aforesaid constituency of Emerson was represented by one Jas. Thompson from 1888 to 1892, and who, in 1888, was elected by a majority of fourteen.

3. The aforesaid Thompson was my opponent in 1892.

4. Donald Forrester, barrister, of Winnipeg, was appointed registration clerk, and W. E. Perdue, barrister, Winnipeg, revising barrister, for the Emerson division, to revise the voters' list previous to the last provincial election.

5. The said registration clerk opened an office at Emerson, according to the terms of the election Act of this province. Every night I had a clerk go to this office and make an exact copy of the list as it was from day to day altered or added to, and continued this rule up to the last day for receiving applications to be put on the list. Late in the evening of that day, I had the said list completed as it was made out by the said registration clerk. When the list was printed and distributed, according to the provisions of the said Act, I found thirteen names on the printed list which were not on my copy of the list, the names being as follows, as appears by the revised list of electors of said electoral division of Emerson, now produced and shown to me, and marked as Exhibit "A."

7. I at once made diligent inquiries as to these particular voters, and as to their right to be placed upon the said electoral lists, but could find no evidence that the said voters, or any of them, ever resided within the electoral division of Emerson. I then made application to the registration clerk to have these names struck off the said list of voters

8. As to the description of residence of these individual voters, it was limited to townships, no section or other particulars being given in the list as to where these parties, or any of them, resided. I had summonses issued by the revising officer and placed them in the hands of responsible parties, actual residents and familiar with all other actual residents in the several townships quoted in the lists, with instructions to make every endeavour to serve these individual voters.

9. At the court of revision the parties whom I had so instructed to serve said summonses appeared and stated that they could not find any of the said voters to effect service of said orders; and further stated that they could get no information that the said parties, or any of them, resided in the township set opposite their respective names in the said list of voters. None of the parties sought for attended the court of revision, and, when application was made to strike their names off the said list, the revising barrister, the said W. E. Perdue, ruled that he would not strike them off the list until it was shown they had been individually served with a summons to attend the said court, and he allowed all the said names to remain on the list as finally revised, and the said names still remain on the said list as bona fide electors of said division, although they are not now, and never have resided in said electoral division.

So that if under those different systems, the systems in Nova Scotia and Manitoba, there are bogus names put on the list for the purpose afterwards of committing personation and all kinds of frauds, they must remain on the lists until service has been made on the parties who do not exist, and therefore their names have to remain on the list.

10. Amongst the names struck off the said list of electors was the name of Donald Forrester, the registration clerk. As he resided and practised his profession of barrister in the city of Winnipeg, application was made to strike his name off. When challenged, he admitted his ineligibility, and the revising barrister had, therefore no alternative but to strike his name off, which was done.

Then follows the formal part of the declaration. At this point I wish to correct a statement which arose owing to a printer's error, as to the number mentioned when Mr. Roblin made the statement of the names of parties robbed of their franchise. I stated the number at 100,000 instead of 10,000. The mistake, I say, is a printer's error, and the hon. member for Marquette has been kind enough to call my attention to it. I observe a very interesting discussion now going on in Manitoba looking to the amendment of the law, and certain criticisms are offered to which I may shortly draw the attention of the committee as showing the state of things in that province, for that law will remain as it is now until next session. An article in a provincial paper says:

It is only reasonable that a registration clerk should be required to place on his list all those who, by being on the municipal, legislative and Dominion lists he is required to consult in its compilation, have the prima facie right to be so included; and, also, that he shall not include therein any names not on the existing lists except upon personal and sworn application. The absence of such provisions has in the past led to great abuses. The registration clerks in many instances, have left off the names of large numbers of Conservatives who were on existing lists; and they have included the names of large numbers of Liberals who were not on existing lists, without any personal application, many of whom were disqualified, and could not possibly have got on the list had they been required to make oath that they possessed the necessary qualifications. The result has been that, in districts where the Conservative party has not had thorough organization, large numbers of Conservatives have been, unknowingly, disfranchised, and Liberals who have been improperly placed on the lisits have been allowed to remain there, owing to the trouble and expense of proving them to be disqualified. It is, also, only reasonable that

a registration clerk should be prevented from manipulating the lists by striking off names that have been once placed there. In the past it has frequently happened that Conservatives, who have taken considerable trouble during the compilation of the lists to see that their names were thereon, have discovered after the lists have been published, that their names did not appear there. There ought to be no objection at all to the provisions of Mr. Roblin's Bill requiring due publicity to be given to the list after its completion by the registration clerk and prior to the holding of the court of revision ; nor should there be any objection to requiring an adjournment of the court of revision in the event of any informality on the part of the registration clerk in so posting the lists.

This statement is made :

It will be remembered that, owing to the lack of such a provision, the South Brandon lists were not revised at all prior to the last general election. The right of appeal from decisions of the court of revision is another provision which must strike every one as fair to all parties. There ought to be some recourse against the arbitrary decisions of partisan revising barristers. Another very necessary provision is that which provides a course of procedure in the event of its being impossible to discover the whereabouts of persons whose right to be upon the voters' lists is challenged. It will be remembered that, at the time of the last compilation of the lists, a number of bogus names were placed on the Emerson lists. The Conservatives desired these to be struck off ; but they could not serve the necessary subpœnas to compel the attendance of the bogus parties at the court of revision, for the very good reason that these persons were non-existent. Because the objectors could not prove that they had served subpœnas upon these bogus voters, the bogus names had to be allowed to stay on the lists.

This is a disgraceful condition of affairs and is absolutely indefensible, and yet that would be the system established if Parliament adopted the present Bill as submitted.

It is also only fair that if by any chance a person unqualified to vote does get his name upon the list, there shall be the right to challenge him when he presents himself for the purpose of recording his vote.

The article goes on to mention the weak points in the present system of Manitoba, and I am all the more inclined to refer to them because to a large extent a similar state of affairs exists in the province of Nova Scotia. It is clear that in pressing this amendment members of the Opposition are not by any means unreasonable. They have the example of the two great provinces to point to. Those two great provinces, whatever other defects exist with respect to them, are to enjoy advantages which will be denied to nearly all the other provinces, and I speak more particularly of Nova Scotia. Without doubt there will be no comparison the systems in connection with which this Bill has to do in regard to the election of members to sit in this Parliament. Conscious, no doubt, of those differences as regards the advantages of the voters in securing their right to exercise the franchise at Dominion elections, the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt) gave the House sometime ago an enactment drawn from the negotiations that have been going on in the Australian colonies to endeavour to show that after all those inequalities were not so indefensible as members on this side of the House seem to think. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Belcourt) endeavoured to show that these inequalities in the present Bill were not so indefensible after all, and he cited as authority for his contention that our Australian brethren had adopted the United States system, and had provided that the different colonies should settle the qualifications of the voters for the Federal Parliament of Australia. But the hon. gentleman (Mr. Belcourt) did not cite the most recent history of the Australian colonies in this regard, and if he had done so I admit that it would have had considerable weight with me. He dealt with the Australian draft Bill of 1891, but I shall call to the attention of the House the fact, that after more mature consideration the Australian colonies have completely changed their views on this matter, and have fallen into line with the franchise principle which is undoubtedly embodied in our British North America Act. You will remember that in 1867 when the Imperial Parliament was distributing the powers between the local legislatures and the Federal Parliament of Canada, there was what amounted to a pact between the different provinces, confirmed and ratified by Imperial legislation, and in the distribution of these powers there were involved some interesting phases of constitutional law which deal directly with this Bill. Even in making the temporary provision for the franchise and system of voting in connection with representation in the Federal House of Commons of Canada, the Imperial Parliament took care to provide that it should not be as from time to time made by the local legislatures : but they took the conditions as existing in 1867, only until they were changed by the Federal Parliament after the coming elections. The Solicitor General shakes his head as if he dissents from this view. Of course I am only speaking from memory, but I have the British North America Act here and I shall read the clause. Section 41 says :

Until the Parliament of Canada otherwise provides, the laws in force in the several provinces at the union——

There, a definite time is stated and that is what I had in my memory.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that no provincial franchise could be used by us except that in force at the time of the union.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. No. My point was that the Imperial legislature by fixing definitely the franchise, did not

say that the local legislatures should settle the franchise for this House, but they simply said that there were conditions existing in those different provinces, certain fixed conditions; that they should not be subject to caprice or change but just as they are when these provinces enter the union, the qualification of voters for the Federal House shall exist. Instead of re-enacting all the different franchises and regulations, the Imperial Parliament, for convenience referred to them as they stood certain and distinct, and adopted them as the qualifications and franchises for this House until this Parliament should be convened and should have the opportunity to enact any franchise it thought proper.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Now I understand the hon. gentleman. He says we had to take the franchise as it existed at the time of the union, and that any subsequent change made by the province cannot affect us here.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I am not arguing that for the present.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. It means that, if it means anything at all.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. My point just now is, that there is nothing in the British North America Act which would sanction the legislation we are now attempting, by which we are to adopt something indefinite and undetermined, and simply delegate our authority to the caprice and will of the different legislatures, and say: that whatever they may from year to year legislate in regard to their franchise, shall be the franchise for the Federal Parliament. I find on reading the section of the British North America Act that it confirms my view in this respect. I wish now to deal with this Australian reference made by the hon. member (Mr. Belcourt).

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I would like my hon. friend (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) to say definitely if he considers this clause of the Bill unconstitutional and ultra vires of our power in this Parliament?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That is a very broad question. I had not the pleasure of hearing the argument of the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Haggart), but I have looked sufficiently into the question to say that a great deal can be said in favour of that view. I am rather inclined in favour of it myself, but I am not sufficiently armed with authorities to say that I have come to that absolute determination in my own mind. As at present advised I incline to the view that this is an attempted delegation of such powers of this Parliament to the provincial legislatures, as involves a violation of the pact under which the provinces came together, and which pact was confirmed by the British North America Act. It does not seem to me any more reasonable or constitutional to say that the franchise in Nova Scotia shall be such as the Nova Scotia legislature determines, than to say that it should be such as the Quebec legislature determines; and that of course would be a very bold proposition. It seems to me that if you can say that the franchise for this House shall be that which that legislature determines, you could in the same way say that it would be such as any other province determined, and that the same would bind you, though the subject would not be discussed or confirmed in this House.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Would the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him if he has any doubts about the constitutionality of this clause in the Bill that was introduced by Sir John Thompson:

> Except as hereinafter provided, the qualification of voters at a Dominion election shall, in any province of Canada, be that established by the laws in force in such province on the first day of June in the year during which the lists for such election were prepared as the qualification of voters at a provincial election.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. As the hon. gentleman reads that, I think there is considerable difference. It seems to me that there is something definite there. It says that there is an Act existing, and that its provisions shall be the provisions governing an election to this House. The hon. gentleman will see the difference between delegating a power to a legislature, at any time, to determine what shall be the law for this Parliament, and saying that what a certain legislature in England, in Nova Scotia or anywhere else did, in a certain Act passed at a certain time, shall be the law here.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Not did, but it may do it at any time on the first of June of each succeeding year—exactly our case.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. If that is right, I certainly would be consistent in saying that the argument I am making would apply to that clause of Sir John Thompson's Bill as well. Of course, I need not call the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that while Sir John Thompson introduced that Bill, he took good care in his speech to free himself from being bound to any clause in it. It was a draft, introduced by Sir John Thompson in the spirit, which I hope is the spirit of the Solicitor General on this occasion, of obtaining and taking advantage of suggestions from any part of the House.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. This is the most serious point in the whole Bill, and we want to hear as much as possible upon it.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Of course, and I would have every possible reason to be anxious not to speak hastily or finally. I have frankly told the hon. gentleman my view; and now that he has read

that clause of the Bill of 1894, it applies as much to that clause as to the present Bill. But that was not my purpose in referring to the Australian case. I wanted to follow up a very interesting reference of the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt) to that case, which seemed to be a discovery on his part, and, being in line with the statement of the right hon. Prime Minister, I have no doubt that the Prime Minister's attention was given to the subject, and that he was glad to know that the Australians were following in the same line as he argued we should now do in Canada. The clause which the hon. gentleman read from the draft of the constitution of the proposed Australian federation is the following :—

The qualification of electors of members of the House of Representatives shall be in each state that which is prescribed by the law of the state as the qualification for electors of the more numerous house of the parliament of the state.

The hon. gentleman then went on to point out that the Australian Conference left to the various local bodies to determine the franchise for the federation, and had gone so far even as to declare that for all time to come the Australian federal franchise should be left to local control. Then, he went on to argue that the Australian colonies—and we all agree with him—were known the world over for their advanced ideas, and that their acceptance of this principle made strongly in its favour. They do not apparently agree with the Minister of Finance that a system that was in existence in 1856 was good enough for 1897. I do not think the hon. gentleman mentioned what was said at the time of the convention. I need not remind hon. gentlemen in this House of the tremendous difficulties that have stood in the way of a union of the Australian colonies, and the compromises and very great concessions that some statesmen representing different colonies there have been almost forced into by the preponderating desire for a union. Sir Henry Parkes took a prominent part in the discussion on that occasion. He was a federalist, and he argued that it was necessary to provide for the present for a system which would be most acceptable. He said that the federal Parliament could take control afterwards, if necessary. That was rather inconsistent with the view of the hon. member for Ottawa, adopted from the draft itself, that that was to be for all time to come. The argument of Sir Henry Parkes was that they could adopt that, if the delegates preferred, and that afterwards Parliament itself, when constituted could regulate its own franchise. Then, Mr. Wrixon, of Victoria, also spoke on that occasion. He said :

It seems to me that we are losing sight of the object in view. We are not forming a unified nation. We are only forming an arrangement by which a number of states can come together for the accomplishment of certain objects which are common to all.

And it is not necessary for me, after the Prime Minister's utterances in the Jubilee year, to remind this House of the difference that exists between that collection of states and a country like Canada which already has become a nation. The language of Sir Henry Parkes on that occasion—I quote a brief extract—was as follows :—

The course I take is to bring the Federal Parliament into existence with the least possible disturbance of the social status, and then leave that parliament to shape its own course as to what its electoral system should be.

Sir Henry Parkes was a very prominent man in that conference, and it is easy to see what his view is—something like the view that is to be found in our own British North America Act.

These local arrangements were to prevail in the beginning, and afterwards, when the union was complete and the country was one, then the country could arrange a uniform system and provide its own franchise. The discussion on that draft took place in 1891, but last year,—the jubilee year—the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt) will find a later discussion and a complete repeal of that system, and the substitution for it of the system for which the Conservative party in the country are now contending and which they did bring into force in Canada. Among the changes was the basis of the federal franchise in 1897, as compared with that agreed to by the conference of 1891. The clause, as it now stands, departed altogether from the provincal basis. Let me read it. I have read the one which the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt) dwelt upon, and I again remind the committee of the strength of the hon. gentleman's argument in connection with his illustration from that year and his reference to the advanced ideas of Australia. If their ideas were advanced in 1891, he will agree with me that they were more likely to have advanced further in 1897. In 1897, this clause was substituted :

Until the Parliament provides otherwise, the qualifications of members of the House of Representatives shall be in each state that which is prescribed by the law of the state as the qualification for electors of the more numerous house of parliament of the state ; but in choosing such members each elector shall vote only once, and no member who has, at the establishment of the commonwealth, or who afterwards acquires the right for the more numerous house, shall, while such qualification continues, be deprived of it.

So that the hon. gentleman will see there was a very considerable change in the principle made by the draft constitution. The Adelaide constitution also provides that the manner of conducting elections shall be the same as in the States until Parliament otherwise provides, almost, in fact, adopting the system that obtain in our own Dominion Act, at any rate to this extent. The hon. gentleman shakes his head.

Mr. BELCOURT. There is a very material difference.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. So far as the argument I am making is concerned, it strikes me that there is no difference whatever in principle, in this respect, that the local regulations and the local control of such things as the franchise is to exist only for temporary purposes until the federal Parliament otherwise provides, just as in section 41 of our British North America Act, it is provided that until the Parliament of Canada otherwise provides, all laws in force in the provinces on that subject are to prevail. I am inclined to press my view further, now that the hon. gentleman has suggested a difference. I concede that there is a difference. The difference, however, is this, that the Australians propose to being earlier in controlling these matters than the Canadian delegates did. In the British North America Act we adopted everything provincial with regard to the franchise and the right of voting, but the Australians imposed a limit. They provided, for instance, that :

Until the Parliament provides otherwise, the qualification of members of the House of Representatives shall be in each state that which is prescribed by the law of the state as the qualification for electors of the more numerous house of parliament of the state.

That is, I submit, similar to our own Act, but they go further than we do, and impose a limitation. They say :

But in choosing such members each elector shall vote only once.

Thus making a change in whatever systems might obtain in the different colonies.

There is a very interesting article, the reference to which can be made briefly and which bears on the hon. gentleman's argument and the views I have expressed. In the "National Review," Prof. Moore, of Melbourne University discussed "constitution making in Australia," and he states that the convention of 1897 was much more federal in its ideas than the earlier one. This is the extract :

Being elected by the people, it naturally entrusted powers to the people, which in 1891 were confided to the parliaments of the several states.

He goes on to say :

In this respect the most important provision by which a change in the character of the Senate is made corresponding exactly with a change in the constitution itself. Its members are to be elected by the people of the states instead of being nominated by the Parliament (that is, by the Parliament of the local states), and the principle of election was as much a matter of course in 1897 as nomination was in 1891. Demoralization may mean centralization ; and in their determination that both houses of Parliament shall be elected on a democratic basis, the framers of the Bill of 1897 provide that the qualification of electors shall be the same for both houses, and that no electors shall vote more than once. With these limitations the commonwealth (federal) Parliament is to determine the qualification of electors, and while the commonwealth is thus secured against aristocratic influences in any state, the democracy of the states is protected against the like influences in the commonwealth Parliament, partly by the provision against plural voting already mentioned, and partly by a section which enacts that present electors for the lower house in any state are not to be deprived of their vote by any legislation of Parliament. In the Bill of 1891, there was no provision for a uniform franchise for the commonwealth or for the restrictions now imposed, and the matter was left to the state, as it is in the constitution of the United States.

So that whatever argument can be made, by way of analogy, in the case of the Australian colonies, I submit, Mr. Chairman, that argument is wholly in favour of the principle upon which the Opposition in this House have attempted to resist the Bill altogether. Any connection with this particular clause that involves so much of the principle of the Bill, I say it is with great regret that it does not seem to be in the power of the Solicitor General to make a fair concession to those who are accepting, or perforce must accept, the general principle of the Bill, and who see in it, not merely a want of uniformity but such a contrast between some of the provinces and others as to make the conditions in the smaller provinces almost unbearable. Why should the Government resist so strongly the proposition for a judicial revision in the smaller that obtains in those larger provinces ? What reason is there for this resistance ? Is it the pressure of their supporters from those provinces ? I do not believe that they could be actuated by so small a spirit. If we were asking for some provision to be made generally that involved extraordinary expense or was entirely too radical and novel, or which from experience in other places was shown not to possess merit, I could understand hon. gentlemen opposite resisting our appeal.

But no one has pretended that the system that obtains in Ontario and Quebec is objected to. That has not been argued in the House. The Solicitor General does not attack these features of the laws of these two provinces. Therefore, when we ask that we shall have the benefit of that judicial revision, on appeal, that safeguard against the possibility of fraud or of even irregularities, it does seem to me the Government would do well to concede that to the Opposition. If this were done, the time occupied with the consideration of this Bill would be very materially shortened. The Solicitor General, if I understood him correctly—and I regret that I have not been able to be present during the whole discussion—has already intimated that he proposes to introduce a limit, that he proposes to make the lists to be used in the Dominion elections those lists in the several provinces that are in existence, say sixty days before a Dominion general election. I

see that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fitzpatrick) assents to that. That is very proper, so far as it goes. But the hon. gentleman will see in that the confirmation of the argument that is now being pressed upon the Government. If the hon. gentleman was satisfied that there was no danger to be feared at the hands of the local legislature of an improper interference or an improper action in connection with these lists, so far as the federal House is concerned, would he dream of suggesting such an amendment, or would such an amendment be required? The hon. gentleman was frank enough, if I am correctly informed, to tell the committee that this amendment was intended to prevent any capricious or unfair action or improper interference on the part of the local legislature in the elections to this House. So, if the hon. gentleman admits that there is such a possibility—and he has the evidence (ex parte, if you like) from counties in Nova Scotia and from counties in Manitoba showing the possibility of most unfair and improper manipulation or preparation of these lists under the system for which we contend—he should exercise control and give us at least this right of appeal to a judicial officer. I do not despair of the Solicitor General coming to what I believe was his first view when he approached this matter, and that was that suggestions that had in them any element of reason or fairness and that did not interfere with the main principle of the Bill, should be favourably considered by him.

Mr. BELCOURT. I have listened with attention and interest to the argument adduced by the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) in answer to the one which I endeavoured to make the other day, when I cited the case of the Australian colonies. With all deference to the hon. gentleman, I do not think he has answered the point I made. The principle for which we on this side of the House contend, or rather the policy, for perhaps principle is not an apt expression—the policy for which we contend and which was propounded by the right hon. the Premier on one or two occasions during this debate, the policy in support of which I rose the other day to cite the precedent I have referred to, is that the provincial legislature should determine the extent and quality of the franchise. Now, I submit that the case which I have cited, the case of the Australian colonies, is a strong precedent in support of that contention. And when one considers section 41 of the British North America Act, he will see there also the consecration of that policy. That section provides that until the Dominion Parliament shall establish a franchise different from that which prevails in the different provinces, the franchise of the different provinces shall be the franchise on which members of this House shall be elected.

It is evident from this that the framers of the British North America Act believed that the best policy was, in fact, the policy which we advocate, that is, the policy of leaving it to the provincial legislatures to determine the franchise upon which members of this House shall be elected. That is the principle consecrated by section 41, and that that policy or principle was the proper one is proved by the fact that, from 1867, the time of confederation until 1885, when the franchise was changed, that principle and that policy were the principle and policy acted upon.

Mr. McINERNEY. With the hon. gentleman's permission, I would ask him a question. Does not section 41 say that the laws in force in the several provinces at the time of confederation shall fix the franchise for the Dominion? In that case, it did not allow the provinces to change it at their own sweet will.

Mr. BELCOURT. I am not arguing that. The framers of the British North America Act evidently thought that the legislatures of the different provinces which were being formed into a confederation were the best tribunals to determine the nature and quality of the franchise, for it stipulated that until the Dominion Parliament changed it, these provincial legislatures should continue to determine the nature of the franchise.

Mr. McINERNEY. No, not that they should continue to do so, but that the laws in force at confederation should continue to be in force.

Mr. BELCOURT. That is the principle and theory and policy followed until 1885. The provincial legislatures, from the time of confederation to 1885, were the tribunals that determined the quality and nature and extent of the franchise upon which members of this House were elected.

Mr. McINERNEY. No.

Mr. BELCOURT. There is no use in saying "no." That is what was done.

Mr. McINERNEY. It was to be the franchise in force at confederation. The provincial legislatures have no power to change it.

Mr. BELCOURT. They took the laws in force in the different provinces and enacted that, until the Dominion Parliament established a franchise, the franchise under which the members of this House should be elected should remain in the hands of the different provinces.

Mr. McINERNEY. No.

Mr. BELCOURT. There is no use in saying "no." That is the only——

Mr. SPROULE. May I ask the hon. gentleman——

Mr. BELCOURT. I am answering the hon. member for Kent (Mr. McInerney).

When I get through with him, I shall try to answer other hon. members.

Mr. McINERNEY. Please read section 41.

Mr. BELCOURT. There is no need of my reading it, I know what section 41 says. It says that the laws in force in the different provinces relative to the franchise shall continue to be the laws in force until this Parliament otherwise enacts.

Mr. McINERNEY. At the time of confederation.

Mr. BELCOURT. Certainly, at the time of confederation; and the franchise continued to be determined by those tribunals until 1885. Therefore, I say that the principle for which we contend, that in a confederation such as ours the provinces are after all the best tribunals to determine the nature of the franchise, has been consecrated by the Act of British North America.

Mr. SPROULE. Does not the hon. gentleman think that that provision was put in to enable the country to elect a Parliament, because there was no provision for it otherwise? Don't you think that was the reason it was put in?

Mr. BELCOURT. No, I do not think that was the reason at all.

Mr. SPROULE. How could Parliament have been elected without it?

Mr. BELCOURT. The best proof that that was not the reason, is the fact that not only the first Parliament was elected under that franchise but also every Parliament afterwards until 1886.

Mr. SPROULE. But is not that suggested by the words "until the Parliament of Canada otherwise provides"? Before that there was no Parliament to provide and could not be, and some provision had to be made to elect a Parliament so that it could provide.

Mr. BELCOURT. The words do not suggest that at all, because the framers of this Act were the men who were charged with the administration of public affairs in Canada, and who were engaged in the elections following the passage of the British North America Act, and who continued to be the leaders of the two parties which, year after year, conducted the elections afterwards. Nobody ever thought or dreamt of changing the constitution, nobody thought or dreamt of making a law in this House to change that order of things until 1885. There is no need of my going into the reasons why that was done in 1885. The reason is well known, at all events, we strongly suspect, although we cannot actually know, that the reason was simply a party reason which prompted that change in 1885. It was not done for a principle.

Mr. McNEILL. Might I interrupt my hon. friend for a moment? He says there was no change made till 1885.

Mr BELCOURT.

Mr. BELCOURT. No change of the principle or policy enacted by section 41.

Mr. McNEILL. This House, in 1882, passed an Act to defend its own privileges against the provinces.

Mr. BELCOURT. I understand the hon. gentleman now refers to the Act of 1882 which was passed for the purpose of enabling Dominion Government officials to vote. But nobody would contend that that Act was passed for the purpose of determining in a general manner the franchise upon which the members of this House should be elected. Surely the hon. gentleman does not claim that.

Mr. McNEILL. I claim it showed that this Parliament was determined to protect its own franchise when it thought necessary.

Mr. BELCOURT. It was to meet an exceptional case. It was not a law passed to determine in a general manner the qualifications upon which electors should vote for members of this House; it was in order to enable a certain number of electors to vote who had been deprived of their votes. That was the sole object.

Mr. McNEILL. If my hon. friend will forgive me—I would just say that this House allowed the local legislatures to exercise that power until it found that they had abused the power; then it took it out of their hands.

Mr. BELCOURT. I do not propose to go into that question. I am merely trying to make this point, that the framers of the British North America Act were evidently strongly impressed with the principle or policy which is actuating this Government in submitting the present Bill to this House. They evidently were under the impression that after all the best way was to leave to the several provincial legislatures the power to determine the nature and quality of the franchise, and that is the point I am making. I think it is quite clear from the enactment that this was the idea which predominated in their minds at that time, that the time might come, sooner or later; when that state of things should be changed, that they contemplated such a thing is quite possible, I am not denying that. But I go further, and I say that for 20 years after confederation that policy was found to work successfully, it was found to work in the best interests of Canada, and nobody ever dreamed of changing it. Now, referring more particularly to the case of the Australian colonies—and that is the only reason I rose, and I would not have taken up so much time had I not been interrupted—my object in rising was to say that in my judgment the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) has not answered the argument I made, he has not destroyed the effect of the precedent which I cited the other evening. Now I freely

admit that at the time I cited section 25 of the Bill of 1891 for the confederation of the Australian colonies, I was not aware that that particular section had been amended. But I have since seen the amendment, and I have read the article to which the hon. gentleman referred in the "National Review," by Mr. Moore. I have read both, and I still think, with all deference to my hon. and learned friend, that he has not answered and he has not destroyed the effect of my citation. Now what is the amendment of 1897? The only change that was made was this: By the draft Bill of 1891 it was enacted that the franchise as existing in the various Australian colonies should for ever continue to exist, that no change should ever be made by the Parliament of the commonwealth. That is the object. But that is restricted by saying in the amendment of 1897, that the present electors of the various colonies shall not be deprived of their qualification, that is to say, that those who are qualified at the present time shall continue to be qualified to elect members to the Parliament under the commonwealth. Well, there again I say is a consecration of the principle that these Australian colonies were after all the best judges of who should vote for members to a Parliament of the commonwealth, and that the laws which have been enacted by these various colonies giving qualifications to certain voters, shall continue to be in force, and that no subsequent Parliament of the confederation shall in any way interfere with them. That is the principle for which we contend here, or rather the object for which we contend—simply that in a federation such as ours and such as the Australian federation, the provincial parliaments after all is said and done, are the best judges of who shall be entitled to vote for the election of members to sit in this House. I repeat that not only does the draft Bill of the constitution of the Australian federation, but our own British North America Act, our own constitution by section 41, recognize that principle. That principle or policy has been found to work harmoniously and to the satisfaction of everybody, not only to meet the emergency of a coming election, as suggested by the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule), but for 20 years after confederation. It seems to me that both these cases are strongly in line, and strongly support the arguments adduced from this side of the House.

Mr. McINERNEY. The contention put forward by the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt) is in support of a similar contention put forward the other evening by the Prime Minister. The hon. member for Ottawa says that to the provinces should belong the right of making the franchise, and that that principle was in the minds of the framers of the British North America Act. He claims that the provinces should have the right to determine from time to time the franchise upon which the members of this House should be elected, and in support of that contention he calls to his aid the British North America Act. Now, the British North America Act does not aid the contention of the hon. gentleman, the British North America Act is in direct contradiction to the contention put forward by him and by the Prime Minister. The best way to find out what the Act is, is to read it. Section 41 says:

> Until the Parliament of Canada otherwise provides, all laws in force in the several provinces at the union relative to the following matters, or any of them, namely:——

And after mentioning voters' lists it says:

> ——shall respctively apply to the election of members to serve in the House of Commons for the same several provinces.

Does the hon. gentleman seek to convince this House that that section, which strictly confines and limits the power of the provinces to the laws in force at the time of the union as regards the franchise, allows the provinces to determine from time to time what the franchise shall be? Not at all. Section 41 limits the powers of the provinces to Acts in force at the time of the union, and it is not for them to determine from time to time what the law respecting the franchise shall be.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Do I understand that the hon. gentleman is limiting the franchise law and the electoral lists to those in force at the time of the union?

Mr. McINERNEY. No, I never said anything so absurd. I made my statement twice, and I will state the point once again. The member for Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt) cited section 41 in support of his contention that the fathers of confederation had in their minds the giving of power to the provinces to determine from time to time as to what should be the franchise. That section contradicts any such position, and it says that only such laws as were in force at the time of union shall be in force to determine the franchise. I therefore say that it does not enable the provinces to determine from time to time as to the franchise, but it limits them to the franchise which this Parliament was perfectly cognizant of, and which was in force and operation at the time of confederation.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Do I understand that the franchise in force at the time of the union in 1867 could not have been modified by the provinces subsequently, as applying to the Dominion elections?

Mr. McINERNEY. Not unless this Parliament or the Imperial Parliament gave the local legislatures power to do so.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. What are we doing now?

Mr. McINERNEY. This is a different matter altogether. I will tell the hon. gen-

tleman what the question now is. In order to avoid the very strong doubt existing as to his power to avail himself of the local franchises, the hon. gentleman is not taking the Acts of the local legislatures, he is not availing himself even of the local franchise, but he is getting away from the doubt that exists in his mind as regards the adoption of the local franchise, and is giving officials the right to vote, which the local Act does not do. He is thus protecting himself against the very strong doubt existing as to this section. What I rose particularly to do, and what I have done, which was a very simple task, was to convince the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt) that he erred in selecting section 41 to support his contention that the Confederation Act did give the local legislatures power to determine from time to time what the franchise should be for election of members of Parliament. It limits the power to the time of union, not giving a continuing power, not a power from time to time, but it limits the power to the laws in force at the time of the union. We have offered a very simple amendment based on the principle in force in Ontario, and we ask that this principle be applied to other provinces where it is not in force today. We ask for provinces where there is no appeal provided to a county court judge or a superior court judge that such an appeal should be given, and we wonder why the Government are not prepared to accept this amendment, which simply embodies the principle I have named. Why? Is it because in the game of politics hon. gentlemen opposite want to play against us with loaded dice? Are they saying what Macbeth said after the death of Duncan: "To be thus is nothing; but to be safely thus."

Do they want not only to be placed so as to keep themselves safely in that position by substituting in place of an appeal to a judicial tribunal, an appeal to a partisan officer? It strikes one as most surprising that hon. gentlemen opposite who for years in this House and the country contended for what they considered to be a clean revision of the lists should now oppose a provision which makes for a clean and proper revision of the lists. The country will support the Opposition in demanding the adoption of the principle for which we now stand, and hon. members on the Government side of the House will lose by the foolish opposition made to the adoption of a simple and straightforward principle.

Mr. DAVIN. I wish to say a few words in order to present to the House the opinion expressed by Sir John Macdonald.

Mr. BELCOURT. It would be more interesting to know what he did.

Mr. DAVIN. That is also very important.

Mr. BELCOURT. He made no change until 1885.

Mr. McINERNEY.

Mr. DAVIN. I will read to the committee not only what Sir John Macdonald said, but what Hon. Alexander Mackenzie stated. Sir John Macdonald:

> Moved for leave to introduce a Bill respecting the election of members to the House of Commons. He said that by the Union Act the election law in force in each province at the time of union applied to elections in each province until the Parliament of Canada otherwise provided. It was important that the election laws of all the provinces should be uniform. In Ontario and Quebec the voters' list was used on the assessment roll; but the question of assessment was one in the hands of the provincial governments. It was, therefore, obvious that assessment must cease to be the basis of qualification of voters for members of this House. So long as the assessment roll was under the control of the local authorities, it might be changed at any time, and thus the qualifications of elections would be changed, and this House would be deprived of the right of fixing the qualifications of those who shall vote for its members. In fact, the assessment of Ontario had already been changed by the Ontario Parliament since the union, and he believed the Government of Quebec was pledged to a change in their assessment law. And had there been a contest in Centre Wellington, and had he been asked as Minister of Justice to decide what voters' lists should be used, he would, according to his interpretation of the law, have had to decide that the only list that could be used would be the last assessment roll existing at the time of the union, although it was quite evident that that list would not fairly represent the real voters, and every year it would be a less correct representation of the voters.

That agrees with the argument advanced by the hon. member for Pictou. It was stated, again and again, that for a number of years the provincial franchises had been used and no suggestion had been made that any change was necessary. Hon. gentlemen will see that in 1869 Sir John Macdonald introduced a Bill on the subject, and not a single member of the Opposition at that time objected to it.

I wish to show what occurred when the Reform party came into power and Alexander Mackenzie went to the country in 1874. He issued his address to the people of Lambton, and it will be found in the "Globe" of January 9th, 1874. This is what he said:

> We shall endeavour to frame laws for such a liberal adjustment of the franchise as may best suit the varying circumstances of the different sections of the Dominion.

So that Alexander Mackenzie intended to bring in an election Bill dealing with this very question.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. gentlemen laugh, but what other meaning can be attached to his words?

Mr. BELCOURT. Does the hon. gentleman ask me the question?

Mr. DAVIN. Yes.

Mr. BELCOURT. In this Bill we are taking exactly the course that Mr. Mackenzie suggested there. We are trying to make a franchise as uniform as possible, consistent with the regulations of the different sections of the country.

Mr. DAVIN. I shall read the quotation again.

We shall endeavour to frame laws for such a liberal adjustment of the franchise——

Do you mean to say we are making an adjustment of the franchise when we pass a law declaring that the local legislatures shall adjust the franchise for us?

Mr. BELCOURT. Read the rest of it.

Mr. DAVIN. I will.

——as may best suit the varying circumstances of the different sections of the Dominion.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. gentlemen laugh, but their laughter is meaningless and senseless. I have read the speeches and addresses of the late Alexander Mackenzie, and he was a man accustomed to use precise language; and you cannot fit on to this language any such idea as gentlemen opposite suggest.

We shall endeavour to frame laws for such a liberal adjustment of the franchise as may best suit the varying circumstances of the different sections of the Dominion.

Now, Sir, I have looked at the franchise that would at that time have returned members to this Parliament, but the hon. gentlemen opposite know that if the idea was in Alexander Mackenzie's mind that the local legislature should frame the franchise for returning members to this House of Commons, all Mr. Mackenzie would have to say was: Although the British North America Act provides that until action shall be taken by the Dominion Parliament; the existing local franchise shall be that for returning members to Parliament; we do not intend to take any steps in accordance with the British North America Act, and we are satisfied with the various provinces returning members in accordance with their franchise. But Alexander Mackenzie used language which clearly indicates that he intended following in the wake of the Hon. Sir John Macdonald, to introduce a Bill similar to that introduced in 1869. I have shown, Sir, that the positions taken by the right hon. the Prime Minister and the statements made again and again from that side of the House, that this system had gone on until 1885, without any action being taken and without a murmer; I have shown that such contentions have been swept clean away by the facts brought forward on this side of the House.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I was rather pained to hear the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) doubt the spirit of conciliation which I have attempted to show all through this debate. In order to reassure him, I think I may safely say that although this Bill was introduced after having been very carefully considered and prepared—not by myself, I am free to admit, but by a gentleman much more competent and of greater skill in these matters—we felt it was far from being perfect, and that much would be gained by a free and full discussion in this House. To show that I went as far as it was possible for me to go, to improve the measure that I brought down, I can point now to what I have already promised to do, and to what will be done. We have already undertaken to amend the law, so as to provide that those who are disfranchised under provincial legislation should have the right to vote, except in the case of felons, &c. We have also provided that in so far as the congested polling districts of New Brunswick are concerned, they shall be subdivided in such a way as to remedy the difficulties which have been pointed out. We have gone further. In consequence of the suggestions made to me yesterday by my hon. friend from Westmoreland (Mr. Powell) another amendment has been made so as to provide for the non-resident voters in the province of New Brunswick? After having gone that far, it seems to me that it is scarcely fair that I should be taunted with an unwillingness to accept reasonable suggestions from gentlemen on that side of the House. I have been willing to accept these suggestions in the past, and I will be willing in the future when it is possible for me to do so without destroying completely the ground-work of the fabric of the Act. Here is a question that goes to the root of the whole Act, namely, the constitutional question. I have heard it alluded to by hon. gentlemen opposite, but I have not heard it discussed except by the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Haggart), and that is a question that I think my legal friends on the other side of the House might fairly give their attention to, so that we may have it properly threshed out. It is idle for us to spend our time beating the air upon questions that are not before this committee; the difficulties we are called upon to meet are of such gravity and importance as to require our whole time, and they should debar us from discussing theoretical questions, as to whether we are delegating to the local legislatures, and whether if we did attempt to do so, we could do so legally. Now we are dealing with a sub-clause (a) of this section.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Does not that bring the whole question up?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Not in the manner in which it has been discussed here. This section means that, as a qualification for the electorate of this Parliament, the franchise we adopt is the franchise in force

in the different provinces. We make our franchise the franchise of the provinces.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Does the hon. gentleman understand the word "established" to mean "established from time to time."

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). At any time?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. At any time, yes. I am trying to get rid of the question which has been raised and which really does not bear on this point. I say that we have the right to adopt the franchise of a province and to make that franchise ours. That is what we are doing. That cannot be disputed.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. An exact and determined franchise.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I say we adopt the franchise of the province.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. As it stands?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Not as it stands, but as it may stand at any time after our Act is in force. It was argued a moment ago that Sir John Macdonald declared that we could not do anything of that sort. I am not going to argue as to what Sir John Macdonald said. I am going to point out what he did. In 1872 Sir John Macdonald introduced a Bill and put an Act on the Statute-book, 35 Vic., chapter 14, in which he provided for franchise and voters' lists, with reference to the province of Ontario, and he made similar enactments for all the other provinces:

In the province of Ontario, subject to the special provisions hereinafter made, the qualification of voters at elections for members of the House of Commons shall be that established by the laws in force in that province on the 23rd day of January, 1869,——

Not at the time of the union, but on that specific date.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I wanted to hear that "hear, hear," and I will go on to show how it applies:

——as the qualification of voters at elections for members of the Legislative Assembly, and the voters' lists to be used at elections of members of the House of Commons shall be the same as if such elections were of members of the Legislative Assembly, on the basis of the qualification aforesaid, and the polling subdivisions or wards shall be the same as if such elections were for members of the Legislative Assembly; and the returning officer shall provide a polling place for each subdivision or ward in the most central and convenient place for such elections.

That is Sir John Macdonald's opinion; and on that point I am willing to put my opinion against that of hon. gentlemen opposite. That statute was a subject of judicial discussion, and here is what Chief Justice Wilson, speaking in the case of Regina vs. O'Rourke, said in discussing that very statute:

In not one of these cases is there the least grant of power. Nor do I think the Dominion has granted any such power to this province. It is an enactment that while such law exists in the province the Dominion enactment shall have a certain operation in that province; or it is a declaration that the provincial law shall, while in force, be, and shall be, accepted by the Dominion as its own law throughout the province for its own purposes; and such an enactment is valid and unobjectionable.

Now, I will draw the attention of the legal gentlemen on the other side, on the subject of delegation, to section 662 of the Criminal Code, which says:

Every person qualified and summoned as a grand or petit juror, according to the laws in force for the time being in any province of Canada, shall be duly qualified to serve as such juror in criminal cases in that province.

This refers to our giving the local legislatures power to deal with a matter peculiarly and entirely under our control.

Mr. McINERNEY. That section is differently worded from section 41. That says "for the time being," whereas section 41 says, "at the union."

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The trouble with section 41 is that my learned friend contends that the law at confederation is the only one that can apply. In the same case, Regina vs. O'Rourke, a discussion arose on the validity of 35 Vic., from which this section is taken; and, speaking of this section, Chief Justice Wilson says:

There is no delegation by the Dominion Parliament of the power to enact jury laws for the criminal courts in Ontario. What is done is by a positive enactment of the Dominion, that a certain law in force in Ontario shall for the Dominion purposes be the law of the Dominion. It is a Dominion law enacted not in extenso, but by relation and reference to a law of Ontario.

Mr. HAGGART. Hear, hear.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Now, the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Haggart) is getting away from the argument for delegation as fast as he can, and he says that we can only refer to a law in force at the time the Dominion law is passed.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman must know that I quoted those very words. My argument was that we could enact a law in extenso without specially going over it. I virtually quoted those very words. In other words, instead of repeating the whole statute, we could in a few short words enact it, and make it the law of the Dominion.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I find here that "it is a Dominion law enacted not in extenso."

Mr. HAGGART. Exactly.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Well, it is in extenso or not in extenso ?

Mr. HAGGART. What I stated was that we could enact the law by simply referring to the statute, or we could enact it in the very words the hon. gentleman has quoted. We do not need to enact it in extenso at all. We can say that clause 6, or the law in force at a particular time in reference to particular subjects shall be the law of the Dominion.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I think I understand the hon. gentleman. It is only good when the law is already in existence in the provinces and we enact it in the Dominion. Let me read the law relating to provinces.

Mr. McNEILL. May I ask the hon. gentleman a question ? Does my hon. friend draw no distinction between accepting a law which is in existence and giving power to frame laws which are not in existence. Will the one be not a delagation and the other a delegation ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Let me first reply to the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Haggart). He says we can only adopt the law already in existence. Let me read again the law relating to jurors :

> Every person qualified as a grand or petty juror, according to the law in force for the time being in any province of the Dominion at any time, shall be duly qualified to serve as a juror.

That says any provincial law that may be in force at any time in a province shall apply to the Dominion, and it does not presume the law in force at the time the Act was passed. But that is not all. Not only have we got Sir John Macdonald making the Act I spoke of a moment ago, but we have got this Bill of 1894, and I am quite satisfied no hon. gentleman will declare that that was ultra vires. In my opinion, it is very much intra vires, and I think my hon. friend will have trouble convincing this House that an Act introduced by the late Sir John Thompson, having for its object the enactment of these provincial laws, would have been introduced by him without very serious consideration. Here is what it provides :

> Except as may be hereafter provided, the qualification of voters at a Dominion election shall in any province of the Dominion, be that established by the laws in force in such province on the first day of June in the year during which the lists for such election were prepared, fixing the qualification of voters at a provincial election.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That is a draft Bill.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I thought it was the Bill introduced.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. On that occasion, Sir John Thompson took pains to tell the House that he did not take the responsibility of every clause of that Bill. It was a draft for consideration, and he disclaimed responsibility.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I refer to this as evidence of the fact that there has been no lawyer of importance in this House who took the responsibility of declaring that it was ultra vires. Many have expressed doubts, and I think the matter was not absolutely free of doubt in the way in which it was first put ; but in view of the form in which section A is drafted, there can be no doubt, in my judgment, that the clause is constitutional, and that that is the construction which has been put upon our law, under section 41 of the British North America Act, ever since confederation. It is a question purely and simply of our declaring that we adopt the provincial franchises as we find them now ; and, as I said last night, an Act of Parliament speaks for the present. It always speaks for the time when it is put into operation, and this measure, if it passes, will mean that at the time an election takes place, the provincial lists then existing shall be the lists applicable to a Dominion election. We incorporate, for the purpose of this Act, the provisions of the provincial laws in so far as the franchise is concerned.

Mr. POWELL. It is undoubtedly the principle of statutory construction that a law always speaks for the present, but does the hon. gentleman think that that rule would operate so as to delegate to a local legislature the power of enacting our franchise ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I contend that there is no delegation. That is the point in dispute. If this were a case in which we said, for instance, that a provincial Parliament will make our franchise, the question of delegation would arise, and I would be debarred from arguing as I have done. But I say that we do not confer any power on the local legislatures. We merely say that we adopt as our franchise the franchise in force in each province. As the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) has said, we adopt whatever change may take place in the provincial legislatures, so long as the measure we now propose remains in force. There I agree with my hon. friend from Westmoreland.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. You draw a distinction between delegation and ratification in advance. For instance, this clause means that we ratify any change which a provincial legislature may make.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. We neither delegate nor ratify—we adopt.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That is a nice distinction.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. It is a distinction that will appeal to all lawyers in the House, I am sure.

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

After Recess.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 64) respecting the Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Railway Company.—(Mr. Maxwell.)

Bill (No. 68) respecting the Montfort Colonization Railway Company, and to change its name to the Montfort and Gatineau Colonization Railway Company.—(Mr. Bourassa, by Mr. McMullen.)

Bill (No. 93) respecting the Canada Atlantic Railway Company.—(Mr. Belcourt, by Mr. McIsaac.)

DAWSON CITY ELECTRIC COMPANY.

Bill (No. 123) respecting the Dawson City Electric Company was read the second time.

Mr. SPEAKER. This Bill is one which contains powers for the construction of a tramway or railway running a good many miles outside the city, and also asks for powers of expropriation under the Railway Act. For that reason, I think the House would desire that it should be referred to the Railway Committee.

Mr. FLINT moved that the said Bill be referred to the Select Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines.

Motion agreed to.

THE ELECTORAL FRANCHISE ACT.

House again resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 16) to repeal the Electoral Franchise Act and to further amend the Dominion Elections Act.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. MONTAGUE. I would like to call the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to the opinion which he expressed when the Franchise Act of 1885 was introduced. The hon. gentleman, I am sure spoke then his conscientious sentiments when the Bill of 1885 was introduced, and when he was discussing the very feature of the Bill which is now being discussed as regards this Bill. I mean the right of appeal. When that Bill was introduced the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will remember that there was no clause in it providing for an appeal from a revising barrister when that revising barrister or revising officer happened not to be the county judge. The hon. gentleman was then, as he always claims to be, ever alert as to the right of the subject in this country to have his rights protected by an appeal to the courts of the realm in any case where he is likely to be defrauded of them.

The Minister of Marine and Fisheries on page 1156 of the "Hansard" of 1885 expressed an opinion as to the necessity of an appeal, and I can scarcely understand, in view of the strong and robust language of the statement, that the hon. Minister can now sit as a member of the Administration and refuse the request of hon. members on this side of the House that there should be in this Bill an appeal not from the decision of a lawyer of five years' standing but from the decisions of men who have no knowledge of the law and who have been appointed, at least in Ontario, for their political services. Speaking on that point, the Minister of Marine declared as follows:—

> They (the revising officers) can put on the lists whom they please, and they keep off whom they please; and so careful has the hon. gentleman been to prevent the possibility of any one complaining, even of arbitrary conduct on their part, that he allows no appeal, no matter how arbitrary, unjust or villainous their decisions may be.

That was a dangerous, arbitrary and villainous conduct which the hon. gentleman expected from the members of his own profession who had been five years practicing law. Does the hon. gentleman wonder that we ask now an appeal from the decision of an officer who does not understand law, and who occupies a position under the Government of the province and who is called upon to decide as to names to be struck off and names to be added. I appeal to the Minister of Marine to stand by his declaration of 1885 and ask him to use his best offices with other members of the Administration to see that we secure this appeal to a county judge.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). The hon. gentleman entirely misconceives the situation. The circumstances before the House then and now are entirely different. The hon. leader of the House was then introducing a Bill providing for a federal scheme of revision and providing in certain cases for an appeal to a county court judge. The right of appeal was being granted in a way that was absolutely unfair and unjust. The hon. gentleman was creating an appeal in one case and refusing it in another. I simply rose in my place at that time to show how unjustly such a system would work. But the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) knows that now we are not adopting a Dominion franchise system, that we are not creating a voters' list or establishing machinery for the preparation of a list, but we are simply adopting the lists of the different provinces, which system long experience has shown to have worked admir-

ably and with which the people of the several provinces are satisfied. In Ontario and Quebec the people desired an appeal, and they obtained it; in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia they did not desire an appeal and they did not have it, and we simply adopt the systems which has received the approval of the provinces. That is the answer I have to give to my hon. friend (Mr. Montague). I now desire to say a word in regard to the discussion so far as it has progressed, a discussion which I think has been somewhat unduly prolonged, although I do not believe hon. members desired to continue it improperly. The question has been pointedly raised that the Parliament of Canada has delegated its powers to the local legislatures. That statement was made by the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Haggart), without perhaps sufficient consideration and without having consulted the legal members on his side of the House. The hon. gentleman seemed to think that having the power to legislate on the franchise question by the British North America Act, we could not delegate that power to other parties. He seemed to imagine that this Parliament was limited in its power of legislation with respect to those powers that had been conferred on it by the British North America Act. I need not say to hon. members who have studied the constitutional aspect of the Act, that while that old idea prevailed at one time, it has been exploded. Every lawyer, as I have said, knows that in Hodge vs. the Queen, decided years ago, this very question as to whether on those subjects which had been relegated to the Dominion Parliament on the one hand or to the provincial legislatures on the other, this Parliament or legislature exercised delegated or plenary power, was argued before the Privy Council and once for all finally decided. Within the subject matter of our powers we do not exercise any delegated power. We have the plenary power within those limits of the Imperial Parliament of Great Britain. The matter is not open to discussion. If some hon. members, whose opinions I highly respect, had not risen, I think somewhat hastily and without consideration, and backed up the opinion of the hon. member for Lanark, I would not have considered it necessary to intervene. But I call the hon. gentleman's attention for one moment to the judgment in re Hodge, which is well known to every Canadian lawyer, which has been published, commented on and acted upon all through the Dominion since it was given, a decision which is to the effect that so far as the powers which have been prescribed in the British North America Act to be exercised by the legislatures on the one hand or by the Dominion Parliament on the other, these powers are plenary powers as fully as the Imperial Parliament can exercise, and being so, there can be no question raised about delegated powers. In this case the question came up whether the legislature of Ontario had power to delegate to municipalities the right to make by-laws on subjects which they had power to legislate upon, and it was contended they had not that power because it was delegating a power and trust which the British North America Act gives. I cannot explain the point to the committee so well as by reading brief extracts from the language used by the Privy Council, and I call the hon. gentleman's attention to it.

Mr. MONTAGUE. No one has made that contention.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Haggart) in his second speech on this subject, reported at page 4296 of the "Hansard," declared that while in his opinion an existing statute could be made the law of the land, we had no power to declare that laws passed by the provincial legislatures from time to time should be the law of the land. The words used by the hon. gentleman were these:

> I admit that we can adopt an Act of the provincial authorities in extenso and say that that shall be the law of the country. But when we say whatever law you pass from time to time shall be the law of the country, although we have power and jurisdiction over the matter, we delegate that power to the provincial legislature. I cannot understand it in any other light than that. It is clear as can be under the clause which he proposes under the Act, that whatever the franchise may be, and however it may be changed from time to time by the provincial authorities, it becomes the law of this Dominion. If that is not delegating power to the provincial authorities to fix our franchise from time to time as they think proper, then I do not understand the meaning of words.

The hon. gentleman contended you cannot do that. I am arguing for a moment on the assumption that his construction of the section is correct. What did the Privy Council lay down in this opinion? I am quoting now from the decision in Hodge vs. the Queen, 9 Appeal Cases, page 131:

> Assuming that the local legislature had power to legislate to full extent of the resolutions passed by the license commissioners, and to have enforced the observance of their enactment by penalties and imprisonment with or without hard labour, it was further contended that the Imperial Parliament had conferred no authority on the local legislature to delegate those powers to the license commissioners, or any other persons. In other words, that the power conferred by the Imperial Parliament on the local legislature should be exercised in full by that body, and by that body alone. The maxim "delegatus non potest delegare" was relied on.

That is the argument here.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Not at all.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I fail to understand the English language if that is not the argument

I have been listening to. This is what the Privy Council says :

It appears to their Lordships, however, that the objection thus raised by the appellants is founded on an entire misconception of the true character and position of the provincial legislatures. They are in no sense delegates of or acting under any mandate from the Imperial Parliament. When the British North America Act enacted that there should be a legislature for Ontario, and that its Legislative Assembly should have exclusive authority to make laws for the province and for provincial purposes in relation to the matters enumerated in section 92, it conferred powers not in any sense to be exercised by delegation from or as agents of the Imperial Parliament, but authority as plenary and as ample within the limits prescribed by section 92 as the Imperial Parliament in the plenitude of its power possessed and could bestow. Within these limits of subjects and area the local legislature is supreme, and has the same authority as the Imperial Parliament, or the Parliament of the Dominion would have under like circumstances to confide to the municipal institutions, or body of its own creation, authority to make by-laws or resolutions as to subjects specified in the enactment, and with the object of carrying the enactment into operation and effect.

It is obvious that such an authority is ancillary to legislation, and without it an attempt to provide for varying details and machinery to carry them out might become oppressive, or absolutely fail. The very full and very elaborate judgment of the court of appeal contains abundance of precedents for this legislation, entrusting a limited discretionary authority to others, and have many illustrations of its necessity and convenience. It was argued at the bar that a legislature committing important regulations to agents or delegates effaces itself.

Exactly the argument made here in so many words.

That is not so. It retains its powers intact, and can, whenever it pleases, destroy the agency it has created and set up another, or take the matter directly into its own hands.

Now, how I could express the matter more strongly, more definitely or more conclusively than by quoting this judgment, I do not know.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Does the Minister (Sir Louis Davies) argue that this Parliament has the power to delegate its powers as regards the making of the franchise to the provinces ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Certainly.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Then the Minister (Sir Louis Davies) states positively that it is his opinion as a lawyer——

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I say the Privy Council has so decided.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Though I am not a lawyer, I think I will be able to show that the Privy Council has not decided any such thing. The Minister tells us that he believes this Parliament has the power to delegate its power as regards the making of the franchise law to the various provinces. I would now ask what the opinion of the Solicitor General is upon that point ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I am not called upon to express any opinion in this connection. There are gentlemen in this House whose legal opinions have very great weight with me, and some of them on the other side of the House, and their opinion is that we have the power to delegate.

Mr. MONTAGUE. This is a strange position indeed. The Minister of Marine says we have the power to delegate that power to the provinces.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I say the Privy Council have so decided.

Mr. MONTAGUE. You say that under that decision this Parliament has the power to delegate that authority ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. If we choose to do it.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The Solicitor General has no opinion to offer, but he tells us that there are other opinions in the House to which he bows with all due deference. Well, Sir, I have forgotten the debate of yesterday, if I did not hear an opinion expressed by the Solicitor General from which the inference was that if it came to a question as to whether this House had the power to delegate that duty to the provinces he would hesitate as regards that point.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That is a question of policy.

Mr. FOSTER. No, it is a question of law.

Mr. MONTAGUE. We have got this far in understanding as to how these gentlemen stand. Yesterday the Solicitor General doubted as to whether we had the right to delegate that power, and now the Minister of Marine declares that the Solicitor General's doubts are of no avail, and that under the judgment of the Privy Council this Parliament undoubtedly has that right. The contention which the Minister of Marine set out for the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Haggart) was not the contention which the hon. member for Lanark made. The hon. member for Lanark never went back to the old maxim which declared that because we had delegated powers, we could not delegate these powers to another parliament. The hon. member for Lanark knew perfectly well, as does the Minister of Marine, that that idea was exploded, and we all must admit now that within the confines of the British North America Act but always bounded and confined by the provisions of that Act, this Parliament has

as large powers as the Imperial Parliament has. Surely the Minister of Marine does not contend for a moment that the Acts of that Parliament are not compelled to be within the provisions of the British North America Act.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Certainly not.

Mr. MONTAGUE. That being so, the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Haggart) contended that the British North America Act declares in its 41st section:

> Until the Parliament of Canada otherwise provides, all laws in force in the several provinces at the union relative to the following matters, or any of them, namely: the qualifications and disqualifications of persons to be elected or to sit or vote as members of the House of Assembly or Legislative Assembly in the several provinces.

These shall be the lists upon which the elections of this Parliament shall be held. But the hon. member for Lanark contended that these powers had been taken out of the hands of the local legislatures when the Dominion Parliament had "otherwise provided"; and that consequently, once and for ever, the power of delegating that power to the provinces had disappeared from this Parliament.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman will surely understand. My contention was simply that whatever and just to the extent that the Imperial Parliament had given us power to legislate upon the subject, to that extent we had plenary powers. We had not a delegated power, which was at once exhausted by its exercise; but we had plenary powers in the same way that the Imperial Parliament has power to legislate upon any such matter. The argument, that because we have once exercised the power we have exhausted it, is, I say with very great respect, simply absurd.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I take it as a great many members of this House take it, that this having been once acted upon by this Parliament, we have no right now to give that power to the provinces. Suppose the hon. gentleman (Sir Louis Davies) is correct and that we can give the right to make a franchise to the various provinces, why cannot we give it to one province? If we have the power of delegating the right to make the franchise for this Parliament to the several provinces——

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It is not a delegation.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Now we have another position.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. This section is not a delegation in the popular sense of the word. It is a declaration by us that the franchises prescribed by the provincial parliaments shall be our franchise.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Now, my hon. friend is getting away from the position from which he started.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Not a bit.

Mr. MONTAGUE. He said that we had a perfect right to delegate these powers. He quoted the decision of the Privy Council, and stated that we must be dull if we did not see that we had a right to give the making of the franchise to the various provinces. I was going on to ask my hon. friend, if we have the right to say that the franchise of the Dominion shall be the franchise established by the various provinces, why have we not the right to say that the franchise adopted by this Dominion shall be the franchise, say, of Prince Edward Island? If we can say that the various provinces shall make the franchise of this Dominion, we can equally say that the franchise of the province of Prince Edward Island shall be the franchise of the whole Dominion of Canada; and that is reducing the matter, as the hon. gentleman knows, to an absurdity. Next, the hon. gentleman says that we are not delegating the power, and that was the contention of the hon. Solicitor General last night. I quite agree that if the hon. gentlemen were coming down here with an Act declaring that the franchises of the various provinces now existing should be the franchise of the Dominion, that would not be delegating power. It would be simply adopting the franchises of the various provinces. But the hon. Solicitor General is going further than that, and if he is not delegating powers, I, for one, cannot possibly understand what he is doing. He is saying to this Parliament: I want you to pass an Act adopting the franchises as they exist at the present time; but I want still further that you should pass an Act which will not only adopt the franchises as they exist at the present time, but will adopt the provincial franchises, no matter what change, however absurd, may be made in them. I am not a lawyer, and I am not able to see the fine distinctions which are drawn by the Solicitor General and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries as regards delegating our powers, and as regards binding this Parliament by statute to adopt whatever changes the provincial legislatures may make in the future. But I leave it to the intelligence of the House that the distinction is a very fine one indeed, and if we are not delegating our powers, I do not know what we are doing.

Leaving that subject, I want to come back to the other point on which I touched, and which brought the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to his feet. He brushes aside in the most perfunctory manner the contention he made for an appeal to the county court judge when the Bill of 1885 was under discussion. What he said was that those officers who made the lists were autocrats and therefore he demanded the right of an ap-

peal from their decision. At that time the promise was given by the Government that judges should be appointed wherever practicable. At the present time what is the fact? In the province of Nova Scoita and in the province of New Brunswick the persons who make the lists are not judges. They are sheriffs appointed by the local administration, removable, as has been clearly shown, by the will of that administration; and what is the position of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to-day? He has gone back on his contention of 1885, and he refuses the right in those provinces of an appeal to a fair and just tribunal in regard to any inaccuracies in the list. If the hon. gentleman will turn up the debates of 1885, he will find that the present Minister of Justice, then the member for Bothwell, also argued for an appeal to the county judge, in every case where the revising officer was not a county judge, in order that there should be equal justice done between the parties in this Dominion. I take it that if the present Minister of Justice were expressing his opinion to-day, untrammelled and unbiased by the influence of those around him, he would express the same opinion that he expressed in 1885. The present Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) fought and re-fought for the same contention. I believe that if I had time to-night, I should be able to show that every member of the present Administration who was in Parliament at that time fought for the same principle for which we are fighting on this side of the House to-night. And if it was a good principle then, I ask hon. gentlemen who are members of the Government, and I ask hon. gentlemen who are their supporters and by whose voice they are in power, to stand up here and say that the principle for which they fought in 1885 was not a correct and just principle. I further ask any hon. member on that side of the House to stand up and say what objection there can possibly be against an appeal to a fair-minded, unbiased, impartial, non-partisan tribunal. I have listened to the Prime Minister. I have listened to the Solicitor General. I have listened to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, I have listened to each one of them; and, while they went away on various side roads, and discussed various little points, not one of them denied the correctness of the proposal which had been made by themselves in 1885. I appeal to hon. gentlemen opposite, in view of the fight they made in the past, and in view of the undisputed correctness of the views which we have advanced on this side of the House, to grant the appeal for which we are contending.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman makes an appeal across the House, but I think it is hardly fair to make it now. The Prime Minister last night argued the question thoroughly, and he said that the position which the hon. gentlemen asked us to accept, amounted to this, that we should withdraw our Bill. The Government cannot do that; it is perfectly absurd to ask them.

Mr MONTAGUE. Better withdraw the Bill than do an injustice.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The Government do not think it is an injustice. The Government, not hastily, but after years of consideration, both in Opposition and since they attained power, came to the conclusion that the proper course was to adopt the franchises of the various provinces. Where the provinces grant an appeal, the Government grant it; where the people of a province do not think an appeal necessary, the Government do not introduce an appeal; and the Government do not intend to alter their Bill in that cardinal respect. If they are defeated by the House, they will be prepared to accept their defeat; otherwise they must proceed on the main principle contained in the Bill, that the provincial franchises shall be the franchise of the Dominion.

Mr. McNEILL. I ask my hon. friend to permit me to say a word just now, because his remark has brought up what I wanted to direct the attention of the committee to; that is, what seemed to me to be the most grave and ominous statement made by the Prime Minister last night. When this measure was at its second reading, we pointed out that just as soon as a local legislature was empowered to assail the seats of hon. members of this House by adding to the lists men who were opposed to them, or by striking from the lists their friends, the independence of this Parliament was gone. To that this reply was made: "You need not be afraid of anything of the kind; the local legislatures are incapable of such conduct." To that we replied by pointing out that it had already been done, and the Finance Minister himself called attention to the fact that this House in 1882, for the protection of its privileges, was obliged to guard itself against such action of the local legislature of one of the provinces.

When that could not be controverted, this reply was made in effect: Oh, well, they will not do it again, and if they should do it again, we have the power to intervene and protect ourselves. When the Prime Minister was making that statement, I, perhaps, somewhat improperly, interjected the remark: But it may be too late; and in reply to that he said: It cannot be too late, for this Parliament will always have the opportunity and the time to guard itself against an injustice of that kind. Let me reply that while it is possible that the majority may have the opportunity of protecting itself, there is certainly no opportunity offered to the minority of protecting itself. The discussion proceeded, and then, attention having been called to this injustice, it was proposed from this side that there should be an

appeal, in every case, to a county court judge, or, if that were impossible, to a judge of a superior court. We pointed out that in Ontario and Quebec this appeal was allowed. My hon. friend the Solicitor General—and I hope he will correct me if I misrepresent him, and I will say, in passing, that I think the hon. gentleman has shown, in the course of this discussion, most exemplary patience and fairness and ability—said, in reply, that if there were any good grounds shown why a judge should be appointed, he would be willing to admit that the appointment should be made. In other words, he said, that if it were shown that real injustice was being inflicted upon the electors in any part of the Dominion, especially in the maritime provinces which, I think, he mentioned at the time, he would consider that a fair ground for the contention we were making, but that no proof of such injustice has been given. In reply to that, my hon. friend from Annapolis (Mr. Mills) read several affidavits, showing that the grossest injustice had taken place in his own constituency. Well, I think that after that my hon. friend practically threw up the sponge, because the only argument he was able to adduce was this, that he must assume that these officials discharge their duties properly. I do not think my hon. friend could expect that argument to be taken seriously. It amounted to this, that officials always discharged their duty as they ought to do. That was the position of affairs when the right hon. Prime Minister rose last night, and what did he tell us ? He did not attempt, for one moment, to deny that there were injustices. No, but he said that this was a matter which rested entirely in the hands of the provinces, that it was for the legislatures to say what was best for their own people in this regard, that within the limits of the provinces the provincial legislatures ought to be supreme in this matter. What did that amount to ? It amounted to this, that if there were judges appointed by the provincial legislatures, well and good ; but if there were not judges appointed by the provincial legislatures to revise the lists, still, well and good—that this Parliament had no right whatever to intervene. That was the position taken by the Prime Minister. What does that amount to ? Why, Mr. Chairman, it amounts to this, that although this Parliament is satisfied that injustice is being done in reference to its own franchise, that although there is no disupte as to the fact that injustice is being done, and although this Parliament has the power to remedy this injustice, yet this Parliament shall not intervene. And it amounts to this further statement, that, so far as this Government is concerned it will not intervene, let the injustice be as it it may. Let the injustice be ever so great, this Government will not intervene, because that would be contrary to the principle upon which this Bill is founded. In other words, the partisans of hon. gentlemen opposite, from this date until the date of the next general election, shall have a free hand to work their own sweet will in the provinces, in assailing the seats of hon. members on this side. I do not mean to say that this legislation is being passed through this House in this way for this purpose, but I say that that will be the result of it : and I say that there is no hon. gentleman opposite who has a fair and open mind, who will deny that there are persons in the provinces, on both sides of politics, who will be glad to seize the opportunity of improperly dealing with the voters' lists. Then, I ask, what has become of the statement which was made to us, when this measure was brought down, that if injustice was being done, this Parliament has the remedy in its own hands. Why, that remedy has all gone up in smoke; there is nothing in it. The right hon. gentleman says that the local legislatures cannot do wrong in this sense, that so long as they have the majority of the people of the province behind them, whatever they do is right. Whatever is is right in the provinces, under these circumstances, and it is useless for the right hon. gentleman or any member of the Government to tell us, under those circumstances, that we may rest content. It is useless for them to say that if the local legislatures abuse their powers, we have the remedy in our hands, because they say that if we interfere with the provinces, we will violate the principle of this Bill. The principle of this Bill, forsooth, is this, that the local legislatures cannot do wrong, so long as they have a majority of the people in the provinces at their back for the time being. That is the principle we are asked to accept here to-night. I say that no hon. member of this House, who has the good of our country at heart—and I am quite sure that some at least of those who have charge of this measure have—ought to ask us to place such a statute as this on the Statute-book.

Mr. McCLURE. I would be quite willing to vote for the amendment proposed if I could see from my standpoint, that there is any necessity for it. So far as the province of Nova Scotia is concerned, I am saying what I think will be borne out by men of both political parties in the province of Nova Scotia when I say that, so far as the people there are concerned, no necessity is felt for such an appeal as this. I have been surprised to hear during the course of this debate several very violent attacks made upon the system of preparing the lists in the province of Nova Scotia. I have been especially surprised because I had thought that I had a somewhat intimate knowledge of the politics of that province during the last fifteen years. I have had practical experience for that length of time, and for a longer period I have studied the history of that province. I am sure I will be supported by hon. gentlemen in this House when I say we had to come

a thousand miles away from home to hear that system denounced in the strong language in which it has been denounced here. What is that system? Why, Sir, long before the Confederation Act was passed the system which prevails in the province of Nova Scotia in the preparation of the lists prevailed in that province. In those days the destinies of the province were guided by men whose memories are respected by gentlemen in this House on both sides, and I am sure that hon. gentlemen opposite will agree with me when I say that gentlemen of the Conservative party in those days were largely responsible for the adoption of the system of preparing the voters' lists. Of coures, that does not necessarily make it a good system. We had that system when we went into confederation. We have had several governments in the province of Nova Scotia since that time, and not one of them has attempted to change that system. From confederation to 1878, we had a Liberal government, and that Liberal government allowed the system of preparing the lists to remain in force. They had strong opposition. Prominent members of the Conservative party opposed them in the legislature of the province, and I challenge hon. gentlemen opposite to cite the name of one man, who, on the floor of the Assembly of the province ever proposed to change this system. In 1878 a Conservative Government came into power in that province. It was controlled by a gentleman whose memory will be respected by every member in this House, Sir John Thompson. For four years he controlled the destines of the province, and during that whole time he made no effort and showed no desire to change the system that prevails in that province in the direction proposed in this House. Not only that, but, during the years that preceded his administration, the control of the lists was largely in the hands of the old courts of sessions. Sir John Thompson abolished that and substituted for it the municipal council, and, in doing so endorsed this very system which is denounced as so iniquitous by hon. gentlemen opposite. Then the Conservative Government went out of power and the Liberals came in again, and the system remained in force. I say I have heard with amazement gentlemen attack this system on the floor of this House. I have had the pleasure of being more or less intimately connected with the politics of my province as long as I can remember, not only in my own county but in other counties, and in no election campaign, in no public discussion, on no party platform has the statement been made that the system is bad and rotten. I know something of the press of that province, having been connected with it. I know something of the discussions that have taken place through the press. And I venture to say that these hon. gentlemen cannot quote from any paper, Conservative or Liberal, any attack upon the system of preparing the lists that prevails in the province of Nova Scotia. I have been a member of the legislature of that province, and in that legislature the Government was opposed by men who are as responsible and intelligent and able to represent the Conservative party as hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, and never once did they attack that system or attempt to have it changed. And now, at this late day, gentlemen attack the system. And on what grounds? That is what amazes me. Hon. gentlemen will rise and produce affidavits and statements made about petty disputes that took place in various localities about the preparation of the lists, and make these the ground of attack upon the system. There is no law upon the Statute-book in Canada that could not be assailed upon grounds of that kind. Will hon. gentlemen tell me that the customs laws of Canada are a fraud and a snare because frauds are committed under them? Will they tell me that the Dominion Franchise Act is an iniquitous, vile law because under it frauds have been committed. They will not attempt to say that, and so it is absurd and ridiculous to try to get the House to believe that the franchise system of Nova Scotia is bad because the hon. gentleman from Annapolis (Mr. Mills) is able to quote some petty ward dispute in his county about the way the lists are prepared. I do not deny that partisans have attempted to stuff the lists in some cases. They have tried to do that under every system that ever was established, and they will continue to do so. But that does not say that a system which has been endorsed and upheld and declared to be good and wise by every public man and every administration in the province of Nova Scotia ever since it was a province is a bad system.

Now, with regard to the right of appeal, the only thing I hear hon. gentlemen urge is this—they say it is very inconsistent and very improper for the Liberal party to refuse this right of appeal because they advocated such a right of appeal under the Dominion Franchise Act of 1885. But do not these hon. gentlemen see that there is a vast difference between the cases. In those days we were seeking to establish a new system, to take the power of controlling the lists out of the hands of the people and place it in the hands of appointees of the Government. These hon. gentlemen are anxious to have safeguards for the proper preparation of the lists. Under the system that prevails in Nova Scotia they have the best safeguard they could possibly have, the safeguard that a Liberal Government should give them, that of having the preparation of the lists in the hands of the people themselves. What better safeguards do you want? Who prepares the list in the province of Nova Scotia? Men chosen by the people in the various localities, not appointees of the Government, but appointees

of the municipal council which are elected by the free vote of the people. And if these men have lost the confidence of the people of Nova Scotia, it is time to ask for an appeal to the judges. For my part, much as I respect the judges of my province, I would prefer to have the preparation of the voters' lists left where it is now, the people selecting those who are to prepare the lists on which members are to be elected to this Parliament. That is the broad principle under this Bill. The Franchise Act of 1885 was a declaration that the people of the localities could not be trusted to prepare the lists, and for that reason, it should be taken out of their hands and men appointed to prepare the lists. This takes us back to the first principle and is a declaration that we will trust the people by leaving it with the people to select men to prepare the lists. The whole argument of these hon. gentlemen on the other side is based on the supposition that the people will necessarily act dishonestly. Parliament should not act upon such a supposition as that. I am surprised that the hon. member for Annapolis and others should rise, and, in the face of this Parliament do what I know they do not intend to do, but what they must appear to do to those who do not know the circumstances of Nova Scotia--circulate the slander upon the people that they have tolerated a system which not only permitted fraud, but, as these hon. gentlemen say, opened the flood-gates of frauds in that province. That is not true, and everybody in the province knows it is not true. I will not speak for other provinces, but, so far as the people of Nova Scotia are concerned, and in their own hearts these hon. gentlemen know that what I say is the truth, there is not a body or party of men who but will rejoice that once more they have restored to them the rights they possessed up to 1885 of preparing the lists upon which members shall be elected to this Parliament.

Mr. McDOUGALL. The hon. member who has just spoken (Mr. McClure) has made a statement to the House which I do not propose to allow to go uncontradicted. He stated that the franchise and the machinery by which that franchise is put into operation in the province of Nova Scotia to-day, had existed for many years, and had existed before confederation. Now I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if it is not a fact that before 1879 our system of municipal government in the province of Nova Scotia was under the management and control of a board of grand jurors and magistrates ?

Mr. McCLURE. Yes, and I said so, that previous to that it was controlled by a court of sessions, and Sir John Thompson passed an Act taking the power out of the hands of the court of sessions, and giving it to the municipal council, incorporating this very system.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I was a member of the Government of Sir John Thompson when that measure was passed, that measure was passed in 1879, and what did it provide for ? It provided that the people of the municipalities had power to elect the councillors, and those councillors were given, as a municipal body, power and authority to distribute the road moneys of the province. The Government divided the general road grants between the counties of the province, and gave power by that Act to the municipal councils to expend that money. Then what happened After the Holmes-Thompson Government went out of power, the Government that succeeded them went to work and changed that provision. I have under my hand the Act that was passed by that Government providing for the granting of $300,000 of money for the roads and bridges. But was that money distributed to the municipal councils ? No, Sir, they did not make any such provision, but the records of the province show how that money was expended. The Government first apportioned that money, not to the municipal authorities, but to men who were running as Liberal candidates within the municipalities. They gave the expenditure of that money to Liberal councillors within the municipalities, but they did not give it to councillors who were not Liberals. In that way they put the machinery under the control of the Liberal councillors within the municipalities by which they could secure their election. But that was not all. Afterwards the Government of Nova Scotia undertook to amend the Franchise Act by providing that the officers who were appointed formerly by the grand jury and magistrates, known as the county sessions, and who had absolute power to provide the voters' lists, should no longer have that power exclusively, but that they should have associated with them in the preparation of the lists, the sheriff. Subsequently they changed the law with regard to the appointment of sheriffs. The law previously provided that the sheriff should be selected by the judges of the Supreme Court at their regular sittings, nominating three fit and qualified men within the county, and submitting them to the Government, and giving the Government the option of selecting from those three men. That law was repealed, and a law was put on the statutes which provided that the Government had power to select their own men regardless of any recommendation from the judges. These sheriffs were given power to make the final revision of the list. And what is that power? When the reviser has completed his list, any man who wants to strike a name off or to put a name on, can go to that sheriff and make his appeal either to put a name on or to take a name off the list. The sheriff can do as he pleases with regard to that name, he has power to refuse the application or to accept it, just as it suits the party who

places him in his position. What we want now is power to appeal from that sheriff's decision, because the sheriff is appointed by a partisan government and must necessarily be a partisan himself. He holds his position at the will of the Government, and if he does not serve that Government, he does not expect to retain his position. That is why we consider it necessary to-day—and we are not asking anything that is not enjoyed by the other provinces of the Dominion—for the right of appeal from the decision of the sheriff to a county court judge. We have county court judges in whom we have every confidence, we have them of different shades of politics, we feel, however, that we are safer in the hands of county court judges in respect of getting a man's name on the list which ought to be there, or of getting a name off the list who has no right to be there. We have every confidence in the fairness of those gentlemen who are to-day county judges within the province. Now, I cannot understand the hon. member for Colchester (Mr. McClure) making the statement in the strong terms in which he made it, to the effect that the franchise law of Nova Scotia is to-day the same as it was before confederation. I need not detain the committee by reading the changes which were made from time to time in respect of this law; I would refer any hon. gentleman to the statutes of Nova Scotia for 1879 and 1885, and subsequent amendments made by the provincial legislature of Nova Scotia.

Mr. FOSTER. I cannot bring myself to vote on this question so long as matters stand in the inconsistent and unjust position that they are placed in by hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches. Let me ask the attention of this committee to one of the latest developments of that inconsistent position. Here is the Minister of Marine and Fisheries who, within the hearing of this committee within an hour, has been arguing that this Dominion Parliament has a perfect right to delegate its powers to the local legislatures, and supporting that by an opinion of the Privy Council of Great Britain on a case which has been cited, and ending up by declaring that it is, although he hated to say so, simply absurd for any one to argue that this Dominion Parliament has not a perfect right to delegate its powers. On the other hand we have the Solicitor General, as able a man as the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and a much more conservative man than the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. When the Minister of Marine and Fisheries gets up in that airy way and says there is no chance of discussion, that anybody could understand, that there is no ground for argument, I am reminded of the fact that last year on the question of the preferential tariff, on the question of the German and Belgian treaties, the hon. gentleman rose in just the same airy way and laid down his dictum, and declared that not even a fledgeling lawyer in the Opposition could successfully contradict him.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman is grievously and grossly unjust. When I stated my opinion I stated it with very great diffidence indeed. If the hon. gentleman will read my remarks he will find that I stated that I took that position with very great diffidence, that I might be wrong, but I had reached that conclusion after a conscientious study of the subject.

Mr. FOSTER. If the hon. gentleman in that language and in those tones and with that manner showed extreme diffidence, it surpasses me to think what he would be under other conditions. I call the attention of hon. members to the words of the hon. gentleman's speech, which have been called to mind in this House over and over again, and have been placed on "Hansard" over and over again, in which he allowed no ifs and buts in his dictum as he laid it down. I could not help but recall that manner and those words of absolute certainty last year, and the result which came in due course of time when his contention fell utterly before the decision of the law lords of the Crown.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman is wrong again. The law lords never decided it.

Mr. FOSTER. The law officers of the Crown.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. They are a very different body of men.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman says they are a very different body of men. They seem to be a sufficiently solid body of men to make it possible for the British Government to modulate its action on their advice, which they did, and did in direct opposition to the dictum which the hon. gentleman laid down.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. One is a judicial body and the other is not.

Mr. FOSTER. I cannot help that. The body is legal enough and strong enough for the British Government to base its course of action on sacred treaties on the advice the law officers of the Crown gave them. I say that after the hon. gentleman's statement here and his argument across the water, where he ran foul of the law officers of the Crown, the British Government simply said to him that his opinion was wrong. We have had the airy and exclusive way in which he cut off the possibility of doubt as to whether this Dominion Parliament had the right to delegate freely and fully its powers.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman again

has misrepresented me—I will not say wilfully. The hon. gentleman was present when I read the case on which I based my remarks, and I can hardly excuse him now. I simply quoted the decision in re Hodge. I read the language of the decision, whether it was right or wrong. If the hon. gentleman chooses to say it was wrong, with him must rest the responsibility. To say that I gave an ex cathedra judgment is absurd. I merely gave the judgment of the Privy Council, and I read it to the House.

Mr. FOSTER. I am quite within the judgment of the House and within the judgment of the report of the hon. gentleman's speech when it is brought before the House. The hon. gentleman rose for a purpose, not simply to read an extract from a decision of the Imperial Privy Council.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That was my purpose.

Mr. FOSTER. He rose to make a contention—I do not care what statement he made—and he put forward his contention, and he read an extract as a stand-by to his contention, and as proof of the justice of his contention. There was no reason for the hon. gentleman reading it if it was not to base a contention on.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That was my authority.

Mr. FOSTER. His contention being that we have the right to delegate our powers. The Solicitor General, who is absent at the present, but is generally present during these discussions, the other evening when speaking on this point took diametrically opposite ground.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No.

Mr. FOSTER. He fought entirely wide of the contention that by this Bill he was delegating the power of this Parliament to the legislatures.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. So did I.

Mr. FOSTER. I cannot go further than to leave the matter to the judgment of the House and to the arbitrament of the "Hansard," when it comes down.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman has misstated me the third time. Does he say I did not contend in the same sense? Did I not contend that this was not a delegation of the powers? Did I not say so in answer to my hon. friend?

Mr. FOSTER. Will the hon. gentleman say now that he did not state to-night, in the course of his argument, at the time he was reading an extract from the decision, that this Parliament had the right and that any legislature which had plenary power had the right to delegate that power, to take back that power and delegate it again?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I did so explicitly; but I stated what were the powers of Parliament, and that I did not conceive that we were doing it in this case.

Mr. FOSTER. I shall again have to leave it to the judgment of the House, when "Hansard" comes down. I am not deceived and I am not wrong. What is the position the hon. Solicitor General took? He took exactly the opposite ground. He took the ground that we had not the right—his statement was not made by inference but was an explicit statement—to delegate such powers as these.

Mr. McMULLEN. No. Read his remarks.

Mr. FOSTER. The Solicitor General in reply said:

> I am sure that I have no fault to find with my hon. friend (Mr. Haggart) for raising this question, because it is really the important question in the whole of this matter.

I again leave it to the judgment of the House if the Minister of Marine did not put it aside as a question of no moment, as utterly trivial in connection with this question. Again, he said:

> And I am prepared to admit now that if this were a case in which we were attempting to delegate to the provincial legislatures powers that we are called upon to exercise, there would be a very serious question as to our right to do so. My argument has been—I think I have stated it before—that we are not delegating our powers.

The contention of the Solicitor General is that that class of powers we have we cannot delegate. That is the inference.

The PRIME MINISTER. Not at all.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the right hon. Prime Minister contend that we have a right to delegate our powers?

The PRIME MINISTER. I was not here when my hon. friend (Sir Louis Davies) made his speech; but I understand he quoted judicial authority that we had the right to delegate our powers and at the same time stated that while we had that naked and abstract right, he considered we were not using it in this case.

Mr. FOSTER. The right hon. gentleman is adding more complications to this already complicated question. Is there anything these hon. gentlemen can agree upon? On any legal question these three lawyers cannot agree. On a question of policy these three members of the Cabinet again cannot agree with each other. The leader of the Government came down upon the Solicitor General, who had outlined a mode of action in respect to this Bill in which he

proposed to put around the powers of the provincial legislatures restrictive clauses to prevent possibilities and contingencies. He came down on the hon. member for East Lambton and the hon. member for Brantford, who contended that as the Indians had been enfranchised to a certain extent, it would be unjust and wrongful to take away the franchise from them. He came down on them, on what ground? That the local legislatures are the natural conservators of the rights of the franchise not only for themselves but for this Dominion Parliament, that there was no middle ground, and that we had, perforce, either to give the whole matter into the hands of the local legislatures or to keep it ourselves.

To-night the Minister of Marine and Fisheries told us: You make a plea to have the courts open to you if you have a grievance, but if we attempted to yield you that it would be tantamount to withdrawing our Bill and so we cannot do it. Justice or no justice, grievance or no grievance, wrong or no wrong, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries declares that his party must put this Bill through on a certain principle, and grievances and wrongs may go to the wall. He tells us that he and his friends must follow out the principle laid down by the right hon. the Premier, whether it be just or unjust. And when my hon. friend (Sir Louis Davies) was confronted with his strong and vehement utterances of 1885, I admired the deftness with which he endeavoured to explain away the inconsistency between his position then and now. Every member of the Cabinet who at that time was a member of the Liberal party in this House, inveighed in the strongest possible manner against the iniquity of having voters' lists at the mercy of a partisan appointee with or without a court of appeal; but without a court of appeal they said it was monstrous, and they fought it for months in this House. Was the principle that was wrong then of such an evenescent nature that a few years afterwards it comes to be right. That principle hon. gentlemen opposite contended for with great strength and persistence in 1885, and now when they are placed in the position of legislators is it not arrant cowardice for them to slip out of the obligation which their former utterances imposes upon them, by saying: We wash our skirts of the whole matter; it is the fault of the local legislatures, and all we are doing is simply to throw the matter into the hands of the local legislatures. The local legislature gives the revision of the voters' lists to a partisan appointee, without any appeal at all, and yet these hon. gentlemen who opposed that as being outrageous and monstrous in 1885, now throw us upon the naked point of the sword, and when we cry out with our wounds, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries says: that is not my fault, the local legislature will have it so, and we must remit you to the tender mercies of the local legislature. And in the same breath the Minister of Marine and Fisheries declares: we have the power to withhold if we like. Then, Sir, if he has the power to withhold he must take the responsibility for throwing us upon the point of the naked sword. The hon. gentleman is guilty of cowardice when he refuses to protect the right, and when he absolutely betrays the right of the would-be elector in this country, out of deference to a mere theory. And the right hon. gentleman who leads the Government, and every member of that Government who inveighed with all their strength against such an outrage as that in 1885, forget all; or if we bring it to their minds try to get out of it by saying: You know we are just letting the local legislatures do as they like; if they choose to do it, it is right. How inconsistent was the right hon. gentleman last night when he said: You have got all you contend for in the province of Ontario; there you have judges as revising barristers. We have, and so far we are satisfied. You have got all you want in the province of Quebec; there you have the judges as revising barristers. So we have, but when he comes to the province of Manitoba and the province of Nova Scotia, he has to admit that there is no such condition as that, and that in the province of Nova Scotia there is no appeal to a court of law at all. How does the right hon. gentleman get out of that inconsistent position? He says: It is right to have a court of appeal, or a county court judge as a reviser in the two great provinces; true, in Nova Scotia they do not give it to you but still it is right there not to grant an appeal because the people of Nova Scotia want it so, and the people of the province ought to rule. Yes, they ought to rule in connection with their own affairs, but they have no business to rule in connection with our affairs unless they rule according to our ideas of what is right. I challenge the right hon. gentleman; I challenge every man upon the Treasury benches to rise tonight and say, it is not a correct principle, that in the formation of this charter of the citizen's liberty, the voting list; he should not have an appeal to a court of law in last resort to get him the privilege which he feels he ought to have and of which he may be deprived. Will the right hon. gentleman who leads the Government say, that is not a correct principle? He has said so often that it is a correct principle that he must admit it now. He says that he has it in his power to give this right, but he does not give it, and the reason he does not give it is because, as he tells us, it would break his Act. And so, Sir, for the sake of a fantastic theory, he will perpetrate this injustice on the electorate. Now, Sir, we have put our plea, and we have asked for an answer. We have received no answer to our plea that we should be protected—not we alone; not Liberal-Conservatives alone, but the great

body of the electorate of this country. What is protection for one is protection for all. That is the principle of the amendment which has been moved, and not a fair-minded man on that side of the House can get up and say that we are asking too much, or asking anything more than we ought to have. Why do not we get that justice then? I have asked for an answer to that over and over again, and I have got none, except the answer of the Prime Minister: Well, it would destroy our Bill. Justice then must not be done because it would break the Bill. Better that ten thousand theory-built Bills in process of becoming law should go to the wall, than that an injustice should be perpetrated, or that a chance should be given for the perpetration of an injustice. We have put our plea and we have contended for it two days and two nights. For it we are contending still. Let this House judge whether it is an extravagant plea or not, and let the country judge the men, who, if they have nothing to answer for to their own consciences will certainly have something to answer for before the tribunal of the people when the people come to pass on their conduct. We make our plea to the House, we make our plea to the country; after we have in vain made our plea to the old time principles and the sense of justice that should sway the members on the Treasury benches.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not rise for the purpose of prolonging the debate but for the purpose of putting myself right on two points with reference to which I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) has misrepresented me. I had the temerity to assert to-night that I thought the objection taken by the hon. member from Lanark (Mr. Haggart) was based upon an entire misconception of the functions and powers of Parliament. In support of that assertion I quoted a paragraph from the judgment of the Privy Council, the highest judicial body in the realm, so far as we are concerned, in the case of Hodge vs. the Queen. In that judgment their lordships said:

> When the British North America Act enacted that there should be a legislature for Ontario, and that its Legislative Assembly should have exclusive authority to make laws for the province and for provincial purposes in relation to the matters enumerated in section 92, it conferred powers not in any sense to be exercised by delegation from or as agents of the Imperial Parliament, but authority as plenary and as ample within the limits prescribed by section 92 as the Imperial Parliament in the plenitude of its power possessed and could bestow.

I thought the judgment of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council closed that argument. It appears that I was entirely mistaken; for my hon. friend from York (Mr. Foster), who is not a lawyer, and who does not profess to have studied constitutional law, attempts to assail and controvert the judgment of the Privy Council, without citing one authority of any kind to show that that high judicial authority is wrong.

Mr. FOSTER. I neither assailed nor controverted it.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman then tried to turn the weight of the argument to one side by saying that I was accustomed to assert very dogmatically certain points of law, and that afterwards it turned out that I was not correct. As a matter of fact, I had made no dogmatic assertion. I had simply done as all lawyers do in arguing a case—quoted the judgment of the highest judical body in the realm, and said that I assumed that until that judgment was modified it would be accepted as the law of the land. "Oh," said the hon. gentleman, "is it not within the recollection of everybody how dogmatically he asserted last session, without any reservation or equivocation—he knew all about it, and anybody was a fool who did not agree with him—that we had the power to pass the preferential clause in the tariff Act notwithstanding the German and Belgian treaties." I rose humbly to say that I had not dogmatically asserted anything of the kind, but that I had expressed my views to the House with a good deal of diffidence. The hon. gentleman again controverted me, and I had to submit in silence, and have had to do, not once, but a dozen times this session, to hear that libel repeated. I stated my views on that subject as quietly as I could, and I wound up by saying:

> I am aware that the opposite conclusion has been for the time tacitly assumed; we have gone on assuming that treaties apply as a matter of course. It may be that my argument is all wrong. I do not profess to be able to speak ex cathedra on a great constitutional point of this kind; but I do profess that my argument is sufficient to say that we have exceedingly good ground for coming to the conclusion.

Now, I do not think that is very dogmatic.

Mr. FOSTER. Was that all the hon. gentleman said?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That was all the hon. gentleman said at the close of his argument. Does my hon. friend want me to read my entire speech?

Mr. FOSTER. I would like you to.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I did not attempt to speak ex cathedra or dogmatically; but I submitted my opinion on that matter to the House with all diffidence and deference. I do not think I can fairly be charged with forcing my views on the House on any question, much less on constitutional questions. I have practiced too long in the courts not to know how difficult it is to speak positively on these questions. What opinions I

expressed I expressed honestly and with diffidence; and if I am not as able a constitutional lawyer as my hon. friend, that is my misfortune—for which I am very sorry.

Mr. FOSTER. I wish my hon. friend would take the time to look up some other portions of his statement on that subject which are very much stronger.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman can do that.

Mr. MONTAGUE. There is one on page 2867:

> Can he produce the opinion of a prominent lawyer, or even of a fledgeling lawyer, endorsing the absurd and ridiculous statement made by him that the resolution was unconstitutional and illegal?

Mr. MILLS. I did not intend to speak any further upon this amendment; but after hearing of the great surprise manifested by the hon. member for Colchester (Mr. McClure) I thought that something more should be said by me with reference to this matter. The great point we are now contending for is to have the same rights accorded to us in the provinces of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia as are accorded to the provinces of Ontario and Quebec, that is, to have the lists made up to a certain extent under some judicial officer. The hon. member for Colchester has expressed a great deal of surprise that he should have to travel a thousand miles from his own province in order to hear of any complaints against the system of revising the voters' lists in the province of Nova Scotia. He has told this House and the country that the system of revision in the province of Nova Scotia had obtained ever since before confederation. He has also tried to impress this House and the country with the idea that he is a man of large experience having been in politics for fifteen years, and having studied the history of the country for a longer period than that; thereby giving a great deal of force and weight to what he may say. Well, if he has not had more profit from his experience, if he has not studied better the laws of his country than he has manifested here to-night I should advise him to have that experience and that study over again; for he is entirely wrong in his assertions respecting the revising of the voters' lists in the province of Nova Scotia. The present system did not obtain ever since before confederation. It has obtained since 1889, and there has not been a Liberal-Conservative Government in power in Nova Scotia to do anything with that system since that time. The Liberal Government has been in power in Nova Scotia since 1882. Now, there is no Franchise Act in this Dominion that throws open the gates to fraud and corruption as does the Franchise Act of the province of Nova Scotia. In the first place, it is an intricate Act. It is an Act that cannot be rightly interpreted even by lawyers. It is an Act that allows almost any man of twenty-one years of age to have his name on the voters' list, provided he is not hindered from doing so by a partisan reviser. If there were no complants in the province of Nova Scotia, if everything was lovely in reference to the revisers, why was it that this little child that the Finance Minister is so proud of should be placed on the Statute-book, making the sheriff the reviser of that court?

Why were the sheriffs placed there if there were not some wrongs to right? Is it not a fact that the appointing of sheriffs to hold courts, as it were, of appeal, shows that these revisers do not do everything that is right and proper, and that there are wrongs to right. If there are wrongs to right, is the sheriff the proper man to right them? The sheriff, a partisan, who may do business properly in his ordinary sphere, the right person to be appointed to interpret an intricate law that often puzzles the lawyers, and adjudicate upon the questions raised under that law. The provinces of Ontario and Quebec say he is not; and notwithstanding what the right hon. Prime Minister has said, I, a representative of the province of Nova Scotia, have just as much right to have a voice in what is done in the province of British Columbia, in the North-west Territories, in Ontario and Quebec, as I have to say what should be done in the province of Nova Scotia. I do not represent the province of Nova Scotia alone, but I am a representative for the whole Dominion. We have had too much petty politics in Nova Scotia. We have had too much provincial politics there altogether. Provincial Ministers, when they have left their little sphere in Nova Scotia and come into a broader sphere, should have their minds broadened by that fact and should understand that they represent, not only Nova Scotia, but the whole Dominion. Notwithstanding the fact that the local government in Nova Scotia is a Liberal Government and that these Ministers come up here and endorse everything that local government has done, even this obnoxious Act which it has placed upon the statutes, I say that we in the province of Ontario—for I am as much a representative of that province as I am of Nova Scotia—and we in the province of Quebec and in the province of British Columbia and in the North-west Territories will say to the people of Nova Scotia: You did not do right in putting that obnoxious Act upon the Statute-book, and you should give the right to appeal to a proper judicial authority and not to a partisan sheriff. The right hon. First Minister comes up with his specious argument and tells us: Oh, you must do this thing because the people wills it. Shall we do a wrong thing in this Parliament because the people of Nova Scotia support the local government of that province in doing it? I

say that that is not a proper argument; it is not an argument worthy of the ability and the broad mind of the Prime Minister of this country. I do not wish to prolong this debate. I have no desire to stop here any longer than any other man, but I say this, that if it is necessary to stay here to fight this thing, I shall make great sacrifices in order to do so, because I believe it is the grossest injustice to allow a privilege to the province of Ontario and Quebec and refuse it to the province of Nova Scotia.

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). I could not at first understand the vehemence with which my hon. friend from Annapolis (Mr. Mills) denounced the franchise of Nova Scotia, and more especially the angry reference he made to the people of Inverness, the county I have the honour to represent here, but I have, since he has spoken, considered the matter over, and I find that the Franchise Act of that province is the one which has enabled his law partner—by the way, an Inverness man—to turn the hon. gentleman down, so to speak, in the town of Annapolis, in the contest for the mayoralty of that town.

Mr. MILLS. He is from Judique, your town, and is another traitor, and we have one or two more there of the same kind.

Mr. McLENNAN. He is from Judique, in the county of Inverness, and he ran for the mayoralty against the hon. gentleman, whose law partner he was until the hon. gentleman disappointed him in some manner or other. Then that young gentleman turned around and ran for the mayoralty of Annapolis, where both these gentlemen resided and practised law for several years together, against the hon. gentleman; and my fellow-countrymen properly turned the hon. member for Annapolis down, and is now mayor for Annapolis. If my hon. friend feels aggrieved at the people of Inverness because this young man defeated him, no wonder that he should feel so much aggrieved at the existence of a franchise Act under which this young gentleman was able to defeat him in his own town.

Mr. LANDERKIN. It was a good Act.

Mr. McLENNAN. I consider that no greater compliment could be paid to the Franchise Act of Nova Scotia than the fact that it has permitted the hon. gentleman to come here and represent the county of Annapolis since 1885 or 1886, in opposition to such a man as the Attorney General of Nova Scotia—one of the most accomplished public men of the Dominion. The fact that the Franchise Act of Nova Scotia permitted the hon. gentleman to come here speaks volumes for its liberality, especially in view of the fact that the hon. gentleman himself acknowledges that the people of Annapolis are liberal at heart. He has admitted that fact, and it must be taken for granted, therefore, that from what has recently transpired, it was not the towns and villages of Annapolis which sent him here, but the back woods districts, and that the Franchise Act must have been more liberal than he admits it to be since he was enabled to secure his election under these circumstances. In view of the hon. gentleman's admission and of his defeat in the election for the mayoralty, it is no wonder that he should have declared the other evening that he did not care much about the people of Inverness. The hon. gentleman talks about partisan sheriffs, ignoring the fact that the sheriff of Inverness, among many others, is a Tory, appointed by the Liberal government of which the hon. gentleman from Cape Breton prided himself a few days ago on having been a member. This sheriff, who is a worthy man, although a Tory, is the gentleman whom the hon. member declares should not be allowed to hear the appeals from the voters' lists in the county of Inverness. Because there is an Act in the province of Nova Scotia enabling the provincial government to appoint sheriffs, he concluded that the sheriffs there are untrustworthy and not fit to be entrusted with the administration of the franchise in the slightest degree; and this he contends despite the fact that the sheriffs in many counties in Nova Scotia are Conservatives. There is another feature with regard to this appeal. Not only is the appeal made to the sheriffs of various shades of politics, but the legislature of Nova Scotia deemed it necessary to give ten days to those sheriffs to hear appeals from the various parts of the various constituencies; and I ask the hon. gentleman from Annapolis or any other hon. gentleman from Nova Scotia or elsewhere whether they would consider it reasonable that a judge of the county court, such as, for instance, the Hon. Mr. McIssac, of Antigonish, who is judge of the county courts of Inverness, Guysborough and Antigonish, could be expected to attend to the revision of the lists of these large counties. How would that gentleman be able to attend to this revision supposing a Dominion election were called at three weeks' notice? It is all very well in such provinces as Quebec and Ontario, where, I understand, there is a county judge for every county but in Nova Scotia, where there is but one county judge, as they are called, wrongfully I think—to three counties, in many instances, the case is vastly different.

The hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Mills) declared that the Act in Nova Scotia was changed in 1889. I bring as evidence against that the statement of the hon. member from Richmond (Mr. Gillies), who declared that this so-called iniquitous Act was on the Statute-books of the province since 1871. I can quote repetitions of that statement over and over again from the speeches of the hon. member. The Act that came into force in 1889 was a mere amendment giving an appeal to the sheriff. The hon. member

for Cape Breton (Mr. McDougall) has convinced the House, I am sure, that the statements of the member for Colchester (Mr. McClure) were absolutely correct. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McDougall) stated that for four years a Conservative Government ruled the political destinies of Nova Scotia, of which the hon. gentleman himself was a distinguished member, and yet although this Franchise Act existed in the province, he, as a member of the government, never moved a finger to remove this Act from the Statute-books. The hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Gillies) would have it that this law had been like the laws of the Medes and Persians, that it had been passed in 1871 and was in force still. But the hon. member for Annapolis met this statement a few minutes ago by declaring that it was a new law enacted in 1889. I think that the hon. member for Richmond is, in the main, correct and his statement tallies with that of the hon. member for Colchester, who has stated that the Franchise Act of Nova Scotia to-day is what it was thirty or forty years ago, so far as conferring the franchise upon the people is concerned. It does not lie in the mouth of the hon. member for Cape Breton, therefore, who has made a dozen speeches, to attempt to find fault with this law, when he, as a member of the Government of Nova Scotia, made no attempt to alter it. The same applies to the hon. member for Annapolis. That hon. gentleman as a leading member of the Conservative party at that time should have warned the people against the alleged iniquities of this Act.

I contend that there is no better evidence of popular self-government on the Statute-books to-day than is the franchise law of Nova Scotia; it is indeed a law of the people for the people and by the people. The hon. member for Colchester has well and accurately stated the case, showing how the making of these lists is in the hands of men appointed by the municipal councils. If the people feel that the municipal councillors are abusing the trust reposed in them, then every three years they have the right to dismiss these and choose others in their places. But, according to the hon. members from Annapolis, Cape Breton and Richmond, it would seem that the people were helpless in the hands of the municipal councillors, as though these councillors were appointed for life and there was no remedy for what they did. I am surprised that the hon. member for Richmond did not pay more attention to these points, but the explanation may be in the fact that he has been so busy asking questions with regard to matters in his own and neighbouring counties that he had not time to fully consider this matter. His course in this House for the last couple of weeks reminds me of the story of the school boy, who, when asked what a point of interrogation was,

Mr. McLENNAN.

replied that it was a little crooked thing that asked questions.

Mr. McDOUGALL. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McLennan, Inverness) who has just taken his seat charged that when the Holmes-Thompson Government was in power in Nova Scotia they did not make any attempt to change the law which then existed with regard to the franchise. There was one very strong objection to the law that existed at that time, and the Holmes-Thompson Government undertook to change the law. The objectionable feature was that government officials employed on the government railways, in the post offices and so on were not allowed to vote in provincial elections. The government undertook to change that and to give these people the franchise. And what happened? They passed through the assembly branch of the legislature an Act to give back the franchise to these people——

Mr. MILLS. By a majority of 28 to 7.

Mr. McDOUGALL. But when that Bill went before the legislative council, that branch of the legislature threw out the Bill and would not pass it. What was the use of the Holmes-Thompson Government during the four years they held power, attempting to perfect the law with such a legislative council in existence?

When I was speaking a few minutes ago I referred to the change that was made by the Liberal Administration in Nova Scotia in the mode by which the sheriffs were appointed. Previous to that change the sheriffs were appointed in this way:

> The chief justice and a judge of the Supreme Court selected by him, or in the absence of the chief justice any two judges selected by the senior judge present, together, in either case, with two members of the Executive Council, shall meet in Halifax during Michaelmas term in each year, and select three persons for each county, each of whom shall be believed to be qualified to fill the office of sheriff, and not unlikely to act if appointed. In case of disagreement a majority shall decide the nomination; and if a majority cannot be obtained, the chief justice and judges, or a majority of those present shall make the nomination. Out of the three persons so nominated the Governor in Council shall select one to serve for the ensuing year, who shall reside in the county and who, upon giving security by bond as hereinafter mentioned, shall receive his commission and be invested with the powers of office.

That is the section of the Act under which the sheriffs were formerly appointed in the province of Nova Scotia. That Act was changed by the Government of which the hon. the present Finance Minister, if I am not mistaken, was Premier at the time. The appointment of sheriffs takes place under that new Act as follows:

> The Governor in Council shall from time to time, as occasion may require, by commission under the Great Seal of the province, appoint

and commission a fit and proper person to the office of sheriff of each county, and shall in like manner fill up any vacancies as they occur, and every sheriff so appointed shall hold office during good behaviour.

So that under the new Act the Government have sole power to appoint sheriffs, the Government appoint those sheriffs, the high tribunal, or court of last resort, who decide as to who should go on the list or remain off. The sheriff in that case is the servant of the Government of the province of Nova Scotia for the time being, is there under the influence of that Government, and is therefore a partisan, and a man in whom the people cannot have the same confidence that they would have in a judge of the Supreme Court or a judge of the County Court before whom to carry appeals in reference to putting on or taking names off the voters' list.

Mr. INGRAM. I am sure my hon. friends opposite cannot complain of my taking up the time of the House in the discussion of this question. But there are some things in this Franchise Act as introduced by the Government to which I take very serious objection. The amendment moved to subsection "a" of section 5, is, I think, an amendment in the right direction. Speaking from the standpoint of one representing an Ontario constituency, I should like to see some uniformity in the preparation of our voters' lists and some uniformity in the method of making appeals to the authority we should finally decide as to whether a man has a right to be placed on the list. Now, in reference to our Voters' List Act, I am sorry to see that the Solicitor General does not seem to have a correct understanding of the method by which those lists are compiled in the province of Ontario. Last evening he quoted a section of the law which applies to the registration of voters' and which does not apply to the preparation of those voters' lists. Under the law, if we find a name on the list, part 1 or part 3, which should not be there, we may appeal to a county judge who has power to decide whether a man is entitled to be placed on the list, or if he is there, whether he should be removed. We have therefore in the province of Ontario two systems of making appeals: One is to the county judge, and the other to a court of appeal under the Registration Act. That is as to cities and towns, provided this measure carries, we will then be placed in this position in cities and towns, that instead of making our appeal to a board of registrators, we make our final appeal to a county court judge. In doing that I claim that we would have our appeal decided on its merits, and not largely decided by the political complexion of the voter in question. For that reason I strongly object to having this section 5 go through in its present shape. It may be said that the different boards of registration or boards of appeal as we have them under this registration Act may be composed largely of judges, and for that reason they will be free from partisan proclivities. I find that board of appeal is composed of different persons. in Toronto of one class of persons, in Hamilton of another, in Ottawa of another, in London of another. The various towns have a variety of classes of gentlemen occupying seats on this board of appeal; and for that reason I object to this section.

Mr. KAULBACH. I certainly do object and that most emphatically to clause 5, subsection "a" of this Franchise Bill being passed without an amendment, or a safeguard attached to the clause as respects sheriff's powers. We may control assessors and revisers, but I fail to see how we can control the sheriffs unless there is an appeal, as he has delegated powers under the Nova Scotia Act, and can do just what his sweet will may dictate, and by the Act we have no recourse. All Nova Scotia asks is for a like privilege as that of Ontario and Quebec where the grievance is redressed by a court of review on appeal and we will be satisfied, but to limit the privileges of Nova Scotia in this manner, is unjust, and we cannot feel satisfied that we are fairly treated. Experience in the past as respects the sheriff of the county I have the honour to represent, is sufficient warning for me to consider the position of that county, and carefully guard the future against similar, if not worse practices than we have yet had in the past. If art is to accomplish anything more than nature has given this official, I fear the future of that county politically, at the time of an election, is a sad one, if left in his hands without an appeal. Does the Government intend our hands shall be tied and we asked to fight? It would really appear so. Say for example an elector applies to the sheriff to have a name or names added to the voters' list which, name or names unintentionally or perhaps improperly had been left off, or that some names were improperly placed on the voters' list, that should not have been there, and a request is made for their removal, and he, the sheriff refused to obey the request, is it fair or just that we should be forced to submit to this ruling and have no appeal, have no recourse to an impartial tribunal, at a final court of review. I say it is an outrage on civil rights, and decidedly unjust to the honest electors of that province.

This injustice we are liable to suffer from at any time, at least it is my opinion, for if a sheriff was capable of committing a fraud in the late Nova Scotia provincial election in the county I have the honour to represent as is alleged, and thereby returns a candidate of his own political caste, no less a person than a member of the Nova Scotia cabinet, the Commissioner of Mines, Charles E. Church, he having the

smallest number of votes cast, consequently at the foot of the poll, and who now occupies that post against the wishes of the people, and, as I believe, illegally placed there by the act of the sheriff, the appointee of that government I am compelled to look upon him, the sheriff, with suspicion, and feel that the only safeguard we can resort to to avoid difficulties like I have referred to, or a something worse, is in granting us this reasonable request, an appeal to an impartial tribunal as a final resort.

I cannot agree with the hon. Solicitor General in the idea he advanced, that "we must assume all sheriffs will do their duty." Sad experience has taught us differently, or that such is not the case, notably the sheriff of Lunenburg. At least it is my opinion, and I have numbers, nay, a legion, to support my views on this point, and unless retributory justice is meted out to this official, by way of a check, which I hope, will be the case, other sheriffs may practice the same, and the Lunenburg sheriff may probably go next time one better.

I claim Nova Scotia has a right to be placed on an equal footing with Ontario and Quebec, as to the civil rights of our people, and that the amendment to clause 5 of the Bill for the reasons advanced, and which are not unreasonable, should be granted, or treat all the provinces alike, and give Canada manhood suffrage, which is practically that now, and thereby avoid all the complications referred to, and better still, greatly simplify election procedures, relieving us of the enormous expense of assessors, revisers and courts of appeals.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). With reference to the question as to whether or not there should be an appeal in the province of Nova Scotia to the county court judge I, for one, have been unable to appreciate any argument advanced on the other side of the House which would militate against that concession by the Government. I have a pretty fair knowledge of the sheriffs of the province of Nova Scotia. With respect to the sheriff of the county of Halifax I am bound to say that in my opinion he is a thoroughly honourable and upright man. He is a Liberal and was appointed by a Liberal Government, but I have as much confidence in him as I would have in any hon. member in this House, on either side of it, and I believe he would do what was right. But if the sheriff for Halifax were here, he would be the first to admit that he has no such technical knowledge as would enable him to deal with a matter of this kind in the same way as a judge who has devoted all his life to such subjects. That is a point I make in favour of this concession. It is a matter in which, as a last resort, we should have the advantage of legal training and a sense of judicial responsibility, and that no sheriff in Nova Scotia would claim for himself. I do not for a moment intend to cast any reflections on the sheriffs of the province when I say that as a court of last resort the county court judges would be far safer and better tribunals than the sheriffs. I do not see any reason why a concession of this kind should not be granted by the Government, or why the principle which already prevails in Ontario and Quebec should not be applied also in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. There is another reason I would suggest, and I do it in no partisan spirit, to the Solicitor General with respect to this matter. In Nova Scotia at the present time, and I suppose the same is true of New Brunswick, the fact that the revisers are appointed by the municipal councils has a tendency to introduce political issues into municipal affairs. I do not say that in every county in Nova Scotia, federal or provincial politics are introduced as a general rule; but I do say this, that in some sections of every county in that province, provincial politics are to some extent at least introduced. In most counties in the province the position is this: in certain districts, federal or provincial politics are introduced and candidates are elected on those lines. If you place in the hands of the revisers elected by the councils the power to arrange lists for Dominion elections the tendency will be to increase that tendency to have municipal elections run on the lines of Dominion politics or provincial politics as the case may be; and whether the result would be good or bad to the Conservative party, I say that so far as the country is concerned the result would be bad. It is not to the advantage of the country that provincial or Dominion politics should be introduced into municipal matters. We have too much politics already to the square inch, in the province of Nova Scotia at least, and to introduce politics further in matters of this kind is a result that should be deprecated by both parties, and the effect of making so much depend on the selection of revisers would be to introduce political issues into municipal affairs in the provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, whatever may be the result in other provinces. If that is the case, it affords a further argument for the adoption in a matter of this kind of a judicial tribunal as the court of last resort, and, therefore, I submit to the Solicitor General that we are only asking what is reasonable and fair when we request that in Nova Scotia this appeal should be granted as it now exists in the provinces of Quebec and Ontario.

The hon. Solicitor General has mentioned a question of constitutional law in connection with this matter. I understand the question which he has submitted as a serious one is this. We may assume that the Parliament of Canada has the right to adopt any legislation now existing in any of the provinces, that is to say, it has the right,

instead of copying that legislation out in extenso to say, that that legislation being already embodied on the Statute-book of the province should be operative as an Act of this Parliament. The question is whether in addition to that, this Parliament has the right to say that future legislative enactments by the various provinces shall have the force of law, so far as this particular subject is concerned——

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The hon. gentleman does not state the position exactly. The proposition I stated I find in Todd.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I was going to refer to that.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Todd says:

The Parliament of Canada has no power to delegate its functions to the local legislature, so as by an absolute grant of discretionary power to enable the local authority to deal with the matter itself.

Now, here is my point:

It is otherwise, however, if the Dominion Parliament merely extends and ratifies arrangements made or to be made——

Past, present or future—

——in accordance with its own legislation upon the subject.

Could anything be clearer than that?

Mr. MONTAGUE. The Minister of Marine does not agree with Todd.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I was just reading from Todd.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I was just saying the Minister of Marine does not agree with Todd.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Oh, yes.

Mr. MONTAGUE. No, no; he toddled away from him.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I may say frankly that I have not had the opportunity of giving this matter the attention which I think it deserves, and which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fitzpatrick) evidently thinks it deserves; but it seems to me that there are some considerations in connection with it which would well deserve the attention of the hon. gentleman. The quotation from Todd may or may not bear the meaning which he evidently puts upon it. It is this:

In any case where, in the distribution of powers by the British North America Act, certain matters are assigned to the legislative authority of the Dominion Parliament, it is not competent for that body to delegate its functions to the local legislature, so as by any absolute grant of discretionary power to enable the local authority to deal with the matter itself.

It is otherwise, however, if the Dominion Parliament merely accepts and ratifies arrangements made, or to be made, in accordance with its own legislation upon the subject.

As I understand the hon. Solicitor General, he suggests that any future legislation of the local legislature would come within the meaning of the words in the last sentence, but if he gives it that interpretation I do not know exactly what meaning he would attach to the previous sentence. For example, I do not know whether the hon. gentleman would contend or not that it would be competent for this Parliament to say, as to every matter confided to this Parliament by section 91 of the British North America Act, that each provincial legislature within its own province, should have the right to make laws notwithstanding the provisions of the British North America Act. Does my hon. friend follow me? It does not seem to me that going thus far would be really extending the principle for which my hon. and learned friend is arguing in this case; but my hon. friend will understand that I do not profess to have given the matter the study which it deserves, and I am merely throwing this out to him as a suggestion. Would it not be a logical consequence of what my hon. and learned friend argues to say this: that the Dominion Parliament could entrust to the legislature of each province, within that province, every right, every power, which is confided to this Parliament by section 91 of the British North America Act. I confess at once that I see the hon. gentleman might make this answer: as to matters of that kind the avoidance of such an extraordinary and anomalous result must always be made to depend on the common sense of the legislators, and that technically this Parliament has the right to so deal with its own powers, and having the right to lay it down it yet retains the right to take it up. Still it seems to me that this would be an extreme position for my hon. and learned friend to take. However extreme that position would be, so far as I comprehend the matter, it would be the logical outcome of what the hon. gentleman has been arguing in favour of this provision of the Bill. Now, whether there be anything or not in what I have ventured to suggest, I think the hon. gentleman will certainly agree with me, that it is a matter that requires careful consideration before this Parliament ventures to put upon the Statute-book legislation of this character. It is true that the Solicitor General, and I think the Minister of Marine, have argued that this is not "delegation." In one sense it may not be delegation; in another sense it certainly is delegation. A person who delegates his authority to an agent has the right to revoke that authority at any time unless it is an authority coupled with an interest. This Parliament confers upon the local legislature the power——

An hon. MEMBER. No, no.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). My hon. friend finds fault with that; I will put it in another way. The local legislature has power

to deal with its own franchise, and this Parliament says in advance that whatever enactment the local legislature sees fit to make with regard to the franchise in that province shall be the law with regard to the franchise for the election of members of this Parliament, until this Parliament sees fit to interfere. My hon. and learned friend will not find fault with that proposition, I think. Now, I venture to submit to the Solicitor General that there is a very thin distinction, if any, between that and between delegating to the local legislature; and if my hon. friend has no better argument on which to rely for the validity of this legislation, then the difference between "delegation" and what I have just stated, I think he is skating on very thin ice. However that may be, it is a matter which perhaps can be more appropriately dealt with at a later stage of this Bill. My hon. and learned friend will understand that I am making this suggestion, not with the idea in any sense whatever of being factious, but merely of endeavouring to assist him, because upon him is the responsibility of this Bill, and I conceive it is the duty of every man in this House who professes to have any technical knowledge on the subject to give my hon. friend assistance on that point.

The further remarks which I have now to make on this subject are simply in support of that with which I first started out. I submit to the Solicitor General, who is a lawyer, and who knows the sense of responsibility under which a judge acts, and knows how different that sense of responsibility is from the feeling which a sheriff —even a sheriff of the highest character and intelligence—would possess; I submit to him whether it is not fair that in the province of Nova Scotia and the province of New Brunswick we should have the same right of appeal to a judicial tribunal which is enjoyed in the provinces of Ontario and Quebec. My hon. and learned friend as a lawyer cannot deny that there is a very great difference between the right conferred upon a party by an appeal to a sheriff having no technical knowledge, and the right conferred upon a person by an appeal to a judge having that technical knowledge and the sense of responsibility to which I have referred. It seems to me that no harm can possibly be done, by conceding that right either to the interests of the county or to either political party; while, on the other hand, if that right is not conceded, it is conceivable, to say the very least, that injustice may be done and wrong may occur which it will not be possible to redress. I put the matter in all sincerity to the hon. Solicitor General. I desire to make a personal appeal to him on this point. I do not say that the omission of this will necessarily result in any disadvantage to the Conservative party in the province of Nova Scotia, because in some of the counties our friends will have a majority, and I suppose they will be as apt to exercise the right as the Liberals. I am not making any partisan plea on this point. I am simply putting it on the ground of fair-play and of the best interest of the country, and because it is right in a matter of this kind that there should be an appeal to some person having judicial responsibility and technical knowledge; and I feel that to the hon. Solicitor General, who belongs to my own profession, I can make this appeal with a great deal of force and earnestness. Whatever the outcome may be, I feel sure that the Solicitor General, at any rate, does not remain unconvinced by the arguments which have been addressed to him from this side of the House.

Mr. POWELL. In dealing with this matter, I desire, in the first place, to acknowledge the very courteous treatment which this side of the House has received from the hon. Solicitor General. I feel that he at least is disposed to give us fair-play. In saying that, I do not mean to insinuate in any way that hon. gentlemen opposite do not generally give us fair-play. In these matters we are inclined to suspect that our opponents are not taking a fair view, but are emphasizing certain things that may appear to us to be trivial, their fears are to us the outcome of their political feeling. I, for one, take exactly the position that has been taken by my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Borden), that there are men, many of them in the Liberal ranks, in the province of New Brunswick, and in the county I represent, whom I would trust as implicitly as I would myself or any of my friends; and in the remarks I am going to make, I do not wish in the slightest degree to be taken as reflecting on any officer of the law whose duty it will be to work out the principles of this Franchise Act. I will direct a few words to the state of the law in the province of New Brunswick. This matter, I understand, came up for discussion the other evening, during my absence. In the objections I am going to take to the present Bill, so far as it refers to the province of New Brunswick, I do not wish to be taken as reflecting upon the motives of the men who framed the New Brunswick Acts. Into the question of who were the authors of those Acts or what their motives were, I am not going to inquire. I take the Acts as they are, and I leave to hon. gentlemen themselves to say if the plea I make to their sense of fair-play and justice is not a good plea. I have not spoken on this subject before; I have not delayed the House, and I do not intend to do so to-night. I shall be as succinct as possible, consistent with putting before the House the points I wish to make.

The franchise in the province of New Brunswick is determined by three Acts; first, the Act of 1889, secondly, the Act of 1891, and thirdly, the Act of 1897. The Act of 1891 I can dismiss from the consideration of the House, and reduce the question down

to that of 1889 as amended by the Act of 1897. The hon. Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair) will pardon a reference to what he said the other evening when I was not in the House. If I had been in the House, I would have taken no objection to the motives of the hon. Minister, for this reason, that the Government of New Brunswick was a coalition government, and it might strike against Liberals in one section of the province and against Conservatives in another section. In the county I represent the sheriff is a Liberal. In counties adjoining, the sheriffs are Conservatives. So that while the law may strike me in the county of Westmoreland, it will strike some of the friends of hon. gentlemen opposite in Kent, Northumberland, or Restigouche. Therefore, I appeal to hon. gentlemen opposite, apart from party considerations, and entirely on the merits of the case I present. Under the Act of 1889, which is the leading Act, to a municipal body is assigned by the legislature of the province the duty of framing the lists in accordance with the requirements of the franchises prescribed in the Act. Afterwards, in 1897, this Act was amended. What I quarrel with is this, and I appeal to hon. gentlemen opposite whether the objections I take are not founded in reason, in justice, and in common-sense.

Under the Act of 1889, after the lists are prepared by this board of revisers, constituted by the municipal council, and filed as matters of record in the office of the secretary-treasurer, the power is given to the sheriff to change the lists. In the first place, he has the power to change the list by striking off the name of any dead person. That may appear a very harmless and wise provision, but that being interpreted means a great deal more than appears in the surface. He has no power to hold a court to inquire who is dead. The county I represent is a county that stretches 120 miles in length, with a population of nearly 50,000 to-day, and on the sheriff, with no power to hold a court is conferred the power of striking off the name of any man who, as he thinks he is credibly informed, is dead. That is what it amounts to. How is he to know whether the man is dead or not? He has not the time to go through the county and make personal inquiry, and if he had, he would be simply relying on hearsay evidence and not on sworn testimony.

There is another objection, and it is this. He has in addition the power—and my hon. friend the Minister of Railways said that that power was in the old Act. I do not care what Act it was in, I am dealing with facts as they exist, but I admit that virtually the same power was in the Act, which existed before 1889.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). Identically word for word.

Mr. POWELL. Almost but not quite, because it is there as respects parish and parish, and not as respects polling subdivision and polling subdivision. The point I seek to make is this, that after this official list is filed as a matter of record, the sheriff has the power to go over it, and on merely looking at it—not by taking any evidence but on simply looking at the list itself, without any extraneous evidence—he can strike off names. Here is the language of the law:

> If it appear by the list itself—not by extraneous evidence—that a resident voter of any polling subdivision is returned as qualified to vote in any other polling subdivision, his name shall only be inserted on the list of the polling subdivision in which he resides.

Frequently in those counties, particularly that represented by my hon. friend from Kent (Mr. McInerney), which is my native county and with which I am very familiar, there is any number of men of the same name. Take the name of Gaudet, there must be 150 men of that name, who vote in the parish of Dundas, and the Christian names of many are the same. And so with other family names, under which are enrolled a number of people, particularly in the parish of Bosford, in the county of Westmoreland. The sheriff, with the only evidence before him of the lists itself and with no power to call in outside evidence, has the power to strike off every man with the same name, except the one he happens to know. Is it fair after these lists have been made up by the board of revisers, who have the power to administer the oath and to call in evidence to settle any dispute, that this extraordinary power should be given the sheriff to revise their action without having any information.

There is another way in which the sheriff has power to change the lists. It is given by the Act of the New Brunswick legislature passed in 1897. That particular Act was passed after the Minister of Railways came to this Parliament, and it is worse than the others. After these revisers have made out their lists, the sheriff has power to apply to a county court judge and have placed upon the lists any names that he sees fit to have put upon them. Hence arises a particular point of hardship, and I ask any hon. gentleman opposite to consider it. If the sheriff is a Liberal or Conservative, he will lend a great deal keener ear to his friends than to his enemies. His friends come to him and say: Here are a lot of people whom we wish you to put on the list. He is a partisan, and there is no disgrace in that, because who in this country is not a partisan? Who in this country has not strong political feelings, from the judges of the Supreme Court down to the lowest man in the land almost? And what would be a man who has not strong political feelings? He would be a perfect nobody. This gen-

tleman—let us assume he is a Conservative—hearkens to his friends more than to his enemies, and takes the names they offer him to a county court judge, and the judge places them upon the list. A Liberal goes to the same sheriff and applies to have other names put on the list, but the sheriff is conveniently busy, he does not know what the qualifications of these men are, and he tells the applicant so, and there are a dozen ways, consistent with the law, by which he can crawl out of the duty the statute places upon him of submitting the names to a county court judge. If a wrong has been done by leaving a name off the list, either through inadvertence or by mistake or other cause, why should the right not be given to the man himself and let him apply? Why give it to the sheriff and not give it to the man himself? If a man desires to get on the list, let him go to the judge, either by attorney or in person, and make his application. Why give that right to a sheriff, who is always a partisan and the appointee of one of the political parties? That of itself is not the full measure of the evil. What does the law provide—I am referring to the law of 1897?

> If at any time after the voters' lists have been deposited with the county secretary, as provided in section 36 of the said Act of 1889, the sheriff shall be satisfied that there was a mistake in copying or any other error or oversight, by which names have been omitted from any voters' lists, it shall be the duty of the sheriff to make application to the judge of the county court for an order authorizing him to add the names.

The sheriff has to be satisfied that there was an error or oversight. He can be satisfied very easily by a man whom he knows well and is desirous to aid, but it may be very difficult to satisfy him, when the application is made by a gentleman of the opposite political stripe. Therefore I ask the hon. Solicitor General, so far as the province of New Brunswick is concerned, to insert some such provision as this, that the application to put on the list may be made by the party himself and not by the sheriff. You may say that that will change the list, but hon. gentlemen opposite will find that we will have to make very serious changes, and that leads me to another matter, a defect in the Bill as it stands, showing how complicated this matter is and how very desirable it is to have one uniform franchise for the Dominion.

Under our law, the non-residents are grouped together in a polling list and have to vote at a particular place, and there is no provision made in the Act for that. There are some words in one of the subclauses which might, at first sight, cover the case, but they do not, because the lists on which voters are required to vote are the lists for the polling division and not the list of non-residents. We will have to change the Act in that respect, or otherwise we will cut off every non-resident from the privilege of voting at an election in the province of New Brunswick.

Coming back to the question of constitutional law, I must say this. I myself, speaking as a lawyer, would have no doubt at all as to the power of this Parliament to delegate its powers, but for the authority of Todd and the expressions of some hon. gentlemen in this House. I could cite numerous cases in which Parliament has delegated very large powers. Take, for instance, the British Parliament—and, as it is a constitutional principle I think that in considering this matter, we have to be guided by the parliamentary principles of Great Britain—in the Judicature Act enacted very few sections and they conferred upon the judges most extraordinary powers. In effect they said: What the judges do under these sections shall have the force of a statute and shall be considered as incorporated in the Act itself. Now, take the case of this Canadian Parliament—and I must say on this point, that I think my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) has misconstrued the arguments of my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart). Take the Fishery Act. Power has been given by this Parliament under that Act to the Governor in Council to make most extraordinary regulations covering the fisheries of the whole Dominion of Canada which are to have the force of law. The hon Minister of Marine will be kind enough to correct me if I am wrong, as I am not familiar with the details of that Act. But I am aware that these regulations governs the whole lobster fishery of the country. In passing the Controverted Elections Act, the Parliament of Canada conferred upon the judges of the different provinces power to make whatever rules are necessary to supplement the Act and carry it out, and has declared that every one of these shall have the force of law as if incorporated in the statute. The province of New Brunswick affords another illustration. Under our Controverted Elections Act, which was passed by eminent jurists under the supervision of the present Judge King of the Supreme Court of Canada, the same power is given to the judges, that rules that they make are to have the same effect as though enacted in the statute. But a more extraordinary case still is the case of our Consolidated Statutes passed under the direction of the present Justice King, who at the time was Attorney General and leader of the government of New Brunswick. He and some eminent jurists who were associated with him, Judge Fraser and others, did the work of consolidating the statutes. In this case they actually delegated to this board of revisers of the statutes full and complete powers to modify the Acts passed during the session and to incorporate these Acts into the Consolidated Statutes, and, being so incorporated, they were to have the same force as if part

and parcel of the statutes as originally enacted. This matter came up before our Supreme Court and the decision was given by that body unanimously that this was a delegation of the power of Parliament and was perfectly constitutional. Another illustration is that in every province of the Dominion of Canada, in England, in the United States, in every country in which British principles of government obtain, it is a very common thing indeed for the fullest legislative powers within certain limits upon certain subjects to be delegated to the municipal councils, and within the limits of these delegated powers these councils have the power to make by-laws which will have the force of law. I have already expressed the opinion I held on this subject, and I confess that I felt so satisfied that I would have almost ridiculed the idea had any hon. gentleman advanced the opinion that such power could not be delegated by us. But here we have the opinion of Todd that a different principle is introduced the moment we have to deal with local legislatures. Why that is so, I do not know. I confess that I cannot see any principle in what Todd lays down.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. His text was written before the case of Hodge was decided by the Privy Council.

Mr. POWELL. That is true, and there may be some light thrown on the case by that. At the same time, I may say, that I scarcely think the case of Hodge would strengthen the opinion I held. Todd is a very eminent jurist, and, in face of his opinion I would hesitate to give expression to my own.

Now, the question arises whether this is a delegation of power. The principle laid down by Todd, as I understand it, is that anything in furtherance of legislation, such as the regulation of details, is perfectly competent is not, as he says, a delegation of legislative power. But, Sir, in the case of the Queen vs. Burah, the decision of the House of Lords in the law reports 3rd appeal cases, I find their Lordships delivered a very strong judgment. Let me state the facts of the case. The Governor General in Council of India had certain legislative powers conferred upon them by the Imperial statute. The Governor in Council undertook to do what the High Court of India held to be a delegation of the powers of the Governor General in Council, and it was argued, and the court held, that the Governor General in Council had no power to make that delegation. This matter came up by way of appeal from that judgment before the Privy Council and the Judicial Committee decided that the only point to be considered was whether or not the delegation was of power conferred upon them by the Imperial statute, and, if these powers that were delegated were a matter of grant under the Imperial statute, then it was held that the decision of the court was wrong, and that the delegated power was constitutional. The sentence that crystallized the law in this is on page 905, L.R., 3 App. cases.

So, it was held that this was a case within the limits of the Imperial Act and that the Governor in Council had a perfect right to delegate their powers. Now, my hon. friend the Solicitor General says that under this Bill there is no delegation of power. I agree with him, but, a little further on I will also differ from him. I agree that it is not a delegation of power. Why? because the Act does not go far enough to make it a delegation of power. As it stands, this is an incorporation of the local Franchise Acts into this Act and no more. Under the principles of interpretation, if there was to be a delegation of power to local legislatures, it must be given expressly or by necessary implication. It would be a delegation of power only if we had adopted not only the franchise already in existence but any that may from time to time be in existence. Therefore, this is not a delegation of authority to the local legislatures, but it is an incorporation into the Act of legislation already passed. My contention is that this Act adopts the local franchise, and the local legislatures cannot change them, so far as this Parliament is concerned. If they make changes, this Act is stultified by the lack of administrative machinery.

The cases in Ontario cited by my hon. friend are the same as would arise on the statute under consideration. I would call his attention to the fact that there was no attempted exercise of a supposed power of delegation. It was a power of incorporation and the court held that that would stand and, if the local legislatures changed it and a change of circumstances rendered the Act a nullity having no subject-matter to which it could attach itself, of course that virtually repealed the Act; but, as a matter of law, they only decided that the case was one of incorporation, and if any remarks go further they are "obitir dicta."

To my mind, it is the veriest play on words to say that this is not a delegated power to the local legislatures if this Act will incorporate Acts hereafter passed by them. True, we give them no power to change their own franchise, they have that power already, we do not expressly give them any power to change our franchise, but we tack on to the power they have as a consequence the power indirectly to change our franchise, and therefore you may call it what you please, it is tantamount to a delegation of power. I do not care, so far as I am personally concerned, which franchise we have. I had serious objections to the late Franchise Act on account of its expense. There is no man, I think, in the province of New Brunswick who had to incur more expense under that Act. In the large county I represent nearly the

whole labour of working out that Act devolved on myself and on those who were in my office with me. It was expensive, it was not only expensive, but it involved a great loss of time. But I say that the principle of that Act is a good one, and the principle of this Act is a bad one. I will go further, and I will say this is retrogressive legislation, we are moving the sun back on the dial, we are not in line with the most advanced legislation of the most advanced countries. I blamed the occupants of the Treasury benches in the late Government for not having simplified that Act when they could easily have done so, and I will point out how they could have simplified, and how this Government can simplify it. The great evil of that Act was that every time there was a revision made, the people of this country were called upon to make an entirely new list. They had to go to the trouble of hunting all through the country to see who was qualified to be a voter and who was not. What should have been done was to have had a permanent franchise roll, so that when a man had his name once on the roll it was there for all time, unless he was disqualified; then he would not have had to hunt round on the eve of every election to see that his name was on the roll. That having been done, then the judges' duty should simply been that of amending that list every year, either by adding names to it or by taking names off that should not be on it. If that were done, the expense of printing would be trifling. The present Superintendent of the Printing Bureau has all the type set up, and the revision of the lists could be on common sense principles. That would be the cheapest possible way that you could have the franchise rolls of this country attended to. The superintendent's scheme was this: He never broke up the type, he allowed it to stand, and in each revision he simply incorporated into that the new names that were added, and subtracted the names that were thrown off. If this had been done by the revising officer in the revision of the lists we would not have heard anything about the cost of preparing the lists. I object to the present system as incorporating largely the evils of the old system, and, so far as New Brunswick is concerned, of intensifying them. One of the great evils under the old Franchise Act was this: that people who took an interest in the elections had to go to an enormous outlay of labour and expense in order to complete the list. That will apply to this Act. I do not care whether the local revisers in New Brunswick undertake to do their duty well or not. They are not omnicient, they do not know every person in each parish. The men who take an interest had to do the work, and precisely the same labour is to be thrown on them in the future as in the past. I say also that this measure intensifies the evil. There may not be the same expense thrown upon the treasury of this country, but there will be a larger expense thrown upon private individuals and the people who run the elections. For instance, in New Brunswick we have no printed list. If you want a printed list you have got to employ men to go and copy 10,000 names; that will cost $30 or $40. Then you have to go to work and get some printers to print that list for your friends, or you have to pay writers to make copies of it. You see what an enormous cost that is, and it is thrown altogether upon the candidate, or upon the parties who contribute to the legitimate expenses of running an election. For these reasons, I appeal to hon. gentlemen opposite, if they do not wish to have a permanent franchise roll and to procure to themselves the credit which could easily have belonged to their predecessors, at least I think they should give us a Bill that is free from the objections I have pointed out in the province of New Brunswick. If we are to have an appeal, give us one under which the greatest right of a citizen shall not be contingent upon the whim of any sheriff, but which permits him whose right it is to assert that right in a court of law the same as any other right under our constitution.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I desire to say a word in connection with an observation of the Solicitor General, showing, as I think, that he misunderstood the position that I desired to take before this committee. It was not my intention, if any language of mine conveyed that idea, to suggest that he had shown individually any disposition to resist reasonable suggestions from this side of the House. On the contrary, the disposition with which the Solicitor General set out in handling this Bill, and which he evinced on more than one occasion, notwithstanding the overpowering pressure from his colleagues, was to hear very patiently any suggestions and arguments that may have come from this side. On the other hand, several members of the Government have not evinced that same disposition, but have endeavoured to drive this Bill through 'coute que coute.' Let me give some proof of the spirit of the Solicitor General as contrasted with the actions which he has latterly been forced to take. Take, for instance, the very ingenious and serious argument with which he dealt with the points, some of which I touched upon, but which were elaborated more fully by other hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. He approached those in a thoroughly professional spirit, but he did not grapple with, nor did he deny the reasons that we urged, out side of those technical questions, when we pressed for a concession under this clause in order to have in the provinces that are now denied it, the privilege of judicial revision in certain contingencies. On the contrary, he confined himself exclusively to these technical

questions, and gave us reasonable argument in support of a contrary view from that we had expressed. But I think it is significant that the Solicitor General did not deal with the arguments that we addressed to the Treasury benches outside of the technical aspect of the question. We appealed to the fairness of hon. gentlemen opposite to make concessions that would not impair the general principle of this Bill, that would not interfere with any argument that the Solicitor General used in introducing this Bill. It has been admitted that the Bill is faulty, and we have presented an amendment which would extend to the other provinces the benefits which are now enjoyed by Ontario and Quebec.

I have no desire to reiterate any of the arguments made in support of that appeal, for it was an appeal to the Treasury benches. But one or two observations occur to me that I should like to put before the committee in connection with some statements that have been made since, and to support, too, that appeal. The Solicitor General has associated with him as a law officer of the Crown a gentleman who once represented the electoral district of Bothwell in this House, I refer to the present Minister of Justice, and I appeal to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, to the leader of the Government and to members of the profession who sat with him when in Opposition to recollect his strong objection to a condition of things to which the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Powell) for a while adverted this evening, his objection to the great power delegated by this Parliament to the Governor General in Council. Hon. gentlemen, particularly those hon. members to whom I have referred, will remember the elaborate arguments advanced, I do not know whether on constitutional grounds, but at all events on the ground of public policy against the Governor in Council being clothed with such extensive powers. And those arguments could be used with greater force on this occasion in connection with the policy, not in regard to the constitutionality, of handling so much, if not everything, in connection with the regulation of elections to this House to the provinces, especially outside of Ontario and Quebec. I should hope that it is not even too late now to receive some information from the Treasury benches that either now or at a later period and before this Bill is fully decided upon, the question will be broadly considered by the Government. I submit it could be dealt with so as to meet every argument put forward on this side without departing from the main principle or incurring a large bill of expense, which seems to have frightened many members on both sides of the House. I desire to make an observation in regard to the case referred to by the Solicitor General, Regina vs. O'Rourke, and Judge Wilson's decision in that case. Reading this part of the decision in regard to the statute of this Parliament touching procedure in criminal cases there is this to be said before I read the observations of that judge, in order to show to the committee that it is by no means clear on the question raised here, that the opinion of Judge Wilson could be considered adverse to the views expressed on this side of the House, even if cases of criminal procedure were on all fours with the case under discussion. This was an Act expressly to remove doubt. I am astonished to observe that the Solicitor General shakes his head. I happen to have read the Act a moment ago; I am quite positive that it begins by stating that doubts had arisen. I have it here, and it commences: "And for avoiding doubt." The section in question raises another very important point, as to whether the legislation was necessary at the time, but at all events it was an enactment simply for avoiding doubt. Let us see what Judge Wilson said. He said:

> The Dominion Act, 35 Vic., chap. 14, sec. 2, enacts that the voters' lists in Ontario for Dominion elections shall be the same as in elections for the Ontario legislature; and by the Revised Statutes of Ontario, chap. 49, sec. 48, it is provided that rules of court made under the Act shall be "of the same force and effect as if the provisions contained therein had been expressly enacted by the legislature." That is a case more of delegation, but the enactment in question is not of that nature.

The Solicitor General would say that was ultra vires, being in the nature of a delegation.

> There is no delegation by the Dominion Parlament of the power to enact jury laws for the criminal courts in Ontario. What is done is by a positive enactment of the Dominion, that a certain law in force in Ontario shall for the Dominion purposes be the law of the Dominion. It is a Dominion law enacted not in extenso, but by relation and reference to a law of Ontario.

To show the issue between us and which that reference brings out, I may say that what we complain of so far as the legal question is concerned is, that there may not be an adoption in extenso or by reference in the case of a local Act of an Act that may be plain and certain; but the Bill as introduced by the Solicitor General is not by any means certain and is subject to the caprice and will of a local legislature. Is any hon. member reading it able to tell under what franchise law or conditions an election in any particular province is to be held, because it depends on action that either may be taken or not by the Parliament of Canada. I will now listen to any question which the hon. member for Halifax may desire to ask.

Mr. RUSSELL. My learned friend read the following passage:—

> There is no delegation by the Dominion Parliament of the power to enact jury laws for the

criminal courts in Ontario. What is done is by a positive enactment of the Dominion, that a certain law in force in Ontario shall for the Dominion purposes be the law of the Dominion.

What I want to call the attention of the learned gentleman to is this: That it seems he has not fully stated the effect of that statute unless Chief Justice Hagarty was entirely mistaken in his view of it. Chief Justice Hagarty says:

It seems to me to be very clear that the Dominion Parliament, by this Act of 1869, adopted and as it were confirmed the existing provincial jury laws, and also declared that future provincial laws on that subject should be equally adopted and confirmed, subject, however, to their own right of control by any existing or future Act.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Whatever the obiter dictum might have been in that case, I think speaking from recollection, that the decision was on the existing law, and not a law that made any reference to laws that might in future be enacted by the local Parliament.

Mr. RUSSELL. I listened to the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Powell) in the hope that he would distinguish the case which the Solicitor General cited from what we are proposing to do in this Franchise Act before the House. I followed the argument of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Powell) very carefully, especially when he was completely overturning everything argued by my hon. colleague (Mr. Borden) who is generally right on legal questions, but who undoubtedly was shown to be completely wrong on this question, by the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Powell). I listened to that hon. gentleman (Mr. Powell) with very great attention, and I listened to him understandingly, until he came to the point at which he sought to distinguish the case of the Queen vs. O'Rourke from the principle contained in the Solicitor General's Bill before the House. I could not follow him there, and if he will favour us with an explanation of that distinction he will do a great service to myself and to many hon. members of this House.

Mr. POWELL. For the information of the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Russell) I may say that he is perfectly correct. I did not pretend to draw any distinction between the Act as it now stands and the Act on the case that was judicially passed upon. The judgment there was on the incorporation of a local Act into a Dominion Act and as I read this Bill, it is the incorporation of an Act and does not do what is tantamount to delegating powers. And wherein I differed from the Solicitor General is in this——

Mr. RUSSELL. Does my learned friend say that this clause under consideration is within the competency of Parliament to pass? Will my learned friend give us the assurance—because I rest very much on his assurance—that this clause of the Franchise Bill is within the legislative authority of this Parliament; if the case of the Queen vs. O'Rourke is properly decided.

Mr. POWELL. What I understand this Act to mean is this: That it incorporates an existing law and does not go to the extent of incorporating any further changes in that law made by the local legislatures. The Solicitor General claims that it does go further, and that it incorporates changes which may hereafter be made in the franchise law by the local legislatures. In my view, because of the Ontario decision, it would be perfectly constitutional for us to pass it. If the Solicitor General in his view of the case is right and I am wrong, then I have very grave doubts, in view of Todd's opinion, whether or not it would be competent for us to pass it.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am satisfied with the hon. gentleman's statement that as he reads the Bill it is within the competence of this House to pass it.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The best answer I can give to the question that was put to me, from a cursory reason of Judge Hagarty's judgment, is this: I believe that if time permitted I would have the assistance of the Solicitor General in dealing with Chief Justice Hagarty's argument, and I am very glad to be able to say that, because not only Chief Justice Hagarty but Judge Cameron was against those later authorities that have been referred to. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Russell) strikes his head, but I think I will be able to convince even that hon. gentleman, that I am right in saying I will have the assistance of the Solicitor General, and the assistance of later English decisions, in showing that even so eminent men as Chief Justice Hagarty and Judge Cameron were on weak ground in dealing with the phase of the case to which he refers. Judge Cameron goes the whole length of saying that the power of delegation exists. It opens up a vast field, and the answer is sufficient, that at present the Solicitor General agrees with hon. gentlemen on this side of the House who have contended against this power of delegation.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I want to say a word to the Solicitor General because it is possible that my position is misunderstood in view of what my hon. friend (Mr. Powell) said afterwards. I have no doubt, and my hon. friend has no doubt, that the English Parliament could confer upon a municipal council in England power to regulate the franchise. But the doubt I have is one which might be illustrated this way. Can the Parliament of Canada validly pass an Act saying that the criminal law should be dealt with entirely by the legislatures of each province. My hon. friend (Mr. Fitzpatrick) seems to think that is not a parallel case. Under what particular portion of the British North

America Act does my learned friend say, that this Bill is being passed? Does he say it is being passed under the authority of section 91? That is a fair question, and will my learned friend the Solicitor General answer it. I see that my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Russell) is anxious to answer, but I am asking the Solicitor General. If my learned friend from Halifax desires to answer in his stead, he can do so.

Mr. RUSSELL. I presume it is free for any one to interject a remark. I say this is a law for the peace, order and good government of Canada.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not often differ from my hon. friend on a question of law, but on that point I do. I say it is not anything of the kind, although what my learned friend (Mr. Russell) suggests would assist me in my argument. I think it is under section 41.

Mr. RUSSELL. Not at all.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I may be wrong, but I have the right to suggest what my point is, and I say it is under section 41 and section 41 alone that this Bill can be passed. The implied authority is in section 41 which says: "Until the Parliament of Canada otherwise provides"; it is under that alone that this law can be passed. It would suit my argument better if my learned friend (Mr. Russell) were right, because if he were right, then it is exactly in line with what I have been suggesting to the hon. Solicitor General.

My hon. and learned friend from Halifax tells me that this is under the peace, order and good government of Canada. In what way, will he tell me, does any question respecting the peace, order and good government of Canada differ in principle from any question affecting the criminal law? That is the question I was putting to my hon. friend the Solicitor General. In no respect whatever, I say. The Solicitor General shook his head, but my learned friend from Halifax apparently bows his head to that.

I want to come back to the point with which I was dealing when my learned friend from Halifax interrupted me. I have no doubt the Parliament of Great Britain would have power to confer upon a municipal council in Great Britain authority to deal with the franchise; but what I suggest to the Solicitor General is this, that where the Parliament of Great Britain says that the Parliament of Canada shall deal with certain things, and that the legislatures of the provinces shall deal with certain things, it is not competent for one legislature to transfer its powers to the other—because that is in effect what it is doing.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. That is where we differ.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). My learned friend agrees with me this far, that it is not competent for one legislature to transfer to the other any powers vested in it by section 91 or section 92. There is no difference between my learned friend and myself on that point. I will therefore proceed upon that premise. Then the hon. Solicitor General says that this is not transferring a power. I venture to submit to him that this is transferring a power for the time being, with the power, if you like, to take it up again at any time; because this Parliament has the right to repeal any Act passed by this Parliament. Has my learned friend ever considered whether it would be competent for this Parliament, after declaring a work to be for the general advantage of Canada, to repeal such an Act?—because that is analogous to the question we are dealing with now. When this Parliament says that future Acts which may be placed on the Statute-books of the provinces shall be the law so far as elections to this Parliament are concerned then, during the time between the passing of this Act and its repeal, you are transferring to the local legislature the power of dealing with the qualification of voters, and the preparation of voters' lists for elections to this Parliament. I understand distinctly the point at which the Solicitor General disagrees with me, but I do not understand how he meets the particular difficulty which I have suggested—that during the period this Act is in force and until it is repealed this Parliament is bound by anything the local legislatures may enact, and that, it seems to me, constitutes a transfer of power for the time being from the Parliament of Canada to the legislatures of the different provinces. If that is within the powers of this Parliament, then the Parliament of Canada can transfer the criminal law or any other subject dealt with by section 91 of the British North America Act to the legislatures of the different provinces. That is the difficulty I have in my mind. I do not say that I am right, but I venture to submit that any reason which the hon. Solicitor General has advanced against it is not a very forcible or powerful reason.

Mr. GILLIES. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to be able to bear willing testimony to the fact that the hon. Solicitor General has handled this Bill with great ability, and has treated us on this side of the House with every fairness, and has evinced every disposition to make the Bill as workable as possible on the basis on which it is framed. Now, I do not want to occupy the time of the committee at any great length, and I simply rise for the purpose of drawing the attention of hon. gentlemen to the anomaly which it strikes me exists in this Bill. I refer to the power of revision dealt with by the section we are now considering. The court of revision presupposes a more learned body than the body from which the appeal is made. In the province of Nova Scotia the courts of re-

vision are made up by the different electoral districts in the counties being grouped together in numbers from two to five. Take my own county of Cape Breton, in which I live, the second largest county in the province. We have six revision courts and eighteen revisers. Then we have three incorporated towns, each of which has three revisers. In the county of Cape Breton we have no less than nine revision courts, composed of twenty-seven members, for the purpose of revising the electoral lists. Now, it will at once strike hon. gentlemen as a very anomalous position of affairs that when an appeal is required, it is had from a court composed of three intelligent men, such as the revisers generally are, to one layman. I cannot see why the Solicitor General or the House can object to having an appeal from a lay court to the county court judge. Under section 5 of the Franchise Act of Nova Scotia, the sheriff has immense powers. He can gerrymander the different districts in the different municipalities when an election is coming on; that is, he can make up the polls in such a way that he can tack part of one district on to another. So that the sheriff is not only the returning officer and the appellant court, but he is also the distributing court. The revisers meet. They get the assessment rolls as made up by the different assessors. They compile the electoral list from these rolls, and then they file that list with the municipal clerk. After this is done, the list is posted in several places in the district, and the sheriff on a certain day opens his court for the purpose of hearing appeals from the doings of the revisers.

What I consider the greatest hardship is this. How can we expect to have a revision properly heard and thoroughly threshed out when the appeal is to a layman, very often an old man, who does not know the most elementary rudiments in the rules of evidence, and is ignorant of procedure, from a court of three intelligent gentlemen, perhaps three of the very best men of the whole district. Section 35 prescribes how the lists shall be made up. After they are filled in and signed by the sheriff, they are filed with the municipal clerk. They are made up in writing, not printed at all, and hon. gentlemen will at once see the door that is thus opened for fraud. Section 40 then prescribes that the sheriff shall furnish certified copies of these lists to the different officers. The lists are made up in writing and filed, and copies of them are made out in writing by the sheriff and handed to the different returning officers. What is there to prevent an unscrupulous or careless and irresponsible man, as the sheriff may be—an ignorant person if you like—filling in any number of names on that list in writing which he has to hand over to the returning officer. This may be done by some person after the list has left the sheriff's hands and during its transmission to the deputy returning officer. I would ask, therefore, to hedge this particular part of the Bill with some safeguard. Let us insist that the lists should be printed at all events; and if they are printed, there will be no danger of having any names added by the sheriff or any one else, whereas as they are, made out in writing and deposited with the clerk of the municipality, and copies being made out afterwards in writing by the sheriff, there is grave danger of their being tampered with. Therefore, I ask that the Solicitor General should see that they are printed before being finally completed. My hon. friend from Colchester (Mr. McClure) was under a wrong impression when he said that the law as it now exists is precisely as it was when under the control of the old sessions of the peace. Such is not the case. I have considerable experience in municipal matters, and am familiar with the manner in which the lists are made out by the general sessions of the peace and also under the municipal council—an institution that was inaugurated in our province in 1879. I believe that the court of session still obtains in the province of Prince Edward Island. The practice that prevailed under the old session was as follows:—A grand jury were selected, and with the magistrate of the county conducted the business of the whole county. The magistrates and justices of the county and the jury selected a certain number of officers to act as revisers. These revisers then revised the lists in the way then prescribed by law, which was pretty much the same method as now obtains. But my hon. friend will see the difference between that practice under the general sessions of the peace and the practice now followed. The municipal councillors are now elected in the different districts, and I assure the hon. gentleman that politics prevails in these smaller bodies just as briskly and violently as in the larger bodies, and the complexion of the county councils is either Conservative or Liberal according as the majority is Conservative or Liberal. Therefore, the officers they select are either Liberals or Conservatives, because these bodies are just as particular in appointing their friends to office as larger bodies are. It follows that the revisers are of a political stripe and are very anxious to fill up the lists in the interests of the political party they support. When that is done, if any one wishes to appeal to have names added to the list, the only court he can go to is that of the sheriff of the county. The sheriff is a layman, an old man in many instances, a man who has been given the shrievalty as a reward for political service, or perhaps meritorious service of one kind or another. He may be a very worthy man but in nearly every case he is ignorant of the elementary rudiments of the rules of evidence, and therefore incompetent to act as a court of appeal. Hon. gentlemen must

agree that it is really conspicuously absurd that an appeal should be made from three intelligent laymen to one layman of less intelligence. Why, then, not let the appeal go to a court of a judicial character. Our county court judges are not overworked. Take the district in which I reside, comprising three counties—Cape Breton, Victoria and Richmond, in which Mr. Justice Dodd is the county court judge. I am sure there is not a Liberal or a Conservative within the confines of these counties who would not go before Judge Dodd with every confidence that justice will be done. The same statement applies to Mr. Justice McIsaac, who presides over Guysborough and Antigonish. I am quite sure that there is not a Liberal or Conservative of that district who would not willingly submit to his rulings, and no one would think of inquiring whether Judge Dodd or Judge McIsaac are Conservative or Liberal. I would therefore ask that the Government would accede to our request and give us an independent authority for this revision, and a competent authority who would be irremovable except by a vote of this Parliament.

I appeal to the hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson), who I know is of a fair mind and desires to see fair-play, why will he not give me the same rights in my province as he claims for himself in his ? In Ontario they have their judges as revision courts to whom they can appeal to have the voters' lists perfected. I put the same question to my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright), who is certainly a gentleman of wide range of knowledge. And my hon. friend the Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair) in whose province in certain cases the same right of appeal to the judge exists. Why will not he give me the same privileges that he has in his province ? If it is right for him to have this privilege, surely it is right for me. This, I contend, is a step in advance ; it is a step that was taken by this Parliament when they enacted a Franchise Act in 1885, and I desire that there should be no retrogression. And I would appeal to the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) himself, who has the benefit of an appeal to the judges in his own province, why will he not give me the same privilege ? Is there any answer that can be given ?

Mr. TAYLOR. No answer can be given.

Mr. GILLIES. Then, why not agree to this amendment ? Hon. gentlemen opposite say that if they do that they will destroy the Bill. But that is not the case. I am willing to go this far with the hon. gentlemen—I am willing that the qualification of a voter in federal elections shall be the same as in provincial elections. That is a point that I consider to be not worth quarreling over. Why, then, do they not meet me in the same manner and agree that the county court judges, of whom there are seven in our province shall be the appellant court which shall have final supervision over these lists ? We are not asking more than is already granted in Ontario and Quebec, and what is provided, in a certain degree, I understand, in the province of Manitoba and also in the province of British Columbia. I discussed this matter with my hon. friend from Vancouver (Mr. McInnes), and he tells me that they have the judges there as the final court of appeal in matters of the revision. If that be the case in these provinces, why not allow us to have it in Nova Scotia ? The judges are already appointed there, and it will not cause expense to allow this appeal. You will then have a competent tribunal, you will have the Act carried out properly and you will have justice done. I am not going to refer to the wild and incoherent utterances of the hon. member for Inverness (Mr. McLennan). There are some things in this life that are better left untouched, and certainly he and his utterances come within that category.

Mr. INGRAM. I rise to protest against gentlemen on both sides of this House stating that appeals are allowed to the county judges in the province of Ontario and Quebec. Speaking for the province of Ontario, I agree, that so far as the Part 1 of the voters' list is concerned, an appeal does lie to the county judge. But this is not the case under the Act respecting the registration of manhood suffrage in cities and county towns. In the town of Niagara Falls, under the statute, the board of registrars consists of three members, and there is not a judge on that board. Under subsection 2 of section 28, it is provided that when a board of manhood suffrage registrars consists of more than three members, the board shall appoint three of its members to be a board of appeal, and where the board consists of three members only, those three members shall constitute a board of appeal. Now, in the case of Niagara Falls we have three gentlemen constituting the board of registrars, and these same three men constitute the board of appeal. I should like to know from any gentleman how we can expect to get justice under these circumstances. How can appeals be settled satisfactorily ? According to our experience in the rural municipalities there are few appeals to the county judge who is the final tribunal. But, in the cities and towns there are a large number of young men who are not otherwise qualified to vote but who have resided long enough in the municipality and long enough in the polling subdivision to be entitled to have their names entered on the list on applying to the board of registrars. There are representatives of the political parties at that meeting, and if there are objections to any name being entered on the list, that objection is stated, and the objection comes up before the board of appeal. We have had some experience in my constituency, and I

want to tell the hon. Solicitor General that, this Registration Act in the province of Ontario is a crude Act, and does not give satisfaction to those who are affected by it.

I will give him some examples. The city of St. Thomas and the city of Toronto were the two first cities in the province of Ontario where the Registration Act applied. When a provincial election came on in St. Thomas, we found the city divided up into several divisions. John Brown did not know any more where he voted than the man in the moon. How do you think John Brown found means of voting? His name was not on the roll, he could not find it. He was entitled to vote in division No. 1, but he made a great search to find his name in division 13, half a mile from where he was entitled to vote. Then the gentleman who had this list in charge, finding that names were omitted, gave him a small slip of paper with his name on it with instructions to go to a certain division and present this to the deputy returning officer, and by that means he secured his vote. That is the way this Registration Act works in the city of St. Thomas. There is another thing. Seven days after the dissolution of the legislature of the province of Ontario, these registrators are called together for the purpose of carrying out this Act. By the time the appeals are decided there is not sufficient time for the clerk of the peace to prepare a proper list of the voters in order that each deputy returning officer may have a proper list. So I say this Act does not give time between the dissolution of Parliament and election day, that it may be worked out properly.

Mr. TAYLOR. Who constitute the board of appeal at Niagara?

Mr. INGRAM. There are three good solid partisans. At Niagara Falls the ex-officio members of the board are: the police magistrate, appointed by the local Government, a partisan; the division court clerk is another, and the clerk of the municipal council is another. These are the three gentlemen who compose the board of registration in the town of Niagara Falls, and is it any wonder that gentlemen on this side of the House protest against having to submit to a court of appeal of that kind? There are many other things. I was not present when the polling subdivisions were discussed in this House, but I protest strongly against the number of polling subdivisions that are created by this Act, compelling the people to pay $4 for polling booths, $4 to a deputy returning officer, $2 for constables, and $2 for poll clerks, making some $12 at least, not counting the stationery that is used, and various other expenses. I will give you a reason why I protest against the number of polling subdivisions. Take the provincial election of 1894. There were 59 divisions in the district of Toronto East, in not one of which were there 200 votes polled. The 59 divisions would average 88 voters for each one. I say that instead of allowing 200 to each one, as the provincial Act does, if you say 300, and take the last election as the basis, you will reduce the number in Toronto East to 18 subdivisions, in each of which there would be 300 votes, or less, polled. Take the difference between 18 and 59, and you will see the large saving the people of Toronto would effect in the matter of polling subdivisions. In Toronto south, there are 105 polling subdivisions, with an average of 98 voters to a poll. Besides creating enormous expense in this way, you are confusing the electors. I hold that our cities and towns should be divided for Dominion purposes, precisely the same as they are divided for municipal purposes. Surely, if the people in our cities and towns can elect a mayor, aldermen, school trustees, and occasionally vote on a by-law, it is reasonable to suppose that they can have ample time to vote for two candidates for Parliament. Besides you are creating polling subdivisions and establishing polling booths in cities and towns just the same as you would in municipal elections; and every person knowing where he has a right to vote municipally, would not be confused when an election came round to know where he should vote. I went into this matter carefully, and I find that in the city of Brantford, the city of St. Thomas, the two electoral districts of Hamilton, Chatham, in the county of Kent, Kingston, London, Ottawa, Woodstock, Peterborough, Toronto east, south, north and west, Guelph, the south riding of Wellington—in the cities and county towns, in fifteen electoral districts, where I find there are 614 polling subdivisions. I have figured out what this result would be if there were 300 voters in each one. It would reduce that number from 614 to 231, saving in those cities 383 polling subdivisions. Multiply that number by $12 each, and the people would effect a saving of $4,596.

The PRIME MINISTER. I rise to a point of order. It is nearly half past twelve o'clock, and I would not interrupt my hon. friend, but he is discussing a question which has already been passed upon by this committee. I do not think the hon. gentleman was in the House the other day, but the section he is discussing has been passed, and is no longer before the committee.

Mr. INGRAM. I am aware that this was discussed before, but the point I am trying to make here——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The point of order has been well taken, because the question has already been decided. It is a well known rule that we have no right to discuss a question which has already been decided. I invite the hon. member to confine his remarks to subsection "a" of clause 5.

Mr. INGRAM. I am trying to show that you are compelling us to adopt a provincial

list in the province of Ontario, and by the adoption of this list you are saddling the people of this country with a great cost in the shape of polling divisions. I am showing what these polling subdivisions cost in order to bear out my argument.

The PRIME MINISTER. Too late.

Mr. INGRAM. If it is too late now, I will take some other time. On the third reading I will discuss it at much greater length. I find that the amendment provides for some of those things proposed by the Solicitor General. A clause is to be proposed to the effect that the revising officer shall prepare a separate list for each polling station, and that it shall be compiled alphabetically.

The PRIME MINISTER. The amendment has not been moved.

Mr. INGRAM. I understand notice of it has been given.

The PRIME MINISTER. Of course, the hon. gentleman can discuss it when it has been moved.

Mr. INGRAM. Up to this time of the discussion I have not occupied thirty minutes of the time of the committee. Both the leader of the House and hon. members on this side have occupied hours, and I should be glad to finish my remarks now; but if the right hon. gentleman refuses to allow me to proceed, I will guarantee to occupy an hour or two at a future time.

Mr. TAYLOR. I draw the attention of the hon. Prime Minister to the discussion that took place the other day. The right hon. gentleman said:

The only question which we have to deal with at this moment is the amendment moved by the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Heyd) regarding the franchise to Indians.

Mr. FOSTER. Would my hon. friend allow me—is that the correct rule? We have a substantive motion which we are discussing, an hon. gentleman has moved an amendment to that motion. Does the right hon. gentleman contend that we have no right to discuss the substantive motion on the amendment which has been proposed, and that we must confine ourselves entirely to the amendment.

The PRIME MINISTER. That is my opinion.

Mr. FOSTER. Then I will ask the ruling of the Chairman with reference to it

The PRIME MINISTER. If my hon. friend will refer to the debates of 1895, which I have reason to remember, because at that time I sat on the other side of the House, he will agree with me that we were rigidly confined to the amendment which was under discussion before the Chair.

Mr. CHAIRMAN (Mr. Cameron). I think the Chairman read the whole of section 5, and this is an amendment to that whole section. Therefore I think that the whole section as well as the amendment are under consideration.

We have therefore section 5 before us.

The PRIME MINISTER. Subsection "b" of section 5 has been carried.

Mr. TAYLOR. We are now on subsection "a."

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The understanding of the committee the other night was that the section would be put to the committee by subsections. Subsection "b," which the hon. member was discussing a moment ago, has been disposed of. Subsection "c" is disposed of. So we are at subsection "a," which has reference to the provincial franchises. The discussion, therefore, should be confined to the question of the provincial franchises pure and simple.

Mr. TAYLOR. The whole clause is before us, according to the ruling the other night.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. It is not different from this one; it is the same ruling.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I rise for the purpose of asking the Solicitor General a question as regards the difficulty which presents itself in connection with the adoption of the franchise of the province of Ontario, and I ask it now because it comes very naturally after the remarks made by the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Ingram) as regards the registration boards. The Solicitor General knows, because he has given consideration to the laws of the various provinces, that in Ontario as regards all the wards and municipalities, with the exception of cities and county towns, the list is revised each year. It is made up by the municipal authorities, and is then revised by the judges, and any appeal as regards the municipal or provincial elections are then heard. So far as regards the great majority of the electors in that province we would have no difficulty in securing a list, supposing a dissolution were declared and an election called on. But the hon. gentleman is aware that in cities such as London, Hamilton, St. Catharines, Chatham and St. Thomas, and all county towns which happen to be incorporated as towns, the system of registration applies, and no list will be commenced to be made there for the purpose of provincial elections until such time as a dissolution of the legislature is declared, and when that dissolution is declared, certain steps will be taken for making a list that is used in the elections then pending.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The amendment to section 8 is to meet that difficulty.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I must say that is one of the most extraordinary sections ever proposed, although I do not propose to discuss it at the present moment. I was simply leading up to the condition of affairs. If the dissolution of this Parliament were declared, lists would have been revised in all the constituencies of Ontario except those which are cities or contain county towns, and in those constituencies there are

absolutely no lists. There is no list in Toronto, Hamilton or London, and the other cities and towns to which I have referred. If this Government declared a dissolution of Parliament, it woud have no right to say to the legislature or Government of Ontario: You are now to call into effect and operation your registration boards in those cities. Then how will a list be obtained? The Solicitor General says under section 8 of this Bill. While I do not desire to anticipate the discussion of that clause, I am bound to say that it would be placing in the hands of this Government power to appoint every officer de novo in those cities, officers who would be appointed by this Government and under its control. Then, we have, on the admission of the Solicitor General, a fact which should prevent us, if possible, passing this Act, which adopts a part only of the machinery of Ontario and supplies, under the control and at the beck and nod of the party in power in the Dominion, the means of obtaining lists in those constituencies, for which there are no lists at the present time. We have had the point argued that if we depart from the provincial machinery we had better drop this Bill entirely. That was the statement made by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. This Bill is such a mixture that the Solicitor General and the other members of the Government find they have to depart from the provincial machinery. That machinery is not available for their purpose, and they are compelled to manufacture machinery for all the cities and county towns in the province in order to get lists to meet the cases of a general election or a by-election. In the face of this admission on the part of the Solicitor General, the Government should pause before pressing this Bill on the attention of the committee. The hon. gentleman admits that the Government have to make new lists by means of new machinery, which power they propose to take under section 8, which is a very objectionable clause.

Mr. BENNETT. I desire to move that the committee rise.

The PRIME MINISTER. I sincerely hope the committee will pass this subsection. I very willingly yielded yesterday to an adjournment at half past twelve and did not press the sitting. We have been discussing this question two days, and if we cannot come to an agreement in regard to it we ought to dispose of it in some way. I do not know that even my hon. friends opposite can have more light on the question than they have already had, and therefore I think it should be disposed of.

Mr. BENNETT. When I addressed the House the other evening——

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Pass subsection (a) and adjourn on that.

The PRIME MINISTER. Very well.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I want to ask whether we shall have perfect liberty on section 8 to discuss the point to which I refer.

The PRIME MINISTER. Certainly; undoubtedly.

Amendment negatived.

Subsection (a) of section 5 agreed to.

Committee rose and reported progress.

The PRIME MINISTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Might I ask the right hon. gentleman to say what business we will have for to-morrow?

The PRIME MINISTER. The same bill of fare for to-morrow as for to-day.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 12.35 a.m. (Thursday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 28th April, 1898.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 125) to amend the Act to incorporate the Interprovincial Bridge Company.—(Mr. Hutchison, by Mr. Campbell.)

CARRIAGE OF COAL OVER THE INTERCOLONIAL.

Mr. McINERNEY (by Mr. Davin) asked:

1. How many tons of coal did the Intercolonial Railway carry from Maccan and Spring Hill respectively to Moncton during the last fiscal year, and at what rate per ton?
2. What is the rate per ton for such carriage under the new Intercolonial Railway tariff?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). 1. During the last fiscal year the following quantities of coal were carried by the Intercolonial Railway from Maccan to Moncton:—543½ tons at rate of 95 cts. per ton of 2,000 lbs.; 327 tons, at rate of 60 cts. per ton of 2,000 lbs.; 1,519 tons, at rate of 50 cts. per ton of 2,000 lbs. From Springhill Junction to Moncton: 3,050½ tons, at rate of $1 per ton of 2,000 lbs.; 2,940 tons, at rate of 66 cts. per ton of 2,000 lbs.; 4,276½ tons, at rate of 50 cts. per ton of 2,000 lbs. 2. The present rates under the new Intercolonial Railway

for coal from Maccan to Moncton and from Springhill Junction to Moncton are as follows:—To the public, 80 cts. per ton of 2,240 lbs.; to manufacturers, 75 cts. per ton of 2,240 lbs.

VACANCY FOR BAGOT.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the First Minister if he can tell the House when he proposes to issue the writ and name the returning officer for Bagot.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). My hon. friend asks me if I will inform the House when we propose to do so. I cannot tell him to-day; I hope to be able to tell him within a few days.

LONG LAKE RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. OSLER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to refer to a speech made the other evening when I was not here by the member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis). He refers to the Long Lake Railway Company, and repeats statements which I thought I had refuted in this House as to the financing of that road. He repeats those statements in my absence. I do not think it is necessary for me to take up the time of the House in going over the figures and facts as I stated them here on the 17th of February last. The statements which the hon. member for Saskatchewan made are all of them not based upon facts; the figures that he gives are all of them entirely wrong and misleading. So far as the financial operations of the Saskatchewan road are concerned, the whole of the money raised from the sale of lands——

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member will allow me—I am afraid he is going beyond a mere personal explanation, because the lines he is taking would possibly call for a reply. The hon. member must make a motion in order to put himself in order.

Mr. OSLER. I will conclude with a motion. I do not wish to weary the House by going into long details, but the cost of that road was $10,000 a mile. The land was sold for $998,000, which money was deposited in the trustees' hands to pay interest for six years on the bonds. By the end of six years that money had all been paid out, and during the whole of the six years the Canadian Pacific Railway operated the road, the earnings practically met the operating expenses, and no more. The Canadian Pacific Railway naturally did not exercise their right to take over the road at the end of that time. The bondholders, unfortunately, were the people who suffered. They went into the transaction fully believing that the country would develop to such an extent that at the end of six years the road would be a paying one. At the expiration of these six years a new arrangement was made with the Canadian Pacific Railway to operate the road on most favourable terms. The gross earnings of the road for the last year ending 31st December were $65,300; the operating expenses were about $62,000. There was no margin of profit, and the difficulty existing in connection with the road is that there is no money available, and I do not see who is going to raise money to repair the bridges. The bonds are of the value of 30 cents or 40 cents on the dollar, and the earnings of the road, as I have stated, are not sufficient to carry out this work. This is a matter that is causing very serious anxiety to the parties who are looking after the road. It has been operated by the Canadian Pacific Railway to the full extent that the business warrants. The road is one which was very much desired by the late Government for military purposes particularly. They gave a subsidy of $80,000 a year for twenty years, an amount equal to the sum we were then paying out for various services in that country. I state here without any hesitation that no railway transaction has ever been carried out in Canada where there was such absolute honesty in connection with it from one end to the other. There was no money made by those connected with it, the promoters made no money, the only persons who made anything were the contractors, who no doubt obtained fair profits. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company has nothing to do with the road. When the subsidy was given they were approached and asked to build the road. They first thought of doing so, but after making an investigation declined, and the gentlemen whose names are on the charter immediately withdrew and have never had to do with it since. Practically the road is owned to-day by the bondholders, and they are only receiving on their bonds the $80,000 given by this Government for the twenty years. In the Department of the Interior and the Department of Railways all the agreements and papers in connection with this road are on file; if not, I shall be very glad to furnish every document connected with the building and financing of the undertaking. I am very sorry the hon. member for Saskatchewan, in my absence, should have repeated the attacks, which I think were very fully answered by me on 17th February. As regards the statement I made that Mr. Willison had told me he had written the pamphlet with respect to the Long Lake Railway, and would be glad to withdraw it, I made the statement then, and I repeat it. I went to Mr. Willison with Mr. Jameson, the member for Winnipeg, and Mr. Willison said to him in my presence that he had made that statement and he told the member for Winnipeg in my presence that he would be glad to withdraw it at any time. I do not think it is necessary for me to again go over the ground, which I think I covered fully on 17th February last, and if

gentlemen will refer to "Hansard" of that date, they will see my reply in connection with this railway and the statement I made. The figures I quoted and the statements I made then are absolutely true; and there is no concealment, nothing behind and beyond the statement I made then in connection with the road. I wish to contradict in the most positive terms that I can the statements that were made regarding that line by the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) the other evening. I beg to move the adjournment of the House.

Motion to adjourn negatived.

COLLISION BETWEEN "YANTIC" AND "LA CANADIENNE."

Mr. LEMIEUX asked,

1. Is the Government aware that on the 29th of October, 1897, the steamship "Yantic," of the United States navy, came into collision with the steamship "La Canadienne," the property of the Dominion Government, in the St. Lawrence River?
2. Was there an investigation held by the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal over said collision?
3. Has the report been sent to the Government, and what is the verdict?
4. What is the amount of damages suffered by "La Canadienne" as a result of said collision?
5. Has the Government taken any steps to recover said damages from the United States Government?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). Yes, the Government was notified by the agent of the department at Quebec. At the time of the collision the "La Canadienne" was chartered to one Lindsay. Yes, there was an investigation held by the Harbour Commissioners to determine whether the pilot on board the "Yantic" was at fault. The Harbour Commissioners form the pilotage authority. The decision of the pilotage authority was that the "Yantic" caused the collision by changing her course, while in charge of Sévère Perron, pilot. The accounts have not been received for repairs to the steamer. No, we do not yet know what the damages amount to.

CANADIAN CUSTOMS OFFICIALS IN THE KLONDIKE.

Mr. DAVIN. I wish to call the attention of the Government to a statement made in a letter signed by Stuart Cameron, which appears in to-day's "Citizen," under the heading, "To Klondike by the Teslin Route." The writer says:

> After eight days' doubling on our provisions we arrived at the boundary line, thirty miles from the coast, and here we had another unique experience. The Canadian customs official, Mr. Turner, informed us if we wanted to leave early in the morning he would have to charge us a small fee for the policeman being put on night duty, which fee, he told us later, would be $1.50. We inquired of several other parties who had to pay the same, and figured out Mr. Turner's daily income to be between $30 and $40 from this source, besides the salary the Government already allows him. No need of Mr. Turner going to the Klondike at that rate.

It would be well to know whether a customs official had a right to make such a charge or not.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). My hon. friend will understand that the Government have no means of knowing whether that statement is true or not. The Government are bound to assume that the officers in charge in that part of the country are doing their duty. All I have to say is, that if Mr. Cameron had undergone any such treatment, the better course to pursue is to lay a complaint before the department, and it will be investigated at once with a view to have redress made.

PREFERENTIAL TRADE.

Mr. McNEILL. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I beg to ask the right hon. gentleman leading the House if he has yet determined whether he can allow me a day for the discussion of a motion on preferential trade.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I have not yet determined on a day, indeed I must tell my hon. friend that I have not thought over the matter since he brought it forward the other day. I may tell him, however, that as soon as the deck is clear from the present encumbrances we will be able possibly to give him some day, or at all events to discuss the question.

Mr. McNEILL. That is scarcely treating me very generously, I think.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has asked a question and he must not go further.

LANDS IN THE RAILWAY BELT, VANCOUVER ISLAND.

Mr. McINNES. Yesterday there was laid on the Table of the House the report of an investigation made by Mr. Rothwell respecting complaints made by certain settlers residing within the railway belt on Vancouver Island. In view of the nature of the report, I desire to ask the Government what line of action they intend to follow?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). The question dealt with in the report is a somewhat difficult and complicated one. I cannot say that I have arrived at a positive conclusion as to what should be done, and I will not do so without asking the consideration of my colleagues in regard to it. I have gone through the evidence accompanying the return, which is very voluminous. My present intention is to give the matter further consideration, and to com-

municate with the provincial government with a view to arrive at a settlement, whereby the settlers on the island, who no doubt have very serious grievances, may be in some way compensated in regard to those grievances.

NORTH-WEST MOUNTED POLICE—INSPECTOR MOODY'S YUKON DETACHMENT.

Mr. OLIVER. I would like to ask the Government if they have received any information with regard to the police party which left Edmonton for the Yukon sometime in September last?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I am very glad that this question has been asked, because I see by the newspapers that there is a certain amount of misapprehension or uncertainty as to the whereabouts of that force. The detachment to which my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) refers was commanded by Inspector Moody and left Edmonton sometime last fall, in September or October. We have received two communications from that force, the first one in December last and the second one late last night Inspector Moody had with him a party of seven men, he had ten sleds drawn by horses, eight train of dogs running loose, and an abundant supply of provisions. His intention was to use the horses until the snow got too deep when the dogs would be brought into service, and the horses killed and fed to the dogs. On the 2nd of December Inspector Moody reported from Fort St. John, on the Peace River, as follows:—

> All are in good health and spirits, and the dogs are looking well. Our outfit is good, but I have difficulty in feeding the dogs. With a good effort I look for a prosperous trip to Sylvester Post, at least. Many things may delay us, but with patience and determination we hope to get through some way or other, and I believe we shall turn up at the other side safely.

Last night we received another communication from Inspector Moody. He now reports from Fort Graham, on the Findlay River. He had to winter at that port as the snow was five feet deep and dog feed was not obtainable and travelling difficult. He now reports that the party is in good condition.

Mr. BERGERON. How are the dogs?

ELECTORAL FRANCHISE ACT.

The House again resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 16) to repeal the Franchise Act and to further amend the Dominion Elections Act.

(In the Committee.)

On section 5, subsection "d,"

Mr. BENNETT. May I ask the Solicitor General what emergency is contemplated by this clause?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). It refers to the unorganized territory in Ontario and also to Algoma West. It would be better for the appearance of the Bill that we should change the word "a province" to "the province," and I move that the change be made.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Has the Solicitor General made any provision to offer where in the case of accident or otherwise the list is not in existence in the county or municipality? Suppose the local official fails to prepare the list of voters, or suppose that when the list is demanded by the returning officer appointed under the authority of this Parliament, the list does not exist, what provision is there for providing a list?

Mr. MILLS. Or supposing, as did actually happen in the county of Annapolis, that the sheriff loses the list. One of these eighteen good men and true, before the election of 1890 did actually lose the entire list of 26 pages. An Act was about to be introduced by the Nova Scotia Government of the day, and I think was introduced, to enable the sheriff to go over the county and make up a list at his own sweet will. Sheriff Morse actually lost the list and he went to Halifax and reported to the Government, and Attorney General Longley, who was then the colleague of the Minister of Finance, proposed to enact a law enabling the sheriff to go into the county of Annapolis and prepare a list just as he wished. The whole discussion is upon the debates of the Nova Scotia assembly in 1890.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The point made by my hon. friend (Mr. Mills) will be more appropriate when we come to paragraph 6, and I suggest that we would make more progress if we proceed in order.

Mr. MILLS. I made my remarks as supplementary to what was said by the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. McDougall).

Mr. McDOUGALL. It seems to me we are at the point where we have a right to discuss this. If it happens that a list is missing or is not in existence, how are we to provide for that? We provide for no authority from this Parliament to see that there is a list in existence, until after the returning officer has received his appointment from the Government, and that may be within ten or fourteen days of the holding of the nomination, when it will be impossible to get the list prepared.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I cannot imagine any such possible case arising as that pointed out by my hon. friend. The only case in any province where no list is in existence is in Prince Edward Island; and it may happen in certain parts of the unorganized territories of Ontario, where a list is made for the purpose of an election, or under the Manhood Suffrage Act in cities

and towns, where lists are only in force for an election. But there is no possible case such as is suggested by the hon. gentleman.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I cannot agree with the hon. gentleman. Suppose a building occupied by the provincial officer who has possession of the lists becomes destroyed by fire or by any other cause.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Section 6 provides for that.

Subsection "d" agreed to.

On section 5, subsection "e,"

Mr. BENNETT. During the discussion on the former clauses of the Bill, a great deal of complaint was made that in the cities and towns in the province of Ontario where registration prevailed, no due notice was given in ample time where voters were to poll their votes, and as a result of the powers conferred upon the returning officer, he could at the very last moment designate where the polling places would be, while his party friends might be placed in possession of that knowledge beforehand. I know it may be argued that under the Dominion election law the duty is incumbent on the returning officer on the day of nomination to announce in the proclamation where the polling places would be.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. That would be my answer.

Mr. BENNETT. But I would ask the committee to add to this subsection the following words, which at least will do no harm :—

And the returning officer shall in all cases designate such polling places and polling stations in the election proclamation.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I do not see at first sight that the addition of these words can affect the clause ; but I have another amendment to make which may cause some discussion, and I will ask that the clause be allowed to stand, till I can consider it, and see how the hon. gentleman's amendment will fit in with the amendment which I have to propose.

Mr. SPROULE. During a previous discussion on this subsection, it appeared to me to be plain, but on looking over it since, I find that there is no such provision in it as the hon. Minister at that time intimated that it contained. There are three classes of persons who can designate where the polling stations shall be. First, the returning officer may establish them ; second, there are a number designated in the Act ; and, third, the Lieutenant-Governor in Council may designate polling stations. This section of the Bill does not, in my judgment, provide for the establishment of polling places in the three different ways contemplated by the provincial Act. It only gives the returning officer the power to appoint the polling stations where the law provides he shall appoint them. The provision giving the Lieutenant-Governor in Council power to appoint them is not mentioned in this Bill, and I do not think there is any provision made for that.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. No, there is no provision made for it. Section 3 of the Ontario Act, chap. 9, provides that the Lieutenant-Governor in Council may from time to time add polling places to those named. We would require to amend the law so as to give the returning officer the power to do it. I will take a note of the hon. gentleman's suggestion, and will consider it when considering the section.

Mr. INGRAM. Under the Ontario Municipal Act, the municipal councils have the right to pass a resolution defining the polling subdivisions. In the cities of St. Thomas and Ottawa the municipal councils passed such a resolution, but the returning officers declined to recognize the polling subdivisions thus defined, although the people were compelled to pay for them. I would like to know whether the hon. Solicitor General confirms that power, and if we are to be as regards Dominion elections, in the same position in this respect as we are under the provincial laws.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I understand my hon. friend to say that in the province of Ontario it is necessary that the returning officers should accept the polling subdivisions made by the municipal authorities, and they decline to do so. Does he expect us to make a law here to provide that the returning officer shall comply with the law ? I do not see how we can do that.

Mr. INGRAM. Will the hon. gentleman recognize the authority or power of municipal councils to pass such a resolution ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes, because we provide that the polling subdivisions shall be those established under the law of Ontario, and that law confers upon the municipal councils the power of defining the polling subdivisions.

Mr. INGRAM. Then, I wish to draw the hon. gentleman's attention to this fact, that while the city councils of London and St. Thomas passed such a resolution, the boards of revisers in these cities declined to recognize it. I would like to know how it was, if the city councils have the power to fix the polling subdivisions the returning officers decline to recognize it ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. We shall see that the returning officers carry out the law.

Mr. MONTAGUE. You can easily provide for that in section "a," where you take the power of providing your own board.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Subsection "a" will stand.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Before you reach section 6, I wish to move amendments, copies of which, I think, are in the possession of my hon. friends. But there is one amendment I propose first to move, which I have not had printed, but which has been prepared on the suggestion of my hon. friend from Westmoreland (Mr. Powell). In New Brunswick, it is provided that certain non-resident voters, non-resident in an electoral district on the lists of which their names appear, shall have the right to vote at the shire town. No provision was made for that under our law, and therefore I introduce an amendment which will give effect to that provision of the New Brunswick law, and I make it general, so that if the same thing should happen in any other province, it will apply to that province as well.

The provision of the law in any province as to the places where non-resident electors shall vote, shall apply, "mutatis mutandis," in the county to such Dominion election, and the returning officer at such election shall have and be charged with the powers and duties of the sheriff or returning officer under these provisions.

Mr. HAGGART. Do I understand the hon. Solicitor General rightly that this only applies where non-residents have a right to vote under a provincial law?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes.

Mr. MILLS. I renew the question I have made, and ask the hon. Solicitor General what provision has been made to meet the case of the loss of these lists?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. As I said a moment ago, I do not see how we can deal with that until we reach section 6. When we do, I think I can point out a remedy.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I suppose the hon. gentleman knows that the provision in the Ontario Act requiring residence, works very severely sometimes against voters. Is he prepared to offer any amendment.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I am afraid I cannot make a new list for the province of Ontario.

Mr. SPROULE. I would suggest to the hon. Solicitor General the advisability of using plain English in drafting provisions of the law, because he does not know the class of returning officers he may have to deal with.

Mr. WALLACE. I called attention the other night to the fact that when a voter in Ontario changes residence from one electoral district to another, he loses his right to vote. Will the hon. gentleman tell us that he is going to continue that injustice? He should provide either that the voter shall remain on the list of his former residence or be put on the list where he becomes a resident. At present every elector who changes his residence from one electoral district to another is, during a large portion of the year, disfranchised.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. My hon. friend will see that it is out of the question for us to pretend to accept the local provincial franchises as the basis of our Act if we are going to interfere with them. The franchise of Ontario is substantially residential manhood suffrage. It therefore would be out of the question for us to attempt to interfere with that law by eliminating the element of residence.

Mr. MONTAGUE. My hon. friend will see that there is a difference between the making of a law and remedying a lapsus in a law which we accept. He need not interfere with the law of Ontario as regards the question of residence. But the point I refer to is with regard to a man who has been put on the voters' list in one municipality and afterwards moves into an adjoining municipality, which happens to be in another riding. I have in my mind an instance of a man in the section of country from which I come, who is the owner of 600 or 700 acres of land, and in every way qualified, but who happened to move to a neighbouring municipality and a different riding. Consequently, although his name was on the list of the county of Haldimand, and he had fulfilled all the conditions as regards that constituency, when he moved into a neighbouring constituency he became disfranchised altogether. That was the point to which I wished to refer, and it would not be very difficult for the Solicitor General to make a provision which would enable a man to vote in a constituency from which he had moved.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. That is a matter of such considerable importance that I could not, off-hand, accept the suggestion. I understand my hon. friend (Mr. Montague) to say that in Ontario, to have one's name put on the list residence is necessary, and a man may have qualified by way of residence so as to get on the list, but when he comes to vote he is met with an oath under which he is disqualified.

Mr. MONTAGUE. He must swear that he is a resident of the electoral division.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. That is a point I cannot deal with now. I would suggest to my hon. friend that he should allow this section to pass, as it does not affect his case, but it is designed exclusively to meet the case in New Brunswick that I spoke of. But I think the matter is of such importance that I am prepared to do this: Let my hon. friend give notice of his intention to move this amendment at a later stage—and I would draw his attention to the fact that this proposal of his applies

simply to the oath, which need not be considered for a time—and that will give me time to consult with those I have to consult with before I can accept amendments of such importance.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I think that the suggestion of the hon. Solicitor General is a good one, and I am glad to say that he has evidenced a fair spirit in regard to the matter. I have no doubt that what he desires is what we desire—that those who are on the list shall have an opportunity to vote. I will bring the matter up at a future time.

Mr. INGRAM. Hon. gentlemen lay great stress on the fact that a man may own five or six hundred acres of land, and because he moves from one constituency to another, he loses the right to vote. That would be important if we had a property qualification. But in Ontario we have abandoned that principle, and have in effect declared that because a man has five or six hundred acres of land that is no reason why he should be given a vote. Under our Manhood Franchise Act a man is given a vote because he has been a resident for a certain length of time, is 21 years of age, and a British subject. Whether right or wrong, that is the rule, and it will apply to a man who has no property just the same as a man who has.

Mr. MONTAGUE. So it will.

Mr. INGRAM. But it is proposed to introduce a clause which would entitle a man, even though he has moved away from the constituency, to vote in where his name is on the list. Now, there is no law on the statute-books but there are some hardships in connection with it. And if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Montague) is speaking from a party standpoint, I can only say that the rule affects equally Conservatives and Reformers. So far as I am concerned, I say quite frankly that I am glad that non-residents have not the opportunity to vote under the provincial law. I think that this feature of the provincial law is a step in the right direction. We have been accused in days gone by, of bringing voters from the United States to Canada. That fact has been a bar to many a man becoming a candidate in the Dominion elections. I am ready to support the proposal to do away with a non-resident vote, as it will do away with difficulties with regard to protests, and so on, and make it easier to bring out the best men as candidates.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Ingram) misconstrues what I say with regard to the non-resident vote. I was not contending that property qualification gave a man any advantage under the law of Ontario, or that a non-resident of the riding should be put upon the list. I take it that the design of the present law of Ontario is to provide that every man in the province who fulfils the requirements of the law shall have a vote, but my contention was that where he has fulfilled these requirements and secured a place on the list he should not be disqualified, after the list has been perfected, by reason of the fact that he has moved to another part of the province. Under the present law of the province of Ontario, a man who thus removes would have no right to exercise any influence by vote in the affairs of the province.

Mr. INGRAM. It becomes a question of distance, then. If a man moved from one township to the next, that neighbouring township being in a different constituency, I can understand that there would be little disadvantage in allowing him to vote. But suppose a man living in one of the constituencies of Essex, after his name had been placed on the list, removes to the county of Prescott—would not the giving to him of the right to vote introduce the very system that has been so much complained of, that of bringing outside voters into the district? In order to clear ourselves of that altogether, I am in favour of the resident vote.

Mr. WALLACE. Why not have that man vote in the county of Prescott?

Mr. INGRAM. I am satisfied with that.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The suggestion of my hon. friend from West York (Mr. Wallace) would be acceptable to me—that a man should have a vote in the county in which he lives.

Mr. McHUGH. I think that the provincial law of Ontario provides for the case that has been brought before the committee. If a man moves from one municipality into another at any time before the final court of revision is held by the judge—he can apply there and have his name put on the list. His name would thus appear on the list in two ridings, but he would vote in the one in which he resided.

Mr. MONTAGUE. If my hon. friend (Mr. McHugh) will permit me, he misconstrues the question I have suggested. He is dealing with the question of getting the name upon the list, but I dealt with the question of the citizen's right to vote after his name was put on the list, when he has removed to another constituency.

Mr. McHUGH. But if he has moved into another riding before the close of a final revision court, he can get his name on the list and he has the right to vote, and under the statue of Ontario, he can select the oath he is to take.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. member for South Victoria (Mr. McHugh) assumes that a man changes his place of residence before the list is finally revised and says he can then appeal to have his name put on the list. That is quite true. But that list is revised in the month of September, and notice will have to be given in the month of August. The list thus revised is the

only list that can be used in an election until the next October or November, or, probably December. If a man changes his residence after the list is revised and an election comes on any time within about a year, he is not allowed to vote. That is the very difficulty we complain of, and it is not met by the suggestion of the hon. member for South Victoria.

Subsection "f" agreed to.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I wish to say now to my hon. friend from East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) that I accept his amendment, except that instead of using the word "designate," I would use the word "indicate," which is the word used in the Election Act. It would then read :

And the returning officer shall in all cases indicate such polling places and polling stations in the election proclamation.

Amendment agreed to.

On section 6,

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I want to substitute 6 for 12, I do not think 6 is well placed in the Bill. I want to introduce here my clause providing for the disqualified voters. I think my hon. friends will have copies of the amendment that I now intend to introduce, and which provides for the qualification of all disqualified voters under the provincial election law. It reads in this way :

6. No person possessed of the qualifications generally required by the provincial law to entitle him to vote at a provincial election shall be disqualified from voting at a Dominion election merely by reason of any provision of the provincial law disqualifying from having his name on the list or from voting—

(i) the holder of any office, or

(ii) any person employed or having been employed or in receipt of wages or emolument in any capacity in the public service of Canada, or of the province, or

(iii) any person belonging to or engaged in any profession, calling, employment or occupation, or

(iv) any one belonging to any other class of persons who, although possessed of the qualifications generally required by the provincial law, are by such law declared to be disqualified by reason of their belonging to such class. (Bill of 1894, cl. 4, sub-cl. 3.)

We must provide in some way for those persons not on the election list, because they are disqualified as above stated, should be able to vote, and here is the way I provide for them :

2. Any person possessed of the qualifications so generally required except that his name has been omitted from the list of voters, may, nevertheless, if not otherwise disqualified, vote at a Dominion election at the place where, but for such omission, he would have been entitled to vote under the first subsection of section 5, on his taking, or offering to take, before the deputy returning officer, or other officer or person in charge of the polling place, the following oath :—

"I, (A. B.), do swear that I am legally qualified to vote at this election (giving then the reasons), and that I verily believe that my name was omitted from the list of voters by reason of my being at the time such list was prepared.... .....and for no other reason." (45 Vic., chap. 3, sec. 5, subsec. 2.)

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The statement that he is "legally qualified." is that absolute ? Does he state that he is legally qualified, or that he is qualified as a matter of fact ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. He states that he is legally qualified. We are making a very exceptional provision here, and we have to be careful to provide against fraud. I have taken this affidavit from the statute of 1882. I do not think it is likely to lead to fraud, but there is a possibility of it, and I have endeavoured as far as possible to protect ourselves against that.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Who are disqualified now ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I would have to read over the franchises of all the provinces.

Mr. MONTAGUE. After this goes into effect ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. That is provided for in the next paragraph :

3. Nothing in this Act shall be deemed to repeal, or to affect otherwise than is provided by section 16 of this Act, the provisions of section 42 of the Dominion Elections Act as that section has been heretofore amended,——

That is to say, we are allowing the old Dominion law as to disqualifications to remain. I have to add something, however :

——or to repeal or affect the provisions of sections 96, 98 or 99 of said last mentioned Act, or of section 15 of chapter 14 of the Statutes of 1894, intituled "An Act to disfranchise voters who have taken bribes."

Now, here is my provision :

And provided that any person who at the time of an election is a prisoner in a jail or prison undergoing punishment for a criminal offence, or is a patient in a lunatic asylum, or is maintained in whole or in part as an inmate receiving charitable support or care in a municipal poor-house or house of industry, or is an inmate receiving charitable support or care in a charitable institution receiving aid from the government of the province under any statute in that behalf, shall be disqualified and incompetent to vote at an election.

Mr. QUINN. I would ask my hon. friend the Solicitor General if subsections 3 and 4 of the amendment are intended to cover the cases mentioned in section fourteen of the Quebec Election Act ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes, I did that on the suggestion of my hon. friend.

Mr. QUINN. Section 14 is very broad, and as subsections 3 and 4 do not go into particulars, I think it would be well to have an expression of opinion from the Solicitor Gen-

eral that the intention of the legislature is that they should cover all these cases.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I quite agree with the Solicitor General that we should hedge around the privilege which he has given of getting on to those who are left off the list, with every possible safeguard. But it appears to me that that oath as read by the Solicitor General, "I do swear that I am legally qualified to vote at this election," will be a very difficult oath for those to take who are not thoroughly acquainted with the law. You will find many persons who are very conscientious on the question, and who, while believing thoroughly that they have a right to be placed on the list, will not go up and take that straight, bald oath that they are qualified. There may be a doubt in their minds, they believe they have a right, and still the doubt might overbalance the belief. I think the Solicitor General will agree with me that there are many who will hesitate, notwithstanding their strong belief that they have a right to be on, to go and make that oath that they are qualified.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I admit that there is something in the criticism of the hon. gentleman, but bear in mind that this oath is to be administered to a special class of persons, to a class of persons, if I may be permitted to say so, of a rather high order of intellect, a class of persons above the ordinary level. This is intended to apply to persons who are disqualified under the provincial laws, therefore it is intended to be used by men who are able to appreciate the oath that they are going to take, who know something of their qualifications, or who are presumed to know something of the qualifications that they must possess to enable them to vote. I think there is some justification for the use of the word, for the reason I have just stated.

Mr. McDOUGALL. In regard to the class of men referred to by the Solicitor General, I might tell the hon. gentleman that some people would come under the disqualification clause in the Nova Scotia Act who were unable to read the Act or write their own names. How are they to know whether they are legally entitled to vote or not? They may believe they have the right to be qualified to vote, but they cannot swear they are legally entitled.

Mr. MONK. It seems to me this clause may lead to a great deal of abuse, at all events in the province of Quebec. I notice that the amendment of my hon. friend does not seem to bind the voter to take the oath which he is bound to take under the provincial law. We have under that law a very severe oath. The applicant is asked eight or ten questions, if necessary, before he is permitted to vote. Will this class of voters have a right to vote without being asked those questions; will they be submitted only to the form of this oath; or will they in addition have to answer the questions under the oath which every other voter may have to answer? That is not provided for by this amendment. It was stated that this oath is an addition to the other oath which they would be bound to take under the provincial law. There is something more. The section says, after designating the persons:

> Any person possessed of the qualifications, as generally required, except that his name has been omitted from the list of voters, may, nevertheless, if not otherwise disqualified, vote at Dominion elections.

Is not that section so worded broad enough to give any person whose name has been omitted from the lists the right to vote on taking this oath by merely stating that his name has been omitted from the lists; and if that is the case, and it is the only interpretation I can give to the section, it leaves the door open to the greatest abuses; and, speaking for the province of Quebec, I can sympathize with hon. gentlemen from other provinces where there is no appeal to a judge, because in Quebec after the municipal officer has prepared the list and it has been examined with some formality by the municipal council, there is the right of appeal to a judge, and that is a safeguard which, under no circumstances, we would be prepared to dispense with. Here is a class of men who will claim, because of the mere fact that their names are not on the lists, the right to come into the polling booth and vote. I think the special class for whom by this enactment we are legislating, should claim the right to vote before polling day. There should be some machinery provided by which, on nomination day, they could claim the right to vote, and that claim might be investigated, because otherwise a large number of people will claim the right to vote without any opportunity being afforded to ascertain whether that right really exists. The other day when the Solicitor General had read the proposed section I asked him very politely to read it again. At that time he declined to do so. I understand now why he did not read it again, because it seems to me he will have to get a little nearer the blarney stone before he will be able to pass it.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I thought I would do better than read it again, and I put in type.

Mr. MONK. I refer to the hon. gentleman's statement yesterday.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I quite appreciate the second reference to that matter.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I thought this section referred only to people who were disqualified.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. When once qualified by tendering the oath, a man is in the same position as a voter on the list, and is subject to all oaths.

Mr. QUINN. I would suggest the insertion of the words "any such person." This would

make the subsection refer particularly to those qualified by section 1. I think the intention of the Solicitor General is that subsection 2 should only apply to those qualified under subsections 1, 2, 3 and 4.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Quite so.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Would not the purpose intended be met by filling up the blanks left by the draughtsman ?

Mr. MILLS. I refer the Solicitor General to the oath which he has followed in framing his amendment, and I wish to point out that it goes further than the oath embodied in the amendment. The oath in the Act of 1872 sets out the qualifications, and reads as follows :—

I, (A. B.), do swear that I am legally qualified to vote at this election, and I verily believe that my name was omitted from the list of electors by reason of my being an employee of the Dominion Government on the Intercolonial Railway at the time such list was last perfected, and for no other reason.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am unable to understand the necessity for all these different clauses. Why could we not simply say that every person who was not disqualified is entitled to vote. There is no connection between this sub-clause and the main section. What struck me was that if we are simply allowing the qualification to stand, we might provide in one section that every person qualified under the provincial law and not disqualified by our own law shall be entitled to vote.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The Solicitor General wants to remove some of the provincial disqualifications.

Mr. McCARTHY. My proposition would remove all the disqualifications.

Mr. RUSSELL. The suggestion made by the learned gentleman (Mr. McCarthy) will, so far as the province of Nova Scotia is concerned, still leave the disqualification of the Dominion officials.

Mr. McCARTHY. Why ?

Mr. RUSSELL. Because they are disqualified by the provincial law.

Mr. McCARTHY. The hon. gentleman did not understand me. My point is that every person who has the necessary qualification under the provincial law and is not disqualified under our law shall be entitled to vote.

Mr. RUSSELL. Then, these persons are disqualified by the provincial law.

Mr. McCARTHY. We remove that disqualification by putting it in the negative.

Mr. RUSSELL. The amendment of the hon. gentleman (Mr. McCarthy) would not remove it.

Mr. QUINN. I quite agree with the section as it is proposed by the Solicitor General. There must be one clause removing the disqualification under the provincial statute, and then there must be machinery for the purpose of affording to the person whose disqualification has been removed the right to vote. Under sections 13 and 14 of the Quebec statute, certain persons are disqualified, and I do not think the suggestion of the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) would carry out our idea as fully as the amendment proposed by the Solicitor General. I, however, object to that portion of the amendment which provides machinery to permit these people to vote, because we are opening the door to the admission of a large number of persons who do not come under section 1, and who are disqualified for other reasons. We have machinery provided in the province of Quebec whereby an appeal lies to a judge under section 46 of the Quebec Act. That compels a person whose name has been stricken off by the authorities to appeal within fifteen days. But under this section of our Bill, after his appeal had been dismissed he would have the right to come to the polling booth and under section 6, he would simply be obliged to swear that he was legally qualified to entitle him to vote. Under this form of affidavit, he is not bound to swear to any particular reason why his name was not on the list, and so the amendment would not apply.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I am afraid there has been some omission in those printed amendments which have been sent around, as is evident from the discussion. I would ask hon. gentlemen to follow the amendment, as I have it here, and see if it agrees with theirs. It says :

Any person possessed of the qualifications so generally required,——

That is the qualification on the provincial list.

——except that his name has been omitted on the list of voters by reason or on account of some such disqualifying provisions,——

Mr. QUINN. Those words are not in the amendment before us.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. There is where the whole trouble comes in.

——may nevertheless, if not otherwise disqualified, vote at a Dominion election.

Some hon. MEMBERS. That covers it.

Mr. McCARTHY. What is the object of that long section 6 ? Why not make it this way :

Any person not disqualified under the provisions hereinafter contained, possessed of the qualifications generally required by the provincial law, except that his name has been omitted from the list of voters, may nevertheless vote, &c.

Mr. MILLS. But some persons who are qualified to vote are left off the list by law.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is what I am providing for. If he is on the list there is no necessity for any provision and he may come up and vote. As the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) pointed out the other night, his name may be struck from the list because he is an officer. If you take section 5 and this together, you get the whole thing complete.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. We reach the same conclusion as my hon. friend by adopting the words I suggest. But I am willing, if this clause goes through, that the matter should be considered on the third reading. It may be considered that I am a little slavish in following the Bill of 1894; but this provision, which is taken from it, I think meets the case:

No person possessed of the qualifications generally required by the provincial law to entitle him to vote at a provincial election shall be disqualified from voting at a Dominion election merely by reason of any provision of the provincial law disqualifying from having his name on the list or from voting, the holding of any office——

I think you will find that this is sufficiently ample to cover all the provincial disqualifications.

Mr. HAGGART. The Solicitor General the other evening spoke of making a provision for tendered ballots in the province of Ontario.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I do not think I said that. I did not mean to say it. I do not think the system of tendered ballots is ideal.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Under this clause one of these disqualified persons may ask to take the oath, and insist upon voting simply by having taken this oath. Of course, it is the intention of the Solicitor General to compel him, if required, to take the ordinary oath required of any person; but you will find that the scrutineers at the polling booth will contend that under this Act it is sufficient if he takes this oath.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I will undertake to make that clear.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. In the second paragraph of subsection 3, I read that "any inmate receiving charitable support or care in a charitable institution receiving aid from the government of the province" shall be disqualified. I think that the words "other than a hospital" should be added, because hospitals are charitable institutions which receive aid from the local authorities. We have hospitals in our province which are considered charitable institutions and receive aid from the local authorities, and I think that the words "other than hospitals" might be inserted very properly.

Mr. McCARTHY.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The remedy or the difficulty suggested by my hon. friend would be to eliminate the words "or care." I am willing to accept this suggestion and strike out these words.

Mr. McCARTHY. Why not make it read "or as an inmate receiving charitable support in an institution receiving aid from the Government?"

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I think the suggestion a good one, and I move that the clause be amended so as to make that particular phrase in the section read "receiving charitable support in an institution receiving aid from the government of the province." The clause will then read:

And provided that any person who, at the time of an election, is a prisoner in a jail or prison, undergoing punishment for a criminal offence, or is a patient in a lunatic asylum, or is maintained in whole or in part as an inmate receiving charitable support or care in a municipal poor-house or house of industry, or is an inmate receiving charitable support in an institution receiving aid from the government of the province under any statute in that behalf, shall be disqualified and incompetent to vote at an election.

Mr. POWELL. How does the hon. gentleman propose to work this out? Will it not require an additional oath? An elector who is disqualified appears before a deputy returning officer or poll clerk and objection is taken to his vote, what particular form of oath will be put to him to cover this?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The first thing the clerk has to do is to tender the oath mentioned in this amendment.

Mr. POWELL. I am not referring to the first part, but to subsection 3, dealing with the poor-house man and the man whom a favourable change brings out of jail.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. My hon. friend will find that before we get through with this Act, we shall have to deal with a series of oaths of a most complicated character.

Mr. POWELL. Suppose a man is an inmate of an asylum, an objection is taken to his vote, you must have it made known in some way or other to the deputy returning officer.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. There is an oath in the Ontario Act which meets the case exactly.

Mr. POWELL. There is no oath in the maritime provinces which meets any such case.

Mr. MONTAGUE. What is the total number of votes?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. We will deal with that when we come to section 18.

Mr. BENNETT. I would point out to the Solicitor General that he does not provide

for certain cases to be found in Ontario. There is not a poor-house in every county, but there are usually a number of people supported by the municipalities. If he is going to deprive a man of a vote because he is an inmate of a poor-house, why not do the same in the case of a man who is dependent upon the corporation ?

Mr. POWELL. The point raised by the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) is well taken as far as the maritime provinces are concerned. I may say to the Solicitor General that in the maritime provinces a poor-house or house of industry is a very rare thing indeed. I do not think that, outside of the cities of St. John, Moncton and Fredericton, there is one in the whole province of New Brunswick. I would suggest that the word "pauper" should be used.

Section 6, as amended, agreed to.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Now I wish to introduce the New Brunswick amendment for congested districts. It is as follows :

Where a polling subdivision has more than 300 qualified voters, according to the voters' list, the returning officer shall provide separate and additional polling stations or rooms, according to the total number of qualified voters on the voters' list, near to one another for the polling of the votes in such polling division, and so that no more than 300, nor when practicable not less than 200, qualified voters' names shall be on the list for each polling station or room.

(2) The returning officer in such cases shall prepare, or cause to be prepared from the voters' list for the polling division a separate list for each polling station or room, made up in alphabetical order according to the initial letter of the surname of each voter. Each separate polling station or room shall be designated with the initial letters of the voters on the lists who are to vote in such station or room in the following manner, that is to say : from A to K, and from L to R, and from S to Z, or as the case may be.

(3) Every voter, the initial letter of whose name shall be included within the letters of the alphabet designating a polling station or room, and contained in such list shall vote in the station or room so designated. The returning officer shall appoint a deputy returning officer for each such station or room, and shall deliver to such deputy in due time a list certified by him to be a correct list of all voters on the voters' list whose surnames commence with the letters of the alphabet included within the letters by which such polling stations or rooms are designated.

Mr. POWELL. Did I understand correctly that there must be in a section not more than 350, and that a division must be made if there are more than 250 ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The first proposal was that it should be 250, but at the suggestion of the hon. gentleman, I made it 300. According to the provincial law the maximum number of voters allowed for one ballot box, so to say, is 400.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Do I understand that for every 300 voters there will be a polling division ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. We are adopting, I may explain, the polling subdivisions as they are in the provinces. Now, under the law of New Brunswick, it might happen that a polling division would contain 700 or 800 or even 900 voters. It would be, naturally, impossible for any such number of voters to poll their votes in one day. Therefore, we provide that where, in any polling subdivision, there are more than 300 voters, the returning officer shall divide the list of voters and shall provide a different polling station. That is as I have said, different ballot boxes, say in the same house or in houses close to one another. For each ballot box there will be not more than 300 voters, and the voters in the polling division will be divided into groups according to an alphabetical division of the list.

Mr. FOSTER. But the rooms or stations must be close together ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes, that is provided.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). The object in placing the polling rooms or stations close together is that a voter may not be misled as to where to go in order to poll his vote. In a country district, a man might drive a long distance, only to find that his name was, in point of fact, upon the list of another, and possibly distant station. If the stations are close together, it will be immaterial even though he goes to the wrong station, as he can reach the right one with very little inconvenience. Now, I wish to say a word or two with regard to a little matter of difference that arose between my hon. friend from Kent (Mr. McInerney) and myself the other day. The hon. gentleman recurred to the subject two or three times, and did so with a good deal of zest, and a good deal of satisfaction because he thought I had fallen into error. I was much, I may say disappointed, surprised, that my hon. friend should have felt as he evidently did—so much pleased to think that he had caught me in an error. He referred to it, I think, if my memory serves me, no less than two or three times, and he drew the inference that because I was in error in one particular, as he assumed, I must necessarily be in error in another. I am sorry to have a matter of personal difference with my hon. friend ; I would have been better pleased if he had followed the ordinary method of treating matters of this kind. I should not have thought it necessary to bring it up again if he had not seemed to attach such an immense amount of importance to the error which he attributed to me. The committee may remember my statement that I had a very clear recollection of having on one occasion accompanied a friend to a polling booth in a Dominion fight. I thought it was in St. John, and this friend, though living close neighbour to me, had found that

he could not vote in that polling booth but he had to vote in another, the next polling station. In stating that, I was speaking from my own recollection at the moment, and I made the statement because it seemed to confirm an observation which was made by my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries as to what the law was then with regard to elections. I am free to confess that so far as my statement of the particular place where the incident occurred, is concerned, I was in error. In thinking it over afterwards I recollected that it could not have been in St. John, because the only Dominion election at which I ever voted in St. John was the last Dominion election. But I did recollect that it was in the city of Fredericton, and for the purpose of satisfying my own mind on the subject, I telegraphed the sheriff of York county to ascertain whether there had been an alphabetical division of the voters' list in Fredericton in a Dominion contest, and I have his reply in my hands. It will be remembered that my hon. friend, at the same time, was particularly confident that the law which was passed in the provincial legislature in 1891 providing for an alphabetical subdivision of the voters' list, had never been in operation in that province; so at the same time I inquired of the sheriff as to whether it was a fact that the Act of 1891 had been acted upon, and whether an alphabetical subdivision of the voters' list had occurred anywhere in his county. The sheriff of York county replied to me in these terms:

> The only alphabetical divisions in local elections, ninety-two and ninety-five, were in the two Fredericton districts,——

So that there was, according to his statement, an alphabetical division of the voters' list in the two elections of 1882 and 1895 for the local.

> ——each of which were divided into two lists in Dominion election, ninety-one.

Now that is the statement of the returning officer who had in his charge, and under his direction, the elections, both federal and provincial, for the years which I stated, 1892, 1895 and 1891 respectively. I presume that his knowledge upon the subject would be of some value, and I give it to the committee. I am sure my hon. friend will see at once that he was wrong in assuming that I was in error because he thought that the law did not authorize such an alphabetical subdivision of the list in Dominion elections. He will find that even though the law might not have authorized it, as a matter of fact—and that is the only statement that I was positive about—there was such an alphabetical subdivision of the list in the Dominion election for 1891, as I thought, according to my recollection, there really was. Now in the same connection I telegraphed to the sheriff of the county of Westmoreland to know whether there had been any alphabetical subdivision of the local lists in that county, and I received the following reply from the sheriff of Westmoreland.

Mr. POWELL. I told the hon. gentleman about that two or three weeks ago.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I said the hon. gentleman for Westmoreland (Mr. Powell) was not present in the committee at the time, or I should have appealed to him, and I so stated. I was quite sure that my hon. friend from Westmoreland would corroborate what I said if he had been present, because there must have been an alphabetical subdivision of the local lists in the year subsequent to 1891. My hon. friend from Kent will understand that I do not wish to attribute to him any intention of stating what he really did not believe. But he was in error, and I think my hon. friend will be hereafter a little less positive and confident in statements which he makes in direct contradiction to statements made by other members of the House who are positive in regard to them. Sheriff McQueen telegraphs me:

> 1892, districts number 8 and 9, Moncton, subdivided alphabetically.

I do not know that I quite understand what he says next in his despatch:

> There was an additional polling district constituted by legislature 1895, Sackville number 16 should be subdivided.

The hon. member for Westmoreland will know whether that was subdivided or not. Now, so far as the question of law is concerned, I would like to call the attention of the hon. member for Kent (Mr. McInerney) to an Act which passed this Parliament in 1891, and he will find on reading the sixth section of that Act, these words:

> In cities and incorporated towns it shall not be necessary to subdivide polling districts or sections thereof by reason of the number of names of voters in such districts or sections exceeding 300, but in every such case the returning officer for the electoral district including such cities or towns shall make an alphabetical division of such names of voters, so that the number in each division may be as nearly as practicable the same, and may establish two polling booths in such districts or sections, and where the number exceeds 600, three polling booths, and so on in the same proportion.

That Act passed in 1891, on the 31st of July. I am not speaking from personal knowledge or from any recollection of the matter, and I may say that I had no particular interest or duty in making myself familiar with the provisions of the Dominion Elections Act, as I had with the local Act, and therefore I am not speaking from any careful examination of the Act, or knowledge of its general provisions. But I do remember the circumstances which I stated to my hon. friend, and I have no doubt that the law, the sheriffs have interpreted the law as the sheriff of York county

interpreted it, as entitling them to subdivide the districts alphabetically. At all events, as I have shown, the sheriff of York did so in this particular instance.

Mr. McINERNEY. If the Minister of Railways and Canals had simply risen for the purpose of setting himself right, I am sure nobody would be more inclined than myself to forgive him for taking the floor this afternoon. I always like to see an hon. gentleman endeavour to set himself right. But when the Minister of Railways and Canals departed from the endeavour to set himself right, to read me a lecture on my duties in this House and on my conduct in the future, I think he adopted a role that does not sit at all agreeably upon the hon. gentleman. I decline to take from the hon. gentleman any lesson as to what my conduct shall be in this House. I have called the attention of this House to the fact that the hon. gentleman is liable to forget. It was said of Charles I., the martyred King of England, when on the scaffold at Whitehall, that the one word he wished the people to recall after his death was "Remember." It may be said of the Minister of Railways that the one word which he will wish recalled after his death will be "Forget." The hon. gentleman has done very much that it would be convenient for the people to forget, and therefore I think he may be considered as occupying in this matter a position in contradiction to the martyred King of England. I have stated that the hon. gentleman has forgotten several things, and the hon. gentleman himself has admitted that he has forgotten several things. The hon. gentleman rose in this House, hon. members will remember the occasion perfectly, to corroborate a statement made by the Minister of Marine and a statement made by the member for St. John (Mr. Ellis). The hon. member for St. John is manly enough to admit that he himself was mistaken when he made that statement, but the Minister of Railways tries to get out by stating that the voting which he said took place in St. John did not take place there at all, but it happened in the city of Fredericton. The House will remember that hon. gentleman did not state that he voted at Fredericton under the action of the sheriff.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS. I might have stated so.

Mr. McINERNEY. The hon. gentleman did not state it. He may now endeavour to fill up the syncopy. I stated that under the law in the Statute-book in New Brunswick no sheriff or returning officer or revising officer has the power of cutting up the lists of voters in an electoral division or subdivision, and I adhere to that statement as strongly as I ever adhered to any statement in my life, because it is true and is the law. The hon. gentleman does not dispose of that statement by reading the Act of 1891. I knew the Act of 1891 was passed as well as the Act of 1897 in New Brunswick, but the hon. gentleman had no knowledge of the latter Act until it was pointed out to him the other day. The Solicitor General had no knowledge of its existence, and the Minister of Railways had no knowledge of it until it was pointed out the other evening. I could have entrapped the Minister of Railways on that occasion. I knew perfectly well from what he said in reply to the leader of the Opposition that he had no knowledge of the Act. I could have entrapped him by asking him regarding it, and afterwards producing the Act. I did not do so, for I do not believe in any such Cheap Jack trickery. I simply wished to call attention to the Act of 1897, I read the Act, and I did not take it for granted that the hon. Minister did not know it was on the Statute-book. But the Act of 1891, which gives power to the revising officer to divide the list, does not give him power to cut it alphabetically into three or four pieces. What is an alphabetical division? An alphabetical division is one according to the alphabet, from the first to its last letter. The local Act in New Brunswick in 1891 gave no sheriff the power to cut up the alphabet into pieces as regards the local elections. What does it say?

When the number of voters on the lists in any one subdistrict exceeds 400, it shall be lawful——

It is not absolutely necessary.

——to provide two booths for such subdistrict, dividing the registered lists alphabetically.

I claim under this clause the division is made in this way. The sheriff takes a certain number of names from A to Z and puts them at one poll and the balance at another poll. You can divide the list in that way but you cannot cut the alphabet in pieces so that A to M may be at one poll and M to Z at another poll.

Mr. ELLIS. The hon. gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. McINERNEY. I do not say that such was never done in New Brunswick, but, if done there, it was done against the law. The Act does not permit, when it speaks of an alphabetical division, that there should be a division, taking certain names from A to M, that is not dividing the list up alphabetically. An alphabetical division is not a division of the alphabet.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS. Do you think you can get any other lawyer in the House to take your view?

Mr. McINERNEY. Yes, and I think the hon. gentleman is the only member who would be prepared to maintain the proposition he put forward. I stated, in answer to the hon. gentleman, that in the county of Kent and in other counties there was no such division made by the officer under the

local Act of 1891. I claim that is true. The hon. gentleman's Act of 1891 does not force the returning officer to divide up his district ; it only makes him able to do so. The Act is not mandatory but is simply enabling ; it leaves the power to have all the votes in one district polled at one place, or divide the list into several districts. The Solicitor General in his amendment makes it perfectly clear what his meaning is, because he states distinctly that the names shall be divided from A to K, and so on. But if he had stopped, as did the Minister of Railways when Attorney General of New Brunswick in the Act of 1891, and said there should be an alphabetical division, he would have left it in doubt as to what was intended by an alphabetical division ; and to my mind an alphabetical division is a division of the whole alphabet from A to Z.

Mr. ELLIS. The hon. gentleman can see that would have no value, because under that system a man with the name of B would have to find out at which of the two booths he could poll his vote, whereas there would be no such necessity if the list was arranged from A to K.

Mr. McINERNEY. The two polls would be side by side ; they would probably be in the same building. A gentleman whose name began with M would come up to poll and it would be very easy to find out where he could vote. A division could be made in that way as well as in the other way ; so my hon. friend's question of fact falls to the ground. This is really a question of the construction of language, as to what an alphabetical division means. An alphabetical division means a division from A to Z in the alphabet, and a division of the alphabet means something else. An alphabetical division means the whole division of the alphabet from A to Z. I think that contention will be supported by the lawyers of the House, and therefore I maintain that any local officer in New Brunswick under the Act of 1891 who divided up the polls in the manner stated as a fact by the Minister of Railways divided it up contrary to the law. I do not know that it is necessary for me to say anything more. I had no great pleasure, and I state this sincerely, in seeing the Minister from my own province make mistakes. It is not a pleasurable sight to see the Minister from my own province make mistakes and be ignorant of the laws of the province whence he comes. It is rather a sad sight to me, and I suppose that in the future my conduct is to be determined by the lessons and lectures I am to receive from the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair), and that while that would indeed be a sad ordeal for me to undergo, I will be subjected in the future as I have been in the past, to the still sadder ordeal of seeing the great and mighty Minister from my own province fall into these errors which he is only too anxious that the House should forget.

Mr. FOSTER. I wish to be sure from the Solicitor General that under this amendment the polling booths or stations shall be all near together. The amendment seems to be that the additional stations shall be together, but it does not say that the additional stations shall be close to the original ones. Perhaps the Minister of Railways could answer that, as he drafted the provision.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They must be all together. The hon. member (Mr. Foster) seems to get his doubt by carrying in his mind the idea that there was an original poll booth. There is not.

Mr. FOSTER. That makes it all right.

Mr. McINERNEY. It is necessary, I think, that the returning officer should state in his proclamation where these particular polls are at which the alphabetical names are to vote. Some such amendment as that moved by the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) to a previous clause might be introduced here, or that amendment might cover both cases.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I will see if we cannot adopt some scheme to carry out the suggestion of my hon. friend (Mr. McInerney).

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Will the hon. gentleman inform me what office this particular amendment has to perform in view of the Dominion Act of 1891 ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The Dominion Act of 1891 would not be applicable under the existing circumstances. Under the local Act there may be as many as 400 voters on the list in a poll.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Under chapter 18 of the Dominion Act of 1891, which has been acted on in the city of Halifax, there is a provision for subdivision of polling districts where the number of voters exceed 300.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. It is limited to cities and towns.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Yes, but if you are going to deal with it here, why not strike it out of the Act of 1891, or deal with it altogether by an amendment to the Dominion Elections Act. Why should we have two sections, both of which cover to some extent the same ground ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Do I understand the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden) to say that the Act of 1891 was acted on in Halifax, and that the lists were subdivided alphabetically ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That is my recollection.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is to say, that the lists were made up from A to Z.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not know about that. I do not know as to the point in issue between my hon. friend (Mr. Blair) and my hon. friend (Mr. McInerney). I do say that this statute makes provision for the subdivision of polling districts in cities and corporated towns where the number of names of voters in such districts exceeds 300.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). What Act does the hon. gentleman refer to ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The Federal Franchise Act of 1891.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. But that Act is repealed or will be repealed when this Bill becomes law.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). In that case, of course, it is all right.

Mr. INGRAM. I understood the Solicitor General to say that he calculated that under this Bill the municipal divisions as passed by the municipal councils would be adhered to. Now, this Bill provides that where polling divisions have more than 300 votes they shall be subdivided alphabetically and I would ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fitzpatrick) how he is going to determine the number of votes in these subdivisions that are divided by the municipal councils and which he intends to adhere to. I understand that the hon. gentleman is so framing this law that the returning officer will state in his proclamation what the polling subdivisions will be and where the polling booths would be located.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The polling divisions are arranged to be stated in the proclamation. I am asked to amend this section so that the amendment of my hon. friend from East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) will apply to the subdivision. The intention is to put all the polling stations in a subdivision together. This does not refer to a polling division or subdivision at all.

Mr. INGRAM. In the administration of the provincial Act the returning officer and the board of registrars in cities and towns declare shortly after they are appointed how the city is divided into polling subdivisions. The returning officer declines to give information as to where the polling booths will be situated, until the day of nomination. I desire to avoid that state of affairs, for the reason that we Conservatives believe that our opponents, who are in power and have the inside information, will give their friends the tip beforehand as to where the polling booths will be situated.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. They are all in the proclamation. The election law provides that.

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. gentleman has not considered the law of the province of Ontario, or he would not give that answer. In the cities and towns of Ontario the board of registrars meet, those who wish to have their names put on the registered list make their application, and after the appeals are settled, the registrars are in a position to complete the list. This list is not complete until a few days before election day, and how are you going to state, in a proclamation issued a month before, where the polling stations will be ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The proclamation refers to the polling division or subdivision, whichever may be the term used in the different provinces. There is but one polling place in any division, but there may be three or four polling stations, but they must be all together. That is the intention of this amendment. For instance, in New Brunswick there may be 900 votes in a polling subdivision, and all the returning officer is to do is to take the electoral list of that polling subdivision, and subdivide it alphabetically.

Mr. INGRAM. When ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. At any time up to the day of election. All the voters come to the same place to vote. They may vote in different boxes, in the same room, or in the same house, or in adjoining houses; but all the polling stations must be together.

Mr. INGRAM. I approve of having them all together, but the hon. gentleman does not see my point.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The hon. gentleman is right ; I made a mistake. So far as Ontario is concerned, the election law of that province has nothing to do with us. The proclamation for the election is a proclamation issued under our election law, and it must state where the polling subdivisions are.

Mr. INGRAM. That is an impossibility, in the province of Ontario, and I will tell the hon. gentleman why. You do not know how many voters there will be until the registration is complete, and the registration is not complete until a day or two before election day. So far as the polling booths are concerned, I am glad to know that the Government intend to have them together. Our cities and towns are divided into wards, and the people are accustomed to voting in those wards, but a great deal of confusion will be avoided by having several polling booths at one place. I would like the proclamation to state the boundary lines of each polling subdivision or ward, the number of stations in it, and at what station each voter is to poll his vote. If that is accomplished, I have no objection to offer ; but so far as I can see, it is not accomplished by the present amendment.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The present amendment is to provide exclusively for a difficulty in New Brunswick.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The point taken by the hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Ingram) is well taken. In the cities and towns, where registration takes place, that begins after the proclamation is issued, and it has the effect in many cases of adding thousands of names to the list. The point taken by my hon. friend from Elgin (Mr. Ingram) is this: How can you determine what shall be the boundaries of your polling subdivisions of a city, which cannot comprise more than a certain number of votes, when you are unable by thousands to know what is the total vote of the city, and the difficulty is that the revision of the lists by these boards of registration takes all the time almost up to the day of polling and men run up to the very verge of polling without knowing where they vote in the city unless some private information is given as regards the intention of the board to make a revision, which private information my hon. friend suggested might be given to the friends of the gentleman who appointed the board and not to the friends of the gentlemen who did not appoint it. It does not refer to this amendment which is suggested by the Solicitor General as to the subdivision of polling subdivision alphabetically, but does refer, and that is a serious matter, as regards Ontario, to those cities where registration is the order of the day, and is not completed in sufficient time to include in the proclamation any information as to the total number of voters, and consequently as to the polling divisions.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). After all is said and done, the Election Act settles the point satisfactorily in the way my hon. friend wants. The proclamation is to be issued by the sheriff within eight days after the reception of the writ by him, and that proclamation shall fix four different things. First, the place and time fixed for the nomination of candidates; second, the day in which the poll for taking the votes of electors is to be held; third, the several polling stations fixed by him in the territorial limits to which they respectively apply.

Mr. MONTAGUE. That is inconsistent with the amendment we are making as to the total vote.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Not at all. He fixes the polling stations in a certain territorial division defined in his proclamation. In New Brunswick the thing works all right. In Ontario, as my hon. friend describes the method, when election day draws near, he finds that within the territorial limit which he has defined in his proclamation, instead of there being 250 there are 500 voters. Then he at once says, now at this polling station which I have fixed, I will have four ballot boxes in four rooms.

Mr. MONTAGUE. And he has to reprint the proclamation in order to give information to the electors.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Not at all. The people are instructed by the proclamation to go to the several places fixed as polling stations. At any polling station, if there are more than 250 voters, the returning officer will place three ballot boxes, and the men vote at separate boxes.

Mr. HAGGART. Is there any provision for that?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That is provided by the very section we are discussing.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The Solicitor General says no.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I did not hear him make any such statement.

Mr. HAGGART. There is no provision in the law to have three ballot boxes in the one poll.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That is just what there is. It says that where there are more than a certain number of electors, it shall be the duty of the returning officer to give one or more polling stations or ballot boxes to enable them to vote.

Mr. POWELL. The hon. gentleman is wrong in this respect. He has not exactly caught the point I made in reply to the hon. Minister of Railways a few weeks ago, and in pursuance of which the Minister of Railways prepared this amendment, for it has come from him. It is not provided that there shall be two or more ballot boxes in the one polling station, but there is a provision for two or more polling stations.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. At or near the place designated in the proclamation—the polling stations may be different rooms in the same house.

Mr. POWELL. The hon. gentleman is not going to get out of the hole quite so easily as that. The Act says:

> When a polling division has more than 300 qualified voters according to the voters' list, the revising officer shall provide separate and additional polling stations.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Each room with a ballot box will be a polling station.

Mr. POWELL. No. Under the Election Act, each polling station must be defined in the proclamation.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Call them polling booths.

Mr. POWELL. Where a statute uses a word it is sterotyped with that meaning, and you cannot go outside of it. The stations have to be named in the proclamation.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. If this were to read polling booth, would it meet your suggestion ?

Mr. MONTAGUE. Why did you not suggest that amendment ?

Mr. POWELL. Whether there is little in the particular point made or not, there is certainly nothing in the explanation by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I understand the difficulty suggested by my hon. friend from Ontario. He says that in the cities and towns the electoral lists are not finally closed till within a day or two of the election.

Mr. INGRAM. If the hon. gentleman will allow me, seven days after the dissolution of the provincial government of Ontario, the registrars are called together for the purpose of registering the voters. There are four days allowed in the city of St. Thomas, four days and two days in other places in which those who wish to register can do so. There is a certain number of days afterwards allowed for bringing their appeals to the Court of Appeal, and on the 17th day of February, in St. Thomas, at all events, the court met to decide those appeals. After the appeals were decided, the election took place on the 1st of March. The hon. gentleman must remember that it takes a great many days to copy these names, and the difficulty the officers find is that the time is too short between the appeal and the election to have the names placed on the list and properly put in the divisions in which they vote. That is the difficulty we complain of under the Registration Act. There is no man in Toronto who understands the divisions in that city sufficiently well to locate those who are registered in their proper subdivision. There is no man who has that knowledge even in a small city say of 10,000 inhabitants. It is for that reason that I object to the Registration Act of Ontario being taken as part of the Dominion franchise. The Act is a crude one, and we have not had sufficient experience of it to so perfect it that this Government can make it a part of our franchise. I call the attention of the Solicitor General to this, because I believe he is just as eager to have a good franchise law that will satisfy all parties as any man in this House, and any suggestion I make is purely with the object of making the Act as simple and workable as possible for all parties concerned. Unless you can have your returning officer, when the proclamation is issued, in a position to tell exactly where the polling subdivisions are, where the polling booths or stations are, you are going to have confusion among the electorate of Ontario at least, and for that reason I want to see the thing properly cleared up now.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. If I understand my hon. friend aright, the polling subdivisions in the city are not defined for a sufficient length of time in advance of the election to enable the voters to know where they should vote ?

Mr. INGRAM. Under the Registration Act, they specify the polling subdivision. That is all right ; but they do not specify where the polling booths or polling stations are to be.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Would my hon. friend (Mr. Ingram) put the suggested amendment as he would like to have it in writing, so that I can see it ?

Mr. INGRAM. I should be happy to do so, but I may explain now what I think will meet the case. I am sorry that I have not the returns of the last provincial election, as with them I could explain the matter better, being able to compare them with the returns for 1894 to show what the increase of the electorate of the province had been. But as a basis take the number of polling booths in the last provincial election, for instance, in the city of Ottawa. In this city in 1894, there were 53 polling subdivisions. The vote polled on that occasion numbered 6,841. Of these polling subdivisions there was only one at which as many as 200 votes were polled, the average being 129 votes. Now, if the city of Ottawa had been divided up in this way—take the vote cast in 1894, divide that by 300, you would get 23 divisions in the city of Ottawa. Then you would be in a position to say how many polling booths or stations there should be in Ottawa, and you would be able to issue your proclamation stating exactly where the polling stations are. That is the suggestion I have to make to the hon. gentleman.

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

After Recess.

House again resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 16) to repeal the Electoral Franchise Act, and to amend the Dominion Elections Act.

(In the Committee).

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). The New Brunswick congested districts clause.

Mr. McDOUGALL. As I understand this amendment relating to the congested districts, it applies only to the province of New Brunswick. I explained a few nights ago in the House here that there is a large number of polling divisions in the different constituencies in Nova Scotia in which there are over 300 votes.

Mr. MONTAGUE. It will apply to those.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I understood the hon. Solicitor General to say that it would apply only to New Brunswick.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. It is in New Brunswick that the emergency arises, but this clause will apply anywhere.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Do I understand, Mr. Chairman, that subsections 2, 3 and 4 are passed ?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Of the old clause—yes.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I suppose we will have the privilege of discussing this on the third reading, it will be printed by that time ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes. I may explain that there are a couple of amendments that it will be absolutely necessary to make in order to perfect the Bill. The hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Ingram) will have to present his amendment himself.

Mr. INGRAM. Yes, with the hope of the House passing it.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I think I made my position perfectly clear to my hon. friend (Mr. Ingram) before we rose at six o'clock.

On section 6 of the old Bill,

Mr. DAVIN. I have an amendment to propose to this clause, in the 4th line, that "forthwith" be changed to "within four days." "Forthwith" leaves it entirely at the option of the officer as to what time he will discharge the duties imposed upon him by this clause. I call the attention of the Solicitor General to the latter part of this clause, which seems to me to be ultra vires:

> Every such officer who omits or refuses to furnish within a reasonable time any such voters' list or copy thereof, or extract therefrom, or any such copy of a by-law, or order, or proclamation or other document or proceeding demanded by the returning officer, shall incur a penalty of not exceeding $2,000 and not less than $200.

It seems to me this House has no power to impose a penalty on the officer of a province for not taking the course suggested here. Take an extreme case. Suppose that the head of the department in which the officer was, were to say to him : You tell these people politely to get out ; what right have they to come here and ask you for our lists. What could be done ? To the first part of the clause there could be no objection, I suppose there is no harm in any Parliament passing a clause providing that somebody may go to somebody else and ask him to give him certain documents he may have in his possession. But how we can enforce on the officers of a province a clause like this, I do not see. It is clear to me that the closing sentence is certainly ultra vires. These officers are servants of a province, and we have no authority to say to them that if they don't give up documents that belong to that province into the hands of one of our officers, they shall be fined. However, I only rose to propose that instead of "forthwith" we say "within four days," which makes it necessary that the officer shall act, at all events, within that time.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I think it would be better to keep the word "forthwith." Besides, I draw my hon. friend's attention to the fact that this is simply a reproduction of section 13 of our Election Act now in force ; you will find it in the Revised Statutes, which say :

> The returning officer of each electoral district shall forthwith on receipt of the writ of election.

I think that the word forthwith is more elastic, and after giving it some consideration, I think my hon. friend will agree, perhaps, that it would be more prudent to use that word.

Mr. MONK. That is dealing with the returning officer under the old law, whereas we are dealing with federal laws. The lists are already printed, whereas here we are dealing with a provincial officer who has to prepare copies of the list.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The person who applies "forthwith" is our officer.

Mr. MONK. He has to deal with a provincial officer. It strikes me it would be better to limit the time on that ground, because a provincial officer would have more work to do than a federal officer would have to do under the old Act.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. My hon. friend will see that the use of the word "forthwith" imposes an additional duty on the revising officer. He will have to act immediately, the very day he receives the proclamation.

Mr. MONK. He may take five or six days.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. He may, but we assume that in the performance of his duty he will do it at once. I think it is more prudent, under all the circumstances, to use the word "forthwith," which may mean instantaneously, under certain conditions. The other subject my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) brought up, is one that has necessarily attracted the attention of those who were engaged in the preparation of this measure, that is to say, when we assume here to impose certain duties upon local officers, whether we have under the constitution the right to do that. It is a serious question, and I would like to draw my hon. friend's attention to an extract from Clements on the Constitution, page 437:

> It is, of course, open to the Dominion Parliament to utilize existing provincial machinery or to confer upon boards or bodies of provincial creation powers and authorities in relation to the enforcement of Dominion laws, but quoad the duties imposed by Dominion legislation the members of the municipal bodies or boards are not provincial officers.

Now I would like to draw my hon. friend's attention to the existing electoral law. We have already, under somewhat similar conditions, utilized the provincial machinery under the Electoral Franchise Act. I refer to 48 Vic., chap. 40, section 15, of the Franchise Act. There it is provided :

The revising officer shall, as soon as possible after taking the oath of office, obtain a certified copy or copies of the list revised or final assessment roll or rolls, and also a certified copy or copies of the last revised list revised under the statutes of the province, relating to assessment and voters' list respectively, for elections to the provincial legislature, and it is provided that the registrar shall proceed as speedily as possible, with the aid thereof and of such other information as he can obtain, to ascertain and prepare a separate list.

Then section 16 provides :

The revising officer shall then forthwith cause to be printed a sufficient number of copies of the said lists, and post up in each municipal territorial division a copy of every such list, which shall be open to the inspection of any person in the office where it is deposited.

Then section 17 provides :

Every sheriff, warden, clerk of the peace and treasurer, parish court commissioner or other officer to whom two copies each of the said lists are to be mailed under this Act, shall forthwith, after receiving them, post up one of them in a conspicuous place in his office, where the said list shall remain until the day fixed, as hereinafter provided, for the preliminary revision thereof, and shall be open to inspection by any one.

Then section 62 provides :

Every officer or person who is by law the custodian of any assessment roll or list of voters, or of any other list or document, which, under the foregoing provisions of this Act, the revising officer is required to obtain and use for the purpose of preparing any list of voters or of any duplicate or duly certified copy thereof, shall furnish the same or a certified copy or copies thereof to the revising officer as by him required; and any such officer or person refusing or omitting to furnish the same to the revising officer within a reasonable time, upon being paid or tendered the cost of preparing the same according to the law in force in the province, shall, for each such refusal or omission, be held to be guilty of a misdemeanour, and shall be punishable accordingly.

You see that goes as far, and probably even further, than we do. it deals with municipal officials. It says that in the event of their refusing to supply documents called for by our own Electoral Franchise Act, they shall be guilty of a misdemeanour. Here we impose a penalty. I admit it does appear somewhat strange at first sight that we should have a right to impose duties, and penalties for their non-performance upon a body which is of purely local creation. But it appears to have been the system adopted up to the present time, though I have not been able to find any authority to bear out what would appear at first sight to be a somewhat serious contention.

Mr. CLANCY. Does this section contemplate any remuneration being paid to the municipal officers ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. That is another omission, but I intend to add the following words to section 26 that will give authority to refund the returning officer the necessary disbursements required under the provincial Act to obtain the lists.

Mr. CLANCY. Does that mean that the fees provided by the provincial statutes for similar work will be paid in this case ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. An amendment will be made to the second schedule of the Dominion Elections Act to the following effect : That the necessary disbursements shall be paid to the returning officers for copying documents and performing similar services as are rendered under the provincial law, and if there be no provision to cover the case, 10 cents per 100 words shall be allowed for copying and a fee of 50 cents to the custodian.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Has the hon. gentleman made any provision for the delivery of copies to the candidates ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. No.

Mr. MONTAGUE. It would be very much easier for the officers of the Government to have copies made and delivered to the candidates than in the candidates having to apply to the officers.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. A suggestion has been made within the last few days by the Queen's Printer, and I think we may be able to utilize it in connection with these lists. It is one worthy of serious consideration, and I intend to consider it carefully, so that on the third reading I may perhaps be able to propose some measure which will enable us to have these lists, after their revision, sent to the Queen's Printer. He would keep the type for the lists standing. It would be possible in that way—I am supposing a hypothetical case—to have the list printed and sent to the members and candidates ; and on each subsequent revision, after the lists have again been revised, they would be sent to the Queen's Printer. These additions and changes would be made to the lists standing, and thus they would be kept up to date. This suggestion will receive from the Government careful consideration, and I desire it to be clearly understood that these amendments and conception were made by the Government and not by me individually.

Mr. McALISTER. In that case I suppose the candidates, by applying to the Queen's Printer, would be able to get a copy of the lists ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. That would be the idea. If we carry out that suggestion we will prepare a scheme some time ahead of the third reading, and submit it

to hon. gentlemen opposite in order that they may consider it and suggest any necessary changes.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Unless some scheme such as that suggested is adopted, I think measures should be taken to furnish candidates with copies of the lists. If we adopt the printing scheme, that will be so much the better.

Mr. McDOUGALL. May I call the attention of the hon. Solicitor General to section 130 of the British North America Act. I should like to ask whether, under that section, Parliament had the power in 1885, when it passed the Franchise Act, from which the hon. gentleman quoted a few moments ago, to exact from the provincial officers information with a view to the preparation of the Dominion election lists; and whether with the adoption of that Act, the power to impose additional duties on the provincial authorities in this respect ceased, because this section reads:

Until the Parliament of Canada otherwise provides, all the officers of the different provinces having duties to discharge in relation to matters other than those committed exclusively to the provinces, shall be officers of Canada, and continue to discharge the duties of their respective offices under the same liability, responsibility and penalties as if the union had not been made.

I take it that this section gave the Dominion Parliament, in 1885, the power to exact the work, that is, to deliver copies of the lists and furnish information to officers appointed by the authority of this Parliament, from provincial officers; and that having been done, and the power and obligation of preparing lists for Dominion elections having been once taken out of the authority of the provincial legislatures, then the power of the Dominion Government or Parliament to exact those obligations on the part of the provincial officials does not rest with us now.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I appreciate what my hon. friend (Mr. McDougall) says. His contention is that this power given to the Parliament of Canada, when once exercised exhausts itself. I cannot agree with that proposition. I think that the power vested in the Parliament of Canada is one that can be exercised at any time. In a case decided before the Privy Council, as to how far the Dominion Parliament can impose duties on provincial courts, it was held that we had the right to impose upon them the duty of trying Dominion elections. That is the law.

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fitzpatrick) refers to Part 1 of the province of Ontario list being printed in the Bureau, but what about the other parts up to the days before the election?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. That, of course, would be a difficulty. However, that list is made for the provincial elections and the Dominion elections are not as a rule run exactly at the same time. That list would be good for one year, and if at the expiration of that year a Dominion election was held we would of course have to make a new list for ourselves.

Mr. INGRAM. The Solicitor General will remember that the registration list is furnished by the clerk of the peace on the payment of certain fees. We had a provincial election on the 28th December, 1886, and a Dominion election on the 22nd February, 1887, and you will find the practice has been that when a local election takes place, almost all the lists that can be found are used for that election. After the general election is over and a by-election occurs, it is a very difficult thing to obtain a copy of these lists. The clerk of the peace having only a written copy of all the names registered, candidates would have to pay so much per name to get the list. When you propose to print Parts 1 and 3 in the Bureau, why not get the lists from the clerks of the peace, of those registered voters and have them printed also in the Bureau, and if a Dominion election takes place we could be furnished with them.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Quite so.

Mr. GILLIES. Has it positively been decided upon that the lists shall be printed in future?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. No. I said that the Queen's Printer has made a suggestion to the Government that there is a way known to him by which we might at a very trifling cost have these lists made and accessible to the members. That suggestion is being considered.

Mr. GILLIES. Last evening I drew attention to the great facility offered for the perpetration of grave frauds under the franchise law of the province of Nova Scotia. When the local elections come on, the sheriffs who are the returning officers furnish the copies of the lists to the deputy returning officers; and my hon. friend will readily see the opportunities there are for committing frauds in the several copyings of the names. Since I spoke last evening information of a very complete character has been placed in my hands, as to the actual perpetration of such frauds. I will not trouble the committee by reading that statement here, but I will call on the Solicitor General at his office to-morrow and place the information in his possession. He occupies the high position of one of the chief legal advisers of the Crown, and I will leave it to him to judge if it is not time that this Parliament should prevent the possibility of frauds in this direction. The information I have is in the handwriting of a very responsible man, an ex-sheriff of the province of Nova Scotia.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is a penalty of $50 against a sheriff for any case in which he fails to have the names correctly copied.

Mr. GILLIES. I know that, but the law is practically inoperative

The MINISTER OF FINANCE Anybody can bring it into operation.

Mr. GILLIES. What is a penalty of $50 in a case of this kind ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is $50 for each name.

Mr. GILLIES. I know, but is it not better to prevent the possibility of a fraud being perpetrated ? Look at the difficulty of setting the machinery in motion. My hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) is big enough and broad enough to understand that what is everybody's business is nobody's business, and as there is no official in Nova Scotia to carry out the law it is practically a dead letter. An ounce of prevention is better than a pound of cure, and it is wise that in legislating here we should legislate to prevent the possibility of such a fraud occurring.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. You can make no law that does not require some one to carry it out, and any officer you put in the place of the sheriff is just as likely to commit fraud as he is.

Mr. McDOUGALL. There is no machinery provided in this Bill by which any other person than the returning officer appointed by the Government can get the voters' list from the sheriff. Suppose I, as a candidate, go to the sheriff in my constituency and ask him for a copy of the list——

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Do not all candidates get the list ?

Mr. McDOUGALL. All candidates get the list in connection with the provincial elections. But I see nothing in this Bill to compel the sheriff to give us a copy of the list for the purposes of a Dominion election. If I understood the hon. Finance Minister aright, he said that the sheriff was liable to a penalty of $50 for every name left off the list.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My recollection is that the sheriff, in his capacity as an appeal court, is liable to a penalty of $200 for any case. But there is a second stage. In the mere copying of the list, from the time the sheriff undertakes to make a list and give it to the deputy returning officer there is a further penalty of $50 for each name he omits.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I cannot see that the penalty is $50 for each name.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I do not think that has anything to do with it.

Mr. McDOUGALL. However, my complaint is that we are entirely in the hands of the sheriff. An election may be sprung on us at any moment, and we are powerless to get a list on which to run an election or to canvass an elector until election day comes on ; and then there is no provision by which we can compel any officer appointed under the authority of this Parliament to give us a copy. We might perhaps secure a list by some indirect means ; but that would not be a list on which we could place any reliance. The more I study this matter, the more strongly I feel that we should oppose a measure that does not give us any better protection than we have in this Bill. At previous sittings of the House reference was made to the machinery by which sheriffs are appointed in the province of Nova Scotia. Now, I will give the House an authority with regard to the sheriffs and what confidence should be placed in them, which, I am sure, hon. members on the Treasury benches ought to accept. This authority was given at the time this measure for changing the law with regard to sheriffs was before the legislature of Nova Scotia. Last night I quoted the old law under which the judges had practically the appointment of sheriffs in that province. When that law was repealed, the law which was passed to take its place gave the power entirely to the Government. Now, anybody must admit that the judges of the Supreme Court were more competent to decide who was fit to be the sheriff of a county than the Government, who would necessarily have to act upon a nomination made by some party heeler. We had a gentleman in the local legislature at that time, who spoke thus :

When I first saw the reference to this Bill in the Governor's speech, the idea struck me that it simply consisted of some amendments to the law with respect to the duties of sheriffs. I, therefore, made up my mind that I would not the first time I addressed the House do so on a subject so unimportant. But when I now see a measure coming before the House involving the sweeping away the practice which the law and usage of the province have for generations sustained, I would be doing violence to the interests of that constituency which I have the honour to represent, and to my own feelings, were I not to address to the House a few observations with reference to this measure. One great point of objection which I observed in this measure is the insecurity of tenure of office which it must necessarily entail upon the position of sheriff in this province. It is all very well to say that those sheriffs will hold their office for life or during good behaviour. The trouble is that when an office depends for its bestowal upon political parties the question comes in what those political parties will call good behaviour. From what we heard yesterday it is evident that what one party would call excellent conduct the other would call very bad behaviour. The present Act, therefore, tends to remove that cool, unprejudiced judgment which should come in between those contesting parties and determine what was and what was not good conduct. In the existing statute, I must say, this was provided for, where

the statute provided that the judges of the Supreme Court are to come in and determine what is and what is not good behaviour on the part of our sheriffs. It may be argued that the judges of our Supreme Court are appointed by the Dominion Government during good behaviour, but in their case it will be remembered that their tenure of office does not depend upon the whims of a political party at all. There is an appeal in their case to the House of Commons, and not only that, but to the Senate also. They must be dismissed by impeachment before the House of Commons, and this circumstance alone serves as their safeguard when their conduct is criticised by either party for political purposes. I will just cite a case which occurred in the House of Commons not long ago—the case of Vice-Chancellor Blake, a brother of the leader of the Opposition in the Dominion Parliament. It might be supposed that the leader of the Government would not have the greatest friendship for that gentleman, but when opposition was shown on account of political prejudice against Vice-Chancellor Blake, the leader of the Government declared that nothing could be done without an appeal to the House of Commons and also to the Senate of Canada. The upshot was that the learned judge retained his position until the Government of the country saw fit to elevate him to a higher sphere on account of the noble manner in which he discharged the duties of his office. Yet without the safeguard referred to, Vice-Chancellor Blake would have been removed from his office. This Bill, however, will place the sheriffs of Nova Scotia in such a position that one party will call it excellent behaviour for a sheriff to go all over his county canvassing for his favourite political candidate, while another party will call it very bad conduct. Hence there must be an unsafe tenure of the office of sheriff under the Bill now before the House. A certain hon. gentleman, the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr Longley), I believe, argued that this measure was akin to the granting of responsible government. When I heard this statement, I looked at the inanimate figure above his head and thought it would leap into life, and in those thunder tones with which these walls were once wont to resound, declare that there was no comparison whatever. Responsible government, Mr. Speaker, made all Her Majesty's subjects in Nova Scotia free to govern themselves. Instead of this freedom we shall have under this Bill eighteen absolute political slaves in this province. With regard to what hon. gentlemen around these benches have said as to the safety of a sheriff's tenure of office under this Bill, in the hands of the executive, I may say that we have in the county I represent one of the most honest and painstaking officers in the province, yet, though I am not a prophet, nor the son of a prophet, I venture to predict that before a year passes over his head he will be superseded by a rank political partisan. So much for the Bill before the House and its results. I need scarcely add that I intend for these reasons to vote against this Bill.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Who is that?

Mr. McDOUGALL. Hon. gentlemen ask who it is. It is the present hon. member for Inverness (Mr. McLennan).

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, that can't be possible.

Mr. McDOUGALL. That is the speech which the hon. gentleman made when the measure providing for the appointment of sheriffs in the province of Nova Scotia was under discussion.

Mr. MILLS. Was he a Tory then?

Mr. McDOUGALL. Yes, and I am sure that both as Tory and a member of the provincial legislature, he spoke in his sober senses, because the temptations, I am sure, were very much less for him to be otherwise than they have been since he came to this Parliament.

Mr. McLENNAN. I am very glad I gave the hon. member for Cape Breton a chance to make a speech. I now desire to say that while this measure to which he refers was passing through the Nova Scotia legislature that impression did strike me and many other members, but when I found afterwards that the Government of Nova Scotia left these sheriffs in office, and did not, as I supposed they would, dismiss them and replace them by others, I changed my mind with regard to the policy of that Government. My predictions on that head were not verified. The Nova Scotia Government allowed these men to continue in office, the sheriff of Inverness among others is still in office to-day, as the hon. member for Cape Breton knows, and again I say that I am very glad that I furnished the hon. gentleman the opportunity to recite a passable speech.

Mr. DAVIN. I must recall the committee to the question I raised as to ultra vires. I suppose the Solicitor General contends that this Bill makes those provincial officers officials of the Dominion. He has not convinced me that it is best to leave the clause as it stands. I am quite satisfied that it would have been better to make the 13th section of chapter 8 read "the returning officer of each electoral division shall, within four days"—because that will prevent his allowing an unaccountable time to elapse. Suppose we had a corrupt returning officer, he might think that he could gain a party advantage by delaying the doing of what this clause requires him to do "forthwith," for seven or ten days. The amendment I suggest has been considered by several members of the Opposition, and we came to the conclusion that it would be better to fix a limit of four days than use the elastic word "forthwith."

Mr. BENNETT. I am sure that we on this side will be very much gratified by the assurance given by the Solicitor General that what we have contended for, and what I, in my humble way, contended for in the early hours of the other morning has at last reached his heart. I felt that when I pointed out to him the difficulties that would beset the unfortunate candidate, he would certainly relent. We are glad to know that he personally has relented; and no doubt his persuasive eloquence with the Government will result in our getting the final lists

printed at the Printing Bureau here. According to the Auditor General's Report of 1895, it appears that when the lists were being corrected at the Printing Bureau the cost was very little. In some counties it was below $100, and in others it ran down as low as $40 and $50. As has been often stated here, the fact that the type is set up in galleys in the Printing Bureau makes the cost of the changes very slight. Hon. gentlemen on this side will heartily thank the Solicitor General for intervening with his colleagues and getting what we so much desire.

Mr. GILLIES. I suggested the other night that the lists might be tampered with after they were completed, and the hon. Minister of Finance pointed out that if the lists were tampered with while in the hands of the sheriff, the law made him liable to a penalty of $50. But the lists may be changed very materially after they have left his hands and are in the hands of any clerk or returning officer, and in such case there is no penalty provided. Supposing John Jones is a deputy returning officer in a certain district, and a certified copy of the list is handed to him by the sheriff, while it is in his hands fifty or one hundred names may be added to it, unknown to him, by a clerk or some person interested.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Did my hon. friend ever hear of such a case?

Mr. GILLIES. I am putting a possible case to show how easily the lists can be tampered with when they have left the sheriff, in which case the penalty imposed on the sheriff does not apply. If, however, the lists were printed, it would be practically impossible to tamper with them, because any names added would have to be added in writing, and the fraud would be at once apparent and no names could be struck out, I point this out to the Minister of Finance who, I am sure, is just as desirous as I am of having every gate through which fraud may creep in closed.

Mr. McDOUGALL. My attention was called a few days ago to the fact that in my own constituency, after the revisers had completed their work, and before the sheriff saw the list, a number of names were added. That was done after the revisers had separated and closed their list.

Section agreed to.

On subsection 9,

Where any provincial polling division, as constituted at the time of the receipt by the returning officer of the writ for an election, lies only partly within the electoral district for which such election is held, the part thereof within such electoral district shall, for the purpose of that election, form a separate polling division, or it may be attached by the returning officer to an adjoining polling division; and the returning officer shall as soon as possible after the receipt of the writ prepare a separate voters' list containing the names of the persons entitled to have their names placed on the list for such part of such polling division.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. On reading this clause, it strikes me that a false interpretation might be given as to the power we give a returning officer to prepare a separate voters' list containing the names of persons entitled to have their names placed on the lists for such separate polling divisions. After the word "prepare" I would insert the following:—"Prepare from the existing voters' lists separate voters' list containing." It is a pretty broad power, if he is authorized to prepare a new list altogether.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I accept that. I understand that my hon. friend (Mr. LaRivière) moves to amend the clause by adding after the word "prepare" in the 49th line, the words "from the existing voters' list."

Mr. MONTAGUE. I should like to ask the Solicitor General to inform us what is the meaning of this clause?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. For instance, the boundaries of the provincial——

Mr. MONTAGUE. I quite understand the boundaries of the provincial division do not conform with the boundaries of the Dominion division.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Is not this giving pretty large powers into the hands of the returning officer? He has to select the names from the list, as I understand.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. He takes the voters' lists as he finds them. He has a constituency, let us say, made up of portions of two provincial constituencies, and he must take the list of each constituency so far as they cover his own territory.

Mr. MONTAGUE. He has no right to select names?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. No.

Amendment (Mr. LaRivière) agreed to.

Mr. McINERNEY. I had an amendment to this section prepared which I would mention to the Solicitor General, so that he may consider it. I would strike out the words "or it may be attached by the returning officer to the adjoining polling division." This would limit the power of the returning officer, but I do not think there would be any grievance resulting from it. In allowing the returning officer to add a part of a subdivision to another subdivision, you give him a power he might perhaps misuse. If these words were struck out, he would make this portion referred into a separate subdivision.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. One containing, perhaps, half a dozen names.

Mr. McINERNEY. That may be. There are a number of subdivisions already in the Dominion where there are only ten or fifteen men. Even though such a case should arise here and there of sections of twenty or thirty names through striking out these words, it would restrain the returning officer from the use of powers which he might use to the detriment of one party or the other. Do not allow him to have any option, but tell him in the law what he shall do.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Perhaps the hon. gentleman would allow the clause to go through. The amendment he proposes is one I should like to consider more carefully than I can think of doing just now. When we come to the third reading we can have the thing discussed very fully and, as far as I am concerned, with a clearer idea of what should be done.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I would like thoroughly to understand just exactly what the returning officer is permitted or authorized to do in this case. Speaking, subject to correction, the returning officer finds that the boundaries of the divisions for the local are not the same as for the Dominion, and he has to take part of the list of two provincial divisions to make the list for his election. Part of the territory of two provincial polling divisions may be within one Dominion division.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes.

Mr. MONTAGUE. In that case the returning officer must select the names for the second polling division on the provincial list——

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. If the hon. gentleman will allow me, I would suggest that he use the word "take" instead of the word "select."

Mr. MONTAGUE. Yes, but he must be affected by his own judgment in taking.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. He has no discretion to exercise. For instance, you may have a Dominion electoral division which would include a municipality from an adjoining provincial electoral division. In that case he would take the whole list of the municipality. Or it might include only a portion of the municipality containing perhaps one hundred or perhaps two hundred voters. Then in the exercise of his discretion, he would take that portion of the municipality and make a separate polling division within the limits of the polling constituency. Or it might happen that, instead of taking a portion of the municipality inhabited by one hundred or two hundred voters, he would have a portion inhabited by ten or twelve or half a dozen voters. In that case, instead of making that a separate polling division, he would add it to another polling division. As to the voters, he has no discretion to exercise at all. He takes the area and he takes the voters on the list for that area.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Then the position is as I expected. The returning officer finds a portion of another polling subdivision the electors of which must be brought into one subdivision under the Dominion law, and added to that, or a new subdivision made.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The question is how is he to select these persons who are entitled to be taken from that municipality into this new division. I want to give my hon. friend an instance. In one constituency in Ontario during the last general election, a mistake was made as regards copying the list sent to the returning officer, and one whole page was left off. The proper custodian of that voters' list was applied to in order that the omission might be supplied, and, strange to say, when the missing sheet came, most of the names beginning with one letter were supplied, and those beginning with another letter, which names, I regret to say, were mainly the names of Tories, were not supplied.

That is what I fear here, that if the returning officer desired to be a partisan, he might select the names of those voters whom he desired to vote, from that portion of territory which goes into the new division, and he might leave off the names of those whom he did not desire to vote. That is a supposititious case, but I think it is worth providing against. I want to point out that the man who knows best about the place of residence of voters in that section of country, is the municipal clerk. He knows every man in the whole municipality. Instead of calling upon the returning officer to make up the list, as regards a piece of territory and as regards the residents, of whom he may know nothing at all personally, I think the Solicitor General ought to provide that the returning officer shall secure from the clerk of the municipality a list containing the names of persons entitled to have their names placed on the list for the part of such municipality in which they reside, and such list shall be the voters' list for that polling subdivision.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. That would apply where the clerk of the municipality would be the custodian of the list.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The municipal clerk in our province has the voters' list and the assessment roll. How is the returning officer going to find out who belongs to that piece of territory and who does not? He finds the voters' list beginning at A and ending with Z, but he does not know whether a man named in A or Z belongs to that particular division of territory.

Mr. MONK. The latter part of section 7 has been altered. It says that the re-

turning officer, after the receipt of the writ, shall prepare a separate voters' list containing the names of persons entitled to have their names placed on the list in such part of such polling division. Now, who are the parties so entitled? Take the case of two federal districts, a polling division being half in one and half in the other. Such returning officer will constitute himself a judge who is to say where the parties who are to vote in this mutilated polling division.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The law provides that the returning officer shall take from the list for that portion of both subdivisions or the new subdivisions, those voters who are qualified to vote in that division.

On section 8,

Where under the laws of a province the voters' lists for any provincial electoral district or division are prepared not at regular intervals, but at such times as are fixed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council or some other provincial local authority, or only from time to time for the purpose of a general or other election in immediate contemplation, the last preceding voters' lists so prepared shall be used for the purpose of any Dominion election in the territory comprised in such provincial electoral district or division, or any part thereof, if such lists have been prepared not more than one year before the date of the writ for such Dominion election; otherwise, new voters' lists shall be prepared, and for the purpose of preparing and giving effect to such voters' lists the Governor in Council may appoint all necessary officers and confer upon them all necessary powers, and in the preparation and revision and bringing into force of such new voters' lists the provisions of the laws of the province regulating the preparation and revision and bringing into force of the provincial voters' lists in such cases shall, as far as possible, be observed and followed.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I intend to move that after the words "the voters' list for any provincial electoral district" the words "or any of them," be inserted; also after the word "thereof" the following words be added: "for use in the district in which they were prepared."

Mr. LaRIVIERE. Under the existing provisions of the law in Manitoba we are to have a voters' list prepared and revised only on the eve of a general election, that is every four years. I find in a summary of the law which appears at the end of the Bill, the following:—

By the Manitoba Election Act, R.S., chap. 49, it is provided (section 19) that lists of electors shall only be made and revised at such times as may be fixed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council, and for the purposes of general elections, and the provisions with respect to their preparation and revision are contained in the Election Act, sections 21 to 66, as amended by the Acts, chap. 12 of 1892 and chap. 9 of 1894.

By one of the sections of our law it is provided that in the preparation of the voters' list every elector to be entitled to be put on the list shall be a resident of and domiciled within the electoral division for at least three months before the date of the list, and he shall be domiciled within the limits of the province for at least a year. It will, therefore, strike hon. members that a revision made only a year after the date of a voters' list would deprive a large number of electors in our province of their right to vote, while under the provincial law a residence of three months within the limits of any electoral division entitles them to be put on the list. In our province where a large floating population exists, where the people before settling down are moving from one place to another, it would deprive quite a number of duly qualified electors from voting at a federal election if this revision was made only after the expiration of one year subsequent to the time when the voters' lists should have been prepared. I would, therefore, ask my hon. friend to shorten this period for Manitoba especially, and to make it coincide with the requirements of the local Act, that whenever a list shall be over three months old, then a revision shall be held, should an election take place. By doing that, we would have our Act conform with the local Act, and every elector who has been a resident during three months of any of our electoral districts, would be entitled, as in the case of a local election, to vote at our Dominion elections.

Mr. BENNETT. The clause now under the consideration of the committee from an Ontario point of view deserves a great deal of attention. Under the law of Ontario and under the revision of the voters' lists under the law of Ontario, it is hard to contemplate a case where a list more than a year old would exist, except in cities and towns where registration takes place only prior to a general election. I assume that is the case here contemplated by the Solicitor General.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes, and in the unorganized districts.

Mr. BENNETT. The clause should be amended somewhat after this fashion. It has been stated that these revisions can only be referrible to cities, and country towns. It must of necessity follow that if the local legislatures change their system of registration so as to include every town and village, then we would have no guarantee that the municipal lists on which the voters' lists were prepared would not be compiled by gentlemen appointed by the Government, and who are friendly to them. Take, for example, the instance quoted to-day, the town of Niagara, a majority of the board in which was composed of appointees of the local government, namely, the license commissioners and the division court clerks. What would be the upshot? If the Act goes into force with this clause in it, the local legislature would have the power next session to

say that the provision respecting registration should be extended not only to cities and county towns but also to villages and municipalities, or townships, as we term them. The result would be that while to-day we have the safeguard of municipal officers furnishing the voters' lists, it would be swept away when the compilation of the lists was left exclusively to partisan officers appointed by hon. gentlemen opposite. I am sure the Solicitor General will see that if we are to accept the voters' lists as they stand to-day in Ontario, this clause should be amended so as to read that this principle of revision shall only be referrable to cities and county towns.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I call the hon. gentleman's attention to chapter 9 of the Ontario Election Act, section 83, which provides as follows :—

> In any municipality in the electoral districts of Algoma East, Algoma West, East Victoria, North Hastings, North Renfrew, South Renfrew, Muskoka, Nipissing and Parry Sound, where there is an assessment roll, but for which no voters' lists containing the names of the voters in the municipality have been filed with the clerk of the peace, or certified by the county judge, the returning officer shall, upon receipt of the writ, deliver to the clerk of the municipality a blank poll-book.

I want to meet that case, and I do not think it would come within the scope of the hon. gentleman's amendment. I do not wish to promise in every case that amendments will be made before the third reading; but I shall have to deal with that difficulty, and I do not think the suggestion made by the hon. gentleman will meet it.

Mr. BENNETT. It is in the power of the local government, as has been demonstrated, to have the revision made in cities and county towns, and that is the principle prevailing to-day. It has been a matter of complaint with the party in our province, we being in Opposition, that the board has been drawn by the Government from its own friends, and thus we have always been placed at a disadvantage. The local government by their legislation made these boards, and there is no power to prevent the local government saying: We find that the system of registration in cities and county towns has worked so well that we will extend it to all towns and all incorporated villages? If that were done there would be no yearly revision in these places, and there would be only the registration prior to the general elections. The Solicitor General and the Government here cannot insure that the local legislature will not amend the law in this respect. Then, all over the province of Ontario we will find ourselves confronted with partisan or friendly boards of revisers, and consequently this is a most objectionable provision of the Bill.

Mr. BENNETT.

Mr. MONK. There is another danger which might materialize in the province of Quebec, and that is that the legislature might completely repeal the electoral law, so that in the province of Quebec we would find ourselves under the operation of the latter part of this section. When I first read the section it occurred to me that as the lists were revised every year in our province, we were sufficiently protected, but suppose the province of Quebec, without taking any measures detrimental to any political party, were simply to repeal the electoral law, then it would happen that on the eve of a general election officers would be named by the Federal Government, and without their being any control on their operations, they would prepare the lists for the whole province. That is the reason why at an earlier stage of the Bill I suggested the advisability of fixing the period considerably before any general election when a change in the provincial law would not affect us; I suggested a year. I submit to the Solicitor General the propriety of taking that view into consideration before the third reading of the Bill. The danger I have pointed out is one that we should guard against.

Mr. McINERNEY. I apprehend that the Solicitor General holds the view that in any province where the law says there shall be a yearly revision, this clause will not operate at all.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Where there is a yearly revision it could not operate.

Mr. McINERNEY. I expected that would be the view of the Solicitor General. It would not operate in such a case?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I do not think so.

Mr. McINERNEY. Then, even though the officer neglected his duty and did not prepare a list, this clause would not operate.

Mr. CLARKE. I would like to ask the Solicitor General as to the effect of the adoption of this clause in municipalities like Toronto, where there are several electoral divisions for the election of members to the legislative assembly. We have registration in the city of Toronto immediately before the provincial election is held, and as I read the clause it provides that if that list is not more than twelve months old it shall be used. If a list twelve months old is used, there will be hundreds, if not thousands, of manhood voters disqualified in municipalities like Toronto, unless provision is made that when their names appear on the provincial list they shall be entitled to vote in the division in which they lived at the time of registration. Under the Bill as it stands, if they move from one division of the city of Toronto to another,

even though it may be only across the street, they will be disqualified. That would prevent hundreds, if not thousands, of those who are entitled to vote under the provincial law from voting at a federal election.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. That is a matter of very considerable importance. Of course, all this would place very considerable expense on the country, but I would be prepared to accept a suggestion that we make it six months instead of one year.

Mr. CLARKE. That is a very valuable concession. Now, under the provincial law when one of these manhood franchise voters appears at the poll he may be challenged, and he must take the oath that he has resided for three months in the division, and so if he has moved out of the division in which he was registered, he will be disqualified after three months.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I do not think I can provide for every case, but if I make it six months I will be going very far in meeting the wishes of my hon. friend (Mr. Clarke).

Mr. BENNETT. As a rule, the voters' lists are finally revised in the Ontario municipalities by about the 15th of November, and if a general election happens to come on seven months after that, then the whole Dominion would be plunged into the cost of a revision.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Not at all.

Mr. BENNETT. I cannot see it otherwise.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. This clause applies exclusively to the case of the manhood suffrage voters and to the unorganized districts in Ontario. It applies exclusively to these cases in Ontario and Manitoba as well, where they have got no revision at fixed intervals. The ordinary revision in Ontario is every twelve months with the exception of the manhood suffrage voters and in the unorganized districts.

Mr. QUINN. How does the Solicitor General think this clause will operate in connection with 60 Vic., chap. 21, section 1 of the statutes of Quebec, which makes special provision for the city of Montreal, and which says:

> At the same time as they make the list of municipal electors in the city of Montreal, in 1898, and thereafter every second year, at the same time the assessors, appointed in accordance with the charter of the said city, shall make in duplicate an alphabetical list of the persons in that city qualified to vote at an election of a member of the legislative assembly in the terms of articles 9 and following of the Quebec Election Act, 1895.

This is a special amendment of the Quebec Election Act having reference to the city of Montreal. I would like to ask the Solicitor General if under this we do not run one chance in four of taking the provincial lists, because there are only two lists prepared in four years.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. There is no reason why in Montreal you should vote on lists two years old any more than anywhere else.

Mr. QUINN. If that is the case, I object to this provision, inasmuch as it provides for the appointment of officers who would no doubt be partisan officers. That is where the evil of it is. If my hon. friend will frame it in such a way as to provide that the lists shall be prepared by the same officers who prepared the original lists, it will be all right.

Mr. McINERNEY. If the hon. Solicitor General accedes to the request which some of my hon. friends have made to him, a very dangerous element will be imported into this section. It now provides that where a list is not more than a year old, it shall be used. Some of my hon. friends have asked that the time be shortened; but if that were done it would give power to the Governor in Council to appoint their own officers to make a list.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I am perfectly satisfied with the section as it is, but I thought it would be fair to meet the difficulty suggested by the hon. member for West Toronto.

Mr. CLARKE. With all due deference to what the hon. member for Kent (Mr. McInerney) has said, I can state that a great outrage will be committed upon hundreds of manhood franchise voters in the city of Toronto and in other cities of Ontario if the time is not shortened, for they would be disfranchised.

Mr. McINERNEY. I admit the difficulty which my hon. friend from Toronto has pointed out. I admit that it is a defect in the law: but there are two evils here, and you have to choose between the evil of a list a year old and the evil of allowing the Governor in Council to appoint all necessary officers and confer upon them all necessary powers to prepare and revise and bring into force an electoral list. Which is the greater evil, and which of the two evils would you choose? If I were making a choice, I would sooner take a fixed list which I knew than allow officials whom I did not know to make up a list for me.

Mr. INGRAM. A very important question has been raised with reference to registration in the city of Toronto. The provincial election was held on the 1st of March. In Ontario we have a revision of the voters' list once every year, with the exception of the registration list. That applies to the city of Toronto. There will not be another registration under the local Act until the next

dissolution of the local legislature, and I would like to know if the hon. member for West Toronto would like to go through the registration every year in the city of Toronto? If he would, I am sure he desires more than people in other cities of the province. But he wants it every six months.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. All that this provides is that if you have a federal election more than six months after the local election, you will have a new list so as to enable manhood suffrage voters to get on the list. We do not provide for an annual revision; we only provide for a revision in the case of an election.

Mr. BENNETT. Do I understand the Solicitor General to say that he is willing, when the Bill comes up for the third reading, to amend this clause so that this principle of registration shall be applicable only as at present to cities and incorporated towns.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I cannot make such an important concession as that without consulting the members of the Government. I quite understand the force of the hon. gentleman's objection. I understand that in Ontario there are a certain number of electoral districts in which the lists are prepared by officials appointed specially for that purpose by the provincial government, and what my hon. friend desires is that the federal Government shall restrict its right to name its own officials to make the lists, to the cases now in existence under the law of Ontario, and not extend it to future cases that may arise.

Mr. BENNETT. That is, if the local government should intervene and undertake to make the principle of registration applicable to villages and all towns, this would not apply.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. To carry out that idea, I would suggest that my hon. friend move on the third reading, that after the words "division are" in the second line, we insert the word "now," so that it will read, "where under the laws of a province the voters' lists for any provincial electoral district or division are now prepared." I only ask time to submit that to the Government.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. member for West Toronto pointed out the difficulty of having a list a year old. My hon. friend from Kent (Mr. McInerney) pointed out the other difficulty of the Government taking power to appoint their own officers and entirely new machinery. I would suggest that that clause should be changed, and the machinery now in force in the cities adopted, namely, county court judges and such officers as now exist in the province of Ontario, rather than place the power in the hands of the Government to appoint their own officers.

Mr. CLARKE. I understood the Solicitor General to say that he would agree to six months being substituted for one year.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. If the hon. gentleman moves that, I will accept it.

Mr. SPROULE. Am I correct in understanding that this shall apply to the unorganized districts as well as towns and villages?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Section 83 of the Ontario Act settles that.

Mr. CLARKE moved that the words in the 9th line "one year" be struck out, and the words "six months" be inserted in lieu thereof.

Mr. MONTAGUE. As there seems to be some doubt, I would ask my hon. friend if he intended this to apply only to those unorganized districts and the cities and towns where the registration system is in force?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. There cannot be any question about that.

Mr. McINERNEY. Then in every case in Ontario, where registration could possibly apply, if the list is over six months old, the Government can put this new machinery into effect and appoint new officers?

Mr. BRITTON. It applies to every place where registration is in force, but registration is in force only in cities and towns. We have got besides the regular list that is revised every year and is not altered at all. This only applies to voters who come under the Registration Act.

Mr. McINERNEY. Registration only takes place before an election, and, therefore, in a province in which there is registration, the law does not call for an annual revision of the lists under the Registration Act. In that case, if a list is six months old, the Government could appoint officers to make a revision of the lists in these districts to which the Registration Act applies. This section will apply to every place in Ontario where there is registration.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The Ontario people are satisfied with it.

Mr. INGRAM. The Ontario leader of the Government and the Ontario leader of the Opposition, have it in their power to say that they shall go on with a revision of the lists even if it is a year or more than a year old.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. Why not add those words "not annually but at regular intervals"?

Mr. McINERNEY. I want to try and emphasize the view I take, and it is this. Suppose that in a district in Ontario in which registration is in force, the last registration should be six months and one day old, when a Dominion election is held, then this Government, immediately before the

election, sets its own officers at work, appointed by the Governor in Council, to make up a list for that district. Are the members from the province of Ontario, where registration is in force, willing to adopt that system ?

Mr. CLARKE. Speaking for myself, I frankly say that I believe that before every Dominion election we should have a general registration of all those who are entitled to vote. We have in many of the provinces manhood franchise. It might be a hardship in some case for persons to have to register thirty or sixty days before a Dominion election, but what the House desires is some solution that will enable every elector who has the right to vote to exercise that right in an election. The difficulty in Ontario has been that those who have resided in their respective electoral divisions for years, when they went to the polls, found that their names, for some reason they could not understand, were not on the list. It would be an inconvenience to many to register their names in order that they might vote at a Dominion election, but they would be only subject to that inconvenience every four or five years, and no one who has the interests of his country at heart will object to that. So far as this amendment is concerned, my only object is to have as late and as clean and as full a list as possible, and having a knowledge of what I am speaking about, I must say that if we are compelled to vote upon manhood suffrage in Toronto—and the same argument applies to other cities—on a list that is twelve months old, hundreds, if not thousands, of men just as well qualified to form an opinion as their seniors will be unjustly discriminated against. That is not the intention of hon. gentlemen opposite, as I understand it, and is certainly not the wish of this House. I repeat that if the list is twelve months old, in view of the position of affairs in Toronto, thousands will be disqualified. The amendment is in the right direction, and I am prepared to accept what the hon. Solicitor General has agreed to, namely, that where a list is more than six months old, a new registration will take place.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I understand that.

Mr. CLARKE. I am perfectly satisfied if the opportunity is fairly and honestly given to those who are entitled to vote as manhood franchise voters, within thirty or sixty days of the Dominion election. But it will be an injustice to the manhood suffrage voters of Toronto if the amendment I have suggested is not agreed to. If all those who are on the manhood franchise list are entitled to vote in the division in which they are registered, I will be prepared to accept that. But, even then, in a growing city like Toronto, where many changes are made from week to week and from month to month in the residence of manhood suffrage voters, many will be disfranchised. If we want a clean list and a late list, a list containing the name of every man who is entitled to vote, we should get a registration by this Act otherwise provided for as near the election as it is possible to have it.

Mr. INGRAM. I am opposed to the reduction of the time from twelve to six months. I do not believe in giving manhood suffrage voters under the Registration Act any unfair advantage over those whose names appear on Part 1 and Part 3 of the voters' list. Suppose this Government dissolves in October and the election takes place about the first or the middle of November. What kind of list have you ? So far as Part 1 and Part 3 of the list under the law of the province of Ontario is concerned, it is the list that was revised one year previous, and you cannot secure a list which has been revised less than a year previous. Imagine the registration list being completed six months and a day before the election. We should then be compelled to have a new registration in our cities and our county towns. It would put the country and us to an enormous expense in order to prepare the registration, while the list of those which would qualify as owners, as tenants, and income voters is one prepared a year previous. That would be an undue advantage given to the registration voters, and I think they should not have any advantage over these others in the regular voters' list.

Mr. SPROULE. If an amendment could be drafted to have those within the city limits vote where their names appear on the old lists, I think it would be desirable.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I am going to make an appeal to my hon. friend from Toronto (Mr| Clarke) to ask him, in order to avoid discussion, to move this amendment on the third reading, so that we may have full time to discuss it.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. In that case, I suppose I am put off to the third reading also. I was asking for three months for Manitoba.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes.

Mr. CLANCY. I would like to ask the Solicitor General if he has thought of making any provision in the case of manhood suffrage voters put upon the voters' lists through the medium of the Assessment Act. They require, of course, to have the qualification of a year's residence and also to be a resident of the locality from the time of making the roll up to the time of their being put upon the list. That, as I endeavoured to point out on a former occasion, does not come under the Ontario Election Act applying to registration voters.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The question the hon. gentleman suggests is one of residence. It comes to that, so far as the manhood suffrage is concerned. That is the

difficulty, I do not think that it is a matter that we can consider in connection with the present clause. I am pleased to say to my hon. friend that I have considered the matter as carefully as I could, and I do not see any scheme that would meet the difficulty he suggests. I admit that it is a difficulty, and if my hon. friend would suggest some way or propose some amendment which he thinks would meet the difficulty, I should be glad to consider it. But I can hold out no hope that, with the consideration I have given it, it is possible for me to meet the difficulty he has pointed out.

Amendment (Mr. Clarke) withdrawn.

Section 10, as amended, agreed to.

On section 11,

Mr. MONTAGUE. That is only to adapt the election law to the franchise law ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes, this and the other clauses are only for that purpose.

Section 11 agreed to.

Section 12 agreed to.

On section 13,

Mr. MONTAGUE. That removes the disqualification from revising barristers ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes.

Section agreed to.

On section 14,

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I would ask here that section 6—that is, section 6 of the original Bill—should be inserted here in amendment of section 12 of the original Bill. I think that for the appearance of the Bill it would read better.

Mr. MONTAGUE. That is the section we considered before ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes.

Mr. DAVIN. That will be instead of section 14 ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Section 14 is carried.

Section 15 agreed to.

On section 16,

Mr. MONTAGUE. I would like to ask the Solicitor General if he cannot provide for giving the returning officer and candidates in elections printed lists.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. That is a point that we discussed in the earlier part of the sitting, it was discussed in connection with the suggestion made by the Queen's Printer that the list should be sent to him after each annual revision, and be printed by him. That suggestion has not been considered by the Government, and I have not authority to say that we will be able to accept it.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I understand that is the rule that the hon. member wants to carry out after the first list is prepared. But we want that to apply in the first instance to the first list that is prepared by the province, and that is in possession of the sheriff.

Mr. McINERNEY. Would you put in the word "certified" before copy.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Section 30 says :

The right of appeal being granted, the returning officer shall furnish to each deputy returning officer copies of the list of voters.

Mr. McINERNEY. He can certify the copy of the list that is in his hands, that he has obtained himself from the county clerk or secretary. In the old Act it was a printed copy, and therefore it was all right. But here you have a printed list.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. You will notice it is exactly the same as in the old Act. In the Dominion Elections Act the returning officer furnishes each deputy with a copy.

Mr. McINERNEY. But in that case the list was a printed list and therefore there could not be any trouble about it. But in this case there is a written list, and therefore there is a necessity for its being certified.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I would suggest to the Solicitor General the propriety of adding to this section, at the third reading of the Bill, the following words :—

In any province where voters' lists are not now printed under the authority of the provincial legislature, the officer having possession of such voters' lists shall be required to deliver to the returning officer and to the candidates in an election under this Act, a printed copy of the voters' lists.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We are getting along very well without that now.

On section 17, now 19,

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. We will have to make an amendment to meet the conditions in New Brunswick. In the 48th line insert after the word 'if" the following :—

In any polling division where, by the provincial law, no such list of voters is required, and if in any polling division where by the provincial law no list of voters is required or provided the same are found——

Then, on the next page, first line, instead of the word "he," insert :

Or if there be no voters' list, such elector is found entitled to vote.

Mr. McALISTER. This section is not applicable to the province of New Brunswick.

Mr. POWELL. It prevents every man in the whole province of New Brunswick from voting. Nothing could show clearer the utter absurdity of this Franchise Act and of the principle that is adopted, than that an able man like the Solicitor General, with the whole Department of Justice at his back, has actually disfranchised the whole province of New Brunswick. I make that assertion as a lawyer, there is no man in the whole province of New Brunswick can vote.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. My hon. friend must remember that in New Brunswick the Dominion Ballot Act applies.

Mr. POWELL. The ballot does not apply :

> Not more than one elector for each compartment shall at any one time enter the room where the poll is held, and each elector, upon so entering, shall declare his name and surname and condition, which shall be entered or recorded by the poll clerk in the poll-book provided for that purpose.

That is the condition on which he can vote. First, his surname ; second, his Christian name, and, thirdly, his condition. That only applies to those officials who, under the laws of certain provinces, are disqualified and are rehabilitated with the Dominion franchise.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Surely they will be entitled to vote when they give their names and surnames.

Mr. POWELL. I am showing what the difficulties are before us.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Perhaps you can suggest an amendment.

Mr. INGRAM. In the old Act respecting elections to the House of Commons, section 45, I find the same language as is used in this section. Is there any difference as regards New Brunswick ?

Mr. POWELL. The old Act, based on the Franchise Act, requires the man's condition to be stated on the voters' list.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I understand the hon. gentleman to contend that if a man's name and surname appear on the roll, but his condition is not stated, he would not be able to vote.

Mr. POWELL. Not under that section.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I do not agree with the hon. member.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I should like an explanation in regard to the last section passed.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The first part of the section provides if an elector's name is on the list he may get a ballot. The amendment goes on to provide that if by any provincial law his name does not appear on the list, he may still be entitled to vote.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Then this is not a clause operative throughout the Dominion ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The first part is.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Under it the voter is entitled to get a ballot under certain conditions. The first condition is that his name is on the list.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes, the alternative condition is that in provinces where no list is required, he may still be entitled to vote.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Then how is a person disqualified under a provincial statute going to get his ballot ? Under the clause as amended we desire to remove the disqualification imposed by a provincial statute by giving him an opportunity of taking an oath, but the revising officer has no power under this section as amended to give him a ballot.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Such an elector comes in under the clause which enables him to vote.

Mr. MONTAGUE. This conflicts with the following :—

> Each elector on entering shall declare his name and surname, and if for some reason his name does not appear on the list of voters for the polling district of such polling station, he shall receive from the deputy returning officer a ballot.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The difficulty has arisen in regard to Prince Edward Island, and some words will have to be inserted to meet it.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. We shall have to prepare a clause in regard to Prince Edward Island. I will undertake to prepare one.

Mr. BENNETT. If it is not shown that section 20 will only be applicable to Prince Edward Island what may happen is that a deputy returning officer may catechise a man presenting himself to vote. If he answers the question satisfactorily, there can be no reason why he should not give the man a ballot, although his name may not be on the list.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I draw my hon. friend's attention to this, that the elector may be entitled to vote if there is no voters' list. I want to amend this so as to make it absolutely clear that the disfranchised voter will not have any trouble.

Mr. MONTAGUE. That is right.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I think, perhaps, that otherwise there might be a

difficulty which would defeat the object we have in view.

Mr. MONTAGUE. There surely would. We clearly understand that the Solicitor General later on will make provision for this.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes.

On section 20,

Mr. CLANCY. The part of this clause which gives power for catechising the voter is most objectionable, and any person who has experience in an election will see that it may amount to intimidation. Men are sometimes timid when they go to vote, and under this clause the voter may be subject to such catechising as to drive him from the polls.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Under the present federal law that is the case.

Mr. MONTAGUE. My hon. friend is altogether wrong ; I have the section here.

Mr. CLANCY. Whether it is in the law or not it is a bad law. This clause says that the voter shall——

Answer such questions or produce such evidence as to his qualification to vote,——

I would like to know what the limit is to that.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. We have to provide here for oaths to be administered to those who are on the voters' lists and also to those who are not on the voters' lists. The case of Prince Edward Island has got to be provided for, and these questions my hon. friend (Mr. Clancy) speaks of would be the questions put to a voter in Prince Edward Island. If my hon. friend continued to read he would see :

——or take such oath or qualification as by the law of the province he may in the like case at a provincial election be required to answer.

Mr. CLANCY. It seems to me that even that does not relieve the voter from being catechised when he is on the list.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Oh, yes it does.

Mr. MONTAGUE. What are the meaning of these words "produce such evidence as to his qualification to vote ?"

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. In Prince Edward Island when the voter comes to the poll, they have no voters' lists, and they have to question him to find out if he has the right to vote.

Mr. BENNETT. Then confine it to Prince Edward Island.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Is it not done by an oath ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Not necessarily by oath, because he has to perform statute labour or pay the commutation money, and he must produce his certificate that he has performed that statute labour.

Mr. CLANCY. These qualifications are required in other provinces as well as in Prince Edward Island. Take the case of a man who is disqualified by receiving aid from some charitable institution. In Ontario that is not alluded to in the oath, because it does not affect his vote if his name is on the list.

Mr. McNEILL. Why not remove the ambiguity by inserting Prince Edward Island ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. This section is clearly intended, so far as the questions are concerned, to apply to Prince Edward Island exclusively.

Mr. CLANCY. But there is the alternative of asking the questions or answering the questions or taking the oath.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. These are only qualifying words.

Mr. MONTAGUE. That might be very well if we had the Solicitor General at every polling booth to explain to the scrutineer and the returning officer what these words mean; but I tell him that under that clause there will be constant badgering of voters by returning officers and scrutineers.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Are questions not allowed to be asked at all, whether there is a list or not ?

Mr. MONTAGUE. No, there is always a list.

Mr. SPROULE. There is no list in the unorganized territory—in Nipissing and Algoma.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am told that in some parts of Ontario there is no list.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I find that section 83 of the Ontario Election Act provides for a list in the unorganized territories. I think it will be found that this applies exclusively to Prince Edward Island.

Mr. HENDERSON. Although the intention is to apply this only to Prince Edward Island, there is danger that it will be applied in every province. I am sure 95 per cent of the returning officers of Ontario would feel that under this they would be entitled to ask the voter any question they thought fit. For instance, a voter might be asked if he was a British subject, whether he was naturalized or not, and if so to produce his papers. If he were not able to do so, he would be obliged to withdraw. I know that under present circumstances voters are badgered and bothered until they retire from the polling booth. In my own county a man who had been compelled to

retire had to drive back to the polling booth a second time and peremptorily demand his ballot before he could get it. I think the words are dangerous indeed, and if they are intended to apply to Prince Edward Island alone, words should be inserted to that effect.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The only safe way is to strike out the words, "answer such questions or produce such evidence as to his qualifications to vote." That leaves the clause for the other provinces. Then add a sub-clause for Prince Edward Island.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I will accept that suggestion. I move that the words in the 14th line, "answer such questions or produce such evidence as to his qualifications to vote or" and in line 17 the words "answer, produce or" be struck out.

Mr. BENNETT. What form of oath is provided—the form that will be appended to this Act or the local form?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I may have to make some provision about the oath, because it occurs to me there will be a difficulty about the disqualified voter under the oath.

Amendment agreed to, and section, as amended, agreed to.

On section 21,

Section 50 of the said Act is hereby repealed.

Mr. MONTAGUE. We have appeals in Ontario under the Manhood Franchise Act. Supposing they should not be decided, does the hon. gentleman intend that those who are appealed against shall not be entitled to vote?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I would consider that in Ontario where there is an appeal, under the Act my hon. friend refers to, and it is not disposed of, that list is not in force.

Mr. HAGGART. All you would have to do to disqualify a whole list would be to appeal against it.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. You have to do it it within a certain day. They are not quite so bad in Ontario as they are represented here.

Mr. INGRAM. In 1886 the voters' lists in the city of St. Thomas were appealed against by a Liberal candidate, and the appeal was brought before the courts and not decided before the election.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Did those on the lists vote?

Mr. BENNETT. They were illegally placed on the lists and the court decided in favour of this illegal course.

Mr. MONTAGUE. There are often appeals undecided before an election.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. In such case the lists cannot be used, and the former lists would have to be used.

Mr. HAGGART. Suppose half a list were appealed against.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. You cannot appeal from one name on it without appealing from the whole list.

Mr. INGRAM. Then you are really disfranchising that municipality.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. No, we are not.

Mr. INGRAM. We must have a better explanation.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I cannot give a better explanation. My hon. friends from Ontario will have to help me out. It seems to me the only common sense explanation I can give. You can get their cases disposed of. If a list is more than twelve months old, the Dominion Government must make a list itself in those places where the Manhood Suffrage Act applies. In the other, the municipalities must provide for an annual revision, and if an annual revision has not taken place, then the previous list is used.

Mr. INGRAM. In the province of Ontario—and I am speaking for the province of Ontario—as a matter of fact and as a matter of practice the list is completely revised only when there is a provincial election, that is to say, once in four years. It is true that the law provides for a revision yearly, as a matter of fact, hundreds of men are placed on part 3 of the list every fourth year who would not appear there but for the expectation of a provincial election.

Mr. CLARKE. Yes, thousands.

Mr. INGRAM. As my hon. friend from Toronto says, thousands of them. You are going to run the risk of driving us back to an old list on which all these names will not appear. Some provision should be made in case of an appeal against the voters' list.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. We are only beating the air and fighting with windmills on this point. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Ingram) says that part 3 is revised only once in four years, in a practical way. Then you have got into bad habits in Ontario, and we are not responsible for that. Section 6 of the Voters' List Act says:

The clerk of each municipality shall, immediately after the final revision and correction of the assessment roll in every year, make a correct alphabetical list in three parts of all persons——

—and so on. It is a yearly revision.

Mr. BENNETT. But the contention is that in local politics no man who intends to be a candidate goes to the expense of preparing the list for the mere contingency

of an election. He does it in the year immediately preceding the election.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. How can we provide against the neglect of those interested in the voters' list?

Mr. CLANCY. Let me point out what we find to be the fact as regards the revision in the county of Bothwell. There are nine municipalities. Out of a vote of 8,000 on part 3 of the list, there are on the present list only 289 names.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The hon. gentleman is simply pointing out that there are practical difficulties because there is neglect.

Mr. CLANCY. But the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fitzpatrick) is imposing new duties.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. How can you remedy the difficulty?

Mr. SPROULE. It seems to me that it would be no worse than it is at the present time, because the elections for the Commons will come around periodically the same as those for the province, and the list intended to be used for the Dominion election would be revised the same as we revise that for the provincial election.

Mr. INGRAM. It is all very well to talk about theory. My hon. friend (Mr. Fitzpatrick), who is a lawyer, and other lawyers, may split hairs——

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. There are others.

Mr. INGRAM. Now, I would suggest that the hon. gentleman allow this to stand over, and then perhaps we can suggest a way out of the difficulty. It is very well to theorize, but when you come to work out the election law in a practical way, you will find where these difficulties come in. I think it should be our duty to place as few barriers in the way as possible, and try to save expense. Why is it proposed to abolish the Franchise Act of 1885 and the whole system of Dominion lists? It is because they involve too much expense. Now, let me give a piece of the history of some appeals that have taken place. In 1886 the Liberal party in my county engaged six men to figure up by the yard hundreds and hundreds of names to appeal against, in order to prevent the revision being brought up before the election could take place. The Conservatives, feeling that the law was not designed to disfranchise men, but rather to give them the franchise, assisted the city clerk in preparing the appeals. Had we waited for the time provided by the law for issuing these appeals in the usual way, these young men would have been disfranchised. Our friends on the other side objected to this way of doing business and appealed to the court. The judges, taking the view that the law was intended to enfranchise men instead of disfranchising them, allowed the Conservative party, or those who were trying to get these men on the lists to proceed, even though they had acted in a somewhat irregular way. In this way the names of these young men were put upon the lists. But the point I want to make is that if the method adopted by these people in St. Thomas had prevailed, hundreds and hundreds of young men in the city would have been disfranchised. Why? Because the Liberal party appealed to the courts to prevent them from voting. I have a city and an incorporated town and incorporated villages in my riding Suppose that in the town they desired to prevent the young men voting, they would enter an objection and make an apeal to Toronto. If they could not carry out the law they could not use the voters' lists and so they would disfranchise a large number of men. We should be obliged to fall back on the other voters' list. I tell you that we do not revise the lists to the fullest extent three years out of four. Why? Because it is too expensive. The municipal clerks do not even put the names on the list, not because it is not the law but because it is not the practice. If the hon. gentleman will allow this to stand, we may be able to find a way out.

Mr. CLANCY. I am afraid that the professions of the hon. gentleman about cheapening the lists have vanished. There is not a gentleman from the province of Ontario but will say the revising of the lists under this section, as we are required to do, taking the view of the Solicitor General, every year, would be greater than we would have been compelled to bear under the Dominion Act. I say advisedly that so far as dollars and cents are concerned, we are infinitely worse off than we were under the Dominion Act.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I think I may say advisedly that we do not intend to have Dominion elections every year.

Mr. BRITTON. I differ entirely from the hon. member for Kent (Mr. McInerney), because the expenses of a revision under the Ontario Act in reference to manhood franchise, is not at all to be compared with the expense under the old system of revising officers. The difficulties that have been suggested will not arise in one case out of a hundred in practical dealing with these voters' lists. Suppose the list appealed against is not used, then the Dominion officers will provide new lists, so far as manhood franchise is concerned.

Mr. BENNETT. Judging from the remarks of the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Britton), it is certain that he never had any practical experience in preparing voters' lists for revision under the local. The hon. gentleman having been an official of the Ontario Government, was consequently not interested in politics. I know that in the East

Riding of Simcoe, there were over 1,500 appeals under the local Act; in Centre Simcoe there were over 800 appeals, and in the three ridings of Centre, West and East Simcoe. there were upwards of 2,500 appeals. Surely the hon. member for Kingston does not contend that 2,500 appeals could be carried on at no expense. In every case where we wished to have the man's name struck off the list, we were compelled to bring a witness there and pay him his fees. Had it been under the Dominion Act, it woud have been sufficient simply to mail him a notice, and then we could have dealt with his case. It is absurd to say that it does not cost anything to prepare these municipal lists. The First Minister, in opening the debate, stated there was no cost to the province at all. As a matter of fact, there was a cost of nearly $8,000 last year when there was a revision for the province. The First Minister stated also that there was no cost to the municipalities except in towns and cities. But in East Simcoe it cost the municipality for the local revision last year, $700 or $800. I can name one single township where it cost $80 to the municipality to revise the list. I know that in those township municipalities there is great complaint at present that they are driven to this large expense simply to revise the lists of the politicians, as they say. Now, when the lists will be fought out more desperately for the Dominion, as I know they will be—because I know that if I am a candidate I shall make a much more thorough revision of the lists than did the local members—the result will be that the cost in that township alone will be $150, and we will have the satisfaction of pointing out to the municipalities that this cost has all been imposed upon them by the Bill now before the House. There will not be a riding in the province of Ontario which will not have foisted upon it an expense of from $800 to $1,000, exclusive of the towns, by reason of shifting the responsibility of the preparation of the lists from the federal power to the municipal powers.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Touching the question of expense, I want to ask the Solicitor General a question as regards clause 8. Under the Registration Act of the province of Ontario, all the expense of engaging rooms for the sitting of the boards of registrators, all the expense of providing blanks, and forms, and everything of that kind, is charged up to the municipalities. Under this Act the government do all the buying, and the bill is sent into the municipalities. I sincerely hope that the hon. gentleman is much too generous to load this additional expense on the municipalities as regards the registration which may be necessary under this Act.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. We will be careful not to put it on the municipalities. We will bear all the expense.

Mr. INGRAM. I would like to draw the attention of the hon. gentleman to another point, and that is the need of making these appeals as economically as possible. Under the Dominion Act I cannot understand why the candidates should be compelled to register a notice to the elector whom they propose to strike off the list, I cannot understand why they are compelled to pay five cents for a registration stamp and three cents postage on a letter to that elector. The Post Office Department has power to send mail matter through the post office free of postage, and I think it should issue an envelope, which might be called a franchise envelope, that would pass as a registered letter without any cost to the candidate, and by that means saving him a large expense. Under our Ontario Act where appeals are made, they are served to the persons whose names are either objected to or to be added to the list. Now, instead of going to the expense of $100, or $200 in some cases, for serving these notices, let the Dominion Government furnish a franchise envelope free which would be considered like a registered letter.

Mr. SPROULE. That could be used for ordinary correspondence.

Mr. INGRAM. For births, marriages and deaths, in the province of Ontario, there is an envelope which passes through the mails free. Could there not be a penalty attached to any man using one of these franchise envelopes for any other purpose than that intended by the law?

On section 20,

Mr. MONTAGUE. This clause requires amendments similar to those which were made to clause 18

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman sees that we inserted a clause between 19 and 21 having reference to Prince Edward Island. We will have to let 21 stand. There would be no use in having two clauses. You will have to put in one to meet the case of Prince Edward Island. This clause 21 cannot do any harm as it stands, because it will refer to two sections generally, one referring to the rest of the Dominion, and one specially referring to Prince Edward Island.

Mr. MONTAGUE. You still have the shadow.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Not the substance.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Sometimes the shadow is made use of. It is inserted opposite the name of the man who has refused to swear, "refused to answer questions put to him." I want to put it beyond the power of a returning officer in my province to question any man or demand anything from him except that he should take the oath when required to do so.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. It is perfectly clear that if the authorities put questions and put the oath that their action must be found within the four corners of section 20. This is only recording what has been authorized under the previous section. If an officer had no power given to him, then if a man tendered his vote he could not record anything opposite his name except "refused to swear." But in the case of Prince Edward Island, if certain questions are put and the elector refuses to answer, then he cannot vote.

Mr. MONTAGUE. There should be a distinct mark in the poll book for cases where men have been qualified by taking the oath, and the entry "sworn" should be made. If a man comes in who is disqualified under the provincial Act and has to take the oath and be sworn as to his qualification under the Dominion Act, will that case be met?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I am going to consider that matter.

21. Section 52 of the said Act is hereby repealed, and in lieu thereof it is hereby enacted that no voter who has refused to take the oath or affirmation, or to answer questions or produce evidence as to qualification as aforesaid, when requested to do so, shall receive a ballot paper or be admitted to vote.

Section agreed to.

22. Section 54 of the said Act shall be applicable also to electors entitled to vote otherwise than by being named on the list of voters.

Section agreed to.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I understand that we have the promise of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that the clause regarding Prince Edward Island, which is to be framed, shall only refer to that province?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Precisely.

Mr. CLANCY. Is it the intention of the Government to pay the cost of the revision of the lists in the unorganized districts? That expense is at the present time borne by the province of Ontario.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. If they are made by our officials.

Mr. CLANCY. If the lists are not a year old, then they are under the machinery of this Act.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. We must take them as they are.

Mr. CLANCY. In such a case will the Government pay the cost of the revision?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. There will be no cost, for we will take the lists as they were at the time the elections were held during the twelve months preceding.

Mr. MONTAGUE.

Section agreed to.

23. Subsection 3 of section 56 of the said Act is hereby repealed.

24. Subsection 1 of section 64 of the said Act is hereby amended by striking out all the words from "or" in line fourteen to "be" in line twenty-eight.

(2.) Subsection 2 of the said section 64 is hereby repealed

(3.) Subsection 4 of the said section 64 is hereby amended by striking out all the words from "including" in line eight to "appeals" in line twenty-four.

25. Form S in the first schedule to the said Act, as amended by section 11 of chapter 11 of the statutes of 1888, by section 16 of chapter 19 of the statutes of 1891, and by section 22 of chapter 14 of the statutes of 1894, is hereby repealed.

26. Form X in the said schedule is hereby repealed.

Section agreed to.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I move that the following be inserted as section 27:—

The second section of the said Act is hereby amended by adding the following as 7a:—"The necessary disbursements under section 13 for fees for copies of documents furnished by the revising officers shall be as under the provincial law, and where there is no provincial law there shall be paid for copying 10 cents per 100 words and a custodian fee of 50 cents.

Section agreed to.

Mr. SPROULE. If it is in order, I move the following to amendment to apply to the Nipissing district:—

It shall be the duty and shall be within the power of the returning officer appointed by the Governor in Council to constitute polling divisions and to appoint and fix polling places and polling stations in all cases where necessary under the laws of the province, irrespective of the duty or power of the returning officer or any other officer or person at provincial elections so to do.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I accept that amendment.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I suppose in going into committee to-morrow some latitude will be allowed as to debate on that point.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I have been so generously treated that I ought to allow any latitude that my hon. friends can reasonably take.

Mr. MONTAGUE. We let you off easily.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I am very thankful for it. I beg to move, Mr. Speaker, that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. MILLS. Before the committee rises I wish to make a personal explanation. In reading the "Hansard" to-night, I was

astonished to find that the hon. member for Inverness (Mr. McLennan) had stated with reference to me that which was entirely untrue. As I see it has been recorded on "Hansard." I wish to correct his statement. I say here emphatically that I never ran for mayor of the town of Annapolis in my life, and not having run for the mayoralty of that town, I could not have been defeated.

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). I certainly indicated the hon. gentleman's nominee. He had his nominee in the field and backed him for all he was worth.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McLennan) is entirely wrong. I had no nominee, and never ran for mayor of Annapolis.

The CHAIRMAN. Order.

Committee rose and reported progress.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. HAGGART. What business will be taken up to-morrow ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We propose to go into committee and pass some amendments which have been reserved, and some clauses which are under consideration by the Solicitor General in reference to suggestions made by hon. gentlemen on the other side. After that is through, if my hon. friend from Brome (Mr. Fisher) is here, it is probable he will move the second reading of the Plebiscite Bill. If we have time afterwards we will go into Supply.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 11.30 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 29th April, 1898.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 126) respecting the Saskatchewan Railway and Mining Company, and to change its name to the Saskatchewan and Pacific Railway and Mining Company.—(Mr. Landerkin.)

Bill (No. 128) further to amend the General Inspection Act.—(Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière.)

THE FISHERIES ACT.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 127) to further amend the Fisheries Act. He said: The changes are not very important or material. The present law provides that where there are violations of the provisions of the Act or regulations, prosecutions may be instituted and certain fines imposed for the first, second and third offences. It has been found practically impossible to carry out the section in that way. There are many difficulties in the direction of reciting that a man has been convicted for a first and convicted for a second offence, and it has been found practically impossible to carry out the provisions of the Act. The penalty for the first offence, $20, is useless, being too small. I propose to introduce a provision by which an offender shall be liable to a penalty not exceeding a certain amount, the sum to vary according as the offence is trifling or serious.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Do you establish as the fine the maximum for the third offence ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I propose $100 instead of $60. The other change I propose is this: Where under-sized lobsters are taken, perhaps one hundred or two hundred are put into a crate with two hundred or perhaps one thousand full-sized lobsters, and the inspector would be occupied almost a day in selecting those under size, for he can only confiscate such lobsters. I propose to provide that if a number of under-sized lobsters are contained in a crate containing lobsters of a regular size, the crate and full-sized lobsters shall be confiscated as well as the under-sized lobsters.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

OFFICER COMMANDING THE MILITIA.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). In the absence of the Minister of Militia (Mr. Borden) moved that the House resolve itself into Committee on Tuesday next, to consider the following resolution :—

That it is expedient to provide that the Officer commanding the Militia shall be paid a salary at the rate of $4,000 per annum, and in addition thereto, in lieu of allowances, such sum, not exceeding $2,000 per annum, as the Governor in Council determines.

Motion agreed to.

ALIEN LABOUR LAW.

Mr. BENNETT. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would ask the Solicitor General, if under the provisions of the Alien Labour Law the duty has been assigned to any person to look after the carrying out of that law in the district of Muskoka and at points on the north shore of the Georgian Bay, where I am informed a large number of workmen from the United States are now employed by American lumber firms? If there is no such official yet appointed, and now that the attention of the Government has been called to the matter, I ask the Solicitor General if the Government will be pleased to appoint an official to carry out the law?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). I am unable to say now if an agent has been appointed by the Attorney General for that purpose. I will make inquiry and I expect to be able to answer my hon. friend (Mr. Bennett) before six o'clock.

IMPERIAL ARMY SOLDIERS IN TORONTO.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I wish to ask the Government if they have any information as to the intention of the British Government to send a British regiment to Toronto, and make it a recruiting station?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). I have no information on that point.

ELECTORAL FRANCHISE ACT.

The House again resolved itself into committee on the Bill (No. 16) to repeal the Electoral Franchise Act and to further amend the Dominion Elections Act.

(In the Committee.)

On section 19a,

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). I now submit the amendment I promised yesterday with reference to Prince Edward Island. This will be a new section, and will be marked section 19a:

In the province of Prince Edward Island an elector, if required by the deputy returning officer, the poll clerk, one of the candidates, or the agent of a candidate, or by any elector present, shall, before receiving his ballot paper, answer such questions and produce such certificates or receipts, or in case such certificates or receipts cannot be produced, take the oath in such case as prescribed, and take such other oath of qualification as by the law of the province he may in the like case at a provincial election be required to answer, produce or take, such changes being made in the form of oaths as are necessary to make them applicable to the election being held, which oaths the deputy returning officer and poll clerk and each of them are authorized to administer.

Mr. FIELDING.

Mr. MONTAGUE. That is a separate clause.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes, a separate clause provided exclusively for Prince Edward Island.

Section agreed to.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I wish in section 18, to make an amendment so as to add after the word "addition" in line 45, the words "and in the province of Prince Edward Island, disqualification also."

Amendment agreed to.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The subject with reference to the disfranchised voter would come in under section 17, now 18, as printed. I wish to amend by inserting after the word "both" at the end of line 1, the following words:—

Or if the name of such elector is not on the list of voters, but he claims the right to vote under subsection 1 of section 6 of the Franchise Act, and takes the oath prescribed by that subsection.

Amendment agreed to, and section as amended agreed to.

On section 20,

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. To meet another difficulty suggested by the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) in connection with section 20, as printed, but section 21, as it will be in the Act, I move that the following be added as a subsection:

The poll clerk shall also enter in the poll book the words, "provincial disqualifications oath taken," opposite the name of each elector to whom the oath prescribed by subsection 2 of section 6 of this Act has been administered, and the words, "refused to take provincial disqualifications oath" opposite the name of each elector who has refused to take that oath."

Amendment agreed to, and section as amended agreed to.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I think it is proper for me to state now that there exists in the public mind an erroneous impression as to the right to vote on affidavit or oath. I received two or three telegrams this morning which indicate that an impression exists that any man can vote on affidavit if his name is on the list. The intention is to limit that to disqualified persons. No person whose name is not on the list, other than a disqualified person, can have the right to vote by taking the oath.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I think that misunderstanding arose from the way in which the clause was printed.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. That may be. There are some other points to be considered between now and the third reading of the Bill. I understand that the intention is to have the Bill reprinted and distributed, and then we will consider the other matters

—as to the subdivisions under the local Act, as to the printing of the voters' lists, and as to the question of an appeal.

Mr. MONTAGUE. And also the question of disqualification by removal.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes, we will consider that also.

Mr. McINERNEY. There is also the question of striking out in section 9 the words "or it may be attached by the returning officer to the adjoining polling division." The hon. Solicitor General, when I proposed an amendment to this effect last night, said it would be considered on the third reading.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes, that will also be considered.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I suppose we are to have on the third reading a little more latitude in speaking than is usual.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I think you will find that I will reciprocate.

Bill reported with amendments.

INSPECTION OF STEAMBOATS AND LICENSING OF ENGINEERS.

Amendment by the Senate to Bill (No. 39) respecting the inspection of steamboats and the examination and licensing of engineers employed on them—(The Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Sir Louis Davies)—read the first time.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES moved that the said amendment be now read the second time and agreed to. He said: The amendment is a very trivial one, and I agree to it, and I am sure the House will, too. It is in section 48, and provides that where a steamboat is seized on a conviction against the owner for a penalty, and ordered to be sold, it shall be sold only after such reasonable notice as the Minister in each case shall prescribe.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The only point that occurs to me in reference to that is that it is rather vague.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The objection raised was that if the Minister did not have some such authority as that, an officer might sell the vessel without proper notice.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Is this notice to the owner or the public?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). To the public.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It is quite clear from the language used that the notice may be to the owner or to the public. No doubt the intention is that it shall be a public notice in order that the boat shall not be sacrificed, but it is not so stated in the Act.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No Minister would ever sanction any notice that is not public, and we may fairly leave the clause as it is. No other notice would be thought of.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That is the danger of assuming that everything will be done properly. This clause is so vague that any notice might do. The hon. gentleman says, Oh, yes, but the Minister of the day will be governed by common sense and make it a public notice, but he need not under this Bill, and might consider a notice to the owner or the captain as reasonable. I do not think that is the intention, and think we should make it read "reasonable public notice."

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not think the hon. gentleman need put that in because there would be no possibility of any Minister allowing any vessel to be sold at private notice.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. If it is to be a public notice, why not make it so beyond doubt.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not think it means anything else. I do not think any Minister ever could be found who would tolerate any but a public notice.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Legally he could. He might consider notice to the owner sufficient.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It is a very extreme and violent presumption to make that any Minister would sanction the sale without public notice. I think the hon. gentleman may be perfectly satisfied on that point.

Amendment read the second time, and agreed to.

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Department of the Secretary of State.. $36,500

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). There are two increases of $50 each, in the cases of a second and third class clerk.

Mr. FOSTER. How many clerks in that department are eligible for statutory increases?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have not got any memo. of that, and if the hon. gentleman attaches importance to it, the item will have to stand.

Mr. FOSTER. I attach great importance to it. I am going to ask the question of every department, for a purpose.

Item allowed to stand.

Department of Public Printing and Stationery $27,800

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The only change in that is the retirement of one official, making a reducion of $1,300.

Mr. FOSTER. Any statutory increases ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Not in that branch, I think.

Mr. FOSTER. How many are eligible for statutory increases ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have not that information, and will have to ask to let that stand.

Item allowed to stand.

Department of the Interior..... $104,824

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). The changes are as follows :—There is one more chief clerk and one less first-class clerk, making no difference in the salary. There is one additional second-class clerk by reason of the promotion of C. J. Steers from the third class to the second class. Among the third-class clerks there is a net increase of $1,200, made up as follows :—Promotion of C. J. Steers to the second class, salary not required, therefore clerkship abolished. There are statutory increments asked for this year by S. J. Eagleson, C. W. Badgeley, Miss B. Barber, R. A. Lewis and Miss May, making in all $250. There are statutory increases for two messengers, H. Ackland and B. H. Wright. I am not able to say at this moment how many clerks in the department are eligible for statutory increases, but I will get that information later.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. member for York asks the question as to how many were eligible in the Secretary of State's Department. I find there were fifteen clerks eligible under the rule that previously prevailed with respect to statutory increases ; two have been granted, to Messrs. Steele and Dubé.

Mr. MONTAGUE. What superannuations have taken place during the year in that department ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My recollection is that there are none, but the returns will be brought down.

Mr. FOSTER. Was any report received from the department as to why Messrs. Steele and Dubé should be singled out of the fifteen who were eligible in that department for statutory increases ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. A report was received recommending these two gentlemen who have been named. No report was received discriminating against the others, but they were not recommended. The Deputy Minister, knowing the policy of the Government in that respect, recommended those names ; my impression is that he did not make any report on the others. The information furnished to me does not include any report respecting the others.

Mr. FOSTER. Were there any special points ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Mr. Steele entered the service as an extra clerk in 1875, and regard was had to his long service, extending over twenty years. He is a good clerk, possessing a knowledge of both short-hand and typewriting, and is entitled to this increase on account of his services.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. It seems to me the Act would require that all those who are eligible for the increase should be recommended. Now, if there is a discrimination made, the reason why these two gentlemen should be selected ought to appear in the report of the deputy. I think it is important to know if any reasons were given why these two gentlemen were selected for an increase, while the others were left out.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Perhaps my hon. friend was not in the House the other night when we had a discussion on that question.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I was here, and took part in the discussion.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Then, I shall have to repeat the reason that was given before, and as my hon. friend was present then, he will hardly regard it with more satisfaction now. The view of the Government was that where a clerk was recommended as being specially meritorious, they might give him an increase. But that did not necessarily imply anything to the disadvantage of the other clerks, they might be very worthy officials, but not specially entitled to promotion or advancement as the others who were selected.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Have any of the members of the Government instructed the deputies not to make that report regarding statutory increases ? The practice is well known. Before the change was made by the Government the principle was that the deputies, as a matter of course, and without instruction, were to bring forward these reports where they saw fit, where, in their opinion, a report should be made under this clause 26 of the Act. In connection with that, I would ask the Government whether any departmental or political heads instructed or intimated to the deputies to change that practice, and to make the reports only when the matter was called to their attention by the political head ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not think any special instructions

of that nature were given; but the deputies certainly did understand that the former practice was not to be followed out, and I have no doubt that a number of the deputies, on that understanding, only made such recommendations as they thought were likely to be accepted. While no special instruction was given, the knowledge that that was the policy of the Government, I have no doubt, influenced some of the deputies in making their reports.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I know of no objection to these two men getting their statutory increases, but I know some of the staff in that department, and if I were to-morrow to make a selection for statutory increases, I do not know that I would exclude these two young men. But this much I would say, that unless things have changed very greatly under the rule of hon. gentlemen opposite, I know of absolutely no reason whatever why these two should be selected and the others left out.

Mr. McNEILL. Certainly the statement made by the Minister of Finance is a very startling one for the committee to consider. My hon. friend is aware of the fact that the attention of the Government has been called by my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) to the view taken of this legislation by probably the greatest lawyer we ever had in this House, certainly on their own side of the House (Mr. Blake) at the time the measure was passing through the House, also to the view taken by my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, also a lawyer of high standing in the House; also to the view taken by the Postmaster General, a lawyer on their own side of the House, all of whom declared emphatically that there was no doubt whatever as to the meaning of the clause, that it meant that these men were to have their statutory increases if they were deserving clerks and were fairly discharging their duties. These things having been brought to the memory of the Government, I would ask whether they have changed the view that they took in regard to this question, or whether they are still determined to adhere to the course they announced to the House the other day.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We have certainly found no reason to change the view which we entertained when this matter was last before the House.

Mr. MONTAGUE. May I ask what the policy of the Government is with regard to these statutory increases? May I ask if the increase is granted because the deputy reports that a certain clerk is specially qualified, or is it granted according to the will of the Government?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I may say, in answer to the hon. gentleman, that in no case is the increase granted without the recommendation of the Deputy Minister.

Mr. MONTAGUE. That is not the question.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If I attempted to give the hon. gentleman further light on the matter, I should only be repeating what has already been stated. Some few may be selected as specially worthy, and, upon the recommendation of the Minister, these obtain the increase. Where the Minister does not recommend it, they do not get the increase.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Well, Mr. Chairman, Parliament votes this money, and Parliament ought to know why certain men are selected for special favours, there can be no question about that. Under this Act the Government have the power—whether it is compulsory upon them or not is another question, but they certainly have the power—to give these officers their annual increase. Now, I think it is treating Parliament with very scant courtesy if we are to be told that one officer is selected over another for his statutory increase, but Parliament shall not be given the reason why one is chosen and the other is not chosen.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It seems to me that the Government, without really amending the legislation or taking regular steps are making a very serious departure from the policy that Parliament has sanctioned by the clause which has been so often discussed providing for the statutory increases. I take it that the difference between the granting of the statutory increase and this request for the increment of salary in a particular case is that in one case there was a departmental policy, and in the other, so to speak, a policy of the political head. To illustrate: When we observed the general Act, and the statutory increase was granted as a matter of course, subject to the character that the officer had earned at the hands, not of the political head of the department, but at the hands of the Deputy Minister, it was the practice for the Minister to come and ask Parliament, wholly regardless of that, some special reward for a special officer, and for that, the report of the deputy was not required in any sense. But there was a distinct policy, for which a good deal could be said, that it clothed the deputy head rather than the Minister with the authority and control over the officers, enabling the deputy head to secure a more earnest and zealous obedience and discipline in the department for which he was responsible to the political head. And, without mentioning any particular names, there was made available by Parliament every year a fund out of which every deserving officer could be rewarded with an increase of $50 when he had won the good opinion of the deputy head and the political head concurred in giving it. Now,

it seems to me that, against the spirit of that legislation, if not against the letter of it, there has been a complete reversal of policy. The Deputy Minister now has none of that assistance, none of that authority, but the grant is made purely and simply a political matter. I do not think that that is in the interest of civil service reform or in the line of the argument of some hon. gentlemen who made themselves very prominent in the matter and who now sit behind the Treasury benches. At any rate, if that is to be the rule, as the Minister of Finance says it is, if the Government has adopted a policy about it, it seems to me that, instead of adopting this system of leaving the clause on the statute-books and ignoring the practice which has obtained without a break since it was enacted, the Government ought to repeal this clause, instead of discussing its construction, and completely inaugurate the policy they seem to be following—that the deputy head is to count for nothing in these matters of discipline, but all that is to be taken upon the shoulders of the political head.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I desire to take exception to what the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) says, though he did not mean it, perhaps, that these recommendations are made on political grounds. I cannot say that there is nothing of the kind, and that all that is necessary in order to establish it is to consult the names of those to whom the increases have been granted. This will show that the grant rests, not upon political claims, but solely upon considerations of meritorious service. I desire to say, and that with the fullest confidence, that hon. gentlemen opposite will be wrong if they assume that rewards are made upon political grounds.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I accept what the hon. Minister of Finance says. If anything that I said seemed to have a different meaning, I did not intend it. Still, the course that the Government are taking opens up the suspicion that these things are given according to political favour and not as the Act contemplated according to the work in the department as known to the deputy head—and necessarily, particularly in the larger departments, the work of the officer is better known to the deputy head than it can be to the political head.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I accept, with regard to the Secretary of State's department, what the Minister has said as to the political significance of these increases. But I desire to ask a question, as I was out for a time and did not hear the Minister of Finance if he stated the facts. How many were recommended for statutory increase by the Deputy Minister ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I cannot say what may have passed between the Minister and the deputy, but I received recommendations in two cases. I believe that the Deputy Minister did not follow the practice of recommending all.

Mr. MONTAGUE. That is an extraordinary statement. It is tantamount to admitting that the Deputy Minister recommends only those he is told to recommend.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Or, put it the other way, that the Deputy Minister would not do anything that he knew was not in accordance with the policy of the head of the department. If he knew that it was the policy of his chief not to make these recommendations generally, I think he would make recommendations of those who were specially meritorious.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Is this duty not a statutory duty on the part of the Deputy Minister ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Even that is debatable.

Mr. MONTAGUE. If so, the will of the Minister, it would seem, overrules the statute.

Mr. FOSTER. The statement of the Minister of Finance raises a very important question, so important that I think we should have some conversation about it. I think that the whole theory of the stated officers of the department—for instance, the deputy heads—is that they shall be departmental and not political officers. The deputy head, who is a permanent officer of the department, should be there not for the sake of assisting the party which may be in power at the time or the party to which he may be affiliated, so far as his politics go ; but he should be there to carry on the business of the department on certain lines of departmental policy. He should be there to give his Minister the departmental view of every question that comes up. It is the Minister's place to shape the policy. But the Minister has nothing secure in the department, it seems to me, unless he has a faithful departmental officer, to wit, the deputy head, who, without considering whether his Minister is Grit or Tory, shall, in all his recommendations and reports, put before his Minister purely, simply and absolutely the departmental view. The Minister may agree with that or not. The Minister may adopt it absolutely or may reject it absolutely for reasons of policy of which he is the exponent. He may moderate the recommendations of the Deputy Minister with an eye to political or party policy. But a Minister is in a most dangerous position if he educates or seeks to educate the deputy head of the department to first think what his Minister's wish is, what the party view is with reference to a matter before he makes any recommendations. And, Sir, the public service of this country would be in a most deplorable position if that is to be the training and tendency of the deputy heads or permanent officers of the depart-

ments. Now, what did the Minister of Finance say? He said practically this: That the deputy did not simply consider the clerks under him and their duties and how they performed those duties, and so report to the head of the department entirely outside of what the Government's view or what the Minister's view might be as a matter of policy, who were the deserving clerks, and which of them, on the line of deserving conduct and good work ought to have the increase.

But swayed by the opinion of his Minister or the policy enunciated by the Government, a party policy, even though it was administrative, he simply recommended two clerks for increases. If that was done in that department, and if all the deputies in so far as they take that view are so going to conduct their departments, they will not be doing their duty to the department or the best duty of which they are capable of performing to the Minister himself. The clerks are under the eye of the deputy, they perform a year's work, the deputy's sole duty in any report is to give them their due as clerks; if they have been negligent to say so, if their conduct has been good to say so, if they have shown specially meritorious conduct to say so and let the facts go before the Minister. Otherwise, in what position do the clerks stand? They have no friends at court, and they have not any impartial head over them to give the Minister and the Government a fair report of what they have done during the year. It is unfortunate if that state of affairs is to be brought about, as is intimated by the Finance Minister. Again, what does the Minister do—and I mention it again to reinforce what the hon. member for Pictou has said in this respect. The Government are simply doing this. They reprobate a general policy, a law under which that general policy was carried out for years in this country, they declare the principle wrong and that they will not be bound by it, but they accept the policy in order to have an opportunity, under shelter of it, to advance by whim or caprice or on their own judgment members of the service just as they please. That is not shouldering their fair responsibility, and they ought, if they believe the principle wrong, to get it off the Statute-book and take simply and solely the responsibility of coming down here with special recommendations and asking Parliament to vote certain increases to certain officers. Again, it seems to be very unfair in this respect. Parliament is asked to give $100 in this case to two gentlemen out of fifteen, who have done their work well, and who under the law we believe are entitled to increases, certainly under the rules which have existed for many years. But only two have been recommended and given increases. The others are stigmatized by not getting increases. So long as the Government keep the general rule on the Statute-book reports should be made and clerks deserving should receive increases. But out of the fifteen clerks thirteen have been discriminated against, as is known to their fellow-clerks, and any one acquainted with the facts. The Minister says the Government take the responsibility of bringing down two recommendations and ask $50 each increase from Parliament. Should not the Government tell Parliament the facts of the case? If the Ministers adopt that rule they give the deputy head the power to judge between the clerks. The Minister practically says: I think two clerks are capable and should have increases; I do not think the other thirteen should have increases, and we have made up our minds from what the deputy has reported; but we will not give Parliament the means of judging as regards the other thirteen clerks who have not received increases. The Minister is not without the possibility of failing in a matter of judgment, and Parliament must always be the judge as to the Minister's action, and how can he judge unless equipped with the facts of the case. So in the case of every department the deputy, in justice to the clerks, must give a fair and unvarnished statement to his Minister, and that statement should be at the call of the House when the Estimates are being passed. Then we can judge whether or not there has been unfair discrimination. It must also be remembered that the deputies are mortal and human as well as the Ministers, and hon. members want to know the grounds on which the decisions were arrived at. As it is, the Minister gives no ground, and I may be more skeptical than I should be, but I believe there is not one Minister out of the six before me who has had a report from his deputy this year with respect to his clerks and how they are doing their work.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). I beg your pardon.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). I beg your pardon.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). I have.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). And so have I.

Mr. FOSTER. I know the Minister of Finance has had a recommendation, but from whom I do not know. The Minister of each department has submitted his Estimates to Council and has urged that two, four, six or eight clerks be given increases. This recommendation has been submitted to Council; but have the Ministers in the different departments actually had a report from the deputy, and if so, why should not Parliament know the reason why discriminations have been made? I say also that to

a certain extent this House is the arbiter as to these clerks in the event of any injustice bing done them. When it is announced that thirteen clerks have been left off and two have been selected, it is clear that action is unjust to the thirteen, for it is unjust if they have done their work efficiently, and if they are unworthy clerks they should not be retained in the service. If a clerk is worthy, what is the cardinal point of difference between the thirteen and the two clerks who have received increases? But the main point to which I wish to ask the attention of the Ministers and the House is, that if we are going to drill up the deputies to report just what they think the Ministers and the Government may wish, we are not treating the public service fairly. The Deputy Minister is a departmental officer, and he should prepare his report without any thought as to what policy or politics of the Minister or Government may be. In no other way can the Minister get the true facts of the case, and the Minister is the only political head that is necessary; and a deputy should be dismissed if he shows in his report that he is studying what his Minister would like to have there, or what the policy of the party in power for the time being is in connection with the work of the departments.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I should like to ask my hon. friend two or three questions. In the first place, I cannot conceive that any reflection can be passed on the deputy heads if, knowing the policy of the Government is to reward the most deserving clerks, he reports those who in his judgment are the most deserving. He is simply performing his obvious and clear duty. Clerks may be divided into three classes, the deserving, more deserving, and most deserving, and if the Minister tells the deputy to report the clerks who are most deserving he simply does his duty in so doing. I am perfectly aware that in a very considerable number of cases there are a large number of these gentleman in the service who would have been recommended by us had it not been for the fact that for a great number of years preceding 1897, the Act was wholly disregarded by hon. gentlemen opposite, and wholly disregarded by the deputy heads. I know, and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) knows well, that it is absolutely and physically impossible that out of several hundred members of the civil service, legally or nominally—supposed to be legally entitled to the increase—every man is deserving. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) will not rise in his place and say on his word of honour as a member of Parliament, that he believes that every clerk in the departments deserves an increase of $50 a year whom the law permitted to receive it.

Mr. FOSTER. I tell you what I will say.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. What will you say?

Mr. FOSTER. I will say that my view of the law, reinforced by the practice of very many years, is, that every clerk in every department who has conscientiously and well fulfilled his duties for the year, has a right to his $50 increase as a matter of quasi contract between himself and the Government when he went into the service.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I do not accept that as a correct statement of the case, but we will take it for the moment. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) on his honour believe, that the four or five hundred young or middle-aged gentlemen in our several departments, who were entitled to receive this increase according to the apparent letter of the law; does he believe that they all, each and every year from 1878 down to 1896 deserved that increase and that there was no exception?

Mr. FOSTER. I will not say that there was no exception and I never did say it.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Now I would like the hon. gentleman to point out to me when any exceptions were made.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Yes.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I doubt if during that eighteen years any of these men were refused an increase.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I recollect one case in the Marine Department.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. It is possible that perhaps in one case the ex-Minister of Marine may have exercised his right. The fact of the matter is the law was rendered a dead letter. I frankly admit it was a dead letter during a large part of the time I administered the Finance Department. I objected to it, but it was a dead letter. Our people did as hon. gentlemen did; they gave these increases and the deputy heads recommended right and left during that period of years. The hon. gentleman recommended the increases without exercising the slightest discrimination between the very best men and the very worst men in their departments, and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) knows it. It is owing to that neglect of duty that this—I grant in some cases apparent hardship—has taken place. Owing to that neglect of duty the civil service estimate has grown to a very large percentage of the actual expenditure of the Government. We are asking for $1,418,000, and I am bound to say that having regard to the work done in the several departments, that is a large sum to be paid. I pointed out to the ex-Minister of Finance that there are three parties to concur before this $50 increase can be given. The deputy head is bound to certify to the

Minister that the person is deserving; the Minister having examined into the case is bound to certify to Council that the person is deserving, and the Council having taken the whole question into consideration—and in that consideration the sum total to be paid for the civil service is an essential factor—the Council finally decides whether or not this increase shall be granted. Any one of the three can block it, and any one of the three under certain conditions is bound to block it. Now, an essential portion of the question whether this $50 increase should be added bears on this point: is the party at the time receiving a just wage for the work he does.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. No member of the Government desires that men should work for the people of Canada for less than a just wage, but all of us who have experience in business or public matters know right well, that the salaries which are being given at this date to the great majority of the civil servants are as large, and probably larger, than they could earn in any other walk of life. That is not invariably the case. I have always pointed out that there are a good many men in the service who are probably underpaid, particularly in the higher offices; but I do say that if you take these several estimates you will see on the average that the men at this moment are probably as well paid as they could hope to be in any bank, in any railway company's employment, in any private man's employment, in, as I have said, any other walk of life. Under these circumstances the policy which the Government have announced is a plain and reasonable policy. They say, for the present, at any rate, that the sum total applied for the service is enough. We will not tie our hands absolutely when we find special cases, but as a matter of public policy we say that the bulk of the civil servants are getting a just wage for the work they do. That is our position, and I think it is a reasonable and fairly tenable position, and I think a position that the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) in his heart would hardly dispute. I pointed out the other day, and I now repeat that unless we do something of this kind we will automatically increase the vote for the civil service at the rate of forty or fifty thousand dollars a year. It was open to us, and it is open to us, but we were reluctant to do a thing of that kind, to have dismissed a great many of these gentlemen giving them a reasonable gratuity or superannuation.

Mr. FOSTER. You have gradually conquered some of that reluctance.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). For cause.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I do not think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) will be able to point to any dismissals, particularly from the inside service.

Mr. FOSTER. I am not talking so much of that.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Well, we are discussing the inside service at this moment. I fail to remember—although, perhaps, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) can recall to my mind—I fail to remember a case in the inside service where a man has been dismissed for offensive partisanship, or indeed for any cause except absolute malversation in office. I do not think that out of the many hundred who form the inside service we have dismissed one. Of course some may have been superannuated in the ordinary course. We are face to face with this position. For many years back, largely under the operation of the $50 a year increase, the expenditure on the civil service has been growing and growing, until it has come to a point where it is absolutely necessary to apply the brakes. We are applying the brakes, but it would be injurious to the service if we were absolutely to deprive ourselves of any power to recommend a single man in any of our departments. We are exercising that right very sparingly, and the division we are making is not a division into incompetents and those who deserve to be rewarded, but a division into deserving and more deserving, and we are giving the increase to a few of those whom we find most deserving. Of course that is a matter which we must ask the House to consider on our responsibility, and if the majority of the House disapproves we cannot carry it. If the majority of the House have confidence in the heads of the department they will sustain the recommeudation.

Mr. FOSTER. They will vote confidence.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I hope they will. There may be grounds, but that is a matter for future consideration, for considering whether some of these clauses might or might not be differently worded. We took pains to obtain an opinion on this from the best legal authority, and if hon. gentlemen will take that into consideration with the first proposition I have made, that when a man is in receipt of a fairly just wage that must be considered before he is recommended for an increase, I do not think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) will be able to establish any unjust act on our part.

Mr. McNEILL. I just wish to say one word with reference to this matter. I may say that I am fully convinced that the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) in so far as his action in this matter is concerned, is thoroughly sincere and is desirous of promoting the best interests of the

civil service and of the country. But I must take exception altogether to the ground he has taken before this committee as being sufficient to maintain his contention. In the first place, my hon. friend started out with the statement that for some years past the Act had been abused, and undeserving clerks have been recommended. Possibly that is true. Possibly the Act may have been violated. I think it is very likely that clerks have been recommended who ought not to have been recommended—undeserving clerks, clerks who were negligent of their duty; but is that any reason why the Act should be violated by hon. gentlemen opposite? Because the Act was not complied with by the preceding Government, because men were recommended who ought not to have been recommended, is that any reason why the statutory increase should be withheld now from men who deserve the increase? That is the argument my hon. friend addressed to the committee in the first instance. I ask my hon. friend himself whether that is a fair argument?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. It may be, under certain circumstances.

Mr. McNEILL. I cannot follow my hon. friend in that. If it has been the course to recommend men who were not deserving of the increase, who were negligent of their duties, is that any reason why we should refuse to recommend the men who were deserving, and who properly attend to their duties? If it be the law that a man who properly and fairly discharges his duties is entitled to the statutory increase——

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. That we do not admit.

Mr. McNEILL. That may be a reason. But suppose for a moment that that be the law, where is the need for the hon. gentleman's contention with regard to those who have not been discharging their duties properly having been recommended? That appears to me to be beside the question altogether. It is perfectly right, if that has been done in the past, that the Government should step in now and say, we will tolerate that practice no longer. If they did that, they would have the country and every right-thinking man in this House with them. But that is no reason whatever why they should violate the law. My hon. friend the Finance Minister said that no reason had been presented to the Government which affected their view in reference to this matter. I must say it requires a very strong reason to affect the view of hon. gentlemen opposite. When it is brought to their minds that Mr. Blake and two of their own colleagues declared that that was the law when this measure was passing through the House, if that has no effect on their minds, it is very difficult to imagine what can have any effect. The hon. gentleman says that an opinion was obtained; but he does not venture to say—because I asked him the question the other night—that that opinion stated that under this Act only the specially deserving clerks were to have the statutory increase. Then, what is the good of quoting the opinion? It is of no value whatever, so far as the hon. gentleman's contention is concerned, if it does not go the length of supporting his contention, and it does not. The hon. gentleman does not venture to say that it does. Then my hon. friend says that there are some clerks who are getting quite as much as they deserve without having the statutory increase. Does my hon. friend say that he has got a legal opinion to support him in stating that under this Act a man who is getting what the hon. gentleman thinks is enough, should not get his statutory increase?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I will not answer for a legal opinion, but I will say that I will act on it. This Parliament makes the law.

Mr. McNEILL. The hon. gentleman undertakes to put himself above the law in this respect, and that is what we complain of.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. We are not putting ourselves above the law. What this Parliament approves is the law.

Mr. McNEILL. The hon. gentleman says that he is going to do it, and get Parliament to sanction his action afterwards.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. If Parliament agrees to it, it is the law.

Mr. McNEILL. He says he is going to do it irrespective of the law.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. No, I could not do it irrespective of the law. I will do it with the approbation of Parliament.

Mr. McNEILL. In other words, he is going to get those behind him, whether it be the law or not, to put this thing through.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. We make the law.

Mr. McNEILL. You are not making the law at the present moment. The law is there, and you are violating the law. If you choose to make a law, as I said before, bring down a law; if you choose to say that this is a bad law, bring in a good law, and let it apply to those who come into the service after it is enacted; but do not violate the law that applies to those now in the service. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) told us what the law was when this measure was passing through the House.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. What measure ?

Mr. McNEILL. This very measure we are now discussing. He objected to it because it gave this very statutory increase which he now endeavours to say that this opinion which he has obtained warrants him in not allowing the clerks to have.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not think my hon. friend has shown that.

Mr. McNEILL. My hon. friend beside me (Mr. Davin) read the words of my hon. friend when the Act was going through the House. He produced "Hansard," and read from my hon. friend's own speech, in which he said that the clerks were all entitled to the statutory increase, i.e., all deserving clerks. My hon. friend cannot go behind that now. He said that was the law.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I told my hon. friend that the Minister of Justice advised that that was not the law.

Mr. McNEILL. But my hon. friend does not venture to say that the Minister of Justice declared that it was his opinion that only the specially deserving clerks should have the increase under the law. There is no use going behind that. We know that a man cannot have the increase unless the deputy reports, and so forth, but that is not what we are talking about. My hon. friend knows the law perfectly well, and he expressed himself most emphatically and unambiguously as to what the law was when this measure was before the House.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not think so.

Mr. McNEILL. Then the hon. gentleman had better look up the "Hansard." We say that he was correct in his interpretation of the law, and he was supported by Mr. Blake and his colleague, Mr. Mulock, at the time. We say that if hon. gentlemen think that the law is not a good law, let them bring in a Bill and alter the law. But if they do so, I for one will protest against men who entered the service under the existing law being made subject to the conditions of the new law. You must maintain your obligations with men who entered your service in good faith. It is an astonishing thing to hear my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce say that although this law declares that the salary of a clerk shall be so much, with an annual increase of $50, if he thinks that any man is getting as much as he is worth, he will not give him that $50 increase. He does not venture to say that he has a legal opinion endorsing that course, but he says: I will do this, whether it be the law or not, and the majority behind me will vote it through. I think that is a very harsh way to treat deserving men, because it is not undeserving men we are talking about, but the men admitted by my hon. friend to be deserving. To treat men of that kind in that manner is, I think, absolutely unprecedented in any British Parliament.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Has it ever occurred to my hon. friend to read section 26 ?

Mr. McNEILL. We have read section 26 over and over again ; and I am quite sure that my hon. friend will not stake his reputation as a lawyer on the opinion that the statement of the Minister of Trade and Commerce is borne out by section 26 or the spirit of the Act. Of course we understand perfectly well that a certain formality must be gone through, that the Deputy Ministers must report, but we are led to understand that they have been told not to report. I would ask my hon. friend the Solicitor General what is the good of pointing to section 26, which requires the report of a Deputy Minister, when the Minister of Finance tells us that the Deputy Ministers have practically been told not to report. My hon. friend knows perfectly well that the spirit of the Act is violated if deserving men are not recommended by the Deputy Minister, and he will not venture to say that it is not. As he has appealed to me, I now appeal to him. I am sure he will not venture to say that the spirit of the Act is not violated if the Deputy Minister does not report in favour of deserving men. My hon. friend will not reply. He is the law officer of the Government in this House, and he does not for a moment venture to make the contention that has been made by the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, and I do say, on behalf of these men, who are admittedly deserving, that I hope the Government will reconsider this matter and allow them the increase which the Act provides for.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to raise one point. I am not going to traverse the argument because I would simply repeat what we said on this side the other night and my hon. friend would repeat what was said on his side. So I would refer him to the "Hansard" and thus save time. But there is one point I want to impress on him, he says that the Government cannot go beyond a certain amount, and, therefore, cannot give the increase to all. He divides the service into deserving, and more deserving, and most deserving, and says he will give the increases to a few. Does not my hon. friend see, on looking over these Estimates, that there is no consistency at all observed as between departments. Take, for instance, the Department of Justice, which has fifteen clerks. Six of these are eligible for the statutory increase, and four out of the six get it. But when you go to the

Privy Council, you find twenty-four clerks, of whom fourteen are eligible, and of whom not one gets the increase. Why should there be that discrimination between these two departments? Take the Department of the Secretary of State. Out of twenty-eight clerks, fifteen are eligible but only two get the increase.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. My hon. friend must see that that of necessity must largely depend on two or three considerations, that are not perhaps immediately apparent. First of all, we must, each of us, rest largely on the judgment of the gentlemen in charge of the departments. The hon. gentleman has selected two extreme cases.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, for the purpose of illustrating the argument.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. It may happen that in one particular department there may be an unusually large number who appear to deserve some increase or recognition, and that in another department the average rate of pay for the work done may be quite equal to what the men really and fairly deserve. The weight of the argument I made is this, and the hon. gentleman did not deny it, that taking the service as a whole, the largest proportion of our clerks are very well paid. I have had occasion more than once to compare the salaries they receive with those received by men of equal attainments and position, in every respect, in other walks of life, and I am bound to say that a very great number of our civil servants are receiving fully as large a salary as men in analogous positions receive elsewhere. When a man receives as much as he is fairly worth, the terms of section 26 do not apply to him. We are told that we should give the $50 increase to those clerks who deserve it. I do not think that any hon. gentleman will seriously contend that the salary a man is receiving for the work he is doing should be left out of consideration. If you leave those two points out, and look merely at the bald, naked language of the statute, you make out a case, but looking at the kind of work done, which in many cases is of a purely routine character, not involving any special exertion, even of attention, but simply what is called clerical work, these clerks are very well paid. That became apparent to the hon. gentleman himself that he introduced a Bill providing for the employment of temporary writers or employees corresponding to those employed in England. I cannot pretend to say what particular reasons may have influenced my hon. friend or the Minister of Justice in the particular case referred to, but I may remind the hon. gentleman that it does not follow that we should take the amount at our disposal and distribute it every year equally among the number. If one department gets a little more than its share one year, next year that will be ratified, and so on. It would be very injudicious to take the amount, and say we will divide this pro rata according to the number of employees in the several departments. That would simply reduce us to pretty much the same conditions which we have found so objectionable and which the hon. gentleman found so objectionable himself that he changed the law.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think that any person who will read section 26 of the Civil Service Act will come to the conclusion already stated by the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright). It sets out the terms on which these increases must be given. The increase must first be recommended by the deputy head of the department, and second, recommended by the head, and then authorized by Order in Council. Now, any one who has given attention to the cost of the civil service at Ottawa must know that this inside service are paid salaries in excess of any other class of the Dominion. Bankers, wholesale clerks, retail clerks—there is no class, taken all in all, paid as good salaries as the inside civil service at Ottawa. The average salary of the inside service is over $100 a month, about $1,220 a year. I admit that some clerks, perhaps, are working for very small remuneration. I have no doubt, also, that some entered the service thinking that they would be granted this increase. They had no right to count upon it as a certainty, as they must have known, if they read the Act under which they were engaged. But I hold that when a man's salary goes above the ordinary salary paid to the civil servants in Ottawa, the Government have a perfect right to refuse to increase the salary further. And where they are receiving already a good, round substantial sum for the work they do, a sum amply sufficient to remunerate them for their work, the Government have a perfect right to refuse to give them more. Hon. gentlemen opposite have charged us on this side with not carrying out the pledges we gave to the country with regard to reduction. In the Budget debate they said that the Government had promised to reduce the expenditure by one, two or three millions. Now the Government are making an honest effort to reduce the cost of the civil service.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. McMULLEN. Certainly they are, and hon. gentlemen opposite find fault with them because they do not grant increases. In Committee of Supply to-day they find fault because there are not increases, and next year on the Budget they will quote the whole expenditure and find fault because they do not make reductions. I do not know what the Government can do to meet the wishes of the hon. gentlemen opposite. As I have said, the inside civil service

are paid a good round sum for the service they render, all that they could earn in any other line of life. Many of them are in the civil service because they could not succeed in any other line of life. Hon. gentlemen opposite cannot deny that they are the best paid class of people in this Dominion, and yet these gentlemen insist upon increases. Is it because these civil servants are largely their own political chickens that most of them have been appointed by themselves. There must be some reason for it. I hope that the Government will hold firmly to the principle laid down with regard to these increases and will refuse in every case to consent to an increase, except where the salary paid is so low that, in justice to the individual, some advance should be granted. I know very well that it is not popular to make reductions.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). Nor pleasant.

Mr. McMULLEN. Nor pleasant. I can well remember the former leader of hon. gentlemen opposite, now in the Senate, stating here—by the way, I think he stated that the present leader of the Opposition had declared that it was more popular, and he would rather defend an increase of $100 than to attempt to justify a reduction of $5. Hon. gentlemen opposite, when in power, increased the salaries of civil servants whether they merited it or not. But I hold that, under present circumstances, the Government are justified in the course they have adopted, and that salaries should not be increased except where men are getting too low salaries for the service they render.

Department of Public Printing and Stationery $27,800

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. With regard to the Queen's Printer. I find that ten were eligible to increase, but no increases were recommended.

Mr. FOSTER. Can my hon. friend tell whether there was any report of the deputy head on the clerks of the department to his Minister.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am not aware of any. I would not be positive, but I think there was not.

Office of the Comptroller of the North-west Mounted Police..... $10,350

Mr. FOSTER. Are there any explanations with regard to this?

The PRIME MINISTER. There is no alteration, the figures are the same as last year.

Mr. FOSTER. How many are eligible for the statutory increase?

The PRIME MINISTER. Without being positive, I would say there are three. If I am wrong, I will have the figure rectified at the next sitting.

Office of the Auditor General..... $26,750

Mr. FOSTER. We would like some explanation with regard to this.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think all the facts of the case have been placed in the possession of my hon. friend (Mr. Foster).

Mr. FOSTER. The number eligible for the statutory increase has not been stated.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It was 18, I think.

Mr. FOSTER. What number received it?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Three.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose I need not ask my hon. friend as a matter of information for my own part whether he has received any recommendations from the head of this department as to statutory increases?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The Auditor General recommended eighteen.

Mr. FOSTER. Was it true that the Auditor General recommended eighteen statutory increases, and explained that he could so arrange the clerks in his department that if the increases had been granted, expenses of his department would not have been any more, or if anything, would have been a little less, than under the preceding arrangement?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. He had made a re-arrangement in that direction; I am not quite sure he went so far as my hon. friend, but substantially that is correct.

Mr. FOSTER. For what reason was it that the Minister of Finance refused the statutory increases in these cases?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The Auditor General wanted eighteen statutory increases, and it was the opinion of the Government that that was too large a number. They told the Auditor General that if he would make a selection of a few of those who were most deserving, they would be endorsed, and thereupon he sent in the names of three gentlemen, and his recommendation was concurred in.

Mr. FOSTER. But I understood from the Minister of Trade and Commerce that the cardinal difficulty in this case of statutory increases was that they only had a certain amount of money to devote to making them.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I spoke rather of the whole sum.

Mr. FOSTER. They must be kept down, because you wanted to keep down the whole appropriation. Now, the Auditor General is the officer responsible to Parliament for the audit of the accounts. He has in his department what he thinks are very excellent, and what I know are most hard-working

clerks. They are not four o'clock gentlemen, they are there to work whenever they are called upon to work. They are as often there after hours, possibly, as they are during hours. What I mean to say is that the exigencies of his department, during a large part of the year, call for consecutive work, and those clerks do the work when they are told to, and they are worked very hard. Now, his argument would be that these men are all deserving and hard-working clerks. A large number of them are clerks on small salaries. I happen to know that most of them have families, and with a small salary and with a family, it is pretty difficult living in this city with comfort. A man who has to have a home and support a family, even though it be small, on $600 or $700 a year, has a pretty difficult task in this town. Any person who will inquire into it will know that. Therefore, a large number of his men are of those who do not fall under the class spoken of by the member for North Wellington as being paid generous salaries. The Auditor General proposes to encourage these men, to keep their ambition up, and to give them the increase that they expected from year to year, but so to arrange his department that it would not cost the Government any more. Therefore, the whole argument of the Minister of Trade and Commerce in that respect falls to the ground. Where an independent officer with the work to do, and his clerks to do it, will arrange his department in such a way that, though giving statutory increases, he still will get out of the clerks a sufficient amount of work to enable him to overcome the duties of his department, and where that would cost the Government no more, the reason falls to the ground that it could not be granted because it would take more money. It seems to me in that case the Minister of Finance was somewhat harsh in refusing the increases to the Auditor General. He cannot refuse them on the ground that they were not highly recommended, they were. He cannot refuse them on the ground that it would take more money; the Auditor General would have arranged his department so that it would not have taken more. He himself is estopped from using the argument that if you give it to one one year, you must give it to them the next year, because the Government holds that it is simply discretionary. Now, what was the reason the increases were not given, more especially as I understand my hon. friend was not so severe with his own department?

Mr. HAGGART. I entirely differ from the view of my hon. friend who has just spoken in reference to this particular department. I think the officers of this department are as well paid, or perhaps better paid, than the officers of any other department of the Government. I think they require no more intelligence or no more technical education than the officers of any other department. I think if you will look into the term of service of the officers of this department, you will find they are far better paid than the officers in any other department. For these reasons, although differing from the Minister of Finance as to his reason for withholding the statutory increases, still, if he is going to stick to that rule, I think he has applied it as well in this department as he has in others. The reason for the passage of the Civil Service Act, by which these gentlemen claim that they are entitled to statutory increases, is well known. It was on the report of a committee consisting of several deputy heads, and there was a moral understanding, if not a legal understanding, that every party who entered the service at that time was to get a statutory increase until he arrived at the maximum of his class, that is, if he was any way efficient or fit to be retained in the service of the Government. After that, his statutory increase ended. There is no doubt about the law in the matter. The law upon the matter is, as stated by the Minister of Trade and Commerce, that it is not at all obligatory upon the Government to grant these statutory increases each year. The law is merely an empowering Act which enables the Government, upon the report of the deputy head of a department, and upon the certificate of the head of the department, to grant the statutory increase. We have had opinions again and again that the Act is only an empowering one. I differ entirely from my hon. friend from Bruce (Mr. McNeill) in reference to the matter; it is not obligatory at all. I had an opportunity when I was at the head of a department, of getting the opinion of the Minister of Justice and others in reference to this matter, and I must say in justice to the prssent Government that the opinion then obtained was precisely the same as that stated by the leader of the House. For this reason, knowing the favours that the Auditor General's Department has received in the past, in proportion to the abilities and technical knowledge of the men employed in that office, for which they are well qualified, I think they receive, and have been receiving pay for their services in excess of the average in any other department of the Government.

Mr. FOSTER. I will not debate the question with my hon. friend who has just sat down. He has his opinion and I have mine, and they are both good. But if he will look at the clerks in the Auditor General's department, the third-class clerks especially, he will find that a large proportion of them are only paid from $450 to $750. One goes up to $850. I am speaking of the salary they received last year. Now, I happen to know these gentlemen. They may be friends of mine, or they may not, I am not arguing it on that score. But I know them to be thoroughly qualified and good men, conscientious in the performance of their duties. Be-

sides I know them to be superior men. It cannot be urged that the salary that they are receiving is at all inordinate. The Government cannot argue that. Besides it is simply at their own will, they can give the increase this year, and another year they are not bound by precedent. If the Auditor General has reported them as worthy and recommended the increases, and if, as I said before, it would not take more from the public treasury, then it would do no harm to the treasury to give the statutory increases.

Mr. McNEILL. We would have liked very much to have had some explanation respecting the statutory increases, especially in view of the fact that in this case they are not going directly to cost the country anything. The argument of the Minister of Trade and Commerce seems to be utterly demolished so far as this department is concerned as regards increases to clerks, who are all deserving and who have been recommended by the gentleman standing in the position of a Deputy Minister. As to what the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Haggart) has said, I do not think there is much difference between his view and mine. I do not suppose the hon. gentleman means to say that Mr. Blake's view of the law was incorrect, and I do not suppose he would venture to set up his authority in a matter of this kind against that of Mr. Blake; I would not dream of doing it, for I do not profess to be a lawyer but merely a layman. I never suggested that it was obligatory to grant increases; and I think my hon. friend must have misapprehended what I said. All I said was that the spirit of the Act required that deserving clerks should receive increases.

Mr. DAVIN. We had better know what the law is. I should like to have the opinion of the Minister of Justice.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Let us have your opinion.

Mr. DAVIN. I have given my opinion, but I thought the opinion of Mr. Blake, quoted the other evening, would have had more weight with the hon. gentlemen opposite. With all deference to the hon. member for Lanark, I do not agree with the way in which he stated the law. This is what Mr. Blake said:

> But, Sir, the practical operation of the law, which was passed in conformity with the recommendations of the commission, and which has not worked in conformity with those recommendations, is that there are these increases and these promotions going on steadily.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Mr. Blake was not construing the law, but he was complaining of its practical operation.

Mr. DAVIN. As the hon. gentleman thinks Mr. Blake's remarks refer to the practice, I will show him that Mr. Blake was not dealing with that matter. He further said:

> That the mischiefs to which I refer still prevail, and they prevail to this extent, as the Finance Minister sums up the case, that 420 out of the civil servants of the country have, within the last six years, received increases which make them now in receipt of $300 a year by virtue of these $50 increases apart from the promotion increases, or a total of $126,000 a year, which would be equal to the average wages of 420 mechanics with families.

Then there is a break in Mr. Blake's speech, and he subsequently proceeds to say:

> I maintain that it ought to be changed; I maintain that the system is a bad one. In those cases in which you give increases, the increases ought not, in my opinion, to be given as this law gives them.
>
> I maintain there ought to be no right to an increase, even in those cases in which increases may be given.
>
> I maintain that the increase should only be given as a stimulus to extra exertion; whereas, by this law, it is given as a matter of course.

That does not mean "given as a matter of course" in consequence of any practice carried on after the law was passed. Surely the hon. gentleman must take this view, that if the law provides for certain things to be done in regard to any person in the community, it should be done. If you have the opinion of a great lawyer as to the interpretation of that statute and it coincides with the opinions of other men, who are not probably such high authorities, surely what we should do if we wanted to depart from the course hitherto followed, was to change the law. I am not discussing the policy; but in view of the interpretation given by the hon. member for Lanark, it is only right that we should really know how the law stands. Mr. Blake further goes on to say:

> I maintain that the increase should only be given as a stimulus to extra exertions; whereas, by this law, it is given as a matter of course, for unless a man's conduct is disgracefully bad, the rule is to give the increase. If the rule is not without exceptions, let us hear the exceptions. But I need not argue this point, because the Finance Minister himself describes the increase as an increase inevitable under the provisions of the Civil Service Act.

Again, Mr. Blake says:

> Then we descend in the grade, and we find a second-class clerk commencing with $1,000, increasable at the same arbitrary rate, as time rolls on, to $1,400 a year. The same fixed sum of $50 a year is added to the salary of each clerk, whether he is of the lowest class or the highest class. The Secretary of State must know that increases in salaries should be in proportion to the value of the services, having due regard to the then salary; whereas, in this case, there is an arbitrary sum of $50 a year, without rhyme or reason, added to the salary of each officer, from the lowest class up to the highest.

Mr. Blake was arguing against the Act, not against the practice. Then the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis

Davies) followed, and he made a statement, obiter dictum. He did not follow in the same debate, but he moved an amendment on the same night. He said :

> Yet, in the face of this fact, Parliament is asked to increase the salaries of these mechanical clerks, and give them $50 annual increase.

Let us repeal the Act, if you will, but let us not retain an Act on the Statute-book under which a contract is made with a man who enters the service, that he shall enter it at a certain salary with a certain statutory increase of $50 a year up to a certain maximum. I am not discussing whether the terms of the Act are wise or not ; but I say that a few thousand dollars are but dust in the balance compared with the honour of Canada ; and I say the honour of Canada is involved and that hon. gentlemen are endeavouring to sneak out of the contract for the sake of effecting a few dollars saving, in the face of reckless extravagance in other directions. Let us do right and do justice in this matter. Hon. gentlemen opposite can make their savings if they please ; they need not add to the expenditure or to the public debt, and they can avoid doing so by preventing expenditures of a round quarter of a million dollars ; but here with a proposed increase of $50 to one poor clerk and $50 to another, the Government are trying to sneak a miserable saving for the purpose of trying to counterbalance their extravagance in other directions.

Department of the Interior..... $104,824

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). I can now give my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) the information he desires. There are thirty-six clerks and two messengers who are eligible for statutory increases.

Mr. FOSTER. How many have been given ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Five clerks and two messengers are to receive the increase under these Estimates.

Mr. FOSTER. Who are these ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. J. S. Eagleson, C. W. Badgeley, Miss Maud May, Miss Barber and Mr. R. A. Lewis are the clerks ; the messengers are H. Ackland and B. H. Wright.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Badgeley has a salary of $900.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Mr. Badgeley was getting $900 and he will now get $950. Mr. Eagleson is in the same category.

Mr. FOSTER. Here is James Shore Eagleson and C. W. Badgeley, who are getting $900, and will now get $950, which is pretty well up to the respectable salary my hon. friend (Mr. McMullen) talks about. But in that same class we find men are getting $700, $650 and $500, comparatively small salaries, and they are not getting any increase. Of course, they have not been in so long a time as Eagleson and Badgeley, but if the increase is to be given as the hon. member (Mr. McMullen) argued, on the ground of getting a fair salary for the work done, it would seem that those who are least paid should have the increase if they are deserving. Perhaps they are not deserving, and the Minister might tell us why he gave the increase to these four and kept it from the others.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Because the Deputy Minister reported, in pursuance of the Act, that these clerks were deserving of an increase, and I concurred in it.

Mr. FOSTER. And he did not report to the Minister that any others were deserving.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No.

Mr. FOSTER. I have no doubt he journeyed in the line the Minister of Finance suggested. The deputy very likely knows what the political desire of his head is. I believe he was put into that department because of that ; that there might be the strictest concordance between the Minister and his deputy in the way of party work and partisan zeal.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Can the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) find any evidence of partisanship in the increases which have been given ?

Mr. FOSTER. I think I could, as a matter of antecedent history.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I am not aware of it.

Mr. FOSTER. And I am not sure that I could not in the less ancient, but equally interesting history of what his procedure has been since the Minister installed his deputy in office, after the great battle, the very great battle, I believe, that the opposing forces waged. I am not sure that the big policeman from Ontario would not relish this if he were present, but I am told that the opposing forces were drawn up in battle array and that the Minister of the Interior had to journey back to his native heath and reinforce the confidence of his friends there, and reinforce himself against the attacks of his friends.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Will the hon. member allow me to make a suggestion ?

Mr. FOSTER. The young Napoleon from the North-west vanquished them by superior strategy or superior obstinacy, I am not sure which ; but he did it at the expense of one of the best officers that the Dominion of Canada has ever had, and one of the most faithful ; a man who, if he did not get the reward that his ser-

vices entitled him to here, has, I hope, got his reward now. Who is the chief clerk that has been made by promotion ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Mr. Ryley.

Mr. FOSTER. Again I call the attention of the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) to this. Here is a division which contains seven chief clerks, and now puts on another. A man who was getting $1,800 might be supposed to be getting what the hon. gentleman from North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) would call a substantially good salary, and I think the Minister has rather offended against the rule laid down by the hon. member (Mr. McMullen).

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The salary of this gentleman is not increased.

Mr. FOSTER. But he is given his promotion, which is tantamount to an increase, and which may be given under this capricious rule laid down by the Minister.

The PRIME MINISTER. Wait until the increase is asked for.

Mr. FOSTER. But we can see the beginning long before the end and my hon. friend (Mr. Sifton) is laying the train for giving an increase to a high-salaried man.

The PRIME MINISTER. Fifty dollars is not much for Napoleon.

Mr. FOSTER. Ah, the Napoleon would not be satisfied with $50. Nothing less than the Yukon satisfied the Napoleon, but the Napoleon has a very apt way of providing his men with small increases, while his mind grasps millions.

Department of Indian Affairs..... $45,070

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. In this department there are two promotions from third-class clerks to second-class clerks ; one statutory increase for a clerk, and one statutory increase for a messenger. There are twenty-four clerks.

Mr. FOSTER. Here is something that ought to be explained. We have been taunted on this side of the House that we are trying to increase the Estimates, while the Government is labouring with all its heart to keep them down. Now, so far as we have gone in the Estimates, you have under one Minister the addition of a chief clerk in one department. You have the addition of a chief clerk in the Department of Indian Affairs ? What is the reason of this ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It is so printed in the Estimates, but it is not so in fact. I fancy that it arises from the fact that the law clerk is put in this year as a chief clerk. But there is no change in the Estimates from last year.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman has two more second-class clerks than last year. What is the reason for that increase in high-class clerkships ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. As I stated in the case of the Department of the Interior, H. J. Brock and E. A. Kemp were favourably reported upon by the Secretary of the department and the deputy as being entitled to promotion, from the length of their services ; and after consideration, I decided to recommend it. There can be no special reason for it, except that they were considered very good officers, and the nature of their work and their attention to it seemed to deserve the recognition of promotion.

Mr. FOSTER This is a direct instance in which the aim of the Government has been defeated. These men, when third-class clerks, were doing a certain kind of work for which they were given $1,000 a year ; I imagine that they are doing the same kind of work as second-class clerks ; but so long as they were in the third-class list, they could not receive any advance in salary, because they had reached the maximum. But they are promoted to be second-class clerks, with $100 a year more, and are put in a position where the hon. gentleman can give them the statutory increases. There is a direct instance where, instead of economy, there is the opposite.

Mr. DAVIN. Does my hon. friend anticipate that there will be any addition to this expenditure in the Indian Department, in the Supplementary Estimates ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I have no information to give on that point.

Mr. DAVIN. Will he explain why it is not less than it is now, because he has dispensed with a Deputy Minister ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The Deputy Minister was not estimated for last year.

Department of Finance..... $50,340

Mr. FOSTER. Can the hon. Minister give us the information on this ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). There are seven statutory increases—that is the entire number of those eligible for the increase. The Department of Finance, not to the credit of myself, but largely to the credit of the hon. gentleman who preceded me, has been, I think, admitted to be one of the most economically managed departments of the Government. While the tendency in the other departments has been to increase the number of their officials——

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Some of the others.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I was speaking of former years. The Finance De-

partment has notably kept down the number of its officials. The result is that we have a very limited number of excellent officials. My deputy has recommended them all for the increase, and, after considering the matter, I think it wise policy to confirm the recommendation.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the hon. gentleman please give me the names of those who are recommended ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. C. W. Treadwell, A. B. Foster, W. H. Hayes, E. L. Brittain, J. C. Saunders, N. S. Garland, S. J. Jenkins, and a messenger, Ostrom.

Mr. FOSTER. No doubt these are all good men ; I am saying nothing against their increases. I am bound not to say anything against the hon. gentleman's compliment to the department as it has been managed in the past, and I have no doubt that it will be managed with full efficiency in the future, so long as my hon. friend is there, if he will, as I did, stick pretty closely to the traditions which have been the traditions of that department for a good many years. But the question is this. The hon. gentleman has seven who were eligible for the increase, and he has given the increase to all of them, on the ground that his deputy reported that they were deserving of it. But the Auditor General, for instance, equally strongly recommended all of his clerks for the increase. We will not introduce any discrimination by saying that the clerks in one department are not just as faithful as those in another. But the hon. gentleman reduced the number of eighteen in the Auditor General's department to three, even though no greater expense to the country would have been incurred by carrying out the Auditor General's recommendation, while the Finance Department will cost a little more to the country than it did before. Does not my hon. friend think, under these circumstances, that he has been guilty of an inconsistency ? I am not finding fault with the giving of the increase to the seven in the Department of Finance ; but why should it not be given to equally good men, so far as doing their work is concerned, in the department over which the Auditor General presides, especially when it would not have cost the country any more ? Has not my hon. friend any reply to that ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have already discussed the case of the Auditor General, and I am afraid I could not add anything to what I have already said.

Department of Customs..... $38,750

Mr. FOSTER. How many are eligible for statutory increases ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Twenty-three are eligible and seven are receiving it.

Mr. FIELDING.

Mr. FOSTER. What are the names of the seven ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Mr. Farrow, who is the accountant and whose present salary is $1,650, gets $50 more ; Mr. Morin, chief of the seizure department, has $1,400 and gets $50 more : Mr. Breadner, chief clerk, at $1,150, gets $50 more. These are the heads of the different departments, and their work is heavy.

Mr. FOSTER. They are good men.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Mr. Watson has $650, Mr. Rorke $650, and Mr. Lafontaine $650 per year. They all came in about the same time in 1891, and I am giving each of them $50 increase. Mr. Moir appointed two or three years later, is getting $450, and gets $50 increase.

Mr. FOSTER. Why does my hon. friend not give the increase to the other sixteen ? Were they not recommended by his deputy?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. He recommended these.

Mr. FOSTER. And the others ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. No ; we talked together.

Mr. FOSTER. And after the big talk, the recommendations came in. My hon. friend shows very well the surroundings of his early political life. He comes from the land of pow-wows and big talks.

Department of Inland Revenue..... $37,340

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to have the number of clerks eligible for the statutory increase, and the number who received it.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière). Ten gentlemen were eligible, but I did not recommend any for the increase.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Were there any reported by the Deputy Minister as worthy ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Yes.

Mr. MONTAGUE. You did not talk together.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. No ; I understood that there were to be no increases, and that, under the circumstances, there was no use in my recommending them.

Mr. FOSTER. Now we see how this worked out. My hon. friend, the Minister of Inland Revenue, heard the general talk of the Ministers that there were to be no statutory increases, thinking that they were saying what they meant, and that there would not be any. He, therefore, going on that ground, although in his department there were men recommended for the increase, did not ask for any. Then his colleagues went to work and asked for increases in their departments.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I wish to explain that I am not quite so guiltless as my hon. friend thinks. There are two branches in my department—the inside and the outside—and when the question of increase came up, and I had to meet the same difficulty as my colleagues, I preferred to recommend the officers in the outside branch who had just passed successfully the technical examinations, by which they could obtain promotion from one rank to another; and when we come to the outside service my hon. friend will see that I recommended every one who passed a successful examination. I thought that since I had to choose between the two, it was certainly my duty to encourage, by every possible means, those officers in our outside service who had passed these examinations.

Mr. FOSTER. But my hon. friend has not explained away his first statement that he understood no increases were to be granted.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I did not say I understood that they were not to be granted in the inside service, but that they would not all be granted. That was the first idea. Then when I had to choose between the two, when I knew I could not obtain the increase for all the officers of my department, I preferred those who had qualified themselves by hard labour in passing these technical examinations.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend is not the first one who has found that professions are not always carried out in practice. No doubt he thought the Government were not going to grant the increase, and so he made his reservation. I will take back what I said just now. I will not say that my hon. friend is guilty of anything for he is not, but he is more wily and astute than I gave him credit for at first. That little trip he took with Li Hung Chang resulted in his acquiring a good deal of astuteness. And even though the employees in the inside service are not going to be very much solaced by that, I am glad that he is going to give some increases to the men in the outside service who passed those technical examinations. Were the increases given last year?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I recommended them last year. I would like to be clearly understood as I do not want for a moment to be considered in a position more favourable than my colleagues. When I knew that every one of those who were entitled by law, or what I understood to be the law and what hon. gentlemen understand to be the law—when I knew it was impossible for all of them to get the increase, I thought it was my duty to choose among them, and my colleagues appeared to appreciate the choice I made in recommending the outside service.

Department of Marine and Fisheries.... $55,830

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). Twenty-two are eligible, and one was granted the increase.

Mr. FOSTER. Who was the fortunate one?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Miss Doyle, acting as assistant private secretary.

Mr. FOSTER. I will not say a word against that. Are there any changes in the department?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. None.

Department of Railways and Canals.... $39,680

Mr. FOSTER. I would like similar information with regard to this.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). There are fifteen, I think, eligible for the statutory increase, and five receive it.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the hon. gentleman please give the names of these five?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Mr. Gleason, Mr. Loftus and Mr. Wright, of the third class; and Mr. Payne and Mr. Ross, of the second class.

Mr. FOSTER. There are no other changes?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. One other. One gentleman was transferred to my department from the Militia and Defence Department—Mr. Payne.

Mr. FOSTER. Was there a transfer to the Militia Department—was it a mutual transfer?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes; Mr. Payne, when in the Militia Department, was in receipt of $200 a year—I think that was the figure—more than Mr. Beard, who was transferred from the Railway Department. So, I brought Mr. Payne's salary up to the same amount in my department as he had received in the other.

Department of Public Works..... $45,550

Mr. FOSTER. We would like to have similar explanations from the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte).

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The hon. Minister of Public Works has committed the offence of saving about $3,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). There are ten employees in my department who are eligible for the

statutory increase. After discussing the whole case with my Deputy Minister, we came to the conclusion that two men were especially deserving of the increase. One of these was Mr. J. C. Blais, who was receiving $1,350, and who will now receive $1,400. The other was Mr. Theriault, who was receiving $1,300 and who will now receive $1,350. Mr. Blais, I thought, was not sufficiently paid. He has charge of the public works in the district of Chicoutimi. He has pretty hard work to do and does a good deal of travelling, and I thought it was good policy to pay him what he earned. Mr. Theriault is a faithful officer. He served as a soldier in the rebellion of 1870. Both of his legs have been amputated. As I say, he is a faithful employee and I think deserving of the increase.

Mr. FOSTER. Is there among these clerks one named Charleson ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Not under this item.

Department of Geological Survey..... $51,950

Mr. FOSTER. What are the changes here ? I see there is one extra man.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes, Mr. J. M. Macoun has been appointed as naturalist of the department, at a salary of $1,500.

Mr. FOSTER. How was he paid before ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I believe he was doing special service in connection with the Behring Sea arbitration. There is a reduction in the salary of the lithologist from $1,550 to $1,450.

Mr. FOSTER. Why is that ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The gentleman who occupied that position has left the service, and we appropriate $1,450 to start the new man.

Mr. FOSTER. Was the new man formerly in the employ of the department or was he an outside man ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We have not made the appointment. We are asking the appropriation, and we expect to make the appointment as soon as we find a suitable man. Then, there is a change in the vote of the salary of the assistant geologist, Mr. R. N. Brock. The assistant geologist formerly in the employ of the department went out. His salary was $1,100. We start the new man at $1,050.

Mr. FOSTER. In both cases where you put in a new man you put him at a less salary ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. That is the rule.

Mr. TARTE.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Were the older technical officers increased ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No, they remain the same.

Mr. FOSTER. As I understand, the officers of the Geological Survey do not come under the civil service law with reference to the $50 increase.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. They do now.

Mr. FOSTER. How many were eligible for the increase ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Twenty-two.

Mr. FOSTER. How many received it ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. None.

Department of Trade and Commerce, including $1,550 for the salary of J. P. Nutting, notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Civil Service Act. $8,780

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. We dispensed with one of the staff. There are five persons eligible for the increases, and two receive it. To the first-class clerk, Mr. Nutting, who acts practically as head of the department under Mr. Parmalee, I propose an increase of $100. He has been in the service for a quarter of a century, and is a specially good officer. The other is Miss Shaw, who was receiving $450, and I propose to give her $500, to put her on an equality with the other lady clerk. There is an increase of $30 to the messenger, who received $300 and is now to receive $330.

Mr. FOSTER. That is, you are giving three increases.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Two increases among the clerks, and one to a messenger. Six would have been eligible, including the messenger.

Mr. FOSTER. Has my hon. friend now, with his added years of experience, recanted the opinion that he at one time held in this House with reference to this Department of Trade and Commerce, and as to its being so unnecessary ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The Department of Trade and Commerce may be made a useful department.

The Office of the High Commissioner for Canada in England, including $1,700 to C. F. Just, notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Civil Service Act $9,300

Mr. FOSTER. What is the number of eligible men here for the increase ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think four are eligible. The increase to C. F. Just is from $1,550 to $1,700.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Is there anything in the estimates for Mr. Colmer? My hon. friend knows he is a very valuable officer.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is nothing.

Contingencies, rent and insurance on office, income tax, fuel, light, stationery, &c., and the amount ($2,000) required towards the contingent expenses (water, light, fuel, carriage hire and railway fare) of the High Commissioner, and $1,200 for contingencies (rates, taxes, insurance, ground rent, &c.) of the official residence, including the income tax on the High Commissioner's salary	$11,700

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is an increase of $500 for clerical assistance, but not an increase in the general vote for the High Commissioner. The increase would probably be for temporary clerks or possibly the employment of one additional clerk.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Was any recommendation made for an increase to Mr. Colmer? I have no desire to press increases upon the Government, but when increases are being made, I suppose it is the desire of the Government to increase the salaries of those who are best fitted to perform their duties, and who perform the most valuable services. I think any hon. gentleman who knows Mr. Colmer's services in London, is aware that they have been exceedingly valuable to the country.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think the High Commissioner has a very high appreciation of the services of Mr. Colmer and of the staff generally, and I think he would like to increase the remuneration of the staff to a larger extent than we would be willing. For the present we have not been able to go further than the increase I have intimated.

Mr. MONTAGUE. There is this to be said about Mr. Colmer, that he has to sustain a position in London which an officer here receiving the same salary would not have to sustain. I am sure the right hon. gentleman who leads the Government must know something of Mr. Colmer's work, and will be able to bear me out in saying that $3,000 is not a large salary.

Mr. FOSTER. Under the item of contingencies, are such things as tumblers, glasses and decanters provided for? I ask that question because at this particular time I do not hear any voice raised in denunciation of the iniquity of having tumblers, glasses and decanters paid for by the people's hard-earned taxes, in the High Commissioner's office.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I can assure the hon. gentleman that Lord Strathcona is not putting in a bill for either glasses, tumblers and decanters, or the contents thereof, in any form or shape. I may just remark that I am rather inclined to believe that the sum which Lord Strathcona pays for the residence that he at present occupies in Cadogan Place, is exactly equivalent to the salary he receives as High Commissioner. I think he is paying about £2,000 sterling for his present residence in London.

Mr. FOSTER. I have not the least doubt that Lord Strathcona is not ungenerous in his expenditures in any way, but that does not give an answer to the question I asked.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I can assure the hon. gentleman that he is not charging us for tumblers or glasses or anything else.

Mr. FOSTER. And that under this item not a tumbler or a glass will be paid for?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I think not.

Mr. FOSTER. We will see next year.

Mr. WALLACE. I think there should be a thorough reorganization of the High Commissioner's office. I think they have drifted away from their duties.

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

After Recess.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS

Bill (No. 109) to incorporate the British American Light and Power Company.—(Mr. Rosamond.)

Bill (No. 116) to incorporate the Canadian Mining Institute.—(Mr. Haley.)

Bill (No. 55) to incorporate the Atlas Loan Company.—(Mr. Casey.)

Bill (No. 88)—from the Senate—incorporating the Central Canada Loan and Savings Company.—(Mr. Casey.)

TORONTO AND HUDSON BAY RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. CLARK moved that the House resolve itself into committee on Bill (No. 77) to incorporate the Toronto and Hudson Bay Railway Company.

Mr. SPROULE. Mr. Speaker, before you leave the Chair I wish to make some observations on this Bill, because I think it is one of very considerable importance. It is a Bill to incorporate the Toronto and Hudson Bay Railway Company and the incorporators are, as I understand it, trustees who are working in the interests of the people of Toronto. The names to this Bill are, George Gooderham, John Herbert Mason, Robert Davis, W. R. Brock, the Hon. Lyman Melvin Jones and John Shaw, all of the city of Toronto, and the latter

being the mayor of that city. In asking Parliament to grant the incorporation of this company, the plea put forward is that the city of Toronto is being injured on account of the imperfect facilities afforded for carrying on their trade between Toronto and the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway in the west, owing to the disagreement between the Grand Trunk Railway Company and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in respect to that portion of the line between Toronto and North Bay. I have always contended that there was another means of accomplishing this connection at a much earlier date, and with less trouble than by asking for the incorporation of a new company and the building of another railway through that section of country. Foreseeing the great need of a direct connecting link between Toronto and south-western Ontario and the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, as long ago as 1881 a company was incorporated for the purpose of building a connecting link between what was then the Hamilton and North-western road, from Gravenhurst to Callander station—which afterwards reached North Bay—for the purpose of making a connection between the south-western system of railways in Ontario and the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway. At that time, as the older members of the House will remember, the Canadian Pacific Railway was being built, and we in south-western Ontario thought that it would side track the city of Toronto, and that district. Several deputations waited on the Government to induce them to build a connecting link of railway that would be open to all companies in Canada for the future to run freight and passenger trains, so that we might have an independent connecting link between the then existing Northern Railway and the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway at Callander or North Bay. I have here the names of the incorporators of that Act, and I will read them to show that that was the object which they had in view. I remember the passing of this Act very distinctly and the reason why the numerous names appear as incorporators, was, that they might represent every portion of that section of Ontario. They are as follows :—The Hon. Frank Smith, of the city of Toronto, merchant, senator of the Dominion of Canada : Adam Brown, of the city of Hamilton, merchant ; Noah Barnhart, merchant ; the Hon. Alexander Morris, M.P.P. ; Dalton McCarthy, M.P. and Frederick W. Cumberland, Esquire, all of the city of Toronto ; John Stuart, merchant : John Proctor, railway contractor ; A. T. Wood, merchant (now member for Hamilton) ; Alexander Turner, merchant ; E. Gurney, manufacturer; William Hendrie, railway contractor ; M. Leggatt, merchant ; P. D. Dayfort, merchant : Thomas Robertson, M.P., Q.C. ; Francis Edwin Kilvert, M.P. (both of these gentlemen then members for Hamilton) ; Britton B. Osler, Q.C. ; James Turner, merchant, and Alexander McInnes, merchant, all of the city of Hamilton ; C. W. Bunting, M.P., newspaper publisher ; Samuel Platt, M.P., Esquire ; James Beatty, jr., M.P., Q.C. ; G. D'Arcy Boulton, barrister at law ; Frederick W. Strange, M.P., physician ; John Fisken, merchant ; William B. Hamilton, President of the Board of Trade of the city of Toronto, merchant ; William F. McMaster, merchant ; William Thompson, merchant ; A. M. Smith, merchant ; William Ince, merchant ; Alderman David Walker, Wm. B. Scarth, broker ; Eugene O'Keefe, brewer ; the Hon. John McMurrich, merchant ; R. W. Elliott, merchant ; Alfred Boultbee, M.P. ; Alderman A. R. Boswell, and Robert Hay, M.P., furniture manufacturer, all of the city of Toronto ; Thomas Arkell, M.P., of the town of St. Thomas ; Timothy Coughlin, M.P., of Offa ; D. MacMillan, M.P., of the city of London, barrister at law ; S. R. Hesson, M.P., of the town of Stratford, in the county of Perth ; William O'Brien, of the township of Oro, in the county of Simcoe, farmer ; William Carruthers Little, M.P., of the township of Innisfil, Esquire ; Thomas Long, M.P.P., of the town of Collingwood, merchant ; Charles Cameron, of the same place, steamboat owner ; George Moberley, of the same place, barrister at law ; Nathaniel C. Wallace, M.P., of Woodbridge ; John White, M.P., of Roslin ; Alexander Robertson, M.P.P., of Belleville ; and Arthur Rankin, of the town of Windsor, Esquire.

Mr. FOSTER. It would take a railway to carry all those.

Mr. SPROULE. Yes. I merely read these names to show that they were residents not only of the cities of Toronto, Hamilton, London and Stratford, but that the incorporators came from different localities in south-western Ontario, because it was conceived that the whole of south-western Ontario was directly interested in the building of this independent line. That company was incorporated and certain provisions were put in the charter, one of the provisions being :

> The company shall make running arrangements with, and give running powers to any railway company or companies in the Dominion of Canada (whether incorporated by the Dominion or any of the provincial legislatures) which are now or may hereafter be situate on the line or lines hereby authorized, or which touch or cross the same, or any line or lines which connect with any of such lines, upon terms to be agreed upon ; and such running powers shall include all proper and necessary facilities in sidings for obtaining fuel and water, and generally for the passing and working of the trains of the company or companies exercising the same ; and the facilities so to be given shall be equal to all companies exercising such powers, so that no unfair advantage shall be given to any one company over another in the use of the said lines.

Then there was a provision inserted in regard to any possible amalgamation of this railway with any other :

> Provided the arrangements therefor shall be approved of by two-thirds of the shareholders. * * * Provided further that the company who may become lessees thereof and the railway leased shall be subject to all the obligations hereby imposed on the company hereby incorporated.

The conditions imposed were that it would be a free and independent line, and that it would give running powers equally to all railways in Canada. With these conditions and obligations it was found difficult to finance the railway, and Parliament was asked to grant it a special subsidy so that it might be kept an independent line. At that time the usual grant given in aid of railways by the Dominion Parliament was $3,200 per mile ; but it was considered that if this company were granted only that much they would be obliged to arrange with some other company to build the road. Therefore, we applied to the Government for a larger subsidy. In the first year after the company was incorporated, this Parliament, by 45 Victoria, chap. 14, granted for a railway from Gravenhurst to Callander, both in the province of Ontario, a subsidy not exceeding $6.000 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $660,000. In the succeeding year the incorporators of the company came back to Parliament and asked for a larger bonus, because they were unable to finance the scheme and keep the railway independent of all other roads ; and in 46 Vic., Parliament granted an additional subsidy for a railway from Gravenhurst to Callander, a distance of 110 miles, a subsidy not exceeding $6.000 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole $660.000. The two subsidies amounted to a million and a quarter of dollars for 110 miles of railway, although the distance afterwards turned out to be a little greater. But I draw attention to the fact that that large subsidy of $12.000 per mile, four times as much as the usual subsidy, was given for the purpose of keeping this an independent line, open to all railways that might wish to take their traffic over it. By that means the road was financed and built. It was afterwards turned over to the Hamilton and North-western, and finally got into the hands of the Grand Trunk. But the agreement which was entered into and ratified by Parliament, contained the same provision, that this road should be open to all other railways to carry their traffic over it on equal terms, and that has been continued down to the present time. There was also a provision inserted in the Act, that in the event of this road not being operated in the interest of the general public, with all railways having the same right to pass over it, Parliament could step in and take over the road by paying its actual cost, after deducting the $12.000 a mile which Parliament gave and $8,000 per mile of bonds which Parliament was to guarantee. That road has been operated for some years, and, so far as we know, satisfactorily to both the Canadian Pacific and Grand Trunk. I think I can appeal to the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) because he took a lively interest in this railway, in the interest of south-western Ontario with the view of securing it as an independent line that would be available for all railways in the country. If I remember correctly, the hon. member was afterwards the president of the road. At any rate, I give you this history to show you the aim of Parliament in granting such a large subsidy to that road ; how it was built, and how it was leased to two other companies ; how all the original obligations imposed on the original company were transferred to these companies ; how in the event of the companies disagreeing in regard to the traffic arrangements the dispute would be submitted to arbitration, each company appointing an arbitrator, and the third being appointed by a judge of the Superior Court ; how in the event of the railway failing to serve the public as was originally intended, Parliament should step in and take over the road. We have reached the stage when the country is not getting its rights over that road, which the country hoped to receive, in return for the large subsidies it had given. These two railway companies have disagreed, they have not attempted by arbitration to settle their dispute, and Parliament has not attempted either to enforce the agreement or to take over the road. Now, what are we asked to do as a remedy for this state of things ? We are asked by the people of Toronto to incorporate another company to build a line over the same route. I have always held that if the Torono people were sincere, they would bring influence to bear on the Government to induce them to compel these two companies to come to terms, or take over that road. The hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Bertram), when offering himself for election, said that one of his first efforts would be to secure better terms for carrying the trade between Toronto and the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, because Toronto was handicapped by the present state of things between the two companies. But when the hon. member comes here, the only thing the hon. member has done since coming here, so far as I know, has been to make one short speech lasting about two minutes, after we had a great deal of trouble to draw him out of his cage, in which he said, "The Toronto people are used badly, and the Government ought to do something"—that was about all. Now, the people of Toronto are asking us to incorporate another company for the purpose of building a railway practically over the same route. If we do that, we shall be practically admitting that the provision which Parliament made in the interest of

the people cannot be carried out; we shall be practically admitting our inability as a Parliament to exercise the powers that were given to Parliament by that Act, and that the railway corporations can defy Parliament. That will be establishing a bad precedent; because that law is surrounded with all the safeguards that could possibly be contained in any Act of Parliament. If we incorporate another company to build a railway between these two points, in answer to the request of the city of Toronto, then I say Parliament will be admitting that it has no power or authority in the matter. I think we should not do that. We are practically ignoring entirely our own rights and powers in this case.

There is another interesting feature about this. I see by the papers the day before yesterday there was an interesting conference here over this matter. I have here a short account of that conference. I do not know that it is absolutely correct, but I presume it is and will read it for the benefit of the House. It is from the Ottawa correspondence of the Toronto "World":

Ottawa, April 27.—(Special.)—An important conference respecting the proposed Toronto and Hudson's Bay Railway was held to-day. There were present: Mayor John Shaw and two of the Hudson's Bay Railway commissioners, George Gooderham and W. R. Brock, with W. T. Jennings, engineer of the company, and Messrs. Wallace Nesbitt, Q.C., Clarke, Osl Bertram, Robertson, Maclean and Wallace.

For the old Nipissing and James Bay Railway Company——

There are two other charters in existence to-day to build railways through the same territory, and we might force these people to either build the railways or give up their charters.

——there were present: Messrs. W. B. McMurrich and Col. Tisdale, M.P., while Messrs. William Mackenzie and D. D. Mann and Col. Hughes, M.P., were there in the interests of the charter, which they got last session for a railway from Toronto to James Bay by way of Parry Sound, known as the James Bay Railway Company.

The two companies that have charters over the same ground combined to fight the present company seeking incorporation, and it is rather interesting to find the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Bertram), in spite of his declaration that he was so anxious to get railway connection for Toronto, associated with parties fighting against this incorporation which he had promised to help on as much as possible.

The two existing companies, Torontonians are well aware, have practically pooled their interests,——

That is the Toronto and James Bay Railway and the Nipissing and James Bay Railway Company.

——or rather Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann have secured a controlling interest in the N. & J. B. Railway, hence their interests in the two charters being identical, they have, so far, opposed the move which the citizens of Toronto are making.

A Regular Pitched Battle.

There was a regular pitched battle this afternoon, but finally matters began to shape themselves, and it was eventually decided to refer the matter to a small committee to see if an agreement could be reached. On the one side were Mayor Shaw, Messrs. Gooderham, Brock, Wallace Nesbitt and A. M. Grier; on the other, were Messrs. William Mackenzie, John Laidlaw, Q.C., Col. Tisdale, Hon. George A. Cox and Mr. Bertram, M.P.

These were the parties fighting against Toronto getting the new incorporation, and among them was the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Bertram). He wanted the men holding charters that cover the same ground and who are not going on, to build the road.

They were in session for three hours to-night, with the result that an agreement was reached which must be satisfactory to both sides.

That is, to the incorporators of the new company and the incorporators of the two old companies, but nothing at all about the public and the city of Toronto except in so far as the city of Toronto was represented by Mayor Shaw and his colleague.

All opposition to the proposed Toronto charter is to be withdrawn, but it is understood that after it has passed Parliament operations will be suspended for two years in order to give the Mackenzie-McMurrich syndicate an opportunity of putting their road through from North Bay to James Bay. Should they be successful in doing this, it is an understanding that a guarantee is given to Toronto in the matter of rates.

A guarantee is given to Toronto in the matter of rates, but all the rest of south-western Canada is left out, though when Parliament gave the last subsidy, it gave it for the whole of Ontario as represented by the large number of incorporators in the original company. So long as the interests of Toronto are satisfied it is all right.

Failing positive action by existing companies within the period named, then the Toronto commissioners will go to work actively under the charter now being asked from Parliament.

Mayor Shaw is well satisfied with the outlook. He has worked hard to secure an agreement, and appreciates the friendly spirit in which Mr. Mackenzie and his associates met the Toronto delegation.

Here is the interesting part of it. First, Toronto says there is urgent need for some immediate arrangements to give us connection with the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, because we have not the right we ought to have. They come forward to charter another company for the purpose of building a road where there is a road already and where Parliament has the right to take over that road, if it is not run in the interests of the country. But if there is urgent need, how do they show it? By entering into a private arrangement with these two

other railway companies who own these other charters. They first say they want an Act so as to build the road immediately, but they agree to suspend their own charter for two years. Then if Mackenzie & Mann do not go on and build, they take two more years to commence, which makes four years, and then they have five years to finish. During nine years, therefore, the city of Toronto and western Canada may be locked up, as far as the charter goes, and it is not a bit better off to-day. Does it show wisdom on the part of the city of Toronto to enter into any such agreement. Should Parliament sanction this thing ? I think not. It seems to me it is practically a quarrel between two corporations, each of which holds a charter, and another which wants one.

Mr. WALLACE. What are these two charters ?

Mr. SPROULE. The Nipissing and James Bay Railway charter and the Toronto and James Bay Railway charter.

Mr. WALLACE. The Nipissing and James Bay only runs from Lake Nipissing.

Mr. SPROULE. But it got power last year to build to Parry Sound from there. The holders of these charters are quarreling among themselves. Two weeks ago in Simcoe I saw the engineers on the road, and was told that they were put on by the Canadian Pacific Railway, that Mackenzie & Mann and McMurrich & Cox were manipulating the charter, and they put on the engineer for the purpose of burking this charter by showing that they were actively engaged in building the railway at present.

I would not be surprised that after this session, in spite of the fact that the surveyors are on now, we will hear no more about it until another session.

The other feature is this, that while these rival corporations are disagreeing among themselves—whether they are trying to sell out their charters to each other or get money from each other—the public has to suffer, and the remedy proposed by the trustees of Toronto is not such a remedy as will give relief in the time required by the public. Parliament has the right to take over that road.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS (Mr. Blair). It has not any right to take that road over, I think, on the ground alleged. The Act is defective in that respect.

Mr. SPROULE. The Act says that when in the interest of the public the road is not being run, Parliament can take it over, and it is for Parliament to say if it is run in the interest of the public to-day. Have all railway companies equal rights to run over that road as was contemplated in the original Act ? Why do I say so ? Because the Canadian Pacific Railway is not availing itself of this road, is not exercising the rights it is entitled to exercise under the provision of the original charter.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There is only one condition on which the Government could resume possession, control and ownership of that road, and that condition is not present.

Mr. SPROULE. Would the Minister (Mr. Blair) be good enough to specify that condition according to his view of it ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There are two or three stipulations contained in this agreement, as I recollect them. One is with reference to the exercise of running rights. The other is as to discriminating tolls. So far as the violation of the contract in respect of the first of these features is concerned, the Government would have a clear unquestioned right to enforce it against this particular company and in respect of this particular road. But it would only be in respect of the violation of the contract in the other particular that the Government would have the right to resume the control of the road upon the payment of a certain amount of money. Now, that has not occurred. The hon. gentleman has not been able to show that there has been any discriminations in rates.

Mr. SPROULE. I am trying to show that the object that Parliament had in view when the road was subsidized was that all roads should have running powers over it.

Mr. McCARTHY. Does not the hon. gentleman overlook the fact that the road was only from Gravenhurst to North Bay ?

Mr. SPROULE. I intended to refer to that.

Mr. McCARTHY. The difficulty is that the road from Toronto to Gravenhurst is not affected by the stipulation. The object at the time, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) will recollect, was to secure to the Grand Trunk Railway, which, at the time, did not own the road to Gravenhurst—it was the property of the Northern Railway—running rights over the road. The Grand Trunk were seeking the right to build to North Bay, and Parliament compromised the matter, so to speak, between the Northern and the Grand Trunk Railway by granting a charter to the Pacific Junction and giving these concessions which the Grand Trunk was supposed to avail itself of.

Mr. WALLACE. And to protect the public.

Mr. McCARTHY. And to protect the public. But the Grand Trunk, under an old provision of its charter, which had been lost sight of, acquired the Northern Railway and the lease of the Pacific Junction.

Mr. SPROULE. I was going to say that this clause does give the right to the Cana-

dian Pacific Railway to run over that portion of the line.

Mr. McCARTHY. Not from Gravenhurst to Toronto ?

Mr. SPROULE. Yes, that part of the line also. The clause is as follows :—

The company shall make running arrangements with, and give running powers to any railway company or companies in the Dominion of Canada (whether incorporated by the Dominion or any of the provincial legislatures) which are now or may hereafter be situate on the line or lines hereby authorized, or which touch or cross the same, or any line or lines which connect with any such lines, upon terms to be agreed upon ;——

Mr. McCARTHY. That gives the right to them, but it does not make the old road subject to the obligation of the new road.

Mr. SPROULE. It does to this extent, that it gives running powers over it.

Mr. McCARTHY. No.

Mr. SPROULE. What does it mean when it says "any line or lines which connect therewith" ? It goes on :

——and such running powers shall include all proper and necessary facilities in sidings for obtaining fuel and water, and generally for the working or passing of the trains of the company or companies exercising the same, and the facilities so to be given shall be equal to all companies exercising such powers, so that no unfair advantage shall be given to any one company over another in the use of the said lines.

Mr. McCARTHY. I have not read it for a long time, but that was not the intention.

Mr. SPROULE. That was the understanding of the members who went with the deputations to Sir John Macdonald about it.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is the new line.

Mr. SPROULE. The provision is made for running powers not only over the Canadian Pacific by this company but over any other line running over it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There may be running powers over either end of the road, but that is not covered by that agreement, according to my recollection.

Mr. SPROULE. Then if there is no right over the road from Gravenhurst to Toronto, that means that there is only a road of 111 miles left out. There might be a justification to build an independent line over that portion, but, when that is done, there is no reason why Parliament should build another line—because there will undoubtedly be an appeal to help the building of it over this 132 miles from Gravenhurst to North Bay, or, as some propose, to Sudbury. Some say there is need of a line from Toronto to Parry Sound. That is entirely a different proposition. I believe there may be need of a road through there to improve the connection between Toronto and the west by way of Parry Sound and Sudbury instead of North Bay. We have already one line that we can take possession of if the public is not served and we can save the cost of building another line over these 132 miles, and we can demand the right, in the interest of the public, that any railway company should have the right to pass over that road and take its traffic over it. For that reason I say, while I am in favour of building this road, I do not see that the passing of this charter will do any good. What do the hon. members for Toronto say ? They say : It will help us to negotiate. With whom ? With men who already hold two franchises and who may amalgamate their interests and a railway company with a road already built. This seems to me to be for a chance to buy or sell a charter, with somebody to make money out of it in the meantime. And when I see the parties connected with this scheme—not this last one, because I admit they are only trustees for the city of Toronto and could have no interest to sell—I am not inspired with great hope.

An hon. MEMBER. Some of them are members of Parliament.

Mr. SPROULE. Some of them are members of Parliament, I admit. But because they are members of Parliament does that say they never sell a charter ; never manipulate a charter ?

An hon. MEMBER. Never.

Mr. CASEY. Hardly ever.

Mr. SPROULE. Hardly ever, perhaps. Who are these men ? One is an hon. member of this House, a gentleman who expresses great anxiety to have some connection between Toronto and the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway at the earliest date, the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Bertram). Another is Senator Cox, who has been a railway manipulator for many years. Another is Mr. Donald D. Mann. The other is Mr. Mackenzie. I am told that there are some other members of this House connected with it. I do not know that, and, therefore, will not say. But I say that the fact that these two charters are held by this crowd is justification, to my mind, for saying that the charters are held rather in the interest of individuals than in the interest of the country. If this corporation would go on and build the road, there would be no complaints, for then south-western Ontario would get what it wants and what it expects, and Toronto would get what it wants. But there is no getting out of it that, through this agreement between these individuals and these several corporations and after they can arrange matters financially among themselves to suit their own purposes and make the best out of it, they will agree, perhaps,

for one company or the other to build the road.

But then the other feature of it is that this charter which is proposed for the purpose of constructing a railway between Toronto and James Bay, practically may be shut up for nine years before that road is built, at least shut up for two years to give the other railway company a chance, and this charter becomes null and void practically for two years. Then there are two years more during which it may commence operations, or practically four years before there need be a shovel full of earth turned for building that railway between Toronto and North Bay, so far as this charter goes. Then what is the trade of Toronto going to do in the meantime? What is the public going to do in the meantime? Where is the interest of the public and the interest of the shippers to come in? They have got to suffer, because the rival corporations cannot come to an agreement that suits their own purposes and give the benefits which the country naturally expected to receive when they granted charters to these various corporations. I may say that I hold one view in connection with charters that ought to be impressed upon the public, and I think the time will come when it will be impressed upon Parliament and upon the country. I believe that when we grant a charter to any corporation and they build a railway, that railway ought to be very much like a highway, that is to say, available to every person in the community, or like a turnpike road, that every person paying a fair compensation for the use of that road should have a right over it. When Parliament subsidizes a railway company for the purpose of building a road that is not in the interests of the general public, the public should not suffer because the holders of that charter do not see fit to work in the interest of the public, and so soon as the company control that corporation to the disadvantage of the public, either with regard to giving running rights to other railways over it, or running facilities, in the interest of the public, then I say Parliament should interfere, and we should claim the right to control that road in the interest of the public the same as provincial governments control every highway in the interests of the public. I say the time should never come that we should give up our control over the railways to the extent that we cannot interfere in the interests of the public until the people build a railway entirely with their own money, not asking any assistance from Parliament. But as long as Parliament gives assistance, then I say we should hold control over these railway corporations. I do not like to oppose this charter, because if the giving of this charter resulted in the building of a railway, it would be a great boon for us, and that is what we want. But I claim that the granting of this charter will not give the benefits to the public which it is claimed it will give. I claim that those gentlemen who are professing to represent the city of Toronto, and to be so anxious to promote the trade of that great city and north-western Ontario, are not taking the best means at their disposal to accomplish what they profess to be desirous of accomplishing, otherwise they would not lock up the country for either two years or four years, in this fast age of the world, when trade once established cannot be easily diverted from its channels. I say they would not lock up that section of country for either two years or four years before they can move hand or foot to relieve the people of the burdens under which they are labouring to-day. Then I say on the other hand that Parliament should step in, we should not give up our rights, as we practically do by granting this charter, because if we accept the explanations of the representatives of Toronto as a justifiable reason why Parliament should give the charter, it is because we are helpless to do otherwise, and all the provision which Parliament up to the present has made, is of no avail in the interest of the public. Therefore we must step in and devise some other way or some other means to accomplish it in the interest of the public. Then I say Parliament is giving over its rights, abandoning its rights, or acknowledging that it cannot exercise the control which it claimed it would exercise in the interest of the public if such a condition of affairs arose as exists at the present time between these two railway corporations between Toronto and North Bay. I am told that the company who are pressing to build that railway to-day is the Canadian Pacific Railway. Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann will be on to build that railway in a short time, and I hope they will do so in the interest of the country, and in the interest of Toronto, and in the interest of south-western Ontario. But they will build it when it suits their own purpose, and the only fear is that as soon as they do it, an understanding will be come to between the two roads, and the travelling public wil be no better off, and the trade of the country will be handicapped as it is to-day, and practically no better off than if we had the one road. We give a right in this charter to amalgamate with either of these companies, to sell out to either of these companies to have running rights with either of these corporations. We leave it practically as it was before, because the parties that hold these charters can turn round and agree with each other and can sell out, the one can sell out to the other, and they can leave the public as they are at the present time. Now, while I am not disposed to oppose the granting of this charter, I think it my duty to bring these considerations to the attention of the House, I think it my duty to show where the parties are, and how they are acting who profess to be so desirous of giving, in the interest of Toronto and in the interest of the travelling public, the facilities which they ought to have be-

tween Toronto and North Bay, or between Toronto and Sudbury.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hour for the consideration of private Bills having expired, the Committee of Supply will resume.

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

High Commissioner's Office, contingencies $11,700

Mr. WALLACE. When the committee rose at six o'clock, I was going to make a remark or two upon this vote proposed for the High Commissioner's office in London. In my opinion the time has arrived when we should reconsider the whole position of the High Commissioner's office. I think that during the last two or three years it has drifted away from the original intention of what that office should be. To-day I do not think it performs the functions that Canada desires. What we want now, and what the office as at present constituted does not fulfil in any degree, is a business office. The business of Canada with Great Britain has increased enormously of late years, and we look forward in the future to a much larger increase. So far as I know, we are not taking very serious steps to promote that business, and I think it is time that we did so. In my opinion the Government should either change largely the functions of the office, or, if they find it necessary to continue the present management, they should have at any rate a business establishment in Great Britain to promote Canadian commerce. I find from the Trade and Navigation Returns that about five-eighths of the total exports of Canada goes to Great Britain, and two-thirds of it, perhaps, to Great Britain and her colonies. Our total exports last year amounted to 130 million dollars, of which $82,500,000 went to Great Britain and her colonies, and about $77,250,000 went to Great Britain alone.

There is acknowledged to a great future for Canadian exports. Of the products of the fisheries, amounting to the value of about $10,000,000, more than $4,000,000 worth goes to Great Britain; of the products of the forest, amounting to $31,000,000, the value of $14,500,000 goes to Great Britain; of animals and their products, to the value of $129,000,000, $33,000,000 in value goes to Great Britain. All these are articles of commerce, which require great care in handling, to retain the market owing to the great competition, and our shippers have to depend on other than Government agencies to see that their interests are protected. Of a total export of agricultural products to the value of between $17,000,000 and $18,000,000, no less than $13,500,000 in value goes to Great Britain; and of manufactures, out of a total of $9,500,000, more than the value of $3,500,000 goes there.

We have no agencies there to-day, no special facilities to enable the people of Canada to market their products there and no one to assist our shippers in enlarging our markets and looking after our general interests. It was originally intended that the High Commissioner's office should attend to these duties, and no doubt some years ago a good deal of work was done in that direction, but within the last two or three years the business portion of the work of the office has fallen away. There may be some reasons for the Government continuing the office as at present constituted. If there are, the Government should state the particular duties performed in the High Commissioner's office. We all know that the present incumbent of the position, with his enormous wealth, large interests and splendid hospitality, could hardly be expected to give attention to business interests, and I know from my own knowledge that this is the case. I think that the Government should take into consideration the propriety of establishing in London or Liverpool, say in the business part of London, a business office for the Dominion. It may be said that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have a business office here, and it is true they have an office where they look after their own particular business interests, which are undoubtedly to a large extent, Canadian interests. Those interests, however, are simply railroad interests and the selling of the company's lands, and the obtaining of settlers for those lands. But in our commercial interests the company are not interested, and it is not their business to look after the hundred and one business matters affected, and which belong directly or indirectly to the whole producing population of Canada. Those interests are not looked after by any one. I commend this suggestion to the Minister of Trade and Commerce, who, I know, has given attention to it, in order that he may consider the advisability of establishing a large office, in charge of competent men sent from Canada, who would have associated with them men who understand business methods in England, for the purpose of looking after and promoting Canadian commercial interests. Let hon. gentlemen consider that no less than $77,000,000 of our total exports of $130,000,000 go to the British Isles. They are landed at two or three ports, and Canadian agents could look after our interests at the different points. The expense, whatever it might be, would be nothing compared with the results, if we secured good and competent men for the work, and surely such men could be found who would make it their special business to promote business interests and push Canadian goods, and look after the interests of the business men and producers of the Dominion. Take our exports of animals and their products, bacon ham, eggs, butter and cheese, and imagine the results that would follow if there were

good men appointed whose duty it would be to advise our Canadian shippers, ascertain the best markets for our products and look after our interests. The expenditure by Canada would be returned one-hundred fold. To-day the High Commissioner's office is removed from the business part of the city, and the officers there do not pretend to look after the business of Canada. Many other things we might fairly expect they would look after which at present are not attended to. I called at the High Commissioner's office one day when in London, and inquired when the next steamer would go to Canada, and there was no one there who know when the next steamer would sail, and the officials had to send out to procure the information. If a business office were established it would have direct communication with all the steamers going to and from, and would know all about our products, and the returns would be most satisfactory: in fact, our exports would be very largely increased if the Government took up the question and dealt with it by establishing commercial agencies in Great Britain instead of adding to the present High Commissioner's office, if it should be considered advisable or necessary to continue the duties of the office as at present carried out.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). I am not at all disposed to undervalue the advice given by the hon. gentleman who has just spoken. We are perfectly well aware that for some time to come at all events the trade of Canada with Great Britain is likely to continue to develop greatly, and as every one knows, and as the hon. gentleman has truly stated, it has already attained very extraordinary proportions. With respect to the question in hand, the hon. gentleman may rest assured that it has not at all escaped our attention; but I may tell him that what he requires may possibly cost a little more than he supposes, although it is very likely the expenditure would prove to be money well spent. The High Commissioner's office, as no doubt the hon. gentleman is aware, was originally constituted more with a view to assist in financial and diplomatic relations, which must always prevail between a Dominion like Canada and the mother country, than with the direct view of attending to any other business, except possibly to some extent supervising emigration to this country. That as far as I remember was the statement made to the House when it was originally instituted in 1879. We had not a High Commissioner in my time; he was an Agent General.

Mr. WALLACE. Mr. Jenkins.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Yes, he was agent general and his functions were much more limited than those assigned to the High Commissioner. The first High Commissioner was Sir Alexander Galt, and at that time a statement was made, if my memory serves me, by Sir John Macdonald to the House, in which he pointed out the advisability on financial and diplomatic grounds of having a man of high position in London to represent the people of Canada. It was also understood that the High Commissioner would exercise a supervision as far as he could over the immigration branch of the Government business, but it was not supposed possible that he could do that and at the same time attend to the commercial interests of the Dominion unless indeed he was supplied with a considerably larger staff. The place where he resides and carries on his official duties is, I think, immediately adjacent to the offices occupied by the agents general of the other colonies.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. They are in a row together.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The question that has been raised by the hon. member for York (Mr. Wallace) as to having separate commercial agencies distinct from the High Commissioner's office, one in London and peradventure one or two in other great centres of population in England, is undoubtedly one of very considerable practical importance.

Mr. McCARTHY. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. And it is one which requires the serious consideration of Government. I may say further that probably some member of the Government, immediately after the termination of this session, will proceed to England and look into that question on the spot. More than that, I am not prepared at present to say. I can assure the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace), and the House in general, that we are fully alive to the great possible importance to the trade of Canada of giving some further facilities in that direction.

While I am on this subject I may venture to say that I think that although it is true no doubt, as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) has said, that we can hardly expect Lord Strathcona to devote his attention very much to matters of purely commercial detail, I believe that Canada has in very important respects been extremely well served by Lord Strathcona since he has represented us in England.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. It is a matter of no small moment to Canada that our representative should be well and favourably known from one end of the Kingdom to the other, and more especially on the London Stock Exchange, as a man of the highest honour and probity, and a man whose word is universally admitted to be as good as his bond.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I need not tell the House that the emoluments of the office are absolutely nothing to Lord Strathcona. I need not tell the House that in all probability the exercise of the hospitality which he has indulged in during a single London season will vastly exceed all that is nominally assigned to him as the representative of Canada. The hon. gentleman is as well aware of that if he has visited London—and I think he did recently—as I am. I think every member of the House who has occasion to visit England will testify, that whether or not the office in other respects comes up to all that he desires, Lord Strathcona at any rate is most worthy of upholding in every possible way the honour and dignity of Canada.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I may add further that Lord Strathcona is a man whose advice is eagerly sought and has very great weight indeed with the English Government, and with Englishmen of every rank and station. As regards his influence in what I may call the diplomatic circle and the ministerial circle, and in financial circles, and on the Stock Exchange, Canada would find it very hard indeed to replace Lord Strathcona.

Mr. McCARTHY. I desire to say a word in support of the view put forward by the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) to which I attach the very greatest importance. I think it would be a very great mistake, a retrograde movement that we ought not to think of for one moment, to withdraw the High Commissioner from the diplomatic position, so to speak, which he now holds. We are aware that every other country has its consular agents in different parts, and upon them the trade of the country relies to a very great extent for the information necessary in order to compete in the markets of Great Britain with the commercial rivals which they are sure to find. There is no reason at all, so far as I can see, why the High Commissioner's duties should not be extended to enable him to have under him in the more important trade centres of England, officers—not, of course, consular agents, because that we would not be entitled to have—but gentlemen who would fill the same position so far as trade is concerned, and who would keep an eye upon the various interests of Canada as to the commodities in which we could compete, and who would be in a position to offer advice to Canadians, which no doubt we would be able to avail ourselves of in order to get possession of the markets which we have not up to the present moment been able to reach. I do not desire to say a single word against the high qualities of the present High Commissioner. I quite echo all the Minister of Trade and Commerce has said in that regard, but I think at the same time that the office perhaps wants a little shaking up. I am glad to know that a Minister is about to visit England after the session, and I think on inquiry he will find that perhaps it is not quite up to date in all respects. I think sometimes people go there to inquire into Canadian matters, and they can get very little more information than they could in any railway office in the city of London. That, of course, is not altogether the fault of the High Commissioner; it is the fault of the system which has grown up, and he has fallen into it, and perhaps he has not taken any steps to change it as might very possibly with advantage to us be done. The other matter to which the hon. member (Mr. Wallace) alluded is still more important than anything else, and that is that we should have gentlemen in the leading centres of England who would advise us as to what branches of trade were opened to Canadians, as to the quality of the goods, and as to the different means that ought to be taken to secure such trade as we would have an opportunity of entering into advantageously to the people of Canada.

Mr. FOSTER. No doubt the subject is an important one which has been discussed briefly, and very much to the point by the hon. gentlemen who have spoken. I would not like it to be taken for granted that nothing had been done by the High Comissioner's office in the line in which my hon. friend argues that something should be done, because for the last eight or ten years past, and even longer, the High Commissioner's office has been doing very useful work in that direction. We have only to take the reports which have been written from year to year by Mr. Dyke, the former efficient emigration agent at Liverpool, to convince us of that fact. While I was Minister of Finance, and just about the time I became Minister of Finance, I remember that we attached especially to the duties of Mr. Colmer (under the High Commissioner then, Sir Charles Tupper), and to the immigration agents in the different cities and centres of Great Britain; we attached to their duties as mere immigration agents, that of being commercial agents much in the line in which my hon. friend suggested, and I think a very large portion of their time was occupied, and certainly very efficient work was done by them in these lines. They kept themselves advised as to the varying markets, the wants of the markets, and everything of that kind, and they sent most valuable reports, some of which were in pamphlet form distributed, and all of which appear in the reports either of the High Commissioner or the report of the Minister of Trade and Commerce. I think you will find that it will not be possible to do it in connection with the

High Commissioner's office. I do not think you can use that office for anything more than an executive or supervising authority over it. If you are going to exploit commerce and trade in that way, you will have to do it by having thoroughly live business men, men who have been brought up in business, and who know its modern methods, who will be employed to do that and nothing else in the different centres. Possibly it would be well to have them under the general supervision of the High Commissioner. Whether you will have them simply find out the conditions of the markets and what is needed or whether you will go a step further and have an up-to-date exhibition mart of the products of Canada, or if you go further, whether you will have a sort of commercial mart in these large emporiums, over which they shall preside and be the principal agents and administrators—whether you can carry on that which is a semi-commercial business or not, I do not know. But I think the Government would be justified in having thoroughly active and practical business men in some of the centres of Great Britain to devote their whole time to the exploitation of the markets and the bringing together of the buyer and seller in the interest of Canada. I want to add my word of testimony to the thoroughly efficient way in which the present High Commissioner is representing Canada in Great Britain. The representative and diplomatic character of his office is, I think, sufficient in itself to warrant the Government in keeping the High Commissioner near the Government offices. I do not think we can over-estimate the advantage of having such a valuable medium of communication between Canada and the home authorities.

Post Office Department, amount required to pay those officers of the Savings' Bank Branch engaged in the balancing of and computing interest on depositors' accounts, to 30th June, 1898.. $2,950

Mr. FOSTER. I see that there is an increase of $100.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. These persons are paid in proportion to the number of accounts; and as the volume of business increases, there is a little increase in the expense.

The Governor General's Secretary's Office, contingencies $13,500

Mr. FOSTER. What is the policy of the present Government with reference to the item of newspapers for the different departments, which has excited a good deal of hostile criticism in past years. I remember that there was a rule adopted by the late Government to reduce all to a maximum of $500 a year. Has any change been made, or is the old rule still followed?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There has been no change.

Mr. FOSTER. That is an existent Order in Council. That maximum is exceeded in the Governor General's Secretary's Office, but I think that was always exceeded in that office, on account of its being that office and on account of so many old country papers being required there.

The Queen's Privy Council for Canada, contingencies..... .... $7,500

Mr. FOSTER. I should like to have an explanation of the item of lunches for the Cabinet, $118. I think the Minister of Trade and Commerce should explain that. What in the world does that mean? Do we have to pay the board of the Cabinet? It may not be amiss to call attention to the facts that the same old items appear as in former years. Penknives 43, jackknives quite a number, but there is one very suspicious thing here I would point out. It is an eyelet punch. Was that for the use of the Cabinet? I notice the Minister of Public Works looks very conscious.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not know anything about that.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It is an article for fastening papers.

Mr. FOSTER. There is an item for car fare of $126. That seems a very large item.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. For the last two or three years the messengers with us, as in all establishments, use the cars to save time, and it promotes economy in other ways.

Mr. DAVIN. I do not like to be critical about things of this sort, but I remember that when the late Sir John Macdonald was Prime Minister, certain items were very severely criticised. I find here travelling expenses $962 and cab-hire of Sir Wilfrid Laurier $121. I do not think that is excessive for cab-hire, but it used to be severely criticised by hon. gentlemen opposite, and of course consistency ought to make them careful about that. There is $126 for luncheons, but I suppose those were lunches that took place on Saturdays when the Cabinet sat a long time.

Department of Justice, contingencies.... $9,600

Mr. FOSTER. I find that in the contingencies there are a great many items for books. If I am not mistaken, the Justice Department has had for some years an appropriation for its law books, and of course that would not come in under contingencies.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is no separate vote for books, but they come in under contingencies. There is no sepa-

rate appropriations for the law department of the Department of Justice.

Mr. CLANCY. I see an item of fifty-six boxes of pens. Is that amount used each year in the Justice Department; also thirty-eight dozen pencils and seventy-two bottles of ink.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That is not much for a department in a year—$16.

Mr. CLANCY. I am not looking at the amount so much as the bulk.

Mr. FOSTER. I notice that the Justice Department exceeds the rule for newspapers, paying $678.50. That is a very large appropriation. Nine-tenths of them are perfectly useless to the department.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I think the criticism is quite acceptable, and I may say that only last month the Minister has revised the newspaper list of the department.

Mr. FOSTER. I am not disposed to cavil with the departments for having newspapers, but a liberal supply can be got for $500, and if a department exceeds the rule then another department is pressed to go beyond it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is very difficult to follow the rule.

Mr. FOSTER. Not in the least. If the Minister makes up his mind and tells the deputy to carry it out, it will be carried out.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The rule is a good one.

Mr. FOSTER. There is another item which appears frequently in this report, and which I will just mention—press clippings from the Canadian Press Bureau. So far as my experience in that sort of thing goes, there is no utility in these press clippings. It may be a little interesting to the Minister to know what the newspapers are saying about him, but it is much more interesting for the enterprising canvasser for that sort of work. It may be an advantage to him, the Minister, to have judicious clippings from the press of his own country; his secretary is largely for that purpose.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I have never seen the clippings, so far as I know.

Mr. CLANCY. I see an item here for "cushion keys." What does that mean?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. That is in the Minister of Justice Department

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No doubt they are part of the machinery of a typewriter. I hope that information is correct, but I do not guarantee it.

Mr. DAVIN. I have some idea of the Department of Justice, but it seems to me that the item I see here for pens, $31.07, is very large for fifteen clerks. There are 56 boxes, $15.07 two fountain pens, $8; and a gold pen, $4, and two gold nibs, $4. These latter items it seems to me are a superfluity of naughtiness. Such an item as this multiplied by the number of the departments, and all such items added together makes a very large sum indeed.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to know what fifteen clerks in the Justice Department do with twenty-three almanacs. Does each clerk have an almanac to carry around with him?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. That would be no more than one apiece.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose when one almanac is worn out he gets another. But there is another question a little more important. I notice in all the departments they are taking the eclipse files—which are good files. Are there any arrangements by which these files can be got by the Government at wholesale prices? Running through the items for the departments, I find that the total expenditure for these files is very large. It would be interesting to find out whether it would not be possible to supply these to the Government by contract. Or does each department simply by them at the retail price? They are an article which can be sold by wholesale.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. So far as I recollect, whenever any department require files, they make an order on us and we buy them at the best possible price.

Mr. FOSTER. In what way does my hon. friend buy them?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I know that the chief architect has been buying them by wholesale, so far as he was able. But my hon. friend knows that we cannot always foresee what quantity will be required. A department may call on us for some to-day, and it may be a month or two before we get any call for others. I do not think we have been buying them wholesale all the time, it would not be feasible.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, it would be very possibe to order from the makers of the Eclipse Files as many as may be needed by all the departments for a year, and they certainly would quote you the prices.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will look into the matter.

Mr. DAVIN. I want to call attention to page I—5 of the Auditor General's Report, brief bags, $12. Then a little further down, four brief bags, $22.75. So there is $34.75 for brief bags for the hon. gentleman's department.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I remember there was one for myself, and one for each of my secretaries. There was a French

gentleman in my office, and another young gentleman who is also connected with the department, each of whom had one. The charge is a little high, but my hon. friend will notice that I was obliged to equip the department when I came in to the extent even of getting a code of laws. There was not a statute in the office when I came there. I am not responsible for that expenditure. The hon. gentleman will admit that these requisities are not easily dispensed with in an office where law is supposed to be taken care of.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend has not solved the mystery of the almanacs yet.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I cannot find the item.

Department of Militia and Defence.... $7,100

Mr. DAVIN. Do sundries, $3,000, include travelling expenses ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes.

Mr. DAVIN. I find here : travelling expenses, Hon. F. W. Borden, $1,171.89 ; C. E. Panet, $246.42 ; H. W. Brown for self and Minister, $304.66, making a total of $1.190.87. Also telegrams, $1,078.80. I want to call attention to the fact that this seems to have been at the time when the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence was ill, away from the House, for which we voted $1,000, and very properly. But if he was lying by, I do not understand how the country is to be charged with $1,171 for travelling expenses.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The Minister of Militia and Defence is not here ; it would only be fair to wait till he is present.

Item stands.

Department of Indian Affairs..... $8,090

Mr. DAVIN. There is an increase here of $410.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. When I started in the department, there were certain extra clerks employed. Last year when I recommended this vote, I thought we would be able to dispense with the services of a couple of them, and I did not ask for sufficient appropriation to pay them. I found, however, that I was not able to dispense with their services, I therefore, ask this year for a supplementary vote to cover their salaries. There is no change in the service.

Mr. CLANCY. What is this item of "books, blank, attendance" ? Then there are cushions here again, an item which appears in every department. There is also an item for fifty-one pocket knives. How many clerks are there in that department ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Forty-five clerks.

Mr. CLANCY. I observe eighty-five boxes of pens. They may be very cheap, but each clerk has more than two boxes: Then, there is twenty-seven boxes of mucilage and 207 penholders. As a matter of information, I should like to know if each department is equipped at the commencement of the year with certain quantities ? The quantities seem to be large.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The Department of Indian Affairs superintends the entire school system of the Indians, and there is a school branch in the department here. A great portion of the supplies in the lines to which the hon. gentleman has referred are for the schools, not for departmental use.

Mr. CLANCY. Is there a department here where school education is going on with respect to Indians ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The entire system of Indian schools is under the charge of the Department of Indian Affairs, and there is a very large sum expended. A considerable number of those articles are called for because we have a school branch in the department, and those supplies are purchased for the use of the school branch.

Mr. CLANCY. But I understood they were entirely for the department.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Not all, a considerable quantity is required for the school branch.

Mr. POPE. How are we to tell what quantity is required for the department and what for the schools ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I can give the committee the information at a later stage, if necessary. This is the way it has always been done—there is no change whatever.

Mr. POPE. I observe there is an item, flowers of Manitoba, $3.18. I have no objection to the hon. gentleman decorating his office, but he should be able to find flowers nearer his office than Manitoba, while I admire his prairie patriotism.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The hon. gentleman is referring to a book called the "Flowers of Manitoba."

Mr. POPE. There is another item—baskets. Is it because this is the Indian Department that so many baskets are required; are these purchased to encourage industry among the Indians, or are they required in the department ; or is a portion used in the Indian schools and a portion in the department ?

Office of the Auditor General..... $3,700

Mr. DAVIN. It is satisfactory to see there is a decrease. Do I understand that the size of the Auditor General's Report is to be diminished ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. We would not object

Mr. CLANCY. This involves a question that was touched remotely in another place with respect to the Auditor General's office. I suppose we have no right to discuss anything that took place in a committee until a report is submitted to the House. What were the travelling expenses for in connection with the Auditor General and Mr. Reid ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The Auditor General visited some of the public works to make inquiries into some accounts pending before him, and I imagine these items are in connection with that.

Mr. CLANCY. Can the hon. gentleman say which of the clerks have received the increase ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The three who received the increases were Messrs. Wagner, Steeves and Johnston.

Mr. CLANCY. Why were these given increases and the others not ?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Brodeur.) I think this discussion is not germane to the item under consideration.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The Post Office and Agriculture are both reserved for discussion.

Mr. CLANCY. I have no objection to postpone it, and discuss it when the proper time arrives.

Mr. DAVIN. I see here a sum of $325 to E. W. Burley for services and expenses investigating Alberta election accounts. What was that for ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE NAD COMMERCE. A very large account indeed was sent down by one of the returning officers. and the Auditor General sent a special officer to investigate the matter.

Mr. McDOUGALL. What is that $20 for "re promotion of third-class clerks" ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The Audit Act allows the Auditor General to take legal advice, and of course he is allowed to pay the usual legal fees.

Mr. McDOUGALL. What is the $20 for "re Goodwin contracts." ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. He took Mr. Lash's independent opinion.

Mr. McDOUAGLL. Is that the contract about which Mr. Goodwin went to law ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Department of Finance, contingencies.. $6,800

Mr. DAVIN. What is that increase of $280 for ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Several of the private secretaries have not yet received any permanent position in the Civil Service, and consequently they are receiving much lower salaries than the gentlemen who have been fortunate enough to obtain permanent positions. It is proposed out of the contingencies to permit these gentlemen to the number of five or six, to be paid a sum not exceeding $1,500. One part of this vote is to enable the private secretary to be paid that additional sum out of contingencies as respects the Finance Department.

Department of Customs, contingencies.. $7,050

Mr. BENNETT. On page T—17 of the Auditor General's Report, under salaries, the payments amounted to $1,783, and this year an amount of $2,730 is asked ? Why this increase of nearly $1,000 ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The item for last year, for clerical and other assistance, was $2,770, and this year we are asking for $2,320, which is $450 less. For printing and stationery we are taking the same estimate. For sundries we are taking the same estimate. The decrease this year over last is $450, and it is brought about in this way. Last year in the clerical and other assistance, my private secretary was down for $600, and he has been transferred to the permanent list, so that we effect in that way a saving of $600, out of which we provide for an increase to five of the extra clerks at $30, amounting to $150, which leaves a net decrease in contingencies of $450.

Mr. WALLACE. What salary does the private secretary get now ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. It is proposed to give him $1,500. He is made second-class clerk at $1,100 and will get $400 instead of $600 as private secretary.

Mr. WALLACE. Has he been in the department before ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. No, he came in with the change of Government.

Mr. BENNETT. There is an item of file-boxes, $187.50, which should be explained.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. There are necessarily a great many papers in that department, and I presume we were put to extra expense for these on account of the fire.

Mr. WALLACE. I think the private secretary of the Minister has been treated a good deal more generously than his predecessor. The previous secretary, Mr. Bristol, was paid for his services in the department $450 or $500, and he got $600 as private secretary, and I can certify that there could have been no more efficient private

secretary than Mr. Bristol was. He had the advantage of having been in the department several years before he became private secretary, so that he had a very complete knowledge of the department, and had not to learn his business.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. All I can say is that I think the gentleman who is acting as private secretary at present is very well worth his salary, and the hon. gentleman will find, if he looks at the accounts, that the sum we are asking does not exceed what was asked before, although there has been a great deal of extra work in the department. He has been made a second-class clerk at $1,100, and we do not propose to give him $600 as private secretary, but only $400. I think what the hon. gentleman has said about Mr. Bristol is quite correct.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). Why is the department asking for $2,700 this year for sundries, when only $1,780 was spent last year?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. That only proves how economical we were.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). It looks as if you were preparing to have a better time this year.

Mr. CLANCY. I would like to ask the Minister of Customs whether there is an educational department in some part of the building where he resides like that in the Department of the Interior, because I find the following expenditures last year:—Dictionary and encyclopedia, $68; English dictionary, $12; Funk & Wagnall's Standard Dictionary, $18; Haydn's Dictionary of Dates, $8. Were these consumed by the fire, and had the hon. gentleman to buy a new outfit? I fancy these account for the learned speeches of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. WALLACE. The dictionary has short speeches. His was a very long one.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Sometimes when new Ministers come in they do not find any there.

Mr. CLANCY. Perhaps the hon. gentleman can give some explanation of why he required three dictionaries in one year.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I do not know that I am able to do that. I do not remember any purchase of a dictionary myself. I fancy my predecessor must have given the order.

Mr. WALLACE. I can tell the hon. gentleman that I gave no order for a single dictionary. I see there is an item of $68 for the Century Dictionary, and $12 for a French and English dictionary. I think the Minister of Customs will have to assume the responsibility for them.

Department of Inland Revenue, contingencies $6,250

Mr. POPE. There are some very interesting items here. I notice an item of three rat-traps, $1. I suppose we may understand that the hon. Minister used these for the purpose of furnishing fresh meat to Li Hung Chang during his visit to Canada.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. POPE. I am somewhat surprised, knowing the hon. Minister as well as I do, to find that there should be required in his department three cork-screws.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Shall I tell the hon. gentleman what these are for? They are to open the bottles of ink.

Mr. POPE. There is another item in close proximity to that—water filters. Is that for the ink also?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I think my hon. friend ought to know what water is.

Mr. POPE. I have not had much experience with water; but the hon. gentleman, I thought, would offer some substantial information, especially with regard to the rat-traps. I will insist on knowing what they are for.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I will make the hon. member a present of one.

Mr. CLANCY. I would like to ask about the sum of $464.74 for newspapers. I do not know whether, measured by the custom of the past, or by what is contemplated in the future, that is to be considered moderate. But, apart from either consideration, I am going to ask the hon. gentleman if that is a reasonable expenditure for newspapers in a single department? It is not perhaps so large as some that I see, but it does seem to me to be a very large sum. I can quite understand that the pressure is very strong, but I cannot help thinking that this is a very large sum to be expended on newspapers. It is inconsistent to haggle over the statutory increase of $50 a year to a sessional clerk and allow newspapers to be piled up to this extent, not one in fifty of which, I venture to say, the hon. Minister has ever looked at.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. All I have to say is that we do not take the newspapers, but they take us, and it is a continual fight to get rid of them. So far, the average expenditure has been about $500, and I am proud to say that I have reduced it by $37. If you allow any newspaper to get a footing in the office, it is very difficult to get rid of it. I would be very glad to give up about nine-tenths of them.

Mr. CLANCY. I do not know whether that comes within our jurisdiction or that

of the provincial legislatures, but it is a decided abuse in the country that newspapers should be sent without being ordered, and then the people to whom they are sent forced to pay the subscriptions by the court. In many cases these newspapers are taken unwittingly.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The local legislatures have jurisdiction in that matter. It is a matter of contract.

Mr. CLANCY. It is a great abuse. I know of persons who have been sent American publications, and have received them as a mere matter of curiosity, not knowing that they were in law compelled to pay for them, and the result was they were forced to pay in the courts.

Mr. McDOUGALL. For whose benefit were these photographs taken for which there is a charge of $19 ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Mine was not taken. Those were the photographs of some of my hon. friends on the other side.

Mr. POPE. I do not see what consolation the hon. Minister can have in looking at his wall decorated with the photographs of Cabinet Ministers since confederation. I see in the next line a charge for a photograph of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, $3. That is cheap enough, and I can quite understand that my hon. friend should derive a certain amount of consolation from having that photograph in his office when his chief is absent. But I do not see any necessity for the larger item of $19 for photographs of Cabinet Ministers since confederation.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. They were not ordered by me, but by some of the hon. gentlemen who preceded me. I have not even received the photographs, though I have paid for them.

Mr. POPE. That is showing great disrespect, and an order of this House should issue that they be hung up in the hon. gentleman's office, since the country has paid for them.

Department of Public Works, contingencies $7,900

Mr. BENNETT. When such commendable economy is being practiced by the Minister of Public Works, it is disgraceful that there should be such outrageous expenditure in other respects. He has certainly set the other Cabinet Ministers an example, because he has been independent enough to pay his own cab-hire for the year, with the exception of a sum of 40 cents, and it is a pity that his colleagues do not emulate his example. But while the hon. Minister is to be credited with this economy, it would seem that those under him are very profligate with the public money. There is no less an item than $25.75 for five brief bags. I can readily understand why the hon. gentleman should have one brief bag, but why there should be four others in the department is a thing that requires explanation.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That must be one brief bag at $25.

Mr. BENNETT. Surely the hon. Minister does not sport a $25 brief bag.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. They are $5 a piece ; that is all right.

Mr. BENNETT. I cannot understand why there should be five gentlemen in the hon. Minister's department all equipped with a brief bag. Seeing the amount of litigation the hon. gentleman himself has on hand, I could quite understand his requiring one bag.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. All my briefs turned out all right.

Mr. BENNETT. There are three typewriters, $300. That seems a considerable increase. The work surely could not have accumulated to such an extent as to require three additional typewriters. Then there is an item that seems outrageous. Newspapers and magazines $1,760. The hon. Minister is a busy man, and has certainly not had time enough to peruse even the outside of these publications. it seems to me that we should know why such a large amount is expended in the department on periodicals.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There was an old amount of $1,700 for newspapers, and I got a special vote of Parliament and paid it.

Mr. BELL. I thought it was $800.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend has only to look at the figures as given at the discussion when the item was voted.

Mr. BENNETT. There seems to be no other payments for newspapers. Were there no current newspapers at all taken in the department ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If the hon. gentleman looks higher on the page he will find some payments for newspapers. It is a difficult thing to prevent newspapers coming into the different departments, as those who have been Ministers know.

Mr. CLANCY. Do I understand that the accounts for which the hon. gentleman got this special appropriation were not recognized by his predecessor ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, they were recognized.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The amount was voted by the House.

Mr. CLANCY. The Government has a good majority, so I have no doubt the amount was voted. But were they recognized by the former Government?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. As a matter of fact, the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) steadily refused to recognize accounts for more than $500 a year from each department; but, at the same time, my predecessors had allowed the newspapers to come and the liability had been incurred, we had to pay.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman came into office on the pledge that he would do better than his predecessor.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am doing better.

Mr. CLANCY. Is he doing better by paying an old account and allowing it to go on as large as before?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman does not understand. I had to pay these accounts incurred by my predecessor. This year, I have not exceeded the amount authorized by Order in Council, $500, in fact I have spent less than that.

Mr. CLANCY. Is the hon. gentleman still at the mercy of the newspaper men?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No.

Mr. CLANCY. I notice here an item of expenditure for a magnifying glass. Is that what the hon. gentleman uses in spying out persons who have been guilty of offences against hon. gentlemen opposite in the past?

Mr. ELLIS. As to the newspapers taken in the department, it should be stated, in the first place, that newspapers in the country are constantly increasing and there is, no doubt, much pressure, as there is upon private individuals to subscribe to many periodicals. My hon. friend (Mr. Clancy) seems to have a special pick at the newspapers. I think they treat him pretty well. In the Department of Public Works it must be necessary to subscribe to many high-priced technical and scientific journals. Still, I think the Government should exercise close supervision over this item.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Five hundred is quite sufficient.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I notice here an item of 72 boxes of pens at a cost of $26.47, also drawing pens, fountain pens and pen-holders; I find also 85 bottles of ink charged for. I suppose these were quart bottles and I cannot understand how the department would use so much ink especially where the principal part of the work is now done by typewriters. That item surely ought to be reduced.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have in my department at Ottawa about 140 employees. We have spent $26.44 for pens and $44.65 for ink. But I may say at once that half of our pens and pencils and ink are stolen. I am very sorry to say it, but I think it is true of all the departments. We cannot keep pens and pencils. Even from my own desk, over and over again, my pens have disappeared.

Mr. POPE. Does that kind of thing increase during the session?

Mr. CLANCY. I just wish to say a word as to what has just fallen from the lips of my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Ellis), who is always moderate in his views. I am not complaining of the newspapers. It would be an unseemly thing if the papers of the country were not found in the offices of the Ministers as well as elsewhere. What I find fault with is the unnecessary accumulation of newspapers.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman is quite right.

Mr. POPE. There seems to be a tremendous lot of soap used in the department. Of course there is a certain amount of dirty linens to be washed and everybody has seen the washing, but it is hardly fair to charge 42 dozen of soap.

Mr. DAVIN. And I see by the accounts that Miss Seguin had 246 dozen of towels to wash and Mrs. Bray 106 dozen towels, so that a total of $88 was paid for washing towels. I do not know whether the Minister would say as the Lord Bishop of Winchester said on one occasion. When visiting Oxford, he was asked by a lady why he was called Soapy Sam, and he said it was because he kept his hands cleaner than did his brethren.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. As clean as theirs. They could not be cleaner.

Mr. RUSSELL. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) has not told the story quite as I heard it. The Bishop's answer was that whenever he got into hot water he always came out with clean hands.

Mr. CLANCY. I see that $1,059.39 is charged for travelling expenses of Ottawa officials. It is put in as a lump sum. We should have some explanation of that.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. On page Q—216 of the Auditor General's Report will be found the details.

Mr. CLANCY. I think we should have some explanation from the Minister here.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. All I can say is that my officials, engineers, clerk of works, &c., are obliged to travel a good deal to inspect public works. I cannot control that expenditure myself, no Minister

can do so. All these accounts have to pass before the Auditor General.

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. gentleman has not explained why it was that the Auditor General criticised that item.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman will find, by looking at the criticism, that the Auditor General calls attention to certain expenditures that he thinks should not have been made. But I must say that when an engineer, for instance, is ordered to go and inspect a work, if he has not a fur overcoat, he will have to hire one. The Auditor General objected to that, but I do not see how we could ask engineers, who are earning very small salaries, to buy a heavy coat when they go out travelling on public business.

Mr. DAVIN. The Auditor General makes some important suggestions in addressing the secretary of the Public Works Department, in a letter dated January 12, 1897 :

Sir,—I have completed my analysis of the travelling expenses of your Ottawa officials during 1896-97, on the same plan as that shown at pages Q—11 to Q—16 of 1895-96, and beg to offer the following remarks thereon :—

The objectionable items mentioned in my letter of February 7, 1895 (1894-95, page P—213), viz. : books, shaving, cleaning boots, baths, umbrella, medical attendance, hire of fur coat, and wear and tear of coat and suit, are now almost eliminated, and a slightly closer scrutiny on the part of the accountant will, I have no doubt, remove them altogether. The overcharges of previous years should, however, be refunded ; please see that this is done.

Progress in the line of purchasing return tickets is as yet only partial. For instance, in travelling between Ottawa and Montreal, Mr. Emery L. Lafontaine, the new engineer, charged 9 return tickets at $5.85 between March 30 and June 30, 1897 ; while during the twelve months, Mr. F. W. Cowie charged 40 single trips at $3.50, and Mr. E. D. Lafleur 28 single trips at $3.50, with no return tickets for either of them.

An economy which was feasible for Mr. Lafontaine, with his inexperience, should be equally feasible for older officers like Messrs. Cowie and Lafleur. Please call their attention to this.

There seems to have been no notice taken of my suggestion that frequent travelling should be done on mileage-books. Books for 1,000 miles each are issued by either railway company for $25, being the equivalent of return ticket rates. Payments for single fares amounting to more than $125 were made by : J. C. Blais, $129.10 ; L. Coste, $204 ; I. Coté, $444.35 ; F. W. Cowie, $342.55 ; E. B Godwin, $246.25 : E. B. Lafleur, $154.85—total, $1,520.90. This, at three cents a mile, would make 50,000 miles, or $1,250 for mileage-books, a practicable saving of $250.

There is a suggestion of the Auditor General that my hon. friend will agree should be attended to.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Certainly so. Mr. Emery Lafontaine was appointed since we took office. He has been going on very modestly. I see the old engineers have not been as economical as the new ones. Still, I have no doubt that they will try in the future to comply with the advice given by the Auditor General.

Mr. DAVIN. Here is another suggestion :

Similar remarks apply to the charging of large sums for cabs to and from the Ottawa stations, where other people use the street cars. Marked instances of the use of street cars will be found under the names of——

He gives the names of five parties.

——Such representative names demonstrate that this economy is within the reach of all.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The Auditor General was right.

Mr. DAVIN. I can safely say from observation on my own part that Ottawa swells, for some years, would not go in street cars. I remember asking them just to enter a street car with me, and they would not enter it. But now they will take street cars.

Department of Marine and Fisheries.... $11,000

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There is an apparent increase here of $1,000, but it is only apparent, as there has been no change whatever in the department.

Mr. BENNETT. There are $1,900 for telegrams. That would run nearly on an average of 25 a day.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. My department is one of those that has constant telegrams from all marine ports, about all kinds of shipping news. I cannot stop it.

Mr. POPE. There is one item here that I cannot see the use of—Blower handles, 5, $1.25. I have known the hon. Minister for many years in this House, and I do not think he needs any blower handles. This is a superfluous item, and should be struck out.

Mr. DAVIN. What is this $2,558 for printing ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The ordinary printing of the department, There is an enormous number of blanks printed.

Mr. BENNETT. Five new typewriters in that department, $477, less $45 allowed for an old one.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I suppose that was caused by the fire, but I could not pledge myself to it.

Mr. CLANCY. A considerable charge appears for dictionaries, French and English.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The library in the Marine Department was much injured by the fire. I have the poorest library of any of the

departments, and I have not yet gone to any expense in connection with it.

Mr. POPE. I notice an item of 75 cents for three jugs. Is there anything in any of them.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No.

Mr. CLANCY. What is the item, New Brunswick Dictionary, mean ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I think my predecessor must have got that.

Mr. McDOUGALL. There is an item for 120 packs of cards. Were they playing cards ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Oh, no.

Mr. CLANCY. Then there is an item for Statesmans' Year Book.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That is an annual publication.

Mr. POPE. There is another item—a hammer. Each Minister seems to have a hammer.

Department of Railways and Canals.... $8,000

Mr. DAVIN. I observe a saving in printing.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). The amount was not correctly distributed. It was erroneous to place the sum for printing at $6,000 and for the other expenditures at $2,000. While the amount has not been increased it was thought desirable to transfer $500 from one heading to the other in order that the vote might correspond with the circumstances.

Mr. DAVIN. In the light of the dictum of one Minister and the ex-Finance Minister, there should not be more than $500 expended by each department for newspapers. I observe an item of $1,189 for newspapers and magazines.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We found that a great many bills, extending over many years, had not been paid. We could not discontinue, according to the general idea, the subscriptions to newspapers, an immense number of which were coming to the department, until we had paid the bills already incurred. I gave instructions to have all the bills verified, adjusted and paid. I stated last year when I asked for an additional sum that it would be required in order to clear the deck. We have done it now, and have matters in such a shape that the expenditure will not exceed $500 in future. The sum of $1,189 will be found to include very many years' arrears.

Mr. McDOUGALL. There is an item of $1,107 for files. This is a very large sum for files for a department that has long been established.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I will make inquiries and let the hon. gentleman know the result.

Mr. BENNETT. There are new typewriters in the department.

Mr. POPE. Is there a jug, and anything in it ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I make a point of keeping it empty.

Department of Trade and Commerce.. $6,200

Mr. DAVIN. There is a decrease in the general vote, but perhaps the Minister will explain the increase which has occurred in the item for clerks and sundries.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. That is partly because there are a couple of permanent employees, whose salaries have been somewhat increased. That will represent about $150. A larger amount was asked for printing and stationery than is required. But we were a little short for sundries and had to increase the amount a little. I, therefore, reduced the printing and stationery by $500 and added part for sundries and extra clerical assistance. The total vote is reduced by $150.

Mr. McDOUGALL. What is the strength of the staff ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The permanent staff numbers eight, and there is a varying number of extra clerks according to the amount of work to be done. I want to get out the quarterly reports somewhat more rapidly, and shall be obliged to obtain three or four clerical assistants. The practice of the department has been to issue these quarterly reports, but they have not been issued as rapidly as I would wish or as the trade requires.

Mr. WALLACE. How long after the end of a quarter will it be before the report is issued ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I hope to get them issued within a matter of four weeks after the termination of the quarter; that is, if I can get the printing department of the Government to do the work as fast as I think it ought. Of course, when the House is sitting, it is a matter of some difficulty to get these things done rapidly in the Printing Bureau, and we have been a good deal retarded, but for the benefit of the commercial community I know that these quarterly reports ought to come out within two or three weeks, and in order to do that I have arranged for two or three extra hands under the head of clerical assistance.

Mr. BENNETT. I see these ubiquitous brief bags figure here to the number of three. Does the Minister hope to equip the other five clerks with brief bags this year, so they will all be on the same footing.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I will endeavour to do so.

Mr. McDOUGALL. There are twenty-three boxes of pens, and other pens amounting to $22. I cannot see how eight clerks with the addition of two or three extra during the year, can use that many pens when they have three or four typewriters besides. There must be a great deal of "lifting" going on in that department.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I do not think $11 for pens is very extravagant.

Mr. McDOUGALL. It is $22.69 altogether. There are some fountain pens.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Oh, well, we did not find any fountain pens when we came into the office, and we had to supply them.

Mr. POPE. Will we find any when the Minister goes out of office.

Mr. BENNETT. Did they get away with the typewriters, too ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I found very little when I went into the office.

Mr. CLANCY. Is the Trade and Commerce Department well supplied with newspapers ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I cannot say that it is. This department requires a certain number of expensive foreign publications, and it is not quite as well equipped as it ought to be ; but I did not care to exceed in that matter, as I have sometimes criticised the newspaper items in the old times myself.

Mr. INGRAM. Could not the Department of Trade and Commerce supply the Department of Customs and Excise with these newspapers ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It would cost more for a messenger to carry the newspapers between the departments than it does for the papers.

Mr. CLANCY. The Minister of Trade and Commerce only asks for $192 for newspapers, including foreign journals, and yet Customs takes $600 and Public Works $500. He is administering a severe rebuke to his colleagues.

Care and cleaning of Departmental buildings..... .... $27,000

Mr. CLANCY. Is there a fixed sum for this every year ?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes. It is voted in a lump sum. There is a practice as to the rate of pay for these charwomen—75 cents a day, I think—and there has been no change.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It is as much as your life is worth to take $1 off these charwomen.

Mr. CLANCY. I am not objecting to this rate of pay, but I simply wish to know how it is managed.

Mr. BELL. How does this item come to be in the Finance Department ?

The MINSITER OF FINANCE. It is a surprise to me. I was there for some time before I knew I was in charge of the department of charwomen. Although I am responsible for it. The matter comes very little before me.

Resolutions reported.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright) moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. WALLACE. Mr. Speaker, the House ordered the Yukon accounts to be brought down, and I am told they have not been brought down yet. I do not see the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) in his place, but I would like to know if the order of Parliament is to be obeyed.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I will call the Minister's attention to that as soon as I have an opportunity of seeing him.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 11.30 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 2nd May, 1898.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES ACT.

On the order being called for motion for the introduction of Bill (No. 129) to amend the North-west Territories Act.—(Mr. Davin.)

Mr. DAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I gave notice of that Bill so that it might be on the Order paper in case the Minister of the Interior did not bring in a Bill, but the Minister has given notice, and I shall have an opportunity of moving the amendments to his Bill ; in fact I believe that one of his proposals conforms with one of my proposed amend-

ments to the North-west Territories Act, so that I would ask that the order drop.

Order dropped.

MINERS' LICENSES AT WHITE AND CHILKOOT PASSES.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I should like to ask the Government whether there is any foundation for the following statement appearing in the San Francisco "Examiner." I am sorry the Minister of the Interior does not happen to be in the Chamber, but perhaps the Government will make a note of it and communicate it to him.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). He will be here in a minute or two.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. In the meantime I will state this: The "Examiner," of San Francisco, has the following flaring headings:—"Klondike Trade Falls to America." "Miners may Secure Free Licenses at the Summit." "No need of Stopping at Victoria to Secure Permits." "Will therefore Secure their Outfits at some Point in United States." "Minister Sifton's new Order." "Uncle Sam's sons win the Battle they have long been waging at Ottawa." These headlines are attached to what purports to be a telegram from the Minister of the Interior and is contained in a special despatch to the "Examiner," dated Vancouver, B.C., 18th April. It says:

> Vancouver (B.C.), April 18.—Indignation here knows no bounds, and civil war in politics is bound to be the outcome of the decision of the Dominion Parliament to have free miners' licenses issued at the summits of White and Chilkoot passes. Within twenty-four hours four of the six members of the Dominion House who represent British Columbia will be asked to resign.
>
> The following special despatch was received from Ottawa to-day:—
>
> "Hon. Mr. Sifton has given orders for free miners' licenses to be issued at the summit of both the White and Chilkoot passes."
>
> This is the concession for which the American miners have been clamouring. By those who are in a position to judge of its effect, it is claimed that the concession will be disastrous to the trade of Victoria especially, as well as to Vancouver, as it will not be necessary for American miners and others outfitting at Seattle, Tacoma and other ports to lay over at Victoria or Vancouver to procure licenses or outfits.
>
> This new order is the death-knell to Canadian trade, and within twenty-four hours every city in Canada will resent it. Although Canada owns the Klondike, America can secure 99 per cent of the trade if the licenses are granted as proposed. The United States has won, and Puget Sound has gained the victory over British Columbia.

Now that the Minister of the Interior is in his seat, I may say that the foundation for this telegraphic despatch in the San Francisco "Examiner" is that the Hon. Mr. Sifton has given order for miners' licenses to be issued at the summit of both the White and the Chilkoot passes. I would like to know whether such order has been given by the Minister.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). I will ask the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) to let the matter stand until to-morrow, and I will make a full statement in regard to it.

TRANSPORT OF GOVERNMENT SUPPLIES TO THE YUKON.

Mr. DAVIN. I wish to ask whether the Grand Trunk Railway Company has received a contract for carrying militia and police supplies to the Yukon?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). The Grand Trunk Railway Company has not received any contract, but is sending a portion of the supplies over its road. A portion is going over the Grand Trunk Railway and a much larger portion over the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. DAVIN. But the portion that goes over the Grand Trunk Railway will go over the Northern Pacific?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I do not know—I suppose so.

Mr. DAVIN. And, therefore, will go to an American port and be shipped in American bottoms?

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. Orders of the Day.

WRIT FOR BAGOT.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to ask the Prime Minister if he is yet able to inform the House when the writ for Bagot will be issued?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). This is a question which we have considered, and I would like to have the view of my hon. friend (Mr. Foster), as to whether he thinks it is advisable to have this by-election held on voters' lists which are already four years old, when we have the prospect that we can have it held on much more recent lists at no distant date?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not suppose, Mr. Speaker, that discussion is in order, but my right hon. friend has asked my opinion, and I suppose I may have the indulgence. I do not quite see why this discrimination should be made at this particular time. It strikes me that the election in West Prince, P.E.I., was carried on upon the same lists, as well as other elections that have taken place since this House has been in session. The leader of the Opposition is at present absent from the House; but, speaking for myself, I certainly think it but just and right that Bagot should have its voice felt

here upon a list which is no older than the list on which the newly elected member for West Prince carried on his election.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). Mr. Speaker, I beg to rise to a question of privilege. A few evenings ago the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Mills) referred to the mayor of Annapolis in these words :

> He is from Judique, your town, and is another traitor, and we have one or two more there of the same kind.

Later on, the hon. gentleman spoke thus :

> Before the committee rises I wish to make a personal explanation. In reading the "Hansard" to-night, I was astonished to find that the hon. member for Inverness (Mr. McLennan) had stated with reference to me that which was entirely untrue. As I see it has been recorded on "Hansard," I wish to correct his statement. I say here emphatically that I never ran for mayor of the town of Annapolis in my life, and not having run for the mayoralty of that town, I could not have been defeated.
>
> Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). I certainly indicated the hon. gentleman's nominee. He had his nominee in the field, and backed him for all he was worth.
>
> Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McLennan) is entirely wrong. I had no nominee, and never ran for mayor of Annapolis.

I wired to the mayor of Annapolis in these words :

> H. E. Gillis, Esq., Mayor of Annapolis.
>
> Mills referred to you in debate as traitor. I rejoined he smarted under defeat in mayoralty contest. He denies having opposed you. Wire whether he did.
>
> A. McLENNAN.

I received the following reply :

> Annapolis, April 29, 1898.
>
> Mills brought out my opponent in mayoralty contest. He canvassed himself personally, and drove 15 miles to see two voters. His canvass was : "A vote for Ritchie was a vote for him—that it would never do to have me elected in Annapolis." I defeated him, and will do it again.
>
> H. E. GILLIS.

You will see, Mr. Speaker, that my contention was correct. I repeat this sentence : "His canvass was, a vote for Ritchie was a vote for him."

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. The hon. gentleman is going too far altogether.

Mr. FOSTER. I think a copy of these telegrams should be laid on the Table. May I ask my hon. friend to lay them on the Table ?

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). By all means you will get a copy. They are in "Hansard" now.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What was the rest of that sentence about "a vote for Ritchie" ?

Mr. SPEAKER. Orders of the Day.

MILITARY FORCE FOR THE KLONDIKE.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I think it would be well for the Minister of Militia to take the present or some near-by opportunity to inform the House as to the extent, nature and cost of the military expedition he is sending to the Klondike. I see it stated in the papers that it is going to cost a large amount of money, and that the force is fairly large ; but, so far as I recollect, the matter has not been discussed in the House at all. The tax-payer will have to pay the bill, and no vote has yet been put before the House. Therefore, I think it would be very interesting and instructive if we had that information either to-day or some day near-by.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). To-morrow.

ACCIDENT AT WELLINGTON BRIDGE, MONTREAL.

Mr. QUINN. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to direct the attention of the Government to an accident that occurred on the Wellington Bridge, Montreal, last Monday evening. I wish to ask the Minister of Railways and Canals if any report has been received from his officers in Montreal concerning that accident, and if any steps have been taken to look after the people who suffered ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Is that what is known as the Curran Bridge ?

Mr. QUINN. Yes.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I have received no official information whatever on the subject. I have seen and heard nothing further than the newspaper reports.

PREFERENTIAL TRADE RESOLUTION.

Mr. McNEILL. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I should like to ask my right hon. friend whether he has yet determined as to his course with regard to the resolution which stands in my name—whether he can give me a day for the discussion of it ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I have no objection at all to give a day to my hon. friend ; but I have not fixed a day, and I am not in a position to fix it to-day. I shall have great pleasure in meeting my hon. friend privately, to see if we can arrange something between us.

Mr. McNEILL. I would say to my right hon. friend that it is more than a fortnight since I first asked him in regard

to this matter across the House, and it is three weeks since I spoke to one of his colleagues in regard to it. I have allowed my resolution to stand in order to meet what I believed was the convenience of the Government; but the time of the session is drifting away, and I hope my right hon. friend will be able to give me an assurance that he will fix an early day.

The PRIME MINISTER. I do not know that my hon. friend's waiting was for the convenience of the Government. I think it was as much for his own convenience because if he had brought his resolution forward by the usual system we would not be hearing of it now. However, I would rather have a discussion on it.

Mr. McNEILL. I am sorry my hight hon. friend has said what he has said, because it was to meet the convenience of the Government that my resolution was not brought forward until the Budget was brought down. That is the only reason why I did not bring it forward in the ordinary course. Will my right hon. friend let me have an early day?

The PRIME MINISTER. I have said to my hon. friend that I shall be glad to discuss the matter privately with him, to see if we can make some arrangement.

INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). I would like to ask when I may expect the papers ordered on the 18th of April, in connection with the death of Macdonald and Fraser, who were employed on the Crow's Nest Pass Railway?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Will my hon. friend send a note of what he wants?

Mr. MILLS. I would like to ask when I may expect the papers ordered on the 30th of March respecting the dismissal of Thomas H. Miller and the appointment of Albert Harris as shipping master at the port of Bear River; and also the papers ordered on the same day respecting the removal of the remains of piers of the old bridge at the mouth of Bear River.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). So far as I am concerned, I will make a note of it.

THE MEMBER FOR NANAIMO.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not wish to pester my right hon. friend for information; but we have been somewhat saddened on this side of the House by the news in the papers of the taking away from us of the young and brilliant member for Nanaimo (Mr. McInnes). It is reported that he has either handed in his resignation or is about to do so. If my right hon. friend would give us the information, it might either assuage our grief or enable us to put our condolences in proper form.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I am very glad to be able to assuage the grief of my hon. friend at once. I have not received any information of that kind from my hon. friend from Nanaimo.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 77) to incorporate the Toronto and Hudson Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. Clarke.)

Bill (No. 94) to authorize the Canada Eastern Railawy Company to convey its railway to the Alexander Gibson Railway and Manufacturing Company.—(Mr. Tucker.)

MILES CANON AND LEWES RIVER TRAMWAY COMPANY.

Mr. MORRISON moved that amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 23) to incorporate the Miles Cañon and Lewes River Tramway Company be read the second time. He said: There is only one slight alteration in paragraph 12. The section, as it passed the committee, said that the company should not obstruct the navigable waters of such river. That has been amended by making it read "navigable waters," which, of course, would include lakes as well.

Motion agreed to; amendment read the second time and concurred in.

HAMILTON AND LAKE ERIE POWER COMPANY.

Mr. MacPHERSON moved,

That amendment made by the Senate to Bill (No. 100) respecting the Hamilton and Lake Erie Power Company, be concurred in.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). What is the amendment?

Mr. MacPHERSON. The only change is with respect to the extension of time. The House of Commons granted three and six years, but the Senate reduced it to two and five years.

Motion agreed to, and amendment read the second time, and concurred in.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 124)—from the Senate—incorporating the Alberta and Yukon Railway, Navigation and Mining Company.—(Mr. Casey, by Mr. Fraser.)

Bill (No. 126) respecting the Saskatchewan Railway and Mining Company, and to change its name to the Saskatchewan Pacific Railway and Mining Company.—(Mr. Landerkin, by Mr. Scriver.)

APPOINTMENT OF MR. CHARLES A. JONES.

Mr. DAVIN asked,

Has the vacancy in the German division, section or department of immigration bureau, Winnipeg been filled up ? Has Mr. Charles A. Jones been appointed ? If so, where does he come from ? Why was not a German appointed to the position ? Is this Charles A. Jones the second appointed to that position since the advent of the present Government to power ? If so, was the previous appointee a German ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). The following are the answers to the hon. gentleman's questions :—1. The Immigration Office at Winnipeg is not divided into departments or sections. 2. Mr. Charles A. Jones has been appointed to a position in the immigration service at Winnipeg. 3. He comes from Macleod, N.W.T. 4. A German was not appointed because there was no particular reason for appointing a German ; but it may be added that Mr. Jones speaks both German and French, and that ample provision is made to serve the interests of German immigrants. 5. No. 6. The answer to No. 5 disposes also of No. 6.

APPOINTMENT OF DR. EDWARDS.

Mr. DAVIN asked,

1. What salary was paid to Dr. R. B. Cotton as medical officer of the jail, Regina, N.W.T.?

2. What salary was paid Dr. Willoughby as medical officer attending the Indian Industrial School, Regina ? Who has been appointed to discharge the duties discharged by these medical men ?

3. Was Dr. Edwards appointed to discharge these duties by Order in Council ? What salary does he receive ? Is he a brother of Mr. W. C. Edwards, M.P., for Russell ? Is it understood between him and the Government that he can while a Government officer, pursue private practice ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). In reply to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) I beg to say :—1. The salary paid to Dr. R. B. Cotton, medical attendant officer of the jail, Regina, was $10 a month. 2. Dr. Willoughby was paid as medical attendant of the Indian Industrial School at Regina at the rate of $480 per annum. 3. Dr. O. C. Edwards has been appointed by Order in Council to discharge these duties. He receives an annual salary of $1,400 ; but for this remuneration he gives medical attendance to the Indians of the Muscowpetung and Assiniboine Agencies, in addition to performing the duties of medical attendant of the Industrial School. He is also paid at the rate of $30 a month as medical officer of the Regina Jail. There is nothing in the agreement between Dr. Edwards and the Government to prevent his engaging in private practice so long as such practice does not interfere with his official duties. Dr. Edwards is a brother of Mr. W. C. Edwards, M.P., for Russell.

APPOINTMENT OF IRISH ROMAN CATHOLICS IN CUSTOMS DEPARTMENT.

Mr. HUGHES asked,

On unrevised "Hansard," page 4318, the hon. the Controller of Customs in speaking re the dismissal of certain Irish Roman Catholics from office, is reported : "How could I possibly be prejudiced against two officers because of their nationality, when in the discharge of my public duties I endeavoured to act as a judge and discharge my duties faithfully, I am at a loss to know, especially in view of the fact that I have nominated ten times the number of men of the same nationality and faith as officers of my department, and some to very high positions."

1. What are the names of the officers so appointed, and where are they located ?

2. What are the names of the officers whose places the newly-appointed officers fill ?

3. Does the hon. the Controller of Customs mean that he has appointed ten times as many Irish Roman Catholics to office as he has appointed Protestants ?

4. Or, does he mean that he has appointed ten times as many Irish Roman Catholics to office as he has removed from office ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). The answer to questions 1 and 2 is as follows :—The following are names of twenty Irish Roman Catholics appointed to office in the Customs Department since I became the head thereof ; the places where stationed, and the names of the officers whom they replaced, namely :

Daniel McBride, Hamilton, appointed in place of S. W. Townsend.

Hugh Leahy, Prescott, appointed in place of Wm. Connell.

J. C. Mahoney, Sarnia, appointed in place of J. A. Couse,

Charles Ryan, Georgetown, Ont., new appointment.

P. Cullen, Canso, N.S., appointed in place of Thos. C. Cook.

J. E. Campbell, Halifax, N.S., appointed in place of A. Doyle.

W. Burns, Victoria, B.C., appointed in place of F. Berry.

M. O'Reilly, Nelson, B.C., new appointment.

P. Harvey, Montreal, appointed in place of P. McNeill.

Walter Welsh, Windsor, Ont., appointed in place of W. P. Killackey.

E. Donahue, Montreal, appointed in place of J. Dufresne.

Thos. Mulcahy, Halifax, appointed in place of W. Shanks.

D. J. Reddy, Halifax, appointed in place of J. A. Mitchell.

Chas. P. Roche, Halifax, appointed in place of M. Dwyer.

Frank Langan, Montreal, appointed in place of H. Jokisch.

E. P. Flynn, Arichat, N.S., appointed in place of R. Benoit.

Jas. Ryan, Toronto, new appointment.

James Harquail, Dalhousie, N.B., new appointment.

E. M. Johnson, Gananoque, appointed in place of A. E. Meggs.

J. O'Neill, Str. "Argus," Halifax, in place of A. Young.

The answer to the 3rd question is: No. And to the 4th question: No.

DISMISSAL OF MR. DAGNAULT, PAYMASTER.

Mr. MARCOTTE (by Sir Adolphe Caron) asked,

1. Has Mr. Dagnault, paymaster for the St. Maurice division, been dismissed?
2. Why?
3. At whose request?
4. By whom has he been replaced?
5. At whose request and by whose influence?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). In answer to the hon. gentleman's questions, I beg to say:—1. Mr. Dagnault's services have been dispensed with. 2. Because the Minister was of the opinion that it was in the public interets. 3. The Minister is responsible for his action. 4. Louis Philippe Dallaire. 5. Mr. Dallaire was recommended by persons in whom the Minister has confidence.

DISMISSAL OF POSTMASTERS.

Mr. GILLIES asked,

1. How many postmasters have been dismissed in Canada since the 13th day of July, 1896?
2. What are the names and residences of the postmasters dismissed in Canada since the date mentioned?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). In answer to the hon. gentleman, I beg to say:—1. Owing to the closing of unnecessary offices, the inconvenience of sites, insufficiency of accommodation, failure on the part of certain incumbents to properly discharge their public duties, also undue activity in connection with political party issues and other good and sufficient public grounds, 521 persons have in the public interest been relieved of duty. 2. Owing to the length of detail involved in answer to the second question, the inquiry would more properly be the subject of a motion.

CANCELLATION OF MAIL CONTRACT IN NOVA SCOTIA.

Mr. GILLIES asked,

1. How many mail contracts in Nova Scotia have been cancelled by order of the Postmaster General since the 1st day of August, 1896?
2. What were the routes over which these contracts extended?
3. Who were the contractors that held the contracts so cancelled?
4. What portion in each case of the period for which these contracts have been entered into was unexpired at the time of its cancellation?
5. What were the dates that these contracts were entered into, the period for which they were entered into, and the dates of their cancellation (in each case) by the Postmaster General?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). The information asked for in this question would appear to be more properly the subject of a motion for a return.

POSTMASTER, ST. FELIX DE VALOIS.

Mr. DUGAS asked,

1. Who is now postmaster of St. Félix de Valois, in the county of Joliette?
2. When was he appointed?
3. Who was his predecessor?
4. When and why was he dismissed?
5. At whose request?
6. How many years had he served?
7. Were complaints in writing against the former postmaster laid before the Government or the Post Office Department?
8. What is the nature of the said complaints, and who made them?
9. Was an inquiry granted to the late postmaster before his dismissal, and if so, by whom was it made?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). Mr. Max Crepeau is at present postmaster of St. Felix de Valois. There are no accessible records to show when he was appointed, although the departmental records show that having been in office in 1854, he has served at least forty-four years. There are no records in the department to show who his predecessor in office was, or that any complaints were ever made against him or any inquiry granted.

CANDIDATURE OF MR. DALTON McCARTHY FOR BRANDON.

Mr. DAVIN asked,

Whether Dalton McCarthy, Esq., Q.C., M.P., was a candidate for election to this Parliament for the constituency of Brandon, Manitoba, in 1896? Whether the Hon. Clifford Sifton was an active supporter of Mr. McCarthy? Whether in fact he was not the leading manager in organizing the Liberal electors of Brandon in support of Mr. McCarthy?

Mr. SPEAKER. I would point out that the last two portions of that question do not relate to any matters before the House, and therefore are not proper to be asked. The first part, I suppose, is.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). In reply, then, to the first part of the hon. gentleman's question, I beg to say that Mr. Dalton McCarthy, Q.C., M.P., was a candidate for election to this Parliament for the constituency of Brandon, Man., in 1896.

Mr. FOSTER. The other two are very interesting questions.

Mr. SPEAKER. They relate to matters outside the House.

INDIAN AGENT, RESTIGOUCHE INDIANS.

Mr. McALISTER asked,

1. Has V. J. A. Venner been dismissed from the position of Indian agent for the Restigouche band of Indians ?
2. If so, who is appointed in his place, and by whom was he recommended ?
3. Where does he reside ? How far is his place of residence from the Indian reserve ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). 1. Yes. 2. Germain Patry, recommended by the representative of the district. 3. He resides at St. Alexis de Metapedia. That place is 18 miles by road from the Restigouche reserve. Patry's predecessor lived across the river in New Brunswick.

Mr. McALISTER asked,

1. Is Dr. V. J. A. Venner dismissed from the position of medical attendant to the Restigouche band of Indians ? If so, is another appointed in his place, and by whom recommended ?
2. If no successor is appointed, who is the acting medical attendant ; and by whom was he recommended ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). 1. Yes. 2. No successor has been appointed, but the Indian agent was, after the dismissal of Dr. Venner, authorized to employ a medical man to attend the Indians when necessary, and he has availed himself of the services of Dr. W.W. Doherty, of Campbellton, N.B.

CLAIM OF WM. BEAUMONT.

Mr. McINNES (by Mr. Maxwell) asked,

Has the claim of Mr. William Beaumont for salary for services rendered as postmaster at Maple Bay been investigated ? Is it the intention of the Government to allow this claim ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). The nature of the claim of Mr. Wm. Beaumont having been investigated, it would appear to relate to services performed by that gentleman, for the province of British Columbia, prior to confederation, and consisted of his receiving at his hotel, near the wharf, a bag containing correspondence, and delivering the same. It would seem that claims of this nature, prior to confederation, are not chargeable to Canada.

KLONDIKE OFFICIAL GUIDE.

Mr. MILLS asked,

1. How many copies of Ogilvie's Klondike Official Guide has the Government received from the Hunter, Rose Company ?
2. Is it part of the agreement with the said Hunter, Rose Company that the said company will furnish to the Government 3,000 extra copies, provided the Minister of the Interior notified the said company to that effect by March the first ?
3. Was such notification given ? If not, why not ?
4. What is the total number of copies which the Government will receive ?
5. Is it intended to make an equitable distribution of all the said guide books to Senators and Members of Parliament ?
6. If not, what does the Government purpose doing with the copies in its possession ?
7. Has any distribution been made ?
8. If so, to whom, and to what extent as to number ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). 1. 5,500 copies in English ; 2,150 copies in French. 2. Yes. 3. Yes. 4. 10,000. 5. 6. 7. 8. In answer to the remaining questions : 10 copies of the English edition were given to each member of the House of Commons and 5 copies to each member of the Senate, and members and senators were furnished, and are being furnished with such additional copies as they apply for, the total number supplied them to date being about 4,000 copies ; 700 copies have been distributed to educational institutions and public men and others outside of Parliament ; 250 copies have been forwarded to the High Commissioner in London, and 300 copies to officials of the Government, making a total distribution of 5,250 copies of the English edition. Of the French edition, 875 copies have so far been distributed, each French member of both Houses being furnished, first, with ten copies and then with such additional copies as have been applied for.

Mr. DAVIN. In that connection may I ask my hon. friend if he is issuing a new hand-book for the department ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. At the present time there is a hand-book of Western Canada under preparation, but no arrangements have been made yet for publishing it.

ROCHE FENDUE AND CALUMET DAMS.

Mr. POUPORE moved :

Copies of all correspondence and documents in relation to claims for damages caused by the construction of the Roche Fendue and Calumet dams in the county of Pontiac ; also, all reports made to the Government by the Government valuators in the connection.

He said : My object in making this motion is to draw the attention of Parliament to the condition of things as they existed in Pontiac, regarding the construction of certain dams on the Ottawa River, in 1883, whereby a number of the property holders along the Ottawa River sustained very serious loss and damage.

In 1882 the Government of Canada gave a contract for the construction of the Roche Fendue and Calumet dam for the purpose of raising the navigable waters of the Ottawa between Bryson and Culbute Canal.

The works were duly completed, and as a result all the low lands along the Ottawa River were submerged, very large tracts of lands belonging to individual farmers along both sides of the river were drowned out, thus inflicting on the holders of the property very serious loss and damage. The Government of the day, realizing that these parties had justice on their side in seeking redress, sent Dominion arbitrators to assess the damages thus caused and settle with the owners of the property for fair compensation for the loss sustained. I have a memorandum here which shows that a large number of claims were sent in. The Government arbitrators visited the different localities, informed themselves of the extent of the injuries done to the different parties, and arrived at a basis of settlement of claims, which the Government from time to time paid. A number of other claims were presented; in fact the same valuators adjusted a number of claims and reported to the Government that a settlement had been arrived at with the different parties, and recommended that the Government should pay those respective amounts. I find on the list I have received from the Department of Railways and Canals that a large number of those claims—I now refer to the cases adjusted and amounts agreed upon—have remained unpaid. Prior to the general election of 1896 several appeals were made to the Government to have justice done to the parties whose cases had not received final treatment. I have a letter from the Department of Railways and Canals in respect to one of these claims in which it is stated definitely by the then Minister that as soon as the bustle and trouble of the election were over the matter would be attended to. However, the result of the elections in 1896 made a slight change in the complexion of the political management of public affairs and hon. gentlemen who made promises were unable to fulfil them. I should like to call the attention of the Government to the absolute necessity of looking into these claims, which are certainly just claims. I find in the list that the valuators in going through and examining certain properties for the purpose of reporting to the department, stated that in some cases the titles are imperfect and consequently the matters were allowed to remain in that position. What I should like to ask from the Government is that they would notify the parties whose claims have been adjusted by the arbitrators or appraisers that they must perfect their claims and send them to the department, and then the department would pay the money agreed upon between the Government appraisers and the owners of the property. There is another class of cases in respect to which appraisers have examined the properties but have in many cases made no report; in fact, in some cases they have reported there has been no damage done. It is rather a cavalier way of treating matters of this kind. I think wherever there has been real damage done to a private citizen of Canada by the Government of Canada, there is not only a legal obligation, but also a moral obligation to see that the citizen shall not be deprived of his rights by the chief authority of the state without any recompense. This is a matter which has caused a good deal of disquiet and unrest in the minds of the people of the county of Pontiac. I learn that last week at a meeting held at the village of Bryson, at which a very large number of those claims were represented by legal advisers, it was decided that a deputation should be sent to Ottawa, asking that this matter be taken up and dealt with on the basis of justice and equity. I do not claim anything more. I wish to assure you, Mr. Speaker, that there is no political scheme, so far as I am concerned; it is purely a matter of asking the Government to do only justice to people who have been injured since 1883. They have suffered on account of the drowning out of their lands. There are some cases, I confess, where perhaps the claims are extravagant; but where there has been real injury, and there are many cases of this kind still unsettled, it is not becoming for the Government of any country not to adjust the grievance, and to give a remedy to those thus affected. It is a very serious matter when we come to consider the condition of the people who are affected by the drowning out of those lands. Here are people who are obliged to pay every year a railway bonus, apart from their municipal and school taxes. The people have some difficulty in meeting their ordinary obligations apart from the railway bonus which is an impost on that county, and now when they have been injured to the extent I have pointed out, thus rendering their lands absolutely useless along the edge of the Ottawa River, the portion of their lands which was most productive and valuable, they find not only their revenue cut off to a large extent, but their burdens also increased. If the Minister of Railways was aware of the condition in which a large number of these people have been placed and the individual cases of hardship that exist in consequence of the construction of those dams, he would be prepared, apart from any report made to the department, either during the administration of his predecessor or since, to deal with the cases in his usual benevolent manner and he would feel glad to come to the rescue of those people. This is not a matter of politics with me, it is simply one of rendering justice to parties where justice is due. As a simple matter of fact I should like to say this, that a great number of the parties whose claims have not been adjusted happen to be owners of property in the county who are not political friends of my own: therefore, in advocating that

justice be done. I am not electioneering nor taking action with any desire to secure advantage in urging the Government to do its plain duty in those cases. Had not a change of Government taken place in June, 1896, the predecessors of the present Government would have felt it an obligation upon them which they could not shirk, to carry out the promises which had been made for years before the election, and they doubtless would have continued the work of valuing the losses sustained by the different holders of the properties to which I have referred. I say, Sir, that had the late Conservative Government remained in office after 1896, they would have been forced to carry out their promises to do what is just and proper towards the people who have been injured there, and whose injury was caused by the Government carrying out work which was for the public benefit. The Government of Canada conceived it desirable to construct certain dams for the raising of the water in the navigable portions of the river, and in doing that they raised the water so high as to injure the properties of private owners along that river. Some three or four years ago it was thought advisable to blow up the dams in order to put the river in its natural state. The very moment that was spoken of remonstrances came from all over ; not so much from the persons whose lands were injured as from those concerned in lumbering interests on the Ottawa River, and we know those holding those interests are very greatly concerned in keeping the water up to the navigable height. When it was suggested, therefore, that the dams should be blown up so as to remove the cause of injury, the Government then discovered that it would be doing even a worse act than they had before perpetrated. They dammed the Ottawa River so as to improve the navigation and that conferred a benefit on a very large portion of the community, but in doing it they injured the properties of private individuals. Now, Mr. Speaker, the simple way, and the only business way of dealing with this question is for the Government to find out what the extent is of the injury done, and to adjust it and compensate those injured, as a business man woud do. I cannot for the life of me comprehend how it is that this simple act of justice should be refused. Surely the Government of the country are not going to take shelter behind the fact that they happen to be the supreme authority ; surely they do not want to shelter themselves behind that authority and say, that because they are all-powerful, they refuse to do a simple act of justice towards some of Her Majesty's subjects. If the Government do not seek to take that course, then there is only one other course open to them, and that is to ascertain the real extent of the damage and pay for it. If they are not willing to pay to the full extent let, at all events, a fair adjustment be arrived at, and let some reasonable consideration be given to the persons who are suffering. If that be done the people of the country will feel that they can look with confidence to the Government of Canada, and that when an injustice is perpetrated upon them they may hope to obtain redress.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). Would the hon. gentleman (Mr. Poupore) permit me to ask him a question so that I may get information. I would like that the hon. gentleman would say whether he wishes to convey the impression that my attention has been called to individual claims, and that I have declined or neglected to give them any consideration. I would like to know if the hon. member (Mr. Poupore) would suggest that, because I must say that I have not in my mind at the present moment, a single individual case that has been called to my attention in connection with this river, that I had not looked into, and with reference to which I have not made a proposal of settlement to the extent to which I thought was the outside limit we would be justified in going.

Mr. POUPORE. I would be sorry if the hon. Minister (Mr. Blair) should for a moment think that I am making any charge against him. I am simply endeavouring to bring to his notice in connection with these drowned lands, facts that I am perfectly confident he knows nothing about. I am perfectly satisfied that if the Minister were himself aware of the injustice that has been done he would feel it his incumbent duty to at once see that redress was rendered to the parties aggrieved. I am glad to know, from what has fallen from the hon. Minister (Mr. Blair), that he has been looking into some of those cases. I may say that I have made several inquiries, not directly from the Minister, but I have inquired at intervals in the department to know if anything was being done. Last session I put a question on the Order paper, asking if it was the intention of the Department of Railways and Canals to place a sum in the Estimates to pay off those claims, and I think the answer I received then was that " it was not the intention of the Government to do so." I inferred from this answer that the Government were remaining inactive in the matter. I am glad to know now from the Minister of Railways that he is interesting himself in those claims, and I trust that in due course of time those who are entitled to redress shall receive it. My only object in moving this motion was to bring before the notice of Parliament and of the Government, the urgent necessity of having something done for those parties who have been injured by the Government through the construction of those dams. I do not wish to detain the House longer than to repeat, that I have no motive in the world other than simply to try and get justice for those people who have been suffering under an injustice for the last

fifteen years. Some of the parties were paid as long ago as ten years and others have been paid more recently. Those who have been paid are of course all right, but what think you of the position of those who have equally just claims and have not yet been compensated? The statement just now made by the Minister of Railways is the first intimation that I have received that any steps had been taken towards granting redress to those parties. I would like to ask the Minister of Railways and Canals, if he does not think it would be proper to have the Government arbitrators ascertain the claims that are reported in this list, and while I am alluding to it, I want to mention one particular case. There is a gentleman named Bishop Hennessy whose lot was appraised by the Government valuators; the amount of his compensation was fixed at $400, and afterwards it seems that the then Government thought they would blow up the dam.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. And they did blow it up partially.

Mr. POUPORE. No.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Well, they tore it down.

Mr. POUPORE. I beg your pardon.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Does my hon. friend (Mr. Poupore) say that the obstruction was not to any extent removed?

Mr. POUPORE. Not to my knowledge.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My hon. friend (Mr. Poupore) must be misinformed upon the subject. I understand the situation to be this: After there had been some progress made—I will not say that any portion of the dam had been blown up, but I surely have been correctly informed by my officers when I say, that a considerable portion of the dam had been removed. After that had been done there were complaints made and the work was stopped. I have been given to understand that what work was done in the way of removing the dam was sufficient to have prevented a recurrence of the injury, and that no damages are being suffered now by the people along the river, by reason of that fact.

Mr. POUPORE. I thought the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals did not understand the question at all, and he has given the very best evidence of it now. The fact is that preparation was made to blow up the dams, but the remonstrance came before that was done. The remonstrance came, not from the parties whose lands were affected, but from a sufficiently influential body of men, and the Government decided that it would be inadvisable to destroy the dams.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Does my hon. friend say that the dam was intact as it was built?

Mr. POUPORE. That is my conviction.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. All I can say is that the officers of my department advise me directly to the contrary. They may be wrong, but that is their report.

Mr. POUPORE. I do not want to be positive, but I am convinced that I am right. There has not been enough of the dam disturbed to lower the water.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Has the hon. member been there recently?

Mr. POUPORE. Yes, I have been there, and I know exactly what I am saying. Had the dams been blown up, the water would have been restored to its original natural height. Some fifteen years have elapsed since that injury was sustained by the parties. Does the hon. Minister imagine that parties who have suffered injury for fifteen years would not be entitled to compensation in any case?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am not questioning that. I am asking as to the recurrence of the injury.

Mr. POUPORE. My information is correct. I remember that at the time the question of destroying the dam was spoken of, dynamite and other combustibles were sent there for the purpose, but a remonstrance came from a source that influenced the Government of the day not to do it, because it was going to cause injury to the lumber interest. They may have put in a shot or two, but the dam itself remains intact. They found that the blowing up of the dam in such rapid water, was a particularly difficult operation, owing to the difficulty of placing the combustibles in the proper place. One thing I do know is that the water remains at the artificial height at which it was intended it should be brought by the construction of the dams and the injury I complain of still exists. The lands are still submerged in the spring of the year so much as to prevent the owners of the soil from plowing and getting in their seed at the proper time, so that the lands cannot be used at all. The particular case to which I wish to draw the Minister's attention is that of Bishop Hennessy, of the township of Waltham. The valuators visited his property, and fixed the damage at $400. Mr. Bryson, who represented Pontiac at the time, wrote to Mr. Hennessy, stating that the Government had decided to blow up the dams and that he would have to be satisfied with half the amount, say $200. Mr. Hennessy refused to accept that amount, on the ground that the valuators had fixed the damage at $400, and that if he was entitled to anything at all, he was entitled to that amount. I would like the Minister of Railways and

Canals to make a note of this case, because the name of Bishop Hennessy does not appear in the list that I have received from the department. In fact, no mention is made of the case; but I have other papers in my possession to show that he has a claim, and that he was offered through Mr. Bryson $200 if he would reduce his claim to that amount. There are many other cases which remain unsettled for one reason or another. Defective title seems to me the great trouble. In each case certain remarks are made by the valuators. There is the case of C. Barsalou, lot 27, north range, Calumet Island. The amount of the claim is $200. The valuators say they do not recommend the payment of it. I do not know anything special about that case. But a number of cases have been settled for and the amounts recommended by the valuators to be paid. I certainly cannot see why any objection should be made to the payment of those claims. I think it is imperative on the Government to ascertain what the extent of the damage is; and, if they feel that they cannot pay the full amount, they ought at least to make some compensation. I hope the Minister of Railways and Canals will give his attention to the matter and see that justice is done to the different parties, regardless of their political complexion or anything of that kind—that he will just see that fair and reasonable justice is done to all who have suffered.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I quite exonerate the hon. member for Pontiac from having any other purpose than a legitimate and proper purpose, as the member representing that county, in bringing this subject before the House. I have a good deal of hesitation in opposing my knowledge of the facts to that of the hon. member, because I know that he can speak in a large measure from personal information, whereas I can only speak from information furnished to me by my officers. I must say that I have had a very clear conviction, from the information I have thus received, that a few years ago a portion of the dam was either removed by being blown up or in some other way, so that the water was permitted free course where it would otherwise have been obstructed; and, as a result of that removal of a portion of the dam, the damage which was complained of as having previously been done by reason of the dam, was not continued.

The damages which it is claimed had previously been done by reason of the dam were not continued, and as a consequence there was no recurrence or revival of claims for damages from the residents along the river. That is my opinion. But since the hon. gentleman tells me that I have been quite misinformed, I shall make it a point to ascertain positively whether I am correctly informed or not; but I think I ought to say that there are circumstances which rather lead me to infer that my hon. friend must be in error, because since I have been in Parliament, I have had no claims submitted to my consideration which have not been of long standing or which relate to any damages of recent occurrence. In fact, I may go so far as to say that there have been only one or two claims in all brought to my notice, and I was not aware that a considerable number of persons are still pressing demands on the Government for damages occurring in that connection, which have not been satisfied. I am not aware of any, and could not have got any from individual claimants, because none have been visiting my department for the purpose of bringing claims to my notice. Ordinarily I have not found it necessary to look people up to ascertain whether they had any claim against the department. They generally find it desirable to present their claims directly or through some member of Parliament, or friend or solicitor, and press it on the notice of the head of the department. That has been my experience hitherto, and the cases of the claimants in respect of the Calumet dam must be exceptional, or the claims non-existent to a very considerable extent. However, the hon. gentleman says that there are claims. Well, if there are any, I have no hesitation whatever in saying to my hon. friend that if there is any good reason why there should be any further inquiry into the facts, I shall have inquiry made. If the reports heretofore made by valuators are not satisfactory to claimants, I do not undertake to offer any sum in excess of the valuations in these reports. The claimants have either to accept the reports or seek their remedy in the courts, which are open to everybody, and which are the usual means of disposing of these claims. If, on the other hand, the valuators have not made reports, I shall see that they do. If my hon. friend will point me to any particular case in which valuations have not been made, I shall see that the valuators are sent at once to ascertain and report on the amount of damages. If the hon. gentleman will deal with me as he would with any gentleman in ordinary business affairs, I shall be happy to afford him every facility.

Mr. POUPORE. I am very much obliged indeed for the kind assurance of the hon. gentleman that he will look into the matter. The reason why these claims were not pressed individually is because of the answer I received last year to my question and to which I have already referred.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I had no estimate presented to me from the department of amounts which we required to pay or which claimants were willing to accept, or which the claimants had a right to ask. I asked my deputy

what sums he wanted for such purpose, and he said that he did not want any. That did not mean that there might possibly have been claims to which my attention should have been called, but there are none now. There are two or three cases in which persons claim large damages, and in which valuations were made and the sums offered not accepted. I am not in a position to ask for an appropriation to cover these. They can only be settled by the courts.

Mr. POUPORE. I thank the hon. gentleman for the assurance he has given me.

Mr. MACKIE. I rise to endorse the statement of my hon. friend from Pontiac. There is no doubt that farmers in that part of the country have suffered considerable loss by the drowning of their lands, and a curious fact in that connection is that some of them were paid and some were not by the late Government. There were valuations made of the lands, and the late Government paid a number of the claimants, and the others they did not. A great many settlers got offers of certain amounts in settlement of their claims, which they refused to accept. I do not say that the Government would be justified in paying the full amount in every case, but I think they should satisfy those who suffered loss, on the same line as that taken by the late Government—so much for every claim. The hon. Minister of Railways thinks that this dam was blown up some time ago.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. In part.

Mr. MACKIE. I do not think it ever was. It is standing there yet, and I never heard of any part of it being blown up. The water is as high now, I think, as when the dam was built. My object in rising was to ask the Government to look into the matter and try to satisfy these claims. He will find, no doubt, that there are some unpaid.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am not looking up the old files to see if I cannot find old claims that are unsettled, but I shall be very glad if the hon. gentleman will tell me what claims there are unpaid and I will look into them.

Mr. MACKIE. I shall be in the vicinity of the dam in a few weeks, and I am satisfied that it is standing there now as when built. I shall inquire into the matter and let the hon. Minister know.

Mr. POUPORE. I am perfectly satisfied with the assurance of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals.

Motion agreed to.

DISMISSALS ON LACHINE CANAL AND ST. ANNE'S LOCK.

Mr. GILLIES. In the unavoidable absence of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), I beg leave to move for the following return :—

Return showing the names of all employees on the Lachine Canal and St. Ann lock dismissed from the public service since the 23rd day of June, 1896, the cause of dismissal, the name of the complainant in each case, the amount of salary paid to the dismissed official, the name and salary paid to his successor in office.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). There has been already a return furnished to the House of the names of persons formerly employed on the canal and who were not re-employed. I think it was furnished a year ago. The hon. gentleman does not desire that we should repeat the return. If he will be content with a return giving the names of all the employees whose names have been already furnished to the House, I shall be happy to accept his motion.

Mr. GILLIES. That will be satisfactory.

Motion agreed to.

BRANCH RAILWAYS IN PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. MARTIN moved for :

Copies of all correspondence, petitions, resolutions and other papers in possession of the Government relating to the proposed branch railway from South Port to Belfast and Murray Harbour, and the proposed branch railways in the province of Prince Edward Island.

He said : The Parliament of Canada has never been slow in granting aid for the construction of railways. And there is no doubt that railways have contributed to the development of the resources of the country. There is no doubt also but Parliament has spent money freely in railway construction. So freely has the Parliament of Canada voted money for the development of the country by the construction of railways, and so anxious was the Parliament to spend money in the construction of railways that some years ago, in 1883, if my memory serves me right, it broke through what may have been a very salutary check in the constitution, and did so in order to spend money to aid the construction of railways still more freely than the North America Act contemplated. At first aid to railways by the Dominion Government was confined to railways connecting two or more provinces. But in 1883, for some reasons which may have seemed very strong and plausible, Parliament broke through that check and railways which were not of interprovincial or Dominion importance have been assisted all over Canada. I do not know that in the construction of these railways, which were, in many cases, merely local, even-handed justice has been done all over the Dominion. At least, I can claim that the province from which I come aid has not been given for the construction of railways on the

same generous scale as in other provinces of Canada. I think I speak with accuracy when I say that the aid extended to Prince Edward Island in this respect has been altogether inadequate. If we refer to the railway statistics we find at confederation that Canada had only 2,078 miles of railway. To-day we have 16,687. In order to increase the mileage to this extent aid has been given by the Parliament to the extent of at least $200,000,000. As every taxpayer in Canada must contribute his share towards the interest on this immense sum, it would naturally be supposed that, in giving this aid to railways, some respect at least would be had for the claims of the different provinces. There is such a thing as provincial autonomy and provincial rights. Prince Edward Island has been contributing largely to the interest upon this great sum of money for the construction of railways from which she has received no direct benefit. When I say that not a mile of railway in Prince Edward Island has been built, as far as commercial purposes are concerned, I think I make a statement which may astonish some hon. members of this House. It may be said that thirteen miles of railway have actually been built in Prince Edward Island, and that to this extent my statement is incorrect. It is true that thirteen miles of railway have been built in that province, but not for commercial purposes or traffic. On the contrary, the few miles built by the Dominion Government in Prince Edward Island was only built to carry out, or to attempt to carry out the terms of confederation in regard to the winter navigation between that province and the mainland of Canada. So the only advantage that Prince Edward Island has had from this large expenditure of about $200,000,000 is the construction of about thirteen miles of road, which for reasons I will give later, are of no advantage to the commerce of the province at all.

When Prince Edward Island entered confederation in 1873, the Dominion of Canada had only a mile of railway for every 700 people, while Prince Edward Island, that small province, had a mile of railway for every 480 people. This shows that the small province of Prince Edward Island was much more alive to the advantages of development accruing through railway construction than was the rest of the Dominion. But how does it stand to-day ? To-day, Sir, the conditions are reversel. While the railway mileage of Prince Edward Island has not increased, the population has increased, and Prince Edward Island now has only a mile of railway for every 510 people, while the Dominion has a mile of railway for every 300 people. The people of Prince Edward Island, I may say, would raise no objection to that were it not for the fact that Prince Edward Island is very heavily taxed for that large extension of railway mileage in the Dominion. I think this shows clearly that a burden has been placed on that little province which is not warranted by any principle of fair-play.

Therefore, the small claim put forward to-day for railway extension here is a very good one, a just one and an equitable one. Sir, the House is aware that last session I had a motion similar to this one on the Order paper, and after it had been to some extent discussed, the debate was adjourned on motion of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, and the question was not reached again during that session. I may say that that delay has been attended perhaps with some advantages ; at least, it had one advantage, that a good deal of new light has been thrown upon this question of railway expenditure in Prince Edward Island. Some hon. members may remember that I asked for a return last year, or rather 1896, covering the railway expenditure by the Dominion in each province of the Dominion separately. That return was brought down, and hon. members who will take the trouble to look over that return will be disabused of the prevailing opinion in regard to railway expenditure in Prince Edward Island. When I say the report of the Minister of Railways and Canals, covering a period of at least twenty years, has misrepresented the railway expenditure in Prince Edward Island, I am sure I will be saying something that will astonish this House. But, what proof have I to adduce for that statement ? My proof is the return which I moved for and which has been placed on the Table of the House last session showing that instead of $3,750,000 being spent in Prince Edward Island, only $635,000 had been spent altogether in that province since confederation, and all we have to show for it is those thirteen miles of railway built in connection with the winter navigation of the Straits of Northumberland, to which I have already referred. It is true that I made this statement last session as I had carefully gone over the figures. I made it before this return was brought down, and I know that it was received, when I made it, with some incredulity on both sides of the House, in view of the great difference between the statement of the Minister of Railways and Canals and the statement I have made. The return issued from his own department, which was laid on the Table of this House. Hon. members who have taken the trouble to look over it must have done so with a good deal of astonishment. It is almost impossible to believe that a report of the Minister of Railways and Canals, supposed to have been prepared with a great deal of care, showed a discrepancy between a return issued from the same department regarding railway expenditure in Prince Edward Island of over three million dollars. I think that is a condition of affairs which the Minister of Railways and Canals is called upon to rectify and he should lose no time in order to place the truth of the matter fairly and squarely before this House

and before the people of Canada. The correction of this mistake in reference to railway expenditure in Prince Edward Island will, I hope, have a good effect.

I have to say that I was very much pleased that the Minister of Trade and Commerce took so much interest in this question last year as to move the adjournment of the House. The Minister of Trade and Commerce has not hitherto been known as very sympathetic towards the maritime provinces, and I fondly hoped when he moved the adjournment of that debate that a change was coming over the spirit of his dreams, and that the maritime provinces were hereafter to receive, perhaps, a little more generous attention at his hands. I am sorry, however, that the hon. gentleman is not in his place.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). Yes, he is here all right.

Mr. MARTIN. I am pleased to see the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is taking his seat. I am not, however, referring to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, he will excuse me. I am referring to the Minister of Trade and Commerce. I may say to him that the reference I made to the Minister of Trade and Commerce was this: that last year he had moved the adjournment of the debate on a motion similar to this one, and that the matter was not reached again during the session. I also remarked that I was very proud to see that that hon. gentleman was taking a little more interest in the affairs of the people of the maritime provinces, and I thought it augured well for the success of this proposed undertaking that he should have done so. Above all, I do hope that this question will be approached without any reference to party politics. I am very sorry to say that on previous occasions that has not been the case; that was not the case when this question was brought up in 1896, and it has not been the case since then. In 1896, hon. gentlemen may be aware that the Government came down with a proposition to build in Prince Edward Island some ninety miles of railway, and the most sensational and untruthful reports were spread broadcast over Canada in regard to the action of the Government. At least, whether or not that is the exact number of miles which was proposed to be built, the expenditure proposed to be made by the late Government was about a million of money. During the election campaign of 1896 the most sensational reports were scattered broadcast over Canada for political purposes in order to bring the Conservative Government into disrepute because of their proposed expenditure in Prince Edward Island, and even the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries was, perhaps, a sinner in that respect. We find that the hon. gentleman went over to Nova Scotia and stated at a public meeting there that the Government of that day proposed to expend $4,500,000 in constructing railways in Prince Edward Island. But, in order to do the Minister of Marine and Fisheries justice, I may say that I think he corrected that statement, and reduced the figure of $2,000,000, and even that was above the mark. But, Sir, the report had done its work; the report had been spread abroad in order to damage the late Government by misrepresenting the amount of money proposed to be spent by them in railway construction in Prince Edward Island. But while that statement had been spread broadcast over Canada, the denial of that statement, the correction which was afterwards made, had not the same extensive publication. Not only that, but I find by the press of the day that even in this city, no less than the Secretary of State stated, that Ottawa's share of the proposed railway expenditure in Prince Edward Island would be $125,000. If Ottawa's share of the alleged railway expenditure in Prince Edward Island were $125,000, no wonder people were alarmed, for, taking the population of Ottawa at 50,000, the sum proposed to be spent on railways in Prince Edward Island would be $12,500,000 instead of $1,000,000. Those statements did a great deal of injury and were calculated to damage the Government of the day and prevent this question being settled in a fair and equitable manner, without reference to party politics. But I may say that not only was that the case under the late Administration, but to-day when the present Government proposes to grapple with the question, the Conservative press is taking the same stand on this question as was taken by the Liberal party when they were in Opposition. When I speak in this regard I must refer to a paper for which I have great respect in other matters and I will relieve myself of any charge of partiality by making reference to the Toronto "Mail and Empire." When the present Government proposed to take up this question, no doubt in order to make political capital, it was stated by that paper that "Prince Edward Islad had not built any railways and that Canada owns and runs its local line." For a journal of the reputation of the Toronto "Mail and Empire," which should be conversant with public questions, to make such a statement as that Prince Edward Island had not built any railways, is not only doing itself very great harm, but is doing the party with which it is associated a great deal of injury also. I hope in the discussion of this question party politics will be dissociated altogether. The province has a good claim for the construction of the railway mileage covered by the motion, and I trust the discussion will proceed without the introduction of party politics. But as the Toronto "Mail" has stated that Prince Edward Island has not built any railways I wish to refer to an authority which I

trust will satisfy that paper that it is in error. This is a matter which is constantly cropping up, and in the interest of Prince Edward Island and for the sake of clearing up the question I will appeal to the records and see whether the Island has paid a cent for railways or not. In the sessional papers of 1876 I find the following :—

By Order in Council dated Windsor, 26th June, 1873, Her Majesty thought fit to approve the terms and conditions set forth in the Addresses from the Houses of Parliament of Canada and from the Legislative Council and House of Assembly of Prince Edward Island, May, 1873, and it was declared by Her Majesty : "From and after the 1st day of July, 1873, Prince Edward Island should be admitted and become part of the Dominion."

By the resolutions which formed the basis of union it was provided that "the railways under contract and in course of construction for the Government of the Island shall become the property of Canada."

To carry out the above provision it was agreed that the cost of the railway should be borne by the Dominion, and the money so paid, charged as a debt against the Island.

The total cost is $2,862,766, being at the rate of $14,400 per mile, exclusive of the right of way damages and general expenses, which it is estimated will be covered $1,900 per mile—making the total cost $16.300 per mile, the amount originally appropriated, which would amount to over $3,000,000

If the writers of the press, and of the Toronto "Mail," to which I have referred, had been conversant with the terms on which the island entered confederation, this statement which was made in their paper would not have been made, because it is here stated distinctly, and it is in accordance with the facts, that the money so paid by the Dominion for railway purposes in Prince Edward Island was charged as a debt against the province. I hope this extract from an order of the Queen's Privy Council—the very highest authority—will finally settle this question and have the effect of preventing the Minister of Railways from again stating in his report that $3,750,000 have been spent in constructing and operating the island railway, which conveys the erroneous idea that the island never spent a dollar on railway construction, whereas, according to the statement I have read, it paid all the cost of those railways up to $3,144,000, which amount was charged against the province as a debt. There is no doubt whatever that it has been charged against Prince Edward Island. The question is, has Prince Edward Island paid it ? The Island of course has paid it, and the sum of $3,144,214 has been deducted from the amount in account between the Island and Canada at the time of confederation. I do not know whether my labours will be altogether in vain if I succeed in correcting this mistake in regard to railway expenditure in Prince Edward Island.

I have confidence that justice will be done Prince Edward Island, by the press of this country, which is the great educator of the people, and I hope the statements which I make will clear the way for Prince Edward Island getting justice. There is no Parliament or Government in the world which would saddle a small province like Prince Edward Island with its share of the cost of railway expenditure all over Canada, and refuse a reasonable and necessary railway expenditure for that province itself. It is all very well to say that the policy of the Government should be reversed in regard to granting subsidies to railways. It is all very well to say : Go on with the construction of canals now, and thereby let those provinces which have reaped a large share in the construction of railways get the largest share in the construction of the canals also. But, Sir, the province from which I come has never received any aid from canal expenditure, and with the exception of the St. Peter's Canal in Nova Scotia there has been no canal expenditure in the maritime provinces. That fact strengthens considerably the claim of Prince Edward Island now. I wish to read to the House the statement of the reasons given by the Dominion Statistician for the policy which the Government adopted in the year 1883, of subsidizing railways which are not of interprovincial importance or railways not connecting two or more provinces. The Dominion Statistician says :

Owing to the danger to provincial finances consequent on pressure upon the provincial governments for aid for local railways (within the province), the Dominion Government, in 1883, determined to change their policy, which up to that time had been to give aid only to those lines which ran through more provinces than one. The change of attitude was necessary. Railways had to be built. The provincial governments could not build them without running into debt. This compelled them to make application to the Federal Parliament for enlarged financial arrangements, a proceeding which, in the interest of the system of government adopted in Canada, was calculated to deprive the provincial governments of that independence of the federal authority which it is deemed advisable should ever be maintained.

This was the object of the Government when in 1883 they began large expenditures on railways which were only of local importance, and railways with regard to which the province of Prince Edward Island has hitherto received no aid or benefit. That policy did not relieve the people of Prince Edward Island in building railways, because the railway expenditure in Prince Edward Island was made by that province previous to that year. But, Sir, it did relieve the province of Ontario and the province of Quebec and the province of Nova Scotia and the province of New Brunswick and every other province in the Dominion except Prince Edward Island. Before that policy is now reversed it should also be applied to Prince Edward Island. I find in the report of the Minister of Railways for the year 1878, a

statement which has been the means of misleading the public mind in regard to railway expenditure in Prince Edward Island ever since that time. By reference to Sessional Papers No. 23 to 146, of 1878, I find the following railway statistics :—

Aid from—	
Dominion Govt. for railways.	$65,939,900 51
Ontario for railways.....	2,229,639 02
Quebec do	8,573,613 27
New Brunswick for railways..	2,730,000 00
Nova Scotia do ..	818,750 00
Municipalities do ..	7,224,579 00
Total.....	$87,456,481 80

This is laid down to be the aid from the Dominion Government, from the provinces and municipalities up to June 30, 1878.

Now, Sir, I think I am within the bounds of truth in stating that this extract was the means of perpetrating an injustice against Prince Edward Island, an injustice which has worked its injury to the province up to the present day. I have read from the terms of union, where the sum of over $3,000,000 was charged against Prince Edward Island for railways, but here are these railway statistics for 1878, which say that not a dollar was paid by Prince Edward Island. I want to call the attention of the House to the fact that this mistake is not of very recent date. It started at least in 1878 under the Mackenzie administration, and it has done very serious injury in preventing Prince Edward Island obtaining that share for public works which it ought to have. We find that Prince Edward Island has not participated in the large expenditure which has been made upon the canal system of this country. The blue-books show that on canals there has been expended as follows :—

Expenditure on land up to the 30th June, 1896	$66,992,736
Additional expenditure for—	
Renewals	2,352,293
Repairs	5,103,787
Staff and maintenance.....	6,476,706
Total.....	$80,925,522

Now, Sir, why is it that the Government do not propose to reverse their policy with regard to the expenditure on canals ? I do not say that canals are not necessary for the development of commerce, but railways are of as much advantage as canals. There is one thing at least that may be said of railways—they are generally distributed all over Canada, and may be made as useful to one part of Canada as to the other. That cannot be said of the canal system of the Dominion, which is altogether in the interest of the two largest and most influential provinces of the Dominion ; I refer to Quebec and Ontario. These two provinces united in 1883 to get aid for railways of local importance, and they have been getting aid largely ever since. Those two large provinces have been getting more than their share of the money expended on railways. Now they are saying, Reverse that policy in regard to railways, and continue your policy with regard to large expenditures on canals. Let us see what return the Dominion of Canada gets from that large expenditure on canals. We have been told that the railways of Canada should be self-sustaining—that the Intercolonial Railway, especially, should be self-sustaining. It was proposed last session to expend more of Canada's money in building Government railways in order to make the Intercolonial self-sustaining. Do the Government propose to make the canals self-sustaining ? Is it not just as necessary that the canals should be made self-sustaining as the railways ? Has any effort ever been made to make the canals self-sustaining ? After the two largest provinces have got more than their actual share of the expenditure on railways, while provinces like Prince Edward Island have received none at all why should the Government reverse their policy in regard to railways and expend more freely on canals ? The two most influential provinces of Canada, Quebec and Ontario, will receive the advantage of this expenditure, and will receive it at the expense of all the other provinces, the maritime provinces, British Columbia and the North-west included. But what returns has Canada received from the canal system ? I find that in the year ending the 30th of June, 1896, the tolls collected on the canals of Canada amounted to only $339,539. That is a very small return from an expenditure of $80,000,000. The interest on $80,000,000 would be about $2,500,000 ; and yet in this case there is only a direct return to Canada of $339,539. How do the returns to-day compare with those of some years previous ? —for instance, with those of the year 1868 ? I find that in 1868 the tolls received from the canals of Canada were $403,879, that is, thirty years ago the tolls from the canals were larger than they are to-day, although at that time the expenditure on those canals was only $20,692,244, against $80,825,522 to-day. Now, I ask, is this large expenditure on canals going to continue ? Is the policy to be propounded that the railways of Canada must be self-sustaining, but no effort at all is to be made to make the canals self-sustaining ? In fact, it seems that the more we expend on the canals the less we get from them. The expenditure has been increased by leaps and bounds, and year by year the tolls have been decreasing. If the Government wished to act in the interest of the tax-payers of Canada, when they say that the railways are to be self-sustaining, they would also say that the canals must be self-sustaining. I put up that plea on behalf of the whole of the maritime provinces as against the two largest provinces, Quebec and Ontario. I put it up especially on behalf of the province from which I come, where not one dollars is expended on canals or railways

either. I may say that if this policy is persisted in, there is a danger in centralizing the power of this Government in the largest provinces. Two of these larger provinces may unite, and propound the policy that the tolls on the canals should cease. That is altogether in the interest of the two largest provinces, Quebec and Ontario. We found that out not very long ago. We found last session that this Government were ready to do that. They are going to be free with their expenditure on canals, but they say they are going to shut down the expenditure on railways. I have a clipping from one of the newspapers, printed at the time of a by-election at Point Lévis, which shows how freely the Government is ready to expend money in some cases. When the by-election at Lévis was at its height, the Hon. J. Israel Tarte went there to plead for the Liberal Government candidate. He said :

> I give you my word that within a few days the Minister of Railways and myself will come here to discuss with your council about the works which we must execute here. Do you wants wharfs ? Do you want elevators ?

The report of this meeting in the newspaper then went on to describe how he entered into a long discussion of the policy of the Government concerning railways and canals which would require an expenditure of $10,000,000 to $12,000,000. The only thing, he said, the Government ask for is your support. Which is the best man to represent Lévis ? I do not know whether he or the Minister of Railways went to Lévis as promised, but if they did not go to Lévis, Lévis came to them, and they were ready with their money. That is their usual system, and it is a great pity we had not a by-election in Prince Edward Island, because if we had, no doubt the Minister of Public Works would have gone there, and we should probably have had this railway under construction. The Government appear to be alarmed by the large expenditure which they proposed to make on canals, and they say that they are going to call a halt in further expenditure on railways. Well, Mr. Speaker, I protest, in the name of the province from which I come, and which has been overlooked in this matter, against any halt being called, in so far as that province is concerned. If the Parliament of Canada wishes to do justice, if it wishes to extend fair-play and expend evenly and fairly the money of the country devoted to public works, it will see that Prince Edward Island is given her share of railway expenditure, in proportion to that made in the other provinces.

When discussing this question on a previous occasion, I was asked why did not the late Government build this railway. Well, I suppose the late Government could just as well have put the question : Why did not our predecessors do it ? We might as well be asked why was not this road built immediately after confederation, which was perhaps the most favourable time, for then the circumstances attending the entrance of Prince Edward Island into the union were fresh in everybody's minds. But we are not now dealing with the past. What we have now to deal with is the present. I can say this much for the late Government, that with all its delay, for which I am not going to offer any excuse, they did bring down a proposition to do justice to Prince Edward Island which would have been satisfactory to the province. And the present Government has also gone one step at least to carry out the proposition of the late Government. It has sent down engineers to survey this road. That survey is said to be completed. When that question was brought up during the first year of this Parliament, we were told that no railway construction should be undertaken. Then when the next session came on, we were told that a survey would have to be made before construction could be proceeded with. We are now in the third session, and it seems that as far as railway extension in Prince Edward Island is concerned, to which at least one of the members of the Government was very strongly committed, almost nothing has been done. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries went over the whole province during the last electoral campaign, and made the construction of this railway part of his platform, which I was very much pleased to see, but since he has come up here he has evidently found out that he has not anything like the influence which his friends in the island boasted of his having with his colleagues. Either he has no influence at all with the Government or has gone back on the promises he made to the people of Prince Edward Island. Great hopes were raised among his friends when the hon. gentleman obtained the seat in this Government. We were told that when he would take his seat here, he would occupy a place in the Cabinet second to none ; but now that we are in the third session of this Parliament, it seems to me that the hon. gentleman is in rather a delicate position, and has not that influence with his colleagues which he should have, and to which he is entitled. Last year he pleaded that we must have a survey before beginning construction, but this year the Estimates are down and not a dollar to start the building of this line. I see by the press that the hon. gentleman is going to take wings for Washington in a few days. What will become of the Prince Edward Island Railway extension then ? Is the hon. gentleman going to make some effort to have the Government carry out his pledges in regard to this railway ? I had hopes that the hon. gentleman would have exerted the influence which he ought to have in this Government, and thus have fulfilled the predictions of his friends, who said throughout the campaign : "Prince Edward Island will never get jus-

tice until the hon. member for Queen's (Sir Louis Davies) has a seat in the Government. I am afraid, however, that the people of that province are going to be disappointed. I am afraid that what hopes we had of a sum being placed in the Estimates for the purpose of railway extension in the island are gone unless they repent at the last moment, before they bring down the Supplementary Estimates. I have heard the hon. Minister of Marine say that we should not advocate this on the eve of an election; we are now within measurable distance of a general election.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. You are not anxious for one now.

Mr. MARTIN. The hon. gentleman may not be anxious, but I think he had better prepare for one, and his best preparation would be to redeem some of his pledges. He will find that the people of Prince Edward Island are watching him closely, and unless some of the pledges he has made are implemented, he may appeal to them in vain when the time comes.

I wish now to call the attention of the House to a return to which I made reference in the beginning of my remarks, as I am sure that that return will assist hon. members in coming to an understanding with reference to railway expenditure in Prince Edward Island. I have here a return dated 30th June, 1896, and numbered Sessional Papers No. 66. It is entitled as follows:—

Return to an Order of the House of Commons dated 28th September, 1896, for a statement showing the amount of money expended by the Dominion Government since the 1st day of July, 1873, for constructing, equipping and subsidizing railways in Canada, with the number of acres of land granted as subsidies, and their estimated value. Also, a statement showing separately the parts of such expenditure made in each province of the Dominion and in the North-west Territory, deducting any sums that may have been charged against any of the provinces or North-west Territory, in their debt account with the Dominion.

(Sgd.) R. W. SCOTT,
Secretary of State.

The first statement in this return shows the amount of money expended by the Dominion Government since the first day of July, 1873, for constructing, equipping and subsidizing railways in Canada. Amount expended $106,026,567.66. You will notice, Mr. Speaker, that this is not the total amount of money expended by the Dominion since confederation, but it is the total amount expended from 1873 to 30th June, 1896. I called for that statement because it was in the year 1873 that Prince Edward Island came into the union, and, to make a comparison, the figures ought to show what share Prince Edward Island received out of that expenditure since that time. The statement also shows how this money was divided between the provinces. And here it is. It is entitled:

Statement showing separately the amount of money expended in each province of the Dominion and in the North-west Territories by the Dominion Government, from the 1st day of July, 1873, to the 28th September, 1896, for constructing, equipping and subsidizing railways in Canada:

Ontario	$29,889,153 51
Quebec	14,666,937 61
New Brunswick	9,045,538 07
Nova Scotia	14,718,155 81
Manitoba	8,024,432 37
British Columbia	21,441,700 42
North-west Territories	7,604,819 60
Prince Edward Island	635,830 27

I desire to call the attention of the House to this statement and also to compare it with a statement in a return brought down from the Minister of Railways Department. If you will look over the volume of railway statistics, table No. 1, summary statement of capital year ending 30th June, 1897, you will find that it is said that for Prince Edward Island, the Dominion Government paid $3,750,565.38 for railways. I think I am only doing my duty when I call attention to the discrepancy between these statements. When I say that that discrepancy, that mistake—I will call it nothing but a mistake—has appeared in these railways statistics every year since Prince Edward Island entered confederation, I say something which I am sure will not be regarded as creditable to this Parliament or to the Department of the Minister of Railways. And even at the risk of repeating myself I trust I am doing some service not only to this Parliament but to the province from which I come when I call attention to this discrepancy. I trust that a report from the Railway Department will never be presented to this House again showing that this large sum was spent by the Dominion on railways in Prince Edward Island when such was not the case. The figures I have just quoted showing the expenditure in the several provinces, are not complete. In fact, the return is incomplete as it does not cover all the facts called for. The order of the House was for a return showing not only the amount of money spent but the quantity of land voted by this Parliament to assist in the building of railways. I think you will find, Mr. Speaker, that the quantity of land voted for this purpose is about 53,000,000 acres. That land was the general heritage of Canada, and obtained at great expense to the taxpayers of Canada—the people of Prince Edward Island among the rest. It would represent $53,000,000. What share of that has the province of Prince Edward Island received? None whatever. Now, analysing this return of moneys paid which I have just given, we find that the per capita of expenditure by the Dominion in each of the provinces is as follows:—

Province.	Per capita.
Ontario received	$14 13
Quebec do	9 85
New Brunswick received	28 15
Nova Scotia received	32 69
Manitoba received	52 61
British Columbia received	218 40
North-west Territories received	76 84
Prince Edward Island received	5 82

That is, for every settler we have in British Columbia, the Government of Canada, since the year 1873, has paid to that province, out of the revenues of this country, $218 for railways; while Prince Edward Island has only received $5.82; Ontario, $14; Quebec, $9; Nova Scotia, $28; New Brunswick, $32; Manitoba, $52; and the North-west Territories, $76.84. I ask again, is that justice to Prince Edward Island? Is it fair to Prince Edward Island that you should expend $14 for railways per capita in Ontario and spend only $5 in Prince Edward Island? Is that fair-play? Will the Government of to-day be doing justice to Prince Edward Island by saying: We will reverse the policy of subsidizing railways, we will not subsidize any more railways, we have got all the railways the country needs, and now we will turn our attention to canals and spend all the money on canals we possibly can. There are no canals in Prince Edward Island, there are none in the maritime provinces, we will scoop in all the money we can, and Ontario and Quebec will certainly have the best of it. But I wish to look at it from another standpoint. I wish hon. gentlemen opposite would give me their attention for a few minutes, because I am going to read a very important tabulated statement which bears directly on the argument I am presenting to the House. I have shown you the amount expended by the Dominion, now I will show you the amount expended by the provinces and municipalities themselves in aiding railways. I hold in my hand a tabulated statement showing the sums contributed by the local governments and municipalities for railway construction up to the 30th June, 1896:

Ontario, local government	$ 7,306,538	
do municipalities	10,069,143	
		$ 17,375,681
		or $8.21 per capita.
Quebec, local government	$12,409,008	
do municipalities	482,075	
		$ 12,991,082
		or $8.72 per capita.
N. B., local government	$ 4,169,729	
do municipalities	273,500	
		$ 4,443,229
		or $13.83 per capita.
N. Scotia, local government	$ 2,376,116	
do municipalities	261,685	
		$ 2,637,801
		or $5.85 per capita.
Manitoba, local government	$ 770,677	
do municipalities	595,600	
		$ 1,376,277
		or $9.02 per capita.
B. C., local government	$ 37,500	
do municipalities	37,500	
		$ 75,000
		or 76c. per capita.
N. W. T., local government		
do municipalities	$ 25,000	
		$ 25,000
		or 25c. per capita.
P. E. I., local government	$ 3,144,214	
do no municipalities		
		$ 3,144,214
		or $28.82 per capita.

These figures show that the provinces which have received so much aid from the Dominion Government have done very little for themselves. Sir, I think these figures tell a tale. Prince Edward Island has only received aid from the Dominion Government of $5.82 per capita, and has spent out of her own resources at the rate of $28.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). Since confederation?

Mr. MARTIN. Yes, since confederation, for railway purposes.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). Where were the railways put?

Mr. MARTIN. In Prince Edward Island of course.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I think the hon. gentleman was misunderstood. Perhaps he will restate his proposition.

Mr. MARTIN. My proposition is this: I am reading here the contributions made by the provinces themselves for railway construction since confederation.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Since 1873.

Mr. MARTIN. Since confederation.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. But you were not in the confederation before 1873.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Is my hon. friend quoting what was spent before confederation in the island and not quoting what was spent before confederation in the other provinces?

Mr. MARTIN. I do not understand the hon. gentleman.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). All the provinces did not come in at the same time.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Do I understand that the local government and municipalities in Prince Edward Island have spent these sums?

Mr. MARTIN. I certainly not only think so, but am sure of it. I may say this, that that money has been spent by Prince Edward Island for railways since confederation, and not previous to confederation. As a matter of fact, a railway was under construc-

tion previous to 1875, but the payments that have been made on that railway were not made until then. So that, so far as that question is concerned, I think my statement is correct and pertinent to the argument that I am making. I say again that Prince Edward Island, out of its own resources, has contributed for railway construction at the rate of $28.82 per head, while the province of Ontario has contributed $8 and Quebec $8.72.

Mr. TISDALE. Do you mean to take those figures since or before confederation?

Mr. MARTIN. Since confederation. I say again, for the information of hon. gentlemen on both sides, that when Prince Edward Island entered confederation we had a railway under construction, and it was agreed by the terms of confederation that Prince Edward Island should hand over that railway to the Dominion Government as a free gift.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Will you take it back as a free gift?

Mr. MARTIN. Well, if the hon. gentleman will take the canals, we will take the railway. The hon. gentleman was not in his seat when I referred to the large expenditure made on canals. I noticed last year that when the House was voting expenditures on canals in Ontario, the hon. gentleman seemed very well pleased. But I will offer this bargain to the hon. gentleman: If he will take the canals in Ontario and operate them, and pay interest on the money spent by the Dominion on their construction, equipment, repairs and maintenance, and take the tolls in return, I think Prince Edward Island will take its railways.

We should look into this matter a little closer. A fiction had some years ago been uttered by the Hon. Edward Blake that Ontario is the milch cow of Canada. It appears, however, that Ontario is not the milch cow but that the large expenditures on canals and no less than $29,000,000 on railways since 1873 is much more than her milk is worth. It appears rather that Ontario is a heavy Durham cow running to beef, and the cost of feeding her is more than we are getting out of the milk. The province from which I come, on the other hand, may well be called the small Jersey cow of Canada which helped to pay its household expenses. If the hon. Minister is now willing to take the canals and work them for the interest of the money invested and take the tolls as a return on the investment, he will end in being a much poorer man in twelve months than he is to-day. I will not state as a contrast the sum expended in each province by the Dominion Government and also the sum spent by the local governments and the municipalities, and thereby present the case in a new light to hon. members. I have prepared a tabulated statement, as follows:—

Expenditure per Capita by the Dom. Govt. on Railways in each Province up to June 30, 1896.		Expenditure per Capita by the Local Govt. and Municipalities on Railways in each Province up to June 30, 1896.	
Ontario	$14 13	Ontario	$ 8 21
Quebec	9 85	Quebec	8 72
New Brunswick	28.15	New Brunswick	13 83
Nova Scotia	32 69	Nova Scotia	5 85
Manitoba	52 61	Manitoba	9 02
British Columbia	218 40	British Columbia	0 76
N. W. Territories	76 84	N. W. Territories	0 25
P. E. Island	5 82	P. E. Island	28 82

I said, in discussing this question last year, that in the provinces of Canada where the Dominion Government spent largely, the province themselves paid little—and vice versa. I think the Government should give serious attention to the statement I have read, and I hope that this state of affairs will not long continue in Prince Edward Island as regards railway expenditure, but that before this session is over the island will receive justice. I have prepared another tabulated statement, which will be interesting to members of the Government and this House as bearing on this question, and I trust it will be of some help to the Ministers when this question comes before the Council.

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

After Recess.

SAFETY OF RAILWAY EMPLOYEES AND PASSENGERS.

The House again resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 4) to secure the safety of railway employees and passengers.—(Mr. Casey.)

(In the Committee.)

On section 7.

Mr. TISDALE. Has this Bill been before the Railway Committee?

Mr. CASEY. A similar Bill was sent to the Railway Committee last session, but this session, the Bill being a public one, it comes in the usual course to the Committee of the Whole House, and has been adopted as far as section 7.

Mr. TISDALE. Such Bills as these are usually sent to the Railway Committee or to a special committee. I notice that the Minister of Railways is absent, and I presume that my hon. friend (Mr. Casey) would not wish to push this Bill, in the absence of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair). I am informed by a member of the House that the Minister of Railways was to have an

opinion from the Minister of Justice on this Bill, and that being the case, it is all the more reason why we should not proceed with it now.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. Minister of Railways was asked to procure, not exactly an opinion from the Minister of Justice, but to find precedents bearing on the matter. The Minister objected that he had doubts as to the power of this House to pass the particular clause now under consideration. He did not say positively that we could not pass it, but he was to get an opinion on it, and I hope to see him here in a few minutes.

Mr. TISDALE. Better let the committee rise, and in the meantime go on with something else.

Mr. CASEY. I do not want this Bill put after all the other orders.

Mr. TISDALE. Under the circumstances, I think the committee should rise and report progress. That will not prevent us taking it up again.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I would be disposed to adopt the suggestion of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Tisdale). We can go back to the Bill.

Mr. CASEY. On the understanding that we can take it up after the other items this evening, I am willing to move that the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to, and committee rose and reported progress.

ATTACHMENT OF SALARIES OF CIVIL SERVANTS.

Mr. RICHARDSON moved that the House again resolve itself into committee on Bill (No. 14), an Act respecting the attachment of salaries and money in the hands of the Government.

Mr. DAVIN. We have not the printed Bill with the amendments.

Mr. RICHARDSON. The Bill was printed a week ago and was distributed last Monday. At least I have a copy of it.

Mr. CASEY. It must be printed, if it got a second reading.

Mr. DAVIN. The Bill was printed but the hon. gentleman (Mr. Richardson) made a new Bill of it, and the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) said very properly that it would be necessary to have the new Bill before us.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I saw that the Bill was printed personally, and I was at the distribution office and got a copy of it last Tuesday, both in English and French.

Mr. DAVIN. I rise to a point of order, Mr. Speaker, and I would like to have your ruling with regard to this Bill. We read a Bill the second time and we got into committee on it, and not only was that Bill gutted, but as the Minister of Trade and Commerce said, it was absolutely destroyed. The hon. Minister (Sir Richard Cartwright) said that the Bill certainly must be reprinted. The Bill is absolutely a new Bill now; this Bill never has been read a second time, and I rise to the point of order, as to whether the hon. gentleman (Mr. Richardson) can go on with it as though it had been read the second time.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Of course, the hon. gentleman cannot raise the point of order that the Bill has not been printed and distributed.

Mr. DAVIN. That is not the point I raise.

Mr. SPEAKER. The order of the House is stated on the Order paper, and there can be no debate or discussion about it. The House made the order on the previous day, the 18th of April, that the House shall to-day go into committee on this Bill. I cannot interfere with that order of the House. The House goes into committee now automatically. When it goes into committee, then it will be for the committee to say what it will do.

Motion agreed to, and the House again resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. TISDALE. I would ask the chairman what Bill he has.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The Bill before the Chair is naturally the Bill that has been presented. Now some motion can be made.

Mr. INGRAM. I understand that the Bill that was originally introduced has been entirely stricken out. The hon. gentleman struck out section 3 of that Bill, and introduced what he called sections 1 and 2. I understood that the substance of these two sections were to be referred to the Solicitor General for his opinion whether or not they were within the power of this House to pass.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I may say that there was a difference of opinion as to whether it was in the power of this House to pass the Bill as originally printed. When I introduced the Bill, it was with the single purpose of finding out what we could do to remedy an acknowledged evil in the country. As a result of a suggestion made by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies), and a conference among a number of the legal members of the House I decided to substitute two very brief clauses for the orginal Bill. I will read those clauses, and members can judge of them for themselves. There can be no object in raising any objection to them at the present time. If they waited a week, or even a year, hon. members would not be in a better position to judge of the merits

of the Bill than they are now. The two clauses of the Bill are as follows :—

1. All moneys or salaries due, or accruing due, to any person employed by the Government of Canada, shall be liable to attachment in each and every of the provinces of the Dominion of Canada, according to the laws and rules of procedure in force in such provinces.

2. This Act shall not apply to any debt contracted before the passing of this Act.

The object is that the Bill shall not be retroactive—that it shall not apply to any old debt contracted by any civil servant.

Mr. DAVIN. I rise to a point of order. I may say to the hon. gentleman that I have no desire to do anything against his Bill that is not fair ; but I want to know from you, Mr. Chairman, as a matter of order, whether he can go on, in view of the fact that there is not an atom of the old Bill left except this :—

Her Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and House of Commons of Canada, enacts as follows :—

which you will find at the head of every Bill. Sections 1, 2 and 3 of the old Bill are withdrawn by the hon. gentleman, and he now offers two brief clauses. Therefore, the point I raise is this——

Some hon. MEMBERS. No point of order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I do not think this is a point of order well taken. There is a Bill before the committee containing three clauses. I understand that a motion is to be made to amend these clauses, and to substitute some other clauses for them to the same effect. So that I do not think the point of order is well taken.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I do not see what object the hon. gentleman has. I do not think he has an evil object, of course ; but surely he will join with other members of the House when we desire to gain a good object. What can be gained by raising technical objections at this stage ? If members desire to kill the Bill, let them do so ; but let us have a fair vote on the question. With regard to the first clause, which is really the crux of the whole Bill, you will see how it is amended. As the Bill was originally introduced, the onus rested on the Federal Government, and I recognized the force of the arguments brought forward that it might entail a great deal of work on the Government. Therefore, I amended the Bill in such a way as merely to remove the ban as it exists in the provinces. Where any province has an Act, as have the provinces of Ontario, Manitoba and Quebec, permitting the garnishment of money due to local civil servants, the Bill merely removes the ban as it applies to Dominion or federal civil servants, so that the law may apply equally to all civil servants in the different provinces. There surely can be no objection to that. I may say that my Bill is really the result of a suggestion of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, that something of this kind be substituted. Besides, I secured the opinion of a great many members of the legal profession in this House, that this Bill is not ultra vires. Therefore, I would urge members to vote for the Bill, and we will see what the result will be. Surely there is no desire that federal civil servants shall be exempt from garnishment when the salaries of local civil servants can be garnisheed. In the province of Quebec, and I think in the province of Ontario, only a certain percentage of the salary of a civil servant can be garnisheed, and this Act will place the federal civil servant in the same position, so that only the same proportion of his salary can be garnisheed. I may say that during the discussion here a couple of weeks ago, I expressed my willingness to withdraw the Bill entirely, if the Government would make a statement in the House that they would pass an Order in Council providing for the dismissal of any civil servant who allowed his salary to be twice garnisheed ; but no such statement has been made, and therefore I will move that section 1 of the reprinted Bill be adopted.

Mr. INGRAM. In view of the statement which was made the last time this Bill was before the House, I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if he is satisfied that the Government are of opinion that this Parliament has the power to pass legislation of this kind. Would any member of the Government undertake to say that it has ?

Mr. BRITTON. The question of the power of the Dominion Parliament to pass legislation of this kind does not trouble me in the slightest degree. But there are other objections to the Bill as it seems to me, and I should think that the Government would hesitate a good while before they would allow such a measure to pass. Hon. gentlemen will notice that this is not only an attempt to garnishee salaries accruing due to any person employed by the Dominion Government, but it applies to all salaries or moneys due.

Mr. RICHARDSON. To persons employed by the Government.

Mr. BRITTON. Yes, I know the word "employed" is used, but that does not limit the Bill to civil servants. It means, if it means anything, that if a person is employed by the Government to do any special service, and if a claim is made upon the Government for remuneration for that service, instead of it being determined by proceeding against the Government by the party who has rendered the service, a third party, a creditor of the one employed is allowed to intervene ; and according to the ordinary rules or laws in force in the different provinces this third party may institute proceedings to attach the moneys alleged to be in the

hands of the Government for the service rendered. Now, I would suppose that a clause in such general terms as that would be a very dangerous one for the Government to allow. If a simple Act could be passed allowing the salaries, up to some amounts that are defined and certain as between the employees of the Government and their creditors to be attached for some small debts, probably something of the kind would be in the public interest, in the interest of shopkeepers and tradesmen. In the very few cases—and I am free to admit there are only a few in which such laws are required—this would be a positive benefit to the creditors, and would be no hurt to the great majority of the civil service. But I submit with all confidence that this clause is too wide, too general, in its terms. It would be difficult to make operative and would be a very dangerous thing for the Government to allow, for the reason I have just given. I am not going to mention names, but, no doubt, hon. members will recollect that a claim was brought against the Government for something it was alleged a Minister of the Government employed a person to do. An application was made to collect this claim by petition of right, and that was refused, and then suit was brought against a prominent member of the Government individually for the recovery of this claim. If this Bill passes as framed, there is nothing to prevent proceedings in any province where the creditor of a person employed by the Government lives against the Dominion of Canada for the recovery of the claim.

Mr. RICHARDSON. While this Bill might appear to go beyond the regular civil servant, it will be remembered that the expression "Any person employed by the Government" was suggested by a prominent member of the legal profession, for he said a man might not be a member of the civil service, he might be employed under salary only temporarily, although that temporary employment might last two, three or four years, and his salary should be garnisheeable the same as that of any civil servant. If the committee think this expression too wide, I have not the slightest objection to any amendment that would cover the ground and meet the approval of my hon. friend from Kingston. The committee knows exactly what I seek to accomplish in this matter, and, I am sure, will agree to any reasonable amendment. And if the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Britton) could suggest any word or words that would get over the difficulty that he points out I, for one, would be glad to accept the amendment. The Bill only puts the federal civil servant in the same position as the civil servant in the various provinces, and surely that is perfectly constitutional, and a fair position to take.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). The situation as stated by my hon. friend (Mr. Richardson) is not by any means the case in all the provinces. The rule is not uniform. Speaking as to my own province, we have never permitted the Government to be embarrassed by garnishee or attachment proceedings of any kind in respect of the unpaid bills of the civil service or employees of the Government. I have always had a strong opinion on that point. I have aways felt that in the public interest, it was not desirable that the Government should be subjected to any of the annoyances or embarrassments which must necessarily follow if procedure of this kind is permitted. I have not had the advantage of hearing the several discussions that have taken place on this Bill, and, therefore, I may perhaps be going over ground that has already been traversed in stating the objections I have to this Bill. The Bill is an improvement on that which was first introduced, but still I would regard it as a very serious matter to place upon the Statute-book a law which will make it necessary that we should practically organize a department of the Government to follow up and pursue all the proceedings to which we may be subjected in all parts of the Dominion under a portion of this Bill. I ask my hon. friend to consider whether the Government of the country is not already encumbered to a sufficient extent in matters necessary to the administration of the country's affairs without being overloaded with matters of this kind. Persons who give credit to the employees of the Government, my hon. friend will say, should be in as advantageous condition and should have the same remedy available to recover their debts as those who give credit to private individuals. Yet we must not shut our eyes to the fact that there is something due to the Government, that we should not allow the instrument of Government to be paralyzed even to the extent, though he will say that it is to a limited extent, to which it is liable to be paralyzed by proceedings of this kind. People who credit employees of the Government do so with their eyes open and ought to realize that they may possibly not be able to recover their debt, and so ought to take the ordinary precautions which persons take who think there is doubt about the credit of the individual to whom they are asked to give credit. Therefore, I should see with much regret this Parliament passing the Act my hon. friends desires us to place on the Statute-book. There are many objections which I will not occupy the time of the committee in stating, but I think the difficulties must impress themselves upon the minds of hon. members. I agree with my hon. friend from Kingston (Mr. Britton) that this Bill goes much farther than the case of the regular civil servant. I think that we would meet with a difficulty as to what is meant by the word "employee" or persons employed by the Government. The contention might be raised that it applied to persons constructing public works, and if the Government are to be

liable to proceedings of this kind in respect of such persons, and consequently compelled to be always on the alert, I take it that the effect will be very injurious to the public service in many ways and of very doubtful advantage to the creditors whom the hon. gentleman desires to serve. I think it is legislation that ought to be very seriously considered, and I am not prepared at present, as a member of the committee, to unhesitatingly subscribe to the passage of this Bill.

Mr. CASEY. I am sorry to hear that the province of New Brunswick is not up to the times in the matter under consideration. The province of Ontario has not found its administration powerless or any practical difficulty on account of allowing garnishee proceedings, nor has the province of Quebec, and both these provinces must have vastly greater number of civil servants than the province of New Brunswick. The hon. Minister seems to exaggerate the amount of work it would entail. I am sure that the Government do not employ a greater number of employees than do the great railways of the country—the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway, which do not seem to be at all embarrassed by these garnishee proceedings.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). They simply dismiss their men.

Mr. CASEY. I do not see why this Government should not follow the same rule. It might perhaps afford much more rapid promotion, and be a very effective means of weeding out those employees whose services it is not desirable to retain, but whom the Government do not care to discharge lest they might be accused of acting from political reasons.

Mr. TISDALE. I heartily concur in what has been said by the hon. Minister of Railways. The Bill contains a provision that it shall not apply to any debts contracted before its passage. The hon. gentleman, I think, should be satisfied with the strong feeling expressed in Parliament as to the necessity of our public servants paying their debts, which cannot fail to be a warning to them in the future. As the hon. Minister of Railways has said, if this Bill were to become law we would require a special department to meet all the labour it will entail on the Government. I think that the Government might at times exercise the salutary authority which the railway companies do over their employees, and this they could do without resorting to a system of espionage on the service. From what knowledge I have of the service, I do not think that the conduct of the Government employees has been such as to render legislation of this kind necessary. I might further add that the hon. gentleman has now brought in what is completely a new Bill, as compared with the one he first introduced, and he tells us that he does not care whether it be adopted in its present form or not, provided the committee put it in such a shape that its main object will be carried out. I must say that when an hon. member of this House introduces a Bill, he should introduce it in such shape that it shall not require to be completely remodelled. That is the work which he should not entail on the committee. What the committee is here for is to amend Bills in their details, and not assume the responsibility of completely remodelling them and passing a measure altogether different in form from the one originally introduced. The precedent set by some of the provinces has been quoted to us, but hon. gentlemen have not seen fit to go into the details of the legislation of these provinces, and we have only a very general idea of what that legislation is like. In any case, this federal legislature is responsible for its own legislation, and while I do not pretend that we should not give consideration to the deliberate conclusions of the provinces, we must, after all, make laws to suit our own circumstances, and there are many reasons why, even if it were well for the provinces to allow the garnisheeing of the salaries of their civil servants, it might not be equally well for us to adopt a similar law. The ramifications, the extent of the work, the circumstances are altogether different in the two cases. For these reasons I am quite prepared to take the responsibility of saying that I am not prepared to support the Bill before us.

Mr. FORTIN. I have spoken already on this measure, and have not since heard anything to induce me to change my mind. I must say that I am astonished to find members of Parliament oppose a measure which aims at putting the civil servants of the Dominion on the same footing as ordinary persons.

I am mistaken when I say an ordinary citizen, because even the salary of a labourer is seizable for debt in many provinces, whereas according to the Bill as now amended, it is only a portion of the salary due to a Dominion official that would be seizable. I see no good reason in the world why the salaries of these gentlemen who are so anxious to enter the service of the Dominion Government should not be attachable to a certain extent, according to the laws in force in the different provinces. I have listened with attention to the arguments advanced against the measure by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals. His main argument is, as I understand it, that it would embarrass the Government. Well, if it does embarrass the Government, let the Government be embarrassed. Somebody has spoken of a special department. If a special department is required, that is the very best reason why the law should be passed. If the

number of civil servants who will not pay their debts is so great as to require the institution of a special department, that is the very best reason why this law should be passed, because it would show that there was so much dishonesty among the civil servants that special legislation was required to meet it. Some hon. members have cited the case of great corporations who have many men in their employ and whose salaries are attached every day for debt. Take, for instance, the Canadian Pacific Railway; I think they have there a special department. That company has thousands of men of all classes in its employ, and their salaries are attachable. So it is, I think, with the Grand Trunk Railway, so it is with the banks, so it is with all great corporations, and it is a scandal that Dominion officials should enjoy special privileges in this respect. Take, for instance, the corporation of the city of Montreal, employing hundreds of men, their salaries are all attachable for a certain portion thereof according to the laws of the province of Quebec. Under those laws, one-fifth is seizable when the salary is under $1,000; one-fourth is seizable when the salary is over $1,000; one-third if it exceeds $3,000. Take the Montreal court-house, the salaries of its employees are seizable. Go half a mile further west, and there is the Montreal post office, the officials of which receive salaries much in excess of those received by the officials of the provincial government, and still you cannot touch them.

Mr. QUINN. Would you attach the salaries of the judges?

Mr. FORTIN. Well, if any one would suggest that a judge administering justice would not pay his legitimate debts, I say we should have a special law adopted to meet their case. A man who receives $5,000 a year to administer justice, and who is empowered to send to jail other men who do not pay their debts, I say if such a man should not pay his debts, his conduct would really call for special legislation or for his impeachment. I do not think the judges themselves will take as a compliment my hon. friend's suggestion made as an argument against this law.

Mr. INGRAM. Suppose a civil servant in the city of Winnipeg owes a small debt If this section becomes law, would the hon. gentleman state what procedure he would adopt to collect that debt?

Mr. FORTIN. I am sorry I am not able to answer the hon. gentleman, for the reason that I am not acquainted with the provincial laws of Manitoba. But according to our statutes in Quebec, if an employee of the Montreal custom-house, for instance, was owing a debt and if this law was passed, a copy of the writ of garnishment would be served upon the collector or deputy collector.

Mr. QUINN. My hon. friend must remember that the provincial Act does not provide for service upon a deputy collector, it provides for service upon the chief of the department in which the local officials are employed. But there is no provision for the federal employee, and there could not be. As a matter of fact, as I understand it, the pay-lists in all these public offices in Montreal comes from Ottawa.

Mr. FORTIN. That would not make any difference. I think the hon. gentleman is correct that our provincial statute does not provide for procedure as regards the seizure of salaries of Dominion officials. The Quebec statute was passed for Quebec officials only, and there is no provision applying to collectors of customs or other Dominion officials. However, there would be no difficulty on that score; we could as well have a writ of attachment served upon the head or deputy head of a department, as we can have it served upon like officials in the city of Quebec. However, I would go a little further. If there was any difficulty we would only have to amend our provincial law, but until this Parliament takes action, we can do nothing in the province whatever. We cannot declare that when ever a writ of attachment is served upon a Minister or Deputy Minister, he will be bound to transmit a certificate or declaration giving the amount of salary due to the person, his annual salary, and so forth. In order to reach the salary of a Dominion official, we must have the consent of the Dominion Parliament, and this Bill is equivalent to such a consent. If this Bill passes, this Parliament will declare that the salaries of officials of the Dominion Government will be seizable according to the laws of the different provinces. If it suits a province to say that a salary should be seizable, then let it be seizable; if it says that only a portion should be seizable, then only a portion would be seizable. If it was found that in the province of Quebec, for instance, as our law exists to-day, the procedure would not be complete, then we will make it complete. A Bill of this kind, as I have stated, was introduced into the Quebec Legislature last session. Unfortunately, it was killed in the Upper House, a majority of whose members, as is well known, are Conservatives, perhaps too many of them are Conservatives. But we have in the province of Quebec a Liberal Government, and I think that a Liberal Government would make liberal laws. In point of fact, a law such as is now proposed in this Bill would be to the advantage of the Dominion officials themselves. I have heard some of them complain that they cannot get credit. When they go and rent a house, giving their names and occupation, as soon as it becomes known that they are in the employ of the Federal Government, landlords will not rent them

houses unless they give security. Therefore, I say, if they were placed on the same footing as ordinary citizens, they would be in a better position, because then they could obtain credit.

I am willing to acknowledge that a majority of them are honest and respectable, but in regard to those who rely on the positions they enjoy now, a law should be passed to place them on the same footing as ordinary debtors. As regard the working of the clause, objection has been made to it on the ground that it is too wide. I do not think the terms used are too wide. Perhaps the terms might be altered so as to read: "Any person in the employ of the Government of Canada." I would go even further, however, and declare that all moneys of any kind due by the Government are attachable by any ordinary citizen but I understand there will be some difficulties where disputed claims are filed against the Government. I am sorry the first provision has been abandoned, because I had intended to move an amendment declaring that all moneys due by the Government on undisputed claims should be attachable as are moneys due to an ordinary citizen. However, the Bill as it is should be passed. The state of the law is antiquated. It was probably a good law two or three centuries ago, but it is not so to-day.

Mr. QUINN. It was not my intention to have sought again to impress my views on the House, having expressed myself on a former occasion and declared myself against the spirit of the Bill; but I feel called upon to do so as the hon. member for Laval has spoken on the question, and has referred to civil servants in the province of Quebec. I interjected a remark about the judges of Montreal, when the hon. gentleman on referring to the civil service in Quebec stated that salaries might be seized in the court-house and be free from seizure a couple of acres away and I said the salaries of judges in the court-house could not be seized. The hon. gentleman waxed warm when he declared that no man was fit to be a judge if he did not pay his legal debts. I would be very sorry to subscribe to that opinion, and I am not saying anything disrespectful to judges or to chief justices when I say that very many of them have been unable to pay their just and honest debts, and if this law had been enforced a few years ago the country would have been obliged to dispense with their services, because some of the cleverest men on the bench in Canada receive salaries which barely enable them to exist. We know that the Canadian judges are the most poorly paid officials in the world. My hon. friend from Laval knows better than anybody else that in Montreal the judges receive miserable salaries of $5,000 a year, which render them incapable of supporting anything like the position they should occupy. The judges who should be able to maintain the dignity of their position, owing to the expense of living in Montreal, are compelled to live in boarding-houses and hotels because they cannot keep house on their salaries. We know that in many of the provinces, particularly in Quebec, the best men on the bench have often been those who through misfortune or spending their lives in the public service and engraving their names on the history of Canada, have died poor men, even when they have been twenty years on the bench. The hon. member for Laval stated that they were unfit to hold their positions and they soiled the judicial ermine if they could not pay their debts. I cannot believe that such is the fact, for many of those men have been among the most honoured and able judges to be found in the world. There are judges who under such a law as is now proposed, might have their salaries seized. The fact that a man owes money does not make him dishonest or dishonourable, and there is no reason why judges should be placed in the miserable position of having their salaries docked one-third. They cannot exist to-day on the salaries they receive.

Mr. RICHARDSON. It is not proposed to seize their salaries for any debt now due. It is to make them pay in future.

Mr. QUINN. Then I say it is dishonest if we are going to give a preference to persons with whom debts may be contracted in the future. Why specially protect them?

Mr. RICHARDSON. Has the hon. gentleman the audacity to lay down the proposition that judges must swindle the men who trust them? That is what it means.

Mr. QUINN. I do not think the House can congratulate the hon. gentleman on the language he uses or the way in which he presents his case.

Mr. CASEY. He says precisely what I say.

Mr. QUINN. I am rather surprised at this remark, because I usually hear reasonably fair ideas from the hon. member for Elgin. If this Bill does not propose to make the judges' salaries seizable for debts already contracted, it is dishonest to give a preference to debtors with whom they may contract debts, and leave them free and clear as regards debts already contracted. I desire to express myself clearly on this matter for the benefit of the hon. member for West Elgin, who, I hope, will not fall into the habit of the hon. member for Lisgar; but if a judge owes money, that is no reason for saying that he is a dishonest man. With reference to the position in which the Government would be placed, it would be utterly impossible for a judge to remain on the bench in any part of Canada with one-third of his salary cut off for any debts contracted by misfortune, probably when he was at the bar or when he was serving as member of this House. The principle is bad in that

it would deprive the country of the services of the brightest men in Canada. Further, I look upon it simply as an attempt to loot the treasury by having officials appointed for the purpose of working out this Bill. Some hon. gentlemen say, look at the provincial governments. Take Montreal. There are the officials in the prothonotary's office, clerk of the peace's office, and the registrar's office, and these are the only officials connected with the local government in the court-house. There are, however, the Lachine Canal, the harbour works, custom-house, inland revenue department, post office and the provincial St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary in the constituency of Laval, each institution having an army of Dominion officials, equalling in number the total employees of the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway in Montreal. What steps would be necessary to enforce such a law as is now proposed ? Machinery would have to be provided by which in each case the person who wished to seize a salary would serve notice upon a representative of the Dominion Government in that particular locality. It must be referred to Ottawa, instructions must be given to some one to represent the Government in every one of these cases, each of which will require a special representative of the Government. The result will be an army of lawyers employed throughout the Dominion and another army of officials for the purpose of making a declaration under the provincial Act to establish whether or not there is any money due to the person whose salary has been seized. We will find that this will be simply a means in this country for making Her Majesty's writ run against herself. We will have an execution issued by Her Majesty against Her Majesty, for moneys belonging to Her Majesty, but due to some one else, because, forsooth, some official of the Government has neglected to declare that Her Majesty did or did not owe a certain amount of money to, say, one John Jones. I do not think that the principle of the Bill can stand for one moment, or should be considered by this committee.

Mr. CASEY. I am very much astonished that my hon. friend (Mr. Quinn) and so many other lawyers should oppose this Bill, if it is going to make all the work for the lawyers they say it will. I believe myself that if it were going to increase business in their professional line, there would not be so many of them against it. The contention that it would be necessary to have a special department and special officers, to look after the garnishee business of the Government seems very absurd, when you know that they do not have a special department for that business in the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. QUINN. Yes, they have.

Mr. CASEY. Pardon me, they do not have anything of the kind. They do not on the Grand Trunk Railway or the Michigan Central.

Mr. QUINN. I do not know about the Michigan Central.

Mr. CASEY. They do not have a special department in the Governments of Quebec or Ontario to look after the garnishees. There can be no doubt as to whether the Government owes a man his salary or not, and the only question is whether it shall be paid to the officer or to his creditor. As to the judges, I am sorry if I misunderstood my hon. friend (Mr. Quinn), but it certainly did seem to me and to those around me, that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Quinn) said that the judges in Montreal and Quebec were not paid enough to live upon.

Mr. QUINN. Yes.

Mr. CASEY. That they could not live on $5,000 a year ; that they had to go into debt to keep themselves and their families alive, and that they would be ruined if they were compelled to pay their debts out of their salaries.

Mr. QUINN. I said nothing of the kind.

Mr. CASEY. When my hon. friend (Mr. Quinn) sees his words in " Hansard " he will see that they bore that meaning and no other. When the hon. gentleman's attention was called to what he was saying, he explained it in another way, but up to the time he was interrupted by the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) and by myself, the drift of his remarks was certainly in the direction I have indicated. As to the contention that this Bill is dishonest because it does not include past debts, I think it is quite the other way. If the hon. gentleman knows the spirit of British legislation, he knows that it is not ex post facto, as a rule. I do not know whether I also misunderstood my hon. friend from East Elgin (Mr. Ingram), but I judged from the current of his remarks, although he said nothing very definite, that he was also opposed to this Bill. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Ingram) must know from his personal and general knowledge of the condition of affairs in St. Thomas, that garnishee orders have been regularly enforced upon employees of the different railways in that railway centre. He knows that it has been quite a source of grievance amongst them, and that considerable ill-feeling has existed against those who enforced these garnishee orders. I do not know whether my hon. friend (Mr. Ingram) means to suggest, that while railway men are still subject to the garnishee order, the civil servants should be continued in their present exemption from it. I understood the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ingram) to say that, and it was as much a surprise to me as the remarks of my hon. friend from Montreal (Mr. Quinn) about the judges.

Mr. INGRAM. I expressed myself very clearly on this Bill when it was last before the committee, and I intend to express myself in the same manner now. I am opposed to this Bill for two very good reasons. I am opposed to it because the cure is worse than the disease. A number of years ago, and before the railway companies took a very decided stand with respect to garnishees, there was much to contend with, and when the companies adopted the plan of dismissing men for being garnisheed more than twice, it reduced the number of garnishees, and it also was the means of introducing a better class of men. We have a much better class of men in our railway service to-day than we had years ago when there were a great many garnishees. My suggestion is, that this Government should take precisely the same action as they took in Washington, where each department issued a circular, that when an employee was garnisheed more than twice he would be dismissed from the service, unless he could show good and sufficient cause why he should be retained. So far as the county of Elgin is concerned, I do not think we have a civil servant there who would be liable to have a garnishee against him. They are all honourable men, men capable of paying 100 cents on the dollar, and no doubt that may be the same in many other constituencies in Canada. But, Sir, if by passing this Bill, we establish a system of employing lawyers from one end of this Dominion to the other, and we know that their costs figure up to a pretty high sum, then I would prefer seeing the different departments of the Government issuing a circular to their employees, that if any of them should get into debt, and have their salaries seized, they would be dismissed from the service, unless they could show good reason against it.

Mr. CASEY. I fail to see why the Government should have to pay any more costs in respect to this than have private individuals or corporations, nor do I see why civil servants should be put on a different basis with regard to this matter than are railway servants or any other employees.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I regret very much that my hon. friend (Mr. Quinn) did not take kindly to the word I used. When I used the word "audacious," it was because I thought it was the only word which correctly described the position the hon. gentleman took. My understanding of his language is exactly the same as that of the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey). I believe hon. members will back me up in saying that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Quinn) stated, that it would be an outrage on the judges of Quebec if you made their salaries seizable, and that if you deducted, say one-third, from their salaries, they would not be able to live.

Now, what is the legitimate conclusion from that? It is that the judges of the province of Quebec, according to my hon. friend (Mr. Quinn) get $5,000 a year, and swindle their creditors out of $1,500 or $1,600 a year in addition. Surely no other deduction can be drawn from the hon. gentleman's remarks; and if that is not an audacious proposition, I would like to know what is. The hon. gentleman spoke of the miserable pittance the judges of the province of Quebec received; and I am sure hon. gentlemen must have felt inclined to take their handkerchiefs out and mop from their eyes the tears they were shedding over the pathetic position of these judges who are compelled, forsooth, to accept only $5,000 a year. I will venture to say that the hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Quinn), like Pooh-Bah, would be quite willing to submit to the insult of a position on the bench carrying a salary of $5,000 a year.

Mr. QUINN. The hon. gentleman is quite mistaken.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I am also sure that he will be willing to accept the post long before his name is enshrined in the history of this country, which he spoke so feelingly about. If the hon. gentleman got $5,000 a year as a judge of the superior court of Montreal, I think he could live tolerably well on that sum. I am quite sure, from all I know, that the hon. gentleman has in past years lived on even less than $5,000 a year. Yet he has been able to subsist, and he certainly does not look like a man who has been obliged to live on less than three meals a day; and I have no doubt that he has sometimes been able to enjoy a Welsh rarebit before he retired near midnight. Now, that argument could not fail to have but one effect on the members of this House. It must have convinced them that if the judges of Quebec are unable to live on their salaries, they must get ahead of their creditors. I appeal to every member of this House to stand by this Bill and see that the judges of Quebec, even though they receive but $5,000 a year, shall be compelled to pay their honest debts. That is the only object I have in introducing and pressing forward this Bill. It was with considerable pain that I heard my hon. friend the Minister of Railways take the position he did to-night; for I have the profoundest respect for that hon. gentleman's acumen, and I am sure that had he remained in this House and heard the debate on this question night after night, he would have changed his view. It is not fair for any member of the Government, or any member of the House, to come here on the last occasion probably that the Bill comes up, and say, "Oh, it has not been fully considered or argued, and I think the hon. gentleman had better quietly withdraw it," and that will be the last of it. I may tell hon. members of this House that during the time my name has been associated with this Bill, and that has been during the last two sessions, I have received petition after petition

from strong associations throughout the Dominion, and letters from all parts of the Dominion, pressing me to go on with the Bill. It is because of that fact that I find myself standing up to-night and urging the Minister of Railways to withdraw his opposition, and let the Bill go through. Even though there may not be many members of the civil service who are dishonest—and I am not here to make any general charge against the civil service, I believe, as a body, it is as honest and upright a body as we have in the Dominion of Canada. But there are exceptions, and no matter at what cost to this country, we want to cure the evil created by these exceptions. Let me give you one sample, and I am sure that members of this House will agree with me that if there are only ten cases like that, the time has come when this Bill should be passed. I know one genleman in the civil service of this Dominion—I will not name the city where he lives—who is in the receipt of a large salary, and who, when he erected his house, got enough marble from a poor dealer to erect an altar in one of the rooms, in order that he might go there and worship God under his own vine and fig-tree; and what do you think happened? He never paid for that marble. The man from whom he got it applied for an order from the court to compel him to pay for it or to allow him to take it out of the House; but he took refuge under this exemption of the civil service, and up to the present time he is able to worship at his own private altar. I would like to have an evil of that kind remedied. There may not be many such cases; but that one case should show the members of this House the absolute necessity of passing a Bill of this kind. Suppose it does result in the establishment of a garnishee office, which it will not do, I agree with my hon. friend from Laval (Mr. Fortin) that no matter what the cost may be, we ought to remedy this evil right here and now. I see that my hon. friend the Premier has been preparing notes on the question. I sincerely hope he will not take a position against the Bill, because I know the very subtle influence of his sunny ways over the members who sit to the rear. If he will just consent not to speak on this question, I will be satisfied; but if he does speak, I will urge all hon. members to remember that it is the Premier who is speaking, and that he naturally desires to smooth matters over. My hon. friend from West Elgin (Mr. Casey) suggests that he be urged not to help the bar on this question. I know the right hon. Premier does not patronize the bar to any serious extent, and I hope that on this occasion he will not do so. Now, it has been said, why pass legislation of this kind? Well, I would point out that the provincial legislatures in various provinces have passed such legislation as this, and it has been found to work admirably. It has not been found necessary to establish a garnishee office, nor has the work of the departments increased in consequence. When the members of the civil service realize that there is such a law as this on the Statute-book, they will pay their debts like honest men, and we will not have such scandals as the one I have mentioned. I am satisfied that it will work admirably, as it has been found to do in regard to the provincial civil service. I may say that two eminent members who sit on this side of the House, who criticised the Bill as it was originally introduced, have told me that they are quite prepared to endorse this Bill. One of them is the learned member for Halifax (Mr. Russell); and the other is one of the members for Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt) who spoke the other night in opposition to the original Bill. In concluding, I would express the hope that if the Premier does speak, he will support me, but if he does not, I would urge hon. members to wink the other eye, and vote for the Bill.

Mr. ANGERS. (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, in rising to participate in this debate, I have no hesitation in stating, from the outset, that I do not think any serious objection can be raised to the principle of this Bill. The only object of this Bill is to place the civil servants on the same footing as the other members of the community. Is there anything unfair in such a position? Is there any interference with the rights of the civil servants of this country? It would occur to nobody to criticise the fact that other citizens, like clerks and labourers, are liable to be sued and have their salaries garnisheed. Why then, I ask, should federal civil servants who live in more comfortable circumstances, and who, as a rule, are being paid higher salaries, not be placed under the ordinary law? Why, I ask, should they be exempt from garnishment and be allowed to escape the payment of their honest debts and to shirk their responsibilities? I think, if we closely look into the matter, it will be found that the federal civil servants are now enjoying an unwarranted and unfair privilege, and one that is not grounded on any principle of sound policy. It is an unsafe and invidious policy to create exceptions in favour of a privileged class of the community. The reason why this Bill commends itself to my approbation is the idea that the Government employees, shall henceforth, under this Bill, be placed on the same footing as every other class in the community. For my part, I cannot help endorsing a policy which was ever upheld and proclaimed aloud by the party to which I have the honour to belong. The Liberal party in Canada have always strongly opposed monopolies and combines, which they have successfully removed and uprooted from our midst. The question now is whether we are willing to go back on that policy. The hon. gentleman asks whether the larger proportion of the civil service pay their debts honestly? With that question I am not concerned here. And if one is to judge from the numerous

grievances that arise all over the country, it cannot be denied that a good many civil servants show very little willingness to carry out their contracts and to satisfy their creditors. But, as I said, this is a matter with which I am not concerned now. The object of this Bill is to provide that in the future the members of the Dominion civil service shall stand on the same relationship with respect to their debts and the collection of those debts as any other member of the community. As to those members of the civil service who carry out their contracts and pay their debts honestly, this Bill will afford them protection instead of proving detrimental to them. This Bill will prove troublesome only to that category of civil servants who shirk their honourable responsibilities and thus bring discredit upon their colleagues. Is there any hon. gentleman in this House who would deem it creditable to vindicate the conduct of dishonest employees who refuse to pay their debts? In my opinion, this Bill ought to commend itself to every member of this House, because it is framed in the best interests of the civil service employees, as it tends to enhance their credit and to keep them in the straight path, as it removes from them the temptation to which they might otherwise yield of not paying their honest debts.

The hon. member for Ste. Anne (Mr. Quinn) has strongly opposed the principle of this Bill which I have just endeavoured to vindicate. As to the objections which he has raised to it, I hardly think them well taken. The hon. gentleman laid much stress on the fact that some judges he is acquainted with are involved in debts, and should this Bill be crystallized into law, they might have their salaries seized under such a law, and it would be utterly impossible for them to remain on the Bench, and the country would thus be deprived of the services of some of our brightest men. Supposing that the fears given expression to by the hon. gentleman were realized, I fail to see what objection there could be to that, and how such an event could warrant us in shelving this Bill. For my part, I do not think such a fear is well grounded. And no doubt, the hon. gentleman has somewhat drawn from his fancy, as often happens in the heat of the debate. I am acquainted with a good many judges of the land and I do not know that a single one of those magistrates would have to suffer in the least from the adoption of this Bill by the House. In his zeal for the magistracy, the hon. gentleman should not forget that he is incurring the risk of placing that same magistracy on a rather discreditable pedestal, when endeavouring to show that with salaries of $5,000 a year, they cannot maintain the dignity of their position and pay their honest debts. Were such a state of things as that pointed out by the hon. gentleman prove true, it would warrant the belief that there are deplorable abuses to be eradicated, and the sooner the better. The hon. gentleman laid much stress on what he considered as an unfair and dishonest feature of this Bill, I mean the clause providing that it shall not apply to debts contracted before the passing of this Act. I must say, Sir, I was not a little amused at the assumed indignation of the hon. gentleman in this regard. In his opinion, it is unfair, it is even outrageous to pass a Bill providing for the attachment of the salaries of the civil service employees. Now, if the hon. gentleman were really in earnest and his opinion well matured, he ought to be grateful towards the promoter of this Bill, for having to a large extent removed the odium that might have attached to his Bill, by providing that it shall not be retroactive and shall not apply to any old debt contracted by any civil servant. For my part, I would not think it unfair if the law were made retroactive, so as to make the salaries of civil servants liable to attachment even for old debts. However, in order to allow the necessary latitude to the Government employees who so far, have relied on the exemption of their salaries from seizure, I shall not oppose the passage of the Bill in its present shape. At all events, it must be borne in mind that if any hardships were to result from this feature of the Bill, it would be the creditors who would be subjected to them, though it would be only partially so, as the object of the Bill is to remove a hardship which has existed for a long time. Now, I come to another objection raised to this Bill by some hon. gentlemen who contend, that if it were passed into law, it would cause considerable inconvenience and expense to the Government. In their opinion, a special machinery would have to be provided, and the result would be an army of lawyers employed throughout the Dominion, and another army of officials for the carrying out of the law. I think those objections are chimerical and ungrounded. And no better proof of it can be adduced than the way in which that system works in the province of Quebec. Here is the way it works in Quebec: A writ of attachment is served upon the head of the department in which the official whose salary is to be seized is employed. The head of the department is in no way compelled to attend in court or to send somebody to represent him in court for the purpose of making a declaration on his behalf; nor is he compelled to employ a lawyer to represent him. There are, in each department, certain forms of declarations, and all that is required is to establish the amount of salary due to the employee whose salary is garnisheed, and the amount of arrears due to the same. This declaration is forwarded to the prothonotary of the court which has issued the writ of attachment and judgment is given in favour of the creditor. When the judgment is issued, a copy of it is forwarded to the head of the department and then the accountant of the depart-

ment forwards to the judgment creditor that portion of the salary which falls due at the end of each month. Should there be several judgment creditors, the distribution is made at so much in the pound. On these several grounds, Mr. Chairman, I would be sorry to see this Bill rejected by the House, and for my part, I must say that I am very anxious that it should pass into law.

Mr. QUINN. Of course, Mr. Chairman, I could not allow the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) to put words in my mouth which I did not utter or distort my views for the purpose of furnishing himself with arguments. The hon. gentleman is a past master in that sort of thing, having served an apprenticeship to it in the North-west rebellion, where he earned, in this respect, an unenviable reputation. I never suggested that the judges of the province of Quebec wanted to avoid the payment of their just debts, but what I said is that there are very few men in this country raised to the bench without having spent considerable time either in this Parliament or some of the local legislatures, and without having contracted considerable political debts, to meet which their salaries are not sufficient without practising the strictest economy, which is not always consistent with the proper maintenance of the dignity of their position. What then will be the case if they are to be forced to devote one-third of their salaries to the payment of such debts? I do not mean to imply that they are in any respect dishonest. On the contrary, I maintain that the judges of our country are above suspicion and willingly curtail their personal expenses and practice the most rigid economy in order to meet these debts. Some of them are struggling under a load of debt, to meet which would require the payment of one-half of their salaries. But, apart from this view of the case, I say that it is an absurdity that a writ should issue to drag Her Majesty into Her Majesty's courts just as an ordinary private citizen may be brought into them. We should not forget that we are living under a limited monarchy and not a democratic form of government, and that the name of Her Majesty is consequently entitled to the greatest respect in this country. What procedure is necessary to obtain the payment of a just claim against any public department in this country which is disputed? A petition must be presented to Her Majesty asking her to deal justly with an individual claim. It has never been heard of under the laws of this country or the laws of England that any individual should have the right to sue Her Majesty and obtain judgment against her as against any private individual. My hon. friend, with that courtesy which is his distinguishing characteristic, informed the House that I was not in the same class with him, and was obliged to live on less than $5,000 per year. I did not say that I was in a position to spend $5,000 or $10,000 a year, nor did I say that I would accept a judgeship. It would be exceedingly premature in me to express any opinion on that latter point. This remark of his is only in keeping with a certain quality distinctive of him, which I am unable to describe without using language that would not be parliamentary, and which makes him always ready to talk about something of which he knows very little. If I would not accept a judgeship, one of the first reasons would be that if I accepted a salary of $5,000 a year, I could not, with the debts I have at present, be able to live. I make this confession openly, and there are very few lawyers who are not in the same position. We all have debts and try to pay them honestly, but do not always very well succeed; and when one of us does get a position on the bench, it will be very humiliating to have a bailiff come right into court and order him to pay over one-third of his salary to some creditor. Can it be said that a judge, under such circumstances, would be able to give that attention to his duties which would entitle him either to the salary he is paid or to the respect of those who are called on to plead before him.

I attack the principle of the Bill. I say that it is not in keeping with the institutions of our country and the form of government, under which we live, that Her Majesty should be compelled to come before any of her courts at the suit of a private individual. My hon. friend said he noticed that the hon. Prime Minister was taking notes. It was my intention to ask the right hon. gentleman to give his views on this subject. I know that they will be sound views, and if he is prepared to assume the responsibility of supporting this Bill, as a matter of principle, because that is the point on which I object to it, there cannot be any difficulty in the House adopting it.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I merely rise to make one observation with regard to the sneer which the hon. member—I regret that the rules of the House compel me to call him an hon. member.

Mr. QUINN. I rise to a point of order. The language of the hon. gentleman is not such as ought to be used in the House of Parliament.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I think that before I am through, I shall make it clear that I am perfectly right and within the rules.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I understand the hon. gentleman is discussing a point of order.

Mr. RICHARDSON. The hon. and distinguished-looking gentleman thought that

he would get a shot at me by retailing a little piece of small gossip which, I have reason to believe, was poured into his ears by another hon. member who sits near him.

Mr. QUINN. I submit that the hon. gentleman is not discussing the point of order I have raised.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to wish to discuss the point of order ?

Mr. RICHARDSON. The hon. gentleman's ways are like those of Providence, mysterious and past finding out, and I cannot make out what his point of order is.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. He claims that the language used by the hon. member is not parliamentary.

Mr. RICHARDSON. What is the language I used which he objects to ?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I did not hear anything unparliamentary fall from the lips of the hon. gentleman. Perhaps it was because I did not pay very much attention to what he said.

Mr. QUINN. The point of order I raised was that the language of the hon. gentleman was unparliamentary. In the first place he said that I sneered at him ; and, in the second place, he said that by parliamentary courtesy he was obliged to call me an hon. gentleman, otherwise he would not.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I understand that the hon. gentleman does not wish to say anything which could impute motives to the hon. member for Montreal, and besides I have no desire to use any language which would be unparliamentary.

Mr. RICHARDSON. No matter what I or other members may think about the hon. member for Montreal, I did not say anything that was unparliamentary, nor would I desire to do so, because I like to defer to the rules of the House on all occasions. I simply observed that I applied the word to him as it is applied in Mark Anthony's famous oration, when he laid particular stress upon it when saying, "they are all honourable men." He put an emphasis on the word "honourable" which I think it is parliamentary in me to put on the word when I apply it to the gentleman from Montreal. The hon. member detailed a small beer piece of gossip about myself in connection with the North-west rebellion, and I merely desire to say that I was not at the front during that rebellion and that any charges against me with regard to despatches sent during it were apologized for in the most abject manner in the press of Winnipeg. The parties who made them had to take them back, and they did so. If this House will only appoint a special committee to inquire into the past of my hon. friend and my own, I am quite willing to stand comparison with him or any other member of this House. I deprecate extremely this sort of thing, because it is not my practice to indulge in personalities in the conduct of debates ; for I like to confine myself to a discussion of the question on its merits. And when I criticised the statement of the hon. member for Montreal that these hard-working judges were unable to live on $5,000 a year and pay their debts, I think I am in the judgment of all hon. members that I said what was right and what will be endorsed by all those within hearing of my voice. I think that I am quite within the rule of the House when I say that the hon. gentleman, be he ever so learned in the law, did not understand what he was talking about tonight.

He persists in talking about the hardships that judges and others may be subjected to in having their salaries garnisheeable for past debts. Now, I have a clause in this Bill which distinctly exempts debts which existed prior to the passing of an Act. There is no hardship with regard to the past, for this Bill applies to the future. And when it becomes known throughout the length and breadth of this land that members of the Dominion civil service shall be placed on the same footing as every class in the community, I am quite satisfied that the best opinion in this country will approve the measure. I may tell hon. members of the House and I may tell the Government, that this is a far more serious question in the constituencies than they believe. People throughout this land have read about this Bill, and judging from the letters that have poured in upon me, I can see that they are very much in earnest with regard to it, that every man who votes against this Bill will be called upon by his constituents to say why the Dominion civil service shall be placed upon a pedestal and have privileges granted to them that are denied to other classes of the community. If I were asking for class legislation or singling out any class of this country against whom to direct an unjust law, I should expect to be driven from the Chamber in derision. But I am simply asking for righteous legislation, and I appeal to every hon. member to stand by me and see that this Bill is carried. I went into the same fight last session and was unable to reach my Bill. Five or six times has it come before the House this session, and we do not want to have it sidetracked any more. I would like to have a straight vote on the Bill, and I would like to have it now, and let every hon. member know that his constituents have their eyes upon him and that they will ask the reason why he should vote to place any class of the community upon a footing not enjoyed by others.

Mr. TISDALE. If the hon. gentleman would argue the question, he might enlighten

me. I am most desirous of voting right on this Bill, but if his is the right side, then he should be able to resolve these difficulties that confront us and have already been pointed out. The hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) spoke about lawyers. I am a lawyer, though it is a long time since I practiced law. I am proud to know that if the records of this country are searched, among the brightest, whether on the Liberal side or on the Conservative side, whether of living men or of dead men, will be found the records of the lawyers. And when the hon. member makes an insinuation of this sort, I, as one who years ago practiced at the bar, as one who took a pride and still takes pride in the bar of this country, whether in politics or in the courts, venture to tell him that it does not become him or any man to insinuate that the lawyers in this House are not as desirous as others of doing right as representatives of the people. I say that in passing. In one thing I agree with the hon. mover of his Bill, and that is in regarding this as a serious matter. But while he says it is a serious matter, I fail to see that he has even touched, much less answered, the arguments of the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Britton) and the hon. Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair). He has not shown wherein this Bill is applicable, he has not shown that the benefits it is supposed to bring are greater than the difficulties in the administration of it, he has not even shown that it would benefit even the very class in whose interest it is proposed. And yet the hon. gentleman almost threatens those who dare to stand up here and speak their minds on this question regardless of whether what they say is popular or not. I say that the legislator who stands up against what is apparently popular in the country is the man who probably has the best of the argument, and will be supported by the best public opinion, whether among Liberals or Conservatives. We who oppose this Bill, even if we do not express ourselves quite so well as we might desire, are yet endeavouring to give some reasons for the position we take, and not to make mere appeals to hon. members that are not supported by sufficient reasons. I understand that the Bill was postponed the other night, and, if so, we should have had better means of information upon it. I have no doubt but the hon. mover from what I have seen of him, expressed his views frankly. But had the Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick) been here to speak upon the matter, he could have spoken to us with authority, because it is his duty to guide the House in these matters. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Richardson) has spoken several times, but he has not touched the difficulties of the question, he has not shown that the Bill is practical or that it is constitutional. He has not shown how the law will be carried out. And in answer to what the hon. member for West Elgin has said, I may point out that none know better than lawyers that no legislation is more subversive of the respect for law, than that which will not serve the purpose for which it is passed, because it leads to unsatisfactory, to interminable contentions. In the very first section of this Bill, there are principles that could only be settled in my opinion, by going to the highest court of the Empire the Privy Council. One of these is the constitutional question. Are we then to be carried away by the appeals of the hon. gentleman—against whose motive I have not said one word and do not propose to. But in justice to my hon. friend from Montreal (Mr. Quinn) I venture to say that the hon. mover of this Bill has not presented his case with the good temper or calmness of argument that I should like. While I would like to see all proper means provided by law for the recovery of debts, I am not therefore convinced that it is wise to pass such a law as this, which according to my own judgment and the opinion of those upon whose opinion on such matters I rely, will not accomplish enough good to counterbalance the harm that it will do. The second objection and one that was presented very strongly by the Minister of Railways is that the hon. gentleman did not attempt to show how it would be possible to carry out the law without hampering the Government with great difficulties and great expenditures. I am not so much in love with garnishee proceedings as some people might be. While they have served some good purposes, they have not been the cheap remedy that is sometimes thought even in simple procedure, and we in Ontario have the simplest and best system that I have ever read of. I shall not be suspected of saying too much on behalf of the Ministers, but I do say that the Ministers and their departments are overworked in coping with the many difficulties that arise in the administration of the affairs of an increasing population in a great and rapidly developing country.

The hon. gentleman says that ten cases are enough to justify all this. He acknowledges himself that it is not the general rule, and still we are ridiculed because we decline to stand up and support a measure so ill-considered. We are asked here to delegate the powers of this Parliament to the provinces, because the Bill says: "According to the laws and rules of procedure in force in the different provinces. I say that is absurd. Let the provinces legislate for themselves, and let us legislate for ourselves, and keep within our powers. In conclusion, I repeat that the well-considered arguments of the hon. member for Kingston and of the Minister of Railways and Canals, besides the result of my own study of the subject, have convinced me that it would be wise for us not to pass this measure at present.

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. member for Lisgar says that last session he devoted a great deal of time to the consideration of this Bill. The hon. gentleman introduced this Bill (No. 14), and during its first trial before this Parliament he abandoned every principle he had put into the Bill. I should suppose that if he had given the Bill any consideration at all, he would surely have consulted the department of Justice to find out whether it was within the competency of this Parliament. I wish to draw attention to the Bill that he abandoned, notably, to section 3. I find that the Solicitor General, when expressing his views on this question, spoke as follows :—

> It is provided here by paragraph 3 how the creditors are to proceed to levy a judgment. I say that is a matter to be settled by the provincial courts ; it is a matter over which we have no control, with which we cannot deal at all. Clearly, then, we have got to eliminate, at all events, that part of the Bill entirely from our consideration.

The hon. gentleman, no doubt, discovered at that time that this section of the Bill was not within the right of this Parliament to pass, and therefore he abandoned the third section. We find here to-night that he has introduced section number 1 of which has been read to the House, and here is the opinion of the Solicitor Genaral with respect to the principle involved in section 1 :

> Suppose we declare here that the salaries of public officials in the employ of the Federal Government are attachable, and find ourselves in Quebec face to face with the statute there which declares that they are not attachable, immediately a conflict of authority would arise, which it seems to me desirable we should avoid.

Now, if there is any doubt about this Bill at all, if it is liable to create dissension between this Parliament and the province of Quebec, surely a little delay in passing it, or even its rejection, would not be out of place until we have the opinion of the Solicitor General as to whether we have a right to pass this section.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not know whether it is constitutional for us to pass such a law ; it is my business to ask or answer that question. But if we have the right, I do not see any objection to the Bill. I have always held that there should be no class of the community exempt from paying their debts ; they should all stand upon the same footing with regard to discharging the legal obligations against them in the ordinary transactions of life. It seems to me that if we have the right to pass such a law, it would not be out of place for us to pass it, and the sooner the better.

Mr. BEATTIE. I would like to put this case before the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson). In the province of Ontario it is well known that every man is exempt to the extent of $25, and how is he going to get over a case like that in the province of Ontario to-day ? He says that we should put the civil servants on the same basis as every other man. I hold he is doing the very reverse, because every man in the province of Ontario, by a law passed twenty years ago, is exempt to the extent of $25, and cannot be garnisheed.

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). I have not heard the discussion of this Bill, and have only looked it over since I came in to-night, but on general principles I may say that I am in favour of the principles of the Bill. However, reasons have been advanced why this Bill should not be carried. The case of judges has been mentioned, and I may say at once that I think the poorest citizen of this country should have the same right as a judge or any other man receiving $5,000 or $10,000 a year. The poor labouring man has to pay his debts, and I do not see why a man receiving a higher salary should be exempted from paying his debts also. However, we find that banking institutions and large corporations in Great Britain and Canada who employ many men, will not retain employees who do not pay their debts. The Bank of Montreal will not retain a man in their employ unless he pays his debts. If the passage of this Bill would cause any annoyance to the Government in the different departments, then let the Government make a rule that if a man does not pay his debts he shall be dismissed from the employment of that department. If that were done, I think there would not be any difficulty. Let it be known that if a man is not prepared to pay his bills he shall make room in the civil servince for a man who will pay. We know that such a rule prevails in the banking institutions and other large corporations of this country, and I think such a rule would answer the purpose very much better than this Bill.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I want to add just one word to what I have already said. My hon. friend who is promoting this Bill has made an earnest appeal to the members of this committee to support him in passing it. Now, I think I would be justified in making a counter appeal to my hon. friend. I can assure him that I am sincerely desirous of assisting him in any legislation he may wish to promote, so far as I possibly can do so. But my hon. friend ought not to expect the members of this House to support a Bill which, in their judgment and conscience, they cannot approve, merely because he is anxious to see it pass. He is asking us to subordinate our judgment to his, and to abdicate our function for the purpose of helping him in passing a Bill that he thinks ought to be passed. I believe those who are opposed to this Bill hold opinions quite as strong as those of my hon. friend in favour of the Bill. I feel myself that the Bill ought not to pass, and I cannot vote for it. I think my hon.

friend is hardly presenting this question fairly. He is assuming that we who are not in favour of this Bill oppose it because we are willing or desire to extend some special consideration to the civil servants which we are not willing to extend to other classes in the community.

My hon. friend is rather reversing the arguments in the case; he is approaching and examining it from an entirely different standpoint from that from which it is being approached by those who oppose the Bill. It is not a question of extending favours or immunity to civil servants; that is not the view in which the strongest objections appeal to my judgment. It is because the Bill is against the public interest that I am opposed to it. I am not desirous of withholding or conferring privileges or immunity on the civil service that is not conferred on or withheld from any other class in the community, but I feel strongly that the general interests of the public are of greater moment and higher consideration than the individual interests which are appealed to in connection with the present Bill. Whether A can obtain judgment of his debt due from B or not is not a matter of public interest, but it is a question whether the administration of this country would be in any degree hampered by the adoption of such a law as is proposed. It is because I am convinced of the importance of this point that I am not prepared to agree with the principle of the Bill. There is no question that in some of the Government branches there are already ample means of protection afforded in the interest of creditors. Take the case of the Intercolonial Railway. Thousands of men are employed on the Government road, and for about two years the Government have enforced an order which makes it obligatory on employees to pay their bills, otherwise they place their positions in jeopardy. The effect is, that while we have some complaints, and we cannot hope to remove all causes of complaint on the part of creditors, it is having a very salutary effect, and after a while we will achieve the desired result. I will say to my hon. friend (Mr. Richardson) that even if the committee were in favour of this Bill, we cannot pass this clause. If we pass the clause it would be utterly unworkable. It would not afford a particle of relief to any creditor. There is no way provided in the Bill whereby you could take any action against any civil servant or employee under the Crown. There is no machinery provided for doing it. There is no machinery provided by the provincial legislatures to accomplish it. We have no right to declare by Act of Parliament that a man's salary should be liable to attachment. I would not like to see such a declaration pass this House. With all respect to the hon. gentleman who introduced the Bill and those associated with him, it would not be creditable to us to pass through this House the clause which declares as to who should or what should be liable to attachment. We cannot do it. Then if it is going to be law, it will be necessary to provide some machinery, which is not provided by the Bill, whereby the Queen can be sued. You cannot take one single step in order to enforce a remedy against the Crown unless Her Majesty permits herself to be a party to the action. The Queen can only be sued upon a petition of right, a fiat has to be granted by the Government. Some provision to meet such a case will have to be adopted. I say, with all good feeling towards the hon. gentleman who has introduced this Bill, that it is not in the shape in which it can be passed, even if we thought the principle one that should be adopted.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I have only a word to say in reply to the Minister of Railways. What are laymen to do when they find lawyers disagree among themselves? I brought down a Bill early in the session providing that garnishees should be served upon the Federal Government. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who is an able lawyer, suggested the present form of the Bill, and I have adopted his suggestion and introduced it as now framed. Then half a dozen able lawyers who are members of the House looked over the clauses and said the Bill was exactly what was wanted. What are laymen like myself, and other hon. members behind me, to do under these circumstances? The Minister of Railways is undoubtedly a very able lawyer, and so is the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, but their opinions differ.

An hon. MEMBER. And the hon. member for Montreal.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I could not say as much for the hon. member for Montreal. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries looked over the Bill and said it was all right. The present position should induce every layman to vote for the Bill. If it is not workable, let a case be taken to the Privy Council and settle the question whether we are able to garnishee the salaries of civil servants or not. I know the Minister of Railways has great influence in this House and that his speech will have a powerful influence on hon. members, but I would appeal to all laymen to draw their own conclusions when they find the lawyers differ; and I say, let us have the vote right now.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) has been rather severe on the lawyers in the House, but he has shown himself to be the best friend of the lawyers, because he has admitted that he is not quite sure about the jurisdiction, and he thinks the best way would be to take a case before the different tribunals and up to the Privy Council. That is certainly helping the lawyers. I do not wish for a moment to express an opinion as

to the principle of the Bill; but surely the hon. gentleman will see that the House is unprepared, more especially in view of the scanty information it has received, to take up this measure now. The hon. gentleman has given one reason for passing it which does not at all apply. He said that a case presented itself to his knowledge in which a civil servant had built a marble altar in his house, and the tradesman could not get paid. But that is not a question of salary. If the hon. gentleman will consult the eminent lawyers sitting behind, some of whom seem to approve this Bill, they will tell him that the case does not come under the purview of this Bill. A man who has been working in a house or building a house has his recourse at law, which would not be in the least affected by this Bill. I should like to know from the hon. gentleman whether he has looked into this question. The jurisdiction of this Parliament in so far as the law is concerned is limited. Civil rights are protected by the provincial legislatures. The hon. gentleman cannot tell me that we can legislate here and declare that the departments can be garnisheed for the debts of individuals, although it might be all right if one special federal law could be made applicable to the whole Dominion. But when you travel from the province and enter into another province, the law is different.

The laws in Quebec are protected by treaty, and have been in existence ever since the province came under the British Crown, but they differ from the laws of the other provinces. As one, who has had some little experience in official life, I say that we should not make the departments of Government collecting agencies for merchants who with their eyes open have taken the risk of giving credit. I say that a Minister of the Crown has more than enough to do, without placing upon him the extra duties which this Bill will force him to undertake. I hold, Sir, that the law officers of the Crown should pronounce upon this Bill before it becomes law, and should say whether or not, it interferes with the rights of the provinces to such an extent as to be ultra vires of this Parliament.

Committee divided: Yeas, 50; nays, 23.

Mr. RICHARDSON moved that the following form part of the Bill as clause 2:—

This Act shall not apply to debts contracted before the passing of this Act

Motion agreed to.

Bill reported.

SAFETY OF RAILWAY EMPLOYEES AND PASSENGERS.

Mr. CASEY. I beg to remind the Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair) of the understanding that was come to when Bill (No. 14) was allowed to take precedence over my Bill, which stood first on the Order paper to-night.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Call the order now.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is it the pleasure of the House that the order for consideration of Bill (No. 4) be again considered.

Order called,

The House again resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 4) further to secure safety of railway employees and passengers.—(Mr. Casey.)

(In the Committee.)

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I have not heard the hon. gentleman state whether he got the opinion of the Minister of Justice or not.

Mr. CASEY. It is not my place to get the opinion of the Minister of Justice. The hon. Minister of Railways himself was to get the opinion of the Minister of Justice, and the opinion of the Minister of Justice, whatever weight it might justly bear, would come before this House only as an opinion. Nobody's opinion is decisive, either for or against the constitutionality of this or any other Bill. We have known the most distinguished lawyers now in this House support Bills, and have them carried through, which were afterwards knocked endways by the Privy Council; we have known other Bills, which were put through by laymen, sustained by the Privy Council; and I do not propose to take anybody's opinion as absolutely conclusive on this question. But if there is anybody who should bring the opinion of the Minister of Justice, it is the hon. gentleman who is opposing this Bill. I say this Bill is all right, its clauses are constitutional, and the country demands them, and if anybody opposes them, let him bring some authoritative opinion or some authoritative decision against them.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. My hon. friend from West Elgin (Mr. Casey) may be quite right, but I take it that the Minister of Railways would have sought, if he required to seek it, the opinion of the law officers of the Crown upon this question. I do not consider that he required to go to the law officers of the Crown for the information he required. His experience in his own department would make him the Minister who should give information to the House upon a Bill of this sort, and I think my hon. friend from West Elgin is wrong in supposing that we should dispense with the opinion of the Minister of Railways.

Mr. CASEY. I am not saying anything about the Minister of Railways.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I think it is most important that we should get the opinion of the Minister of Railways. The fact that Bills introduced by laymen happened to be good Bills does not at all remove the objection I would have to any measure against which the leaders of the House, on whatever side they might happen to be, have expressed their opinion. I think we have to look to the Treasury benches for opinions on the measures that come before the House, and I would ask the hon. Minister of Railways what his opinion is upon this.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I ventured to express to the committee, on the two previous occasions when this Bill came up, the judgment I had formed as to the competence of this Parliament to pass the clauses up to the general heading of section 7. The first evening that the matter came to my notice, I expressed doubt upon it; the next evening I was a little stronger in my doubt; and I am stronger to-night than I was when I last stated my view to the committee. I am very much inclined to believe that this seventh section is not within our legislative competency. My hon. friend does not have very much respect for the opinion of lawyers because lawyers differ, and yet it is by lawyers that these questions are ultimately determined. That is my view, and I leave it with that statement.

Mr. CASEY. My hon. friend must not think that I have no respect for the opinion of lawyers.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am not at all sensitive on that point.

Mr. CASEY. But we have had such distinguished lawyers as my hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) giving opinions in this House, and carrying Bills through this House, backed by the Government of the day, which turned out not to be worth the paper on which they were written when they came before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. I am not saying that it was his fault. It may have been the other lawyers who were wrong. I am only trying to emphasize the fact that you can never be sure of a legal or constitutional position until the question is decided by the Privy Council. And I say that until there is an authoritative decision of that highest court which can be quoted to show, even by analogy, that a measure which I or anybody else proposes in this House is unconstitutional, this House has a right to assume that it has the power to pass it, each member of the House exercising his individual judgment on the question, and each member voting according to his own individual opinion without regard to mere opinions given by legal gentlemen, however eminent. That is the stand I take in regard to these clauses. I have laid them before the House as part of the Bill. It is for the House to say whether it will take the responsibility of passing them or not. I intend that the House shall take the responsibility of accepting them or throwing them out, and that the Bill shall not be dropped, or these clauses dropped out of it merely by a side wind. The question is much too important, and has been much too long before the country to be decided in any other way than by a vote on the merits of the question, pro or con. My opinion as to the constitutionality of the Bill has the support of some lawyers.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Are they members of this House?

Mr. CASEY. One, at least, is a member of this House, and was a member of the committee on this Bill. I refer to the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Powell). His opinion as a lawyer has been taken, even by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, within the last week or two, in amendments to legislation; and his opinion is in favour of the constitutionality of these clauses. He approved of them in the committee, and he told me that he going to speak in favour of them, and urge their constitutionality, if the Bill came up. Not being a lawyer, I am not going to discuss the constitutional question, any further than I have already done on the two former occasions when it was discussed. This is the third time that the Bill has been before the committee, and I must leave it to the committee to say whether it will accept these clauses or not.

Mr. WALLACE. For my part, I am most heartily in accord with the Bill. In the first place, on the clauses providing safeguards for the employees, I think there ought to be no difference of opinion.

Mr. CASEY. That is all passed.

Mr. WALLACE. I am speaking of the whole Bill.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. member must confine his remarks to the clause under discussion—clause 7.

Mr. WALLACE. I am coming to that. I am also discussing the other clauses, and I am quite within my right to do it.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I do not think the hon. gentleman has any right to discuss the other clauses of the Bill.

Mr. WALLACE. If necessary, I will move that the committee rise, and then I can discuss what I please. I wish to promote the passage of the Bill. I was referring,

when you called me to order, to the fact that the Bill was divided into two parts, and I was coming to the second part. The railway companies are the only business people in this country whose business steadily increases. The business of every railroad that has been built originally on any business basis, has year by year, or at any rate in every decade, largely increased. Years ago the Grand Trunk Railway was doing but a small fragment of the business it is doing to-day. I remember when it was said that the Canadian Pacific Railway, when it became a competing line with the Grand Trunk Railway, would largely decrease the business of the Grand Trunk Railway. But experience has shown that the business of the Canadian Pacific Railway has grown exceedingly, and that the business of the Grand Trunk Railway has doubled and trebled on these same competitive lines. The country is improving, and the railroads get the advantage of the country's improvement and progress more than any other class of the community. The men who are employed on these railroads are undergoing great risks in the interests of the company they work for, and in order that the whole community—because almost the whole community travel more or less on the railroads—may have protection and safety. These men are risking their lives in order to carry goods and passengers safely, and it is no more than a fair proposition that the railway companies, which are growing large and wealthy, could, in the first place, be compelled to protect the lives of people using their lines, by means of the most improved machinery, and in the second place that where accidents occur, the railways should clearly assume responsibility for them. That is what section 7 provides. It seems to me that there is no clause in that 7th section which does not commend itself to the fairness of any one who is a disinterested citizen. It simply provides, in every case, for fair-play to the employee and imposes no hardship or injustice upon the railway companies. It has been suggested by the hon. Minister of Railways that it may not be constitutional. He has expressed, however, no positive opinion upon that point. The Minister of Justice who was to have examined into it and give his opinion has not reported, and I presume he has not reported because he could not report adversely to it. The Minister of Justice was in the House of Commons for many years, when the principle of this Bill was frequently submitted to the consideration of this House, and is quite familiar with every subsection of section 7; and if I remember rightly—though I would not like to speak positively—he always expressed a favourable opinion of it. If that be the case, the House need have no hesitation in endorsing it as a very just and equitable measure.

Mr. CLARKE. I shall have very great pleasure in casting my vote in favour of this Bill, for I have received a great many letters from men employed by railway companies, asking me to do so, and have not heard a word from any particular interest against it. If it is in the competence of Parliament to pass this Bill. I do not think any one will assert that the railway companies will ask the shareholders to set apart a portion of their profits for the purpose of paying the compensation provided for by section 7. The public generally will have to provide the necessary moneys by the payment of increased fares and rates; and in view of the hazardous nature of the employment in which the railway employees are engaged, it is only reasonable and just that exceptional legislation should be passed in their interest. We know that time and again, in cases before the courts arising out of accidents, the railways appeal from court to court, and in many instances employees who had been injured, and who had obtained judgment in the first court, were unable, from want of means, to press their claims through the higher courts, and had either to abandon them or accept an unjust compromise. The provision is a reasonable one and will be endorsed by the great body of railway servants and the people of this country.

Mr. DAVIN. It shall have my hearty support, and I hope we will go on and carry this legislation through Parliament.

Mr. INGRAM. We have not had the objection of the railway companies stated, and perhaps it is only fair that it should be made known to the House. The law, as it now stands, puts the onus on the employee to prove negligence on the part of the company, but this Bill will put the onus on the company to prove negligence on the part of the employee. The railway companies hold that as this is a new country, requiring the construction of a great number of miles of railway, the effect of this would be to prevent capitalists from investing in railway construction, under the belief that this legislation would work such a radical change as to entail very heavy expenditure on railway companies to meet claims for compensation. That is the argument of the railway companies against this section. Personally, as a member of the committee on this Bill, having listened to the evidence of employees from different parts of Canada and to the representatives of the railway companies, I am strongly in favour of the Bill. I believe it is a step in the right direction. The occupation of railway employees is a very dangerous one, and every safeguard should be thrown around it. A few years ago I went carefully into the number of accidents that had occurred in this country and the United States, and was astonished to find that many thousands of men were yearly

killed in the United States and Canada and thousands of others injured, by losing legs, and arms, and so on, and I think it is the duty of Parliament to place around the employees of these companies all the barriers possible to prevent accidents.

The PRIME MINISTER. This section goes much further than has been stated by my hon. friend who has just taken his seat.

Mr. INGRAM. I have particular reference to the subsection.

The PRIME MINISTER. The hon. gentleman stated that the object of this section was simply to reverse the well known rule that any body making a claim for compensation, as the result of accident, is bound to prove negligence on the part of the party against whom he makes the claim. That principle is now to be reversed, and it will be for the defendant to prove negligence on the part of the claimant. But the Bill goes much further. It makes the company liable whether it has been guilty of negligence or not. An accident may occur through the negligence of a company but it may also occur without any negligence on the part of the company or anybody else. Suppose a freshet takes place which destroys a section of railway, if an accident should happen and an employee became disabled, he would be entitled, under this Bill to compensation, though there was no negligence, either on the part of the company or the employee. The principle is one which I am not prepared, either to combat or affirm. The Government desires to have and will have the opinion of the Department of Justice upon this question. We have not been able to have it up to this time, not for the reason given by the hon. member for York (Mr. Wallace) but because the Minister of Justice unhappily has been called away from the Capital owing to sickness and death in his family. However, I do not wish to keep back this Bill at all, so we may have the section passed and simply reserve the action of the Government for future occasion.

Mr. INGRAM. In answer to the hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) I may say that while this subject was put before the committee the question was put to the employees who were there whether they would expect compensation in the case of an accident which was not the fault of the company or of an employee, but that was, as might be said, the act of Providence. For instance, if, on a frosty day a train were passing over a line and a engine ran off the track owing to a broken rail, but through the fault of nobody, would they expect compensation ? This case was put to them, and they said decidedly not. So far as my judgment is concerned, I believe that the Bill could be framed on that line.

The PRIME MINISTER. Then the Bill will have to be amended.

Mr. INGRAM.

Mr. McHUGH. I do not wish to speak on the constitutionality of the Bill, but I am in sympathy with the object of it. I see that it is a Bill designed for the protection of human life, and I think that is an object to be promoted even if it does involve the forcing of some obligations upon railway companies. I hope to see the Bill become law even if, in an amended form. I have received petitions from very respectable parties, employees of railways, asking me to support the Bill. I believe that the railway employees do not wish to ask for anything unreasonable. Let the Bill be amended so as to be in accordance with reason and justice, and I believe the committee and the House will adopt it.

Mr. TISDALE. I submit to the Prime Minister that there would be some difficulty unless the understanding was that we should get back in committee with regard to this clause 7. There are a number of propositions there that it would be useless to discuss, upon which the opinion of the Minister of Justice should be expressed. But, to attempt to discuss the matter on the third reading would be unwise, because the discussion could not be carried on so freely.

The PRIME MINISTER. Let us pass the clause. If the Minister of Justice reports against it, we would have to strike it out. If he is in favour of it, we can adopt the principle, but the whole section will have to be recast.

Mr. CASEY. I propose to add something to the Bill. There was another Bill which equally passed the special committee last year. It was introduced by my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean) and provided for the use on railway trains of automatic couplings and air brakes. I would like to add the provisions of that Bill to my own, as my hon. friend has not introduced this Bill this year. As my hon. friend practically has a prescriptive right to the proposals in that Bill, I did not introduce them in mine, but, as his measure of last year is not before the House, I propose to add them, and I move that they be added as sections 8, 9 and 10 of this Bill.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Does not my hon. friend (Mr. Casey) think it would be better to give notice of this amendment ?

Mr. CASEY. Very well, let that stand as a notice to be moved on the third reading.

Mr. TISDALE. We cannot discuss it on third reading with the same freedom.

The PRIME MINISTER. I do not think that clauses should be tacked to this Bill in this way. It is hardly fair to the committee that we should have this hasty legislation on this important matter.

Mr. CASEY. These have been just as long before the House, and have been fully accepted by the House as the provisions of the present Bill.

The PRIME MINISTER. But that Bill has not been introduced this year.

Mr. CASEY. No, but I propose to add the clauses to my Bill, and I have given notice that I will move, on the third reading, to refer the Bill back to committee to make these amendments.

Mr. ELLIS. With regard to the objections I took to the Bill on a former occasion that it should be made to apply only to the roads under the jurisdiction of the Dominion I offered an amendment covering the first six sections. I would like to move it now. It is as follows :

The first six sections of this Bill shall not apply to any railway within the limits of any one province, unless the same is declared by the Parliament of Canada to be for the general advantage of Canada or of two or more provinces.

It was quite understood by the committee, I think, that this Bill should not apply to railroads that were so poor and had such difficult work that some of them were not even able to pay their employees.

Mr. CASEY. But they are rich enough to kill their employees.

Mr. ELLIS. We all have to take some risks in this world.

Mr. CASEY. I quit agree with the understanding in committee as stated by my hon. friend from St. John's (Mr. Ellis). We understood that this legislation would not apply to any railways except those under the control of the Dominion of Canada, and I have no objection to saying so in so many words.

Mr. TISDALE. That is introducing a principle that I think we had better leave alone. Surely we are not going to pass both a positive and a negative law. It is clear that the laws we pass relate only to railways under our jurisdiction. If my hon. friend thinks there is any doubt about it, he had better consult the Minister of Justice.

Mr. INGRAM. It is not necessary that the amendment of the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Ellis) should be tacked on to this Bill. I do not understand that the committee has any power to promote a Bill affecting railways wholly under the control of a provincial legislature, but only those under the control of the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. ELLIS. Although the hon. gentleman may have given a great deal of attention to the Bill, he evidently does not understand the effect of the 7th section of the Bill. It was the understanding in the committee that in the case of those railways in the smaller provinces that were just living from day to day, it was not advisable to enforce against them restrictions which are no doubt necessary in the case of others. My hon. friend from South Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale) says that there can be no doubt about this. But there is doubt about it, and the Bill as drawn would seem to convey the idea that it applies to all the railways in the country.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. It is quite certain that we cannot legislate for any railway that does not come under the jurisdiction of this Parliament. The only railways which are recognized as being affected by the jurisdiction of this Parliament, are those which are declared to be for the general benefit of Canada. Now, surely, as my hon. friend says, we are not going to adopt a clause stating that we do not consider that a law passed by this Parliament can affect a railway that does not come under our jurisdiction. I think to do so would make our legislation ridiculous. The clause had better be dropped.

The PRIME MINISTER. Perhaps I may suggest to my hon. friend that as this Bill must be referred to the Minister of Justice, the amendment might also be referred to him at the same time ; and that, therefore, it would be better not to press it now.

Bill, as amended, reported.

RETURNS ORDERED.

Copies of all Orders in Council, complaints, depositions, reports, correspondence, papers and other documents in relation to the dismissal of Mr. Elzéar Lanouette, postmaster of St Anne de la Pérade, and to the appointment of his successor.—(Mr. Marcotte, by Sir Adolphe Caron.)

Return showing the number of acres seeded in 1897, the nature of the seed sown, and the amount of crops grown on each Indian reserve in the provisional district of Assiniboia during the year ending the 31st December, 1897.—(Mr. Davin.)

Copies of all correspondence, estimates, tenders, reports and petitions addressed to the Government in reference to the proposed works upon River St. Pierre in the vicinity of the Lachine Canal, and the dredging, deepening and widening of the said river.—(Mr. Monk.)

Copies of correspondence and reports addressed to the Militia Department concerning accidental shooting at Côte St. Luc ranges, of a farmer named Larose, of the parish of St. Laurent, in Jacques Cartier county.—(Mr Monk.)

ADJOURNMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

The PRIME MINISTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Might I ask the right hon. leader of the House what he intends taking up to-morrow ?

The PRIME MINISTER. The Plebiscite Bill to-morrow.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 11 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 3rd May, 1898.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

DOMINION LANDS ACT AMENDMENT.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 130) further to amend the Dominion Lands Act.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The first two sections of the Bill are provisions empowering the senior assistant in the land office to take certain affidavits. The third section provides that a certain quantity of the Dominion lands may be withdrawn from ordinary sale or settlement for the purpose of enabling a group of settlers to occupy the land on the hamlet system, under which a certain portion of the total area of the land will be cultivated instead of a certain portion of each quarter section. Section 4 provides for the taking of affidavits by a clerk. Section 5 is for the purpose of bringing the provisions relating to the amount of cultivation required on a second homestead into conformity with the rest of the Act. At present a person who takes up a pre-emption as a second homestead has to cultivate forty acres, but if he takes up a second homestead not a pre-emption, he does not have to do so. The purpose of the section is to make the law consistent. Section 6 is in reality an amendment of the amendment of the Dominion Lands Act which was passed last session, and the purpose of which was to enable the settler who took a second homestead adjoining his first homestead, after he had received his patent for his first homestead, to put in his residence on his first homestead. It is found undesirable to compel the settler to remove from the first homestead and to put up a shanty on the adjoining land and live there; but the clause was so drawn that it only applied in case the farmer who took up the second homestead had obtained a patent for the land upon which he was living as a homestead. Immediately after the Act passed a number of cases arose in which persons who bought land and improved it had taken up adjoining lands as homesteads. Of course, there did not seem to be any reason for treating them differently from others, and this recasting of the clause will put them in the same position. Section 7 is simply for the purpose of more clearly defining the meaning of the section. The section as it stands is difficult of interpretation. It required that a homesteader should prove:

That he has fulfilled three years' residence upon the land which is the subject of his entry, if the land is a homestead, and upon his homestead if the land is pre-emption, in accordance with the provisions as to three years' residence upon a homestead, which are contained and explained in this Act.

Section 7 amends subsection "a" of clause 10 of section 4 of the Dominion Lands Act, as amended by chap. 29 of the Act of 1897. That subsection provides that the Minister or the commissioner of Dominion lands or the Dominion lands board must be satisfied that the settler has fulfilled three years residence upon the land which is the subject of his entry, if the land is a homestead, and upon his homestead if the land is pre-emption, in accordance with the provisions as to three years residence upon a homestead which are contained and explained in this Act.

The wording of that is somewhat confusing, and I propose to change it by simply providing, in lieu thereof, that the Minister or commissioner shall be satisfied that the settler has fulfilled three years residence within the meaning of this clause.

Section 8 of the Bill is inserted for the purpose of giving the board of examiners of Dominion land surveyors the power to allow certain provincial land surveyors to become Dominion land surveyors upon passing a special examination. This is inserted at the request of the board of Dominion land surveyors.

Section 9 of the Bill provides a penalty for any defacing or removal of survey posts. A good deal of difficulty has occurred in the North-west Territories and Manitoba by reason of the removal of survey posts, and the Deputy Minister of Justice has suggested this section for the purpose of getting rid of this difficulty.

Section 10 provides that a person entitled to make a homestead entry may select as his homestead one or more of the legal subdivisions of any section which comprise one-quarter section, and if the area he takes up is not greater than 80 acres, he may be granted his entry therefor for one-half of the amount of the fee exacted for the homestead entry of the whole quarter section.

Section 11 gives power to the Government to make certain exchanges of lands with the Manitoba Government. These exchanges have in reality been provided for—some of them some years ago—and the question arose whether the lands given the Dominion in exchange shall be deemed Dominion lands. This section provides that they shall be Dominion lands, subject to administration under this law.

Section 12 reads:

The Minister of the Interior may withdraw from general sale and settlement, under the

homestead provisions of the said Act, any lands in the North-west Territories which he believes to be so arid as to be unsuited for proper cultivation without the aid of irrigation, and he may dispose thereof to any persons for such price, upon such terms, and subject to such conditions as to the colonization or settlement thereof and as to the cultivation thereof by the aid of irrigation, as the Governor in Council fixes and determines.

Section 13 provides that when a time sale is cancelled, the department may allow the land which thus reverts to the Crown to be homesteaded; but may fix a price to the land in addition to the homestead conditions, if deemed advisable.

Sections 14, 15, 16 and 17 were drafted by the Deputy Minister of Justice for the purpose of providing legal machinery for the ejectment of persons wrongfully in possession of Dominion lands.

Mr. DAVIN. I would ask the hon. gentleman whether, in the case of those communities whose settlement he proposes to facilitate, they will be allowed to settle on the odd and even-numbered sections alike? He said that he was providing, by the first section, for the withdrawing from general sale and settlement, under the ordinary homestead provisions, any available Dominion lands, for the purposes of such associations. I did not catch whether these comprise odd and even-numbered sections.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Both, where we can do it.

Mr. DAVIN. With regard to section 10, what has led the hon. gentleman to revert to the division of 160 acres into 80-acre homesteads? Has there been any demand for that? At one time we did have 80-acre homesteads, and we did not find that work very well.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I am not reverting to that at all. All I am providing is that if a man comes along and finds 80 acres of Dominion lands, he may take them up as a homestead. The Act at present provides that he can only homestead a quarter of a section.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES ACTS.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 131) further to amend the Acts respecting the North-west Territories. He said: Section 1 is for the purpose of striking out the words "Lieutenant-Governor in Council," and inserting instead the words "Legislative Assembly" in the clause giving power to legislate respecting education in the North-west Territories. Last session a Bill was introduced largely amending the constitutional Act of the North-west Territories, and changing, amongst other things, the definition of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council. The Lieutenant-Governor in Council now means what it means in the provinces—acting by and with the advice of the Executive Council. Under the old Act it meant the Lieutenant-Governor acting by and with the advice of the legislative body which was called a council. Last session, although the amending Act was carefully revised, this clause was overlooked, so that it was found that the legislative power rested with the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, and not with the legislative assembly. Section 2 of the Act will be struck out in committee. Section 3 provides that the Supreme Court in the North-west Territories may sit at such places as the Lieutenant-Governor in Council may appoint. At present the Supreme Court is compelled to sit at Regina, and the judges desire the power to sit at Calgary at times, because a large amount of litigation arises there. It is at their request that this provision is inserted.

Section 4 may give rise to some discussion when the Bill comes to a further stage. It is for the purpose of removing the disqualification which exists in the case of officers of the Dominion Government, preventing them from sitting in the legislative assembly in the North-west Territories.

Mr. DAVIN. The first section is an important amendment, and it was to provide for such an amendment that I gave notice of a Bill, but waited to see if the hon. gentleman would bring one forward. Has the hon. gentleman considered whether the action taken since the passing of the Act of last session by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council in regard to education is valid?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I discussed that with Mr. Haultain, and he was satisfied to leave it to the legislature to re-enact what they have done rather than that we should undertake to do it here.

Mr. DAVIN. In regard to clause 3, he says that it is introduced at the request of the judges. Do I understand that the judges wish to sit in banc in Calgary and elsewhere?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There is no suggestion that they wish to sit elsewhere, but it is suggested that they should sit at Calgary, and they want this Bill passed so that it will be within their power to do so if they see fit.

Mr. DAVIN. I was under the impression that some persons had wished that the sitting in banc should be perambulatory, but my impression, after talking with the judges was that they do not wish that, but they wish it to be stationary.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. That is as it was represented to me. I will look it up and see if there is any correspondence on the subject.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

LAND TITLES ACT AMENDMENT.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 132) further to amend the Land Titles Act, 1894. He said: I think it would be better for me to defer explanation of this Bill, which is a long and somewhat involved measure relating to real property in the North-west Territories, until we get to the committee stage.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

BOUNTY WARRANT EXTENSION.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 133) to make further provision respecting grants of land to members of the militia force on active service in the North-west. He said: After the rebellion of 1885 an Act was passed providing for certain grants of land to persons who had served in the militia. Under this Act the Governor in Council made grants of homestead or scrip, generally known as bounty warrants. There was a time limit placed upon persons who had served, under which they were required to make application. This time limit was extended, I believe, in 1891, again in 1892, also in 1893 and, I think, in 1894. Within the last few weeks certain persons have sent in a request to have it extended again, so as to allow parties who desire to do so to put in applications. I saw no objection to their doing so and the Bill is to give them this privilege.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

CLAIMS OF A. E. KILLAM.

Mr. McINERNEY. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to ask the Government when they propose to bring down the correspondence, papers and documents ordered on the 30th March last concerning the claim made by A. E. Killam for cattle injured or killed at Chandler's Cutting on the Intercolonial Railway. I may explain that about thirteen days ago I spoke of this matter to the Minister of Railways and he promised to have the return brought down shortly afterwards. He may have omitted to call the attention of his officers to the matter, and so I thought I would bring it to the attention of the Government again.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I gave directions that the papers should be forthcoming at once, but they have not yet been received from Moncton. Now that I am reminded of the matter, I will make further inquiries and have the return brought down as soon as possible.

Mr. SIFTON.

PROHIBITION PLEBISCITE.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 121) respecting the prohibition of the importation, manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors. He said: When I moved the first reading of this Bill, I was asked to explain to the House the nature and provisions of the Bill itself, and it will not be necessary for me, therefore, to-day, to go into those points. But perhaps it would be well for me to say a few words with regard to the principle of the Bill and the events that have led up to its introduction. I feel keenly the honour and responsibility resting upon me in having charge of this Bill, because for many years I have been earnestly active in the work of the Prohibition cause in this country, and I feel that in the progress of the cause, the introduction of this Bill marks a very decided step in advance. It is now twenty years since what might be called the last Prohibition law was passed by the Parliament of Canada. It was in 1878 that the Canada Temperance Act was adopted by this Parliament, and it is worthy of note that the gentleman with whose name this Act has always been connected, the Hon. Senator Scott, is again to-day a member of the Government which is responsible for the introduction of this Bill. During the years from 1878 to the present time the question of Prohibition has been frequently before this House, being brought to the attention of hon. members usually in the form of a general resolution in favour of the total prohibition of the importation, manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors in Canada. These resolutions have been dealt with in various ways in the House of Commons. Sometimes they have been voted down directly, sometimes they have been so amended as to emasculate the proposition, sometimes they have been adopted with amendments which have materially altered the scope and object of the resolution. But at no time has the House of Commons deliberately and definitely declared that prohibition should come into force in the Dominion of Canada. I may refer specially to the fact that in 1889 a motion was introduced in the House by my friend, Mr. Jamieson, who was then the hon. member for North Lanark, and seconded by myself:

That, in the opinion of this House, it is expedient to prohibit the manufacture, importation and sale of intoxicating liquors, except for sacramental, medicinal, scientific and mechanical purposes. That the enforcement of such prohibition, and such manufacture, importation and sale as may be allowed, shall be by the Dominion Government, through specially appointed officers.

In amendment to that, the hon. member for Brockville (Mr. Wood) moved:

That all after the word "purposes" in the original resolution be omitted, and the following substituted therefor:—"When the public senti-

ment of the county is ripe for the reception and enforcement of such a measure of prohibition."

This amendment carried, and the resolution thus amended was eventually adopted by the House. So that the House of Commons of Canada in 1889 was committed to this principle :

That, in the opinion of this House, it is expedient to prohibit the manufacture, importation and sale of intoxicating liquors except for sacramental, medicinal, scientific and mechanical purposes, when the public sentiment of the country is ripe for the reception and enforcement of such a measure of prohibition.

The question having thus been decided in the House of Commons that when the country was ready for prohibition it was advisable that prohibition should be enacted, the next step would seem naturally to make some provision by which the opinion of the people of the country could be obtained, so that Parliament might be guided thereby in its consequent action. Since that time there has been no effort made, however, to find out what is the opinion of the people of the country ; on the contrary, another mode of proceeding was adopted by the party in power during the last Parliament ; and in 1891, when a prohibitory resolution was introduced into this House, the hon. member for York, N.B. (Mr. Foster), then Minister of Finance, moved that a royal commission should issue to inquire into all the facts connected with prohibition. In 1892, on the 14th of March, a royal commission was issued with this object :

Whereas it is deemed expedient to obtain for the information and consideration of Parliament the fullest and most reliable data possible respecting :

1. The effects of the liquor traffic upon all interests affected by it in Canada.
2. The measures which have been adopted in this and other countries with a view to lessen, regulate or prohibit the traffic.
3. The results of these measures in each case.
4. The effect that the enactment of a prohibitory liquor law in Canada would have in respect of social conditions, agricultural business, industrial and commercial interests, of the revenue requirements of municipalities, provinces and the Dominion ; and also, as to its capability of efficient enforcement.
5. And all other information bearing on the question of prohibition.

That commission was appointed in 1892, and in 1895 the report of that commission was completed and issued. However, there has been no action taken as a result of that inquiry, or as consequent upon that report. Now, Sir, in the meantime, although Parliament has taken no positive action, although there was no result from the commission on prohibition, still the public opinion of the country, and I think I may also say the habits of the people of the country, have been progressing. The people of Canada have been steadily, if not very rapidly, progressing towards that condition in which a prohibitory law might fairly be expected to be possible of enforcement. I think I may safely say, without going into details, that to-day the drinking habits of the people of Canada have largely and visibly decreased ; I think that I may safely say that there is very much less drunkenness in the country to-day, and we know that there has been a large decrease in the consumption of liquor. We know that in Canada to-day the consumption of liquor per head of the population is very much less than it is in other countries similarly situated and inhabited by the same races. I think that a large porportion of the people of this country are of the opinion that Canada is ripe for a prohibitory law. Under these circumstances, therefore, it is not to be wondered at that when, in 1893, the great Liberal party of Canada met in convention at Ottawa, the question of what could be done to meet the views of the prohibitionists of Canada should have been discussed and decided. We know that that convention was one of the most representative gatherings that had ever taken place in Canada, that it was not only representative of the Liberal party from all parts of the country from a party point of view, but that it was also representative of the views and opinions of the people upon all questions connected with the constitution and good government of the country, that it was in fact representative of the bone and sinew of the land, of the most respectable and responsible elements of this our country. Under these circumstances, I say, it is not to be wondered at that this question of prohibition came to the front, and that a resolution, proposed by myself, should have been passed in that convention as an outcome and result of the development of prohibition sentiment in this country. The resolution was this :

That whereas public attention is at present much directed to a consideration of the admittedly great evils of intemperance, it is desirable that the mind of the people should be clearly ascertained on the question of prohibition by means of a Dominion plebiscite.

That resolution was adopted, as the report of the convention says, by an overwhelming majority. The party which was thus committed to this view of dealing with the prohibition question, went before the people in 1896 with their platform clearly defined ; they went before the people on the very questions put forward and defined by resolution after resolution passed in that convention, amongst others, upon this method and manner of dealing with the prohibition question. Everybody in this House and throughout Canada knows the result of that appeal to the country ; we know that the Liberal party, coming into office as a result of the election of 1896, have been

and are desirous of fulfilling the pledges of their platform adopted in that convention of 1893. In the pursuance of that policy, and with a desire to accomplish that end, the Government of the day, representing that party, are now introducing a Bill for the purpose of fulfilling that pledge and carrying out that plank in their platform. Now, Sir, the question before us is one for ascertaining the views of the people of Canada upon the question of prohibition. It is not my purpose, and I do not think it would be at all in place, for me to-day to discuss the question of prohibition. That is not the question which is before the House of Commons, that is a question which by the very nature of this Bill, is to be removed from the arena of the House of Commons for the time being, and to be relegated to the electorate of the country for them to declare their views upon it. The discussion of the question of prohibition seems to me to be relegated to the campaign which will arise if this Bill becomes law, at the hustings where the question will be thrashed out. When the vote has been given, when the people of the country have declared their will in respect to this question, it will come back again to the floor of Parliament and will have to be dealt with again by the representatives of the people in Parliament. But until that time comes, it would be, I think, out of place and inadvisable for us to discuss the question at issue, and I do not myself intend at all to deliver here a prohibition speech, strongly as I feel on the question, largely identified with that side of the question as I have been for many years, in fact I think any particular exposition of details in regard to the question itself would not only be out of place at the present moment, but would contribute against and militate against a proper discussion and would tend to hamper eventually the votes of the people by directing their attention away from the main question, resulting in a discussion on mere detail which are not necessary to be discussed in the presentation of this Bill in the House or in the passage of the Bill through Parliament. Sir, the Bill is a simple one. It has been our desire, as much as possible, to make it a simple Bill for the purpose or removing any chance or opportunity to cavil at it, any chance or opportunity to take issue so as to retard the passage of the Bill through Parliament. We know that a large number of the people have earnestly desired that this Bill should be presented. We know that the Government was unfortunately prevented from introducing the Bill last session in consequence of the pressure of work at the early part of the session, and the departure of the right hon. leader of the House to attend the Jubilee in England, and there was great disappointment felt by a great many people because the Bill was not presented. Sir, there would be still more serious disappointment felt on the part of the people were the Bill not now to be passed as rapidly as possible and become law, so that they might have an opportunity of entering into the campaign which must result from the passage of the Bill, at which time we Prohibitionists expect to be able to show that Canada is ripe for prohibition and for the passage of a prohibitory law. Under these circumstances, I hope and trust that while the Bill will be fairly criticised and fairly understood by Parliament and the country, there will be no serious opposition to it, but that the Bill will pass through Parliament and become law and give the people that opportunity as early as possible. In this connection it may not be out of place for me to say, speaking for the Government, that while in the Bill no fixed date is named for the taking of the vote, it is the intention and expectation of the Government that as early a day will be fixed as is consistent with the other business of the country and consistent with the proper convenience of the electorate in calling on men to cast their votes on so important a question. I will only say in addition, that when the Bill comes into committee it is my intention to propose a single amendment, in the form of the ballot, so as to simplify it a little and make it, I think, more clear, so that there can be no possibility of spoilt ballots when the election comes off. When that section is reached in committee I will move the amendment respecting the form of ballot, which I have now before me. I do not think it necessary to enter into any further details and particulars in moving the second reading of the Bill, but leaving the question before the House after the few words I have addressed to it, I move the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the hon. Minister takes his seat, will he be kind enough to let the House know, if he has at hand the information, whether the form in which the question has been put in the provincial plebiscites, and the form in which the question is to be put under this Bill, is the same, or whether there is to be any distinction between the several forms used?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have not the provincial laws at hand at the moment. I can, of course, send to the library for them, and no doubt they will be produced in the course of the debate. The other plebiscites to which the hon. gentleman has referred were taken under the laws of the provinces, and a different form was used in the different provinces, not differing, however, in any important particular, and speaking from memory, not differing much from that which will be submitted to the people of Canada. There is a slight difference in the actual shape of the ballot and the wording of the question, but there is no material difference that I remember in regard to the form of

the question submitted at the different provincial plebiscites. I may say further that the provincial plebiscites were a little different in their nature from this plebiscite. At that time it was not understood and supposed that the provincial legislatures had any power to pass a prohibitory law, and, therefore, these plebiscites were more of the nature of the submission of an academic question without any subsequent results being anticipated. This plebiscite is in an entirely different position, because it is well understood and thoroughly ascertained by the highest tribunals in the land, that the Canadian Parliament has a right to pass a prohibitory law without question or doubt. Since the provincial plebiscites were taken, there has been a decision rendered by the Privy Council of England, which was referred to in some detail when the question of prohibition was discussed in this House and when this expected decision was made a reason on several occasions for not dealing with the prohibition question in Parliament; and that decision, speaking as a layman, and with some diffidence, because the decisions of the Privy Council on the question of the sale of intoxicating liquors have been somewhat complicated, clearly indicates that the provincial authorities have a right, to a certain extent at all events, to pass prohibitory laws in their various provinces ; but that does not and cannot be held in any way to diminish, lessen or interfere with the absolute right of the Parliament of Canada to pass a prohibitory law for the whole Dominion, whenever it considers that the time has come for doing so. I think, therefore, the question as put under this law will meet the views of the people of the country, who have been asking for an opportunity of expressing their opinion, and who would be delighted and glad to take the opportunity thus afforded them.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the hon. gentleman any idea of the cost that will be entailed by the proposed plebiscite ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman having been Finance Minister and having dealt with various elections in the Dominion of Canada, must appreciate fully what the cost of an ordinary election is, and I have no reason to suppose that the cost of the plebiscite vote will be anything very greatly different from the cost of a general election.

Mr. FOSTER. That will be about how much ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Speaking from memory, I think it costs from $200,000 to $250,000 to carry on a Dominion election.

Mr. BERGERON. I think it is more than that.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Well, I am speaking from memory, but my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) ought to know better than I, he having paid the bills on one or two occasions.

Mr. MONTAGUE. May I ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fisher) whether the amendment he proposes to make with regard to the ballot paper will affect the discussion in any way ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not think so. It is a mere matter of the form of printing the ballot paper.

Mr. MONTAGUE. It is not in regard to the wording of the question.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Not in the least. The wording is exactly the same. It is merely with regard to dividing the ballot paper for the putting of the cross so as to simplify it as much as possible.

Mr. BERGERON. May I ask my hon. friend (Mr. Fisher) the reason why he classes cider amongst the beverages which should be avoided ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am very glad indeed to answer the question of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergeron). Cider is included because cider is known to contain alcohol very frequently, and being an intoxicating drink it ought to be prohibited by a prohibitory law. I may say, however, that personally—and I think I am speaking for others—that the word cider put here in the list of intoxicating liquors means cider fermented. It means "cider" and not apple juice. It means cider which is in the nature of an intoxicating drink and not simply apple juice. The hon. member (Mr. Bergeron) probably understands very well the difference between grape juice and wine. Grape juice is simply the juice squeezed out of the grape ; wine, is after it has passed through certain stages of fermentation and has become alcoholic. So in the same way the word "cider" means apple juice which having been treated in manufacture has become an intoxicating drink, and it does not mean apple juice simply in its raw state.

Mr. BERGERON. As my hon. friend (Mr. Fisher) says, I know something about it, but of course we are to assume that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fisher) himself does not know. I believe my hon. friend (Mr. Fisher) is very sincere in wishing that this question in the plebiscite should he answered "yes," but is he not frightened that when cider even is forbidden, a great many people will vote "no" instead of "yes." When the hon. gentleman speaks of cider which is intoxicating, he no doubt refers to cider that they make in Normandy, France, which really is intoxicating, but we never had that kind of cider in this country, and the people who vote on this ballot paper are people who are accustomed to get weak cider.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergeron) is mistaken when he says that the cider in this country is not intoxicating.

Mr. BERGERON. How do you know ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergeron) will endorse my statement when I say that I am not in the habit of drinking intoxicating liquor, but I have frequently been tempted to drink cider by people who told me it was not an intoxicating drink, and when I was younger and more innocent I sometimes took them at their word, and tried the cider which they told me was not intoxicating.

Mr. BERGERON. What was the result ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I can assure the hon. gentleman that sometimes under such conditions and circumstances, I have felt the effects of that cider in my head, and consequently as a temperance man I consider that it is very important that such cider as that should be prohibited in this country.

Mr. TAYLOR. Then that should be explained to the voters.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I therefore think it quite right that this question should read as it is printed here :

> Are you in favour of the passing of an Act prohibiting the importation, manufacture or sale of spirits, wine, ale, beer, cider and all other alcoholic liquors for use as a beverage ?

If the hon. member will read the question carefully he will see that cider is put in amongst certain alcoholic liquors, and that there is the qualification immediately afterwards: "and all other alcoholic liquors." This very evidently indicates that this cider which it is intended to prohibit, is the alcoholic cider which I have just described and which certainly any temperance man who values his principles must hope to see prohibited, just as much as wine. I venture to say that to-day there are wines in Canada and elsewhere which contain no more percentage of alcohol than do hard ciders or fermented ciders. Therefore, I am satisfied that it is important and right that cider should be included, meaning the cider which is an intoxicating liquor.

Mr. BERGERON. That word "cider" in the question will surely make a great deal of difference in the vote.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think, with the explanation I have given, if it is read at all or understood at all, there can be no doubt about what this cider means ; and if the people understand what they are prohibiting, those who are in favour of prohibition will be quite desirous of prohibiting that as well as "all other alcoholic liquors."

Mr. MONTAGUE. My hon. friend from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) has not looked into this question very carefully or he would have seen that it is not because of the intoxicating effects of cider that it is included in the question, but because of the "knocking out" effects of cider.

Mr. POWELL. Since the Minister of Agriculture seems to be an authority on this matter, I would like to ask him if it is well known what percentage of alcohol must be in liquor in order to make it intoxicating ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Hear, hear.

Mr. POWELL. It occurs to me that the question is put in this form for the purpose of defeating prohibition.

Mr. McCLEARY. What objection can there be to describing it in the question as "fermented cider" or "hard cider" ?

Mr. FOSTER. It would not be courtesy to my right hon. friend and his Government to allow so important a Bill to go to the second reading without at least giving an expression of opinion with reference to it. I am sorry that I was not in the House when my hon. friend (Mr. Fisher) commenced his remarks, and I do not know just how much, or what important parts of his observations I have missed. Therefore, in the very few remarks that I am going to make on this matter, I shall have to deal with what I did hear the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fisher) say. Every one will agree with the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fisher) that the Bill he has introduced is important, and for several reasons. It is important in the first place, because to a certain extent—I am not going to say just now to what extent—to a certain extent it voices the desire of a very large, a very respectable, and a very intelligent number of the electors of Canada—I had almost said a majority, but I do not wish to anticipate the vote which is to be taken upon the question. But certainly the observation I made will be agreed to by members on both sides of the House. I must limit that remark by this, that I do not think that this large and intelligent element of the people of the country who are in favour of temperance and prohibition have at all, of their own free choice, asked the submission of a plebiscite Bill to this House. That is, I do not think the Government, in introducing this Bill for the taking of a vote on the abstract principle of prohibition, are doing what the great majority of the temperance people of this country wished them to do. The temperance people of this country asked the Government to do something else and something more—something far more practical ; but the hon. gentleman has voiced to-day the opinion and the action of this Government, in that they have simply decided to go so far as to submit the abstract principle to the vote of the electorate. The hon. gentleman said that at the present time he did not consider that it was necessary to go into a discussion of the prin-

ciple of prohibition. He said that was relegated to the campaign which would take place upon this Bill, if it became law, and that possibly it would be in order later, when the results of that campaign were consummated, to have the question again brought before this House. That probably gives a clue to the action of the Government as a matter of policy. They did not wish to commit themselves on the question of prohibition, and so they chose a non-committal policy in order to avoid that very difficult point, which was to make the policy of the Government known, not upon an abstract question, but upon a concrete question. And so my hon. friend to-day deprecates a discussion of the principle of prohibition or the applicability of the principle of prohibition to the conditions of this country. Well, I think that every discussion should come upon its proper and germane matter; and I agree with my hon. friend that if to-day we are simply to take into consideration whether we shall give the electorate of this country an opportunity to answer yes or no upon an abstract principle, it probably is going wide of the field if we undertake to discuss the whole question of prohibition and its applicability to this country. But I want to point out another thing: I hinted at it when the hon. gentleman introduced his Bill. It is, to speak in a careful and candid way, simply a matter of little moment, a matter which does not possess a very great element of interest, if the Government are not prepared to follow out what, if it has any justification at all, is simply the first step in a plan which requires a second step. What I wanted to say to my hon. friend was this, that I believed his remarks did not go far enough to satisfy this House or far enough to satisfy the temperance people of this country; because he omitted all allusion to this point, namely: provided the step now taken results in approval by the electorate at large of the abstract principle of prohibition, whether my hon. friend and the Government which he represents are prepared to take the second step, and translate the will of the people into a prohibitory law, to be introduced into this House, and to stand or fall by that measure. Unless the Government are prepared to take the second step, it is altogether foolish to take the first step, and a costly proceeding as well. I put the question to my hon. friend, how much he thought the cost of polling the vote would be; and my hon. friend answered me that it would cost somewhere in the neighbourhood of $250,000. He is asking Parliament to take a vote upon an abstract question, which will cost $250,000 of the people's money; and I hold that we have no business to do that unless the Government are prepared and Parliament is prepared, if the vote is in the affirmative, to take up the question, and translate the will of the people into a stern, strong prohibitory law. I think the country has a right to ask the Government, and to get a straight, frank answer from them to the question: "If we take up this Bill and vote upon the question which you submit to us, and a majority of the total electorate of this country not divided into provinces, vote in favour of the principle of prohibition, will you as a Government be prepared to introduce a Bill in accordance with that vote, and push it to a conclusion"? Otherwise, we are legislating to little purpose—to less purpose than the provinces legislated in a like direction within the last five years; for there is to-day a different aspect to this matter from what there was ten years ago. During the last five or six years we have had plebiscite votes in four or five different provinces of the Dominion, and these votes have resulted in most cases in the affirmative, with sweeping majorities. That shows, with reference to the provinces of Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Ontario and Manitoba, and I think we may say the same with reference to the North-west Territories, that the Government and the country will know no more after this vote is taken, with reference to the sentiment of the electorate in these provinces and territories, than they know to-day, namely, that a majority are in favour of the principle of prohibition. What may take place in the province of British Columbia, I do not know; what may take place in the province of Quebec, I do not know. I only hear it stated by gentlemen who come from the province of Quebec that that province will not vote in the affirmative on this question—that the people's vote in the province of Quebec is so overwhelmingly on the no side of this question that it may wipe out the overwhelmingly large vote on the yes side in these other provinces. Unless that can be predicated—and I doubt whether it can be or will be attempted to be predicated here—what better position will the Government be in after the vote than it is to-day? Or is the Government going to take the position—and we should like to be enlightened on that point as well—that unless there is a majority in every province in the Dominion in the affirmative, it will not consider that it has a mandate from the electorate of this country to introduce a prohibition Bill and carry it out into law? My hon. friend was entirely silent on that point, but that is a question which is asked in this House and in the country, and which ought to be answered or else after this vote is taken, after the plebiscite has been acted upon, the subject will not be advanced to a settlement one single step. I do trust that before we get through with this debate, we shall have a frank and clear statement on this point. Is it to be considered that the decision of the majority of the total electorate, if given in the affirmative, will constitute a mandate to this Government sufficiently clear to demand for the people of Canada a prohibitory law? That is

a question which ought to be answered before this Bill is passed and the people are called upon to go to the trouble of a canvass and a vote.

I put strongly the next point, that if this Bill is passed and the people called on to vote, they should know, and this House should know, whether this is but the initial step that the Government is taking and that if the majority of the electorate vote in favour of prohibition the Government will then translate their wishes into a prohibitory Bill to be submitted and pushed by the Government through this House with the majority at their back. These are two important questions which should now be determined.

As to the form of the question, a very legitimate curiosity has been excited. For a number of months this curiosity has been whetted in the country—a curiosity which has not simply arisen from the desire of the people for knowledge, but which has been piqued and goaded somewhat by the diversity of opinion expressed and the diversity of stand taken by the Government itself, or if not by the Government itself, by very important members of it, from the right hon. leader of the Government down to less important but still influential members of the Cabinet. It was said for a long time that the temperance people were a little dubious as to whether they should have a vote on the simple question: "Are you in favour of prohibition or not?" There were certain utterances of my right hon. friend the leader of the Government and the Finance Minister in a certain conference which took place, which, like some of the utterances of judges and the law lords, when a case is being argued before them, would lead to the inference that it was not the simple, naked question of prohibition—yes or no—that was to be put before the people, but that the whole case was to be put before them as to what prohibition really entailed. Then, the hon. and gallant knight who sits opposite to me, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies), took a notion at one time to write a letter for the purpose of enlightening one of his own constituents, and through his own constituent the constituencies of the Dominion. I am prepared for a negative assertion on his part; but still I venture to make the statement that at the time that letter was written, he must have had the firm belief that the Government proposed to submit a double question to the electorate and not a single one. I have not the letter before me, but every hon. member who has read it knows that the plain inference to be drawn from it, and the impression created by it, was that 't was impossible to submit the question in the shape the temperance people wanted it submitted, namely, the simple question: "Are you in favour of prohibition or are you not?" but that along with that question other questions were also to be submitted, whether they were prepared to take the consequences, whether they were prepared to submit to the extra taxation necessary in order to raise the revenues which would require to be raised in case prohibition should be carried. That letter was explicit. How could the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries have indicted it and sent it out to the public at that particular time unless the Cabinet had then pretty well come to the decision that it was not going to submit the single question, but was going to put the double question. My hon. friend does not deny my statement, and I hope he will endeavour to show his consistency now. But very few weeks have elapsed since he wrote that letter, and if he speaks in the course of this debate, he should explain why the Government have decided to put the simple question before the people, not encumbered with other issues, and to credit the temperance and other people with intelligence enough to consider the matter in all its aspects, and to know, when they vote, quite well what the consequences of their decision will be. My hon. friend has experienced a change of heart. Why? The hon. gentleman who introduced the Bill must have laboured earnestly with him, and his arguments appear to have been strong enough to convince my hon. friend. Or was it the fear of certain votes in the tight little island of Prince Edward that made him think that after all it was probably best to cater to the temperance people in this respect, and that, in some way or other, the end which he desired to be brought about would be brought about in a different way.

Then, there is another element in the Government. There is the Minister of Justice (Senator Mills) who has charge of the legal conscience of the Cabinet, and who absolves the different heads of the different departments of the Government, so far as he consistently can, by giving the opinion that whatever they do is legally just and right. The Minister of Justice has very strong opinions upon this question of prohibition—opinions, abstract and concrete, as to what should and what should not be put before the people; and having arrived at a somewhat mature age, he is not as changeable as is the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and not as liable to a change of opinion. Convictions he has from long years of study, and when once he has reached convictions, he, at his mature years, does not change them. What did Senator Mills say at one time, with reference to this matter? Not long ago, when asked the question—and you will find it in a letter to the "Globe"—"Are you in favour of the abstract question, 'yes or no'?" he replied:

I am not; I am very much opposed to it. The honest thing to do is to put the whole matter before the people.

And I have no doubt that three weeks ago, just about the time my hon. friend (Sir Louis Davies) indicted that letter to his constituents—the Government had determined to do what Senator Mills called the honest thing, namely, put the whole question before the people, or both sides of the case, so to speak. The now Minister of Justice went on to say:

Of course I do not know what action the Government and Parliament will adopt, but, in my opinion, the measure that is to give effect to the decision of the public, in case prohibition carries, ought to be the measure on which the vote is taken.

Unless the Minister of Justice (Senator Mills) has changed his opinion entirely, he believes that this abstract principle is not the proper one to submit to the people, but that the honest thing to do is to submit the whole question, so that the people may know what they are voting upon. I can understand the Minister of Justice saying that the people may vote on this abstract question, and vote in favour of prohibition, and then that all they will have done will be to affirm the principle, and that the question will not be solved, except through the long and tedious way of a vote at the general election, when that comes round, in connection with all other controverted questions. He said:

The Ministers must decide upon how they will meet the loss of revenue that will be caused by the adoption of prohibition, and the creditors of Canada are entitled to know how the $7,500,000 of the revenue that will be wiped out by prohibition is to be made up.

I think that is a proposition the Government should have met, and I have no doubt that before they committed themselves to this Bill they had before them the result, which, if they are honest and sincere, must eventually follow if there is a majority in favour of a prohibition measure. And it would have been instructive if my hon. friend who introduced this Bill had told how, in the event of that measure being required—and I know that he thinks will be required, because he believes that the prohibition vote will be carried by a large majority—they will meet the deficiencies in the revenue. If a clear and definite statement, showing how easily this loss might be made up, had been given this afternoon by the hon. Minister of Agriculture, what an argument it would have been for the temperance people in the coming campaign—to have been able to quote the utterance of Ministers to the effect that if we vote yea and prohibition becomes an established fact, the matter of revenue may be arranged in this way or in that way quite satisfactorily to the country. Will the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), before this debate is finished, satisfy the laudable curiosity of this House and the country on that point? And, as in the course of his Budget speech, he took occasion, incidentally, to throw out a very strong argument against the plebiscite on prohibition by detailing the amount that would be lost to the revenue by prohibition in case the majority voted in favour of it, cannot he now administer the antidote and give his views to the House and the temperance people of the country as to how he, as Finance Minister, if called upon, will be able to make up that deficiency. And how, if the deficiency is made up, it will be to the benefit of this country, not morally only, but in every other sense, that the vote should pass and a Bill founded upon it should become law. So the Hon. Mr. Mills felt three or four months ago. How he feels now, I do not know. He goes on:

There should be a well-considered Bill prepared, and the vote should be taken upon it.

But the vote is not to be taken upon a Bill. Mr. Mills, as Mr. Mills, is of one opinion, but Mr. Mills as the Minister of Justice, as a member of the Cabinet, can, it seems, subordinate his opinion, as a Minister has to do, to the general opinion of the Cabinet. But that subordination measures either the strength of the opinion or the complaisance of the man held or not.

The question is not whether the public favour prohibition in the abstract. It is whether they are realy honestly to carry it out in the concrete. The abstract position does not mean anything, and it will be wholly delusive to submit it, because it will not be indicative of the will of the people.

That is a very strong utterance from the Minister of Justice. Now, I will not follow it up with the opinions of other members of the Cabinet who have spoken on this question; suffice it to say that these different opinions expressed have excited curiosity to a greater degree than would otherwise have been the case, as to how this question was to be put. I congratulate my hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and the Government upon having at least the good sense to submit this question plainly upon the issue of prohibition, yes or no, as the temperance people understood it, as the leader of the Government, if he knew what the opinion of the temperance people of this country was, must have known they understood it, and, consequently, in accordance with what was the pledge that actually passed between them. I hold that anything else would have been a violation of the pledge, which was well understood as between the Government and the temperance people of this country.

Well, Sir, my hon. friend stated that there was some disappointment last year that the Bill was not introduced. There was. And the disappointment was well founded, and the excuse given for it—if I may be allowed to say so—was as lame an excuse as was ever given in this Parliament, And what was the excuse given? The ex-

cuse given last year was that the Prime Minister was not in his seat and this important legislation could not be gone on with. But the Prime Minister was not in his seat when the most important legislation we had in this Parliament last year was introduced by his Ministers and carried through the House in the latter part of the session. That excuse is not a valid excuse. It helped to put off the question for a little time, and the temperance people have been thinking seriously during the past whether there was to be a proposition to put off this vote to some future period. And, just on that point, let me ask the attention of the hon. gentleman who introduced this measure to a suspicion to which he has appeared to give some foundation, that there was hidden in this measure a probable further postponement of the taking of the vote on prohibition. In this way: I find a very peculiar clause in this Bill, to the effect that the regulations to be made for taking this vote, without which the vote cannot be taken, shall be such as are set forth in what is known as the Dominion Elections Act and the North-west Territories Representation Act and their amendments and the Franchise Act of 1898. Now, can any good reason be given—my hon. friend has not given it—why that peculiar wording should appear in this Bill? Would not every purpose have been fulfilled if, instead of saying "the Franchise Act of 1898" the Bill had said "the Franchise Act in force at the time the vote is taken"? This would have covered the case if the Franchise Act now under consideration becomes law, but it would not have baulked the measure as this Bill will be if by any manner of means the Franchise Act does not become law. That is why I say to my hon. friend that in the opinion of many people he is harnessing two issues which ought not to be harnessed together. Everybody knows that the Franchise Bill is to a large extent a party measure, everybody knows that the Plebiscite Bill is to no extent a party measure. Adherents and opponents of the Plebiscite Bill are to be found on both sides of the House. But the Franchise Bill of 1898 has its adherents on one side and its opponents on the other—that is to say, it is a party measure. Why did my hon. friend think it well to risk the plebiscite on the chance of a vote on a partisan measure, on the party question whether the Franchise Bill should become law or not. And if the Government should give up their Bill, as they may be induced to do, at the last moment, or if the Bill should be defeated, or if there should be an amendment made in it which the Government may take it into their heads not to assent to, then the foundation is taken away from the holding of this plebiscite vote, and it is deferred for another year or more. Again, I propose this pertinent question: Would it not have been better simply to have made the carrying out of this Plebiscite Bill depend upon the Franchise Act of the Dominion, rather than to make it depend upon a partisan measure which has not yet become law and which is still simply a Bill and not an Act? Now, my hon. friend who leads the Government was very eager to take cause of offence and challenged what he was pleased to call a threat when my hon. friend from East Durham (Mr. Craig) pointed this out to him when the Bill was being read the first time. He wanted to know from my hon. friend if it was a threat that the Senate was going to throw out the Franchise Bill. That was unworthy of my right hon. friend, I do not think he will repeat that again in this House. No Government has a right to come down to this free Parliament and to take it for granted that every measure it brings down, by the very fact of its being brought down, is therefore tantamount to enactment, and that it will become a law. Such is not the spirit in which free Parliaments ought to be treated, and such is not the spirit in which this Parliament of Canada will consent to be treated. There are possibilities that may go to prevent that Act from ever becoming law. Is my hon. friend prepared to say that unless the present Franchise Bill is carried through, the temperance people of this country should not get a chance to vote on the plebiscite? If he is seeking for delay, if that is the arrangement by which another year of grace may be given then, he may have provided for it fully. But if he has had an eye simply to have a plebiscite poll, it seems to me that he had better change that clause, and put it, as I have said, the Franchise Act which, for the time being, or at the time of the vote being taken, may be law in this country. Again, my hon. friend was all indefiniteness on the point of the date for the taking of this vote. When we were listening with bated breath as to the date when this vote was to take place, the hon. gentleman simply defined it in this way: That it will take place at a time consistent with the other business interests of this country, and with the interests of the electorate of the country. Now, why cannot the Government tell us within some definite period when this vote will take place? Do they wish a vote of this importance to take place without thorough discussion in this country? They cannot, surely. Whichever side wins, and whatever the result may be, whether in favour of the prohibitionists or of the anti-prohibitionists, it is in the interest of this country and of its people that the most thorough possible canvass shall be carried on by both sides so that the people may, from one end of the country to the other, see every side of this question that is possible to be presented, and come to their conclusion on reasoned convictions. What notice is this Government going to give to the people that this vote is to be taken, and when it is to be taken? Simply

the notice in an issue of the "Gazette," that six weeks from a certain day a vote will be taken? Surely not. Is it not fair to both sides in this great contest, which will sometime, if this is carried out, take place in this country, is it not fair that timely and stated notice should be given in order that the electorate may proceed to its task of discussing this question and preparing the minds of the people for the coming vote? Why cannot my friend do this in the interest of the whole country—telling us somewhat definitely when this vote will be taken? Will it be taken this summer, will it be taken this autumn, will it be taken in the winter or before? I think it is a duty that my hon. friend owes, not only to the temperance people but to the country as a whole, to give notice now, when this is being discussed before Parliament, of the probable date when this election will take place.

Now, I think I have made most of the criticisms that I have to make at present with reference to this matter. I propose to say a word or two as to my own personal position upon the question. So far as I am concerned, I may state to my hon. friend who has introduced this Bill, that it will not meet with any opposition from me. If the Government thinks it is worth the expense, I am quite willing that the whole electorate should have an opportunity to poll its vote on the abstract question. I again appeal to the Government to give the people this benefit in the contest which they are evoking, that they shall tell the people honestly and frankly whether it will be followed by consequent legislation if the vote is in the affirmative. Earnest people whose time is worth something, desire, when they fight a contest, to fight it upon issues which are somewhat definite at least, and if the Government were to state to-day that the object of this Bill was to give the people a chance to vote upon the abstract question without its being followed by consequent action if the vote was in the affirmative, I do not think you would arouse the electorate of this country in the least to a vote upon it. The country does not wish to play at voting or to play at canvassing. When people have taken the time, when they have spent an immense amount of energy and of money, which they will have to spend in the three or four months canvass of this question and a consequent vote, they want to know whether it is going to be followed by action if the temperance people, as they believe, are in the majority in this country, and vote in the affirmative. So I say that no opposition will be received on the principle of this vote from the temperance people on this side of the House. We consider it defective in these two points that I have stated: First, as to what the Government will consider a majority vote, whether of all the provinces, or whether of the total electorate as massed; or, whether of all the voters upon the list, or of the voters who simply come out to vote? What is their position upon the question of consequent action in the event of the majority of the electorate voting in the affirmative? I do not myself place, under present circumstances, very much stress or force upon the result of this vote in the Dominion of Canada. Suppose it goes to a vote, and suppose that a majority of the electorate vote in favour of the principle of prohibition as an abstract question, my own opinion is that, barring the educative effects of the canvass which will take place, we shall be in about the same position that we were before. To-day the temperance people know their strength in five provinces, and believe that they are fairly strong in two others. They will not know much more when this vote is taken, and when the result of the poll is totalled up. So that I do not see, outside of the educative effects of the campaign, very much good that is going to result. I would see much good that was going to result from it if we had the pledge of the Government that, if the affirmative carried, a Bill giving effect to that affirmative vote would be introduced and carried by the Government with all its force in this Parliament. I would have taken a position different from this ten, or twelve, or fifteen years ago. Why? Because at that period the opinions of the people of this country were an unknown quantity so far as this principle was concerned. Not a single plebiscite had been taken, and with the exception of the province of New Brunswick, in 1854, or 1855, there had never been a poll upon the question of prohibition. The only knowledge at that time was gathered from the different Scott Act contests which took place in some of the provinces of the Dominion, and the Dunkin Act contests which took place in some other provinces of the Dominion, contests which were not altogether satisfactory, even to the strongest temperance men. But, Sir, since that time, things have changed, as I have said, and you have had your provincial plebiscites in four or five provinces of the Dominion, and the relative strength of the parties is pretty well determined, almost as well as it will be by this Bill. To my mind, practically, we will not in this way put the temperance people in a much better position to come to this Parliament and ask for the legislation that they need, and to press for that legislation, so that this will be a much less useful measure than it would have been ten or fifteen years ago before this question was polled by general votes in the different provinces. I am not going to take up the general question of prohibition and its enactment in this country. I know that there are difficulties with reference to such a measure. If the Government undertake to say that they will introduce a prohibitory law, and if this Parliament undertakes to pass that prohibitory law, I do not shut my eyes to the facts

of the case as they appear to me, that there are grave and serious difficulties still in the way of the march forward to that time which I think, most men would like to see, the time of complete sobriety in a great country like ours. Those difficulties are financial, they are racial, they are constitutional, they are of various kinds, and they have been set forth in every way ; but the only one I wish to refer to to-day is the revenue difficulty. Everyone knows, every temperance man knows as well as others, that the moment you prohibit the sale or importation of intoxicating liquors you have to face a large fall in the revenues of the country. The Finance Minister knows that, as every man knows who has been Finance Minister, and every thinking man who has not been Finance Minister knows ; that is a question of practical moment which the legislature has to face in the first place, and the electorate has to face in the second place. Do I consider that this presents a difficulty so great that the very effect of the statement ought to make prohibitionists pause and not call for a prohibitory law ? I do not think so. As a temperance man, as a prohibitionist I am willing to pay my share of the taxes, either direct or indirect, that may be necessary to make up the revenue, and my belief is that if you could pass and enforce a strict prohibitory law and make it effective, greater progress and greater prosperity and a larger revenue would ultimately result. There is the difficulty of the enforcement of a prohibitory law which has to be looked at, and the Government and the Finance Minister have to face the question as to whether two things may not happen, namely, on the one hand, a loss of revenue, and on the other hand an inefficient enforcement of prohibition in the country. That is a practical difficulty, and you will have difference of opinion as to whether it will work out in experience according to theory. My belief is that if the people of the country by an overwhelming conviction want prohibition enforced, they can have it enforced as well as other laws are enforced in this country, that if they do not honestly and earnestly and by a very strong majority want it, they cannot have it as well enforced as old settled laws are enforced. But taking all these things into consideration, this is an age of progress, an age of advancing legislation, and legislation is attempted in all the great Parliaments of the world that would not have been thought of ten or fifteen years ago ; and I am here to say that if the strong opinion of the majority of the electorate of Canada believe that prohibition would cure this evil, the existence of which they deplore, they have the right to press for a trial of their plan, and to have it tested honestly and fairly. We will never arrive at a decision in any other way. It will be an academic fight all the time until you try such a law under fair conditions, and once you have tried it under fair conditions you have made a fair experiment and you have arrived at a conclusion one way or the other. My position, therefore, is this : I am a prohibitionist, and I am going to vote for this resolution. With the limitation I have stated, it may do some good and cannot do so much harm ; and I will hold the Government, so far as they are concerned, to the consequences of the first step, and if they give the people a chance to vote on the question and a majority of the electorate vote in favour of prohibition, I shall, so far as I am concerned, press the hon. Minister and his colleagues to show the honesty of their first step and to face the consequences of their action, and place upon the Statute-book of this country, as they can easily do with their strong and consistent majority behind them, a prohibitory law, which will ring out the knell of an evil which the temperance people of this country, myself among the number, have deplored for a long time, and deplore at the present moment. May I ask if some member of the Government will enlighten the House and the country on these practical points I have raised. There are three of them, and I need not reiterate them.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier. Mr. Speaker, those who have just heard the speech of my hon. friend and who know his record in this House were not surprised that he was shocked and horrified at the simple idea that a man might possibly have an inconsistent record on this question of prohibition. If there is any inconsistency in regard to the record of any hon. member in this House, it cannot apply surely to the hon. gentleman. He has never changed, he always was consistent. He told us to-day that he had been a prohibitionist. I have heard the same declaration before from the hon. gentleman, but it is at least seven or eight years since I heard anything from him on this subject. The hon. gentleman is consistent, I must admit ; his convictions were simply dormant, he has been slumbering, but though sleeping, he was always the same man, always an advocate of temperance but a silent advocate. But to-day my hon. friend has been aroused to his former enthusiasm in favour of the cause of prohibition. Do we not remember that in the early years of his parliamentary career hardly a session passed but he introduced in this House a resolution in favour of prohibition, asserting that according to his own convictions, at all events, the time had come when the Parliament of Canada should enact a prohibitory liquor law. But as time went on his enthusiasm diminished, until it disappeared for ever. How long is it since we heard the hon. gentleman speaking on the prohibition question ? At least seven years. The last time we heard in any way from the lips of the hon. member anything on the question of prohibition was on the 24th June, 1891. And then did he speak in

the same strain in which he had spoken before ? Not at all. At that time he did not declare that the Parliament of Canada should enact a prohibitory law, but he simply stated that when he had spoken before, he did not know what he was talking about, that when he made statements in favour of a prohibitory law he had spoken in a moment of weakness ; at that time he wanted to have more information than he had received on the subject. Five years before, in 1884-85-86, and so on and on, the hon. gentleman had stated to this House that the time had come for this Parliament to enact a prohibitory liquor law ; but in 1891, having on his shoulders the responsibility of office, the hon. gentleman asked Parliament to appoint a commission on the question of the liquor traffic, to ascertain : "The effect of the liquor traffic upon all interests affected by it in Canada ; the measures which have been adopted in this and other countries with a view to lessen, regulate or prohibit the traffic ; the results of the measure in each case ; the effect the enactment of a prohibitory liquor law in Canada would have in respect to social conditions, agriculture, business, industrial and commercial interests, of the revenue requirements of the municipalities, the provinces, and the Dominion, and also as to its capability of efficient enforcement."

My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) wanted to have information on all these different aspects of the question. He got his information. His commission was appointed, and if I remember aright it cost nearer $200,000 than $100,000 to enlighten the soul and the mind of my hon. friend (Mr. Foster). But whether he was enlightened or not, we never knew up to this moment, when again he tells us that he is a prohibitionist and a temperance man. Well, Sir, if my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) is a prohibitionist and a temperance man, I take it that he ought to be satisfied with the present Bill, which is, at least, a step in the direction he advocates. But my hon. friend is not satisfied with this Bill, which he tells us to-day is purely an academic measure which will be barren of results. Then, Sir, if my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) is not satisfied with this Bill such as it is, if it does not go far enough for him, why, he and his friends have the remedy in their own hands. He can do what he has done before ; if he and his friends who sit on that side of the House are not satisfied that we have gone as far as we could go on this question, it is open to them to do on this occasion what they did in the case of the Yukon Bill ; they can vote against it and have it rejected. But, Sir, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) will not do anything of the kind. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) will be satisfied to stab the Bill if he can, but he will not oppose it directly. The hon. gentleman is quite satisfied to reap whatever political advantage he can on this question, as to which he says there should be no party division. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster), notwithstanding this declaration is, however, quite prepared to take out of this measure—which, he says, ought not to be a party measure—whatever he can of party advantage by sowing the seeds of discord. He can do that, but when it comes to the point of opposing the Bill, which he says is imperfect, his courage issues out at the tip of his boots and he will not do it.

Sir, this Bill has been brought down in this form for good and obvious and certain reasons. I admit that the preparation of this Bill gave to the Government a good deal of anxiety. I am not above stating that it was a difficult question, and the Government had to deal with it knowing full well that no matter how they dealt with it they would be subject to the opposition of hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. But, Sir, we were not scared by that. We prepared the best measure that could be prepared under existing circumstances, and we prepared that measure to be submitted to the people of Canada with one sole object in view, the object of obtaining, as far as could be obtained, the views and opinions of every individual elector in Canada, as these views and opinions exist in his own heart and conscience. That is the object of this Bill. We might have put a rider to it ; yes, we might have added several riders to it.

When we came to the preparation of this Bill, we had representations made to us by those who favour prohibition ; we had representations made to us by those who did not favour prohibition ; we had representations made to us to add a rider such as my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) wants now, as to what shall be the immediate consequences should the vote be in the affirmative.

Mr. FOSTER. Will my right hon. friend allow me to ask him a question here ? What does he mean by that, because it is well to be clear, when he speaks of a rider such as I wish to have added ?

The PRIME MINISTER. I mean that there were representations made to us that we should put a rider stating that the Bill should come immediately into effect if there was an affirmative majority in favour of it.

Mr. FOSTER. Which Bill ? This Bill will come into effect the moment it is passed.

The PRIME MINISTER. Well, that is a very nice distinction, but it is too thin for practical effect. This Bill to take a vote will come into effect when it is passed, but what I meant to say was that there were those who wanted to insert a rider stating that prohibition would come into effect the moment there was an affirmative answer. There were those, on the other

hand, who wanted to put a rider in another direction, so as to take the vote upon the consequences of prohibition itself and to place before the people that if prohibition were to become law the people should say whether or not they were prepared to submit to the consequences in the way of additional taxation. We would not submit either one class of rider or the other.

With reference to what shall be the effect of a prohibition law in the matter of the falling off in revenue, should such a law be enacted, that is a question which we thought it better to leave to the electors themselves to ponder over and to consider, and to state their judgment upon in the best way they thought fit. Of course, as has been said by my hon. friend, if this Bill should result in a prohibitory law, then it goes without saying that the Minister of Finance will have a very serious task before him in deciding as to the method of replacing the revenue which would be immediately cut off. We receive at the present time something like $7,000,000 in customs and excise duties from the liquor traffic. Should this Parliament pass a prohibitory liquor law, the Minister of Finance would at once have the serious task before him of finding other modes of taxation. It has been stated that if we were to pass a prohibitory liquor law, there should be additional taxation. I do not think the phrase is an apt one. There should not be additional taxation, because taxation has always to be governed by the necessities of the revenue, but there must be a displacement of taxation. The Minister of Finance will have to provide other sources of revenue. If the Minister of Finance has not the $7,000,000 which to-day flow to the treasury from the liquor traffic he will have to get it from other sources. He may have to get a revenue, for instance, from coffee, or from tea, or from sugar, or from tobacco, but there is this consideration which temperance people must keep in their minds; That the duties which can be placed upon these different articles in order to produce a revenue must be moderate, for if they go beyond a certain point they will not produce a revenue. Take the duty on tobacco under the present law. At the present time we have a law which gives us $7,000,000 a year from the liquor traffic, and if the Minister of Finance has to seek other sources of revenue he may put a duty on tea, on sugar, and on coffee, but he cannot put a single penny more duty on tobacco. If he were to put any heavier duty upon tobacco it is well known that it would not produce any revenue at all; indeed, it is a question whether or not the duties now levied on tobacco are not too high for the purposes of revenue.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The PRIME MINISTER. This, therefore, shows the difficulties of the situation; difficulties which have been pointed out by my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) himself. You can put taxation to a certain extent upon these commodities, but if you raise these taxes beyond a certain point they will cease to be productive of revenue, and therefore it is quite possible that we may have before us the necessity of direct taxation. But, Sir, these questions are to be left to the electors themselves to judge. We would not put them upon the ballot; we did not put them in the Bill; we left them for the consideration of the electors to be determined by their own judgment.

Now, Sir, this brings us to another consideration which has to be kept in mind by those who have to vote upon this question. Would prohibition prohibit? That is a question which the electors have also to consider. There are those amongst us who favour prohibition; there are those amongst us who do not favour prohibition, but whether we favour or whether we do not favour it, the question which the electors have to solve in their ballot is as to whether or not—let them be ever so ardent prohibitionists—whether or not a prohibitory liquor law would prohibit the liquor traffic. That is a question as to which there may be serious doubts. We have the fact that at the present time, tobacco which is moderately taxed, although somewhat highly, but after all moderately, yields practically no revenue because we know there is a considerable amount of smuggling done in that article. This is a consideration for the electors. As I said a moment ago, all these considerations might well have formed part of the question to be submitted to the electors; but we thought it better to leave the question unhampered by these considerations, so that every man would be free to give his vote on the simple question, according to his own judgment and conscience. I come to the other class of rider which has been suggested by my hon. friend, namely, that we should provide in this Bill that if there should be an affirmative majority, then, immediately and mechanically, prohibition would come into force.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend has a perfect right to state his own views, but he certainly is not stating mine, as I stated them. All I ask is, that when the Government take the first step, which involves this expense and requires a contest, they will let the people know whether they will follow with the second step if the people will tell them to do so.

The PRIME MINISTER. Well, I do not know whether I understood my hon. friend, or whether he was correct in his first statement or not. I do not care; I accept his present version. My hon. friend wants to have a declaration from the Government to this effect. I have often said, and I can only here repeat, that when the will of the people has been affirmed, as it will be

affirmed one way or the other, then the Government—every Government—must be prepared to abide by the consequences.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, I understand that my hon. friend, if he will permit me——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend stated a moment ago that he would hold us to a strict account if there was a majority recorded in favour of prohibition. I accept the challenge and the notice of my hon. friend. He will hold us to a strict account, to bring in immediately a prohibitory liquor law. Well, all I have to say to my hon. friend is simply this, that before he does that he will have a little bill to settle with my hon. friend from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron), because my hon. friend from Beauharnois will not second his motion or vote for such a law as that. My hon. friend need not be too previous. If he thinks we shall have our little troubles, he has his troubles on his own side. We would not put that rider in the Bill, simply because we wish to leave the people free to determine the question, and to dictate to the Government what should be their policy afterwards. I have only to say that if the Government should be recreant to the duty that will be imposed upon them by the people, my hon. friend will be there to remind the Government of it, and to abide by the will of the people.

Mr. FOSTER. For the sake of clearness—we want to know just where we stand. The hon. gentleman has said that whatever the will of the people is, he will carry it out. That is one version. I want to ask my hon. friend if that means that if there is an affirmative vote for the principle, my hon. friend will straightway, at the next session of Parliament, we will say, introduce a Bill to carry out the will of the people.

The PRIME MINISTER. It means nothing of the kind. It means that the Government, when they have the will of the people before them, will have to take such steps as will give effect to the will of the people. There is the question of revenue to be considered; there is also the question of compensation to be considered. There are different questions which will have to be considered.

Mr. FOSTER. The people consider them when they vote.

The PRIME MINISTER. The hon. gentleman stated a moment ago that there were difficulties in the way, constitutional and others. Sir, the game of my hon. friend is very plain, very obvious. We have already had evidence of it. He commences by saying that this Bill is not sincere—that it will not be followed by any action. If this Bill is not sincere, I can only say that Her Majesty's loyal Opposition in this House will only be too glad to have a stab at the Government if they do not perform their duty. If this Bill is to be followed by serious action in due course, my hon. friend is not playing the part of a temperance man, which a moment ago he said he was, but is playing the part simply of a party man, the part of a Tory, when he seeks in advance to discount the effect of this Bill. But, Sir, I place myself and the Government in the judgment of the people of the country, those who are in favour of prohibition, and those who are not in favour of prohibition, and I ask them if the Government have not acted in this matter as sincerely and as honestly as it was possible for them to act. For, what is the task we have before us at the present time? I will not try to shield myself, as the hon. gentleman did on a former occasion. We introduce this Bill at the present time in the form in which it has been asked for by those who had a right to speak on this question, not the hon. gentleman; and those who have a right to speak on this question have expressed their satisfaction with it, so far as I know; and if they are satisfied with it, my hon. friend as a temperance man ought to abide by their decision. But there are two men in the hon. gentleman; there is the temperance man, a very small man, and the party man, a very big man. My hon. friend, in his attitude on this question, looking, not after the interests of temperance, but after the interests of his party, wants to know what we shall do and what we shall not do. He wants to discount the Bill; but the only thing the people of Canada are looking for at the present time is the opportunity to express their views on this question. This is a question that has been troubling the people for a very long time. I have sat in this Parliament for about twenty years, and I remember that in the very first year that I was here I heard this question mooted. At last we are taking a practical step—the first serious step that is to be taken if prohibition is to become law. At present the only thing we want is to have the honest expression of the people on this question; and we have provided for obtaining this expression by disentangling the question from every other consideration, and by asking every man who comes to the poll to say whether or not he is in favour of a prohibitory law. The hon. gentleman stated that there would be a certain majority in certain provinces and a certain majority in other provinces. All that remains to be seen. I do not know what the vote will be—I do not care. I simply claim this for the Government, that they have honestly redeemed the pledge they made to the people that they would endeavour to obtain, without favour to anybody, and without fear of any consequences, an honest expression of the opinion of the people on this important question.

Mr. OSLER. Mr. Speaker, this is apparently one of the questions on which most of the members of the House would like to say nothing. I have as strong views on this subject as the most ardent temperance man. I do not think you can put a country into greater turmoil or do greater damage than by introducing such a measure as the Government propose. This is one of the ante-election promises of the Government that I would have well forgiven them if they had broken, like so many of their other promises. Prohibitory laws have been a failure wherever they have been enacted. Failure is written in broad plain letters upupon prohibition wherever it has been tried. It is bound to end in failure. It will create a demoralizing influence in the community and lead to perjury and deceit and a degraded moral sense, far worse than intemperance. Canada is progressing steadily and firmly on temperance principles. We are improving from day to day, and from year to year as a temperance people. We are improving in that respect without prohibition, without one part of the community taking another part by the throat and saying you shall not do this, but simply owing to the increasing moral sense and knowledge of the people that drinking to excess is wrong and vicious. Let us go on steadily, from year to year, improving as we are doing, and thus helping to solve this question in the only way it can be solved, by creating temperance living in the country. I believe that no greater calamity could befall Canada than an attempt to enforce a prohibitory law. Such a law cannot be enforced, as we know from experience everywhere. With regard to the point, whether the question submitted should be simply : "Are you in favour of prohibition, yes or no," I do not agree at all that it should be put in that shape. I think it is the duty of statesmen, when face to face with an important measure like this, to tell the people how they are going to provide for the loss of revenue which would be involved, in case the majority should vote in the affirmative. We are, I hope, a fair-minded British people, and yet it is proposed to do away with all the buildings and money and capital invested in enterprise which is now perfectly legal. Why, you cannot put this law into effect without compensating all those now engaged in the legitimate traffic, the manufacture and sale of liquor. You are stirring up strife among the people, you are taking a leap in the dark, and you are declaring that we should take a step which involves the loss of seven millions or eight millions of dollars of revenue and perhaps one hundred millions of dollars of capital, and you are about to do this simply on a chance vote "yes or no." I claim that the people should have before them, when voting on this question, all the consequences involved, and should be called upon to vote whether they are prepared to face these consequences. I firmly believe that the Government have not the slightest intention of ever putting prohibition into effect, even should the majority vote in the affirmative. They are simply trying to deceive the temperance people and catch their votes. If the people vote in the affirmative in Ontario and in the negative in Quebec, if they vote in the affirmative in Nova Scotia and in the negative in New Brunswick, do you mean to tell me that this Government is going to enforce prohibition on a community which has declared itself opposed to it ? I do not wish to speak at any length on this Bill, but simply desire to put on record my opinion on the legislation now proposed and my strong belief that the Government are simply attempting unblushingly to delude and deceive the people.

Mr. SPROULE. I was somewhat amused at the line of argument taken by the right hon. leader of the Government. He steadily avoided any reference to the Bill whatever, but did, as he has often done in the past, lead away to other lines and scenes so as to show the people later on that he did not commit himself in anything he said on this measure. His first effort was not in defence of the Bill but an attempt to lead us away to ancient history by referring to the commission appointed to inquire into the whole question, including the amount of revenue we would have to raise by other means if a prohibitory law were passed. He took a good deal of time in commenting on the conduct of the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) who is one of the parties that was instrumental in the appointing of that commission. Well, I shall only say with regard to that liquor commission that notwithstanding the fact that it cost a good deal of money to the country and that there was some time wasted in doing its work, it put on record a lot of valuable information which we can use to-day, in considering this most important issue. Although the amount expended was large, it was not, in my judgment, money altogether wasted. It seems to me that the right hon. leader of the Government was very much chagrined and disappointed because the Opposition did not oppose this Bill. He would have been very glad, evidently, if we had come out flat-footed in opposition to it and given him something to talk about. He floundered about for a long time, without saying anything about the Plebiscite Bill at all. That Bill is evidently an effort by the Government to carry out one of their promises to the people which they could not very well avoid, because the Government have staved off so long, on one excuse or another, action on this matter, that the forbearance of the temperance people ceased to be a virtue and the pressure became so great that they forced the Government to do something to redeem its pledge. I am not in favour of the principle of a referendum. I have al-

ways held that it is un-British and utterly opposed to British parliamentary usage. The heads of the various departments of the Government, or the Executive Government itself, are charged with the duty of governing the country, and are bound to be sufficiently well informed on the condition of things in the country to be able to decide whether special legislation is required on any subject, without asking a special vote of the people on that subject. The Government in 1878 might just as well, instead of introducing and carrying out the National Policy, which they had pledged themselves to enact, have referred that policy to the people for a special vote upon it, and asked them: Do you want it or not? and thus wasted two or three years ascertaining what the opinion of the people was. And they might have tried to hedge that question with considerations, which would have prevented a direct decision of the people's will with regard to it. They might equally have referred the question of the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway and the question of the deepening of the canals, or any other of these great questions, which a Government are supposed to deal with, to a special vote of the people. We have the right to expect in a British colony, where the Government of the country is based on the same principles as that of the mother country, that the executive for the time being will take the responsibility of saying what the country requires and providing legislation to carry that out, without asking the people, by means of a referendum, whether they want a certain thing or not. The referendum is not in harmony with our system of government.

The hon. gentleman, by one of the clauses in this Bill, in my judgment, will go a long way towards defeating the very object he is supposed to have in view. I do not know whether he is responsible for the Bill as now drafted, but whether cider has been included as one of the beverages that should be prohibited, on his own motion, or at the reqest of his colleagues, or of the temperance people, it is bound to defeat the purpose of this Bill. If it was his suggestion it shows how insincere the hon. gentleman and his colleagues must be in regard to this important measure, because there is no doubt a large number of people will vote in the negative for the very reason that cider is included as one of the beverages that will be prohibited. A great many who raise fruit and who sell it for that purpose, and who drink cider as one of the harmless beverages, will vote against the principle of prohibition so as not to interfere with them to make and use cider right, so that, whether intentionally or otherwise, the Bill is very much handicapped by having that beverage included in it.

Now he puts another restraint upon it, not in the form of a clause in the Bill but by telling what must happen if the vote is carried. He says that higher duties must be put on tea, on tobacco and on sugar, and so he virtually threatens what the result will be in an attempt to deter the people from carrying this vote. With regard to the wisdom of prohibition or otherwise, I will not go into that matter, because, in my opinion, it is not pertinent to the question before us. The Government are making an effort whether willingly or unwillingly to carry out one of the pledges made to the people, and I am not disposed to throw anything in the way of their doing so, because they seem reluctant enough to carry out their promises without any one on this side attempting to oppose them when they do make an effort.

Mr. CASEY. There is a consensus of opinion that the second reading of this Bill will be adopted without opposition, in which opinion I fully agree. This is a measure that was promised to the people by those who are now the Government during the last campaign. They are compelled to keep their promises and I, as a supporter of theirs and one who shared in their pledges, feel compelled to support the Bill on its second reading. But I cannot induce myself to do so without a few words on the subject of the principle involved. We do not seem to be aware that in adopting this Bill we are taking a very grave step in a new direction, a direction which is entirely new to our constitution. I will not say hostile, or even foreign in the bad sense, that is for us to decide. But we should realize what we are doing when we refer a question to a popular vote which should be decided within the walls of this House. I have in years past declared my opposition to that principle, and cannot now vote for a Bill involving it, without a protest that I do it, in consequence of a promise given and arrangements made over which I had no control. I do not refer to the action of the Government or members of the Government, but to the action of the convention of 1893, of which so much has been said. This plank in our platform was not adopted on that occasion as the result of calm deliberation, but it was adopted at the end of a very exciting session of a very large convention, and its adoption, Sir, is a proof to my mind of the awkwardness and inadvisability of framing a party platform by means of a convention. The gentlemen who formed that convention were not all conversant with our constitution, they were there practically to adopt what was brought before them by a committee. This and other motions being so brought forward were adopted by the leaders of the party and the party generally. Now, I think there is no doubt that the members of this House should take the responsibility—should have taken it in the first instance—of saying whether they wanted prohibition or not. We

have long had that question before us. It has been before this House ever since I became a member of it, and that is more years ago than I care to remember. But, though the question has been brought up from time to time it has invariably been shunted, and this is the first practical step that has been taken in the direction of ascertaining what the people think should be done, and it is for this reason, in addition to those I have given, that I am prepared to give this Bill, though in opposition to my judgment in its principle, my hearty support in its general features. It is time something was done to settle whether we are to have prohibition or not. This settled we may cease to waste the time and energy of the country discussing it without effect. If the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster), a former apostle of prohibition in this House, does not believe in the principle of the Bill or in its provisions, why does he not now propose in amendment that this Bill be not read now a second time but that it be resolved that the time has come to pass a prohibitory Bill without reference to the people at all. If he would do so he would be consistent. But he is, as the right hon. Premier has said, simply trying to make capital against the Government, to damage their Bill and prevent its success as a means of ascertaining the opinion of the people.

Granting the principle of a popular vote on this question at all, I am compelled to range myself entirely with Hon. Mr. Mills in his opinion of how it ought to be done. The people should not be asked to vote for an abstract proposition but they should be asked to say whether some particular scheme of prohibition which is laid before them suits them or not. I need hardly enlarge on this point. Anybody who knows anything of the popular vote, knows that it is easy to get people to vote for an abstract proposition like free trade, or protection, or prohibition, or anything else, while you could not get them to agree, by the smallest majority upon some particular plan of carrying out the principle that might be adopted. The logical plan, therefore, would be to adopt the referendum rather than the plebiscite, to pass a Bill through this Parliament with the condition that it should not become law until it was carried by a certain specified majority of the people of the country. They are both foreign to our constitution, an hon. gentleman beside me says, yes, but of two foreign expedients, I would adopt the more reasonabe and logical one. Therefore, I should prefer the submission of a Bill rather than the submission of an abstract proposition. In his criticism of the features of the Bill, there is no doubt, the hon. member for York had some reason to complain that the vote was only on an abstract proposition. But I am afraid that what reason and logic his remarks showed in that respect was at the expense of his prohibitionist friends who have forced this form of question upon the Government.

Mr. CASEY.

Mr. FOSTER. If my hon. friend (Mr. Casey) will allow me, I do not think that he is right in saying that the prohibitionists or temperance people of Canada have forced this on the party or on the Government.

Mr. CASEY. It is, perhaps, going too far to say "forced," because we do not admit that this Government can have its hand forced on any question. But there is no doubt that the prohibitionists urged that upon the Government.

Mr. FOSTER. No.

Mr. CASEY. I am afraid I must differ from my hon. friend (Mr. Foster). All the prohibitionists that I know are strong upon that point, and I know nearly all that are in this House. I know that they urged that the question should be put in that form as likely to be the one least embarrassing and least likely to divert the mind of the voters from the point at issue. They said: It is not fair to ask the voters a lot of outside questions; it is impossible to get the voters to agree upon any scheme of prohibition that you may draw up. I think that is so. But if the people cannot be got to agree upon any particular form of prohibition, it shows they are not ready for prohibition, and a vote upon such a Bill would give more enlightenment to the Government than a vote upon an abstract question. In fact there is no doubt that the question as it is to be put has been drawn exactly to suit the prohibition sentiment of the country.

Mr. FOSTER. I am afraid I misunderstood my hon. friend, then. If my hon. friend meant to say that the form of this question suits the prohibitionists, then I agree with him. But what I understood him to say was that the plebiscite policy was forced on the Government by the temperance people.

Mr. CASEY. I do not say that, I said the form of the question was made to suit the prohibition sentiment of the country, and I think it was made to suit that sentiment without due consideration of the trustworthiness of the information to be obtained by the submission of that question. I hope that the Government will allow, without prejudice to their Bill, a free discussion of the question of the wording of that question in Committee of the Whole, when we get there, as we undoubtedly shall. It would add greatly to the public confidence in the measure if free discussion were had on this question, and I think it would add greatly to the usefulness of the Bill if more information was asked.

It is said that you should not submit arguments to the people on a ballot. I quite agree that you should not submit arguments to them, they will not read them. But we want information, or else this plebiscite is of no

advantage. We want to know, not only whether the people are in favour of prohibition as an abstract idea, but whether they are willing to submit to the consequences of enforcing prohibition. One of those probable consequences will undoubtedly be direct taxation. You do not ask the people to vote for direct taxation; but if it is necessary, in order to have prohibition, to have direct taxation, you should ask them: are you willing to bear it? The Government should ask the people if it is found necessary, as a matter of fair-play, to compensate those whose business is destroyed by a prohibitory law: Are you willing to agree to that? In other words, will you agree to direct taxation or compensation, one or both of them, if prohibition is passed? There should be three distinct questions. You cannot get the information you want by a plain yes or no to one simple proposition. Then I think, if the question goes in this abstract form, it must certainly be distinctly understood by those who agree to the passage of this Bill, that the mere vote of a majority of those who attend the polls on that occasion shall not bind this House. My hon. friend from York (Mr. Foster) has been trying to get a definite pledge from the Government. Well, it is quite open to the Government to pledge itself, and to say it will introduce the Bill if such and such a thing happens. But nobody can expect, not even the apostle of the prohibitionists can expect the House to pledge themselves, and to say that they will accept as conclusive a verdict given on an abstract question like that proposed to be asked under this Bill, which takes a verdict given of the difficulties and dangers surrounding it, and that they will bind themselves to pass such a prohibitory law as may be introduced. I certainly shall not forswear my independence and responsibility to that extent. Then, I consider that a vote, taken as this Bill proposes, will simply obtain the abstract opinion of those who vote upon the question. I think that will be very valuable information to be used for what it is worth as one of the elements to be taken into account when considering whether we shall have a prohibitory law. It is going to cost a good deal to get it, and I hope it will be very valuable. We all know that even when a concrete Act is submitted to the people, the vote is not an absolute index of their feelings in regard to it. In most parts of Ontario we have seen the Scott Act adopted by overwhelming majorities, enforced nominally for three years, and repealed by large majorities at the end of that time. We have noticed that during those three years the zeal of many who voted for the Scott Act evaporated with the mere act of casting their ballots, and that during the subsequent three years they were quite as ready to take advantage of a chance of getting a drink as others who had voted against the Scott Act. How much more would that be the case if a mere abstract proposition was submitted to the people. I speak in regard to the Scott Act from having personal information on that point. I regret to say that I was not altogether guiltless of violating the Scott Act myself while it was in operation in my county; and I had means of observation which, fortunately, for myself I do not now possess. I feel able to speak on this question with absolute impartiality, because I have tried both sides of it, the teetotal side and the other.

Mr. BERGERON. Which side do you like best?

Mr. CASEY. Well, I like the teetotal side best at the present time, and I am sticking to it. But that is quite apart from the question of how this vote should be submitted to the people of the country. I want to emphasize the fact that even a vote on a concrete measure like the Scott Act does not prove that those who voted for it will assist in having it carried out and made effective after it becomes the law of the country; and that therefore the value to be attached to a vote on an abstract question like this must be only such as each member of this House, in his individual capacity, sees fit to give to it. I shall support the second reading of the Bill, and I shall support the final passage of the Bill in such shape as it goes through the committee; but I urge the Government to allow full consideration in committee, without drawing party lines, on the points to which I have called their attention.

Mr. BERGERON. The right hon. gentleman having mentioned my name two or three times in connection with the discussion of this Bill, on a previous occasion and to-day, I wish to say one word to prevent the impression going abroad that I am not a temperance man because I oppose this Bill. I may say that in opposing it I am simply following out the position I have always taken on the question of prohibition during the twenty years that I have had the honour of occupying a seat in this House. As has already been said, this question has been before Parliament at nearly every session since 1878, and I have always voted in the same way upon it, that is to say, that while wishing to see temperance promoted in this country, I do not approve of promoting it by the policy of prohibition. Sir, I think this Bill is very characteristic of the present Administration. They made promises before the elections, they fabricated a platform in 1893, full of promises, and they have broken every one of them so far. But now they think it is about time to fulfil one of their promises, and they have pitched upon this one. Why did they select this one?

Because it was the easiest to adopt. It is no sacrifice on their part at all, it will cost $300,000 or $400,000, probably, but it is the people's money, and therefore does not concern them. When the right hon. gentleman is asked what action his Government will take in case the electorate vote in favour of prohibition, he makes no answer. He speaks in a most eloquent way, he always does that, but he avoids answering questions. He chaffs my hon. friend from York (Mr. Foster) because of the position he formerly took on this prohibition question. My hon. friend from York might turn round and make the same remarks concerning some of the hon. gentlemen opposite. I think they are all sincere, but we have remarked that whenever these gentlemen were in power they began to modify their opinions. Take, for instance, my hon. friend from Yarmouth (Mr. Flint), in whom I have entire confidence and whom I respect as one of the most interesting men in this House. That hon. gentleman has taken a very strong position on the liquor question ever since he has been in Parliament. I have always admired him for the position he has taken, because I think he is sincere. I am convinced that instead of voting for a plebiscite Bill, that hon. gentleman would much rather vote at once fairly and squarely in favour of immediate prohibition of the liquor traffic, thinking in his own conscience that the people of this country would be better off under prohibition than under the system which prevails to-day.

The hon. gentleman was obliged to modify his opinion and declare that he would support the measure of the present Administration and be willing to have the people declare whether they want this measure proposed. The Government wanted to keep one of their promises made to the people, and they have chosen this one. I asked the other day from the Government, and I expected an answer to be made by the hon. Minister of Agriculture, whether any report had been made to any department of the Government by any law officer of the Crown whether a constitutional question is not involved, whether we are not here attempting to enact legislation that will prove useless after it has been passed at a large expenditure of the public money. I stated the other day, and I repeat it, that in the opinion of leading men in my province, in the opinion of the Attorney General of the province of Quebec, if this measure is carried, if the people of the six provinces declare they are in favour of a system of entire prohibition in Canada, such a measure cannot be forced on the people of Quebec or any other province not in favour of accepting prohibition. Where are we going to land ? After we have brought this country into the turmoil of a general election, and the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Osler) has stated to-day that we are going to do a great deal of harm in passing this Bill, this Parliament will probably be unable to put prohibition in force and the whole measure may be declared to be unconstitutional. It would then cost the Government nothing to simply say that they have adopted what measures they could, but the people would have been called upon to spend nearly half a million dollars to secure that result. It has also been declared by lawyers of prominence that the Parliament of Canada cannot prevent the manufacture of liquor in the different provinces, because this is a civil right. This Parliament can prevent the importation of liquor and it can deal with the liquor trade, but we cannot by Act of this Parliament prevent the manufacture of liquor in any of the provinces. When we have asked the people to prevent the importation and manufacture of liquor, and have found that we have worked to accomplish no result and that we cannot enforce the measure adopted, I hold we shall have been acting in a manner not worthy of this Parliament. If there is one thing more objectionable than another in this world it is hypocrisy. I want to go further, but I do not wish this remark to be considered personal to the present Administration. Every time this question has been before Parliament, the Government in power, in order to shield themselves, have acted in a manner that was not manly. Under the old Administration the Government had recourse to a commission which perambulated through the country and took testimony. We knew in advance what the evidence would amount to. They brought in a majority report to show that prohibition was not in the interest of the country, but that commission cost, if my memory serves me, over $100,000. Whatever the expenditure may have been, and we will not quarrel over the figures, whether it was $80,000 or $100,000, the money was spent without achieving any result whatever. This Government announces that it has promised the country to have a plebiscite or a referendum, and it must hold to its promise. I do not believe that hon. gentlemen opposite came into power on that issue, and I believe the people had not this question in their minds at the time of the general elections, or at all events very few of them thought of it. We are now going to spend a large sum of money upon it, and the action of the Government reminds me of the saying of a great politician, who said that it was very important to give the people of the country something to play with in order to keep them busy. The leader of the Government proposes to keep the people busy with this question up to September and then go through the turmoil of an election. The right hon. leader of the Government has not yet answered the question whether, if the people of Canada by a majority give an affirmative answer when the vote is taken on the plebiscite, the Government will bring down

a measure to establish and enforce prohibition. Until the Prime Minister makes this statement and the Government give their pledge, the whole of this action in regard to the plebiscite is nothing more than a huge farce, and it will prove a very costly one, too.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time, on a division.

Mr. FOSTER. Do you, Mr. Speaker, hold that the Bill has been read a second time on a party division ?

Mr. SPEAKER. It means that the vote is not unanimous, and any one hon. member, I suppose, can prevent it being unanimous without the yeas and nays being taken.

Mr. DAVIN. Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I may say that if the second reading had been carried, as I understood it would be carried, unanimously, I would not have spoken at all——

Mr. SPEAKER. The House has decided that it go into committee now. It is moved by Mr. Fisher, seconded by Mr. Sifton, that I do now leave the Chair.

Mr. FOSTER. Six o'clock.

The PRIME MINISTER. Will five minutes do ?

Mr. DAVIN. Five minutes will not do.

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

After Recess

Mr. DAVIN. A considerable number of my constituents take a deep interest in the question of prohibition, and whenever the question has been asked me as to what my position in regard to prohibition was, I have always replied, that to this extent I was a prohibitionist : that I was in favour of prohibition, and the only thing in which I differed from a prohibitionist was, that I did not think it feasible. Now, Sir, this question has been bandied about the country so long and it has been so falsely played with, that even if the Government only brings in a plebiscite Bill I am ready to vote for it with a view of seeing the question as it were rounded down to a final issue. But, Mr. Speaker, it is, as you, an old parliamentarian, must feel, a melancholy thing to find a Government, powerful at least in its majority, bringing in a Bill of this kind, which is the sign and symbol of the dethronement of Parliament, which is the abandonment by this Parliament of its functions, and which is a shirking by the Government of Canada of its responsibilities. It is a continuance, Mr. Speaker, of what we have seen in regard to other measures, a continuance of the policy of skulking. We have had an extraordinary spectacle here this afternoon, and it is not desirable that the House should go into committee until it is remarked on and the attention of the people called to it. Here is a Bill brought into this House that is an innovation of the British constitution, and the Minister who introduced it never gave a reason why it was necessary to resort to this innovation. He contented himself with giving us some ancient history in regard to this question in Parliament and out of Parliament, since first it came up in Canada. Then we had a speech from the Prime Minister, and what did he do ? He, supposed to be a disciple of Edmund Burke, he, supposed to have sat at the feet of English constitutionalists, what did he do ? When this innovating measure was introduced by one of his colleagues, he got up and criticised the conduct of the ex-Minister of Finance. Sir, we are not concerned, nor is the public of Canada concerned with the past history of the ex-Minister of Finance upon this question. What we are concerned with now is the conduct of the Government and its supporters with reference to it. The feeling throughout the country, that the Government in regard to prohibition is insincere, and the feeling that in the political character of the Prime Minister there is a lode and vein and mine of inexhaustible insincerity ; that feeling will be intensified by the course taken by the right hon. gentleman this afternoon. When the Prime Minister taunted the ex-Minister of Finance with inconsistency, I could not help thinking of the utterances of the right hon. gentleman not quite twelve months ago, for it is not quite twelve months since a deputation of gentlemen interested in the manufacture and sale of liquor waited upon the Prime Minister, and this is what he said to them at that time. I quote from the "Globe" of May 14th, 1897 :

> Mr. Haverson had objected to the naked question going to the people, that it should not be——

I ask the attention of the House to these words of the Prime Minister :

> ——that it should not be a mere academic question, but should be a practical one, so that the people could give a practical answer as well.

Later on in the same speech the Prime Minister said :

> The revenue was the really important point, and was a very serious consideration to the Ministry, and to the Minister of Finance especially. If prohibition were applied, revenue to the amount of $8,000,000 would be wiped out at once, and would have to be made up in some other way. What source of revenue was there that had not been adopted already ? Direct taxation was the only source open. It was not the policy of the Government to advance the duties on customs, but rather to restrict them. If it were possible for any one to point out any other way than direct taxation he would like to know it. The people who favour prohibition said the country was ready for it, even if it meant direct taxation. He believed they were honest, and that they were prepared to undertake the burden of direct taxation, but whether the rest of the

people were prepared for that remains to be seen.

What impression did that language make upon those who read and heard it at the time? The impression was that when this question was put to the people there would also be a question that would make it, according to the words of the right hon. gentleman, a practical one. That was the impression given to the writer in the "Templar," who characterized the words of the right hon. gentleman, then the Hon. Mr. Laurier, in this way:

> Mr. Laurier's reply must be very disappointing to all who expected the promised plebiscite as an honest effort to promote temperance reform or to solve the drink problem. Undoubtedly thousands of sincere friends of the cause believed that the plebiscite policy was prompted by a desire to further the interest of temperance and to ascertain whether or not public sentiment was ripe for temperance legislation.

And the "Templar" goes on to assail the Prime Minister for the answer then given by him. The reason I refer to that is, because there is nothing to show in the speech delivered by the Prime Minister this afternoon that he has changed his opinion, that he considers that this question he is putting is an academic one, or that the question to be put is a practical one. There is nothing to show that he does not still hold that the question that will be put to the people under this Bill is a non-practical one, and so far we have no guarantee whatever, if there should be a majority in favour of prohibition, as to the further action of the right hon. gentleman and of his Government. He was asked at that time what majority should be given in order to enable the Government to act upon the verdict of the people; and what was his answer? He said fifty per cent at least of a majority, whatever that meant—whether it was fifty per cent of the whole or fifty per cent of the majority. I say, therefore, that the hon. Minister in not explaining what he would do, or in not giving us any information as to whether he abandoned his proposition of twelve months ago, leaves us to infer that the Government are merely placing before the people a scheme that is intended to play with the prohibitionists, as they have been already played with many a time and oft.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there were two questions which the hon. gentleman was bound to answer, to himself, to this Parliament and to the people of Canada, before he introduced this Bill. One of these questions was this: what is our constitutional position in regard to legislating on this question? Because, if the doubt that has been raised, inside of this House and outside of this House, as to our power to prohibit the manufacture of liquor, has anything in it, then, after going to the expense of a plebiscite, and learning what the people want, we may see this Government turning round and saying to the people, "We have gone to the trouble of getting your verdict, and now that we have got it we really do not know what to do, because we do not know what jurisdiction we have." We must remember that up to a short time ago there was a member of that Government who had played hide and seek with the people of Ontario in regard to this very question; we must remember that there is another member of that Government who treated the people of Nova Scotia in a similar manner; we must remember that Mr. Greenway, another Liberal Premier, treated the people of Manitoba in that way also; and are we to see the converse of the thimble-rigging in regard to this question that took place in these provinces, perpetrated by this Dominion Government? And, as the provincial governments told the people, after putting them to the expense of a plebiscite, "We can do nothing, because the judicial decisions show that the responsibility and the authority are in Ottawa," are we now to find the Government of the Dominion turning round, after they had got a majority for prohibition, and saying, "We find that we cannot prohibit, and you must go back to the provincial assemblies and the provincial governments once again." That this is not a mere theory of mine, I want to read the language of the present Minister of Justice. I am not going to read the letter which the ex-Finance Minister (Mr. Foster) read in his able speech this afternoon. I am going to read another letter written by the present Attorney General of Canada, who was properly described by the hon. member for York as the keeper of the conscience of the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches. In response to a question asked by a Liberal Premier as to where the authority for dealing with this question lay, Mr. Mills, no farther back than April 7, 1898, wrote as follows:—

> Office of the Minister of Justice,
> Ottawa, 7th April, 1898.
>
> Dear Sir,—I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 19th of March, and in reply beg to say that the regulations to which you refer are all within the jurisdiction of the provincial legislature to legislate in the direction which you indicate, as far as they think it in the public interest to go, to the extent of total prohibition. There is nothing to prevent any province prohibiting the sale of intoxicants for consumption as a beverage within the limits of the province, if so disposed.
>
> Yours truly,
>
> DAVID MILLS.

It is plain that the authority cannot inhere in the two bodies. If it is in the provincial legislatures, it cannot be here; and if it is here, it cannot be in the provincial legislatures. But we have the Minister of Justice giving his high authority to the statement that it inheres in the provincial legislatures. Of course, there is the chance that these hon. gentlemen are going on. There is the speech of the Prime Minister twelve months ago, which of course will be

placarded by the liquor men, very properly too, all over Canada, in which he says that eight million dollars will be lost if this policy is carried out, in which he says that it is not the policy of his Government to impose more taxes, in which he says that direct taxation will have to be resorted to. I admit that hon. gentlemen have a chance that there may be a majority against prohibition. But what we may have to confront is this, as was pointed out by my hon. friend from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) to-day. Suppose you get a clear majority of the electorate throughout the entire Dominion, and yet one large province, say Quebec, gives a majority against the measure. We had the dictum recently laid down in this House in regard to another question by the Prime Minister himself—I speak of the franchise—that it is the provincial view that is to prevail in these matters. With that principle before them, hon. gentlemen opposite will turn round and say, "It is true, we got a majority of the Dominion electorate in favour of the measure, but there is an adverse majority in one of the provinces, and therefore we cannot act." There is another thing necessary in order to place this matter honestly before the people, and it is this. If you get a clear majority of the electorate to answer in the affirmative, what will be the size of the majority that will satisfy you? If you get a majority of the whole Dominion, and there is an adverse majority in one of the provinces, will that make you pause? That the prohibitionists are fully aware that they are being hoodwinked, I want to call attention to what a leading prohibitionist, the Rev. Mr. Huxtable, says on the subject of plebiscites:

> I am not one of the men who worship the plebiscite. I believe it is the duty of the Dominion Parliament to pass a prohibitory law without the preliminary of a plebiscite.

Of course, that is not only the opinion of a clergyman speaking on this question as a clear matter of duty, but it is the opinion of statesmanship—that if a question is to be dealt with in this House, the Government of the day should take the responsibility of dealing with it. He goes on:

> What has the plebiscite done in Ontario, Manitoba and those other provinces? It has deduced the public sentiment of the provinces, for which I am glad, and the coming Dominion plebiscite will give a magnificent view of public opinion, but will the Dominion Government follow its provincial precedents and ignore the issue?

So that not merely to me has it occurred, but it has also occurred to a leading clergyman and prohibitionist, that this Government may do the very thing that was done elsewhere. He continues:

> What has the Government at Ottawa done in response to the popular opinion that has been put before it? It is true it has abolished the bar-room of the House of Commons. The Senate, however, could not see its way clear to follow suit—that was going a little too far, in senatorial estimation. The Government also appointed a Royal Commission, but four out of the five persons appointed were known to the Government to be opposed to prohibition previous to their appointment. And what has resulted from this famous commission, but the useless expenditure of an immense sum of money? In the matter of legislation we have not advanced a single step.

It may be remarked that resorting to this plebiscite is resorting to the same kind of action that the right hon. Prime Minister condemned in the previous Government. That previous Government, I grant you, shirked responsibility by issuing a commission on the subject, and now you have this Government shirking responsibility by bringing in a Bill for a plebiscite. You have the same shirking of responsibility, and in this, as in other things, we have seen this Government, which is a Government of imitators, imitating its predecessors, not merely in policies that are useful and wise, but in their very mistakes. And what has resulted from this famous commission? In the matter of legislation, we have not advanced a single step, and there is not very much reason to believe that we shall advance under the present circumstances any further.

Now, Sir, I want to call the attention of the House to our real position in regard to legislation. We are not here as the mere delegates of constituencies. The delegate of a constituency, who does just what his constituency orders, does, generally speaking, merely what the leading wirepullers in that constituency require him to do. And in the case before us, what do we see? It has been painfully illustrated since the present Government came into power, more than ever before, that the Government has completely usurped the functions of the members of the House. The influence of each member of the House of Commons is reduced to zero, because the Government of the day insists on initiating all legislation and of repressing all initiative on the part of members. Such a thing as an independent member among the following of the Government seems to be now unknown, and the result is that the three or four most active members on the Treasury benches are those who control everything in this House and Parliament is self-effaced. I want to read to you the opinion of the great statesman, Mr. Burke, on what a representative should be. He had been condemned by the people of Liverpool for having voted in the House of Commons in advance of the views of statesmen and politicians, but the course he took is now the gospel of what is wise in legislation. He was condemned by the electors of Liverpool, and he proudly said to them:

> Your representative owes you not his industry only, but his judgment, and he betrays instead of serving you if he sacrifices it to his opinion. I maintained your interests against your opinions

with a constancy that became him. I knew that you chose me to be a pillar of the state, and not a weathercock on the top of the edifice.

Sir, if that be true of a member of Parliament, how much more is it true of the man whom the people have placed at the head of the Government and the parliamentary head of the nation. We chose the right hon. gentleman to be a pillar of the state and not a mere weathercock, and certainly we did not choose him to present the spectacle he presented here to-day when he shirked from assuming all responsibility, skulked behind evasive utterances, and gave this Parliament to understand that he intended, in passing this Bill, to screen himself behind it and avoid all responsibility in regard to this great question of prohibition, although we have on record what his real opinions are and what impression those opinions made at the time on men competent to observe and deal with them and who were deeply interested in this question.

I have declared to you, Sir, the view I take with regard to this question. I am sorry to see it treated here as it is. I am told on pretty good authority—and it was not told to me in confidence—that in the recent caucus a gentleman declared that he was strongly in favour of prohibition, but that he was before all things a party man, and that the only thing to do was to yield to the people, and then that a hint should be given in various quarters to knife the measure. Sir, I have seen for fifteen years in this House men interesting themselves outside in a very active way in this question, and then playing hide-and-go-seek with it in this House, allowing their position as party men and their strong allegiance to party to dominate their allegiance to the Dominion Alliance and the prohibitionists. And we have, on the other side of the House now, an hon. gentleman who is the head and front of the representatives in this House of the Dominion Alliance, and who, when the party to which he belonged was in Opposition, spoke in the strongest manner in favour of the proposition, but who now sits there silently when he ought to be the very first to come forward and demand of his leader that he at least should say this, that if, when this Bill is passed and the plebiscite put in action, the verdict of the country is in favour of prohibition, then the Government of Canada will bring forward legislation to carry out the will of the people. The hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) asked the right hon. gentleman if he would do that, and what did the right hon. gentleman reply. He did what, I grant you, he is a master in doing, he used language that reminded me of the greasing of an eel, and the more you try to lay hold of a greased eel the more it slips from your fingers. The right hon. gentleman is a master of dubious expression and a great coiner of sentences with nothing in them. It is not merely that when the people ask for bread he gives them a stone. He does not give them anything so substantial, but gives them an airy nothing, without either local habitation or name in thought or fact. That is the sort of language he uses with regard to everything, and I was sorry to see him take the position he did to-night, because when he was leading the Opposition there was no man in this House who felt a greater regard for the right hon. gentleman than I did; but no sooner did he become weighted with power and responsibility than he flung to the winds the reputation that for fifteen or twenty years he had been building up, and in the short space of twenty-two months —although we all still feel for his gracious and kindly character much of the regard we once felt—he has dispelled all regard we ever had for his honesty of purpose. From Halifax to Vancouver his utterances on every question have been so contradictory and dubious that you can hardly find one man, the least instructed in past events, who would put the slightest faith on any political statement or programme or comment of the right hon. gentleman. I am sorry for that, and I am sorry, in the face of such a serious question as prohibition, in which many of the most earnest people of the country take so deep an interest—people who are the backbone of its moral and business and intellectual character—to see the Government unwilling to assume even the responsibility of stating that if the measure they themselves have introduced should eventuate in a given way, they would be ready to take the responsibility of action, which one would think would be mechanically—not to speak morally—forced upon them by such verdict.

Motion agreed to, and the House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 5,

The persons entitled to vote shall be all persons who would be entitled to vote at a Dominion election the day of nomination for which was the day appointed for the voting.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I think the attention of the House ought to be called to one of the bad features of the Franchise Act as it has been practically adopted by the House. The vote will be taken through the whole Dominion, and I suppose the subsequent course of the Government will be dictated by the majority vote. But attention should be drawn to the fact that the vote, in comparison to the population must be much larger under the proposed franchise arrangement in some provinces than in others, which not only shows a weak feature of the Franchise Act, but must give an unfair advantage to one side or other with regard to this question.

Mr. DAVIN. I think this clause should be amended so as to enable that class of the community to vote who are most in-

terested. The women of Canada should be allowed to vote on a question like this. It is simply a pedantic adherence to symmetry on the part of the Government that causes them to shrink from including among those entitled to vote on this question the ladies in every constituency in Canada who take an interest in public questions generally, and above all in this question. What body has had the greatest effect not only in Canada, but all over this continent, in spreading temperance views, in circulating temperance literature and creating a sentiment in favour of temperance, but the Women's Christian Temperance Union. That great body includes in its membership some of the most distinguished women in Christendom and we ought to give a vote to those ladies who, in every constituency, exercised such a powerful influence——

Mr. TAYLOR. Particularly property owners.

Mr. DAVIN. Particularly property owners. I do not see the Minister of Agriculture here. This is an extraordinary thing, and I have to comment upon it, as it shows the utter want of earnestness of the Government in this measure. The Minister who introduced this Bill is actually not in his place.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière). He is receiving the monster petition.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). From the very women the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) is talking about.

Mr. DAVIN. Then that excuses him. I hope he will come up laden with the petition. Do I understand from hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches that the Government of Canada is receiving, in one of the sacred edifices of the capital, this petition, and the Prime Minister is there too?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I hope there is no harm in that.

Mr. DAVIN. As to that, with the greatest possible reverence for the place where the petition is being presented and for those who are presenting it, I say that it would be more becoming for the Prime Minister and the Minister who has charge of the Bill to be here. They could easily have chosen another time for presenting that petition, when Parliament was not sitting. But that is another question. I move that this fifth section be amended so as to provide that all who are entitled to vote in municipal elections shall be entitled to vote on this question respecting prohibition.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). While the hon. member (Mr. Davin) is writing out his amendment, perhaps I may be allowed one observation with reference to the remark of the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague). I think that if my hon. friend who has charge of this Bill were here, he would point out to the hon. member for Haldimand that it would be more in accordance with the fitness of things that the same constituency which has the right to choose the representatives of the people in this House should also pass upon the question of prohibition. If I am right in assuming that, I should think also that any addition to the electoral lists for this purpose would be attended with rather serious results. It might happen that the larger constituency to which the hon. gentleman would appeal in this case would not come to the same conclusion as the constituencies which elect the members of this Parliament.

Mr. MONTAGUE. If my hon. friend (Mr. Blair) will permit me, I was not asking to have the constituency widened and any additional persons given the right to vote. But I wish to point out that this is a practical illustration of a very peculiar and at the same time a very unjust feature of the present franchise system, or the system about to be adopted. The point I made was this, that whereas in some of the provinces there was manhood franchise, and consequently every one of the full age of twenty-one years, and a British subject, could vote, in an adjoining province there was a property qualification, and not nearly so large a proportion of the people of that province would express their opinion upon this question as in Ontario. But when it came to totalling up the votes, it must be the majority that rules, and while in one province a small number in comparison to the population has voted, in an adjoining province a larger number in proportion to the population has voted. The remarks of the Minister of Railways and Canals are quite applicable to the gallant motion which has been made by my ever gallant friend from West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), but they do not refer to the point which I mentioned.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. With all deference to my hon. friend I think they do have reference to the suggestion which he made, because any Government that would undertake to deal with this question as the result of a vote taken upon it would necessarily take into account the strength which those who vote yes to this question would have in Parliament as reflected by the vote taken. The number of representatives in this Parliament is not in the slightest degree affected by the number of electors in the different constituencies. After all the potential voice is the voice which is expressed by the representatives here when we finally come to deal with this question. Therefore, I do not see the force or application of my hon. friend's remarks.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I think my hon. friend still misunderstands me. The decision on

this question must be the popular vote in all the provinces as expressed at the polls; and the point I made was this, that it was unfair to take, for instance, a municipality in the province of Ontario where you have manhood suffrage, and where every man twenty-one years of age, and a British subject, and not disqualified, has the right to go and mark his ballot on this question; whereas if you go across the line into the province of Quebec, in a municipality of the same size, possibly, with exactly the same population, but where you have a property qualification instead of manhood franchise, and where consequently not nearly so large a proportion of the people can vote as in the corresponding municipality in the province of Ontario; but when you come to find out how the question stands at the close of the election under this Plebiscite Act, you must take the total number of votes for and against. The point I made was this, that it was unfair to one province under a property qualification and where a smaller proportion of its people have the right to vote, to pit that province against another province having manhood franchise where a larger proportion of its people vote. As regards the election of members to this House, of course, it makes no particular difference. However, if I may be permitted to go back to the Franchise Act, I may point out that in the province of Quebec one man may vote in three, or four, or even eight constituencies if he chances to have property in as many, and if he is able to visit each constituency on polling day; while in another province a man can only vote in one constituency. That brings up the question as to the effect of the vote under this Plebiscite Act. Are you going to permit one man to vote in every constituency where he has property, or is he to vote only in one?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I take it that no doubt he has a right to vote in as many constituencies as the local franchise will give him a right to vote in.

Mr. MONTAGUE. My hon. friend will see what an exceedingly incongruous thing will happen. In the province of Ontario a man may have property in twelve constituencies, but under the provincial franchise he votes in only one against prohibition, we will say. A man in the province of Quebec has a vote in eight constituencies, and he votes in the eight constituencies for prohibition. In other words, one man in the province of Quebec is as good as eight in the province of Ontario. Now, with every respect for our fellow-citizens in the province of Quebec, I do not think one man there is as good as eight in Ontario.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). The hon. gentleman sees that the same man would have a right to vote for twelve members of Parliament in the same way. The same apparent incongruity exists there, and has already been discussed in the House.

Mr. MONTAGUE. My hon. friend sees how the difference would affect the result on this question. By as many votes as he can poll in the province of Quebec, he is advantaging his side and disadvantaging the other side under the peculiar Franchise Act which the hon. gentlemen have placed on the Statute-book. I can scarcely think that on this question where the popular vote decides, the Government will follow the idea which has just been thrown out by the Minister of Railways and Canals and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and give a man a vote in four or five constituencies in one province on this question while he only has one vote in another province.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman is basing his arguments upon the assumption, which, so far as I am capable of forming a judgment at this moment, is not well founded. He assumes that in determining whether the policy of prohibition has been carried throughout the Dominion, inquiry will be made as to the total number of votes polled in all the constituencies on each side. Now, I am not going to say whether that ought to be done or not, but I can well conceive that the suggestion the hon. gentleman has made is a strong reason why we may well consider whether it would be proper to total all the votes that are recorded on one side or the other and draw our conclusion from that as to whether legislation ought to follow.

Mr. MONTAGUE. That is the only way to judge.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not concede that that is the only way to judge. There are many considerations that must be taken into account in determining whether the country is prepared to adopt the policy of prohibition. You must satisfy yourself, among other things, that it is likely to commend itself to the approval of Parliament. Well, if the apportionment of the votes in the different provinces is such that a very much larger number of votes would be polled in an election on this question than the number which would be polled for an election for members of Parliament, or relatively with the whole parliamentary representation, the hon. member can see that it would be very proper to consider how far that ought to influence the final result. I quite take in the point the hon. gentleman is making, but I think he is suggesting it at a premature moment. It would be proper for him to consider it when the matter reaches a more advanced stage than the present.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. gentleman, I am quite sure, sees the point I was endeavouring to make; and I propose to move later on that an oath be added so that a man who comes up to vote has to swear that he has not voted in any other constituency previously at that election. I do so for this purpose. Take the city of Toronto and the city of Montreal. A man has property in say three constituencies in the city of Toronto, but under the Franchise Act of Ontario he votes in only one constituency; while another citizen in Montreal who has property in five wards may vote in those five wards under the Franchise Act of Quebec. Both men vote on the one question; and while the citizen of Ontario has only one vote for his view of the question, the citizen of Quebec has five votes for his view of the question.

I am referring to the fact—I may be wrong in the suggestion—that if a plebiscite were carried by a majority vote, hon. gentlemen opposite would bring in a Bill on the matter to which it refers. At least I must go this far, that the size of the vote on both sides must be one of the factors that will influence hon. gentlemen as to their course in the future. What I am contending is, that in the province of Quebec or any other province where a man has a right to vote in four or five constituencies, he has the power of swamping votes which oppose his view of the question, especially the votes of men in other provinces where a man has only one vote.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). The hon. gentleman, no doubt unintentionally, overstated the question. I do not understand that electors in Quebec, certainly under the election law, have more than one vote for one candidate. No doubt a man may have five votes in five different constituencies.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I intended to mention different constituencies.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The number of men who vote in more than one constituency is very few. The same law prevails in Prince Edward Island and in New Brunswick.

Mr. MONTAGUE. There are thousands of men who can vote in three or four electoral divisions.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The law is no different in the province of Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick, and for ought I know, in Nova Scotia. I will not say it is a difficulty that is pedantic or imaginary, but it is one not involving very much danger.

Mr. CLARKE. Notwithstanding the explanation made, the fact remains that in Ontario the electors who are entitled to vote for members of this House or members of the legislative assembly can only give one vote on this question, while in the provinces to which the hon. gentleman has referred, Quebec, New Brunswick, and Prince Edward Island, an elector can vote as frequently as his property qualification entitles him in the different constituencies. There are thousands of electors in Ontario who have property qualification to entitle them to vote in more than one constituency, but by this clause these electors will be discriminated against by not being given the same opportunity that is given to their fellow-electors in the different provinces to which mention has been made. There seems to be, rightly or wrongly, an impression prevailing in the House that the majority of the electors of the province of Quebec are not in favour of prohibition. I do not know whether that opinion is well founded, but in provinces like Ontario and Manitoba, provinces that have emphatically expresed their opinion by a plebiscite in favour of prohibition, electors should not be placed in a less favourable position than the electors of a province supposed to be opposed to prohibition. It would be fair and reasonable that if property qualification may enable a man to give more than one vote, and this privilege is allowed in Quebec, it should be allowed to electors in other provinces.

Mr. INGRAM. I wish to call the attention of the committee to sections 17 and 18. Section 17 provides:

> 17. Immediately upon the receipt of the return from each electoral district, the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery shall in the ordinary issue of "The Canada Gazette" give notice with respect to that electoral district of——
>
> (a) The total number of affirmative answers to the question, and
>
> (b) The total number of negative answers to the question.

That refers to each electoral district. Section 18 says:

> 18. The Clerk of the Crown in Chancery shall also in the ordinary issue of "The Canada Gazette" in which any such notice is given, publish a summary of all the returns then received, classifying the totals in each particular according to provinces, and in the North-west Territories by provisional districts.
>
> 2. This summary shall be so arranged, and contain such further particulars based upon the returns, as the Governor in Council sees fit to order.

It is quite evident that electors in the province of Quebec who may have five or six votes in different electoral districts, will count in the grand total as compared with electors in other provinces.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. They are comparatively few.

Mr. INGRAM. We know by experience in Ontario that men may have four or five votes or more; in fact, there are thousands of men of that class.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHEIES. Does not the hon. gentleman

see that that rule works both ways, that it applies both affirmatively and negatively, so that it cures itself. No doubt there will be as many names applicable on one side as the other.

Amendment (Mr. Davin) negatived.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I beg to move in amendment, that after the word "voting" in third line of section 5, the following be added :—

Provided, nevertheless, that no elector shall vote more than once in this election.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). I would observe to the hon. gentleman that practically I think there is very little danger of any injustice being done. In the first place, he must bear in mind that those who vote in more than one constituency are few, as has been already pointed out. There is another point which deserves consideration, and it is this. Any man who has had personal experience with the returns of voters knows that the voters in Ontario in proportion to the population are far more numerous than the voters in the province of Quebec. Ontario in this way will have a far larger total vote than Quebec if the proportion of the population of the two provinces be taken into account. This duplicate vote will prove a slight means by which the people of the province of Quebec will be able to neutralize that condition, and I repeat that a comparatively small number will be able to vote in more than one constituency and it will be far less than the number of people in Ontario who will be enabled to vote by reason of the greater extension of the franchise there.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If this amendment involves any sound principle it should have been incorporated in the Franchise Act, and it should not be introduced at the end of a clause in the present Bill. The object we all desire, I take it, is to ascertain the views of the constituencies, and the views of those constituencies as they find expression in this Parliament. It would be entirely unwise and would weaken the effect of any vote—and I am sure the hon. member does not want to do that—that might possibly be given on this question, if it were possible to declare that the vote which carried prohibition in the affirmative had been less than the vote necessary to elect to this House a member who would be in favour of prohibition. Whatever may be the conclusion which may be arrived at by those who may have to deal with this question, it must be in accord with the sentiment of Parliament. Therefore, it strikes at the very basis of the whole question here, and if the amendment were to carry it would be a fatal alteration in this Bill. I do not think my hon. friend would wish to press the amendment, in view of its having such serious consequences.

Sir LOUIS DAVIES.

Mr. POPE. I do not agree with the conclusion arrived at by the hon. Minister of Railways. In submitting the plebiscite to the people you make one grand constituency of the Dominion, and the result is totalled up, and so far as that goes the lines of the constituencies are obliterated. It does not make any difference to a member of this House what happens inside of a particular constituency, but it all goes to show that according to our British system of parliamentary government the plebiscite is entirely out of place. We are in this Parliament elected to deal with public questions, right or wrong, and to assume the fullest responsibility for the action we may take. In disposing of the question of prohibition or any other, if I were left to choose the position I would wish to assume, I would face the issue squarely, and I would not get behind any curtain or any hypocrisy, nor would I dodge the real issue. If the time has arrived and the opportunity is here when it is in the best interests of the people of Canada that prohibition should be law, each and every member of this House ought to be ready to assume that responsibility, and he is bound under the constitution to assume it. This plebiscite is only a farce ; it is going to be an expensive farce to the people of this country, and when it is all over, we are not going to have prohibition, it has got to be passed by the vote of the members of this Parliament. In the end it is the members of the Dominion Parliament who will have to face the issue. I do not myself see why it would not have been better for us to face the issue now. If the time is ripe and the hour is opportune, it would be better for us to vote prohibition or no prohibition, rather than to put the people of this country to this extraordinary expense which after it has been incurred, will leave us very little nearer the final result. Of course, it is not necessary nor opportune now, to speak of the effects of prohibition in other parts of this continent. There are many large territories which now enjoy, if enjoyment it is, prohibitory laws. For many years there has been a prohibition law in the State of Maine and I do not think there is any State in the Union where you can find so many Gold Cure Institutes and places of retreat for gentlemen who overindulge than you can find in that State. Notwithstanding that, when you come to the legislature of the State of Maine, you find a peculiar influence that carries prohibition. I can well understand that when some hon. members in this House are making nothing out of the liquor traffic and have no material interest in it, there is a disposition on their part to say, "We will get rid of this question by voting for it whether we believe in it or not. But this is a serious matter, and hon. gentlemen should consider well what the result will be before they ask the people of this country to spend at least $200,000 for a plebiscite. When you have got that election completed, you have sim-

ply polled up a whole lot of votes in one volume, you have found so many thousands on one side and so many thousands on the other, and then you have got to come back to Parliament and ask Parliament to do precisely what it is the duty of Parliament to do now. Since the Government have seen fit to propose this plebiscite since they have taken this means of dodging the real issue, no matter what it may cost the country, I suppose it is useless for any hon. member in this House to do other than to enter his protest. There is no object in taking up the time of the committee and prolonging the session by arguments against it, and so I wish to place myself on record as being perfectly prepared to-night as well as on any other occasion, to cast my vote in this House either for or against prohibition as I believed would be in the best interests of this country. As to the details it does not make a great deal of difference, because hon. gentlemen in this House will eventually have to vote on prohibition according to their judgment irrespective of whether the plebiscite was in favour of prohibition or not.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. What way would you vote ?

Mr. POPE. I should vote according to the dictates of my conscience. If standing up in this House for prohibition, I should vote straight for prohibition. Now, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Somerville) knows precisely how my conscience lies in that particular ; and I would like to ask the hon. gentleman to be as frank to this House as I have been, and to state how he would vote on the question of prohibition.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I voted lots of times.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Answer.

Mr. POPE. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Somerville) does not chose to avail himself of the opportunity to answer, I suppose we may take it for granted that he is a dodger.

Mr. CHAIRMAN (Mr. Brodeur). Order.

Mr. POPE. That he is afraid of somebody inside of his constituency ; that he has not the courage of his convictions.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I have voted in this House for prohibition many times.

Mr. POPE. You have voted, but you will never do it again.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. How do you know ?

Mr. POPE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Somerville) repents that he voted for prohibition. He has said that he has voted for it, but the very tone in which he says it designates him as a doubtful character.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Not at all.

Mr. POPE. If I were running as a candidate, and if the hon. gentleman answered in the tone he did to-night, I would put him in the very doubtful list. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Somerville) regrets that he ever did vote for prohibition.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. You are entirely mistaken.

Mr. POPE. Hon. gentlemen in this House have played with this issue ever since I have been a member of it, and judging from the expert manner in which both sides of the House have handled the question, I fancy that they must have had a training before ever I came here, and that they had been amusing themselves with it before.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Brodeur). I do not like to interfere with the speech of the hon. member (Mr. Pope), but I am of opinion that his remarks are not absolutely in order.

Mr. POPE. Yes, sir ; I was just coming to the point.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER. We are not now discussing the principle of the Bill.

Mr. POPE. I know. I was just coming to the point. And now in order to continue that play and amusement they are proposing to give, by this peculiar Bill an opportunity for a man in the city of Montreal to cast five votes as against the one vote of a man in the city of Toronto. Now, Sir, if that is not continuing the game of trifling with the affections of a most sacred and highly moral cause, I do not know what trifling with any cause is.

While there is something in what has been said by the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) that in the province of Quebec we have very large families, and therefore we do not have as many voters per capita as the province of Ontario, I think, for that portion of the population that really has the right to vote, we stand man for man with the province of Ontario. So that, as this is a peculiar election, an election of the common people, all voting together on one question, I do not see that it is a violation of any sacred rights privileges which the Government are giving under the Franchise Act, which I presume is soon to come into force, that an equality vote should be taken on this question in all the provinces. Therefore, I think the Ministry should take into serious consideration the amendment that has been proposed by my hon. friend.

Mr. BRITTON. I think there can be no doubt, on principle and logically, that the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) is right, that in a matter of this kind there is a very great difference between voting on a particular question in one large constituency, and voting for representatives, where the provinces is limited to a certain number of representatives. In the present case everybody voting either for or against the measure is counted. Notwithstanding

that, it seems to me that as we have taken this Franchise Act for better or worse, we had better stick to it; and I submit to the hon. gentleman who has addressed the House on the question, whether there is really going to be any practical wrong done in the matter. Let me illustrate. Suppose we have in Ontario a place with a population of 1,000, and in Quebec a place with a population of 1,000. Unquestionably the place in the province of Ontario will give more voters than the place in the province of Quebec. Therefore, the place in the province of Quebec might say, and say justly and properly: "This is an unfair thing; the place in Ontario, with only 1,000 population, can give 200 votes for or against prohibition, while we cannot give more than 150 votes, so that the province of Ontario has an unfair advantage either way."

Mr. QUINN. How does my hon. friend prove that a thousand people in the province of Ontario will give a larger number of votes than a thousand in the province of Quebec?

Mr. BRITTON. The reason I said that, and I think it is correct, is that in Ontario we have a manhood franchise, a wider franchise than that in the province of Quebec, which I think is a property franchise.

Mr. QUINN. I do not think it is wider than the Quebec franchise.

Mr. BRITTON. I suppose it is, and it was on that supposition that I used the illustration. That, together with the argument used by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies), seems to satisfy me that as we cannot have something that is going to do complete justice between all parties, and as it is likely that as many who have more votes than one will vote against prohibition as will vote for prohibition, and whether one man has one vote or five votes, no harm is done. So that it seems to me that we ought to stick to the Franchise Act.

Amendment negatived, and section agreed to.

On section 6.

Mr. DAVIN. I beg to move that after "1898" in line 7, the words be inserted, "should this last measure have been passed by Parliament." Here we are asked to pass a clause which speaks of "the Franchise Act, 1898." There is at present no such thing as the Franchise Act, 1898. There is a Bill; but suppose that Bill miscarries. This is another element in this legislation that emphasizes the insincerity of the Government in regard to this matter. Suppose anything prevented that Franchise Bill carrying. The Government would then be in a position to say, "We cannot go on with this plebiscite," which of course they are dying to be in a position to do. Therefore, if we insert the words I propose, they cannot do any harm in case the Franchise Bill should pass, and in case it should not pass, they will save the Plebiscite Bill; whereas, if you pass this clause as it is at present and the Franchise Bill should miscarry, then the Government might seize on it as an excuse. Now, I think it is very much for the honour of the Minister of Agriculture that he should accept this amendment. When the hon. Minister was introducing this Bill, my hon. friend from Kent, N.B. (Mr. McInerney) suggested how illogical, how impolite, how unjust it was to place this phrase, "the Franchise Act, 1898," in the section; and thereupon the Minister of Agriculture, with great confidence, said that they considered it a perfectly certain thing that the Franchise Act would pass into law. Well, Sir, I do not think this House of Commons has so completely lost all freedom that the hon. gentleman was in a position to speak with that arrogant confidence; and now I say, in the interest of prohibition, in the interest of fair play, in the interest of honesty and common fair dealing between man and man, do not let this principal clause of the Bill be tainted with a phrase that seems to imply by irresistible necessity insincerity on the part of the Government of Canada.

Mr. McCLEARY. Surely the hon. Minister of Agriculture will give some reason why this clause should not be amended. It does seem most unfair to those interested in the prohibition question that it should be subjected to the contingency of the Franchise Bill passing this Parliament. Of course we were told the other day that it would pass, but this same Franchise Bill was brought down last session and did not pass.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There is nothing in the Bill which says that the vote must be taken under the Franchise Bill of 1898.

Mr. McCLEARY. It says "and the Franchise Act of 1898 shall apply." If there is uncertainty as to the Franchise Bill passing, we are entitled to have an explanation as to what will be the conduct of the Government in regard to taking a vote.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I did not think the amendment required any reply because I do not think it makes the slightest difference in the meaning of the section or is worth discussing. I cannot conceive myself that the Franchise Act of 1898 shall not become law. The principle of the Bill has been accepted by the House of Commons, it has passed its second reading, and almost passed through committee, and I cannot think for a moment that an other Chamber would interfere in a matter concerning the election of members to this House.

Mr. HENDERSON. It does not appear to me that the amendment would have any material effect. Section 6 provides the

machinery that will be employed for the purpose of taking this vote. It mentions the Dominion Election Act, the North-west Territories Representation Act, and the Franchise Act of 1898. If a portion of that machinery does not exist when this vote is taken, the vote would simply be taken on the other Acts in force at the time, so that the amendment is quite unnecessary.

Mr. DAVIN. My hon. friend would be quite right if he were face to face with a Government bent zealously on carrying out this policy of pushing forward prohibition, but everybody knows that they would be delighted to have any quibble by which they could get out of acting on this plebiscite if it should succeed. We have leading prohibitionists supporters of the Government, who, when they were on this side were loud and long in favour of prohibition, suggesting, in the committees and elsewhere, that the plebiscite itself should be postponed until a general election. And when we find such evidences of the cloven hoof, do you suppose we are not to read a clause like this with suspicion. What I want is not to allow the Government a single hook on which they can hang a pretext for refusing to carry out the provisions of the Bill. I know very well that if the Franchise Bill were not to pass, they could go to the country under this clause; but I also know that if the clause remains as it is, there may be an excuse for a Government that loves to hide behind a fence, hiding behind a very small fence indeed, but still small enough to cast its shade over hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches. In reply to the hon. Minister of Agriculture, I might say that the third reading of the Bill has not taken place. How then can he know that at its third reading it will not be defeated? How can he know that a measure, the worst that ever was presented to any Parliament, having been further considered by members of this—shall I call it a free Parliament—and the members having had time to reflect on the demeanour of the Government and the general character of the measure, may not, if they are not slaves, defeat it on its third reading? Of course, if he has not the conscience and intellect of every man behind him in his pocket, if these members, are members of a free Parliament, and not so many members of a flock shepherded by gentlemen on the Treasury benches, the hon. gentleman cannot speak that way.

Unless they are like sheep following the bell wether he cannot possibly say with confidence that, on the third reading we may not be able to beat that Bill. I remember reading of a traveller in Switzerland going across a great bridge between two hills. He saw a bell wether leading a lot of sheep across the bridge. And whether because the leader became demented or not, he pushed himself through an opening at the side of the bridge and leaped down, and for nearly half an hour there was a little cataract of muttons going down. It may be that hon. gentlemen opposite have determined to follow their leader, however degrading to their own sense of independence, however injurious to the country, however false to their pledges, to their constituents. But, not knowing that, the Minister of Agriculture is not in a position to say with confidence that this Bill will not be beaten on the third reading.

Mr. FOSTER. Section 5, no doubt, settles who are entitled to vote, and therefore settles the electoral lists so far as this Act is concerned. Now, the hon. gentleman who has charge stated in regard to section 6 and my hon. friend's amendment, that he thought there was no doubt that the Franchise Act would pass and seems to think the only chance it had of not passing would be that in another House some adverse action might be taken. And he took the opportunity of putting in a word as a sort of warning to the members of the Upper House not to interfere with this legislation. Well, I take equal exception with my hon. friend from West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) to the utterances of the hon. Minister that a Bill which has not become law, which has not even passed this House, must necessarily become law, is so certain of becoming law that another Bill can be founded upon it. That is not, I think, the rule of legislation in this House.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is very frequently done.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the hon. gentleman point out an instance.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I could point out twenty.

Mr. FOSTER. I would be glad if my hon. friend will take the floor and point out these instances.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman might as well ask me to carry the statutes of the realm in my mind.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not ask the hon. gentleman to carry about too much. I do not wish to overburden him. I ask my hon. friend if it is the usual way?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is often done.

Mr. FOSTER. I am not asking the hon. Minister of Railways, but the hon. gentleman who has charge of the Bill.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I cannot say whether it is usual or not, but it is the way we are doing in this case.

Mr. FOSTER. But that is very far from being proof that it is the constitutional way or the usual way or the right way. But I ask the hon. gentleman why such an expression as this was put in. I had ven-

tured to point out that it is not the usual form of legislation. Every Bill that comes to this Parliament is supposed to stand by itself and be complete in itself, and any legislation that is introduced, as I understand it, is made conditional upon the passage of some other measure. Every one knows that legislation is liable to changes in its passage through the House. But I ask my hon. friend would it not be just as well as to have this vote taken under the Franchise Act at the time existing and in force. I have heard the contention from some hon. gentlemen on the other side that to leave it out would not modify matters at all. Then why is surplusage introduced into the Bill? Now, my hon. friend (Mr. Fisher) knows that there is no class of legislation so liable to legal proceedings as temperance legislation, and it ought to be the object of my hon. friend in introducing a Bill to carry out the plebiscite to avoid putting anything in the Bill upon which could give even a chance of the constitutionality or the legality of any act performed under the Bill being called in question. Now, suppose that the Franchise Act of 1898 does not pass this Parliament, but this Plebiscite Bill does pass, and the vote is held under the Bill, does not my hon. friend think that there would be a chance for a legal case to be brought up against the legality of the plebiscite as having taken place under conditions laid down in a Bill which never was passed and consequently is non-existent? Now, I wish to say to my hon. friend, and I do not say it in any party sense, if as some hon. gentlemen opposite have conteneded, it makes no difference if these words are left out, then, why not leave them out? Why introduce this element of uncertainty? What is the objection to leaving this vote to be taken under the Franchise Act in force at the time?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I can tell my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) very easily my objection. In the first place, I want to do what the hon. gentleman has pointed out—to make it clear and distinct under what franchise law this plebiscite shall take place to make the machinery complete, so that there may be no room for doubt in the minds of the people. The hon. gentleman is supposing all the time that the Franchise Act of this session will not become law and I have stated already that, for reasons which to my mind are conclusive, I cannot suppose anything of the kind, not because of any action of the Government or any effort of theirs to impose it on the House, but because the House has accepted the principle of the Bill, and has practically passed it in committee, and because it is a Bill which essentially applies to and is within the purview and within the proper control of this House. There has been no threat on my part. When I spoke as I did of the other Chamber of this Parliament, it was simply because I cannot conceive that the gentlemen in that Chamber would take upon themselves to reject a franchise Bill which had been accepted by this House. What I said was not a threat, but a tribute to what I conceive to be the intelligence of that House. Suppose the hon. gentleman's suggestions were taken and it were provided that the vote should be taken under the franchise law in force at the time. The franchise law of to-day is most cumbrous in its application, a law which requires a very expensive and difficult and troublesome operation in the way of revising the lists.

At the present time the lists under that law are about four years old. If it was for a moment contemplated that this pebiscite would have to take place under that law, we would be on the horns of a dilemma. Are we going to accept lists four years old? As a temperance man I would not for a moment consent to taking a vote upon those lists. The alternative is that we must have a revision of the present lists during this summer.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Would not the old lists be better for your cause?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not care whether they would be better for my cause or not, they are improper lists on which to take a vote, because they would disfranchise hundreds and thousands of men who have a right to vote. It would be an outrage to ask the people to vote upon those lists for an election of any kind. Under these circumstances, whether they are lists which might be better for my side of the cause or better for the hon. gentleman's side of the cause, I would not consent to allow a vote to be taken upon them under any Bill of which I had charge. But if we do not adopt those lists, we have to have a revision this summer, a revision which must cost in the neighbourhood of $200,000, when the hon. member for York is already deploring the fact that an election under this plebiscite law will cost over $200,000. The hon. gentleman's contention simply brings us to this point, that we will either have to do as we propose under this section, or vote upon lists four years old, or else make a new revision, and that at a time when we are about repealing the old franchise law, as if it is not repealed this session, it must be repealed by the intelligence of this Parliament before another general election.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend's argument is altogether aside from my contention; it has no more to do with it than an argument about the configuration of the moon. My hon. friend wants us to put in these words, "the Franchise Act, 1898," when no such thing exists. The hon. gentleman is asking us to pass here in section 6 a thing which has no existence in this Parliament at all. There is a Bill before this House which is

called the Franchise Act, but no such Act at present exists. My argument was not at all that you must either vote upon the Franchise Act as put in here in these words, or else you must have a revision of the lists. That is not at all my argument. I simply asked him if his measure would not be equally strong if, instead of putting in "Franchise Act, 1898," which has no existence, he should put in something like this: "Under the Franchise Act at that time in force in the Dominion." That takes away the whole of the gravamen of the hon. gentleman's charge that I was trying to saddle the country with great expense or to bring on an election under antiquated lists. The hon. gentlemen have, with fine discrimination, carried on an election lately in the province of Prince Edward Island upon these very lists, and with equally fine discrimination they have refused to carry on an election in Bagot on these lists. Why, I do not know. The hon. gentleman's whole argument has been as to the cumberous machinery of the present Election Act. But he is not obliged to face that if he puts in the words I suggest. I wish to correct my hon. friend in another respect. I did not deplore the expenditure of $200,000 or $250,000 for this purpose. He is scarcely fair in saying that I deplored it. What my words meant, I think, was this, that I would exceedingly deplore an expenditure of $250,000 in order to carry out this vote upon an abstract principle unless the Government were prepared to introduce an Act of prohibition, provided the affirmative was voted when the pebiscite was taken.

Mr. MONTAGUE. What is the use of these words here in clause 5 providing that every man who is entitled to vote at a provincial election is entitled to vote at this election? I submit that in the opinion of any lawyer it is clear that there can be no necessity for defining the Act under which a man may vote.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. This relates to the machinery and the modus operandi of taking the vote. Without some such provision as that, the Act would not apply at all.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The strong point made by my hon. friend still exists, that the Franchise Act mentioned in section 6 is not in force, and we are building upon something which has no existence.

Mr. WALLACE. I think it is a very serious objection that you mention "Franchise Act, 1898," which has no existence. There has been a Bill introduced into this House, but the House has not finally pronounced upon it. There are likely to be some amendments made to it before it is finally passed. I do not see what justification the Government has for doing this except what has been insinuated by the Prime Minister himself some days ago when he said that these two Bills had to go together. I think that is a great mistake. If it is the desire of the Government that this Bill should pass, they should not compass it around with objectionable provisions. It appears to me to be on the same lines as the other clause to which objection was made this afternoon, as to including cider among liquors that are to be prohibited by the passage of this Act. Provisions have been inserted in the Bill that should not appear there, but there is an important omission in view of the discussion this afternoon, the lack of a provision that legislation will follow the passage of this Act. It is true the Prime Minister said this afternoon that Parliament would be asked to give effect in some way to it. But there should be a definite statement that this Bill is not for the purpose simply of obtaining an opinion on an abstract question, but that it means practical legislation, that if a majority of the voters record their votes in favour of prohibition the Government will feel themselves bound to introduce a measure to prohibit the manufacture, sale and importation of intoxicating liquors. What makes the people suspicious is that in Ontario, and I am told in other provinces of the Dominion, plebiscites have already been taken on this question. In Ontario the people did not obtain a pledge sufficient to bind the provincial Government, for although they thought they had such a pledge, Sir Oliver Mowat and his successor denied they gave any such pledge; and although the province was turned upside down and people took party sides on the question of prohibition, and it was carried by an enormous majority of about 80,000, from the time that vote was taken no step has been taken towards the passing of a prohibitory law in Ontario. Are we to have a repetition of that kind of humbug carried out by the Government of Canada under the Bill the House is now considering? Is no legislation to follow with a view to carry out the wishes of the people if the majority decide they are in favour of prohibition? The Government on this point has not given a very certain sound. The people will come to the conclusion that the Government on this question are lacking in sincerity, that they are trying by this means to get rid of a very perplexing and disagreeable question, that they have placed themselves on record on this matter in Parliament and in their conventions by the statements of the Premier and other leading members of the Government, and now come to Parliament to supplement their actions, and at the same time they do not pledge themselves, even if a majority of the electors vote in favour of prohibition, to do more than consider the next step to be taken, if any advance is to be made. Parliament should be told definitely what the Government propose to do, and to that end a suitable clause should be inserted in the Bill.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is going outside of the clause under discussion.

Mr. WALLACE. What clause is under discussion ?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Clause 6.

Mr. WALLACE. The Chairman omitted to read the clause.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has no right to make such an insinuation, when a moment ago he asked what clause was under consideration.

Mr. WALLACE. I make the statement that the clause was not read.

The PRIME MINISTER. The clause has been put again and again.

Mr. WALLACE. I understand it is the usual custom in important matters like this that the clause be read, and I make the statement that the clause was not read.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. We are not obliged to read the clause, and according to the procedure adopted some time ago, according to parliamentary procedure by Dr. Bourinot, we are not obliged to read the clause except when a member asks that it be done.

Mr. FOSTER. Any member can have it read.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. No member asked that it be read, and so no insinuation should have been made.

Mr. WALLACE. I presume it is not yet too late to ask that it be read. The omissions as regards the Bill must be pointed out, and I cannot find any more appropriate clause on which to do this than on No. 6. In my opinion there should be a definite statement as regards the intention of the Government to submit practical legislation, if a large number of the people pronounce in favour of prohibition.

Mr. INGRAM. The introducer of the Bill dislikes the idea of using a voters' list four years old. It has occurred to me that there is an unfair situation in view of the speech delivered by the leader of the Government this afternoon. He stated that if the people pronounced in favour of this measure it may eventually result in direct taxation. If that be true, surely those who would be called upon to pay a large proportion of the necessary taxation to make up the loss of revenue should not be excluded from the franchise, for thereby great injustice would be done. As an example of what I mean, I will take the people owning property in one of my own subdivisions, in polling district No. 3. No less than 54 ladies hold property there, and they would be called upon to contribute to the taxation necessary to be raised in case a prohibitory measure should become law, and in order to make up for the loss of revenue.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Does that follow ?

Mr. INGRAM. I am taking into consideration the remarks of the First Minister.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Taking them into consideration, does that result follow ?

Mr. INGRAM. I consider it would follow as regards ladies just as much as gentlemen.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It does not follow that there will be direct taxation on property.

Mr. INGRAM. The First Minister considered the question of imposing additional taxation on tobacco, and he thought that would not work ; he also spoke of additional taxation on tea and sugar, and then he said, to use his own words, it might result in direct taxation. If that be true, ladies owning property would have to contribute their share the same as men. Taking into account the strong temperance principles of the Minister of Agriculture, one would have naturally supposed that he would have been strongly in favour of giving ladies an opportunity to vote on any prohibitory measure. For that reason I think there is a great injustice done to that class of persons in this country.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. FOSTER. I beg leave to move :

That the section be amended by leaving out "1898" after the words "Franchise Act" in the sixth line ;

And by adding after the words "Franchise Act" the following :—

"In force at the time the vote is taken."

I do not see why this amendment should not be accepted, and if it be accepted it would settle any suspicion that has been in the public mind that there has been an attempt to saddle two Acts together, in order to use the one as a leverage for the other.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There is no suspicion in the public mind.

Mr. FOSTER. Is there not ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend (Mr. Fisher) knows a great deal but he scarcely knows what the public mind is.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. You will find I do.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I see many reasons why that amendment should commend itself to the consideration of the Government, and I cannot see how the Government can object to it. In so far as I am

personally concerned, I am absolutely opposed to the plebiscite to settle any public question. Under the form of Government which obtains in Canada, I believe the plebiscite to be antagonistic to the constitutional principles which prevail both in this country and in England. There is another very strong objection to this Bill, and that is that Parliament is asked to consent to anticipate the action of Parliament. Even if we knew that the Franchise Act of 1898 was going to be passed to-morrow, we must consider well that it is not yet the law of this country, and without any party feeling, I say that to anticipate its passage is utterly opposed to all precedents. We know that many times before the Railway Committee, and other large committees of this House, Bills have been deferred because they were based upon legislation which had not received the sanction of Parliament. If the Franchise Bill of 1898 were law, I could understand that we should make it the basis for the plebiscite, but why should the treasury benches be afraid of accepting the amendment of the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster). This is one of the most important questions that has ever come before us, a question so important that the Government have set aside the constitutional principles which have hitherto prevailed in Canada and in England, in order to deal with; and I ask why should the Government be afraid of the amendment of the hon. member for York, which leaves the people of Canada to vote on that question under the machinery now provided by statute. If the Government want to use the new Franchise law, then why not wait until the Franchise Act of 1898 is passed, and then all objections will disappear. I ask Parliament to pause before it sets aside the old precedents which have been our guide in legislation. I say that this proposal of the Government is an infringement upon the constitutional principles which have made the English Parliament the mother of Parliaments, and on which we have modelled our Parliament. If you break the rule now, and anticipate the action of Parliament in one instance you may anticipate it in many others, and thus open the way to grave abuses. I am opposed to the plebiscite for I believe that the parliamentary system which has made England great and Canada progressive is sufficient to settle all public questions. The Minister of Railways said he could quote many precedents for this.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS. Yes; many.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I have had the honour of sitting in this House for a good many years, and I fail to recollect one single instance where important legislation like this was based upon a Bill which had not yet received the sanction of Parliament.

Mr. CLANCY. The amendment of the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) is so reasonable that it is humiliating to see hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House oppose it simply because it is the will of the hon. Minister (Mr. Fisher), that it should be opposed. So far as the principle of the thing is concerned, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fisher) might with as much reason ask the House to assent to a Bill that had not yet been introduced. I can tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fisher) that the people have neither so much confidence in him or in his Government as to believe that their pledges are going to be carried out.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. CLANCY. Yes, the record of hon. gentlemen opposite is not such as to give any guarantee in that direction. This Bill asks this House to assent to a fiction and a falsehood. There is absolutely no such law in existence as the Franchise Act of 1898. What does the Franchise Act of 1898 mean if it has any meaning at all?

It means no more, nor does it mean any less than a law which is not in existence. Suppose it should be in the will of these hon. gentlemen, as it is in their power, to so completely change the Franchise Act as to cripple the vote on this question in the future. The fact is that the hon. gentleman who has this Bill in charge is asking that a blank check be signed and given to himself and his friends. I say that there was never in a representative assembly in a civilized country a more childish piece of play than for these hon. gentlemen to ask their supporters to assent to a Bill which is based on legislation that has no existence whatever. If you open the door to that kind of thing, I am afraid the Minister of Railways and Canals would have a precedent for the first time for what he was asked to-night to give us an instance. His memory either failed him, or he did not have an instance; but to-morrow morning he would have an instance, the first that ever occurred in this Parliament, and I should hope the last. I must say that the hon. Minister of Agriculture is not cutting a very great figure as the champion of this Bill when he refuses to amend this clause, and refuses as well to give a reason. I think the House and the country may conclude that the reason he refuses to give a reason is that he is absolutely without one.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. gentleman in charge of this Bill is a layman, like myself, and I want to submit a proposition, not only to him, but to the legal minds in this House. Suppose we pass this Bill through committee to-night and to-morrow it receives its third reading and then becomes law. Suppose then that this Bill should be attacked, as no doubt it will be attacked, in the courts. The question will be raised that when this Bill was passed, it referred to an Act of 1898 which had no existence. Would not this Bill be illegal?

It looks to me as if it were not common sense to pass this Bill and to put it in force to-morrow when it refers to an Act which is not in existence to-day. That is a question which it will be for the lawyers to settle and to my mind the chances are that they will say that the Bill is not legal in referring to an Act which has no existence.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman has put a suppositious case which I cannot conceive. He says that this Bill might be read the third time to-morrow and become law; but my reading of the constitution is that a Bill has to pass through the Senate and be assented to by His Excellency before it becomes law; and, as I explained before, the Government who have charge of this legislation purpose that the Franchise Bill shall precede this Bill in its course through Parliament, and therefore by the time this Bill becomes law, it seems to me likely that the Franchise Bill will be law.

Mr. McNEILL. The hon. Minister has not quite caught the point of my hon. friend. The point, I take it, is that there is a doubt as to the constitutionality of the Franchise Act.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Who has doubt about it?

Mr. McNEILL. I think the Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick) has expressed in this House his opinion that it is a grave question of law whether it is constitutional or not.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You must have misunderstood him.

Mr. McNEILL. I must have greatly misunderstood him if he did not say in reference to that particular point that it was a very grave point and one worthy of the deepest consideration, on which he required all the light the lawyers in the House could give him.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. My hon. friend misunderstood him.

Mr. McNEILL. I do not think it possible to misunderstand such plain language, because he distinctly asked to have all the light the lawyers could give him on that point. Under these circumstances, I think the point made by my hon. friend is a very grave point indeed, that this Act is needlessly encumbered with that legal difficulty. I do not see any reason why it should be made dependent upon another Act which is not yet in existence, and which may not be constitutional when it does pass this House and the other Chamber. According to the principles of hon. gentlemen opposite, I do not see why that is necessary at all. To those of us who object to the franchise of this House being made over to the local legislatures, I could understand that there might be more reason in the position the hon. gentlemen have taken; but in view of the fact that the Government hold that the franchises of the provinces should govern, I do not see why they should not have provided that the vote should be taken on the local franchises. I do not see why they should have placed this Bill in the peril in which it will stand when it does pass, by tacking it on to a Bill which has not yet become law, and which when it does pass this Parliament may prove to be ultra vires. They have the franchises of the provinces to go upon, if they wish, and, that being their principle, I do not see why they should not adopt it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Hon. gentlemen opposite have been complaining a good deal that their strictures on this portion of the clause have not been replied to at all on this side of the House. Now, I desire to pay every respect to the understanding and intelligence of our hon. friends opposite; but I have felt a good deal of difficulty in treating their criticisms seriously, for the reason that I felt that it would be paying a very small tribute indeed to their understanding and knowledge. I have thought their sole object was to chaff the gentlemen on this side, and that they did not feel any serious difficulty upon the question they have been remarking upon. Now, it is much to be regretted, if our hon. friends opposite are really serious, that they have not taken counsel with some of the professional gentlemen on their own side of the House with regard to this question. There are lawyers of standing associated with our hon. friends opposite, and if they had referred to any gentleman of any standing in the profession among their number, they would have been told that what they have referred to as a blot or blemish on this Bill is not an unusual or unprecedented matter in legislation, either in this country or in the motherland. I have been called upon to name a case in which this peculiarity occurred, and because I have not been able to do it on the spur of the moment, hon. gentlemen have chosen to assume that it cannot be done, or that my memory must be at fault. It is an exceedingly difficult thing for any gentleman to call to mind a particular case of this kind unless it has made a deep impression on his mind: but I affirm with all confidence that it is something of frequent occurrence not only here, but where my hon. friend who has just spoken (Mr. McNeill) would look for the best examples—in the Imperial Parliament. There is no question at all that on principle it is quite proper and reasonable in every way; and the reason on which it is founded is this, that these Acts will speak from the moment they receive the

assent of the Crown. They are not Acts until they receive that assent; and when this Act is put beside the Franchise Act of 1898. it is eminently proper that the one should refer to the other.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Suppose it does not receive the assent?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Then no harm is done. If there is no Franchise Act of 1898 in existence, this Bill will not be injured in any way; but if the Franchise Bill does become law, it would be an immense advantage that it should be referred to in distinct terms in this Bill. The hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) said it was assumed on this side that the Bill would be just as well without the Franchise Act of 1898 as with it. I have not heard that statement made nor am I prepared to make it, but I am prepared to say that it will be entirely effective, even if the Franchise Bill does not pass, because we have provided in the section 6 that the proceedings to be taken shall be those provided in the Dominion General Election Law. I do feel that my hon. friends cannot be serious in spending so much time in making so many speeches upon a question which, if they were to take the trouble of consulting some one who has knowledge of the law, they would be advised has nothing in it.

Mr. CRAIG. I am glad to hear the hon. Minister of Railways say that if the Franchise Bill does not pass, it will not affect this measure.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I say that in that case you can take the vote under the Dominion General Election Law, according to this Bill.

Mr. CRAIG. I am glad to hear that statement, because I have heard considerable talk to the effect that if the Franchise Bill did not pass, that would block this Bill, and it would not be effective. The hon. Minister of Railways says that will not be the case.

Mr. FOSTER. On the other hand, the hon. Minister of Agriculture has said that if the Franchise Bill is not included by name, the vote will be taken upon the present Dominion Franchise Act.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is a question of policy.

Mr. FOSTER. And the machinery of the Dominion Election Law is so cumbersome and a revision so necessary, that it will be practically impossible to have the plebiscite under it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman will see, if he wishes to see it, that that is a question of policy and not a question of interpretation. It is a question of the effective operation of this law.

Mr. FOSTER. It is so much a question of policy that the hon. gentleman who has the Bill in charge has practically declared that unless the Franchise Bill is passed, to make a revision of the lists of the Dominion and carry out the Dominion Election Law, under the cumbersome machinery of that law, would make the taking of a plebiscite practically impossible.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I said it would be very difficult but not impossible.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman gave the impression that it would be exceedingly doubtful if the Government would in that case carry out the Bill.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is very likely.

Mr. FOSTER. Therefore, I say that the Franchise Bill blocks this one.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is not a question of interpretation at all.

Mr. CRAIG. I said that I was very glad to hear the statement of the Minister of Railways, but I do not know now whether I am glad or not, because things seem a little mixed. However, I was pleased to hear the statement that supposing the Franchise Bill is not passed, then this measure will not be affected. But it seems there would be some difficulty in carrying it out. I notice that the Minister of Agriculture said that the Government will see that the Franchise Bill precedes this all the way through. I do not know whether that means that in case the Franchise Bill is not passed by the Senate—and I hope it will because I have no desire to see any interference by the Senate with our Franchise Bill; but supposing the Franchise Bill should be amended in the Senate and the amendments not be acceptable to the Government, would that block the Plebiscite Bill.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We will deal with that when it comes.

Mr. CRAIG. That is all right. I was going to ask this question, and I ask it with the object of supporting the Government and being friendly to this Bill, and that is, what objection there is to accepting the amendment of my hon. friend from York?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It would not be very becoming in us to say that we are in doubt as to the passage of the Franchise Bill.

Mr. CRAIG. If the Government are satisfied, I am.

Mr. CLANCY. Is it customary, in legislating, to imperil the fate of one Bill by making it depend on the passage of another? We have two Chambers. The popular Chamber may pass a Bill but the other may not; and

by tacking one Bill to another which has not passed a second Chamber, you are tying up that branch of the legislature completely by telling them that unless they pass the first Bill, the second will have to be withdrawn.

Mr. McNEILL. I would like to say that this objection to the Franchise Bill was first raised by a lawyer in this House, and until to-night I have not heard any one suggest that the objection was badly taken. Does the hon. Minister of Marine say that, in his judgment, the failure of the Franchise Bill would not in any way militate against the proceedings under this Bill now before the House.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The Bill is clear as it is.

Mr. McNEILL. Would the failure of the Franchise Bill affect it ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Such an improbable contingency has not been considered.

Mr. McNEILL. That is not a reply. We were told by the hon. gentleman's colleague that its failure would have nothing to do with it. He said that no one who had any knowledge of the law would suggest what we were suggesting, that the failure of the Franchise Bill would imperil the operations of the Bill now before the House.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. He was referring to the contention that it was improper to dove-tail one Bill into another when the Bill so dove-tailed into the other has not passed the House.

Mr. McNEILL. He was not doing that alone. He distinctly laid it down as his opinion that those on this side of the House who said that failure to pass the Franchise Bill of 1898 would imperil this Act were talking nonsense. I understand that the hon. gentleman would not take that position. It should be understood, then, that though the Minister of Railways has made that statement he is not supported by other lawyers on his own side of the House, and the condition is, as is pointed out, that the success of this Act is contingent upon the passing of the Franchise Act. I think that it is as well that that should be distinctly understood.

Amendment (Mr. Foster) negatived, and section 6 agreed to.

On section 8 (form of ballot).

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I desire to propose a change in the form of a ballot and to substitute a form I now submit to you, Mr. Chairman. This form is exactly the same as the one in the Bill, except that the lines which cross the upper part of the ballot are taken out and the words "Yes" and "No" appear on the same level with the top line of the question as printed. There are thus no lines at all upon the ballot except the two perpendicular lines which divide the spaces in which the cross should be put. It was thought it would make the ballot less complicated and give less opportunity for errors.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the word "yes" come in a line and with and just after the word "Act" ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, but there is a line between.

Mr. FOSTER. Where does the voter mark?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Anywhere within the space the "yes" or "no" is put.

Mr. MONTAGUE. In this form of ballot, though I do not know that I can suggest anything to remedy it, you are likely to have it marked "yes" or "no," instead of with a cross.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The words "yes" and "no" are printed. It is the duty of the returning officer, as in an election to Parliament, to inform the voter that he is to vote by making a cross. I think that the cross as a sign of voting is now so thoroughly understood, as it is used in every form in ballot in use in the country, that voters will readily understand that they must use it in this case. The only question in my mind at all is whether the spaces in which the cross would come were perfectly clear.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Notwithstanding that, I think you will find in practice that the voter will vote by saying "yes" or "no." This is a peculiar vote. I would ask whether any instructions will be given to the returning officer not to adhere too strictly to the law as to counting ballots.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think it would be well to do so.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I think so, because this is not a case of contention between the two parties where fine points of law might come up. Anything that indicated the intention of the voter should be accepted as a vote one way or the other.

Mr. CLARKE. Will there be any lines across the ballot ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, they have been eliminated.

Mr. CLARKE. And the top line of the question will be close to the top line of the ballot ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There will be no lines or divisions, except the divisions of the question from the columns "yes" or "no," and the division between these two.

Mr. CLARKE. No room to make a cross above the words "yes" and "no" ?

The MINISTER OF AGICULTURE. No.

Mr. MILLS. I would ask that this section be amended by striking out from the ballot paper the word "cider." I think its presence there would have a tendency to weaken the temperance vote.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That has already been carried in section 3, where the form of question is given.

Mr. MILLS. Then I will make that motion at a later stage.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman will have an opportunity on the third reading.

Mr. FOSTER. Though it is clear enough to us as we are discussing it I think you will find that in a multiplicity of cases the man who is in favour will write "yes" and the man who is against will write "no." He reads the question "are you in favour of the passing of an Act prohibiting, &c.," as his answer is "yes" or "no." I believe in many cases he will write that answer.

Mr. BEATTIE. I think we should strike out the words "yes" and "no," and put in "for prohibition" and "against prohibition." Then there could be no mistake; that might meet the difficulty.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Even then some would vote "yes" or "no" instead of with the cross. But those who mark their ballots thus shall be returned. It is got like counting the ballots in the election for members of Parliament. The actual facts will be returned to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. Nobody would contend that if a man marked his ballot "yes" instead of with a cross that that should invalidate his vote.

Mr. FOSTER. But suppose it comes to a case and—improbable case though it be—that there is a very small margin one way or the other. Suppose that the affirmative have carried it by a small majority, could not a legal case be made up against it, that it was not actually carried, unless these cases referred to are actually mentioned in the Act. I still adhere to my opinion that you will find a large number of people who will write their answer in the column where they should make a cross.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think that under any form of ballot that we can adopt there will be some loopholes for people who cannot possibly do the right thing. We know perfectly well that in elections there are occasional lapses, and ballots are thrown out. But when we consider the large number of votes which are cast in our Dominion elections, and the comparatively infinitesimal small number of spoiled ballots that are found, I think I may safely say that the electorate of this country pretty well understand the way to mark their ballots. The way they are to mark their ballots in this election will be thoroughly explained to them, and they will understand that they are to vote in the same way as they do for members of Parliament, that is, that they are to put a cross on their ballot in the space which, in Dominion elections, indicates the person for whom they vote.

Mr. FOSTER. But in the case of the person you do not put the question in print, "Are you in favour of John Jones?"

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I understand that, but at the same time the great mass of the people understand that it is a simple question on which they are voting, to be answered then and there on the ballot. I acknowledge that it is possible still for some people to make mistakes, they make mistakes to-day. But I think the ballot that is now proposed after very careful consideration of the matter, is on the whole the one which will give the least chance for mistakes to the ordinary elector.

Mr. INGRAM. No doubt there will be many spoiled and rejected ballots. Take the city of Kingston, a very intelligent city; but in the provincial election of 1894 there were 36 rejected ballots and 18 spoiled ballots, out of a total of 3,418.

Mr. BEATTIE. I have the honour to represent one of the most intelligent constituencies in this country, and for the information of the Minister of Agriculture, I will say that there were over 400 spoiled ballots cast in the city of London at the last Dominion election.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). They were not London residents, they came from outside.

Mr. BEATTIE. We did not permit any from Prince Edward Island to come there and vote.

Mr. TAYLOR. I would suggest to the hon. gentleman who has charge of this Bill that he amend it by striking out all the words after the word "of" in the third line, until he comes to the word "alcoholic." Then it will read: "Are you in favour of the passing of an Act prohibiting the importation, manufacture or sale of alcoholic liquors for use as a beverage."

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is provided for in section 3.

Mr. TAYLOR. This ballot is the question that is to come before the voter. Does the Minister who has charge of this Bill want to say to the voter that he cannot manufacture cider? I live in an apple country where a great many people manufacture cider. A man who manufactures cider sees that ballot and immediately says to himself, If I vote for that, I must stop manufacturing cider. I want to hear what the hon.

member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint) will say to that, as he comes from an apple country. It seems to me this word was put in there purposely to damage the temperance vote of this country. Why not put in champagne and half a dozen other articles that you might mention? Why mention cider particularly, which is an article manufactured all through this country for family use? Section 3 does not come before the voter, this simple ballot comes before him. Are you in favour of prohibiting the manufacture of cider, among other articles? My hon. friend from Annapolis (Mr. Mills) has suggested striking out the word "cider." If that word was dropped the ballot would not be so objectionable. Then it would simply include spirits, wine, ale, beer and all other alcoholic liquors.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Would that not take in cider?

Mr. TAYLOR. Cider is not alcoholic. But being named here it is prohibited from being manufactured.

Mr. RICHARDSON. But it is intoxicating.

Mr. TAYLOR. Cider is not intoxicating. Hard cider is, after is is a year or two old.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Yesterday, in conversation with a gentleman, he told me that a friend of his got drunk every fall on cider.

Mr. TAYLOR. That may be, it may be specially prepared with alcohol, but the cider our farmers manufacture is not intoxicating. But being specially named here, no matter what the character of the cider is, it is prohibited from being manufactured in the country. In my opinion it is put in here purposely to injure the temperance vote

Mr. MONTAGUE. Will this prevent the manufacture of cider in the ordinary way on a farm?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Alcoholic cider.

Mr. MONTAGUE. It is all right to talk about that, but will it prevent a farmer from grinding up his apples and barrelling the apple juice? I would like to have the opinion of the promoter of the Bill.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It will not interfere with apple juice in any way whatever.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I will put the question straight: Will it apply to a man who grinds his apples up in the fall and who bottles or barrels up the apple juice in the ordinary way of farmers?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not understand what the ordinary way is that the hon. gentleman alludes to. But certainly if a farmer or anybody else ferments his cider and makes it an alcoholic drink, that will be interfered with by the operation of the Act which may be founded upon this Bill. If it is not an intoxicating drink, I do not think it will be interfered with.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. gentleman being himself a farmer knows how cider is made. The apples are ground into cider, and after a time certain preservatives are put into it.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. When these preservatives are put in, it does not ferment and become alcoholic.

Mr. McCLEARY. I would suggest adding after the word "beer," the words "fermented or hard cider."

Mr. CLANCY. By the wording of the section you declare that cider is an alcoholic liquor, and comes within the prohibited list. That is clear because the hon. gentleman uses the words, "all other alcoholic liquors," therefore cider is understood to be one of the alcoholic liquors. I do not think the Government intend to draw the line at the cider that a man might innocently manufacture for purposes of domestic use, or for such sale as farmers make. I think that would be very unreasonable. If that is not the meaning of the section, then it has no meaning. It will certainly restrain a farmer from selling in that way. I think the hon. gentlemen have put this in, believing in their own minds that it will never become law.

Mr. CLARKE. I would like to ask the Minister of Agriculture if it is intended that there should be a counterfoil on this ballot, any number or mark by means of which the ballot could be traced from the counter foil remaining in the possession of the deputy returning officer.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There has not been any provision made for that, I confess. I do not think there is any need for it. I do not see why there should be, but if the House thought it was best to do so, it would be very easy to have a small space left on one end which could be torn off. I did not myself think it was necessary.

Mr. CLARKE. We have a ballot that is used in the provincial elections in the province of Ontario that has a counterfoil and a number, and a corresponding number on the ballot paper proper. I presume it is not the intention, from what the Minister says, that this should be anything but a secret ballot.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Certainly not.

Mr. CLARKE. I do not think there is any occasion myself for a counterfoil. But I understand it is to be an absolutely secret ballot.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It is intended to be an absolutely secret ballot.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I call attention to the fact that the ballot is to be printed by the Queen's Printer, and the present distinguished occupant of the Speaker's Chair introduced a provision that a certain weight of paper should be used for the ballots in Dominion elections, and I presume that course will be followed out.

Mr. McNEILL. In regard to the secrecy of the ballot, I called the attention of the hon. member for York to the question as to the word "yes" being admitted. If ballots are permitted to be marked "yes" or "no," you may as well allow the votes to be given without secrecy. No doubt it will be found in this election, as in other elections, that a good deal of pressure will be brought to bear on both sides, and men may go to the polls and deliberately write "yes" or "no" in order that their votes may be traced through their hand-writing. That is a point worthy of consideration.

Mr. MILLS. I ask the member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint) if the pledge of the Sons of Temperance includes beer and cider?

Mr. FLINT. I am not now a member of the Sons of Temperance, although I was so when I was younger.

Mr. MILLS. I rather think the introduction of the word cider will have a tendency in Annapolis county and in a large portion of Nova Scotia to weaken the temperance vote. My county is largely a temperance county and an apple-growing county, and I do not think they make cider from apples for the purpose of getting drunk on it, but they use it for beverage purposes and for cooking purposes; and the Government would do the proper thing and secure a more representative vote by striking out the word cider, or at all events striking it off the ballot so that it will not be before the temperance men of Canada when they go to vote.

Mr. FLINT. There are two points made. One is in regard to the desirability of allowing electors to mark their ballots "yes" or "no" instead of making a cross. Hon. gentlemen who make that objection forget the agitation that will be aroused on this subject and the large quantity of literature that will be placed before the electorate in which no doubt this point will be dwelt upon, and the electorate will be educated not only as they are in general elections but also specially educated by literature on this subject. In regard to the introduction of the word cider in the form of ballot, I may say that those familiar with the working of temperance societies and organizations must be aware of the very lengthy and elaborate discussions had during the last thirty years on this question, and I am justified in saying that throughout Canada, with very few exceptions, the course has been followed by those identified with total abstinence of placing the word cider in all pledges. The argument made against cider being considered an alcoholic beverage has been set aside by the practical experience of those labouring in temperance work, and they have almost unanimously named cider in the pledge as a drink which should be prohibited just as fully as ale, lager beer or any of the light wines. I agree with that idea.

Mr. McNEILL. It is not stated here to be alcoholic cider.

Mr. FLINT. If cider is left out, we open the door to such evasions of the law as will render all efforts of the prohibitionist party nugatory.

Mr. McNEILL. Why not say fermented cider?

Mr. MOORE. The effect of introducing the word cider will be prejudicial as regards prohibition in my county. The people of my county are largely composed of farmers who raise apples, many of which are not suitable for market, and are therefore ground up and made into apple cider and vinegar. Under this section a great many temperance people will vote against the Bill, and I therefore would prefer a clause inserted under which they would be able to manufacture sweet cider.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). I think a mistake has been made with respect to the position of Annapolis county on the question of cider. Many years ago a distinguished representative of that county, Mr. Longley—not the gentleman of that name who now acts as a nightmare to the hon. member for that county in this House but a rival of his—was a leader of the temperance movement in the legislature of Nova Scotia, and a very prominent member of the Sons of Temperance, having filled the position of Grand Worthy Patriarch for many years.

Mr. MILLS. He was a member of this House.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The temperance pledge of that day, and I presume it is the same to-day, referred to wines, spirits, cider or other intoxicating drinks. At that time, after a very thorough discussion, the late Mr. Longley, as the representative of the temperance men, included cider among the intoxicants. In Annapolis there is a distinction drawn between cider and apple juice, as has been done by the Minister of Agriculture to-day.

Mr. CLANCY. What is the difference?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Apple juice is not alcoholic and cider is alcoholic.

Mr. BRITTON. I can remember very distinctly the pledge of the old Sons of Temperance. It included spirits, malt liquors, wines and cider. I think I know something also of the sentiment of the temperance people at the present time, and of

the reasons given by the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint) why they want the word cider in the ballot. They all remember very distinctly the difficulty experienced in enforcing the law when the question arose respecting 4 per cent beer as to what beer was prohibited and what was permitted. So it is in the case of cider. We all know there is cider and cider, some harmless and some intoxicating.

For my own part I am not as willing as the hon. member was this afternoon to say just how I would vote on the question of prohibition. In this particular matter I for one wish to give the temperance people what they want themselves, an opportunity at all events of testing public opinion on this question, and if it so happens that prohibition is introduced and is carried, then the temperance people will have no difficulty such as they have had in the past, of giving it a fair trial. If cider is not among the articles proscribed there will be the greatest difficulty, because everything in the shape of intoxicating liquor will be called cider. Every one who has had experience of the Scott Act and Local Option, will remember the attempts that were made to evade it in the province of Ontario, and the omission of the word "cider" would certainly help in attempts to evade the law.

Mr. MOORE. I am very well aware that what the hon. gentleman has stated with regard to the pledge exists. In many associations they are obliged to take that pledge and the result is that it keeps hundreds of people from taking that pledge and joining these associations throughout the country. The constituents of the Minister of Agriculture in Brome County, make large quantities of sweet cider every year to be made into apple sauce and vinegar, and if they are compelled to forego the use in this way of the small apples for which they cannot find any other market, I believe the promoter of this Bill will not be able to justify its wisdom before the electors of his county. It would be in the interest of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fisher), as well as in the interests of the farmers of this country, to modify the clause in such a way as to permit farmers to make sweet cider for the purpose I have mentioned. Including the word cider in the clause in question will greatly weaken the temperance vote amongst the farmers of the county.

Mr. FOSTER. The Minister of Public Works is in a contemplative mood now, and we would like to have his opinion on the matter of cider.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. He is only an authority on ginger ale.

Mr. FOSTER. I did not like to be so personal.

Mr. CRAIG. It is just as well to leave this clause as it stands. As far as admitting the word "yes" in marking the ballot is concerned, there is no necessity for that at all. I think we all agree that it will not be desirable to pass a prohibitory law unless there is a large majority in its favour, so that the case mentioned by the hon. member for York would not apply.

Mr. MONTAGUE. You would not do it on a recount.

Mr. CRAIG. No. With reference to the word "cider," I think we had better leave it in the clause and prohibit cider as well as other intoxicating liquors; because cider is rather a dangerous drink in the view of temperance reformers, and if it were not included in a prohibitory law people might be open to the temptation.

Mr. POWELL. As regards the form of the ballot paper, I may say that the Minister of Agriculture has not that range of experience in this matter that I thought he had. In the very intelligent city of St. John, N.B., last election hundreds of ballots were rejected for being improperly marked, and I think my hon. friend (Mr. Ellis) will bear me out in that statement. This may not be a very serious thing, and it may be a very serious thing; it just depends upon what view the Government will take of the result of the election. If they are going to require a certain percentage of the total votes upon the lists, then it would be very important indeed because all these votes would be counted against the temperance party. If the Government inclined to act on the majority of votes it will not be a very important matter, because there will likely be as many spoiled ballots on one side as on the other. Every precaution should be taken to have the matter as clear as possible. I believe there were over 150 spoiled ballots in the city of St. John at the last election, and I would like to hear from the hon. member (Mr. Ellis) as to that.

Mr. ELLIS. I cannot speak accurately from memory, but my recollection is that there were between 500 and 600 ballots rejected.

Mr. POWELL. That is a most intelligent constituency and yet between 500 and 600 ballots were rejected. If that were to occur on the plebiscite vote it might be a very serious matter, for if the Government require a certain percentage of the total vote the cause of the temperance people will suffer very seriously indeed.

On section 18,

Mr. MONTAGUE. We have not yet had any policy declared by the Government as to what they propose to do if there is a majority of votes in favour of prohibition? I think it should be given in connection with this clause because I presume it will be announced in the "Canada Gazette" whether or not it is the intention of the Government to introduce a Prohibition Bill.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We shall see when the "Canada Gazette" is published.

On schedule "b."

Mr. TAYLOR. I propose that the following be added as schedule "c":

I (A. B.), do solemnly declare that I have not before voted at this election at any other polling place.

In making this motion I have had it upon the best information that in the city of Montreal there are a thousand persons who average five votes each in Montreal in the different constituencies surrounding that city. There are at least 2,000 voters in the city of Montreal who have five votes each. These 2,000 persons voting five times against the Bill would be giving 10,000 votes, whereas 2,000 persons in Ontario could only give 2,000 votes. Therefore, I think this schedule should be added that an oath can be tendered to every voter, that he has voted only once on this question.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Perhaps the hon. member was not in the House when the amendment was moved to section 5 by the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) in just the same sense, and it was lost.

Mr. TAYLOR. That simply referred to persons having one vote, whereas this refers to the oath that may be put to the voter. If the oath is not tendered, he may go on and vote.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The other amendment provided that no elector could vote more than once at this election, and I think it is the same opinion that is made by the hon. member now.

Mr. TAYLOR. No, he may vote if the oath is not tendered, at as many places as the law of the province will permit; but if the oath is tendered, he is only permitted to vote once. I think the schedule should be added.

Mr. MONTAGUE. In view of the specific declaration which we have had as to the policy of the Government, I think we should have another clause added to the Bill—it should be section 19—to the following effect:

Nothing in this Bill shall be taken to mean that the Government shall, under the circumstances, be compelled, morally or otherwise, to introduce a prohibitory measure.

I am humourous of course in proposing this, but I see that the Government do not see any humour in this matter at all. To them it is, Sir, no joking matter. It is getting serious.

Mr. CRAIG. I am glad the First Minister is in his place, because I desire to ask him a question about which it is most important this House and the country should know something at this time, that is, what will be considered a majority—a majority of the votes cast or a majority of the votes on the list? This is a question that has been talked about a good deal in the country. I am not speaking for the purpose of talking or finding fault, or criticising, or placing the Government in a false position, or in a hole, or anything of that kind. The hon. Minister of Railways a while ago rather insinuated that we were treating this matter in a jocular spirit. I am not treating it in that spirit at all. I know that a great many people, both temperance people and people who are not in favour of prohibition, think that before the Government should feel any obligation to bring down a prohibitory Bill, there should be a majority, not of the votes cast, but of all the voters on the list. I notice that that question has been discussed in some of the papers. It is feared that if this policy were laid down, it would simply mean that prohibition would be killed, because they say it would be impossible to get a majority of all the voters on the list for any measure of this kind—that no member of Parliament was ever elected by a vote of that kind. Whether that is so or not, before this measure, one of the most important that can be contemplated by any Government, goes through the House, we ought to have, if he will give it to us, the opinion of the Prime Minister, which will, no doubt, be the opinion of the Government, whether they will feel any obligation to propose a prohibitory law in case there is not a majority of the votes on the list cast in favour of it. I myself would like to have some declaration on that point. I have my own view, which I shall be pleased to state at the proper time.

The PRIME MINISTER. Would the hon. gentleman state his own view?

Mr. CRAIG. My own view is this, that in a measure of this kind there ought to be cast a majority of the votes on the list.

The PRIME MINISTER. Well, we will take that into consideration.

Mr. CRAIG. I do not think that is treating me very fairly. The Prime Minister got me to state my view, and I think he should let us know what he thinks about it. My view makes no difference to the country, but his view may make a great deal of difference to the country.

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend knows that I have great respect for his view on all questions, and I shall be glad to take into consideration his suggestion tonight.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the Bill is reported, I would like to ask the hon. First Minister if he would now give the information to the House, and through the House to the country, as to the probable time when

this vote will be taken. It is of the first importance that upon a vote of this kind there should be a thorough and exhaustive campaign and full notice provided for. I suppose, unless we have some declaration, that the people will only know the date of the election within four or five or six weeks of the time. I think that is not long enough for a campaign of this nature, and the First Minister would be doing a favour to both sides in the contest if he could name about the probable time at which the vote would be taken?

The PRIME MINISTER. I may say that it is the intention of the Government, as far as they can, to consult the wishes of the people in this matter. I presume that if the vote were to be taken, say towards the end of the summer or in the early fall, or thereabouts, that would be a convenient time.

Mr. FOSTER. That is somewhat satisfactory, and the country will understand from that unless some cataclysm takes place, the vote on this question will be taken about the end of the summer or the early part of the autumn.

The PRIME MINISTER. There is no cause for anxiety upon this point.

Mr. FOSTER. I am not indicating that there is anxiety at all whether or not there will be a vote. I think it would relieve the public mind and be fair to both parties if it were known about when the vote would take place; and the hon. gentleman has defined it as nearly as I think he can define it, about the end of the summer or early in the autumn, which I think is a very fair and satisfactory time to take the vote. There is another point, of academic importance; but it would be very interesting to know what operated to change the mind of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) within the last fortnight. He was very explicit when he wrote that letter, and he and the Government are very explicit to-day, but the two positions taken are diametrically opposite.

Mr. MILLS. In this connection I may say that it is a very interesting fact that a petition was sent by some persons in Nova Scotia about the time this letter came out from the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, calling upon me to use my best endeavours to see that the Government on this question required in answer a plain yes or no. But that petition was retained, the gentleman in whose hand it was placed being more of a politician than a temperance man, and it was not sent to me until yesterday, when it was found that the Government had changed their mode of procedure, and would require a plain yes or no in answer to the question.

Mr. FOSTER. A more interesting occurrence than that, I am told took place. I am told that one of the principal papers in the island has been vigorously arguing that there should be submitted just the plain question "yes" or "no." Very shortly after the publication of my hon. friend's letter, that paper came out in strong editorials saying that after all probably it was better that all sides of the question should be voted upon, both the prohibition question and the matter of taxation. I have not heard since what position that paper has taken.

Amendment of (Mr. Taylor) negatived.

The committee reported Bill with amendments; amendments read the second time, and agreed to.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the hon. gentleman state what will be the business to-morrow?

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. colleague the Solicitor General has been detained in Quebec by the unfortunate demise of a friend. We will take up the Franchise Bill if he is here to-morrow, and if not we will take up a few minor Bills, and then Supply.

Mr. FOSTER. If it will not interefere with the programme of the Government, I would prefer that the Franchise Bill should be left over until the day after to-morrow.

The PRIME MINISTER. That will be convenient to us, if the hon. gentleman desires it.

Mr. FOSTER. It would be more convenient to both sides of the House in the case of the Solicitor General's absence.

The PRIME MINISTER. If the Solicitor General is absent, then we will hold the Bill over to suit the hon. gentleman.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 11.25 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 4th May, 1898.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

STATIONARY ENGINEERS AND STEAM BOILERS.

On the order being called for the introduction of Bill respecting the examination of stationary engineers and the inspection of steam boilers.—(Mr. Sutherland.)

Mr. SUTHERLAND. When this Bill was first brought up for discussion, members on both sides suggested that the legislation proposed was not within the jurisdiction of this Parliament, but that of the provinces, and it was suggested that the opinion of the Department of Justice should be had on that point. The Department of Justice has given its opinion that this legislation comes under the jurisdiction of the provinces, and therefore I would ask you to withdraw it.

Order dropped.

THE CRIMINAL CODE.

Mr. FLINT moved first reading of Bill (No. 134) to amend the Criminal Code, 1892. He said: This Bill is of a purely technical character and its object is to provide that where imprisonment may be inflicted in the case of the contravention of certain portions of the criminal law, on the non-payment of the pecuniary penalty, hard labour may be added. By some strange oversight in the framing of the Criminal Code, it appears that, in many instances, imprisonment with hard labour can be inflicted for the non-payment of costs, but that only imprisonment, without hard labour, may be inflicted upon non-payment of the fine imposed. My attention was drawn to the case of the Queen vs. Horton in the province of Nova Scotia, in which this matter was discussed, and in which it was held that although in certain cases the penalty of hard labour might be imposed for non-payment of the costs, it could not be imposed for non-payment of the fine. I propose then to amend section 872 of the Criminal Code by inserting after the word "months" in the 9th line of paragraph A, the words "with hard labour," and after the word "months" in paragraph B, the words "with hard labour." I do not care to go into a thorough explanation of this Bill on the first reading, as I think it would be more desirable that hon. members should have the Bill printed in their hands before we enter into any discussion of it. It certainly does appear an oversight that under any clause of the Criminal Code, hard labour can be imposed for non-payment of costs and not for non-payment of a fine. I am informed by a stipendiary justice carrying out the law, that it works to the disadvantage of the public in this respect, that parties convicted, perfectly able to pay the fine, and who would have paid it if the justices had the power to inflict imprisonment with hard labour for non-payment, prefer to spend the allotted term in prison without hard labour, rather than pay the fine.

Mr. TISDALE. The session has reached such a stage that I think it is hardly advisable to take up the consideration of a matter of that sort which will involve, according to the statement of the hon. gentleman himself, considerable discussion. It would probably be better to let the notice stand and bring up the Bill at an earlier stage next session. By introducing his Bill now, the hon. gentleman will give us an opportunity to consider it during recess, but I think it would not be desirable to press it to a second reading, for we could hardly hope for a discussion of the principle of an important amendment to the Criminal Code at this stage of the session. I hope that we are getting within sight of prorogation, and if that is the case, we can hardly be expected to deal with so important a measure introduced at this stage.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

SUB-COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS AT KILLARNEY.

Mr. ROCHE (by Mr. Taylor) asked,

1. Were charges made against Thomas Shannon, late sub-collector of customs at port of Killarney? If so, what was the nature of those charges?

2. Who made the charges, and was an investigation held? If so, by whom?

3. Was counsel permitted to represent either party at investigation? If so, who?

4. Was a petition sent into the Government, after the holding of investigation, asking to retain the services of Mr Shannon?

5. Who is now sub-collector at Killarney? Is he now personally discharging the duties of the office, or has he received leave of absence? If so, for what purpose?

6. Has the present sub-collector given bonds?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). The answers to the hon. gentleman's questions are as follows:—1. Mr. Shannon was charged with political partisan conduct during the last Dominion general election. 2. The charges were made by Mr. R. L. Richardson, M.P. An investigation was held by A. N. MacPherson, barrister, of Winnipeg, a commissioner appointed for the purpose of this and other investigations. 3. It does not appear from the record that either party was represented by counsel at the investigation. The department is not aware that a request was made by either party to have counsel present. 4. Yes. 5. Hugh Miller Sutherland is now sub-collector of customs at Killarney. He is not personally discharging the duties of the office at present, being laid up through illness. 6. The department has not yet received bonds from the sub-collector, but it is informed that application has been made by him to a guarantee company for such bonds, and it is expected that the same will be received soon.

THOMAS NULTY.

Mr. DUGAS asked,

Has the Minister of Justice received petitions asking for a commutation of the sentence of death recorded against Thomas Nulty, convicted of murder at the last assizes for the district of Joliette?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). No petitions have been received asking for the commutation of the sentence recorded against Thomas Nulty.

POSTMASTER AT ELKHORN, MAN.

Mr. ROCHE (by Mr. Taylor) asked,

1. Who has been appointed postmaster at Elkhorn, Manitoba, in the place of the late John McLeod ?
2. Who recommended his appointment ?
3 Was a petition received for the appointment of James S. McLeod, son of the late postmaster ?
4. If so, how many names were on the petition ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). In reply to the hon. gentleman, I beg to state that William M. Cushing has been appointed postmaster at Elkhorn, in place of John McLeod, deceased. Mr. Cushing was appointed on the recommendation of the Minister of the Interior, who represents the riding in which the post office is situated. No petition was received for the appointment of Mr. James S. McLeod until after Mr. Cushing had been appointed. Subsequent to that appointment, a petition asking for Mr. McLeod's appointment was received.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. gentleman has not answered the last question.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have not the number of names on the petition. I thought it was immaterial in view of the fact that the petition came in subsequent to the appointment.

DREDGING TORONTO HARBOUR.

Mr. CLARKE asked,

1. Has a contract or agreement been made for the dredging to be done in connection with the Toronto harbour works for the season of 1898 ?
2. If so, upon what terms ?
3. Were public tenders asked for ? If not, why not ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). The answers to the hon. gentleman's questions are as follows :—1. On the 19th July, 1897, an agreement was entered into for the dredging required. The same agreement holds good for season of 1898-99. 2. W. E. Phin, at the rate of $8 per working hour. 3. No. It has always been the custom of the department to give out dredging of this nature to persons having the plant required, at a fixed rate never exceeding $8 per hour.

DISTRIBUTION OF KLONDIKE OFFICIAL GUIDE.

Mr. MILLS asked,

What are the names of the Senators and Members who have been forwarded the Ogilvie Klondike Official Guide, and how many of such guides to each ?

Mr. DUGAS.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). Ten copies of the Klondike Guide were forwarded from the Department of the Interior to every member of the House of Commons whose name appears in the official list of members, and five copies to every member of the Senate whose name appears in the official list of Senators.

Mr. MILLS. Quite a number did not get them.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It is the fault of the post office, then, for they were all sent.

FASCINE FISHERY AND RIPARIAN OWNER.

Mr. FOSTER asked,

1. Was any objection made by D. and A. Gauthier, of St. Irénée, Charlexoix County, to the reissue of a license for erecting a fascine fishery in front of D. Gauthier's property by one Paulémon Gauthier ?
2. If so, what was the objection, and to what extent did it prevail ?
3. To whom was the license granted, and on what grounds ?
4. What is the rule of the department in regard to the licensing of fascine fisheries in front of properties owned and occupied, when applications are made by owners and non-owners ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). The answers to the hon. gentleman's questions are as follows :—1. Yes. 2. The ownership of the property in which the fishery was set ; their claim to the fishery was not admitted. 3. Mr. Paulémon Gauthier, who had been an occupant of the fishery for twenty years. 4. Other things being equal, if a license were granted the owner would get the preference ; although the department does not necessarily recognize riparian ownership as carrying with it the right of such license.

THE VACANCY IN BAGOT.

Mr. BERGERON. I desire to ask the right hon. Premier (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) if the Government have appointed a returning officer and fixed a day for the election in the county of Bagot ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). They have not.

Mr. FOSTER. May I ask the right hon. gentleman if it is his intention to do so during the life of the present session ?

The PRIME MINISTER. I suggested the other day what I thought was a very reasonable course, but this suggestion does not seem to have been received with favour by my hon. friend (Mr. Foster), and the Government will have to consider its action again.

FREE MINERS' LICENSES.

Mr. HUGHES. I desire to remind the Minister of the Interior of the promise he made to inform us as to the issue of miners' licenses in the passes at the entrance to the Yukon country.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). When this matter was brought up by the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper), I asked that it be allowed to stand because I came in when the hon. gentleman was making his remarks, and I did not know what he had said before I entered the Chamber. The matter referred to was the issue of free miners' licenses in the Yukon district. I beg to say in regard to that matter that I have given directions that miners' licenses should be issued by all the customs officers and mining recorders in the Yukon district. This course has been taken in consequence of the report of Major Walsh, the commissioner, who reported that there was serious difficulty arising in dealing with the people who had gone in and who could not get miners' licenses without going back to Victoria or Vancouver, which would be impossible.

Mr. WALLACE. I would like to ask the Minister of the Interior whether the rumour is true that Major Walsh is returning from his travels without having reached the Yukon country, and if so, what is the cause of this turning back ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. In reply to the hon. gentleman, I beg to say that Major Walsh has been in the Yukon country for several months, and he is not returning without having reached Dawson City, which is, I believe, the point the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) has in his mind.

Mr. WALLACE. Has he reached Dawson City ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No, he has not.

Mr. WALLACE. Is he returning ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. He is not.

INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Mr. DAVIN. I wish to call the attention of the Minister of Public Works to the return he has brought down to a motion made on the 14th of March, for copies of all papers connected with the letting of the contract for the construction of a railway bridge at Edmonton, including advertisements, specifications, tenders, the contract, and any subsequent modification of the same, correspondence, and returns respecting the forfeitures connected with said contract, and the action of the Government thereon, and a further return stating the condition of the work at present. I call the Minister's attention to the fact that the papers are not complete ; he has not here the extension of the contract. On September 22nd, the engineer reported on the subject, and there is an Order in Council here, but the paper dealing with the subsequent action of the department with the contractor is not here.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). I can only say that I instructed my officers to give everything we had, but I will draw their attention to what my hon. friend says now.

Mr. DAVIN. Will the Minister allow me also to suggest, although it is not literally called for here, yet I think it was by implication called for, and as there could be no objection to it—would the Minister also give directions that not only the extension of the contract should be brought down, but also the plan ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I cannot see any objection to that.

Mr. DAVIS (Saskatchewan). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the Minister of Railways and Canals if anything has been done in connection with the matter I brought before the House a few days ago concerning the Saskatoon bridge. He promised to look into it, and to say what the Government would do.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). Immediately on receiving the correspondence from the hon. gentleman, I forwarded it with some inquiries to the Department of Justice for the opinion of the Minister thereon. I have not yet had a reply from him.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to remind the Minister of the Interior that he has not brought down that return in answer to an Address passed early in the last session for a list of the mining and dredging licenses.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). I will inquire and let the hon. gentleman know to-morrow. The return must be very voluminous, and extra clerks have been working on it. I hope to be able to lay it on the Table within a day or two.

Mr. CALVERT. I desire to ask the Government when we may expect the papers with reference to the late London election fire, for which an order was passed some time ago.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I will take note of that.

THE YUKON CONTINGENT.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to mention a matter which came up two or three days ago when I made a suggestion that the Minister of Militia and Defence might very well give some information to the House

with reference to the military expedition which I believe has been prepared and is now on its way to the Yukon. It is a matter, as I stated then, involving a large amount of expenditure, and information has not been given to Parliament as to the reasons for it, its size, and generally information with reference to the expedition. The hon. gentleman, I think, promised to give that information in a day or two. I will suggest now that if he is prepared to give it, it would be convenient for the members to have it when they go into the Estimates. There may be a little discussion about it.

ACCIDENT AT WELLINGTON BRIDGE, MONTREAL.

Mr. QUINN. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like again to draw the attention of the Minister of Railways and Canals to the subject which I brought up on Monday last, that is, the accident at the Wellington bridge, Montreal, and to an incident connected with it wherein a young man named Mattison risked his life for the purpose of saving the lives of those who had fallen into the canal. The Minister of Railways and Canals was good enough to say that he would cause an inquiry to be made concerning it; and I wish at the same time to draw his attention to the conduct of this young man, and to suggest that some recognition of his services should be made by the Government, or that his conduct should be reported to the Royal Humane Society.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I have given instructions to inquire into the circumstances of that accident, and I will be glad to take into account what the hon. gentleman has said.

PREFERENTIAL TRADE WITH GREAT BRITAIN.

Mr. McNEILL. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask my right hon. friend whether he has been able to decide to give me a day, not later than Wednesday of next week, to discuss the subject of preferential trade with Great Britain.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I will be able to give a day to my hon. friend, and during the course of to-day, I will tell him what day we can give to that subject.

DEPARTMENT OF GEOLOGICAL SURVEY.

Bill (No. 114) further to amend the Act respecting the Department of the Geological Survey was read the second time, and the House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to have some reasons from the Minister as to why this change is necessary, and as to what extent he proposes to use this power.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The Bill is for the purpose of giving power to the Minister who has charge of the department, upon the recommendation of the director of the Geological Survey, as my hon. friend will see by reading the two clauses, to employ such a number of temporary assistants as technical officers as may be necessary, without being limited by the provisions of the Civil Service Act in regard to the payment of these officials. Under the Civil Service Act it would be impossible to pay these men more than $400 per annum. The director of the survey finds it necessary for short periods to employ men possessed of special technical qualifications, and it is impossible to procure the services of those men for $400 a year. It is not desired to appoint them permanently, but he wishes to have this power so as to have a free hand on special occasions when work requires to be done.

Mr. FOSTER. This clause gives pretty large powers, which have not been given heretofore, I believe, although we have had the Civil Service Act in operation and the Department of the Geological Survey in working order for a number of years, both conjointly. I do not think the hon. gentleman has detailed the difficulties which arise now as compared with the difficulties which arose previous to this time, and as to why he requires these powers, when former Ministers appear to have conducted the department without possessing them. It might be supposed that the director of the department and the Minister might know very well beforehand what work would require to be carried out during the coming year, and submit the case to Parliament, if any extraordinary aid were needed. I also observe that this clause places these employees outside of the civil service examinations, and leaves everything at the discretion of the Minister, as represented by the deputy head and the director. I do not say that the deputy head is going to make recommendations if men are not wanted, but there should be very good reasons adduced for breaking in upon the general law.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). My hon. friend will notice, in the first place, that the director of the survey is responsible for the persons who may

be thus employed possessing the qualifications required by the Act respecting the Geological Survey. In the second place, they cannot be employed except under the arrangement that payment is made from the contingencies of the department. So the power after all is extremely limited, and could not be extensively used even if the director of the survey so desired.

On section 2.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the extent of section 4 of the Act respecting the Department of the Geological Survey? Does it refer to any help in the form of clerks or anything of that kind?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The hon. gentleman will find on page 38 of the Appropriation Act of last year the same provision.

Bill reported, and read the third time, and passed.

THE ADULTERATION ACT.

Bill (No. 72) to amend the Adulteration Act was read the second time, and the House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE Act (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière). The purpose of this section is merely to complete the description of the articles which are to be considered as adulterated.

On section 5.

Mr. QUINN. Are there any radical changes in this?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. The only change is that it increases the penalty in cases of fraud, especially in cases where the adulteration endangers the health of the people. Our inspectors generally discover adulterated articles in retail stores and necessarily the retailer is hardly morally responsible as he buys the article from some one else. I want to provide by this Bill that when a retailer is brought into court, there shall be means of proceeding against the manufacturer or original vendor of the article so as to make one case.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

SAFETY OF FISHERMEN.

Bill (No. 111) for better securing the safety of certain fishermen, was read the second time, and the House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. KAULBACH. I desire to inform this House that an enactment of this sort for the better securing the safety of fishermen, I do not object to, as the principle is a right one, and the motive commendable, but I certainly object to some of the details, and my reasons for doing so are as follows, which I hope the Minister in charge of this Bill will recognize, and make the necessary corrections by way of amendments. I may say that all this Bill asks from the owners and crew of each vessel have been observed for many years, and the crew more particularly have been careful for their own safety to see it carried out. The corrections I recommend are as follows:—Strike out at the commencement of clause 2, fifteenth line, after the words, "The owners of such vessel shall supply her," and insert instead thereof, the following:—"vessel shall be supplied." My reason for suggesting this change is, that I have had communication with our fishermen and they ask it on the grounds that the owner is not at all times in command, but invariably owns a part of the vessel, and if it says "vessel shall be supplied," it covers with all that is intended.

I seriously object to the words "fog-horn or trumpet" being left at the end of section 2, nineteenth line, as the construction is bad, with all due deference to the promoter of the Bill in the other Chamber, who probably was the framer, as it implies that every boat shall of necessity carry a fog-horn, and the fact of the boat carrying it would be interpreted that it was intended for use by the boat's crew in case of fog, which would be misleading, and tend to much confusion, and endangerment of life, as it would be the medium in most cases, if used in this way, of carrying them further away from their ships than otherwise, and the cause of injury instead of a benefit, as each vessel carries from six to eight boats, and if each were sounding a trumpet simultaneously they would probably be following each other's sound, and thereby, in the multiplicity of sounds, be unable to distinguish the trumpet sound from their ship, and instead of recovering their ship, would probably have the chance of finding themselves hopelessly lost.

The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries will see the difficulty and the confusion that a trumpet in a boat, if used in this way, would naturally lead to. But I want to be understood in this connection that I do not object to each boat carrying a fog-trumpet, if it is used at the proper time and place, as it might be useful and necessary on the approach of a vessel under sail, or a steamer in a fog, or if astray from their vessel and in their boat in the darkness of night, and hearing the approach of a steamer, that they in their boat with a trumpet, which would then be useful as well as a comfort, could sound the note of

warning and avert danger. Consequently I would ask that after the word "trumpet" in the nineteenth line, as referred to, the following words be added, "The trumpet to be used only on the approach of danger." I would also suggest that after the word "owner," in subsection 2, twentieth line, that the words "or master" be inserted, so as to read "The owner or master.

With these amendments as advised, save that the penalty clause, is in my opinion, a stiff one, and should be reduced, which I trust the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries will recognize himself as being excessive. I am satisfied to give the Bill my concurrence.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, this Bill comes from the hands of a gentleman in another place who gave a great deal of attention to the subject some years ago, and it has not had the advantage of being carefully considered and drafted by the technical officers of the Department of Marine and Fisheries. It was in the charge of a private member in another place. The principle of the Bill is one against which nothing can be said, so far as it means an effort to save the lives of fishermen at sea. We know that the loss of life is something terrible in connection with these fishing journeys, and I can understand the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Kaulbach), who is most familiar with the question, and who is interested in it, directly and indirectly, suggesting as he has done some of the difficulties which occurred during the time I was Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and had occasion to consult the technical officers on the subject. I propose to ask the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries to be good enough to submit the Bill to his officers, who are experienced in the working out of these things, in order to see whether the difficulties that occurred at the time when I had to consult them, have been in any wise removed. There are one or two things in this Bill that make it not altogether so desirable as one might think at first sight, and which may leave it open to the charge that it may do serious wrong or great injury. These compasses are no good unless they are accurate, as every one will admit. The first clause of the Bill makes it necessary that there shall be an accurate compass on board of every one of these boats, and a very severe penalty, as my hon. friend from Lunenburg (Mr. Kaulbach) has pointed out, attaches to an infraction of that clause. If the Bill is to be enforced to the letter, the difficulties attending compliance with it around the cosat, not only of Nova Scotia but any of these coasts, where these vessels are fitted out, will be very great. Even if it were proved that the master of a vessel tried to get a good compass but could not, or even if it were proved that there was no one at the port where the vessel was fitted out, to test the compass.

Mr. KAULBACH.

none of these excuses, fair and reasonable as they would be, would avail against the imposition of this penalty, and the industry might be seriously embarrassed owing to the difficulty of complying with the law. The very men whom we want to benefit may be injured. Instead of waiting for the Bill to go into committee, to draw attention to its drafting, I would ask the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries to grant that concession, if it be a concession, and allow the Bill to stand, or he might take the reading now if he prefers.

Mr. SPEAKER. The second reading has been taken.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. At any rate, there are lots of ways of bringing about what I desire, and I would suggest that the hon. Minister should let this Bill stand over until we have the benefit of the decision of those who are experienced in the work, and to whom he must look for advice on the subject of the drafting of this measure. They will be able to discuss these points with him, which they discussed with me before, better than I can. Not only is a compass to be put on board but it is to be retained, and there is no bona fide excuse possible which can avail a man who has failed to retain these things after he has made a bona fide effort to do so. There are also various other suggestions which could be made, and I would ask the hon. gentleman to defer the consideration of this measure for the present.

Mr. McDOUGALL. It seems to me there is another objection to the passing of this Bill, especially in its present shape. It provides that, in any case, where a boat is launched from a ship to engage in fishing, whether with trawls, lines or anything else, the owner of the vessel is liable, if the boat is not provided with two pounds of food per man. In many cases, boats are sent out but a short distance from the vessel and for a very short time, and you would subject the owners in such cases to a great deal of risk, if they did not supply these boats with a quantity of provisions not at all required. Suppose the captain of one of these vessels sent his boat out only a few yards, there would be no need to supply the quantity of provisions required by this Bill; but if trouble subsequently arose between him and the crew, there is nothing to prevent any one of the crew taking action against the owners for having failed to supply the boat, on a particular occasion, in accordance with the provisions of this Act. I would suggest that the hon. Minister should provide some kind of a limit or allow some discretion to the master of the vessel in cases where there was really no need for supplying the boat with the provisions required by this Bill. The fine to be imposed is very heavy, and consequently the Bill is liable to abuse.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). I am glad to see that, at any rate, the hon. gentleman who criticised the Bill, admits it to be an excellent one in principle. These men who go down to the sea in ships and do business in these waters, incur enormous risks, and from time to time great loss of life results, consequent upon the dangers they necessarily have to encounter. I may therefore assume that it is the desire of every hon. member to minimize those dangers, in every possible way, and that is the object of this Bill. This Bill was introduced in the other Chamber a good many years ago. It has had the advantage of the criticisms of that Chamber on many occasions, and has emerged from it in the form in which it now is. It was shipwrecked in this Chamber once or twice, when the slaughter of innocents took place at the close of the session, without being considered by the House. On one occasion, I think the hon. Minister of Marine, for the time being, rather objected to the Bill in the form in which it then was, but my hon. friends who have raised objections will notice that they are such as might well be considered in committee. The last objection raised, my hon. friend from Cape Breton (Mr. McDougall) will find is not tenable. He says that the master of a vessel may send out a boat for a short distance, without the quantity of provisions required by this measure, and no harm will ensue. But the object is to provide that the owners of vessels engaged in deep sea fishing, who send out small boats for that purpose, which are liable to be overtaken by fog, should supply on all occasions a certain quantity of water and food so as to have the men sufficiently provided with these necessaries, in case they should be required. It does not seem unreasonable that the shipmaster should see, in every case, that these necessaries are put in the boats. If he allows a dory with two or three men in it to leave his ship on the banks, and go one, two or three miles away, where it may be overtaken by fog or stress of weather, without a reasonable amount of food and water and a compass, he should be liable to punishment. There is no arbitrary penalty imposed. Circumstances may arise which call for the imposition of the highest penalty, but there may be other cases in which the offence may be partly accidental and partly due to negligence, and the court will take these circumstances into consideration and give such effect to the excuses made as the court thinks reasonable and impose a reasonable penalty. The court may fine 50 cents, or $5, or $50, according to the circumstances of each case, so that my hon. friend will see that the Bill has been drawn with very great care, and is the result of years of criticism passed upon it, not only in this House but in the Senate and the newspaper press. I have not the slightest desire to force the Bill through the committee against the wishes of hon. gentlemen, but I would suggest that we go into committee, and if any reasonable suggestion be made, I would be very glad to reserve the Bill for further consideration.

Mr. KAULBACH. I think my hon. friend is right in regard to his answer to my hon. friend from Cape Breton (Mr. McDougall). I do not see where the limit would be placed exactly.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Kaulbach) must remember that we are not in committee and he has already spoken once.

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into committee on the Bill.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That clause is very badly drawn. I do not hesitate to say that it ought to be recast very carefully. For instance, take the point I referred to a little while ago, with regard to the word "retained." I find that in the penalty clause this is quite overlooked. When I first read it, I thought, of course, that the penal clause would cover this non-retention of an accurate compass. The penalty clause shows that the owner and master shall be liable where a boat is launched or set out in contravention of these provisions. This makes the provision as to retaining meaningless. And it would be most unreasonable if the penalty clause happened to cover it, to make any one responsible for a dory, a ticklish thing like that, during its absence, retaining an accurate compass. Again I point out to the Minister of Marine how carelessly this Bill has been drafted. Subsection 2 of section 1 refers to "serviceable compasses," while the first subsection refers to an accurate compass. I need not argue this distinction or difference. The clause reads:

> No dory, flat, whaler or other boat whatsoever shall be launched or set out from any vessel engaged in deep-sea or bank fishing,——

That means that these shall be considered boats within the meaning of the Act, for section 3 provides that this Act is to be read and construed as if it formed part of the Fisheries Act. That being the case, it is most important that this should be put in the hands of a careful draftsman, because confusion may arise, which it is most desirable to avoid. The boat in which these other boats go is a boat within the meaning of the Bill. So you have the master liable if he launches the fishing smack of a schooner without this paraphernalia. What is the launching in this case, is it setting out from port or running off the ways? I could point out a good many other objections, and I am

satisfied we shall not gain much time by attempting to lick these three clauses into shape. The draftsman should sit down, take the Fisheries Act of which this is a part and see that the language is in accordance with that Act, and distinguish sharply between the liability of the owner and the liability of the master and also make clear what is meant by this expression "launching."

Mr. KAULBACH. The hon. Minister will see in regard to the penalty clause——

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I think we had better finish the first clause first. We can make no progress if we attempt to discuss all the clauses at once. I cannot see why the hon. gentleman objects to this first clause if he agrees to the principle of the Bill. It is a mere declaration, which I think is pretty accurately phrased. It describes a dory, flat or whaler as a boat and provides that none of these " shall be launched or set out from any vessel" without these appliances provided.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What does "launched" mean? Can she not be launched without these things?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. She cannot leave the vessel without these things. The alternate language is "launched or set out," which shows distinctly what is intended. The clause is as follows:—

No dory, flat, whaler or other boat whatsoever shall be launched or set out from any vessel engaged in deep-sea or bank fishing, for the purpose of fishing with hooks and lines, trawls or other similar appliances, or with intent that the same shall be used in so fishing, or for the purpose of examining trawls, set lines or other similar appliances for fishing, unless there is placed in such boat and retained therein during absence from such vessel an accurate and serviceable mariners' compass, and unless there is placed in such boat at least two quarts of drinking water and two pounds of solid food for each each man of the crew of such boat.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Now, to begin with the first section, I have no doubt as the hon. gentleman has read it is the way he understands it. But it is not forcing the construction, to put it on the lowest level of criticism, to say that "launched" does not mean launched from the vessel.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I read it "no dory, flat or other boat whatsoever shall be launched," then I leave out the words "or set out from any vessel," as might properly be done——

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No. It means "launched or set out from any vessel," it means that or nothing.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I think I am giving the meaning that would be put upon it. The boat is not launched from a vessel; it shall not be launched, nor shall it actively set out. In the one case we are not at liberty to launch these boats. Launching is rather an extraordinary expression.

Mr. FLINT. Would it not be better if the word "launched" was struck out altogether?

Mr. McDOUGALL. Would it not be better to say that no dory, flat, whaler, or other boat whatever shall leave or set out from a vessel?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Is that any better than saying she shall not be launched from any vessel? It says launched from a vessel.

Mr. McDOUGALL. It does not say that, it says shall be launched or set out from a vessel.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That is the alternative.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Would this interfere with the principle of the Bill, acting on the suggestion of the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint), and dropping these words "be launched or"?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not think it would be as well expressed that way as in this way. People will understand it better this way, that they shall not launch any boat from the deck of a vessel engaged in deep sea fishing. "No dory, flat, whaler or other boat whatsoever shall be launched or set out from any vessel." There is no possible way of misunderstanding that.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Either set of words will do, but both together make confusion. For instance, say that none of these boats shall be launched from any vessel, or leave that out, and say none of these boats shall set out from any vessel.

Mr. KAULBACH. Leave out the words "be launched or." It will read a good deal better.

Mr. FLINT. The objection of the hon. gentleman could be met easily enough by altering the construction this way: "No dory, flat, whaler or other boat whatsoever shall set out from any vessel engaged in deep sea or bank fishing, or be launched therefrom."

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That would do.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not think it improves it, but I am willing to accept it.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I move to drop these words out of the seventh

line: "and retained therein during the absence from such vessel an accurate and." I need not argue that, unless my hon. friend desires it, because it would be a most iniquitous thing to punish the captain of a vessel for the act of some of the men in the dory in throwing that compass out. His duty in every sense is complete when he gives them a compass, and gives them food and puts them in the dory and tells them to go to their work. But after that, it seems to me no one could claim that he should be responsible because this compass was not retained during absence from such vessel.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. This is put in as a declaration of what it is the intention of the Act that they shall do, to avoid the formality on their part of putting it in the boat and taking it right out.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. "The master of every vessel from which any boat is launched or set out in contravention of the provisions of the preceding section." It may be that these words are inoperative. I do not think we ought to put in notices to the public that mean nothing. Let us put here the law we propose to enforce, instead of putting a meaningless declaration as to one's duty. Then again in that clause I ask to be omitted "an accurate," leaving the word "serviceable," because in the next subsection the words "serviceable compass" are used.

Mr. ELLIS. I do not think there can be any objection to strike out the words "an accurate." But I think the section ought to contain what the plain intention of the legislature is, that is, that a compass should be kept in the boat during the time the boat is away from the ship when she is in danger of being lost. To strike out the words would seem to allow the captains, if they so choose, or the owners, by collusion or in any other way, to escape furnishing sufficient compasses to provide these boats. The legislation is really necessary. The newspapers on the coast during the fishing season are continually giving descriptions of boats or men that are lost at sea, or men who are starved. It should be compulsory at least, the Act should express that the intention of the legislature is that the compasses should be retained in the boat, not put upon the boat and taken out five minutes afterwards.

Mr. MONTAGUE. What if the compass is lost?

Mr. ELLIS. There is always the contingency that the compass might be lost. No one could be blamed, probably, if the compass was lost, and the court would take this matter into consideration. There is always a possibility of that contingency arising, but the law should provide that the compass should be in the boat, and that one compass should not be passed around from one boat to another through ten or twenty boats.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The provisions of the Fisheries Act are sometimes enforced for the sake of reward in connection with penalties obtained. The hon. gentleman's experience will furnish him with cases of the law being rigidly enforced in certain districts, not for the purpose of enforcing any general principle, but in order to give people trouble. It is a most vicious principle of legislation that we should either pass ineffective clauses or penal clauses, on the ground that although they might cover hard cases, yet no one would seek to enforce the penalty. There seems to be a very unfair liability put on the man in charge of the dory. It was right if the master could not be sued for having failed to place a compass in the boat; it might be that the owner was not liable; but this is construed as if it formed part of the Fisheries Act, and there was a general provision in that Act making every one liable for violation of any provisions of that Act or fisheries regulations. Section 18 provides that any one who violates any provision of the Act shall be liable to a penalty. Here you have men starting out in a boat with the duty imposed on them by this section to have a compass on board; and when the hon. gentleman states that this section was merely a statement of duty without liability, he will look in vain for any legislation regarding this subject or other subjects under the cognizance of the Government where the legislation is identical with that now proposed. The subsection requires that a serviceable compass should be put in the boat.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The Bill does not provide for punishing any man who, bona fide, places a compass in the boat, if that compass is afterwards thrown out of the boat and lost. The object of the section is to prescribe a penalty if a compass is not bona fide placed in the boat and retained there at the time she leaves. I suggest that the word "and" be struck out, and the following words substituted: "placed in the boat to be retained."

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The amendment will cover the point.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am also willing to strike out the word "accurate" before the word "compass" and allow it to read, "a compass."

Subsection, as amended, agreed to.

On section 2,

Mr. KAULBACH. I move that after the word "the" the following words be struck out: "owners of such vessels," and the

following words inserted: "the vessel shall be supplied."

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There are two different classes of persons who should be made liable. The first are the owners, whose duty it shall be to see that when the vessel leaves on a voyage she shall be supplied with the necessary articles stated. Second, the master is held liable if he allows a dory to leave the vessel without compass, bread and water. If there are five or six owners of a vessel, there is always a ship's husband, whose duty it will be to see that the vessel is properly equipped.

Mr. KAULBACH. In many cases a vessel has eight or ten owners, who probably reside at different places, and the vessel is in charge of a master, who in many cases is part owner. The vessel is liable for any dereliction of duty on the part of the master. If the words I have suggested, "vessel shall be supplied," are inserted, both the owner and the master will be responsible. It will be very unfair to place on the owner this liability, when he is probably a hundred miles distant, and has no means of exercising the necessary supervision.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The owner must employ some one to carry out the requirements of the law. If he is not liable to be present personally he must act by an agent. The hon. gentleman will not find any difficulty in regard to this section.

Mr. FLINT. Some one must be held responsible for supplying the articles required under the law. The owner must be held responsible, even if the vessel is at sea.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. This section necessitates a direct personal supervision over the vessel by the owner; it does not say that he shall exercise or use all reasonable means to see that the vessel is properly supplied. I am not attacking this subsection, but I desire to point out that it involves a line of duty not hitherto demanded.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman will see that the penalties imposed on an owner who has been negligent in performing his duty are variable, and depend on the extent of the legal and moral guilt. If he has absolutely neglected his duty and has given no instructions and adopted no precautions to carry out the law, then he may be liable to the full penalty.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. And if he does not do it in fact?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. He is liable to the same penalty, but the amount is in the discretion of the court. If this man has done all in his power to take proper precautions and was not guilty of an absolute neglect of duty, the court would not punish him to the same extent as another who was absolutely at fault. Unless you want to make the Bill a farce it is perfectly plain the owner must be liable.

Mr. KAULBACH. Why not say the "master" of such vessel instead of the "owner." The owner cannot, at least should not, be responsible for what has transpired during the voyage.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The master is liable if he allows the boat to leave the vessel for the purpose of fishing without the proper equipment, but this is a statutory duty cast upon the owner to see that the compasses and things are supplied to the vessel when she leaves the port. A great part of the usefulness of the Bill would be destroyed if the owner is held not to be responsible. This clause is for the protection of the lives of the hundreds of men engaged in the fishing vessels, and if the owner neglects his duty absolutely, he should be punished to the fullest extent the law provides. If there are excuses that he can bring forward in palliation of his conduct, the court will take that into consideration.

Mr. KAULBACH. The master is the person really in charge in setting out on the voyage, and I should say he would be the party really responsible.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Suppose there are several owners, some of whom do not participate in the management of the vessel, may there not be some difficulty about the word "owner" in this section?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not think so. The Interpretation Act says the singular includes the plural.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Yes, but should you include those who are not directly concerned in the matter?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The court, in its discretion, may find that the owner was not so guilty as the ship's husband.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I appreciate what the Minister says, but it seems to me to be questionable whether you should make the owner liable for any penalty of that kind. I would ask the hon. gentleman whether under the Merchants' Shipping Act there is any obligation upon the fishing vessels to have a fog-horn?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. No, they are exempted.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Would it not be desirable to provide, as is done in the Merchants' Shipping Act, with regard to the

character of the fog-horn ? Would it not be well to say that it should be a " serviceable" fog-horn ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I think that is a very good suggestion, and I am glad to accept it.

Mr. KAULBACH. It will lead to a great deal of confusion if every boat with a trumpet were to sound it in time of fog, for we would have one boat following the sound of the other.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I think we can trust to the experience of the men on board with respect to that. The hon. gentleman will see that they would not all begin blowing their trumpets without necessity.

Mr. KAULBACH. I do not object to the words " fog-horn or trumpet " remaining in the clause, but I would ask the Minister to use the following words : " The trumpet to be used only on the approach of danger."

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not think that is necessary. The men must themselves judge of the time for using the trumpet.

Mr. KAULBACH. It is quite possible that they might use it without necessity. I contend that my suggestion is a reasonable one.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. This provision makes such a radical change that it should be well considered. The policy of Parliament so far has been in the opposite direction to the provisions of this subsection. We provide that these dories or little boats shall all have serviceable compasses, and my recollection is that the law exempts fishing vessels from the regulations in this respect, which apply to other ships. A vessel may go out without any serviceable compass so far as the law is concerned, but we now provide that these little boats which she carries shall each have a serviceable compass when they go away from the ship, so that they may be able, for instance, to find the position of the schooner, which they left at a certain time ; but for all the law says, the schooner from which the boats started, if she moves, will not be able to fix the position of the nets or trawls from which the dories have gone with the compass. If you want this measure effective, you must not take everything for granted. You take for granted, for instance, that the magistrate is going to be reasonable, and that the penalty he imposes will often be the lowest amount. If you touch the subject at all, you should do it completely ; and if you provide that these small boats shall be so fitted out, surely you must provide that the boat carrying them shall have a serviceable compass as well. According to my information, there are vessels, particularly on the Labrador coast, which are reported season after season to have none of these things. There are considerable parts of the coasts of this country —I am not referring to provinces like Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, but to certain out-of-the-way parts of the province of Quebec, for instance—where, if you would not permit vessels to go to sea without such things, they would not go to sea at all, and it would be a question how they would get a living. Questions of that kind were in the minds of the officers of the department who advised me with reference to a Bill of this character—how far you would be prepared to stop such an industry in certain parts of the country ; and I call attention to the fact that you make this provision with regard to the small boats, and let the large boats go free.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The Bill cannot be construed as applying to fishing smacks such as my hon. friend refers to. It is carefully confined to those vessels which are engaged in deep-sea fishing ; and I am sure that the hon. gentleman himself on reflection will be satisfied that no vessel should go out and engage in deep-sea or bank fishing with these dories on board, and launch them on the deep, without providing them with a compass.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I am pointing out that the hon. gentleman's legislation is incomplete—that he is only providing that the dories must have a compass, but is not providing that the big ship must have it.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There is no danger of her getting lost in a fog.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Are we to understand that this does not apply to small boats that fish around the coasts or in the Gulf of St. Lawrence ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It only applies to those engaged in deep-sea or bank fishing.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Take two or three miles from the shore—would not that be considered deep-sea fishing ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Of course not.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I think that three miles from the shore is deep-sea fishing.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I suppose you could find deep-sea fishing in the gulf.

Mr. McDOUGALL. In Nova Scotia we have two-ton boats which go out ten miles from the shore. Does this apply to them ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. If these vessels are engaged in deep-sea fishing, it will apply. If they confine themselves to the shore, it will not apply.

Mr. KAULBACH. With regard to compasses, the hon. gentleman will see that the Bill breaks up any arrangement between the owner or master and the crew. Hitherto the crew have always furnished themselves with compasses for the boat, as well as the utensil for carrying water. This clause compels the owner of the vessel to furnish these articles.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. He can make an arrangement to charge them to the seamen if he likes.

Mr. KAULBACH. My contention is that if this were made to read, "vessels shall be supplied," that would mean that the article would have to be supplied, without naming the owner or the crew.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The object is to provide that somebody shall do it, and that he shall be punished if he does not.

Mr. KAULBACH. I would urge that to be added, if it is at all possible.

On section 2,

Mr. KAULBACH. I would suggest that the words, "or master," be inserted after the word "owner" in the 20th line.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. You could not do that very well unless you altered the preceding section by inserting the same words there. The idea is to make the owner liable in one instance, and the master liable in another. If the vessel leaves port without these things, the owner shall be liable, and if any boat is launched from her in the deep sea without them, the master is liable.

Mr. KAULBACH. The owner may not be there when she leaves.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Then he must see that some one is there. The object is to make some one liable.

Mr. KAULBACH. Would it affect the clause if the words "or master" were included?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I think it would.

Mr. McDOUGALL. When is it intended that this Act shall go into force?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. At once.

Mr. McDOUGALL. A great many men are now absent from their homes for the season, prosecuting the fishing industry, and it would be unjust to render them liable.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Let the hon. gentleman suggest a date.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I would suggest that this Act do not go into force until next year. It will entail a great deal of expense. A vessel that proceeded to the fishing banks a week ago may not return to her owners for three or four months. Say that a vessel goes to the Newfoundland banks from Nova Scotia, the master would be under necessity of going into a port on the coast of Newfoundland and getting those supplies or be liable to a penalty from the moment this Bill came into force.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am quite willing to accept any reasonable suggestion. How would the first of August do?

Mr. McDOUGALL. Supposing that vessel does not return for three or four months. They usually make but one trip during the season.

Mr. KAULBACH. My hon. friend is reasonable in his request. These voyages usually terminate about the middle of September, and not any earlier, and, therefore, the Bill should not go into operation before the first of October next.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Will there be any hardship making it the first of August, because it does seem to me that if the dangers we propose to avoid are really serious, and both sides admit they are, it would be a cruel thing to postpone the taking of reasonable precautions any longer than is absolutely necessary.

Mr. KAULBACH. The major portion of those vessels do not return until the middle of September. Some of them go for the whole season, and get their supplies in St. John's and other ports in Newfoundland.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I will accept the hon. gentleman's suggestion and make it the first of October.

Mr. KAULBACH. Whilst on my feet, I would refer to the penalty clause. It seems to me excessive.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to call his attention to the fact that there is no arbitrary sum fixed. There is a maximum, but no minimum limit, and the penalty may be only a dollar.

Mr. KAULBACH. The maximum appears to be too heavy.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Suppose two men lose their lives through a violation of this Bill, do you think a fine of $100 would be too great a punishment?

Mr. KAULBACH. The hon. gentleman is putting an extreme case. My reason for asking that a lesser penalty be imposed is that the master of a vessel is compelled to exercise a certain amount of discipline on

board, and very often fishermen, who were not previously on board that vessel or who were never at sea before, feel the ruling rather rigid on the part of the master, and may try to exercise some of their rebelling powers, and violate the law intentionally so as to bring the master to punishment. Therefore, I ask that the maximum penalty be not $100 but a less amount.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The feeling of all those I have spoken to is in favour of increasing the maximum.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I hope there will be a pretty good minimum fixed. At present, there is no minimum fixed at all. Those in favour of the principle of the Bill desire it to have some effect. My hon. friend from Lunenburg (Mr. Kaulbach) represents what we may call the wealthier class of men who go into this business, and they can never well afford to comply with this law.

Mr. KAULBACH. Some of them are very poor.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. But others we know from experience are not. We know that heavy steamship owners, all of whom no doubt are anxious that no lives should be lost, find it very difficult to comply with the different Acts passed for the purpose of preserving life, and our experience is that unless the penalties are considerable and effective, they will not take the pains to comply with the law. What may happen under this Bill? In districts where the influence of the shipowners and masters are considerable, they may go before a magistrate friendly, or unprincipled if you like—for there are unprincipled magistrates—and have themselves fined, and then be able to plead this conviction, if the matter be taken up seriously afterwards. They may have been fined only 50 cents or $1. We know how our Fisheries Act works, and the hon. gentleman who is trying to neutralize such influences, should fix a sufficiently heavy minimum penalty. It seems idle, when enacting a law to protect life, that it should be left subject to such influences as I have mentioned, and have merely nominal fines inflicted because of these special reasons, which the hon. gentleman has mentioned, advanced by the owners and others who really intended to violate the law. I shall not press the hon. gentleman finally on that point for the moment, but I think it is worthy his serious consideration.

Mr. KAULBACH. The hon. member for Pictou is labouring under the very erroneous impression that the fishermen are a rich class. They are not.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Some are.

Mr. KAULBACH. The major portion of them have become very poor within the last year or two from the fact that the hon. Minister has withdrawn from them a certain amount of the bounty which was due to them.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I did not withdraw any bounty. I gave them a larger bounty.

Mr. KAULBACH. No, you reduced the bounty.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FIHERIES. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. The inshore fishermen have had the bounty increased.

Mr. KAULBACH. The deep sea fishermen, as a rule, have been greatly curtailed, as regards the bounty.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. How much?

Mr. KAULBACH. I do not remember exactly the figures, but I am correct in my statement. I contend that the bounties should be increased instead of reduced, and I take this opportunity now of reminding the hon. gentleman that instead of reducing the bounty for the deep sea fishermen, he should increase it and thus encourage that industry in ship-building as well.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Does the hon. gentleman intend to fix a date when the Bill will come into operation?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I intend to provide for that by another section.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I would like to move the following amendment:—

This Act shall not apply to vessels that proceeded to engage in fishing before the passage of this Act is published in the customs offices of Canada, and will not go into force before the first of August, 1898.

I take it that the hon. Minister will have the provisions of this Act posted up in the customs offices as soon as it passes.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Such a clause is never inserted in any statute because it would give rise to doubt whether in some instances the amount was posted up. I am willing to accept the suggestion as to the first of October.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I move that the following be added to the Bill clause 4:—

This Act shall come into force and effect on and after the first day of October, 1898.

Motion agreed to.

Bill reported as amended.

SUPPLY—THE YUKON CONTINGENT.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). Questions were put the other day by the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) to which I desire to reply. I would have made my statement on the subject yesterday had the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) been in his place. The questions he asked related to the sending of the contingent of troops of the permanent militia into the Yukon district, and the probable expenditure that may result therefrom. Of course, it is well understood by the House that the principal object of the militia is to support the civil power, and it is for the purpose of aiding in this respect that it is proposed now to send this force into the Yukon country. The very large extent of territory there, and the wide distribution of gold in that country, as we are led to believe now on the latest reports received, will result in the establishment of a large number of mining camps. This caused the Government to believe that it would be necessary to increase the force which is now in that country. I think there are about 190 North-west mounted police in the Yukon district. At first, I believe, it was intended to increase the mounted police force, but on further consideration it was thought that it would better serve the objects in view to send a detachment of the permanent force, which would establish a central force in that country, would have a certain decided moral effect upon the scattered population through the district, and if necessity demanded, would be ready to assist in enforcing law and maintaining order there. It was proposed to send 200 additional North-west mounted policemen, but, instead of that, there are to be sent 200 of the permanent force, including officers and non-commissioned officers. In addition to the 200 members of the force, there will be a very few men who will go up as artificers and boatmen to assist in carrying the expedition. I might point out, what was very well known, I suppose, to every member of the House, that the United States have at the present time four companies of their regular troops in Alaskan territory.

Mr. FOSTER. What number does that make ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I think between three and four hundred men.

Mr. WALLACE. Whereabouts are they ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I think that two companies of them are at Skagway, but I am not informed as to the distribution of the others. With regard to the question of expense, I may say that it is a difficult matter to estimate, when sending into a country like that, exactly what the expense will be, because of the difficulties in the way of transportation and so on. So far as I am able to estimate now, this force will cost, in addition to what it would cost if it were left where it has been, about $200,000 a year. This, as I say, is extra, but for the first year only. I should think that it might be reduced, if they remain there, by $50,000 a year, in succeeding years.

Mr. FOSTER. Does that estimate include the cost of transport and maintenance for the year ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Possibly it will be a little more for the first year, but it will certainly be less in subsequent years. The cost of this force of 200 men now is about $100,000 a year, that is, the whole permanent force numbers about 800, and the annual cost is something over $400,000.

Mr. TISDALE. What would be the cost if you sent mounted police ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. It would have cost more. I believe that the pay of the mounted police is higher than that of the permanent force.

Mr. WALLACE. What is the pay of the privates in this force ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Fifty cents per day. I may explain that we pay the North-west mounted police, while they are in that country, double their regular pay. We propose to treat the militia force in the same way while they are there, so that really if it were not for the fact that the pay is actually double what it has been here, the increase would not be more than $100,000 to $160,000.

Mr. TISDALE. Is not their pay double the pay of the mounted police ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. No, the police get double its normal pay, and the normal pay received by the mounted police is greater than the pay of the militia. The militia will simply receive the double of its pay. I may say it is intended to send the troops by the Stikine River, and overland from Glenora to Teslin Lake and down Teslin Lake to Fort Selkirk. That is the objective point to which it is intended to send this detachment. It is intended, for perhaps a few months, to leave a portion of the force at Lake Teslin until towards the close of the season, but the objective point to which the expedition is going is Fort Selkirk. It is intended there to establish barracks, to construct certain defensive works, and make the men as comfortable as possible at that point.

Mr. WALLACE. Are they under the control of Major Walsh ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. They will be under the control of the civil power; whoever is administering the district will have control, because the military is sent out simply in support of the civil power, and will be at the call of the administrator of the Government there whenever necessity may require.

Mr. HUGHES. What armament are the men to take? Are they taking any Maxim guns?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes, they are armed with Lee-Enfield rifles; they will take two Maxim guns and two seven-pound field guns. The ammunition taken will be 300 rounds per rifle, and 12,500 rounds per Maxim gun.

Mr. McDOUGALL. By what route are they going from here to Glenora?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. They are going to Vancouver over the Canadian Pacific Railway, and I believe from Vancouver up the Stikine River by the Canadian Pacific Railway Navigation Company. I think that is the arrangement the Quartermaster General has made, and from there we expect to be assisted by the Hudson Bay Company in the transportation of freight from Glenora to Lake Teslin.

Mr. SPROULE. Then there is no truth in the report that they were going by an American vessel?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Not the slightest.

APPOINTMENTS BY THE LATE GOVERNMENT.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Before you leave the Chair, I desire to refer to a matter which has already been pretty thoroughly discussed in the House on previous occasions, but which, by reason of a return that has recently been brought down, assumes a somewhat new aspect. It has to do, Sir, with the appointments which were made by the late Government after its defeat at the polls in June, 1896. I shall refer to it very briefly for the reason that we are all anxious that the business of the House should progress as quickly as possible, and by reason of the fact too that the points in question have been pretty well discussed, and the points which I hope to be able to make will be so clear that they will not need amplification or much discussion at my hands. I may say at the outset that I do not desire to bring this question up for the purpose of showing that the Government of the day are inconsistent. So much evidence has been brought forward on that score, the point has been so well established, that no matter how strong a case I might be able to make, no matter how well I might be able to establish it, I think it would be altogether love's labour lost. Nor do I bring this matter up for the purpose of opening up the wider question of dismissals from the public service and the general treatment by the Government of the public servants of this country. That question has also been thoroughly discussed in the House, and has practically gone into history, and will form a precedent for subsequent Administrations; and if we are to believe, as it looks likely now that the cry of the party press is to be heeded, the precedent will in the future be made even more baneful than it is at the present time. I bring this matter up for the purpose of establishing two points: in the first place, that the chief executive of Canada has been placed in a very unenviable position by the action of the Government on this question; and in the second place, that the clear, well-defined and unmistakable promise of the Prime Minister of Canada, made to this House, has been disregarded by his colleagues in office. It will be necessary for me to recall the circumstances, though I shall not dwell upon them, which led up to the new phase which I say it has now assumed. After the defeat of the late Government, as hon. gentlemen will remember, certain Orders in Council were passed making recommendations as to appointments in the public service, and His Excellency, when the Treasury Board reports having to do with these Orders in Council were submitted to him, exercised what he believed to be his right in dividing the Treasury Board items into two classes—the first of those classes he proposed to approve, the second, for various reasons which he gave in his correspondence to the late Government, and which has been brought down to the House, he proposed to disapprove of. Of course, I do not propose to offer any criticism upon the course of His Excellency, that would be out of order, and at the same time it would be entirely unnecessary, because I fancy that every one in the House, as well as almost every one in the country, understands thoroughly that a Governor of Canada can do no act for which his Ministers, whether of one Government or another, must not be responsible. Now, for the purpose of my argument, perhaps I had better read from "Todd's Parliamentary Government of the British Colonies," an opinion which has been frequently read to the House, but which refers particularly to this point:

> Upon a change of Ministry it is essential that the gentlemen who may be invited by the Governor to form a new Administration should be unreservedly informed by him of the circumstances which led to the resignation or dismissal of their predecessors in office, and that they shall be willing to accept entire responsibility to the local Parliament for any acts of the Governor which have been instrumental in occasioning the resignation or effecting the dismissal of the outgoing Ministry.

But, Sir, I do not need to read from Todd or any other parliamentary authority, be-

cause I think I shall be able to establish from "Hansard" that the Government of the day, led by the right hon. gentleman, only last year, as will be seen at page 1652 of "Hansard," assumed full responsibility for the course which His Excellency had pursued in regard to this question. If the right hon. gentleman will turn to the page to which I have referred, he will find that he declared :

> But I would recall the statement made by His Excellency at the time, giving the reason for disregarding certain recommendations made by his advisers after their defeat. * * * I had occasion afterwards to state that we accepted the statement of His Excellency, which we thought laid down a fair and equitable rule.

And he proceeds to add that the consent which had been given by His Excellency to certain Orders in Council which were passed by the Government, also met with his approval. What was the course pursued by His Excellency? He took those items of the Treasury Board report, which I have under my hand in the sessional papers of 1896, and he returned them to his Ministers with a memorandum. With that memorandum the House is familiar. He divided them into two sections : those of which he could approve, and those from which he felt it his duty to withhold his approval. From some he withheld his approval, as hon. gentlemen know, for three reasons : First, because some might be the creation of new offices and appointments ; second, filling vacancies for which no provision had been made by Parliament, and which vacancies had existed for more than one fiscal year ; and third, superannuations consequent on appointments for which applications or requests had not been received from the persons affected. Outside of those cases His Excellency gave his approval to every appointment which had been made by the Government after its defeat at the polls on 23rd June, 1896. On this side of the House we hold that in consequence of the Order in Council which had been passed in consequence of the Treasury Board report which had been passed, and in consequence of the approval of His Excellency to those instruments, the parties whose names did not come within the exceptions to which I have referred as being given in His Excellency's memorandum, had a right to consider themselves members of the civil service just as much as though they had been for years in the public service of Canada. There can be, I fancy, no doubt on that question, and if there be any doubt on it, I think I shall have authorities to submit in favour of the position I have taken which the Government of the day will not feel like gainsaying. What had they? They had the appointment made by the Government that had gone out of power, they had the approval of the Government which came into power, because the Government which came into power were thereupon responsible for the action which was taken by His Excellency, which action was the approval of the appointments to which I have referred. But in order that there may be no misunderstanding on this question, perhaps I had better refer to the opinion of the Prime Minister, which is given on page 1652 of the "Hansard" of 1897. In an address made upon a motion for papers in connection with this very subject, moved by the present leader of the Opposition, the right hon. gentleman said :

> We would not, and we could not, in fact, in consistency with the rules which we have laid down for our guidance, dismiss anybody appointed under such circumstances any more than we would have dismissed anybody else who had been in office, except for cause shown.

So I take the declaration of the present Prime Minister to be a proof of what I said, a defence of what I said that those people whose appointments were approved by His Excellency had as much right to consider themselves members of the civil service of Canada as though they had been for years engaged in the duties of their offices. On page 1621 of the "Hansard" of 1896, a conversation took place between the hon. member for York and the present Prime Minister, in which the hon. member for York used these words :

> So all the officers which did not fall within that schedule became by the sign manual of the Governor General and the report of Council, bona fide officers.

After hearing that statement the Prime Minister made no objection to it, but he proceeded to excuse himself and the Government for not having previously notified those officers of the appointments they had received from the hands of the late Government, which appointments had been approved by His Excellency under his own signature to the Treasury Board report. I now come to the first point which I wish to make in reference to this matter, and it is that the promise of the Prime Minister, unintentionally, I am sure on his part, unintentionally I must suppose on his part, has been entirely disregarded in the actual and practical working out of this question in regard to those appointments by the late Government. Let me turn to "Hansard" of 1896, page 1619, where this subject was dealt with, after a question had been asked by the member for West York and another question by the member for Bothwell as regards a certain individual case. When we look into the statements made by the Prime Minister we will observe that he made an answer to myself in this connection. This is the statement I made :

> What I stated for the information of the committee was this : That to my knowledge appointments had been made on the recommendation of the previous Controller of Customs and an Order in Council approving these recommendations had been passed, and I desire to know

whether the policy of the Government was to repeal the Orders in Council.

The Prime Minister said in reply :

I cannot speak specifically as to the position at Berlin or any other port. The hon. gentleman is aware that certain recommendations were made by the late Administration after 23rd June to His Excellency, and he is aware that all those recommendations were approved by His Excellency except three categories ; that His Excellency refused to ratify appointments to new offices or to offices which had been vacant for more than twelve months. If the vacancy at Berlin had not exceeded that time, then the appointment made is permanent, and the present Administration has not disturbed it.

I asked the right hon. gentleman across the floor :

Do these appointments stand ?

I have the right hon. gentleman's answer as reported on page 1620, as follows :—

They stand like every other appointee, until removed for cause.

Then I asked the question :

Why have not these gentlemen been notified ? It is extraordinary, in regard to the announcement made by the leader of the Government, that those gentlemen, properly appointed by Order in Council to positions at Wallaceburg and Berlin, have not been notified.

The Prime Minister said :

It is a matter very easy to explain.

The explanation as to why they were not notified—I may remark here :

There was a batch of four or five hundred Orders in Council sent to His Excellency, and afterwards, two weeks or so were occupied in making a classification as between those appointed and those not appointed.

Then the leader of the Opposition asked the right hon. gentleman a question :

Is it the intention of the Government, now that they have gone over these recommendations, and have decided on those which should become effective, to see that the appointments will be promptly made to the offices which do not come within the categories mentioned ?

The Prime Minister replied :

It is for the different heads of the departments to do that in the course of their ordinary duties.

Then the right hon. gentleman proceeded to say :

We had nothing to do but the pure Ministerial duty of ascertaining whether or not certain officers came within the category laid down by His Excellency. It was a work of arduous labour to ascertain that, and now that the thing is done, it will be for the different heads of the departments to act.

The leader of the Opposition understood that statement, as he understands the English language and as we all understand the English language, to be a declaration on the part of the leader of the Government that so far as those officers whose appointments did not come within the special category which had been made by His Excellency, would receive their appointments, be notified of them, and be placed in positions to discharge their duties. I ask my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to read again the statement which he made, and to say whether I am putting too severe a construction upon the words he addressed to the House. I am willing to leave it to any man in this House and to any man who can understand a question in English and its answer, as to whether I am construing his words too literally when I say, that his was a direct and unequivocal statement, that these men would receive their appointments and that they would go on with the work in which it was intended they should be engaged. Last year there was a promise also made by the Prime Minister. I refer to the "Hansard" of 1897, the discussion which arose upon the motion of the hon. the leader of the Opposition to which I have referred, and speaking upon that, the Prime Minister declared as follows :

I stated upon the floor of the House that it would be the duty of the Administration to respect all these appointments unless there was some cause to the contrary.

Again the Prime Minister says :

There may be a few cases—I know there were —where the parties did not receive their commissions.

And the right hon. gentleman goes on to excuse even those few cases of omission, but the whole tenor of his speech as found on page 1651, Hansard, 1897, is a direct and unequivocal promise by the Prime Minister of Canada, that as regards these appointments which had received the approval of His Excellency, there would be no question that the Government intended that these men should receive their appointments. He goes on to say :

It is for his Ministers to act in their ministerial and departmental way.

Now, I am here to-day to tell him in the light of evidence which has been brought down to the House of Commons, that his Ministers have acted in their departmental and ministerial way ; but I am here to tell him also that his Ministers have acted in a manner which has utterly disregarded his promise made in 1896 and repeated in 1897. Why, what was his statement in 1897 ? He says :

A large number of them have already been carried out. There may be a few where the parties did not receive their commissions, though they came within the rule, but the reason was that behind every one of these cases——

And, Sir, I want to emphasize and call attention to these words of the Prime Minister :

——but the reason was that behind every one of these cases, as the papers will show when they

are brought down, there were good reasons why the appointments should not be made. * * * We would not and we could not in fact, in consistency with the rules which we laid down for our guidance, dismiss anybody under such circumstances.

That is the class to which I have already referred, that he would not and he could not if he desired displace these people from office, because they had as much right to office as the parties who had been engaged for years in the civil service of Canada.

Now, we will see what the hon. gentleman's Ministers have done. In reply to an Address of the House of Commons of Canada, moved by the hon. leader of the Opposition in 1897, in this year of grace, 1898, we get a reply. The Address moved by my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition was as follows:

Copy of schedule "B," showing recommendations of the Treasury Board as submitted by report of Council to His Excellency the Governor General on the 6th and 7th of July, 1896, and intended to be approved by him, laid upon the Table of the House last session, with a statement of the action taken by the Government upon each of these appointments, as made by the said Order in Council, approved by His Excellency, or, where no action has been taken, the reason for such a course.

It was commenting upon that motion that the Prime Minister declared that when the papers did come down they would contain a description of these good reasons which prevented action, if no action had been taken; or, as I take it, he meant to say too, if adverse action had been taken as regards the appointments to which this Address refers. Now, here we have the return, and what has been the action taken by his Ministers, whose only duty, the Prime Minister said, was that in a departmental manner the opinion of the Government should be carried out; and whose opinion was that these people, according to the Prime Minister's own statement, were actually members of the public service and that he had no right to dismiss them without good cause. Here are some of the figures regarding the appointments submitted to His Excellency for approval. There were 92 recommendations. There were rejected by His Excellency, upon the classification made by hon. gentlemen opposite—which I do not object to and which I suppose was perfectly correct as regards the categories into which His Excellency divided the list—there were rejected by him 47, and there were approved by him 45. Now, Sir, this return shows that of these 45, two men who had their new appointments from the late Government have got their places; just two out of forty-five. The one is the Rev. J. Fraser, Indian agent, and the other is Mr. McDougald, who, after the defeat of the Government, was voted by Council a sum of money to remunerate him for being Chairman of the Customs Board. He was appointed by Order in Council, and his appointment assented to as Deputy Minister of Customs before the defeat of the Government, and the item of the Treasury Board referring to Mr. McDougald is only one as regards the paying to him of a certain sum of money to remunerate him in connection with his duties as Chairman of the Customs Board.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Does the hon. gentleman intend by these figures to indicate promotions?

Mr. MONTAGUE. No; I shall deal with that now. The promotions are in addition to the two I have already mentioned. These were appointments, I said, of new men to the public service. There were six promotions, namely:—J. Smith, Library of Parliament, from third to second class; Denis D'Aigle, a railway mail clerk, from third class to second class; A. W. Owen, Marine and Fisheries Department, F. H. Cunningham, Marine and Fisheries Department, in Owen's place on promotion, T. Aumond in Cunningham's place. These are the promotions, but one exceedingly funny thing is that while the promotions were allowed, I notice that the new appointments in the several cases which were necessary to fill the vacancies caused by the promotions, were disallowed. In other words, while the hon. gentlemen were perfectly willing seemingly to allow promotions which gave them some patronage at the bottom of the list, they declined, notwithstanding the expression of opinion in the House, to allow the new appointment to fill the vacancy which had thereby created.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Will the hon. gentleman give an instance of that?

Mr. MONTAGUE. My hon. friend will find an instance on this sheet, which I shall hand over to him, and which was prepared by the Government and brought down to the House. The next thing is the superannuations by the old Government. We have that of S. Thayne, in the library of Parliament, confirmed, and that of Angus Beaton, a lighthouse keeper, confirmed, but the appointment of the person who was to fill his place was disallowed. Now, what have we got, after all the promises of the Prime Minister in 1897, that those parties whose appointments were approved by His Excellency were to all intents and purposes permanent members of the civil service of Canada? Out of forty-five Orders in Council, as I have shown, we have two new appointments confirmed, six promotions confirmed, and two superannuations confirmed, or, all told, ten out of the forty-five, notwithstanding the statement of the Prime Minister in 1897 that the most of these cases had been attended to, but that there were a few who had not yet received their commissions, and had not yet gone into the discharge of their duties as members of the civil service of Canada. Now, what is the information brought down as regards the causes which led the Government to pursue this policy? When the hon.

Prime Minister of Canada made the promise to the leader of the Opposition that these papers should contain full and ample information on that point. I am sure this House accepted the statement in the fullest extent, and I am sure that the Prime Minister intended that that statement to the House should be carried out. Now, I ask the right hon. Prime Minister to look over this list—and I am perfectly willing to depend upon his judgment, because I know his fairness—and say whether this is full and ample information as to the causes which led the Government to pursue the policy they did.

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

After Recess.

DAWSON CITY ELECTRIC LIGHTING AND TRAMWAY COMPANY.

Mr. MORRISON moved that the Order for committee on Bill (No. 118) to incorporate the Dawson City Electric Lighting and Tramway Company, be discharged, and the Bill referred to the Select Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines for further consideration.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the reason for this ?

Mr. MORRISON. The Bill was referred to the Private Bills Committee, and it contained provisions for the construction of a tramway, and the Private Bills Committee were of opinion that that was a matter for the consideration of the Railway Committee.

Order discharged, and Bill referred to Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines.

THE KINGSTON AND PEMBROKE RAILWAY COMPANY.

The House resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 69) respecting the Kingston and Pembroke Railway Company.—(Mr. Britton.)

(In the Committee.)

Mr. SPROULE. What is the amendment to the seventh section ?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Bain). The amendment is as follows : "and shall be offered pro rata to the holders of preference stock and first preference bonds and debentures."

Section, as amended, agreed to.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the new section 9a ?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Bain). The company shall also issue fully paid-up second preference stock to the amount of $150,000, in 3,000 shares of $50 each, upon which dividends, if any, when earned and payable, shall be limited to 3 per cent per annum, non-cumulative, which stock shall rank next after the first preference stock and in pro rata to the common stock. Such shares shall be issued to the holders of the first preference bonds or debentures, pro rata to the certificate or certificates for such number of shares to which they may be respectively entitled, and shall be delivered with the new debentures, and there shall not be any fractional share or any claim of any holder or owner of any of such first preference bonds or debentures to any sum or surplus that may remain over and above the number of full shares.

Section agreed to.

Mr. SPROULE. There are no sections 10 and 11 in the original Bill, and those sections, thus numbered, which you are calling must be new. I should like to hear them.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Bain). No. 11 is the only other clause that has a material amendment, and there is a clause, No. 12, which we have not reached. Section 11 reads :

> Nothing in this Act contained shall, save as aforesaid, as to such bonds and debentures in any way hamper or affect any such proceedings, charge or lien now pending, substituting or outstanding upon or against the company or on its railway or assets, and the benefits and liabilities given and incurred by contracts, agreements and liens, either expressed or implied, heretofore made by the company with any person or corporation, shall remain as if this Act had not been passed, nor shall this Act prejudice or affect the relative existing legal rights or priorities of any class of creditors of the company.

Mr. HAGGART. I do not know whether that clause covers exactly what was agreed upon in committee. This railway company was liable under the Railway Act for some claims for work done by labourers, work done by engineers, repairs to engines and the running of the railway. I hardly think that that clause gives the people the legal rights they would have under the Railway Act.

Mr. TISDALE. The solicitor of the gentlemen who are interested was there. I have forgotten his name.

Mr. BRITTON. Mr. Creelman.

Mr. TISDALE. He assented to these words, and I think they are quite sufficient for the purpose.

Mr. BRITTON. The intention was not to give these parties any new rights, but to protect them in the fullest manner possible as to any rights they might already possess. I think, and the solicitor of the company thought, that the words of the Bill as they originally stood were sufficient. However, Mr. Carter and Mr. Ruthven were both present before the committee and expressed their views with regard to it, and, to meet

their views, this clause was amended in the way it appeared. These added words were :

Nor shall this Act prejudice or affect relative existing legal rights or priorities of any class of creditors of the company.

I am sure this does protect the parties.

Mr. HAGGART. I would like to have the opinion of the Minister of Railways. If he says that this is sufficient to protect them, that will be quite satisfactory. The question is, does that clause fully protect parties who have a lien by the Railway Act against that company.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I believe it is the clause agreed to in committee. I think it is sufficient.

On schedule " b."

Mr. TISDALE. There are several blanks in that, are there not ?

Mr. BRITTON. The blank left by the committee in schedule " b " is as to the aggregate of bonds held before the mortgagee can be asked to take proceedings under the mortgage and sell the road. I move that the blank be filled by inserting the words " fifty thousand dollars."

Section, as amended, agreed to.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 105) respecting the Montreal Island Belt Line Railway Company.—(Mr. Belcourt, by Mr. Bostock.)

LAKE MANITOBA RAILWAY AND CANAL COMPANY.

The House proceeded to consider the amendment made by the Senate to Bill (No. 66) respecting the Lake Manitoba Railway and Canal Company.

Mr. JAMESON moved :

That the said amendments be disagreed to for the reason that they merely allow amalgamation with a portion of the road owned by a company with which it is proposed to amalgamate, and are therefore inconsistent with the object of the proposed amalgamation between the two companies, and are, moreover, repugnant to the object of the Bill ; also, that a Message be sent to the Senate giving the foregoing reasons for disagreeing to their amendments.

Mr. OLIVER. In regard to this motion I would like to say that I am to a certain extent interested as the promoter of a Bill called the Hudson Bay and Pacific Railway charter with which this proposed amalgamation interferes, and I would like just to state to the House the position which I understand the matter to be in. In 1896 the House granted a charter to the Hudson Bay and Pacific Railway to run a line from Fort Churchill to the Saskatchewan River near the head of Lake Winnipeg, and thence with branches westward. The House having agreed to that charter, and there being no other charter at that time covering that ground, I submit that it is not fair or right that another company should be given under any colour a charter to traverse the same ground until that company has lost its right under its charter by failing to commence and complete according to the terms of the charter. The charter which it is proposed to revive in this case is the Winnipeg and Hudson Bay charter. That charter was granted in 1887, it expired in 1889, and although there has been a certain amount of legislation since in regard to that charter, that legislation has never purported to apply to that part of the line from Saskatchewan River to Fort Churchill. Therefore, on behalf of the promoters of the Hudson Bay and Pacific Railway, I contend that the Winnipeg and Hudson Bay charter did not exist from the Saskatchewan River to Hudson Bay, and that if the House insists upon giving this amalgamation in the terms in which it is given here, they will duplicate the charter over the same ground, with the natural result that the Hudson Bay and Pacific people will be to that extent placed in difficulties in forwarding their scheme.

I beg to enter my protest against the motion made for the purpose of supporting the amalgamation entered into, which I say is prejudicial to the interests of the Hudson Bay and Pacific Railway, which is contrary to the well-defined policy of this House, and which, if assented to, will certainly prevent the building of any railway to Fort Churchill from Saskatchewan River. This charter, which it is proposed to revive, was granted in 1880, and it is a matter of notoriety that the existence of that charter has absolutely prevented, up to the present time, the building of a railway to Hudson Bay, an object very greatly desired by every part of Manitoba and the North-west Territories. That charter having been in existence since 1880, and no action having been taken on it, although it has been repeatedly before Parliament, it is only fair that when other men have come forward with another company and are within the terms granted by this House, they should be given the fullest opportunity to carry out what is a practical and valuable scheme.

Senate amendment disagreed to.

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 125) to incorporate the Ottawa Interprovincial Bridge Company.—(Mr. Belcourt.)

SUPPLY—APPOINTMENTS BY THE LATE GOVERNMENT.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I promised when I first rose to make a few observations on this subject I would be very brief, and I promise you, Sir, now that that statement will be fulfilled to the letter, only desiring as I do, to occupy the attention of the House for a few minutes longer. Before I proceed to finish the reading of the return which was brought down in answer to a motion made by the leader of the Opposition, perhaps, Sir, you will permit me to answer a question asked by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. That question was as regards my statement that whilst superannuations had been confirmed and some promotions had been confirmed, it was equally true that appointments to vacancies which had been created by those promotions and superannuations had been disallowed. The hon. gentleman asked me whether I could give cases. Just at the moment I had not selected cases from the list, but if the hon. gentleman will examine the return, a copy of which I have in my hand, he will find these facts: That Angus Beaton, lighthouse keeper, was superannuated, and the superannuation was confirmed on 26th November, 1897; that C. J. Chapman was appointed lighthouse keeper, vice Beaton; that no action was taken, it not being deemed in the public interest to take any action. There is still another case, that of Denis D'Aigle, promoted to second-class railway mail clerk; confirmed on 9th June, 1896; H. Steele was appointed third-class railway mail clerk, vice D'Aigle, promoted; no action was taken, it not being deemed in the public interest to take action. Those cases are apparent on the face of the return, how many more there may be I am not able to say, because the information given is not sufficient to enable me to do so. I desire to continue reading from this return, which gives the list of all these appointments which His Excellency declared his assent to and the reason which the Government have brought down for their action in the several cases, in which I find as follows:—

STATEMENT of Action taken by the Government on the Appointments made by Orders in Council, 6th and 7th July, 1896, as per Schedule "B."

No.	Subject.	Action.
	Treasury Board, 2611.	
2	Dr. George H. Duncan, appointed quarantine medical officer and superintendent of quarantine, British Columbia.	Cancelled, 31st October, 1896.
9	Reginald Grant, Halifax, N.S., appointed third-class clerk, Library of Parliament.	Cancelled, 4th March, 1897.
10	Edouard H. Guilbert, fish hatchery officer, Magog.	Cancelled, 7th October, 1896.
12	Fabien Vanasse, re-appointed shipping master, Montreal.	do do
13	Thomas Jenkins, promotion to second-class clerk, St. John post office.	No action taken; not deemed in public interest to take any action.
16	Pierre Boutet, letter carrier, Quebec.....	do do
22	J. M. Scully, collector of customs, Berlin....	Cancelled, 31st October, 1896.
23	Hugh Murray, promotion, surveyor of customs, Hamilton.	do do
24	Andrew Alexander, promoted chief clerk, vice Murray, above.	do do
31	C. E. Houde, appointed inspector of weights and measures.	No action taken; not deemed in public interest to take any action.
	Treasury Board, 2612.	
1	H. LeBreton Ross, promoted to first class, Railways and Canals.	No action taken; not deemed in public interest to take any action.
2	A. W. Cameron, promoted to second class, Railways and Canals, vice Ross.	do do
	Treasury Board, 2613.	
3	Charles E. Macdonald, appointed lightkeeper, Prince Edward Island.	Cancelled, 8th March, 1897.
4	James Yeo, appointed inspector of fisheries, Prince Edward Island.	do 7th October, 1896.
7	David Halliday, appointed collector customs.	do 13th July, 1897.
8	Allan Bowman, appointed sub-collector of customs.	No action taken; not deemed in public interest to take any action.
13	William Powley, appointed assistant inspector of weights and measures.	do do

STATEMENT of Action taken by the Government on the Appointments, &c.—Con.

No.	Subject.	Action.
15	J. C. Turnstall, appointed deputy collector of inland revenue.	No action taken ; not deemed in public interest to take any action.
17	J. T. Craystone, appointed letter-carrier....	do do
20	A. W. Owen, promoted chief clerk and accountant, Department of Marine and Fisheries.	Confirmed and carried into effect, 11th March, 1897.
21	F. H. Cunningham, promoted to first class, vice Owen.	do do
22	T. Aumond, promoted to second class, vice Cunningham.	do do
23	J. Spence, collector of inland revenue, superannuated.	No action taken ; not deemed in public interest to take any action.
24	E. H. Sinon, promoted to collector of inland revenue, vice Spence.	do do
	Treasury Board, 2614.	
3	H. Tryon, appointed light-keeper.....	Cancelled, 14th January, 1897.
28	J. A. Fitzpatrick, appointed sub-collector of customs at Joliette.	Another appointment made in his stead (Bazinet).
31	R. A. McClusky, fish hatchery, Grand Falls, N.B.	Cancelled, 7th October, 1896.
	Treasury Board, 2640.	
4	Angus Beaton, light-keeper, superannuated.	Confirmed, 26th November, 1897.
5	C. J. Chapman, appointed light-keeper, vice Beaton.	No action taken ; not deemed in public interest to take any action.
7	John Kinefick, fish hatchery, Newcastle, Ont.	Cancelled, 7th October, 1896.
9	Denis D'Aigle, promoted to second-class railway mail clerk.	Confirmed, 9th June, 1897.
10	H. Steele, appointed third-class railway mail clerk, vice D'Aigle.	No action taken ; not deemed in public interest to take any action.
11	H. P. Buck, promoted to second class, Post Office Department.	do do
12	Miss K. Merrick, appointed second-class clerk.	do do
19	J. W. Bates, landing-waiter, retired.....	do do
22	John McDougald, chairman Customs.....	Confirmed, 26th April, 1897.
23	W. Millichamp, appointed Dominion appraiser	Cancelled, 31st October, 1896.
27	W. S. Wood, exciseman.....	No action taken ; not deemed in public interest to take any action.
	Treasury Board, 2653.	
4	Rev. J. Fraser, appointed Indian agent.....	Carried into effect.
5	A. E. Kemp, promoted to second-class clerk, Indian Department.	No action taken ; not deemed in public interest to take any action.
8	E. S. Thayne, second-class clerk in Library of Parliament, superannuated	Confirmed, 4th March, 1897.
9	J. Smith, promoted to second class, Library of Parliament.	do do
128	C. W. Magee, appointed letter-carrier.....	No action taken ; not deemed in public interest to take any action.
129	C. H. Kemhaus, appointed letter-carrier....	do do
130	R. C. McRoberts, appointed third-class railway mail clerk.	do do
136	A. E. Jodoin, appointed letter-carrier.....	do do
138	A. P. Healy, appointed third-class clerk, Halifax post office	do do
191	H. H. Grant, collector of inland revenue, &c., appointed inspector.	Cancelled, 23rd December, 1896.

Now, Sir, that is the list of the appointments which under the decision of His Excellency—which decision the hon. gentlemen are responsible for—and under the classification made by the Government of the day: that is the list of those, who, appointed by the late Government (as declared by the Prime Minister in this House) should have their places and be notified that they were required to discharge their duties. I am going to ask the colleagues of the right hon. gentleman, since he is not present him-

self, whether or not his promise to this House has been fulfilled; whether or not the action of the department and the action of his colleagues is in direct contradiction to the policy which the right hon. gentleman laid down as the policy of the Government? I do not believe that the Prime Minister could have intended to have misled the House. I do not believe that a gentleman occupying a place so responsible; occupying a place so high among the public men of the British Empire would deliberately attempt to mislead the House of Commons as regards the intention of his Government. But, Sir, this I must say, that if the hon. gentleman was not—and I have said I believe he was not—attempting to mislead the House of Commons of Canada, I cannot help thinking that he was peculiarly ignorant of events that were transpiring around him in his own Council and in the departments which were under the control of his own Ministers. Let me read the First Minister's speech again, because it has a direct bearing upon the point which I shall mention now. This speech was made in the House of Commons on 3rd May, 1897:

> So far as concerns the recommendations made by the hon. gentleman which were approved by His Excellency, I stated on the floor of the House that it would be the duty of the Administration to respect all these appointments unless there was some cause to the contrary. We have gone upon this rule. We have respected, or intend to respect, all the recommendations approved by His Excellency, except in a few cases.

I want hon. gentlemen to put that statement beside that list and to say whether the right hon. gentleman's promise has been carried out. Let us continue the quotation:

> The hon. gentleman says that in some cases the parties have not been notified of their appointments, and, in others, did not receive their commissions. That may be in a few cases. There may be a few cases—I know there were—where the parties did not receive their commissions, though they came within that rule; but the reason was that behind every one of those cases, as the papers will show when they are brought down, there were good reasons why the appointments should not be made.

I ask hon. gentlemen who are members of the Government, whether these papers which are the papers the right hon. gentleman referred to contain these good and ample reasons with regard to the non-carrying out of these appointments to which the right hon. gentleman referred in that speech. Let me quote him (the Prime Minister) again:

> We would not, and we could not, in fact, in consistency with the rules which we laid down for our guidance, dismiss anybody appointed under such circumstances, any more than we would have dismissed anybody else who had been in office, except for cause shown. In many of those cases, so far as I remember, we thought it was preferable to hold an inquiry, departmental or otherwise, and we came to no determination in such cases. These reasons may have delayed the notification to some of those gentlemen who were appointed; but that was the only reason, and when the papers are brought down my hon. friend will find that these cases are very few indeed.

In view of the list I have read, and in view of the reasons which are given, I ask hon. gentlemen opposite whether in all fairness they can say these cases are very few indeed. I have made the statement, that while I was sure the right hon. gentleman did not intend to mislead the House he must have been sublimely ignorant or unconscious of what was going on around him in the various departments under the control of his Ministers. We have here the statement of the Prime Minister on the 3rd of May, that these appointments are to be carried out, that it is the policy of the Government to respect all these recommendations to which His Excellency had given his approval, and yet in the return brought down we have the evidence that all but two of them had been cancelled while the right hon. gentleman was upon his feet and addressing the House. I have here the dates of the cancellation of many of these Orders in Council to which the right hon. Prime Minister referred when he made the speech in reply to the leader of the Opposition, and in view of that fact I am justified in saying, that if he did not desire to mislead the House—from which charge I have exculpated him as in duty bound and in obedience to the rules of order—I must conclude that he was sublimely unconscious of what was going on around him.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me repeat that of these appointments ten were cancelled absolutely in 1896, and were cancelled before 3rd March, 1897. There were two or three cancelled—two only, I think—after the hon. gentleman made his speech, but I have made the statement deliberately that upon the face of these returns it appears that when the hon. gentleman was making his speech all but two or three of the cancellations had taken place, by his advice, or the advice of his Council, to His Excellency. I repeat that all but two or three cancellations had been made before the hon. gentleman delivered his speech in this House. Now, Sir, what of the twenty-four others—the reason for no action in regard to which are given in that beautifully indefinite phrase: "not deemed in the public interest to take action."

Sir, what is the position of His Excellency with regard to these appointments? His Excellency had recommendations placed before him, and His Excellency understanding, or as he believed he did, his rights and his duties as a constitutional governor decided to take a certain course. The Government assumed full responsibility for that course as they were bound to do if they desired to take office in succession to the Government defeated on the 23rd of June, 1896. They

went further than that, they actively accepted responsibility for his acts through the mouth of their leader declaring that acceptance in this House. Has His Excellency been notified that no promulgation has taken place in regard to these appointments? Has His Excellency been notified that these appointments to which he attached his signature went no further than the pigeon-holes of the Ministers to whose care they were committed?

It appears to me that not only is that an act disrespectful towards the chief executive officer of this Dominion, but that hon. gentlemen have gone very wide of an understanding of their duties as members of His Excellency's Government. I cannot for a moment believe that His Excellency has been informed that these appointments have not been carried out; and what is the position of the office-holders? We have had the word of the Prime Minister that these men whose nominations were approved by the Governor in Council were as much members of the public service as those who had been discharging the duties of that public service for years. If they were members bona fide of the public service when that speech was made, they are members bona fide of the public service still; because, in the beautifully indefinite language to which I have referred, the Ministers say that they decided that no action was necessary; no action consequently was taken; and if no action was taken, these men, to whom these indefinite words apply, each and every one of them, are members of the public service of this Dominion, and can come upon this Dominion for indemnity for losses which some of them have sustained. I come back to the point, whether His Excellency was informed of what had taken place, and I want to read the following section from Todd bearing on this point:

> In order to enable a constitutional governor to fulfil intelligently and efficiently the charge entrusted to him by the Crown, he is bound to direct—as by his commission and instructions he is authorized to require—that the fullest information shall be afforded to him by his Ministers upon every matter which at any time shall be submitted for his approval; and that no policy shall be carried out or acts of executive authority performed by his Ministers in the name of the Crown, unless the same shall have previously received his sanction.

Now, I contend, though I am not a lawyer, that the very announcement upon this return that the Government did not intend to take any action as regarded twenty-four of these appointments, is an announcement of public policy; and I challenge hon. gentlemen opposite as to whether they have consulted His Excellency upon that point, and as to whether they have his authority for bringing that down as a matter of public policy. Once more, what position have they placed the chief executive officer of this country in? Let us see. I have said that to my mind it is a most unenviable position. I have referred to the responsibility of His Excellency's Government for every act which they advise him to perform as I have said. It is equally true that the members of this Government are responsible for every act which he performed which was not upon the advice of his previous advisers, and which was performed before hon. gentlemen opposite took up the reins of power. So that upon the question of approving of these appointments hon. gentlemen are just as responsible and just as liable as though they themselves had recommended the appointments—as though the advice in the first place had come direct and straight from themselves. In other words, His Excellency formed a policy upon these appointments upon the advice of hon. gentlemen opposite. Now, let us see just where hon. gentlemen stand. They come one day to His Excellency, and they say these appointments are to be approved; because, boiled down, it comes to that. They come the next day to His Excellency and give him the directly opposite advice. They say to him that they want the appointments cancelled, for the approval of which they themselves became responsible only a few days before. I conclude that hon. gentlemen opposite have in that one act placed the first executive officer of this Dominion in a most unenviable position—in a position in which no previous Administration had ever placed the chief executive officer of Canada. Now, Mr. Speaker, suppose the Government of Canada to-day, of their own free will, pass an Order in Council upon an ordinary matter, and a few days afterwards go to His Excellency and ask that that Order in Council be cancelled. I am sure that when His Excellency sees the second Order in Council, he will require some reasons for the change of policy on the part of his advisers. But if that be true with regard to a simple matter in the hands of the Government itself, how much more must it be true as regards a matter in which a previous Government were concerned—a matter upon which the Government have, as I have said, not only given their advice, but as regards which they have announced their policy publicly to the Parliament of the country. Therefore I conclude that reasons must have been given to His Excellency much stronger, much more ample, much more complete, much more convincing, than are contained in the return which has been brought down to the House in answer to the motion of the hon. leader of the Opposition; and I contend that the House should have these fuller and more ample reasons. Now, Sir, just a word as to a saving clause which the right hon. gentleman placed in many of his speeches. He said that these appointments would be approved, would be promulgated, except in cases where there was good and ample cause for the contrary. Now, I am not acquainted with all the cases referred to in

this return. But there is one case which I will mention, not only because I am acquainted with the facts, but because it was the foundation of the first statement the right hon. gentleman made to the House as to his policy in this connection. That is the case of Mr. Scully, who had by the previous Government been appointed collector of customs at Berlin. I see by this return that Mr. Scully's appointment was cancelled. Now, Sir, what are the good and sufficient reasons? Mr. Scully, I am informed, and in fact I know, is a very competent man to discharge the duties of that office. He is also a very prominent man where he lives, having once contested the constituency for the provincial legislature; and I am informed that he is a very responsible man. I would ask the Government to state what are the good reasons why, in this individual case, if not in others, the appointment was cancelled after it had been approved by His Excellency upon the recommendation of the late Government.

Sir, I am of course quite aware that the Government desire to serve their party friends, and I do not hesitate to say that I would believe in that doctrine, nor am I envious or annoyed because a supporter of hon. gentlemen opposite gets any place they have to give him. But what I say is this, that in the case of Mr. Scully, the reason given is that the public interests were being better served by his dismissal than by his retention. I am afraid, however, that the reason is that their party interests were being better served, and while that may be a good reason for hon. gentlemen opposite I have no desire to question that it is a good one for hon. gentlemen opposite. I submit in all candour, that it is not a good reason upon which to ask His Excellency to cancel an appointment made by the previous Administration.

I might amplify and enlarge on the facts to which I have referred in this connection. I might refer perhaps to unworthy motives, but I do not desire to do so. I have made a plain statement of the facts offering little comment, and I am sure, that the facts which I have brought before the House are of sufficient importance to demand the attention of the House during the short time in which I have asked its attention, and that is my only excuse—if excuse be necessary—for having detained the House as long as I have.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). The hon. gentleman who has just sat down (Mr. Montague) devoted some little time to the discussion, in general terms, of a question into which I do not propose to go at all in general terms. He, however, took exception to the action of the present Government in certain specified instances, with regard to appointments which were made by the Government of which he was a member, after their defeat at the polls in 1896, and before they resigned office. As to the question of the propriety of a moribund Government making such appointments in the way and to the extent they did, I do not propose to enter. This is a question which has already been threshed out in this House on several occasions. It is a question which, I am satisfied, this Government is willing to leave to the judgment of the people of this country, and therefore I shall not deal with that part of the hon. gentleman's speech. But the hon. gentleman, in reading the list of these appointments, came to one which happened to have been made in my own department, and I therefore crave your attention, Mr. Speaker, for a few moments while I give the hon. gentleman the reply which, I suppose, he wants. He challenged members of the Government to give the reasons why these various appointments were either not confirmed or cancelled, and as the first one he read to this House happens to be that of Dr. George H. Duncan, who was appointed quarantine medical officer and superintendent of quarantine in British Columbia, and whose appointment was cancelled on the 3rd October, 1896, I propose to tell the hon. gentleman why that appointment was cancelled. In the first place, I may say that when I assumed charge of my department, I found that apparently the office in question was vacant, the late incumbent having died a short time before. Dr. Geo. H. Duncan had been appointed acting in the office by the hon. gentleman who was then Minister of Agriculture. The question was brought to my attention as to whether the office was vacant or not. I inquired into the matter, and I found that apparently that was one of the appointments which, under the rule accepted and carried out, His Excellency would naturally sign and confirm. I supposed, of course, that the office then was filled up, and, as a matter of fact, Dr. Duncan filled the office and performed its duties for some little time. Later on, however, certain actions of his were brought to my attention—actions which I do not know that it would be very wise, or necessary in the public interest, to go into to-night.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It is all in the "Hansard" already.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I was going to tell the House, if the hon. leader of the Opposition had allowed me time, that they were already in the "Hansard" of last session, and very thoroughly threshed out in this House. They were actions which, on my responsibility as Minister in charge of the department, I did not feel were such that I could any longer entrust the quarantine establishment of the Pacific Coast in the hands of that gentleman. I therefore recommended the cancellation of his appointment and the appointment of another officer to take his place. If the hon. gentleman wishes any further amplifi-

cation of these reasons, I shall be very glad to repeat them to the House and let them go before the country; but in the interest of the public, I do not think that that is necessary, and perhaps it is better, in the interests of the gentleman himself, that the matter should be dropped. But I want the hon. gentleman to understand that in this case—I speak not of others, but of this, which is the only one that happens to be in my department—there was, to my mind and the Council's mind, abundant reasons why the appointment made should be cancelled. There was no question of party in the matter. There was no question of action in any way except such as was called for by the conduct of that officer, and which indicated his unfitness for the office. The appointment was, in the first instance, confirmed, and the officer held the office for a short time; and had it not been for his conduct which led me to take the action I did, he would have held the appointment as long as he efficiently carried out the duties of the office. I can only say further that this, which is the only case that arose in my department, is probably a fair sample of the others, and that we may take it for granted that the hon. gentleman's contention falls to the ground, and that, as a matter of fact, the other dismissals or cancellations of appointments or non-confirmation of appointments, were probably just as thoroughly supported as was the action of the Government in this case, which came under my particular charge and which I know all about.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that such a spectacle has ever before being witnessed in this House as that which we have witnessed this evening. The right hon. leader of this Government is charged with having made statements on the floor of this House, in his capacity of Prime Minister, which are either totally inaccurate and which he knew to be totally inaccurate, or the right hon. gentleman was scandalously ignorant of the conduct of the members of his Administration. What is the spectacle that this House has witnessed? We have heard a gentleman who occupied the position of member of the previous Administration, making this grave indictment against the right hon. Prime Minister and his executive, and we have seen the right hon. gentleman leaving the House without venturing to offer a single word in reply.

Was there ever in any country in the world enjoying parliamentary government anything more scandalous? Imagine, the Prime Minister of England charged on the floor of Parliament with a statement of that kind. Why, Sir, his position would not be worth 24 hours purchase if he did what the Prime Minister of Canada has done here to-night. Irrespective of party, there is no Parliament that would not resent anything so utterly at variance with parliamentary government. When the time comes that the Prime Minister of Canada is unable to vindicate his character against a charge made on the floor of Parliament of attempting knowingly to mislead the House or of being ignorant of that which is going on in the Council of the country over which he presides, we have a cynical disregard of the open violation of public pledges which will place this Government in a most unenviable position, not only before this House, but before the people of this country. Is there any man in this House on either side of it who has ever witnessed anything like this, a Government willing to sit there and allow itself to be charged that they are guilty of attempting to mislead the House and yet not a member of the Cabinet rise—all willing that this question should be disposed of and this debate closed without a member of the Government venturing to stand up and defend the integrity of their leader or their own conduct as Ministers. They may think that, with a mechanical majority behind them, they are in a position to brave the opinion of this House. But they will find that, independent of the minority in this House, they must face a great body of intelligent electors in this country who will know that but one cause could account for such a spectacle, and that is that the Government are in an utterly untenable position.

As to the facts, the ground has been covered so clearly and succinctly by my hon. friend (Mr. Montague) that not a word is required from me until what he has said is met and refuted, because there is not an explanation that can be presented by hon. gentlemen opposite that will relieve them from the imputation of departing from a course of fair, frank, honourable, open dealing with this House. Now, I do not intend, for the reason that this has been discussed before, to go into the constitutional question. It has been dealt with in a manner entirely to my satisfaction, and I am quite prepared to leave the constitutionality of the position assumed by hon. gentlemen opposite to stand upon the records as it stands to-day. I am ready for the judgment of the people of this country on that question. But I would remind hon. gentlemen opposite of the contrast presented by the conduct of a former Governor General, the Right Earl of Dufferin, one of the most distinguished and able men that ever presided over the destinies of Canada. I will remind them of the course that that right hon. nobleman pursued when the party now in power were placed in the minority. My hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) ventured to speak of a moribund Government, the Government having sustained a defeat at the polls on the 23rd June, 1896. But, Sir, what was the Government of which the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce

(Sir Richard Cartwright) were members in 1878? Was that a moribund Government? That Government, after five years of maladministration of the affairs of this country, had been condemned by the overwhelming judgment of the people of this country. They went to the country at the head of a large majority and came back to face a majority of 86 members of this House opposed to them. Were they a moribund Government? And yet how were they treated? The Governor General of that day, who was an able man and a constitutional Governor, allowed these gentlemen, before they left their offices to make no less than 116 new appointments and promotions to the number of 17 more, a total of 133 appointments of their friends to office. Lord Dufferin respected the constitution under which he was governing this country. In the light of the instructions from the Imperial Government that when the action of the Governor General of Canada was not specially provided for by the precedents in Canada, he was to be guided by the precedents in the mother country, and looking down the long line of precedents in that country, he found there was not an instance of a Government in Great Britain in which Her Majesty the Queen had not recognized the right of an outgoing government, whatever the position of the Government was, to fill up the vacancies that existed and to carry on the Government down to the last moment that they occupied their offices. That, Sir, was the position of Lord Dufferin when Governor General of Canada. Every one of the 133 appointments and promotions submitted for his approval received his imprimatur without question as the indefeasible right of a defeated Government before leaving office, as has been recognized from time immemorial in England. As this has been discussed, I will not detain the House upon it. But if there is one single fair-minded candid gentleman on the other side I want to present to him the contrast of this with the case of the outgoing Government of which I had the honour to be at the head. We submitted for His Excellency's approval not 133 appointments and promotions, but 92, and of these His Excellency the Governor General in the exercise of his judgment signed the memorandum to the Treasury Board, subject to the exceptions to which my hon. friend has referred, of parties for whom there was no provision in the public service for new appointments and other cases in which the parties did not apply for superannuation to create the vacancies. But, Sir, he signed this memorandum to the Treasury Board subject to these exceptions. I need not tell you, Sir, that I regard these exceptions as an invasion of parliamentary government and entirely at variance with constitutional practice both in Canada and in the mother country.

But I will not say more with reference to that than this, that he submitted to his present advisers these Treasury minutes, and he asked them to indicate, as he had not the information under his own hand, which of the appointments to which he had thus given his sanction and signed his name, were the appointments to which the exceptions would apply. These gentlemen, having reviewed the Treasury minutes signed by His Excellency reported to him that out of these ninety-two appointments, forty-five were open to no exception, and therefore were appointments regularly made by the Governor General in Council. These returns were brought down and laid upon the Table of the House shortly after the House met, and a discussion upon this question took place. As my hon. friend has stated, the Prime Minister was asked what was the intention of the Government in regard to these appointments that they had brought down themselves and laid on the Table of the House as appointments approved by His Excellency the Govenor General in Council, and which they stated would stand. I need not repeat the words which fell from the lips of the Prime Minister on that occasion. But a year ago, or nine months after this occurrence, in May last, I moved for the return that has been brought down here a few days ago. The House would naturally inquire, that motion having been made in May last, why these returns were not brought down before a recent period. But nobody would need to ask that question. After listening to the details of that return, one is only surprised that the Government could muster up courage to bring it down to the House at all. If a blush of shame could suffuse the faces of hon. gentleman opposite, it must have suffused them when such a return as this was laid upon the Table of this House after that long period. Every person knows that you could give no more formal, no more complete, no more thorough declaration to the parties interested, of the position in which they stood than by the Government of the country laying upon the Table of the House of Commons a return which declared that they had been appointed to certain offices, and sustaining that action by the statement that it was the intention of the Government to confirm those appointments. Under these circumstances, I ask if there is a single hon. gentleman on that side of the House with a particle of independent spirit and candour in his nature, that will not feel that the Government have reason to blush for shame when, having cut down the nominations of the late Government from ninety-two to forty-five, having brought those forty-five names down here as persons whose appointments had been regularly made by His Excellency the Governor General in Council, down to this hour they have left all but two of those forty-five persons in utter ignorance of what their position was, or what action was to be taken with regard to them. Could there be any more complete publication of

the fact of their appointment than the Government of the day laying upon the Table of the House a return showing that His Excellency had signed and ratified their appointments in Council ? There could not be. Under these circumstances, I cannot conceive how it is possible that the hon. gentleman can expect the support of his most partisan supporters in this House when the spectacle is presented that, while in 1878 the Government, defeated by such an overwhelming majority, were permitted, and rightly so, to exercise their power to fill all the vacancies in the public service from the highest to the lowest, many of them being most important offices, such as judgeships in the Supreme Court, and so on, while this list of ninety-two recommendations made by the Government of which I was the head, contained hardly an appointment that was not of a comparatively insignificant character. Yet how are they treated ? In the one case there may have been a few cancellations by the new Government, and that was within their right, but they were very few. Almost the whole of those appointments were allowed to remain just as if they had been made by the Government of the day. On the other hand, you find here what I do not hesitate to say is the shameful spectacle of this Government treating with utter contempt the Order in Council signed by the Governor General in Council, conferring the appointments, and cancelling some of them, as they had a right to do it if there was cause for the cancellation—but with the exception of a few cases, absolutely treating those appointments with such profound contempt as never to communicate with the parties in any shape or form. The first information that these gentlemen have received as to what their position was, is given by this return laid upon the Table a few days ago in which it was found that some fourteen had been cancelled, that only two of the appointments had been made out of the whole forty-five, and ratified by the Governor General in Council, and that in twenty-four cases the statement is that no action was taken. Now, I want to invite the attenion of hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches, who, bolder than their leader, have had the hardihood to remain in this House in face of such an indictment as, I do not hesitate to say, was perhaps scarcely ever presented against any Government, or against any leader of a Government in any Parliament whatever. Why, Sir, you have the remarkable statement made that with reference to Thomas Jenkins, promoted to be a second-class clerk at the St. John post office, "no action was taken, not deemed in the public interest." I do not believe in the truth of that statement. Do they mean to tell me that the position was left vacant, that it has not been filled, that no action has been taken ? They are ashamed to say that they dismissed this man, regularly appointed by the Governor in Council, they are ashamed to proclaim to the world that they have dismissed him and put one of their friends in his place. Is that no action ? Is superseding a gentleman who has been appointed under the signed manual of the Governor General of Canada, and appointing another person in his place, no action ? One of two things is true ; Either these twenty-four cases in which appointments were required in the public service of Canada have remained vacant, and nothing has been done down to the present hour and no notification whatever has been given to any one of the recipents of these appointments—either that is true, or these statements are all untrue. I believe they are all untrue, I do not hesitate to say so. I cannot believe that gentlemen charged with carrying on the public service of this country would leave twenty-four cases in which appointments had been made without any action whatever being taken upon them. The subject has been so fully discussed by my hon. friend that it is not necessary that I should take up any more time. But one curious exception of no action being taken, has been made. J. A. Fitzpatrick, appointed sub-collector of the Customs Department at Joliette, was dismissed and another appointment made in his stead. The right hon. gentleman who leads this Government promised this House, speaking on the floor of this House last session, that the fullest information why changes had been made should be given to this House. Is that the fullest information, that another appointment has been made in his stead ? I congratulate the right hon. gentleman in having mustered up courage to enter the House once more.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes. This House has never witnessed such a spectacle from the first day of confederation down to this hour, as that of a Prime Minister, charged by a responsible member of this House with having betrayed his pledged word given on the floor of Parliament, or having been blindly ignorant of what his colleagues at that time were doing, and convicted, by the most clear, the most unequivocal, the most overwhelming and unanswerable indictment ever presented, leaving his seat, and doing what had never been done in the face of such an indictment, avoiding the discussion that he felt was forced on him and his colleagues. After the hon. gentleman had left his seat, his colleagues, afraid and unable to offer any defence for their fleeing leader, wanted to have the debate closed and a vote taken at once, so as to prevent hon. gentlemen having an opportunity to offer a single word in his defence. That hon. gentlemen opposite could offer any vindication, no man would believe who had listened to the strong indictment made, fortified by language uttered by the right hon. gentleman, and from all of which hon. members must conclude one or two things, either that the statements made

to the House were made for the purpose of misleading it, which my hon. friend did not charge, but it was the only excuse if the hon. gentleman's statements were not intensely misleading; or that he was in complete ignorance of what the Privy Council were doing, what his own colleagues were doing and had done before that speech was delivered. I regret to say that I am not in condition to press this subject in the manner in which I would desire. But not an additional word is required. The very fact that the Government wanted the debate closed, without taking advantage of the opportunity of saying a word in contradiction of the statements made by my hon. friend who moved the adjournment of the House, is the best evidence that they realized the position in which they stand.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies.) I can assure the hon. leader of the Opposition that it was not with any desire to be discourteous to the hon. member who moved in the matter this afternoon, or with any desire to shirk the discussion of the merits of this matter, the occupants of the Treasury benches deemed it desirable to keep quiet. They kept quiet because this question had been threshed out ad nauseam, not only last session, but during the session preceding.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I wish to say——

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman cannot keep quiet a moment. He has gone so far as not only to abuse my right hon. friend the Prime Minister, but also the Governor General of Canada; the hon. gentleman has occupied hour after hour in reiterating and reiterating in the very self-same language, the very self-same arguments and the self-same denunciations, until hon. members on his own side are sick and tired of the subject.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That is why we kept quiet. The matter is so simple and the answer has been given so frequently, that I must ask the pardon of the House for repeating it. The late Government, when defeated by the people, when they knew they had not the sanction or authority of the people, but were a discredited and moribund Government——

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). A Government which had never received the sanction of the people.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. A Government, which, as my hon. friend reminds me, had never received the imprimatur and sanction of the people, undertook to do what? To recommend appointments not only to offices that were vacant, not only to offices for which Parliament had made provision to pay salaries, but to make appointments to offices and create salaries that the Parliament of this country had never voted, and which those hon. gentlemen must have known were unconstitutional and illegal. There was no more authority to make some of those appointments than there would have been for the city council of Ottawa to have made them. It is a well known constitutional rule that the Government, as advisers of the Governor General cannot create offices and pledge salaries in respect to them until Parliament has authorized the offices and sanctioned payment of the salaries. But those hon. gentlemen, discredited by the people, never sanctioned by the vote of the people, who had been told by the people that they had no confidence in them, not only attempted to override the constitution, but to thrust into office large numbers of people and fix salaries to be met subsequently by the taxpayers without the people's representatives having had a voice in the matter. This question divides itself into two distinct branches. So far as regards those recommendations made when hon. gentlemen were in power, by accident, for a short time, and which His Excellency did not approve, my hon. friend took the entire responsibility of His Excellency's action. We have never shirked that responsibility. The hon. gentleman debated it hour after hour last session, hour after hour the session before, and he made no progress either on the feeling in this House or on the public feeling in the country. Sir, the hon. gentleman would have been well advised if he had left that matter alone, because I venture to say that the opinion of this House and the opinion of the country thoroughly endorse the action which His Excellency took, and for which my right hon. friend the Prime Minister assumed the responsibility. The attempt to fill vacancies in the Senate, to fill the judgeships with appointees of hon. gentlemen after they had been defeated at the polls, appointees of hon. gentlemen who never received the imprimatur of the people, was an attempt which the people did not encourage or countenance. So far as the other branch of the question is concerned, those appointments which His Excellency did not sanction—for there is a broad distinction—but which he suggested in a memorandum his willingness to sanction, when my right hon. friend came into power he was met face to face with the question whether he would advise the carrying out of these nominations. What did he do? There were 48 of those cases about which we have had all this row. To hear the vituperation and abuse which the leader of the Opposition has heaped on my hon. friend, one would suppose that some violent wrench had been given the constitution by him in advising His Excel-

lency not to assent to those attempts to make appointments. Twenty-three cases were recommended out of the 48; as to the cancellation upon or confirmation of those 23, the hon. gentleman dare not challenge the Government that we were not strictly within our rights. The hon. gentleman has asked why have we not brought down the reasons which led the Government to advise that no action should be taken. What was the position in the matter? His Excellency had not signed those particular recommendations. He had in a memorandum signified his willingness to sign them, and when my right hon. friend came into power he had to advise His Excellency whether he should sign or not.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Allow me to correct my hon. friend.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Well?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If the hon. gentleman will look at the records as laid on the Table of the House he will find that the Governor General did sign those Treasury Board minutes, subject to the exceptions which he pointed out as regards three classes.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman is stating no doubt what he actually believes to be the fact, but he is not stating accurately the fact. The Governor General signed a memorandum in which he expresed his willingness to sign his name to a certain class of the recommendations made. He signed the general Treasury minutes, subject to that memorandum, but he did not sign his name to individual appointments. His name had not been placed to any of those individual appointments when we came into power, and when my right hon. friend assumed his position as leader of the Government he was bound to take the responsibility of recommending His Excellency either to attach or withhold his signature to those appointments.

What is the fact? To-night the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) told the leader of the Opposition why one of these appointments had been cancelled. Did the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) accept the challenge to discuss the details of that case? No, he shelters himself amidst a mass of vituperation of which he is master, but he carefully avoids arguing the question before the House. Hon. gentlemen opposite dare not discuss the recommendation to cancel Duncan's appointment; they dare not discuss any particular facts in relation to the action of the present Government on these recommendations of the late Government. The reasons why we recommended these fifteen appointments to be cancelled are of record; and have we heard a whisper from any one of these gentlemen opposite that our advice was bad.

Sir LOUIS DAVIES.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Will my hon. friend allow me.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Excuse me a moment. The hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) did not dare to discuss any individual case, but he shielded himself as usual in his general denunciation of the leader of the Government.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Will the hon. gentleman allow me one moment; as there is a very important question of fact at issue between us. I hold in my hand the paper laid on the Table of the House by the Government, and it says:

Respecting certain proposed appointments and Orders in Council.

To the Honourable the Privy Council.

Memorandum with reference to the Treasury Board Reports numbered 2611, 2612, 2613, 2614, 2640 and 2653, which are returned herewith, subject to this memorandum and signed by the Governor General, having been submitted to him on the 6th and 7th instant.

These qualifications were:

The undersigned is directed by the Governor General to request that pending further consideration by Council, His Excellency's approval be withheld from all recommendations which involve—

1. The creation of new offices or appointments;
2. The filling of vacancies for which no provision has been made by Parliament, and which have existed for more than one clear fiscal year;
3. Superannuations (and the consequential appointments) for which application has not been received.

By command,

(Sgd.) JOHN SINCLAIR,

Gov. Gen.'s Secy.

The Governor General's Secretary there declares that these appointments were signed.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No, no.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will read it again:

Orders in Council which are returned herewith subject to the memorandum and signed by the Governor General.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That is, the memorandum is signed.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Not at all.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I can remove any doubt in the mind of the hon. gentleman. I have had the Treasury minutes in my hands dozens and dozens of times.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. And you got the Governor General's signature in his own writing, for I have seen it.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. You will find the Governor General's signature in his own writing on

the outside of the first page, and he signed that intending to sign the body of appointments, forty or fifty, subject to his memorandum attached.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is exactly correct.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. But stop a moment. Every one of these forty-eight appointments were a separate appointment, tied together by a string, and there was no signature on any one of them, and no signature except the one before-mentioned, subject to his memorandum.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Other hon. MEMBERS. Yes.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. But the outside cover contains His Excellency's name, and he intended, apparently, to sign them subject to his memorandum.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Here is the letter from the Governor General's secretary saying that he has signed them.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There were not only the forty-eight, mind you, but there were a large number of these outside the forty-eight, and we had to assort them, and we put to one side those which apparently His Excellency did intend to sign, but which he did not sign, and when we came into office action had not been taken, and we had to advise whether it should be taken or not. That advice we are responsible for, and are prepared to defend in every case, and we challenge hon. gentlemen now to single out any particular case or any body of cases and discuss them in this House or before the country, and we are prepared to defend the action we have taken. The first case is that of Dr. George H. Duncan. Will the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) discuss the propriety of the cancellation of his appointment ?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman will find a complete answer from me on that case last session, showing that there was not the slightest justification.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FSHERIES. Of course any answer which the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) makes is complete in his own opinion, but I listened to his abortive attempt to explain that, and it did not amount to anything. The Minister of Agriculture produced the most unanswerable case why that man should be dismissed. Go to the next case almost, that of E. H. Gilbert, fish hatchery officer, Magog. I took the responsibility of advising that that office was not necessary and the appointment was cancelled, and I am prepared to discuss it with the hon. gentleman now. Take the next case ; that of Fabien Vanasse, of Montreal. He had been shipping master of the port of Montreal ; he resigned to run an election ; he was defeated. The Board of Trade, the great commercial body in Montreal, protested against this man's appointment on the ground that he was unfit. Did the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) care for the recommendation from the Montreal Board of Trade ? Not at all. The man had done some party service for him and he recommended his appointment. We cancelled the appointment of Mr. Vanasse and we were within our right, and if the hon. gentleman wants discussion on that, we challenge it. And so I could go through every one of these one after the other and show the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) that of the fifteen appointments which we cancelled, we gave the reasons in our recommendations to His Excellency, and those reasons are on record and can be obtained, and in many instances have been obtained by hon. gentlemen opposite. So far as I can recall at the present moment, I have not heard any serious challenge made of the correctness of our advice to His Excellency. As regards the eight or ten appointments that were confirmed, I suppose hon. gentlemen opposite will not object. Now, what did we do with reference to the others ? I have already stated to the House that we found that other appointments were made without provision having been made by Parliament for the payment of their salaries. We were advised, and I think properly advised, that in these cases the appointments were unconstitutional, that the Governor in Council had no power to create offices with salaries attached and impose this burden upon the tax-payer until Parliament had provided the necessary money.

Mr. MONTAGUE. These surely came within the category which His Excellency did not intend to sign.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. His Excellency acted upon the advice of his Council, and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Montague) was one of them, and he advised that His Excellency should sign, and His Excellency expressed a willingness, on that advice, to do so, and when we came in and found it was unconstitutional, we advised His Excellency not to sign. That is the whole case in a nutshell, and I say we did right.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I hope the hon. gentleman will permit me, for he will no doubt agree that I was quite fair in stating the case. What I say is this : That when His Excellency returned this list and asked the members of his Government to classify it, they would not include in the list to which the Governor had said he could give his approval the ones to which he has now referred to as unconstitutional. They would be placed in another category entirely.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. His Excellency returned

them to his present advisers with a memorandum stating the class of cases which he had been advised to sign, the class of cases which he had made up his mind not to accept the advice of his former Ministers to sign, and we classified them ; and when we came to look them over, his signature not appearing upon them, we said : " As no provision has been made for these appointments, we advise you not to sign them."

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. gentleman does not understand me. What I stated was that as regards certain of these appointments, which we all admit on both sides of the House it was the intention of His Excellency to sign, the hon. gentleman says that when they came to inquire into them, they found that they were unconstitutional.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. In my opinion.

Mr. MONTAGUE. He says they were, because they were new appointments, and no money had been provided for them. What I say is that the hon. gentleman and his colleagues must have been greatly in error in making a classification, or they would have excluded these in the first place, and have put them in the category of those which His Excellency did not intend to sign.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Not at all. The classification was a mere mechanical action, and when we had to advise His Excellency to withhold his signature in each case, we had to do it on our responsibility after determining whether the case was one that came within the constitution or not. I am not going to detain the House on this matter. We divided these appointments into three classes : those which were confirmed, those which were cancelled, and those on which we advised that no action should be taken, for the reasons I have given ; and if our advice in any one case is challenged, we are ready to give our reasons, and the record will show the reasons. Parliament is sick and tired of these repeated attempts, on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite, to thrash this dead horse. The sentiment and heart of the House is with His Excellency and the present Government in the action they have taken, and the heart of the country is with them, because they believe that an attempt was made, which partially was thwarted, to foist on the people of this country a large number of office holders for whom no official salaries had been voted.

Mr. HAGGART. Mr. Speaker, I have heard many extraordinary speeches from the hon. gentleman who has just sat down, but this is one of the most extraordinary I have ever heard from him. The hon. gentleman says that this thing has been thrashed out again and again before the House. Why, it was only a few days ago that we got the return so that we could discuss the matter. The hon. gentleman finds fault with the appointments made by the last Government, and states that numbers of those appointments were made without a single cent having been appropriated for them. Does the hon. gentleman not know that that reason can not apply to one of the cases which have been communicated to the House ? The hon. gentleman knows that it would be impossible for one of these appointments to pass the Treasury Board unless a salary had been provided. The only appointments which were made for which no salaries were provided were those of the parties appointed to revise the Statutes of Canada. That is done again and again, and that is the only case, the vote being afterwards taken to cover the expense. In every case mentioned in this return the salary was provided, the vacancy did not continue for over a year, and the retiring Government had a right to make the appointment. That is the practice in England, and it has been the practice again and again in this country. The hon. gentleman says the Governor General did not approve of or sanction these appointments. How are these appointments sanctioned by the Governor General ? They are sanctioned by the Governor General affixing his signature to the Treasury Board report. Did he not sign the Treasury Board reports? He signed them in full. The hon. gentleman said there was a pile of papers, and the Governor General's signature was not affixed to the different papers. The papers simply give the Governor General the reasons for the appointments. Where the appointments are made and passed by the Treasury Board the Governor General never affixes his name to the back of the individual papers at all ; he signs the Treasury Board report. Did he sign it in this case, and did he consider that the appointments were made ? The evidence is indubitable. Why is it that the hon. gentleman brings down a statement to the House that these appointments were cancelled if they were never made ? Why is it that the hon. gentleman does not bring down the information which the House is entitled to have, by which we shall be able to judge whether the reasons assigned to the Governor General were sufficient for the dismissal of these parties or not ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. You did not move for it.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman says, why do we not challenge each particular case, and we will discuss whether the cancellation was right or not. Why does the hon. gentleman not bring down the reasons they assigned to His Excellency the Governor General for the cancellations ? An Address was passed by this House asking for these reasons to be brought down, but they have not been brought down yet.

The responsibility rests upon hon. gentlemen opposite. We have a right to assume that hon. gentlemen gave no reason to the Governor General, and it is a most extraordinary position for them to occupy. I never heard of a Governor General dismissing an official. He is obliged to act on the advice of his regularly constituted Ministers, and he is most careful to do it. If he thinks the evidence is not sufficient to justify the dismissal, he asks for further evidence. We have not seen the evidence or the reasons which hon. gentlemen assigned to the Governor General. In regard to the statement of the hon. gentleman that these appointments were never made, what can be plainer that the memorandum which was read by my hon. friend? The memorandum refers to the Treasury Board reports Nos. 2611, 2612, 2613, and so on, which are returned herewith, subject to this memorandum," and signed by the Governor General. What is it that is signed? The hon. gentleman wants to get out of it by a quibble. He says, was the memorandum signed? It is the Treasury Board reports that are signed, and the hon. gentleman knows it. The memorandum was signed by the Governor General's secretary. Do you think we do not understand English in this House? Does the hon. gentleman think he can delude the House by making a bold, bald statement in loud and energetic tones?

Is it not as plain as possible that His Excellency the Governor General signed these appointments and reserved others for further consideration. These appointments which he signed were specially accepted by him; and yet the hon. Minister of Marine tells us: Oh, but we had sufficient reason for the dismissal of these parties. Sir, they had no reason. The Governor General having signed the appointments, is supposed to have sufficient reasons for doing so, and we know nothing about any reasons he may have had for subsequently dismissing them. We are entitled to have the reasons, but none have been given to us, although if he performed his duty towards this Government as he did towards us, when we were in power, he must have required reasons for the dismissal of any one appointed to the civil service by Order in Council. In such cases, he insisted on our giving the fullest reasons, as did every other Governor General that this Dominion has ever had. More extraordinary still, we have had the authority of the right hon. gentleman who leads the Government for believing that all these parties in schedule "b" would be retained in office. Certainly he made that statement to the House, and yet at the very moment when he made it, two-thirds of these appointments were cancelled. I shall read to the House again the statement of the right hon. gentleman:

We have gone upon this rule, we have respected, or intend to respect, all the recommendations approved of by His Excellency,——

According to the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, there were none approved at the time by His Excellency. What then could the right hon. gentleman have been speaking about at that time?

——except in a few cases, where we thought there was cause for removal or for different advice being given to His Excellency. The hon. gentleman says that, in some cases, parties have not been notified of their appointments, and in others did not receive their commissions. That may be in a few cases. There may be a few cases—I know there were—where the parties did not receive their commissions, though they came within that rule;——

Who were the parties that came within that rule?

——but the reason was that in every one of these cases, as the papers will show when they are brought down,——

What information did we get from the papers when brought down. "Cancelled, cancelled, cancelled, no action, it being in the public interest not to take any action."

——they required some inquiry,——

Where has been the inquiry?

——and no decision was come to at the time.

And yet when the right hon. gentleman was speaking, two-thirds of the men appointed had been dismissed.

We would not, and we could not, in fact, in consistency with the rules which we laid down for our guidance, dismiss anybody appointed under such circumstances, any more than we could have dismissed anybody else who had been in office, except for cause shown. In many of these cases, so far as I remember, we thought it was necessary to hold an inquiry, departmental or otherwise,——

In what cases was there any inquiry held?

——and we came to no determination in such cases. These reasons may have delayed the notification to some of these gentlemen who were appointed; but that was the only reason, and when the papers are brought down, my hon. friend will find that these cases are very few indeed.

What has the hon. gentleman to say now in view of that statement made by his right hon. leader of the House? He must think, as my hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition, has said, that the right hon. gentleman did not know the facts, because the very moment he was making that statement, two-thirds of these men had been dismissed. Out of forty-five appointments, only two were retained in office. What answer has the hon. gentleman to that? After the right hon. leader of the Government had promised that the appointments would be treated the same as other appointments in existence, and that the appointees would not be discharged without reason, without investigations being made, we have these forty-three men kept out of office and not a single bit of evidence furnished us why they were. We have not even brought down to the House

the advice on which His Excellency acted, or the evidence which decided him to act on that advice. I know that His Excellency never acted on the simple recommendation that the parties should be dismissed. There must have been some reasons given and some evidence adduced in support of these reasons. If he acted without such reason or evidence, he would render himself liable to be called to account by this House and country and the Imperial authorities. He must have had reasons for the course he took, and this House is entitled to know what those reasons were, especially after His Excellency had given his sign-manual to the appointments, which made these appointments just as solemn and binding as that of any civil servant or judge whose appointment was made by the Government and signed by His Excellency. I did not intend to discuss this matter at length. I only rose to answer the remarks of the hon. Minister of Marine that the appointments never were made. The appointments were made, because the right hon. leader of the Government has told us that they were. We have the authority of the sign-manual of His Excellency, we have the statement of the military or private secretary of the Governor General that His Excellency affixed his signature to the Treasury Board reports, which is the only way in which his sanction is given to any civil service appointment. There is no other proceeding necessary in the appointment of an ordinary civil servant. If it were the case of the appointment of a judge or other parties who require a patent for their office, that patent would go to the secretary of the department and receive the sign-manual of His Excellency; but I am not aware that in the case of ordinary civil servants, anything else is required than the approval of His Excellency of the report of his advisers. A civil servant can receive no other appointment from His Excellency; and it is an extraordinary spectacle in this House that after His Excellency's signature had been obtained and after we had the promise of the right hon. gentleman who leads the Government that no dismissal would be made without cause, we should be informed, as we were by this return, that the Government never gave any reason to His Excellency for the dismissal of these parties. Certainly they did not give to the House, at any rate, any reasons, as they are bound to do, if any were given. As my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, has said, there never was such a spectacle presented to this House before. We have never had before any instance of the kind—of appointments having been made by the Governor General, followed by the solemn promise of the leader of the Government to this House and country that none of the parties appointed would be dismissed without the ordinary course being pursued in regard to them, as is pursued in the dismissal of other civil servants, namely, holding an inquiry before taking action. We have simply the bald information that they were dismissed in the public interest, and the statement made by the hon. Minister of Marine that the sole reason for their dismissal was that they had been appointed by a moribund Government. Is that an answer to His Excellency the Governor General? Is that in accord with the statement made to this House by the hon. gentleman's leader? We ask nothing but fair, honest action in this matter. As my hon. friend says, the course followed by the Government is not the English practice. According to that practice, a retiring government, after its defeat, has the right to not only fill all vacancies in the Government, but also to make personal appointments, and no gentleman that ever succeeded the ministry of England would go to the length the hon. gentleman did and cancel such appointments. It is well known that the rule in Great Britain and in all its colonies is that a retiring ministry has the right of filling all the vacancies. We exercised that right. I take no objection to the action of the Governor General, but what I do object to is that, having his sign-manual and the statement of the right hon. leader of the Government, these parties should have been dismissed, so far as we know, without a single reason being assigned for their dismissal.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I am sorry that I was called away from the House by a previous appointment and deprived of the pleasure of hearing some of the vituperations which were hurled upon me, in my absence, by the hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition. But, Sir, I was here in time to hear some of it. I may say just here that I was sorry to hear that the hon. gentleman had not fully recovered his health, and I hope he will soon be in good health again. But whether the hon. gentleman is in good health or bad health, he has always the same power of reckless assertion. The hon. gentleman to-day has given another exhibition of a power with which we have already been made familiar, his power to distort facts which are very plain. But I must say at once to my hon. friend that I cannot find it in me to be indignant whatever vituperation he may hurl at my head. I have known him too long for that. I know that the weaker the cause he has to defend the louder and more violent will be his language. It is now almost two years since the general elections took place and the hon. gentleman has not yet been able to overcome the spleen and mortification which filled his soul because the Governor General would not allow him to prostitute the remnant of power that he held, would not allow him to prostitute his office to make a partisan Senate still more partisan. He who was Prime Minister of this country only by the machination of a nest of traitors,

who never had the sanction of popular will for the authority he then exercised, who had been signally defeated at the polls—this gentleman had the audacity to ask the Governor General to sanction the appointments to the Senate of men who had just resigned their positions. Apparently there had been a bargain between the hon. gentleman and those members of his Cabinet who had been in the Senate that they would resign and try their luck at the polls, and if they were not successful, he would ask the Governor General to re-appoint them. But the Governor General would not prostitute his office for such a purpose, and ever since the hon. gentleman has not scrupled, on every occasion that offered, to heap insult on the head of the Governor General. He can be vituperative, he can be brave in words, he can be insolent and insulting in language, but he has never dared, insulting, impudent though his language is, to challenge the conduct of the Governor General by a vote of this Parliament. Even to-day, as has been stated by my hon. friend beside me (Sir Louis Davies), when, for the tenth or twelfth time, he has been again insulting to the Governor General, when he has it in his power to make a motion, he will not do so; he will be as before insulting and impudent in language but weak in action.

Now, Sir, what have we as a basis for this debate; what is it that these hon. gentlemen complain of? We have it for a fact, well known to this House, that though the hon. gentleman was defeated at the polls, he tried to appoint officers right and left. In a single day he sent to the Governor General memoranda on the Treasury Board's report, on no less than 92 appointments. Half of these were absolutely illegal, and he had no more right to recommend them than had any member of this House. The Governor General was not able to go through them all, but sent a memorial that he would approve of those that did not come within any one of three categories—those for whose salary no provision had been made, those for which no superannuation had been approved leaving the office vacant, and another which I have forgotten at this moment. Of these there were 47. There remained 45 to be accounted for, which the Governor General would have confirmed, but which, as has been said by my hon. friend beside me he did not actually confirm. But, Sir, the question afterwards came up, and we said we would respect the intention of the Governor General, that in all those appointments that were matters of routine and which the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) had power to advise the Governor General to make, we would respect the intention of the Governor General and would treat the appointments as made, that none of the appointees should be removed except for cause. This is the position in which we stand at the present time. Now, my hon. friend states that, out of these 45 appointments 10 have been retained in office or promoted. But what about the other 35? That is a question about which I can give an answer and will give it at once. All these 35 have been removed for just as good cause as that given by my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) regarding the removal of Mr. Duncan in British Columbia. I hope that my hon. friend the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) will also speak as to other appointments and removals made in his department. Let the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) challenge every case individually and every one will be accounted for as fully as that of Mr. Duncan by my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture. And what is all this fuss about? It is because the report we brought in gave in general language the reason for the removal instead of giving a special report in each case. That would have occupied reams of paper. We gave the general causes for removals, but if the hon. gentleman wants particulars he can have them. Let him challenge one case or any number of cases and he shall have the reasons for removal. I make bold to say that every removal will be found to have been made for reasons satisfactory to this House. Now, this is all there is of this matter. As I said, this is another occasion taken by the hon. gentleman to be unjust, unfair and even insulting to the Governor General. But so long as the hon. gentleman takes this course and will not dare to ask Parliament to pass censure upon the Governor General, I can only repel as I do, every charge and every insinuation, and say, as I do, that the attack of the hon. gentleman is as outrageous as any that ever was heard in a British Parliament.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, as the Prime Minister lacks argument he has resorted to oratory, or, at least, what those docile members behind imagine to be oratory—upon which opinions may differ. Now, the right hon. gentleman at the outset, said that he courts a vote of this House on this question. Why, we know that the right hon. gentleman is speaking in a jocular strain when he asks that this House be divided. He can safely challenge hon. gentlemen opposite to vote against him when scores of them sit there with promises of office in their pockets. Does the right hon. gentleman expect the member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron) to vote against him when that hon. gentleman has a promise of a Lieutenant-Governorship in his pocket? Does he fear the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) who haunts the corridors seeking a judgeship? Why, it is a farce to ask this Parliament to be divided on any question whatever. But the leader of the Government had an opportunity a little while ago to appeal to the great inquest of the people when his Government was defeated on the Yukon Bill.

Mr. GIBSON. It was not defeated. Where was it defeated ?

Mr. BERGERON. By the Parliament of Canada.

Mr. BENNETT. Well, all I can tell the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson) is this : he has trouble enough at home, and I think that after the severe snubbing he got in the committee room this morning, he had better at least be docile for a little time. But there never was a skin so thick that it could not be irritated sometimes, and perhaps the time may come when even his thick skin may be irritated by the taunt of some of the Ministers. Now, where is the First Minister on this occasion ? He has doged the whole issue. When the hon. gentleman came in they found that the outgoing Ministry had done exactly what their predecessors had done in 1878. I can tell the First Minister one thing he did not find, he did not find that the late Government had given to one of their followers hundreds of miles of the public domain they had been administering without price and without remuneration. The hon. gentleman was a member of a Government that gave to one of his supporters, my predecessor in this House, Mr. H. H. Cook, hundreds of miles of timber limits. These are the hon. gentlemen that to-day are sticklers for propriety and for nicety in the administration of public affairs. But here are the plain facts. The First Minister, when he came into power, found there had been certain appointments made, and when he looked into those appointments—and nobody will complain that the Governor General was unfriendly to them—when these reports were placed under the supervision of himself and his Cabinet and the Governor General, the result was that this long list of forty-five cases were of such a nature and of such a class that the Governor General himself thought that these gentlemen on this list should all be placed in the positions to which they had been appointed. On the 3rd of May, 1897, the First Minister, speaking in the House, took strong grounds that these men whose names were on this list were all entitled to the positions to which they were appointed. I will quote his own language :

> We have gone upon this rule. We have respected, or intended to respect, all the recommendations approved by His Excellency, except in a few cases, where we thought there was cause for removal or for different advice being given to His Excellency.

Now the hon. gentleman tells us that they themselves had given advice to His Excellency because they are his advisers, and in the advice they had given they stated that all those who came within the purview of that clause B should be retained in the offices to which they had been appointed. But further on the hon. gentleman said this :

> We would not, and we could not, in fact, in consistency with the rules which we laid down for our guidance, dismiss anybody appointed under such circumstances, any more than we would have dismissed anybody else who had been in office, except for cause shown.

Now, on the 3rd of May, when the hon. gentleman made that statement, in 1897, the facts are that a number of these appointments had been cancelled six months before ; all but two of the whole forty-five had been cancelled six months before. Now, the right hon. gentleman was in this position : either he did not know that these dismissals had been made, or they had been made and he knew about them having been made when he made this statement. I incline to the former opinion, that the right hon. gentleman was not aware that the dismissals had been made, but that on the other hand they were made without his knowledge. There is the position the whole matter is in, and the hon. gentleman stands convicted on the written evidence, on the plain facts, that after he had pledged his honour, not only to the House, but to the men who held these positions, that every one of them should be retained in his position, at the very same time these men had been decapitated by the hon. gentleman's associates and those with him in the Cabinet. The question is plain, it is not a case for attempting to stir up the feelings of his followers behind him, it is not a question for appealing to them in that spirit at all. It is a plain, simple matter of fact, and on the record the hon. gentleman is convicted beyond the shadow of a doubt. The hon. gentleman can well afford to be brave in this House, he can well afford to challenge a division in this House at any time. Why, the hon. gentleman knows that no Premier ever sat with a more servile following than he has to-day in this House. The hon. gentleman knows that as soon as this Parliament comes to a close there will be a retirement to those positions that so many of his followers are longing and looking for. The hon. gentleman holds in the province of Ontario a senatorship, and within the sight of those whose names are daily being dangled in the country in respect to this position. The hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Britton)—and my compliments to him—on one occasion recently stated that I never addressed the House unless I referred to some hon. gentleman opposite as being in quest of a position. The hon. gentleman does not state what is correct. I have not stated that. I have appealed to hon. gentlemen on that side of the House who, I believed, were fair, and had some atoms of independence about them. But the hon. member for Kingston must never expect me to place him in that category, must never expect me to treat him as does his own newspaper, the Kingston "Whig," which booms him perpetually for a seat in the Senate, or for a judgeship, or something else.

Mr. DAVIS (Saskatchewan). I do not think you ever will be a judge, anyway.

Mr. BENNETT. I am at a loss to know whose musical voice that is, but I rather think it is the hon. member for Saskatchewan. I advise him that under the contract he has made, he can never again be a candidate, and that if the party are to have the patronage while he is a member, he had better have as good a time here as he possibly can. Now, let the First Minister remember this: there will come a time some day when he will have to appeal to the people, and when he does appeal to the people in the province of Ontario, at all events, let me tell him and tell his Ministers that if an appeal were had to-day all that would be on trial would be their Drummond deal and their Yukon railway scheme, both nipped in their infancy but not in their innocence. But outside of these two things, no person has ever heard of politics or public matters other than the decapitation of a few officials. That has been the whole range of politics in the province of Ontario. There is an army of hungry office-seekers rushing on to places that they so eagerly and anxiously desire, because they believe that the time is short which the hon. gentlemen will have to bestow them. The hon. gentlemen had an election lately in the province of Ontario, and they do not take much comfort out of it, and I have reason to believe that when that senatorship that is being dangled so long in the province of Ontario is given, it will not be given to a member of this House, because hon. gentlemen opposite do not wish to court the opening of a constituency to-day in the province of Ontario, much less than they are willing to fill a riding that has been so long vacant in the province of Quebec.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). In the discussion that has taken place, the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) has called attention to one case connected with the department over which, for the time being, I preside, in which he thinks there was an injustice done, saying that the pledge uttered by the Prime Minister in the House had been set at naught. He alluded to it very pointedly, I think, and wanted to know the reason. Well, I will give it to him. The reason is set down here why J. M. Scully, a collector of customs at Berlin was not appointed. The comment is because the appointment was cancelled. Well, that is precisely what took place. The hon. gentleman when opening his remarks alluded to the fact that His Excellency in regard to the many appointments placed before him made some reservations of his own motion. First, he was not prepared to consider recommendations made for filling vacancies that had existed for more than one year. Another was that he was not prepared to endorse any recommendations for superannuation that had not been made by the officers whom they sought to superannuate. The third reservation, if I remember rightly, was that there should have been provision made in the Estimates for the expenditure. I will give the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) a statement of the case of Mr. Scully. My accountant reported to me at the time, and he has since reported to me, for I have refreshed my memory and asked him for a report, that the reason Mr. Scully's appointment was not confirmed was because the vacancy at Berlin had existed for more than one year.

Mr. MONTAGUE. On that point, I might say to my hon. friend, that while I am fully of the opinion that the information he is giving as having been received from the accountant is quite correct, it is not so in fact. I of course absolve the hon. gentleman from wilfully making a statement that is not absolutely correct.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Allow me to make a suggestion, which will show the hon. gentleman that his information is entirely incorrect. Every member of the Cabinet is committed to the declaration that it is not true, because if it had been true they would not have put that name among those names which were not open to the objections raised by the Governor General.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). Does not the hon. gentleman see that he is giving away his whole case. If the hon. gentleman admits that there has been one mistake in the list, then a great many mistakes may have occurred.

Mr. MONTAGUE. A mistake did not occur.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The accountant told me that no public moneys were paid to the late collector after 30th June, 1895, not one cent of public money.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I may be pardoned for interrupting. I am satisfied a mistake has been made in regard to Mr. Scully, and no doubt the hon. gentleman, whatever may be the course adopted by some of his colleagues, desires to be fair towards his officers. The previous collector at Berlin—I cannot remember his name——

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Bowman.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Under circumstances that it is not necessary to refer to because they were of a painful character, left his office during the month of July. He was not in the country to draw his salary. No sum therefore had been paid him during July; but the hon. gentleman will find on indisputable evidence that the previous collector did perform his duties during part of July, and that the position was not vacant for a term of one year.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I can only say as to what appeared on the books, that no moneys were paid for the purpose of the collector at Berlin after that date.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Permit me to say——

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. It is no use going further. I have heard what the hon. gentleman said.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. gentleman will find also——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. MONTAGUE. If the hon. Minister does not object to my interruption, hon. members need not, I think, object. The hon. gentleman will find in the department a record of the circumstances to which I have referred, which will prove indisputably the statement I have made.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Even if that statement were true, I would consider the office vacant when there was no appointee entitled to receive any money from his office. After 30th June, 1895, no money was paid. This recommendation of Council is dated, I think, 6th or 7th July. I have given the hon. gentleman his answer with regard to that matter. If he is going through the cases he will find other examples. There are two cases which I happen to know about. We have here the case of "J. Spence, collector of inland revenue, superannuated. No action taken. Not deemed in the public interest to take any action." I submit that is a proper answer, for that was the reason. Again, we have "E. H. Sinon, promoted to collector of Inland Revenue, vice Spence. No action; not deemed in public interest to take any action." I submit that is the proper reason, and it is given to the House. I think the hon. gentleman will not ask for any further reason in regard to this matter.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Not at all.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I do not think the hon. gentleman would like to discuss it.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Yes, I would.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The hon. gentleman is getting uneasy at once.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Not at all.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I invite attention to "Hansard" on this question. One of the rules laid down by His Excellency was that he was not prepared to consider any superannuation not made at the request of the officer sought to be superannuated. The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) asked a number of questions. I will give two of them and the answer given by the Controller of Inland Revenue. The first question was:

Mr. MONTAGUE.

1. Whether one John Spence, of the Inland Revenue Department, has been superannuated, and if so, the date of his superannuation?

The second was:

2. Did the said John Spence make application to the Inland Revenue Department to be retired and placed on the superannuation list, and file the medical certificate required by the Act along with his application, and whether said application and certificate are on file in the department?

The answer was:

1. John Spence has not been superannuated. 2. No such documents are on file in this department

The recommendation that went to His Excellency from his advisers and on which he was willing to consider the case, under the rule laid down was because John Spence had been superannuated at his own request. Where did the Government have the request? The recommendation placed before the Governor General, embodying the request for superannuation for Mr. Spence, declared that it was made at his own request. The question was asked in this House, and the responsible head of the department answered that no such request was to be found on the file of the department. If the hon. member for Haldimand would move for a return with a view to ascertain which of the late Ministers submitted the recommendation stating that Mr. Spence was superannuated at his own request, no doubt the papers would be brought down. Perhaps the hon. gentleman would then be able to say where the document is in which Mr. Spence made this request, for I understand that he most emphatically denies having done so.

Mr. WALLACE. What is the date of "Hansard?"

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The date is 22nd April, 1897. I give that as another case, and I submit that the answer given in the return is perfectly correct. If the Governor General would not consider a request for superannuation unless made by the party to be superannuated, and when no such document or request, with the accompanying medical certificate, is to be found on file in the department, it was correct to state "No action was taken; not deemed in the public interest to take action."

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Allow me to draw attention to the fact that this return does not give a correct statement. The answer to that should have been:

Was not superannuated at his own request;

And not—

No action taken; not deemed in the public interest to take any action.

That answer does not furnish the facts. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson) says that the reason this superannuation was not carried out was because the officer denied

that he requested to be superannuated. If that be the case, the answer in this paper is wrong, and the return is misleading.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. What followed. No action was taken and it was not deemed in the public interest to take any action.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is not a reason.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Certainly it is a reason. That man who would have been on the superannuation list drawing hundreds of dollars of the money of the people for doing nothing, is now performing his duty, and another man is not appointed in his place at a salary. This man whom they sought to get out of office is there today performing his duty, and performing it well. I believe he is a good officer and well able to perform his duty for, perhaps many years to come. It was certainly in the public interest to retain that man and not to put a charge of his superannuation on the public, and not to put the salary of a new appointee as a burden on the treasury. I have now given the House some samples from the list as we find them here, and I have no doubt as the First Minister said, that if there are other cases which hon. gentlemen opposite wish to discuss separately there can be no objection to give them full and explicit answers with regard to them. When a return is brought down to the House it is expected to be put in a concise shape, and this return was put in that shape. I believe I have given instances to show that the action taken by the Government in this matter was warranted in the public interest, and is entirely consistent with the utterances of the First Minister.

Mr. GIBSON. What is the name of the person they intended should replace Spence after he was superannuated ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. E. H. Simon, from Brantford.

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

(In the Committee.)

Department of Agriculture..... $48,422 50

Mr. BERGERON. There is a decrease here.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). There is a reduction in the staff which occasions a decrease.

Mr. BERGERON. There are some reductions and some increases.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There are some statutory increases to some of the deserving officers on the staff whose work appeared to be underpaid. But in consequence of the reductions in the number of the staff there is a decrease in the whole expenditure.

Mr. BERGERON. There is a decrease of three third-class clerks and an increase of one first-class clerk.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The increase of one first-class clerk is due to the promotion of Mr. Caron who is one of the examiners in the Patent Branch. Mr. Caron was a second-class clerk, but the other examiners were both first-class clerks and Mr. Caron was doing the work fully as well and just as much of it as those other officers, and I thought it was right he should be in the same class. He is promoted to the bottom of the class, while the other two examiners, because of length of service, are really getting higher pay than Mr. Caron.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Are there any statutory increases ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The first statutory increase is that of Mr. Jackson, who is the chief clerk in charge of the Trades Marks. His salary was $2,200, and it will now be $2,250. Mr. Jackson is an old servant of the public, has been a very long time in the service, and I thought deserved an increase in his salary. Dr. Brymner, the Archivist, also gets a statutory increase for the same reason. Mr. W. J. Lynch gets his increase. I promoted Mr. Lynch last year from being a first-class clerk to a chief clerk. At the time the late Mr. Pope died and the position of Commissioner of Patents was abolished. Mr. Lynch was given a great deal of extra work. He was put in charge, under the Deputy Minister, of the Patent Branch. He is doing very responsible and very important work and doing it very efficiently, and I therefore thought he deserved an increase.

Mr. McMULLEN. What is his salary ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It was $1,800, it will in the future be $1,850.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. How many have received the statutory increase in the Department of Agriculture, and how many have not received it, if any ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Six clerks and one messenger have received it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. How many were eligible and did not receive it ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Thirteen did not.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Had the hon. gentleman the recommendation of the deputy Minister in favour of all those who did receive it ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I had not an opportunity, unfortunately, of being present when this subject was very fully discussed, and I do not propose now to take up the time of the committee at any length. The question is one of great importance. The Civil Service Act, I think it will be admitted on all hands, was based on the principle of obtaining the services of young men of ability and qualifications for the discharge of the duties imposed upon civil servants for a small salary, with a regular statutory increase; so that while they were obtaining experience and qualifying themselves to discharge their duties in a more efficient manner from year to year their salaries were increased. That policy, in my judgment, was a sound one. Upon that, however, there is room for a great difference of opinion, which no doubt does exist among hon. gentlemen in this House. But one thing I think will be admitted by everybody, that is, that the law, whatever it is, should be carried out. I have not the advantage of being a lawyer; but I observe that in the discussion of this question there has been a great difference of opinion as to what the meaning of the law is. So far as I am able to form any judgment, I think the intention of the law was that the engagement with the civil servant was that he should receive the statutory increase provided his conduct entitled him to it. That was to be evidenced by the report of the Deputy Minister under whom he served, concurred in by the Minister and by the Governor General in Council; and in that case it was to apply uniformly. Now, I have no doubt that the hon. gentleman has been justified in all these cases in which he has given the statutory increase; but I would like to ask him whether any others were recommended for the increase by the deputy head. I think I may take for granted that the recommendation was not confined to the persons to whom the increase was given, but that the hon. gentleman exercised his own judgment and discretion as to whom it should apply to. Now, I want to draw the attention of the Government to what I think would be a wise course to pursue with regard to this very important question. If under the law now on the Statute-book the civil servant who discharges his duty faithfully and is recommended by the deputy head is entitled to the statutory increase, then I think all will admit that one of two things should happen—either the law should be repealed and a law substituted which will not be subject to any misconstruction or misconception, or measures should be taken to ascertain whether under the law the parties are entitled to have the statutory increase. The effect upon the civil service must be most detrimental, if, instead of it being a question of law and of good conduct, it is an optional matter with the Minister to give the statutory increase to whomsoever he may consider entitled to it. I think the time has come when that question ought to be settled, because it will at once be perceived that every person who believes that under the law he is entitled to the statutory increase and does not get it must feel aggrieved. The selection of a few persons in the department for the statutory increase, and the refusal of it to others, is to a certain extent a ban upon the character and standing of all those who do not receive it. I believe the intention of the law—and probably it was never carried out with sufficient rigour—was that the statutory increase should be given only to those who by their conduct proved that they were entitled to it. Now, without taking up the time of the House, I want to suggest that the Government should agree to have a case made for submission to the Supreme Court, to get their opinion as to whether a civil servant who faithfully discharges his duties and is recommended for the increment provided by law is legally entitled to receive it or not.

Mr. McMULLEN. I do not think that I can agree with the hon. leader of the Opposition that the statutory increase should be given in every case.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I did not say in every case.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. gentleman carried out that system for many years without any discrimination whatever.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, perhaps too much so.

Mr. McMULLEN. I must enter my protest against the continuation of the statutory increases to men who are receiving a good round salary. Here we have a case of a man receiving the $50 increase in the Department of Agriculture when he is already getting a salary of $2,200. I say that is wrong. I do not think that increase should be made. We find that in the Department of Customs the salaries of the clerks are not as high as those in the Department of Agriculture. I think that any man receiving $2,200 is receiving all that he can earn, and more than he can earn. The judges get only $2,200 a year, and this includes $200 for travelling expenses. I think this is a case in which the hon. Minister should have hesitated before adding $50 to the salary.

Mr. McNEILL. I hope that the Government will take into consideration the suggestion made by my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition. I think it is a very fair suggestion and one, I am sure, that would go a great deal towards settling this question in the minds of the public and the members of the civil service. Nothing could be fairer than the suggestion that this matter should be stated as a case, and that we should have a thoroughly reliable legal opinion upon it, so that we may know exactly where we are with reference to it. Nothing could be worse for the civil ser-

vice than the idea that they are being unjustly and illegally treated, and I think further that there really could not be a very much greater blot upon the fair name of our country than that other countries should suppose that our Government was unjustly treating its civil servants by deliberately depriving them of the statutory increases which the law provides.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). It does not provide it, and the hon. gentleman knows it does not.

Mr. McNEILL. The hon. gentleman has not heard what I have been saying.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I have heard everything. I have heard all this fifty times over, and we are tired to death of it.

Mr. McNEILL. He does not know really what I have been saying.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I have heard all you have said and could say and will say to the day of judgment about this, I believe.

Mr. McNEILL. The suggestion made by my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, when my hon. friend who has just interrupted me must have been thinking of something else, was that there should be a case stated.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I heard the suggestion.

Mr. McNEILL. It is all very well for my hon. friend to say that the law is so and so, but he will admit that there are some lawyers in the House to-day and some who were here in other years, who knew something about the law. There is his friend Mr. Blake, for example, who took a perfectly different view; and when Mr. Blake takes one view and my hon. friend another——

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I do not at all admit that the hon. gentleman interprets Mr. Blake's language correctly. On the contrary, he interprets it entirely wrongly.

Mr. McNEILL. There can be no doubt at all about his language, and there was no suggestion by any one when the Act was passed, that its language could have had any other significance than that which we have been placing upon it. All we ask now is that this should be done for the sake of the service of the country—that we should have a case stated and absolute knowledge as to what the law is. Surely that is not an unreasonable proposition. My hon. friend says that he knows everything that has been and can be said with regard to it. Well, this suggestion was only made a moment ago and is one that should commend itself to the approval of the right hon. gentleman who leads the House.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I do not think so.

Mr. McNEILL. Will the right hon. gentleman say that it is not a reasonable proposal, that, in a case of great doubt and gravity, and one which concerns the welfare of a great many people, we should find out what the law really is?

The PRIME MINISTER. No, and I will tell my hon. friend the reasons why. There are good reasons and authority for the course which the Government has taken under the law. Either the law is satisfactory or it is not. If it is unjust, it can be amended; but at present there is no reason why we should seek the opinion of a court of justice as to the interpretation of the statute. If the statute is not satisfactory as we interpret it, we can amend it. That is the best reason I can give my hon. friend.

Mr. INGRAM. A deputation waited on the right hon. gentleman the other day of civil servants with respect to the statutory increase. Will the hon. gentleman say what answer he gave on that occasion?

The PRIME MINISTER. I cannot recollect at this moment the "ipsissima verba" I used to the delegation that waited on me; but I think I told them that, so far as this matter is concerned, the Government had taken a course which I thought was quite consistent with the law and the only one consistent with the law. I told them also that I did not apprehend that the Act contemplated that every civil servant should be entitled to promotion, whether deserving or not. I could not admit either that the rule should be that a civil servant was entitled to promotion in every case, unless adversely reported upon by the head of the department. I said that, in my opinion, the proper course to take was that every officer should be entitled to promotion if recommended for promotion by the head of the department; but I said, at the same time, that I saw very great difficulty in working out the law, if it were the law, and that I would be very happy, after the session, to receive any representations they had to make on the subject.

Mr. SPROULE. I shall not say anything about the difference of opinion between Mr. Blake and the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), because the one stands eminent as a lawyer and the other does not claim that distinction, and the House will draw its own conclusion. I have always thought that one of the objects of the establishment of the Supreme Court was to get reasoned judgments upon these questions on which the House could not agree, and I think that Mr. Blake at one time very deliberately stated

so in this Chamber. It would not be at all out of place to get such a verdict from that court. In fact, it would be very much in place, when there is such a diversity of opinion as exists, even between lawyers in this House, with regard to this matter.

The PRIME MINISTER. What is the hon. gentleman's opinion as to what the law should be?

Mr. SPROULE. What the law is, as interpreted by the Supreme Court, is what we desire to know. I was going to ask the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) what disposal did he make of the other three clerks, when he reduced the number of his clerks from twenty-one to enghteen third-class clerks.

Mr. DAVIN. Before the hon. gentleman answers that question, I think it is not desirable that the House should go away from the question raised by my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, because it seems to me that if you have a law on the Statute-book, and a great lawyer says that the law means a certain thing and the Government says it does not, and a large body of men are affected by that law, the suggestion of the hon. leader of the Opposition is one that should commend itself to reason and justice alike. With regard to the way in which the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) treats the opinion of Mr. Blake, all that the hon. gentleman says is that he does not at all accept the interpretation placed on Mr. Blake's language. But he has not done the House the courtesy of analysing that language and giving us his reason for saying that our interpretation is wrong. What we did was to quote the opinions of the former leader of the Liberal party (Mr. Blake), when sitting in this House and leading the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) and also the right hon. gentleman now at the head of the Government, and there is no record that these hon. gentlemen ever dissented from the opinion which the Hon. Mr. Blake expressed at that time. Mr. Blake's language is not obscure.

It does not need any careful analysis to get at his meaning. And I will call the attention of the committee to what Mr. Blake said. And for this purpose—to enforce the suggestion made by the leader of the Opposition. Not for the purpose of getting an advance for the civil servant, but for the purpose of showing where we are and showing what justice demands. Because, if Mr. Blake is correct—not if our view of Mr. Blake's language is correct, because there can be no doubt of what he meant—then the Government pursuing the policy it does is weakening the authority of law in this country and destroying the morale of a great service, what should be done is to repeal the Act and bring in a measure under which the Government could legally carry out the policy which they believe best. I am not now discussing that policy, nor is it necessary to discuss what the right hon. gentleman suggested to my hon. friend behind me, what he thinks should be the law. It is not what we think should be the law that is the important question for the people. Fortunately or unfortunately for the country, it is what my right hon. friend thinks should be the law that is the important thing, because he is in place and power. Now, this is what Mr. Blake said in discussing this measure:

> But, Sir, the practical operation of the law which was passed in conformity with the recommendations of the commission, and which has not worked in conformity with those conditions, is that there are those increases and these promotions going on steadily.

He goes on further:

> That the mischiefs to which I refer still prevail, and they prevail to this extent, as the Finance Minister sums up the case, that 420 out of the civil servants of the country have, within the last six years, received increases which make them now in receipt of $300 a year by virtue of these $50 increases apart from the promotion increases, or a total of $126,000 a year, which would be equal to the average wages of 420 mechanics with families.

He goes on further:

> I maintain that it ought to be changed; I maintain that the system is a bad one.

He says, the system is a bad one. Clearly he refers to the law. He does not condemn the Government for doing certain things, but he is condemning the Government of the day for having passed a statute that compels them to do certain things.

Mr. McMULLEN. What is the date of that speech of Mr. Blake?

Mr. DAVIN. This discussion took place in 1885. He says:

> In those cases in which you give increases, the increases ought not——

Now, I call the attention of the committee with all respect to this. I have a great respect for the authority and position in this House of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). With great respect for the hon. gentleman I will call his attention to what Mr. Blake said, and then I will remind him of what he said a few moments ago that he did not care for our interpretation of what Mr. Blake had said.

> In those cases in which you give increases, the increases ought not, in my opinion, to be given——

How, as the Government gives them? No, but—

> ——as this law gives them.

Now, how will the hon. member for South Oxford support the proposition laid down

that the construction we put on Mr. Blake's language was not the correct construction? Why, Sir, there is no room for a double construction of this language; it is emphatic and precise. He goes on further:

I maintain there ought to be no right to an increase, even in those cases in which increases may be given.

I maintain that the increase should only be given as a stimulus to extra exertion;——

I will call the hon. gentleman's attention to this:

——whereas, by this law,——

By this law, mark you—

——it is given as a matter of course.

He does not say: You are not bound to give it by the law, but he says that it is given as a matter of course. He said further:

I maintain that the increase should only be given as a stimulus to extra exertions; whereas, by this law, it is given as a matter of course, for unless a man's conduct is disgracefully bad, the rule is to give the increase. If the rule is not without exceptions, let us hear the exceptions. But I need not argue this point, because the Finance Minister himself describes the increase as an increase inevitable under the provisions of the Civil Service Act.

Would Mr. Blake have said this if these increases were not necessary under the law? We know what a polemic he was. He would have said: The Finance Minister is wrong; this law does not compel him to give these increases, but they are made by the Government without justification, adding unnecessarily to the burdens of the country. And the present Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock), in this same debate, said:

When we pass to the first-class clerk, we find he draws a salary of $1,400, increasable to $1,800 by an annual increase of $50. Then we descend in the grade, and we find a second-class clerk commencing with $1,000, increasable at the same arbitrary rate, as time rolls on, to $1,400 a year. The same fixed sum of $50 a year is added to the salary of each clerk, whether he is of the lowest class or the highest class. The Secretary of State must know that increases in salaries should be in proportion to the value of the services, having due regard to the then salary; whereas, in this case, there is an arbitrary sum of $50 a year, without rhyme or reason, added to the salary of each officer, from the lowest class up to the highest.

Then we have the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies), and this was said as an obiter dictum:

Yet, in the face of this fact, Parliament is asked to increase the salaries of these mechanical clerks and give them $50 annual increase.

Now, Sir, here we have three or four sentences in the same speech in which Mr. Blake emphatically declares that the law compels these increases.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. No, he does not say anything of the kind. What he says is that the law gives it, and that does not in the slightest degree imply that in his opinion it is a legal right.

Mr. DAVIN. I will ask the hon. gentleman to consider Mr. Blake's language——

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I have heard the language fifty times over. It has been read fifty times in this House; it has been read a dozen times by my hon. friend (Mr. Davin), a dozen times by gentlemen beside him, and a dozen times by gentlemen beside him. We know the whole thing by heart.

Mr. DAVIN. Let me say, with all respect for the hon. gentleman, that that is a charming specimen of his capacity for heroic inaccuracy, because I have read it only three times and my hon. friend to my left (Mr. McNeill) only referred to my quotation of it.

Mr. McMULLEN. Will my hon. friend (Mr. Davin) permit, me to ask him a question? He has read from the speech of Mr. Blake which he says was made in 1885. Is he aware that the Civil Service Act was recast in 1886, and that three clauses affecting this subject were completely wiped out.

Mr. DAVIN. My hon. friend (Mr. McMullen) must be aware that Mr. Blake is discussing this section 26.

Mr. McMULLEN. He was discussing in 1885 an Act that was recast in 1886.

Mr. DAVIN. He is discussing the very words we have in the Act to-day and the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) has shown the grossest ignorance of the question by his interruption. I want to discuss this question from the standpoint of parliamentary action. We have an Act on the Statute-book that a great lawyer tells us gives to a clerk who has no bad mark against him, the right to a statutory increase; it is called a statutory increase, that is the very phrase employed; showing the consensus of Parliament as to its interpretation. We have a great lawyer interpreting it as a man of sense would interpret it. But we have the hon. member for Cape Breton (Sir Charles Tupper) who has been in Parliament for so many years and has vast experience, taking the responsibility of suggesting that the Act passed by Mr. Blake empowering us to get the opinion of the Supreme Court as to the meaning of the statute, should be utilized to obtain an authoritative opinion. Then I believe there is another distinguished lawyer sitting on that side of the House, whose opinion coincides with ours, but I have not his permission to give his name. Under these circumstances should we not either repeal this Act and pass another, or get an authoritative opinion from the Supreme Court as to its meaning?

Mr. CLANCY. I want to ask the First Minister a question. Has he any doubt as to

the meaning of the Act upon this statement: Not that the civil servant is to have a statutory increase upon all occasions, but upon such occasions as he is recommended by the head of the department, showing that he is a worthy servant and that there is nothing against him. I ask the right hon. gentleman if he has any doubt as to the meaning of the law under such circumstances.

The PRIME MINISTER. I have no hesitation in answering the question of my hon. friend. Though I am a lawyer myself, I have not given much attention to law for a great many years. But when this question first came up it was of course referred to the Minister of Justice, Sir Oliver Mowat at that time, one of the ablest lawyers in the land, and we have acted upon his opinion.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. Minister has not explained with regard to the three dismissals, or doing away with three of his clerks.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The three vacancies in the third-class clerkships are due to two promotions into the second class, and one death in the service. The vacancies in the second class were available in consequence of the dismissal from the service of Mr. J. H. Lyster, and the promotion of Mr. Caron into the first class. There is an extra clerk in the first class, the same number in the second class, and fewer in the third. Mr. Caron is promoted from the second class into the first class for the reason I explained to the hon. member for Beauharnois, a few minutes ago. One clerk was dismissed for misconduct, one died, and no appointments have been made.

Mr. WALLACE. Is the hon. Minister going to pay any attention to the representations made by the member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen)? It appears to me that the objection raised by him was a very proper one, that these men getting such enormous salaries, were not doing a very high class work. When was Mr. Lynch promoted to a chief clerkship?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Last year. He was at the head of the other class, and he was promoted to the bottom of this class at the same salary, $1,800. Mr. Jackson is in charge of the copyright and trade marks branch, an important piece of work in the department, and I think its importance justifies an additional salary. The same is true of Dr. Brymner, who has been for many years the archivist, and who does excellent work in a very important branch. He also gets a statutory increase. Mr. Lynch is doing a great deal of the work which used to be done by the commissioner of patents, the late Richard Pope. When Mr. Pope died the position was being taken by the deputy head of the department, but Mr. Lynch, as chief clerk in charge of that particular branch, has now to do a great deal of work and has a very responsible position. He is doing his work efficiently and well, and I thought it right, as I considered the pay he was getting was less than he was entitled to, that he should have a statutory increase.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I had an opportunity, when on the other side of the water, of knowing a good deal of the services of Mr. Brymner, and it is impossible to overrate them. A more indefatigable, untiring public servant is not to be found, I am satisfied, in the service of the Government, and I am very glad that his right to a statutory increase has been favourably considered.

Mr. SPROULE. May I ask the Minister if he requests a report from his deputy on all these clerks, or only on certain ones?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. My deputy and I discussed the work in the department, and we agreed upon certain lines which I will explain to the hon. gentleman in brief. They were that where the work was not paid for commensurately with its importance; whatever the officer had shown unusual or extraordinary diligence, or aptitude, or capacity in his work, an increase should be given. But except in such cases, or where the officer was doing new work, more important than the work that he had been doing before, we gave no increases. I may say that in the patent branch especially, the work has been very considerably reorganized as a result of the changes which came about after the death of the late commissioner of patents. In that reorganization I found that I was obliged to throw upon certain officers of that department, notably Mr. Lynch, greater work and responsibility than they had before. Under those circumstances I believe the statutory increases could properly be given.

Mr. SPROULE. I assume there were a number of clerks in regard to whom he did not report.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have stated that the deputy and myself discussed and talked over the clerks in the department.

Mr. SPROULE. The inference to be drawn from the explanation given is, that the Minister talked over the different clerks with his deputy, and because some clerks did important work and did it well, an intimation was given that it was desirable to give those statutory increases, and to do so on the usual principle that a favourable report from the deputy was required. But the balance of the clerks were apparently left out in the report asked with respect to their right to receive increases or otherwise. Then I take it that only a certain percentage of the clerks were reported on?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The whole of the clerks and the work of the whole of the clerks were discussed between myself and the deputy, with the result that these increases were given.

Post Office Department..... $197,160

Mr. SPROULE. I notice an increase, which perhaps the Minister will explain.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). There have been a number of changes in the staff, increases and reductions, with a net increase of $1,140. There was a draughtsman, Minguay, who at one time was attached to the outside service and was classified as connected with the Toronto chief inspector's office, although he has always been in Ottawa and has been in the inside service. He has been transferred to the inside service. His salary was $1,400.

Mr. WALLACE. How many new appointments were made during the year?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There was a transfer in the case of Minguay, and another transfer, this being from the Ottawa inspector's office—I forget the name. There have been no new permanent appointments made to the inside service, unless the hon. gentleman includes temporary clerks. There have been two or three of that class. There was a Mrs. Armstrong appointed. Altogether there have been, I think, two at $500 and one at $400 during the year.

Mr. WALLACE. Any dismissals?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No dismissals, except by Providence.

Mr. SPROULE. How many statutory increases were given?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Sixteen increases.

Mr. HUGHES. How does it occur that the salary of the accountant is $1,800, while last year it was $1,850?

Mr. SPROULE. Will the hon. gentleman give the different classes in which statutory increases have been given?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. In reply to the hon. gentleman for North Victoria (Mr. Hughes), I may say that the accountant last year was Mr. Barrett, who received $1,850 a year. He died last September, and the next in command—Mr. Johnston, was $1,800, being $50 less than that of his predecessor. In reply to the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), I beg to say that the statutory increases are as follows:—Three among first-class clerks, seven among second-class clerks, six among third-class, and seven increases to packers and sorters.

Mr. INGRAM. I notice the Controller of the Railway Mail Service appears to have been reduced from $3,000 to $2,500. Does this indicate that the service is not satisfactory, or that Mr. Armstrong is not satisfactory and his salary has been decreased?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Mr. Armstrong receives $2,500. He entered the service on 1st January, 1897. At that time he was drawing $1,500 as a clerk in the Toronto post office. He was promoted to the rank of controller here at $2,500 a year. So there was $500 to be paid from 1st January, 1897, to 1st July, and $2,500 for the succeeding year. The $3,000 therefore includes the $500 difference between his salary in Toronto post office and his salary as controller for six months, and $2,500 for his regular yearly salary since.

Mr. SPROULE. In making these statutory increases will the hon. Minister state the principle on which he has made them? Was it by first requesting the deputy to report on all the civil servants in the department, or did he ask a report on certain civil servants, whose salaries he wished to increase?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I desired to ascertain from all proper and available sources of information what was the right thing to do with the staff. In my department, in addition to having a deputy, we have a number of heads of branches, and I consulted personally the heads of the branches both last year and this. I may say that I did not get what I thought proper advice and assistance in many cases. I know that I thought it was quite an erroneous view to take of the law for the head of a branch to recommend every one in the branch as deserving of increases, including amongst them, for example, a certain officer with reference to whom I had occasion to give express instructions, for very good reasons, that he should not have an increase. I found no discrimination exercised by the heads of the branches in many cases, so that I felt I could not get the heads of the branches to interpret the law as the Government intended to interpret it. Lately I was able to get some little assistance from the heads of the branches, and the recommendations I have made for increases are endorsed by the heads of the branches, as well as of course by the deputy.

Mr. SPROULE. Are we to understand that the report was received from the head of the branch and not from the head of the department? Is that the hon. gentleman's interpretation of what the Civil Service Act provides should be done?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not know what view the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) takes of the law, but the deputy head brought me the information and I also conferred with him and with the heads of the branches, who advised me. I presume that the law expects the deputy head to use his best efforts to find out what is right to recommend. My deputy did that. My department advised me, and I also had the advantage of hearing directly from the heads of the branches on the subject.

Mr. HUGHES. Was that the new or the old deputy?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. My present deputy.

Mr. HUGHES. There are thirteen first-class clerks this year and only ten last year. Is there any explanation of that ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Certainly.

Mr. HUGHES. I should like to hear it.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Mr. Walter Rowan, a second-class clerk at the head of the revenue branch, who has been a memebr of the staff for 24 years, is recommended for promotion from second to first-class. He is an able and faithful officer. His present salary is $1,400.

Mr. McDOUGALL. What is the increase ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not think it means an increase, he simply passes from one class to another. The second promotion is Mr. William Smith, of the Mail Service branch. He was appointed in 1876, and he is a very able officer. The third promotion is that of Mr. W. D. O'Brien of the Stores branch ; he was appointed in 1862.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Will the Postmaster General explain how it is that a gentleman who has been put in the position of chief clerk in July, 1897, receives $2,500, while the chief clerks in other departments, who have been there for many years, receive only $2,000 and $2,200. I refer to Mr. Armstrong, chief clerk and controller of the railway mail service.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. He has been in the service, I suppose, for thirty years. He is one of the most experienced officers we have in the postal service. Mr. Armstrong entered the service on the 5th November, 1857,

Mr. WALLACE. I would point out to the Postmaster General that the law says the maximum salary for a chief clerk should be $2,400, and in this case $2,500 is proposed to be voted.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Mr. Armstrong is what is called the Controller of the Railway Mail Service. I am not aware that there is anything in the law limiting the salary to other than what Parliament may vote.

Mr. WALLACE. You may describe an officer in any way you like, but if he is made a chief clerk, as Mr. Armstrong is, then the Civil Service Act says that the maximum salary for a chief clerk shall be $2,400.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. When this Supply Bill is passed it will be an Act of Parliament, and just as efficacious as the Civil Service Act.

Mr. WALLACE. That is, it over-rides the statutory law as it stands now.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The laws passed by this Parliament will supersede any prior inconsistent laws.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The Postmaster General is going a long way in making any such statement as that. There is the Civil Service Act, and no one will contend for a moment that because the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) brings down an estimate and the House passes that estimate that he is within the law, when that other law, until it is repealed, is the law of the land. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) desires to vote a larger sum than is allowed under the Civil Service Act, he must place it as we used to place it, in an item by itself, and say : Anything in the Civil Service Act to the contrary notwithstanding."

Mr. McDOUGALL. In reference to the salaries of the chief clerks, I find John Walsh went into the service in 1862—thirty-six years ago. He receives only $2,100 as chief clerk in the dead letter branch. I find also that David Matheson, chief clerk in the savings bank branch, receives $2,400. He has been in the service since 1863, and why put up the salary of this man, who only came into the service last year, to $2,500 ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. He came into the service thirty years ago.

Mr. WALLACE. This gentleman, I understand, was a first-class clerk. The law says :

A chief clerkship in any department shall only be created by Order in Council passed after the deputy head has reported that such an officer is necessary for the proper performance of the public business in the department, stating the reasons on which he has arrived at that conclusion.

Was that done ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Mr. Armstrong was appointed controller by Order in Council.

Mr. WALLACE. Was the clause of the Act complied with specifically ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have no doubt that last year the necessary formalities of the law were complied with, and Mr. Armstrong was legally appointed.

Mr. WALLACE. We want a definite statement whether that was done.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. You might have got it last year.

Mr. WALLACE. We want it this year, because we are asked to vote the salary this year.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I suppose it was done last year.

Mr. WALLACE. I suppose we shall have to be content with that answer, though it is very unsatisfactory. The Act also provides :

The minimum salary paid to a chief clerk shall be $1,800, with an annual increase of $50 up to a maximum of $2,400.

Now, it is proposed to give $100 more than the maximum that the law allows. We want some explanation of that.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I can only say that the matter was explained to Parliament last year, when we established this branch. My recollection is that there was also special legislation referring to the controller.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I do not know the circumstances in connection with this case, but I submit that this committee cannot allow to pass the statement made by the Postmaster General that because he brings a vote down here, and that vote is passed, the civil service law is over-ridden. That is a statement which no Minister has a right to make and which this committee will not submit to from the Postmaster General or any one else.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Will the Postmaster General please explain why the salary of Arthur Lindsay, chief clerk and superintendent of the mail service branch, is $2,200, he having come into the service in 1864, and having been made chief clerk in 1891, while the salary of Armstrong is put at $2,500, he having been made chief clerk only last year, and having come into the service in 1867, three years later than Lindsay.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I submit that it is discourteous to this committee that the hon. gentleman does not deign to answer us in regard to this. The law is plain, and the Postmaster General has no right to state to this committee that he is going to over-ride the law by an estimate. This is not the way to get Estimates through this House.

Mr. BRITTON. I think the hon. gentleman misunderstood the Postmaster General in part. When he spoke of Armstrong, he said he was put there with the chief clerks, but he is a controller.

Mr. MONTAGUE. My hon. friend from Kingston (Mr. Britton) misses the point altogether. The statement of the Postmaster General was that if this House votes it in the Estimates, it does not matter about the Civil Service Act.

Mr. WALLACE. He also said Mr. Armstrong was a controller, and the hon. member for Kingston thinks that is sufficient. One chief clerk is controller of postal stores. That is Mr. Smith, who gets $2,400, the maximum of his class; but because he is the controller of stores, it is not considered that the law should be over-ridden and he should get $2,500.

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend appealed to me a moment ago. I beg his pardon, as I was engaged in conversation at the time.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I did not refer to you as being discourteous.

The PRIME MINISTER. At all events, the hon. gentleman put a question to me. Let me remind him that Parliament makes the law. The Civil Service Act is only a law which guides the members of the Government and the members of Parliament; but my hon. friend knows that in many instances, for the time being, it is amended by the votes of Parliament in Supply. Very often when we pass an estimate for an officer against the rules of the Act, we use the words, "notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act," and the thing is done very often without even using these words.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

The PRIME MINISTER. I will mention an instance at once. Some of the deputy heads have been voted more than the sum allowed to them, by special vote of Parliament. There is the case of Mr. Lash, who, when Deputy Minister of Justice, received $6,000 a year by special vote of Parliament. Another case in point is that of the present Deputy Minister or Railways, Mr. Schreiber, who has a salary of $6,000 a year voted by Parliament. So that there are exceptions, and every case stands by itself when brought before Parliament.

Mr. WALLACE. But this is not a special vote. It is a vote taken in the ordinary way.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. My hon. friend from Haldimand (Mr. Montague) thought I was discourteous because I was simply waiting to get the statute before answering him. I would refer him to the statute of last session, chapter 26:

The salary of the controller shall be determined by the Governor in Council, not to exceed $2,500 per annum.

This branch was established by Act of Parliament last session.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I am not finding any fault with the controller's salary. First, let me set myself right. The right hon. Prime Minister is always courteous to the House, and I regret that he thought I said he was discourteous. The statement of the Postmaster General was that it did not make any difference what the Civil Service Act said, the vote of Parliament was, of course, law.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. What I desire to say, and what I think I did say, was that the Supply Bill, when it becomes an Act, will supercede every existing Act wherever that Act conflicts with it.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I am not a lawyer and cannot follow these points out as a lawyer could, but I know, from the little experience I have had, that whenever we asked for any vote that exceeds what is allowed by the Civil Service Act, we invariably placed

the words after it: "Notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act to the contrary." What I object to was the very free statement of the Postmaster General that he did not care what the Civil Service Act provided, he would put what he liked in the Estimates. As regards the salary of the controller, that is an entirely different thing, why is he called a chief clerk if he is a controller?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If the hon. gentleman will look at the item, he will find that Mr. Armstrong is called the controller of railway mail service. He will find the details on page 18.

Mr. WALLACE. On page 87 he is called chief clerk, controller of the railway mail service.

Mr. SPROULE. I notice that the accountant has been reduced from $1,850 to $1,800, what is the explanation?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Mr. Barrett, the former accountant, died, and his salary was $1,850. Mr. Johnson, who was next in order, took his place at a salary of $1,800.

Mr. HUGHES. I did not hear the explanation about the $3,000 last year.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Mr. Armstrong, who filled the position of clerk in the Toronto civil service, where his salary was $1,500 per year, was transferred from Toronto to the inside service, and his engagement began on the first of January, 1897. For that year he was getting at the rate of $1,500 per annum and then got another $1,000 for the year, or $500 for the half year from 1st January, 1897, to 1st July, 1897, and that $500 was added for the first half of that year, together with the $2,500 for the year we are in now. That should have been divided into two items—$2,500 for the current year and the other $500 for the half year when he was really on the staff.

Mr. WALLACE. When was the $500 voted?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. In the Supplementary Estimates of last year.

Mr. WALLACE. In the main Estimates it is $2,500.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. On page 16 of the statute, the arrears of salary from the 1st January to the 1st June, 1897, due Mr. Armstrong, being the difference between the salary paid him as first-class clerk in Toronto post office and his salary as controller of the railway mail service, namely, $500.

Mr. INGRAM. Last year, when this question was up for discussion, the hon. Minister was not in a position to give very full information. He may be in a better position now. The appointment of Mr. Armstrong, he said, was for the purpose of economy and making the service much more efficient. Perhaps the hon. gentleman could give us some information this year after the experience of how this new system is working.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think it is working well and economically. There has been considerable reduction in the cost of the mail service. There was a reduction of 35 in the staff.

Mr. McDOUGALL. How does that give advantage to the people?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think it will be to their advantage. I think they are getting better mail service than the year before.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think you will find, Mr. Chairman, that no member in the House will be able to make any point against the Government with regard to that branch.

Mr. INGRAM. I do not rise to find fault with Mr. Armstrong, because I believe he is an efficient officer, but last year the hon. gentleman said he was not in a position to give information but had instructed the chief inspector and Controller Armstrong to select the most efficient as local superintendents in the different districts.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I should be very glad to give the information, but perhaps that would come in more properly, when dealing with the outside service. If my hon. friend prefers to leave it over until then, well and good. But I may say to the hon. gentleman that I have done what I stated I would do. I have refrained from interfering in the slightest degree in the selection of the superintendents of the outside service. I will not take any credit for it, because it was my duty to select the best men, and I gave my instruction to the officers that such men should be selected. Only one consideration is admissable—the interest of the public service. I cannot give the hon. gentleman at this time the names of all these appointees. Commencing at Halifax, the superintendent is Mr. Brown. I may say that all these superintendents were appointed for a period of probation, and, if their record warranted it in the opinion of the Controller, they were confirmed. Mr. Brown has not been confirmed because he was, to some extent, a weak man. The next district is St. John. I do not remember the name of the superintendent there. The Ottawa superintendent is Mr. Plumb; then Toronto superintendent is Mr. McLeod. The men who were appointed as a rule, had been filling corresponding positions of chief clerks.

Mr. BENNETT. May I ask if Mr. McLeod had been filling the position of a chief clerk?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think so, but I cannot say positively. I said that this was a rule, but I do not pretend to speak with accurance upon these points.

Mr. BENNETT. Had Mr. Plumb, appointed in the Ottawa division, been a chief clerk ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No, he was not ; he was a railway mail clerk. I instructed the Controller to select a superintendent for this division. I am not aware that there was a superintendent before. The Controller submitted to me a number of names of men who had various political affinities. Mr. Plumb was a prounced Conservative ; and I do not hesitate to say that when I was making the selection arguments were advanced why he should not be appointed. I selected him because he was capable ; I did not allow his politics to interfere. I sent for him and told him that I had been advised that he was the best man in the division and I propose not to promote in the department except for merit ; that he should get the office without regard to his politics, and I trusted that he would be as fair to those under him as the department was to him. He was appointed and has proven a satisfactory officer.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. Does that rule prevail with regard to postmasters all through the country ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It does not.

Mr. BENNETT. May I ask if Mr. Plumb had passed what was known as the chief railway mail clerk's examination ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. We are not now discussing the outside service, and I think it would be better to postpone this discussion until we reach that item.

Mr. BENNETT. The Postmaster General is asking for $2,500 for a controller, as he is termed, and he must remember that last year he made a statement that this was an experiment.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Not an experiment.

Mr. BENNETT. I beg pardon, I will read from "Hansard" :

> My desire is to make promotions in the mail service the reward of merit, and I instructed the chief inspector and controller in each case to select the most efficient men in the district as local superintendents.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That does not say that it is an experiment.

Mr. BENNETT. Now the Postmaster General admitted that Mr. Plumb was what was known as a chief railway mail clerk.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No, I did not say that.

Mr. BENNETT. Then I can tell the hon. gentleman that Mr. Plumb was a chief railway mail clerk, or rather, a first-class railway mail clerk.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think he was a second-class. May I explain to my hon. friend what is a chief railway mail clerk. There is a difference——

Mr. BENNETT. I know. I misquoted the word and corrected myself. Mr. Plumb was a first-class railway mail clerk, as was Mr. McLeod. And I do not think either have passed the examination for chief railway mail clerk, which was a very high grade examination and a feature of the system. Last year the hon. gentleman stated and he reiterated the statement this session that he had not part or portion in the selection of these superintendents. What the hon. gentleman did was this : He found chief railway mail clerks discharging their duties, and Mr. Sweetman and Mr. Armstrong will not contradict that. He found Mr. Winstanley a most efficient officer in Toronto in the prime of health, and he stepped over his head and appointed Mr. McLeod in his place, and without being personal, I may say is a relative of a strong supporter of hon. gentlemen opposite. Mr. Winstanley was displaced, and, for all I know, Mr. Winstanley is on the superannuation list, though in the prime of health. Is that so ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No.

Mr. BENNETT. What position is he occupying and what salary is he receiving ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. He is receiving a salary of $1,500, and is in the office of the inspector in Toronto. I do not wish to prevent my hon. friend from pursuing his line of argument if he thinks it is advisable to do so. I do not propose to question his statement of fact very much, though I could do so. I do not think that it would be fair to the officers concerned. With regard to Mr. McLeod I do not know of his being related to any member of Parliament. I never saw the gentleman so far as I know, until a month or two ago. I had no personal knowledge of him, no acquaintance with him. He was recommended to me by Mr. Armstrong as the proper person to fill that place. He has been appointed and has filled the place ably and has proven himself useful and a desirable man. I do not think my hon. friend will speak of the personnel any further.

Mr. BENNETT. I see that the Postmaster General is very anxious I should not say anything further on the subject.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Do as you like.

Mr. BENNETT. Oh, I am not to be terrified or threatened by the Postmaster General. I had the pleasure of meeting him in a by-election in my constituency two years

ago. And the Postmaster General came to another division. He came to what was known as the Barrie division——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I am obliged to ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) to confine himself to the item under discussion, the item of Civil Government. The hon. gentleman, I hope will not discuss on this item, questions of the outside service which will come up later on.

Mr. BENNETT. I will call the attention of the Chairman——

Mr. GIBSON. Oh, he will tell us about the Midland Railway.

Mr. BENNETT. Now, let my hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Gibson) be quiet. I thought that the Minister of Finance had snubbed him severely enough in the committee this morning, and that he would be quiet for a little while.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). I thought it was the other way. I thought my hon. friend (Mr. Gibson) had snubbed me.

Mr. BENNETT. However, I do not mind the hon. member for Lincoln, because I may always recall these lines :

Faith never wounds more deep the generous heart
Than when a blockhead's insult points the dart.

Now, we have under discussion here a vote of $2,500 for a controller of railway mail service.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I must remind the hon. member that he might as well discuss the salary of all the postmasters in the country, because they are under the control of the deputy postmaster here. I will ask the hon. gentleman to confine himself to the discussion of civil government.

Mr. BENNETT. Well, in connection with civil government, you will find a controller of railway mail service on page 18, for whom the House is asked to vote $2,500. I want to review some actions of the controller of railway mail service during the past year in order that the House may judge——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I shall be obliged to rule the hon. member out of order if he continues to discuss this question now, because the conduct of these persons to whom he alludes will come up under another item of these Estimates.

Mr. BENNETT. But I am discussing the item on page 18 of $2,500 for a controller of the railway mail service.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman might as well discuss the salaries of the postmasters all over the country.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I do not think it will expedite the work to confine us in lines more strict than usual. We have here the salary of a controller of railway mail clerks, and certainly in discussing his salary and the effect of his appointment upon the general service, you must go out into the service over which he has control.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I understand the hon. gentleman wishes to allude to some dismissals of certain persons whose salaries come under some other item.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. member for Simcoe said he was going to call attention to the actions of the controller of railway mail service, and we are asked to vote the salary of a controller of railway mail service now. That is the item under discussion.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. That is all right, if the discussion only covers the acts of the railway mail clerk. But we are going outside of that, and it will come up under another item.

Mr. BENNETT. We are asked to vote $2,500 to Mr. Armstrong, and the Postmaster General to-night has said that during the past year there has been a very satisfactory state of affairs in that department under Mr. Armstrong, and that Mr. Armstrong has made many recommendations which have been satisfactory. I am going to ask the House to bear with me while we consider these appointments that have been made, and consider whether they were proper. I have said that Mr. Armstrong, on coming into office, found a gentleman named Winstanley. I find by looking up the Civil Service list that he is a gentleman about 50 years of age. This Mr. Winstanley is taken from the position which he then occupied as chief railway mail clerk, having been in charge of the Toronto division and having been thoroughly conversant with that large division, and he is relegated to the inside work of the office ; so that Mr. Armstrong is the gentleman who is responsible, according to the statement of the Postmaster General, for having placed Mr. Winstanley in retirement.

Mr. WALLACE. Mr. Winstanley's name does not appear on the civil service list.

Mr. BENNETT. I consulted a prior list to find his age. The Postmaster General has stated to-night that Mr. Winstanley is in the Toronto postal division at a salary of $1,500. This Mr. Armstrong, who is thoroughly conversant with the duties of his office, and who is the responsible man for making these appointments, found in the Barrie division a chief clerk who, unfortunately for himself, was a brother of mine, and who had passed the civil service examination, and was a chief railway mail clerk. Now, Mr. Armstrong, for some reason, dispossesses Mr. Winstanley, who had been in the position of a chief railway mail clerk in Toronto, so that there was a vacancy

in the Toronto division for a chief railway mail clerkship. Coming down to the Ottawa division, where there was a chief railway mail clerk, he was superannuated. so then there were two vacancies.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Gordon, do you mean ?

Mr. BENNETT. I think that was his name. Now, one would suppose that Mr. Armstrong, having been appointed for a position like this, and finding two vacancies for two superintendents, would at least have said. finding in the Barrie division a Mr. Bennett. who had passed the chief railway mail clerkship examination, and who is 40 years of age, that he should be given one of these two positions, either appointed to the Ottawa division or appointed to the Toronto division.

But this prejudiced Mr. Armstrong overlooked the case of two vacancies and brought up a second-class railway mail clerk and placed him in the position of chief clerk or superintendent, as he is now called, and it was unfortunate that the chief mail clerk in Barrie, whose only offence was that he was a brother of mine, was superannuated at 40 years of age. He is now a pensioner on the public service, receiving $600 a year. I only wish to show the committee how utterly unfit for his duties Mr. Armstrong must be, because I am bound to say that not a word of complaint has been made against Mr. Bennett in the Barrie division, and I am free to mention that he passed the railway mail service examination for chief railway mail clerk, something neither of the two others have done, neither the man appointed in the Ottawa division, Mr. Plumb nor Mr. McLeod, who was appointed in Toronto. The Postmaster General has said he has had nothing to do with these appointments and the work appears to have been done by Mr. Armstrong. It is only fair to Mr. Bennett and Mr. Winstanley that the report should be placed before the House submitted by Mr. Armstrong, who had been placed over the head of these other officers.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Do I understand that a report against these officers was made by Mr. Armstrong ? The statement made by the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) is an extraordinary one.

Mr. GIBSON. He makes a great many of that kind.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I meant to say that it was a statement of extraordinary action, and in this respect I agree with the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson). The statement has been made that an officer was retired at 40 years of age, that he was an officer performing his duties, that he was in good health and willing to continue to perform them, and yet on a report made by Mr. Armstrong he was retired at an expense of $600 a year, and a man not so well qualified was given the position.

Mr. BERGERON. Was that done for the sake of economy ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think Mr. McLeod, who was appointed superintendent at Toronto, has been in the service, speaking from memory, many years longer than Mr. Bennett, who was said to have been so efficient as the chief mail clerk at Barrie. With respect to Mr. Bennett I would say that the office of superintendent at Barrie was abolished. The inspectorship at Barrie was abolished, and all the staff at Barrie were relieved of their duties there. When it became necessary to deal with them, I offered Mr. Bennett the position of a first-class railway mail clerk. He accepted that position, and I gave him what I considered and what I was advised was in fact one of the best runs in the province of Ontario. In order that no injustice should be done to him, he was given a first-class mail clerkship from Toronto to Owen Sound.

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. gentleman is entirely incorrect.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am entirely correct. An Order in Council was passed, with his approval, giving him the rank of a first-class railway mail clerk in connection with the Toronto division. After he had been notified of his appointment, he subsequently wrote saying he preferred to withdraw from the service and to be superannuated on the status to which he was entitled as superintendent, and he was accordingly allowed to have his own way.

Mr. INGRAM. What became of Mr. Jones ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Mr. Jones was the inspector in Barrie. I advised the abolition of the inspector there. It was a useless piece of furniture and not wanted, it was an absolute waste of money, and I abolished the office for that reason and that reason only. I told Mr. Jones that I contemplated establishing a certain branch in Ottawa in connection with the money order business, namely, a postal note system, and I told him that if he would like to be identified with the inside service and come to Ottawa, I would try to make him the head of a branch here, which would give him as good a status as he possessed formerly and it would not interfere with his salary. I offered him that position ; he took time to consider it ; he called on me and thanked me, and said that he was not in the most vigorous health and he would prefer withdrawing from the service. I gave him, as I did Mr. Bennett his option, and if he had chosen he could have had the rank in the inside service and a very desirable position in connection with the postal note system.

Mr. BERGERON. How old is he ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Speaking from memory, about 50 years.

Mr. BRITTON. That is how rumours are manufactured by such a gentleman as the hon. member for Simcoe.

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. gentleman is insinuating at me beause he thinks I will feel a little a sore that my brother is not retained in the employment of the Government. The hon. gentleman can sympathize with him; he has been at the public crib, he has fed well, and he hopes to feed again no doubt.

Mr. BRITTON. That is one of the assertions the hon. gentleman has made so often without a contradiction being offered, that he thinks it is true. It is not true, and no one but the squirt gun of a party would all the time pour dirty water on somebody.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I rise to order.

Mr. BRITTON. If the expression is unparliamentary, I withdraw it.

Mr. BENNETT. Only a judge of grain water and bilge water would make such a statement as that. I tell the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Britton) that I never made any reference to him until one day he took occasion to make reference to myself. I have only talked about the hon. gentleman as I have seen his name mentioned in the public print. The Kingston "Whig" booms him for a senatorship, and he has been talked about in connection with a judgeship.

Mr. BRITTON. I want to say here that nobody has ever said one word to me in regard to either of the positions about which the hon. gentleman has spoken; nor have I ever asked for them, nor am I an applicant for any position in the gift of this Government or any other.

Mr. BENNETT. Time will tell. The Postmaster General, however, has not yet satisfactorily answered the question as to whether he would bring down the report made by Mr. Armstrong condemning Mr. Winstanley and Mr. Bennett, and by reason of which two superior clerks were succeeded by two junior clerks. In regard to the statement respecting superannuation being requested by Mr. Bennett, I believe he did ask for superannuation.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. You are aware he had the option?

Mr. BENNETT. I was informed he got the option, that he could go back on the road as an ordinary first-class mail clerk. Being under Mr. McLeod, he was assigned, not as the Postmaster General has stated and as perhaps Mr. McLeod informed him, to one of the most important runs in the district, but to the most subordinate one in the whole Toronto district.

An hon. MEMBER. Where was that?

Mr. BERGERON.

Mr. BENNETT. A run somewhere in the county of Bruce, a short run.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Toronto and Owen Sound.

Mr. GIBSON. I wish to call the attention of the committee to a statement made by the hon. gentleman from East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) with reference to the age of his brother. I find that in 1864 his brother was appointed to the service of the country. From 1864 to 1898—thirty-four years. Mr. John Othniel Bennett was in the service of Canada, so that he must have been appointed by the Government when he was six years of age. I leave the committee to deal with that in connection with other statements made.

Mr. BENNETT. There are times when I would not wonder at the hon. member for Lincoln seeing double, but I should not expect that to-night. The hon. gentleman has got the wrong bull by the horn, so to speak. My brother was appointed, I think, in 1879.

Mr. GIBSON. I hope the Civil Service List is correct.

Some hon. MEMBERS. You have got hold of another Bennett.

Mr. GIBSON. Perhaps this is another brother of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) that he is making complaint about.

Mr. GILLIES. It must be his grandfather.

Mr. INGRAM. In view of the statement made by the Postmaster General as to the chief inspector and the statement made by the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett), I cannot believe that the instructions of the Postmaster General have been carried out. Has the appointment of Mr. Armstrong been the means of reducing the inspectors in the different postal divisions, as was done in the case of Mr. Jones?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not think it is necessary to connect Mr. Armstrong with everything that has taken place in the department. The Barrie division and also the Stratford division have been abolished. There have also been two abolished in the province of Quebec, one in Three Rivers and the other at Sherbrooke.

Mr. INGRAM. I have no doubt the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) is desirous of making the department as efficient as possible, and that is why I ask the reason for the inspectors being dispensed with in some of the divisions. In the London division, Mr. Fisher has been acting as deputy inspector for years, and is a very efficient officer. Under the late Government a gentleman was taken from another division and put over Mr. Fisher's head, and the inspector of that division was taken somewhere else. Under the present Government Mr. Hopkirk was taken from Stratford and also put over Mr.

Fisher's head. If a man acts as deputy in a certain division and gives satisfaction, surely the Government ought to encourage his promotion.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Mr. Fisher is going to be transferred to Toronto on the 1st of July.

Mr. MONTAGUE. As an inspector ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Not as inspector, but he will be transferred to the same rank in the Toronto division.

Mr. GIBSON. The hon. gentleman from Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) says I see double. I admire his modesty, because instead of seeing double, I should have seen nine times, for I see by the Civil List that there are nine Bennetts in the service. I should like to ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett), who talks so much about people feeding at the public crib, if he has any complaint to make about this brother of his who gets $960 a year. I would like to know from him if this is the brother who was appointed on the 24th June, 1864, and if any of the other nine Bennetts are connected with him, or are cousins, or uncles, or any other relations ?

Mr. BENNETT. There are some people who never have relatives ; they start from a point that they can never look back, so they look sideways. I have relatives. I can, however, tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. Gibson) that there is no relative of mine in the civil service to-day, and there never was one except my brother who was decapitated by Mr. Armstrong. My brother was in the service long before I had anything to do with politics. And, Sir, if the reference has been made here to-night by myself, it was not made because I am smarting under any sense of the injustice that I believe has been done to him and to Mr. Winstanley, and if I have to notice the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson), as I suppose I have to, I will tell him that I have no relatives in the civil service to-day, and never had any relatives in the service except my brother. My brother got that position thanks to the kindness of Mr. Dalton McCarthy. I may tell the hon. gentleman that Mr. Bennett who was superannuated, passed all the examinations, and did his duty well. The best proof of that was that he was the only clerk in the Barrie division who passed the chief railway mail clerkship examination, which is a difficult examination. And while he was overlooked by Mr. Armstrong, I will be bound to say that neither Mr. Plumb nor the other gentleman, Mr. McLeod, passed the examination to entitle them to the position.

Mr. MONTAGUE. May I ask the Postmaster General whether he will bring down the reports with regard to these two men ? As I understand it, reports have been made by Mr. Armstrong with reference to Mr. Bennett and Mr. Winstanley, and these reports have not been brought to the attention of Parliament.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not know what foundation the hon. gentleman (Mr. Montague) has for referring to such reports.

Mr. MONTAGUE. There are no reports, then ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have never heard of any except what the hon. gentleman states.

Mr. CLARKE. It would be a very great mistake, I believe, for hon. members of this House to blame Mr. Armstrong for the decapitation of these officials. I do not think Mr. Armstrong had anything to do with it or was responsible for it.

Mr. BENNETT. The Postmaster General said that Mr. Armstrong made the recommendation.

Mr. CLARKE. I have known Mr. Armstrong for twenty or twenty-five years, and it is my pleasing duty to bear testimony to the efficiency of that gentleman, and I think no better appointment could be made to the position of controller of the railway mail service than the same Mr. B. M. Armstrong. I am satisfied that Mr. Armstrong will do his duty in that position in a straightforward manner, if he is not interfered with. I felt it my duty to rise and make this statement with reference to Mr. Armstrong. On the whole, when the Barrie division, for economic reasons, was abolished, it would have been better if some consideration had been given to gentlemen who occupied positions such as the brother of my hon. friend (Mr. Bennett). Any person who knew that officer knew that he was thoroughly efficient. I desire to give the Postmaster General credit for everything he is trying to do, but I believe that he might have strained a point, when there was a vacancy made in Ottawa and Toronto, to have looked more carefully into the claims as well as the capabilities of Mr. Bennett, and to have given him one of the vacancies thus created. So far as Mr. Armstrong is concerned, I believe that there is no more efficient officer in the postal service of the Dominion, and I am satisfied that if he is not hampered by political instructions he will do his duty fearlessly and faithfully.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not wish any hon. gentleman to suppose that Mr. Armstrong is responsible. I take the fullest responsibility for every change in the service, although it is my duty, of course, to be guided by advice. As my hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Clarke) has stated, Mr. Armstrong is a most zealous and efficient officer, and it would be entirely erroneous to suppose that he has made any unfavourable report upon Mr. Bennett. I

instructed Mr. Armstrong to recommend to me a superintendent for each division, and when it came to Ottawa, I naturally expected to give the appointment to a member of the railway service connected with the Ottawa division. I found that the provinces had been divided into divisions, and railway mail clerks had been assigned to divisions. They were supposed to be local in their appointments, and it did not appear to me that it would be fair to take a man out of one division and appoint him over the heads of all the railway mail clerks in the other division. So that when it became necessary to select a man from Ottawa, I instructed Mr. Armstrong to give me the best man he could select from Ottawa. He selected Mr. Plumb. There were some objections to Mr. Plumb, which some persons might have thought serious, and I would have been fully warranted had I thought it necessary to pass him over. But I was satisfied that these objections were not really valid, and I ignored them. With regard to Toronto, it was an independent division; and therefore I did not contemplate appointing over all the mail clerks of the Toronto division, an officer not connected with that division. I am sure that my hon. friend who represents West Toronto would have been hard to satisfy if I had transferred to the Toronto division an officer who was not connected with that division. I had to deal with the existing officials. With regard to Mr. Bennett, I can only say, whether the hon. member (Mr. Bennett) gives me credit for it or not, that I studied his interest in every way. The office had to be abolished, and I tried to put him in a position where he would earn as much money as he had earned in the former position. I gave him the position of first-class mail clerk at $960 a year, and he had a run from Toronto which was desirable both socially and financially. That I had done by Order in Council; but before it took effect, he asked me for a little time for consideration, and subsequently asked to be retired, and I accepted his views. I submit whether I could have done anything fairer to any man in the service.

Mr. HUGHES. I do not know anything about Mr. Armstrong, but I think the Postmaster General was perfectly justified in abolishing both the Barrie and the Stratford divisions. To my mind they should not have existed. But after the Barrie division was abolished, it became part of the Toronto division, and I think the Postmaster General made a mistake in not giving Mr. Bennett the corresponding position in the new division. He was in the amalgamated division, and he had just as much right in the city of Toronto as any chief mail clerk there. It would be just as proper to say that we who live in the Barrie division should have a clerk from Toronto put over. I think if the Postmaster General had been well advised, he would have reatined Mr. Bennett, who was undoubtedly a most capable officer, and would not have put a junior like Mr. McLeod, who had not passed his examination at all, over Mr. Bennett. We used to find very serious complaints of the Toronto division. We were told that we had the patronage of the Barrie division, but we had not a single mail clerk appointment there. All the runs were made from the Toronto division, and when a mail clerk was to be appointed to the Barrie division, we were told the patronage belonged to Toronto. I think that the Postmaster General will consider that he made a serious mistake in regard to Mr. Bennett. Undoubtedly he should have been a chief mail clerk in the amalgamated division.

Mr. HENDERSON. I would like to ask the Postmaster General when the Barrie division was abolished, which division was it attached to? Did it not become merged in the Toronto division? If so, it seems to me that there would have been nothing wrong whatever in taking a man from Barrie and placing him in a position at Toronto. He would have been still in his division, and the argument that it would be taking him from one division and putting him in another does not hold good.

Mr. GILLIES. I cannot understand on what principle the Postmaster General acted in this case. When the Barrie division was abolished, it was not abolished in the technical sense of the word. A line of demarcation between that and some other division was simply wiped out, and instead of having the Barrie and Toronto divisions, we had the Toronto division as it is now. When that state of affairs arose, there was a chief postal clerk required for that division. Why, then, did not the Postmaster General, on the ordinary principle that guides in such matters, have reference to his list of clerks and see who among them was the most prominent, and who by virtue of his qualifications was the most competent; and the only standard by which he could judge the qualifications was that of examination. Now, it appears that Mr. Bennett was a chief mail clerk in that division, because the very moment the line was blotted out between Barrie and Toronto, he became a chief mail clerk in the new division. He was as much a clerk in the new division as the clerks who were in it before the abolition of the Barrie division. If that be the case, if Mr. Bennett was as much entitled to be appointed in the new division as any other clerk within its territorial boundaries, why did he not receive the appointment? He was entitled to it, by virtue of service, by virtue of his examination, his qualification and his position as chief mail clerk of the old division. Then I ask the Postmaster General under what rule, and guided by what principle, did he call upon Mr. McLeod, who has no qualifications whatever, so far as the standard of examination goes, and appoint him to this position, overlooking

the claims of Mr. Bennett and Mr. Winstanley, for the argument that applies to Mr. Bennett applies equally strongly to Mr. Winstanley. The Postmaster General must explain under what principle he acted when he overlooked the case of Mr. Bennett in the first instance, and is certainly bound to explain how he came to overlook the case of Mr. Winstanley.

Mr. CLARKE. The Postmaster General found some fault with my remarks respecting the advisability of recognizing Mr. Bennett's services and qualifications. He said that as long as there were qualified officials in the Toronto division, it would not be proper to bring Mr. Bennett down and give him a position there as chief clerk. But that did not apply when a vacancy occurred in the office of post office inspector, although there were officials in that division just as responsible and with as long a record as the gentleman whom he appointed. He went outside that division to appoint an inspector in the place of Mr. Barker, who was superannuated, and I think he made an argument against himself when he did not promote some of the officers of the Toronto division to the vacancy in the inspectorship of that division.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Mr. Spry was inspector at London. He died, and at the same time we were abolishing the Barrie division. Mr. Henderson had been assistant inspector at Barrie, and Mr. Bennett was chief mail clerk, and Mr. Jones was inspector at Barrie. I tried to find positions for those three men, and offered Mr. Jones a position in the inside service here. I asked him if that would not suit him, whether there was anything else in the service that would. So much for Mr. Jones. Mr. Bennett I transferred to Toronto. Mr. Henderson had been in the Toronto office for years in connection with the inspectorship of that division, and he had also been for years in Barrie in connection with the Barrie inspector's office. It occurred to me, therefore, that when we were doing away with the Barrie division and putting a portion of that division into Toronto, it would be a good thing to get in command of that whole division an officer who was familiar personally with both divisions that were being amalgamated or the portions that were being amalgamated. Mr. Barker had been inspector at London for many years. He had been seventeen years in that division, and when a vacancy occurred I gave him the position of inspector in it, which he was well qualified to fill. That was my arrangement and I think it was a business one.

Mr. CLARKE. We are quite willing to give the Postmaster General credit for all that he has done or is trying to do, but we would like the hon. gentleman to be perfectly frank in the explanations he makes with regard to these transfers and promotions. He has told us that he appointed a gentleman who had the position of assistant inspector in the Barrie division to be the inspector in the Toronto division, the most important one in the Canadian postal service; and in order to give him that appointment, he had to remove Mr. Barker, who was a most efficient inspector, back again to the position he occupied many years ago, as inspector of a division not so important as Toronto. Mr. Barker had no superior in the Canadian postal service, and it was a peculiar way of recognizing his services, to put him back again into the position he occupied for many years and appoint a gentleman, who was only assistant inspector at Barrie, to the important office of inspector at Toronto. The reasons which prompted the Postmaster General to appoint an assistant inspector to be the chief officer of the division of Toronto did not seem to apply when the case of Mr. Bennett was being considered.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Mr. Barker is out of the service, and therefore I do not wish to make any reference to him other than to say that I think that I have had a much better opportunity of knowing his fitness than those who have not been brought into daily contact with him. I say that Mr. Barker was not, in my opinion, entitled to the status in the profession given him by the hon. member for West Toronto. He is out of the service and I shall not say more.

Mr. MONTAGUE. When did you remove him to London?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. About September last.

Mr. SPROULE. I thought the hon. Minister said last year that the changes which he made then in his department were made in the view of economy, and that there was an efficient service and that when taking charge of that branch, he found that the various places were more than filled with employees, and therefore he could dispense with the service of some of them without destroying its efficiency. How is it that he has 195 employees on the list this year as against 193 last year?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman will observe that in that increase there are certain officers who were never there before. Take the controller, and if the controller has several members on his staff, they are included in the inside service and were not there before. I think there are perhaps three or four—Controller Mr. Jones and two or three more not in there before—that have been brought from the outside to the inside service. There is also Mr. Minguay, a draughtsman, taken from the outside to the inside, and one or two others from the outside to the inside, where vacancies occurred. I had two courses open to me. One was to wait until a vacancy occurred and then to transfer superfluous men from the outside to inside. Or I could

have dealt with the inside service direct and at once recommended dismissal. I chose to await the ordinary course of events. As vacancies occurred in the inside service in the ordinary course of events, I transferred from the outside officers that were unnecessary, and quite a number have been added to the inside service in that way, far more than the number my hon. friend refers to.

Mr. SPROULE. I thought the hon. gentleman referred to the fact that there were too many in the inside service. So I would have supposed when a vacancy occurred he would have abolished the office instead of bringing in new apointees.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) does not understand that the service is a growing service, and if we have been keeping the number of inside employees stationary, whilst our revenue and the volume of our business are increasing, we are practically reducing the staff, because we are doing more business with the same numbers.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood the Postmaster General to say that there were only two ways to reduce the service ; one was by dismissal and the other by waiting until a death or some other cause removed those holding office. I would have supposed that he would take advantage of this latter measure to make reductions. But he tells us that, instead of abolishing offices, he brought in men from the outside service. The service may be developing, and thus require an additional number. I have not the facts and am not prepared to discuss how far that would apply. I would ask him if, in making appointments in his department, he has had in view the qualification of the individual and his familiarity with the work to be done ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Would the hon. gentleman name the officers he refers to ?

Mr. SPROULE. I was referring to the appointments of the inside service generally.

Mr. INGRAM. I am astonished at this interposition, breaking a line of discussion that we were carrying on.

Mr. SPROULE. I thought it was ended. I would like an answer to the questions I have just asked.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. In making promotions I have had regard to the efficiency of the service. New appointments have been so trifling that they are scarcely worth referring to, as we have generally transferred men from the outside to the inside service. My hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) does not object to that, I presume. I recall only two or three new appointments. One young man was appointed in connection with the distribution of postage stamps. The counting of postage stamps does not require previous training or more than an elementary education. I think we had one minor clerk appointed to assist in the savings branch bank, and another one appointed to do clerical work also in the savings bank branch.

Mr. SPROULE. The answer of the hon. gentleman is pretty much in the line of what he said some time ago. In view of that, I would like to ask where his deputy became familiar with the work he was expected to do and what his qualifications were. If I recollect correctly, he was a medical man practising in Aurora, and not acquainted with the postal service or the work of a deputy Postmaster General.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I suppose the hon. gentleman, being a medical man, does not think that a medical man is per se disqualified from filling any other position.

Mr. SPROULE. No.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I selected the deputy because I considered him eminently qualified to discharge the duties of the office. The worst class of men that I know of to deal with are those who have been in the rut of the service for years. I tell the hon. gentleman frankly that when I took charge of the department, I was quite of the opinion at first that I could carry it on with my then deputy. But as my familiarity with the details of the department increased I came to the conclusion that the long service of fifty years made it impossible for a man to get out of the rut and for that reason and for that reason only I came to the conclusion that it was advisable to make a change.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Is that the reason the Postmaster General retained him as adviser ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Did I say so ? If the hon. members (Mr. Montague) will make a statement I will try to answer it.

Mr. GILLIES. Was he retained ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Colonel White was not retained as adviser. If the hon. gentleman desires it, I will tell him my feelings towards Colonel White. When I came to the conclusion, after the best part of a year in the department, that it was necessary to introduce more vigorous management, I first made my views known to the deputy, Colonel White. I told him my reasons, and he with a frankness and fairness, for which I was grateful, acceded to my view, and, in the most friendly and fair way said he thought my attitude was quite reasonable, that he would take no exception to it whatever, and would not in the slightest way embarrass me in making the change. That was most gratifying to me because I thought it would be a wrench to a man who

had been fifty yeas in the public service to be taken from a field of activity and to retire into private life.

For that reason, I desired to recognize his conduct, and was about establishing under the Act of last session, a system of promotion examinations in the railway mail service. Col. White knew nothing whatever of that service, as it had not been in existence, but it was not a very difficult thing to learn, and I said to him that if he did not care to break off his connection with the work so abruptly, but would take charge of some of these examinations, and if he would study the system of examinations, I would be very glad if he would take charge of them. It is one thing for a man to be at the head of a large department with a mass of details such as the Post Office Department, and another thing merely to conduct, as presiding examiner, examinations in given points in the country. He was pleased to take the position, and I sent him through Canada to give a preliminary examinations to all the mail clerks, so that when ultimately they went up for examination, as they are now doing for promotion, they would not be taken by surprise, and make mistakes and be disappointed. Whether he may be continued in that office I do not know. Whilst I am desirous of befriending him, if the committee does not desire it, or if there is any undue criticism, I may have to take a different course.

Mr. SPROULE. Nothing I said could be construed into an unfavourable criticism of the Minister's action in superannuating Col. White. The Minister informed us that it was very difficult to run his department on account of the deputy being so long there that he could not get him out of the old rut. Now, with regard to the qualification of the party who has taken his place, I am not aware that it would be possible for the present deputy to have the qualifications which are required in that position. If I am correctly informed, he never had anything to do with the postal service of the country.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I should be very sorry to have any one that had been connected with that service.

Mr. SPROULE. Then, the hon. gentleman has a very strange view of the qualifications for that position, if the less a man knows about it the more valuable he is.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There was not a man I knew in the srvice fit for it.

Mr. SPROULE. Then, how do we account for the fact that the Postmaster General made such a serious blunder as to reduce the postage, and afterwards admit that he knew so little about the laws governing the service that he was obliged to withdraw his regulation ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Where do you say I admitted that ?

Mr. SPROULE. I think I read in one of the Toronto dailies that he admitted he was not aware at the time that he made the reduction that the laws governing postal union were such that the reduction could not be made. Had he had an intelligent deputy there like Col. White, he would not have made that unfortunate mistake.

Mr. INGRAM. Shortly after the hon. gentleman was appointed to the position of Postmaster General, I asked him if he intended to superannuate Col. White, and his reply was something like this. I have no idea of superannuating Col. White. I find him a good and efficient officer and have no idea of making any such change. Shortly afterwards the hon. gentleman did superannuate Col. White and made another appointment.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Will the hon. gentleman say how long afterwards ?

Mr. INGRAM. I suppose about nine months or a year afterwards ; so I do not understand now how that statement could be consistent with the statement he has made to-night. Now, there is another point with regard to Mr. Barker. The hon. gentleman stated here to-night that Mr. Barker was not an officer so efficient that he cared to continue him in the service.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I did not say that.

Mr. INGRAM. It was equivalent to that. The statement was to the effect that Mr. Barker was not competent for the position.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. My hon. friend must not distort what I said. When the hon. member for West Toronto described Mr. Barker as the best qualified inspector in the province of Ontario, I took exception to that relative certificate.

Mr. INGRAM. I understood from the hon. gentleman's statement that Mr. Barker was not sufficiently competent to meet the requirements of the Toronto division.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I said it was in the public interest that Mr. Barker should be transferred to the city of London, where he had had seventeen years' experience, and fill the vacancy by Mr. Henderson, who had been in the Toronto division, and was familiar with that and with the Barrie division, which were to be largely amalgamated.

Mr. INGRAM. I am surprised at the hon. gentleman making a statement of that kind. Mr. Barker filled the position of inspector in Kingston division years ago, and he was sent from there to London and afterwards transferred to the Toronto division. In all these divisions, I understand, he has given entire satisfaction. The hon. gen-

tleman has stated before this evening that in the Stratford and Barrie divisions he reduced the inspectors by two; he placed the Barrie division into the Toronto, and the Stratford division into the London. Does not the hon. gentleman think the London division is of as much importance as the Toronto division? Surely it requires just as competent a man in the Toronto as in the London division. In view of the long service of Mr. Barker, who was certainly entitled to promotion, if he is not competent to fill this position as inspector in one division, he had no right to be retained in the service; but being competent to fill the position of inspector in one division, it is unfair to Mr. Barker to promote Mr. Henderson out of his class, and to give him the preference over other inspectors who are better entitled to that position. I found fault with the last Government for changing the inspectors, not in the interest of the service, but, as I am inclined to think sometimes, for political purposes. I am sorry that such changes are made for political purposes, and that they should be made in a department like the post office, which should be conducted on purely business lines. There were six divisions, and I take it that every inspector has certain instructions to carry out in the administration of his position. The controller must have some instructions, and I should like to know the instructions given to the inspectors, whether they have any control over the mail clerks in the different postal divisions, and if they have received instructions similar to those of the controller. Has he entire control over the mail clerks or has the inspector control in so far as making a recommendation or removing those clerks.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. They are under the control of the controller and are attached to the controller's branch. They report in the first place to the superintendent and he afterwards reports to the controller. The inspectors have no control over the mail clerks.

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. gentleman has claimed a decrease of 36 clerks. Are they employed in any way by the department?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No; they are outside the service.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I am not satisfied with the explanation given with respect to the salary given to Mr. Armstrong. He was promoted to the position of chief clerk only in 1897, and receives $2,500 a year. There are a great many chief clerks who perform more responsible duties who receive much less. In the Militia Department, Mr. O'Meara, who has been in the service since 1861——

Mr. WALLACE. He has been superannuated.

Mr. McDOUGALL. The highest salary he received was $2,400. Benjamin Sulte receives $2,050; he entered the service in 1867, and was promoted to be chief clerk in 1889. In the Geological Department there is Dr. Hoffman, who receives $2,400; he occupies the important position of assistant director of chemistry and mineralogy. John Macoun, assistant director, receives only $2,200, and of course his services are very much more important than those rendered by Mr. Armstrong. There is a chief clerk in the officer of the Controller of the North-west Mounted Police who receives only $2,000; he entered the service in 1875 and was promoted in 1892. In the Auditor General's office there is Edward Sutherland receiving $2,150; he entered the service in 1875 and was promoted in 1890. John Gorman receives $2,100, and he entered the service in 1880. Mr. Fred Hayter also receives $2,100. In the Finance Department, C. J. Henderson, chief clerk in savings bank branch, receives only $2,400; he has been in the service since 1858 and was promoted to be a first-class clerk in 1874. M. J. Dickenson is chief clerk in the Dominion Savings Bank and receives $2,400; he has been in the service since 1874, and was promoted to a chief clerkship in 1886. I might go through the whole civil service list and would find in each department a chief clerk who has been in the service a great many years, who fills a more responsible position than does Mr. Armstrong, and who is receiving a less salary. On what principle or by what rule did the Postmaster General act when he placed Mr. Armstrong's salary at $2,500?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. A year ago I gave the explanation. If the hon. gentleman thinks the other officers are not sufficiently paid, he can bring in an amendment to the Act, and Parliament will consider the proposition.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I want to know on what rule Mr. Armstrong's salary is fixed at $2,500?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Under the statute of last session.

Mr. McDOUGALL. The statute is no reason for it.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. We consider it a reason.

Mr. GILLIES. I should like to obtain from the Minister an answer to the question I put to him a short time ago, and which must have escaped his notice. It is a reasonable question and I will repeat it. I wish to know on what principle the Postmaster General acted when the new division, which is called the Toronto division, was created and Barrie division was eliminated from the territorial division. At that time there were two chief clerks eligible for the position of chief clerk of the new division, Mr. Bennett, chief clerk of the Barrie division, and Mr. Winstanley, chief clerk in the old Toronto division. Upon which principle did the Post-

master General act when he overlooked those two gentlemen, who are competent in every respect and hold first-class certificates of qualification, and who have also been a long time in the service. I want to know why he overlooked Mr. Winstanley and Mr. Bennett, chief clerks, who held certificates and appointed Mr. McLeod, who held no certificate and who was a grade in rank below either of these gentlemen ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Gillies) is helping his cause by pressing that question.

Mr. GILLIES. I want to know.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not think the hon. gentleman ought to press the question. One of these officers is one of his own friends, and he had better not press the question. I think if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Gillies) will consult some other members he will not force me to answer and I think the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) will agree with me. As regards Mr. Bennet I have given my explanation.

Mr. GILLIES. I know nothing of the private character of any of these gentlemen, but as the matter has come before me to-night it seems a most extraordinary proceeding on the part of a chief executive officer such as the Postmaster General, that he should pass over two men long in the service and admittedly competent and qualified, and foist another officer over their heads who was of lower rank. I want to know on what principle the Postmaster General acted ? The hon. gentleman seems to make an insinuation and he tells me that I had better not press the question. If there is any private reason, it will be within my discretion whether I should press the question or not, but if there is no private reason, then we should know on what principles the hon. gentleman acted.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. So far as I know both of these gentlemen are very honourable and upright men. I know nothing of their moral character and I think in that respect they are all that could be desired. I have given the reasons why Mr. Bennett was not appointed——

Mr. GILLIES. What about Mr. Winstanley ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Gillies) will consult his own friends and he then desires that question answered I will answer it. He had better inform himself before he presses the question.

Mr. BENNETT. A year ago when the question came up as to the appointment of Mr. Armstrong, the Postmaster General said :

My desire is to make promotions in the mail service the reward of merit, and I instructed the chief inspector and controller to select the most efficient men in the districts as local superintendents.

To-night the Postmaster General made the statement that these local superintendents had been chosen by the chief inspector, Mr. Armstrong, but later on the Postmaster General changed his ground and he entirely absolves Mr. Armstrong from having had any thing to do with the appointments, and he takes upon himself the sole responsibility. I think I am correct in assuming that from the tenor of his remarks——

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. You are correct in assuming that I take the responsibility, but you are not correct in assuming that I changed my ground as to having acted on advice. I am entitled to the best advice of the officers under me, and I acted on their advice. I say I acted on their advice and take the responsibility of what I have done.

Mr. BENNETT. I am absolutely at a loss to understand whether Mr. Armstrong was the gentleman who is to assume the responsibility for the passing over of Mr. Winstanley and Mr. Bennett, or whether the Postmaster General himself is ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I take the responsibility of passing them over.

Mr. BENNETT. Then, Mr. Armstrong is absolved from any fault in that regard. I am pleased that the Postmaster General has taken that ground, for the reason that I believe Mr. Armstrong, Mr. Winstanley, and Mr. Bennett were all personal friends, and I know that both Mr. Winstanley and Mr. Bennett will be pleased to know that no comment or ill remark has been made against them by Mr. Armstrong, as I believe none was made by Mr. Armstrong. But it comes to this, that the Postmaster General utterly regardless of merit and knowing that Mr. Bennett and Winstanley had passed the high examination required for chief clerks appointed two subordinate officers.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. They are not to be compared in merit with Mr. McLeod, neither your brother nor the other.

Mr. BENNETT. I challenge the Postmaster General to lay on the Table any report of Mr. Armstrong to that effect. I take it that that is his own judgment and his alone, and I tell the Postmaster General with all due deference to his exalted rank and great attainments, that he knows nothing whatever of the comparative merits of Winstanley, Bennett, McLeod or Plumb. I defy the Postmaster General to show by the records of his department any case in which it was shown that there was on the part of Bennett any deficiency in the knowledge of his office. I know that personally from Mr. Spry, who was a first-class superintendent, and I know from Mr. Jones that in the Barrie Division there was no possible friction and that the post office clerks had

never been in better conduct there than during the time Mr. Bennett was the chief clerk. The Postmaster General has made a bold statement and I can tell him that McLeod was placed over Bennett not on the ground of merit but for this reason: that the Postmaster General, smarting under the reverse which he had met with in the constituency of East Simcoe, where he came and fought a battle against me, as the Minister in charge of the district in which that riding was situated, thought he would have to revenge himself on some person, and he did revenge himself by dispossessing my brother of the position he held. I have only this to say, that if politics has no other or higher aim for the hon. gentleman than to vent his spleen and his vindictiveness, as he did in this case, then politics has no high or ennobling aims to which any man may hope to attain.

Mr. MONTAGUE. In view of the statement of the Postmaster General, that he has had no report as regards these officers or their efficiency, I think he ought to explain to us how he comes to know their relative efficiency.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not know how many times I have answered it. I am prepared, however, to continue it. I myself exercised no judgment whatever in the selection of a single superintendent, with the exception of having dealt with certain objections which were brought to me against the appointment of Mr. Plumb. When the controller was instructed to appoint the superintendents, he recommended them and I acted on his judgment.

Mr. GILLIES. The statement which the hon. gentleman has just made differs from the statement he made a moment ago. He said: "Neither Mr. Winstanley nor your brother (addressing the hon. member for East Simcoe) was to be compared in merit with Mr. McLeod." If there was no report adverse to any of these gentlemen by any of his officers, how is it that this statement was made by the hon. gentleman?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Mr. Armstrong simply furnished me with a list of the superintendents. I had no knowledge of them at the time. I acted on his judgment, but I am not incapable of knowing something. I had no personal knowledge of Mr. Bennett's qualifications; but I had occasion to inform myself, and I may say that though his status has been referred to here as a very high one, it is said in the department that he did get his promotion with undue haste, and in a way which created a good deal of dissatisfaction. Mr. McLeod, I think, was Mr. Bennett's superior in point of time.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Not in qualification.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think he is. I think there is no superior to Mr. McLeod as a superintendent in the service. I have had an opportunity of knowing the way in which he has discharged his duties, and he has done so in a way that is eminently satisfactory to the service. A more efficient officer than Mr. McLeod could not be procured. Not a man here knows anything about the relative merits of Mr. McLeod and Mr. Bennett. I take my statement from Mr. Armstrong, who selected him.

Mr. MONTAGUE. You have said that Mr. Armstrong made no report.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Mr. Armstrong made no report. He selected the men, and I have no reason to believe that he made a mistake. Watching the mail service from that time to this, I am entirely satisfied with the way these men have managed it. I have made it my business when in Toronto to call at the office of the superintendent to see the manner in which they perform their work. Not that I am competent to judge: but I have always found them engaged in their work, and I have received the most satisfactory accounts of the way they are discharging their duties. They are loyal, enthusiastic and industrious to a degree, and I think no Government could have more satisfaction with the service rendered as a rule by the railway mail service.

Mr. SPROULE. May I ask the hon. Postmaster General if he regarded that provision in the Civil Service Act which requires that before any promotion is made the individual must first pass the promoion examination; and if he did not regard the passing of that examination as an evidence of qualification for the position as against one who did not pass it or could not pass it?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Some hon. gentleman has stated that Mr. McLeod did not pass the examination. I think the hon. gentleman is quite in error. Mr. McLeod was reported to Council, recommended with others, and I do not think he could have got his promotion without having passed the examination. The routine, as the hon. member for Haldimand knows, is to send the question to the Treasury Board, where all conditions precedent are looked into, their report is made to Council, and finally an Order in Council is passed.

Mr. HUGHES. Inasmuch as the fitness of Mr. Bennett has been called in question, I would like to state that I knew Mr. Spry, who was post office inspector in Toronto, then in Barrie, and then in London, and, though he was not of the same political faith as Mr. Bennett, he stated that he had found no more efficient officer than Mr. Bennett in the whole course of his service. I also know Mr. Henderson, the present assistant inspector at Toronto, formerly the assistant inspector of Barrie, and, though he is not of the same political faith, he also

testified to Mr. Bennett's efficiency in the service. While Mr. Jones is of the same political faith as Mr. Bennett, yet he had the same sentiment as the others in regard to Mr. Bennett. The only mistake the Postmaster General made in abolishing the Barrie division was in his treatment of Mr. Bennett. I think it would have reflected more credit on himself if he had treated Mr. Bennett in such a way as not to leave himself open to the charge of personal feeling after the exciting time we had in that district in a couple of elections a few years ago. He would have shown better grace if he had allowed Mr. Bennett to be the chief clerk of the amalgamated division. I would like to ask what time Mr. Winstanley was retired and what time Mr. Bennett was retired, and what time the amalgamation took place between the two divisions? Was Mr. Winstanley retired at the same time as Mr. Bennett, and was that the time the amalgamation of the old Barrie division and the old Toronto division took place?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Mr. Winstanley is still in the service.

Mr. HUGHES. Then when was he changed to the inner office?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. In the case of the Barrie division, the report to Council was made in July or August, and Mr. Bennett's superannuation took effect probably the 1st of September.

Mr. HUGHES. When was Mr. McLeod appointed?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think he was appointed in the spring.

Mr. HUGHES. Previous to this?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes, some time before—perhaps the 1st of March.

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. Postmaster General, feeling the awkwardness of his position, as shown by the warmth with which he rose to speak on one or two occasions, insinuated then this much-talked of Mr. Bennett had, by some unfair means, arrived at the position of chief clerk. Am I right in this?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I did not say unfair or suggest unfairness. If I have anything to say of that nature I will say it in unmistakable language. What I said was that the brother of the hon. member for East Simcoe had succeeded in obtaining promotion in a way that some members of the staff considered as the result of a disregard perhaps of their prior interests. Mr. Bennett was rapidly promoted, and his predecessor in Barrie, a Mr. McCarthy, was superannuated and had arrived at a good old age. I am not going to say that he was superannuated unfairly, but he himself contended that he was.

Mr. HUGHES. On Mr. Spry's recommendation.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That may be. I have not studied the details, but Mr. McCarthy was in vigorous health when he retired, and complained of his retirement as unnecessary because he was still able to discharge his duties. He contended that he was retired, not in the public interest, but in order to make a vacancy for Mr. Bennett, and that Mr. Bennett's promotion was rather rapid compared with those of other mail clerks. That is the case I make.

Mr. BENNETT. I have only this to say in reply.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Oh, but that has nothing to do with this.

Mr. BENNETT. Why then did the Postmaster General drag it in?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Simply because when the hon. gentleman is contending that his brother ought to be recognized and be still passed over men who are his seniors in the service, I cannot but remember that he, in his turn, did succeed in passing over men who were prior to him in order of time.

Mr. BENNETT. Now, the hon. Postmaster General will have to back down again. He says that this Mr. Bennett was advanced unfairly.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I did not say unfairly.

Mr. BENNETT. Well, unduly and too rapidly. Then it must mean this, that in the Barrie postal division, there were clerks who were senior to Mr. Bennett. Now, in the Barrie division at the time of the retirement of Mr. McCarthy—who was retired on the report of Mr. Spry, the inspector, also a Liberal as Mr. McCarthy was—this Mr. Bennett was the only clerk who had passed the examination which would qualify him for that position.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. You say he was retired because he was a Liberal.

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. gentleman's understanding is at fault. I did not say that at all. I said that Mr. McCarthy was a Liberal and retired on the report of Mr. Spry, who is also a Liberal, so that this Mr. Bennett was the senior clerk in the division and entitled to the promotion, and, as the Postmaster General said, Mr. McCarthy was a very old man. If the Postmaster General thinks that he should not have been retired, why did he not reinstate him? If Mr. McCarthy suffered such injustice at the hands of the hon. gentleman's predecessors, why did not the hon. gentleman remedy that injustice? The Postmaster General is in the judgment of the House, and I think the judgment of the House is this, that the appointments were made not on the ground of merit, but first and foremost to gratify the

vindictive spleen which the hon. gentleman was suffering under at that time—smarting as he was, under the reverse he had sustained in East Simcoe ; and this Mr. Bennett was not the only object of the hon. gentleman's spleen, because other persons, one man in particular, suffered in East Simcoe by reason of the wrath of this vindictive Postmaster General. In the next place, the appointments were made on a political basis and on that basis alone, and I can tell the hon. gentleman frankly that his conduct in that regard has not made for himself, even among strong Liberals in Barrie, any more admirers than he ever had, and it is doubtful if ever he had any.

Mr. McMULLEN. You are putting in a last spoke for your brother.

Mr. BENNETT. No, I am not ; and I can tell the hon. member for North Wellington this, that any relative of mine in the civil service had not to be relegated to a penitentiary position, but had the intellect and the brains to fit him for a better one. I do not know how menial and how contemptible may be the position in the penitentiary, but most men of ambition and brains want to go into a little higher groove than that. Let us come to this clerk, Mr. Smith, who is promoted or rather is getting the statutory increase, did he get it last year, may I ask the hon. Minister ?

Mr. McMULLEN. I would say in reply to my hon. friend that he is evidently spending his spleen to-night on the Postmaster General, because in the readjustment of the postal service, his brother has not been recognized and promoted. I can only say this, that if his brother renders no better service to his country than the hon. gentleman opposite does, it is time he was retired. The hon. gentleman has virtually constituted himself the gutter snipe of that side of the House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

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

Mr. McMULLEN. I am quite in order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. What is the point of order ?

Mr. MONTAGUE. The Chairman is not deaf and has heard the point of order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman himself is certainly not in order in thus addressing the Chair.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. member for North Wellington referred to the hon. member for East Simcoe as a "gutter snipe." It is a very gentlemanly term, but I submit that gentlemanly as it may be, it is not in order in this House.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I am glad that some members are asking me to decide a point of order. I tried some time ago to keep the discussion within the limits of order, but I was not obeyed.

Mr. MONTAGUE. That is not the point, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I find that the expression used by the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) is not out of order.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Well, Mr. Chairman, it is in order, then, for one member of this House to call another hon. member in debate a gutter-snipe, and I desire to have that plainly stated by the Chair ; and having it so decided, I want to ask the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), who is the senior Minister present, what he thinks of it ?

Mr. McMULLEN. As to the remarks I made in answer to the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett), I think he was justly deserving of it from me. However, I had no desire to say anything unparliamentary. I believe he has constituted himself that in a political sense. However, I am not disposed to press it further. I apologize to the committee if I am at all out of order in making the reference, and I am quite willing to withdraw it.

Mr. HUGHES. The Chairman has ruled that the expression is perfectly in order. Unlesss that ruling is retracted by the Chair we will have the Speaker in here and have the matter settled.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. member for North Wellington having withdrawn the word——

Mr. MONTAGUE. No, it has been upheld by the Chair.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The ruling of the Chair, as I understand it, was not that an hon. gentleman might be called a gutter-snipe, but that the form of words used by the hon. member for North Wellington admitted of debate. As he has withdrawn it, I think we should accept and——

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. All right.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I think the Minister of Finance is asking us to be a little too generous. Undoubtedly the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) used the offensive term quoted by the Minister of Finance and applied it directly to the hon. member for East Simcoe. I raised the point of order and the Chairman ruled that term gutter-snipe might be applied by a member of this House to another member directly and unequivocally, and it was ruled that this was quite in order. I must say that, so far as I am concerned, and so far as the members on this side are concerned, while we would desire to bow as respectfully as we possibly can to the decision of the Chair, whether the Chair be occupied by the Speaker or the Deputy Speaker, we cannot, having regard

to our own feelings, having regard to the dignity of Parliament and the decisions that have been given from the Chair in the past, we cannot submit to that ruling.

Mr. SPROULE. I wish to refer to the rule which is so plain that I do not see how it can be misunderstood :

No member shall speak disrespectfully of Her Majesty the Queen or of any or the Royal Family,——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. SPROULE. Now, will hon. gentlemen wait a little before they get their laugh in. I am quoting the rule that must govern debate, so far as this point is concerned :

——nor the Governor General administering the Government of Canada, nor shall he use offensive words against either House or any members thereof.

Now the question is : Was the word used by the hon. member for North Wellington an offensive word against a member of this House ? If so, the expression clearly comes within the rule. And I think we have a right to question the ruling of the Chair if he rules that it is not offensive and its use is not a violation of the rules or amenities of debate.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have no doubt that the term as we understand it in English is not regarded as complimentary. Of course, my hon. friend from North Wellington, if I remember the phrase correctly, said the hon. member for East Simcoe was constituting himself——

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think that is what he said. But even with the qualification I have mentioned, the word would be considered the reverse of complimentary. We whose native language is English no doubt are more familiar with this form of expression than Mr. Deputy Speaker is. Perhaps he would accept the view we would take of it. For my part, I hope that it would not be regarded as a parliamentary term and I think it would be better if the Chairman took that view of it, seeing that peace has been restored.

Mr. HUGHES. But it has already been ruled.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. But if Mr. Deputy Speaker were informed that in the English language the term is not considered complimentary I think he would——

Mr. WALLACE. Is it considered complimentary in the French language ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I suppose it is not known in the French language at all. The French polish and politeness would exclude it from the vocabulary.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I do not know if I understood the hon. member for North Wellington aright, but I understood him to say that the hon. member for East Simcoe was constituting himself in such a way.

Mr. WALLACE. No, no.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. That is what I understood. We shall see by the "Hansard" later on what the form of expression was. So long as the language has been used in the way I understood I think it is not unparliamentary. The expression may not be polite, but it is not unparliamentary. Being called upon to decide whether it was in order, I decide that it was in order, because the way it was used was parliamentary.

Mr. SPROULE. Would you regard it as an offensive word ?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. If it were applied to an hon. gentleman himself, I think it would be impolite and, perhaps, unparliamentary, but not in the way in which it was used.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood the hon. member for North Wellington to say that the hon. member for East Simcoe had constituted himself the gutter-snipe of this House. I think those were the exact words. Under the rule I have quoted, and, taking the word in its common acceptation, I would respectfully submit that that is an offensive word.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Of course, I am not very familiar with the English language——

Mr. MONTAGUE. Do you rule the expression out of order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Perhaps I did not give to the expression the same meaning that seems to be accepted by members of the committee. Of course, hon. members will recognize the fact that there are many expressions which do not bear the same shade of meaning in French and English. It may be that I do not understand the meaning of this word as it is understood by those whose native language is English. I found that the expression was impolite. But many impolite expressions have been used since the beginning of this discussion, and even many unparliamentary expressions. I would ask hon. members to see to it that only polite expressions are used in debate.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Do I understand you, Mr. Chairman, to rule that the expression is out of order ?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Impolite.

Mr. MONTAGUE. And unparliamentary and out of order ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If the Chairman will permit me, I do not think we should allow the words to go on record as parliamentary. As we understand them

in the English language they are not complimentary.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Most offensive, most insulting.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I would be exceedingly sorry to have those words accepted as parliamentary, and I should be much pleased if the Deputy Speaker, instead of pressing the point, will merely agree that the decision he has given should not be insisted upon. I am sure we are all anxious to get along and avoid any unpleasantness.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER. I have no objection to submit myself to the judgment of the Committee on this question. As it seems to be the judgment of the Committee that he expression is unparliamentary, I am willing to submit my view to theirs.

Mr. ROGERS. There has been a great deal of fuss made about this little word, but much more disrespectful words, if possible, have been used towards myself, and the words were not ruled out of order.

Mr. INGRAM. Hon. gentlemen should not so far forget themselves as to use unparliamentary language. I have heard my hon. friend from Simcoe called the squirt gun of the Conservative party, and now he has been called the gutter snipe of the Conservative party.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Which is it?

Mr. INGRAM. Now the hon. gentleman who used that phrase, while occupying a position on this side of the House, took a very active part in criticising the estimates, as we are doing now; and I think if at that time he had had a brother who had been treated in the same way as the Postmaster General has treated the brother of my hon. friend from Simcoe, I would like to know if the hon. member for North Wellington would not have raised a pretty strong protest.

Mr. LANDERKIN. He would not have cried all night.

Mr. INGRAM. I have heard the hon. gentleman whine a good deal himself over the estimates, and perhaps he was justified in doing so. My hon. friend from Simcoe is doing what he believes to be his duty in criticising these estimates, and I do not think the hon. gentleman should get so warm as to use the language he did tonight.

Mr. BENNETT. As the matter has got to be of a somewhat personal nature, I have only this to say, that when I look for a member of gentlemanly deportment, my eyes will never look in the direction of the hon. member for North Wellington. I am glad that the Minister of Finance has brought the House up to the level where it should be brought, despite the fact that it sometimes has to be dragged in the mire by people whose inclinations tend in that direction. The question that has been before the House is one of fair comment, and I do not think the Postmaster General himself will say that I have unfairly commented on it. As to my own position in this House, I have fought my way here, but I hope I should be the last to do so in an offensive manner to any hon. gentleman. I have been very much honoured in the opposition that has been given to me by hon. gentlemen opposite, from the Premier down, in my elections. If I have been struck by anybody I have had the manliness to strike back again, and I hope I shall always do that, at all events. Now, the Postmaster General tells us that Mr. Smith received his advancement last year of $50, statutory allowance.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. He received $150 of an advance last year.

Mr. BENNETT. I would like the Postmaster General to take into consideration a very deserving class of employees in his department, I refer to the railway mail clerks. I think I am correct in saying that the railway mail clerks only receive a salary of $25 per month.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. And mileage.

Mr. BENNETT. The Postmaster General knows well that the position of railway mail clerk is one of great danger. I think it was in Ottawa division that two mail clerks were killed last year in a railway accident. It is an occupation that endangers the health, ill-ventilated cars, opening doors frequently at points where they have to throw off the mail bags—all this makes the work unhealthy. I think it is unfair that while clerks in the inside service are receiving large salaries, the mail clerks are cut down to the miserable pittance of $25 per month and mileage. The Minister should bear in mind that they are away from their homes, and this allowance for their mileage barely pays their expenses while they are on the road. I trust that the Postmaster General may see his way clear to advancing the pay of these clerks.

Mr. SPROULE. How many employees is the Postmaster General giving the statutory increase to?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Sixteen.

Mr. SPROULE. How many were eligible for the statutory increase as reported on?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is contended by some that if the clerks are not at the maximum of their class and are in other respects qualified, they are eligible. If they were reported on, the following would be eligible in that sense. Three chief clerks, seven first-class clerks, seven second-class clerks, sixty-nine third-class clerks and seven packers and sorters.

Mr. POPE. What are the names of those who are going to get the statutory increase.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Mr. Rowan, Mr. Smith, Mr. O'Brien, Mr. Rochester, Mr. Greenfield, Mr. Briggs, Mr. Glover, Mr. Code, Mr. Carson, Mr. Barrett, Mr. Maingy and Mr. Anderson.

Mr. POPE. What principle guided the Minister in making these increases ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The principle of their being deserving of it. Mr. Rowan is head of the revenue branch and is a very efficient officer and has been in the service for very many years. The same applies to Mr. Smith. Mr. O'Brien has been in the service since 1862 and has been passed over many a time. Mr. Maingy is a professional gentleman, a draughtsman who drafts the maps and is a very efficient officer. Mr. Rochester is next in charge of the railway mail service and is a very efficient officer, who works without regard to hours and is loyal to the service and has his heart in the work. Mr. Greenfield has been in the service for many years and has been recommended highly for promotion. The same remarks apply to Mr. Briggs, Mr. Martin, and the others.

Mr. SPROULE. Have any got more than the statutory increase ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not think so.

Mr. POPE. Were those who received the increase recommended by the deputy ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. In the Post Office Department there are heads or branches who have a number of clerks under them and these recommendations came first of all with the imprimatur of the head of the branch, and they were endorsed, of course, by the deputy.

Mr. HUGHES. Did I understand the Minister to say that railway mail clerks start now at $300 a year ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Some other gentleman said that.

Mr. HUGHES. It used to be $40 a month.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I concur entirely in what has fallen from the hon. member for East Toronto in regard to the railway mail service. I am not satisfied with the status of the mail clerks. I recognize the risk and the severity of the service they perform. The risk incurred cannot be ignored, and while I claim no credit for it, I may say in passing, that I did not find, prior to my becomng the head of the department, there has been any recognition by Parliament of the lives of the mail clerks when lost in the service. Last year one of the clerks, Mr. Edgecombe was killed while on duty. I submitted the propriety of granting $2,000 as an allowance to his widow and children, and Parliament passed it without a murmur. A similar vote appears in the general Estimates this year for another mail clerk who met with an accident from which he ultimately died.

Mr. HUGHES. Is that Pedan ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No; there is a cause of action in that case against the railway company, and that will have to be determined. I do not think it would be fair to prejudice the case by making any statement now. If Parliament voted a sum of money, it would prejudice the case against the railway company, and therefore I do not think it fair to make a statement.

Mr. HUGHES. Do I understand that the hon. Minister agrees that $25 is the amount they start with ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have not turned up the Act. I think that amount is correct, and there is mileage besides. I think there has recently been a change.

Mr. INGRAM. Who made the change, and when was it made ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think last session. If so, I am responsible for it. I do not, however, retain it in my mind at this moment.

Mr. CLARKE. In view of the discussion that has taken place, in which every hon. member has sympathized with the small remuneration paid to the railway clerks, I desire to ask if the department has ever considered the desirability of insuring these men's lives. The Government now deducts from the salaries a certain appropriate amount for superannuation ; and I would ask whether some similar arrangement could not be made with a view to securing endowment insurance on the lives of these railway mail clerks. As they follow a hazardous occupation, I submit that the department might consider whether additional protection to the widows and children might not be secured by apropriating each year a certain sum to procure insurance on the lives of these men.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That question has been the subject of consideration. I am not, however, prepared at the moment to make a recommendation, nor at this session to refer to the salaries of the mail clerks further than to say that at present I am not satisfied with the remuneration paid them, and I hope before another session to obtain the concurrence of Council to submit a measure to the House.

Mr. POPE. Has there been any adverse report made by the Deputy Minister in regard to those who have not been recommended for increases ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There has been no adverse report. I got an affir-

mative opinion in regard to the worthiness of these men in whose cases increases are recommended.

Mr. HUGHES. Has the deputy or any officer recommended that an officer suspended or under the displeasure of the Minister during the past year, should obtain an increase ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Will the hon. gentleman ask me that question at another time ?

Mr. McDOUGALL. Am I correct in understanding that the hon. gentleman accepted the reports for statutory increases from the heads of the different branches under whom the clerks served ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. My deputy brought me certain names of gentlemen recommended for increases. I did not act upon them at once, but I had the heads of the branches come to me and give me their reasons. I went carefully through those recommendations and I concurred in those names that I recommend.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I cannot understand that the new deputy would be in a position to inform the Minister as to the merits of his staff, because he has been only a short time in the service. I understood from the Minister that all the appointments had been made on recommendations. I should like to ask the Postmaster General on whose recommendation did he appoint the Deputy Postmaster General, and what reasons existed for placing him in that position.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman quite misunderstood me. It is quite incorrect to say that I made all the appointments on recommendations. I said the promotions in the railway mail service had been made on recommendations. Appointments to the service are not made on the recommendation of persons in the service. There are many considerations in connection with appointment to the service. I recommended the appointment of the Deputy Minister because I knew him well and I considered him thoroughly qualified for the position, and the country will be well satisfied with the selection made.

Mr. SPROULE. Have any of the parties received more than the statutory increase ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No; from $30 to $50 are the highest figures.

Mr. POPE. The preference given to a few clerks in the large number employed by the Government is a serious reflection on the balance of the clerks not recommended. I cannot believe that so business-like a Minister as the present head of the department would retain so many men undeserving of the fulfilment of their contract with the Government, as may be inferred from the few clerks who have received the statutory allowance. It cannot be considered otherwise than as a serious reflection on those clerks who, having faithfully fulfilled their duties, do not receive that just recognition. I do not think any financial considerations should interfere in the carrying out of what these gentlemen had a right to consider as their moral and legitimate contract with the Government when they entered the service. If any of these clerks are neglectful of their duties, I do not think the Deputy Minister or the Minister himself should have any hesitation in placing a black mark opposite their names. I understand that it is considered the proper form for the Deputy Minister to recommend to the Minister those clerks who are deserving of preferment. Well, Sir, it may be a failing of mine, but I must say I have not much confidence in these Deputy Ministers. They are more or less permanent arrangements; in many instances, they are there to a fossilized age, they have forgotten a great deal they once knew, and finding themselves in a permanent position, they have neglected to learn a great deal they might have learned, consequently arriving at a period when they have become mummified. I do not think hard-working employees like those the hon. Postmaster General has under him, should be subjected to the judgment of men who have survived their usefulness. As a clerk in a department, I would much prefer to submit myself to the judgment of the Minister, whether he agreed with me politically or not. Some hon. gentleman suggests that the Minister may not be fit. But under these circumstances there is one salvation for the clerk, that the Minister is bound to be changed from time to time. He cannot be so unfortunate as always to have a Minister who is unfit for the portfolio he holds, and in the course of time he is certain to be changed. The Postmaster General has recently appointed a new deputy. I do not know that he is an improvement on the gentleman who held that position for many years, who on a recent occasion I saw trotting about in a manner that made me think he was not altogether useless; and I must say that during my experience as a member of this House I found the late Deputy Postmaster General quite capable of performing his duties. But there will be no great quarrel between the Postmaster General and myself because he has chosen to appoint a Deputy Postmaster General more congenial to himself or more in conformity with his own ideas than Mr. White. But on general principles I do seriously object to men who have no responsibility in this House, having in their hands the entire disposition of the promotions in the civil service. More than that, in our communication with the departments, we find that the gentlemen who occupy these positions fancy that they are more than the Ministers—that they have the right to pigeonhole applications made by members of this House to the departments with regard to various questions. I cannot help feeling

that in this particular there is room for a wide improvement in all departments of the Government in the direct connection between this House and the departments. If the Postmaster General, or any other Minister, should happen at any time to have a seat in the Senate, we would have no Minister in this House to answer for his department. Therefore, I think it is worthy of the serious consideration of the Government whether they could not conceive of some way by which these poor old fossilized remnants of humanity would be furnished with a home, with proper remuneration, without being imposed on the good-will of this House and this country. I quite understand that with the wonderful influence these Deputy Ministers have in this country, it is unpopular for me to speak so boldly and so frankly in regard to the Deputy Ministers; but, Sir, I feel that it is a duty that I owe to this country and to my consituents, no matter what the result may be.

No matter how detrimental it may be to me, Sir, no matter how serious it may be in my next appeal to my constituents, I feel bound to point out that not only have we the Senate which is recognized by hon. gentlemen opposite as a serious block to legislation, but there is standing between us and the Ministers of the Crown a set of people known as Deputy Ministers, living in the departments, not only as persons, but as fossilized persons which, of course, means Egypt, in a sense, mummified people who have forgotten long since to realize or reckon beyond the limits of their desk; and you know, Mr. Chairman, that that is but three feet square, and this country is 4,000 miles long. We no longer, under those circumstances, have popular Government; we are no longer a popular Chamber; our presence here is a farce. Of course, if you have an energetic Minister, as we undoubtedly have in the Postmaster General—a man who devotes a great deal of time and attention to details—possibly you may avert some of the serious consequences; but supposing you have as all Governments are bound to have from time to time among their number, respectable men, because in order that a Government should properly represent the country, it should not only have capable men, men of ability and business capacity, but also respectable men, and very often, in order to get these respectable men, so-called, you have to go to past ages—supposing you have in your Cabinet such men, what are you going to do? In order to get that element, you have to seek a man who has arrived at that point when sin is useless to him, when virtue is a bitter necessity, and when he clothes himself in virtue in order that he may possibly enter the Government. Fancy one of those Ministers at the head of a department, and under him one of those fossilized mummies I have spoken of, between that respectable Minister and the people of this country. Think for a moment of what the citizen of Canada has to wade through in order to get justice, fair-play and reasonable business treatment from a department of that kind. That is known in some places as red tape. I do not call it red tape but by its proper name—past centuries, past ages, things that have been, things that at one time had a being and an existence and for which there was a necessity. In their childhood, they attracted attention because people fancied that as they grew up they would be somebody, and they succeeded, by dreaming over this thing from time to time, in fooling a sufficient number of people in their constituency into that belief and into electing them to Parliament. Not having succeeded anywhere else, as a last resort they were sent to Parliament. And they arrived there at a time when respectability was hard to find. They were thus selected by the Cabinet. They became Ministers, and as Ministers became rulers over departments with these poor old unfortunate creatures presiding over them as Deputy Ministers. This seems perhaps an extreme picture, but to me it is not altogether an extreme one. It is not a reflection on the hon. gentlemen who sit opposite any more than it is upon the hon. gentlemen who formerly occupied their seats at the same salary. We, who have the responsibility and labour of representing constituencies, when we meet one of these combinations, it impresses itself upon us so completely that it perhaps becomes a grievance. And as it becomes a grievance with us, it becomes a grievance with our constituents, and anything that tends to be a grievance is an injury to popular Government, and is bound to work against the best will of the people. And no matter what that grievance, whether it is well founded or not, it is worse than reality. You cannot sell it, you cannot dispose of it in any way, you cannot get anybody to buy it from you, you cannot trade it off for a horse, no matter how cheap, and heaven knows horses have been cheap enough for years. That thing becomes harnessed on to you and your constituents, and that becomes a nest-egg of rebellion, discontent, and all these things that change Governments, even though the majority of the Government be pretty good. Under those circumstances, knowing all the serious results that might flow from a fossilized Deputy Minister, I do say that if I should ever be in the employ of the Government—and I trust I never shall, and do not presume I ever will under hon. gentlemen opposite—but should that hour arrive, I hope that when it does, those remains of pleasant recollections of other ages will have passed away, and that I shall be able to get at the man who hires me direct, and that my faithful services rendered to the department will be known to the Minister direct. From him alone I shall anticipate receiving recognition of the service that I have rendered in the department in which

I might be employed. This may be of course an agricultural view of it. It may be simply a farmer's way of looking at it, but I have employed a great many men myself, and I always like to know what man is worthy of recognition by my own eyesight. I do not want any man to stand between me and the man whom I employ, whose services are worth recognizing, and I never permit it. I should never think of going to the many foremen I have and asking them who is worthy of an increase of salary. I have always found that the gentleman who is worthy of an increase of salary, some way or another impresses himself upon me. I fancy if I had one of those dummies there, things that have ceased to speak or reason or even think, that open their mouth three or four times a day to receive food and enable them to allow their salary to run on—if I had one of these peculiar arrangements standing between me and my servants, I do not think that the condition of the servants would be improved or my condition as an employer. If that is the case in my instance, why should it not be the case with a business Government, because this is recognized as a business Government. I think it was announced early in its origin as a business Government; it floated a banner with that motto on it: "Business is business"; I think that that was announced by the principal member of that Government, upon some occasion, a gentleman who not only rules the destinies of one department, but who indirectly influences the destinies of many others. Under these circumstances, if the condition I have mentioned is applicable to myself as an employer of labour, I cannot see why it is not, with equal force, applicable to the department over which any of these hon. gentlemen presides, and I am bound to make a plea in conclusion, after having given to this House these very forcible arguments, which I am sure will be recognized by hon. gentlemen opposite, perhaps to a greater extent than by hon. gentlemen on this side, because there are very few men on this side who have occupied positions inside the Cabinet, and being outside the Cabinet, of course they are not able to realize the force of my remarks or so thoroughly appreciate them as hon. gentlemen on the other side.

Never having had the extreme honour of occupying a Cabinet position, I am perhaps not qualified to criticise. But, Sir, I should like to live as everybody hopes I shall, particularly myself—and of course I am not speaking after the manner of the Senate, where they never die, but from the point of view of the member of the House of Commons—if I should live to that amusing age where a man gets to be useful as a gentleman, I may possibly find myself occupying a position in a Cabinet to be formed at some future day. In view of that possibility, I have an interest in urging upon the Government of the day to do something with regard to these fossilized people. How unfortunate it would be if, having reached a Cabinet place, but still continuing to think, I should find myself with a Deputy Minister who had ceased to think ten years before I got there. Hon. gentlemen opposite must recognize that changes will take place. Even if not through our cleverness, through their blunders, we shall some day be called to that side of the House. By the time I occupy the position I speak of I shall probably have reached that stage where I shall be permitted to occupy a corner seat nearly under the balcony and close to the respectable part of the Government. I have a personal interest, therefore, in having these Deputy Ministers active men. I should like to see them occupy seats in this House and be answerable to the House for their actions. It would not be then as it is now. A member calls upon the Minister at the head of some department and asks him to deal with a certain matter. The Minister informs him that he will see his deputy and will he please come to-morrow. Of course, you go back next day. We have all gone back. We all understand it. I understand it thoroughly, as a common slave of this House. You go back to the Minister and ask him if he has seen his deputy. "Really" he says, "I am so very busy and I have not been able to——and Council meets in ten—oh, in three minutes—and will you please excuse me—and will you be kind enough to call to-morrow." And to-morrow you find is a holy day, and the Minister is not in his office. And the next day is Sunday. Then you discuss the matter with the one nearest to you, and you find that he is in the same position. And so the matter is dropped in utter disgust. This tends to disgust the best people and keep them away from this House. That is the reason why we have not better men here. There are better men in the country than have ever sat here—lots of them. But the representative goes home and he tells the story of his desperate struggle, of his wrestling with the Premier or the head of the department in which his constituency happens to be most interested. Hon. gentlemen who sit back of the Ministers understand it. My hon. friend over there has to go back and say to his people, and say that the Minister is a good fellow and well-disposed, but you cannot get over the Deputy Minister; the work that the Ministers do is tremendous—deputations after deputations waiting on the Government, for this, that and the other thing, and while they are well-disposed and desire to give the matter every attention, they cannot do it in the time at their disposal. The Minister is well disposed to give you everything you want, but his time is so occupied and then you are forced down upon the miserable Deputy Minister—the fossilized remains that exist in the department. Now is not that discouraging to a bright Liberal? Is not it discouraging to the supporters of hon. gen-

tlemen opposite who anticipated better things to find that these Tory deputies standing between them and Liberal justice, the justice that should be measured out according to their anticipations on the advent to power of the party which they supported? In every constituency we find men walking about who are completely discouraged, who feel that the advent to power of the party has not brought them what they anticipated and all because these fossilized remains of humanity, the deputies, stand between them and common justice. Now, all this tends to weaken the strong opinion in the minds of the people of this country of the possibilities of the Government which has come into power.

Mr. SPROULE. I think we have done a pretty good night's work, and at this hour in the morning, perhaps, I would suggest to the leader of the House that we now adjourn and prepare for another day's work.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think that our minds are so thoroughly devoted to the postal affairs of the country that we might at least take the two items which remain under civil government in relation to the Post Office Department, that is to say, this particular item under consideration, and item number 40. If hon. gentlemen would agree to that, it would be a sensible course.

Mr. SPROULE. The next item belongs to a branch of the department that will necessarily bring out a good deal of discussion.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If the hon. gentlemen could agree to have these two items passed, then we might be able to report progress, otherwise I am afraid we cannot say that we have.

Mr. WALLACE. I endorse what has been said by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule). We have just heard the commencement of the eloquence on this side of the House the last hour or so. It is now pretty nearly daylight, and I do not think there will be any progress made. I think we may fairly appeal to the Minister to allow the committee to rise now, so that we may proceed to-morrow diligently with business.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I think the Minister had better allow us to adjourn with the item we have had under discussion.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I find the House in such excellent working trim that we might as well put in a couple of hours more.

Mr. SPROULE. The present item has been discussed at considerable length, and it might be allowed to pass. No doubt, however, that the discussion of other items will take much time and we will not make much progress.

Mr. GILLIES. The Postmaster General stated that the deputy recommended for promotion a certain clerk, whose name he did not mention, and he announced that he had not acted on that recommendation. Who is the clerk, when did he come into the service and what salary was he then receiving?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman misunderstood me. I did not say that the deputy made a recommendation; it was made by the head of a branch. The officer in question is not one recommended for increase.

Mr. GILLIES. Who is the clerk?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Excuse me for not naming him. This is not before the committee. I submit there are many reasons why the names of men who are not now recommended for increase should not be stated publicly. I have already stated to the member for North Victoria (Mr. Hughes) that I am willing to give information of this kind privately, and I repeat the statement to the hon. member for Richmond.

Mr. HUGHES. I did not ask for the name of the officer—I knew his name. I was merely asking as to a fact.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think it would be very unfair to give this information.

Mr. McDOUGALL. We are not voting money for private purposes.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No increase is asked in this case.

Mr. GILLIES. I am not asking for private information. The hon. gentleman, having, however, volunteered the statement, my curiosity was a little excited, and legitimately so. I should like to know the name of this clerk, if it is not a private matter. I cannot understand why the name should be a matter of private information. I desire to ask again if the Postmaster General withholds the name of the clerk, and if so, why?

Mr. HUGHES. The reason I asked the question in the case referred to was not because I wished to ascertain his name—it should not be brought in here—but because I wished to point out that reports of officers recommending increases to clerks who have been derelict in their duty were not worthy of much consideration.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I gave that as an illustration of the laxity of the system. The officer, I think, recommended for increase every one in the branch. That was about the style of all the recommendations given, and among them was the officer to which I have referred. I had considered whether I would recommend his dismissal. I took, however, a more lenient view, and decided, on account of his family and people dependent on him that I would accept his version, although I had my own opinion of it.

Mr. INGRAM. Are we to understand that the opinion of the head of the department who recommends an increase to an employee is given even when employees are not worthy of increases ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman has been told that the practice has grown up in the department generally of increases being made automatically, without regard to merits or value of services ; and as an outcome of that system, the case to which I have referred occurred.

Mr. INGRAM. If the Minister refuses to grant the increase, after the head of a branch has recommended the officer, some reason should be given to this committee why the increase was refused. Surely we are entitled to an answer to this question ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have answered it half a dozen times already.

Mr. INGRAM. Are we to understand that the Minister will not tell Parliament why he refused to give the increase to this man though he was recommended by the deputy head of the department ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I refused because he was guilty of conduct which disentitled him to it.

Mr. INGRAM. Has the Minister instructed the heads of the different branches that they were not to make these recommendations ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have given no instructions what they are not to do.

Mr. INGRAM. Then it occurs to me that the deputy head who would recommend an unworthy man is not fit to be retained in the Cabinet.

Mr. POPE. It all shows what we must expect from these men who unfortunately are fixtures in the departments and who have arrived at that age when even if we went to the expense of painting them and varnishing them up it would not improve their appearance. It shows the state to which the Government of this country has come when the real Government of the country is entrusted to these specimens which we have discussed at some length. When I spoke of those deputy heads some time ago I hardly knew that so soon my word would come true, and it must now be evident to hon. gentlemen opposite that I was not talking against time, a thing which I would deprecate in any member of the House.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Hear, hear.

Mr. POPE. The Minister of Public Works who has known me for many years fully recognizes that I would be the last member in this House to occupy the attention of hon. gentlemen with anything than "business is business." The hon. gentleman (Mr. Tarte) is a literary character and I would advise him that if he should write a book he need not put anything inside of it but simply on the outside the inscription : "business is business," and it will be sold by the thousands. If he can find a camera old enough to photograph some of these fossilized Deputy Ministers and put their pictures inside the book, he would make a fortune for himself and his families, no matter how many families may follow him. The hon. gentleman knows that there was a fire in his department some time ago.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. POPE. I am out of order, I will get right back to it. I came into the Chamber rather late and I did not know there was any order, but I will, however, obey your ruling. If the Minister of Public Works could get up the book I have described he would make money enough to build us three times as many post offices as we have now, and I think that is a point worthy the consideration of the committee. Have you ever seriously considered, Mr. Speaker, the territory we have in Canada ? You take our country from Halifax to Vancouver.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Take it from Sydney.

Mr. POPE. Well, we will go to Sydney, we do not care where we go. But at all events I am informed that Canada is 4,000 miles long and if you put a post office at every mile, you will have 4,000 post offices. That would increase the number of mails and would give an immense increase to the revenue of this country. Then, you know, this is a great mineral country. Its mineral development has just begun, and no man knows where a mine may be discovered. We may have a mine for every mile of that 4,000 miles, and we may have a post office for every mile, and if the herdsmen established these post offices, the results to this country might be immense. To put it upon a conservative basis, I think we ought to sell a three-cent stamp for every office, provided the Postmaster General does not interfere with that international postal arrangement.

An hon. MEMBER. But he is going to war.

Mr. POPE. Oh, he is not going to war. I do not believe he wants to go to war. I believe his greatest desire is to see these Estimates pass. I do not think he is a pugilist or is disposed to fight ; and my observation is that it is the fault of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House that these two items are not through. But I think the Postmaster General has done his best. Of course, he has not given the proper explanations ; but his deputy is not present, and he could not give them. I understand that his deputy is modern, and I would like to have seen one of these modern arrange-

ments. One of these modern deputies would be a curiosity in this House, and he ought to be brought in. From what I have observed of the Postmaster General, I do not think he is disposed to go to war ; he is a man of peace. Of course, he has grieved a great many people in this country by disposing of certain postmasterships, as the opportunity presented itself. On that question I have a magnificent speech which I propose to give him in this House on the proper occasion. So I will not take up the time of this committee with anything that is not absolutely pertinent to the quesion. As I undersand it, we have to pass two items.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Oh, no.

Mr. POPE. One item, then ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Not necessarily one.

Mr. POPE. That is first rate. I thought I was limited ; but that cuts me loose. I thought we had to get these two items passed before daylight. Not being a parliamentarian, I thought we had to do something. The Minister of Finance says we have not to do anything, and I believe we have been fulfilling our duty in that respect since the 4th of February, and I congratulate hon. gentlemen on having accomplished what the Minister of Finance says we are here for. It is a great pleasure to me, and will be a great gratification to my children to know that their father took part in a great work which has led up to nothing. Of course, Mr. Chairman, if I get out of order, I trust that you will bring me back to the right path, although I do not believe it makes much difference what I talk about. There is so much time to take up, and I do not think it matters much whether I am in order or out of order. As the leader of the House says, we are here for a special purpose ; we are here to perform nothing, and it is not absolutely necessary for the progress of this country that anything should be accomplished. I have heard insinuations made by gentlemen on the other side of the House against the Chamber which sits above us. Why, Sir, if that Chamber were not there, we would have accomplished something. We would have passed a certain contract which would have meant something, which would have opened up a mail route from the Pacific Coast towards the Klondike. I can now understand why that route did not go from somewhere to somewhere. Because it is the duty of this House to accomplish nothing. But the hon. senators who are sitting above us——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. POPE. I am now speaking of the mail route.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I am very sorry, but the mail route does not come under the item we are discussing.

Mr. POPE. Having considered Deputy Heads of departments, I come now to the allowance for private secretaries. I myself have great respect for the private secretary. He is essential to the happiness of his Minister, but at the same time I believe, since we have a Government that was elected upon economic principles, that this item should not be found in the Estimates. In my opinion, the private secretary ought to be paid by his Minister. If a Minister of the Crown were to devote his time assiduously to the duties of his department, he would be able to perform all the duties imposed upon him as Minister, he would be able to do what is expected of him in his department in the way of correspondence outside of politics and political organizations. At least 75 per cent of the time of a private secretary is taken up in making arrangements for his Minister's political meetings, and I say, therefore, that his salary should be paid by the Minister himself. The other 25 per cent of the secretary's time is taken up in writing invitations to dinner to the supporters of the Government in order to keep them in line. When the Ministers have some scheme invented by themselves, some idea of achieving something for their country, that we will not say reflects upon their honour because that would be a reflection upon the country itself, and require to bring a certain pressure to bear upon their following, then the private secretary is kept busy sending out invitations to the innocent following of the Government, willing at all times to be fed. I remember the pic-nics and can speak of them from experience. I am no novice in being fed at the tables of hon. Ministers, when they send out invitations and ask their flock to come in and feed at the trough prepared for them ; and I know that the secretary has to be very particular in putting each guest's name opposite his chair, so that he may not be seated at the wrong place, because these men have to be kept in line. There are certain people whom the Government can always depend upon to support it under any circumstances and conditions. Those gentlemen, few as they are, have to be scattered around the table and seated next to those who are not so certain ; and in order that this may be thoroughly done, the private secretary is the only man in whom the Minister can confide. The Minister says to the secretary : This gentleman is a little bit shaky on this question that is going to come up in a few days, and I think you had better seat him alongside the whip or sub-whip of the party, as the case may be, and put him in a position where he can be controlled. Or, it may be a lady. We know that ladies are clever in controlling men. This is a systematic arrangement on the part of the secretary, though it appears to be by accident. If it is not one of the cold storage dinners that I understand are given by certain gentlemen who are not now in the

House, but if it is a dinner worth having, a dinner that makes you feel that you like your fellow man as you should like yourself, the arrangement of the secretary takes effect. And some of these gentlemen sitting there begin to open up their schemes, but graudally so as not to scare the man for whom it is unfolded. It unfolds like a rose in the sun and rain until finally it is in full blossom. And around that table some of the most nefarious transactions that this country has ever known are arranged. And all this is brought about by this private secretary. Now, the Finance Minister would not have gone to the trouble of issuing these cards nor would he pay for it, if the money came out of his own pocket. I have just received a message: "Breakfast is waiting for you." There is an idea I never heard of a private secretary giving an invitation to breakfast. I never heard of a private secretary to get up early enough in the morning to give an invitation to breakfast. But the Ministers neglect to act upon this idea. We know that first impressions are lasting, and by bringing their friends to breakfast they might be able to accomplish many things which now they find difficult. And it would be further occupation for their private secretaries and assist them in their political work. We all know and the Minister of Finance will frankly acknowledge that his private secretary is a political organization in himself. The Minister of Finance would not deny that one of the most useful persons in his political organizations is his private secretary. He has been carefully trained and is an expert, and I think the Minister of Finance must have brought him with him. I remember, on one occasion in the Russell House, the secretary of the Finance Minister shook me by the hand and said: "Mr. Fielding was so sorry he could not have you to dinner to-night." I could not doubt the sincerity of the Minister. The Minister of Finance himself, with all his urbanity could not have been more sympathetic, could not have done it better. Now, should this country pay for that? I say no. The Minister of Finance should have paid for that shake of the hand, and I am sure the private secretary is worth to the Minister himself every dollar of the salary he gets. If I knew this young gentleman, I should not hesitate to make the remarks I do. Now, as to the secretary of the Postmaster General, I do not know the gentleman. But I venture to suggest to these Ministers that now that young ladies can be employed to operate these typewriters, do a great deal of clerical work, they could be employed as private secretaries, and half of the money paid to the present private secretaries saved. Of course, it might in some cases arouse jealousy.

An hon. MEMBER. The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) has carried out that idea.

Mr. POPE. He could well afford to, because there are no domestic difficulties that could arise, the Minister being a single man. This plan of employing young ladies would save much money to the country. Now, Sir, having dealt with the question thus far, I leave to other hon. members its further consideration until I go and get my breakfast.

Mr. WALLACE. I think we ought to get from the Postmaster General some further explanation than we have yet received. He stated at an earlier hour in the evening that Mr. McLeod had passed his examination for chief clerkship, and all the evidence he has given is that the application of Mr. McLeod had passed the Treasury Board and passed through the other forms required for appointment and promotion. But that is not evidence, that was his impression, he did not give it as a known fact at all, but as his impression on the matter. I think his impression is wrong, because the law does not require that they should pass this promotion examination at all. The Act under which superintendents were appointed passed last year, and I think that all the qualifications that are required are that no person shall be eligible to be appointed as such superintendent unless he has served at least ten years as railway mail clerk. I presume that is all the qualifications that are necessary for transforming a railway mail clerk into a superintendent, and that I presume was the case with Mr. McLeod. Now, with regard to this other man, Mr. Winstanley, I understood from the Postmaster General that Mr. Winstanley, who had been in the railway mail clerk's department, was transferred to the inspector's office. His name, however, does not appear in the Toronto division or in the index.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That is an omission of the printer.

Mr. WALLACE. There is another feature worthy of consideration, and that is the large number of officers who have reached the maximum of their class and for whom there is no hope of promotion. The Postmaster General has picked out those who received appointments from the Government of Mr. Mackenzie. He has taken three second-class clerks, Rowan, Barrett and Smith and has made them first-class clerks. They cannot be the only meritorious clerks in the department. This action is very suspicious and shows the manner of selection adopted. The hon. gentleman has declared that his actions are taken apart altogether from political considerations, but his action cannot be justified by this selection. Again, with respect to the number of clerks in the Post Office Department, the hon. gentleman when in Opposition always declared the number was excessive and it was imagined that when he assumed office the expense of the department would be largely reduced.

Nevertheless there is an increase of over $1,000 this year. As a reason for that the Postmaster General tells us that this is a growing department. Well, all the other departments of Government are increasing in volume and in the amount of work they transact. But the Postmaster General is curtailing the work of his department for he told us he has abolished a number of post offices because they were non-paying. Now these non-paying post offices are the very ones the Postmaster General should have retained because they are established in the interests of the pioneers, who are developing the wealth of Canada in remote regions. There are other ways for the Postmaster General to economize rather than by his cutting down the annual compensation of a man who carries the mails for miles, from $55 to $50. The system of secret tender has brought down the price to a lower figure than the work is worth, and if the Postmaster General really wanted to economize he could cut down the remuneration paid for mail subsidies to railways and steamship companies to whom we are paying millions of dollars a year. I am under the impression that we are paying higher rates to-day for carrying the mails on railways than we paid forty years ago when the railway system was first established in Canada. Hon. gentlemen know that owing to improvements in the rolling stock and railway construction the cost is now much cheaper, and all freight rates have been lowered. As a matter of fact the only railway rates that appear to have grown are the railway subsidies for carrying the mails and we are entitled to some explanation from the Postmaster General on that subject.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is not in order in discussing this question now.

Mr. WALLACE. Why ?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Because we are discussing the item under Civil Government and the mail service is included in another vote altogether.

Mr. WALLACE. If the Chairman thinks this is not a suitable time to discuss the subject, I am willing to defer it. I admit that the daylight is coming on, and that the hour is perhaps not appropriate, and I am glad the Chairman has called my attention to the fact. We all realize that the subject is one of great importance, and that the discussion would be perhaps more appropriate and more satisfactory at another hour of the day. I think we might fairly ask the Minister now to pass this item, and let the committee rise and the House adjourn. What does the Minister of Finance say to that proposition ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I shall be glad to agree to the first part of my hon. friend's proposition, to pass the item.

Mr. WALLACE. We had better have an understanding.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman wished me to be serious. We are just beginning a day now, and we had better take the second item also.

Mr. WALLACE. There is a good deal to say on that.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is ample time to say it.

Mr. WALLACE. I think we may fairly ask the Minister to pass this item and let the House adjourn. We have discussed matters pretty fully on this item. I do not think the business of the House is promoted by being too positive. I think we can fairly appeal to the Minister. Of course, if he remains stubborn, other people will get stubborn too. But we do not desire to have anything of that sort. I think we may ask the Minister to pass this item and let the committee rise. There are a good many things to be discussed on the other item.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If the hon. gentleman wishes me to be serious, I may say that hon. gentlemen opposite have been spending many hours in discussing nothing, but in repeating the same thing over and over again.

Mr. WALLACE. I submit that when it comes to two or three o'clock, it is time to ask the House to adjourn. That is always recognized.

Mr. INGRAM. I am glad now that we have been three months in session, that hon. gentlemen opposite are showing an earnest disposition to work long hours to get through the business. In discussing this very important item of $197,000 for the Post Office Department, I may be allowed, perhaps, to take up the time of the House in going over the different items under this head. I find in one part of the statement of the Postmaster General that as the deputy head of the department had ceased to be of very much use to the department, the hon. Minister desired a change ; but I notice in the report of the new Deputy Minister that great praise is given to the late Deputy Postmaster General, who was appointed to the department in December, 1854, was appointed Deputy Minister in 1888, and ceased his connection with the department on the 1st of August, 1897. He was instructed to go to Washington to perform a very important duty with respect to certain changes which I believe the department propose to introduce on the 1st of January next. Perhaps the Postmaster General will enlighten the House as to what those changes may be. But it struck me as peculiar that if the late Deputy Postmaster General had lost his usefulness, he was considered so reliable and trustworthy to perform that important duty as the re-

presentative of Canada at Washington ? I would also like to know whether it was under the late Deputy Postmaster General or under the new one that the idea was suggested of lowering the postage between Canada and the old country. If it was under the new deputy head, I understand that he made a very serious mistake, for I am informed that the department had not the power to lower that rate of postage.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Neither the old nor the new Deputy Postmaster General had anything to do with a matter of policy of that kind. Policy is one thing ; to carry it out is another.

Mr. INGRAM. Would the hon. gentleman state what these proposed changes will be that are to take place on the 1st of January ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman stated that after the late Deputy Postmaster General had been superannuated he had been sent to Washington. Permit me to correct him. The late Deputy Postmaster General was sent to Washington in May, 1897, when he was still Deputy Postmaster General, and took part in that international conference as the representative of Canada ; and whatever decisions that conference arrived at are as much within the reach of the hon. gentleman as myself. The postal union meets once every five years. In 1897 it met at Washington.

Mr. INGRAM. I find that I was in error in stating that the ex-Deputy Postmaster General went to Washington after his superannuation. I am glad to be corrected as to that. But I do not think the committee is altogether satisfied with the explanation the hon. gentleman made with reference to the controller of the railway mail service.

Contingencies—Post Office Department... $42,855

Mr. CLARKE. Is the printing done in the Bureau at Ottawa ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes.

Mr. McDOUGALL. It seems to me that at this hour of the morning, the hon. Minister leading the House should consent to an adjournment. He knows as well as any member of this House that the Postmaster General, from the beginning of the session until the present, has been most discourteous to hon. gentlemen on this side when they have asked for information connected with his department, and they have to get all the information they can from those items. What is the cause of this increase of $3,285 ?

The POSTMATER GENERAL. The item is made up of clerical and other assistance, $23,855 ; printing and stationery, $15,500 ; sundries, $3,500. The item of $23,855 is comprised of the following particulars :—19 clerks at $400 and one at $600, making $8,200 ; 13 copyists at $400, making $5,200 ; 10 writers at $400 and one at $300, $4,430 ; four messengers at $320, two at $300, and one at $1 per day, making $1,285 ; 10 packers at $300 each, $3,000. There is an increase in the salaries of fourteen packers, sorters and messenger, and 44 temporary clerks at $30 each, making a total increase in salaries of $1,740. That deducted from $3,250, the gross increase, leaves the balance of $1,550, which represents one messenger and three clerks altogether.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Why this increase ? Has the business increased or does the hon. Minister propose to supply the work which might have been supplied by the officials he dismissed ?

The POSTMATER GENERAL. I do not know what the hon. member means. If he is aware of my having dismissed any officials in the inside service, I shall be glad to be informed of it. I am not aware of it. The volume of business has increased and is increasing. We have in the present year increased the money order offices by 50 per cent in round numbers. There were 1,200 money order offices when we took office. On the first of July last we increased them about 600 more. We cannot do that without increasing the service. The revenue increased in the first year, 1896-97, $260,000, and in the present year probably about $400,000.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Did the Jubilee stamps count in this ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The Jubilee stamps were issued on the 20th June, 1897. A part of them went out before the fiscal year closed.

Mr. McDOUGALL. How much was realized on the sale of these stamps ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am unable to give those figures.

Mr. McDOUGALL. How many were issued, and what was the value of the issue ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. All the information is in "Hansard." I stated it in the House last year, and it is on record.

Mr. WALLACE. That is not very satisfactory.

Mr. McDOUGALL. We want the information now. We can hardly be expected to search through "Hansard" for what the Postmaster General said last session.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. If the hon. gentleman will turn to the report of the Postmaster General for the year ending 30th June last, pages xiii. and xiv., he will find the information.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I have not the report.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It will afford me pleasure to send it to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Perhaps the Postmaster General would give me the amount?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I will read the report. Mr. Gibson asked some questions on the subject of the jubilee stamps and the Postmaster General explained that it was his intention to issue these stamps. A schedule is given showing all the details of denominations, &c., but it is not added up.

Mr. WALLACE. That shows how many were to be issued; how many were issued and paid for?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. We kept no track of these stamps separately from the ordinary stamps, so far as revenue is concerned.

Mr. WALLACE. They were different from ordinary stamps inasmuch as they were not redeemable.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Quite so, but I said we kept no separate account of them so far as revenue is concerned.

Mr. WALLACE. Could not the hon. gentleman give us the amount received from these stamps?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I could not. The hon. gentleman will understand that these stamps were sold and returns made in the ordinary way, and many of them may be still on hand in the hands of postmasters. Unless we asked every postmaster in Canada to send a return to say what he had on hand, it would be impossible for us to know.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Is it not the rule that stamps are paid for in advance?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No, not exactly, it is done in some cases.

Mr. McDOUGALL. In Cape Breton, the postmasters have to send their money to the inspector in order to get stamps.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There is a system of keeping accounts.

Mr. McDOUGALL. If the system is properly carried out, I should think that the Postmaster General could tell us what has been received from this issue of jubilee stamps. The hon. gentleman said that we should go to "Hansard" for the information, yet he could not read it from the book he assumed to quote.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Does the Postmaster General intend to make any change in the colour of the stamps he has issued recently? From a number of business men I have heard that the stamps are very unsatisfactory, as the denominations are not properly marked and the colours are not good, and thus many errors arise.

Mr. INGRAM. I see that the revenue from stamps, &c., exceeded that of last year by over $277,000.

Mr. SPROULE. When it was proposed to issue these jubilee stamps it was understood that a certain number were to be issued at a certain time. But, if I remember well, they were not issued on time. I understood the Postmaster General to say at that time they expected they would realize a certain sum. Surely there must be an account somewhere of the results. If the stamps have passed out of the hands of the Government, they must have realized a certain amount of money, and somebody should know what that amount is.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I thought the hon. gentleman would have understood that these stamps were taken into stock and sold to the postmasters, and the results of the sales transmitted to the Finance Minister, and every month the Finance Minister issues a statement showing the revenue from the post office. That shows the revenue from all kinds of stamps. These jubilee stamps were not kept track of separately from the others.

Mr. SPROULE. Is there no means of knowing what amount would have been realized if they had been all sold?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes, but I have not extended it. Speaking of the matter in the first place, I said I thought it would be about a three-months' issue, that is it would be about what we would require in three months, and the revenue from the post office is something like $4,000,000.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Among these jubilee stamps were some of high denominaton. How can the holder of a fifty-cent stamp make it take the place of fifty cents worth of stamps of ordinary denominations?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There is a certain class of mail matter that is posted, but the postal stamps are not affixed. I refer to periodicals and newspapers that are posted in bulk. For instance, if a news agent desired to deliver, say 500 pounds weight of magazines, he does not bring in stamps and fix the proper weight of stamps to each separate paper, or pamphlet, or magazine, but they are all weighed. Supposing they were to weigh 1,000 pounds, at the rate of one cent a pound he would have to pay $10. He would hand $10 in stamps to be cancelled by the Postmaster. Then if there was only one stamp of $10, he would hand that to the Postmaster. If they were two of $5, he might hand them. He may make it up in any form he chooses, as a man may pay a debt by bills of various kinds. In that way the higher denominations serve a great convenience. Moreover, I may say that they are also available and have been used for letters and packages of large quantities. I myself saw a package

with stamps on it sent to England containing stamps exceeding $8.

Mr. CLARKE. The hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) has drawn attention to the quality of the new stamps. It has been my experience, and I presume it has been the experience of many hon. gentlemen in the House, that owing to the colour of the paper that is used for the stamps, the image of Her Majesty is very indistinct, and that half the time, unless we are very careful, we put the stamps on upside down, we cannot see whether the stamp is right side up or not. I may say also that I think the mucilage used on the new stamps is far superior to that used on the old, but their is an indistinctness about the figure on the stamp, which is a cause of inconvenience.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think the observation of the hon. member is well founded. But I may say that arrangements have already been made to correct that, and I think he will be perfectly satisfied when he sees the next issue. The two lower corners will in all future issues contain the denominations themselves in good plain figures. In regard to the remarks of the hon. member for Haldimand as to the colour, I fancy his reference is particularly to the two cent stamp. It is a very beautiful colour, although I admit it is open to the objection that it is indistinct. That has been got over, as you will see when the next issue takes place. The parallel lines running across give a light colour, whereas in the first instance they were too close together, giving a more solid appearance to the ink. That has been remedied, and the colour will appear very much brighter on those that are printed from the new die.

Mr. INGRAM. I notice that 40,000 eight-cent stamps were returned by the postmasters as unfit for use, and that 40,000 were destroyed as unfit for use.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The explanation of that is this: The total number issued was limited to the schedule mentioned in the answer that I gave to Parliament. By a mistake, a larger quantity was delivered to the department, and before it was discovered the department had distributed a larger quantity than was mentioned in the schedule. They discovered it when the mail had gone out, and at once re-called the overissue. Of course they were at once destroyed so as to keep the amount within the figure named by Parliament.

Mr. INGRAM. Then it was not through the stamps being unfit?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not know how it is worded there. "Unfit for use" is not a proper description. There was not one stamp in excess of the limit stated in Parliament that got into the hands of the public. There was that little error I speak of, but it was detected at once and corrected, and of course the extra amount was at once destroyed—I suppose by the Auditor General and by Mr. Stanton of the stamp department.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like an explanation why it was that the post offices in the rural districts of the country could not get certain denominations of those stamps. When the explanation was made here before the issue was to take place, it was stated that they would be sent all over the country in proportionate numbers of the various denominations, according to the quantity of stamps issued in the post offices. My information is that the rural post offices could not get certain denominations at all, for instance, the half cent stamp, and I think the one cent stamp. I know there were many inquiries made about them for a length of time. There were some few distributed through offices here and there, but the denominations that were in great demand were not supplied, they were taken up somewhere before they reached these post offices. The denominations that were not saleable were suppled in larger numbers in some cases than they could be sold or distributed in the locality.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The stamps were issued in the ordinary course without regard to their being Jubilee stamps, and half cent stamps to which the hon. gentleman refers, are only used on papers weighing less than half an ounce or perhaps less than an ounce. It is a rare thing for rural offices to use such stamps, and officer Stanton simply distributed them in the ordinary course to offices that had been in the habit of purchasing half cent stamps. The practice as a business connected with the Post Office Department, was strictly adhered to so far as I know, and my instructions were carried out. An office that never bought a half cent stamp for the ordinary purposes of business, would not therefore receive them without application, at least the half cent stamp, it being assumed they would not have any use for them.

Mr. SPROULE. My information is that they made application more than once from the same offices, and could not get them.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. A great many people applied for them, everybody wanted to get half cent stamps, and in a few days one person would have been able to buy them all up and make a corner in them.

Mr. SPROULE. The information given in this House was that they were to be distributed to the various post offices throughout the country in proportion to the amount of business which they did, and the various denominations in proportion. That was not the case.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. They were distributed strictly according to the pledge given upon the floor of Parliament.

Mr. SPROULE. I can assure the hon. gentleman that they were not, to my knowledge. I have it, not from one postmaster, but from three whom I know very well.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I sent to the department here the day before leaving for British Columbia as I wanted to take some with me, and I could not get them.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Of course not, you are not a postmaster.

Mr. McDOUGALL. That should not prevent me from getting them from the department that issued them.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes it should ; you had to go to a postmaster.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I sent a messenger for them, I do not know whether he went to the Post Office Department or to a branch outside, but all I could get was three cent stamps.

Mr. SPROULE. I applied personally and could not get them unless I took the full set, and I paid for the full set in order to get two or three half cent stamps.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. As to getting them from the Post Office Department the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. McDougall) may have my sympathy. I tried to get some from the Post Office Department and I was refused. I was told they could only be supplied by the postmasters, and I failed to get a stamp.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I would remind the hon. gentleman that while this discussion is very interesting, it would come up more appropriately on the item respecting stamps, postal cards, &c.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I wish to read to the committee what I stated in Parliament last year on the point :

On 10th June the Post Office Department will proceed to supply Jubilee stamps to the principal offices in Canada, and through them the minor post offices will obtain their supply until the issue is exhausted.

Inasmuch as the department is already receiving applications for the purchase of Jubilee stamps, it may be stated that the department will adhere to the established practice of supplying them only to postmasters and through them to the public, who may purchase them on and after the 19th June, 1897.

Mr. SPROULE. What I am pointing out is, that people did not receive them, although these stamps were applied for. If the sale were made to the postmasters, the customers of the post office would have received them. I tried three or four offices, and wrote to postmasters, but failed to get them.

Mr. INGRAM. In June there were stamps issued to the value $1,268,000, of which $719,650 were ordinary stamps and $444,000 Jubilee stamps. That will explain the issue.

Mr. SPROULE. Is the amount for printing and stationery a regular one ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is more or less an uncertain quantity.

Mr. SPROULE. There is a reduction of $1,000 in sundries. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will explain that reduction ?

The POSTMATER GENERAL. The reason is that there is nothing charged in the department for my travelling expenses, which has not been the practice in the past.

Resolutions to be reported.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. WALLACE. What is the next order of business ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If the Solicitor General is present we shall proceed with the Franchise Bill : and if not, we will take some minor Bills, and afterwards Supply.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 5.40 a.m. (Thursday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 5th May, 1898.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

BILL WITHDRAWN.

Bill (No. 98) to incorporate the Edmonton and Peace River Railway and Navigation Company.

GOVERNMENT HARBOURS, PIERS AND BREAKWATERS.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 135) to amend the Act respecting Government harbours, piers and breakwaters. He said : I explained the nature of this Bill the other day when I stated my intention to introduce it. The object is to permit the Minister of Marine, in cases where Government wharfs make an average return to the Government of a very small sum, to lease the wharf to the municipality in which it is, at the average sum received by the Government during the previous three years.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

PROTECTION OF NAVIGABLE WATERS.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 136) to amend the Act respecting the protection of navigable waters. He said: The object of this Bill is to provide that in navigable waters where there is not at least 12 fathoms of water at low tide, ballast, ashes, cinders, and other material that would sink to the bottom shall not be thrown into the water. This has grown into a practice with some of the large ships and the shipping interest asked that it be stopped.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

GANANOQUE CUSTOMS HOUSE.

Mr. TAYLOR (by Mr. Mills) asked,

Is the Government aware that the customs-house at Gananoque is so out of repair that the collector lately appointed cannot occupy the residential part of the building, much to his inconvenience? Is it the intention of the Government to cause the said repairs to be made at an early date?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). The answers to the hon. gentleman's questions are as follows:—1. The building is, it is true, out of repair; but not to that extent that the residential part cannot be occupied by the collector. He has applied for alterations and repairs which cannot be made now owing to insufficiency of appropriation. 2. It is the intention to have the repairs made as soon as a vote is available for that purpose.

THE LAURENTIAN RAILWAY.

Mr. GAUTHIER asked,

1. Whether the Government is aware that the Laurentian Railway, between Ste. Thérèse and St. Lin, is not provided with a telegraph line for the regulating of its trains, which constitutes a serious danger for those who travel thereon?

2. Is the Government aware that the said line is not sufficiently ballasted to insure the safety of trains running on its rails?

3. Is it the intention of the Government to inquire into the truth of these facts, and to compel the company working the railway to make such improvements as may insure the safety and comfort of travellers?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). 1. The Government is not aware that the Laurentian Railway between Ste. Thérèse and St. Lin is not provided with a telegraph line for the regulating of its trains. 2. The Government is not aware that the said line is not sufficiently ballasted to insure the safety of trains running on its rails. 3. If a complaint is made to the department that the road is in an unsafe condition to operate, the Government will most assuredly make all proper inquiries.

Sir LOUIS DAVIES.

MINING LEASES TO G. A. DROLET.

Mr. DAVIN asked.

Has the hon. the Minister of the Interior given his consent in writing to G. A. Drolet, of the city of Montreal, province of Quebec, to assign, transfer or sublet the right and privilege of taking and extracting by sub-aqueos mining and dredging all royal and base metals other than coal from certain portions of the bed of the North Saskatchewan River leased to the said Drolet by Her Majesty by virtue of an instrument or lease bearing date the 25th August, 1897? How many dredges has the said Drolet or his assignee at work on the portion of the North Saskatchewan covered by the said lease?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). In reply to the first question, I beg to say, yes. To the second question: the agent of the department has not yet reported as to the number of dredges at work. A report will be procured a little later in the season.

CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN MR. CHARLES RUSSELL AND CARDINAL RAMPOLLA.

Mr. McDOUGALL asked,

Has the Government knowledge, and was the same authorized by the Government or any of its members, of a letter written by Mr. Charles Russell to His Eminence Cardinal Rampolla, Secretary of State, of which the following is from a French translation:—

"Rome, 26th November, 1897.

"Eminence,—I have just arrived at Rome once again, at the urgent request of the Catholic members of the Government and of the Parliament of Canada, in whose name I have already presented myself to you. Although I have come so far, I do not dare to present myself to Your Eminence, because I would not in the least like, at this moment, to seem to be bringing pressure to bear or wish to impede the complete liberty of His Holiness. Moreover, I know how busy Your Eminence is, and I remember with what patience Your Eminence has so many times before heard our representations on the subject of Manitoba, which besides, Your Eminence now fully understands.

"I should not even like to give you the trouble to read this letter if I had not been very particularly asked to go to Rome by those whom I represent, and who, living far from Rome, do not know quite what to do in order to plead their cause and fulfil their duty to the Holy See.

"This is, therefore, why I take the liberty of writing to Your Eminence as follows:—

"Some days ago the Canadian newspapers caused to appear an item by which it was set forth that His Holiness has published a letter condemning in the most formal terms the concessions obtained for the Manitoba schools.

"A few days afterwards a declaration of official appearance made it known that no such letter existed.

"Although not resting upon any foundation, the publication of this news has created in Canada such a state of feeling that my principals thought they would be wanting in their duty

to His Holiness if they did not bring their respectful representations before him.

"The object of my visit is to call the attention of Your Eminence to the subject upon which I have so often negotiated, to know that such a condemnation would have the most disastrous effects for the peace of Canada and the cause of Catholic education in this country, while at the same time it would sow discord among the Catholics themselves.

"We do not solicit His Holiness to sanction as perfect the concessions obtained, but that in his wisdom he will be pleased to regard them as a beginning of justice. With the aid of time and thanks to the patient work of persuasion by their compatriots, the Catholics of Manitoba may hope to obtain satisfaction. The condemnation of the concession made would, at the present hour, render (I am begged to insist upon this point) any further concessions impossible.

"My instructions enjoin me again to renew to Your Eminence the desire, which I had already the honour to express to you, that His Holiness will be pleased to name a permanent delegate to Canada. The representative of His Holiness would reside on the spot, but would be outside local interests, and thus he could with more wisdom guide Catholics through the difficulties which they have to surmount.

"There is another point which I dare beg Your Eminence to be good enough to consider.

"Almost immediately when the Latin text of the letter of the Holy Father appears, difficult and even contradictory translations will appear, and, I am sure of it, most regrettable discussions will at once arise as to the interpretation of the words of His Holiness.

"In order to avoid such a misfortune, may I be permitted to suggest to Your Eminence, how desirable it would be that the Latin text should be accompanied by authorized texts in French and English. This procedure has been followed, if I recollect aright, on several occasions in the case of France and of England.

"I shall leave Rome on Saturday; till that day I am entirely at the disposal of Your Eminence."

And—

1. Whether the words "at the urgent request of the Catholic members of the Government" can in the present instance be applied to any other Government than to the Government of which the Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier is the Prime Minister?

2. Whether Mr. Russell tells the truth when he affirms that he went to Rome at the request of the Catholic members of the Government?

3. Whether Mr. Russell tells the truth when he affirms that he had already presented himself to the Secretary of State in the name of the same Catholic members of the Government?

4. Whether Mr. Russell tells the truth when he affirms that he was particularly requested to go to Rome by the Catholic members of the Government whom he represents?

5. Whether Mr. Russell tells the truth when he affirms that those whom he represents, living far from Rome, do not know quite what to do in order to fulfil their duty to the Holy See?

6. Whether Mr. Russell tells the truth when he affirms that his "principals, the Catholic members of the Government" thought they would be wanting in their duty to His Holiness if they did not bring their respectful representations before him?

7. Whether Mr. Russell tells the truth when he affirms that the Catholic members of the Government beg him to insist upon the fact that the condemnation at present of the concessions already made in the school question would render impossible any future concession?

8. Whether Mr. Russell tells the truth when he affirms that his instructions enjoin upon him to renew the demand which he has already made for the nomination of a permanent delegate?

9. If Mr. Russell tells the truth, how can the answer given up to this date in the Senate by some members of the Government be reconciled with such contradictory assertions?

10. If Mr. Russell does not tell the truth, is it the intention of the Government to continue to make use of a man whose assertions it is obliged to disavow?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The Government never had any knowledge of this letter, and does not know of its existence nor of its genuineness.

APPOINTMENTS BY THE LATE GOVERNMENT.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the right hon. gentleman if he would be good enough to lay upon the Table of the House the original reports of the Treasury Board submitted by the late Government just previous to leaving office, and the Orders in Council relating to them.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I thought we had had enough of this question, and I should suppose my hon. friend would think so himself. But I am not prepared to say yes or no to his question at the present time. I will give him an answer in a day or two.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will say, with the permission of the House, that the reason why I have not had enough of it is that there was a sharp issue as to a matter of fact between the Government and myself. I declared that the Governor General had signed these reports from the Treasury Board making these appointments, and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries joined issue with me and declared that the Governor General had never signed the reports of the Treasury Board, that his name was merely on the back.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). The hon. gentleman is quite mistaken, I made no such statement. I said that the reports of the Treasury Board were all fastened together, and that the Governor General signed his name on the outside, subject to his memorandum, and that the individual reports, each one of them, were not signed by him. When I made that statement, the hon. gentleman said across the floor of the House, "That is exactly correct," as the "Hansard" will show.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. What I said was that it was correct to say that the Governor General had signed the reports of the

Treasury Board subject to the exceptions which he had taken.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Well, I say that the hon. gentleman is correct, and I said so yesterday, that the Governor General appended his name to the outside of the bundle, subject to his memorandum. But the individual reports were not signed by him, and on the advice of the then Minister of Justice, before they were completed, they had to be signed by him. There is no issue of fact between us.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. You added that consequently the appointments had never been made.

Mr. FOSTER. May I ask——

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. I have allowed the hon. gentleman to transgress the rules of the House, as I looked upon their statements as in the nature of a personal explanation as to what they had said. I do not think any other hon. members have a right to intervene.

Mr. FOSTER. I just wish to ask a question, if that is in order. I ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if he will be kind enough to answer whether, when the work of a Treasury Board consisting of many recommendations, passes up in the shape of an Order in Council and goes to the Governor General, it is the custom for the Governor General to sign each one individually, or is the signature made by the Governor General upon the back of it, covering the order ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am not able to answer the hon. gentleman as to what is the practice. I am saying what was done in this case. The signature was subject to a memorandum, and the advice of the Minister of Justice of the day was that it was not complete until each order was signed.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). I think the practice was this, unless it was altered : His Excellency usually signs each separate report, but not each separate item. As I understand, half a dozen of these reports all went to His Excellency for his signature, and His Excellency, I think, to make it a lawful signature, should have signed, not each item but signed each report. I think there were four or five of them.

VACANCY FOR BAGOT.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to ask the right hon. leader of the House if he proposes to name a returning officer, and name an early day for the election in Bagot, as you have yourself, Mr. Speaker, declared that you have issued your warrant for the purpose of holding that election.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). My hon. friend was not in the House the other day when I suggested that under the circumstances now existing, it would be advisable to delay this election until there could be a full electorate. As my hon. friend is aware, if this writ is to be issued at present the election must take place upon lists which are nearly four years old. This suggestion was not received with favour by my hon. friends on the other side of the House. I may say to my hon. friend—this is Thursday—I will give a positive answer on Monday.

NEGOTIATIONS WITH NEWFOUNDLAND.

Mr. RODDICK. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I should like to ask the right hon. Prime Minister whether it is the intention of the Government to reopen negotiations with the Government of Newfoundland with the view of bringing that island into the confederation.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I received a note from my hon. friend within a couple of hours, informing me that he would put this question. I answered him—but I suppose he has not received my answer—that it was a matter of some consequence, and the Government would not be prepared to give an answer on the spur of the moment, and asking that he would give notice in the usual way.

INQUIRY FOR RETURNS.

Mr. McALISTER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the Postmaster General when the returns will be brought down concerning the Oak Bay Mills post office, in the county of Bonaventure. The order was passed two weeks ago.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). I will send to the department at once and see why the return has not been produced. Instructions were given.

PREFERENTIAL TRADE WITH GREAT BRITAIN.

Mr. McNEILL. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I should like to ask my right hon. friend a question as to which he has had some little time to think over his answer—whether he will be able to let me have a day, not later than Wednesday of next week, to discuss the preferential trade question.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). My hon. friend and myself had some private conversation yesterday upon that subject. If he will agree to the day which I privately mentioned to him, I will be glad to meet his wishes. If he will not accept that day, I cannot give him an answer today.

Mr. McNEILL. My right hon. friend, I suppose, has no objection to my referring to the day, although it was a private offer.

The PRIME MINISTER. No.

Mr. McNEILL. The day my right hon. friend proposed was a week from Wednesday next, and I understand that on his own side of the House there has been an impression abroad that the House will be near or about prorogation at that time. If that be so, I must say that I am very much surprised at the offer made by my right hon. friend. I do not think it is treating a great question with that degree of gravity and consideration which it deserves.

Mr. SPROULE. At the rate of progress made last night, we shall not reach prorogation very soon.

Mr. McNEILL. This question, my right hon. friend knows, is regarded by the Colonial Secretary as the greatest of all questions which a British Parliament can discuss.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman must not discuss it now.

Mr. McNEILL. I have no intention of discussing it now. The time will come, I hope, when there will be an opportunity afforded to discuss it. I do not wish to trespass on the time of the House, and I do not desire to move the adjournment, unless it is absolutely necessary, but I cannot allow the matter to stand over later than Wednesday of next week, or Thursday at the very latest day. I should like to know from the right hon. gentleman whether he will be able to give a day not later than Thursday of next week?

The PRIME MINISTER. I scarcely think it is necessary for the hon. gentleman to ask me the question, when he has already announced his determination to take a day. I have offered a day to the hon. gentleman, and if he will not accept it, I shall have to accept another day he may state.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will repeat his statement.

The PRIME MINISTER. I said I had suggested a day next Wednesday week, and I may add that I suggested that day for the reason I stated a moment ago. We are anxious to facilitate the business as much as possible in order to secure at some early day the blessing of prorogation. We want next week to send as much work as possible to the Senate in order that when the time comes for prorogation, nothing will hamper it. I suggested as a day very convenient Wednesday, 18th May. That is a very fair arrangement. If the hon. gentleman wants a previous day, I suppose he will take it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would recommend my hon. friend to accept the proposition of the leader of the House, so as to have a day fixed and definitely arranged, and in order that the House may know it.

Mr. McNEILL. Under the circumstances, if the hon. gentleman announces without any doubt that that will be the day, I will accept his proposal.

The PRIME MINISTER. I cannot make it any more definite than I have done, and the hon. gentleman should be satisfied.

MAILS FROM LAKEFIELD AND APSLEY.

Mr. LANG asked,

Did the Government ask for tenders in the year 1897 for carrying the mails from Lakefield to Apsley, in the county of Peterborough? If so, what were the names of those who tendered and the amount of each tender?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). Tenders for the carrying of the mails between Apsley and Lakefield were invited on March 5th, 1897; tenders to be received until April 16th, not later than twelve o'clock noon. The department received the following tenders:

Patrick Kennedy	$288
T. C. Eastland (tender dated 26th March)	300
R. J. Lennox	300

And another tender from T. G. Eastland, dated 19th March, for $340. The contract was awarded to the lowest tenderer, Mr. Patrick Kennedy, and has been signed by him.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 111) for better securing the safety of certain fishermen—(Sir Louis Davies.)

THE OFFICER COMMANDING THE MILITIA.

The House resolved itself into committee to consider the following resolution:

It is expedient to provide that the officer commanding the militia shall be paid a salary at the rate of $4,000 per annum, and in addition thereto in lieu of allowances, such sum, not exceeding $2,000 per annum, as the Governor in Council determines.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. SPROULE. Will the Minister state the present salary paid?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA (Mr. Borden). The law as it exists at the present time gives the general officer commanding $4,000, to cover salary and all allowances. It is proposed to change the law so that the salary paid shall be $4,000, but that

a sum not exceeding $2,000 may be paid as allowances.

Mr. SPROULE. Then the salary has been $4,000 heretofore, and it is now proposed to increase it by $2,000 ? The Government are more liberal towards the general than the poor civil servants.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA. This matter has been the subject of correspondence between this Government and former Governments of Canada and the Imperial Government, with the result that the present proposal is made to the House. It has been pointed out to this Government that it is impossible for an Imperial officer, occupying the prominent position which he holds in this country, to live on the salary at present given him. It has been pointed out, too, that while we are paying $4,000 a year salary and allowances, and while the strength of our militia is between thirty and forty thousand men, the commandant occupying a similar position in the colonial forces of Victoria, Australia, is in receipt of £1,400 sterling or $7,000, $3,000 more than we pay, and he has command of some five or six thousand troops only, whereas our commanding officer is in command of between thirty and forty thousand. It is also a fact that the commandant of the colonial forces of New South Wales receives £1,250 sterling, and has about the same number of men under him as the commandant in Victoria. The commandant of the S. M. mining and superintendent defence works, New South Wales, receives £1,050 sterling, and the commandant of the colonial forces in Queensland receives £1,200 sterling. The commandant of the Canadian forces is therefore paid very much less for a great deal more work than are the commandants of these colonial forces, and certainly the Dominion of Canada is not less important than are these other colonies. I have asked the quartermaster general to prepare for me a statement showing what the officer commanding the militia of Canada would, if employed in England or with the Imperial forces, receive. Such an officer as usually comes here as Major General——

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. That is in the way of allowances.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA. Pay and allowance. Such an officer is employed in England or with the Imperial forces would hold one of the following appointments, according to his rank in the Imperial service :

If a major-general in the army, he would be employed either as (a) major-general on the staff or (b) brigadier-general on the staff. The pay of a major-general on the staff is £3 sterling a day, or £1,095 sterling a year ; his allowances amount to about £1 7s. a day, or £492 15s. sterling a year. Total, £1,587 15s. The pay of a brigadier-general on the staff is £2 10s. a day, or £912 10s. a year ; his allowances are about 18s. 3d. a day, or £333 1s. 3d. a year. Total, £1,245 11s. 3d.

If his rank was that of colonel in the army, he would be employed as colonel on the staff, when his pay would be £2 a day, or £730 a year, and his allowance 15s. a day, or £273 15s. a year. Total, £1,003 15s. In view of these facts, taken in connection with the statement I have made that this is being done as the result of correspondence which has taken place between this Government and the Imperial Government, I hope the committee will approve of this resolution and will expedite the passing of it into law.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would ask the Minister of Militia if this resolution passes, whether Major General Gascoigne will receive any increased emolument under it ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA. The Act will not come into force until after the 1st of July. As the hon. gentleman is aware, Major General Gascoigne has resigned his position and is simply continuing until his successor has been appointed. I may say this, in justice to General Gascoigne, that this action of the Government has not been of his seeking at all.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I did not ask that question. I may say that I should give this resolution the most strenuous opposition in my power if it were contemplated that General Gascoigne would receive a single dollar of the money that will be voted under it. I give a most hearty support to this resolution for the reason that I believe it to be of the utmost importance to Canada, that we should have the office filled by an Imperial officer who is of high standing and ability, and who is calculated to discharge the duties of that important position in a manner suitable to the service. There can be no better evidence of the absolute necessity of passing this resolution than what we have witnessed in the administration of that department by Major General Gascoigne. If it were necessary to give even a larger amount in order to protect Canada from the employment of such an officer, I would cheerfully concur in it. As I understand it, the appointment of the commandant of our militia rests with the Canadian Government, but it has been the invariable practice, and I have no doubt will continue to be the invariable practice, that the Imperial War Office should be consulted in regard to the appointment. The Act provides that the Major General commanding the Canadian militia shall be an officer holding a certain rank in the Imperial army, and the practice has been to secure the recommendation and approval of the Imperial authorities to his appointment. But, Sir, that has not been sufficient to protect us from the presence of a gentleman occupying that position,

who, in my opinion, has disgraced it. The conduct of Major General Gascoigne in the discharge of what he thought to be his duties has brought the Government again and again into contempt, and has brought the department over which he presided and the officers of that department into contempt; that fact is, I say, a sufficient reason for the Minister of Militia proposing to this House that we shall give a larger salary for the purpose of securing a person properly qualified to fill the office. I am stating what is a matter of public notoriety when I say, that Major General Gascoigne involved himself in a most discreditable position in connection with the militia in Halifax, a position which led to great humiliation on his part. His conduct in relation to Col. Strathy was such that if a change of front had not been exhibited, serious consequences would have resulted. Major General Gascoigne rushed into the public press in that case, violated every principle of military rule, and described the differences between officers under his command as "a squabble between washerwomen." When that came to the notice of the public it was enough in itself to lead the Government to call on him the next day for his resignation. But the Government did not call for his resignation then, and Col. Strathy was forced into the position of protecting himself by an appeal to the press, the medium that was used by the Major General in attacking his officers. I say that Col. Strathy was forced to appeal to the public press to protect himself, and that was followed by his dismissal from the command of his regiment, and by his having his commission and rank removed. The conduct of the Major General resulted in a civil action being brought by Col. Strathy against him, and, speaking with the authority of one of the most eminent counsel in Canada, I have no hesitation in saying that that civil action would have resulted in a verdict against Major General Gascoigne in the courts of this country, which would have driven him out of the Imperial service altogether. Fortunately for him, he has been able to avoid that disgrace by getting his resignation accepted. I am delighted that it has been accepted by the Government, and I trust that the resolution before the House will enable us to secure an officer who will not degrade the position as Major General Gascoigne has degraded it from the time he came into this country up to the present moment. I trust we shall secure the services of an officer of high standing in the Imperial army, an officer who, in future, will be able to discharge properly these most important services for the Government of Canada; services as important as it is possible to conceive in relation to our country. We do not know at what moment we may want officers possessing the standing in the Imperial army, and the ability to render the most important service, not only to Canada, but to the Crown and the Empire to which we belong. I give my support most cheerfully to this resolution, on the assurance of the hon. gentleman that no portion of this money will be used for the advantage of Major General Gascoigne.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I am sure we must have heard the language just made use of by the hon. gentleman with astonishment and regret. There was no occasion at all for the exhibition of temper he has just shown; and, moreover, I think it was quite unworthy of him to use such language towards a brave officer. The fact that General Gascoigne has the honour of wearing the uniform of the British army, should alone be a reason for the hon. gentleman not speaking of him so lightly as he has done. I cannot refrain from saying that the hon. gentleman, when he used such language towards General Gascoigne, was simply indulging his personal spite. With regard to his conduct, there are different views, as there must always be with regard to the conduct of any man who occupies a public position; but when a man serves the public to the best of his light, even if he should be guilty of indiscretion, there would be no reason whatever for imputing improper motives to him, or using such insulting language as the hon. gentleman has used towards an officer of the British army. Though General Gascoigne will leave the service of Canada at an early day, I must say to the hon. gentleman at once that this resolution is not to be voted upon the understanding that no part of it is to go to General Gascoigne. General Gascoigne has submitted his resignation, which has been accepted, but he is to remain in office until his successor is appointed; and if his successor is not appointed before this resolution goes into force, that is, before the 1st of July, General Gascoigne will have the benefit of whatever benefit there may be in it. Therefore, let it be well understood that, if the Government have brought this resolution, it must be accepted by the House without any reference whatever to the merits or demerits of General Gascoigne. I conceive that his personality has been brought into the discussion of this matter by the hon. gentleman, for no other purpose than the indulgence of a little personal spite.

Mr. TISDALE. The hon. Minister of Militia was courteous enough to send me a copy of the correspondence with the War Office in Great Britain, and a comparison of the difference between what is paid to the Major General commanding the militia of Canada, and what is paid to similar officers in other colonies. It is expressly stated in the correspondence that a proper increase in the pay of the Major General Commanding would probably lead to the appointment of a commandant of a higher grade than

those hitherto sent out to Canada. Without reflecting upon any of them, which would be foreign to the few remarks I have to make, I may say, so far as my responsibility goes, that I am only too happy to support this motion; because, as has been well said, even if a higher amount were necessary to procure the best material in the British army to command our militia, it would be none too much to pay for such an improvement. I think our militia, without disparaging that of any other colony, stands equal to the best, and, therefore, I am quite willing to support such an increased emolument as will secure for our militia an officer of superior rank and attainment, such as the War Office in England is anxious to send. I am sure this is a step in the right direction, and I am quite confident that both sides of the House will support it. That is the main question at issue, and is the main reason, I understand, why the hon. Minister has proposed this moderate increase in the salary. This is an especially opportune time for taking this step, when we are pleasantly as well as seriously face to face with large Imperial opportunities and larger Imperial feeling, and I hope more intimate relations in all respects with the Empire; and one of the first necessities of any free country is to show, by the organization of a proper defensive force, that we are prepared, when the proper time comes, to take our share of responsibility in a more serious manner even than granting the money necessary to secure for our militia the best class of officers. I have great pleasure in supporting the motion.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I fully agree with every remark that has fallen from the lips of the hon. gentleman who occupied for some time the position now occupied by the hon. Minister of Militia. This matter was a subject of discussion between the Imperial Government and the Canadian Government, even when I was Minister of Militia, and I think the resolution is a move in the right direction. I think the General Officer Commanding has been underpaid, though he occupied the highest position in this country that could be conferred upon any military man from the old country. But admitting as we do that the increase now proposed is not too great, I think the hon. Minister should be extremely particular about the officer who will be recommended to us. The appointment is a Canadian appointment, but the Canadian Government, in selecting an Imperial officer to command our forces, naturally and properly consult the Imperial Government, in order to obtain that information which they can hardly be expected to possess themselves, as to the qualifications of the officer who may be recommended. It is extremely important that the very best man available should be selected, not only from a military standpoint, but from the standpoint of other qualifications which are probably even more indispensable——

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Hear, hear.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. In an officer commanding the volunteer forces such as we have in Canada than in one commanding an army, controlled absolutely by regulations which enforced a discipline more rigid than can be expected among volunteers. I think that we can, as Canadians, be very proud of our militia. We know that whenever that force has been called upon to do its duty towards our country, it has done it in a manner which has commanded the admiration not only of Canadians, but of people living outside the realm of Canada.

With regard to the increase in the pay of the commanding officer, I am not quite certain whether the hon. gentleman has explained how he intends to make that increase. Is it to be in the shape of allowances or in lieu of allowances, or is it as an increase to the salary, because I can see a distinction? For instance, the commanding officer should be allowed a certain amount to keep a charger, which is as indispensable to him as his sword; and if the hon. gentleman gives an increased amount, I think that regulations should be laid down as to how that increase is to be utilized.

Mr. HUGHES. I very heartily endorse the proposition of the Government to give an additional sum of $2,000 allowances to the general officer commanding our forces. I wish to point out that the mistakes or the faults, if there have been any, in relation of the officers commanding the militia in this country have not always been with the general officer commanding. It will be remembered that up to the year 1875, our militia force drilled every year. We had the various excitements of the Fenian raids, the Red River rebellion, and so on, which kept the martial spirit alive in the country, and the consequence was our various corps were well filled up with good men. In 1874, the same party who now controls the Government assumed the reins of office, and on that occasion they pursued a policy entirely different from that now actuating this Government in relation to the militia. At that time their policy was openly expressed to break up the militia as far as possible. To-day an entirely different spirit, I am pleased to see, pervades the Militia Department of the Government. The volunteer forces, on account of being brought out for drill at company headquarters only once every two years, fell undoubtedly into a disorganized condition, and in 1880 we found the first attempt made after 1875 to revive the annual camps. Even then these were merely spasmodic. The Liberal-Conservative party failed to return to their old line of policy, and pursued

a half-hearted policy with regard to the militia until very recent years. Therefore, I maintain that when Generals Luard and Middleton and Herbert came out they found the militia in a condition which undoubtedly called for adverse reports. But although I have had my own differences with some of these gentlemen, I stand here to say, as one who pretends to know something about the militia of our country, that these gentlemen, in many of the recommendations and strictures they made to the Government were entirely in the right. So far as General Gascoigne is concerned, I must say that while I do not know the details of some of the little scraps he seems to have got into—and I think it would be very strange, with all the conditions surrounding our militia force if the officer commanding would not occasionally run foul of somebody—so far as my observation and experience have gone, I have always found General Gascoigne a most efficient and gentlemanly officer, and personally I shall be very sorry when he leaves the country. I believe he leaves in the end of June, and at all events, he will carry with him, so far as I am concerned, nothing but the very kindest regards. Whether he has made mistakes or not, I am not here to say, but undoubtedly he has done a great deal to promote the effectiveness of our militia, and I believe that if the hon. Minister of Militia (Mr. Borden) expresses his views, he will say that undoubtedly he has been greatly assisted in carrying out every necessary reform by the Major General commanding our forces.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Hear, hear.

Mr. HUGHES. References have been made here to the fact that we can get a better commanding officer by paying him more. No doubt, we can more readily get men to leave the Imperial service and come here by that means, but many gentlemen in this country seem to think that it requires one type of man to command a regular regiment and another to command a militia regiment. I had the pleasure of seeing the militia march past in Aldershot, and in appearance, physique and drill they compared very favourably with the regular service, and I believe that the same qualities which enable a man to command in the volunteer service make him fit to administer a command in the regular service. This cry that one type of man is required for the regular army and another for volunteer regiments is entirely wide of the mark. To-day the old tyranny and cat-o'-nine-tails have fortunately disappeared in the service, and the man who understands how to manage the regular service undoubtedly will understand how to manage the militia service of this country.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA. The remarks which have fallen from the hon. leader of the Opposition render it necessary for me to make a short rejoinder. I think it was extremely unfortunate that the hon. gentleman should have deemed it his duty to take advantage of a motion of this kind to make a violent attack upon the Imperial officer commanding the militia in this country. The hon. gentleman ought to have remembered that that officer has no opportunity of replying. Therefore, I think it was exceedingly unfair, under the circumstances, for the hon. gentleman to have made the attack he did. It is due to General Gascoigne that I should say—and I say it with the greatest pleasure—that my relations with him up to this moment, have been of the pleasantest character. I believe him to be a man well qualified to fill the position he holds. He has worked hard, and has brought about reforms in the militia greater than any that have been effected in an equal number of years at any previous period. It is only fair to General Gascoigne to say that while I was recently in England, I met there a gentleman who had been in command of the force here, and that gentleman told me that more had been done during the last two or three years for the militia of Canada than had been done during any previous ten years, and those previous ten years to which that gentleman referred covered a time during which he was general in command here himself. So far as the departure of General Gascoigne from this country is concerned, it is not due to any breach of pleasant relations between him and myself, but is entirely due to personal matters of his own. As I have said, throughout his career, I believe, he has endeavoured honestly to do his best and to do his duty, and he has done it. He is not perfect, as the Premier has said, any more than any of the rest of us, but whatever he has done he has done conscientiously. I have always found him ready to meet me on any case in which we differed, and we have always been able to come to an amicable settlement of the difficulty. The hon. leader of the Opposition has referred to the case of Colonel Strathy. I think it is unfortunate that that case should be brought up here. Whatever cause Colonel Strathy may have thought he had for taking the course he did, his course was certainly an unsoldierlike course. If it were a fact that the General has committed an indiscretion—which I do not admit—there would have been no justification for Colonel Strathy to take the course he did. The hon. gentleman well knows that two wrongs do not make a right. I repeat that it is unfortunate that this case should have been brought up here. With regard to the matter at Halifax, that has been entirely settled. There was for a time a slight misunderstanding, but there is not the least doubt that General Gascoigne was right in the letter of his contention that there were

men enlisted in the 66th Battalion of Halifax who had no right, in view of the contract they had entered into to serve the Imperial Government, to enlist in that battalion. I have thought it only fair to say this single word with reference to the General.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am not surprised at the remarks that have fallen from the hon. Minister of Militia. He has found General Gascoigne a very complaisant commanding officer, he has found him making reports of the strongest character to the late Government on an important question, and taking those reports back and making other reports at the request of the Minister. He has found in General Gascoigne exactly the sort of man that suits some Ministers, and that is a man who has no opinions except those dictated to him by his superior officers, and so complaisant as to be ready to take back his own recommendation and throw contempt upon it at the instance of his superior, and again change it when the Minister found the pressure upon him too strong, and to go back to his original report. I say I am not surprised at the defence the Minister of Militia has made for him. But I may say that the Minister of Militia is entirely wrong in saying that General Gascoigne has not the means of defending himself. The hon. Minister says rightly that Colonel Strathy was guilty of great indiscretion, to say the least of it, and violated military orders, in going to the press. But it must be remembered that Colonel Strathy had the example, before he did so, of the General Officer Commanding. He only followed the pernicious example which led him into that indiscretion. General Gascoigne has no means of defending himself, says the Minister of Militia. Why, he has an action for libel to-day against the Montreal "Gazette," if he ventures to take it. The hon. First Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) says he has a profound respect for a red coat. I have no respect for a cad because a red coat is on his back, not the slightest. I respect a red coat and I respect every man who is engaged, whether in Canada or in any other part of the Empire, in defence of the country, and no man will be more ready to sustain that important branch of the service than I, here and everywhere. But to say that because a man wears a red coat we must bow down like a Chinese before him and hold his person as too sacred to allow us to speak of him is an opinion I do not entertain. The Montreal "Gazette" states the facts as I have stated them with regard to Colonel Strathy, and not only that but they state that when General Gascoigne was confronted with legal process that would put him on the stand in the courts of the country to answer for his conduct, he endeavoured to take back what he had said, but was unable to do so. And the Montreal "Gazette" says that there is abundant proof of what he said and attempted to deny when face to face with legal process. This requires no elaboration on my part; these facts speak for themselves. But I express my satisfaction that the country is soon to be rid of an officer who, since he came to the country has proved himself so unfitted for the position he held. I am not a militia officer, I am not one under his command, I am not one of his professional associates—but I am in a position as a layman to judge of the conduct of militia officers, just as I am to judge of the conduct of anybody else. I say that tried by everything that involves manly, straightforward, independent able discharge of public duties, General Gascoigne has been the most signal failure ever sent to this country to occupy so high a position.

Mr. WALLACE. I was rather surprised that the Minister of Militia in one sentence, should condemn Colonel Strathy in the most measured terms for what he calls unsoldierlike conduct in rushing to the public press, while, in the same breath he eulogizes General Gascoigne who was guilty of the very same wrong. I think the superior officer should have set an example to his subordinate, and I think if censures are to be inflicted, a commencement should be made with the chief and most grievous sinner.

Now, the Minister of Militia said that he had it on high authority, and he himself endorsed the statement, that the militia had improved more during the past three years under General Gascoigne's management than they had for ten years before. If that is the case, I would like to ask the Minister why he so readily accepted the resignation of General Gascoigne? Why, that resignation was hardly put in before he jumped at it and accepted it at once. If we had such a valuable officer, one who had done more in three years than others had done in three or four times that length of time, the Minister of Militia was not doing his duty to the country in accepting that resignation unconditionally and so readily. I think he is bound to give an explanation of his conduct in that respect. We are told, and I think told now for the first time, that this resignation was sent in for personal reasons. That statement should have been made before. The people of this country, the press of this country have been making comments and suggesting various reasons for this resignation, and not until to-day have we been informed that those reasons were of a personal nature.

It is a well known fact that General Gascoigne is not specially needed in the British army at the present time. I regret that when the Government are coming down with a proposal enormously to increase the pay of the General commanding the Canadian forces, they should not have taken power to appoint a Canadian to that office. We have had experience in the past of the difficulties to be encountered in the appointment of a British officer, coming here, as has been the

case with every one of them, without a knowledge of our Canadian militia, without a knowledge of the genius of the Canadian people, without a knowledge of the spirit which animates our Canadian volunteers, without which a General commanding cannot effectively do his work. We have been getting these British officers, and it has taken them years to get educated so as effectively to perform the duties they are called upon to perform in Canada. Very few of them, I think, have succeeded. They have always had this difficulty to contend with, that they have spent their lives in the permanent force of the British army, and they do not realize the great difference that exist between a permanent force of that character and our Canadian volunteers. As a result, there has been a great deal of friction, a great deal of unrest, a want of unification and success in the efforts of the commanding officer. We are training up in Canada many able and competent militia officers, and I think that the command of the Canadian contingent should be something that every Canadian militia officer, who devotes his time and his talents to the defence of our country, might fairly look forward to. But hitherto that has been denied them, the officer has been selected from the British army; and, as I understand, the regulations require that he shall be an officer of the British army. But, Sir, our Canadians have had experience of war, our Canadians have had experience in the theory of war, and in the drilling and organization of troops. They know the country, they know the genius of our people, and in many respects Canadians would be the best qualified to have control and management of our Canadian volunteers. As to their loyalty to the Empire, Mr. Chairman, we yield to no part of it in our loyalty and our devotion to Great Britain. Therefore there is no danger to Imperial connection, but on the contrary a cementing of those loyal influences would be secured by the appointment of a Canadian officer to command the Canadian forces.

Mr. TISDALE. I will venture to trouble the House a little longer, because the discussion has wandered to some extent from the very important matter that the House is called to pass upon. For that reason I will take the liberty of putting on the "Hansard" an important part of the correspondence, because it is more valuable and probably more cogent than anything which could be said in justifying this resolution, which, as I have said before, I have great pleasure in accepting. The first letter is addressed to the Under Secretary of State from the War Office:

I am directed by the Secretary of State for War to request you will be good enough to draw the attention of the Secretary of State for the Colonies to the inadequacy of the pay received by the General Officer commanding Canadian Dominion Militia and his aide-de-camp.

With the view of assisting Mr. Chamberlain in approaching the Canadian Government on this question, should he think fit to do so, the following summary is given of the main points for consideration:—

1. The General Officer commanding Canadian Militia is in receipt of only $4,000 (£800) a year, which rate compares very unfavourably with the pay assigned by the various Australian colonies to the commandants of their local forces, especially when the small strength of their respective commands is compared with that of the Canadian forces, which consist of 35,000 men. (See statement inclosed.)

2. The post is intended to be held by a general officer. An officer of inferior rank would not be likely to have sufficient weight and authority in the Dominion. The pay (exclusive of allowances) which a general officer can obtain in an ordinary appointment, as major general on the staff at home is £3 a day, or £1,095 a year and when unemployed his half-pay is £500 a year. There is, therefore, an obvious difficulty in inducing such an officer to accept a post so onerous as the Canadian command for only £300 a year more than half-pay when unemployed.

The Marquis of Lansdowne considers it very desirable, as a matter of Imperial policy, that this appointment should be filled by a general officer on the active list of the British army, who would, during his tenure of it, remain in touch with the authorities of the army at home. He fears, however, that it is entirely out of the question to expect the general officer concerned to maintain a proper position upon the existing rate of pay, and he, therefore, desires strongly to urge Mr. Chamberlain to press the matter upon the Canadian Government in any way he may consider most likely to be successful. It has been suggested that, as there are at present no allowances attached to this command, it might be possible to obtain an increase of the officer's emoluments in that form, and it is understood that the Adjutant General and Quartermaster General of the Dominion Militia receive $600 a year in this manner.

With regard to the post of aide-de-camp, the total pay is $1,200 a year, which is considerably less than that received by an aide-de-camp on the home establishment, who receives 15s. a day, exclusive of allowances.

The next letter is from the hon. Mr. Chamberlain. I may ask the Minister if these letters were laid on the Table?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA. No.

Mr. TISDALE. Well, the other letter is a confidential one, therefore, I will not read it. That is the main letter, and that was followed by a communication from the Governor General in regard to this matter. As I understand the proposition, it is no disparagement to the distinguished officers who have occupied the position of commandant here. These have been colonels of regiments before they came here. I understand it to be part of the intention of the Minister of Militia and Defence that this additional allowance we are asked to vote, is to enable him on the advice of, and after communication with the War Office, to procure a general officer from the British army instead of simply a colonel of a regiment. Now, that is a most important distinction, and possibly it

was not fully enough explained before. But I understand that is the reason for which this is to be voted. I think we could give a considerably larger sum, and yet be within the amounts that some of the other colonies, with smaller forces, vote to-day. Now, with regard to the proposition of the hon. member for York (Mr. Wallace), I do not propose to discuss it, because both the late Government and the present Government are controlled by the Militia Act which says that the commandant shall be an officer of the British army.

Mr. WALLACE. Who was it made the Militia Act ?

Mr. TISDALE. I am not sure, I think it was Cartier, and from that time up——

Mr. WALLACE. I thought it was the Parliament of Canada.

Mr. TISDALE. I thought you meant what Government was responsible.

Mr. WALLACE. Parliament can unmake it.

Mr. TISDALE. I am not raising the question, but I am saying that it has been well settled, because the late Government adopted the law and the present Government have adopted it. I may say, however, that I do not agree with my hon. friend that the time has yet come when a Canadian officer should command our militia.

Mr. CLARKE. Why not ?

Mr. TISDALE. The very letter from the War Office in London gives the reason, it is that we shall be kept in close touch with the British army. There is another reason which is quite sufficient for me at the present time. We should have a general officer who has had experience in commanding a regiment, not in commanding a brigade, not largely in simply drilling corps, but an officer who has seen service in commanding large bodies of men. In case we are ever called out to active service in a foreign war, our forces will be auxiliary, and they will be kept in direct touch with the British army through an experienced general who has seen service in commanding larger bodies of troops, and who would not only command our confidence, but command the confidence of the Imperial army. I am not saying but that the time may come when this change may occur, and when it does come, I shall be prepared to support it, but the question is not raised, and I make these few observations, though they are not strictly pertinent, because there is no proposition to change the Militia Act, but there is simply before the House a proposition to increase the pay of the Major General Commanding, in order that we may get, and I emphasize this point, a thoroughly qualified commanding officer, and I understand that is the object aimed at by the Minister. I would not be prepared, however, to make even this increase, except with the understanding that we do not get a colonel of some regular regiment, but a major-general or a brigadier-general on the active list, as the hon. Under-Secretary of War intimates. That being the case, there will be a unanimous feeling, not only in the militia, but among the people of the country, that this is a wise proposition, and will be the means of preventing the troubles that have been alluded to, because I have confidence in the superior knowledge, experience and capacity of an officer who has attained the rank of General in the British army, that he will be able not only to bring military qualifications, but other qualifications necessary, proper and desirable to distinguish as between the command of a regular force and a volunteer force such as ours.

Mr. HUGHES. Representations have been made in the press in favour of the appointment of a Canadian officer to command the Canadian militia. Although it may seem a little heterodox in one of the militia, probably with some aspirations in the military line, to oppose any such scheme ; nevertheless, I stand here to say that I am heartily and emphatically opposed to the command of our militia being given to an officer simply possessing training in the Canadian service. There are hundreds of high positions open to Canadians in the military service of the Empire, as compared with those offered in the Canadian service. There is no reason why a Canadian at an early day should not become Field Marshal of the British forces. We have here many able young Canadians, graduates of the Royal Military College, who have attained high rank and are considered superior officers by those in authority in the old land. What is to hinder these men in the near future attaining high rank, because not very many years have elapsed since Lord Roberts and Lord Wolseley were juniors in the service, and the whirligig of time may bring one of our Canadians to the command of the Imperial service. Should there be in the Imperial service a Canadian of rank to command our militia, there would be no objection to bringing this officer back and placing him in command of our forces. Take, however, any officer of the permanent, country or city corps and place him at the head of the militia, and the result would be to bring about dissensions. At no time during which an Imperial officer has been in command here, has there been anything like the trouble that would follow if a Canadian officer were placed in this position, because there are fifty or a hundred officers who think they are just as good as the other officers, and I do not think there would be any reason to suppose that one is not as good as the other. The only way to have the militia properly managed is to have members of Parliament create an enthusiasm in its favour in the country.

I congratulate the hon. gentlemen opposite on reversing their old niggardly policy and adopting a progressive policy, and I congratulate specially the hon. Minister of Militia and Major General Gascoigne on this change, and if the members of Parliament and the people would feel greater interest in the force, there is no reason why any officer of the Imperial service should have the slightest trouble whatever in commanding the militia. The trouble has arisen owing to the militia being half-hearted, owing to the department being half-hearted and owing to Parliament being less than half-hearted, and officers have been called upon to make great sacrifices, and have not been able even after making those sacrifices to maintain the high position which the force should occupy.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not desire to enter the list of military critics, but I should like to ask the Minister of Militia a question in regard to a matter of procedure. Suppose a responsible officer makes grave charges against the commander of a regiment and offers to prove his charges, they taking quite a wide range, and suppose that the officer demands an investigation, what would be the routine followed ? Does it rest entirely with the General whether an investigation be held or not ; or do the General and the Minister of Militia in common have certain powers in respect to it ; or has the Minister himself ultimately the supreme power with respect to the matter ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA. In the first instance, the matter will go as one of routine to the General. If the officer aggrieved did not get satisfaction from that quarter, if an investigation were refused, then he would have the right to appeal to the civil head of the department, to the Minister. As a matter of fact, in matters of discipline, the General does not come to me at all until he has got through the case. Then, of course, it comes to me ultimately, to decide whether I approve or disapprove of his conclusions. If the General fails to act, I may know nothing about the case. If he acts ; before his recommendation is carried into effect, I must approve of it.

Mr. FOSTER. In regard to the ultimate appeal to the Minister, what is the procedure ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA. I think it would be open to any officer to appeal direct to the Minister. The case, however, should go through the regular channel. The officer should write a letter to his commanding officer if he be a subordinate officer or if a commanding officer of a battalion should write to the district officer ; from the district officer the case would go to the General, and the General would send the officer's letter to me. That is the course such an officer should take, and then the matter would be considered.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not rise to say anything in regard to criticising the proposed vote, and I may say in passing that I approve it, but I desire to refer to the criticism of the Minister of Militia and the First Minister with respect to the observations of the leader of the Opposition, when they expressed surprise that he should have availed himself of the present occasion to have addressed the committee as he has, seeing there was very little connection between the item and a commandant occuping the position of Major General Gascoigne. Now, if I understand correctly the proprieties of Parliament ; it is proper that when an estimate is before the House for the purpose of paying the expenses of any department, any hon. gentleman can either criticise the management of the department or the actual incumbent of the office. In my judgment, there could be no time more appropriate than the present for the observations which were made by the hon. leader of the Opposition.

Resolution to be reported.

FISHERIES ACT AMENDMENT.

Bill (No. 127) to further amend the Fisheries Act, was read the second time, and the House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What is the change here ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The law at present provides that fishing stands under license need not be removed from the time of low water mentioned in this clause, and the amendment provides that they shall be removed whether under license or not.

On section 2,

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. At the present time in order to overcome the regulation that the meshes shall be of the prescribed size, it is a practice to double the nets so as to make the meshes half the regulation size. This provision is that the nets shall not be arranged in any manner so as to defeat the object of the regulation.

On section 4,

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. This section provides that where legally caught fish and illegally caught fish are intermingled, all of the fish may be forfeited.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It came up in connection with lobster fishing.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

SUPPLY.

The House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Ocean and River Service—Maintenance and repairs to Government steamers. $112,000

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. How comes this decrease of $400 ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). I cut it off because I found that the service could be performed for the round sum of $112,000. The steamers are the "Newfield," "Lansdowne," "Stanley" (when used in the summer service), "Aberdeen," "Quadra" and "Druid."

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What has become of the "Canadienne" ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. She is going on this year in the fishery protection service.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Is the "Lansdowne" going to be used this year for the tidal service ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Not this year; we cannot spare her.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Is any vessel ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We have no vessel to spare for the tidal survey this year. The tidal survey will be the usual service that Mr. Dawson carries on. He has seven tide gauges in different parts of the river and Gulf of St. Lawrence. I consulted with Mr. Dawson and he thinks that by having some one to inspect them he can be better employed here in tabulating the results and forwarding them to the Hydrographic Office in England. I have a special vote for that.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Is the hon. gentleman going to add to the vessels on the Pacific Coast ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Not this year. I hope to press on my colleagues some day in the near future the propriety of an appropriation to have a vessel detailed there for the fishery service, so as to confine the "Quadra" to the marine branch.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Is the "Quadra" used now by the Customs Department ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Not to any extent. She is at present up the coast with Col. Anderson, superintendent of lights.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That is her regular service, but is she not used for customs work ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Not that I know of.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Is there an arrangement between the two departments as there used to be, for a division of the charge, when a vessel is used by another department than that to which she is primarily charged ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The Department of Customs has the "Constance," and the "Stanley" will be specially detailed this summer for customs work; and of course they will be charged against that department.

Mr. CLARKE. I notice it stated in one of the papers that some of these fishery protection vessels are being armed with Gatling guns. May I ask if that is so ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It is so. I thought that, instead of having old-fashioned guns which were of very little use, on these fishery protection boats, it was desirable to have one or two modern quick-firing guns; and I was fortunate enough to be able to secure from my hon. friend the Minister of Militia a number of these, and one is being placed on board of each of the fishery cruisers.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I think that is a move in the right direction, and I shall be glad when the Government is able to improve the fishery protection vessels in every respect, so that they may be serviceable for any contingency that may arise. I think it would be proper for the Government to consider the desirability of having vessels which would command more respect than schooners or pleasure yachts; and I have reason to believe that the Minister of Marine has given some attention to the subject of having for this service a better class of vessels, which could be used for other purposes should occasion require. Is the hon. gentleman able to say in this connection whether he has had before him any proposition from a society or organization in Toronto with regard to the improvement of this service ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes. I have had very important representations made to me from the society in Toronto, and from other parts of the Dominion, as to the necessity of improving our fishery protection service, so that

it should afford some protection to our marine and to our ports and harbours. That subject has been receiving the consideration, not only of myself, but of my colleagues before whom I have brought it; and I am in hopes that before the session ends I may be in a position to propose a small vote in that direction. When that comes down, I shall be happy to discuss the question fully with my hon. friend, and I am sure he will strengthen my hands in that matter.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I quite agree that the present fishery protection boats are not quite as effective for purpose of attack and defence as they might be; and, so far as my voice goes, it will be my care to see, that if any addition is made to that fleet, the vessels shall be fitted to receive a reasonable number of guns and a reasonable amount of armament, so as to protect themselves and to afford some protection to the ports and harbours in the vicinity where they ply.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. When I was in the Department of Marine, I adopted a plan which worked very well indeed for the short time it was tried. It was this. We found that in connection with the protection service we got a splendid class of men as seamen for a limited period. We put them under regular discipline and training, instructing them in revolver shooting, sword exercise, and so on—in fact, such regular discipline as they would have on a man-of-war. After the season was over, these men had nothing to do in the Government service; and they got places much cleaner and nicer in every way than the hard and rough life of seamen on the coast. Preferring not to go back to that life, they went to other countries and entered the navy. Many of them entered the United States navy to carry on the profession which we had practically taught them. That was not desirable from any point of view. To counteract that, the scheme I speak of was adopted by the department, and I want to know how far it is in force at present. We took the pick of the men, and after the season of the protection service was over, we put them on the pay-list of the vessels on marine duty, such as the supply boats that serve the lighthouses. We had more men than were required for those boats in the winter, but we had them available for the spring. I see nothing in the reports about that system, and I would ask the hon. gentleman if he has continued to carry it out.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I may say that I have carried it out, at a great deal of personal inconvenience to myself. Many of our friends were under the impression that these vessels should be supplied with new hands every spring; but, at the risk of some personal unpopularity, I have adhered to the old system, because I thought it was a wise and judicious system. I have retained the old hands on board, and have continued the system of promotion, thus making the whole service one as far as possible: and, so far as I know, since I have had charge of the department, Commander Spain has enforced the discipline quite as fully as before. But I prefer to leave this matter open, because it is so intimately allied with the proposition which I hope to submit for still greater improvement in the training of our naval force. I am in hopes of submitting a scheme whereby we may train annually a certain number of seamen, so as to constitute them into an effective naval reserve, and so that no man shall be employed on any Government ship until he has received that training and a certificate. But I would prefer to leave that matter until I bring down the proposition.

Mr. KAULBACH. When is it the intention that the fleet for the patrol service shall proceed to the waters of the North Atlantic? It is desirable that it should go as soon as the run of mackerel comes from the south.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Commander Spain has gone, and he is now commissioning his vessels without any delay

Mr. CLARKE. I do not know whether this is the time to inquire about the granting of fishing licenses on the waters of the great lakes. I communicated with the hon. gentleman on behalf of one of my constituents who applied for a license and whose request could not be granted.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That is hardly germane to the vote before the committee. The system on the great lakes has been to grant licenses largely to the local fishermen. Of late years, the past season particularly, the fishermen who sail out from the north shore lakes—Goderich and other places which I call the north shore, I do not know whether I am right or not—desire to have their licenses made out so as to allow them to follow the fish south, but the fishermen of the southern parts protest very vigorously against that, and I have had numerous protests made by the captain of the "Petrel" and other qualified gentlemen against this. I, therefore, am disposed to adhere to the system I found in operation. There are some advantages which could possibly be urged in favour of the change, but weighing them against the disadvantages, I have been unable to come to the conclusion that the present system ought to be changed.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. How much does the hon. gentleman estimate for such steamers? In the Auditor General's Report, I find that instead of costing $112,000 they cost $136,000.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That comprises the "Stanley," $26,250.25, which is not in the present estimate. You will find that that will exactly make the $112,000. The "Stanley" has been detailed for other work, and is therefore not in this item.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Is the "Douglas" going to be held on to?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It is tied up at the wharf at Victoria and has been for years. I have had a couple of offers at $2,000, but would not listen to them for the reason that I may employ it on a hydrographic survey of the coasts of British Columbia, for which it might be used effectively. The great trouble is, she is such an expensive boat to run, but I thought it would be better to keep her at any rate than sell her for $2,000.

Mr. KAULBACH. I hope the hon. gentleman will not consider that I am departing from the usual practice by taking too wide a range in this discussion, but the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) having referred to the drill or practice on board these government cutters. I desire to offer a word or two in that connection.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not want to be dragged into a discussion of this matter unless it is really necessary, but would prefer that the hon. gentleman would reserve his remarks until the vote comes down for that subject.

Mr. KAULBACH. As I may not be here then, I desire to say a word or two now. There is a young man residing in my town, who has been on board the steamship or man of war "Blake," and is thoroughly well drilled in his work as an able seaman in every particular. He has been on board one of the steam cutters in the patrol service last year, and reported as a very excellent man. Last autumn, when the vessel was taken off the service, he was discharged and left to paddle his own canoe. I would like to ask the Minister whether he could not possibly manage to retain his services, as I would not like to have him leave the country. I may say his habits are excellent, and in every particular I can recommend him as worthy of the employ of the service. His name is Alfred Wood.

An hon. MEMBER. Politics.

Mr. KAULBACH. No, not politics at all. If he has any, it may be the other way.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I want to ask whether the Registry of Shipping has been completed and distributed, because I find an item in the Estimates for this purpose?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It is not in this item, and we will come to it in a moment.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Is there a general officer for supervising the repairs of steamers?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No, except Captain McElhinney, who is a nautical officer. We have them of course in different places.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I understand that Mr. Stevens was the inspector of steamboats, and Mr. Stewart, of Charlottetown, was appointed inspector in his place.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Not at Charlottetown.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It was Stewart, or some name like that. At any rate, he was appointed before the late Government was defeated, and Mr. Stevens, a very experienced man, who had been inspector for quite a number of years at Halifax, was appointed to the position of general supervisor of repairs for these steamers, one of the largest items that go to make up this amount, and a great deal of abuse can occur from negligence or anything of that kind under this head. The idea was to have Mr. Stevens in full charge of these steamers, at any rate those in New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island, so that these repairs might be made as required and made with the strictest economy.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That is carried out still.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Is the hon. gentleman able to say how the experiment has resulted? I found that private steamship companies, for instance, the "Cunard" and others, had an officer like that whom they paid well—a first-class man of course—but I have never seen anything to show whether the experiment resulted in a reduction in the amount required for repairs.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I have not had my attention called to that, but will look into it.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. For that reason, this item ought to be a declining one, and we have only a reduction of $400.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It is pretty hard to make them decline, I notice.

Mr. FOSTER. Harder now than it was before.

Rewards for saving life..... $7,000

Mr. INGRAM. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Marine if Mr. Berry has been dismissed from the lifeboat station at Port Stanley?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am not aware that he has.

Mr. INGRAM. I was informed that he had been.

Mr. FOSTER. Can my hon. friend inform me whether any change has been made in the keeper of the lifeboat station at Wellington ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND ISHERIES. None that I am aware of.

Mr. FOSTER. I wish the hon. gentleman would inquire of his deputy.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. My deputy cannot recall the facts, but I will make inquiry and give the information before my estimates go through.

Mr. FOSTER. Probably I had better give the Minister the information, and he can think it over. The statement was made in a letter received this morning that the officer on the lifeboat station at Wellington has been for 15 years in the service and captain of the life-saving station. He has received a letter notifying him of his dismissal, and stating that the lifeboat is to be removed to Weller's Beach. From what is said, this seems to be a bad move, as the new location is not well chosen. The statement I have is that during these 15 years the station has been well kept and the officer in charge of it has given good service and been thoroughly satisfactory, and he does not know why he has been dismissed.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Now that the hon. gentleman mentions details to my mind, I recollect something of the case. The change has nothing to do with the officer, no charge against him having been made. But representations were made to the department as to the necessity for changing the location, and I have had reports made by the inspector and by Captain McElhinney, who has charge of the life stations, and these officers recommend the change. As the life station is to be removed, of course the present officer cannot be captain.

Mr. FOSTER. If it would not be too much trouble, perhaps the Minister will ask his officers to put these papers together that I may have an opportunity to see them. There is no charge, so far as this letter is concerned, that politics has anything to do with the change.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPEPR. Is there not a mistake in the heading of this item ? I should think there would be danger of difference with the Auditor General if this were voted as simply "Rewards for saving life." These men are under salary and considerable sums must be paid out for building .boats, buying boats, maintenance, and so on.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. My deputy tells me that this is the form that the vote has always taken. The Auditor General is always especially careful not to allow the expenditure of a dollar unless it comes within the appropriation, has not raised any doubt about this so far.

Mr. McDOUGALL. The heads under which these expenditures are entered in the Auditor General's Report is "Lifeboat stations, &c."

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I propose to add, with the consent of the committee, "including life-saving stations."

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Are there any changes being made in the life-saving service of Scatary, Cape Breton ? I have heard the rumour that some change was in contemplation.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No.

Mr. BRITTON. Reverting to the subject of the Wellington life station, as it is near my constituency, and as I know something of the locality, I may say a word with reference to what the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) has said. Wellington station is not considered a desirable location, because it is in a bay and would not be easily within reach in case of disaster. This has been a ground of complaint on the part of captains for some time, and efforts have been made to have the station moved to Weller's Beach.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the distance ?

Mr. BRITTON. Between 30 and 40 miles. I do not know whether the Minister has decided upon the change, but there is a considerable feeling in favour of it. There has been some apparatus, a boat and so on, at South Bay, which will be rendered unnecessary if this removal takes place.

Mr. FOSTER. It may be a very desirable change. I do not know.

Registry of Shipping $500

Mr. McDOUGALL. I would like to know whether this publication is complete now and whether it is distributed or not.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We are not publishing one this year ; it is only published every second year.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I had a number of demands for the book. Was one published last year ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes, but it is not in the expenditure of last year. The expenditure of last year included $104 paid to the Board of Trade in England for measuring tapes, a subscription to the "Register Veritas," and printing, stationery and supplies from the Queen's Printer.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What was the printing last year?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Forms of all kinds.

Tidal Service	$2,500

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. From what the hon. Minister said in connection with maintenance and repairs of Government steamers, I am afraid he has overlooked entirely the importance of this subject. He certainly is not carrying out the recommendations of his chief engineer. So much has been said in the press, including papers friendly to the Government and papers of a non-political character, that if nothing is done, those who are well informed as to the importance of this subject will be greatly disappointed. The question of a proper tidal survey is one that, I think, ought to have been grappled with by a country like Canada before now. It seems to be a disgrace that a country so well known for its large shipping should be in such a position as Canada is in compared with other countries in this respect..

The United States, for instance, are in this very connection humiliating us to a very great degree, according to information I have received, in suggesting that they be given permission to do a little of this work on our Pacific Coast, seeing that we won't do it, and that their vessels are running risks that every vessel has to run where she cannot have scientific information concerning the currents, and so on. The reports teem with information from valuable officers in our own service as to the dangerous condition of the very important waterways of Canada. Take the Gulf and River St. Lawrence, take the report long ago made by that able officer now gone, Lieut. Gordon, who sailed up and down that gulf, and where, from personal investigation into the matter, he found, if I remember aright, that going by all the guides now open to a navigator at night, taking his own calculations and all other means at his disposal, his vessel, by means of these unknown currents, would be eighteen miles out of its course in twelve hours. That is a terrible statement to make, showing at once that in the opinion of many those great losses in the gulf and in the straits to our big ships have been due to the action of these unknown currents. Take the case of the "Montreal" and several other vessels, the loss of which men well up on this subject have attributed to the fact that masters had to navigate a place where the ship was affected by currents of which they could know nothing whatever. Now, this subject was first broached by men like Prof. Johnson, of McGill, backed, as his opinion was, by those interested in large ships, and by all captains who have studied their profession carefully, who have the advantage of the tidal service of Great Britain as they leave British ports, who have the advantage of the tidal surveys of India on the Indian coasts, who have the advantage of the tidal service of the United States coast, splendidly done by a trained and skilful service. When this gentleman some years ago pressed the subject upon the late Government, they were unable to deal with it. But he continued to press the subject, and the Royal Society took the matter up and looked into the question. These reports of our own officers could not longer be overlooked. We ought at the start to have taken an appropriation of something like $40,000 a year to put the work through. Instead of that, the best that could be done when the matter was brought up was an appropriation of some $10,000 a year. It would take longer to accomplish as much, but the work was of course the same as would be required had we started with a more generous appropriation. But supplementing that, in my department, we used the "Lansdowne," the expense of which was not borne by the $10,000. Much work was done, and an attempt was made to grapple with this subject. Now, the hon. gentleman has whittled the whole thing down to an appropriation of $2,500 for salaries merely. It is a bitter disappointment to the people who have studied the subject, apart wholly from any political question. I ventured a short time ago to press upon the Prime Minister the views I am referring to, in the hope that the subject would come before the Minister of Marine and Fisheries before these Estimates were completed, and that ample provision would be made. I do not propose at this time to go very fully into the subject, though it could be enlarged upon at length. You have an expert officer who is specially brought into the service for this object. I am certain he never would have been appointed under an estimate of only $2,500. Mr. Dawson came into the service particularly in connection with this work, and the provision that was made then in order to justify his appointment and make it useful was a minimum of $10,000, and, as I say, we afterwards got the advantage of the Government ship that involved so much additional to the $10,000 annual appropriation. That is dropped altogether, and we are asked now to vote this sum, which, as the Minister says, will simply enable them to take observation of those gauges that have been put up at different parts of the coast, but will not enable a single current to be surveyed, nor its strength to be calculated. So that work practically stops and the department proposes to use the money simply for the purpose of looking after these gauges that have been erected at different places, and the department is now to lose altogether the knowledge and experience of this valuable officer. Let us see what the hon. gentleman's own report says on this sub-

ject. Of course, the officer immediately in charge might be supposed to exaggerate the importance of his particular work, but the chief engineer over that officer, dealing with this subject, says, in his report to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries :

In consequence of the material reduction in the vote for the tidal and current survey it was necessary to abandon for the season all work in connection with observations and currents.

That is last year, under an estimate of $2,500, that work proper had to stop.

The sum allotted for the service barely suffices for the maintenance of the seven tide-gauges previously established ; and to utilize the records obtained from them, which are yearly increasing in value, some help will have to be given the engineer in charge, and some additional outlays incurred to pay for computation.

We cannot even compute these records, we cannot even make proper use, for the purposes of navigation, of the very gauges the hon. gentleman says he is going to look after. His chief engineer tells him that. There is a halt called. Then there is a very large waste of money in doing valueless work, that is to say, simply to keep the gauges in order, but no computations can be made which are so much required to be printed in the standard nautical journals.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There is nothing to prevent these computations being made.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The chief engineer says that you cannot do it with $2,500.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No, what I understood him to say was that you could not carry on the current work.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That is my point. No one will dispute that the survey of the current stops absolutely with the drop in the appropriation. Some work has been done in the survey of the current, and I am going to give testimony as to the great value of that work. Now, upon the point that we cannot make these computations for these annual publications all over the world for the use of mariners, here is what he says :

To utilize the records obtained from them, which are yearly increasing in value, some help will have to be given the engineer in charge, and some additional outlay incurred to pay for computation.

We are therefore in this unfortunate condition. We are not starving in this country, the service is not so hard-up that a useful public work has to be abandoned in this faint-hearted way. $12,000 can be got to prosecute or persecute, whichever you like to call it, political opponents, to employ Pinkerton detectives and let them loose over the province of Manitoba, resulting in the conviction of one man who had entered into a conspiracy to raise $800 out of the Conservative committee. $12,000 can go to four or five lawyers in Winnipeg and other political heelers, and thus be thrown away; but you cannot give $10,000 for a work that would be of interest to the whole world, and of use to every ship that sails our Canadian waters. That is the position in which practically the Marine Department appears before the House. The chief engineer—and I am reading only an extract from his report—says :

I am particularly anxious to have an investigation of the currents between Cape Breton Island and Cape Race undertaken, as soon as the necessary funds and a steamer can be allotted for the work.

I have overlooked a very important fact. There has been communication between the Government of England and Canada in regard to what contribution we should make toward the defence of the Empire. These large proposals have their advocates, and many views are expressed in this connection. Whatever may be said in regard to British vessels being in Canadian waters to protect this country, we appear to forget the risk they run owing to the lack of this information which we should supply. To such an extent is this the case, that we are in the humiliating position that England has been paying year after year for work we will not do in our own waters. During some years we were good enough to meet half the cost of work done by the hydrographers of the Admiralty for surveys on our own Canadian coast. We have neglected our duty—I am not blaming this Government for that—but Canada has not surveyed the coast which the Imperial vessels have to navigate. The Imperial authorities have accordingly done the best they could. In the first place they did the work at their own cost, and later the Canadian Government agreed to pay half of the cost of surveys on our own coasts, and the "Gulnare" was employed.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. She is there yet.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. There is no one who would not bear out the testimony of Lieutenant Gordon, who was himself in the Imperial service, and the officers of the Marine Department as to the great importance of carrying out this work at the earliest possible moment, and there is no reason why this duty should not be well and thoroughly performed. Another circumstance that should bring a blush to the cheek of Canadians is set out in the report of the chief engineer, as follows :—

I also learn that the publishers of the British Columbia Almanac are indebted to the United States Government for the tide tables of British Columbia waters which they issue. I beg to

draw attention to the desirability that tidal observations in British Columbia waters should be made and the records reduced for use by our own service.

So it appears we have not done the work that other colonies have completed and we are not taking proper care of our shipping; we have not done the work that the United States have done on their own coast, and which they have attempted to do on our coast as we have neglected the work. Together with the chief engineer's report we may take that of the officer in charge of the service. He says:

Little attention has been given to the currents in Northumberland Strait, and around Prince Edward Island, or to the tidal currents of the lower St. Lawrence from Anticosti to Quebec, as some knowledge had first to be obtained of the Gulf currents and their relation to the ocean. A further examination of the currents in the Strait of Belle Isle is also desirable, to obtain more complete data for its tidal character.

It appears as if we cannot afford to obtain this information, although we have an officer well qualified to do the work, and whose work has been accepted by the Admiralty authorities in Great Britain.

The work has been carried on with the assistance of one of the supply steamers of the light-house and buoy service,——

That was several years ago.

——which has been placed at the disposal of this survey for the three months of July, August and September in each season, which was as long as it could be spared from its other duties; but it has proved unsuitable for the purpose, as it is so slow and unwieldy as to add materially to the difficulty of carrying out the work to advantage, and the time allowed cuts the season too short, even with the best endeavour, to take advantage of every available day, and to make the observations continuous day and night. The further surveys of the currents was discontinued this season to save expense to the department, and when it is resumed a steamer of suitable character and properly equipped for the purpose should be made available for the work, and in some regions one or two schooners, if properly fitted out, could be used with advantage as auxiliaries.

Members from Montreal and gentlemen familar with the business there and on the St. Lawrence are well aware that this subject affects every shipowner as regards the rates of insurance. The Montreal Board of Trade has brought the subject forward in connection with the national waterway of Canada, and have pointed out that Canadian rates of insurance are very seriously affected. Enormous rates are paid compared with the insurance rates on other waters. This subject was under the consideration of the board as late as 15th March of the present year, as I observe by a report of the proceedings, and no doubt they have pressed the subject on the attention of the Government. Then we have a statement from

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

the Chairman of the Board of Examiners of Masters and Mates, and I think the view of that experienced navigator, who was for some time commodore of the Allan Line is important. He could tell the Minister the risks incurred by the vessels of the line, and especially by slow boats navigating the St. Lawrence, owing to the absence of this information. He understands the subject thoroughly, and he is aware as to the value of such information in approaching the British Isles, and as regards the danger that will always exist in connection with navigating the gulf, which every captain enters with anxiety. If hon. gentlemen opposite are anxious in regard to the fast line service, they know the merits of the St. Lawrence route will be investigated before any man asked to take a pecuniary interest in the fast line will agree to make an investment. If the dangers are such as are reported, and if the Government do not take the trouble to make as far as possible navigation safe, how do the Government expect the contractors for the fast line service to be able to establish their line, and go before the public and secure capital with which to build the necessary vessels; and, in fact, their chances of success are very much reduced if the Government will not see that all these dangers to navigation are as far as possible provided against. No one will deny that when investors take up the records of success on the Allan Line and find that the experienced navigator of such a fine ship as the "Montreal" attributed the disaster to the vessel to unknown currents, that public attention will be given to the subject. When they read in regard that a steamer was drawn towards Anticosti by unknown currents and nothing but daylight and the experience of the navigator saved the vessel from running on that island, it will be apparent that further investigation should be made of the route. Looking back at the report of Captain Smith made in 1897, I find he said:

In December, 1895, I received a letter from the department stating that it was carrying on a survey of tides and currents on the coast, by which important additions to its knowledge was being obtained, and informing me that the latest knowledge of this character would be included in the subjects for examination before my board, and I notified the instructors of navigation to that effect. The information gained from a survey of the Gulf of St. Lawrence and Straits of Belle Isle made for the purpose of ascertaining the movement of the tides and currents of those waters, will, no doubt, be of much service to mariners, and the inauguration of the method of continuous tidal records obtained from the automatic gauges placed at some of the principal parts of our coast and other places in the gulf, will no doubt hereafter prove beneficial and assist in the safe navigation of all classes of vessels. The influences which act upon the waters of the Gulf of St. Lawrence are ever changing, making it most difficult for officers of ships to calculate the force and direction of the tidal currents with any degree of certainty.

There is the statement of a man who has spent his life navigating these waters, and who now in an official position testifies as to the great importance of our having what other maritime nations of the world had long ago :

Mr. W. Bell Dawson, who conducted the survey, has given much valuable information upon the subject, and it is to be hoped the Government will see their way to prosecute this useful work for many years, as the short time occupied in the survey is not sufficient to give any proper knowledge of the movements of the tides.

I have not in my hand, though I should like to have been able to give it to the committee, the remarks from other authorities upon the value of this work. You have, however, enough to show, not only that it is useful but that it is an absolutely necessary work for the successful carrying on of the shipping business around our coasts and particularly up the Gulf of St. Lawrence. You have the fact that the representations of all these interests in Montreal have been most anxious in connection with the matter. We have had the advantage, for which we have not had to pay, of the valuable advice of such men as Prof. Johnson, and of a non-political body like the Royal Society of Canada quoting the testimony of able men who are competent to give valuable advice, on the subject. You have the pressure of the Montreal Board of Trade, and you have the opinion of the underwriters, such as Major Edward Bond, who have given a great deal of attention to the subject. The Government have been pressed, not merely for the increase of this $2,500 item, but strong arguments have been produced to show that the former vote was altogether too small, and that it meant that we had to take several years to do what a larger appropriation would have enabled the Government to have done in a couple of years. It is a most disheartening thing to see that instead of there being an increase to the annual vote of $10,000, the hon. Minister should ask for a mere $2,500, which his own officer tells him is not enough to enable him to utilize for practical purposes the information which these gauges supply, and which gauges have been set up at considerable cost.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I have listened to the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) with a good deal of interest, and I am not by any means insensible to the importance of the work which he has spoken of. I call the attention of the hon. gentleman to the fact that it was quite impossible for this work to be undertaken unless we had a steamer built for the purpose or a special steamer chartered. $10,000 would hardly pay for the steamer if I hired her, and it would cost fifty or sixty thousand dollars if we built a steamer. I did not feel justified, in the present state of my mind on this question, in asking my colleagues to vote sixty or seventy thousand dollars until I had thoroughly satisfied myself that this was a very pressing necessity. We are asking the country to spend enormous sums of money on the aids to navigation in the River and Gulf of St. Lawrence, for it would be most unfortunate if the slightest suspicion got abroad that we were not doing our very best to light, and guard our coasts from the danger of accidents. We are constructing on Belle Isle Island, at very great cost, a magnificent lighthouse and fog alarm. We are constructing, or propose to construct the coming summer, on the southern side of the Belle Isle Straits another lighthouse which was recommended to us by the consensus of opinion of the captains of the ocean-going steamers. I have at the present moment a report to my colleagues, which may or may not be adopted, for the expenditure of a very large sum of money in the St. Lawrence River, near the Traverse, to put a permanent light there instead of the floating light. That will require a very large sum of money. My hon. friend the Minister of Public Works is now having a most elaborate and perfect survey made of the channel of the River St. Lawrence, in order that he may make the navigation of that river as safe as a liberal expenditure of money can make it. I am not insensible to the importance of the subject, but, as the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) knows, there are limitations which surround every Minister, and you cannot get all the money you want. There is such a gentleman as the Minister of Finance who stands guard and cuts down and cuts out, too.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What provision for any necessary public work has been cut down except this ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Lots of them.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I do not notice any.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I state to my hon. friend that I have not got a ship, and therefore that part of the service to which he refers, of taking the force of the currents, cannot be gone on with this year. I may tell him that all the work which was suggested to me by Dr. Dawson that he could perform will be carried out by him this summer in the Bay of Fundy, and I have had a supplementary estimate made up, after careful consultation with him, to add to this sum, which is before my colleagues and which I have no doubt will be approved by them. This summer we will not only have the tide gauges and the preparation of the results obtained from them done here by a staff of officers, but we will have all the work done which Mr. Dawson is prepared to carry out in the Bay of Fundy. Although he will not have a ship at his disposal, he will, I suppose, take a survey to some extent of the currents.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. He cannot do that without a ship.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not know exactly, but I suppose he will go with Captain Pratt. At all events, whatever he is able to do he will do, and there is a sum in the supplementary estimates for that. I am considering the question very carefully, not only from personal consultations with captains of ocean-going ships, but by reading those reports which the hon. gentleman has referred to. It may be that in the near future I will be able to convince my colleagues of the supreme importance of this phase of the case, and perhaps get enough money to build or charter a ship to carry the work on. At the present time, I do not do it simply because I have not got the ship, and cannot get her this year.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I would implore the hon. Minister to not yet give up the hope of getting the money in the supplementary estimates for the charter of a ship.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am not giving up the work in this direction by any means. I have arranged with Dr. Dawson this year that his services will be engaged part of this summer in the Bay of Fundy, and I have a sum in the supplementary estimates for carrying out the work he himself recommended.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I am delighted that the hon. Minister is going to do more than this item provides for, and I would urge upon him to press his colleagues with more earnestness than perhaps he has used before, for enough money to charter a vessel. Surely the hon. gentleman can obtain that if his colleagues agree with him, and they should agree with him, backed up as he is by all the authorities I have mentioned, in the contention that there is pressing need for this work and that it ought to have been done long ago.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I find here these items: A. Blakeney, wages and expenses, as observer at Sydney, June to October, 1896, $139; George G. Hare, travel to North Sydney, October 1 to November 7, 1896, $64.55; John Harpel, observer at East Bay, nineteen days, $38.50. I do not know any man of the name of John Harpel at East Bay, nor of any services of this kind. There is no tide there, and no work that could be done, unless making a report on the tide at Port Sydney.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am not able to give the hon. gentleman the information, because no part of the work was done under my authority. It was done under my predecessor. I have no doubt it was quite proper, but I never heard of the man, and certainly gave no authority for the work.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Will the hon. Minister let me know later on?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I will promise to make the necessary inquiries.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman is so obliging that I assume that the usual course will be followed of allowing a certain latitude in the discussion of these matters in concurrence.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Certainly.

Removal of obstructions in navigable rivers $1,000

Mr. POWELL. I wish to refer to an item that is passed. Before making a few remarks on the subject, I would like to ask the Minister as to the circumstances which justify an investigation into a wreck—whether the mere fact that a wreck has occurred is sufficient, or whether there must be some special circumstances. I would like him to state the general principles on which investigations are held.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There are no arbitrary principles. There are two investigations: one preliminary and the other more full and complete. The application is made to the Minister, and if sufficient information is laid before him to satisfy him that an investigation is required, it takes place under statute. I can give no definition or how much information is required.

Mr. POWELL. The case I refer to is the case of the vessel "John McLeod," which was lost last summer. One of the chief owners of the vessel is Mr. Troop, of St. John, N.B., and there has been considerable correspondence between him and the department. As soon as the papers are brought down, I will call attention to the matter.

Winter mail service.....$7,000

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman last year took a special vote of $21,000 for an experiment in this service. Will he shortly state what was the result of the experiment?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND ISHERIES. The experiment was not successful. I requested Captain McElhinney to have an examination made of all the boats available in Canada, and any that he thought could be obtained in the neighbouring republic, if none were available here, for the purpose of making the experiment. After looking over the different boats available, he selected the "Petrel." In the opinion of many, she had not sufficient horse-power, but with that exception it was thought by Captain McElhinney and others that she was suitable and would be a success.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Where was she got ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. She was got somewhere on the lakes above Kingston. She was sent down and commenced the service between Summerside and Cape Tormentine. She ran there satisfactorily for a little while, but when the winter storms came on, she was nipped by the ice inside the Tormentine breakwater or pier. In a north-west storm, the captain took her to the eastern side of the pier for shelter, and she became bound inside the "L," and when the ice made and piled up, she could not be got out, although time and money were spent in the effort to get her out. Therefore, she did not do one-twentieth of the work it was hoped she would have done. Towards the spring she did some work, but on the whole I could not pronounce the experiment a success.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What did the experiment cost ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. About $11,000.

Mr. FOSTER. What did the experiment consist in—in taking soundings ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No, in sending a steamer to see if it was possible to keep a channel open during the winter months between Cape Tormentine and Cape Traverse. It has been held by residents for many years that owing to the tides meeting at that particular point, there is more loose ice there than anywhere else, and the vessel was sent to test that. The ice which bound the vessel at Cape Tormentine became so enormously thick, owing to a north-west storm. It was piled up five to ten feet thick. That was a misfortune which could not be helped, and for which the captain could not be censured. It was due to one of the storms that frequently take place in the fall of the year, and which nobody could predict. Unfortunately, therefore, the experiment did not give the result hoped for, although it cost $11,000.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Was that boat his own choice ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes, Captain McElhinney reported it as suitable, and the only suitable one he could get.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What did he say about the horse-power ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. He said that it was not sufficient.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Yet the vessel satisfied him.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It was the only one that could be got in Canada that would suit. The hon. gentleman will find all the information he requires in the report.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. From whom was this vessel got ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. From the Collins Bay Rafting Company.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Was she bought outright ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No, she was chartered for eight months during the winter, at the price of $7,000.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Was she one of the boats of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No ; he had nothing whatever to do with it.

Mr. POWELL. Was the experiment conclusive as to the feasibility of the attempt ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No.

Mr. POWELL. I am very much pleased to learn that the hon. gentleman did not purchase the boat, because the experiment was simply absurd. She was unable to go through the smallest quantity of ice. When the straits were calm as a mill-pond, she was able to make her trips, but the very first frost put an end to them, and I think the best thing to do with her was to put her in the "L," in which she was located the rest of the winter.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The experiment was not a success, but the hon. gentleman is not correct at all in his description. The boat was far different from what he leads us to suppose it was. Captain McElhinney reported that she was an excellent one and very fast.

Mr. POWELL. Eight miles an hour.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. She might not have been much faster than eight or nine knots an hour. She went between Summerside and Cape Tormentine, but no boat would have been able to make its way through the thickness of ice accumulated a mile out from the wharf. Instructions were given to the captain to keep outside the edge of the bord ice, under any circumstances almost, so that he might be in a position to run across. We know that the bord ice runs a mile and a half from the shore, and it was impossible for any boat to get through it. It could only cross from the edge of the bord ice on one side to its edge on the other. Even a boat of 80 or 100 horse-power could not have cut its way through the ice from the edge of the wharf. I sent

down Captain McElhinney to take charge in addition to Captain Macdonald, and nobody has greater experience than Captain McElhinney, but it was one of those misfortunes that could not be helped.

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

After Recess.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). Before recess, the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) desired to ask a question, and as he is not here, I am perfectly willing that he should ask it on any other item. He wanted to know if I had obtained Captain McElhinney's report, which was brought down to the Senate, and I said that I had sent for it. It is not a part of this item, but there was a supplementary vote taken last year, and we were discussing whether the steamer "Petrel" had been a success or not in the experiment provided for by that vote.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Were her services secured direct from the owners?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes, the owners of the boat are in Ontario. She was employed on the lakes previously, and we chartered her for seven months and sent her back at the end of that time.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I suppose that $7,000 covers all the service.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I did not know that the removal of the obstructions of navigable rivers was under the hon. gentleman's department.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes, we always take $1,000 for that, and last year we spent $671.

Mr. MONTAGUE. You could easily spend the balance of $429 in the Grand River.

Mr. McDOUGALL. What tonnage was the "Petrel"?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I could not say.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I thought I understood before six o'clock that her speed was seven or eight knots?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Eight or nine knots.

Mr. McDOUGALL. A boat of that speed could not be a success in that experiment.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. She was not powerful—only about forty horse-power.

Mr. McDOUGALL. She could not be anything but a sailer, running only eight knots.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That is all.

Mr. POWELL. Before the item is adopted, in pursuance with what I intimated when we were about closing at six o'clock, I desire to call the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to the "John McLeod." This comes fairly under the 4th item on page 199. It seems that last summer one of our largest ship-owners in the maritime provinces, named Howard Troop, who was at the time managing owner and a very large registered owner of this vessel the "John McLeod," was unfortunate enough to have her cast away by the master in attempting to enter the harbour of Halifax. Mr. Troop states that he immediately notified the Department of Marine and Fisheries and the department caused a preliminary investigation to take place, of which preliminary investigation, he says, no notice was given to him. The circumstances of the loss were peculiar. The captain attempted to enter that harbour during a very dense fog and at night time, and, when making or approaching the land, he failed to keep his lead going, and the result was that the vessel ran on the rocks and became a complete wreck. As she was a valuable ship, the loss to him was very great. At the preliminary investigation, of which he had no notification, and therefore no opportunity of attending, the evidence taken was chiefly the evidence of the captain. The report made by the officer who had charge of the investigation to the department, and his conclusion, approved of by Captain McElhinney, the adviser of the department, was to the effect that this vessel, under the guidance of the captain, was nearing the coast during a dense fog without any lead being kept going. It was found that the captain was very much to blame. Notwithstanding that he was shown to be very much to blame and that this vessel was lost because of his negligence, his certificate was not cancelled, and the captain is now credentialed as a first-class master mariner and able to take vessels to any part of the world. This extensive ship-owner complains very much that the department should have taken the course it did. Though I do not look on the action of the department as quite as bad as Mr. Troop regards it, yet I think it would be well, in future cases of loss, where the investigation is held, to notify the parties interested, so that they may have an opportunity to appear and produce their witnesses. In this case the captain alone was examined. The seamen were allowed to go, and when Mr. Troop desired afterwards to have a full and complete investigation, no one who knew anything about the circumstances could be produced to give evidence. Mr. Troop thinks that wrong has been done to him and those associated with him. The commissioner

who made the investigation, Captain McElhinney, considered that the captain himself, who was part owner, was sufficiently punished for his neglect of duty by the loss of his shares in the vessel. It seems at the time he was the registered owner of a large part of the vessel, about 8-64ths, or one-eighth, for himself, and a considerable number of shares beside which he held as registered owner in trust for some other person. The statement of the commissioner that the captain was punished severely enough without depriving him of his certificate is altogether groundless for the simple reason that there was a very heavy insurance, I am informed, upon his own shares, and instead of an inducement to save her, there was an inducement to cast away the vessel. Now, if the facts are as Mr. Troop supposes, and the papers substantiate his supposition, and if this vessel was cast away through barratry of the master, and a fair opportunity was not given to investigate the case, a great injustice has been done. I do not feel like charging the head of the department in this case, or even any particular individual in the department, with wilfully or maliciously injuring Mr. Troop. But I think it was incumbent upon them to give full notice of the inquiry before they entered upon it. It may be one of those cases in which good people err through force of circumstances, and error of judgment, and do innocently a great injustice to people who are without a remedy. I would ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, in the interest of the ship-owning part of our population to have a thorough investigation in the first place in such cases, and not a preliminary investigation where the testimony taken will be only that of those interested on one side. All parties interested should have an opportunity to produce their testimony in order to properly bring home their guilt to parties who are guilty of crime or negligence.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The preliminary investigation in this case was held under the statute by Captain Smith, Royal Navy Reserve, the officer who has for many years conducted these investigations for the department. The examination was held in Halifax on the 17th, 18th and 19th of November. Captain Smith made his report, which, in the ordinary course, was referred by me to Captain McElhinney, and he reported that he approved of it and thought that the master had been sufficiently punished by the loss of the ship, and he thought the preliminary inquiry held was quite conclusive for the purposes of the department. I read the report and concurred in it, and I think that, under all the circumstances, quite as full an investigation was held as the case demanded or justified. I am rather surprised, I must say, to hear what the hon. gentleman says that no notice was given to Mr. Troop, because my information is that he had every opportunity of bringing out at the preliminary inquiry everything required. The preliminary inquiry lasted three days, full reports were published in the papers and everybody knew about it. I cannot understand how Mr. Troop was at any disadvantage, but of course I cannot controvert what the hon. gentleman has said. I have the report here, and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Powell) is welcome to examine it. I will make further inquiry from Captain Smith whether he notified those interested specially in addition to giving public notice. The officers and sailors who were accessible were examined, and the report was thoroughly approved by Captain McElhinney, and I saw no reason to dissent from his decision.

Mr. POWELL. As I understand, the department in these cases notify the parties interested, and if that has not been done in this case it is an oversight. I am glad to hear the Minister make this statement, as Mr. Troop feels aggrieved.

Mr. CLARKE. What was the detailed cost to the country of that steamer that was employed and brought down from Lake Ontario ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The contract was $7,000, which, with incidental expenses and everything, run up to about $10,000.

Mr. MARTIN. I hope the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will see his way clear to make some improvement in this service. I have called the attention of the Government this session to the exorbitant rate for freight charged over that route in winter. The Minister who was asked that question very skilfully evaded answering it by saying that the Government had not enough information. I showed that the rate for baggage and freight was 3 cents a pound, which is equal to $60 per ton. How can trade be encouraged between Prince Edward Island and the mainland under those circumstances ? We were discussing not long ago the Yukon Bill, the freight rates over the 140 odd miles of that railway was supposed to be $50 a ton ; but here, over a short run of nine miles across the Straits of Northumberland, the Government charges at the rate of $60 a ton. I know whereof I am speaking, because I have conversed with the travelling public, and when I came here during the first part of the session I found that every pound of baggage carried over that route was charged 3 cents a pound—at least all baggage over thirty pounds in weight. I believe the Minister himself on former occasions when sitting on this side of the House, drew the attention of the Government to this fact. That the travelling public should have to submit to pay 3 cents a pound for freight over that short run of nine miles, is, I think, disgraceful to any

country pretending to any degree of civilization at all. I hope that the winter season just passed is the last season this will ever be permitted to continue. I know of travelling agents who are passing to and fro between that province and the mainland, who have paid for their samples as high as $20. Does the Minister of Marine and Fisheries intend to remove this exorbitant tax on the people of Prince Edward Island and the travelling public ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I promise the hon. gentleman to give his representations every consideration. Of course, he knows that this is not a paying line. I have continued the previous regulations and the rates charged in previous years, I have not made any change except to lighten them slightly. But I will be glad to consider and read over very carefully the observations the hon. gentleman has made, and if I can make any move in that direction, I shall be very glad to do so. Now, with reference to the remarks of the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster). I have in my hand the statements which he desired me to produce. In the first place there is No. 1, which I do not think I need read, which is the memorandum from myself for Captain McElhinney's information, sent in August, 1896, as to what I desired him to do. I stated that I desired him to ascertain exactly what boats were suitable. I have two reports of Captain McElhinney, dated in September and October, 1896. There is a statement that he had proceeded to Ontario for the purpose of examining the tugs there, and a memorandum is attached stating the different tugs in Canada that he had examined and reporting upon them. This I will be glad to hand to the hon. gentleman if he desires. Then he speaks of the boat that we accepted, reporting that an officer had come from the Collins Bay Rafting and Forwarding Company, offering the tug "Petrel" from the 1st of September to the 1st of May, for $6,000. As he had never seen the steamer, he requested that he might be authorized to visit and examine her to see whether she was fit for that purpose. That authority was granted.

Mr. SPROULE. For what purpose was it proposed to employ that boat ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It was an experiment, to see whether, in the winter months, steam communication could be maintained instead of by ordinary boat, the service which we have by oars or running on the ice, which has been maintained for the last forty years. We thought it was possible that steam communication might be maintained instead of the ordinary boat service.

Mr. SPROULE. Surely you would need a different boat from that. She was running round Georgian Bay trying to pick up fishermen. She has neither power nor steam.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman is mistaken about the boat. It is not the Dominion steamship "Petrel," it is a boat of the same name belonging to the Collins Bay Rafting Company.

Mr. SPROULE. A boat on the Georgian Bay, the same boat.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. She plies on the Georgian Bay. I am telling the hon. gentleman that I gave general instructions to Captain McElhinney to examine all the boats in Canada that were suitable for the purpose, and I went on to describe, in my instructions, what kind of a boat I thought would be suitable. I do not know anything about the Collins Bay Rafting Company. Captain McElhinney reported to me in the following terms :—"The Collins Bay Rafting and Forwarding Company offer the tug "Petrel" from the 1st of September to the 1st of May," for so much, and he suggested that he might be allowed to go and examine her. I at once gave him instructions to examine her, and he reported to me :

> This is the most suitable vessel I have been able to find in Canada, and I recommend that the offer be accepted, and all necessary steps be taken to place the boat on the route between Cape Tormentine and Summerside from the 1st of September next.

He has been for a long time the nautical adviser of the department, and I accepted his report the same as any other Minister would do. He reported adversely to all the other vessels, and reported in favour of this one.

Mr. FOSTER. Are there any precautionary remarks in his report as to whether this boat is really suitable or not ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Perhaps I had better read the report :

REPORT ON TUG "PETREL."

Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

Sir,—I beg to report that I visited the steam tug "Petrel," as instructed, for the purpose of examining her as regards suitability for running during the winter between Cape Tormentine and Cape Traverse.

I find that the vessel was purposely constructed for towing large rafts, assisting and taking charge of wrecks, and was designed and adapted for going into ice on the lakes, being provided with a 40-ton water tank at the stern, and receding stem.

The dimensions are : Length, 129 feet ; breadth, 26 feet, and depth, 9½ feet ; is built composite, steel floors, frames and angles ; bottom planking hard wood 3 inches thick ; ceiling and inside double bottom all of steel ; wales or sides ½ steel plate ; stringers and beams are of steel, and all the deck-houses are steel plate covered with wood. The hull contains five water-tight compartments which add considerably to the strength to resist the crushing in ice.

Her computed nominal horse-power is 22, which will probably work up to 30; is fitted with twin-screws with portable blades, and a full spare set of which is always carried. There is ample deck room covered in for all the ice-boats required, also cabin-room for passengers, mails and ice-boat crews.

A surface condenser is required to adapt her for running in salt water; this will be put in at owner's expense.

Iron sheathing-plates on both bows will have to be put on to protect the wood planking; this will cost from $200 to $300, which can be done on the owner's marine slip with least expense, which will have to be borne by the department.

The owners offer to hire the vessel from 1st November to 15th May for $6,000, not found, and I estimate the cost of running for the six months, fuel, crew and provisions, at about $7,000, making the total about $13,000. The vessel can be made ready and taken to the capes to commence work 1st of December.

This is the most suitable vessel I have been able to find in Canada, and I would recommend that the offer be accepted, and all necessary steps be taken to place the boat on the route between Cape Tormentine and Summerside about the 1st of December.

Respectfully submitted,

(Sgd.) M. P. McELHINNEY,
Nautical Adviser.

Ottawa, 8th October, 1896.

Mr. SPROULE. Is there anything said about speed?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No. Her speed, however, was between 8 and 9 knots.

Mr. SPROULE. I thought it was the small boat.

Mr. McGREGOR. The hon. gentleman is thinking about a small boat. This is a large boat, a tug boat.

Mr. MARTIN. Does the Minister think that the failure was owing to the want of power in the boat, or to the thickness of ice?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman unfortunately was not in the House when I explained the matter before dinner. There has been an opinion held for many years by the residents on both sides of the straits that inasmuch as the tides meet from the east and west at the particular point where Cape Tormentine and Traverse are located, there is more or less opening of the ice at every return tide, and so it would be easy for a steamer to force her way through the loose ice. I have crossed many times, and do not share that opinion, but I do not consider that I am competent to form an opinion against that arrived at by those who have crossed hundreds of times. I determined, however, that an experiment should be made to ascertain if the ice was loose and a passage could be made through it by a steamboat. I authorized Captain McElhinney to inspect all the tug boats in Canada and ascertain if any were fit for the service. He visited them and made a report, to the effect that the only boat he found suitable was the "Petrel" belonging to the Collins Bay Rafting and Forwarding Company. Having received that report I accepted the offer of the owners. She was a twin screw steel steamer, a very strong boat accustomed to tow heavy rafts across the Georgian Bay. She went down to the island and did fairly good work between Summerside and Cape Tormentine before the water froze and the ice came in. As this took place she was moved to her destination between Cape Tormentine and Traverse. Then there came on one of those awful storms that almost inevitably happens once or twice in the fall of each year. The instructions the captain had were to take care to keep the vessel out from the wharf so as to avoid the bord ice, that is the ice which formed from the shore and which remains steadily from the time it forms in the fall to the spring. It was supposed that between the bord ice on the mainland and the bord ice on the island the vessel could be kept moving and pass through the loose ice. It was to make this experiment that I asked a vote from Parliament. During the storm the vessel was run east of Cape Tormentine pier; she kept creeping around the "L" of the pier and the ice piled up so it was found she could not get out. Captain McElhinney was at once sent down to do everything possible to release the vessel, and Captain Macdonald was also employed, but it was found utterly impossible to get the boat through the bord ice, which was from eight to ten feet thick, because it had formed and piled up until it reached that thickness. The vessel remained there several months. The Government had to pay the charter money, and in that sense the experiment has proved to be a comparative failure. I have not, however, lost hope that eventually means may be devised by the skill and energy of those well up in the business to overcome the apparent insuperable difficulty of securing steam communication at that point. Everything was done that could possibly have been done, but nothing was left undone that I know of; and my advice from the nautical adviser of the Marine Department was as strong and conclusive as hon. gentlemen opposite could desire. This was an honest effort made on my part; unfortunately it was not successful, but, I repeat, I have not given up hope that some day or other we may yet be able to overcome those difficulties. We shall not always meet with an unfortunate storm occurring at a critical moment as in this case, which resulted in hemming the vessel in the ice.

Mr. MARTIN. At page 51 of the report of the Department of Marine for 1897 it is stated, in the course of a description of the ice there:

The ice was found to be about two feet in thickness, and although every possible expedient was resorted to, it was not found possible to release the steamer from her ice-bound condition until towards the spring.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That was inside and east of the wharf.

Mr. MARTIN. I merely call attention to it, because two feet in thickness is very much below the mark.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It is between seven and eight feet thick at different times.

Mr. MARTIN. Then this part of the report is misleading.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman will find that this reference is to the thickness of the ice at the point where an effort was made to cut the boat out. He found it two feet thick and he cut out some hundreds of yards.

Mr. MARTIN. It does not make a distinction in the report; it simply says the ice is about two feet thick.

Mr. McDOUGALL. How is that we cannot find the name of that boat on the Canadian Shipping Register?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I really cannot say. I know nothing about the boat, except that the Collins Bay Rafting Company tendered amongst others, and I sent the nautical adviser to examine her, and he reported. They asked me the other day if I would try her for another winter and I said no. Is there anything at all behind this cross-examination, because it would almost appear that there is something behind all this which the hon. gentleman is trying to get out. I know nothing about it. Mr. McElhinney inspected a number of boats at St. John, Halifax and along the St. Lawrence, and he reported as I have read about the vessel. I know nothing else in the wide world about it. I do not know the Collins Bay Rafting Company, nor anything about them.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I do not know that there is anything behind it, but there seems to be a mystery from the fact that I cannot find the boat registered in Canada.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Has the hon. gentleman got the list of the vessels registered in Canada?

Mr. McDOUGALL. Yes, the last issue of 1896. There are several vessels called the "Petrel" here, but none from Ontario.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. All I can say is that the "Petrel" was in esse. She was inspected by the nautical adviser, reported to be the best vessel in Canada for the purpose, chartered, and did a certain amount of work but was not as successful as I had hoped.

Mr. BRITTON. The Collins Bay Rafting Company have their headquarters at Collins Bay, eight miles west of Kingston, on the Bay of Quinté. Their manager is Mr. William Leslie, and they own a tug named the "Petrel," which I have been on many times, and which has being doing some work in the Lower St. Lawrence. Whether that boat is registered or not, she has been afloat for many years. Mr. Leslie is a man of good repute; he has done work in connection with laying the intake pipe at Toronto, and has had the contract for pontooning one of these large western tugs down the canals. The "Petrel" is a well-known boat on the St. Lawrence.

Mr. McDOUGALL. She may be a well-known boat, but she is not registered.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). I am glad to able to inform my hon. friend (Mr. McDougall) that the "Petrel" is registered. My hon. friend (Mr. McDougall) has been reading from the register of sailing vessels, but on the next page he will find the registered steam vessels, and there the name of the "Petrel" appears as registered at Kingston and built at the port of Collins Bay, Ontario.

Mr. SPROULE. The Minister of Marine seems to think there is something behind it.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not think so at all, but I thought my hon. friend (Mr. McDougall) believed there was something behind it.

Mr. SPROULE. I know something about the "Petrel," and from the knowledge I have of her, as soon as I heard she was chartered for this purpose I felt perfectly satisfied that she was no use to run through ice. If you went to Lake Superior and Duluth, where they have iceboats breaking through five or six feet of ice, and saw those boats, you would at once see that the "Petrel" was no good for any such purpose.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. She was not intended to break through ice. Capes Tormentine and Traverse are eight miles apart, and the tides which come around the island meet at these points. It was contended that as the tides receded the ice opened out, and that it was possible to run a steamer through the openings. The theory seemed reasonable, and it was asserted that any ordinary steel boat such as the "Petrel," could accomplish the work.

Mr. McGREGOR. She is a good boat.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That the "Petrel" was not successful was not due to the fact that she could not get through the ice, but that she was met with a big storm on the 24th

December lasting two days, which would have interrupted any boat no matter what her horse-power was.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman (Sir Louis Davies) broke in before I had concluded my remarks. I thought it was a legitimate subject for inquiry, because remembering the speed and strength required by boats to cut through the ice, I believed that the "Petrel" would not be of any value whatever for the purpose. A boat of 24 horse-power with about nine knots an hour speed would not be regarded as a very strong boat to get through a place like that. From my knowledge of the "Petrel," I knew she could be of no use down there, and the fact that she was chartered rather suggested the suspicion that either the Minister had been imposed upon, or that there was a job behind it. For that reason I asked several questions to bring out the information.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not object to the hon. gentleman's questions. We have in Prince Edward Island, the "Stanley," an extremely powerful steamboat built when Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper was Minister of Marine, which can go through two feet of ice with perfect ease. The "Stanley" crosses from Georgetown to Pictou, a distance of 40 miles, but it was not for any such use as that we employed the "Petrel." It was for the purpose of experimenting as to whether an ordinary steel steamer could get through the openings in the ice, and that experiment had nothing to do with her horse-power.

Mr. POWELL. The selection of the "Petrel" for this work was undoubtedly a mistake, and if the Minister had acted on his own judgment he would have come out more successfully. The ice does separate at that particular place, and what is required is a boat, not only to go through open water, but a boat which will crash through the ice fields.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Average moving ice fields.

Mr. POWELL. Yes, and the "Petrel" was not at all suited for that purpose. The proper boat would be one something like those they have on Lake Superior or on the coast of Norway; a boat that had considerable of a drag and an enormous horse-power. The Minister, no doubt, is thoroughly satisfied now that the "Petrel" is not suitable, and probably he will in the future make the attempt with some other style of boat. There is a matter in connection with this vote to which I wish to call the attention of the hon. Minister.

A very old servant of the Crown, who spent fifty or sixty years of his life in the service between the Capes, gave me a numerously signed petition, requesting the Minister to place in the Estimates a small sum as a gratuity to him. He had lost the toes of both feet, as a result of having been out at night to save the lives of people who were lost on the ice-floes; and when incapacitated for night service, he took the work of driving the mails to meet the life-boats. But he got unfitted for that, and he is now in very poor circumstances. In view of the many superannuations that are going, his sixty years of service and his trying circumstances should entitle him to some small gratuity and he appeals to the hon. Minister, who in his open-heartedness and generosity is aiding and abetting his colleagues in the Ministry in granting large superannuations to various people on the ground of their being Conservatives, and thinks that for a much better reason, namely, that he has sacrificed his health and used his best endeavours for sixty years in serving the public, he should receive some small degree of compassion at the hands of the Ministry. There is no political axe to grind in this matter, because last year the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan) brought up against the Conservative party as a very serious charge, that they had turned this man adrift on account of his politics. So, inasmuch as he is a Liberal in politics, and does not at present reside in Westmoreland, the fact that I am urging his case from a purely disinterested motive, will appear evident.

Mr. YEO. I would like to say a word in support of the application of the hon. member for Westmoreland. All who know the gentleman to whom he refers will heartily join in saying that he is entitled to some sympathy and assistance from the Government. He has devoted the best years of his life to the public service, especially in the winter, and I know he has been the means of helping many who have made the perilous voyage across the straits. If there is one individual in Canada who deserves to be remembered it is the person to whom the hon. member for Westmoreland has referred.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I may say that the person to whom my hon. friend from Westmoreland and my hon. friend from East Prince refer is a historical character in the maritime provinces, known popularly as Tom Allen, and it will be my great pleasure to support the application which my hon. friend has made. But the difficulty is that the Ministry are hedged about by statutory restrictions which they find it very difficult to overcome. However, I shall be very glad to bring the matter to the attention of my hon. friend the Postmaster General, for whom Mr. Allen has carried the mails for so many years, to see if he can suggest any method of getting around the hard and fast statute which prohibits us from giving a superannuation allowance to any persons except those prescribed by the statute. Per-

haps some way out of the difficulty may be found. I may say that personally I would be very glad to see it done, if it can be.

Mr. POWELL. A gratuity could be given to him by a vote of the House.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Oh, yes.

Mr. FOSTER. I have very hurriedly run through the daily record of the "Petrel," which constitutes, I suppose, the history of her behaviour in the ice during the little time she was outside of the "L," and I have also looked over the Minister's memorandum and the reports of Captain McElhinney Any one who reads the daily record of the actions of the boat will see in a moment that the prime trouble was that she had not power enough. She could not make her way through ice of anything beyond the most ordinary thickness ; and when she was once walled up and the heavy ice had formed and deepened, she was there in quod, and could not be cut out or freed until spring. But while the Minister's intentions were all right, and while Captain McElhinney is a good officer, there is no doubt that he gave way to the idea that some vessel must be got, and when he looked over the different vessels, he said that this was the most suitable one he could find ; but he never said that the "Petrel" was a suitable boat for the work. In fact, for a time it was a toss-up between the "Petrel" and the "Bayswater." I am sorry that in that state of things the Minister did not subordinate his laudable desire to have the test made to the necessities of the case, and come to the conclusion that he had better wait for another year and get a suitable boat. The cost of the experiment was large, amounting to $15,162, and we have got a little worse than no result from it, for it has to a certain extent jeopardized the experiment. I want to ask my hon. friend if on account of this failure he has made up his mind to do nothing towards having a fair and adequate test of that passage ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. By no means.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose we shall have to forgive the Minister for his mistake. I have not been pursuing this with the idea that there is anything behind it at all. The only thing behind it and in front of it is that the "Petrel" was not a suitable vessel, and that the test has not been fairly made, but we have succeeded in spending about $15,000 of the people's money. My impression, gathered from my experience in the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and from my interest in the matter, is that that route between Cape Tormentine and Cape Traverse is a feasible route, and that all the department has to do is to have constructed the proper vessel. I think you will get a cheaper service by that route than you will by any other route. I hope my hon. friend will not be deterred from making a thoroughly adequate test ; and, after all, if you can once prove the feasibility of the route, the expenditure of $20,000 or $25,000 in doing so will be more than saved in one year's service.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's). In my opinion, the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries has made a mistake in this matter. I know his intentions were good, and he did the best he could under the circumstances ; but I think he made a mistake in regard to the capacity of the boat that was engaged. As he says, it was the best thing that could be done by himself, under the able superintendence of Captain McElhinney, but with respect to the route being feasible, I myself have very serious doubts. The hon. member for York seems to have the impression that it could be made a feasible route. The distance would lead anybody to think that it is the most feasible one, because the distance is the shortest, but the disadvantages of it for winter service would always be felt and render it impracticable. It is closed up and jammed by the running ice, and in this respect attended with difficulties not experienced to anything like the same extent in the route between Georgetown and Pictou which, up to this time, has proved itself a proper and feasible route. It is my impression, and I believe it is that of all those who have conducted the winter service up to this time, that it will continue to be the best one until some other means are found of getting across during the winter. It has proved itself a much greater success than was ever anticipated, and with the very excellent boats which is, I was going to say, one of the wonders of the world, it no doubt is the one that will continue to be used. That boat has been such a success that the Russian Government talk of sending over one of its officials to see the wonderful work she does, in order that they may find the means of navigating their ice-bound harbours. She does work that those who only hear of it can hardly understand. She has succeeded in making winter navigation a success in the face of enormous difficulties, and except where there is a continuation of strong gales from a certain quarter, which impose barriers that are insurmountable by anything that can be constructed, she plies her way to and fro, and it is only occasionally that she is unable to make the passage. Under these circumstances, seeing the success that has attended that navigation, I think that, so far as winter navigation is concerned, it will be a loss of public money to further attempt the navigation of the straits between the capes with steamers. I believe if there had been a suitable boat there last season, with sufficient power to penetrate the somewhat heavy ice, some success might have attended the experiment, but she got confined behind the pier in such a way, as the hon. Minister has already said, and the drift ice piled

around her in such immense quantities, that no boat could by any possibility have got out. Otherwise she might have met with a small amount of success. There is no doubt a mistake was made in not obtaining a boat of sufficient power to give a fair test to that route. However, I am of the opinion, as I said before, that it is not a proper route for winter navigation, notwithstanding all that can be said about it.

Mr. YEO. I do not suppose this is the proper item on which to discuss the best route for the navigation of the Straits of Northumberland.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Hear, hear.

Mr. YEO. In my opinion, the hon. member for King's, P.E.I., is altogether astray. If a steamer of sufficient power were put between Cape Tormentine and Summerside or Cape Traverse, I have very little doubt but she would do excellent work and make almost regular daily trips. The distance is not one quarter between the capes that it is between Pictou and Georgetown. The route between the capes has never been tested properly, and I am quite satisfied that the people of the western part of Prince Edward Island will never be satisfied until a proper test has been made. In ordinary winters, the "Petrel" would have done good service, but as has been explained by the Minister of Marine, it was unfortunate that we had more severe weather than we had for many years so early in the season and in so short a time as we had just at the time the "Petrel" was put on this service. In ordinary winters she would have done good service in the early part of the winter and in the spring, but unfortunately she was closed in by the ice. I hope at no distant day a suitable boat will be put on this route, and I feel positive that if the route is given a fair trial it will be shown to be the most feasible one for winter navigation.

Salaries and allowances of light-keepers. $207,000

Mr. FOSTER. In this item I want to draw the attention of the hon. Minister of Marine very briefly to a case that I consider, not on account of the amount of salary involved or anything of that kind, but on the simple priciple of fair-play, an important case which the hon. gentleman ought not to treat altogether so lightly as he might think the salary attached to it might justify. I mean the course which was taken by the hon. gentleman with reference to Benjamin Palmer, a lighthouse keeper in King's County on the St. John River, to whom, I think—and I hope it will be proved unwittingly, although I am afraid the hon. Minister has pledged himself very strongly—a great injustice has been done. I would not say that in the case of most people. Those who go into a contest and are partisans, if they come to grief have had their share of the fun; and whilst I would stand up for them and try and have justice done, I quite acknowledge that in warfare there must be blows given and somebody must have scars, when the battle comes to a conclusion. But this is the case of a man who never was a partisan, who, by his nature and his characteristics, is not fitted to be a partisan. He is one of those men who take life quietly, who does what business he has to do without interfering with anybody else; and in the whole course of the contests, from 1882, in King's County, whilst I ran there, he never was a violent partisan, although he always voted for me and was a friend of mine, politically as well as personally. This man has a brother whose temperament is quite different. He is up and alive in every contest that takes place, and he left no honest stone unturned in the election, so far as his advocacy of the Liberal-Conservative policy was concerned. But I do not suppose that my hon. friend or the Government think that it is right to punish an unoffending man for the work of one whom they may call an offending man, in the light of political partisanship. Benjamin Palmer was the lighthouse keeper at Palmer's Point. Shortly after the election in October 27th, 1896, the member who was returned, defeating the Conservative candidate, asks in a letter for the dismissal of Mr. B. R. Palmer. He says:

> I think I state sufficient reason when I say the present incumbent was a bitter organizer in the parish of Kars, and did all that he could in the interest of the Conservatives to obtain my defeat.

That is the charge. Well, the request of the sitting member was not immediately complied with. There seemed at first a disposition not to engage in this work of decapitation too hurriedly. However, the opinions of the member prevailed to this degree in that he triumphed over the sense of justice and fair-play for the time being of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and induced him to go back on the statement of the Government through the right hon. the Premier that every person who was charged should have an investigation and that none would be dismissed without having their cases looked into. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries ordered Mr. McAlpine, the commissioner, to hold an investigation on the charge preferred by the member elect, namely, that Mr. Palmer was a bitter organizer and did all that he could to defeat the candidate in the Liberal interest. Mr. McAlpine who was a very strong partisan went into this work con amore, of course. One could easily see that he was not biased in favour of Mr. Palmer, that, if anything, his bias would naturally be in favour of the contention of the sitting member of whom he was a strong supporter and for whom he had done a lot of political work. So Mr. McAlpine was appointed to look into this case. But the procedure was not sufficiently strong or quick, and about half a month

after the appointment of Mr. McAlpine to investigate the case, the sitting member again writes and recalls to the memory of the Minister, his "Dear Mr. Davis" that he had not paid prompt and executive attention to the request which had been made before. He said:

Mr. Palmer has been a most bitter political enemy, and has used all possible machinations in counjunction with his brother, Whit Palmer, against us, and so successfully that at last election I was beaten in that parish nearly two to one. If an investigation is held there is ample proof ready, and I wish to see this man removed, as my people in that parish are really very angry to think I have not been more active in pressing for his removal

Trusting you will carry this without delay,
I remain, &c.,
(Sgd.) JAMES DOMVILLE.

That, I suppose, acted as a spur to the Minister. Anyway, the commissioner held his investigation. Mr. Palmer says, in the letter in which I read last year, that the investigation was not quite fair to him, that he did not get in all the evidence he should have got in and also that he was not present when the evidence against him was given and consequently he was put at a disadvantage. I will read some short extracts from the evidence taken by Mr. McAlpine. In the first place I will read the evidence of Mr. Palmer himself, which is as follows:—

I reside in Kars; am lighthouse keeper and farmer. Have kept the light-house about ten or twelve years. I voted for the Conservative candidate,——

That is no harm—

——but I did not take any active part in the last election, or in any election since I have been appointed to the position. I did not canvass a single voter. I did not ask any man to vote in a certain way. I did not assist in organizing the parish. I took no part except to vote. I paid no man to vote. My brother is an active worker in Conservative ranks.

People who live in that section, if told that Benjamin R. Palmer had gone out to organize would smile. He is not an organizer in any sense of the word. He is not built that way. He makes the declaration under oath that I have just read. Then we have the evidence of Robert Vanwart, who says:

I live in Kars; am a farmer; I know Mr. B. R. Palmer. I remember last election, June 1897. I saw Mr. Palmer at the polls. He did not stay over twenty minutes. After dinner on 23rd June,——

That is the day of the election.

——Mr. Palmer and myself went to Wickham, Queen's County, to vote. I did not hear Mr. Palmer canvassing any one, nor did I hear of him doing so. I never heard of Mr. Palmer offering money or holding out inducements of any kind to any man to get him to vote.

Then we have the evidence of his brother with whom he lives and ought to know, and who would not swear to a lie.

Mr. FOSTER.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. He is not so quiet a man.

Mr. FOSTER. No, but he is an honourable man. He says that the charge that his brother is an active organizer and worker in the parish of Kars is not true. It is absolutely false that he took any part in any Dominion election. And here is the report of the commissioner, and it is to this particularly that I wish to ask the attention of my hon. friend. This commissioner heard all the evidence, and he gives his report as follows:—

I have the honour to submit herewith my report concerning B. R. Palmer, lighthouse keeper, Kars, King's County, N.B. Mr. Palmer was charged with active political partisanship in last Dominion election and in previous elections. The charge was not satisfactorily proved.

I have the honour, &c.,
(Sgd.) E. H. McALPINE,
Commissioner.

Then I find, Sir, that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries makes a report to Council. This report of Mr. McAlpine was signed 6th March, 1897:

Extract from a Report of the Committee of the Honourable the Privy Council, approved by His Excellency on the 7th May, 1897.

On a memorandum from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, recommending with reference to the Order in Council of the 21st June, 1884, appointing B. R. Palmer keeper of the light-house of Palmer's Point on the St. John River, that the appointment be cancelled, as it has been established to the satisfaction of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that the keeper referred to was an active partisan on the occasion of the last Dominion election.

That is to say, a charge is made by the sitting member, the charge is given to the commissioner to investigate, the judge investigates by hearing witnesses and reports that the charge is not proven, and yet the Minister who employs the judge to hold the investigation comes to Council with a report that it has been established to his satisfaction that this man was an active political partisan—and out Mr. Palmer goes.

Then comes a communication with the joyful note running through every word of it, to the member for King's (Mr. Domville) to tell him that at last the desire of his heart has been consummated, and that although the real culprit was not touched, the inoffensive brother has been deprived of his office. Now, Sir, neither I nor, I think, the brother who was deprived of office, care very much about that. It was a small office, but there are two principles concerned. In the first place, if there is a charge, and the Government say that a man who is charged shall have the charge investigated, shall have a chance to prove himself innocent, if that is the maxim which is to be acknowledged that a man is innocent until he is proved guilty, if the judge who is appointed to try the case tries it fairly, as we will suppose he has done,

and reports that the charge is not proven, it does seem to me that the Minister is bound to take the report of the commissioner, and is bound to retain the officer. I do not see where fair-play and common justice can find a resting place at all unless this principle is admitted. But there is another thing, and that is the injury to a fellow-man. Now the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is a high and mighty man. He has long been a high and mighty man, and he is higher and mightier now since he has kneeled before Her Majesty, figuratively, and has been dubbed a knight. He is now Sir Louis, and this is only plain Benjamin Palmer that kept a lighthouse down in the county of King's. The mighty Minister may think that it does not matter much, that there is no use of talking about it. But Benjamin Palmer and Sir Louis Davies are both men, and between men the code of fair-play and even justice holds, whether one is a knight and the other is a farmer, or whether they both be on a plane of equality as far as their occupation is concerned. That man feels that an injustice has been done him, and he rightly feels so. He was charged with a certain offence, the man who charged him was determined to make him pay a penalty for what he charged as the crime. The charge was disproved, and yet the penalty has to be paid, the man has to be branded as one kicked out of office, and kicked out of an office where he performed his duties with perfect satisfaction to the department, a man against whom morally or in any other sense, not one word can be said. If the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is satisfied to take the simple word of Col. Domville against the report of his own commissioner, against the sworn evidence, against the finding of his own judge, to please a partisan, to inflict this wrong upon an unoffending and innocent man, then the Minister must take the responsibility. But it is mighty poor work.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There never was a case affording better evidence of how facts can be—I will not say distorted, but improperly presented, than the case which my hon. friend has placed before the House. Now, this case is as plain and simple as a, b, c. I do not think I can be charged by my friends opposite with a desire to carry out the spoils system. I have resisted it, because I do not believe in it, and I have resisted it firmly and honestly from beginning to end. But I have invariably held that where a public official is an open, active, violent and bitter partisan, that man, on proof of his partisanship, ought to be dismissed from office. The hon. gentleman has intimated that the commissioner reported the charge was not proved. That is perfectly correct. I have never been guided myself by the report that a commissioner may make. I did not ask him to make any report, I asked him to report the evidence. I am responsible for the judgment taken, I must read that evidence, and I must determine whether, on the evidence, there is sufficient to dismiss the man. Whether Mr. McAlpine reports that the case is proved or not proved, does not matter to me, and will not absolve me before this House. If Mr. McAlpine reported evidence which showed the charge unfounded, I think hon. gentlemen will hold me to a stern account. But here we do not care what Mr. McAlpine reported, we want to know what the evidence proves, and therefore I remove that part of the case entirely. I do not care whether Mr. McAlpine reported it was proved or not. I come down to the evidence. What are the facts here? A lighthouse keeper holding a small appointment, but as my hon. friend truly remarked, being also fully entitled to every privilege that belongs to a British subject, was a perfectly innocent man, a stool-pigeon, a man who took no part whatever in the proceedings. He was not a man who could organize, nobody would accuse him of that. I have heard a good deal about it personally from my hon. friend the member for King's and others, and I know he was a man who could not organize, who would not organize, he was a stool-pigeon. But he had a brother who was the incarnation of the party. As my hon. friend said himself, he left no stone unturned——

Mr. FOSTER. No honourable stone.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There was not an honourable thing he could do to oust the Liberal party that he did not do. What position did he hold? He did not draw the salary direct, oh, no. His stool-pigeon, his brother, who took no active part, drew the salary. But the man who guided and organized, and controlled the Tory party in that parish, was Whit Palmer, and I will now quote his brother's evidence as to the relations he bore to the light-house keeper:

> My brother is an active worker in the Conservative ranks. We live together, and share everything we make.

That is the substance of the whole thing. He did not draw the salary direct, but he was the organizer, he put his brother forward to fill the position nominally, while he shared the profits. As soon as I read that I said: Well, there can be no question about it. I looked upon it substantially as if Whit Palmer was the lighthouse keeper himself. He lived with his brother and he shared the salary.

Mr. McNEILL. What is the salary?

Mr. FOSTER. A matter of $80

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not care what it was. He was the incarnation of the Tory party

in that province. He put his brother forward as the nominal lighthouse keeper, whereas he was the real one.

Mr. McNEILL. The amount of salary matters a good deal, because if the salary was very small and they were living together they could not require much money to support themselves, if any part of it went to this man's brother. If the salary was $60 or $100 only it would, from this point of view, be a very different thing from a salary of $500 or $600. However, I do not want to say very much so far as the hon. Minister's conduct in these matters is concerned. Personally, I have found that he has dealt with matters of this kind in what I consider to be a very fair way.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I should like to ask the Minister with respect to what he justifies as a proper reason for dismissing an official. If I understood the hon. gentleman correctly, he said that because a man was a partisan, an offensive partisan, that was justification for his dismissal. Admitting that to be the case, would the hon. Minister justify the appointment of a man to take the place of an official dismissed under those circumstances, who himself was a very strong and offensive partisan.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That is a very different matter.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not intend that the Minister shall get away on that exceedingly thin ground. I do not know but that the case is at its best when left just simply on the terms in which it has been pleaded before the House by the hon. Minister, and to let the common sense of members of the House settle it. But there are two points to which I should like to call attention. The hon. Minister stands in the position of final arbiter. On what? On a charge which was preferred definitely, tried by one of his own commissioners and reported upon by that commissioner. What was the charge? Not that Whit Palmer got half of the salary of $80 from his brother Benjamin; not that the two brothers of the same parents, living together, neither married, sharing everything equally, were as if they were one man; not that one-half of that immense salary paid to Benjamin Palmer went to his brother Whit. The charge was that Benjamin Palmer was an offensive partisan. The commissioner said he was not. It is very well known in the administration of justice that very much depends on active contact with witnesses when giving testimony. The commissioner had that advantage and the Minister had not. The commissioner having that advantage decided that the man was not an offensive partisan and so reported. The Minister sits here, and if he has an ear it is not for Benjamin Palmer, but for the member for King's, so that he had to rush over to London in order to boost an enterprise for him, the class of which he was trying to damn at the other end, to boost an enterprise which the insinuating member for King's told him to boost, ordered him to boost, if not that he would speedily heap sorrow with a spoon of grief.

An hon. MEMBER. What has that to do with the question?

Mr. FOSTER. I think I am the judge as to what this has to do with the question. My hon. friend, I was going to say, has a very willing ear for the hon. member for King's. That is the man the Minister listened to when he decided that Benjamin Palmer should be dismissed, and except for the insistence of that hon. gentleman, Benjamin would not have lost his position as lighthouse keeper. But what a position it is for the Minister to take, that when a man is charged with an offence and is found not guilty, the hon. gentleman cuts his head off all the same but for an altogether different reason, because in partnership with his brother in every affair of life, in the farm, in the fishery, and in this little lighthouse, he is said to have received a portion of this $80 a year. If the hon. gentleman can afford to do that injustice, if the Government can get along by those little means, let them do so, but to my mind it is pretty small business. I ask the Minister if he does not feel ashamed of cutting off an official's head in this way. There was only one objection I took to the hon. gentleman's remarks, and that was when he charged Benjamin with having acted secretly. He took charge of the lighthouse above board, and I regret that the hon. gentleman's inherent sense of justice has been overridden by the imperative demand of the hon. member for King's.

Mr. SPROULE. It seems to me the hon. Minister has laid down a most extraordinary doctrine. Would the hon. gentleman adopt such a course in any line of life except in politics? The hon. gentleman is a lawyer to-day, and he may be a judge next year. If he were on the bench and a case were brought before him and tried and the evidence proved that the accused was not guilty, but that some one else was the offender, surely he would not condemn the man who had been shown to be innocent. The hon. Minister has admitted that the party charged did not commit the offence. According to British justice no matter what the offence may be, if a man is found innocent he is allowed to go free, and no authority could administer punishment. But because Benjamin Palmer is stated to have been an offensive partisan and his brother is shown to have been an offensive partisan, and the charge against Benjamin is not proved, the brother has to receive the punishment, the innocent for the guilty. If the Minister were a judge, would he apply that rule in any similar case? There is another extraordinary circumstance connect-

ed with his case. A commission was appointed. Either the commissioner has a right to give final judgment or not. I notice that in several commissions of late the commissioner has acted as judge, and decided whether punishment should be awarded or not. I always considered that was overstepping his duty, as a commissioner is only to ascertain the facts and report them to the department; but it seems this course has not been followed by political commissions which travelled around the country and investigated charges of alleged offensive partisanship, for they have decided whether an offence had been committed or not. But in the face of the facts the Minister goes behind the decision given by the commissioner; he looks over the evidence, no doubt with the object of trying to find out whether a charge of political partisanship could be sustained, and when he finds he is unable to convict Benjamin Palmer on the evidence, he learns that his brother was a political partisan, and as the two men live together he decides to convict Benjamin, although entirely innocent, the ground really being that his brother had committed an offence of the same nature. Does it not seem very extraordinary that a man occupying the high position of Minister of Marine and Fisheries, an eminent lawyer who has practised for many years, should lay down such a principle and endeavour to defend it, and should try to convince the people of Canada that it was a fair trial and a just judgment. It was a most unfair trial, and I do not think it will reflect any credit upon the Minister of Marine, notwithstanding that he is usually very fair in those things. I will say that I understood he was a man who was not desirous of carrying out the spoils system very strongly, but I confess that the good opinion I have entertained of him heretofore is very much shaken by this case which he himself has cited.

Mr. McNEILL. The contention of the hon. Minister is, that he would not have dismissed this man had it not been that he believed he was actually drawing the salary from which his brother derived the benefit.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The brother swore they shared the salary between them.

Mr. McNEILL. When the Minister agreed to the dismissal, he surely could not have realized that the salary was only $80 a year, because after this lighthouse keeper paid for his own board out of the $80, the Minister must see that he had nothing to give to the brother.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. In many places a contribution of $40 towards a political fund is quite a nice little thing.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Are you getting $40 out of the new appointee.

Mr. CLANCY. The committee must be delighted with the declaration of the Minister that he was not thirsting for the heads and blood of officials. I have no doubt that the hon. gentleman has probably resisted a very great deal of pressure, but be that as it may, he has laid down an extraordinary rule for one who is not anxious to engage in such doubtful enterprises. The Minister's principle is, not that a man must account only for his conduct, but that he must account for his salary, and if a single dollar goes to a partisan, though that partisan may not be an official, then off goes the head of the employee of the Government.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Suppose an official comes forward and says: I am not an active partisan, but I give the half of my salary to my brother who is notoriously an organizer of the opposite party in the district.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Did he say "notoriously?"

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We all know it; he admitted it. I ask my hon. friend if the lighthouse keeper, as he swore, shared his salary with the political organizer, would the hon. gentleman not consider the maxim, 'Qui facit per alium facit per se,' would apply?

Mr. CLANCY. What is the difference in principle whether he was a brother or a distant relative, or some person holding no position whatever? If the Minister lays down a rule of that kind, an official could not lend a dollar to any person who was a partisan. And let me ask, is the Minister the keeper of the salaries of every official in his department? A man has a right to do just as he pleases with his own money.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. To give it as a contribution towards a political fund?

Mr. FOSTER. The Minister is trying to make the House believe that that money went into the active organization of the Conservative party to defeat the Liberal candidate. I stand here to say that I do not believe for one moment that a single cent of that money went to that purpose. Mr. Whit Palmer may conduct a canvas in his parish, but he is not an organizer in the sense that Mr. Smith is the organizer of the Liberal party, which means the handling of funds, and the conduct of a large organzation.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. He chips in, does he not?

Mr. FOSTER. It is altogether unfair for the Minister to try to produce the impression that this money was given to Whit Palmer for election purposes. The two brothers shared everything alike, and this brother who had no selfish interest in letting the world know the partisanship of the brothers, himself gave the evidence.

Mr. CLANCY. The Minister would try to make us believe that the half of this paltry annual salary of $80 was the means of overturning the whole Liberal party. Why, if every dollar of the salary went into the fund, the Minister had no justification for his course. From this day out any civil servant who gives or lends a dollar that may be diverted against the Liberal party, will lose his position. That is the doctrine of the Minister. These two brothers sat at the same table, shared the $80 salary between them, and the lighthouse keeper is dismissed for helping his brother to live out of this beggarly sum of $80 a year. If the hon. gentleman (Sir Louis Davies) is proud of such a thing as that, he has lost his reputation for being possessed of any sense of justice.

Mr. BENNETT. It is a matter of consolation for me to have the dictum of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in this case, because I shall appeal to him in another case in reference to which I will ask him to apply the converse rule. The brother of an official whom I hear the Minister is going to decapitate, is a very strong opponent of mine. I refer to the case of one Thomas Marchildon, the keeper of Hope Island lighthouse. A couple of weeks ago an investigation was held in reference to his conduct in the election of 1896. It seems rather a long time that after two years the Minister should have awakened to the fact that an investigation was necessary, and still more so is it strange, because I believe that many times representations have been made to him and he thought that the charges were so flimsy that an investigation even should not be held. Whether that was so or not, I do not know. But this I am free to admit, that after two years the Minister was fair enough to give to the accused party an investigation, which was conducted before Mr. Harty, one of his officials; and I think the lighthouse keeper cannot fairly complain that the investigation was not fair and above board. In this connection I would ask the Minister whether he has decided, on the evidence heard before Mr. Harty, to dispense with the services of Mr. Marchildon?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I may say that complaints were made from time to time of Mr. Marchildon's conduct. I did not feel disposed to go to the expense of a special commission to investigate those complaints. What I said was that when the Inspector of Lights next went on his rounds, I would instruct him to make an investigation. Mr. Harty is not in politics; he is simply an official of the department. I instructed him to make an investigation and report to me the facts. He made the investigation, and I said, "I think the lighthouse keeper should be suspended and his assistant should carry on the light for a time." The evidence is there, it is quite voluminous, and though I have suspended the lighthouse keeper for the time being, I have made no determination in the matter at all.

Mr. BENNETT. I am free to admit that Mr. Marchildon did vote for me on the occasion of the election in June, 1896.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That would be no offence in my eye at all.

Mr. BENNETT. I am free to admit that the lighthouse keeper would of necessity have to leave his light on that day to come in and vote on the mainland. But I think the Minister will find it borne out in the evidence that during the by-election that occurred in 1897, the lighthouse keeper was on the mainland, owing to permission which he had received to winter there, and I have no doubt that out of gratitude at having received his appointment on my recommendation, he voted for me on that occasion also. But I would ask the Minister to bear in mind that in 1897 Mr. Marchildon met with an accident while painting the lighthouse, and that he was in consequence put to considerable expense for medical attendance and for the assistance of a man to look after the lighthouse during his illness. What I contend is that the affair having occurred so long ago, though at the time he was at the polls he may have perhaps spoken in a heated way, the Minister should condone and overlook it, especially in view of the fact that Mr. Marchildon in supporting me was supporting the candidate of the Government which had given him the position; and I think there should be a sharp distinction drawn between an appointee who supports the Government which appointed him, and one who has been appointed by a prior Government and opposes a subsequent Administration. Furthermore, in that part of the province there is a large provincial reformatory, and as it is the custom of the officials of that institution to use their best efforts on behalf of the candidates on the Liberal side, it is rather placing a premium on interference in elections. I would also ask the Minister to bear in mind that the other day, in answer to an inquiry of mine, he stated that he did not purpose interfering with one Baxter, a lighthouse keeper at the adjoining light, against whom a complaint had been lodged, and who, as shown by a report in the hon. Minister's own department, had been found guilty of illegal fishing. If the Minister is going to condone the offence of Baxter, a Government lighthouse keeper who deliberately sets the law at defiance, he should certainly overlook the action of Mr. Marchildon, particularly in view of the fact that the matter complained of occurred nearly two years ago. I trust the Minister will give Mr. Marchildon the benefit of the doubt.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I promise to give it every careful consideration. I am not going to act hastily at all.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I must do the hon. gentleman the justice of saying that up to the present time he has had the reputation of not being one of those who carry out the policy that to the victors belong the spoils; but I am very much afraid that this case of Mr. Palmer is going to seriously interfere with his reputation in that respect. Not only have we had a change of Government in Canada, but the new Government have changed the law and even the principles of justice. I have always understood that when a man is charged with an offence, and it is investigated before a commissioner, and the commissioner decides up on the evidence aduced before him, that the man is not guilty, that disposes of the case. But the hon. gentleman says no. Why, it seems to me that the old principles of British justice have been replaced in Canada by the fables of Lafontaine. From our classical studies we all remember how in Lafontaine's fable of the wolf and the lamb, the wolf says to the lamb, "You have sinned against me; I was drinking in the stream, and you troubled the water and prevented me from enjoying my refreshing drink." But the lamb says, "That is quite impossible, because I was down stream below you." "Oh, but," says the wolf, like the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, "if it was not you, it was your brother." So the hon. Minister says, "There cannot be any doubt about your guilt, because you have a brother, and it must be your brother." Now, Sir, I put it upon this one ground. The hon. gentleman and his friends happen to be on the right side of the Speaker to-day, but to-morrow they may be on the left; and I say that for the protection of the rules regulating the relations which should exist between the Government and the people of the country, that kind of thing should not be done. I did not rise so much for the purpose of discussing the case of Mr. Palmer, although I have a strong conviction that Mr. Palmer has been treated by the hon. gentleman in a manner which it is absolutely impossible to defend. I think that possibly the Minister's own judgment was set aside, and that he was controlled by the ardent wish of a strong supporter, Col. Domville. Whether it be on account of Col. Domville or for any other reason, the hon. gentleman, as a Minister and a lawyer, cannot defend the action which was taken in that case. I want to refer to another case, which is not in the province represented by my hon. friend (Mr. Foster), but the province of Quebec— that of the light-house keeper at Point du Lac—Mr. Biron.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That is St. Peter's light ship.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I do not want to make any charge now, because I asked the hon. gentleman for information and he was kind enough to refer me to his officers, and I must say that whenever I have had the opportunity of visiting his department, I have always been treated in a manner which prevents my making any complaint whatever. But when I heard of the fate of Mr. Palmer, I thought I would put in a good word on behalf of Mr. N. Biron, so as to prevent the hon. gentleman, if Mr. Biron should happen to have a brother, from treating him as he did Mr. Palmer. I hope the hon. gentleman will let me know, at his convenience, exactly what I may expect in the case of Mr. Biron. He is a Conservative, because I believe in that parish there were only two Liberals altogether.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Then he is safe. They cannot get a Grit to put in his place.

Mr. HENDERSON. I must confess that I was more than surprised to-night at the fine point raised by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries in the case under consideration. I always had the impression that the hon. gentleman would be the fairest man in the Cabinet to deal with a case of this kind. I have never before risen to say a word with respect to dismissals made, either by him or any other member of the Government, but allowed them to have their own way without any criticism from me. But I must say that I feel a very nice point indeed was raised by the hon. gentleman to-night, and that he has certainly gone a very long way to find an excuse for dismissing this man with a paltry salary of $80. Even supposing that his brother did get a portion of this $80, as I understand he did, both living together and sharing what they may make whilst the lighthouse-keeper put $80 into the common pot the brother put in another $80 alongside of it from his earnings elsewhere, and they would divide, so that the brother did not gain an advantage in the end from his share of the salary. I think that the hon. Minister should take this into his consideration, and he will realize on inspection that he has gone too far in the matter, and that he should do this man the justice to which he is fairly entitled. Had this man thought for a moment that he was going to be dismissed on account of this nice distinction, he might just as well have taken an active part in the election. But the evidence is clear that he did not; and since he abstained from any partnership, and since his brother did not derive any benefit from that division of salary, I think the hon. gentleman should reconsider the case.

Mr. McDOUGALL. In the early part of the session I endeavoured to get a list from

the hon. gentleman of the dismissals in my county from his department, but he did not have the courtesy to let me have it.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not think the hon. gentleman should charge me with discourtesy. He asked the question across the House, and I said I thought the better plan would be to move for a return.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I put a notice of motion on the paper, and whenever I brought it up, some hon. gentlemen on the other side would ask to have it stand.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I cannot help that.

Mr. McDOUGALL. The hon. gentleman could have helped it by answering my question. The list is not a very large one. I would ask him if he did not dismiss the keeper of a fog horn in my constituency at a place called Cranbery Head and also the keeper of a lighthouse at Louisburg ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That is not in the hon. gentleman's county.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I think that I ought to know something about the county I have represented for 20 years. I would also ask him if he dismissed a lighthouse-keeper at Piper Cove and a lighthouse-keeper at Gabarous and the board of pilot commissioners at Sydney ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We are not on the matter of pilot commissioners.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Then I will confine myself to the lighthouse-keepers and the keeper of the fog-horn.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. What is the name of the lighthouse-keeper ?

Mr. McDOUGALL. The man's name was James P. Burke, lighthouse keeper, Louisburg.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes, and Philip Price was appointed in his place.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Was there an investigation ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I could not tell ; I do not remember of any.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Was John Hardy, the lighthouse-keeper at Gabarous, dismissed ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I have not any such name on the list.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Was E. A. McNeill, the lighthouse-keeper at Piper's Cove, dismissed ?

Mr. McDOUGALL.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes, and John C. McNeill was appointed in his place. I do not know whether they were brothers or not.

Mr. FOSTER. In view of the Palmer case, you had better be careful about that.

Mr. McDOUGALL. And the Minister provided him with a salary three months in advance. The man dismissed was dismissed about the time the lighthouse was being closed for the season, and the other man got the key and drew the salary during the season when there was nothing for him to do. Can the hon. Minister give me information about the fog-horn keeper at Cranberry Head ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Mr. James McNeill was appointed keeper of the fog-horn August 26, 1896.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I would like to know who was first recommended for this place ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am not able to give the hon. gentleman that information.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Is it not a fact that the person who was first recommended was not fit for the place ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. If the person recommended was not fit for the place, I have only to say that nobody has been appointed yet. This appointment is only temporary.

Mr. McDOUGALL. And there is no responsible person in charge ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes ; there is a responsible person in charge.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's). I wish to call attention to several of the lighthouse-keepers in my county.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. My hon. friend (Mr. Macdonald) is not going to complain of dismissals. He has no need to do that.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's). I do not know ; I shall see before I sit down, but that was not my purpose in rising. I wish to point out that the lighthouse-keepers at Cape Bear, Panmure and St. Andrews have to keep their lights the whole year on account of the winter steamer from Pictou to Georgetown, and yet their salaries are not so large as those of some others who only keep their lights during the summer season. Some of these gentlemen are friends of mine, and some of them are friends of hon. gentlemen opposite. I think that, as a matter of justice this matter should be considered to see if more liberal provision cannot be made in these cases.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. My mental energies so far have been entirely engrossed with the considerations of applications to dismiss these men from office, which I have not seen fit to do so far. But now that the hon. gentleman has brought this new phase of the question before me I shall consider it. So far as the Panmure light is concerned, and passibly Cape Bear there may be arguments in favour of his view, but I do not think the same applies to St. Andrews.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's). They have to keep the light.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FIHERIES. But it is a far different thing.

Mr. SPROULE. I desire to call the attention to the lighthouse keeper in my riding, Mr. Lowe, of Thornbury. He is attentive to his duties and has given good satisfaction. His salary is only $80. He is comparatively helpless. I think he lost one of his limbs or had it disabled so that it is of little use. I previously applied for an increase for him, but I did not get it. I hope the hon. Minister will take into consideration this man's comparatively helpless condition.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I may say to my hon. friend that in the matter of salaries to lighthouse keepers, I invariably refer to Col. Anderson, who has charge of that branch, because they have to be considered, not only with reference to the duties the keeper discharges himself, but with reference to the relation that his salary bears to all the others. The Colonel is well up in the matter, and between him and the deputy I am generally pretty well advised. I shall be glad to bring this matter to their attention.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's). I hope the Minister will not forget his own province in that respect. I find that the salaries of lighthouse keepers in the other provinces, on the lakes and the upper St. Lawrence, are much in excess of those paid in our province. I do not see why there should be such a vast difference.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman knows that the delightful island he and I come from has always been rather shabbily treated.

Mr. McNEILL. I would ask the Minister if it is not possible to increase the salary of Mr. McKay, lighthouse keeper of Stoke's Bay. The lighthouse is in a position which makes it exceedingly inconvenient for the light keeper, and is also the cause of a good deal of danger, owing to the service of an open boat being required to get ashore. Mr. McKay is a gentleman whose name, I think, is familiar to my hon. friend, a man who has distinguished himself by saving life on more than one occasion.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I will consult with my officials on the point.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not want to bother my hon. friend too much, but there is another case down on the St. John River just about opposite this Palmer's Point. At Oak Bay there is a lighthouse on the St. John River, not far from Palmer's Point. The Oak Bay lighthouse was kept by a young man named George B. Pickett. He was the son of a very estimable Church of England clergyman who has long ministered to his flock in that part of the country. He is a very worthy, quiet and efficient young man, who does his work well. Now, the same gentleman, I believe, who was very anxious to have Mr. Benjamin Palmer eliminated from the lighthouse at Farmer's Point, was equally anxious to have the same process carried out upon Mr. Pickett. I think his request was made to the Minister, and the Minister instructed Mr. McAlpine to hold an investigation. But before Mr. McAlpine came around to that part of the country to hold the investigation, Mr. George B. Pickett's head was cut off. Has the Minister any explanation for that?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am sorry to say I am not able to give my hon. friend any information. It was a small salary, only $50, but that should not matter. I do not recall the facts at all.

Mr. FOSTER. If my hon. friend will look into that matter, he will find the facts as I have stated. I do not know what excuse he may invent. The same malign influence, I am afraid, has been at work in both this case and the Palmer case.

Maintenance, repairs to lighthouses, &c..... ..... $230,000

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I desire to say to the House in passing that item, that the Auditor General requires, if anything not strictly within the words "maintenance of lights" is going to be spent, that should be stated in the House. In this matter we have had for some time a vessel in Prince Edward Island and on the north shore of New Brunswick, engaged in carrying supplies to lighthouses. That vessel is worn out, and had to be sold. We are building a new one, on which it is proposed to spend $15,000, which will come out of this vote. It is necessary that I should state to the House that it is my intention to pay out of this vote the sum of $15,000 to build a small steamer for carrying on the lighthouse service on the coast of Prince Edward Island and north shore of New Brunswick. It is to take the place of the boat Mr. Lord used to have, that is sold.

Mr. BRITTON. Under the head of Maintenance, quite a large sum was paid last year for legal expenses. Has there been any

investigations connected with lighthouses west of Montreal, or why should there be a charge for legal expenses ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There have been no legal expenses since I came in. I had to pay a lot of expenses that had been incurred before.

Mr. BRITTON. The item of $500 to Mr. Hodgins was incurred prior to this Administration ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am told that was incurred in 1896, before I came in.

Construction of lighthouses..... $45,000

Mr. BENNETT. The MINISTER will recall to recollection an application that was made last year by a deputation of the town council of Midland, for placing a light off what was known as Sawlog Point. Does the Minister intend this year to erect a light on that shore ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I may say to my hon. friend that Col. Anderson, the chief inspector of lights, is at present in British Columbia, and I have delayed making up my estimate for special lights in the supplementaries, until he returns. We desire to divorce as far as possible politics from the matter, and I am generally guided by the advice of Col. Anderson in these matters. He has to have a report upon it. I cannot say until he returns—I am expecting his return daily—whether that will be put in or not. But if he advises it and I am able to do so, I will be glad to do it.

Mr. BENNETT. I admit that a great deal of expense is necessitated after the building of the light, by the appointment of the lighthouse keeper. If the Minister finds he will not be able to meet the expenditure this year, I would ask him to consider the question of placing on this shoal a gas buoy, which will not cost a large sum, and will meet the purposes as well as a light. It is an important point where large vessels pass continually. Last year two or three went down in the dark on this shoal.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I will be very glad to make a note of it to-morrow morning from the "Hansard" report of the hon. gentleman's remarks, and bring it before Col. Anderson. In these technical matters I am not prepared to give an offhand opinion, but I am inclined to think the cost of a gas buoy is very much larger than the hon. gentleman has any idea of.

Mr. McALISTER. I desire to ask the Minister if it is his intention to open the two lights that were closed at Oak Point, below Campbellton, on the opposite side of the river. These lights were erected there a number of years ago, but for some reason they were closed a few years ago. Campbellton is an important port, and the shipping is increasing very rapidly. A petition has been sent in asking that these lights be re-opened, and I know some of the parties there have been in communication with the Minister about it.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Is the hon. gentleman able to say whether the lights afford accommodation to shipping, or is it only for fishing boats ?

Mr. McALISTER. They afford accommodation for shipping. Under present circumstances, supposing a vessel was loaded at the wharf at Campbellton, after the month of September, when the evening tide is the highest, if she cannot get away before dark, it is impossible for her to get out with any degree of safety until the next day, and it is necessary to remain 24 hours perhaps before she can get out.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. When were these lights discontinued ?

Mr. McALISTER. About five or six years ago. They have been very much needed ever since. I may say that the lumbermen and shippers who have moved in the matter, have tried to get the light re-established.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I have not had the matter brought to my attention, but I will look into it.

Mr. MONK. The lighthouse at Point Claire has been burned down a year ago. Will that be in operation this year ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It will.

Mr. MONK. I suppose it would be useless to speak about the dismissal of the lighthouse keeper. I believe they have all been dismissed in that vicinity, brothers or no brothers.

Repairs to wharfs..... $3,000

Mr. SPROULE. Are those wharfs used in connection with the lighthouse service ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. They are wharfs which are administered by the department. These wharfs are constructed by the Minister of Public Works, but small repairs are done upon them from time to time under my department.

Mr. SPROULE. It is a small amount, but it seems to me they should come under the head of Public Works.

Hydrographic surveys..... $16,000

Mr. FOSTER. What work has been done?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Captain Stewart is with his

staff on Georgian Bay completing surveys which have been prosecuted for many years very effectively.

Mr. SPROULE. The work has gone on for several years. Can the Minister give any information as to how much has been done and how much remains to be done?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The work done in the summer is completed during the winter, and the results forwarded to the Admiralty, where the maps are prepared and sent out here. I shall be very happy, if the hon. gentleman will call at the department, to give him the necessary explanation by referring to the map. Captain Stewart is a very energetic officer. I should have been very glad if I could have induced my colleagues to double the vote in order to establish a branch for the survey of the British Columbia coast. Her Majesty's Government, feeling that we have not carried out the necessary surveys, have sent Her Majesty's ship "Ælgeria" to commence surveys on the British Columbia coast this year. I feel that the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) was very nearly correct this afternoon when he said that Canada hardly discharged her duty in this regard. I think we could assume a little more responsibility in this direction, and I do not think it right to ask the British Government to do what we should do. I hope to bring the matter before my colleagues, so that next year we may ask Parliament for an increased vote for the purpose. In point of fact, I would have endeavoured to do so this year, except for the expense involved in getting a boat ready. Next year, however, we hope to ask for the necessary vote, and I am sure from the reception given to this vote every year, Parliament will be prepared to vote an increased amount when it is shown that our necessities require it.

Mr. SPROULE. The sum seems very small for the work done. I can bear testimony to the efficiency of the officer, Captain Stewart. I have heard many captains and others navigating the Georgian Bay speak of him most favourably; he appears to be highly respected and considered a very efficient officer. Already he has done a great deal of good work, as did his predecessor, Captain Boulton. The increase in trade on Georgian Bay requires that this work should be very carefully done. A great many accidents have occurred, and dangerous spots have been found from time to time since these surveys were entered upon. This is very valuable work, and much needed in the interests of trade. A good officer is doing the work, and the only matter of surprise is that so small a vote is taken for the purpose.

Meteorological Service..... $62,000

Mr. SPROULE. I observe an increase in this item of $1,061.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There are increases in the salaries of Messrs. Denison, Blake and Kingsmill, and provision made for a messenger at $300 a year. There is also a small amount, $500, for the observatory at Kingston, which was omitted last year.

Observatory, Toronto..... $2,700

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON. What is covered by this item?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There are two votes, one under the head of Observatory, Toronto, $2,700, and one under the head of Meteorological service, $62,000. The vote of $2,700 is merely to cover the expense of weather forecasts at Toronto, the officers being Messrs. Webber and Payne. The amount of $62,000 is to cover the general expenses of the observatory, including officers' salaries.

Mr. CLARKE. What changes have been made in the Meteorological Office in Toronto?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The scientists of the British Association who visited the Toronto Observatory last year met in Ottawa and pressed on me the necessity of removing a part of the Observatory to a place which would be free from the electric currents caused by the street cars. Mr. Stupart, acting on instructions, secured a couple acres of land about nine miles from Toronto and I have a vote in the Supplementary Estimates to construct a small building there this year. Our observations then will be free from the influence of these currents which now render them almost useless.

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON. Will the new station be connected by telegraph with the General Observatory in Toronto?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes.

Mr. MONK. I would call the attention of the Minister to the necessity for having a re-survey made of Lake St. Louis on the St. Lawrence, near Montreal. It was surveyed as far back as 1836, but that survey was not a very complete one. At any rate, there has been a great deal of dredging both at the entrance and the outlet of the lake since then, and a great deal of other changes have taken place which make a re-survey necessary, or at least a correction of that old survey of 1836. The Minister is probably aware that during the summer the lake is frequented by a large number of steam and sailing yachts from the United States and Canada. It would seem necessary that those visiting the lakes during the summer should have the advantage of an exact chart. I called the attention of the Minister to this last year and I trust he will consider my proposition favourably now. The same remark applies with increasing force to the Lake of Two Mountains on the Ottawa River, about

twenty miles from Montreal. It is some two or three miles wide and about fifteen miles long, but it never has been surveyed at all. It is also the resort of a great many strange craft in the summer and it is proper that we should have a proper chart of the lake which is a dangerous lake for navigation. If the hon. members for Vaudreuil (Mr. Harwood) and Two Mountains (Mr. Ethier) were here, I am sure they would bear me out in this request. I have been told that a survey of both of these lakes would not cost more than $2,000, and it would be a very proper expenditure to make.

Mr. CLARKE. Have any changes been made in the staff of the Meteorological Office at Toronto ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Mr. Denison is granted an increase of $100, Mr. Blake an increase of $50, Mr. Kingsford an increase of $80, and a messenger at $310.

Marine Hospitals..... $38,000

Mr. SPROULE. What number of patients are cared for in these marine hospitals ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There is a Sick Mariner's Fund contributed to by the shipping interests and out of that fund these mariners are provided for. It costs the taxpayers nothing. Formerly we used to provide for them in hospitals maintained at the public expense, but we now find it more economical and better to send them to the general hospitals where we pay at the rate of 80 and 90 cents a day each.

Steamboat Inspection..... $27,000

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There is an increase of $1,000 to provide for an additional inspector in British Columbia. There has been an immense increase of shipping there during the last year, and some time ago I sent Mr. Adams out to hold a board for the examination of persons qualified to become inspectors of steamboats, and an additional inspector was appointed.

Mr. FOSTER. Who is the new inspector ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Mr. Russell.

Fisheries $243,000

Mr. FOSTER. We have been pretty good to the hon. gentleman in letting his Estimates go through, and I think some gentlemen were here quite a time last night. I propose to my hon. friend that if he will leave one item, we will let the others go through.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That is reasonable.

Mr. MONK.

Salaries and disbursements of fishery inspectors overseers and guardians... $95,000

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There is an increase here of $5,000 which calls for an explanation. For the past two years I have been making a very stern attempt to improve the service for the protection of the lobster fisheries in the maritime provinces. There appear to be two diverse interests at play. One is the lobster fisheries as viewed from a national standpoint—is it desirable to conserve it and preserve it ? The other is the interest of the lobster fisherman, who is carrying on the lobster industry. He has an interest in preserving the industry ; but he has a greater interest in catching all the lobsters he can for the time being. He is not disposed to observe regulations, or times or seasons, and a conflict has been going on between him and the department. The lobster industry gives more employment and brings in more money than almost any other industry in the maritime provinces ; and my predecessors came to the conclusion, and I have adopted their conclusion, that it is of the greatest national interest that this industry should be guarded in every possible way. Regulations were adopted for guarding it, and a close season was adopted. Up to the 15th of July lobsters of a certain size can be caught ; but after the 15th of July men who engage in this fishery violate the law. Yet they continue fishing after the time has come when fishing should cease. Although we have a very large staff of fishery officers around the coasts, they are insufficient to cope with the difficulty, and my proposal is to increase the vote by $5,000, to cover the cost of supplying two small steam launches which will go along the coast and enable the officers not to confine their efforts to the land, but to go out one, two three, four or five miles, and catch the men in flagrante delicto, and seize and destroy their traps. We tried last year to cope with this evil by means of the ordinary cruisers, but they found it difficult to go into the bays. Captain Spain strongly recommends that two small steam launches be supplied, and as soon as the House votes the money for the purpose, I intend to have them built. The Auditor General requires that I should state that this $5,000 is to be spent for these steam launches, and that is what the increase is for.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's). I am pleased to find that the hon. Minister of Marine is taking active measures to try and preserve this valuable industry from being completely wiped out. There is no doubt that it is nearing that period year by year ; and unless very strict measures are taken, it will soon become a thing of the past. With respect to the mode in which the hon. gentleman is going about it, I must say I do not agree with him. I do not think it is

possible for steam launches to detect these people when they lay themselves out to deceive or to get to the windward of the authorities. I made inquiries last year of the parties engaged in this business, and I find that when the season is over they do not put out any buoys, but set their lines of traps under water and take landmarks, by which they can strike the line of traps every time with their boats. A steam launch cannot detect that kind of thing at all. There is only one way in which it can be stopped. If the hon. gentleman would spend the same money or half the money which these steam launches will cost, to have a detective organization on the shore, to catch these fellows when they bring the lobsters to land, something might be done. In some sections of the country nothing of that kind is carried on. In the eastern section of the island, from Cape Bear to East Point, it is not done; but around the southern and western sections, I am told that it is done to a large extent; and it will continue unless there is an active police patrol set on the coast to detect these men and catch them. I do not think that if a dozen steam launches were got, they would be of any use to stop this practice.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I have a great respect for the opinion of the hon. gentleman, because he is a practical man who is engaged in the business, and he knows the difficulties; but I am acting in this case, not only on the opinion of all my officers in the maritime provinces, but as a result of the experiments which I tried myself last year. On the authority of the vote granted to me by the House, I chartered a steam tug and employed her on the coasts of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island, and by that means my officers destroyed thousands of traps. A steam launch capable of going ten or twelve miles an hour can go along the coast and come upon these men before they know where they are. Whether the traps are buoyed or not, the steam yacht can catch the men who go out in the boats, and then pick up the traps and destroy them. It may be not as effective a system as hon. gentlemen desire, but it is a step in the right direction.

Mr. YEO. The great difficulty is in the law compelling fishermen to fish at a time when there are no fish to be caught, and preventing their fishing at a time when fish are plentiful. It will be impossible to prevent their trying to get fish when fish are to be caught. These people have gone to a very large outlay, and under the present law are compelled to fish at a season when there are no fish on the coast and are not allowed to fish when fish are plentiful. If the hon. Minister would make a change in the regulations as regards certain portions of the eastern provinces he would find no difficulty in having the law observed. These people do not ask for a longer season than is allowed in other parts, but they want the season changed.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I must congratulate my hon. friend who has just spoken (Mr. Yeo) for having brought this matter to the attention of the hon. Minister. I must say that the remarks he has made apply equally well to the Magdalen Islands. It is a well-known fact that lobsters are caught at these islands three weeks and sometimes a month later than in certain portions of Prince Edward Island and the Nova Scotia coast, and the same thing is the case in Cape Breton, according to statements made by hon. gentlemen last year. Under the circumstances, would it not be better not to provide a uniform season for lobster fishing which will apply to all parts of the maritime provinces. Many complaints have been made and petitions sent to the hon. gentleman since a couple of years, and I have been told, on every occasion on which I made representations, that it was absolutely necessary we should have uniform legislation on this subject, and that it was out of the question to have some parts of the Dominion dealt with differently from others. Well, there is no dissentient opinion among those engaged in the business in the Magdalen Islands, among the merchants, very important firms, on this point. It is a well-known fact that the lobsters are caught in the Magdalen Islands three weeks and a month later than in the other parts of the Dominion, and under the circumstances it seems to me it would be better to extend the season. What happens at present? The regulations of the department are violated, and any regulations that may be made in this connection will be violated. I do not approve of the violation, because I respect the law, and I desire that my constituents shall obey it, but I must press earnestly on the hon. gentleman the unfairness to the Magdalen Island fishermen of fixing the same close season for them as in other parts of the maritime provinces. According to the Treaty of Washington, those islands are the only place in the Dominion where the American fishermen can catch fish inside the three-mile limit in Canadian waters.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Not lobsters.

Mr. LEMIEUX. No, but other fish. The people of these islands labour under more unfavourable circumstances, under the law, than the fishermen of other parts of the Dominion; and what I ask is not that they be given any special privilege, but that justice be done them by the Government by extending the season. I sincerely hope that in his visit to the maritime provinces next summer the hon. gentleman will call at the Magdalen Islands and judge for himself the facts that I have the honour to present to him.

Mr. MACDONALD. No doubt the hon. gentleman has stated the facts with regard to the Magdalen Islands, but there is a serious side to this fishery business. It is a very important industry. We can catch, perhaps, more fish during the close than during the open season, but the fishermen of our section do not wish for any change. Even if they got the privilege, they would not take fish in the season now prohibited, because they desire to preserve the fisheries. The hon. Minister has a very difficult task, as had his predecessors, in carrying out the regulations. But our fisheries are a very valuable asset, and they are getting fished out. I believe that my county is the first place in the maritime provinces in which lobster fishing was started, and that industry has been continued there from that day to this. At the time the industry was started, two lobsters would fill a pound can, whereas now it takes ten. That tells the whole story, and that will be the result in the whole of the maritime provinces if the present law is not observed. I would strongly urge the hon. Minister to have a good stiff back on the question, and take every means to carry out the law as strictly as possible. That may seem very hard to some people, but it will be in the interests of the whole country.

Mr. McALISTER. I represent a county in which lobster fishing is carried on to a great extent, and I have not, for some years past, heard any complaints whatever about the close season being too short. I agree with the hon. member for King's (Mr. Macdonald) that if we wish to preserve this valuable industry, we must enforce the regulations. The fishermen in the county of Restigouche, which I have the honour to represent, and all along that coast are perfectly satisfied with the length of the season and do not ask that it be changed in any respect. They desire all through to see the regulations strictly enforced and thus preserve this valuable industry.

Mr. MARTIN. As long as those regulations are not suitable to the different localities, it will be almost impossible to make the fishermen obey them, and they have some cause for not doing so. The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries knows that, even so far as the small province from which he comes is concerned, the season that suits the north side does not suit the south side. In the south side they begin earlier and can continue their fishing later. As a matter of fact, after the 15th July and even up to September, there is a larger run of lobsters suitable for canning on the south shore than in July. Now, if you attempt to force a regulation that will prevent these men from fishing in that season and thus deprive them of all returns from the very large sums of money they have invested in this business, why it can hardly be expected but that they will try to recoup themselves for their investment. I will say with all due respect to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that if the sum he proposes to spend in steam launches——

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It is only $5,000 on a steam launch.

Mr. MARTIN. Well, if that $5,000 were expended in dividing the lobster fishing country into sections and giving a season to each section, the results would be much better. I do not see any great difficulty in that. Unless you do that any expenditure of money you make is merely an attempt to make these men honest by law. They are not naturally disposed to violate the law, and will not violate the regulations except as a matter of self-protection. I am sure that not one of these fishermen would violate the law if you would give them the fishing at the proper season. I know the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has a lively interest in the success of this industry, and I do not think it would be too much of a task for the department to make regulations more suitable in regard to the proper season for each section. If this were done it would give more satisfaction than the expenditure of money for steam launches, which, after all, will not stop the illegal fishing.

Mr. GANONG. If the conditions of lobster fishing in the different localities are to be considered, I must respectfully call the attention of the Minister to the county of Charlotte in which I reside, for the conditions of the lobster fishery there are as different from those around Grand Manan as they possibly can be. I shall not take the time to discuss the matter, but, if these local differences are being considered, I should like to have attention paid to the conditions in my county.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am much pleased to have had this discussion. I desire to say a few words to call attention to the facts. My predecessors had to grapple with this question, and one of them, I think it was Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper, appointed a commission composed of some of the best officials in the maritime provinces to examine into this question thoroughly. This commission held meetings and heard evidence in all parts of the maritime provinces, and made their report. There was also a special committee appointed by this House. They also called evidence from all parts and made a report on the subject. The department acted on these reports and adopted not exactly the present close season but one very much akin to it. The department had the advantage also of a discussion in this House almost every year. Though hon. members have suggested that possibly a change could be made in this close season from time to time the House will see that the moment the suggestion is made hon. members, even on

the same side of politics express their opinions but cannot be got to agree. I do not say that the present system is perfect, but I do say that it is the result of experience for many years of the fishery officers and of the evidence given by many hundreds, and I may say by many thousands, of fishermen. The importance of the fishery cannot be over-estimated. Take, for instance, that about the Bay of Fundy in the county of Charlotte. I think it is criminal to can lobsters in that bay. Why ? Because the fishermen get for 1 to 1¼ cent for each lobster for canning, while they can get from 18 to 20 cents for that lobster to be shipped alive to Boston. I have under consideration an amendment of the rule as to the length of lobsters in that bay for the purpose of canning, to extend the minimum length from 9½ to 10½ inches so as to stop canning there altogether. The Americans have cleaned out their own coast along the shore of Maine and they are creeping up the Bay of Fundy and establishing themselves on the Grand Manan. I propose that if possible the fishermen shall get from 18 cents to 20 cents for a lobster instead of 1 cent or 1¼ cents that they get now for canning. Then take the Magdalen Islands. It is a debatable question, and I do not pretend to speak ex cathedra or with certainty, but I have consulted some of the leading lobster packers in the Magdalen Islands and they are of opinion that the present close season is the best we could adopt. I know from personal knowledge a good deal about the lobster fishery in Prince Edward Island. I am aware that the close season that is proper for one part of the island is not best suited for another. My hon. friend from East Prince (Mr. Yeo) has spoken of the west end of the island. I know the west end of Prince Edward Island. I think that there and in New Brunswick they ought to have a more extended season than the present. But the difficulty is that if you grant that extended season, they will insist upon it in Cape Breton and Antigonish and other countries, and so we are face to face with a grave problem. If we extend the season in one or two localities, the rest will be up in arms demanding the same ; and if we make the extension general we strike a blow at one of the most important industries in the maritime provinces. The question is not by any means free from difficulty. It has given me more anxiety than any other I have had to face since I became head of the department. When I came into office I called a meeting of lobster men, and got together about 150 of them, men representing a very large amount of capital and employing thousands and tens of thousands of men. And I could not get them to come to any agreement. They have as different opinions as have hon. members of this House. I sent my officers to investigate, chief among them being the commissioner, Mr. Prince, a scientific gentleman at the head of the fishery branch, and he held meetings in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick and came back with the same report. It seems impossible to get an agreement among the different localities and different interests. But I think that the season we have chosen suits the large majority of those localities, and with respect to the minority of localities, either they will have to be content with the law as it is, or we shall have to make a slight extension to meet the very grave cases of hardship that has occurred in some cases. I promise my friends to do the best I can in that regard, and I am in hopes to be able fairly well to meet honest and reasonable demands, while I reject unhesitatingly unreasonable demands. I am sorry to have any member of Parliament say it will be impossible to enforce the regulations. I say it is not impossible to enforce honest and reasonable regulations. It can be done, we did it well last year in some places, although public opinon was against us, we did not have the steam launches, and we had not our machinery arranged. But I think this coming season the illegal lobster fisherman who attempts to poach on the preserves we have down there after the season expires, will find he is taking great risk.

Mr. SPROULE. As I understand the object of the Minister is to get these items through, and he is to allow one item to stand upon which we can refer to other items, I will defer making any remarks to-night.

Mr. HENDERSON. I might possibly not be here when the item comes up again, and I desire to ask the Minister who is the overseer at the present time at Bronté, in the district from Brant House to Port Credit, on the north side of Lake Ontario. Who is the present overseer of fisheries there, or is there one appointed ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I cannot give the hon. gentleman the information off-hand. I have not got the book with me.

Mr. HENDERSON. Perhaps I may be able to draw his attention to it again.

Resolutions to be reported.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright) moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 11.20 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 6th May, 1898.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

JUDICIAL DISTRICT OF RAINY RIVER.

Mr. BENNETT. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to say that I have had placed in my hands by the leader of the Opposition a letter written to him by a firm of solicitors in the town of Rat Portage, to which I would call the attention of the Government. It would seem that the districts of Rainy River and Thunder Bay were attached for judicial purposes. On the 4th of April last a proclamation went into effect separating the two, and owing to the non-appointment of a judge to the Rainy River district, they are not now able to go on with the administration of justice. Under the former arangement the Rainy River district had a stipendiary magistrate who exercised the functions of a district court judge, and a local judge of the high court of justice, and also other extensive powers. By reason of the proclamation separating the two districts, a part of the Rainy River district is no longer under the Thunder Bay district, and consequently since the 4th of April all legal processes in that district have ceased, and the courts cannot be carried on. A further telegram dated yesterday has been sent by these gentlemen to the leader of the Opposition, asking him when the Government proposes to appoint a person to take the position that was formerly occupied by the stipendiary magistrate. I do not know what title the new appointment is to hold, whether that of stipendiary magistrate or judge. But these solicitors complain that the law business has all been suspended there now, and that they are in a chaotic state so far as the processes of law are concerned, and they ask that the Government may be pleased to appoint an officer at the earliest possible date.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I may say to my hon. friend that that is not an altogether unpleasant task for the Government, and if the hon. gentleman will kindly let me have these papers, I will communicate them to the Department of Justice.

ENFORCEMENT OF THE ALIEN LABOUR LAW.

Mr. CLARKE. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the First Minister if there has been any officer appointed yet to visit Toronto and enforce the Alien Labour Law?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I have received information—I have not got it here—that all the men who had been imported from the other side have been sent back; so there has been no necessity for the appointment of such an officer.

Mr. CLARKE. The hon. gentleman's information does not accord with some information which I have.

The PRIME MINISTER. The hon. gentleman knows that at present he can only put the question, but if he wants to debate the question, he will have an opportunity of doing so when we move the House into Committee of Supply.

Mr. CLARKE. I would not like to take up the time of the House even then. I have some information that I can communicate to the right hon. gentleman which would show him that he has not been correctly informed.

Mr. BENNETT. I desire to ask the leader of the House if an officer has been appointed to enforce the Alien Labour Law on the north shores of the Georgian Bay, where, I am informed, a large number of Americans are now being employed to the exclusion of Canadians.

The PRIME MINISTER. I cannot answer my hon. friend at this moment. I will make inquiries.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I beg to move:

That from this date to the end of the session, Government Orders have precedence on Mondays immediately after Private Bills.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Does my right hon. friend propose to take next Monday?

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think it would be better to say after next Monday, in order that we may have more means of disposing of the resolutions and motions.

The PRIME MINISTER. I had intended to take next Monday, but if the hon. gentleman insists upon having that day, of course, I will yield to him with the view that we can come to some satisfactory arrangement towards reaching a close of the session. If the hon. gentleman insists, I will amend the motion so as to read after Monday next.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think that would facilitate business, because we can take up those motions that are on the Order paper. I should be glad to do everything in my power to facilitate the business so that we may reach the close of the session.

Mr. DAVIN. In this connection I would like to call the right hon. gentleman's atten-

tion to one or two items on the Order paper. One of them is the Pension Bill. The right hon. gentleman, in moving the adjournment of a debate on that Bill, stated that his desire was to get the opinion of the Department of Justice on a question that he raised. I should like to say to him that even with Monday next given to private members, it is hardly likely that will be reached, and even if it were reached, I know that a private member cannot take charge of such a Bill. I would urge the hon. gentleman who is at the head of the North-west Mounted Police to take this matter up, especially if he should be advised that my view of the law was correct. The right hon. gentleman will remember that at a previous session I had a pension Bill on the paper, in which I provided for meeting even a greater grievance than this.

Mr. SPEAKER. I would remind the hon. gentleman that he is not speaking to the motion before the House.

Mr. DAVIN. I am informing the right hon. gentleman. Of course, if I am out of order——

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman will see that his remarks are out of order unless he can make them relevant to the motion before the Chair, that after next Monday Government measures should have precedence.

The PRIME MINISTER. I would suggest to the hon. gentleman that he can bring this matter up when we go into Committee of Supply.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask my right hon. friend whether he is able to make a statement to the House as to the probable date of closing the session.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). I think you had better make that statement.

The PRIME MINISTER. Following the suggestion of my hon. friend beside me, I think that is a question which the leader of the Opposition could better answer himself. However, I understand that the hon. gentleman wants to know, and it is a very fair question, whether the Government have any new questions to bring before the House. I will be able to give an answer on Monday or Tuesday next.

PRIVATE BILLS LEGISLATION.

Mr. LANDERKIN. With the permission of the House, I will present the 17th report of the Select Standing Committee on Standing Orders. I also beg to move:

That that portion of the 49th Rule which limits the time for receiving petitions for Private Bills be suspended in reference to the petition of the Anglo-French Telegraph Company (Limited) for an Act of incorporation; and also in reference to the petition of the International Radial Railway Company, for an Act to amend their Act of incorporation, in accordance with the recommendation of the Select Standing Committee on Standing Orders, as contained in their Seventeenth Report.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. We should have heard the report read before that motion was made. But I want to call your attention to the fact that this year we have been ignoring the rules of this House in respect to a very large number of private Bills, much more frequently than on any previous occasion. Three or four years ago the House decided to put a stop to this private legislation when it was not brought forward in accordance with the established rules of the House. These people are allowed to come before us in the latter days of the session without having given public notice of their intention, and therefore leaving interested parties unaware of the legislation sought from this House. I believe if we are going to keep on the way we have pursued so far this session, we might as well remove that rule from our rules of order. It is a great mistake, I believe, to ignore the rules of the House to such a large extent. I can easily understand that in special cases there might be good and strong reasons for allowing such legislation to pass through the House; but I also believe there is speculation on the part of certain parties to bring in legislation without giving the least notice thereof, in order to avoid opposition on the part of other parties who may be interested. I do not know anything about this last case, and I am not referring to it, and I do not wish to oppose the motion before the House, but I desire to call your attention, Mr. Speaker, and the attention of the House to the fact that we are relaxing too much the rules of the House in matters of private legislation.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think it is absolutely necessary at this stage of the session that no such permission should be granted without the fullest statement being made by the parties moving in the matter as to the grounds on which they ask for a suspension of the rules.

The PRIME MINISTER. I do not think we should be any more severe on this occasion than in other cases; but I equally agree with the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. LaRivière) that we have been altogether too lax in the application of the rules of the House, and if both parties would agree, we might very well give notice to the public, and have it well understood, that next session the rules will have to be adhered to.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I desire to say, on behalf of the Committee on Standing Orders, that the members are as anxious to maintain the rules of the House as are the members of any other committee, and they have not

relaxed the rules this session unless good and sufficient reasons had been submitted for so doing. There may be a possibility that the amending of the rules governing standing orders might well be considered by the House. Those rules were made years ago, before the means of communication were such as they are at present, probably before the introduction of the telegraph and telephone lines. It might be well to consider the advisability of maintaining or changing the rules in view of the facilities at present provided for submitting objections and representations before the Committee on Standing Orders. I am quite satisfied that the committee has been painstaking and careful in considering the reasons why the rules were not complied with by those presenting petitions, and time and again the committee have refused to suspend the rules until the fullest reasons and satisfactory reasons for non-compliance have been submitted to the committee. I can say this, on behalf of the committee, that I do not believe they will take any advantage of the rules and not further any scheme that is not of public benefit, but the committee merely listen to the reasons why the parties have not complied with the rules.

Mr. WALLACE. Will the hon. gentleman state some of the reasons why suspension of the rule is asked now?

Mr. LANDERKIN. The reasons are always given in the report.

Mr. WALLACE. A report was not made.

Mr. LANDERKIN. They are given to the committee by those in charge of the proposed legislation, and the committee judge whether those reasons are good and sufficient. If they deem the reasons good and sufficient they ask the House to suspend the rule and allow the petition to be received.

Mr. WALLACE. There are no reasons whatever given in the report.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The reasons were given before the committee, and if they were incorporated in the report it would make it very voluminous, and it could not be read before the House.

Mr. WALLACE. Let the hon. gentleman state the reasons verbally now.

Mr. LANDERKIN. It is the committee who take charge of the reasons, and who ask the rule to be suspended if these reasons are considered sufficient. I am only there to preside..

The PRIME MINISTER. It is hardly in order to refer to what passed in the committee.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We must ask either the chairman or some member of the committee to state briefly the reasons in order to justify the action of the House. One of these Bills refers to an Anglo-French cable. I do not know that there is any objection to it, but the very title of the Bill shows it to be of a grave character, and there should be some reason given for asking the House to suspend the rules.

The PRIME MINISTER. Hear, hear.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I am sorry that the rules of the House prevent me from giving the reasons that transpired in committee.

The PRIME MINISTER. We can discuss the report.

Mr. WILSON. I have had the pleasure of being a member of the Committee on Standing Orders ever since I have been in the House, and every year we promise that we are going to enforce the rules more rigidly in the future. However, instead of getting more careful I believe that committee is getting more lax every session. Those who want to get through this kind of legislation are always ready with some excuse, and whether they are honest or dishonest in their reasons, they always say that the circumstances justifying the legislation have recently arisen and they had no knowledge of them before. It is high time that the rules should be revised with reference to that committee, and that they should be more rigidly enforced. In fact, I have almost refused to attend that committee this year, because I thought that the rules are not carried out as they should be.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is it the pleasure of that House that the motion be agreed to.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Not until we get the reasons.

The PRIME MINISTER. Any member of the House can object to this motion being carried, and if no explanation is given in reference to this report of the committee, it must take the consequences.

Mr. FOSTER. If they cannot give an explanation, I object.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would not take the responsibility of objecting to a thing until I know what it is, and that is the reason why I have asked for an explanation.

Mr. LANDERKIN. If the leader of the Opposition has any repugnance, his colleague (Mr. Foster) will object to it at any time for him.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, I object to this report going through without an explanation. The chairman of the committee says it is not his business to give the reasons, as he is simply the chairman, but I trust that some member of the committee will be able to give us some reasons why we should suspend the rules. There are no reasons given in the report.

Mr. SPEAKER. The question will have to be considered on the merits of the motion, because I have put the motion. It was not moved at the regular time, but I asked that leave of the House should be given to move this motion and leave was given. Therefore, the merits of the motion will have to be considered by the House.

Mr. WALLACE. We did not object to the motion being made, because we expected that there would be reasons given for it.

Mr. SPEAKER. The rule does not require any notice of motion concerning the conduct of a private Bill. The only rule of the House which was suspended was that this motion was brought in after I had called "motions," and when we had proceeded to the Orders of the Day. This motion could then only be made with the consent of the House, and I asked for that consent and received it. Now, the question is before the House on its merits.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Let us have the merits.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt this motion?

And the yeas and nays being asked for, the motion was agreed to on division.

Mr. FOSTER. We throw the responsibility on the Government.

CONTRACT—AMERICAN CANNED MEATS.

Mr. QUINN. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to mention a matter to which I drew the attention of the Government some time ago concerning an article which appeared in the New York "National Provisioner," and which I have already spoken of to the Prime Minister. At that time the Prime Minister said that the statement contained in the article concerning the sale to the Government of some goods by the firm of Libby, McNeill & Libby, was not true. Since that time the statement has again appeared in the Canadian papers and has caused some unrest amongst the trade. I have in my hand now a letter which has been handed me by an hon. member of this House, which letter was written to him and contains the following statement:

> To-day, however, we received a letter from our representative in the United States, in which he stated that Libby, McNeill & Libby had informed him that they had just shipped three carloads of canned meats to British Columbia on Canadian Government account.

I bring this matter up to-day for the purpose of having a denial given to the statement, because, as I have said, it has caused some unrest in the trade, and with the hope that the denial will be taken notice of by the Canadian press.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I have only to repeat, Mr. Speaker, what I have already stated, that no order has been given to the firm mentioned. Contracts have been made after tenders were asked for, and if my hon. friend (Mr. Quinn) will give notice of motion I will be very glad to bring all the papers down.

Mr. QUINN. I do not suppose that is necessary.

ROULEAU POST OFFICE.

Mr. DAVIN. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to ask the Postmaster General about a post office, concerning which I wrote to him last year. The post office of Rouleau is a small post office on the Sault branch. I received a letter from his private secretary at the time, November 30, as follows:—

> In the absence of the Postmaster General, permit me to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 19th inst., protesting against the closing of the Rouleau post office, and beg to assure you that the same will receive the Minister's consideration.
>
> Yours truly,
> E. H. LASCHINGER,
> Private Secretary.

I had some communication with the department subsequently, and I believe that orders went out to do away with the office; but I am under the impression that my hon. friend the Postmaster General was good enough to say that he would reconsider his decision, and I would like to ask him whether he has done that.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). I cannot recollect any of the circumstances connected with the office in question; but I will inform the hon. gentleman on Monday.

INQUIRY FOR RETURNS.

Mr. MARTIN. I wish to remind the Postmaster General that two orders of this House were issued on April 21, 1897, one relating to the dismissal of the postmaster of Kinross, P.E.I., and the other relating to the dismissal of the postmaster of Little Sands, P.E.I.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). Will the hon. gentleman be good enough to send me a memorandum about them?

Mr. MARTIN. I sent a memorandum three weeks ago.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I gave instructions to have that complied with, and I am surprised that it has not been complied with. Has the hon. gentleman looked at the Votes and Proceedings?

Mr. MARTIN. Yes. There is also a return, which I asked for since, regarding the post office of St. Mary's Road, P.E.I.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I will try and have them attended to ; but I must ask for a memorandum of them.

SUPPLY—MOUNTED POLICE PENSIONS

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. DAVIN. Before the House goes into committee, I should like very briefly to call the attention of the right hon. Prime Minister to what is really a serious and pressing grievance on the part of some of his most deserving officers, for instance, those officers of the Mounted Police who have been promoted from the ranks. Some of them were promoted a few years ago, and were forty-five years of age when promoted. The men at that age would not be entitled to superannuation at all, if retired from the force, and some of the most deserving officers who were promoted a few years ago, would only be entitled to a wretched pittance. In one case a man would be entitled to only a month's pay for each year that he had served as an officer ; others may have served only a year or two or three years ; whereas the same men, if retired as sergeant-majors, would each be entitled to thirty-fiftieths of their pay as a pension. I may mention one case which I pressed upon the attention of the right hon. gentleman, because I knew the man to be a deserving man and a good officer, who takes no interest in anything but his profession. He was then sergeant-major. When pressing his merits on the attention of the authorities in other days, I did it unwillingly, because I knew that in becoming an inspector he would be sacrificing a much better position, and a much better prospective position than he would gain. All he would gain would be the social rank that belonged to the higher position. When I mentioned his claims to those in authority they said they knew he was a first-rate officer, but surely he was not fool enough to become inspector, and give up his position as a sergeant-major." If he were retired, he would be entitled only to a month's pay for each year he served as an officer. There are others who were promoted after the age of forty-five ; and, as I read the Act, they would be entitled to nothing if retired by way of superannuation. I dealt with this subject in a Bill I had before the House the session before last or the previous session, and the right hon. gentleman said that he would consider it. What was suggested in a clause of that Bill was that the service in the ranks of those men who had been promoted from the ranks should count. That is obviously a claim of the commonest justice ; because it is a cruel promotion that you have given them, if in giving them superior rank you place them in such a position that if ill-health or anything else caused them to be retired, they would be ex-inspectors of the Mounted Police and almost indigent. Therefore, I would ask the right hon. gentleman, who I know takes a great interest in the force of which he is the head, to consider that question, which I deem much more urgent than anything in the other Bill.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). All I can say at this moment is that the reasons just set forth by my hon. friend appear to me to be entitled to consideration and weight. I was not prepared the other day to give assent to his Bill. The session is too far advanced to remedy the grievance this year ; but he has thrown new light upon the subject, and I will promise to take it up and consider it with a view perhaps of dealing with it later on.

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

Civil Government—Department of Agriculture—Contingencies $16,500

Mr. FOSTER. I would like some explanation of this.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). The two gentlemen, Messrs. Thompson and Farmer, whose names are here mentioned, are young gentlemen, graduates of McGill University, whose assistance I was obliged to obtain for the purpose of aiding the examiners in the Patent Office. The examination of patents had got very much in arrears, and I found that the staff did not seem able to overtake the arrears. This year, unfortunately, the oldest examiner, Mr. McCabe, was laid up for a considerable time. Some delay occurred in consequence of the shifting of the model room from the Langevin Block, the rooms of which were required for the Interior Department in consequence of the fire. A great deal of time was thus lost in the examination of applications for patents. I required some technical officers as assistants, and applied to the authorities of McGill University to recommend me a chemist and a mechanical electrician. They recommended these two young men, but I could not get them to come on the ordinary terms of temporary clerks, who are only allowed $400 a year, and was obliged to give them the higher salary of $600. Therefore these words had to be put in. In consequence of that increase, I am obliged to ask for the round sum instead of $9,415.

Mr. FOSTER. Is the work of such a nature that it requires a technical officer ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It is work which requires a good deal of technical knowledge. The examiners ought to be, according to the particular lines of patents which they examine, mechanics or chemists or electricians, and so on—men who understand at once or easily the drawings

and the descriptions of the things for which patents are applied for. The work is really of a highly technical nature. The examiners who have been for some years in the department said it would be no use getting men not technically qualified.

Mr. FOSTER. How many examiners has the hon. gentleman ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Three, and we issue over 4,000 patents in the year, every one of which has to pass under the examination of one of those three examiners. That makes an average of about 1,300 or 1,400 to each examiner. In the United States the average number of patents examined by any one examiner, is 350 or 400. In fact, so much work have our examiners to do, that they have been for a long time in arrears, and there has been constant complaint that patents are not examined as rapidly and as promptly as they should be. But notwithstanding the drawbacks we have suffered, owing to the illness of Mr. McCabe and the fire, we have overtaken a good many of the arrears.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman knows more about the technical needs than I do, but I can hardly understand why he should need a chemist to examine applications for patents.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. A great many applications deal with chemical processes, and it requires considerable technical knowledge to examine them.

Mr. HAGGART. Are these young men graduates from any school of technology ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. They are graduates of McGill. I applied to Dr. Harrington, the Professor of Chemistry and Technology.

Mr. DAVIN. The item for telegrams, $1,286, seems very large.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Last year we had a great deal of bother about hog cholera and a great many telegrams in that connection. My deputy informs me that the telegraph bills have been larger in that connection very much than usual. I am sorry that people often send telegram marked "collect" to the department, which I do not think ought to be done nearly as much as it is. I felt tempted on certain occasions to send them back, because the business might just as well have been done by letter, but it really was public business, and consequently, although tempted, I did not do so.

Mr. DAVIN. It seems a small matter, but I must confess that some of the items strike me as startlingly large. For instance, there is a charge of 138 boxes of pens. That seems an enormous quantity to be used in a department the size of that of Agriculture.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I drew my deputy's attention to that very fact, and had him go over the work of the department and make a fair estimate of what amount of stationery each clerk ought to have for his work. A direct charge now is made against every clerk for every piece of stationery taken by him, and I hope in the future considerable reductions will take place in these items.

Mr. DAVIN. May I ask what is this item of $1,952 for printing and stationery. Is it for printing the Year-Book ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No. Without being positive, I can say that that is for the printing and binding of the patents. We have to keep on record in the Patent Office the face and form of every patent, and these we get bound into volumes. There are hundreds of large volumes there of all the patents that have been issued, and every year we have to pay a good deal for binding.

Mr. DAVIN. Is it issued monthly ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, there is a monthly publication called the "Patent Record," which is under a different item which we shall come to later on.

Archives $8,000

Mr. DAVIN. I suppose this item does not require much explanation. I do not know if other members of the committee visit Mr. Brymner, the archivist, but I sometimes do. The work that Mr. Brymner is doing is an important and valuable one.

Mr. HAGGART. Would the hon. Minister of Agriculture state what progress is being made in the amalgamation of the several archives. There is one, I believe, in the Department of the Secretary of State, also there is one in the Department of the Privy Council, and this one in the Department of Agriculture. When I was in the late Government, an effort was made to have these united, and I thought that that had been done.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I quite agree that something of that kind should be done. A commission was appointed some time ago to examine into this question and report. I do not know whether this was done under the late Government or under our Government. It may have been done at some Council meeting when I was not present. The commission consisted of Mr. Courtney, Mr. Joseph Pope and another gentleman whose name I do not recollect. I believe their report is ready, but it has not yet come before Council, and therefore, I cannot give the hon. gentleman information as to what it contained. I trust that something practical will result from it.

Patent Record..... $9,000

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) asked a few minutes ago as to the "Patent Record." I may explain that it is a monthly publication issued by the department, giving one picture and a short description of every patent that is issued. It is necessary to the proper administration of the Patent Office, and of great use to the public, inasmuch as a person is able to learn from it whether any idea which he may think of having patented has been anticipated. It is distributed regularly to public libraries, to members of Parliament and to people throughout the country who are interested in this sort of thing. This item has been the same for a great many years. I have not looked into the details of the matter, but I have every reason to believe that the expenditure is necessary.

Mr. DAVIN. I receive a copy of this publication every month and usually give it to some person whom I know to be interested in scientific matters and inventions, and to such persons I believe it to be of great value. I gather from what the Minister has said that the publication is in no way self-sustaining. But it struck me that if the public knew the nature of it, there might be a sale for it. However, it is probably a difficult thing for the department to regulate that.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The work is a very expensive one to publish, because there are so many cuts, and because the issue is not a large one. If a very large edition were put out, the cost per copy, of course, would be reduced. It is issued by the Printing Bureau, and, of course, there are no profits for anybody in it. It is for sale, but the number of copies sold is very small.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the price at which it is sold ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I cannot give the hon. gentleman that information at the moment.

Mr. WILSON. The price is $2 a year.

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON. Would the hon. Minister inform me whether this publication called the "Patent Record" contains, in addition to a description of the patents issued in the previous month, a list of the books copyrighted in the department ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It does not.

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON. Is there any official publication giving a list of that kind?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No.

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON. Would it not be well to publish such a list in the "Patent Record" ? It would be no additional expense to give a list of books copyrighted each month, as is done in England.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. At the suggestion of the hon. member (Mr. Ross Robertson) I shall look into the matter. I do not see any reason why it should not be done. The expense would be very small.

Mr. McDOUGALL. If the hon. Minister would adopt the plan of sending a few copies of this publication to the educational institutions of the country it might lead to those institutions becoming regular subscribers, and thus make the publication more profitable to the department.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I will remember the hon. gentleman's suggestion.

Mr. CLANCY. Did I understand the Minister to say that these bound volumes were distributed in some cases ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, that is not what I said. Perhaps the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) will allow me to explain. The bound copies to which I had reference in answering the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) were not the bound copies of the "Patent Record," but the official record of the patents for the use of the department. First, we have the application for the patent which is filed away in a particular form of file. Then, when a man receives his patent, one copy of the patent is sent to the patentee and another is kept in the department and the copies thus kept are bound.

Mr. CLANCY. I thought from what the hon. Minister said that there was a distribution of the bound volume made in some cases to the mechanics' institutes and free libraries.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Only the "Patent Record" is sent out to those institutions, not the bound form, but monthly as it is issued.

Mr. SPROULE. Is the bound volume for sale ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. These bound volumes are not for sale. They are the official records in the department, and they cannot leave the department at all.

Mr. SPROULE. But you distribute them to the members.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Not those things at all. There are two copies made up of every patent, one is sent to the patentee and the other is kept in the department as a record. These are bound together in volumes, and kept as records in the department.

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON. Would the Minister allow me to ask him a question with

regard to item 73 that has already been passed? When will the new room in the department of the archives be ready, so that the books that were removed after the fire may be in such order that those desirous of information may obtain it? At present there is a good deal of complaint that it is impossible to get information, from the fact that so much delay has occurred in making that information accessible.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I may say to the hon. gentleman that I have been prodding up my department and the Minister of Public Works in regard to that matter. I received the other day a letter from the chief architect saying that this room would be ready very soon. But there has been a good deal of delay, I confess, much to my own inconvenience.

Collection and compilation of criminal statistics $1,300

Mr. DAVIN. I should like to ask the hon. gentleman what officer or officers in his department prepare this volume?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Mr. Gravelle is one of them, and I think Mr. Skead is the other. I have not got my book with me at the moment which gives the duties of the different clerks, and I am speaking from memory. I think it is Mr. Gravelle and Mr. Skead, or it may be Mr. Gravelle and Mr. Wilkins.

Mr. DAVIN. The statistics are, of course, most valuable; but I think that with very little more trouble whatever clerk edits that volume could give us in a readier way and more rapidly indicative, what are the general results. I have been accustomed in the past continually to refer to them, and it struck me that a little improvement could be made in that direction.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That book is in charge of Mr. George Johnson, who is the chief statistician. I will bring the matter to his attention.

Statistical Year-Book..... $4,000

Mr. SPROULE. Will the Minister tell us how many copies of this book he intends to issue, and when the next edition will be out?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think the current edition came out in the winter; I cannot say when the next edition will be out, but I think it is in about a year from the last publication.

Mr. SPROULE. How many copies were issued?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Speaking from memory, there were more copies issued this year than ever before, but the book is much smaller in extent. It seems to me there were 4,000 copies of the English and 1,000 copies of the French.

Mr. SPROULE. Why is it, then, that members of Parliament can only get one copy, when we are told that they are for distribution?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There has been no change in that respect. Each member of Parliament gets a copy, and copies are sent to a large number of institutions all over the country, copies are issued to exchanges, and are sent out to anybody who applies. Mr. Johnson, who has charge of that book, has a long list of those to whom it is regularly sent. If the hon. gentleman sends a name in, unless the edition is exhausted, it will be sent to him. I am constantly having applications from people all over the country, and I do not remember to have had to refuse one yet.

Mr. SPROULE. I applied for it before it was out, and I was instructed that none would be available but one copy for each member. I had application from some parties for them, and I could not get a supply. My opinion has always been that we should print a larger number of copies than usually are printed. A great many school teachers want them; they find them valuable on account of the statistics they contain. I think if they were supplied in larger numbers and put at a certain price, a larger number than at present would be put into circulation.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Of course, if Parliament wishes to spend more money on it, it is very easy to print a larger number. As a matter of fact, this year I printed a much smaller book, eliminating a good deal that was in it before, condensing it, and striking out some tables which appeared to be repetitions; and the consequence was that something like 20 or 25 per cent greater number of books was published this year than ever before. So I am proceeding on the lines the hon. gentleman has indicated.

Mr. WILSON. I applied for an extra lot of these books, and wrote to Mr. Johnson, and he informed me that if I would send in the names he would send the copies.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I know that is done.

Mr. SPROULE. I dropped into the office desiring to obtain copies of last year's issue, especially as I had applications made to me, but I found there were no copies available. I notice that in the Auditor General's Report the cost of the Statistical Year-Book for last year was $7,700, but only $4,000 had been voted.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That is for the previous year. The work will be done this year for $4,000.

Mr. SPROULE. Are there any copies available now?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes.

Mr. CLANCY. Does the term "exchanges" mean that copies of the book are sent to newspapers and to other parties on the distribution list? I have had inquiries from free libraries and mechanics' institutes for this work. It is a very valuable book and one to which the public should have access. The number must of necessity be somewhat limited, but it should be placed where the people can readily have access to it.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. On Mr. Johnson's list there are most of the mechanics' institutes and all the free libraries, and a good many schools, which have made special application to be placed on the list. I have not seen the list personally, but it has been described to me by Mr. Johnson, and the intention is as the hon. member has indicated.

Mr. McNEILL. Formerly copies of this book were bound in cloth, which were very convenient for purposes of reference. Lately, however, they have been sent out in paper covers, which very soon get broken. I would suggest that a certain number of copies bound in cloth be prepared and sent to members of Parliament.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That might be done.

Mr. BRITTON. I was going to call attention to the expenditure, but this has already been done. Does this publication cover the fiscal year, or the calendar year?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Although I have consulted the work, I never took notice as to that point.

Mr. BRITTON. In other years there has been a good deal of dissatisfaction expressed with regard to the Statistical Year-Book, and considerable complaints made. Mr. Johnson is a pretty highly salaried officer, and there have been complaints in regard to this work. Has the publication of the last year been satisfactory?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I hope so.

Mr. McMULLEN. How many clerks are there in the statistician's office, and what do they cost?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That question was answered by me about two weeks ago. I cannot remember the answer given, but it will be found on the pages of "Hansard."

Mr. McMULLEN. I have been under the impression that there are a great many departments in which the pruning knife should be vigorously applied, and I think this department is one of them. There are twelve or thirteen clerks in connection with the statistician's office, and the head receives a salary of $2,400 a year. What does the country get in return for $2,400 a year?

Mr. DAVIN. Full value.

Mr. McMULLEN. The country gets the Year-Book containing some information, but it does not get anything like value. There should be considerable change made in that department. I do not think Mr. Johnson earns his salary—I say so frankly, and the people of the country should not be asked to continue to pay such an enormous salary to a man who has spent only a few years in the department. I know he was an old newspaper man, but whatever he learned in this line he learned after he entered the department. There are a lot of clerks. I think the Minister should be able to state the entire cost of that branch of the department.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I see, on counting the names I recognize in the branch, there are six regular clerks and two who do temporary work.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I should like to say in connection with this matter that I cannot at all agree with the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. McMullen). I believe it would be difficult to over-estimate the value to Canada of Mr. Johnson's work. It is sought after in Europe, and in all quarters is regarded as the highest authority, and has been the means of disseminating a great deal of most valuable information. The book had become a little too bulky, and perhaps is not as useful as a smaller volume would be, but I am quite certain it would be of the greatest possible value, and I think it would take a long time to replace Mr. Johnson or to find a gentleman who, without spending some years in giving attention to this class of work, would be able to do the work quite as efficiently as he has performed it. While I quite agree that the greatest economy should be exercised in regard to public expenditures, I should be extremely sorry to see measures taken that would not secure real economy but would prove a very serious detriment to the public service.

Mr. CHARLTON. I believe there were reasons to a limited extent, perhaps to a very considerable extent, for criticising Mr. Johnson's work in years past. He was in a position where statistics could be made to do service, so far as they could be represented with any degree of fairness, to the party in power, and there were suggestions made that some of those statements might possibly have been slightly coloured. I do not doubt Mr. Johnson's ability; and believe he has the ability to fill that position and he is now likely doing the work very well, as he is under different influences and is perhaps watched more closely than formerly, and is not prompted to do what he did before.

But I rose specially to refer to a remark made by the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) about the cost of managing departments, not this one, but all departments of the Government. We used to say a great deal when in Opposition about the uselessness and unnecessary cost of conducting civil government in Canada. We can scarcely expect to bring that cost down to the actual cost under business management. We all know about the influences, the currents and counter currents and the political pulls that are used respecting appointments, perhaps of men who are not absolutely required. But I believe if the Government were to set themselves to reform the civil service and determined to put the service on a business basis, and turn a deaf ear to all political influences and representations and pay no attention to political pulls, our departments of the Government could be managed and carried on more efficiently than they are at the present moment for at least not more than two-thirds of the present cost.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. CHARLTON. Yes. An instance has come to my knowledge which illustrates the position, an instance of a clerk who had fallen behind two and a half weeks in his work, while at the same time he was receiving a salary of $1,400 a year. A young lady, working in the department at a salary of less than one-third, brought up the arrears within three days. The young woman probably worked faithfully, and if we required our civil servants to do a day's work, and placed in positions men capable of doing a day's work, men capable of performing their duties as they would be required to do if employed by corporations and business firms, and if we required eight or nine hours service per day, the expenditure would be largely decreased and efficiency very greatly increased and we would be relieved of that demoralizing influence which exists to-day of crowding the service with people who have friends to whose influence it is necessary to pay some attention, and who desire to have men put in the service, not because of their fitness to perform the duties, but because they desire to do some friend a favour. It is worthy of consideration how far we could make reductions in the public service if we set ourselves honestly about the task. I believe that very great reductions could be made, and our duty to the people of this country calls upon us to make such efforts as we may in this line. I fully comprehend the difficulty of moving in this direction; I fully comprehend that a thousand influences will surround the reformer or reformers who attempt to do this, and will make the task a difficult one; but so far as possible it ought to be done. Coming back to this vote under consideration, my opinion is, that the work of that little bureau could be performed with a smaller clerical force. Although I do not feel a disposition to criticise very severely the amount of money spent, or the character of the occupants of the office, or the character of the gentleman who is statistician for the Dominion; yet I believe we could make reductions there and I believe that in dealing with these questions we ought to try so far as we can to reach the result of reducing the public expenditure, and at the same time increasing the efficiency of the service by putting into positions men fit for them, and by keeping in positions only men who are capable of discharging their duties.

Mr. DAVIN. I do not know whether my hon. friend (Mr. Charlton) rose to have a side slap at the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) who I believed has got a relative of his into the public service, or at some others of his political friends who have got relatives into the public service, but I do not intend to deal with that at this moment. I rose to say, as a public man who has been much indebted to Mr. Johnson and who is in a position to say something as to the qualities requisite to produce such a book as Mr. Johnson produces; that it would be a very difficult thing to get a man competent for that work at the salary paid him. I rose also to repel the sneer that the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) flung at newspaper editing and newspaper editors. He sneered at Mr. Johnson as having been a mere newspaper writer.

An hon. MEMBER. What about the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding)?

Mr. DAVIN. The Minister of Finance, I am reminded from behind me, was a newspaper editor. One of the best men that we ever had at the head of the Interior Department, the late Hon. Thos. White, was a newspaper editor; and in this Chamber, and in the Chamber of the legislative assembly of Nova Scotia, a man of genius, the late Joe Howe, he was a newspaper editor. And, Sir, let me remind the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) that Thiers, Cavour, John Morley, Sir Edward Russell, Whitelaw Reid, Hay, the American Ambassador at the Court of St. James; they were all newspaper editors. D'Arcy McGee, whose name will always be connected with our history, who fell the proto-martyr of the Canadian confederation and whose genius and eloquence illustrate our parliamentary life, he was a newspaper editor. So, Sir, the fact that Mr. Johnson had been a newspaper editor is no reason why he should not be a good statistician. I may say to the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) that in this very place there are gentlemen connected with the newspaper press who earn more than this $2,400 a year which Mr. Johnson is paid. I venture to say there are gentlemen within the sound of my voice writing for newspapers, earning much more than $2,400. It would be simply impossible to get anything like a

first-class man—and you want a first-class man for this work—under $2,400 a year. I may say that the man who gets up that Statistical Year-Book is eminently fitted for the position, and is a first-class man, and both Grits and Tories are deeply indebted to him for bringing the compilation of these statistics into their present form. Anybody who has set himself at times to form exhaustive conclusions in regard to our commercial and political progress will have been confronted with the fact, that there are statistical fields which are not yet explored ; so that if there is any ground for complaint it is that not enough has been done in this direction. Sir, I wished to not only speak the truth about this Statistical Year-Book, but I really wished to recall—not so much to resent—but to recall my hon. friend (Mr. McMullen) to something like a sense of justice in regard to the newspaper press, and above all to put him in a position to retract what was an indirect sneer at his own leader, the Minister of Finance.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) was mistaken if he concluded that I offered any sneer or discourtesy to the press. In mentioning the very distinguished men the world over who have occupied positions as newspaper editors, I am sure that nothing but extreme bashfulness prevented the hon. member (Mr. Davin) mentioning the name of one distinguished individual in this House, to wit, the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin). I had no intention of offering any discourtesy to the press. I simply said that Mr. Johnson for the best part of his life put in his time as a newspaper man and that he was not educated in the line necessary to make a successful statistician. My hon. friend (Mr. Davin) proves that by showing that the Year-Book is not what it ought to be.

Mr. DAVIN. Oh, no.

Mr. McMULLEN. My hon. friend (Mr. Davin) admitted that there was very great room for improvement.

Mr. DAVIN. Not in the sense the hon. gentleman means.

Mr. McMULLEN. My complaint is, that there is too much expense connected with this and other departments, and I say there is room for reduction in the statistician's department. This office seems to cost about $25,000 a year, and I contend that the country does not receive a return for that expenditure. As my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) has said, we all promised that reductions could be made and would be made, and we are extremely anxious that they should be made. We know that hon. gentlemen opposite have kindly feelings for their political friends installed in office, and I suppose if the Liberals had been in power so long as they were, we would look kindly on our friends, but these feelings must be subdued in the interests of the country. There are several departments of Government to which the pruning knife could and should be vigorously applied, and this is one of them. I would like to know what Mr. Johnson has been doing during the past year, and I am not referring to him any more than to the rest of the clerks in that office ? We have the Year-Book, but that seems to be all that is issued. I would like to know how many clerks are engaged in that department, what Mr. Johnson is doing at present, and what he has been doing during the last few months.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am very glad to answer the hon. gentleman. I find that there are five permanent clerks under Mr. Johnson, and Mr. Johnson himself, making six—besides these, there are four temporary employees under him, making a total of ten in that branch. As to the work they are doing, I can say in general terms that Mr. Johnson and the staff under him are keeping up the statistics as time goes on, from day to day and week to week and month to month. There is a certain work called criminal statistics, which come in regularly from the local authorities all over the country. These have to be compiled and brought together, and put in such a shape that they can be made use of for the whole Dominion. Mr. Johnson and his staff are also constantly preparing the work of the Year-Book, keeping track of the events as they occur from day to day and week to week and month to month, so as to have them all ready to put in the Year-Book when it comes to be published. Besides that, Mr. Johnson is frequently engaged in working up information in connection with the industries of the country. I will give an instance to the House. Lately Mr. Johnson has been working up the details of all possible information in connection with the pulpwood and paper industry, which is assuming such great magnitude in this country, and which I venture to believe is shortly going to be one of the most important industries in our land. The staff under Mr. Johnson are also very frequently engaged in looking up references for people who apply for information. I am constantly getting letters asking for what may be called statistical information of various kinds, and I refer these matters to Mr. Johnson and ask him to prepare the information. The other day I received an application from a gentleman, saying that he had received a letter from England, in which he was asked to give the names of all the pulp mills in Canada, so that this gentleman, who is a pulp broker and dealer in pulp in England, may open up communication with the pulp mills in Canada, with the view of opening up a trade. I referred that letter to Mr. Johnson, and in a few days received a list of all the pulp mills in Canada that he could ascertain, and that information will be sent. This is the kind of work Mr. Johnson and

his staff are engaged in. I dare say I am speaking imperfectly in regard to it, as there is no doubt a great deal of other work. There is another class of work which the junior clerks in that department are engaged in. During the period when the census is not engaging their attention, two or three of them are largely occupied in preparing returns, and making up the details asked for from the department, instead of my getting temporary and extra clerks for that work. You will find that since I have been in office, there has been no work of that kind given out, and no temporary clerk has been brought into the department to do it.

Mr. McMULLEN. I would like to ask the Minister of Agriculture whether from his general knowledge of the statistician's department, he has any hope of further reducing the expenses of that branch ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I may say that since I came into office I have very considerably reduced the expenses in connection with that branch. I have not under my hand a list of the temporary clerks who were in the department at the time I came into office. Speaking from memory, I think twelve or thirteen were dispensed with, of whom. I think, four or five were engaged in the statistical branch. I asked Mr. Johnson if he could do without them, and he said he thought he could, and he has been getting along without them.

Mr. McNEILL. I am sure the committee must have heard with great satisfaction the explanations given by the Minister in reference to this matter. I regret very much for my part the attack that has been made on this branch of the service and on Mr. Johnson personally. I am quite sure there is no officer in the service who less deserves an attack than Mr. Johnson. As for his having been connected with newspaper work before he became a statistician, I think anybody who knows anything about newspaper work, must have seen that the natural trend and bent of Mr. Johnson's mind was in the direction of statistics, and I am quite sure that the information which he has gathered since he became statistician has been of the greatest possible benefit to Canada. Personally, I know that it has been of the greatest possible assistance to me on very many occasions.

Mr. McMULLEN. I do not at all wonder at the hon. gentleman's remarks. The fact is, I would expect not only the leader of the Opposition, but every member of it to rise and in the very strongest terms express their high appreciation of Mr. Johnson. It would be indeed a very poor return for many years of faithful service on his part to the party to which they belong, if they did not do it. It is a return to which he is unquestionably entitled ; for not only up to the time he took charge of the department over which he presides, but for years after that, I believe up to the year 1891, he still continued to render very important services to hon. gentlemen opposite. I would certainly expect them to get up and manfully defend their friend and plead that he should be kept where he is. I do not blame them for doing so, but after all, we have the interests of the country at heart, we are not pleading for friends or urging to have men kept in office simply because of their political relations. What we want is to see the best interests of the country attended to, and I contend that there are opportunities for making savings that might well be taken advantage of. I commend the hon. Minister of Agriculture for having made reductions, and hope to be able to renew my commendations next year. Not only he, but other Minister have, I believe, room in their departments for considerable reduction. That may possibly hurt the feelings of hon. gentlemen opposite, but that cannot be helped.

Mr. McNEILL. I am glad that the hon. gentleman has so completely thrown off the mask. We now understand that this attack on Mr. Johnson on his part is a mere party attack.

Mr. MOORE. I have listened with a great deal of pleasure to the explanation of the hon. Minister of Agriculture, and am glad that he appreciates the importance of the work done by Mr. Johnson. I do not think there is a record in this Parliament any more important than the Statistical Year-Book, and in my opinion there is no man in this country better qualified to discharge that important work. I was very glad to hear the commendations which fell from the hon. gentleman who opposed the expenditure in that department. That hon. gentleman may possibly be correct, but there is one thing certain, and that is that a man of the ability of Mr. Johnson, who only gets $2,400 a year, cannot be said to be getting a very extravagant price. His work is under the supervision and direction of the hon. Minister of Agriculture, and we must leave the matter in his hands. That hon. Minister is responsible for the carrying out of the work in an efficient and economical manner, but I would be very much pleased to see the work extended and more information given the people through the Statistical Year-Book than what is given now. Certainly I think it should not be lessened in any way, but rather extended. We are able to pay for the information, and I trust there will be no stinting of the amount placed at the disposal of the Minister of Agriculture for the purpose of keeping up that work.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). There can be no question of the ability and energy of Mr. Johnson. Our friends opposite are in duty bound to say a good word for him, because,

to my certain recollection, he has done them numerous services while drawing the pay of the country. No doubt, he does his work well and efficiently, but I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Agriculture if he employs Mr. Johnson in the same capacity in which he was employed by the former Government. I do not suppose he does. I wish further to ask if it is the intention of the Minister of Agriculture to employ Mr. Johnson in taking the coming census, because from the position he occupies, I presume he is the most likely person to take charge of that very important part of the public service.

Mr. WALLACE. I would like to know if the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) has got through, because I would not like to interrupt him in his questions. I would like to ask him still further if the answers of the hon. Minister of Agriculture were quite satisfactory to him. They appear to have been, as he nods his head. What I have to say is that he appears to be very easily satisfied. The hon. Minister assured me that he had reduced the expenditure from year to year, and my hon. friend took the Minister's word for it, and hoped the Minister would go on from year to year doing the very same thing. What has the hon. Minister done? He tells us that he has reduced the expenses of the department. Well, the figures for 1896-97, for which those gentlemen are responsible, of the expense of the interior service are $64,282. The next year they were $64,922, being an increase of $600 or $700. The hon. Minister assured us that that was a decrease, and of course the hon. member for North Wellington considered that all right and very satisfactory. In 1897-98, the expenses were increased over those of the former year to $1,200, being $65,478, and of course that was equally satisfactory to the hon. member for North Wellington. When he was in Opposition he was always preaching economy. I believe he does so occasionally yet; but now whenever a Minister makes an explanation, that explanation is perfectly satisfactory to my hon. friend, and he has no further complaint to make. Some people say on this side that the secret of the hon. gentleman's complacency is that he had some relatives he wished appointed to office, and that they were appointed, and that consequently the hon. member is completely satisfied. I do not know whether that is the case or not, but he is here and perhaps he would inform the House whether it is true, and we can form our own conclusions. I was much struck with the statement made by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) this afternoon. He said—and I presume he had given the matter study and consideration—that a reduction could be made in the expenses of government of one-third, that is, in the inside service at Ottawa. If that could be done, it would effect a saving of over $470,000 a year. But I do not see that the Government have made any material move in that direction. I can understand that a Government which has been a long time in power, and which has many influences surrounding it, may find the work of reduction a very difficult task; but I assume that a new Government, coming in unfettered by any political considerations with regard to these civil servants, and that had pledged itself up to the hilt to accomplish such economies, ought to be able to present to the House and the country some plan for reducing the expenditure in Ottawa as would carry out its pledge and conform somewhat to what the hon. member for North Norfolk said might be easily done, and at the same time make the service more efficient. I am not in a position myself personally to say whether that could be done. You would require to have some intimate knowledge, particularly in the case of a large department employing a great many civil servants, before you could speak with any authority as to whether such economies could be fairly made; but no doubt large economies could be practised, and I regreat that the Government is not carrying out its pledges to the country by taking some step to reduce the expenditure. I remember the statement made by the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce the other evening, that if the annual increase to the civil servants went on as they have been going on, adding $40,000 or $50,000 every year to the expenditure, in a very few years the expenditure would be so large that it would be quite unjustifiable. I agree with the statement, still further, that if, after thorough examination, the Government found that the staff in the various departments was too large, they would be justified in reducing it. There is no doubt that in every large employing agency—and even in a small one for that matter—some men work faithfully and effectually, while others render but little service. But the Government, representing the whole country and justifying the expenditure they propose to make—and particularly this Government, pledged as it is to economy—should have taken measures to largely reduce the expenditure in the departments here in Ottawa. But this they have not done. With regard to the particular item before the House, the expenditure on the Statistical Year-Book, the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) makes the statement, that this branch costs $25,000 per annum. I presume he has included the various expenditures for printing and other things in this sum total. Well, I think we have very inadequate results from that expenditure, so far as giving information to the country is concerned. As has been stated here, each member of the House receives only one copy of the Statistical

Year-Book. We receive at least two copies of every other Government publication, including the Auditor General's Report. I think we should receive a number of copies of the Year-Book, as it contains information furnished by all the departments. I do not think that it requires a great deal of genius to prepare this Year-Book, because it is compiled on lines which are followed year after year, and the information is taken from the reports of the various departments. It is work that any one could do who would take the time to do it. Now, the Minister of Agriculture said Mr. Johnson performed many other duties. He said that he wanted some information on the subject of pulp manufacture and applied to Mr. Johnson for it. In my opinion the proper course would have been to refer it to the Department of Trade and Commerce, to which it specially belongs. Mr. Parmalee of that department, a very efficient man, could have got the information more promptly and more accurately and on better authority than Mr. Johnson could. I am sorry I cannot concur in the eulogies that have been passed by hon. members on this side upon Mr. Johnson's work. I have taken some interest in statistical work and have watched these matters in past years, and cannot coincide with the statements made on this side of the House in that regard. I think the Government is in duty bound to take the advice given years ago by the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), and practise a little economy. That hon. gentleman appears to have almost forgotten what he used to say, and I think it would be well for us to remind him and the Government that these pledges have been made to the people, and that the people look for their fulfilment.

Mr. McMULLEN. Permit me to give the expenses of the Agriculture Department from 1890-91 down to the present time. Now, for a gentleman who occupied the position virtually of a Minister of the Crown, and with the figures before him, to get up and make a statement such as that made by the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) is somewhat surprising :

1890-91.....	$ 87,050 21
1891-92.....	144,124 60
1892-93.....	93,828 08
1893-94.....	76,674 18
1894-95.....	77,876 87
1895-96.....	75,379 49
1896-97.....	70,002 37

There is a reduction of about $5,000 last year as compared with the year before. Yet the hon. gentleman states that there has been no reduction.

Mr. WALLACE. The figures I have were taken——

Mr. McMULLEN. My hon. friend (Mr. Wallace) will have to revise his figures. I have the expenditure of every department here, and if the hon. gentleman challenges them I can give him the figures. I can tell him that the present Government are making reductions, that there are reductions in nine different departments last year as compared with the year previous, and if the hon. gentleman doubts it, I can give him the figures.

Mr. WALLACE. I have here the figures for 1896-97 taken from the official documents. They show an expenditure of $64,202. In the figures given by the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) I presume that the expenditures for 1891-92 and several subsequent years are to be accounted for to the extent of more than half by the extra work of taking the census. If the hon. gentleman had been as honest as he professes to be, he would have stated that the census was taken in these years, thus accounting for a very large share of the expenditure. But he did not state that and has misled the House and the country to that extent. I do not say that he did so wilfully, or of deliberate and malicious purpose.

Mr. McMULLEN. I merely give the total figures because I wish to place the contrast on record in "Hansard." I do not doubt at all that what my hon. friend (Mr. Wallace) said is true and that the census has something to do with the extra expenditure for 1891-92. But, take the expenditure for 1895-96 or for 1894-95, or even 1893-94, and we find that in these years the expenditures were higher than in this year. There is not a year when the expenditures were so low as that my hon. friend has given for 1896-97.

Mr. McDOUGALL. When was it that the work in connection with the taking of the census, the classifying of the returns, &c., was completed ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I can only say that it was completed before I came into office.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Was it not in 1895-96 ? I feel pretty sure that I got the last publication some time in that year. The hon. Minister might tell us where the saving was accomplished to which the hon. member for Wellington refers.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have not the figures for past years here, and cannot inform the hon. gentleman at the moment.

Mr. BENNETT. Is the number of clerks in the hon. Minister's department reduced ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes. I was looking at the estimates for the first year after I came into office. I find that at the present time there are five fewer permanent clerks, and, as I said a little while ago, I think there are twelve or thirteen fewer temporary clerks.

General Statistics $3,200

Mr. FOSTER. What is included under general statistics ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. A part of that work I have been alluding to. It is out of that that the temporary clerks are paid, and the printing office statistics, and work of that kind.

Paris Exhibition (towards preparation for)..... ..... $20,000

Mr. SPROULE. What preparations are being made ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Perhaps I ought to give a little explanation in regard to this vote. My hon. friend asks what preparation was being made. No preparation is being made, because I have not got any money to make any. But I may say that I am looking forward to a representation of Canada at that exhibition which shall be worthy of the country. It is going to be one of the greatest universal exhibitions that have ever been held, and I thought it would be right for me, as exhibition matters are generally in the hands of the Minister of Agriculture, to discuss the matter with those who had had some experience and consider what steps might be taken to make a worthy representation of our country at that exhibition. I may say that my attention was drawn to it partly by letters which I received from various parties in the country urging that Canada should have a worthy representation there. I have in my own department Prof. Saunders, who was the commissioner of Canada at the Columbia Exhibition at Chicago, and Dr. Dawson, of the Geological Survey, who has had a good deal to do with exhibition matters in various exhibitions where Canada has been represented. Prof. Robertson also has had a good deal to do with the representation of Canada at the Columbia Exhibition at Chicago. Therefore, when my attention was drawn to this matter and I began to think about it, I naturally consulted those three gentlemen, and after talking the matter over with them, I came to the conclusion that a few dollars spent early in preparation for such an exhibition would be worth perhaps hundreds of dollars spent in the hurry and heat of preparation at the last moment. Dr. Dawson especially pointed out to me that he had been called upon more than once to prepare mineral and mining exhibits of Canada at various exhibitions, and that he had always been hampered by the short time at his disposal to prepare those exhibits, to get the necessary specimens and make the necessary arrangements. Prof. Saunders also pointed out that in preparing for the Chicago exhibition a great difficulty had arisen from the fact that so short a time was at his disposal for obtaining specimens and arranging for the articles which they wished to send. In respect to the productions of Canada, it will be quite possible that we will have to send specimens which have been produced in the country during the coming fiscal year. It seems a long way off, I know, it may seem almost too soon to begin. But it was so pressed upon me by those gentlemen who had experience in this kind of work, that I decided to take time by the forelock, considering that it would be more economical to make an early preparation for the exhibition, and I asked Council to give me leave to put in an item to be spent during the coming fiscal year. I may say frankly, that I have not yet made any definite plan as to how this money can be spent. I have simply had two or three conversations with these gentlemen, and they have pointed out to me in general terms the necessity of taking this precaution. It is my intention, in connection with some other work of my department, to go to England soon after the close of the session. Prof. Robertson was over there last year in relation to the cold storage work and the placing of our products on the English market. He is going over again this summer, and I shall go myself to see what can be done to prepare for this exhibition. I have had communication with Lord Strathcona who has been appointed by our Government as the Canadian representative on the Imperial Commission representing the British Empire at the Paris exhibition. I desire to consult with Lord Strathcona, and will probably have to go to Paris when I go over to England this summer, for the purpose of looking into details and the best way by which Canada can obtain the proper space for making an exhibit. I regret to say that up to the present time communications have not been at all satisfactory in regard to the space at that exhibition. We applied for 60,000 square feet of space, but so far only 12,000 square feet have been allotted to us. A separate space has been allotted to the colonies of the Empire to the extent of 58,000 square feet, of which Canada has 12,000, India 22,000, Australia 12,000, and 12,000 to the Cape colonies. I think 12,000 feet is a very much smaller space than will suffice to enable us to make a worthy representation of Canada.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Is that space paid for?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, it is not. Lord Strathcona informs me that the buildings and grounds there are not at all in a forward state. When he went to Paris a month or two ago to get information about it, he found things in such a chaotic condition that he could not obtain at that time the information he hoped to obtain. I may say that he was over in Paris on other business, and went to see the grounds between two and three months ago, and made me a report in regard to them. I wish very much indeed to urge strongly both on the Imperial authorities and the French authorities in connection with the

exhibition that we should be awarded greater space and privileges than have been accorded at present. There are a large number of people, especially French Canadians, but I speak not of them only, who desire that Canada should be properly represented at the exhibition. I sympathize with that view. It will be one of the greatest universal exhibitions ever held, and this country occupies that position and has occupied that position in the past, and perhaps now more than at any other time, when a worthy representation of the products of this country would redound not only to the credit of Canada but to the material progress and prosperity of the Dominion. Under those circumstances I thought I would be fully justified and fairly entitled to ask the House to pass a vote, and I ask for $20,000. I may tell the committee frankly that I do not very clearly understand for what purpose the $20,000 will be expended. I hope not to require this year to spend the amount, but if I find that work will prove effective, appropriate and economical in order to secure a proper representation of Canada in 1900, I think I will be justified in expending the amount up to that limit. We can understand that for the purposes of a great exhibition of this kind a sum of $20,000 will be only a small proportion of the expenditure eventually required. I shall be glad to answer any question in regard to this proposed vote.

Mr. SPROULE. Has the hon. Minister had any communication with the provinces and territories of Canada in order to ascertain what they propose to do in this connection?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No official communication. I have spoken to several members of local governments, and they have expressed their willingness to co-operate, but so far we have not come to any arrangement as to the terms on which we will co-operate. That will form a subject of immediate official correspondence with the local authorities, but I do not wish to take official steps or any active steps until authorized by such a vote as the present to go ahead.

Mr. DAVIN. I think the space mentioned by the hon. gentleman would be quite inadequate. This opinion is the result of my experience at the Philadelphia Exhibition in 1876, to which the hon. gentleman has referred. At the Columbia Exhibition, Manitoba was compelled to erect a building for its exhibits outside of the exhibition itself, because the space allotted to Canada was entirely inadequate. If 12,000 feet is given to the Cape of Good Hope and only the same space to Canada, it will be seven times bad treatment for a country like Canada, that really represents seven colonies, each as important as the Cape.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I would say that this is for all the different African colonies, but still I believe they are not as important as Canada.

Mr. DAVIN. I hope the hon. gentleman will pay strict attention to have Manitoba and the North-west Territories properly represented at the Paris Exhibition, and it cannot be done, as we know by past experience and by what took place at the Columbia Exhibition, unless we have adequate space: and now that the Klondike has been opened up, the exhibit will be far more extensive than that at the Columbia Exposition.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I wish merely to state that I fully agree with what the hon. Minister of Agriculture stated, that the Paris Exhibition of 1900 was going to be the greatest and most important the world has ever known. There is no question about that, for it is well known that the result of every exhibition is that the one following it is always an improvement on the last, owing to the experience acquired and the development of the various countries that took part in the exposition. I believe it is of the greatest importance that Canada should make a full display of the resources of this country, which are daily acquiring greater importance. I wish to ask the Minister if he has considered, or possibly he may think the time has not yet arrived to do so, the manner in which he intends Canada to be represented in so far as taking charge of the exhibits of Canadian products in France is concerned. Does the hon. gentleman mean to have a commission appointed for the purpose, as I believe was done in 1861 in Paris? That commission was composed of three or four members, one of whom was Dr. Taché, who has left a name in Canada among literary men and scientists and who at that time occupied the position of deputy of the department over which the Minister of Agriculture now presides. I should like to ask the Minister if the $20,000 which he asks the House to vote now is for the purpose merely of prospecting work and the proposed visit of Lord Strathcona to Paris, or for any other specific purpose, because outside of the Minister's proposed trip to Europe after the session, and the possibility of securing some products for exhibition purposes, I do not see that the hon. Minister has given the House any intimation as to the policy he is ready to adopt so far as this proposed vote is concerned. The representative of Canada in Paris, Mr. Fabre, who has acquired wide experience and possesses much influence, no doubt will be able to give the hon. Minister valuable information when he visits Paris. Mr. Fabre, as the leader of the Government ascertained when he visited Paris, is in close touch with the French Government, and he will no doubt be able to render services of great value to Canada. I more especially ask the hon. gentleman how he intends to deal with the representation of Canada at the exhibition, and the real pur-

pose to which the amount of $20,000 will be devoted ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have not yet by any means decided as to the representation of Canada at the exhibition, as regards the personnel or anything of that kind. We have not decided whether there should be a special commission or one commissioner, the two plans having been adopted at different times. Both plans have been adopted at different times. The hon. gentlemen has spoken of Dr. Taché as having been one of the commissioners to Paris in 1855, but at that time Dr. Taché was not deputy of the department over which I have the honour to preside. He was then, I think, a journalist, and not in the civil service at all. As to the $20,000 I must confess that I have not yet by any means estimated at all exactly what that money will be expended on. I do not even think that I will have to spend $20,000 or could properly spend $20,000 during the coming fiscal year, but I was informed by the gentlemen whom I have consulted, that if they were to be able to secure certain things they could do so much better in advance, than if at the last moment they were obliged to search the country round.

Mr. FOSTER. What could these things be ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Dr. Dawson specially mentions such things as mineralogical specimens.

Mr. FOSTER. Surely you are not going to buy $20,000 worth of specimens ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have no intention of doing any such thing ; but these gentlemen also pressed upon me the importance of laying out plans, preparing for the exhibition, and of having one or two persons who would go about the country to find out what exhibits could be obtained and what arrangements could be made. I tell the hon. gentleman quite frankly that I am not prepared to definitely estimate what this money will be spent on; it will be used as occasion may arise. From the advice these gentlemen gave me it will be very likely proper to appoint some individual who would take upon himself to devote his time almost entirely to making preparations for that exhibition—not in the sense of a commissioner to go to Paris—but a man who would work in Canada preparing the details for the exhibition. I may tell the hon. member for Three Rivers (Sir Adolphe Caron) that it would be a very small proportion of the $20,000, if any, that would be spent on my trip to Paris. I was not thinking of that at all in connection with the vote.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. Minister mentioned the trip.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I mentioned the fact that I would have to go to Paris.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON.

Mr. FOSTER. Two hundred and fifty dollars would pay that.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I hope so.

The PRIME MINISTER. Cold water.

Mr. FOSTER. Sure.

Mr. SPROULE. It has always been the rule, and I think a proper one, that when a vote is asked for the Minister should explain how he intends to apply it. Now the Minister of Agriculture has evidently not yet made up his mind as to how he will expend this money, and he has given us no information, or very meagre information as to what will be done with the $20,000. While it may be that the expenditure will be properly made and the result beneficial to Canada, yet I do think that the Minister ought to be able to give the House some information on the subject. I rise particularly to refer to what I consider a matter of importance in connection with this exhibition, and that is, that an effort should be made at the earliest possible date to get the provinces and territories to act in harmony with the Dominion, so that whatever is done may be done conjointly and the expense distributed. The Government should endeavour to prevent any such fiasco as that which took place in connection with the Chicago Exhibition in the case of Manitoba, and which was not at all creditable to Canada. The object we all have in view would be frustrated by the squandering of this money in the manner in which Manitoba squandered her money at the Chicago Exhibition. I believe that the space of 12,000 feet square allotted to Canada is entirely too small, and it would seem that considering the importance of the Dominion, the extent of her territory, and the large population as compared with other portions of the British Empire, we should be assigned more space. It is to be hoped that the Minister will at once communicate with the Imperial authorities and secure a larger space for Canada.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I may say that we are protesting against the smallness of the space, and Lord Strathcona has vigorously protested. The right hon. the Premier informs me, that in consequence of the information I gave him a few days ago on the receipt of a letter from Lord Strathcona, he has communicated with the French consul in Montreal in the hope that we may be able, through the French Government itself, to secure further consideration. The space which we have demanded, namely, 60,000 square feet was about the same as we had at Chicago. The Imperial authorities are getting 350,000 square feet for the Imperial exhibit, but the French authorities of the exhibition seemed to think that the colonies must not expect anything like what the home country would, and they have refused so far to listen to the repre-

sentations made on behalf of the colonies by the Imperial Commission, whose chairman is the Prince of Wales. However, the Imperial Commission is still urging the question and we are yet in hopes that we will get greater consideration. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule), that 12,000 feet is entirely inadequate. If we can only get 12,000 feet, Lord Strathcona wrote me seriously questioning whether we had better be represented at all. I would hardly like to take that view, although I would be very much discouraged on behalf of the country if we were restricted to 12,000 feet.

Mr. WALLACE. The 60,000 feet asked for, represents an acre and a half in superficial area, and it would entail an enormous expenditure upon this Government to fit it out. It would be worth while considering whether the opinion of Lord Strathcona in that regard should be taken, and whether we should engage in such an enterprise at all. Notwithstanding that we have made a treaty with France which should have encouraged trade between the two countries, our exports to France last year, which was the largest in the history of the country, amounted only to six or seven hundred thousand dollars, and it is therefore a matter of consideration whether Canada should get involved in such a large expenditure for this exhibition. The Minister of Agriculture has given us merely a crude statement as to this vote of $20,000. He should have given us details of the expenditure, and I object to voting such a large sum to be expended in a manner we do not know of, and even the Minister himself says he does not know how it will be expended This House should be careful to vote no such sum without having further and specific information upon it. Another objection ; it is rumoured throughout the country that the Canadian commissioner to that exhibition is to be no less an individual than the present Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) ; so that if it goes on, this House will be deprived of the presence and services of the Minister of Public Works.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I could not consent to that at all.

Mr. WALLACE. And I often wonder how we could get on without him.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS You would be very sorry yourself, I know.

Mr. WALLACE. If the Prime Minister is to be deprived of his wicked partner——

The PRIME MINISTER. There is no wicked partner here.

Mr. WALLACE. I am delighted to hear that.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is no nest of traitors here.

Mr. WALLACE. There was an impression throughout the country that the Prime Minister had a wicked partner, and that that wicked partner was the Minister of Public Works ; but when we have the assurance of the Prime Minister himself that there is none, it will make the mind of the country a great deal easier.

The PRIME MINISTER. Commencing with your own mind, I have no doubt.

Mr. WALLACE. Oh, yes, I feel quite easy to start with. With regard to another matter, the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) gave a statement to the House of the expenses of the Department of Agriculture. The Public Accounts, prepared by hon. gentlemen themselves, do not bear out the hon. gentleman's statement. They show that the expenditure on agriculture, arts and statistics for the last three years was as follows : For 1895, $216,000 ; for 1896, $210,000 ; and for 1897, $224,000 ; the last year being under the present Government, and the two others under the Conservative Administration. These figures are completely contradictory of the statement made by the hon. member for North Wellington.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman knows perfectly well that during the last two years there has been a cold storage expenditure charged against "agriculture, arts and statistics" to the extent of about $100,000, which was not there before.

Mr. McNEILL. I think the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) might on this occasion allow the vote for the $20,000 to pass the committee. It is for a work of the greatest possible consequence to Canada. We cannot have a better opportunity than will be afforded by the Paris Exhibition, of showing to a great number of the best people in all the world what we can grow, what our minerals are, and what we can manufacture ; and if the Minister is not ready to-day to say exactly what he is going to do with this $20,000, I think we might give it to him on trust ; and if he does not make a good use of it, he may look out for squalls afterwards. I can understand that it is difficult or almost impossible to foresee exactly what may be required, and some considerable sum of money ought to be in hand to meet unforeseen expenses.

Mr. CLARKE. I would like to ask the Government if any request has been made to the Government to have Canada represented at the Mid-State Exhibition to be held during the coming summer, I think at Omaha. It was pointed out by a commissioner from that exhibition who visited us this session, and who, by the way, was a Canadian, that very substantial advantages would be gained for Canada, especially

for Manitoba and the North-west Territories, if a really good exhibit of the products of this country could be made there.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I hope that when the Supplementary Estimates come down, my hon. friend will see an item in them for that purpose. I think that exhibition may be made of great advantage to Canada, especially for immigration purposes. The tide of immigration is now setting in to a considerable extent from the western states to our own North-west.

Mr. CHARLTON. I have no doubt that the Minister of Agriculture will see that there shall be a good representation of Canadian products at the Omaha exhibition. It is in the heart of the Mississippi Valley, and a good exhibition of the products of Manitoba and the North-west ought to lead to a large immigration to western Canada. The available lands of the western states are very limited, and if we could set in motion a tide of immigration from that country to our North-west, it would no doubt soon reach a large volume.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) has pretty nearly converted me to the opinion that we might trust the Minister of Agriculture with that $20,000; but we are seldom called on to vote so airy an appropriation as the hon. gentleman has asked. We are two years from the exhibition for which he wants the $20,000. His purpose is good, but he has not given this committee any idea of what he proposes to expend the money on. In fact, he has no idea himself. He wants it so that if anything turns up he may be able to catch occasion by the forelock; but if all the Ministers are going to get $20,000 votes for what may possibly turn up two years before the event, we shall have to revise the traditions of Parliament in that respect. The hon. gentleman cannot want it for his trip across to interview the French Government. Being a cold water man, with a large system of cold storage in operation, he ought to get over for $250 or thereabouts.

Mr. CHARLTON. Did you go to the West Indies for that?

Mr. FOSTER. It was hotter in the West Indies, and I had to get something to keep me cool.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. All the more need of cold storage.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman hinted that he might want a commissioner to go round and lay plans, and see what could be got for the exhibition. That should not cost a large amount of money. A thousand dollars ought to pay the expenses of a commissioner for that purpose. There is no use of stuffing the Estimates with votes unless there is some plan as to how the money is to be expended. There is nothing that can be gathered and kept in store for two years. I am not opposing Canada having an exhibit there, but I am questioning the utility of having so large a vote when there is nothing in the field.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I fully appreciate the position, and I explained quite frankly, to begin with, that I had not any special estimate of how this money was to be spent. I explained that I had consulted three gentlemen who I thought had a good deal of experience in connection with exhibitions, and it was at their suggestion that I decided to ask for the vote. They thought that before the end of the next fiscal year there would be occurrences which would make moderate expenditures more effective and economical then than greater expenditures later on.

Mr. FOSTER. Would the hon. gentleman tell us the suggestions of these gentlemen that had weight with him, because they might have weight with the committee. $20,000 is not a moderate expenditure.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The representations they made were those I explained a while ago. I do not know that I shall have any opportunity of spending the $20,000, and I can assure the hon. gentleman that I shall not spend any portion which I find cannot be spent with telling effect. I want to have sufficient, so that I shall be able to take up any scheme or plan that may commend itself to my judgment and the judgment of those I may consult.

Mr. DAVIN. What is needed, no doubt, is to begin at once to collect exhibits. The suggestion of Dr. Dawson is an excellent one. From our experience of small exhibitions, we know that if you put off to a year beforehand the collecting of exhibits, it will be impossible for you to get them. It is not a bit too soon to begin collecting, and I think the hon. Minister is perfectly right in seeking to be put at once in a position to get the information required. The question is whether the amount may not be excessive.

Mr. McMILLAN. Is the intention to take over live stock?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have not yet come to a decision about such details, but I hardly think it would be wise to do so. We took live stock to Chicago, but I do not think that any were ever taken to any European exhibition, and I hardly think it would be advisable.

Mr. McMILLAN. If you are going to do so, the farmers ought to be informed in time, for you cannot prepare cattle for an exhibition in a month or six months.

Mr. FOSTER. The Parisians are not going to allow any of our live stock into the city of Paris.

Mr. HAGGART. How many persons does the hon. gentleman intend to employ in getting information and making collections ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I shall begin with one, and if I find more are needed, I shall employ them as they are found necessary. Several references have been made to the commissioner. I do not mean the commissioner of the exhibition. I have no idea of attempting to name any such commissioner, and this vote has nothing to do with the commissioner who will deal with the exhibits in Paris when the time comes. This is merely for preparatory work.

Mr. FOSTER. I would advise my hon. friend to content himself with $10,000, unless he has some more definite plan.

Mr. McNEILL. I want to ask whether the hon. gentleman, in his conversation with Prof. Saunders and Dr. Dawson, discussed this question of expenditure and the sum required ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. During that conversation the question arose. I do not remember exactly whether a sum was fixed then or not, but this figure was the result of that conversation.

Mr. POPE. Were any details of the figures gone into ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No ; we just thought in a general way of the necessary preparatory steps to be taken to accomplish the object in view. If hon. gentlemen think they can trust me with $10,000, they can trust me with $20,000.

Mr. FOSTER. It is not a question of trust. The hon. gentleman is not going to take any of the money himself or throw it away, but it is a principle the House ought to keep pretty close to, that the estimates should be kept pretty close and that you should not ask for a sum without giving details, and say that you will not spend it unless you want it.

Mr. McNEILL. I may say that I should not have made the suggestion or observation I did, had I not thought that this was an unusual kind of expenditure, and I do think still that we would all regret very much if we found that because we cut the vote down to $10,000, some difficulties occurred, and that in any respect the exhibit we made was not as good as it otherwise would have been.

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

After Recess.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 101) respecting the harbour of the city of St. John, in the province of New Brunswick.—(Mr. Ellis.)

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 129)—from the Senate—to incorporate the Tobique Manufacturing Company.—(Mr. Taylor.)

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

River St. Lawrence ship channel..... $256,000

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). I hope the explanations I am going to give will convince the committee that this amount, although it may look somewhat large, should be granted. I have no doubt my hon. friends understand the importance of the St. Lawrence ship channel. It is one of the most important highways that Canada possesses. Last year the House granted me a sum of $200,000, of which sum there had been expended up to the 30th of April, $162,488.88. This year I am asking a little more. We intend having on the St. Lawrence ship channel at least four dredges; as it costs $20,000 to work each dredge, we shall expend on that head $80,000. But if we use five dredges, as it is proposed we might do, it will amount to $100,000. At the present time I think we will employ only four dredges. In the next place, we intend building two new steel dredges at a cost of $75,000 ; two new tugs at a cost of $12,000 ; two new hopper scows at a cost of $12,000 ; one stone lifter, $10,000 ; one testing scow, $6,000. With the $80,000 I have mentioned, these sums will amount to $200,000 in round numbers. Now, with the remaining $50,000, the question is whether I will buy a property in Sorel and have a new building and new machinery erected, or whether I will buy a new steamboat. Sorel is our headquarters, we have a very important shipyard there, nearly all our dredges and tug boats winter at Sorel. We are also building there these new dredges and tugs that I have just enumerated. Until the present time we have rented those yards in Sorel from the McCarthy estate, paying a rental of $1,200 a year, and while paying that large amount of money, we are not at home. During the last year I have negotiated to buy that property, but so far I have not been able to come to any satisfactory arrangements with the McCarthy estate. I have not yet decided whether during the next year to buy that property, or to buy a new steamboat. I would ask my hon. friends to remember that when that ship channel was transferred to the Government in 1888, we took over all the plant of the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal, and we have been working with that plant ever since. I may say that some of those dredges can scarcely be kept afloat now. I may add that we have some new dredges which are giving us every satisfaction. But the reason why we are building these two new steel dredges, and the tugs

and scows that I mentioned, is because we are working to-day with very old plant. Now, Sir, I have given briefly the details of the expenditure which I propose to make during the coming year, and I shall be glad to answer any questions which may be asked with regard to this important work.

Mr. FOSTER. Do I understand my hon. friend that out of that vote of $256,000, he is going to expend $120,000 for buying or building boats, and $80,000 for running them. What is he going to do with the remaining $56,000 ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have just explained, but I am sorry I did not make myself clearly understood. The $80,000 will be employed to work four dredges, at $20,000 each for the season. We intend building two new steel dredges at a cost of $75,000 for the two ; two new tugs for $12,000 ; two new hopper scows, $12,000 ; one stone lifter, $10,000 ; one testing scow, $6,000, which makes $115,000, aside from the $80,000. Then there are $10,000 for salaries of the staff and other officials, and office expenses. Besides what I have mentioned, there remains a balance of $51,000 which, as I have already explained, may be used either to buy and equip a shipyard in Sorel, or to build or buy a new steel boat, I have not yet made up my mind which. I have tried to negotiate with the McCarthy estate, but so far I have not been able to arrange with them as regards the price. I have also negotiated for the dredges and a boat. We are badly in need of a boat, but as the price has gone up a little on account of the war, I could not make up mind to buy at the present time. However, I desire to take the House into my confidence and tell them how I may expend that $51,000.

Mr. FOSTER. How many dredges did the hon. gentleman operate last year ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Last year we worked five dredges on the St. Lawrence ship channel. I intend to work there with three dredges, the Laurier, the Laval and the Cartier, and as to the fourth, I am sending that dredge to Kingston for a while. Kingston is badly in need of a dredge, as my hon. friend knows. Three new elevators are being built there, and I have made up my mind to give them the use of a dredge. They are going to have four dredges on the St. Lawrence.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the hon. gentleman expect to dredge at Kingston with a dredge which is charged to the St. Lawrence Ship Canal account ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No ; I provided in my estimate only for four dredges, for which I asked $80,000.

Mr. FOSTER. What sum is the hon. gentleman going to credit to the River St. Lawrence Ship Canal account by reason of the dredge that is going to Kingston ?

Mr. TARTE. Nothing. I am going to ask in the Supplementary Estimates a vote for a dredge.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose the accounts are kept under their proper headings, and we will know at the end of the year the amount of the St. Lawrence Ship Canal account. Suppose the hon. gentleman takes half a dozen dredges and applies them to general dredging work, is he going to credit nothing to the St. Lawrence Ship Canal account, when the dredges have been originally charged to that account ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No.

Mr. FOSTER. But the hon. gentleman is doing it this year. He is taking a dredge paid for out of the St. Lawrence Ship Canal capital vote, and he is utilizing it for general dredging work. If he can do that with oue dredge, he can do it with all the dredges.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman must not forget that this is an exceptional case. There is a large amount of business doing in the grain trade, and people represented to me that there is not enough water to allow boats to discharge grain at the Kingston elevators. I, therefore, decided to send a dredge there. I did so because it was in the public interest that we should not allow the grain trade to go by another route. I am taking a dredge which last year worked a large part of the time in the harbour of Montreal. I do not see anything irregular in that. The hon. gentleman will agree that those dredges should be employed elsewhere if they are not needed on the St. Lawrence. I see that in course of time we shall only employ two there, and then there will be dredges for other purposes ; and if the hon. gentleman saw the applications made daily for dredges he would find no trouble in using the dredges on works at large.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman scurries over the water and talks about the necessity of dredging at Kingston. I am not questioning the necessity of that work. But this dredge belongs to the St. Lawrence Ship Canal account, and he is now sending it to Kingston. It was either taken over at the time——

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It was taken over.

Mr. FOSTER——or it has been purchased and paid for since. It was part of the capital stock of the ship canal work, the accounts of which must be kept by themselves in order that we may know exactly what we have expended. If the hon. gentleman sold the dredge, the amount received would pass into the Receiver General's hands, but it would be credited to that fund. I wish the hon. gentleman to understand that he is going to transfer this dredge

from the St. Lawrence Ship Canal account to the general service account, to do work at Kingston, or anywhere else, but not on the St. Lawrence ship channel. If the hon. gentleman makes this transfer to the general dredging account, he should credit the value to the St. Lawrence Ship Canal account.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am not asking one dollar for a new dredge. I am only asking $80,000 for four dredges. An application will be made to Parliament subsequently for a fifth dredge.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the value of the dredge ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is an old dredge that has been repaired. My deputy informs me that it is worth $25,000 or $30,000.

Mr. McDOUGALL. When were the repairs made to the dredge ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Every year we have to make repairs to dredges.

Mr. FOSTER. I am not discussing the manner of carrying out dredging work, but the hon. gentleman is asking $150,000 for plant. If the hon. gentleman is going to divert dredges from the St. Lawrence Ship Canal work to general rivers and lake service without crediting the account with it, the accounts cannot be kept in proper form, so as to be able to make any comparisons. So if the hon. gentleman is going to make that transfer, he should credit the Ship Canal account with the value of the dredge, say $25,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is true I am going to use the dredge for a few months at Kingston, instead of on the St. Lawrence Ship Canal works, where it has been for a number of years. But that does not alter the case ; the dredging is part of the work to be done for Canada. In every general business, accounts must be kept separately, as is done by all merchants, for the purpose of seeing at the end of a certain period how the accounts stand.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Why not charge the rent of it to the Kingston works and credit the amount to the St. Lawrence Ship Canal account ?

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman has transferred the dredge to the lake and river service.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am doing so for the time being. I do not know how long the dredge will have to work at Kingston. We have a certain quantity of material to remove at that point, and I have taken one of the dredges from the St. Lawrence to give relief to our Kingston friends.

Mr. FOSTER. When she is done with Kingston, where does she go ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will take her back to the St. Lawrence again.

Mr. FOSTER. Will you let her lie idle ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will have some work for that dredge there or elsewhere. The Dominion assumed the debt of the Harbour Commission of Montreal in 1888, and the commission transferred to the Government their plant. That plant does not belong to the ship channel especially. but to Canada as a whole. When I take an appropriation for the ship channel it does not mean that I am not free to use one of these dredges anywhere.

Mr. FOSTER. If the Minister asks Parliament for $20,000 for the ship channel, is he at liberty to use that $20,000 somewhere else ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, he is not at liberty to take a dredge and use it somewhere else unless he gives a quid pro quo on that account.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am perfectly free to use the dredges wherever I like, provided I get authorization to spend a certain amount of money here and there.

Mr. FOSTER. You cannot divert the money voted for a certain place. This dredge represents money that you get from Parliament for a certain purpose, and you cannot divert the money or use it anywhere else.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That dredge is part of the consideration of the $3,000,000 debt of the Harbour Commissioners, assumed by Canada. I do not see that there is anything to interfere with my using that dredge at Kingston. I may be wrong, but it is a question of book-keeping, and that is the book-keeping done in the department.

Mr. SPROULE. I see you have one item here, "Less—charged to other votes—dredge vessels, repairs, $4,663.69," "New dredging plant, $2,368." That was evidently charged to another vote. I draw the Minister's attention to the fact that a portion of the cost of dredging repairs is charged to another vote, as shown at the bottom of Q—19 of the Auditor General's Report.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have a special vote outside of that ship channel vote, for other dredging operations, and it is out of that vote that the repairs are made.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Will the Minister replace the dredge sent to Kingston with one

of the proposed new dredges ? What work will these new dredges be engaged in ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have some dredges that we can scarcely keep afloat and we are building these new dredges to replace old craft that will be out of shape in a year or so.

Mr. McDOUGALL. The Minister proposes to build two new dredges, and as I understand it they are to be used in connection with dredging of the St. Lawrence channel to Montreal. This dredge that was sent to Kingston was used there before. Why not use this dredge sent to Kingston on the St. Lawrence ship channel and only build one new dredge ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We would have to build two new dredges whether this dredge was sent to Kingston or not.

Mr. McDOUGALL. If the dredge was not sent to Kingston it would be used on the St. Lawrence.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, and in other places where dredging is needed.

Mr. McDOUGALL. At all events, the St. Lawrence ship channel is deprived of the services of that dredge for the time being. I would suggest that the Minister would charge a rental for this dredge to the Kingston works and credit it to the St. Lawrence ship channel work. If that were done, the thing would be nearer right.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think that suggestion might be adopted. I have no objection to it as a matter of bookkeeping.

Mr. SPROULE. I see an item on Page Q—22 of the Auditor General's Report : D. & J. McCarthy, Sorel, $2,353.15 for rent. That seems to be a pretty large sum for rent. Could there be no other permanent arrangement made whereby that cost would be reduced ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have had our shipyards on the McCarthy estate for a great number of years, and we are under the same rental now as before. The rental we pay is $1,200 per year. In the item $653.15 is for arrears.

Mr. SPROULE. Do the wharf and the office belong to the same parties ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr FOSTER. I want to call my hon. friend's attention to another point. He has two votes. One is a vote for public works chargeable to capital, under the heading of River St. Lawrence Ship Channel. He has, of course, no business to spend any of that for dredging, which is provided for out of income. On page 53 he has a dredging vote chargeable to income. When my hon. friend mixes up these two, he is going outside of the aim of the parliamentary appropriation, and is complicating his accounts besides. When I turn to the Auditor General's Report, I find, under capital account, St. Lawrence Ship Channel, that a certain amount is deducted from the expenditure and charged to the income vote for dredging. How does my hon. friend explain that ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My deputy explains to me that we had certain work at Sorel for dredges outside the ship channel, and for that we made a special account.

Mr. FOSTER. I have my hon. friend where I want him. He does that to keep his accounts straight. In this case he diverts the expenditure for dredging for four or five months out of this capital account, and he makes no corresponding entry. If you make the entry in one case and not in another, you complicate your accounts, and you are diverting the vote intended to be used on the ship channel of the St. Lawrence under capital account to what is arranged by Parliament to be defrayed out of income.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not divert one dollar of what I am asking from Parliament for the work in the ship channel. I am asking $80,000.

Mr. FOSTER. I want my hon. friend to drop the $80,000 out of his mind entirely. I am not discussing that. I am discussing the point that a certain amount of capital which has been invested in plant you are now diverting to dredging work which Parliament has said should be paid for, both as to plant and work, out of income.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman and myself agree in the main, namely, that when a Minister asks Parliament for a sum of money for a certain purpose, he has no right to spend it on anything else. But where we differ is in this. In 1888 this Parliament assumed the debt of the Harbour Commissioners, who in return gave us a certain quantity of material and plant. It was not stipulated that those dredges should belong to this and the other part of Canada or be employed only in such and such particular work. That plant was simply transferred to us, and the Minister of Public Works has the right to send any of those scows and dredges where he likes. They are the property of Canada. I do not propose to charge one dollar of expenditure at Kingston to the ship channel.

Mr. FOSTER. There are but two things in an expenditure. There is the thing you work with and the actual cost of working it. Take, for instance, the vote given you for dredging chargeable to income. You do two things with that money. If you want a dredge, you build her with part of it, and then you work her with part of it, but both

are payable out of income, and you have no right to take out of that vote money for plant to be used down in the St. Lawrence channel, which is always charged to capital account. My hon. friend gets a vote, and out of that takes $115,000 which he puts into plant, and $80,000 which he puts into work. He admits that he cannot take any part of that $80,000 and apply it to work at Kingston or any other place. Can he then take one of his dredges, which he has built out of that $115,000 and use it at Kingston or any other place on work not provided for in this vote? My hon. friend says the case is not the same because we took over this plant from the harbour commission. That does not make a bit of difference. We assumed the debt of the commission and charge it to our capital account. We paid for the plant in that way, and if you use any portion of that plant for temporary works, chargeable to income, you should charge the income fund and credit capital with the value of the work done.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). Is not that carrying the thing to a very fine point?

Mr. FOSTER. No, it is a $25,000 plant that is in question.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I will not say that, in strict accuracy, there may not be something in the hon. gentleman's contention. But what amount of rent would be involved in the use of that dredge? It may possibly be used two or three months at Kingston, and the rent would be a mere bagatelle.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think it would, and in any case it involves the accuracy of accounting.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. In the hon. gentleman's own time and before that, I do not think that the Government insisted on charging things with that minute accuracy, although I will not gainsay that there might not, from a book-keeping point of view, be something in the hon. gentleman's pretension. At the outside, the amount involved would not be much more than a couple of hundred dollars.

Mr. FOSTER. It would be more than that.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Supposing the dredge cost $20,000, what would the rent be?

Mr. FOSTER. $50 or $100 per day.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Everything asked for in this vote of $256,000, my hon. friend will have to spend on the St. Lawrence ship channel.

Mr. FOSTER. He says he is going to do it.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The Auditor General will take extremely good care that he does.

Mr. FOSTER. As long as you let him.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. We cannot help it; he will compel us no matter what we may care to do. I think the hon. gentleman will find that the whole of this $256,000 will have to be expended for this purpose. It may be the case that my hon. friend, the Minister of Public Works, may borrow a part of the old plant and use it elsewhere, so as to avoid the expense of procuring separate dredges for every separate bit of work he has to do. The hon. gentleman is too good a business man to say that we should have a dredge set apart for each separate work we have to do.

Mr. FOSTER. I am keeping the distinction between capital and income only.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. That does not come up in this particular matter. Everything my hon. friend asks for he means to spend on the St. Lawrence channel. He would have to spend this sum, independent altogether of what he does with this small old dredge that he proposes to send to Kingston. I do not say that, strictly speaking, there is not something in the hon. gentleman's contention, but he is pushing the matter too far, and the course he urges was not taken in former times. The dredges were used pretty indiscriminately where they were wanted.

Mr. FOSTER. There is a certain vote chargeable to income for dredging and the Minister of Public Works cannot exceed that. Now there is work to be done in Kingston, which is properly chargeable to income. You want a dredge to do that work at Kingston. Suppose you advertised for a dredge of the capacity of the one you are going to send up, your officer will tell you how much a month you would have to pay.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It would cost about $40 a day.

Mr. FOSTER. Take three months, or 100 days dredging at $40 per day, that will give $4,000. Does not my hon. friend see that by that device of borrowing a dredge from the capital account, he is extending his capacity to work in that class of work chargeable to income by $4,000, and is exceeding the vote chargeable to income by that sum. If he can do that with one dredge, he can do it with five dredges.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Suppose the dredge were lying idle.

Mr. FOSTER. It would not lie idle because my hon. friend has already said that if he did not send it to Kingston, he would have other work for it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Once more, I am very much afraid, we are at loggerheads altogether. I am building now two new dredges out of ship channel money. I suppose that when the work is completed on the ship channel or when I have not as much work there as I now have, I will take those two dredges elsewhere, and I do not see why I should not. Those dredges are after all the property of Canada, and I do not see the point my hon. friend makes.

Mr. FOSTER. If the hon. gentleman does not see the point we will not pursue it further.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Leave it to the Auditor General.

Mr. FOSTER. He can hold you to expenditure as it is being charged, but once it is put into shape of a shovel or a spade or a dredge or a tug, and even the Auditor General finds it hard to trace it.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Presuming that that matter is disposed of, I should like to ask the Minister for an explanation with regard to some payments that appear in the Auditor General's Report for coal. On page Q—22 I find that the Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company were paid at the rate of $3.10 per ton on 453 tons of coal; in another place on the same page I find T. F. Moore & Cie paid $2.90 per ton on 1,326 tons of Scotch coal; and on the preceding page, Kingman, Brown & Co. paid at the rate of $2.55 per ton on 2,215 tons of coal. I would like to know why this difference in the price.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We were short of coal and were obliged to buy some from the Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company, and were obliged to pay their price, which is $3.10. As to the difference between $2.55 and $2.90, it is because of a difference in the coal. We bought some Scotch coal, which is a great deal better for the use of dredges than the Nova Scotia coal. I see my hon. friend from Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) is protesting, but there is no occasion for it. Nova Scotia furnishes very good coal; but the chief engineer and all the engineers report that for dredges, Scotch coal is a great deal better, and that is the reason I pay a little more for it. I do not pretend to be an expert; I am acting on the advice of my chief engineer.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I am not inclined to agree with the hon. Minister's opinion with regard to the Nova Scotia coal.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. For certain purposes.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I do not think it is possible for the hon. Minister to get any coal better than the Nova Scotia coal. I find also, in connection with the handling of this coal, the unloading, several items at 12½ cents per ton and some at 15 cents per ton. I would like to ask the hon. Minister, first, whether this coal was bought after tender and contract.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Tenders were called for from different parties, my deputy tells me.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Were tenders called for with respect to the coal bought from the Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, that was a small quantity. The Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company have their headquarters at Sorel, and they often borrow from us and we from them.

Mr. McDOUGALL. But the amount paid for this coal and some other comparatively small items was $1,729. It appears to me that that is too large an item for the purchase to be made without tender. At a place like these points on the St. Lawrence where coal is offered in large quantities, many would probably have tendered.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It was during the early part of the spring and we wanted the coal immediately.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I hope I can successfully appeal to the hon. Minister of Public Works to investigate a little further into the relative merits of Scotch coal and Nova Scotia coal. I would remind him, in connection with that subject, that, as every one who has had experience with engineers and shipping men will know, there is a great deal of prejudice on this subject that is liable to mislead. I had to deal with that subject once when I was in the Marine Department. The agency at Quebec and the men in connection with the ships at that port were all wedded to the use of Scotch coal. I investigated the subject and found that there was nothing in it but sheer prejudice. The men who handled Scotch coal, the commission merchants and others make the production in a sense, local. They have their friends on the steamers—I am not saying there is any corrupt arrangement—and Nova Scotia coal is at a comparatively low range, and is not forced and pushed in the same way for the use of the Government ships. But I am satisfied that if the hon. gentleman will take advantage of the experiments that have been made in the city of Montreal to determine the relative merits of Nova Scotia and Scotch coal, he will find that the Scotch coal is the inferior article. It comes out in ballast—it is a cheap coal. I am almost positive on that point; I know it was correct when I looked into the matter. Coming out in ballast it is landed at a comparatively cheap rate at Montreal and Quebec. If the hon. Minister will take the trouble to get the result of the experiments made, I think by the harbour authorities, at any rate by the public authorities

outside of the Government departments themselves, he will ascertain that I am right and that Nova Scotia coal is a much superior article. There is no complaint, I am sure, from any of the dredges of the Public Works Department in the provinces where they use Nova Scotia coal. They have no trouble about it and can show that the service can be carried on as efficiently using our own coal as using coal from outside. and, whether the hon. gentleman is in favour of the National Policy or not, I hope he would prefer, unless the expense was very serious, to use the home article rather than that which is imported. And as the duty on coal is to sustain another cut in the coming year, I trust the hon. gentleman will make an effort consistent with his own idea of what is due to the public, at least to give the Nova Scotia article a fair trial.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) may be perfectly sure that I have no prejudice against Nova Scotia coal. When my chief engineer, Mr. Coste, represented to me that it was better to use Scotch coal, I made the very same representations as have been made by my hon. friend, but Mr. Coste, who was a very experienced engineer——

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. He is not a coal man.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. He knows all about it. When he stated to me that Nova Scotia coal, though a good coal was not so good for the use of dredges as the Scotch coal, on account of the draft and because it clogged the grate——

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Oh, oh.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Well, I would much rather use the Canadian coal than any other. But I am not an expert and, when my chief engineer made a report to me that our dredges could not work with the same advantage with Nova Scotia as with Scotch coal, I felt that I could not set my opinion against his, and, with great regret—I say it again—I consented to buy Scotch coal. But, I take in good part the advice that is tendered me and will have new experiments made.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. In regard to that question about clinkers in the grate, much of that difficulty can be obviated at very small expense in connection with the grates themselves, the arrangement of the furnace. If they are in the habit of arranging for Scotch coal they can alter that arrangement so as to give the other such a trial as will obviate these difficulties. But I ask the hon. gentleman to bear in mind these tests that can be made, and to consult the representatives in Montreal of the several companies, who will be able to put the merits of the coal before him in a business shape.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will have tests made on our boats during the next month or two.

Mr. GILLIES. I would like to put in a word or two for the Nova Scotia coal, and draw the attention of the Minister to the fact that the large liners now running between Montreal and Liverpool and other transatlantic ports call at the ports of Cape Breton and take in Cape Breton coal. For a long time a strong prejudice existed against Cape Breton coal in favour of Scotch coal. That prejudice has long since been exploded, and it is well for the Minister to wake up to the fact that these large transatlantic liners are using Cape Breton coal exclusively for bunker coal. Another fact that demonstrates the superiority of the Nova Scotia coal is that the French fleet on the Atlantic Coast use exclusively Cape Breton coal, as do also the British fleet on the coast of Newfoundland. To my mind, these facts should weigh more with the Minister than any opinion given by any civil engineer in his department.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have used a good deal of Nova Scotia coal this year, I think about 2,000 tons. I promise again to make a complete test.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I am sorry the Minister's chief engineer should have given such an opinion, because Cape Breton coal is generally looked upon as a very superior coal, with perhaps one or two exceptions. The product of one or two seams might be somewhat inferior. I do not think the general run of coal there has been offered on the market of the St. Lawrence to any extent; I know it has not been offered, unless very lately or perhaps many years ago, to any extent at all on the St. Lawrence. Perhaps it was offered at a time when they had not facilities for separating the coal from the objectionable products that were mixed with it in the seams, and made it unsuitable for steamboat purposes. But in making any future tests of Nova Scotia coal, I would strongly recommend the Minister to get the opinion of those large liners who use it constantly.

Mr. FOSTER. Would my hon. friend tell us about what work was done in the channel last year, and what he proposes to do this year?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Last year the dredge "Laurier" worked till about the 20th of October, removing 80,500 yards of sand and stone, at a cost of 8·86 cents per yard. Later in the season the "Laurier" was removed to a point near Montreal in the Contrecœur channel, where it remained to the 25th of November. The material removed there consisted of 31,650 cubic yards of clay and stone, at a cost of 8·45 cents per yard. The dredge "Laval" was employed opposite Lotbinière up to the close of navigation. The ma-

terials removed were 36,431 cubic yards of hard-pan and boulders, which cost 31·29 cents per yard. Dredge No. 12 was employed at Isle St. Ours, where she worked till the 14th of August. She removed 59,760 cubic yards of clay and sand, at a cost of 5·75 cents per yard. The dredge was then removed to another point where she worked till the 4th of October, removing 33,800 cubic yards of sand, at a cost of 10·12 cents per yard. She was then removed to Champlain, where she worked till the 11th November, removing 13,520 cubic yards of sand, clay and stone, at a cost of 18·82 per yard. The work being completed at this place, the dredge was removed to Upper Pointe aux Trembles channel, where she worked until the close of navigation, removing some small obstructions. The material removed was 1,280 cubic yards of gravel and stone, at a cost of 27·37 cents per yard. Dredge No. 11 worked at the widening of the upper end of Pointe aux Trembles channel until the 14th of August, removing 19,512 cubic yards of gravel and stone, at a cost of 13·77 per yard. She was then taken to Longue Pointe for the purpose of removing a portion of the isolated shoal located a little below the Longue Pointe church. This work was completed on the 9th of October. She removed at that spot 25,969 cubic yards of gravel and stone at a cost of 16·62 cents per yard. The dredge was then removed to Contrecœur, where she worked till the 24th of November, at the close of navigation, in conjunction with the dredge "Laurier," widening the channel at Isle St. Ours. The material removed there consisted of 47,580 cubic yards of clay and stone, at a cost of 6·67 cents per yard. At the beginning of the fiscal year 1897 there were twelve dredges working in the Montreal harbour, and they continued there until the close of navigation, removing 20,100,000 cubic yards, at a cost of 50 cents per cubic yard. This was the work done last year on the St. Lawrence.

Mr. WALLACE. What is the total value of the work done?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The total expenditure up to 30th April last on the St. Lawrence ship canal was $163,488.

Mr. FOSTER. What portion of that expenditure represented the actual taking out of quantities of material?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. $62,873 was the amount of the working expenses of the dredges.

Mr. FOSTER. Now that the Minister has read a mass of technical details from his memorandum, will he give the committee an idea of the condition of the work generally, how near to completion the ship canal has advanced, and so on.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have here the depths of water during the last two years, and the figures may possess some interest. The table is as follows:—

	Lowest Water, 1890.		1897.	
May	36 ft.	6 in.	35 ft.	6 in.
June	35	3	32	6
July	31	9	30	3
August	30	6	29	3
September	30	9	28	0
October	29	9	27	0
November	30	6	27	6

The lowest depth in 1890 was 29 feet. The lowest depth in 1897 was 26 feet 6 inches, and the highest 37 feet.

Mr. FOSTER. When the hon. gentleman gives the depth for May, I suppose he gives the average monthly depth.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes. On one day in 1897, the depth of water was only 25 feet 6 inches, which was due to an east wind, but it only continued a day or a day and a half.

Mr. FOSTER. How does the Minister account for the fact that the average for 1890 was perceptibly higher than for 1897, with six full intervening years during which dredging work has been done?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The depth has varied a good deal. For instance, I find that in 1891 the lowest depth was 27 feet 3 inches, while the lowest during the preceding year was 29 feet. The lowest in 1895 was 26 feet, but it continued only for a short time. As to the cause, it is very difficult to state the cause. The engineers of the department have given a great deal of attention to the matter, but they cannot explain the reason of the change. As the hon. gentleman knows, the important sources of supply for the St. Lawrence are the great lakes and the Ottawa River. When the water falls in the great lakes there must be a loss of water in the St. Lawrence River.

Mr. FOSTER. All the same it is somewhat disheartening in view of the amount of money we have been spending on the river every year, to find that during seven years there has been a decided lowering of the available floatage.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is not disheartening. The water has fallen in the lakes by four feet, and we cannot expect to have the same depth in the St. Lawrence. If we look at the facts we will find that the St. Lawrence is one of the most important highways and moreover it is one of the cheapest routes. I will give the hon. gentleman some facts to show the importance of our trade.

Mr. FOSTER. We know the importance of our trade and the value of the St. Lawrence route, but we are now considering

the floatage power of the river. What is the draught of the largest vessel coming up the channel?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have low water only during a short period of the season. Last year the only accident that could be fairly attributed to the low water was the grounding of the SS. "Arabia" at Cap a la Roche. When she left Montreal we were supposed to have 27½ feet of water, but there is no doubt that on account of the east wind there was not that depth of water there. In May last year we had 35 feet 6 inches.

Mr. FOSTER. Just the same as in 1890.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In June we had 30 feet 6 inches.

Mr. FOSTER. Three feet less than in 1890.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In July we had 30 feet 3 inches.

Mr. FOSTER. Which was 1½ feet less.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In August we had 29 feet 3 inches.

Mr. FOSTER. Which was 1 foot 3 inches less.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In September we had 28 feet.

Mr. FOSTER. Two and three-quarter feet less.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In October we had 27 feet.

Mr. FOSTER. Three feet less.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In November we had 27 feet 6 inches. The hon. gentleman must remember that the water was falling in the lakes and everywhere last year, and there are not many great water channels in the world which have a greater depth than this.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend (Mr. Tarte) seems to think that the whole question is solved if the channel is still quite deep to-day. That is not the point. He must remember that the weakest link in a chain measures the strength of the chain and your channel will be serviceable according to the depth it is at an average. It is somewhat disappointing that after seven years work and expenditure the channel is even shallower than it was before. I find that on the average each month you come down to about two feet six inches less water in 1897 than in 1890. That is a little bit disappointing.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In the year 1896 we were better off. In that year the following were the depths of the water in the channel each month:—May, 33 feet 6 inches; June, 30 feet 6 inches; July, 28 feet 9 inches; August, 28 feet; September, 27 feet; October, 27 feet 6 inches; November, 29 feet. Last year was an exceptional year and the water was very low.

Mr. FOSTER. And 1896 was quite a falling off from 1890.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, a little.

Mr. FOSTER. Do these shallow places extend over quite a large area, or are they confined to one or two places?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The most difficult part of the channel is at Cap a la Roches which is three miles long. When the "Arabia" grounded there was only 25½ feet there, but it only lasted a day or so and the greater part of the year we have between 27 or 28 feet. There are very few steamers which draw more water than that. We had last year in Montreal bigger ships than we ever had before. The Elder-Dempster Company are bringing to Montreal to-day very large ships indeed, and I have it from Mr. Harling, the able and efficient manager of the Elder-Dempster Company, that the St. Lawrence ship channel is a safe channel, but of course it has to be deepened and widened as we are doing from year to year. The reason why I am asking a larger amount this year is to enable us to do as much work as possible. I think myself that we have achieved pretty satisfactory results.

Mr. FOSTER. I will conclude my remarks by reiterating what I said before, that it has struck me for a number of years that in the case of the St. Lawrence channel and as well as the whole dredging business of the country, it is very, very expensive as carried on by the Government. Between your dredges, and your officers, and your hangers-on, and the men who are actually employed, and all that, an immense amount of money is spent, and I am decidedly of the opinion as I have been for years—though I may be wrong—that the Government would get better results if it would simply sell out its whole concern of plant and everything else and go on the principle of getting by contract proper dredging companies to do the work for us. I believe that for the amount of money you spend, you would get a great deal better work done in this way and the companies would do their work more cheaply and provide their plant more cheaply than the Government possibly can. That place at Sorel is a regular sink. In it there is from $120,000 to $160,000 spent each year for repairs and plant and one thing or the other, and a modicum only of the vote goes to the actual taking out of earth or stone in the channel. I held that opinion while I was a member of the Government and I hold it yet. There is the difficulty, of course, that you have all this plant on hand and the Minister has charge of it; that your officers are there and none of them want to go; but for the good of the country I believe it would be better if it

were known that Canada hereafter would simply pay for her dredging by the cubic yard, and you would find contracting companies that would do the work and make a business of it; it is not going to be a small business either. If it has been expensive in the past, it will be still more expensive in the future, for the Government. If it were once well understood that the country depended upon contract for its dredging, you woud find enterprising companies to complete, and I believe we could get far better value for our money.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) and myself practically hold the same view. There is no pleasure in supervising that work, and if I could get rid of it as Minister of Public Works I would not continue it. I must, however, take issue with my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) with regard to the cost of the work. I grant that he is right to a very large extent as to the past. When the Government took the old plant of the harbour commissioners, they went on for a number of years with that old plant, and I am quite of the hon. gentleman's opinion that the work in these days was expensive indeed. But the figures I have given to the House show the great improvement that has been made, and we are now able to take out material at 8 or 10 cents.

Mr. FOSTER. So would a modern dredging company; it would make no difference in that respect.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. You could not find in Canada any company which has the plant to do that work. More than that, there is not in America to-day a dredge that could be compared with the "Laval" or the "Laurier." With the improved dredges we have, we can do the work more cheaply than it can be done by any private company at a profit.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I find a charge for providing two sign-boards—one $30 and the other $25. I consider these prices extremely high.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Of course, I do not buy these sign-boards myself. My hon. friend knows that I cannot control these details; no Minister could.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Besides, I do not see why any difference should be made in price between the two.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There are a few more letters in the one than in the other.

Harbours and Rivers—Ontario—River Kaministiquia $15,000

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is for the continuation of the work of last year.

Mr. FOSTER. How much work has been done there?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We spent last year $6,800 in dredging, and expect to spend the balance of $10,000 before the 1st of July. This year we shall spend $10,000 for dredging and $5,000 for pile work.

Mr. FOSTER. How much money has been spent on that work altogether up to the present time?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. To the 31st of December, 1897, $231,179.63.

Mr. FOSTER. And, briefly, what have we there now?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have deepened the channel of the river to 20 feet, for a width of 200 feet and a length of five miles; and we have built a turning basin opposite the Canadian Pacific Railway elevators.

Mr. FOSTER. What is supposed to be necessary to finish the work?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This year the work will be completed, so my officers inform me.

Mr. FOSTER. I want my hon. friend to make a broad note of that with a finger-mark, for we have heard for many years that this was to be the last of it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My officers tell me positively that this will be the last time. As a matter of fact, the dredge which is working there now cannot work any longer. We can scarcely keep it afloat.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose that is working to great advantage.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is working fairly well, and is good for this year.

Mr. BENNETT. The Minister referred to the construction of some boats at Sorel. Last year the old tug "Trudeau," with the barge "Challenge," had the machinery taken out of her, and I understood that a new tug was being constructed at Sorel. Is that correct?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My officers inform me that we have a tug under construction at Sorel to take the place of the tug "Trudeau." It is not yet completed, but it will be completed in a month.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. I would like to know if we are to expect anything in the Estimates this year for the improvement of St. Andrew's Rapids in the Red River?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. As my hon. friend knows, that is a subject of very great importance. I visited the place myself, and I had a careful survey made of the river. Upon that survey an estimate has been made, and, if I remember rightly, the cost of the work would amount

to $600,000. Of course Parliament would pause before engaging in such a large expenditure. At the same time I recognize the great importance of the work. Several deputations have called upon me and made representations in regard to it; and we have before us now a suggestion, which was made by some members of Parliament, especially by the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Jameson), but I could not promise anything for this year.

Public Buildings at Ottawa—Towards reconstruction of portion of Western Departmental Block, destroyed by fire, 11th February, 1897..... $50,000

Mr. FOSTER. We would like a full history of everything done.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. As hon. gentlemen know, the work is not yet completed. I am aware that a good deal of comment has been made on the fact that the work is progressing very slowly.

Mr. FOSTER. So slowly that it has become a joke for the end men in the minstrel shows.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The reason we are not more advanced is that we have called for tenders for the iron structure. Fortier & Godbout got the contract at the price of $20,000. They gave the work to the Hamilton Iron Works of Hamilton. They were to have completed the work by the 1st of April, but although we have been calling on them every day, we have not been able to make them go quicker. That is the reason for the delay. The work of restoring the building, repairing the chimneys and walls, etc., has progressed favourably. It is first-class work, done under the supervision of the chief architect himself. We have spent so far $116,000. Out of the $32,000 that we had after 1896-97 and out of the vote of last year of $100,000 we have spent $116,000 up to date. I understand that the total amount of work will represent in round numbers $200,000. The balance of the work consists of the iron structure, which, as I have said, is under contract. My hon. friend wants complete details. I have them under my hand. Total expenditure from 11th February, 1897, to 1st of February, 1898, clearing away debris, taking down portions of the wall, &c., $84,055.16. Amount required to complete reconstruction of the walls, doors, chimneys, stone-cutting, &c., 31st June, 1898, $32,924.20. Contract for steel roof, $20,000; terra cotta for walls, $7,637.50; laying the terra cotta, and so on, $3,000; concrete between joists, &c., $1,135.80. The works, when completed, will probably cost about $200,000, according to the estimate of the chief architect.

Mr. WALLACE. Did you charge any of that to the Hull election fund?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I never heard in my life of any such election fund. I am both surprised and scandalized at the hon. gentleman's suggestion.

Mr. FOSTER. It is just the different sections that my hon. friend has heard of—not the hull. What is the date at which my hon. friend thinks this will be finished?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The chief architect expects that the whole work will be completed by the end of September. We had a great deal of work to do. Hon. gentlemen who have experience in the restoring of buildings seriously damaged by fire know what work that involves. You start out with the idea that you have very little work to do, but you find that when you pick out a stone twenty-five come down.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that a correct statement?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. What?

Mr. FOSTER. That wherever a stone is picked out, twenty-five come down.

Mr. POPE. I would like to know from the hon. Minister if they intend to pick out any more stones?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I only wish that my hon. friend's opposite would pick out a little fewer ones to throw at me.

Mr. FOSTER. Is this being done by day work?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Mostly. The chief architect, who is a very experienced officer, supervises the work himself and has employed the best men he could find. I did not interfere at all. The work has been carried on very successfully indeed, and is well done.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Are the men employed working hard?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think that the chief architect of Public Works to-day is an officer able to handle men. He began himself at the very foot of the ladder as a workman, and reached the position he has to-day by his own hard work. I am glad to have the opportunity of paying him the compliment of saying that I have learned to have full confidence in him. He is an old officer, has been in the department twenty-five years or more, and I have found him most faithful and efficient.

Mr. McDOUGALL. The place of that officer is not outside, but rather in the office, is it not?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. His office is very near the works. I know that the chief architect goes on the works

every day and several times a day. He is a very capable man.

Mr. FOSTER. Is the work of pulling down and refacing the wall that is now going on being done by contract?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, it could not be done by contract. The chief architect saw that the walls were falling and directed that the rebuilding should take place.

Mr. WALLACE. Was the work of plastering done by contract or by day's work?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend will agree that, in a building like that, it is not possible to do such work by contract. A piece of the wall gives away here or there, and it is impossible to estimate what is necessary to be done. When a building has been damaged by fire and water it is out of the question to make repairs by contract.

Mr. FOSTER. At page Q—56 of the Auditor General's Report begins the general repairs pay-lists. Does that include the men employed on this Western Block?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That has reference to the general repairs which, as my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) knows, are going on all the time. This comes out of the item of about $75,000. It was $100,000 or something like that formerly.

Mr. FOSTER. There are enough men here to make an army to invade Cuba.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) was Minister of Finance for a long time——

Mr. FOSTER. But I never saw so many names on such a list before.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman is exaggerating the facts, if he will allow he to say so without offence. It certainly did take a great many men as the building was half destroyed and a great deal of dirt and rubbish had to be cleared away. On account of the fire, I must agree, we had to employ a great number of men. I was surprised myself at the length of time occupied.

Public Buildings, Nova Scotia—	
Halifax Drill Hall (lapsed amount)....	$18,000
Kentville Public Buildings.....	5,000
Liverpool Public Buildings.....	5,000

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The first item is a revote to build the Halifax drill hall, which is now under contract. I am informed that the work will be completed by the end of the year.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What has been done on the Kentville post office?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Nothing has been done so far. The proposal is not a new one. The building was applied for five or six years ago under the administration of which my hon. friend (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) was a member.

Mr. FOSTER. When was the vote brought down?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In 1897-98, I think.

An hon. MEMBER. What is the population of Kentville?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In 1891 the population was 2,526.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What is the estimated expense of the building?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Between $15,000 and $18,000.

Mr. WALLACE. Does that include the site?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, and fittings—the whole building complete.

Mr. WALLACE. I remember that that was brought up last year and it was regarded by many hon. members as an unjustifiable vote, and I think the House divided on that item and the one following it. But the statement was not then made that the building would cost $18,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If my hon. friend (Mr. Wallace) would refer to the "Hansard" I do not think he would find that I made any estimate of the work last year. No plans were then prepared.

Mr. WALLACE. Surely the hon. Minister did not call for an appropriation without having any plans.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend has more experience than that would indicate. You often ask for a vote of Parliament without having any plans, especially when you do not ask for the whole amount. You only want enough to buy the site and start work.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Of course it is a complete change of base for the hon. gentleman (Mr. Tarte) to advocate this building for a place of the population he has given. Still, personally, I am very glad to see Kentville receiving attention of this kind, because it is a centre of a very important county and a fine country, and the mere statement of population does not indicate the amount of business transacted there, I am quite certain that there are many places in Canada that have received this attention that would not be able to show as much business done as Kentville.

Mr. FOSTER. As the one in the following vote, for instance.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Liverpool is a flourishing place. Will this

Kentville public building include custom-house, &c. ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We are not going to build only a post office, of course, but a public building as it is usually understood.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Has the site been obtained ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Not yet.

SIR CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Does the hon. Minister know what he will have to pay for the site ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have no estimate yet and no site is recommended.

Mr. TAYLOR. What is the revenue at Kentville ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The postal revenue in 1896-97 was $4,659.62 ; custom duties collected, $23,405.06 ; money orders issued and paid, $41,583.07 ; value of exports, $74,102 ; value of imports, $118,849.

Mr. WALLACE. The Minister has included in the customs revenue, the revenue from half a dozen other places.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Well, I have just read the figures prepared for me by my officials, the same as is done in every other department.

Mr. FOSTER. What has been done on the next building ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have bought the site for $1,600. The site is 100 x 60, that is for Liverpool. The population of Liverpool in 1891 was 2,465, and the postal revenue last year was $2,202.

Mr. FOSTER. I want to know whether this is going to be followed by a full-fledged building in that little town ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The plans which have been prepared are for a building costing between $15,000 and $16,000, including land, furniture and everything.

Mr. WALLACE. I would like to hear from the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) about these two items, because last year he asked us to vote against this appropriation, which we did with great pleasure. A few years ago this House declared its opinion that small places were not entitled to have public buildings, and since that time that rule has been fairly well observed. This seems to be going back to the principle condemned in the past by Parliament. We now find that $16,000 in one case and $18,000 in another are to be voted for buildings in these hamlets.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Order.

Mr. WALLACE. At any rate, they are small places whose population would not justify the erection of public buildings of this kind.

Mr. McMULLEN. It is quite true I opposed the appropriation last year, and moved that it should be struck out. I am opposed to the erection of public buildings in places of this size where the revenue is so limited. At the same time, the site has been bought in this case, and last year the committee voted $5,000. I earnestly hope that the Estimats this year will not contain another single appropriation for a public building where the population is as limited and where the revenue is limited as they are in this case. If the Estimates do contain such appropriations, I shall certainly oppose them. Last year there was a kind of understanding come to that these appropriations given in violation of the principle laid down before, should be dropped. I accept that contract, and I am willing to allow this to go in the face of that distinct understanding come to last year. But if in any other case the rule is violated, I shall be glad to join my hon. friends in voting against it.

Mr. McDOUGALL. But the Minister says the site is not bought in the case of the Kentville building.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman who has just sat down has an awkward record on this subject, while I am at liberty to hope that these appropriations will not stop. Liverpool and Kentville are entitled to the consideration that every other part of Canada has received. Besides, these places have the good fortune at present to be represented by Ministers : The Minister of Finance speaks for Liverpool, and the Minister of Militia and Defence for Kentville. But the member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) is not here, and I want to say a word for Guysborough. I hope that is not to be left out, and I trust that the Ministers from Nova Scotia will resist the pressure from the member for North Wellington. I think they won't have much difficulty, from what we see. The hon. gentleman has not made a very successful fight against these two items which he tackled last session. So long as the Ministers have made such progress in spite of all that he says, I trust they will gradually carry this policy out, and that all the counties of Nova Scotia, at any rate, will be provided for.

Mr. McMULLEN. I claim to be just as consistent as my hon. friend, and more so. Last year I stated, as I state now, that there was an understanding come to that this should be the last instance of violation of the principles laid down years before.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. McMULLEN. Well, I understood it so, that no appropriation should be voted

for the construction of public buildings in a place with only 2,000 population, and where the postal revenue is only $2,000. If there is any appropriation of that kind proposed, it will meet with my determined opposition. We have got to establish a principle. There was a principle established years ago for which every man in this House voted, Sir John A. Macdonald accepted the proposition himself. It was then agreed that in the erection of public buildings the claims of the place to consideration should be regarded, and they were to be erected only where the revenue showed a surplus, or justified the money being invested. If we had taken that course, the town of Woodstock, where there is a revenue of $16,000 a year, would have a post office, whereas it has none now. I contend that is a good rule, which should be carried out. If you are going to depart from that rule, I can draw the attention of the Minister of Public Works to other places in my riding where the amount is double the amount received in Liverpool; and simply because I respect the principle that was then adopted by this House, I have not asked that that principle should be broken. Last year, as I said before, there was a kind of consent given that this should be the last of this thing, and in face of that fact I am willing to allow it to pass.

Mr. CHARLTON. I hope the Government will take note of the fact that there seems to be a rather sinister anxiety on the part of hon. gentlemen on the opposite side, that this policy should be continued. I think it will serve the interests of our hon. friends opposite very effectually to do so, and that is worth considering. It is always a safe thing to avoid pleasing your enemy. The appeals of my hon. friend from Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) and other hon. gentlemen opposite, are appeals to which I trust our friends upon the Ministerial benches will have the wisdom to turn deaf ears.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I hope the Minister of Militia and Defence will not forget to provide a drill-shed in Cape Breton, notwithstanding the threats of the hon. member for North Wellington. This is a matter which was laid before his attention some time ago.

Mr. BAIN. I thought they were all warriors from that country who did not need any drilling. Now, on this question I would like to say a word on behalf of the ordinary citizen who has to bear the burden, not being specially interested in a public building in my county, nor in any other county. I want to ask the people's representatives, what advantage it is to any town to spend $15,000 or $20,000 of public money on a post office when, for $200 or $300 a year, you can find accommodation just as efficient, just as central, and as useful for the public service. You are borrowing money upon which you pay interest, you have to hire a man to take care of that building, all of which expenditure lands on the public treasury. And for what purpose? To enable the inhabitants of the town to say: The Government have erected a nice building here, they have spent so much public money, and we have spent so much a year to keep it up. Is that business?

Mr. McDOUGALL. No. Business is business.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. And your business is very small now.

Mr. BAIN. The hon. member for Wellington is on the right track, and I hope my hon. friend will continue to remind the House that we are spending the people's money, and I say unhesitatingly that we are spending it to serious disadvantage in putting up a building under these circumstances.

Mr. BENNETT. I remember five or six years ago, on the occasion of a grant being proposed to the Laprairie post office, that hon. gentlemen opposite, then on this side of the House, kept the House sitting the whole night while they protested against that expenditure. And the loudest probably in denunciation of that vote was the present Minister of Trade and Commerce. I think no words of mine and no arguments I could put forward would be half so strong and forcible as the language used on the occasion of that grant, which was about on all fours with this for the Liverpool post office. I ask the attention of hon. gentlemen because every word uttered by the hon. gentleman applies with double force to this case, because hon. gentlemen opposite are to-day making an appropriation for a similar undertaking. Speaking on May 18th, 1892, Sir Richard Cartwright made use of the following language in regard to the Laprairie post office grant:

> It appears to me that this is a most monstrous and disgraceful job. We are asked to spend $16,000, costing us in interest at least $640 a year, for the accommodation of a post office of which the total revenue is $433. We will have in addition to provide the salary of the postmaster, the fuel and light, the repairs, and, as we are our own insurers, something should be allowed for that. So that to collect a revenue of $433, the country is going to be saddled with an annual charge of $1,400 or perhaps more. There will be $400 for the salary of the postmaster, $640 interest on the money spent in the building, and at least $400 will go to fuel and light and caretaker, so that it will cost $1,400 a year to erect a building for the lodging of a post office with a revenue of only $433. I think it is a scandalous proceeding and that this should be struck out forthwith. I do not feel that there can be any possible excuse for this expenditure, except as a deliberate bribe to the electors.

I have looked up the revenue in this case and it will be about $900 a year. The remarks of the hon. gentleman will apply, no doubt, with full force to the Minister of Finance, and when he goes to this consti-

tuency on the next occasion, he will feel that he is being criticised by the Minister of Trade and Commerce as one deliberately bribing the constituency in order to secure his election.

I should like to hear from the Minister if there is any possible reason he can give except that which I have alleged, for the expenditure of $1,400 a year for the accommodation of a post office of which the total revenue is a little over $400.

The hon. member for Huntingdon (Mr. Scriver) made a strong protest, but as he does not say a great deal in the House one way or the other now, I will not quote from his remarks. But there is one gentleman who is blatant in his professions about expenditures, the Postmaster General, and he on that occasion was even more wrathy than the Minister of Trade and Commerce. He said :

I ask the Minister of Public Works if he can stand up before the people and say that he considers this public work in Laprairie is necessary in the public interest.

Now, I will ask the hon. Minister of Public Works if he thinks this Liverpool post office is a work in the interest of the public ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Certainly.

Mr. BENNETT. That is the difference between the Minister of Public Works of the present day and the then Minister of Public Works, and I am proud to say that the Minister of Public Works at that time had not the effrontery to stand up and unblushingly support a proposition of that kind. Then the present Postmaster General said :

There is not a Minister of the Crown to-day, from the Minister of Justice down, who raises his voice before this Parliament in defence of the country, but, one and all, they seem to be engaged in the crime of looting the treasury.

It is to be regretted that the present Postmaster General is not here to-night in order to back up some of the hon. gentlemen who are stalwarts, and I am glad to say that the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Bain) put in a word for the county as against what the Postmaster General was pleased to call the "looters of the public treasury." It is true the hon. member for North Wellington has made a promise, but it is not a promise the country wants at this time, it is a performance. Let me commend these words uttered by the Postmaster General to some hon. gentlemen opposite :

You cannot do a better service to a Government, if you are truly loyal to it, than to check it in wrong-doing, nor can you do a better service to the country than bring the Government back to right principles. Unfortunately, public opinion in Canada has been so debauched that we know we are speaking to many deaf ears.

This is rather prophetic language, and it is more applicable to-day than it was then. The hon. gentleman proceeded to say :

But I hope there will be some in this House behind the Government sufficiently independent to condemn a transaction of this kind, which is so disgraceful in itself that the Minister of Public Works will not dare to tell the people of Canada that it is necessary in the public interest.

Then the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) got indignant that night too, and I will quote from his language. He said :

This is a businesslike transaction, indeed. Is this something that really commends itself to hon. gentlemen over there, who charge me with obstruction when I oppose it ? I am glad I am obstructing ; I want to be considered an obstructionist of everthing of that character. I wonder that the hon. member for Laprairie (Mr. Pelletier) does not get up and defend this vote. He apparently has got too much good sense to do that. There are other places in his riding, I believe, larger than Laprairie, and if he defends this vote he is going to get into trouble with other places, unless he gets post offices for them. What a position for the Government of the Dominion—going around and peddling the public money like a lot of hucksters for the purpose of gaining support ; building a post office in order to buy votes.

I cannot help but think that after the lapse of five years and with the goal of his future preferment in sight, I mean something hgher than the present worldly position, he will be more virtuously honest than he was then. I expect that before this item passes he will tell the Minister of Finance that it appears as if the Government is spending the money of the people going about peddling the public money like a lot of hucksters to build post offices in order to gain support. As the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) said :

Where a clear case can be shown that they are bartering away public money for the purpose of gaining political support, they should be dealt with by the courts if their own supporters have not honesty enough to deal with them in this House.

One thing to be said in defence of this little post office is that the code of morals in that country is lamentably low. How is the average elector in that riding to be asked to view public appropriations, or asked to appeal to the Government. The ordinary elector in that riding is told that he must never look up to those in authority because he cannot expect anything from them, for in that riding they, in their innocence, elected a gentleman who thought the only reason of his election was that he was one better than themselves. And yet they found that Mr. Forbes profited by his position, and he transferred his seat in Parliament for a judgeship, which he now enjoys.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. He was first appointed a tide waiter.

Mr. BENNETT. The code of morals is low in that riding, as proven by the fact that in the case of Mr. Forbes, for the reason that it was a doubtful question whe-

ther he was fit to be a judge, the Government made him simply a tide waiter. I am not sufficiently acquainted with the duties of a tide waiter to know whether they require a judicial ken or not, but I do know that after Mr. Forbes had served a certain length of time as a tide waiter he was promoted to a judgeship. I am pleased to see that the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) has come in. I know that the hon. gentleman has a memory that never lapses, one that we might all envy, and I will quote for his benefit a speech made by him when the House was asked to vote a sum of money under exactly similar circumstances to this. On the 18th of May, 1892, referring to a similar vote in this House, the Minister (Sir Richard Cartwright) said:

It appears to me that this is a most monstrous and disgraceful job.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That sounds familiar.

Mr. BENNETT. He continued:

I should like to hear from the Minister if there is any possible reason that he can give, except that which I have alleged, for the expenditure of $1,400 a year for the accommodation of a post office whose total revenue is a little over $400. I think it is a scandalous proceeding, and that the vote should be struck out forthwith. I do not see that there can be any possible excuse for it, except as a deliberate bribe to the electors of Laprairie, in violation of the rules laid down by this House, in violation of every proper rule which ought to govern the proceedings of Parliament.

The Minister of Trade and Commerce is certainly consistent, and I expect that he will forthwith rise in his place and move that this item be struck out on the ground that it is "a most monstrous and disgraceful job," and in addition to that, "that it is a violation of every proper rule which ought to govern the proceedings of Parliament." I understand that in this case the site for the public building has already been purchased. It is not too late to stop now. Surely if the site is worth purchasing some one will be found to purchase it back again, and even though they lose something by the transaction, the Government had better do that than go to this enormous expenditure. That is what the Minister of Trade and Commerce recommended in the case of the Laprairie post office. There is to be a building erected at Liverpool, the interest on the cost of which will be $600 a year, and may I ask the Minister (Mr. Tarte) will he appoint a caretaker.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. When it is built, of course it will have to be taken care of.

Mr. BENNETT. Then there will be $400 for the salary of a caretaker, an allowance, at a low estimate, of $100 a year for repairs, and so we are erecting a building at a cost of $1,200 a year to the people of Canada, when, as the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Bain) stated, the Government could easily in the same town obtain suitable premises for $100 or $200 a year. This is simply a bribe to the constituency. This is a monstrous and disgraceful job—if the Minister of Trade and Commerce will allow me to borrow his words—and it is all the more disgraceful because there has been an enormous amount of looting of the treasury going on in the different departments—to borrow the language of the Postmaster General. The Minister of Trade and Commerce will remember that this is the constituency in which the member-elect traded his membership in the House for a position on the bench.

An hon. MEMBER. Tide waiter.

Mr. BENNETT. Oh, that was simply a waiting spell for him, a kind of purgatory he was put through to fit him for better things. Where is this going to stop? Every other member on that side will want a post office.

An hon. MEMBER. Every other Minister.

Mr. BENNETT. But there are no more Ministers to be satisfied. The Minister of Militia (Mr. Borden) has his post office, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) is to have his, and what is to be done for the rank and file from the province of Nova Scotia. These gentlemen will say to the Ministers: covered as you are by all the prestige of Ministers of the Crown, surely you cannot expect us to carry our ridings without a post office, and especially since you yourselves began the looting of the public treasury. I ask the Minister of Public Works if he will now give us assurance that no more public buildings will be erected in Nova Scotia?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Oh, no.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am very sorry to hear that my hon. friend (Mr. Bennett) and those around him make so much opposition to the very small grants that this Government is giving to the fair province of Nova Scotia.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We do not want to be unfair. Other provinces of this great Dominion have been so well treated by the late Government that this Government intends to be fair to Nova Scotia. It happens for the time being that Queen's County is very well represented indeed. It is not a crime for a county to be represented by a Minister, and it is no reason why it should be excluded from public favours. If my hon. friends were fair they would admit that they erected many

public buildings and post offices. I quite agree with the view that we should not build public buildings in too many small towns, for, as Minister of Public Works, I see every day that these buildings cost us a great deal of money. On the other hand, while being economical, we must be fair and just. A public building costing $10,000 or $15,000 will be looked upon by a town of 2,000 or 3,000 people as a great public favour. It seems to me that on this occasion my hon. friends are a little unfair. Nearly every county represented by a supporter of the late Government was given a public building. I say again, I do not think we should build too many of these public buildings.

Mr. FOSTER. How many, for instance ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Just enough to be fair.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I am, of course, not opposing this vote for Liverpool ; but the Minister of Finance represents two important towns in his riding, Liverpool is the shire town of Queen's, and Shelburne is the shire town of the other half of his riding, and I want to know what about Shelburne ? Was there no pressure for a public building there ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Everything comes to one who knows how to wait.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Will the hon. gentleman tell me whether that has been pressed on his attention ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will give it my best consideration.

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. Minister said that the lot was 100 feet by 60 feet. Which is the frontage ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I understand that it is a corner lot.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Where is it ? The Minister of Finance can tell.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is on the Main street of Liverpool. It is a corner lot.

Mr. HUGHES. How may streets in the place ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Oh, many.

Mr. BENNETT. As the hon. gentleman is going to erect a building at a place where he can rent suitable premises for $100 a year, and is going to place against that an annual expenditure of $1,200 a year, let it be remembered that there are a great many towns in the province of Ontario of much greater importance than Liverpool ; and as the Minister of Public Works has announced that the policy of justice is to be carried out, I hope he will be just all round. But we may take this consolation, that after all the tales of blue ruin which we have heard in a wayside country village in Nova Scotia land is worth $26 a foot, which is not bad considering all we have been told about the depression that has existed in that part of the Dominion.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Who owns the lot ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think it belongs to what is called the Rees estate.

Mr. McMILLAN. With regard to the building of this post office, I wish to say that the town of Seaforth in my riding has a population of over 3,000, and the postal revenue is $4,800 or $4,900. Last year application was made for a new post office, and we could not get it. The postmaster had to repair the post office at an expense of $1,500, and all he gets for rent, light and fuel is $200 a year. I hold that it is an injustice to build post offices in small places like this, and let places like Seaforth stand aside.

Mr. BENNETT. I think all on this side of the House can come to the assistance of the hon. member who has just taken his seat, and point out the great injustice which the riding he represents is suffering under. The postal revenue of the town of Seaforth is in round numbers $5,000, while that of Liverpool is $2,200. The riding the hon. member represents is a riding that deserves a great deal of consideration at the hands of hon. gentlemen opposite, particularly from the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright). When that hon. gentleman was once driven by a relentless fate out of a riding, I think the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan) vacated his seat, and the Minister of Trade and Commerce found there temporarily a resting place for his feet.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Which foot ?

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. gentleman always lights on both feet. But there is one town of Ontario which deserves a great deal of consideration, especially from the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson). A few years ago that hon. Minister was hard pressed in an election in North Grey, and among the many promises he made on that occasion, one was that the town of Owen Sound should have a post office. Let me call the attention of the Minister of Public Works to the fact that while this little town of Liverpool, with a revenue of $2,200, is to have a magnificent post office building, the town of Owen Sound, which accepted the Minister of Customs when he had been spurned in his own riding has an income of nearly $12,000, and has no post office building. Let me appeal to the hon. Minister of Public Works whether he thinks it right, under these circumstances, that Owen Sound should be dis-

regarded, while Liverpool is selected for this favour. May I ask him if he will consider the claims of Owen Sound? I know that it is diffidence and bashfulness on the part of the Minister of Customs that prevents him from asking, and so in his interest I would ask that the promise be kept in the Supplementary Estimates.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. What I said a moment ago applies to Owen Sound as to every other place: everything comes to those who know how to wait. There is already a large Government expenditure at Owen Sound, and it will no doubt be all right in time.

Mr. BENNETT. The diffidence of hon. gentlemen opposite compels me to come to the assistance of some of them. I know it is only due to their inate bashfulness that they have not asked for grants. The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) has in his constituency the large and flourishing town of Mount Forest, with a postal revenue of $4,400. Is that to be cast to one side, when Liverpool, with an income of $2,000, is to have a post office?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If my hon. friend and those who surround him advise me to put in the Supplementary Estimates a vote for every town in Quebec, Ontario and the other provinces, I shall be very glad indeed to meet their wishes.

Mr. BENNETT. No, but we are asking that the most deserving cases should be met.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Will my hon. friend give me a list of those?

Mr. BENNETT. We are asking particularly on behalf of gentlemen who, but for their modesty, would ask it themselves. Since the hon. Minister will not promise any thing this year, I would ask him to take a note for next year of Owen Sound, Seaforth, and, last but not least, Mount Forest, and keep them before him.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Has the hon. gentleman done anything in connection with the buildings destroyed by fire in Windsor, N.S.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We are repairing the walls and intend asking for tenders for the balance of the work. As to the drill shed, we propose to rebuild it, and the item will be in the Supplementary Estimates.

Mr. McMULLEN. As far as Nova Scotia is concerned, there appears to have been a weakness in past years, on the part of Ministers from that province, in seeking to get special grants for their own ridings. I notice that the ex-Minister of Justice (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) did everything he could to get post offices in his riding. He got New Glasgow a post office that cost $37,000, when the revenue was insignificant. He got one built in Pictou that cost over $20,000. He certainly exercised all the influence he could, whether just or unjust, to get public buildings in his own riding. I hope that we have put an end to the hawking around for political purposes of public buildings, and that we will follow up the principle which we laid down last year when we turned over a new leaf. As far as my riding is concerned, the people are patriotic enough and patient enough, and have sufficient confidence in the present Government to wait until their turn comes to get a post office. I am grateful to the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) for drawing attention to the fact that the revenue has largely increased in Mount Forest, and I believe it will get a post office when the time comes. I hope that the principle which was laid down last session will be carried out. We came to a definite understanding then, and while I am willing that the items now proposed should pass, I am quite sure they will be the last of this kind.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) reminded me—I am very glad he did—of a portion of the county of Pictou which deserves a great deal of consideration and will press upon the hon. Minister of Public Works, in the strongest manner possible, the consideration of Westville. It is one of the most important mining centres in Nova Scotia, and a very large amount of business is done there. I do not know what the postal returns are, but the hon. Minister of Customs will know; he has had to appoint extra officers in connection with the port of New Glasgow, especially at Westville, owing to the great development of business at that point.

Mr. HUGHES. I might take this opportunity of drawing the attention of the Minister of Public Works to the fact that in the riding I have the honour to represent, there is a village as large and thrifty as Liverpool, whose postal revenue is as large, and which has not got a new post office. I refer to the village of Fenelon Falls, which is very much in need of a post office, and I trust that when the Supplementary Estimates come down—or possibly we could wait another year—the hon. Minister will give this place his serious consideration and have a post office erected there.

Mr. POPE. I am very glad that the hon. Minister of Public Works has asked hon. gentlemen on this side to furnish him with opportunities for constructing public buildings. As it is well known that he is our representative in the Government, having been selected to represent in the Cabinet the Conservative element of this country, he has done nothing more than I should have expected of him, and it is with great pleasure I find that not only outside but inside the House he is true to the position he occupies, and we have the right to expect

something from him. He is asking us to do a thing that I do not think he can wish us to do too long, and that is to wait. He says that all things come to him who waits. Now, our leader in the Government (Hon. Mr. Tarte) did not wait until all things came to him, but went and met those things, and as a result of the meeting, he finds himself favourably situated on the other side. Under the circumstances, I would like to represent to him the claims of the town of Megantic in Compton—a very important flourishing place, the last town on the Canadian Pacific Railway, towards the State of Maine, and having a large customs business. I am sure that these people would be pleased to have a public building, and I think it is in the public interest that a building should be constructed there. But I must take exception to the hon. Minister's saying that it is not a crime to belong to the Ministry. I am beginning to think, when the places mentioned to-night, whose representatives are in the Cabinet, are preferred to the places of greater importance, represented by supporters of the Government, there must be a little crime attached to a Cabinet portfolio. The pleasant little scoff which the hon. Minister casts at this side about dealing in small matters, should have been addressed to his own colleagues. The quotations given from the speeches of the Postmaster General and the Minister of Trade and Commerce should have impressed themselves upon the mind of the Minister of Public Works, and instead of looking at us, he should have cast his eyes on his colleagues and have severely punished them, in some way or other, for having put him in this awkward position. I think also that the member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) now that the Minister of Public Works has intimated that he intends to continue his good work from time to time, that he intends to listen to the appeals made by his supporters on this side of the House, as they offer names of towns worthy of consideration, the hon. member for North Wellington must see that his future is not a happy and a bright one on the other side. And he must expect, from time to time, to face, as a supporter of the Government the same issue that he had to face when he was on this side of the House. And, while he says—and no doubt he is frank and honest in all his utterances—that he is prepared to support this particular item because he believes it to be the last, it is to be noted that he said that before the Minister of Public Works took the House into his confidence and asked us to give him the names of places which could be favourably considered for public buildings. Under these circumstances, I do not see any comfortable resting place for the hon. member for North Wellington on the other side of the House. And as there is a disposition on this side to accept anything and everything that the Government is willing to give us, I do not see that there is any chance for him to come to this side. Therefore, while we should all regret to see the hon. gentleman leave the House, I do not see any future for him in politics, unless he can find some comfortable quarters, at Regina let us say, where he can rest until all the public buildings are constructed and the Minister of Public Works has rewarded his friends on this side of the House as he has promised to do. Of course, for the remainder of the session we will draw it very mild for the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) and endeavour to squirm him through. But we can hardly promise, when so prominent a man as the Minister of Public Works has promised to consider cases we lay before him, to make things quite to suit the hon. gentleman, and I am sure, we should all regret to see him occupy an uncomfortable seat. Again, I wish to impress on the Minister of Public Works the importance of the town of Megantic and to express the hope that I may see in the Supplementary Estimates an appropriation for a building there second to none outside the large cities.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am sure I am grateful to the hon. gentleman for his sympathetic reference to myself. I endeavoured to do my duty when I was on that side of the House, and I shall endeavour to do the same on this side. With regard to the town my hon. friend (Mr. Pope) has made his appeal for, I do not find the name of Megantic in the post office list at all. The hon. member for Pictou makes an appeal on behalf of a town in his riding, the postal receipts of which are a little over $1,700, and yet he is lecturing the Finance Minister for having asked for the erection of a post office in Liverpool, where the receipts are over $2,000. But I do not find any information about the town of Megantic, not even the name.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Agnes is the name on the list.

Mr. McMULLEN. Turning to the figures for Agnes post office, I find that the receipts reached the magnificent total of $671.90.

Mr. FOSTER. There is a good chance for growth there.

Mr. McMULLEN. A very good chance. I think we have an understanding as regards this matter now, and I hope the item will be carried.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I should like to remind the hon. member for North Wellington of one thing with reference to what he said concerning New Glasgow. The customs revenue of New Glasgow last year was $24,913. In Liverpool, for which the hon. gentleman is now assisting the Finance Minister to obtain a public building, the customs revenue was $4,704.

Mr. FLINT. But how about Westville ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Westville would be considerably in advance of Liverpool, though I do not wish to prejudice the claim of that town. I am supporting, as well as I can, this praiseworthy effort of the Minister of Finance to get a public building for Liverpool. But I venture to tell the hon. gentleman that this method of criticism will lead him into all sorts of trouble. I would suggest that he should adopt a better method than a mere quotation of these returns. For instance, Westville had a postal revenue of only $1,700. But the customs receipts come high, and it is not merely a post office that Westville wants, but a place to accommodate the Customs Department, the inland revenue, the post office, &c. Kentville shows up well with a custom revenue of over $19,000 for last year.

Mr. McALISTER. Claims have been made on behalf of a number of towns where post offices have not yet been built, and I think I can justly put in a claim for the town of Campbellton, as it is a more important town than a number of those named. We find that in Kentville last year the gross post office revenue was $4,659, and the total amount of money orders issued $23,456. The gross postal revenue in Liverpool was $2,202.06, and the money orders issued $20,394.40. I find that there is an appropriation for a post office in Montmagny, in the province of Quebec, where the gross postal revenue was only $1,750.54, and the money orders issued $10,215.90. Now, in the town of Campbellton in the county of Restigouche, which I have the honour to represent, the gross postal revenue was $3,377.86 last year, and the money orders issued $31,532.42. Now, if it is going to be the policy of the Government to have post offices erected in these places—a policy I do not pretend to criticise at all—I think that, taking all the circumstances into consideration the town of Campbellton should have an appropriation for a public office. The Minister of Public Works said that everything came to him who waited. I can do nothing but wait patiently, but I would ask the Minister of Public Works to take it into his favourable consideration, and if he cannot put the town of Campbellton an appropriation in the Supplementary Estimates this year, let it appear in the Main Estimates next year.

Mr. POPE. The hon. member for North Wellington has asked me to discover the post office in my county. Of course he will understand without the use of a geography or anything like that, I would know the location of the most important town in my own county. He speaks of the post office of Agnes, which is a little village across the river in the county of Beauce, but practically a part of the town of Lake Megantic. The post office of Lake Megantic is separate from that of Agnes, but if a public building were erected at Megantic one post office would supply both places, as they are separated only by a narrow river. Lake Megantic is a growing town.

I am astonished that after the effort that has been made on this side of the House to make the hon. member for North Wellington feel comfortable in the position he occupies, he should take an opportunity to prejudice the Minister of Public Works against the town of Lake Megantic. That town is not as large as the city of Montreal, but it is a growing place, a great centre, and has a great future before it, in fact, it is the largest town in my county. Being an old personal friend and of course an old political friend of the Minister of Public Works, I felt that I could depend upon his favourable consideration for this town.

Mr. POWELL. The fact occurred to me this evening that the first time I had the pleasure of listening to hon. gentlemen in this House was in 1891, when an estimate for the Farnham post office was under discussion. I remember particularly the very bold stand taken by the present leading Government whip, by the present Minister of Justice, by the present Minister of Customs, and I must say I was thoroughly in sympathy with the arguments that they adduced. I remember how this room fairly rang with denunciations of Tory corruption and attempts to bribe constituencies. The first speaker on that occasion, I find by "Hansard," in leading the attack, was the present member for North Wellington:

> Mr. McMULLEN. What is the amount of the receipts?
>
> Mr. FOSTER. The postal revenue is about $2,000.

The hon. member for North Wellington led off in the attack, and his language was vigorous indeed. He says, as reported on page 6202:

> I have not lost an opportunity since I have become a member of this House to draw its attention to the impropriety of erecting public buildings at places where the revenues are so exceedingly limited as they are at the town which my hon. friend represents.

I ask the House to remember that the revenue of the Farnham post office was about the same as that of the Liverpool post office. He goes on to say:

> He says it has increased in population. I am glad that it has, and I am sorry so many towns have decreased. But the point at issue is not the increase of population but the respective business to be done. There are a hundred places in Canada where the money order transactions are four or five times what they are at this place, where the revenues are three times greater, where the rent paid is more than double, and where there are no post office buildings. Will hon. gentlemen opposite explain why this discrimination is made? My hon. friend says it is not for political purposes. I would like to know then what it is for—why the Government have

thought it wise, out of the whole Dominion, to select the little town of Farnham and decide to build a post office there ?

Afterwards the present Minister of Customs spoke strongly indeed. One paragraph I will quote, referring to the estimate for the Farnham post office. He said :

But votes such as this are sure to call forth comment when places in my constituency, and notably in the constituency of Oxford, are found unprovided with public buildings, though their claims are much greater than many places to which public buildings are given. The Government do not act on principles of equity, and leave their conduct open to the imputation that it is governed by other motives than a desire to promote the public welfare.

The present Government whip also spoke very vigorously and very well :

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I am bound to accept the statement of the hon. member for Missisquoi that he had nothing to do with the obtaining of the grant, but that it was given on the petition of the Board of Trade and council of the town. But a few sessions ago this House adopted unanimously, with the consent of the Government, a resolution laying down the principle that appropriations for the erection of public buildings should depend on the amount of revenue derived.

But the gentleman who, I think, indulged in language the most vigorous, was the present Minister of Justice. He says in the course of his speech :

There are scores of places in this country where more revenue is collected, and where it would be of much greater importance to expend this money. In many places where these buildings are put up they will require caretakers, and so on, adding to the public expense, and enormously increasing the fixed expenditure without any corresponding increase in the revenue, and this is one of these places. There are places where large amounts of revenue are collected, and where it is important that public buildings should be erected in the public interest, but this is not one of those places. I say the Administration are not keeping faith with this House ; they are disregarding the principle laid down in this House, without a single dissentient voice, for the guidance of the Administration, and acquiesced in by the members of the Administration, and this House ought not to allow this item to pass without the Government taking the responsibility of asking the House to repeal the resolution adopted twelve months ago. I say, Sir, that the hon. gentlemen cannot go on in this kind of way. The day of boodling, and of commissions, and this attempting to bribe constituencies with their own money, has gone by. We can no longer tolerate it.

Again he says :

These public expenditures are made out of the moneys of the people of this country, and not out of the moneys belonging to the Administration. The hon. gentlemen sitting on the Treasury benches are the trustees of the people, and it is our business to see that that trust is fairly administered, and that the scales of justice are held evenly between all classes of the population of this country.

And again :

This policy they are pursuing now can no longer be sustained, and the people of this country shall hear of it from one end of it to the other, until these hon. gentlemen either reform their policy or retire from the positions which they occupy. They must remember that they are the trustees of the people of this country, that the moneys they are expending are not their own moneys, but moneys which belong to the people. We find large places, where there are thousands of dollars of revenue collected yearly, that are left without proper office accommodation, because they are in constituencies represented by Reformers in this House and here we find a constituency carried by the hon. gentleman from Missisquoi (Mr. Baker), in which there is a small village, and a post office yielding a revenue of a little over $1,800 a year, which is to be provided with a public building, entailing a large expense upon the people of this country, simply because it happens to be in a constituency that he represents, or that may be pretty close between the two parties.

These remarks apply particularly to the constituency of Shelburne. The reason a post office is asked is, as we know, because it is a close constituency, and represented by the Minister of Finance, who desires to entrench himself in the affections of the people. Now, the hon. member for North Wellington went further on that occasion, and read a very long list to the House of towns having a larger postal revenue than Farnham, and which were not provided with a public building. He considered it a crying evil that all these places should be passed over, and gave some of the names and I quote them :

Take Alexandria, for instance, in the county of Glengaryy, which returns $2,291.06 of receipts ; in Almonte, county of Lanark, the receipts are $4,176.26 ; Amherstburg, Essex, $2,000.34 ; Arnprior, $3,581 ; Aurora, $2,268 ; Aylmer West, $4,201 ; Blenheim, $2,529 ; Bowmanville, $4,745 ; Brussels. $2,541 ; Campbellford, $3,298 ; Carleton Place, $4,359 ; Chelsea, $2,613 ; Colborne, $2,911 ; Clinton, $4,541 ; Collingwood, $5,822 ; Deseronto, $4,142 ; Dresden, $2,278; Dunnville, $3,028; Durham, $2,066; Elora, $2,235 ; Essex Centre, $3,271 ; Exeter, $2,106 ; Forest, $2,574; Gananoque, $5,041; Glencoe, $2,335; Gravenhurst, $2,802 ; Harriston, $3,092 ; Hespeler, $2,393 ; Huntsville, $2,187 ; Ingersoll, $8,556 ; Iroquois, $2,056 ; Kincardine, $4,135 ; Leamington, $2,716 ; Lindsay, $8,091 ; Listowel, $4,129 ; Lucknow, $2,349 ; Madoc, $2,169 ; Mattawa, $2,895 ; Meaford, $3,500 ; Midland, $2,438 ; Milton West, $2,370 ; Mitchell, $3,314 ; Morrisburg, $3,888 ; Mount Forest, $3,902 ; Newmarket, $3,441 ; North Bay, $2,919 ; Norwich, $2,244 ; Norwood, $2,134 ; Oakville, $2,364 ; Oshawa, $5,433 ; Owen Sound, $9,625 ; Paisley, $2,777 ; Paris, $2,661 ; Parkdale, $5,268 ; Parkhill, $2,850 ; Petrolia, $6,113 ; Port Arthur, 4,972 ; Port Elgin, $2,181 ; Port Perry, $2,805 ; Prescott, $4,811 ; Preston, $2,156 ; Rat Portage, $2,075 ; Renfrew, $3,804 ; St. Mary's, $5,850 ; Sarnia, $8,505 ; Sault Ste. Marie, $3,548 ; Shelburne, $2,357 ; Simcoe, $5,139 ; Smith's Falls, $6,023 ; Sudbury, $2,844 ; Thorold, $2,854 ; Tilsonburg, $4,174 ; Uxbridge, $3,526 ; Trenton, $5,011 ; Wallaceburg, $2,831 ; Waterloo West, $4,263 ; Watford, $2,479 ; Welland, $3,343 ; West Toronto

Junction, $3,420 ; Whitby, $4,235 : Wingham, $3,976 ; Woodstock, $15,423 ; Yorkville, $6,277.

Only three or four out of that long list of sixty or seventy places have been supplied with post offices, and each and every one has a larger revenue than the post office at Liverpool ; so all the remarks of the present Minister of Justice apply particularly at this point. It had been hoped that the period of these extravagances had gone by, I do not hesitate to reflect on the record of the Conservative party when I feel that that record deserves censure. In New Brunswick there was a post office building erected in Sussex, which should never have been built, and another one in the town of Dalhousie, represented by my hon. friend from the county, and I have no hesitation in saying that that post office should not have been erected, although the revenue is, I believe, nearly as large as that of Liverpool. The reason I object to these votes—and I propose to take the opinion of the House on this matter at a later stage—is that such are useless expenditures of public money. Take this post office, and what do we find ? We all know there has been a large deficit in the Post Office Department, and probably there will continue to be a deficit for some time to come. Here is a post office that afforded a net revenue in aid of the public service of $1,158 ; and what do hon. gentlemen propose to do ? They propose to cut down the net revenue to a little in excess of $100. How is that to be done ? The salaries are $780. The very first thing done after the erection of a large building is to increase the salary of the postmaster. I will say nothing about that. He now receives $63.50 as commission on the money order business done there. Then there will be charges for heating, lighting and caretaking, $400. In addition there will be interest on the money at 3 per cent. $480. Then there must be an allowance, for instance, ½ per cent which is very low, $75. Altogether the charges against the revenue of that office will be $2,098.76, making those allowances, which are very reasonable. Simply by the action of the Minister of Finance this amount, in round numbers, $1,100, will be practically swept away, and this post office, which is supposed to contribute to make up the deficits occurring in adjoining country districts, will not do so, and be very little more than self-sustaining. At present the total charges against the post office are $973, as against the total revenue of $2,278. We all know the kind of place Liverpool is. There is no necessity for the proposed expensive public building. If the hon. gentleman were true to his trust, if he had the idea which the present Minister of Justice entertains, that this is a sacred trust and should be administered in the public interest and economically, the Finance Minister would not ask this appropriation. The present rental of the post office building at Liverpool is $80. Let the hon. gentleman add to that sum $120 or $125, so as to give a total rental of $200. A proposition of this kind has been made by the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Bain). For that sum a magnificent building, in view of the size of the place, could be rented, and we could retain $1,000 of surplus revenue. I will mention a place of equal importance in my own county, Shediac. For $100 the department rents a very nice flat in a brick building, and that sum covers fuel and rent. In Sackville, where there is a very large revenue collected compared with Liverpool, there was an agitation for the erection of a post office building, but I did not favour the proposition and protested against the expenditure of public money on the ground that it would be wasteful to expend the required expenditure until there was a revenue of $5,000 or $6,000 and a population of between 5,000 and 6,000 souls. The present proposal before the committee is thoroughly unjustifiable, and hon. members who decried this policy year after year when in Opposition must feel that it is against public policy to make such expenditures. No doubt they decried against these expenditures honestly, and they should not now allow themselves to be dragged in to support this proposal because the hon. Finance Minister wants to boom himself in his own constituency. A man occupying the position of the Finance Minister should be able to carry a constituency without being bolstered up by such an extravagant grant. When the proper time arrives I propose to divide the House on this item. We will take the yeas and nays now.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I declare the ayes have it.

Marysville, N.B., public building..... $8,000

Mr. COPP. What is the population and revenue ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The population is 1,339 ; I have not particulars of the revenue. It is a very interesting town and has a large factory.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. What county is that in ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is in York County, which is very well represented indeed by the ex-Minister of Finance.

Mr. FOSTER. Since the question has been asked, perhaps the Minister will tell what the arrangement is with reference to that. It is not a $16,000 building ; it is an $8,000 building.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The difficulty is that while Mr. Gibson, who owns the town, is willing to give a very long lease, he has not been willing to sell a site, but all the same I have made up my mind to go on with this building.

Mr. HUGHES. What is the population of that town ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). About 1,500.

Mr. HUGHES. Is it near Fredericton.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. About two miles.

Mr. HUGHES. A little too far to walk.

Montmagny post office, customs office, &c. $7,500

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I beg to move that this item be struck out altogether.

Mr. BENNETT. There will be an election there soon.

Mr. FOSTER. Who represents the county of Montmagny ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Mr. Choquette. The whole thing is settled now.

Mr. FOSTER. How settled ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. A building and site were bought for $5,000 and it will cost $2,000 to fit it up for a public building, so the whole amount will be spent by the 1st of July, and I ask that the item be struck out.

Mr. FOSTER. There is no extra vote ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No.

Mr. HUGHES. Is the member for the county satisfied to have this struck out ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. All our friends are satisfied.

Mr. BENNETT. $7,500 were voted last year for this post office. Does the Minister tell the House that no part of that will be expended ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Quite the reverse. The $7,500 voted last year will be spent by the 1st of July, and it is not necessary to ask for any vote this year.

Mr. BENNETT. How was that money expended ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We bought a building for $5,000, and it will require $2,500 to refit it. The whole amount, but no more, will be spent.

Mr. BENNETT. Last year there was quite a discussion in respect to this post office, and I think I am correct in saying that the Minister promised that no portion of the vote would be spent on the purchase of a building that was then erected. Was the building purchased, the one referred to last year, by the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) as a building that a mortgage was on ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The building we bought belonged to the Seminary of Quebec, and I may say that we have made an arrangement by which this new public building will not cost us a cent, because the town of Montmagny has agreed to take care of it.

Mr. FOSTER. To take care of its maintenance ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We will not have a dollar to pay for caretaking, and that is a good arrangement.

Mr. BENNETT. I was incorrect in my recollection of the matter. The following took place :

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If I do not buy a building I will certainly not spend one dollar more than I am asking now.

The amount asked for was $7,500. Now, the Minister has bought the building for $5,000, and he proposes to spend $2,500 more on it. If there is one case more glaring than another it is this one. Would it not be in the public interest that this building should be sold even at a sacrifice—because from the discussion that took place last year it appears that this building could not be sold for more than $3,000—rather than the country should spend $2,500 more to patch up an old building, which, as stated last year by a gentleman familiar with the place, is only a cottage.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The building referred to then was not the same as the building we have purchased.

Mr. BENNETT. That makes the case all the better for my argument because I assume it a much better building has been purchased and the Government will likely get a better price when they sell it. Here we are spending $7,500 for a post office in what is certainly an out-of-the-way place, where the postal revenue is only $1,750, and the population only 1,700. A little while ago, as a result of some remarks made in the House, we succeeded in making some converts. The hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Bain) spoke strong against the expenditure at Liverpool ; the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan) also demurred to that expenditure ; and we had the assurance of the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) that if we had not his vote with us, we at least had his heart. When I appeal to them in this case, which is a much stronger case, I think we should have the support of hon. gentlemen opposite, and have this item struck out of the Estimates altogether.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That is just what I am asking. I want it to be struck out. I am glad to have my hon. friend as my seconder.

Mr. BENNETT. We want the Minister to go a little further and give us his assurance that he will not expend that $2,500.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I cannot do that ; it is gone.

Mr. BENNETT. If we did not succeed in making all hon. gentlemen opposite converts, we at least attained some appreciable results, for I notice that the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) has quit the Chamber, no doubt because he saw looming up ahead of him this case, which was less defensible than the other. When I last addressed the House and made a convert of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, another Minister was not in the House whom I am pleased to see here now; and I trust that the Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) will not weaken on these strong words which he addressed to the House in 1892: and I am bound to say that every time he did address the House in denunciation of public expenditures his speeches were models of excellence, particularly in point of invective. Speaking on the Laprairie case, which was on all-fours with the present one, the Postmaster General said:

I ask the Minister of Public Works if he can stand up before the people and say that he considers this public work in Laprairie is necessary in the public interest? I pause for a reply.

I pause for a reply to ask if it is in the public interest that there should be this large expenditure made at this little village of Montmagny. Allow me to call the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that while he is voting away thousands of dollars for the erection of public buildings in these little places, the large towns of Aurora in his own riding, with postal receipts of $2,682, is without a public building, and the large town of Newmarket, also in his own riding, with postal receipts of $3,315 and a population of 2,150, is without a post office building, while this large expenditure is made at this little village of 1,709 people with paltry postal receipts of $1,750. But the Postmaster General went on, and the further he went the stronger his language got:

I say it is history repeating itself; and whatever the people of Quebec may say who get this work, I, from the province of Ontario, if I stand alone, will protest against this malversation of public money. I say it is a gross crime against our people to place the great spending department of our country in the hands of a Minister who has the audacity to ask Parliament to give him money for a work which he cannot defend, and the time has come when his record is a fair subject of criticism.

I ask the Postmaster General what he thinks of his colleague to-day, who is making an expenditure as bad as that for Laprairie was then, when he stated that the then Minister of Public Works was indulging in malversation. Further on, he said:

The time has come before this Parliament to withdraw its confidence from a Minister whose record alone ought to have prevented his being selected for the office, and whose present record in office is sufficient to demand his early expulsion.

I ask the Minister of Public Works to note these words, because there may be a conspiracy hatched against him. The Postmaster General will never go back on anything he has said, I am sure, and he stated a few years ago that the time had arrived when the Minister of Public Works should be expelled from the Cabinet, because he indulged in an expenditure similar to what the present Minister of Public Works is indulging in. I warn the Minister of Public Works to beware of the Postmaster General, because Cassius-like, he may stab him in the back.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. He is not so bad as that.

Mr. BENNETT. Well, he felt strongly on this before, and we have no reason to suppose that he will change his mind. He said:

I say that if there is one representative from the province of Ontario who gives this matter honest consideration, and feels that he is bound at some time or other to justify it before the country, let him raise his voice now, before it is too late and aid in stemming this tide of wastefulness which is setting in. We were promised, when this Government was formed, that they would reform and serve the public honestly, and that everything would be pure and right in their administration. The country especially the province of Ontario, took them at their word, and gave them its confidence. They succeeded in getting an overwhelming majority at their back and since then, intoxicated with power, they have thrown aside all regard for decency, and have plunged their hands to the arm-pits into the public treasury. There is not a Minister of the Crown to-day, from the Minister of Justice down, who raises his voice before this Parliament in defence of the country, but, one and all, they seem to be engaged in the crime of looting the treasury.

This is the language of the Postmaster General, and we can believe that language like wine improves with age. Here we have the statement of two hon. gentlemen who are now members of the Cabinet—first, the Postmaster General, that a case exactly like the present one was a looting of the public treasury——

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It was a good deal worse.

Mr. BENNETT. I cannot see very much difference. I think this case is equally bad. But here is the position of these hon. gentlemen. The Postmaster General said six years ago that an action of this kind was the looting of the public treasury, and the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce who, fearful that this was going to come up, moved out of the Chamber a little while ago, characterized such a proceeding as a most monstrous and disgraceful job. Well, this is just as bad as the late Laprairie case. If it was true that in the Laprairie case the treasury was being looted by the hon. gentlemen who then sat on the Treasury benches,

there is no difference between them, and these hon. gentlemen opposite, who then made such blatant professions of honesty, now, intoxicated with power, have thrown their professions to the winds, and, with an utter disregard of decency, parade themselves before the public as the looters of the public treasury of to-day.

Mr. HUGHES. Is this building conveniently situated in Montmagny ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is situated in the very centre of the town. The site was chosen by the Deputy Minister himself.

Mr. HUGHES. Will it be given up entirely to the Government ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It has been agreed, so as to save the cost of a caretaker, that the town council shall have the use of two rooms, and we are to have the balance. I think that is a very good arrangement indeed. I wish I could make the same arrangement everywhere, because these public buildings cost a great deal for caretakership, fuel, and so on.

Mr. HUGHES. Is the agreement in writing with the town council to that effect ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. HUGHES. For how many years ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. For all time.

Mr. BENNETT. Have there been any appointments made in the past year as caretakers of public buildings in any of the provinces ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. What is the uniform salary ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I try my best to decrease them but have not been able to do so each time. There is an item of $70,000 for this, which will come up for discussion later.

Mr. HUGHES. What was the building used for previously ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The room that will be occupied by the town council was used in the town council meetings. In the past the building was used as a town hall.

Mr. FOSTER. From whom did the hon. gentleman buy it ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. From the seminary of Quebec, after a great deal of trouble and negotiations.

Mr. BENNETT. How was the valuation fixed ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My deputy conducted the negotiations, and tells me that two prominent contractors of Montmagny made the valuation.

Item struck out.

Resolutions to be reported.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 12 o'clock (midnight).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 9th May, 1898.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

GANANOQUE DRILL SHED.

Mr. TAYLOR. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to bring before the House a matter of considerable importance to myself and of some importance to the country, and in order to put myself right, I will conclude with a motion. I may say at the outset that a few days ago when discussing the tariff I made some reference to the composition of the Cabinet, pointing out that it was composed of lawyers with the exception of one or two business men, and a doctor, no doubt, of standing in his own profession.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman must be careful not to refer to a previous debate.

Mr. TAYLOR. I am not referring to a previous debate further than to say this. I had asked certain questions, which I proposed to read with the Minister's reply, and in his reply the Minister diagnosed the case. To-day I propose to dissect the case, and ascertain if the diagnosis was correct. I moved for a return, and it was brought down. I have the return, and I wish the Government to understand that so far as I am concerned as a member of the Opposition, I propose to obtain a full return when asked for. I think it is due to the Opposition that, when a return is asked for, it should be brought down in full, and members of the Government must not expect to get their Estimates through if they fail to bring down full returns when ordered. I have received the return which I propose to read before I conclude, and from it I will prove conclusively that certain papers are not included in it. No doubt the papers have been held back because if they had been brought down they would have convicted the Government. The questions I

submitted were asked, in my absence on 14th February, as follows :—

(a) Has the Government removed the drill shed at Gananoque from the site sold to the town for the purpose of a high school ?

(b) Did the Government give the town a deed of the site for the sum of a thousand dollars ?

(c) Has the town paid for the said site ; if so, when ?

(d) Did the Government promise to remove the drill shed within a reasonable time ?

(e) Is the Government aware that the High School is greatly inconvenienced by the non-removal of the building ?

(f) Was part of the drill shed taken down to enable the High School building to be erected in 1895 ?

(g) What disposition was made by the Government of the lumber and timber of that part of the building that was taken down—was it sold by tender—who was the purchaser—how much did the Government get for it—or is the report true that it was given away to one of the Government supporters to repair his wharfs and buildings with ?

(h) Has the Government rented a warehouse from Mr. C. E. Britton, in which to store the arms and ammunition of the volunteers force? if so, when, and for how long ? What rent have they agreed to pay for the said warehouse ?

(i) Has the Government purchased a new drill shed site from Mr. J. B. Turner ? If so, what price did they pay for it ? How much land does the site contain ?

(j) Was the said C. E. Britton the defeated candidate for the House of Commons in the general elections of 1882 and 1887 ? Was the said J. B. Turner the defeated candidate for the House of Commons in the general election of 1891 ?

(k) Was the renting of the warehouse from Mr. Britton and the purchase of the drill-shed site from Mr. Turner, to in part recoup them for their election expenses ?

The Minister's reply was as follows :—

(a) Not entirely. A sufficient part has been removed to enable the High School building to be erected. (b) The title deed in favour of the corporation was sent to Geo. Taylor, Esq., M.P., on the 27th December, 1895, to be transmitted to the corporation. (c) Yes. By deposit receipt, received 16th November, 1895. (d) Yes, or rather the town council (on 4th July, 1895) agreed to "permit the remainder of the drill shed to remain on the present site for a reasonable time." (e) It is stated. The inconvenience is stated, in a letter from the Mayor of Gananoque, dated 28th April, 1897, to be that "the shed stands an unsightly affair, and also endangers the school buildings from an insurance point of view." One cause of the delay is that the transfer of the land for the new site was only completed on 13th November last, and the removal of the shed was impossible before that was done. The drill shed contained arms and clothing, and the removal of these to a temporary armoury was necessary. This could not be fully effected until last month. Mr. J. B. Turner agreed some time previously to pay $200 for remainder of old shed, not already taken down, and to take it down within two weeks of purchase of new site. This could not be done until the arms, &c., had been removed from old shed. Mr. Turner has been notified that the shed is now ready for removal. (f) Yes, authority telegraphed to Mayor 9th July, 1895. (g) The council (Mayor's letter of 4th July, 1895) undertook "to take down, and remove and store at our expense" the portion which was to be taken down and to "rebuild a new end to said drill hall for present purposes." Presumably the old materials were in part used to build the new end. Mr. C. E. Britton, in a letter dated 21st October, 1897, offered $20 "for that portion of the old drill shed which was torn down and stored inside and outside of the remaining portion" which then remained. On the recommendation of Lieut.-Col. Cotton, A.A.G.A., this offer was accepted. (h) Yes ; the Government being under obligation to remove the remainder of the old drill shed from the site sold to the town council in 1895, and the shed not being fit to stand the strain of removal to the new site, it became necessary to secure, temporarily, a suitable building in which to store arms, &c. The Assistant Adjutant General of Artillery recommended, and the Q.M.G. approved of the building selected. Lease dated 20th September, 1897, for one year from 1st October, 1897, with right of renewal. Rent, $150 per annum ; owner to put up all internal fittings required for arms, ammunition, stores and clothing, which he has done using the fittings from the old drill shed. (i) Yes. The lot was selected by the then D.O.C. of the district, now the Assistant Adjutant General of Artillery, and approved by the Q.M.G. as being the best available. The deed is for $2,500. Three lots, frontage of 60 feet each, extending back to the river—size of level portion of building about 180 feet by 95 feet. (j) I have not inquired. (k) I am informed by Col. Lake, Q.M.G., that both matters were recommended by the District Officer Commanding and himself without any suggestions from the department, or outside, and without any knowledge of either Mr. Britton's or Mr. Turner's political opinions. From the inception of the negotiations, which were begun in 1894-95, between the town council of Gananoque and the late Government, as a result of which the country has been compelled to buy a new site for a drill shed there, one Geo. Taylor, of Gananoque, seems to have taken part therein. In the autumn of 1896 said Taylor strongly urged the purchase of the J. B. Turner lots, claiming that the late Government had, through a former Minister of Militia, committed the country to the purchase. He requested me to write to His Honour the Governor of Manitoba—who was the former Minister referred to—for confirmation of his statement, which I did, and, in reply, received a practical confirmation of said Taylor's statement. In view of said Taylor's presumably intimate knowledge of the matter, I respectfully refer the member for South Leeds to the said George Taylor for information as to what disposition Mr. J. B. Turner may have made of the purchase money received by him. For the further information of the House I will read a letter just received from the aforesaid J. B. Turner :

Gananoque, Feb. 12, 1898.

Hon. F. W. Borden,
Minister of Militia,
Ottawa.

Sir,—In reference to Mr. Taylor's questions in regard to who I am and in relation to the price paid for the drill shed site purchased from me by your Government, I beg to inform you that Mr. Taylor agreed to recommend the late Government to purchase the same site for the same purpose for the sum of six thousand dollars ($6,000), and he informed me that the Hon. Mr. Patterson, now Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba

and late Minister of Militia, wired from Winnipeg to the present Government that he had recommended the purchase of the same site for the drill shed; all of this can be proved by the most positive evidence. I think it only right that you should be placed in possession of this information, and will be glad to substantiate it by further evidence, if necessary.

I have the honour to be,
Your obedient servant,
J. B. TURNER.

The next time this matter came before the House was on the 16th February. I was absent when the hon. Minister gave this uncalled for answer to the questions which I put on the Order paper, and on the 16th February I moved the adjournment of the House for the purpose of bringing this and another matter before the attention of Parliament. This discussion then took place:

Now in reference to the question the Prime Minister raised in answering the motion on the Order paper for papers, there is a statement made in the answer given to me that will not appear in the papers, but which is personal to myself, and I want to make a personal explanation. The question No. (j) on the paper reads as follows:—

Was the said C. E. Britton the defeated candidate for the House of Commons for the general elections of 1882 and 1887? Was the said J. B. Turner the defeated candidate for the House of Commons in the general election of 1891?

The Minister, in reply to that question, says: "I have not inquired."

Now I think there are returns made to Parliament of all the general elections. He has the information, and I think, to treat me civilly, he should have turned up the Government returns and said, I find in the returns made to the Government the names of the gentlemen.

Then there was considerable discussion, in which the Prime Minister took part, and the hon. the Speaker ruled in my favour, and I made the following statement:

Mr. TAYLOR. I purpose keeping strictly within the rules of the House. The notice on the paper calls for correspondence and has no reference to the subject I am now discussing. The answer the Minister gave me referred to something that was not in the question, neither is it in my motion calling for papers. He said:

"In view of the said Taylor's presumably intimate knowledge of the matter, I respectfully refer the hon. member for South Leeds to the said George Taylor for information as to what disposition Mr. J. B. Turner may have made of the purchase money received by him."

I claim, Mr. Speaker, that there is an insinuation here made by the Minister of Militia that Mr. Turner sold his property at a price to some person, and he refers to me as if I got a commission on it. Now if he insinuates by that reference to me that I received any commission, or that any person that I know has received any, he states something that is unfounded. I have been in this House for some fifteen years, the records of the late Government are in the hands of the hon. gentleman, and I ask for the papers for the purpose of getting the correspondence brought down to this House. They can bring down everything they have got, and they will find no reference——

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman must not refer to correspondence.

Mr. TAYLOR. I am not referring to correspondence, but I am asking the Government to bring down all the papers they have in their possession including communications from me to the late Government, and they will find that not a cent of the Government's money ever came from any contractor or anybody else into my hands. The Minister makes an insinuation here that I participated in the sale. He read a letter here. I ask for the correspondence. This will come down. I may just say that in the letter of Mr. Turner that he read here and that was uncalled for, there is not the shadow of a truth, for I never recommended to the late Government or anybody else that this lot should be sold for $6,000.

On the 14th March I moved for:

Copies of all correspondence between the mayor and corporation of Gananoque or any other person, with the Government in reference to the removal of the drill shed at Gananoque. Also, all correspondence in reference to the sale or purchase of a new site. Also, all offers made by the president of the Agricultural Society of Gananoque, or any other person, offering to rent or sell a suitable building in which to store the arms and clothing; and also, all other correspondence with the Government dealing with this question.

This motion was ample and broad, and included every detail of the correspondence that could or should have taken place between the Government or any person either offering to sell a site or lease a site or anything else dealing with this question. The return that I have before me ought to include all this, but as a matter of fact, it contains some papers not at all pertinent to the issue, and it does not contain many papers that should be produced; papers which to my own knowledge have been sent to the Government, and yet they have not brought them down, for reasons which the Minister must certainly explain before he can expect to get his Estimates through the House this year. I am satisfied that many hon. members of the Opposition feel as I do, that when we ask for papers, and the resolution passes the House, the Government are in duty bound to lay all the information on the Table called for in the resolution. The papers brought down here contain, first, an abstract; second, the will of the late James Turner, mixed in with an affidavit made by Mr. Peck in reference to another document that appears further on. After the will of Mr. Turner comes a portion of the lease from Mr. C. E. Britton for a building in which to store arms; a portion of it is connected at the front of the return, the balance is in the latter part of the return, and as the papers are all numbered consecutively, they evidently have not been displaced. Next comes an extract from Mr. McCommon, the clerk of Gananoque, stating that the town council had passed the resolution authorizing the purchase of the Government site for $1,000.

The only letter in the return from the late Minister of Militia (Mr. Patterson) is dated Ottawa, April 23rd, 1895, addressed to the Hon. Mr. Dickey, and is marked "private." It is as follows:

My dear Dickey,—The removal of the Gananoque drill shed to another site was urged on me more than once, and a couple of months ago I visited Gananoque to look into the matter. The town council is very anxious for the removal, and they have offered $1,000 towards a site and to help defray the expense of moving the building. I consented that the removal should be made, and I earnestly hope you will be able to carry out my promise.

Very faithfully yours,
(Sgd.) J. C. PATTERSON.

That is the only communication in the return from the ex-Minister of Militia (Mr. Patterson); but the present Minister (Mr. Borden), in answer to my question, stated that there was another communication, and I expected that that would be brought down. If it had been brought down it would have proved conclusively that the late Government had not promised Mr. Turner, or anybody else this $6,000, but had simply made the statement that they had agreed to purchase. The next letter is from Mr. Rogers, the chairman of the board, to myself; the next document is an Order in Council, signed by Mr. McGee, passed on the 8th June, 1895, stating that the Government had decided to sell the site to the town of Gananoque for the sum of $1,000. The next is a letter from Mr. D. E. Sheppard, secretary of the committee, urging upon the Government to take action and carry out the agreement, so that the town school authorities might go on and erect their new building. The next is a letter from the mayor, the late Mr. O. D. Cowan, addressed to the Hon. Mr. Dickey, accepting the proposition the Government made in purchasing the site, and allowing the building to remain on the ground for a short time. The next is a telegram from Mr. C. B. Rogers, chairman of the board, asking the Minister of Militia, the Hon. Mr. Dickey, to telegraph to Mr. Mackenzie, the officer in charge, that a portion of the building might be taken down. The next is a letter from Colonel Panet, Deputy Minister of Militia, addressed to the Deputy Minister of Justice, authorizing the sale for $1,000. The next is a letter from Colonel Percy Lake, stating:

The Minister has decided that the corporation of Gananoque may be allowed to carry out their proposal to remove a portion of the drill shed, as stated in the mayor's letter of July 4th, and a telegram has been sent to the mayor to that effect. Please communicate the decision to the officer commanding the corps affected, and give the necessary orders for carrying into effect the wishes of the Minister.

The next is a letter from the department, acknowledging the receipt of $1,000 from the corporation, signed in triplicate. The next is a letter from Captain Benoit to myself transmitting the deed, and asking me to hand it over and take a receipt for it from the corporation. The next is a communication from the Department of Militia to the Department of Public Works asking for the sum of $2,500 to be placed in the Estimates for the erection of a drill shed at Gananoque. The next is a communication offering a site to the Government, as follows—

Gananoque, March 26th, 1897.

Sir,—The militia authorities, of which you are the head, require in this town a site for a drill hall.

I own two lots on Stone Street, 120 x 120 feet running to the Gananoque river, with dock. These lots are situated 400 yards to the south of the old site of the shed cut in two and partially removed by the late defunct Government.

This is the best place in the town for the drill hall, as I have spent a great deal of time and money in the past, both in the interest of the party and for the militia force.

The party late in power always looked after their own here, to my loss, and I now want a fair field and no favour in regard to this matter.

Kindly do the best you can for me.

Sincerely yours,
(Sgd.) D. E. JACKSON,
Gananoque.

The Honourable
The Minister of Militia and Defence,
Ottawa.

I may say that this is the only offer that has been brought down, though I know of several offers of sites that were made to the department. The next is a letter from Captain Benoit, acknowledging the receipt of Mr. Jackson's letter. The next is a letter from Mr. Britton, the mayor of Gananoque, dated April 28, 1897, addressed to the Minister of Militia, reciting all that has taken place, and urging the removal of the drill shed. The next is a reply from Colonel Panet acknowledging the receipt of that, and stating that Sir Richard Cartwright is acting Minister, and that he will have all the papers brought before him and inquire into the matter at once. Accordingly, he did so, and sent Colonel Cotton up to investigate and report. Colonel Cotton makes this report:

With reference to the above, I beg to report that I have again visited the site proposed.

In my opinion that marked "D" on the plan is the most eligible.

There was a plan that ought to have been brought down, showing all the sites that had been submitted, and the price of each site. Colonel Cotton refers to it. He says:

The owner, Mr. Turner, in presence of the mayor, made me the offer of this property for $2,300. Mr. Turner also agreed, in the event of the purchase of his property, to give the sum of $200 for the old shed as it now stands, and to remove it within two weeks from day of sale.

This is another statement in this report which I want the Minister to make a note of, because he referred to it in his answer to

my question. I want to know if he got the $200 yet. Colonel Cotton's report continues:

The special fittings for harness, &c., &c., he agrees to take down and remove, free of cost, to any building the department may arrange to occupy as temporary quarters.

This property marked "D" has a frontage of three lots of 60 feet each on South street, and extends to the water front. There is an old wharf (in bad repair) almost the entire width (180 feet) of the property.

For 95 feet on Charles Street the ground is level enough for building purposes. At this point it slopes abruptly down to the water level, about 20 feet.

The size of the level portion for building on would be 180 x 95 feet.

I would not advise hiring or purchasing drilling rights over adjoining vacant property for the present.

(Sgd.) W. H. COTTON, Lt.-Col.

The Deputy Minister makes this note on it:

This site appears to me to be certainly the best available. I would suggest that it be approved and that the Department of Justice be requested to take the necessary steps to complete the purchase before the vote lapses—31st inst.

(Sgd.) PERCY LAKE, Col.

The next thing is a continuation of the report, dated July 26, 1897, in which Colonel Cotton says:

I have inspected the portion now remaining of this drill shed. It is unsightly and almost butts against the new school buildings. The "reasonable time" for the removal, which has apparently been promised, would seem to have expired.

Undoubtedly it is detrimental in every way to the school and church property adjoining. I would recommend immediate removal and that a building be rented for a year in which to store the field battery and infantry equipments. The present building is nearly 30 years old and is entirely of wood. The sills have greatly perished. It would be of no use re-erecting the remaining portion, as its removal would impair the material to too large an extent.

I desire, therefore, to recommend that it be disposed of by tender or sold at public auction, the purchaser to remove it within two weeks of sale. For the requirements of the school, the ground should be entirely cleared by 31st August.

If sold, the internal fittings should first be removed and placed in rented buildings. A suitable building for both the field battery and company stores, can be rented for about $150 per annum.

As to a new site, I have visited all shown on plan and others, and am of the opinion that that marked "D" on the banks of the St. Lawrence River is entirely the most suitable. It is also one which will in short course of time enhance in value. It has a wharf, and water front privileges, as well as adjoining suitable ground for drill purposes.

This should not, however, be hurriedly decided on, and certainly not until the question of regimental armouries be fully considered.

(Sgd.) W. H. COTTON,
Lieut.-Col.

At the foot of this is a note by Colonel Panet, saying:

The money voted for this service will lapse at the end of this month if not utilized. Please report to me what can be done.

On the 31st of July the next document was completed, giving a deed of this lot, transferring it from Mr. Turner to the department for $2,500. Colonel Cotton reported that it was offered to him for $2,300, and he recommended the purchase of it; besides $200 was offered for the old building. There is the Colonel's recommendation saying that this was the most suitable lot, that it had been offered to him for $2,300 in the presence of the mayor; and yet the next document is a deed of the property for $2,500, dated the 31st of July. The next is a letter from Colonel Panet to the Deputy Minister of Justice inclosing a check for $2,500 to pay for the lot. The Department of Justice had so much work to do that they could not attend to the little details of taking the transfer of the site for the drill shed; but they must employ an agent. I remember when hon. gentlemen sat on this side of the House they found fault with the late Government before they had a Solicitor General on account of their legal expenses; but after there was a Solicitor General, they said that all these expenses should be saved. But what do we find this economical Government doing? They handed this matter over to Mr. O. K. Fraser, of Brockville. Mr. Fraser presents a nice little bill for $73.79 for drawing a deed for Mr. Turner and examining the title at the registry office, and handing it over to the Government. Why did he not make it $73,80? Any lawyer in the country would have done the work for $10. One hon. friend says he would draw ten such deeds for that; but they had a pet in the person of Mr. O. K. Fraser, and they pay him $73,79 without any hesitation. The Department of the Solicitor General, with their staff, could not look after this little business, but they had to transfer it to Mr. Fraser and pay him four or five prices. The next document is a certificate from Mr. Mansell, showing that there were no taxes registered against the property. On the 27th of August, Mr. Britton, the mayor, writes another very strong letter to the Minister:

Gananoque, Ont., Aug. 27th, 1897.

Lieutenant-Colonel Cotton,
Assistant Adjutant General for Artillery,
Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—Please let me know what is being done with regard to the removal of the drill shed. Steps must be taken at once to have it removed. I was in hopes that arrangements would have been made so that we could have got the whole thing out of the way before the school re-opened. That now is an impossibility, but it must be removed at once. The school authorities are crowding this matter, and justly so, as they require the ground upon which it stands, and the insurance companies are complaining about the extra hazard on the school building.

Please let me hear from you by return mail, and oblige.

Yours truly,
(Sgd.) C. H. BRITTON,
Mayor.

The next document is a portion of the lease of the building which was rented from Mr. C. E. Britton, to which I have already referred. Then comes a letter dated October 21, from Mr. Britton, addressed to Colonel Cotton, as follows :—

Gananoque, Ont., Oct. 21st, 1897.

Lieutenant-Colonel Cotton,
Ass't Adjutant General for Artillery,
Ottawa, Ont.

Dear Sir, —Owing to absence from home I have not been able to reply to your communication in regard to a debris of the old drill shed. I beg now to repeat in writing the offer which I made and which you accepted when on the ground, for that portion of the old drill shed which was torn down and stored inside and outside of the remaining portion of the old drill shed : Namely ($20.00) twenty dollars.

Yours truly,
C. E. BRITTON.

There is reference in this to a letter which is not on the file at all. If it were here, I fancy it would reveal something ; but the Minister sees fit not to bring it down. Mr. Britton had drawn the timber away and repaired his wharf with it early in the summer. Of course, the Government had made him a present of it.

But at that time the timber was practically all removed, with the exception of a little old debris not worth very much. A larger portion of the drill shed had been taken down, than the portion remaining, for which Mr. Turner offered $200, as it stood, they sold the larger part for $20 to another political friend.

The next document is a letter from Colonel Panet acknowledging receipt of the deed to the property. Colonel Cotton reports that Mr. Turner offered to sell the site for $2,300 and to give $200 for the old building. Colonel Cotton's report is corroborated by a letter from Colonel Lake, dated 4th December, 1897 :

When the new site for the drill shed at Gananoque was purchased this fall, Mr. Turner, the owner, agreed, in the presence of the Mayor of Gananoque, in the event of the purchase of the property, to give the sum of $200 for the old drill shed as it stood, and to remove it within two weeks of the date of sale ; also, to take down and remove, free of cost, to the temporary drill shed hired, the special fittings for harness, &c., in the old drill shed.

Please report whether this sum has been paid and the work carried out.

Colonel Lake, as well as Colonel Cotton, says that Mr. Turner made this offer. Colonel Lake writes to the Commandant of the battery at Gananoque to find out if the $200 had been paid and the building removed. Colonel Mackenzie replies :

As far as any bargain is concerned, I know nothing of it. Consequently have received no money. Mr. Turner says that no such arrangements were made, but refuses to give a letter to that effect.

The harness fixtures have been transferred to the new shed. Mr. Britton informs me that he paid expenses of same.

Mr. Turner, the witness whom the hon. Minister put into the box here to prove that the late Government had offered $6,000, tells two of the Minister's representatives that they are lying, because, he says, no arrangements were made, and the harness fixtures, that he agreed to transfer, were transferred to the new shed and Mr. Britton paid the expenses of removal. Yet Turner was to have them transferred at his own cost and paid besides $200 for the old building.

The next document on the file is the letter from Mr. Turner which I have already quoted, stating that the late Government had agreed to purchase the property for $6,000.

Now, I think the hon. Minister ought to be pretty well satisfied that when he read Turner's letter, he had in his own hands evidence that Turner had not carried out his agreement and denied having offered $200 for the old building. He knew that the Agricultural Association had offered to the Government a building in which they could store arms and ammunition and a much better site attached. Where is the site that they have located ? The drill shed to-day stands within six feet of the railway track. There are trains running by every few moments, liable to set the building on fire, and on both sides are a planing mill and a lumber yard, with the lumber piled right up against the building. At the other end is a residence. That is a nice place for a drill shed. There was a place offered, away at the east end of the town, on the agricultural grounds, with a first-rate building on it, which was offered at the Government's own price. Yet they preferred this old warehouse, alongside a railway track, in the centre of the manufacturing part of the village, and alongside a planing mill and a lumber yard—a nice place in which to store Government property. On the 14th February the hon. Minister said, in reply to my question :

One cause of delay is that the transfer of land for that new site was only completed on the 13th November.

The money was paid on the 31st July, the deed was issued the 31st July, and yet the hon. Minister says that the transfer only was completed on the 13th November.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA. I am sure the hon. gentleman does not wish to be unfair. If he will look through the papers he will see that there was a good deal of difficulty about getting a correct title, owing to mortgages that were against the property and the difficulty of ascertaining the number of owners of the property. It took until some time in November, I think the hon.

gentleman will find, to get a perfect title to the property. The Government were not in position to take possession of the property until that time.

Mr. TAYLOR. If the hon. Minister had brought down all the papers, he might have proved his case, but the papers he has laid on the Table prove the very reverse. Before the 31st of July, the money passed out of the department's hands and, so far as I can see, the matter is closed up after the 31st July. He makes the statement that Mr. J. B. Turner agreed to pay $200 for the remainder of the old shed and to take it down within two weeeks, but this could not be done until the arms were removed. On the 14th February the Minister said that Mr. Turner was notified; but what do the documents prove? I have just read them. They show that Col. Lake notified Mr. Turner on the 4th December. It was true he had been notified, but an answer came back from the department that no money was paid and Mr. Turner said that no such arrangement was made. The Minister had the information then before him that Mr. Turner repudiated having made such a bargain. The Minister had that information when he led this House to believe that the bargain was made for $200, and Mr. Turner had been notified to carry it out. He notified Mr. Turner some time before, and this was the answer that came back. It was not until the town council took the matter in hand and appointed a deputation to come to Ottawa that action was taken. The deputation arrived here one evening, and the next day Mr. Britton, or somebody else, tore the building down and carried the material away, even before the deputation had returned. Was the building sold? Did they carry out the advice of Col. Cotton, to put the building up and sell it, either by tender or by auction? Did they comply with the recommendation of their own officer? No, I expect they simply gave it to a man to tear it down and draw it away to his own property. That is the way that this Government deal with the public property that they have in charge. They pay $200 more for the site than their own officer said it could be bought for, and they lose $200 that they might have had for the old building. And when a straightforward question is asked by a member of this House, the hon. Minister tries to make a case against the hon. member who asks for information. He says he can prove so and so, and yet the papers that he has brought down show the very reverse. Had the Minister complied with the order of the House and produced the letter he got from the Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba, the ex-Minister of Militia, the House would have had an opportunity to judge of the correctness of the allegation that I had recommended the purchase of this site for $6,000, which allegation I repudiated before and which I repudiate now. A number of applications had been sent in, but the Minister did not produce any of them. I recommended no price on any site to the late Government. Now the hon. Minister of Militia must expect, that before he can get his Estimates through he must either establish his case or admit that he made uncalled-for answers and, in my case, to produce the papers ordered by the House. When an order of the House is made, a Minister should bring down every paper covered by that order. But this is not the only case, for I have heard other members of the Opposition complain not only that when they asked for information by question they do not get satisfactory answers, but even that when they moved for papers they do not get the returns that the House orders. Surely it is time that this thing should cease. If I have done an injustice by stating that the Minister gave wrong information, that he said the transfer of this property was not completed until the 30th November, I cannot find anything in these papers to show that I was wrong. The cheque went out on the 31st July and it is retained, and the lawyer that they paid $73.79 to for completing the title—which is seven or eight times what it is worth—makes his report long before the 13th November. And another statement that he made to the House is, that on the 14th February they notified Mr. Turner to remove the building. But the report of his officer is here stating that on the 4th of December Mr. Turner refused to do so. How can a member of this House be held accountable for not knowing the facts of the case when the Minister will not bring down the papers? He must have some sinister motive in not complying with the order of the House and keeping back a portion of the return. But I have to say that, in my opinion, from the first to the last, the Government have dealt unfairly in this matter. They have dealt unfairly with the school authorities at Gananoque; they have dealt unfairly with the military authorities in having placed their armoury in the centre of the manufacturing district in Gananoque and alongside of a railway track; they have dealt unfairly with certain residents of the town in depreciating their property by renting a warehouse and filling it with munitions of war. The people in that neighbourhood feel that their property has been very seriously injured, and I think that any person will see that it is no place to have military stores. The Agricultural Society offered a building at the Government's own price and yet that offer has not yet been brought down. I want the return completed before the hon. Minister asks for supplies for militia purposes this year. I know that the letter of the Agricultural Society was sent in to the department offering their property for the storage of arms at the Government's own price. There are other offers also in the hands of the department,

and I want these papers brought down in order to complete the return. And I contend that the hon. Minister ought to investigate and withdraw the insinuations he made when he answered me. After examining witnesses he put in the box, after seeing that two of his own officers contradict his statements, after relying on the evidence of the Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba, formerly Minister of Militia—which does not support him—after all this, surely he will withdraw the insinuation that I would be profited by this transaction. I beg to move the adjournment of the House.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) seems to have smarted very much under an answer I gave to a question which he put to the Government in the early part of the session. I may say at once that I had no intention of making an insinuation against the hon. gentleman, but I felt that the question that he put, although a proper one enough in itself, perhaps, was put in a most improper and unfair manner. I will tell the House why. The hon. gentleman, during the session of Parliament of 1896, came across the floor of this House, as I am happy to know hon. gentlemen differing in politics do, and came to me as a member of the Government and asked me, as I supposed, and as he represented it, a favour. He said that the late Government had proposed to buy a lot for a drill shed in Gananoque. The sale had not been completed before the late Government went out of office; he said that a certain lot, which, by the way, is the one that has been purchased, was the lot which he thought ought to be purchased; he said that a former Minister of Militia and Defence, then and now the Governor of the province of Manitoba, was cognizant of the fact with reference to it, and that although there might not be anything on file in the department showing that to be the case, he thought that if I would write to Governor Patterson, that gentleman would give me such assurances as would satisfy me that the Government of the country was under an obligation to take the particular lot of land which we have bought, and which was owned by Mr. Turner, who, I supposed, was a friend of the hon. gentleman. Now, in perfect good faith, the hon. gentleman, the whip of the Conservative party, having made that request to me——

Mr. TAYLOR. I know the hon. gentleman does not want to misstate the facts, but I never told him that the lot had been bought.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I did not intend to say that the lot had been bought, what I intended to say was that the late Government had agreed to buy it, and that Mr. Patterson would tell me so if I wrote to him. That is what I think I said. Now the hon. gentleman having taken that course, having come to me, I at once cheerfully acceded to his request, and having done so, I got the information, which was in accordance with what the hon. gentleman stated. But it did seem to me, after I had done that in good faith, somewhat of an extraordinary proceeding for that hon. gentleman to come to this House two sessions afterwards and put the questions which he did put on the paper:

Has the Government purchased a new drill shed site from Mr. J. B. Turner? If so, what price did they pay for it? How much land does the site contain?

Was the said C. E. Britton the defeated candidate for the House of Commons in the general elections of 1882 and 1887? Was the said J. B. Turner the defeated candidate for the House of Commons in the general election of 1891?

Was the renting of the warehouse from Mr. Britton and the purchase of the drill shed site from Mr. Turner, to in part recoup them for their election expenses?

Now, I leave it to you, Sir, and to any hon. gentleman on either side of the House, whether, in view of the statement which I have made, and which the hon. gentleman confirms, it was a proper use of parliamentary privileges to put such questions on the paper in the manner the hon. gentleman did. I did not so consider it, and the hon. gentleman must not smart too much, must not object too much, if I did what perhaps I ought not to have done, if I answered him in kind, and told him that he knew a great deal more about this transaction than I did, and that he might ask himself whether the money had been properly disposed of or not. Now, the hon. gentleman said that I have failed to bring down all the papers, and he adds a threat that I shall not be allowed to get through with my Estimates because I have not brought down all the papers. Well, the hon. gentleman is very powerful, but possibly his friends of the Opposition may not all take the view that this thing is of such prime importance that the whole militia Estimates for next year should be stopped until the documents which the hon. gentleman wants, are produced. But let me say, Mr. Speaker, that there is no difficulty of that kind likely to occur, because I shall be delighted to bring down every paper the hon. gentleman wants. I supposed that every paper had been brought down. It is true I did not bring down the letter which I received from the Governor of Manitoba, because it was not a public letter but a private letter written to me. But if the Governor of Manitoba, the former Minister of Militia and Defence, gives me his consent I shall be happpy to produce the letter, and I think I can get his consent by telegraphing to him. As the hon. member for Leeds spoke to me in the House, and as I wrote to Governor Patterson from my seat in the House, I did not keep a copy of the letter which I sent to him; therefore, if I lay on the Table the letter of the former Minister of

Militia and Defence, I shall not be able to lay a copy of my own letter. But it was merely a formal request that he should let me know what he knew about this matter. Now, I understand the hon. gentleman to say that several formal offers of sites were made to the Government. I can only say that there were none made to me or to the present Government, except those which he has. I will ask the officers of my department to look up every offer that has been made, and add it to the papers which the hon. gentleman has now. I am surprised to hear that the plan of the site is not there. I have seen that plan, and it must be in the department. I will see that that deficiency is promptly supplied.

Mr. TAYLOR. The paper referred to is a plan of the town, with all the sites marked in red, and with the prices of each.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I have a distinct recollection of seeing the plan, and it ought to be among the papers. There could be no motive on my part for keeping back the plan, and it will be supplied. The lot, however, which was approved of by Colonel Cotton is, as a matter of fact, and as I think the hon. gentleman knows, the plan which we selected.

Mr. TAYLOR. If the price was right, the property was all right.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The hon. gentleman has referred to the building which was selected in which the stores are now placed. I believe the Agricultural Society made some offer. But I can assure the hon. gentleman that after a careful examination, I think by both Colonel Cotton and the Quartermaster General, the present building was selected, and it was not selected because it was the property of Mr. Britton. My report states that it was the best place available for the purpose, and it was chosen for that reason. My information is that the rent paid is not excessive. The hon. gentleman will remember that it was only a temporary arrangement and intended to be so, because we hope to construct a handsome drill shed in that town before very long, and as soon as a drill shed is erected, there will be no need of renting the present rooms. The hon. gentleman has referred to the transfer of land. I have already explained to him—and if the papers are not sufficient to prove what I have said, I shall be able to supply further evidence that the transfer was not completed, as a matter of fact, until the month of November, although it appears to have been earlier. It was subsequently discovered that there were some flaws in the title which had to be remedied, and for that reason the transfer was not completed until November.

Mr. TAYLOR. How about Mr. Fraser's bill of costs Is that reasonable ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Mr. Fraser's bill of costs was paid upon the recommendation of the Department of Justice, and I think I may fairly place the responsibility for that upon the Department of Justice. I think the hon. gentleman does an injustice to the department and to Mr. Fraser when he endeavours to convey the idea to this House that there was only a deed of this property prepared. I can assure the hon. gentleman that it was necessary to make many searches in the records, and that a great deal of time was occupied in procuring a clear title to this property. With regard to the hon. gentleman's reference to the fact that Mr. Turner seems to have offered to sell the land to Colonel Cotton for a less sum than the sum which was paid, I can only say that the whole of the files, including all the originals of the papers that the hon. gentleman has before him, and including this report of Colonel Cotton where he alleges that an arrangement was made with Mr. Turner for the purchase of $2,300—all these papers were sent to the Justice Department with instructions to procure for the Government a deed of the property. The Department of Justice seems to have employed an agent. That agent might have called Mr. Turner's attention to the fact that he had at one time previously agreed to sell the property at a lower price than $2,500 ; I am unable to tell the hon. gentleman whether such is the fact or not, but I can inform him that the question is being looked into. It is a matter entirely before the Department of Justice, and I quite agree with the hon. gentleman that some reason should be given why $2,500 was paid for the property when the seller seems to have offered it at one time for $2,300, but I do not think that is a matter with which I, as the head of the Militia Department, am specially called upon to deal. I have only, in conclusion, to repeat what I have already stated, that I think the hon. gentleman's question was in very bad taste, that I think he has not much to complain of in the answer I gave him ; that I quite absolve him from any charge, in fact, I did not pretend to convey the idea that he was connected in any way with this transaction, but I was aware that he had had something to do with it more than I had, and I therefore told him to inquire from himself as to how the money might have been disposed of. If the hon. gentleman would be kind enough to prepare a list of the papers he wants, or if the hon. gentleman will do me the honour to come over to my department, I will endeavour to give him from the records everything he desires. I supposed that everything except Hon. Mr. Patterson's letter was there. I have no desire to keep anything back, and I am fully disposed to give the hon. gentleman every scrap of paper in the department in respect to this matter.

Mr. TAYLOR. I desire to say a word as to the reason why I put the question on the paper. After last summer's experience, knowing the Government pretended to deal with the people's property in a business-like way, after seeing that property had been disposed of to political supporters and not put up to public auction, seeing that a building had been used that was not suited for the storing of arms, and that the Government seemed anxious to look after their friends, I put the question with respect to Mr. Turner and Mr. Britton, and the renting of the building from Mr. Britton, because he was a political supporter of the Government. The Government might as well have made one of their supporters a present of the building as to have accepted $20 for it. Two-thirds of the drill shed had been removed. What was done with the balance? When I saw these things going on, I thought it was time to inquire what this business Government was doing with the property of the people, and knowing that $2,500 had been paid, I wanted to know why $200 more had been paid, and also why $200 for the old building had been refused, making $400 lost on the total purchase price.

Motion to adjourn negatived.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I should like to remind the right hon. leader of the House of the intimation he gave that he would be able to convey some idea to-day as to any further Government business that would be brought down with a view to prospective completion of public business.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I am sorry that I cannot at this moment implement to the full the promise I made to the hon. gentleman. I may say, however, that the Government do not contemplate submitting any new business of a serious character. There may be, perhaps, one or two matters of moment and importance locally, but nothing of a general character, or as to general policy.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. May I ask the right hon. gentleman if the statement appearing in the morning papers is correct, that the Government intend to bring down a Bill for the organization of the Canadian Yukon territory?

The PRIME MINISTER. It is the intention to bring in a Bill for the organization of the Yukon territory—not a full Bill, because we do not possess at the present time all the information and data necessary to fully organize the territory—but we require, in view of the special conditions prevailing there, to have some general legislation passed.

CONTRACTS FOR SUPPLIES FOR NORTH-WEST MOUNTED POLICE.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I should like to draw the attention of the Government to a message which I have received to-day from a member of this House, Hon. Colonel Prior, now in Victoria. He wires:

Victoria B.C., 6th May, 1898.

Hon. Sir Charles Tupper, Ottawa.

Seattle "Post-Intelligencer," 5th inst., jubilantly states Canadian Government given contract to Boston and Alaska Trasportation Company for carriage of some hundreds of tons freight to Yukon via Seattle, thus proving Seattle's supremacy as supply centre for Canadian North-west. If true, this serious blow to Victoria and Vancouver shippers, who state they are equally good position to carry out contract.

(Sgd.) E. G. PRIOR.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). This is a purely departmental matter, and I cannot give an answer at the moment. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will send over the telegram.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I sent a copy of it to the Minister of Militia.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA (Mr. Borden). The fact is, a contract has been made with the Boston and Alaska Transportation Company to transport some of the supplies that are going up to the North-west for the troops sent forward, but very much the largest part of the supplies is going from Vancouver. A small portion will go via Seattle. The company has three boats, and the contractors desiring to get supplies forward early, asked that a portion be allowed to be put on board at Seattle, to which request we consented.

Mr. WALLACE. Where were those goods purchased?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA. They were purchased here. They were purchased from the contractors to be shipped on board, not of the cars, but on board of the boats, and at the request of the company we could see no great objection to a portion going through Seattle, probably less than one-third, while the rest would go by Vancouver. The majority will go through Manitoba.

Mr. FOSTER. By the same boat.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA. By different boats; the same line.

Mr. DAVIN. This will be in addition to the transportation that my hon. friend the Minister (Mr. Borden) told me of a few days ago.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA. Yes.

ALIEN LABOUR LAW ENFORCEMENT.

Mr. WALLACE. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to ask the First Min-

ister if an agent has been appointed to carry out the Alien Labour Act in the city of Toronto. Mr. DuVernet, who is acting for the men out of employment in J. D. King's & Co.'s factory, makes the statement that the law has been violated and that he has made application to the Government for the appointment of an agent there in order that Canadian laws may be vindicated and our Canadian workmen protected. Mr. DuVernet says that nothing has yet been done. I would like to know if the First Minister has yet made the appointment of an agent.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The order has been sent over to the Department of Justice, to have an agent appointed.

Mr. WALLACE. When ?

The PRIME MINISTER. I think it was on Saturday or to-day.

THE QUEEN VS. SKELTON ET AL.

Mr. DAVIN. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to mention the case of the Queen vs. Skelton et al., and I may say that I gave notice to the Solicitor General that I should draw attention to this matter. Early in the session I saw the Minister of Justice and he assured me that no ex parte proceedings would take place in regard to this case, and that he would listen to no application for a new trial without hearing me. On April 21st I wrote a letter to my hon. and learned friend (Mr. Fitzpatrick) asking how the matter then stood, and I would like to ask how the matter stands now.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). I am quite sure that I may be able to answer the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) to-morrow.

INQUIRY FOR RETURN.

Mr. MARTIN. I wish to ask the Prime Minister when I may hope to get an answer to the Address passed by the House, for copies of Order in Council, correspondence, &c., in connection with the Dominion Government and a delegation from the government of Prince Edward Island relating to the settlement of claims at issue between that province and Canada.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I can inform the hon. gentleman that the papers are in course of preparation, and I would not be surprised if they have been brought down to-day in the Senate.

KLONDIKE AND DAWSON CITY BANK.

Mr. MORRISON moved that the House resolve itself into committee on Bill (No. 117) to incorporate the Klondike and Dawson City Bank.

Mr. MORRISON. This Bill has stood for some time at the request of the Government, who have given notice of an amendment providing that the head office of the bank shall be in Canada. I have no objection to that amendment.

Motion agreed to, and the House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 2,

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). This clause provides that the head office shall be in London, Eng. I move that it be amended by fixing the head office at some place in Canada to be determined by by-law to be passed by the directors.

Mr. FOSTER. I have no objection to the Act stating where the head office should be, but it goes a long way, to allow the head office to be placed wherever the directors wish. Has my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) thought of that. I do not think that will do at all.

Mr. MORRISON. They are quite willing that the head office be fixed at Montreal.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That information was only given to me a moment ago. I understood that the promoters of the Bill were absent and that my hon. friend (Mr. Morrison) might not be able to reach them. My amendment was with a view to facilitate the hon. gentleman in the passage of the Bill. I quite agree that it is better to fix the place, and I move :

That the head office of the bank shall be in the city of Montreal, Canada.

Amendment agreed to.

Bill reported, and read the third time, and passed.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Before the questions by members are proceeded with, I wish to draw the attention of the House to a matter which I think will be regarded as one of a good deal of importance, and, in order to put myself in order, I will move the adjournment of the House. I want, Mr. Speaker, to draw the attention of yourself and the House to the question how far we are in a position to exercise any authority over parties connected with the press who are allowed to occupy seats in the press gallery, and who are employed by committees of this House. I am, of course, quite prepared to respect the reporters and the correspondents of the various newspapers, and to regard their treatment of the events passing in this House or before the committees which are brought under their notice, as coloured to a very considerable extent by the views and opinions of the papers they represent ; but I think that every member of this House will agree with me that some limit must

be placed upon parties, connected with the press, who occupy positions in the gallery of the House of Commons, in making communications of an utterly false character as to proceedings, and especially proceedings under oath, which take place before the committees of this House. I wish to draw the attention of the House to an article which appears in the "Globe" newspaper of Saturday, 7th May, in the form of a special despatch from its Ottawa correspondent, who, I understand, is Mr. Magurn. I may say that Mr. Magurn occupies an extremely important position as shorthand reporter appointed by the hon. gentleman who is the chairman of the committee regarding the Drummond County Railway. It will thus be seen that the position that person occupies is one which gives considerable weight to his statements. The "Globe" reports from its correspondent the following :—

Mr. Farwell's Impressions.

Mr. Farwell's examination by the Chairman proceeded :

Q. Before the elections took place in 1896 was there any sort of promise made by any member of the Government that in case the Conservatives were successful in the elections the road would be taken over ?—A. I never heard such a promise.

Q. Did you ever see such a letter ?—A. I have an impression that there was such a letter ; but I am not prepared to swear that there was.

Q. Who was the writer ?—A. I would not be prepared to say.

Q. To the best of your recollection ?—A. I am not prepared to say that there was ; consequently it is only an impression.

Q. The other would be an impression also ?—A. I do not think I could——

Q. It is only an impression, of course ?—A. I would rather not mention the name of an impression.

Q. The committee wants you to mention it.—A. I cannot, because it is only an impression.

Q. What is your impression ?—A. I would not swear that there was such a letter.

Q. You have told us that. Whom do you think it was from ?—A. Is it right to give your impression ?

Q. Yes, sir ; we are trying to find out the facts.—A. I do not think I can answer that question.

Q. Do you swear you cannot answer it ?—A. Well, I swear that I had an impression ?

Q. That is all I want.—A. It is not evidence.

Q. No matter ; this is not evidence here, entirely ; we are searching.—A. I do not know whom such a letter was from.

Q. I do not ask you whether you knew it or not. You told me that you have an impression. I ask you now to let us know what that impression is ?—A. I did not have any such letter.

Q. You have told us that.—A. I never had such a letter.

Q. Your impression is that you saw a letter. I want to know what is your impression as to whom the writer is ?—A. Very well ; I have an impression that it is Sir Charles Tupper. I did not have any such letter from him, and I may be wrong.

Q. You may be, I understand that perfectly, but your impression is that you saw a letter written by Sir Charles Tupper ?—A. Yes.

Q. What is your impression as to whom that letter was addressed to ?—A. I have an impression that it was addressed to Mr. Pope.

Q. What is your impression as to the contents of that letter ?—A. Well, in a general way, that the Government would be favourable to some arrangement to take over the road.

Q. To take over the road "if" ?—A. There was no "if" about it.

Q. If they succeeded at the election ?—A. No "if" about it.

Q. How long before the election was that ?—A. I cannot say.

Q. Was it in 1896 ?—A. Yes, in the spring of 1896.

Q. And taking over the road, in your mind, meant $2,500,000, or $100,000 a year ?—A. That is what I asked for.

Q. And that is what you expected if it were taken over ?—A. I should have taken less if I could not have got that.

Q. But you would have taken that ?—A. Yes.

Q. That is what you expected ?—A. That is what I hoped for.

Q. Can you be no more definite as to date ?—A. No.

Q. In the spring of 1896 ?—A. I think so.

Q. The elections were in June ?—A. Yes, I think so ; but I am not much of a politician. I am not a political organizer, as was stated.

Q. Your memory is not good ?—A. I had nothing special to fix the exact time.

Q. Where did you see this letter ?—A. It was in Montreal.

Q. At the hotel ?—A. Yes, I think it was in Montreal.

Q. Was anybody present besides you two ?—A. No, I do not think so.

Q. What hotel was it at ?—A. The Windsor.

Q. Did you communicate the fact that you had seen that letter to anybody else ?—A. I do not know that I did, unless it might have been to my partners in the railway transaction.

Q. I suppose that stimulated you a little politically ?—A. I mean Mr. Mitchell and Mr. Greenshields, if to anybody. I do not know whether it stimulated them or not.

Q. Did you ever have any communication with Mr. Hugh Ryan within the time of giving up that option and the time you saw this letter ?—A. No, I do not think so.

Q. Then any effort that you made in the interval to sell the road to the Government was made through Mr. Pope and Mr. Ives ?—A. Well, yes : although they were not active measures ; as I say, we were forced to adopt a waiting policy.

Q. Till they got into a critical place ?—A. No, until their good judgment would convince them that it was a good thing to extend the road to Montreal.

That is the evidence that this shorthand writer reports to the "Globe" newspaper, of which he is the correspondent, as to what took place before that committee. Now, I want to draw the attention of the House to the fact, and it is greatly to the credit of the "Globe" newspaper, that the messages which their special correspondent, Mr. Magurn, sends to them, are of an entirely different character from the messages which he sends to the Halifax "Chronicle" and the St. John "Telegraph," with which papers, I understand, he is connected. I shall now draw the attention of the House to the despatch that this gentleman—this person sent

to the Halifax "Chronicle," distorted from the evidence which, as a stenographer, he had taken before the committee and which he had sent to the Toronto "Globe." I now quote from the Halifax "Morning Chronicle" of 7th May:

VERY INTERESTING.

A Genuine Boodling Arrangement Brought to Light.

And Sir Charles Tupper wrote a tell-tale Letter on the eve of the General Elections—Who was to share in Hugh Ryan's Handsome Allowance of $1,667,000?

(Special despatch to "Chronicle.")

Ottawa, May 6.—Highly interesting evidence was given at the House of Commons Drummond County Railway investigating committee this morning. Wm. Farwell, ex-president of the Drummond County Railway Company, was the witness and swore that he carried on negotiations through Rufus Pope, M.P., Hon. W. B. Ives and Mr. Cleveland, ex-M.P., for the sale of the road to the late Government for the purpose of the extension of the Intercolonial to Montreal. The price named was $2,500,000, of which the other shareholders of the road were to get one-third and the other two-thirds to go to Hugh Ryan, Government contractor. He saw a letter from Sir Charles Tupper to Rufus Pope just before the last general elections promising to see to the purchase of the road after the elections.

In view of the fact that Mr. Blair secured an option to purchase the Drummond County road for $1,600,000 or a rental of $64,000 a year, Mr. Farwell's evidence to-day before the committee is important, namely, that Sir Charles Tupper wrote a letter to Rufus Pope, M.P., on the eve of the last general election, 1896, promising to buy the road for two and a half millions or $100,000 a year rental

I need not add another word to show that this person, the special correspondent of the Toronto "Globe," sent to the Halifax "Chronicle" a telegram filled with a mass of lies of a most striking and positive character, utterly at variance with the testimony which, as a shorthand writer, he had taken down. I ask you, Sir, whether there is to be any protection in this House against parties who are admitted into the Press gallery and employed as stenographers by committees appointed by this House, thus abusing their privileges. I ask whether we are to be protected against the sending broadcast of falsehoods, which the person sending them knew to be false, by a person enjoying such privileges. I do not intend to let the matter rest there. I say that there is not the slightest foundation for the statements made as regards myself. I never wrote any such letter to any person. I never had before me, nor had the Government of which I was a member, ever before it, any proposition to purchase the Drummond County Railway.

The PRIME MINISTER. Order. My hon. friend is now proceeding to discuss a matter which is before the committee.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Not at all. This is not before the committee.

The PRIME MINISTER. I beg my hon. friend's pardon. We all know what took place in the committee, and I find no fault with my hon. friend if he wants to give his version of it. But the only way in which he can do that is to go before the committee or wait for the report of the committee. Now, however, he is proceeding to give his version of a certain fact, which transpired before the committee.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. My hon. friend will see the injustice of what he proposes. I am not dealing with anything which is before the committee, but with the conduct of a reporter, who has access to the galleries of this House—a correspondent of the "Globe" newspaper, who, as such, has access to the reporters' gallery, and is employed in an important position by one of the committees of the House. In so doing, I am entirely within my right. I would fail altogether in what I owe to myself and the House if I did not draw attention to the fact that a party who, by his own report to one newspaper, shows that he knows the facts, nevertheless sends to another newspaper a mass of falsehoods. My hon. friend will see at once that that is a matter which I cannot overtake by going before the committee.

I propose to ask the committee to call me and take my evidence under oath. That is an entirely different matter. But my hon. friend knows perfectly well that I cannot, in justice to myself, allow these false statements to go uncontradicted or fail to draw the attention of the House to the conduct I complain of. My right hon. friend, the leader of the Government, is perfectly correct in saying that we cannot discuss what is before the committee, and I do not propose to do so. All I say is that there is not a particle of foundation for this false report to which I have alluded. I felt that it was my duty to the House and to myself to draw your attention, Mr. Speaker, to the question as to whether hon. members of this House are to be subjected to such monstrous injustice as the dissemination of statements of this character, wilfully false and unfounded, by parties who are permitted to have access to the galleries of this House as correspondents of newspapers, and are proved to have been guilty of such flagrant misrepresentation and unwarrantable attacks against members of this House.

The PRIME MINISTER. I have just one observation to offer to my hon. friend with reference to what he has said. As to the version he has given of the facts before the committee, that closes the debate, and I have no word to say on that subject. But in justice to Mr. Magurn, I understand my hon. friend has not complained of the report sent to the "Globe" but admits that to be correct.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. So far as I have read it.

The PRIME MINISTER. But he says that the report sent to the Halifax "Chronicle" was altogether unfounded and incorrect. That may or may not be. Personally, I am not in a position to judge. I do not know whether Mr. Magurn is the correspondent of the Halifax "Chronicle" or not, but I think he is correspondent of the 'Globe." But whether he be a correspondent of these papers or not, I understand my hon. friend to raise the point as to whether it is desirable that members of the press gallery should be allowed to act as secretaries or stenographers of committees?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not raise that point.

The PRIME MINISTER. Then I have nothing more to say.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. What I ask is whether members of the press gallery are to be permitted to falsify the evidence they have taken down as shorthand reporters.

The PRIME MINISTER. That applies to all correspondents, whether secretaries of committees or not.

Mr. DAVIN. Do I understand the right hon. First Minister to lay down the doctrine that a correspondent may send accounts to a newspaper utterly false as to what has taken place in this House or in any of the committees? Surely such a thing would not be permitted by the House, nor I hope would it be permitted by newspapers of standing. With regard to what has been brought before the House by the leader of the Opposition, it is clear that the correspondent of the Halifax "Chronicle" has wilfully and maliciously misrepresented what took place in the committee. I do not know whether Mr. Magurn is correspondent of that paper, but I do know that misrepresentations have been made in the newspapers on other occasions of what has taken place in this House. I do not mind how harsh may be the judgment of any newspaper correspondent or publicist or critic with regard to any public man, but the moment he deals with matters of fact and misrepresents the facts, that moment he has become a culprit at the bar of public opinion and this House. Apart from personal interest altogether, in the interest of the public, in the interests of the press itself, the honour of which is a matter of vital importance to modern society, we should use the power we have to prevent misrepresentation of facts. Even if our interests were not in any way concerned then, in the interest of the press itself, we should use the power we have in this House to prevent misrepresentations of facts. I do not complain of any harsh criticism, any invective or abuse. But when, in regard to something that an hon. gentleman does and says in this House or in any committee of this House, a gentleman occupying the high position of correspondent in the gallery of a leading newspaper should maliciously misrepresent, why, it is so gross an offence against public morality that we must not allow it to pass without censure, and, if more than censure be necessary, then let more than censure be administered. Sir, the most illustrious predecessor, at the very least one of the most illustrious predecessors, of the right hon. leader of the House, the late Right Hon. Sir John Macdonald, had occasion at one time to deal with misrepresentation on the part of an occupant of the press gallery, a gentleman who was known throughout the length and breadth of the land as the Ottawa Liar. He is no longer in that gallery. I do not know who he was, but he is no longer there. I am not going to say that he has any successor there, or that there has been any transmigration of his spirit into any present representative of the press. But the Right Hon. Sir John Macdonald, as will be seen in reference to "Hansard," said in this House that misrepresentations of matters of fact would not be permitted. And he used this strong language—that if this continued and misrepresentations as to matters of fact were sent out by anybody in that gallery, the person so offending would be expelled from the gallery.

Mr. LISTER. The hon. gentlemen on the other side seem to be very sensitive as to what the Reform press of the country thinks proper to say about the proceedings before this committee. I would refer them to their own press, not only as to the proceedings before the committee, but as to everything that takes place before the House, concerning which representations are made that are grossly incorrect. Now, so far as this matter is concerned, there has, no doubt, been an error on the part of the reporter in the statement he made in the press as read by the hon. leader of the Opposition. For, as a matter of fact, the evidence did not show, and I do not think the reporter intended to convey the impression that it did show what the hon. gentleman has read. I may say to the leader of the Opposition that, on being informed that that statement was made, I am instructed, the reporter at once telegraphed to the paper correcting the error. But what was said? The hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) does not deny that a letter was written.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do deny it. I stated in express terms that I had never written such a letter to any person. Nor was it sworn to that I had.

Mr. LISTER. The hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) says that he never wrote such a letter. Do I understand him to say that he never wrote a letter concerning the Drummond County Railway?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I never wrote a letter on that subject to any person under any circumstances.

Mr. SPEAKER. I may remind the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lister) that he is not allowed to go into matters that were brought before the committee.

Mr. LISTER. I do not intend to, Mr. Speaker. So far as the report is concerned, it simply goes on to state that the letter suggested that the road was to be purchased for $2,500,000. The evidence goes to show that there was a letter.

Mr. DAVIN. No.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Lister) must avoid going into the evidence.

Mr. LISTER. I do not intend to go into the evidence. According to the report the hon. leader of the Opposition has read, the witness gave it as his impression that a letter was written, and his expectations was, if the road was taken in accordance with the letter, it would be taken over for $2,500,000.

Mr. DAVIN. He does not say that he saw a letter.

Mr. LISTER. His impression, he says, was there was such a letter. He gives the details, where he saw the letter, to whom it was addressed, and who showed it to him.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think we ought to discuss a matter of this kind with reference to making any capital against either one side or the other. It is a matter which concerns a member of this House as a member, and the very remark by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lister), who has just taken his seat, shows that if it affects one side at one time, it may affect the other side at another time. Consequently, I think it is a matter which does not affect the House divided into sides but it affects the House as regards its individual members, and I, for my part, do not like to have it passed over with the simple remark that hon. gentlemen on one side or the other are very sensitive as to what is said of them in the press. I think hon. members ought to be very sensitive as to what is said of them in the press.

Mr. LISTER. They will have a very unhappy time of it.

Mr. FOSTER. If my hon. friend (Mr. Lister) will allow me, I think hon. members ought to be sensitive as to what is said of them in the press. When it comes down to statements such as are made here, we have a direct attack made upon a man's character and standing, and disseminated through the press. I do not care whether this is done by a reporter who has certain privileges as correspondent or who has certain privileges and emoluments in connection with committees in this House. All that a member of this House has is his character as a public man; and if that character is to be assailed in the way in which the character of an hon. member has been assailed in this report sent to the "Morning Chronicle," and we choose to pass it over with the remark that we ought not to be over-sensitive about these things, I do not think it is fair, I do not think it is just, and I do not think it will promote public morals, newspaper morals or political morals in any way. Now, I am not going into the discussion of what took place in the committee, but I am going to show how aggravated is this case. The gentleman who is said to have sent this despatch is the very gentleman, who not only heard that evidence, but took it down and transcribed it for another paper, and must have had it before him. If another reporter, who had not been present at the committee and who, we will say, got his impression of what took place at the committee at second hand, had made a statement of this kind, he might have pleaded that he had a distorted impression of the proceedings, he might have pleaded ignorance of what took place. But if it be true that it was Mr. Magurn who penned this despatch for the "Morning Chronicle" there is no excuse for him, it is a downright misrepresentation and meant to be so; it cannot be anything else. Now, as to the extent of the misrepresentation, I think I have the right to read the report in the press of what took place. I was not in the committee; I am not a member of it. But, taking the report in the "Globe," I find, with reference to this matter, certain statements: First, that Mr. Farwell did not commence by stating that there was as a fact, a letter, nor did he end by swearing it. Though the attempt was made to bring out strongly that Mr. Farwell should state that there was such a letter, he swore that he was unable to state that there was such letter, but he had an impression that there was, and that was as far as he would go. If he had only the impression that there was a letter—and that was his statement and that was his oath persisted in when question after question was put to him—why, it stands as a matter of simple sequence that the alleged contents of that letter could not have been sworn to as facts; they must have been impressions as well, or impressions of impressions. But the question was asked him, for instance:

> Your impression is that you saw a letter. I want to know what is your impression as to whom the writer is.
>
> A. Very well, I have an impression that it is Sir Charles Tupper. I did not have any such letter from him, and I may be wrong.

Again:

> Q. What is your impression as to the contents of that letter?—A. Well, in a general way that the Government would be favourable to some arrangements to take over the road.

Then, I find in another place:

Q. Did you ever see such a letter ?—A. I have an impression that there was such a letter, but I am not prepared to swear that there was.

Now, with reference to the amount, when the chairman rather insinuatingly, I think, wished to draw from the witness that the sum of $2,500,000——

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the hon. member is going a little too far.

Mr. FOSTER. I am taking it exactly as it appears in the paper which has been read already.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). The only question the hon. gentleman ought to discuss is as to whether there was a fair report of that evidence. He is going away beyond that.

Mr. FOSTER. I am trying to do that. My hon. friend's sense of right is parallel with my own. I was reading what was stated, first, in order to prove that there was a distorting of the evidence. Hon. gentlemen have heard what I have read. The right hon. gentleman who leads the Government has heard it read twice. Now, let us see what this gentleman says when he comes to pen his interesting despatch to the "Morning Chronicle," the gentleman who took the evidence down first and transcibed it, who put it in a despatch to the "Globe," and who consequently has twice gone over that evidence, if not more than twice, the evidence being of such a nature as I have read. Now, what does he state when he comes to pen a despatch to the "Morning Chronicle"? I do not know whether Mr. Magurn wrote the headlines; I imagine he did not. I suppose these are made up in the office of the "Chronicle" in Halifax. But I may say that the headlines are entirely in keeping with the body of the despatch, and it is impossible not to believe that the despatch as printed is not the same as it was sent by the person inditing it in the "Globe." There may have been an error here or there in the transmission, or in looking over the printer's proof, but the whole despatch is consistent, and it displays open and plain and complete misrepresentation of what the man who had the information under his hand knew to be the truth of the matter:

Highly interesting evidence was given at the House of Commons Drummond County Railway investigating committee this morning. William Farwell, ex-president of the Drummond County Railway Company, was the witness and swore——

Now, I ask my hon. friend's attention to this:

——swore that he carried on negotiations through Rufus Pope, M.P., Hon. W. B. Ives, and Mr. Cleveland, ex-M.P.

Hon. gentlemen have heard the evidence read. Did Mr. Farwell swear to a fact of this kind? He did not.

The price named was $2,500,000, of which the other shareholders of the road were to get one-third, and the other two-thirds to go to Hugh Ryan Government contractor.

Mr. Farwell swore to nothing of the kind.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Does the hon. gentleman profess to have read to the House all Mr. Farwell's testimony? I was not present and did not hear it. But does the hon. gentleman profess to have read to the House every word of Mr. Farwell's testimony?

Mr. FOSTER. I have read the testimony which was published in the "Globe," and which gives the gist of Mr. Farwell's evidence.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Certainly it refers to Mr. Farwell's evidence so far as it had alleged reference to Sir Charles Tupper. I do not understand that the evidence read professes to have any reference to the statement now being made. So far as the quotation goes which the hon. gentleman has read from the "Globe," it neither proves nor disproves anything. He did not give any expression of opinion. The hon. gentleman is building up a false argument here altogether.

Mr. FOSTER. The next sentence I find is this:

He saw a letter from Sir Charles Tupper to Rufus Pope just before the last general elections, promising to see to the purchase of the road after the elections.

Now, the evidence given by Mr. Farwell was explicitly that he simply had an impression of a letter.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman is saying that from having heard it himself. Did the hon. gentleman hear the evidence?

Mr. FOSTER. I was simply taking the other report that was given in the "Globe."

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. You are comparing the two reports, and you say they do not agree. Which is correct and which is not, you cannot state.

Mr. FOSTER. I am holding the contention that this is a complete misrepresentation of what Mr. Magurn, the well-known reporter of the Toronto "Globe," gave to his own paper, the Toronto "Globe." Now, the man must have been making a wrong statement in one or the other, it is immaterial, to my mind, which was wrong. My impression is that the wrong statement is made here, and that is borne out by the facts given in the answers in the evidence which have already been read to the House.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). Will the hon. gentleman say how

he knows that the same reporter sent the two reports ?

Mr. FOSTER. I am taking that for granted, it is so stated, and I believe it to be true. Of course, I said at first that I take it for granted that that was the case. Now, Sir, I have simply to say this, that I think it is a matter of a great deal of moment if a gentleman can be allowed to sit in the gallery of the House of Commons and misrepresent, in such vital matters as this, hon. gentlemen who are sitting on either side of the House. It does not make any difference to me on which side of the House the gentleman so misrepresented may sit. I think that in all these vital matters it is important that falsehood should not be stated, and that the truth should be stated. I am quite willing to give reporters all the license that reporters will have, and which they ought to have, to a certain extent. But when it comes down to a matter of such vital importance as this, I think both sides of the House should feel that a reporter ought not to be allowed so to misrepresent on so important a question as this, any member of this House. I quite understand that in discussing this matter we are at a loss in not having the whole evidence of the committee before the House. But this statement has been sent broadcast about my hon. friend, and I think he has a perfect right, as a duty to himself as well as to the House, to call the attention of the House to it at once. Whether I was on that side of the House or this, I should express my sympathy with any gentleman who is so misrepresented. I hope, and I am compelled to say, that this misrepresentation ought not to be made.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No possible objection, of course, can be taken to the hon. gentleman bringing the matter before the House, and making the statement he did, and making the further statement that it was his intention to come before the committee and give his evidence there. I thoroughly agree with my hon. friend when he says it is most unfortunate that misstatements should be made through the press as to what has been said or done by any public man, either in this House or out of it. That is all very well so far as it goes. But what I deprecate is that the hon. gentleman should attempt to catch the judgment of the House now as to what was actually said before that committee when we are in complete ignorance of what was said. I do not know what was said, I was not there, I never attended a meeting of the committee, I have not even read the evidence taken, except the evidence which was in the "Globe" newspaper, which I did read at the time it came out. But I never saw the "Chronicle" before. But unless the hon. gentleman was present or read the whole of the evidence, he is neither in a position to condemn Mr. Magurn, nor to judge——

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Allow me to say a word. Did the hon. Minister hear the hon. member for Lambton say that under his direction Mr. Magurn had been directed, and had corrected, this misstatement in the "Morning Chronicle ?"

Mr. LISTER. I did not say under my direction. I said I had been told that the reporter seeing that the report was erroneous, had corrected the error.

Mr. MACLEAN. I think in the interest of the House that no employee of the House, in the receipt of money from the House, ought to be connected with the public press ; and in the interest of the newspapers themselves, I hold that no newspaper ought to allow its employees to be servants of the House in that way, or to allow the independence of papers to be questioned.

Mr. FLINT. I think hon. gentlemen, apart from the hon. leader of the Opposition, who brought the question before the House, have travelled somewhat beyond the records and have been somewhat premature in their discussion of the newspaper correspondent. I do not find fault with the remarks the leader of the Opposition has made, and all hon. members will agree in a general way as to the course which gentlemen of the press should pursue, and that they should report absolute facts. But in mentioning the name of an individual reporter, and in referring only to a portion of the evidence before the committee, and in not referring to the point mentioned by the chairman of the committee, that the reporter of the "Chronicle" had subsequently telegraphed a correction to his paper, which will no doubt appear in the issue when it arrives here, the leader of the Opposition may fairly be charged with being premature in his comments, especially in mentioning the name of an individual reporter. There is more than one official reporter of the committees, there are three, and even if one should be correspondent of a paper, who misrepresented or who is alleged to have misrepresented the evidence given before a committee, it would not follow that he did it deliberately or intentionally, because, unfortunately, he may have been absent when the evidence was given. But when, as has been stated, the reporter of the "Chronicle" made a correction of the error, all has been done in that particular direction that can be asked by any member of the press. If upon investigation as to the facts, an error appears to have been committed, and immediately on the attention of the reporter being called to it, he telegraphs a correction, he certainly has acted in an honourable way and we should delay further discussion on the question until copies of the paper containing the correction comes to hand. I

think we can all subscribe to the general sentiment that reporters of the press should be as truthful as possible in presenting absolute statements of facts, and neither one side of the House or the other is in a position to charge one party more than another with being unfair. I think in this particular case, after the leader of the Opposition has presented to the House his statement, it was unnecessary to proceed further with a view to establishing the status of the representatives of the press before the country.

Mr. McNEILL. I think this is a very grave matter, and one that should not be glossed over. The character of the members of this House and the public men of the country is a very important matter and one in which we are all very deeply interested. We ought to be protected against deliberate misrepresentations as to facts. I listened to the statement made by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and I am quite sure he intends to be fair; but it seems to me that the matter comes to this, if we are to accept his version of the matter, we must assume that the report of the "Globe," which is presented as a verbatim report——

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No.

Mr. DAVIN. It purports to be so.

Mr. McNEILL. It goes before the public as a verbatim report so far as it goes.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes, so far as it goes.

Mr. McNEILL. Then we must assume that the report is incorrect, if we are to assume that the statements made by the correspondent of the Halifax "Chronicle" are correct. If the report of the "Globe" is a correct report so far as it goes, it is quite evident there is no justification for the statement made by the correspondent of the Halifax paper.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman should not form any judgment on it, except in regard to the one item, which has been corrected.

Mr. McNEILL. It is in regard to one item, I am discussing it, and it is to that item the leader of the Opposition referred. It makes no difference whether the statement was sent by the correspondent of a paper supporting hon. gentlemen on this side of the House or supporting the other, for I would blame one as quickly as the other. It is, however, in the interest of hon. members and of the House that the character of public men be protected in every way possible, and I think a matter of this kind should not be glossed over.

Mr. FOSTER. This is a matter on which it may be important to say a word. Mr. Magurn informs me there are three stenographers on that committee, and that as a matter of fact he was not the stenographer who took down the evidence, and he did not send it to the "Globe." I take it, from his note, that he was the person who sent the report to the "Chronicle." Mr. Magurn also states that he telegraphed a correction of that report. It is fair to make this statement.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. leader of the Opposition, in moving the adjournment of the House, took the opportunity to deny a statement in the Halifax "Chronicle" referring to himself, and the hon. gentleman asked me if members have any protection against libellous articles in newspapers. Of course they have a remedy, but a special course of procedure has to be followed. The article complained of has to be read, the name of the supposed writer has to be stated, and he has to be called to the bar of the House and examined. All these proceedings have to be gone through with. In view of the personal explanation made by the hon. gentleman in regard to the statement published, I suppose it is not intended to proceed further, and of course further proceedings are not open under this motion. With respect to the question which the hon. gentleman asked the Chair also, as to the control over the stenographers appointed by committees of the House, I may say that in this case the House itself gave authority to a certain committee to employ shorthand writers, and it is the committee itself who controls them, and the Speaker of the House has no jurisdiction whatever. I may mention, however, for the information of the House, that since I have had the honour of occupying this position, I have laid it down as a stringent rule, which I believe has been literally carried out, that no employee, sessional or permanent, in this House under my control, shall take part in politics, either personally or as political correspondents of newspapers.

Motion to adjourn negatived.

PETERBOROUGH DRILL SHED.

Mr. LANG asked,

Did the Government ask for tenders for repairing the drill shed in the town of Peterborough, in the year 1898? If so, who were the parties who tendered and what was the amount of each tender?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). Tenders were asked for. Each party tendering to supply plans of the method proposed to be followed in making the repairs. Tenders were received from Thos. McKee, $425; Thos. Wilson, $450; Thos. Rutherford, $475. The specifications were prepared by the parties tendering and the departmental architect recommended the acceptance of Thos. Rutherford's tender as being really the lowest, in

view of the work undertaken under it, and the one most likely to attain the object sought, viz.: the permanent strengthening of the roof of the drill shed.

PAYMENTS TO MR. NOBLE, BARRISTER.

Mr. HUGHES (by Mr. Bennett) asked,

1. What sums have been paid to one Noble, a barrister of Cannington, Ontario, by the Government of Canada since 1st July, 1896?
2. For what purposes were these sums paid?
3. Who is now Indian agent to the Rama Indians?
4. What was the result of the inquiry into the conduct of the said Indian agent?
5. What is the total cost to April, 1898, of the said inquiry?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). I cannot find that any sums have been paid to Mr. Noble by this department.

Mr. TAYLOR. The Solicitor General has not answered all the question. Who is the Indian agent.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). The answer, so far as it concerns the Interior Department, is as follows:—1. Seventy-five dollars. 2. As an advance for witness fees and other disbursements, in the investigation of charges preferred against D. J. McPhee, Indian agent for the Rama Band. 3. D. J. McPhee. 4. The report has just been received, but has not yet been considered or acted upon. 5. Not known, as all the bills have not yet been rendered.

SOULANGES CANAL EXPENDITURE.

Mr. BERGERON (by Mr. Taylor) asked,

How much money has been spent upon the construction of the Soulanges Canal up to the 1st of May, 1898?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). There has been expended upon the construction of the Soulanges Canal up to the 1st May, 1898, the sum of $3,257,080.87.

ISSUE OF MINERS' LICENSES.

Mr. MACLEAN asked,

How many free miners' certificates were issued during the month of April (a) in Canada; (b) in Great Britain?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). It is impossible to state how many free miners' certificates were issued in the month of April, as complete returns for that month have not yet been received at the department.

GOVERNMENT CLAIMS—YUKON DISTRICT.

Mr. MONK asked,

1. What number of claims, according to latest reports, does the Government now hold in the Yukon, under the terms of regulation 16 of the regulations concerning placer mining in the district of Yukon, approved the 16th of January, 1898, by which every alternate ten claims are reserved?
2. In what manner does the Government intend disposing of said alternate claims so reserved?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). 1. No statement has yet been received from the Gold Commissioner showing the claims in the Yukon district held by the Government. 2. Pending the receipt of the statement no decision has been come to as to the manner in which the claims are to be disposed of.

CAPE BRETON RAILWAY—HARD PAN APPROPRIATION.

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness) asked,

1. What are the names of claimants for "hard pan" appropriation in connection with the building of the Cape Breton Railway, and the respective amounts claimed?
2. What are the names of claimants to whom money was paid from this appropriation, and the respective amounts so paid?
3. What is the amount remaining unpaid of the grant made by Parliament to meet such claims?
4. Whether the Government intend paying over any moneys remaining unpaid, under this head, to the various claimants whose claims remain unpaid?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). The following are the claimants with the amounts paid:—

1.—

Names.	Amount Claimed.
Isbester & Reid	$303,273 00
Neil, McDougall & Co	22,929 00
John McKeen & Co	4,700 51
McGregor, Kennedy & Graham	4,500 05
Dan McGregor	3,155 00
S. C. Graham	2,805 56
McAdam & Grant	15,723 72
W. J. Sims	4,035 20
Sims & Slater	60,026 88
Beatty, Shirlie & Beattie; McAdam & Grant; Sims & McDonald and others; Neil, McDougall & McNeill; McDonald & Cameron (sub-contractors of Sims & Slater)	*

*There appears to have been no specific amount claimed.

2.—

	Amounts Paid.
Isbester & Reid	$145,472 69
Neil, McDougall & Co	11,261 88
John McKeen & Co	4,000 00
McGregor, Kennedy & Graham	2,400 00
Dan McGregor	1,200 00
S. C. Graham	1,000 00
McAdam & Grant	6,000 00
W. J. Sims	416 23
Sims & Slater	4,855 50
Beattie, Shirlie & Beattie	6,442 00
McAdam & Grant	9,756 40
Sims, McDonald and others	2,822 40
Neil, McDougall & McNeil	4,883 20
McDonald & Cameron	7,709 20

As to the other two questions of the hon. member (Mr. McLennan) the grant made by Parliament has lapsed and it has not yet been determined whether the Government can pay any of the moneys remaining unpaid under the heading to the various claimants.

DES JOACHIM AND MACKIE'S STATION MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. POUPORE (by Mr. Taylor) asked,

Has the mail service between Des Joachim and Mackie's Station, on the Canadian Pacific Railway, been discontinued ? If so, for what reason has such service been abolished ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). In the absence of the Postmaster General, I beg to answer. The mail service between Des Joachim and Mackie's Station, on the Canadian Pacific Railway, has not yet been discontinued, but with the view if possible of establishing a daily instead of the present tri-weekly service, tenders have been called for a daily service between Moore's Lake Station and Des Joachim.

SEED GRAIN—AMOUNT DUE.

Mr. DAVIN asked.

How much is owed the Government for seed grain by settlers in the North-west Territories ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). On 1st April, 1898, there was owed for seed grain by settlers in the North-west Territories, $145,235.49.

PARRY SOUND—HARBOUR MASTER.

Mr. McCORMICK asked,

1. Who is harbour master at Parry Sound, Ontario, and what is his salary ?
2. Have the services of John Galna as harbour master at Parry Sound been dispensed with ?
3. If so, upon whose complaint, if any, and was there an investigation ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). 1. Mr. Frank Strain. Salary, $200 of fees collected. 2. Yes. 3. Mr. Galna's services dispensed with by Order in Council of the 26th April, as he had lately been dismissed from his position of landing waiter for offensive partisanship after a full and exhaustive investigation.

LEGAL AGENTS OF THE GOVERNMENT IN GREAT BRITAIN.

Mr. WALLACE asked.

Who are the legal agents of the Canadian Government in Great Britain ? When were they appointed ? How much have they been paid (1) as solicitors' fees (2) as counsel fees ; (3) for other services, and what were such other services ? What is the amount of accounts presented but not yet paid ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). Day, Russell & Company, solicitors, 37 Norfolk Street, London. They were appointed in September, 1896. They have been paid altogether up to the present time the sum of £738 8s. 2d. It is impossible to distinguish the amount paid to them as solicitors' fees, from the amounts paid to them to be paid over to counsel in the different cases in which they have acted for the Government. They have performed no services for the Government, except as solicitors before the Privy Council in England, and they have not been paid anything for other services. Their outstanding accounts rendered the Government, amount to £1,713 6s. 8d.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is in addition to the first sum ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. That is the amount of their claim upon us and presented to the Government by them.

INSURANCE COMPANIES.

Mr. BRODER (by Mr. Taylor) moved :

That in the opinion of this House some changes in the laws governing insurance companies should be made by which those insured with the honest intention of protecting their properties would be less under the control of the companies and their agents in reference to the value put upon property when insured, the rates charged for insurance, and the adjustment of claims when losses occur.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). I imagine, Mr. Speaker, that the object of the hon. gentleman who gave notice of that resolution was to address the House in explanation of its contents. I can hardly imagine that his purpose will be served by having it moved and pressed to a vote without discussion. If it is my hon. friend's intention to discuss the question, I will give way to him. If not, I ask him whether he will serve the object of the mover by pressing the resolution ?

Mr. TAYLOR. When I took the paper up hurriedly, I thought it was the intention to take the motions that call for papers, and as this is the last day for making motions of this kind, I thought the wise course would be to make the motion to-day. But I see that this motion involves discussion, and it had better stand.

Mr. SPEAKER. The motion stands.

NORTH-WEST ROUTE TO THE YUKON.

Mr. DAVIS (Saskatchewan) moved for :

Copies of all reports and plans respecting or in any way relating to a route through and from the North-west Territories to the Yukon district via Prince Albert, Saskatchewan, Green Lake, Isle La Crosse and the Clear Water River and Fort McMurray on the Athabasca.

He said : Mr. Speaker, I think it is in the interest of the country, as a whole, that a

route to the Yukon district should be opened up from the centre of the North-west Territories, not only for the purpose of obtaining communication with the Yukon district for the settlers of the Territories, but also for the purpose of developing the vast agricultural lands in the valley of the Peace River and opening up the extensive placer deposits which we have in that country. I think it will be conceded by all that it is not practicable to build a railway from the centre of the Territories to the Yukon district at the present time. The shortest distance, even if we could build a railway in a direct line, would be about 1,500 miles; and if it would cost $30,000 a mile, it would involve the expenditure of over $30,000,000. I think that $30,000 a mile is not too large an estimate, when we consider that the Intercolonial Railway cost something like $32,000 a mile. As it is not practicable to build a railway through the Peace River country to the Yukon district from the centre of the North-west Territories, I think it would be wise on the part of the Government to take some steps to open up the waterways which nature has provided as a means of communication. We have a magnificent system of waterways, running from the eastern portion of the Territories to the Yukon district, with only three small portages. The route I allude to, the Prince Albert route, is the shortest route by some 360 miles from any point in eastern Canada, through Winnipeg and Prince Albert, to the Yukon district. It is that much shorter than the Edmonton route, and is a better route in every way. It is the old route which has been used by the Hudson's Bay Company for some 200 years to transport men and merchandise to the north. Starting from Prince Albert, it runs to Big River, a distance of 70 miles, thence by way of the Big River to the head of Green Lake; from this point to Isle LaCrosse. Here there is a Hudson's Bay post, a Roman Catholic mission, a saw-mill and a considerable settlement. From this point the route goes up the Beaver River to Buffalo Lake, thence by a portage of about 12 miles to Clearwater River. Then there is straight sailing down the Clearwater River for about 80 miles to Fort McMurray on the Athabasca River. From here there is a choice of two routes to Dawson City, one by way of the Peace River, and the other by way of Slave River to Great Slave Lake, thence by the Mackenzie River 1,000 miles to Fort McPherson, thence by a portage of about 25 miles to Rat River, thence down the Rat River to the head waters of the Porcupine River, and down that river to the Yukon. The total distance from Prince Albert to Dawson City by this route is 2,829 miles. That looks like a great distance, but when we take into consideration the fact that nearly the whole traffic going to the Yukon goes by St. Michael's on the Behring Sea, and up the Yukon against the stream, a distance of 1,300 or 1,400 miles, we shall find that the route I am speaking of is a much shorter one from the heart of the Territories. Another thing in its favour is that it is practically down stream and clear sailing all the way. On the Mackenzie River for the 1,000 miles there are no impediments to navigation. At the present time there is a steamboat that draws six feet of water running on the Mackenzie River. There are only three portages, and there is plenty of electric power to be had to run tramways across these portages. There is no doubt that if the Government would take the matter up and build tramways across the portages, there would be companies to put steamers on the rivers. The Hudson's Bay Company have at present steamers on the Mackenzie and Athabasca rivers and the Great Slave Lake. This is a very important question to the people of the Territories, because we not only want the people who are going to the Yukon to pass through the centre of the Territories, so that they will see our agricultural lands, but we would like those who return from the Yukon to come that way, in the hope that many of them will stay in the country. We must not assume that all the people who are going to the Yukon will make large fortunes. Where one man may make a fortune of a million dollars, there will probably be many who will not make over $1,000 or $500. These are the men we want to come back through the centre of the Territories, and if possible have them settle there.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Before the hon. gentleman leaves that point, will he briefly state what the distance is from Prince Albert to Dawson City over that route?

Mr. DAVIS (Saskatchewan). Two thousand eight hundred and twenty-nine miles.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Would it be convenient for the hon. gentleman to say how much of that is land and how much water?

Mr. DAVIS (Saskatchewan). The portages are 70 miles from Prince Albert to the head of Green Lake, 12 miles from Beaver River to Lake La Crosse, and 25 miles form Fort McPherson to Rat River. The total distance of land that will have to be traversed will be about 120 miles. I might say in this connection that for the first seventy miles I have mentioned, I do not think it would be necessary to have a railway at all. There is a splendid wagon road all the way and old settlements. The country is all taken up in the first seventy miles, and I do not think there is any necessity for a railway there. The only thing required would be a tramway over Portage Laloche to the Clear Water River, which runs into the Athabasca at Fort McMurray. That would give us uninterrupted navigation the whole way; and it is import-

ant to us to have a road going from the town of Prince Albert, in the district of Saskatchewan, and it is also more important in the general interest of the country, for this reason. It is generally conceded that the district of Saskatchewan is the finest agricultural district in the North-west Territories. It is a country adapted for mixed farming and well timbered—a rolling country the same as Ontario. No doubt, a great many of the people going to the Yukon would settle in the Saskatchewan country. I hope that the Government will take this into their serious consideration. I understand that there is a vote in the Supplementary Estimates for the purpose of exploring the country north of the Saskatchewan River, with the intention of finding out the practicability of building a railway through it. If that is the intention, I think it would be very well for the Government to explore these waterways. I do not think it is practicable to build a railway from the centre of the territory to the Yukon at present, because that will take five or six years, and by the time it would be completed a great many of the people who went in would be prepared to come out, if they had not already left. In fact, at present there are hardly so many people going in as have been going. Therefore, I do not think the Government would be warranted in going to the expenditure this railway would involve for that purpose. But the route I advocate is a poor man's; it is a cheap route. It is a route that starts right from the centre of the territories, and will give us a chance of supplying all the food required by the people of the Yukon. The stuff can be hauled down the navigable rivers very cheaply, and there are many reasons why all the food products required in the Yukon should go from the centre of the territory. This route would connect with the Edmonton, by the way of Athabasca Landing it connects with that route at Fort McMurray. The only difference between the Edmonton and this route is that it is 360 miles shorter going from the east.

Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to take up any more time of the House, as others wish to speak on this question, and it is nearly six o'clock.

Mr. DAVIN. Before this motion is carried, I wish to say that I am exceedingly glad the hon. gentleman has brought this matter before the House, because I think that the merits of this as one of the routes to the Yukon cannot be too emphatically placed before the notice of the public. My hon. friend the Speaker of the North-west Assembly, went before the boards of trade of some of our principal cities and placed the merits of that route, which my hon. friend has advocated to-day, before these bodies, and it is a matter of notoriety, judging by the reports in the newspapers, that a most favourable impression was created upon the various boards of trade as to the feasibility of this route, the readiness with which it can be utilized, and its cheapness; and if I remember rightly, opinions were expressed by leading business men very favourable to the idea of the Government utilizing it. Early in the session I put a question on the paper asking the hon. Minister of Railways whether he had considered the feasibility of the Prince Albert and Edmonton route, and the hon. gentleman replied that when the Supplementary Estimates came down, I would see whether or not the Government had paid any attention to the question, and I am somewhat surprised that the Government should allow this motion to pass without giving the House some information as to the view they take of the merits of this route which my hon. friend has brought to their attention. Much more might be said in its favour even than what he has stated. He knows better than I do that you do not travel very far upon this route until you come to a place where gold has been already discovered, and is now being successfully mined, and the information we have is that not merely have you a vast ranching country there all the way, but that certainly over a great part of the route, before you come to the Mackenzie River—all along that line—there is mining that will probably arrest the attention of people going over to the Yukon. The town council of Prince Albert has published an excellent pamphlet, in which the opinion of ecclesiastics who have gone over that route are set forth. The bishop of the Roman Catholic church wrote a letter to a gentleman in Prince Albert, which is published in a pamphlet, in which he says: We have travelled over every part of this route and it is one well adapted for a poor man's road to the Yukon.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). What pamphlet does my hon. friend refer to?

Mr. DAVIN It is a pamphlet issued by the Board of Trade of Prince Albert. Not only does that pamphlet contain a letter from the bishop, but also from one of the clergymen in his diocese, endorsing the view taken by him. You need only look at the map that accompanies the Klondike Forward Guide to see that nature has here, as elsewhere in Canada, placed at the disposal of the Government waterways that must prove of the greatest value in opening up and developing the country. Now, my hon. friend the Solicitor General asked me a question, and I think I cannot do better than read the following letter, which was received by the Prince Albert Board of Trade as to the practicability of the route:

Bishop's Palace,
Prince Albert, 3rd December, 1897.

To F. C. Baker, for the Prince Albert Board of Trade.

Dear Sir,—You have expressed a wish to know my opinion as to the best route to follow in order to reach the celebrated gold mines on the Klondike. Here it is :

While waiting until the railway companies, with the assistance of Government, open a direct line across the fertile valley of Saskatchewan to reach Peel River (let us say for example via Portage la Prairie, Yorkton, Prince Albert, Shell River, Jackfish Lake, Victoria, Athabasca Landing, Little Slave Lake, Peace River, Liard River and Peel River), while awaiting this railway which is now impending, I do not hesitate to tell you that in my opinion—and I believe it to be the true one, the most comfortable, the most direct, and the most easy route is that which the hand of Divine Providence has traced, and which has been followed for a century by the Hudson's Bay Company's men and for half a century by the missionaries who evangelize the Indians of the North-west in the immense districts of Athabasca and Mackenzie.

Taking Regina for a starting point, we may go to McMurray by two routes, one via Prince Albert, Green Lake, Portage la Losche, Clearwater River and McMurray ; the other via Calgary, Edmonton, Athabasca Landing and McMurray. On leaving McMurray the traveller was borne down stream as far as Peel River, without effort, without danger, and without difficulty. Everywhere on his road he will meet with Hudson's Bay Company's posts, and missionaries willing to render service and inculcate charity ; Half-breeds and Indians ready to serve as guides and facilitate this voyage without being too exorbitant. Besides Lake Athabasca and the Great Slave Lake, which one can cross without danger, there is the portage of Fort Smith, 140 miles below Lake Athabasca. This portage is eighteen miles in length, and can be made by wagons or carriages drawn by horses or oxen.

Starting from Regina, you will ask me which is the best route to reach McMurray ? Is it via Edmonton or via Price Albert and Green Lake ? I confess, dear sir, that I should prefer Prince Albert and Green Lake. These are my reasons : This route is direct everywhere, and is shorter by about 300 miles ; it presents not the least danger, and is exceedingly cheap. It is by this road that the Hudson's Bay Company has transmitted its goods for seventy-five years to provision its trading posts on the Athabasca and Mackenzie. The company would still continue to do so had not the development of its commerce compelled it to utilize the Calgary and Edmonton Railway and to construct a steamer on Athabasca River.

All those who have ascended or descended the River Athabasca have retained a souvenir of the difficulties and dangers to which they were exposed in descending the impetuous torrent. When the waters from the mountains swell the river, as happens two or three times each spring, the waves are enormous, and one blunder might cost you your life. It is better to avoid the rapids. The guides, who at such times hold the fate of the traveller in their hands, occasionally show themselves exorbitant and dishonest. In autumn, when the water is low, the bed of the rapids is strewn with rocks and shoals, necessitating, in such cases the portaging of goods, and occasioning much loss of time. Besides Grand Rapid, which resembles the key of the country to the north, the traveller has yet to pass nine more rapids, some of them several miles in length, in which there is great risk of loss of life and property. These reasons alone, to say nothing of economy and saving of time, decides my opinion in favour of the route via Regina, Prince Albert, Green Lake Isle a la Crosse, Portage la Losche, Clearwater River and McMurray. As I have already said, this route presents no danger, is direct, very pleasant, and is like a pleasure trip. The essential point is to have a boat at Green Lake prepared beforehand, so as to gain time.

Such, my dear sir is my humble opinion, based upon my numerous voyages by each of these routes during the twenty-four years I have resided in the North-west, sixteen of which were passed in the missions on the Athabasca and Mackenzie.

Accept, dear sir my best salutations.

(Sgd.) ALBERT PASCHAL, O.M.I.,
Vic. Apost. de Saskatchewan.

Now, there was one remark that fell from my hon. friend from Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) that I do not quite agree with, if I understood him correctly. I understood him to say that it was not practicable at present to build railways from the centre of the territory.

Mr. DAVIS (Saskatchewan). What I said was that I did not know whether it was practicable to build a railway from there or not, but it would take forty-five years, and we want to get a road open at once.

Mr. DAVIN. Then, there is no substantial difference between us, Mr. Speaker. I do not think the Government can too soon entertain the idea of building a line of railway that shall develop that Peace River country. I say there cannot be a better work for Canada or for the North-west Territories than to utilize these magnificent water stretches reaching from Prince Albert right on to the Mackenzie River, and thence by the head waters of the Porcupine you are swept down into the Yukon country. The Government cannot do better than immediately utilize this magnificent channel of lakes and rivers placed by nature at our disposal, as it were, to enable us to get in and possess the Yukon country. The Government cannot do this too soon. Not merely will they be opening, as it were, a door, and a door easy of access, for the miner into that country, but they will be preparing for the development of a country that, the shores of those lakes and rivers, is rich not merely in pasture lands and in some few places rich in arable lands, but I am assured by gentlemen who can speak with authority, in almost every corner of which mining can be successfully pursued. The railway from the centre is the true railway for Canada, the true railway to get the trade of this country for Canada. Look, Sir, what has come to our knowledge within a few days as to the peril to Canada with regard to the trade of the Yukon, because we have not a central railway. If you

take over all these parts, you could have a good route, such as my hon. friend (Mr. Davis) speaks of, but you would have then a railway that would infallibly bring to us all the trade of this mining country that will be of such immense value to Canada, or ought to be, for years to come. For I do not believe it will play out with the rapidity that some gentlemen speak of. A short time ago I was reading in the "North American Review" an article written by an official of the United States, an official who spoke with authority in regard to mining matters, and he calculates that the mineral wealth of Alaska is equal to the whole mineral wealth that has been developed in California and on the Pacific Coast in the last fifty years. Well, if the mineral wealth of Alaska is so great, what must be the mineral wealth of the Canadian Klondike and Yukon? We know that this immeasurably exceeds the wealth of Alaska. What is the proof of it? The proof is that the American miner, instead of remaining in his own country, in Alaska, and mining under his own laws, has been for many months back hurrying across into Canadian territory in order that he may reap the rich gold harvest that is to be reaped there. So we have in our Klondike and Yukon country, if it be properly managed by the Governme if they be wise, untold wealth yet to be developed. Let us make sure that the great wealth of gold that is there shall be for our own people here in Canada.

If they do that, the trade of the Yukon and the trade of the Klondike will be secured for the merchants of Montreal, the merchants of Toronto, the merchants of Victoria. Then we shall have an invigorating source of wealth operating on older Canada that will give to Canada itself an immeasurable push forward in the march of progress. As it is now six o'clock, and as I do not want to prevent my hon. friend's motion from passing, this being our last day for private business, I will conclude my remarks.

Motion agreed to.

ANGLO-FRENCH TELEGRAPH COMPANY.

Mr. FRASER moved:

That the petition of Alexander Ferguson, of the city of Ottawa, and others, presented this day, praying for an Act of incorporation under the name of the Anglo-French Telegraph Company (Limited), be received forthwith and referred to the Select Standing Committee on Standing Orders.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Will the hon. gentleman explain the object of this motion? My hon. friend is aware there was some discussion on the subject.

Mr. FRASER. It does not relate to the Act at all.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. Ferguson, on behalf of his friends, asked leave the other day to present a petition, which leave was granted, and the petition was presented. But it was omitted to have a motion passed, when motions were called. This is merely to remedy the neglect.

Motion agreed to.

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

After Recess.

SAFETY OF RAILWAYS EMPLOYEES AND PASSENGERS.

Orders of the Day for considertion of the Bill (No. 4) further to secure the safety of railway employees and passengers.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved that the order be discharged, and the Bill recommitted to Committee of the Whole.

Mr. MACLEAN. I hope before this Bill is referred back that the Government will give an expression of their opinion in regard to it. This is a measure on the lines of which I introduced a Bill five or six years ago; it is a Bill on the lines of legislation that is taking place in the United States, and it has been successful there. Railways under that legislation have been compelled to change their equipment, and a great many railways are having their equipment changed, all these provisions in the interest of the public are being enforced, and the time has now come when the roads must equip all their cars in the direction of this Bill. It is urged on behalf of the railways over there that the Bill is too stringent, and that some time ought to be given to them to allow them to equip the whole of their cars. I believe that time will be given to them. But so far in this country we have not given that power, we have not made the Bill law, and it is urged that we should not make this Bill law, because it is too hard on the railway companies. I say, make it law and give them reasonable time to change equipment. If the time proposed in the Bill is not sufficient, we can follow the example of the United States and extend the time. But so far as I can see, there is no disposition on the part of the Government, and their is no disposition on the part of this House, really to tackle the railway problem of this country, and to secure in some way justice for the people.

What is wanted in every country is for the legislature to try and solve the railway problem and compel the railway companies to do justice to the people. So far nothing of this kind has been done in Canada. Nothing has been done except in the direction of aggravating the railway situation. We vote large subsidies to railway corporations, and thereby make it harder for a railway company to exist. And then it is urged, why pass laws which make it

more difficult for a railway company to secure a return on their investment? If such be the fact, we should stop creating further railway corporations and at the same time pass laws to compel the railway companies to-day to do justice to the people. This Bill is asked by men who work for the railways, it is asked by the people in the public interest; and yet although it was introduced five or six years ago, it has not made any headway, and the intention of the Government apparently is to discharge the order and not allow the Bill to pass. I hope, however, the Government will change its policy, and let the people understand clearly that they intend to do something in respect to this question. In view of the statements made by members of the Administration in this House and pledges given to the country, they are bound to do something towards the solution of the railway question. First, they should stop the subsidizing of new roads, which aggravates the situation and does not ameliorate the condition by giving cheaper rates and securing better accommodation. If they are earnest in dealing with the railway question, they should depoliticalise the Railway Department. The Minister has told the House that he administers the department from a political point of view, that he does so because of recommendations made by hon. gentlemen behind him. Such a course is not in line with progressive legislation. Another thing hon. gentlemen opposite should do is to create a railway commission.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is not permitted by the rules of the House to discuss the merits of the Bill on the question now before the Chair. The rules say:

> On a motion to discharge the order for the second reading of a Bill, it is irregular to discuss the merits of such Bill.

Mr. MACLEAN. There is a motion before the Chair to discharge this order, and this is equivalent to defeating the Bill. I propose to show the reasons why the order should not be discharged and the Bill allowed to pass. If the Government are in earnest, I say they will appoint a railway commission. The Government have been in power three sessions, in each of which the Bill has been considered, but no progress has been made and no legislation apparently will be had during the present session. The Bill altogether has been before the House five or six years; I have brought it up myself. It was jollied along by the late Government, and is being jollied along now. If the Government are in earnest they will pass a railway law and do the railway men and the public justice. I take this opportunity to protest against the action being taken against this Bill, and I hope the Government will not allow another year to pass without passing it into law.

Mr. DAVIN. I certainly must add my protest to that of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) in regard to the present Bill. I thought the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) saw a haven of rest for his measure. It had passed through many difficulties, and after several years, during which it was taken up and discussed, it looked as if it would be carried during the present session. It is quite clear that the reason it is not to be carried is because of the powerful hostility, that has thus far been carefully veiled, of the Government in power. In 1891 I brought forward a Bill dealing with a similar condition of affairs to that proposed to be met by the present Bill. One of my objects on that occasion was to deal with the question of second homestead, and on dividing the House I brought down the Government majority to fourteen, whereupon Sir John Thompson stated that he would put my Bills on the Government paper. Then I thought my railway Bill was secure. I thought when the Government said they would take up my Bills, it was intended to take up all of them; but, as in this case, my railway Bill was referred to the Railway Committee. When before the committee I saw at once the position occupied by my poor Bill; an overwhelming majority was arrayed against it, comprised of members from both sides of the House; and an extraordinary circumstance occurred, namely, that an hon. member, who had given me good points and furnished me with arguments in support of my Bill, spoke against it, because of the tremendous influence exercised in his constituency by the Grand Trunk Railway. I got, however, a promise from the Canadian Pacific Railway that they would gradually introduce into the North-west the things provided for by the Bill, and I must say they have to a considerable extent, done so, and they have shown very good faith. These included fire brakes and the gradual introduction of automatic couplers and some other things. I saw, however, it was no use whatever for a private member to initiate legislation of this kind. Each time either the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) or any other hon. member has brought forward a railway Bill, I have supported it, and when the Conservative Government was in power I used whatever little influence I possessed with that Government to have them push it forward, and since then I have urged on hon. gentlemen who are supposed to have influence with the present Government to forward any measure of this kind, but an hon. member cannot succeed unless the Government throws its heavy hand into the scale. I thought my hon. friend was really to succeed in regard to this, but now it seems that this year he too will have to succumb.

The PRIME MINISTER. Will my hon. friend (Mr. Davin) permit me to interrupt him to say, that his indignation is altogether wasted as there is no cause for it. I think my hon. friend (Mr. Casey) is satisfied that there is no cause at all for the indignation of my hon. friend (Mr. Davin). The Government have looked into this Bill and we are satisfied, as has been explained on more than one occasion by the Minister of Railways, that the first six clauses which deal with the object of my hon. friend (Mr. Casey) has in view, can be legislated upon here; but the 7th clause is one which is clearly beyond the purview of this Parliament. It deals with a question which affects civil rights and is within the domain of the provincial legislatures. Last Monday night when we had this matter under consideration, the Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair) was absent from the House, and as I had not the benefit of previous conference with him, I had to allow the 7th clause to pass, although I had very grave doubts as to its legality. I then told my hon. friend (Mr. Casey) that we would consult the Minister of Justice, and if the Minister of Justice reported that the 7th clause was within the power of this Parliament we would let it go, but if the Minister of Justice found that it was not within the power of this Parliament, then I would ask the Bill to be referred back to the Committee of the Whole, in order to expunge this 7th clause, so that the rest of the Bill should pass.

Mr. DAVIN. I was under the impression that the motion made by the Prime Minister was to discharge the order.

The PRIME MINISTER. Exactly, but to refer the Bill back to the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. DAVIN. If the Bill, with the exception of the 7th clause is to be adopted, I candidly admit that substantial progress will have been made.

The PRIME MINISTER. I expected it was the policy of my hon. friend (Mr. Davin) to oppose the Government.

Mr. DAVIN. If the righteous indignation needs a salve, I can assure the right hon. gentleman that the salve will not be refused by me. I am glad to learn that the first six clauses are to be adopted, and I suppose when we go into committee there is nothing to prevent us moving a substitute for clause 7?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. So far as there having been any disposition on the part of the Government to frustrate the first clauses of the Bill, my hon. friend (Mr. Casey) will, I think, acknowledge that he had every assistance which is was possible for me to render in perfecting them.

Mr. CASEY. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have devoted some little attention towards providing suggestions with regard to clauses 3, 4, 5 and 6, which I thought would make the Bill effective, and which were readily accepted by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Casey).

Mr. CASEY. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. An insuperable difficulty has arisen as respects the 7th clause and the subsections connected with it.

Mr. CASEY. The question apparently at issue is whether this course proposed to be taken will make an end of the Bill. We might as well argue the matter of jurisdiction in committee as now, but I do not wish to agree to this motion to discharge the order and go back into the Committee of the Whole if is is going to prevent the passage of this Bill to-night, in the shape in which it leaves the committee. We are well aware that this is probably the last night for Bills of this kind, as the Government, in the latter part of last week, made a move for taking Mondays. If the right hon. the Premier undertakes to see that the Bill, in whatever shape it may leave the committee, is put through its final stages to-night, I am willing to agree to the motion to go back into Committee of the Whole; otherwise I will have to take a vote upon it.

The PRIME MINISTER. In so far as the Government is concerned, there will be no disposition to delay the Bill; on the contrary, there will be every disposition to assist my hon. friend (Mr. Casey) in passing the first six clauses.

Mr. CASEY. There is another point I wish to refer to. I presume that any person can object to the Bill taking its several stages to-night?

The PRIME MINISTER. We cannot help that.

Mr. CASEY. We can only help that by not going back into committee. If any opposition of that kind arises I do not propose to go into committee with my consent; of course it will have to go to committee if the Government say so.

Motion agreed to, order discharged, and the House again resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I move that clause 7 be struck out.

Mr. CASEY. I am aware of the grounds urged for striking out this clause. I have been told, again and again, by the Government that it was beyond our powers. I have urged in reply that it seemed to me

that the power to legislate in this direction was a necessary incident of our power over railways declared to be for the benefit of Canada. I have urged by way of analogy the case of real estate. Real estate is a matter placed under the jurisdiction of the provincial legislatures; but in so far as real estate is a necessary incident of railway legislation, it has been admitted on all hands to be within the power of this House in regard to Dominion railways. Provincial legislation in regard to drainage, fencing, and so forth, has not been held to apply to Dominion railways on that ground. I have urged, and I still urge by analogy, that the relations between employers and employed in connection with Dominion railways are within the jurisdiction of this Parliament. We constantly make legislation in regard to contracts. In banking legislation we enact laws as to the giving of warehouse receipts. In this legislation matters of contract are involved, and I believe that contracts between the employer and employed in connection with Dominion railways are also within the jurisdiction of this House, with all due respect to the legal authorities that have been said to be against that view. Though I have asked the hon. Minister of Railways on several occasions to produce a written opinion of the Minister of Justice as to the unconstitutionality of this provision, I find that he has not yet had time to get it. Now, it would certainly have great weight with this House if such a written opinion were obtained, for we know that the Minister of Justice is a constitutional authority. I do not say that his opinion should be or would be decisive with every member of this House. We have each a right to form our own opinion on constitutional questions, irrespective of any legal opinion that may be given. We have a right to our own opinion on this question, which is a legal question, and not a party question, or one affecting the Government in any way. The Government whip tells me, while I am speaking, that the Minister of Justice is the adviser of the Crown, and not of the House. Well, I think probably the Crown might obtain the loan of one of his reports or opinions on this question for the use of the House. I have been waiting for that opinion, but it has not yet been produced. I have not heard the opinion of any of those lawyers who have dealt much with constitutional questions on this provision. From that statement I must except the right hon. Premier himself, whose opinion appears in this case to be adverse to me. I am afraid, however, that he has not had his attention called very earnestly to all the phases of the question. If it had come up in discussion with any lawyer, he might have gone more fully into it. I am not sure that he might not change his opinion if he went into all aspects of the question. For these reasons I am not willing to assent to the knocking out of this clause. It is the important clause of the whole Bill. The improvements which are asked for by the Bill in the equipment of railway cars, are being made with fair rapidity by the railways themselves in their own interest. The use of this Bill would be chiefly to hasten those improvements. But this clause is of supreme importance in establishing what railway men consider to be fair-play between themselves and their employers. Railway employment is a peculiarly risky one, and it is held by those who favour this Bill—who I think are the majority of this House—that special provision should be made in the case of such a risky employment—that the ordinary rules of law as to negligence should not be enforced, and that the employer in such a risky employment should be made subject to the risks arising out of the nature of the employment itself, and not simply those arising out of any special negligence on his part. I need not go over the whole ground. The British Parliament has taken the same view and has enacted something wider than this; but I am only proposing to legislate with regard to railway employment, which I think we have power to do. I am, therefore, obliged to oppose the motion of the Minister of Railways to strike out this clause. If the House think with him, they will have to vote that way, otherwise I ask them to vote for the clause.

Mr. MACLEAN. The way to test the constitutionality of this provision is to make it the law, and let it go to the courts and be settled there. The Government are not prepared to give an opinion to-night as to its constitutionality. With regard to compensation to workmen, what are the facts? In the United States, where the population is twice that of Great Britain, thousands of men are killed every year on the railways, whereas in England not a dozen people are killed in a year, because there they have better laws for the protection of the men who work on railways.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). Has my hon. friend the statistics on the point?

Mr. MACLEAN. The statistics are in the reports of the Inter-State Commerce Commission. They are something alarming as to the sacrifices of human life on the railways, and the railway companies simply snap their fingers at the brakesmen and engineers who are killed one after another. In this country we cannot get remedial legislation for railway employees. I would like to quote what is said in the paper of which the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) is the editor in regard to getting railway legislation through this Parliament. It says:

> Things have apparently come to a pretty pass when no legislation can be passed without first saying by your leave to the Canadian Pacific Railway, and arranging a compromise with the company.

I hope this Parliament will rise superior to this state of things and pass this law, and let it go to the courts where it can be decided whether we have jurisdiction or not. Let us show the workingmen on the railways that Parliament does take an interest in their calling, and put a law on the Statute-book in the line of the laws that have been enacted in England and in the United States. The Government are not prepared to-night to give their express opinion that this Bill is ultra vires of this Parliament. Then I say they are in duty bound to grant the petitions which have been sent here from one end of the country to the other, by passing this law.

The PRIME MINISTER. When this matter was before the House a week ago to-day, I undertook to consult the Department of Justice in order to ascertain whether or not this Bill was within the purview of the powers of this Parliament. The answer I received was that beyond doubt this clause is not within the purview of the powers of this Parliament, as it is a provision which clearly affects the law of contract with regard to civil rights. If that be so, I would point out to my hon. friend that it would be a very poor service to render to the class he wants to benefit to pass such a law. His argument is, let us pass the law, and let the question of its constitutionality be decided by the courts. It would be well enough to do so if the men who were to be the parties to the litigation were two powerful companies who would be quite able to carry the law from court to court until it should be finally determined by judicial authority. But if my hon. friend will remember that one of the litigants would be a poor working man, having neither the power nor the money to carry litigation to that point, I think he will see that by this Bill we would be rendering this man a very poor service indeed. By the civil code of the province of Quebec, whoever receives an injury upon a railway has a remedy against the company, so that no legislation is required in this Parliament, and the legislation proposed will introduce a new condition of things which does not exist under the laws of Quebec. If, therefore, that man were to sue under this legislation for compensation, it is certain he would not obtain any whatever. When the judicial authority of this Government is clear and beyond doubt the Parliament has no jurisdiction over this matter, I think it is better for us not to meddle with it and to refer the parties to the provincial legislatures for their remedy. Far be it for me to offer any objection upon the merits of this proposed legislation. Legislation is progressive in every country, especially to-day, and I know that during last summer, the British Parliament went very far indeed in the direction of providing compensation for injuries. The only objection I offer is that we have no power to pass such a law, and that we would be rendering no service to the workingman to put useless weapons in his hands.

Mr. MACLEAN. Where does the jurisdiction lie?

The PRIME MINISTER. In the provincial legislatures.

Mr. POWELL. I would like to ask the right hon. Prime Minister if, in consulting the Justice Department, he drew any distinction between railways that are under the jurisdiction of the Parliament of Canada and those that are not. When this Bill was before the special committee, I remember distinctly pointing out that clearly the Parliament of Canada had no right to infringe upon the jurisdiction of the local legislatures in the case of railways that were chartered by the local legislatures, and I did, at the same time, express some doubts as to whether we had jurisdiction in the case of Dominion railways. I would like to know if the Department of Justice drew any distinction between the two.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). In reply to the hon. gentleman, I have to say that this is a question that is not in doubt, so far as the courts are concerned. The very point now brought up was decided in the case of the Canada Southern and Jackson, 17 Supreme Court Reports. In that case the court decided that the Workman's Compensation for Injuries Act of Ontario, 49 Vic., c. 28, applies to the Canada Southern Railway Company, notwithstanding it had been brought under the operation of the Government Railways Act of the Dominion.

Mr. POWELL. It is not exactly the same point, but it is a kindred one.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. It seems to me to be the very point my hon. friend has suggested, as to whether or not a provincial legislature would have the right to legislate in the case of a railway which was declared to be for the general benefit of Canada.

Mr. POWELL. No doubt it would be unconstitutional for this Parliament to deal with any railway that is entirely under the jurisdiction of the local legislature. But the point I raise is as to whether the local legislatures had jurisdiction over railways for the general benefit of Canada.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I cannot see the distinction in principle at all. The question here, at all events, is one of civil rights. It does not amount to anything else. Are you going to determine here what the rights are of an individual to obtain compensation for an injury suffered by him within the limits of a province? That is surely a question of civil rights beyond our jurisdiction. In the very case I have cited, Judge Patterson said:

It is not legislation respecting such local works and undertakings as are excepted from the legislative jurisdiction of the provinces by article 10 of section 92 of the British North America Act. It touches the civil rights of the provinces. The rule of law which it alters was a rule of common law in no way dependent or arising out of Dominion legislation, and the measure is strictly of the same class as Lord Campbell's Act which, as adopted by provincial legislation, has been applied without question to all our railways.

I cannot see the distinction between the two cases. If the hon. gentleman will read the report, he will see that it is identically the same point.

Mr. CASEY. What is the nature of this case ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. My hon. friend must be aware of the fact that there is legislation in Ontario exactly similar to the one he wants to introduce here.

Mr. CASEY. Not at all.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. 49 Vic., chap. 28.

Mr. CASEY. Was this a suit for wages ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. It was a suit for compensation for injury. It is exactly clause 7.

Mr. CASEY. My hon. friend surely does not wish to create the impression that there is legislation in the province of Ontario similar to what I am trying to secure by this Bill. I know he is aware that such legislation does not exist in that province, and he could not wish to convey such an impression. But the point is not whether provincial legislation may be held to apply in certain cases, but whether Dominion legislation might not also apply. I hold there is concurrent jurisdiction. It is quite as clear in the constitution that real estate and everything incident to it are under the control of the local legislatures as that civil rights are, yet it has been held, time and again, that legislation as to real estate, where Dominion railways are concerned, is within the power of this House, and by analogy it is quite as clear that there is concurrent jurisdiction in the question of the relations between employer and employee when Dominion railways are in question. One decision of a court on a local Act, in the absence of Dominion legislation, does not decide the matter. Previous to the legislation in the early eighties, when so many railways were declared to be Dominion railways for the benefit of Canada, local Acts did apply to them : but as soon as this Parliament chose to legislate on the matter, it was held that our legislation overrode that of the local legislatures in regard to these particular roads declared to be Dominion roads, and the provincial legislation did not apply to them any longer. I believe the same thing would happen if we were to legislate in the direction I ask. If we were to pass a law determining the relations between employer and employee on Dominion railways, the courts would hold them to be constitutional just as they did our other legislation with regard to these railways. I am not a lawyer, but I have studied the constitution to some extent, as a member of Parliament must. All I can do is to listen to the legal arguments and offer my opinion, as a juryman or an independent man, and I simply ask the House to do the same. No opinion from anybody is absolutely decisive until we have the decision of the highest court, and we have not had that on this question.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. We have the decision of the highest court in this country. Without being a member of the Bar of the province of Ontario, I do know, and I presume the hon. gentleman ought to know, of the existence of the statute 49 Vic., chap. 29, which has for its effect the providing of compensation to workingmen for injuries sustained by them on railways

Mr. CASEY. Not similar to this Bill.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. It is absolutely the same.

Mr. CASEY. It is not absolutely similar, though it may be in the same class of legislation. I suppose what he wishes to point out is that it is legislation of the same class, but no similar legislation to this has been passed in this country yet.

The PRIME MINISTER. There is a statute of the province of Ontario upon this subject. I desire to draw the attention of my hon. friend (Mr. Casey) also to the law of the province of Quebec. In that province there is no statute applying to workmen on railways in particular, but we have a general law respecting the responsibility of parties in such cases. Section 1053 of the Civil Code, which is the common law of the province, says :

Every person capable of discerning right from wrong is responsible for the damage caused by his fault to another, whether by positive act, imprudence, neglect or want of skill.

Nothing could be broader than these words. A subsection says :

The responsibility attaches in the above cases only when the person subject to it fails to establish that he was unable to prevent the act which has caused the damage.

Now, here you have a section enacting the very reverse of what the hon. gentleman proposes here. He is putting the responsibility upon the company, without having to plead the contributory negligence of the employee.

Mr. CASEY. If contributory negligence can be proved, this Bill cannot apply.

The PRIME MINISTER. But here is enough to show that this new provision is antagonistic to the law of our province.

I say this merely to illustrate the likeness that exists between this and the legislation we were asked to pass in regard to the Sabbath. We found that there was legislation on the subject in every province. We rejected the Bill, though we had jurisdiction in the matter, because it was a Bill establishing a criminal offence. But here you have a direct invasion of the law of civil rights as it exists in the province of Quebec. Therefore, it seems to me the argument is overwhelming that we have not jurisdiction.

Mr. MACLEAN. Then, I understand that the Solicitor General and the First Minister recommend the railway men, if they desire legislation of this kind, to go to the several provincial legislatures, because the subject is not within the jurisdiction of this Parliament.

The PRIME MINISTER. Certainly.

Mr. POWELL. I am sorry to say that I cannot regard the argument of the Solicitor General or that of the Prime Minister as absolutely conclusive. There is no question, as the Solicitor General says, that this legislation is an interference with private rights. But I do not assent to the proposition that because legislation is an interference with private rights it is ultra vires of this Parliament. What private right can be more sacred than that of personal liberty, yet this Parliament can take away a man's personal liberties in case of infraction of its laws. I mention that merely to show that it is not conclusive to say that this is an interference with private rights and therefore we have no jurisdiction. When this matter was before the special committee, of which I was a member, I pointed out to the committee that I regarded this clause as it stood ultra vires in some aspects in which it could be looked upon as it applied to all railways in Canada, and those incorporated by the local legislatures are beyond the control of this Parliament. My opinion is not a matured opinion, or one that I would care to bind myself to act upon without further looking into the matter. This matter came up before our committee, and Judge Clark, who was present at the time, was of the opinion, so far as it applied to companies incorporated by the Dominion, it was not ultra vires, and that is my opinion, as far as I have formed an opinion, although I would not give it as a final opinion without further consideration of the matter. The Solicitor General says that inasmuch as it has been decided by the highest court of our Dominion that the legislation of the province of Ontario relating to workmen is applicable to railways, therefore it is conclusive of the proposition that this Parliament has not the right to legislate concerning it. I will bring to the notice of the hon. gentleman a perfectly parallel case. This Parliament has the right, and the exclusive right, to legislate on bankruptcy and insolvency. Yet, notwithstanding that, in the absence of legislation on these subjects, the legislature has certainly the right to go, not to the full extent of bankruptcy, and but to go far in that direction. Take the Ontario Act which dealt with subjects usually covered by the word insolvency. And that Act was carried to the highest court and went on appeal to the Privy Council and was decided to be constitutional. The legislation of Ontario will stand until this Parliament exercises its jurisdiction so far as bankruptcy is concerned. If it does exercise its jurisdiction over the subject of bankruptcy, and enacts provisions inconsistent with the Ontario Act, there is no question that the legislation of this Parliament would override that of the province. So long, then, as we have no legislation touching upon railway companies, in the matters touched upon by this Act, so long it is within the competency of the local legislatures, in the exercise of their jurisdiction touching civil rights, to pass legislation such as the Ontario Act. That does not say that we cannot legislate on the subject or if we did our legislation would not override theirs. Without giving an opinion by which I would care to be bound without looking further into the matter, I see the difficulties in the position of the Solicitor General, and see how his arguments are not conclusive. I will give a perfectly analogous case, one under navigation and shipping, which is relegated exclusively to the Parliament of Canada. Now, according to the argument of the Solicitor General anything that extended the rights of the sailor to his wages would be ultra vires of this Parliament.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Of course, my hon. friend (Mr. Powell) will understand that I do not agree that my argument went on that line.

Mr. POWELL. I certainly so understood it. If I misconstrue the hon. gentleman's words, perhaps he will be good enough to set me right.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Let the hon. gentleman go on and make his statement.

Mr. POWELL. I will take chapter 74 of the Merchants' Shipping Act, which may not be in force by reason of the last Imperial Act, but it was in force up to a short time ago, and acknowledged universally to be constitutional. By subsection 36 of that Act this Parliament went further than strict legislation in navigation and shippping, and conferred new rights, unknown to the common law, upon seamen in connection with their wages. This was a modification of the common law and a direct interference with civil rights a subject exclusively within the jurisdiction of

the province. Another case is the Banking Act. This Parliament has gone so far as to override the provisions, express and implied, of the statutes of local legislatures by its legislation in respect to cove receipts, warehouse receipts—matters universally acknowledged to belong to the local legislatures as civil rights, and have overridden the provisions made by the legislatures with regard to the bills of sale. The matter before the committee is not one that I regard as free from doubt. It has never been expressly decided by the highest tribunal for the colonies, and it must have a judicial decision before we can say that the matter is free from doubt. It seems to me, however, at present that we have the jurisdiction. The advisability of passing this legislation is another thing. There is no doubt that in England the most socialistic legislation probably in the world is being enacted by Parliament.

These may be good provisions, or they may be bad. One thing is certain, that the growing socialistic influence in England has operated badly upon her trade and commerce within the last few years, and has seriously embarrassed her within the last twelve months. One feature of this Bill calls for remand—that under all circumstances negligence shall be imputed to the railway company and not to the individual. is a very hard and tyrannical provision, I think.

Mr. CASEY. There is no such provision.

Mr. POWELL. That is practically what it means. The Bill, I admit, was modified by us after it came before the committee. It virtually constitutes a railway company an insurance company with no premium paid for the risks they are undertaking. That seems to me a harsh provision, and it does not go to prevent the injured individual from going beyond and exercising his common law rights in addition. The provision seemed to me harsh at the time, and my objections to it were objections on the merits. This Bill, I think, might be allowed to go with a lot of other measures that have gone through this House, notwithstanding the opinion of the Solicitor General.

Mr. CASEY. I would like to correct the hon. gentleman's recollection in one respect. This Act says that if any employee or the representatives of any employee accept the compensation provided by this Act, he or they shall have no further claim at law against the company. If he accepts compensation he can proceed no further. But he can take his choice between the compensation given by this proposed Act and the compensation he could get at common law. He cannot have both.

Mr. POWELL. Our statutes are full of provisions of that kind. Take the cases of suing constables for violation of their duties; take the cases of suing justices of the peace for breach of duty; take the case provided in our Criminal Code by which, if a man pays a fine which is imposed for common assault, he shall be free from all civil suits thereafter. That provision strikes one as being, on the face of it, unconstitutional, and I have no doubt the Solicitor General will say that it was unconstitutional, yet it has been enacted and re-enacted two or three times since 1869 when it first passed. The proper course is to let the courts of the country decide as to whether this Bill is ultra vires or intra vires.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). I want to ask a question to enable me to vote intelligently. I want to know from the Solicitor General whether at the present time there is a law in Ontario to give an employee on a railway the same right that would be given to him under this Bill, if passed? If that is the case, I do not see why we should go any further. It is a matter of civil rights under the jurisdiction of Ontario, and we should not interfere. I wish to be enabled to cast an intelligent vote, and would like to have an answer from the Solicitor General.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I believe the Ontario Compensation Act goes quite as far as this provision of the law does.

Mr. CASEY. If the Solicitor General will take the trouble to read the Bill carefully, he will find it does not, that the Ontario Act proceeds on quite a different line. The Ontario Compensation Act gives compensation in case of negligence by the employer, in case of neglect of certain precautions, and so forth. I have not got it here, as he has, and cannot give the exact terms, but that is the drift of it. This Bill pre-supposes, as the British Bill on the subject presupposed, as we think it ought to be presupposed, that the employer, in a specially risky employment, shall be responsible for accidents arising out of the nature of the employment itself, even where no negligence on his part has been proven. This Bill does not throw the blame of negligence upon the employer, it says that if a man is killed in this particular employment, or if he is injured, he shall have a certain moderate compensation, no matter whether there has been any actual negligence on the part of the employer or not. It says, however, that if the employer can prove negligence on the part of the employee, then he is not to be liable to damages, and if the employee or his representative accepts the compensation given by this Act, then he cannot proceed at law for any other compensation. It is possible that under the Workmen's Compensation Act of Ontario, the workman might get higher damages than this Bill gives, in some cases he probably could. But this Bill simplifies the proceeding, it does not require the man to prove negligence, and makes it much more convenient and fair

for the employee. I am sure the Solicitor General has not read this Bill with sufficient care thoroughly to understand its bearing, or he would not say it is the same as the Workmen's Compensation Act of Ontario. The Workmen's Compensation Act of Ontario is practically the same as the Workmen's Compensation Act of England. I know the Bill that has been passed in England, referring to employees in risky occupations, is practically the same as my Bill, but my Bill is not a copy of theirs, and theirs was not copied from mine, although it happened that mine was in print and introduced to this House a year before theirs was passed, and is different in some of its details. But even if this Bill were identical with the Ontario Workmen's Compensation Act, that would not settle the case, because there are other provinces where the legislation is considerably different on the subject.

Mr. MACLEAN. I would like to point out for the information of the First Minister, when he says that if this Bill becomes law a poor workman, being a single man, would be unable to vindicate his rights against a powerful railway corporation, that these railway workingmen have large and strong organizations for the vindication of their rights, and that if they have this Bill on the Statute-book that they will find sufficient money, and they will be backed up by the public in having that law vindicated. I still think, notwithstanding the opinion that has been expressed here to-night, that this committee ought to pass this Bill and let it go to the courts that we may find out whether we have jurisdiction or not. The Minister of Trade and Commerce asked me: What are the statistics in regard to railway accidents. The statistics are such that unless some legislation like this is passed, and the railways are compelled to be more careful of life, then this widespread destruction of human life will continue. In Canada last year there were 213 people killed on our railways. Seven of them were passengers, 76 were employees, and 130 were other persons. In the United States the statistics are simply appalling, and show the necessity of passing some kind of legislation with a penalty attached, which will compel the railways to be more careful of the lives of their employees. The statistics in the United States for 1895 show that 1,811 railway employees were killed, and 25,696 were injured. Of passengers, 170 were killed and 2,375 were injured. Of other persons, 4,135 were killed, over 8 a day, and 5,677 were injured. The total shows 6,136 people killed annually in the United States by railways, and over 33,000 injured. Now, that is a state of affairs in Canada and in the United States which calls for legislation in protection of the life and limb of the people who are working on these railways. The way to secure that protection is to compel railways to adopt these safety appliances, and to attach a penalty to the law as we propose to do. That is all we ask, that is all the railway men of this country ask. From what the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Powell) says, I believe this House has concurrent jurisdiction in this matter, and that if we pass this law the courts will vindicate it, and we will do simply what has been done in the old country in the way of putting a law on the Statute-book which will compel the railway companies to adopt such appliances as will guarantee a sure protection to life and limb. In the United Kingdom they do not kill thirty railway employees in a year, and a very small number of the public, and this is simply on account of the legislation which compels the railway companies to adopt life-saving appliances.

The PRIME MINISTER. It is advisable that we should understand where we are and what we are doing. If the hon. gentleman wants the House to pass legislation regarding appliances to secure the safety of life and limb, that is what we are doing by the first section of the Bill. So far as the first section is concerned there is no difference of opinion as to what the hon. gentleman is advocating. When the hon. gentleman says it is necessary to attach penalties for the non-observance of those requisites by the company, so far I agree with him. But that is not what is suggested by clause 7. That does not apply to any negligence on the part of the company as regards operating the road, but it undertakes to say what shall be the civil consequences of certain acts done by railway companies. This is very far from imposing a penalty. This Parliament has the right to impose a penalty, because it has jurisdiction over similar matters. But this Parliament has no right to determine by legislation what shall be the legal or civil consequences of a tort or wrong. This is an attribute of the local legislatures. I sympathize with everything that has been said by the hon. gentleman in regard to the railway employees. I think the men who work on railroads are as much exposed to danger as are soldiers, and they are entitled, to every sympathy and consideration; but, though so entitled, there is a way of giving them the protection to which they are entitled, and this Parliament can give a certain class of protection, and we do it by compelling the railway companies to use certain appliances for the protection of life and limb. But when it comes to the civil consequences of a wrong done by a railway company, we have no power, whatever may be our desire to benefit them or come to their aid. I therefore ask Parliament not to be carried away by any sense of the wrongs to which railway men are subjected—I agree with everything of that kind—but let us legislate within our power and purview. There are other legislatures. The railway men have undoubtedly rights, but there are proper tribunals to adjudge and legislate as to those rights. This is not the

place to obtain the remedy as regards certain of those rights. But the remedy should be sought from the legislatures which have the power to deal with the question.

Mr. CRAIG. I intend to vote for the amendment to strike out the clause, for the reasons given by the right hon. Prime Minister. The grounds on which I oppose the clause are the same as those presented by the right hon. gentleman. Some of the subsections have been discussed, and I am not discussing them at present. I am not a lawyer, but I agree with the view expressed by the Solicitor General that we have not the power to pass a clause of this kind, that this deals with matters within the jurisdiction of the local legislatures. I wish, however, to reply to one remark made by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) when discussing this question. He seemed to insinuate, in fact he more than insinuated, that it was impossible to have any measure passed respecting the power of the railway companies because the House is under the control of those railway companies and powerful corporations. I have heard that statement made before, but I do not agree with it. I believe this Parliament is always willing and is ready to-day to do anything that may be necessary to restrain their powers, but hon. members should not feel compelled to do something which they do not deem desirable simply because it may be said that they are afraid to act. I do not feel under any obligation to either of the two great railway companies, and if there is any measure submitted in the interest of the country I am willing to support it no matter what these corporations may think. I scarcely deem it necessary to make this statement, but I do so because this remark has been made more than once, and the people of the country, may possibly think, if no contradiction is given, that there may be some truth in the idea.

Mr. POWELL. In the Railway Act I find two provisions that support the principles I have endeavoured to set forth. If section 241 of the Railway Act is to be taken as good legislation, this is probably so too. Take the case of cattle running at large. It is a civil right, and the Dominion Parliament has no power to deal with it as such, yet it is in fact dealt with in our legislation. Section provides as follows :—

No horses, sheep, swine or other cattle shall be permitted to be at large upon any highway, within half a mile of the intersection of such highway with any railway at rail level, unless such cattle are in charge of some person or persons to prevent their loitering or stopping on such highway at such intersection.

All cattle found at large contrary to the provisions of this section may, by any person who finds the same at large be impounded in the pound nearest to the place where the same are found, and the pound-keeper with whom the same are so impounded shall detain the same in like manner, and subject to the like regulations as to the care and disposal thereof, as in the case of cattle impounded for trespass on private property.

There is a case where jurisdiction has been exercised by this Parliament. I can see where the Solicitor General would attempt to draw a distinction.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. He would succeed too.

Mr. POWELL. He would draw the distinction that the legislation was to protect the railway especially at crossings where cattle might be dangerous to the safe operating of the railway with safety. I will come in a moment to a clause affecting railways in respect to which the hon. gentleman cannot draw that distinction. That clause is in regard to weeds, and is 275. It reads as follows :—

Every company shall cause all thistles and other noxious weeds growing on the clear land or ground adjoining the railway and belonging to such company to be cut down early in July in each year, or to be rooted out.

Every company which fails to comply with this sections shall incur a penalty of $2 for every day.

My hon. friend may say that he has made that part and parcel of the criminal law. That would be an extreme contention. It is not ordinarily a part of criminal law ; but I will not go to the extent of saying that this Parliament has not the power to create something not heretofore regarded a criminal crime. It has that power. The provision of this Bill relating to compensation to employees, it is argued, is not incident to railway legislation. In the case of shipping legislation, this Parliament had extended the right of seamen, where it is not necessary in the ordinary sense of that term. The judge in these matters is this Parliament, and so long as this Parliament exercises its judgment bona fide, it has the power. The Privy Council has intimated, that from the facts on the face of the legislation it may have been for some ulterior purpose, and not bona fide railway legislation, and consequently a fraud on our constitutional power. That may be so clear as to influence the court to decide that the statute is ultra vires. The question is this : Does this Parliament consider that this is so necessarily incidental—I do not mean absolutley necessarily incidental ; we all know what necessary means in law—does this Parliament consider that this is so necessary to railway legislation that it should pass it. Take an extreme case : Suppose that under existing laws companies found it was difficult to get employees to work upon railway lines, and this Parliament thought it was an advisable means tot meet that difficulty by providing that any man who worked upon a railway would be entitled to an allowance of $3,000, or any other sum, in case an accident happened to him. It would

then be considered necessary by a court to enact such a law, and if that emergency occurred there could be no question at all about this Parliament having the power; but whether it would be advisable to exercise that power would be another matter entirely. I repeat that I lean to the view that this Bill, technically at least, is within our jurisdiction; whether it is in the spirit of our jurisdiction or not is a question that might be open to comment. However, I do not think that as a matter of expediency the time has arrived when it is desirable to have such legislation, or to give force and effect to the jurisdiction which is reposed in us.

Mr. BRITTON. I am in sympathy with the attempt of the promoter of the Bill to have some legislation of this kind, considering the number of accidents that have happened on railways and considering the desirability of protecting as far as possible the lives and limbs of those engaged in such employment. In regard to what some people have said, and some newspapers have said, I, for one, resent any statement or insinuation that this Parliament or any member of it is afraid of any railway company, or is afraid to vote against railway companies because of their power in the country or anything of that kind. We are prepared at all times to do justly by the railways on the one side and by the employees and the public on the other. There are two or three points in connection with this measure to which I wish to call attention. In the first place, the Ontario legislation does not go as far as this Bill does, and the Ontario Act is consequently very different from the one we are considering. The proposed Bill practically makes the railway company the insurer of the lives of its employees. Very few of us believe, who have had experience in the courts, that in one case out of twenty would a jury find that a man was guilty of negligence when an accident happens him. And when we go so far as to admit that, then practically if this Act did pass it would make the railway company the insurer of the lives of its employees and so it goes a great deal farther than the Ontario Act. Whether we have come to the time when such a law ought to be passed against railway companies is another matter, and I think, under the circumstances we perhaps have hardly come to the point when such a law as this ought to be passed. It will come, I dare say, and before long too, that either in the provincial or Dominion Parliament such a law will be enacted. Whether we ought to pass it just now, and merely upon the discussion that has taken place is another and a very different matter. There certainly is a doubt about our jurisdiction, and ought we in the face of that doubt, pass a law merely for the purpose of having it carried by litigants to the highest courts of the land.

Mr. MACLEAN. Yes.

Mr. BRITTON. I differ from my hon. friend on that. I do not think it is well to invite a poor man, or the family of a poor man who is injured, to carry litigation to the highest court merely for the purpose of testing his right. I admit that the hon. the Solicitor General has not convinced me that we have not to some extent jurisdiction to pass some such law as this. There are three phases involved in the Bill presented. First, so far as it applies to provincial railways I suppose it is acknowledged that we have no jurisdiction to legislate. Second, as to whether it applies to railways that are for the general benefit of Canada or railways that have their charter from this Dominion, it depends upon whether this question is one of civil rights pure and simple. It seems to me it is something more than that. Here is a corporation that for its very existence depends upon what this Parliament has done. If it depends upon that, surely we have a right to say something in regard to how that railway should use its statutory powers. If the railways chartered by this Parliament use their statutory powers in such a way that some one is injured cannot this Parliament say: Not that we are taking away the right of the individual and dealing with something that only the provincial Parliament has power to deal with; but that we are rather putting a liability upon the railway company, and which may be to a certain extent enlarging the rights of the individual who has been injured by this railway corporation the creature of the Dominion Parliament. Then again we unquestionably have the right here to deal with the Government railways.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The Bill does not profess to deal with Government railways.

Mr. BRITTON. If it does not then that is a different thing.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. In the absence of clear and explicit language involving the Crown it cannot apply to Government railways.

Mr. CASEY. The Bill says "all railways."

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is not sufficient.

Mr. BRITTON. That may not be sufficient, and this goes to show the difficulties that arise on the wording of the Bill. So that I think under present circumstances we perhaps ought not pass the 7th clause to-night. We should, I think, leave it for further consideration, and if necessary have it introduced at another session.

Mr. CASEY. It has been introduced often enough.

Mr. BRITTON. It has never been discussed before to my knowledge, and the attention of members has never been called to

it as during the present session. Having had our thoughts directed to the importance of the measure, and having regard for the doubts and difficulties in the way, I think we ought not to go further with it at the present time.

Mr. CASEY. I am obliged to my hon. friend who has just sat down for having pointed out a very material consideration—that we have a right to impose conditions on the charters granted by this Parliament. I have always understood that it has been upon that line of argument that we have acquired our right to deal with questions of real estate when they concern Dominion railways. The hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Powell) has shown very clearly, that when dealing even with what may be called matter of municipal police, like the running of cattle at large and weeds on the roadbeds of railways, this Parliament has exercised jurisdiction without question.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Surely there is no analogy between these cases.

Mr. CASEY. I quite agree with the hon. Minister that there is no strict analogy, because of the two cases the one that seems far the least likely to come within our jurisdiction is that regarding the cutting of weeds. If either of the two could possibly come within our jurisdiction, it is the treatment of their employees by the corporations which we create, whereas the cutting of weeds is a matter for the benefit of the adjacent farmer. Surely that is much further from what may be considered our powers than the relations between railways and their employees; and I am obliged to the hon. member for Westmoreland for bringing up that case. It has been urged by more than one that we should not pass this law so long as we have any doubts about its constitutionality. I do not think there is much in that. I think those who ask for legislation, if that legislation is desirable, ought to get the benefit of the doubt. You can never be sure that any legislation that passes this House is constitutional. Many a time we have passed legislation which has turned out to be unconstitutional when it got to the highest court in the realm. There was a great variety of opinion about it, as there is about this measure; but there is no way to have the question finally determined except by carrying it through the courts to the Privy Council. It may be that the Privy Council is not right in its decisions; but whether it is right or not, its decision is final. The Solicitor General has proven that in the absence of Dominion legislation certain provincial statutes have been held by the Supreme Court to apply to Dominion railways. The decisions of the Supreme Court have frequently been reversed by the Privy Council. We do not know whether they are good laws or not. But supposing they are, it does not follow that the Dominion Parliament could not legislate upon the same questions. Cases of concurrent and overlapping legislation have been cited, and must occur to everybody. As I have already pointed out, provincial legislation in regard to drainage, equipment of cars, coupling, and so forth, was held to apply until a large number of the railways were taken under the protection of this Parliament by special legislation, and now it is held not to apply. Dominion legislation, when it occurred, was held to override the other. I claim that the railway men should be given the benefit of the same doubt that was given to the railways when that legislation was passed; and I claim that the courts would be just as likely to hold with me, as in the other directions, if the case came to trial. This is a question upon which every one must form his own opinion. It is not a party question, and I ask everybody to vote according to his own opinion, and give the railway men the benefit of the doubt.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not imagine that any argument which I can address to the committee would convince them as to which is the correct view to take upon this question if they should decline to be influenced by the view which the Department of Justice, through the Prime Minister, has presented. I would, however, make an observation or two with regard to the arguments that have been advanced by some hon. gentlemen who are inclined to the opinion that this legislation is within our competence. My hon. friend from Westmoreland (Mr. Powell) rather inclines to this view, pointing out in support of it that Parliament has already in the Railway Act legislated in respect of two matters which he thinks are rather analogous to the present matter, one of these being with regard to cattle, the other with regard to the growing of noxious weeds on the railway. It seems to me to be abundantly clear that these powers may be entirely, as I have no doubt they are, within the competence of Parliament. Admitting that freely, it goes very far from establishing that the present clause is within its competency. Parliament unquestionably has the right to lay down provisions which will regulate the destruction, maintenance and operation of all railways which are incorporated by it, or which are declared to be works for the general advantage of Canada. What more germane to the subject of the safe and proper operating of railways than to provide that cattle shall not be permitted to run across the tracks of railways? Nothing could be more necessary to insure the protection of life and property. With regard to noxious weeds, what does Parliament undertake to do? It simply undertakes to provide how the roadway of the railway company shall be cared for.

Seeing that sparks will drop from passing locomotives and spread flame into the adjoining property, and thereby destroy it, it is necessary that some legislation should be had by the authority which creates that railway and gives it the power to operate, to protect property against that danger.

Mr. POWELL. Would the Minister allow me to make a remark? What he says might have a great deal of force were it true that noxious weeds were more inflammable than grass. But the provision applies simply to noxious weeds. The object must certainly be to prevent the seeds of noxious weeds spreading to the farms adjoining, not to prevent fire, because dry grass is just as combustible as weeds.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That may be, but we know very well that if on either side of the track, the vacant land is allowed to be cultivated so that grass may grow, the grass is cut. It is not allowed to remain, after it becomes dry, standing, but it is cut.

Mr. COCHRANE. If this Parliament has power to pass a law to protect individual property, why should it not have power to protect human life?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I was trying to point out that Parliament might very well have provided, as it provided here, for the protection of property in the neighbourhood or adjoining the track of a railway and for affording protection to life and property by prohibiting the running at large of cattle, but I fail to see why my hon. friend should feel justified in basing a conclusion upon that in favour of the 7th clause of this Bill. I admit that the question is a complicated one. I admit that it is possible to make an argument on each side of it, and I recognize the possibility——

Mr. POWELL. You have not a strong opinion either?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The more I think of it, the stronger my opinion is against the constitutionality of this clause 7.

Mr. POWELL. We are about in the same boat.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am not going to say that I would like to give a very positive opinion upon it, because I think it is a question that would require some study; but as far as I am able, from what study I have given to it, I am decidedly of the opinion that the clause is not within our competency. If Parliament were legislating in a general way, in respect of the manner or means or methods which should be adopted in the maintaining or operating of railways, and if in so doing it imposed duties upon railway companies, I admit at once that if a railway comapny disregarded those duties which the law imposed upon it, we might attach penalties in the form of compensation to the persons injured by reason of its failure to discharge those duties. Therefore, I would not like to go the length of saying that, under no circumstances or conditions, could Parliament be seized of a subject which would nearly approach that which is embodied in this Bill. But I think you only have to look at this 7th clause to see that you are not asking us to legislate in that direction. You are not dealing, as the basis of this penalty to be imposed upon a railway company, with the fact that they must follow out some duty which Parliament has cast upon it. That is where I think the strong argument lies against the constitutionality of this clause. This clause proposes to fix an arbitrary liability upon a railway company, even though that railway company had complied with every requirement as to its running, operating and maintenance, which had been imposed upon it by law. There is no connection at all between damages imposed upon a railway company under this Bill and its infringement of any duties which Parliament has imposed upon it. So that it seems to me impossible for any one to take up this proposed legislation and interpret it as being the natural outcome of parliamentary regulation for the running or maintaining of rail ways.

Mr. POWELL. I said the same thing. It is arbitrary and may be tyrannical.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It appears to me that in order to accurately determine whether Parliament is legislating within its competency, you must show that Parliament is pursuing a purpose which it is legitimate and proper for Parliament to pursue, in the exercise of its general power to plant railways over this Dominion. But under and by virtue of that you have no business to say that Parliament may legislate as to the remedies which shall attach between the company and its employees when there is an entire absence of any infringement of any duty imposed by Parliament or an entire absence of any ignoring of any statutory duty which Parliament has imposed. Read this section from beginning to end, and you can totally disconnect it from any duty or the observance of any duty or the carrying out of any regulation which Parliament has imposed on railways incorporated by it. That is my difficulty with regard to this clause, and therefore it appears to me that all the reasons are against our passing it. I do not think it would be proper for us, if we entertain grave doubts with regard to our competency to legislate in this direction, to do so off-hand. It is a subject which might well be considered, not only this session, but during recess, and be deferred to another session. No great harm can result

from taking ample time in a question of this great importance. I am not going to comment at all on the merits of the clause. I am only remarking on the question of its constitutionality, and I do say that if there are good reasons why Parliament should add to the duties we now impose on railway companies, we should enact there more stringent regulations, whereby the running of roads would be attended with less risk and danger to public life and property. Let us do that. Let us ascertain and determine what it would be well for us to do by statute for the better protection of the lives of those employed on railways; and after we have satisfied ourselves as to what additional protection and regulations are required, we should impose upon railway companies the penalties we think right in the way of compensation to those who suffer from any accident attributable to a violation or disregard of the regulations Parliament has made. But you here, irrespective of whether the company has failed in any single particular to do its full duty, undertake to say that we shall give people who have unfortunately suffered injury a remedy against a company which may be absolutely innocent of the violation of any law, which may have done its whole duty and be absolutely free from the slightest cause of complaint.

Mr. MACLEAN. If the argument of the hon. gentleman means anything, it means that this legislation is within the jurisdiction of this House, but that it ought to be within the Railway Act. That may be a good argument, but it is simply an argument that we should incorporate this in the Railway Act rather than enact it by special legislation. The hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Britton) made the whole argument of our case, but like a great many lawyers, when he came to the conclusion, he ran away from it and left the railways in possession of the field. He says that we may incorporate railway companies and grant them all sorts of powers and give them millions of public money, but we must not say to them: When you kill or injure one of your employees or the public you shall pay. That hon. gentleman and the Minister of Railways admitted the whole case, but after the fashion of lawyers, they put up some little difficulties to get away from the consequences of their argument. Then the right hon. First Minister told us that we should not make any experiments in legislation. Why not? That is the proper way to ascertain the facts. Make the experiment, and send it to the courts to find out. Is this Government one which should say that no experiment shall be made? What is its record? It is that of a plunging Government. It plunged in the matter of our trade relations with the mother country and legislated without knowing what our constitutional rights were; and when told it was wrong, it brought down other legislation this session to correct its first experiment. The hon. Postmaster General plunged in the matter of postal rates. He then found out what the law was and he proposes now a new Bill to meet the case, he proposes to make the punishment fit the crime, and we are to have remedial and progressive legislation. Considering all the opinions we have heard, it seems to me that the way to meet this case is to pass this legislation and send it to the courts. If it is right it will be upheld, and the railway men and the public—because this will protect the public as well as the railway men—will get the benefit of it. It does not cost a great deal to send a case to the Privy Council—a few thousand dollars will do it—and the men have the money and are ready to spend it to vindicate their rights under this law if Parliament will give them the law.

Mr. POWELL. With respect to the comments of the Minister of Railways in section 1257 of the Dominion Act, I have to say that it seems to me that his arguments are quite inadequate. This section provides that every railway company shall cut down noxious weeds upon thir tracks and on their right of way on adjoining lands early in July, or shall root them up. Now to cut them down does not mean to gather them up and take them away. But the words "or be rooted up"—as the hon. Minister will see as a lawyer, show that the object was to get clear of these noxious weeds so that adjoining farmers shall not suffer through them.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Will the hon. member (Mr. Powell) allow me. Does the hon. gentleman see any reason why Parliament might not declare that, as to the user of the portion of property which belongs to the company and which they are authorized by Parliament to acquire, by expropriation or otherwise, nothing shall be allowed to stand or be put upon the property which shall operate injuriously to the persons near there.

Mr. POWELL. That is precisely the line on which I was proceeding. Might not this Parliament, which has general jurisdiction over railways, entrench in its legislation upon railways upon the region of civil rights of the provinces and enact a law which indirectly affects civil rights. Take a special case. This Parliament has jurisdiction over railways, and therefore, over their employees. Might not this Parliament make enactments which will contravene the principle of civil rights of the province so far as those employees are concerned?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, Parliament may properly declare that the railway company which is exercising this privilege under charter from Parliament, shall not exercise it with-

out such and such a regard to certain regulations, the violation of which shall result in the imposition of certain penalties.

Mr. POWELL. That is not the only matter.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is all that is necessary.

Mr. POWELL. This is an incident in the mode of exercising jurisdiction whether there is a penalty attached or not.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No.

Mr. POWELL. I acknowledge that this is a grave constitutional point. I admit that I am arguing on this subject with the ordinary stock of information that I have; I have not looked into the matter specially since the committee sat on this Bill about a year ago. A similar question arose under a constitution which, in this respect, is similar to ours; I refer to the constitution of the United States. A year or two after that constitution had been adopted, two of the ablest men the United States ever had, Alexander Hamilton and Thomas Jefferson took diametrically opposite views of the right of the United States to incorporate a bank, which bank was afterwards incorporated and became known as the Bank or the United States. Hamilton laid down the principle, that inasmuch as the federal power had the right to control the revenue, it must have the power to control matters incidental to that power, and as the bank was the ordinary means of the country for dealing with money, the United States had a right to establish the bank. Jefferson took the opposite view. The matter came before the Supreme Court was decided by Marshall, the greatest jurist our neighbouring republic has had. Judge Marshall took the same view of the case as Hamilton had taken, and what seemed not necessary to the exercise of the power was declared constitutional; and this power was considered in the same light down to 1837 or thereabouts, when, under the influence of President Jackson—the Act was repealed. Now there is really very little difference of opinion between the Minister of Railways and myself when we get down to the bottom of the question. He says, if I understand him, that he is not prepared to give a positive opinion that this Bill is unconstitutional. I am not satisfied with the reason advanced by the Solicitor General or by the Minister of Railways. The argument of the Minister of Railways does not convince me of the unconstitutionality of the Bill, but it seems strong as to the inadvisability or inexpediency of passing it. Now, the point which caused the difficulty in my mind may be summed up in a few words. This Parliament, if it thinks that, in the correct exercise of its jurisdiction respecting railways, and the employees are part and parcel of the machinery of railways—to throw around those employees this protection which the Bill provides for them, may have the power to do so, just as under the Merchant's Shipping Act we have the power to go beyond the common law and confer upon seamen new rights and impose upon ship owners new liabilities. By analogy it does seem to me this Parliament has the power to impose new obligations and to impose on the employees new rights. Though I do not express a matured opinion as to the constitutionality, I think the proper thing to do is to enact the law and allow it to be decided in the courts. However, I will vote for the amendment of the hon. Prime Minister if my hon. friend (Mr. Casey), the promoter of the Bill, does not restrict it to railways within the jurisdiction of the Parliament of Canada. My hon. friend from Kingston (Mr. Britton) raised the question as to the Government railways. I did not hear the answer of the Minister of Railways, but I would point out to the hon. gentleman that there is a principle of statutory interpretation that nothing affects the Crown unless it is expressly stated that it does so. Therefore, Government railways are eliminated from consideration.

Mr. CASEY. So far as the proposal to restrict this Bill to railways within the jurisdiction of Parliament is concerned, I may explain that it was deemed advisable not to say anything about that, because it was held, that this Act could only apply to railways under Dominion jurisdiction. I am quite ready to put in these words if it is desired. They were left out because it was thought it would affect the scope of the Bill.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I find myself in a somewhat peculiar position in this question. As I understand it, all hon. members shall sympathize with the object of this Bill. The disposition of every person is to grant all possible protection to railway employees.

There is no difference of opinion on that subject. But the Government having, as they are in duty bound to do, looked carefully into this question, have come to the conclusion that if we pass this it would be ultra vires. Now, my hon. friend behind me (Mr. Powell), for whose opinion I have the greatest possible respect, says that he is by no means certain that this is not ultra vires, that although he regards it with an open mind he is not prepared to say that it is not. Under these circumstances I think that the wiser course for the committee would be to accept the opinion of the Department of Justice, and not enact a clause that is likely to lead, in the opinion of the Department of Justice, to very injurious litigation to persons who are mainly interested.

Committee divided on motion of Minister of Railways and Canals, which was agreed to by yeas 58, nays 18.

Mr. MACLEAN moved :

That the following be inserted as a new clause :—

That on and after the 1st of January, 1900, it shall be unlawful for any railway company to use on its lines any locomotives or cars not equipped with automatic couplers in proper working order so that such locomotives and cars can be coupled and uncoupled without its being necessary for men to go between the ends of cars.

He said : I may point out that this amendment is on the line of the one that has already passed the House. The amendment of the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) governs entirely the use of air brakes. Railway men have also asked for legislation enjoining on the companies the use of automatic couplers. This provision is simply to compel the railways after 1900 to adopt automatic couplers as well as air brakes, and is on the line of legislation adopted in the United States some years ago.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think it would be advisable for us to look into and consider a subject of this kind before we adopt it. I could not say offhand. I would be in no position to advise the committee whether this clause could properly be passed now or not, or what the effect would be on the railway companies. We cannot ignore these considerations altogether, however much we may desire to do so. Therefore, I would suggest that the effect of the hon. gentleman pressing this additional section upon the committee would be to imperil the other portions of the Bill. If he feels friendly disposed towards the measure as it now stands, I think it would be wise for him to defer the submission of this new proposition, at all events until another session, when the matter might be well considered.

Mr. DAVIN. I think after what the Minister of Railways and Canals has said, that my hon. friend ought not to press that, because substantial progress has been made.

Mr. MACLEAN. Then I simply give notice that I will introduce it next session and put it first on the Order paper.

Amendment withdrawn.

Bill reported with amendments.

On consideration of Bill as amended.

Mr. CASEY. I think it is my duty to those who may be considered as my clients in this matter, to get the opinion of the whole House on this question, and I beg to move without discussion on my part, the following amendment :

That the Bill be not now considered as amended, but that it be recommitted to a Committee of the Whole, with instructions to add the following section as section 7 :—

7. Every employee of a railway company injured while in the discharge of his duty shall, for every day during which he is thereby unfitted for duty be entitled to compensation from the railway company at the rate of not less than sixty per cent of the current rate of wages for men similarly employed by the company at the time the injury occurs, to be paid for not more than fifty-two weeks.

(2) Every such employee permanently disabled while in the discharge of his duty, shall be entitled to compensation from the railway company to the amount of not less than four years' wages at the rate thereof at the time of the accident.

(3) The family or dependents of every employee who is killed, or who dies from injuries received, while in the discharge of his duty, within six months after such injury, shall be entitled to compensation from the railway company to the amount of four years' wages at the rate thereof at the time of the accident, but not exceeding in all three thousand dollars.

(4) If any employee, or the representatives of any employee, accept the compensation provided by this Act, he or they shall have no further claim at law against the company.

(5) The rights under the foregoing provisions shall not be capable of being renounced or given up by such employee by any agreement or contract with the railway company, for value or otherwise, and the said provisions shall not be made void by any rules or regulations of the railway.

(6) The certificate of two duly qualified disinterested physicians shall be sufficient to prove permanent disability ; and the certificate of the attending physician shall be sufficient to prove unfitness for duty, for a period not exceeding ten weeks, after which time a monthly certificate of a physician named by the company shall be sufficient.

(7) The foregoing provisions as to compensation shall be void in the case of any employee whose injury disablement or death is caused by his own negligence,—the burden of proof of such negligence being upon the railway company ; but if such injury, disablement or death occurs by reason of the handling or use of trains, locomotives, cars or appliances which are out of repair, or insufficient, or not in accordance with the provisions of this Act, the railway company shall not be allowed to plead contributory negligence on the part of the employee so injured, disabled or killed.

(8) In any suit for damages by an employee against a railway company, the act, default or negligence of any fellow employee shall not be pleaded or given in evidence on behalf of the company as a defence to such suit.

House divided on amendment :

YEAS :

Messieurs

Bell (Addington),	Hodgins,
Casey,	Lang,
Clarke,	Maclean,
Cochrane,	McAlister,
Corby,	McCleary,
Davin,	Oliver,
Dyment,	Powell,
Ganong,	Roche,
Gilmour,	Rogers, and
Guillet,	Wallace.—21.
Henderson	

NAYS :

Messieurs

Angers,	Landerkin,
Bain,	Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),

Bazinet,	Lavergne,
Beausoleil,	Lewis,
Belcourt,	Livingston,
Bergeron,	Logan,
Bourassa,	Macdonald (Huron),
Britton,	Macdonell (Selkirk),
Brown,	Mackie,
Burnett,	McDougall,
Calvert,	McGregor,
Cargill,	McGugan,
Carroll,	McIsaac,
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd),	McMillan,
Champagne,	McMullen,
Charlton,	Malouin
Chauvin,	Mignault,
Christie,	Monk,
Cowan,	Morin,
Craig,	Morrison,
Davis,	Mulock,
Dobell,	Paterson,
Douglas,	Pettet,
Dupré,	Proulx,
Edwards,	Quinn,
Erb,	Richardson,
Ferguson,	Rinfret,
Fitzpatrick,	Ross,
Flint,	Russell,
Fortin,	Rutherford,
Fraser (Lambton),	Scriver,
Frost,	Semple,
Gauthier,	Sifton,
Gibson,	Snetsinger,
Gillies,	Sproule,
Hale,	Stenson,
Haley,	Tupper (Sir Charles),
Hughes,	Wilson,
Hurley,	Wood (Hamilton), and
Joly de Lotbinière (Sir Henri),	Yeo.—80.

Amendment negatived.

Amendments made in committee read the second time and agreed to, and Bill read the third time and passed.

ATTACHMENT OF SALARIES OF CIVIL SERVANTS.

On the Order :

Consideration of Bill (No. 14) an Act respecting the attachment of salaries and moneys in the hands of the Government as amended in Committee of the Whole.—(Mr. Richardson.)

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I would ask the hon. member not to press the continuation of this Bill. Since we had this Bill under consideration the other day, I have caused inquiries to be made into it, and for my part I have been struck by the arguments brought in support of it, and having looked over it carefully, I am prepared to give my support to the principle of the Bill. But I understand after consultation with the law officers, that the Bill will have to be considerably recast before it is passed into law, and therefore I ask that it be not pressed this evening.

Mr. RICHARDSON. If the right hon. gentleman will say that the Government will deal with this question next session, I will bow to his request and accept the situation. I should have been very glad to have had the Bill passed, but I will not press it under the circumstances.

The PRIME MINISTER. I am not prepared to tell my hon. friend that I will make it a Government measure. But for my part, I think it is well founded, that the principle is right, that it is one which should be acted upon and carried into law.

DISMISSAL OF JOHN F. TENNANT.

House resumed further consideration of the proposed motion of Mr. Quinn :

That an Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General for copies of all papers in connection with the dismissal of John Tennant, late Collector of Customs at Gretna, Manitoba.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). The hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Quinn) brought this resolution up, and it was allowed to go over. I desire to make a brief statement to-night, without, however, going at length into the subject. I should like to ask the attention of the House for a short time to the statement the hon. gentleman made in moving for the papers, and the few words I spoke in reply. The statement the hon. gentleman made in closing his remarks was as follows :—

Now, I do not wish to excite any religious feeling in this House. Rather do I wish to prevent any such feeling either entering this House or spreading throughout the country. But I deem it my duty, as an independent member of this House, I deem it my duty, as a citizen of Canada, as one loving his country and wishing to see that cordial feeling existing between the different races which will one day make up a glorious nationality, to protest in the strongest terms against this act—this act which has no other excuse than such as can be given for a political-religious dismissal. There is no single item of proof against Mr. Tennant in connection with this matter ; there is not a tittle of evidence against him that he was either guilty of active or inactive partisanship. There is nothing to prove that he did more than any man of honour would do, his religion and nationality being attacked by the Attorney General of Manitoba on that occasion referred to in these newspapers. There is not a particle of proof against this man in any way. Are we not, then, forced to the conclusion that it was not because he had neglected his office, it was not because he had been guilty of partisanship, it was not because he had used intemperate language that he was dismissed, but it was because he was an Irish Catholic and his place was wanted by some political heeler in that particular constituency. In entering the protest I do upon this question—and I do not limit this appeal, thank God, to the Irish Catholics of this House : I do not limit it to the Catholics of this House—I call upon every man who has the true interest of his country at heart, whatever his nationality, whatever his religion, to join with me and protest by his vote, which I shall ask later, against this dismissal of a man because he was an Irish Catholic.

That was the deliberate statement of the

hon. member for Montreal Centre. Another statement made by the hon. gentleman in the course of his remarks was as follows :—

Now, I do not wish to introduce into this debate, or into any other debate, any question of religion or nationality ; but I expect that certain members on the other side, possibly the Minister who was guilty of this act of injustice—because I say it is an act of injustice, and I charge the Minister with having been guilty of it—possibly the Minister who was guilty of this act of injustice will repudiate the statements that are made concerning it, repudiate what has appeared in the public press, and will say that there was no question of religion or nationality in the matter at all.

I would say that the hon. gentleman's supposition, uttered in the words I have just quoted, was a correct supposition. I do repudiate the statements that appeared in the newspapers from which the hon. gentleman quoted certain articles. I do most emphatically repudiate the statements made by the hon. gentleman, and I wish that I could fully believe that he was entirely sincere when he said he had no desire to introduce questions of race or nationality in this House. But what are the facts in regard to this case in respect of which the hon. gentleman asks for papers ? What will the papers disclose when they come down ? What the hon. gentleman has alleged ? Not one tittle of evidence of partisanship against this man. I think he will find himself wholly mistaken in that respect. He will find there a statement of a reputable member of this House declaring of his own knowledge, that he knew this man to be guilty of partisan conduct during the last Dominion elections. He will find a statement made by another gentleman of prominence in this country, also declaring that from his own knowledge this man was guilty of very extreme partisan conduct, for if I remember rightly his words were : that at a public meeting he addressed he had been subjected to more interruptions by this gentleman and others associated with him than he had on any other occasion. Yet the hon. gentleman (Mr. Quinn) says there is not a tittle of proof. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Quinn) says that Mr. Tennant was dismissed solely because, that in the provincial election when the Attorney General of Manitoba was making a speech, Tennant gave utterance to a sentiment which he has not established, which I would be sorry to know he could establish, and that because of that this gentleman was dismissed from office. I wish to tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. Quinn) and I wish to tell the House, that whatever may have transpired during the provincial election did not enter into the decision of this question. What we had to deal with was the partisan conduct of this official in the last Dominion general election. And though there is a statement on file from the Attorney General of Manitoba, that during the provincial election this official was abusive, and had gone to the length of calling the First Minister of that province a liar, I believe was the expression ; yet that did not enter into the consideration because we had nothing whatever to do with what took place during a provincial election. The statement of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Quinn) as to what took place on that occasion, is I believe founded on the statement of some one who may have made it to him, or of some newspaper in which he read it. Such a statement I am not prepared to accept, and in any case it does not concern this question at all. Now what did this official do ? We have the testimony of an hon. member in this House over his own signature that this man was an active partisan—and the First Minister has stated that when a responsible member of this House will say that of his own knowledge he knows that an official has acted an offensive partisan part that he would be liabe to discharge at the hands of the Government. My hon. friend from Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) might find fault with me perhaps that I should ask for more than his statement of the fact. I was not seeking the man's dismissal. The hon. member (Mr. Richardson) said to me : "Further proof can be given, if proof you require in reference to this matter. The question was not dealt with for some time. Many matters were engaging my attention ; it was not unduly pressed by my hon. friend (Mr. Richardson); but when the case came before me with the proofs, then I found it my duty to report to Council and they dealt with it. My hon. friend (Mr. Quinn) says, Mr. Tennant was dismissed without any notice or without any chance being given him to defend himself. I have to tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. Quinn) that when the charges were preferred by the hon. member, I wrote to Mr. Tennant stating that certain charges had been preferred against him, and I asked him to favour me with his reply, and he did so, and in the course of that reply, while he shielded himself as well as he might he was even then compelled in candour to admit that during a part of the election day of the 23rd of June he was in the polling booth, that he was there at the request of the Conservative scrutineer, but that he declined to accept papers at the hands of the returning officer. Oh, no, he would not do that, but he was in the polling booth. Mr. Tennant says further in this declaration as a proof of his innocence, that he did not act a partisan part, that he was not known as a partisan, that he had been pressed to take the platform and to speak against my hon. friend (Mr. Richardson) but he says: I would not do that. Well, I thought inferentially, though that did not weigh much in the case ; yet inferentially it occurred to me that if a public officer in Her Majesty's service was known to be so strong a partisan that a party man would come to him and ask him to take the platform and expect him to do it ; I thought that carried with it inferential proof that he was not known to be one who

was devoting his whole time to the duties of his office. What further? It was stated that while Tennant was in the polling booth taking the place of the Conservative scrutineer, the American customs officer was in charge of the Canadian customs office in Gretna. I notified Mr. Tennant that this charge had been made, and he denied it and sent an affidavit of the American customs officer in which the latter admits that he was in the office during that day, but he was not in charge of it. Here was Mr. Tennant, the Canadian customs officer leaving his office, going to the polling booth, requested by the Conservative scrutineer to take his place there, remaining there, but refusing to take the papers. According to the two affidavits read by the hon. member for Montreal (Mr. Quinn), one made by the returning officer and one by the clerk, both state that Mr. Tennant was there and was requested by the Conservative scrutineer to remain in his place when he went out, that he did remain there, but that he refused to take the papers and to be officially recognized as the official scrutineer. What right had Mr. Tennant to be in that polling booth at all, if he was not an agent of one of the parties. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Quinn) perhaps knows the election law ? Does he suppose that this man could be in there, be requested by the Conservative scrutineer to take his place and remain there, without being an agent of one of the parties. One would wonder that an hon. gentleman trying to make out a case, and a lawyer too, would have understood his case a little better and put it a little stronger. While the hon. gentleman (Mr. Quinn) read affidavits from the returning officer and from the clerk that this man was taking the place of the Conservative scrutineer, he also read an affidavit from the American customs officer declaring : I was not in charge of the office, but I was in the office. Here, then, we have an official whom a member of this House declared was guilty of gross partisan conduct, which statement was verified by the Premier of Manitoba, and we have affidavits read by the hon. member for Montreal (Mr. Quinn), that Mr. Tennant was in the polling booth, and remained in the booth at the request of the Conservative scrutineer. I ask again, how could he be there and what right had he to be there unless he was taking the place of that scrutineer. What right had he to remain out of his office, what right had he to remain in the polling booth, and how can he now shield himself behind the statement that he did not take the papers from the returning officer. He says he was there to poll his vote ; then. Sir, his place was to have gone back to Her Majesty's customs office and to have taken his place there, but instead of that we find that when another gentleman goes to the office he discovers the American customs officer in that office alone. They may play on the words whether the American official was in charge of the office or not, but the fact remains that the Canadian customs officer was in the polling booth taking the place of the Conservative scrutineer at the request of the Conservative scrutineer, and remaing in the polling booth while the American customs officer was in Her Majesty's customs at Gretna. And yet, the hon. member (Mr. Quinn) says, there is not a particle of evidence against this official. I would ask hon. gentlemen opposite what they think of the case made out by the hon. member for Montreal (Mr. Quinn), who stated that he wishes to bring in no question of race or nationality. He told us indeed that he was trying to appease any such feeling, but yet he declared that Tennant was dismissed for no other reason than that he was an Irish Catholic. Well, as I had occasion to tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. Quinn) the other day, I endeavoured to discharge my duty without regard to these considerations, and if with the proofs in his hands he was bold enough to say that I had acted through prejudice against either a certain nationality or a certain faith in this country, he had his answer to that in the fact that in the discharge of my official duties, although the question did not enter into the appointments at all, nevertheless many of that nationality and faith had been appointed to office by me. That in itself would be sufficient to disprove the charges made by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Quinn.)

I have been told since this matter was up before, that the very brother of this Mr. Tennant, though I was not aware of the fact, is a customs officer at Coutts in Alberta. He was a temporary officer employed there for some years ; and in 1894, I understand, he applied to be placed on the permanent staff. It was not done at that time ; but representations were made to me by a number of those who were cognizant of his ability, that he was a good officer, and deserving of a permanent appointment in Her Majesty's service. I recommended it, it was done by Order in Council, and he is to-day on the permanent list. Nevertheless, the hon. gentleman saw fit to quote an article from the "Catholic Register," a paper that has been most unfair in its statements, and that has been filled with untrue statements in regard to this case. I cannot see what object he had in doing so, unless it was to bring up the case of another gentleman whom it became my duty to relieve from official duties in the town of Cobourg. I refer to the case of Mr. McAllister, who was not dismissed, as I said hurriedly the other day when I addressed the House, but who was superannuated. I may be censured by members of this House for not having asked for the dismissal of that man instead of placing him upon the superannuation list. But I have regard to his length of service, I had regard for his family, and I had regard for the fact that he had been a good officer in the past ; and I allowed my feelings to weigh in the matter, and instead of dismissal I recom-

mended that he should be superannuated. And yet that case is brought up by the hon. gentleman as proof that I am prejudiced against a certain portion of the community. I think my whole official career and my whole political life gives the lie to the statement that I am in any way influenced by considerations of nationality or creed. Never have I been guilty of that, and I repudiate the hon. gentleman's charge. I had no wish to injure Mr. McAllister. He has not recognized that leniency was exercised in his case. He has evidently asked others to bring his case forward; but I notice that he has not asked the hon. gentlemen opposite to move for the papers in connection with his case. I now ask the hon. gentleman to move for the papers. The hon. member for West Northumberland (Mr. Guillet) has sat in this House all these months, and though Mr. McAllister is in his constituency and was a strong friend of his, he has not ventured to move for the papers. I want the hon. gentleman to do it. What are the facts in connection with that case? I am forced to refer to them because of the attack made upon me in connection with it. It was not a case of partisanship at all. It was a case of something more serious—a case of trafficking in public offices, a case that came, I am informed, within the Criminal Code of Sir John Thompson. That being the case, I could not pass his offence by; but, as I said before, having regard for his long services, and believing that he had not recognized fully the position in which he had placed himself, and making such allowances for him as I could, I recommended that he be placed upon the superannuation list, and upon the superannuation list he is to-day. And yet, Sir, in the face of this, the hon. member for Montreal Centre rises and charges me and charges the Government, for this was the action of the Government in both cases, with being influenced by feelings that would be unworthy of the members of any Government. I say to the hon. gentleman again, that if he asks me now, I will bring the papers down with reference to the case of Mr. McAllister.

Mr. WALLACE. Will the Minister bring them down without requiring a notice to be put upon the paper? Because it could never be reached in the regular order?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I say that if the hon. member for Montreal Centre will ask for them, I will bring them down.

Mr. QUINN. I know nothing about the McAllister case. I did not refer to it. I read an article in which the name of Mr. McAllister was mentioned. The hon. Minister, as usual, is trying to draw a herring across the trail—he is trying to draw the McAllister case across the Tennant case; but that will not wish. I want the papers in the Tennant case.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The hon. gentleman says he did not refer to the McAllister case. Why did he read that long article from the "Catholic Register," and embalm it on the pages of "Hansard?"

Mr. QUINN. Because it was in the article; that is the reason why I read it.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The hon. gentleman brought the article here as proof positive of the unfounded statements he made.

Mr. QUINN. So it is.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Very well, if it be so, the hon. gentleman accepts those statements with referenceto to Mr. McAllister.

Mr. QUINN. If the hon. Minister wishes me to answer. I read the article in reference to the Tennant case. I did not wish to suppress any portion of the article; and so, in the course of the article, I was obliged to read the reference to Mr. McAllister. I know nothing of the McAllister case, and do not want the papers in connection with it, and the Minister is trying to confound it with the Tennant case, but he cannot do it.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The hon. gentleman read from the "Catholic Register" what he need not have read at all; but he read it to allay racial or religious feeling, which is so abhorent to him that he cannot bear any thing of the kind. For the purpose of soothing this feeling, and preventing it arising, he reads this article, which deals thus with the McAllister case:

> Last week we gave a long list of the names of Catholics in the Kingston district who have been driven out of Government employment by the Liberals. The "Globe" had been denying only a few days before that Catholics have any grievances against the new Administration; but the chief Government organ prudently abstains from offering any defence of the dismissals enumerated. We had hoped to induce the organ to descend from virtuous and patriotic generalities and come down to plain facts and particular instances. But we may have been at fault ourselves in not offering direct proof that religious opinion was the evident "crime" of the Catholic office-holder in any stated case of dismissal.
>
> The circumstances surrounding the removal of Mr. McAllister, of Cobourg, by Hon. Mr. Paterson, leave no room for supposing anything else than politico-religious persecution. This week we propose to take up another case in Mr. Paterson's department in which we are prepared to demonstrate a religious persecution beyond aye or nay.

It was not necessary for the hon. gentleman to read that at all. He could have read the whole thing, but no, he wanted to bring in this case of Mr. McAlister in order to strengthen the unworthy purpose he was engaged in trying to excite religious and racial animosity. The hon. gentleman was right when he supposed that possibly the minister, against whom he hurled these unfounded charges, would repudiate them. I do repudiate them. I have given the circumstances. I have given what the papers

disclose, and I leave the case in the hands of the House. The hon. gentleman beside me (Mr. Richardson) points out to me that further proof has been furnished since this took place. I, however, shall not go into that, because that did not influence me in the decision I arrived at. I give what was before me when I arrived at a decision which I believed at the time, and still believe, was a just one. Mr. Tennant, instead of attending to his duties as customs officer, was engaged actively in promoting the candidature of the Conservative candidate, and on one occasion rendered himself extremely offensive to those opposed to him in political belief, and, moreover, acted as scrutineer in the poll which he had no right to do, remaining in that poll for a long time, while an American customs officer took his place in his office in Gretna.

Mr. DAVIN. Before the hon. gentleman takes his seat, will he tell us the occasion he has refererd to when Mr. Tennant made himself extremely obnoxious ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The meeting that he disturbed was held during the Dominion general election at Gretna. It was a meeting that had been called, I believe, by the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson).

Mr. DAVIN. What proof have you of that ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I have the statement both of the hon. member for Lisgar and of the Prime Minister, of Manitoba. I have also the statement of Mr. Tennant himself admitting that he attended one meeting.

Mr. QUINN. He does not say that meeting.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. No, I do not think he would be apt to do that in his own defence, but I have the evidence of two gentlemen who testified distinctly that they did see him there, and I suppose I am entitled to accept that as proof, even if fifty other men said that they did not see him there.

Mr. DAVIN. That would depend. I listened with great attention to the speech of the hon. gentleman, as I was very anxious to hear his rebuttal of the charges made by my hon. friend from Montreal (Mr. Quinn), but while the hon. member was energetic and eloquent, and repudiated in a most vigorous manner having been influenced by any sectarian or racial feeling—and I would be very sorry to suppose that he would allow himself to be actuated by such unworthy motives—what we wanted was a rebuttal of the position established by my hon. friend from Montreal, that this man had not taken any part in the Dominion election. I have some papers which were placed in my hand, and which probably I would have brought to the attention of the House had not the matter devolved on an hon. member (Mr. Quinn) who could go into it much more effectively than I. But as the hon. Minister has not, in my opinion, at all repudiated what was proved by the hon. member from Montreal, I propose to refer to these papers. The hon. Minister has affidavits in his possession negativing the charge that this man Tennant took any part as an offensive partisan in the Dominion election. He admits that he took part in a local election, but with the strong description ringing in our ears, given by the Prime Minister and the Minister of Railways, of the difference between what is provincial and what is Dominion, I should suppose that because this man took a part in a local election—no doubt offensive to the Attorney General (Cameron) of Manitoba—he should not be condemned as an offensive partisan in Dominion politics. The statement is made by my hon. friend the Minister of Customs that Tennant acted as a scrutineer. But he denies that most positively, and gives circumstances that made it impossible he could have acted in that way. He said :

> The other charge made against me was that I acted as scrutineer on election day for the Conservative candidate in Gretna poll. This is not the fact, and I stated so to the Minister of Customs when asked. I can at any time send you, if wanted, affidavits from the deputy returning officer in charge of the poll, or any other official present, that I distinctly refused to act as an agent or scrutineer in the polling booth.

This statement is confirmed by what fell from the Minister of Customs, who told us that this man had refused to act officially, but implied that nevertheless, in some way or other, he actually did act. But he gives us no proof of that. All that he required to do, to place my hon. friend from Montreal (Mr. Quinn) in the wrong was to come forward with his proof that this man had acted the part of an offensive partisan, and my hon. friend from Montreal would be completely silenced. Instead of that the hon. Minister of Customs, who is an experinced campaigner, harked back upon the well-known artifice, that if you have a bad case the best thing is to surround it with as much thunder and blasting powder as you can, and people will think there is something behind.

The PRIME MINISTER. Do not use too much powder now.

Mr. DAVIN. There is no danger that I will offend in that way. The actual facts are that Tennant went in the afternoon to vote. He was asked by the scrutineer, Mr. Pearson, to take his place while he went outside for a while. This he refused to do officially or to take out any papers, as the law requires. Under these circumstances, my hon. friend has certainly failed. I think with the record before us and seeing how men have been dismissed, the fact that

this man admits that he went out and gave a good Conservative vote on that day is ground enough for his dismissal. Now, my hon. friend states that an American officer was left in charge of his office by Mr. Tennant on that day. I will read the substantial part of the affidavit of that officer—and mind the papers are in the Minister's own hands.

I am an officer in the United States Customs, situated at Neche, North Dakota. In the regular performance of my duties I visit Gretna daily, and, while waiting the arrival of the southbound train, I usually wait in the office of the Canadian customs. I declare that I have not been placed in charge of the office of the Canadian customs at Gretna on the 23rd June or at any other time, and I further declare that I was not requested by J. F. Tennant, sub-collector at that office, to do so on that or any other occasion.

Now, my hon. friend the Minister of Customs made an appeal to me whether I would take the testimony of two gentlemen. I said it depended. I would like to cross-examine them. If I would take the testimony of two gentlemen, why should I not take the sworn affidavit of one gentleman and the statement of another—one of these a gentleman who has served under arms.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I beg the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Davin's) pardon. May I ask if he read what was before him?

Mr. DAVIN. I did.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS Where, then, did the hon. gentleman get that paper?

Mr. DAVIN. I read everything before me. I am told that it is the substance——

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I was watching the hon. gentleman. I may be mistaken. I have here the affidavit the hon. member from Montreal (Mr. Quinn) read, and I did not understand the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) to read the following:—"I was in the office of Mr. Tennant on the 23rd June, 1896." I did not hear the hon. gentleman read those words.

Mr. DAVIN. That is not here.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Then, the hon. gentleman should have the affidavit. He has read a sworn statement.

Mr. DAVIN. If my hon. friend (Mr. Paterson) will read it to me. I read all that I have here.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Ah, the hon. gentleman should have the affidavit before he began to speak.

Mr. DAVIN. Surely not; I have given——

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Who was to blame for putting the paper into the hon. gentleman's hands

Mr. DAVIN. Does any hon. gentleman say that when the affidavit is in the hands of the Minister of Customs, it is not perfectly proper for any member of this House to read what has been furnished him?

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Who furnished it?

Mr. DAVIN. One of the foremost men in Canada.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I am reading from the "Hansard" the affidavit of this American officer.

Mr. DAVIN. Will the hon. gentleman send it to me by the page boy, and I will finish the reading of it.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) read what is on his paper?

Mr. DAVIN. I will not only do that, but I will send the paper to the hon. gentleman:

This is the substance of a statutory declaration made by P. Horgan——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. DAVIN. Well, will the hon. Minister of Customs give me the affidavit.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. You have the "Hansard." There it is at page 4298.

Mr. DAVIN. Then, we will get it, and I will read it with pleasure. Has the hon. gentleman given me the page of the unrevised "Hansard"?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Yes, unrevised.

Mr. DAVIN—

I, Patrick Horgan, of Neche, North Dakota, in the United States, do solemnly declare that I am an officer of the United States customs at Neche, in North Dakota, and I am well acquainted with J. F. Tennant, ex-sub-collector of customs at Gretna, Man. In the performance of my duties I visit Gretna almost daily.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The hon. gentleman in his previous reading said "daily."

Mr. DAVIN. The document I read says, "in the regular performance of my duties, I visited Gretna daily."

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. One of the foremost men in Canada has imposed upon you.

Mr. DAVIN. I will send this to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson). The affidavit in "Hansard" goes on as follows:—

I was in the office of Mr. Tennant on the 23rd June, 1896.——

If there is any comfort for the hon. Minister in that it must be the comfort that the drowning man gets when catching at a straw:

——I was in the office of Mr. Tennant on the 23rd June, 1896, as I usually wait there when meeting the train going south on the Great Northern

Railway. I was no longer there on that date than on any other occasions. I was not in charge of said customs office at Gretna on the occasion nor at any other time. I was never requested by Mr. Tennant or any other Canadian customs official to look after said office on the 23rd June, 1896, or at any other date whatever.——

That makes it stronger.

——I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing the same to be true and by virtue of the Canada Evidence Act, 1893.

(Sgd.) P. J. HORGAN.

Declared before me at Gretna Man., in the county of Manchester, this 28th day of December, A.D. 1897.

M. LONG,
A Commissioner in B. R.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. That is all right.

Mr. DAVIN. If the hon. gentleman is thankful for having the whole affidavit read, he is thankful for very small mercies, for, if it were necessary to strengthen the operative part of the affidavit which I read, then, what had to be read strengthens it. I am in the judgment of the House in saying that. If the hon. gentleman finds it so necessary to squirm out of the position he took, why, surely, there is not ground enough for taking away a man's bread and butter, taking away his position in life. It is sailing very close to the wind indeed for the hon. gentleman to take such a course as that. I merely rose to say that I know, coming as I do from the North-west, that there is a very strong feeling in the North-west Territories that harsh treatment has been dealt out to this Mr. Tennant. I feel that the heart of the Minister is perhaps now wounded, that he feels that he has been misled. He laughs; but I perceive that it is not the joyful laugh of exhuberant emotion, but rather the hysterical cachination that seeks to veil a feeling of repentence.

I can easily understand that the hon. member for Lisgar was animated with furious passion. He shakes his head, but I say that on the morrow of the 23rd of June, never in the history of Canada was such a spectacle witnessed as the furious passions that animated a certain number of gentlemen who were victors on that occasion. The victory was new to them, and to some extent it was unexpected, as it was undeserved; and the furious passions which have hardly now abated, were let loose upon everybody who happened to invite decapitation. Not only were people furious, but they were hungry, and they had hungry retainers behind them, clamouring for the heads of men to be thrown into the basket in order that they might get compensation. I can understand how the hon. member for Lisgar pressed this matter upon the Minister of Customs. Now when he gave his evidence, if we could have cross-examined him, and if some other reputable gentlemen came forward and made statements and we could have cross-examined them, does anybody suppose, knowing what was the state of things throughout this country, knowing the state of mind of these men, drunk with victory, excited beyond all past experience by the new sense of power——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. member is going a little too far. The hon. member for Lisgar has made a statement in this House that he was present on such an occasion, and I think the hon. member from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) must accept that statement without suggesting that a cross-examination would make him contradict it.

Mr. DAVIN. I was not disputing that. You misapprehend the position that I took. If I alleged that the statement made by the member for Lisgar was not true—and I do not say that—that would be out of order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. member has suggested that if the member for Lisgar was cross-examined, perhaps he would obtain from him a statement different from the one he has made.

Mr. DAVIN. No, that is not what I say. I would not be so guilty, I would not so offend against parliamentary rules and etiquette, as to say such a thing. What I say is this, that if we could cross-examine the member for Lisgar we should then be in a position to know whether he was at the time a fit person to give evidence. That is a wholly different thing. Now, it is very doubtful to me if, on the 24th of June, or for three or four weeks afterwards, any of the successful candidates who were new to political life, were in a position to give evidence.

An hon. MEMBER. Were they all tight?

Mr. DAVIN. I do not say that. Mr. Disræli said of Gladstone that he was intoxicated by the exuberance of his own verbosity. Villemessant said that the Marseillais used to get drunk on their own saliva. It all depends upon the constitution and the temperament, upon what they can get, or what they would like to get drunk. I will certainly say that on the morrow of the 23rd of June there were men drunk, but not with wine, and intoxicated, but with something more potent than either beer or whisky. Now, the Minister of Customs, after having had days to prepare, has not brought out a single thing in rebuttal of what was laid down by the member for Montreal. My right hon. friend the Prime Minister, in the first session, in 1896, laid down the law that only men who were guilty of offensive partisanship would be dismissed. We all accepted that, but I regret to say that that bulwark that was given us by the Prime Minister for men who had only voted, had only been true to their principles, has been but a small protection for only too many all through this country. I regret to have these cases come up, I regret it greatly

in the interest of this poor man Tennant; but I regret still more in the interest of the public service, that such a charge can be made as has been made by the hon. member for Montreal, and that, after days of incubation, we can get from the Minister of Customs nothing better than a lame, an impotent, an inconclusive defence.

Mr. ROCHE. I promise the hon. members of this House that I will have rather more regard for their aural appendages, and discuss this question more calmly and with less vehemence of expression, than did the Minister of Customs. That hon. gentleman was, in my opinion, most unfair to the hon. member for Montreal (Mr. Quinn) when this question was up for discussion on the last occasion, in having accused that hon. member of deliberately trying to deceive the House by reading a newspaper article containing the statement that Mr. Tennant had been defrauded of his superannuation allowance, when the hon. member for Montreal knew the contrary to be the case. Now, had the Minister of Customs desired to be fair to a political opponent he would also have quoted the qualifying expression used by the member for Montreal wherein he stated that it was true that since that time Mr. Tennant had been paid a sum of money by the department in lieu of that which he had paid into the superannuation fund. So the Minister's feigned indignation on this score was entirely uncalled for. Now, the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson), in discussing this question in that elegant diction of the slangy variety of which he seems to be a master, disposed of it in a free and off-hand manner as if it was entirely unworthy of serious consideration: and he even, to use his own classical English, accused the member for Montreal of having displayed a great deal of gall in championing the cause of Mr. Tennant. Well, while I am not disposed to contradict the hon. member for Lisgar, or to deny that he is an authority upon gall—I am quite willing to concede that point—still I think this question is deserving of more serious consideration than he appeared disposed to give it. It is true that he has likened it to another question and another case that has been championed by the hon. member for Montreal, but it was entirely foreign to the subject under discussion to bring in the name of the widow McManus, and to tell the House that she had handed out the contents of the post office at the point of a revolver. In doing this he was simply indulging in that extravagant language which robs any remarks that he might have to address to this House, of a great deal of the weight that would otherwise be attached to them. It is true that the hon. member has declared that he had been the cause of 15 political decapitations in his constituency. That is not a bad record for the hon. member, considering that he has been a member of this House for so short a time. Still, he disclaims any idea that any of those dismissals took place because of religion or nationality. In fact he instanced one case where he was the means of causing the dismissal of an Orangeman, and declared that he was accused of being an enemy to that organization while in this case he is accused of being an enemy of the Irish Roman Catholics. This only shows how very unpopular the hon. member is becoming with all factions and all sections of the people in his own constituency.

While I am not personally acquainted with the gentleman, Mr. Tennant, who has been dismissed from the sub-collectorship of customs at the port of Gretna, still he having been an officer in the Manitoba service, and I being one of the few representatives on this side of the House from that province, I consider it my duty to protest against the harsh and unjust treatment which he has received at the hands of this Government. The hon. member from Montreal has very fully and very ably presented the case, and it will not be necessary for me to engage the attention of the House for any length of time, and what I do say is not for the purpose of making political capital against the Government, but merely to try and convince the Minister of Customs, if any poor words of mine can have that effect, that Mr. Tennant has been harshly and most unjustly treated in denying to him the first element of British fair-play. At the last session of Parliament I placed a series of questions on the Order paper in reference to this case to which I received the following replies:—

1. Has Mr. J. F. Tennant, for several years sub-collector of customs at Gretna, been dismissed.

Answer. Yes.

2. Were any charges made against him? What was the nature of the charges, and by whom preferred?

Answer. Charges to the effect that he took an offensive and public partisan part in the last Dominion general election were preferred against him by the hon. member for Lisgar, and were supported by other gentlemen.

3. Was Mr. Tennant given the opportunity to defend himself?

Answer. Mr. Tennant was notified of the charges and his reply thereto received.

4. Is he entitled to any allowance under the Superannuation Act?

Answer. This question is still under consideration.

Now, it appears that in the early part of last year charges of active and offensive partisanship were formulated against Mr. Tennant, these charges being that he had absented himself from his office on election day, leaving a United States customs official in charge, while he acted as scrutineer or agent at one of the polls. To these charges that gentleman gave a most unqualified denial, and not only a denial in the ordinary way, but sworn declarations to the same effect. Mr. Tennant denies being away from

his office a single day during the whole campaign, declares he only attended one meeting, and then merely as a spectator. He asked for and courted an investigation, so that he might have the opportunity of meeting his accusers face to face so sure was he as to his ability to disprove those charges. This reasonable request not to be condemned until he had a fair and impartial trial, a request that the humblest of Her Majesty's subjects is entitled to make, was denied him. Here was a confliction of testimony—charges preferred on the one hand and denied on the other; not only denied by Mr. Tennant, but a statutory declaration was made by the United States customs official who was supposed to have taken Mr. Tennant's place in the office, also denying the accusation; besides, other friends of Mr. Tennant were prepared to give evidence in rebuttal of these charges. Now, if I am correctly informed, Mr. Tennant was the only customs official in Manitoba against whom charges were preferred who was not granted an investigation, a Mr. McPherson having been appointed a commissioner to take evidence under oath in other cases.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Allow me to state that the reason was because I did not know of the partisanship on the part of the deputy collector of Killarney, and I did know, of my own knowledge, of Mr. Tennant's partisanship. In order that I might do no injustice to the sub-collector of Killarney, I asked for the appointment of a commissioner, and on the report of the commissioner, that official was dismissed. In the other cases, I had my own knowledge.

Mr. ROCHE. Why was not the same procedure followed in the case of Mr. Tennant? One would think that if those gentlemen who formulated these charges were in a position to prove them, they would have been only too glad of the opportunity to do so before a competent tribunal, and thus relieve themselves and the Government of the blame that is now undoubtedly attached to them by the majority of the people, irrespective of politics, because of their underhand methods of warfare. Why was he singled out for the vengeance of some hon. gentlemen opposite? I will tell you why. Mr. Tennant took no part or share as a partisan in the last Dominion election. This he positively denies, and we are bound by every sense of justice to believe him innocent until he has been properly proved to be guilty. What he did do is this. At the time of a provincial election the Hon. J. D. Cameron, now Attorney General of Manitoba, held a meeting in Gretna and grossly insulted Mr. Tennant and his co-religionists, who are in a small minority there, because of their opposition to the School Act, and accused them of disloyalty, and made use of some very violent expressions. Mr. Tennant, at that meeting, was called upon to refute those, what he and his friends considered to be slanders, which he did, and took Mr. Cameron severely to task for his uncalled-for attack. Now, while my opinions are not the same as Mr. Tennant's on the school question, I claim that in a matter like that, on a question of conscience, there is not a reasonable man in this House who will not say that Mr. Tennant did perfectly right under the circumstances. That gentleman's whole life gave the lie to such an accusation as disloyalty. He went to that country in 1870 as a member of the Red River expedition under Lord Wolseley; he has served his country in one capacity or another for the past twenty years, and it was not natural for such a man to sit quietly and hear so unfounded a charge without resenting it. Since that time Mr. Cameron and some other Liberal politicians have had it in for Mr. Tennant, and made the threat that he would be hounded out of office as soon as the Liberals came into power. How was he served? He held a magistrate's commission since 1872. His political opponents cancelled it, although he had on several occasions received the thanks of the provincial government for upholding law and order on the frontier. A commission for taking affidavits in the courts met the same fate, and this gentleman feels that he has been persecuted by the provincial government in every possible manner. And now, at fifty years of age, with a large family, he has been turned adrift, with no provision for the future. The amount he had paid into the superannuation fund—$201.60—having been returned to him, and all to make way for a political friend of the hon. member for Lisgar, who, by the way, has proved to be so thoroughly incompetent that he had to call in Mr. Tennant a short time ago to straighten out affairs for him, they had got into such a muddle that business had almost come to a standstill.

Now Mr. Tennant directed an appeal to the Prime Minister himself. He had read the expressions made use of on the floor of the House by the Premier, that whereas if any civil servant had taken his official life in his hands and had been a partisan, no mercy would be shown; but unless it came within the personal knowledge of the Minister—not as the Minister of Customs said, "within the personal knowledge of an hon. member"—unless it came within the personal knowledge of the Minister himself, the Prime Minister would see that an investigation was held and the act of justice done towards the official, of giving him an opportunity of defending himself. Mr. Tennant directed an appeal to the Prime Minister, believing the Prime Minister was a man of his word, and Mr. Tennant asked, not for mercy, but for a fair and impartial trial. Here is the letter of Mr. Tennant to the Prime Minister:—

Gretna, Man. 20th May, 1897.

To Hon. Wilfrid Laurier, M.P., Premier of Canada, Ottawa.

Sir,—I beg the honour of addressing you briefly by way of an appeal to your characteristic sense of justice and charity in the case of one treated with undue harshness.

By an Order of the Governor General in Council dated 9th April, 1897, my services as subcollector of customs at Gretna were dispensed with, no investigation being held or any opportunity given for defence. I was charged, of course, with offensive partisanship, but, though a commissioned officer in the civil service, my request for an investigation into the false charges was denied with the result that my many years of faithful and efficient service count for nothing, whilst I find myself, at nearly fifty years of age, with a large and expensive family, out of a position, with even my superannuation cancelled, although I have paid into the fund since 1888.

I might also explain, in case the Minister of Customs should take exception to my quoting this, that this was before the $201.00 was paid to Mr. Tennant.

As to my alleged active partisanship, I was not absent from my office for one day during the late Dominion election campaign. Inspector Young and the records of my office will substantiate this statement, the untruthful affidavits of my enemies notwithstanding, and only on one occasion did I attend a public meeting, and this in Gretna. I took no active part in this meeting or any other, by speech or otherwise, although repeatedly pressed by the Conservative organizers so to do. The only occasion upon which my accusers can truthfully or reasonably rely was at a meeting during the provincial campaign, to which I went as an ordinary spectator. The speaker was the Hon. J. D. Cameron, now Attorney General for Manitoba, who grossly insulted Roman Catholics (I being one in a very small minority resident here), and I, being called upon and named, took up the taunt and expounded hotly for myself and few co-religionists. We were charged with disloyalty, which I could refute in my own person, since I was a member of the Red River Expedition of 1870, and have served on the frontier ever since, on the Boundary Commission, as a land guide, &c., besides holding a commission of the peace from 1872 to 1896, a municipal councillor, twice mayor of West Lynne by acclamation, alderman of the city of Emerson, and finally customs officer (after passing the qualifying examination). Neither are my politics of the wild, uncompromising order depicted by Mr. Richardson, since I have voted with the Liberals in general elections, looking rather to the principles and sincerity of the candidate than to his stripe of politics. I will confess, however, that I hold my Catholic religion to be dearer than any politics, therefore it was that I was led into giving Mr. Cameron a chance of complaint.

Permit me sir, in conclusion, to say that I do not desire to cast all blame on the Government, knowing, as I do, that the harshness and injustice of my treatment is directly attributable to the animosity of a very few individuals. Neither do I care for mercy. Merely that you will exercise in my behalf that generosity with which you are everywhere credited, and order that simple justice be shown to me, and, that my punishment be made proportionate to my offence.

The granting of an inquiry will result, if granted, to a very great modification in my sentence.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
J. F. TENNANT.

After a long delay an assistant-secretary replied to the foregoing, that the letter was referred to the Customs Department, and without any word from the department up to date, the 24th February, 1898; this letter being pigeon-holed in the Minister of Customs' Department, and no reply even being deigned to Mr. Tennant. Now, Mr. Tennant's service to this country deserved better recognition than this; he had been a faithful and efficient officer, no charge of carelessness or incompetency had been made against him in all those years; his reputation as a citizen is above reproach, his veracity has never been impeached, and still those sworn declarations have been ignored, his official head cut off, without granting that very reasonable request, to allow him an investigation, treatment, in my opinion, most arbitrary in its character, and deserving of the severest censure, and I think the hon. member for Lisgar, in his hour of victory, might well have afforded to be more magnanimous in his treatment of that gentleman, to the extent, at any rate, of insisting that he should be allowed the opportunity of defending himself before a proper tribunal.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. He has had that opportunity.

Mr. ROCHE. No, he had not, and the Minister of Customs knows it, and I appeal to him even at this late day to do justice to Mr. Tennant and allow this investigation. By doing so, and if Mr. Tennant is not able to prove himself guiltless, the Government will have washed their hands of all responsibility and will have relieved themselves of all blame that is now attached to them.

Mr. GUILLET. It was most unfair for the Minister of Customs to make the comments he did on this case, in the absence of any papers bearing on it. The hon. Minister (Mr. Paterson) endeavoured, as the hon. member for Montreal (Mr. Quinn) declared, to draw a red herring across the track. He endeavoured to take credit to himself for having dealt in a generous manner towards another member of the civil service, while defending himself against the charge of dealing unjustly with Mr. Tennant. Well, if the Minister of Customs had a good case, he had neither reason nor right to travel outside of his brief, and he should have refrained from casting reflections on Mr. McAllister, who certainly was one of the most estimable and efficient officers of the civil service. Mr. McAllister was deputy collector of Customs at Cobourg for years, and he performed the duties of Collector for quite a length of time, owing to the illness of the Collector, Mr. Ewing. It is a fact that Mr.

Ewing expressed his determination to resign his position so that justice might be done Mr. McAllister, and in order that his services might be recognized by the Government. Mr. Ewing had a claim for special consideration to superannuation under the Civil Service Act. He had performed special services, and had been assured by the Government that on his applying for superannuation they would give him the full benefit of the Superannuation Act, in view of these special services which he had rendered to the department in Montreal. Mr. Ewing conducted an investigaton in Montreal which resulted in a very large sum of money being returned to the public revenue, and for which he got no extra pay. Mr. McAllister discharged the duties of Mr. Ewing's office during the long time Mr. Ewing was in Montreal, and also for a long period before the latter's death. Mr. McAllister felt, and his friends felt, and Mr. Ewing's friends felt that he, Mr. McAllister, had special claims on the office of Collector of Customs when Mr. Ewing should resign. Mr. Ewing expressed his desire to resign, but he said: I must be sure that I shall have my full superannuation allowance; that is, an allowance for 35 years, and he had been but 32 years a Government official. Although that statement was made known to Mr. McAllister, he took no action on it, until a Liberal friend of his, a Mr. Meagher suggested to Mr. McAllister that an effort should be made to guarantee Mr. Ewing this addition of two or three years to his superannuation allowance in case his resignation was accepted. Mr. McAllister consulted an able lawyer in Cobourg, and the result was that a document was drawn up under the terms of which Mr. McAllister undertook to guarantee Mr. Ewing against any loss, and guaranteeing him that the Government would do justice to him. This is all that was done by Mr. McAllister in the matter. Mr. McAllister had no promise that he would get the office. The Government had given no indication; they gave him no sign that they would do as was proposed, nor had he any assurance excepting the fact that I myself would be willing to recommend him, and so Mr. McAllister's friends induced him to put his name to the document which his solicitor, an able lawyer in Cobourg, advised him would meet the case, and as he assumed that that was the proper thing to do, he signed that document. Yet this is exaggerated here, and is spoken of as an offence against the Criminal Code. These hon. gentlemen know that no such charge would lay against Mr. McAllister, that in no court could it be sustained, that no grand jury would bring in a bill against him and no petit jury would convict him on any such charge. The spirit of the law was never offended against by Mr. McAllister. His offence was a technical and trivial offence, if it was an offence at all. There have been cases of the same kind committed by friends of hon. gentlemen opposite and reported in the public press. We know that the Liberal paper in Brantford stated that a certain county judge had expressed his willingness to resign if Mr. Hardy were appointed in his place, on condition that he be allowed to retain his position of registrar of the surrogate court and be appointed master in chancery. These facts being publicly known, both governments were committed to carry out that arrangement and they did so. I think this constitutes a far more serious breach of the law than Mr. McAllister's action, and yet it is looked upon as a matter of every day occurrence, and is not considered as any offence against the Criminal Code. Moreover, I venture to say that if the secrets of the Cabinet could be ascertained, the Government themselves would be found to have committed far more grave offences against the Criminal Code than are charged against Mr. McAllister. This case of Mr. McAllister is brought up here simply as a blind, in the attempt to show that sympathy and kindness have been shown, which the facts will not bear out.

Mr. McMULLEN. I have listened to the discussion that has taken place on two occasions on this question of Mr. Tennant's dismissal. Now, it appears to me that three points in connection with this case are very clear. In the first place, Mr. Tennant is charged with acting the part of a partisan by the elected member of the constituency in which he lived. We know very well that in 1896, when this whole question was before the House, a claim was brought before the House in which Sir Charles Tupper, the leader of the Opposition himself, secured the dismissal of Mr. Wade in Digby, simply and solely because he himself stated that Mr. Wade had been guilty of opposing the party in power. I consider that the word of a member of this House with regard to a party taking a partisan part in an election is just as good as the word of a Minister. Though Mr. Wade asked for an investigation, he was refused an investigation. In the present case, the member has declared that he personally was cognizant of improper conduct on Mr. Tennant's part. Mr. Tennant remained for some time in the polling booth, not merely as a voter, but as a scrutineer; and to prove the truth of that statement, the Minister of Customs has in his hand a certificate of the state of the poll at the close, in Mr. Tennant's own handwriting. I want to know if that is not positive proof that he was there acting as a scrutineer, and taking an active part in the election. He left his office during office hours, and went to the polling booth; he stopped there longer than was necessary to record his vote. In his absence from his office, he left an American customs officer in charge of it. I would like to ask my hon. friend from Montreal Centre, who has a law office in Montreal, if he left a clerk in his office, and during his absence that clerk went out

to discharge the duty of a scrutineer, and went for an opponent and left him there to attend to the business of the office during his absence, and stayed away long enough to see the close of the poll and make a certificate of it, would my hon. friend say, "Well done, good and faithful servant?"

Mr. QUINN. Admitting for the sake of argument that the American officer was in the office, will my hon. friend assimilate the case of an American customs officer with the case of two political opponents on election day?

Mr. McMULLEN. I certainly think a man occupying the responsible position of collector of customs under Her Majesty's commission openly violated the duties he was appointed to perform when he went out and left another man in charge, leaving the door of his office open till he returned. I certainly think that in itself was an offence. I would like to know why hon. gentlemen opposite consider that the Government or any of their followers should be deprived of the same privilege that hon. gentlemen opposite exercised in 1896 when they were in power.

Mr. COCHRANE. Did you not accuse the Conservative party of wrong-doing in that case?

Mr. McMULLEN. I am saying that in 1896, Sir Charles Tupper stated that any man who acted the part of a partisan openly and in the face of a member of Parliament, who stated on the floor of this House on his word of honour that he had done so, ought to be dismissed, and on that ground he justified the dismissal of Mr. Wade. I would like to know if the word of a member on this side of the House is not as good as that of the leader of the Opposition. I certainly think we have the same rights; and my hon. friend the member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) has reported on his word of honour that this man did take an open part in that election by acting as scrutineer and giving a certificate of the state of the poll at the close, and that he was an unfaithful servant when he left his office in the charge of a customs officer from across the line.

Mr. WALLACE. In this case, I think there has been a very gross miscarriage of justice. According to British law, every man is innocent until proved guilty. When was this man proved guilty? We have simply the fiat of the Minister of Customs. In the absence of evidence, in the absence of a fair trial or investigation, the word of the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) was taken, that this man had done various wrongs, and the Minister dismissed him. But what do the papers disclose? That there is not a tittle of evidence to substantiate the charges. What does the hon. Minister say? He says that Tennant was in the polling booth. Was not that a shame? Was not that trampling on the Liberal party, that he should have been permitted to go into a polling booth? But was there any law prohibiting him doing so? He was a loyal Canadian citizen, who has served his country in a dangerous expedition, and he surely was entitled to the privilege of any other citizen. But the Minister says he not only went into the polling booth but remained there some time.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I said more, I said that he was there as scrutineer.

Mr. WALLACE. There is not a particle of proof of that. I challenge the hon. gentleman to get up and give us the proof.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. How did he come to stay there, if he was not?

Mr. WALLACE. I will read the evidence and challenge the hon. Minister to contradict it. I ask him to get up now, and I will sit down and give him a chance to prove that Mr. Tennant acted as scrutineer. At the close of the poll, any elector has a right to be present. If there is not a scrutineer for both parties, anybody can be invited to come in and act as such, and if there is no scrutineer there at all, the deputy returning officer must invite some one to be present at the counting of the polls.

Mr. DAVIS (Saskatchewan). He could not be there and be in his own office at the same time.

Mr. WALLACE. He was not in his office.

Mr. DAVIS (Saskatchewan). He should have been there and have put the Yankee out.

Mr. WALLACE. We will come to the Yankee later on. What did he do in the polling booth? Here are two affidavits—the first from the polling clerk, and the second from the deputy returning officer. What does the polling clerk say? He says:

I was the poll clerk for Gretna to the polling booth of the Dominion general elections held on the 23rd June, 1896, for the electoral division of Lisgar, being so sworn in as such by the deputy returning officer, H. G. Bean, and was present at the opening and holding of the poll to its close on the said election day.

The other officials present in the polling booth on the said election day were: H. G. Bean, deputy returning officer; R. B. Fisher, agent and scrutineer on behalf of the Liberal candidate, Mr. R. L. Richardson, and J. Pearson, agent and scrutineer for the Conservative candidate, Mr. R. Rogers.

The said R. B. Fisher and J. Pearson presented properly executed agents' papers on behalf of their respective candidates, which were received by the deputy returning officer, who authorized them to act in the said polling booth as scrutineers or agents for their respective candidates in the said poll.

Mr. J. F. Tennant first entered the Gretna poll in the afternoon. He recorded his vote, and was requested to act as scrutineer or agent for R. Rogers.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Hear, hear.

Mr. WALLACE. Is that a crime for an elector to go in and give his vote ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. What about his office ?

Mr. TAYLOR. Had he not a right to leave long enough to vote ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. But then he remained as scrutineer.

Mr. WALLACE. He recorded his vote. Up to that, I suppose he was complying with the law. He then was requested to act as scrutineer or agent for R. Rogers. Was that any crime on his part ? The hon. Minister of Customs says "hear, hear," as if he had discovered a mare's nest. But what follows :—

J. F. Tennant refused to act in any official capacity in connection with the said election, and rejected the papers presented to him by the deputy returning officer appointing him agent and scrutineer for R. Rogers.

Was that breaking any law, regulation or rule ?

Mr. DAVIS (Saskatchewan). If he were not scrutineer, he should not have been allowed to stay in the poll.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Let me read one clause of the statutory declaration of the deputy returning officer to that poll.

Mr. WALLACE. I have it under my hand, and can read it myself.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Read it.

Mr. WALLACE. I am reading one now. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to finish this one.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Certainly.

Mr. WALLACE. I am very glad indeed to find the hon. gentleman so gracious.

——but consented to remain as an ordinary elector if there was no question raised, and to this R. B. Fisher, scrutineer for R. L. Richardson, made no objection.

Mr. Tennant simply remained there in the absence of the two scrutineers as an ordinary citizen, was that taking an active partisan part ? I say that his dismissal, under the circumstances, was a totally unjustifiable piece of inexcusable tyranny. The affidavit of the deputy returning officer is similar in substance, in its first part, to the one I have just read.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Read clause 4 of that declaration.

Mr. WALLACE——

No other scrutineer or agent than Mr. Pearson was appointed to act for or on behalf of Mr. Rogers at the said poll on the said election day In the afternoon of the said election day, the said J. R. Pearson left the said polling booth, and Mr. J. F. Tennant, who was in the said polling booth recording his vote, was requested to act as scrutineer for Mr. Rogers. Scrutineers' papers were offered Mr. J. F. Tennant ; he refused them, and declined to act.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Read on.

Mr. WALLACE. There does not seem to be much consolation to the hon. gentleman in any thing I do read.

——but consented to remain under the clause in the Dominion Elections Act permitting an elector to be present in the absence of the agent or scrutineer, provided there was no objection raised to his presence by any person. R. B. Fisher, the agent and scrutineer for R. L. Richardson, said there was no objection.

He was quite agreeable to Tennant remaining there as an independent scrutineer to see that there was fair-play. J. F. Tennant remained, but refused to act in any official capacity to receive the ballots of any man in connection with that election. That is the statutory declaration of the deputy returning officer, and I am quite sure it does not afford a single ground for this disgraceful conduct towards Mr. Tennant. Now, this is the only crime that the Minister of Customs had against him. The only crime against him is that he went to the polling booth and remained there some time, and because he did that, this old servant of the Government was cast out.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. What does the hon. member for Montreal say : He said that Tennant was discharged because he was an Irish Catholic.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. member for Montreal (Mr. Quinn) stated what I have stated.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. No.

Mr. WALLACE. Yes, I can quote his language.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. So can I.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. Minister of Customs must not say "no." But if the man was dismissed because of his religion then, so much more disgrace for the Minister of Customs ; so much more disgrace for the Government—that a man in this country should be ostracized or punished for his religion, no matter what he may be. Then, according to the Minister of Customs, the next crime he committed was that he went to a meeting and was asked to come on the platform. And the Minister says that inferentially he was a partisan. The Minister of Customs himself does not say that he took any part in the proceedings. But he was present at the meeting, and that is one crime ; he was asked to take the platform, and that is another. Inferentially, he must be a partisan or he would not have been asked to take the platform, says the Minister of Customs. If ever there was a flimsy excuse for the dismissal of a competent public servant—for I know he was a competent customs officer.

An hon. MEMBER. Why did you not appoint his brother?

Mr. WALLACE. There is a question. A man is competent, so why do I not appoint his brother? I did appoint his brother. But Mr. Tennant is said to have been a partisan because he was asked to take a platform at a meeting. The Minister does not say that he took a platform or took any part in the meeting.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Yes, I do.

Mr. WALLACE. The Minister did not say so and he will not say so now.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I say the declarations show that he took the part of a partisan in the meeting.

Mr. WALLACE. Whose declaration?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The declaration of two gentlemen I named.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. Minister says he named them. But has he any objection to state again who they were?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson).

Mr. WALLACE. Did the hon. member for Lisgar make a declaration?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. He made a declaration in his letter.

Mr. WALLACE. Oh, the hon. member (Mr. Richardson) wrote a letter saying: We want this man dismissed, and the Minister gets up and says that this is a declaration that the hon. gentleman has made.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I did not say a statutory declaration. The hon. gentleman must not——

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. member (Mr. Paterson) will please take his seat and allow me to proceed. There is a transparent fraud. The Minister gets up and says there were two declarations made, and when I ask him whose, he first shirks the question——

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) is misquoting me.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. gentleman will please sit down, unless he raises a point of order.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) says I said what I did not say.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. gentleman has no right to interrupt me except to raise a point of order. The Speaker can allow one on that side to interrupt when he will not allow one on this side to do so. The hon. Minister said there were two declarations made, when, as a matter of fact, there were no declaration made in the sense in which we are using the word to-night. The hon. Minister chips in and says: You did not read the other two declarations. I should like to see them. Why have they not been presented to the House?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Where is there any declaration, statutory or otherwise, that Mr. Tennant did not act as a partisan?

Mr. QUINN. He never was called upon to defend himself against such a charge.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. Minister wrote a letter to Mr. Tennant. Why did he not call upon him to defend himself against this charge. Here is the letter that the hon. Minister wrote:

Ottawa, 17th February, 1897.

Jos. Tennant, Esq.,
Customs Officer, Gretna, Man.

Dear Sir,—I beg to inform you that I have received a statutory declaration in which the charge is made that one Patrick Harrigan, a member of the staff of the United States customs at Neche, in the state of North Dakota, was in charge of you office for some time during the 23rd of June, 1896. Please let me have your reply to this charge at your earliest convenience.

Yours truly,
WM. PATERSON.

Mr. QUINN. That is the only charge made against him.

Mr. WALLACE. That is the only charge. He sent a statutory declaration answering that amply and completely. And that is the only chance that was given——

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. You are wrong there.

Mr. WALLACE. I will read the declaration made by this man Horgan to disprove the only charge made against him.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. No, no.

Mr. WALLACE. Was there any other charge?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. What does the hon. gentleman mean—that that was the only communication sent to Mr. Tennant?

Mr. QUINN. That was the only charge made against him in writing.

Mr. WALLACE. I believe that is the only charge made against him. The Minister interrupts me, and when I ask if that is the only charge, he asks me a question instead of answering me.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The hon. gentleman may go on if he likes; but he is making statements that will not be borne out by the papers when they come down.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. gentleman had two chances to state his case and he does not seem to be satisfied.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The papers will come down.

Mr. WALLACE. Why are they not here now ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The motion ordering them has not been carried yet.

Mr. WALLACE. Why did not the Minister, when he made his speech, lay the papers on the Table. Here is the answer to the charge that Patrick Horgan was in charge of this office some time during the 23rd of June. Here is the answer, not in the form of a letter, but in the form of a sworn statutory declaration :

Dominion of Canada,

Province of Manitoba.

In the matter of J. F. Tennant, and his dismissal from the service of the Canadian Department of Customs :

I, Patrick Horgan, of Neche, North Dakota, in the United States, do solemnly declare that I am an officer of the United States customs at Neche, in North Dakota, and I am well acquainted with J. F. Tennant, ex-sub-collector of customs at Gretna, Man. In the performance of my duties I visit Gretna almost daily. I was in the office of Mr. Tennant on the 23rd June, 1896, as I usually wait there when meeting the train going south on the Great Northern Railway.

These are the courtesies usual between officers on the boundary. I presume the Minister of Customs knows better than almost any member of the House how necessary it is for officers on both sides of the boundary lines to be on friendly terms, in order to aid each other in the performance of their duty. It is necessary to the efficient performance of the duties of customs officers on either side. The declaration goes on :

I was in the office of Mr. Tennant on the 23rd June, 1896, as I usually wait there when meeting the train going south on the Great Northern Railway. I was no longer there on that date than on other occasions. I was not in charge of said customs office at Gretna on the occasion nor at any other time.

Now, there is a sworn declaration. Have we any contradiction to that ?

Mr. RICHARDSON. We have the declaration filed with the department by one Byrans of Morden, swearing that the office was in charge of this man Horgan.

Mr. WALLACE. In what way does he prove it ? He says that a statutory declaration was forwarded to the department from one Bryans, of Morden, that he found the Canadian Customs office at Gretna in charge of an American Customs official. But Horgan swears that, although he was in the office, he never performed any duties there, and was not in charge of it. What does Bryans swear ? He says he went there and saw him sitting in the office. He does not swear that he was performing any duties, he does not give one specific statement to show that he was performing any duties there. The member for Lisgar says further :

I may say that so far as my own personal opinion is concerned, I did not think any investigation was needed in this case.

Of course not. He voted Tory, and so out he must go. He was not the only one that had to walk the plank in the exercise of his rights as a British subject.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Will the hon. member mention one ?

Mr. WALLACE. The sub-collector of Customs at Killarney, Thos. Shannon. I am prepared to discuss the case of the dismissal of Thomas Shannon with either the member for Lisgar or the Minister of Customs, or with both of them, and I give the Minister of Customs warning that that case will be brought up, and we would like to see the papers in that case before his Estimates are passed through the House. I have now disposed of this question of the Customs officer from the United States being in charge. There is not a line of proof that he was in charge. There is the sworn affidavit of the man himself that neither at that time nor at any other time had he been in charge of a Canadian Customs House. But Tennant was offensive, we are told. What was the offense ? The first offense was that he did not vote for the member for Lisgar ; the second was that he was offensive, and that he admitted attending a meeting. Well, is it a crime for a citizen to attend a meeting ; is it a crime even for a Government officer to attend a meeting ? He took no part in that meeting. It is true he did take an active part in the provincial campaign, but, surely, Mr. Speaker, is it to be a cause for dismissal on the part of this Government, that a man has committed an offence against the Government of Manitoba ? They tell us it was not for that offence he was punished, but it was for other offences. It was another case of the Minister of Customs and one of the supporters of the Government putting their heads together and saying : These men have been Conservatives, our friends want the offices, and we must drive them out of office. Here is a man who has served his country, and at a moment's notice is deprived of his office, and deprived of his honour by dismissal. He had been nine years in service, whereas it requires ten years service to entitle a man to superannuation. They did not even pay his money back until public attention was called to it, and then, months afterwards, they paid him back the money he had paid into the Government. I say in this case there is not a tittle of evidence to justify the Department of Customs in dismissing such a worthy and capable official as Mr. Tennant was. The hon member for North Wellington says his defence is divided into three parts. The first one was that Sir Charles Tupper did the same thing fifteen years ago. Why, the cases are as dissimilar as day is from night. The case he alludes to was that of a man who got up in a meeting

of Sir Charles Tupper's, who was then a Minister, and abused him personally. When charged with it, he did not ask for an investigation, and admitted the truth of the charge. The man was dismissed. But there is no parallel between the cases at all. He never asked for an investigation, while Mr. Tennant did. Moreover, this other man was employed by the day, and could be dismissed at a day's notice, whereas Mr. Tennant was appointed by the Governor in Council, and could not be dismissed except for cause. What cause did they tell the Governor General? I believe that some representation was made to the Governor General which the evidence that is brought before this House to-night, proves was not true. In the next place, the member for North Wellington says that the statement of the poll was in Mr. Tennant's handwriting. Of course it was. That is what we stated, that he was an elector called upon, and could not refuse. It was after hours, because the Custom House closes at four o'clock and the polling closes at five. He was not neglecting his duties there. But the returning officer can call on any elector to step in and see that the thing is done fairly, and the elector cannot refuse. That was Mr. Tennant's crime, and it leads to the laughter of the hon. member for Lisgar, who thinks it is a huge joke. If he should go back to that constituency, which I am told he is not going to do, he would find there was not such a big joke in it. I would like to see him go down to Gretna and Killarney and justify the dismissals of these two competent men. I would like to go down with him to hear what he would have to say.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I would be glad to have you come with me.

Mr. WALLACE. Then the third defence of the transaction by the member for North Wellington, was that the United States Customs officer was sitting there. If there ever was an unjustifiable case of the dismissal of a customs officer without cause, it is the one under discussion, next to the dismissal of Thomas Shannon, of Killarney, whose case we will investigate subsequently.

Mr. FLINT. In a general way there is ample proof before the House that the Minister of Customs was fully justified in recommending the dismissal of this officer named Tennant. But it must be borne in mind that the discussion arose on a motion for papers in the case and when those are produced—and the Minister has consented to the motion being adopted—the House will then be in a much better position to discuss the subject. At the present time we are at this disadvantage, that we have before the House only copies of such papers as have been used by the hon. gentleman who brought up this complaint, and who, of course, made the best he could of his case. It seems to be assumed by these hon. gentlemen, and also by the gentleman who drew up the affidavit, that Mr. Tennant had a perfect right under the law to remain in the polling booth after he had deposited his vote; yet the fact is that unless he was acting agent or scrutineer for one of the candidates, he had no right to remain in the polling booth even with the consent of those present. The Dominion statute gives no such power as to waive its provisions by not raising objections or acting by unanimous consent. The law is simply that an elector must enter the polling booth, give in his name, receive his ballot paper, mark it and hand it to the returning officer, and retire. Under no circumstances except the one circumstance that he remained as scrutineer and took the oath provided for scrutineers, had he a right to remain, and the presiding officer violated the law and the gentleman himself violated the law in remaining notwithstanding the fact that no objection was raised. I call attention to the manner in which this affidavit is drawn. I can see quite clearly that the individual who prepared it might not have intended that which the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) considered he intended. The affidavit says:

> In the afternoon of the said election day, the said J. R. Pearson left the said polling booth, and Mr. J. F. Tennant, who was in the said polling booth recording his vote, was requested to act as scrutineer for Mr. Rogers. Scrutineer's papers were offered to Mr. J. F. Tennant: he refused them and declined to act, but consented to remain under the clause in the Dominion Election Act permitting an elector to be present in the absence of agent or scrutineer provided there was no objection raised to his presence by any person.

There is no such provision under the Dominion Election Act; there is no disqualification permitting any one to remain in the polling booth unless he takes the oath of a scrutineer, and Mr. Tennant could not remain and act as such without taking that oath.

Mr. WALLACE. I am afraid the hon. gentleman has not read the Election Act.

Mr. FLINT. I have it before me, and I shall be glad if the hon. gentleman can point out to me the clause which gives any further powers than those I have stated. The voter must either retire from the polling booth or take the oath of scrutineer, and if he remained then he was under the obligation and liability of a scrutineer. No doubt from the history, as shown by the papers, he was acting as a partisan, and there may be still further evidence when the papers are brought down to show a stronger case in favour of the Minister and the hon. member for Lisgar.

Mr. QUINN. After the many compliments that have been paid me by the hon. Minister and by the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson), it would be very difficult for me to allow the debate to close without exer-

cising my right to devote a little attention to the argument, or rather to the language used in place of argument, in answer to the direct charge I have made against both of them. The hon. member for Lisgar has been good enough—perhaps he intended it as an insult, but I did not consider it an insult—to call me the O'Connell of the Canadian Parliament. Fortunately the laws of this country are such and the constitution is such that there is no necessity of an O'Connell in the Canadian Parliament; but if this Parliament were constituted of men like the hon. member for Lisgar, there would be required more than one O'Connell to show hon. members the right path, the path of honesty and fair dealing towards their fellow-subjects. The hon. gentleman has been good enough also to refer to the fact that I spoke in favour of a poor unfortunate widow, Mrs. McManus, who was attacked last session. It was stated by the hon. gentleman that it had been proved that the widow delivered the mail to applicants at the point of a revolver.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I said nothing of the kind.

Mr. QUINN. At the point of a shotgun.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Did I say it was proved in this House?

Mr. QUINN. Yes.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Will the hon. gentleman read what I did say?

Mr. QUINN. Yes.

Mr. RICHARDSON. At the point of a shotgun—exactly.

Mr. QUINN. But the hon. gentleman a moment ago stood up and said that he stated nothing of the kind.

Mr. RICHARDSON. You said it was delivered at the point of a revolver.

Mr. QUINN. Then you split hairs between a shot gun and a revolver.

Mr. RICHARDSON. A shot gun is jocular and a revolver might be serious.

Mr. QUINN. The hon. gentleman made the statement that the widow when attending to her duties delivered the letters at the point of a shotgun. I challenge the hon. gentleman or any hon. member to show any evidence of that kind. On the contrary, the report of the investigation made was that the widow had been guilty of no offence, but that perhaps on account of the friction excited it would be better to change her to another post office, but instead of doing this the head of the department cut her head off. The hon. gentleman took hold of this matter. It is quite true that the hon. gentleman and other members whispered in the ears of members on this side of the House, declaring how useless it would be to defend a woman whose character was worthless; but none of the hon. gentlemen had the courage to make a declaration that the woman was unworthy of belief or of the position she occupied as postmistress at that time. But they did have the questionable courage to whisper, where they could not be reported, statements in the same way as they whispered statements in this case, into the willing ear of the Postmaster General, who acted on those whispers and dismissed the woman.

That is just what has been done in the case. There is no evidence against this man Mr. Tennant. I have stated so before and I state so now. The Minister of Customs has not been able to name one fact on account of which he has dismissed this man. He has not been able to stand up in this House since this debate began and to say: I dismissed Tennant because of such and such an action he committed as an offensive partisan; and I have in support of my action the uncontradicted statement or oath of any individual that Tennant so conducted himself. The Minister has not been able to point to one fact which has been proven, sufficient to hang the lowest dog upon, as a reason why Tennant should be dismissed. But the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) has lots of reasons. In the course of his address he gave us six reasons, and they were, first: Tennant took an active part in organizing committees; second: He was known as one of the most active organizers; third, he acted as scrutineer; fourth, he went to a meeting in the town hall of Gretna in the midst of a gang and was most offensive in his interruptions; fifth, he did not report his assistant, Mr. Bryan, who was absent attending to political business; and, sixth, there was a statutory declaration that one Horgan was in the custom-house on the day of June 23rd. But the Minister of Customs says: My ground for dismissing him was the letter written by the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) supported by the statement of Mr. Greenway, Premier of Manitoba, and backed up again by the statement of the Attorney General of Manitoba Mr. Cameron. When driven to the last ditch that is the statement the Minister makes. But, is it why Tennant was dismissed? No. The hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) says: I did not think an investigation was necessary. The witness, the accuser, the Judge, the jury, did not think an investigation was necessary; he was the only one to be consulted. Is that in accord with the statement of the right hon. the Prime Minister recorded in "Hansard" in 1896? Is that in accord with the statement made by the Minister of Trade and Commerce? It is not. Listen to what the premier said:

> No Minister would pretend to dismiss any official unless he had an opportunity to defend himself. But when the case is in the personal knowledge of the Minister himself, under such circumstances there is no case for inquiry.

The right hon. the Prime Minister did not say, when it is within the knowledge of the hon. member for Lisgar, and he reports it second hand to Mr. Greenway, Premier of Manitoba, and he reports it third hand to Mr. Cameron, Attorney General for Manitoba, and they all club together and send their little statements to the Minister of Customs; that then the Minister is to dismiss an official. And what did the Minister of Customs tell us? He said there were two declarations against this man that he had attended a meeting. Now, what is the general acceptation of the word "declaration?" It is a statutory declaration; declarations such as I have produced in this House, declarations which are used in the legal language of this country as equivalent to an oath. That is what the Minister of Customs intended to convey to the House.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. It is not.

Mr. QUINN. That is what the Minister of Customs intended to embalm on "Hansard."

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. It is not.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. There is a statement made by the Minister of Customs that he never intended to convey that idea to the House, and that statement must be accepted by the hon. member (Mr. Quinn).

Mr. QUINN. I am bound to accept the statement, and I do so. But I do say that the manner in which the language was used showed an ignorance of the use of this word as it is generally accepted in the House. It showed an ignorance of the significance of the ordinary acceptation of the word "declaration" on the part of the Minister that it is very difficult to understand, but I am bound, to accept his statement, and I do so. When I spoke of a declaration, and when I spoke of the proofs which were put by Mr. Tennant before the Minister of Customs, I spoke of a sworn declaration; statutory declarations which are equivalent to sworn statements. The Minister was disingenuous enough to try and draw a herring across the trail in the first statement which he made to the House, by saying I wished to charge him with meanness, and that I made a false statement because I did not admit that Mr. Tennant had received a sum of money from the Department of Customs. If the Minister had paid attention to what I was saying, or if he had not been disingenuous, he would have heard my admission that a paltry sum had been returned to Mr. Tennant. But mark you, Mr. Speaker, when was it returned? It was not before Parliament met this session; not even before my motion was put upon the paper, but it was after my motion was put upon the paper that this money was returned to Mr. Tennant. If my motion had come up in the ordinary course, and if I had spoken on it then, I would not have been obliged to qualify my statement at all, for it would have been absolutely true had I used the words in the paper, that Mr. Tennant had been robbed of this sum of money. He was dismissed in May, 1897, and it was after the 4th February, 1898, that this money was refunded to him.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Your motion had nothing to do with it; not in the least.

Mr. QUINN. I do not know that it had, but I do not think the Minister of Customs is a fair judge of circumstantial evidence. If it were submitted to an impartial jury, the majority at any rate would say that probably my motion had something to do with it.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. May I ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Quinn) one question. Does he say that Mr. Tennant made a statutory declaration?

Mr. QUINN. No.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Denying the charges?

Mr. QUINN. I never said so.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I thought the hon. gentleman had been speaking of declarations made by Mr. Tennant.

Mr. QUINN. Oh, no.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Certainly the hon. member for West York did.

Mr. QUINN. The only charge that was made against Mr. Tennant of which I have any knowledge, and the only charge which the Minister has mentioned, was that contained in his letter of the 7th February, 1897. I say that in answer to that charge Mr. Tennant wrote inclosing a statutory declaration of Horgan, and declared himself willing to make a statutory declaration if required, and subsequently he sent two statutory declarations of Byng and Bryan.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Did he make one himself

Mr. QUINN. No, he offered to do so.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Roche) said he did.

Mr. QUINN. Tennant offered to do so in his letter to the Minister of Customs.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Roche) said he did, and I thought perhaps he might have done so.

Mr. QUINN. The hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) also tried to draw a red herring across the trail, and he endeavoured to display his generosity because a certain Mr. Barrett had not been dismissed. Now, Mr. Speaker, you must remark, and I am sure the country will remark, the great solicitude that the defenders in this case have

shown in dragging in every other case, and mentioning every other possible man except Joseph F. Tennant, of Gretna, Manitoba. We are asked, why was not Mr. Barrett dismissed? What does the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) put up as his great defence for his conduct in this case? "Why," he says, "Mr. Barrett was the plaintiff in the great Manitoba School Case; if there was any reason in the world for dismissing a man surely this gentleman should be dismissed; yet in the generosity of his heart he says: I never asked that Mr. Barrett should be dismissed." I answer very properly to the hon. member for Lisgar, why, of course, people who act in that invidious manner, people who act unfairly, always try to cover up their unfairness and invidiousness; and the hon. member would not select Mr. Barrett, who had occupied such a prominent position in the constitutional history of this country, as one of his victims, because hs reason for selecting him would be too easily apparent.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I had nothing to do with him. He was not in my constituency.

Mr. QUINN. I am only answering the statement the hon. member himself made. I did not say he had anything to do with him.

Mr. RICHARDSON. What statement did I make?

Mr. QUINN. The hon. member stated that Mr. Barrett had not been dismissed, although he had been the plaintiff in the Manitoba school case. I simply answer that if the hon. member for Lisgar had had the power, he certainly had the desire, but he did not consider it expedient to have Mr. Barrett dismissed, because the reason of his dismissal would be too easily known.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to tell him what I did say?

Mr. QUINN. The hon. gentleman has had his time.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman has stated that I said that Mr. Barrett was not dismissed because he took part in the school case. What I said was, that that gentleman had, in a newspaper he edited, attacked most violently every Liberal——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is not speaking to a point of order.

Mr. QUINN. The hon. gentleman also took a great deal of glory to himself because in the course of three years he had only dismissed one Irish Catholic, although he boasted of having fifteen scalps at his belt. He did not tell us how many Irish Catholics there were in his constituency. Perhaps he cleaned out all he could; but he did his best in the short time he was there, and I have no doubt he will carry on his meritorious work to the best of his ability for the rest of his life.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I appointed an Irish Catholic in one case.

Mr. QUINN. Well, I suppose the hon. gentleman is ashamed of that.

Mr. RICHARDSON. No, he happens to be a very decent fellow.

Mr. QUINN. The hon. Minister spoke of Mr. Horgan's affidavit, stating that it proved that Mr. Tennant was in the polling booth as a scrutineer, and that he, Horgan, had charge of Tennant's office. I ask the hon. gentleman, does he make that statement now, after he has had time to think about it? The hon. gentleman refuses to answer.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. No, I do not.

Mr. QUINN. Well, I will wait for the answer.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I said, and I say now, that that affidavit shows that Mr. Horgan was in the Canadian Customs office, and the affidavits of the returning officer and the clerk show that Mr. Tennant was in the polling booth, having been requested to stay there as scrutineer by the Conservative scrutineer.

Mr. QUINN. The hon. gentleman has been good enough to modify his statement somewhat; but it is altogether different from the statement he made the other day. Yet, he does not modify it so much after all, because he says he consented to remain at the request of the others and act as scrutineer. Now, these affidavits do not prove anything of the kind. As a matter of fact, Mr. Horgan's affidavit, as read by me, proves that Mr. Horgan was in the office that day, as he was nearly every day of his life since he has been in that country, that he was there no more that day than any other day, that he did not have charge of the office that day, that he never had charge of that office, that he was not requested to remain there that day; and yet the hon. gentleman hedges himself behind the statement now, that because it appears in the affidavit that Mr. Horgan was in the office that day, he must have been there while Mr. Tennant was in the polling booth. There is no such thing in the affidavit. There is no affidavit in existence to prove that during the time Mr. Horgan was in there he did anything in execution of the duties of the office. There is no affidavit saying that he acted in any way as the custodian of the office. How easy it is to get some young man to go to the office after four o'clock, after the office is virtually closed, after the business of the day is over; and, knowing that Mr. Tennant has been up to vote, to get him to go there and see another man in the office, and have him make a statutory declaration that he went there and found Mr. Horgan

in possession of the office. Will the hon. gentleman pretend that that is a fair or truthful statutory declaration? And yet that is the only statutory declaration that has been filed against Mr. Tennant. That is the only piece of evidence that has been adduced to support the charge against him, and it is most questionable. The hon. Minster also spoke about my statement concerning the money; but he must have known, though of course he could not have worked himself into the wrath he showed if he had admitted it—that I was reading from a paper published early in 1897, after the dismissal of Mr. Tennant and before a dollar of the money was paid. He knew that I was not using my own language, and that I was not reading from a recent paper, for I gave the date of the paper when I read it. I would interject here that when the Minister or any member of this House finds me making a misstatement of fact, it must be either through inadvertence or from a mere slip of the tongue, and as soon as my attention is drawn to it, I will take good care to make myself clear. I have not come into this House for the purpose of injuring my reputation for truth that I possess outside of this House, and I think it ill becomes a Minister of the Crown to distort the language of any member into making a false charge against an hon. Minister or any other hon. member of this House. The hon. Minister attempted to distract the attention of the House by daring me to ask for the papers in the McAllister case. What has that to do with this matter? He charged me with having dragged in that case, but the whole head and front of my offence consisted in Mr. McAllister's name having been mentioned in the article I read, and which was taken from the "Catholic Register."

Last week we gave a long list of the names of Catholics in the Kingston district who have been driven out of Government employment by the Liberals. The "Globe" had been denying only a few days before that Catholics have any grievance against the new Administration; but the chief Government organ prudently abstains from offering any defence of the dismissals enumerated. We had hoped to induce the organ to descend from virtuous and patriotic generalities and come down to plain facts and particular instances. But we may have been at fault ourselves in not offering direct proof that religious opinion was the evident "crime" of the Catholic office-holder in any stated case of dismissal.

Then comes the reference to Mr. McAllister:

The circumstances surrounding the removal of Mr. McAllister, of Cobourg, by Hon. Mr. Paterson, leave no room for supposing anything else than politico-religious persecution. This week we propose to take up another case in Mr. Paterson's department in which we are prepared to demonstrate a religious persecution beyond aye or nay.

The Government campaign against Catholics is not confined to one district or province.

So the reference to Mr. McAllister was simply to point the moral of the article and not intended as a reference to that case. But the hon. Minister swelled out in importance, he was buoyed up by his own eloquence, and his voice resounded in these halls, as he dared me to ask for the papers in the McAllister case. I do not ask for those papers, because I know nothing of that case, but I have made the direct and positive charge that Mr. Tennant was dismissed, and I gave my reason for making it, and the papers brought down show that he was simply dismissed on the statement of the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson), supported by Attorney General Cameron and First Minister Greenway of Manitoba. No one who reads through the return can help coming to the conclusion that Mr. Tennant was dismissed without cause on the pretense of partisanship, but really because he is an Irish Catholic. It was no doubt very gratifying to the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) to be able, as it were, to kill two birds with one stone—that is to kill a Tory and a Papist at the same time. But I say that the gravamen of Mr. Tennant's offence, in the mind of the hon. member for Lisgar and Messrs. Greenway and Cameron, who furnished the only evidence in support of the charges made by the hon. member for Lisgar, and whose evidence is contradicted by much more trustworthy proof, is that the office-holder in this case was an Irish Catholic. No investigation was held, no chance was given this man to defend himslf. He demanded an investigation, but got no reply, and the affidavits he has furnished in his own defence show how baseless were the charges against him.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I rise to a question of privilege. I deny most positively that the reason I asked for this man's dismissal was because he was an Irishman and a Roman Catholic. When I called for his dismissal, I did not even know his religion or nationality.

Mr. QUINN. I simply wished in conclusion to refer to the point made by the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint), as to the right of Mr. Tennant to be in the polls. Subsection 2 of section 45 of the Election Act provides:

Such elector, if required by the deputy returning officer, poll clerk, or one of the candidates or agents, or by any elector present, shall, before receiving his ballot paper, take the oath of qualification in the form 8 in the first schedule of this Act.

I say that the words, "or by an elector present" imply that an elector may be present other than the deputy returning officer, poll clerk, one of the candidates or one of their agents.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Are you a lawyer?

Mr. QUINN. Yes.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Is that your legal opinion?

Mr. QUINN. Yes.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Good.

Mr. QUINN. I presume the hon. gentleman is not a lawyer?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. That is why I put the question.

Mr. QUINN. My opinion on a legal question is as good as the hon. gentleman's on candles. Then the article provides:

Immediately after the close of the poll, if the candidates and their agents or any of them, are absent, then in the presence of such of them as are present, and of at least three electors, the deputy returning officer shall open the poll-book and proceed to count the number of votes given for each candidate.

By its very reading, that allows three voters to be in the poll, if the candidates and their representatives or agents or any of them are not there at the time. Under these circumstances, Mr. Tennant had a perfect right to be in the poll, if there was no representative of the other candidate in opposition to the hon. member for Lisgar present. He had the right to be there as an elector, as a voter, and if there was any doubt in the mind of the Minister as to whether he had the right to be there, that was time the matter was a fit subject for investigation.

Motion (Mr. Quinn) agreed to.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. TAYLOR. Will the hon. Prime Minister please inform us what business he intends to take up at the next sitting?

The PRIME MINISTER. We shall take up the Franchise Act.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 1 o'clock a.m. (Tuesday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 10th May, 1898.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 137) to revive and amend the Act respecting the International Radial Railway Company.—(Mr. MacPherson.)

FAST ATLANTIC SERVICE—CONTRACT.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright) moved the following resolution:—

That the supplemental contract between Her Majesty the Queen and Messrs. Petersen, Tate & Co., dated the twenty-third day of April, 1898, respecting the fast Atlantic mail service, modifying, explaining and defining certain of the provisions of the contract (of date the twenty-fourth day of March, one thousand eight hundred and ninety-seven) be approved by the House of Commons, which said supplemental contract is as follows:—

This agreement, made this 13th day of April, 1898, between Her Most Gracious Majesty Queen Victoria, herein represented by the Honourable Richard Reid Dobell, one of Her Majesty's Ministers for the Dominion of Canada, of the one part, and William Petersen, of Newcastle-on-Tyne, in the county of Northumberland, England, and Arthur Tate, of same place, trading together together under the name and style of "Petersen, Tate & Co.," ship-owners (hereinafter called "the contractors,") of the other part.

Whereas this agreement is to be read, construed and take effect as supplemental to an agreement (hereinafter described as the principal agreement), dated the 24th March, 1897, and made between Her Majesty and the contractors, being an agreement for the establishment of a fast steamship service between Canada and the United Kingdom.

And whereas the contractors contend that by reason of the strike in the engineering trade they are entitled to an extension of time allowed by the principal agreement for the commencement of the service.

And whereas the Government of Canada, while not admitting the contractors' contention, are willing to allow an extension of time on the terms and subject to the conditions hereinafter mentioned, and are otherwise willing to modify or explain the principal agreement in manner hereinafter expressed.

And whereas the said Richard Reid Dobell has represented to the contractors that he has authority to bind the Canadian Government and the Minister by this agreement.

Now this agreement witnesseth that the contractors, for and in consideration of the premises and of the covenants and agreements on the part of Her Majesty hereinafter contained, for themselves their executors, administrators and assigns, do hereby warrant, promise and agree with Her Majesty, her heirs and successors, and Her Majesty, for herself, her heirs and successors, hereby covenants to and with the contractors, their executors, administrators and assigns in manner following: that is to say:

1. The time for commencement of the service shall be extended to the first day of May, 1900, and the contractors agree that on that day all four steamers mentioned in the principal agreement shall be ready and complete in all respects to commence the service, and that from that day the service shall be a weekly service respectively from and to Great Britain and Canada.

2. The Minister hereby approves Wednesday as the day of sailing from the port of departure in Great Britain and Saturday as the day of sailing from the port of departure in Canada, subject, nevertheless, to the right to change the day of sailing (but only by agreement with the contractors or the company) or to delay the sailing of a steamer as given by the principal agreement.

3. The Minister hereby approves the changes and modifications in the plans (figures and specifications) incorporated with the principal agree-

ment which are shown in the modified plans (figures and specifications) which were submitted to the Minister during the month of February, 1898, and such modified plans (figures and specifications) are incorporated with and to be read and treated as part of this agreement, provided that the vessels are to be built under the supervision of the Admiralty, and in conformity with the requirements of Her Majesty's Imperial Government respecting armed cruisers and also of the British Board of Trade.

4. A permanent mail-room of 2,000 cubic feet capacity shall be erected on each steamer (in position shown on the said modified plans, or as may be approved by the Minister), and the contractors or the company undertake to find proper storage for any extra mail matter, as required under the principal agreement such as is the practice in the existing Atlantic mail services.

5. The draught of water of the steamers, when fully equipped, loaded and ready for sea, may exceed 25 ft. 6 in., if and so far as the steamers may safely and without infringing other conditions of this and the principal agreement be loaded deeper.

6. Section (a) of clause 2 of the principal agreement shall be read and construed as if the following words and figures, namely, "an average speed of 500 knots per 24 hours" were substituted therein for the words and figures "a speed of 500 knots in every 24 hours. Clause 18 of the principal agreement shall be read and construed as if after the words "500 knots per 24 hours" were inserted the words "in ordinary weather."

7. This agreement and the principal agreement shall be read and construed as if they were one instrument, and in this agreement and the principal agreement "The Minister" means Her Majesty's Minister of Trade and Commerce for the Dominion of Canada for the time being.

8. Provided terms and conditions satisfactory to the contractors or the company with respect to calling at an Irish port, and with respect to the compensation for the additional obligations imposed in consequence of the stoppages at such port and as to all other matters connected with such calling shall be agreed upon between the company and the Minister, the steamers shall, if required by the Minister, call at an Irish port to be hereafter agreed upon between the contractors or the company and the Minister.

9. The contractors covenant that on or before the 30th day of May next:

(a) The company contemplated by the principal agreement, and having a capital in shares and debentures, or either of them, of not less than £1,250,000 sterling shall have been incorporated and its capital responsibly subscribed;

(b) Proper contracts shall have been made by the contractors or the company with responsible ship-builders for the construction of the four steamers; and

(c) Two of the steamers shall be substantially under construction. If the contractors shall have failed to perform this covenant or any part of it then this agreement shall determine and the principal agreement shall remain in force as if this agreement had not been made.

10. This agreement shall not be binding upon either party unless Her Majesty's Imperial Government consent to contribute the proportion of £51,500 sterling of the subsidy under the terms of the principal agreement as altered by this agreement, and such assent is notified to the contractors by the Minister.

11. This agreement shall not be binding upon Her Majesty unless within a week of the date hereof the contractors give to the Minister a guarantee in a form to be approved by him for the sum of ten thousand pounds sterling from the North Eastern Banking Company (Limited), who furnished the guarantee under the principal agreement by which the said banking company shall bind themselves to secure the performance of the principal agreement as modified by this agreement, and so soon as this agreement becomes binding upon both parties hereto the guarantors shall be released from their guarantee under the principal agreement and this guarantee substituted therefor, and this guarantee, together with the deposit under the principal agreement, shall be held as security for the performance of the principal agreement as modified by this agreement.

12. If this agreement does not become binding under clauses 10 and 11 it shall be absolutely void and of no effect, and the principal agreement and all rights thereunder and the guarantee given under the principal agreement shall remain in force as if this agreement had not been made.

13. For all the purposes of this agreement time shall be deemed to be of the essence of the contract.

In witness whereof the said parties to these presents have hereunto set their hands and seals the day and year first above written.

RICHARD R. DOBELL. (L.S.)

PETERSEN, TATE & CO. (L.S.)

Signed, sealed and delivered by the said Richard Reid Dobell in the presence of

WALTER E. BATESON,
Solicitor, Liverpool.

Signed, sealed and delivered by Petersen, Tate & Co., by William Petersen, a member of the firm, in the presence of

E. L. COULTON,
Solr.,
31 Old Jewry, London, E.C.

It is further agreed that one of the four steamers mentioned in the above written agreement may usually be kept in reserve as a relief steamer, it being the intention that it is to be utilized as an extra steamer at such times as the Canadian traffic may warrant additional sailings or its being required to replace any of the other three steamers.

RICHARD R. DOBELL. (L.S.)
per CHARLES RUSSELL.

PETERSEN, TATE & CO. (L.S.)

Signed, sealed and delivered by the said Richard Reid Dobell per pro Charles Russell, solicitor, 37 Norfolk Street, Strand, London, authorized by letter dated 2nd April, 1898, from the said Richard Reid Dobell, in the presence of H. J. Brashier, clerk to Messrs. Day, Russell & Co., 37 Norfolk Street, Strand, London, W.C.

Signed, sealed and delivered by Petersen, Tate & Co., as above, in the presence of E. L. Coulton.

He said: I wish to direct the attention of my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition and of hon. gentlemen, to the modified agreement of which notice has been given between Petersen, Tate & Company, and the Canadian Government, in pursuance of the agreement which was entered into last

year the ratification of which agreement was made the 14th of June, 1897, and if my hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) wishes to see the original agreement he will find it in our proceedings of that date. The only really important alteration that is made is this: That the time is extended as regards the first two steamers. The House will recollect that the original agreement provided that two steamers should be completed by the 31st of May, 1899, and the four steamers by the 1st of May, 1900. Instead of that we propose now to allow the contractors up to the 1st of May, 1900, to complete the whole four steamers, waiving the right to have the two vessels in readiness on the 31st of May, 1899. I may observe to the House that in the original contract there was a clause that if by reason of a strike on the part of shipwrights or on the part of engineers it was found impossible to construct the vessels on time, that should not be held to involve a forfeiture of the contract. The House is aware that during last year there was an extraordinary and protracted strike on the part of the engineers throughout England, and that almost all ship-building was suspended during that time. Her Majesty's Government in common with ourselves were greatly inconvenienced, as may be seen by reference to several speeches of the First Lord of the Admiralty on the subject, in which he explained to the House of Commons that it was utterly impossible to obtain the requisite number of vessels in consequence of that strike. Now, in the clause of this modified agreement, as I have said, the time for the commencement of the service in the original contract is extended to the 1st of May, 1900, as regards the first two vessels. That is the chief and important alteration. In the second section of the original agreement, no days were fixed, and we now propose to approve in section 2, of Wednesday as the day of sailing from their port of departure in Great Britain and Saturday in Canada. Certain modified plans have been submitted, they in all respects, I am advised, being rather an improvement on the original ones, which modified plans I will now lay on the Table of the House for the inspection of hon. gentlemen. The modifications do not in any way, I am informed, affect the original design or idea, but the vessels are a little longer and we believe a little better than they were to be before. Section 4 refers to the space allotted for mail room. This was not specified in the original agreement and it is specified in this contract. Section 5 refers to the draft of water, and it specifies that the draft may exceed 25 feet 6 inches; that is provided always that the steamers may safely and without infringing the other conditions of this and the principal agreement, be loaded deeper. In the 6th clause, after the words "five hundred knots per twenty-four hours" are inserted the words "in ordinary weather." That does not in any way modify the contract, but these words are inserted at the request of the English solicitors, to guard against the possibility of losing time by unavoidable stress of weather or detention by fog. In section 8, there is an understanding that the vessels will call at an Irish port, provided always that the matter can be arranged with the British Government. No stipulation to that effect was inserted in the original contract. I have also here a copy of the draft of the proposed agreement now being executed with respect to the additional guarantee of £10,000 on the part of the Eastern Banking Company (limited). They had become guarantors for Messrs. Petersen, Tate & Co., in the first instance, and of course their guarantee now requires to be amended, which has been done. Beyond these alterations, there is nothing of any importance in the agreement to which I need call the attention of the House. With respect to the prospects of Messrs. Petersen, Tate & Co., I can inform hon. gentlemen opposite and the House in general that I understand that a very good company has been formed, under the presidency, I believe, of Lord Tweedmouth, and having on its board several persons prominent in the shipbuilding world, and I am advised that the British Government have approved of these various alterations and are quite willing to extend the subsidy. On any other points that hon. gentlemen desired to be informed about, I shall endeavour to give all the information required.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The House will remember that when the Government announced that they had effected a very important saving of the public money with regard to this matter, and submitted for our approval the contract that was made between the Government and Messrs. Petersen, Tate & Co., I did not share the sanguine views that the Government then entertained upon this subject. I gave the House at that time my reasons for altogether disbelieving that Messrs. Petersen, Tate & Co. could command the necessary capital to carry out the contract which they had made. The House now learns that that opinion, which I ventured to express, was well founded. It was one founded upon the experience which I myself have had, acting under the direction of the former Government in Canada, to give all the aid and assistance I could to the parties who had a provisional contract for this service. The House will remember that His Excellency the Governor General assumed the responsibility of refusing to sign the Order in Council enabling the late Government to enter into this contract, although His Excellency could not but have been aware that the Act which had then recently passed the Parliament of Canada, authorizing the late Government to invite tenders and enter into that contract, had been passed unanimously by this House.

Because at that time. I need not remind the House, the Government of that day were entirely in the hands of the Opposition, who, owing to the expiry of the life of Parliament at an early day, were simply in a position to offer factious obstruction to any proposal that could come from the Government. They did not, however, venture to offer factious obstruction to this proposal, and therefore the Bill, which passed this House, authorizing us to invite tenders and enter into a contract, subject to the approval of Parliament, was an Act passed unanimously by this House. Notwithstanding that, His Excellency the Governor General interposed his prerogative and refused to sign the Order in Council. I did not know at that time that we should, at a subsequent period, be discussing the question of the contract in connection with a company on the board of which would be a brother-in-law of His Excellency as the chairman. But I pass from that to say that I felt the importance of this measure was of such vital consequence to Canada that I wrote a letter to the right hon. gentleman who succeeded me, suggesting that he should promptly obtain from His Excellency his assent to that contract with the Messrs. Allan, who, I need not tell the House, united as they were with the Glasgow firm of that name, presented a combination of capitalists, able of themselves to carry through this contract in the most undoubted and effective manner. Not only had they the financial strength that would enable them to carry it through, but, as pioneers of steamship communication between the St. Lawrence and Great Britain, they had a vantage ground for such a purpose certainly not possessed by any other parties who were proposing to take that enterprise up. My hon. friend, however, thought that he could do something better in the interests of Canada than adopt the suggestion which I ventured to make, and which I did make, because I felt that this was not only a vitally important question, but one in which any loss of time might be very serious. I cannot help thinking that the right hon. gentleman must by this time have come to the conclusion that he did not act in the interests of Canada in rejecting the suggestion I made to him on that occasion. It is true that a year ago we had paraded before this House the probability of a large saving of public money by this service being obtained upon much more reasonable terms than were presented by that contract, but it must not be forgotten that all the efforts made to obtain the necessary capital—I say it advisedly and unhesitatingly—by the parties with whom the Government contracted, signally failed; and no person knows better than the hon. member for Quebec (Mr. Dobell) and the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), who had the best possible means of knownig, that down to the time they left London, late last autumn, every attempt by Petersen, Tate & Co. to obtain the association of capitalists of sufficient financial strength to deal with this enterprise, had ended in signal failure. It is quite true that on a memorable occasion, at a political banquet in Toronto, we had a telegram from the Minister of Finance to the right hon. leader of the Government published announcing that Petersen, Tate & Co. had put up a deposit that was to be forfeited by them in case they failed to carry out this contract. Well, they did fail, and what has become of the forfeit that the Government exacted? I knew at the time that not a pound of it would ever be exacted from the contractors if they failed, as the Government now confess they did, fail signally to carry out the contract they had entered into. It is very easy to get parties to put up money as a forfeit, provided they are well advised that the forfeit is a mere matter of form, that it will never be exacted by the Government, and that some excuse will be found for not carrying out that which the contract demanded in the interests of Canada. I say that, apart from the present war altogether, from the exasperation produced in the United States by the Dingley Bill, and the severe measures taken in connection with the passenger traffic between Europe and the United States, Canada has lost a golden opportunity such as probably she will never have again. Had my right hon. friend condescended to adopt the suggestion which I ventured to make to him as a matter of public duty, and obtained the prompt signature of His Excellency to the contract with the Messrs. Allan in 1896, we would have had on the first day of this month a fleet of ocean steamers running between Europe and Canada that would have compared favourably with anything that floats on the Atlantic Ocean or anywhere else; and those steamers would have derived great advantages resulting from the exasperation caused by the Dingley Bill among passengers coming from Europe to New York, and especially in connection with the present war, which I will not hold the hon. gentlemen responsible for not having foreseen. Had that contract received the prompt signature of His Excellency the Governor General, when my right hon. friend obtained the position to advise him, we would have had to-day four ocean steamers, sustained by men of the highest and strongest financial position and resources, and in the hands of the pioneers of Canadian and European Atlantic navigation, and with all the experience that is so very important to make a success, in the first instance, at all events, of such a great and important enterprise. Just imagine what the position of Canada would have been to-day if during the present summer we had such a line of steamers plying between Europe and the cities of Quebec and Montreal, filled with passengers from New York, Boston and every other part of the United States of America, who would

have crowded these steamers throughout the entire season. That would have been a position which it would be vain to hope this fast Atlantic service could obtain during ten years under ordinary circumstances. I still do not believe that this contract will be carried out any more than the last contract was carried out, for the reason that a time when ships could be built certainly as cheaply as they can be built to-day, I had the experience of twelve months of communication with the strongest financial people in England, gentlemen connected with the largest ship-building enterprises in the United Kingdom; and, after a struggle of a year to get any parties connected with ship-building or with strong financial houses in England to take up the proposition authorized by the Parliament of Canada to pay $750,000 a year for ten years for such a service, without inducing any men of financial strength or standing in the United Kingdom to take up the enterprise, I went, at the request of the Canadian Government, to the Secretary of State for the Colonies, and was enabled to get from the right hon. gentleman who now fills that important position, backed by the great strength of the Imperial Government and sustained by a great majority in Parliament, the assurance that the Imperial Government would contribute £75,000 sterling a year for ten years on condition that Canada contributed £150,000 sterling a year for ten years. Under the authority of an Act which was passed unanimously by the Canadian Parliament authorizing us to invite tenders, we succeeded in making a contract for that service with the best qualified people who could be found on either side of the Atlantic for the purpose of carrying it out effectually. I supported the proposal brought forward before by the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, because hon. gentlemen opposite had made a contract, and they felt sure that they could carry it out. I then ventured to say that they would be entirely deceived—that the parties with whom they had made that contract never could carry it out; and the result has proved that my words were prophetic. I do not claim any gift of prophecy, because I had the personal experience which convinced me of the utter futility of those parties undertaking to carry out such a contract. It was said at that time that the Imperial Government had approved of this new scheme of bottle-necked or turret ships for the performance of that service. I think I may say that I am speaking with absolute knowledge when I say that Her Majesty's Government never expressed any approval of that class of steamers, further than this, that Her Majesty's Government required that the steamers should be of a certain speed and capacity and prepared to take an armament of a certain character whenever it should be necessary to turn them into transports for Her Majesty's service in case of Imperial necessity. Further than that, I believe I am thoroughly authorized in saying that no approval of this new-fangled project had been given. The fact remains to-day, as it did when this contract was made, that you may search the world over in vain to find any fast mail or passenger communication carried on by such steamers as are provided for in this contract. Some colliers and freight boats have been constructed on that principle; but such a thing as a fast steamship service constructed on that principle you will search the world in vain to find. I am prepared to support this project just as I supported the project a year before, because it is the best, under the circumstances, I suppose, that can be done. But I will say here that one of the reasons why I have no confidence in the contract which was presented to this House a year ago, and the reason why I have but little additional confidence in the contract presented to this House to-day lies in the fact that my right hon. friend selected to negotiate and carry out this enterprise, a gentleman who, while a member of his Cabinet, had publicly, at a meeting of the Board of Trade of the city of Quebec, denounced the whole project as one that he did not believe in at all. It appeared to me, when my right hon. friend selected the hon. member for West Quebec (Mr. Dobell) to deal with this question, as if he were trying how not to do it, instead of how to do it—as if he were putting his honourable colleague in a position to carry out his own views, which he had announced with so much force, with regard to this service, rather than to carry out the views to which my right hon. friend had been converted at last of the vital importance of having a fast Atlantic service between Canada and Great Britain. There is a feature of this contract to which, I think, great exception must be taken. I do not at all undervalue the importance of having every possible facility for parties in Ireland to come to this country, or to reach Ireland from this country. But, Sir, that is an altogether subordinate matter to the great question of Canada being able to compete with the fastest steamers that can be put on the line between England and New York. Every person knows that the great success that has attended the American line of steamships put on between Southampton and New York is mainly due to the fact that they have been able to compete so successfully in rapidity of passage with all the other fast Atlantic steamers running betwwen these two points, because they are not obliged to call at Ireland. Why, the last time I came from Britain to New York, I came by a very fast steamship, the Teutonic of the White Star Line. But we were outdistanced and out-sailed by the steamer that left nearly twenty-four hours after we did,

because she was not obliged to stop a long time at Mobile, as we did for the purpose of taking on the mails.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I would point out to my hon. friend that this is merely permissive.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am very glad to hear that. I would like to be understood as speaking even more strongly on the point, in the hope that my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce will endeavour to have that feature eliminated from the contract. Every person must see that the benefit of the geographical position which Canada enjoys in being so much nearer to Europe than any part of the United States is largely lost if you cause an enforced delay to which steamers competing with you are not subjected. I believe that, with steamers of the same speed and capacity, it is perfectly practicable to make the voyage between England and Quebec in summer and Halifax in winter in so much shorter time as to actually deliver passengers and mail matter in the city of New York twenty-four hours earlier than they could be delivered by steamers running direct to New York. But our advantage will be to a large extent lost, and the conditions will be all changed, if this contract provides for a long detention at either Queenstown or Mobile, as the case may be. I can see how comparatively easy it would be to give facilities to passengers from any part of England, to join the ship at either Liverpool or Southampton, so that whatever port may be ultimately decided upon, detention may be avoided which, if allowed to occur, would be a most serious defect in the plan.

In conclusion I desire to say that no person hopes more sincerely than I do that the contract now laid upon the Table will be successfully carried out. I have given you, Sir, the reasons for the grave doubts I entertain in the matter. I again express my great regret that the golden opportunity that Canada had has been lost. The delay will, no doubt, to a large extent, offset the small amount of money to be saved, even if it is saved—and let it be remembered that a large portion of the additional contribution which would have been made under the old contract would have come from the Imperial Government. I shall cheerfully support this motion, in the hope—though I cannot indulge the same sanguine anticipations as expressed by the hon. Minister—that the proposal now submitted to the House may be successful.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Though I cannot deny that in asking the House to sanction the contract laid upon the Table to-day we are confessing some disappointment, I submit to the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) himself that in this matter we have made reasonable and satisfactory progress. No man knows better than the hon. gentleman himself the difficulties that beset this scheme from the first. I have a distinct recollection that the idea of having a line of steamers equal to the best upon the Atlantic, was first mooted in the year 1888. Yet, it was not until eight years afterwards, in 1896, that the Government of the day, which had been in office all those years, were able to submit any practical suggestion to the Canadian people. During all these years the leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) was then in the position of High Commissioner to England, and it is only due to him to say that he was, during all that time, pushing this idea forward to completion with the vigour and energy which he puts into anything that he undertakes. If it had been possible by vigour, energy and activity to bring this scheme to completion before the year 1896, it would have been done by my hon. friend. But, notwithstanding all the powers which he brought to the task, and all the efforts he made, it was eight years after the scheme was first proposed that, at last, a practical step was taken and the Canadian Parliament was asked to vote a subsidy. During that time, the matter had been a subject of negotiation—negotiation with the steamship companies, negotiation with the Imperial authorities, negotiation with this country. At last the plan in part materialized and the Government were enabled to ask for a subsidy of $750,000 a year for the scheme that had taken eight years to mature.

Now, my hon. friend says that if the Government, which came into office in July, 1896, had accepted the successful tender of the Messrs. Allan, we should by this time have had the line of steamers established and running. It is easy to prophesy after the event. It is easy for my hon. friend to say with a certainty that if we had ratified this contract we should have had this line of steamers in operation. But I have only to say that the hon. gentleman expresses more confidence in the successful issue of the scheme than the Messrs. Allan themselves felt. Though they were the successful tenderers, the hon. gentleman himself knows that their tender was not really a tender to establish a fast line. Under that tender Messrs. Allan did not bind themselves, the bargain they made was not a hard and fast contract; it was simply an offer and they wanted the Government to be bound, but they asked four months, if I remember aright, in order to complete their arrangements. The Government were in this position: We found before us certain papers, including the tender which my hon. friend says would have been ratified if his friends had maintained in office. But that tender would have bound the Canadian Government, while it would not have bound the Messrs. Allan, but would have allowed them four months to complete the agreement. Therefore, I am at liberty to say, that,

though the hon. gentleman speaks with so much confidence as to the results that would have followed this contract, he shows more confidence in the scheme than did the Messrs. Allan themselves. As I say, it is easy to prophesy after the event.

But I must say to my hon. friend that though the late Government put themselves in a position to ask for tenders, and did ask for tenders, when they were received they were found to be no tenders at all according to the terms of the notice which had been published in the newspapers. I think my hon. friend is over-sanguine altogether in saying that he is quite sure that if those tenders had been accepted we would have had to-day a line of steamers in operation. He alluded a moment ago to the fact that when this Government came into office we did not ask His Excellency to ratify the contract which was ready, as he says, to be ratified. I fully acknowledge that my hon. friend, after we came into office, suggested to me the advisability of accepting that contract. I do not know in what spirit he made that suggestion, whether it was to blame His Excellency for having refused to ratify the contract which he asked His Excellency to ratify, because it is a matter of history that during the interval which elapsed from the 23rd of June to the time he left office on the 11th of July, my hon. friend wanted the Governor General to ratify a contract with the Messrs. Allan. But it should have been stated here, not by myself but by my hon. friend, that His Excellency, in refusing to ratify that contract, had the approval of Mr. Chamberlain, the Secretary of State for the Colonies, who thought it advisable that the contract should be submitted for the approval of a new Parliament.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not think the hon. gentleman is at liberty to refer to that, unless he will lay on the Table of the House the communications that passed between His Excellency the Governor General and Mr. Chamberlain.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I was under the impression that these papers had been brought down in the second session of 1896. But if they have not been brought down, I will look into the matter and see that they are laid on the Table of the House, as it is only reasonable that my hon. friend should have the satisfaction of seeing them. Such was the condition when we took office. We thought the terms proposed with the Messrs. Allan were such that they ought not to be accepted, and that we could make a better bargain, and I contend that we did make a better bargain in the following winter when we made a contract with Mr. Petersen. Mr. Petersen has not been as successful as he expected to be, but if he was disappointed in his anticipations there is a good reason for it. That reason is suggested by that clause in the contract contemplating the possibility of a strike which would prevent him from building the ships. The hon. gentleman referred to the fact that on a certain occasion I had read a telegram received from the Minister of Finance who was then in England, stating that Mr. Petersen had made the deposit which had been enacted in the contract. That is so. I read that telegram, and the telegram correctly stated that Mr. Petersen had made the required deposit, and the money is now on deposit. My hon. friend asks what it is for, if it is simply an ornament. He asks if the deposit has been forfeited. No, it has not been forfeited for the reason that it cannot be forfeited. We have no power to forfeit it, and the hon. gentleman knows well, if he has read the contract, that it is specially contemplated and enacted in the contract that if Mr. Petersen cannot build the ships on account of a strike, then the deposit shall not be forfeited. Everybody knows that the engineer's strike in England paralyzed the whole ship-building trade last year.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. My hon. friend will permit me to say that I think when this correspondence comes down, he will see it stated that it as good as lapsed, unless some other reason is given on the part of Mr. Petersen for not fulfilling his contract.

The PRIME MINISTER. Whether it has lapsed or not, in matters of this kind it is not extraordinary that parties should not agree. But I state the fact that it is contemplated in the contract that if a strike occurred which prevented Mr. Petersen from carrying out his terms, he is to be exempted from the forfeiture provided for in the contract. My hon. friend has also alluded to the character of the steamers. He says that there are no such steamers now afloat between England and America of the character of the ships which we have adopted. We admit it, we claim that these new ships are a new design, a new model, wherein they will be superior. My hon. friend is aware, no one knows it better than himself, that the character of the mail steamers for the last forty years has been constantly changing, and we claim that in this new type we shall have a class of steamers superior to anything that is now afloat. One other remark I wish to make, and that is as to the ships calling at Ireland. There is great force in the remarks of my hon. friend as to whether these steamers should call at Ireland. But as has already been stated by the Minister of Trade and Commerce, that is optional with us. We have made it optional, because we fully recognize the objections which have been set forth by my hon. friend in that regard, and we may act in this instance upon his suggestion, and say that the ships shall not call at Ireland. But that is a point we have not yet determined, it is a matter for consideration.

But in view of the strong objections which have been set forth by my hon. friend, objections which have occurred to all those who have given attention to the matter, we think it better to leave that point optional and not to bind ourselves to require the steamers to call at Ireland. I may say that in this matter, as my hon. friend knows very well, we are bound to consult the wishes of the British Government, who are also parties to this enterprise. In this matter we are not absolutely free agents, and we have to act in conjunction with the Imperial Government.

Mr. DOBELL. I do not wish to discuss this matter in a controversial spirit, but only to say a few words in answer to the remarks of the leader of the Opposition upon this proposed new fast line steamship service. The leader of the Opposition stated that the difference in the two contracts amounted to only a small sum. Well, I do not know the hon. gentleman's estimate of what is a small amount, but I claim that if we are going to save £500,000 on this contract, and Her Majesty's Government are to save £250,000, they cannot be called small amounts. They are both considerable amounts, and I think they amply repay the expense of any member of the Government in making a trip or two across the Atlantic.

Mr. FOSTER. Will my hon. friend tell us how he figures out that saving?

Mr. DOBELL. Certainly. We save $250,000 a year for ten years. $250,000 a year is equal to £50,000 a year. Multiply that by 10, and you have £500,000. Now, the leader of the Opposition referred to a speech that I made before the Quebec Board of Trade. The hon. gentleman does not really and frankly state to the House what I did say. It makes all the difference in the world how things are stated, and I have not sat patiently in this House for two years without learning something as to the desirability of always being accurate, and in stating things as they are. Now, what I did distinctly state was that $750,000 a year was too extravagant a sum for Canada to pay for a fast line steamship service. I repeated that on the floor of this House, not intentionally, but having been reminded of it at the time, my inexperience led me to go off, and I repeated the statement that I did not believe this Government should give $750,000 a year. But, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that it is open to every member of this House to satisfy himself as to the nature of this contract. Take the contract as submitted by the late Government, read it carefully section by section, and then take the contract which is now in a fair way of being carried out, and I appeal to any impartial member of this House if the latter is not a business-like contract, while the other is positively a one-sided and unfair contract, binding the contractors to nothing. Any class of steamers might have been furnished under the first agreement. The leader of the Opposition has stated that Petersen & Co. failed to carry out the contract. They have not failed. They deposited sixty days before the time required by the contract no less than £10,000. On the last occasion I was in England I looked into this whole question of the engineer's strike, and I found that counsel's opinion had been taken by Her Majesy's Government in regard to it, and I obtained the benefit of that opinion, which was that the contract with Petersen & Co. was covered by that strike, and also other contracts, including contracts with Her Majesty's Government, and it was stated by Mr. Goschen that it was not possible to expend the money voted by the British Parliament because the contracts could not be carried out on account of the strike. This strike, of course, largely increased the difficulty encountered by Petersen & Co., and those difficulties have been increased by no one more than by the leader of the Opposition. He and his friends had been thorough in their condemnation of this contract, and the leader of the Opposition has no faith now that the contract will be carried out. Let the hon. gentleman look at the names of those who are now to carry out this contract, let him look at the names of the directors and the chairman, and he will learn that no more practical, honourable and reputable set of men could be obtained to carry out this enterprise. I will not say a word more. Hon. gentlemen opposite have stated that the vessels were being built on a newfangled type or system. In my presence, Mr. Thompson, the founder and owner of the Thompson line of steamers, which is one of the most important lines that run from Liverpool to the Mediterranean and also to Canada, said that this type of steamer would revolutionize the Atlantic service.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I believe he is one of the compny.

Mr. DOBELL. Yes, he is one of the company, and will have a large interest in it. He stated further that he would have to unlearn the knowledge he had acquired during the last thirty years as regards shipbuilding, so satisfied was he that this system would effect a perfect revolution in steamship building. For myself, I am perfectly satisfied that if this line of steamers is established, Canada will be proud of it, and that is what I want it to be; and we will seek to promote in the best way possible Canadian interests in our transatlantic service by adopting this type of steamer which we have taken up.

Mr. SPROULE. I desire to say——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. SPROULE. The indications of dissent may in some respects represent the bottle-necked ships and hon. gentlemen op-

posite do not like to hear about them. Is there any provision in the contract that these ships shall be available for war purposes ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. All these vessels are built under the special inspection supervision of the Admiralty, and it is on condition that they are suitable in case of war that, if I remember rightly, the Admiralty grant a special subvention to vessels so built, and in this case the subvention will be totally apart from the £50,000 we will receive from the British Government.

Mr. SPROULE. It is a great pity that the contract was not entered into with the Allan Company, because if those ships had been available now, in view of the prospect of increased trade resulting from the war, we would have had that additional fleet on the Atlantic at the present time.

Mr. DAVIN. It is desirable that we should know exactly what was said by the hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. Dobell) on previous occasions. On 16th September, 1896, this question was brought up, and the hon. member for Montmagny called attention to some remarks made by the hon. member for Quebec West, in which he said :

Mr. Dobell is reported as having made the following statement at a meeting held in Quebec the other day, as reported in " La Semaine Commerciale " :—

" This meeting was of more than ordinary importance. The presence of a member of the Government gave rise to observations made on the question of the fast line of steamers, the bridge and other topics. Mr. Dobell stated that Quebec would not receive any advantage from the establishment of a fast line of steamers, as a line running 17 or 18 knots was sufficient for the needs of the country, and the fast line could only be useful to Quebec when other great enterprises shall have been accomplished, such as the Great Northern Railway, the bridge and the deepening of the canals.

Then the hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. Dobell) is reported to have said, and in order to be accurate, the hon. gentleman having emphasized the advantage of accuracy, I will quote his words :

I have no hesitation in replying to the hon. gentleman who has called my attention to the report of a meeting of the Quebec Board of Trade. I appeared there in my capacity as president of the board, and I spoke on the same lines as those I have followed for a great many years past. I have always called attention to the inadequacy of the passenger service that is now conducted between Quebec and Great Britain. The subsidy is too mean, it is not sufficient to maintain such a line of steamers as we should possess. At the same time, I have always claimed that a 20-knot steamer is too costly, and the wants of this country are more in the direction of having extra good accommodation, larger steamers, but at the same time the passage money, not more costly, that Canadians desire to cross the Atlantic with all the comfort that it is possible to give them, but they do not want to pay more than $75 or $80 for the passage. We have not people in this country who are prepared to pay £100, which was often paid from New York, and if we had 20-knot steamers from Quebec, I believe the enterprise would end in disappointment. I do not think there is any more danger in running a 20-knot line of steamers from Quebec than an 18-knot line, but I believe it would be too costly as compared with any advantage which this country would derive from it. It would involve an outlay of $750,000 a year. An 18-knot service—I have never said 17 or 18 knots, and I have always claimed that we should have 18 knots—could be performed from Quebec to Liverpool in the same time as a 20-knot service would perform the voyage from New York to Liverpool. The working of this line would cause a saving of about half the cost, we would have accommodation in the way of cold storage, and more capacity for general cargo. Besides, I believe that before long power will be applied to steamers in a more economical way than is the case to-day.

So that in order to be quite accurate, it is worth while quoting the statements made by the hon. member, because it is perfectly clear from what I have stated that the representations presented by the leader of the Opposition were absolutely correct.

Motion agreed to.

ROYAL CANADIAN REGIMENT.

Mr. CLARKE. I desire to ask the Prime Minister if any decision has yet been reached by the Government as to the stationing of the Royal Canadian Regiment in Toronto. I will ask the hon. Minister of Militia if any decision has been reached by the Government in connection with this matter.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA. No decision has been come to yet.

PACIFIC CABLE—INQUIRY FOR RETURN.

Mr. CASEY. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I have a question to ask the Government. About two weeks ago an Address passed by this House on my motion, calling for papers and correspondence in connection with the project of a Pacific cable from Vancouver to Australia. These papers are of two classes ; one containing the report of the Imperial Commission on the subject which I understand cannot be published without the consent of the Imperial Government ; the remainder of the papers, however, being reports from our own commissioners and largely departmental documents. My question to the Government is: Whether they have taken any steps to obtain permission from the Imperial Government to bring down such of these papers as are Imperial, and when we can expect to see on the Table of the House such as are Canadian departmental papers ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). We are waiting to bring all the papers

down together, but I cannot give any answer to my hon. friend (Mr. Casey) to-day on this subject.

VACANCY IN BAGOT.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to remind my right hon. friend of his promise to state to-day, whether the Government had determined to interpose its authority between the warrant which the Speaker has issued for the vacancy in Bagot, and the opportunity of the electors in that county to elect a representative to this House.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). This is a subject which has given the Government some little anxious consideration. I conceive that there is a difficulty in the case which I hope my hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) will himself realize. It was stated some time ago by my hon. friend or by some of his followers, that if the writ were not issued for the election in Bagot the county would be practically disfranchised for this session, and that there would be a discrimination as between that county and the electoral district of West Prince, P.E.I. I would call the attention of my hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) to this. Mr. Perry, the late member for Prince, died in the last days of February, and my hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) and the hon. gentleman beside me (Sir Louis Davies) and myself, referred to his death in this House on the 2nd or 3rd day of March. Within two days of that, notice was given to His Honour the Speaker of the death of Mr. Perry, and the Speaker's warrant was issued almost immediately. Our lamented friend, Mr. Dupont died, if I remember right, about the 14th of the month and a full month elapsed before any notice was given to Mr. Speaker of his death. If my memory does not deceive me it was about 20th April that the usual notice was given, and the following day the warrant of the Speaker was issued. In the one case notice was given to the Speaker within two days of the death of Mr. Perry and in the other case almost five weeks elapsed, and the warrant of the Speaker was not issued until the 21st of April. This shows clearly, manifestly, and conclusively, that neither party in this House was particularly anxious to have an election at that time in the county of Bagot. When the attention of Mr. Speaker was called to the death of Mr. Dupont, he issued his warrant, and I might tell my hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) who is now looking up this matter that the warrant was issued on the 21st of April.

Mr. BERGERON. My right hon. friend is wrong as to the dates of the deaths of Mr. Perry and Mr. Dupont.

The PRIME MINISTER. No. I say Mr. Perry died about the last day of February, and if my hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) will look to the "Hansard" of the 1st or 2nd of March, he will see the remarks which were made in the House relative to the death of Mr. Perry. If my hon. friend will then look to the "Hansard" of the 14th of March, he will see that on that date reference was made to the death of Mr. Dupont; and if he will look again at the "Hansard" of the 20th of April, he will see that the attention of the Speaker was called to the vacancy in Bagot. Under such circumstances there was no particular anxiety evidenced by one party or the other to have an election take place in Bagot. It was on the 20th of April only that Mr. Speaker's attention was officially called to the death of Mr. Dupont so that the warrant could issue, and at that time we were within measureable distance of the prorogation of Parliament. We are now asked to have an election in Bagot almost within sight of prorogation. It is argued that unless that is done the county will be disfranchised for the rest of the session, and my answer is, that even if the writ had been issued at the time the warrant of Mr. Speaker was issued, the county of Bagot would have been practically disfranchised all the same. I point out further that if you have an election at the present time, the consequence will be that certainly twenty-five per cent of the electors of that county will be disfranchised, because there has been no revision of the voters' lists for almost four years. Under such circumstances I leave it to the justice, and to the fairness and to the common sense of my hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper), if it be not better to wait a few weeks until we can have the election upon a franchise which will give the right of voting to all those who are qualified to vote. If my hon. friend wishes to have the writ issued at the present time, he is bound to admit that the election will take place upon an imperfect electorate, and that certainly one-fourth of those who by the nature of things have the right to vote will be disfranchised. I think my hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) will agree himself that it will be preferable not to have the election at this time, but rather to wait until the new Franchise Act is in operation.

Mr. BERGERON. Am I to understand, then——

Mr. SPEAKER. If my hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) wishes to be in order, he had better move the adjournment of the House.

Mr. BERGERON. I will conclude with such a motion, Mr. Speaker, but I do not want to move it now because I wish the right to speak. I understand from what has been said by the right hon. the Premier that there will be no election in Bagot this session, and that we will have to wait until the new franchise law is in operation before the people of Bagot can send a representative to Parliament. I rise to protest against

that. I repeat to my right hon. friend that not more than ten or twelve days elapsed between the death of our late friend (Mr. Perry) and the death of our lamented friend (Mr. Dupont). My right hon. friend made a mistake when he said that Mr. Perry died about the end of February ; it was about the middle or the 20th of that month.

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) is quite mistaken.

Mr. BERGERON. I may be ; I was looking up the date but my right hon. friend concluded before I had time to find it.

An hon. MEMBER. Mr. Perry died on the 24th of February.

Mr. BERGERON. Yes, and the attention of Mr. Speaker was called to that fact on the 3rd of March. The Government never then gave as a reason for issuing their writ for West Prince, the reason which they give now for not doing the very same thing in the case of Bagot County. Mr. Dupont died in the commencement of March, and for more than two months the county of Bagot has been disfranchised. Now, Mr. Speaker, we might as well say things here openly. I am going now to take a page out of the book of my hon. friend from Quebec West (Mr. Dobell) and talk openly. The real reason why the right hon. gentleman and his Government will not issue the writ is that they know they will be beaten in the county of Bagot. When my right hon. friend says that 25 per cent of the electors will be disfranchised, I tell him that there are 4,000 electors in the county of Bagot who are not represented in Parliament to-day. I do not want to make any comparisons to-day ; but why grant an election in the county of Prince, in the province of Prince Edward Island, and refuse an election in the county of Bagot, in the province of Quebec. The reason given by the right hon. gentleman is not a good one. His Franchise Act is not yet law. It is true, a revision of the lists under the old Act might take place ; but that could not be done before August or September. At any rate, it is decided now, by what the right hon. gentleman says, that the people of Bagot will not be represented in this House this session. I protest against it once more. The other day we heard in this House my right hon. friend and some of his colleagues telling the members on this side of the House to bring motions or questions before the House, and take the sense of the House, to see whether they were right or not. Why, Mr. Speaker, this is an occasion for getting an opinion from an independent tribunal, whether the Administration is right or wrong. Let us go before the people. The opinion of members of Parliament does not amount to a great deal, when we know that the right hon. gentleman and his colleagues are perfectly sure that any motion they bring before the House will carry. Where is the independence of the representatives on that side of the House ? Why should the right hon. gentleman be afraid to go before the county of Bagot. He is positive that he has a majority of the people with him and his policy. Why should he disfranchise to-day 4,000 of the electors of the province of Quebec ? They will hold him to account for it. The county of Bagot is an independent county, and if the policy of the right hon. gentleman is a good policy, he will have every opportunity to have it sanctioned by the majority of the electors of that county. But he dare not submit it to them. This is the true reason : The Government of Canada to-day are afraid to open a constituency in the province of Quebec. I move the adjournment of the House.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, hon. members on the other side of the House seem to be very indignant at present because an election is delayed in the county of Bagot for a short time for apparently good reasons. This is not the first time that a constituency has remained unrepresented for a short time in this House. There have been occasions when constituencies have remained unrepresented in this House for a very long time. I myself was unseated in December, 1887.

Mr. BENNETT. What for ?

Mr. EDWARDS. That has nothing to do with the case. It is simply sufficient to say that I was unseated. The session took place at the usual time in the year following, and the constituency remained unrepresented until within a few days of the close of the session. Then the writ was issued and the election took place. I think this is a flagrant case, out of all comparison with the case now being discussed. Even if an election had taken place in the county of Bagot, the representative would only be in this House for a few days. In the case I mention the constituency remained disfranchised for nearly a year. There is no comparison between the two cases. I mention this only to show that hon. gentlemen change their views according to the conditions that arise.

Mr. CHAUVIN. (Translation.) In rising now, it is not my intention to press upon the Government the necessity of a new election in the county of Bagot, but to ask the right hon. Prime Minister whether he does not deem it his duty to allow one of our friends to be returned by acclamation in that electoral district. So far as I know, —and the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe (Mr. Bernier) is here to correct me if I am not right, I believe that in 1896, at the time of the general elections, an agreement was arrived at between the members for Bagot and for St. Hyacinthe to the effect that both elections should be paired in those counties.

Now, if such an understanding were come to, it would only be courteous and even a matter of fair play, on the part of the

Government, under the circumstances, to allow the electorate of Bagot to continue to a Conservative member for the balance of this Parliament, the seat vacated by the death of the late member.

According to our civil code, a lease is not cancelled by the death of the lessee, and that provision of the law ought to hold good in the case of vacant seats in this House. Now, if such a lease was executed by the two counties in question, it seems to me that the demise of the Conservative member ought not to interfere with the agreement entered into by the parties, and the Government should adhere to their pledge.

This pledge was not only taken by both candidates but, I presume, by both parties in the county of Bagot. Now, were it true that the Liberal party were willing to set off the loss experienced by them in the county of Bagot by the gain which was to accrue to them in St. Hyacinthe owing to the return of that member by acclamation, it seems to me it would only be fair now for the Government to redeem their pledge by allowing one of the political heirs of the late Mr. Dupont to be returned by acclamation, in the interest of the Conservative party, in Bagot County.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am very sorry, Mr. Speaker, that my right hon. friend has in this manner interposed the authority and power of the Government between the electors of Bagot and this House. My right hon. friend must recognize that every elector in this country has a right to be represented here during a session of Parliament, and every elector is entitled to have a representative ready to serve the Parliament at the earliest possible period. I find that it was on the 14th of March that this House expressed its deep regret at the loss it sustained by the lamented death of the late representative of Bagot. The right hon. gentleman is perfectly well aware that if the Government weigh at all in a matter of this kind they ought to weigh in the other direction. The Government should not lay itself open to the charge that it is using the power placed in its hands by Parliament to prevent a vacancy being filled on the opposite side with the same promptness that it would have been filled had it occurred on the Government side of the House. That is a principle which ought to commend itself to every hon. gentleman, and it is greatly to be regretted that my right hon. friend should have come to the conclusion to deprive, for an indefinite period, the county of Bagot of its representation in this Parliament. No one is able to say that the exigencies of public business will not require my right hon. friend to have this Parliament summoned for the despatch of business in the month of August. It is quite possible that matters might arise which would compel my right hon. friend to summon Parliament, and there is no possible reason why, in such an emergency, the county of Bagot should continue to remain unrepresented. The fact that the lists under which the election would require to be run are those under which the former election was run is no excuse. The lists now in force in the province of Quebec have given my hon. friend such an overwhelming majority in that province, that there is no reason why, even on party grounds, he should hesitate to interpose the authority of this his Government to prevent the electors of Bagot having the representation in this House to which they are entitled, as promptly as possible. The Speaker of this House has issued his warrant, but that warrant remains suspended by the action of the Government, and the course followed in the case of a vacancy on the Opposition side of the House differs from that which the right hon. gentleman pursued when the vacancy occurred on the Government side of the House. I can quite understand that plausible reasons may be brought forward for almost any course and under almost any circumstances, but I think it is very unfortunate that this House or the country should be led to believe that so important a duty as the giving of a prompt opportunity to the electors of every constituency in Canada which is unrepresented, to choose its representative, should be regarded from an altogether different point of view, according as the vacancy occurs on the one side or the other. It is quite true that my right hon. friend might possibly obtain some party advantage by having this election run under the new law now being enacted and not under the law now in force, and under which a constituency in Prince Edward Island, whose representation became vacant a short time ago, was called upon to fill that vacancy. I hope that my right hon. friend will reconsider the position and remove the suspicion that the Government of the day are going to take advantage of the position they occupy by dealing differently with a vacancy that occurs on the Opposition benches from that which occurs on the Government side.

Mr. LANDERKIN. If the Opposition were so anxious to have the election in the county of Bagot, why did they not, immediately after the death of the late lamented representative of that constituency—who died, I think, on the 12th March—notify the Speaker officially of the vacancy. In the case of the vacancy in Prince Edward Island, the hon. member for King's, shortly after his death, called the attention of the Speaker to the fact, but in the case of the vacancy in Bagot, whose representative died on the 12th of March, the Opposition waited until the 20th of April before calling the attention of the Speaker to the fact at all. The warrant was issued the very next day, and had the election been brought on immediately, it could not have taken place until after prorogation, so that if the constituency is disfranchised during this Parliament, that is

due to the want of diligence and vigilance on the part of the Opposition. Why did they not follow the same course that they did in the case of the vacancy in Prince Edward Island? They were apparently ready in Prince Edward Island for an election, and they got the election, and what was the result? A Government supporter was elected by about 400 of a majority—a larger majority than was ever obtained in that constituency before. If they were so positive that the county of Bagot would vote in their favour, why did not the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron), who talks so loudly now, draw immediate attention of the Speaker to the fact of the demise of the late member, so that the warrant could have been issued and the election held at the same time as that of Prince Edward Island. If it was in the interest of the Opposition that an election should be held at once, why did not the Opposition do their duty, and after neglecting their duty, they have no right to complain, because, as the right hon. First Minister has said, the election could not be held until after prorogation, and, therefore, it is not desirable to hold it on the old lists. In the case of the vacancy in Prince Edward Island, the Opposition were very prompt, but in the case of the vacancy in Bagot, which occurred on the 12th March, they neglected to inform the Speaker of it until the 21st April. We have any amount of precedents, under the administration of hon. gentlemen opposite, for the course the Government have taken. We know that when Mr. Patterson, the member for Huron, was appointed Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba, it was only eight months after his appointment that the writ for an election was issued. What was the reason for this delay? The hon. leader of the Opposition was not then in the House, but his friends were, and they believed that the proper thing to do was to leave the constituency vacant and not have an election held until the middle of the session. The case mentioned by the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Edwards) is another in point. I could go on citing precedents, one after another, and if these cases were good precedents then, why should they not hold now? But it is not the Government in this case that is to blame for the delay, but the Opposition. Within the last year, we have had five elections in the province of Quebec and what has been the result? In every constituency in that province, where there was a vacancy and an election, a supporter of the Government was returned.

Mr. BERGERON. What about Champlain?

Mr. LANDERKIN. The election in Champlain was more than a year ago.

Mr. BERGERON. But you did not win.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I do not say that we did, but we gained five elections since that, and we are prepared to in Bagot and will gain there too.

Mr. BERGERON. Better bring on your election before you brag.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Why did you not call sooner for the issue of the writ?

Mr. BERGERON. Did you not know the man was dead?

Mr. LANDERKIN. You are getting pot valiant.

Mr. SPROULE. The only trouble with the logic of the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) is that it does not square with his conduct in the past. He instances the vacancy in the county of Huron, where an election was not held until nine months after its representative had been appointed Lieutenant-Governor. Well, no one protested more loudly, in the interests of the people, against that abuse than did the hon. member for South Grey. Yet now he quotes that as a precedent why his own friends should do the same thing.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I did not say anything of the kind. I said that the Opposition have not done their duty in this case, as I did mine then.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman blames the Opposition in this case and yet praises them in the other. What will please him? He says that the intention of the Government was not drawn to the vacancy. But the Government were just as well aware of the death of the late hon. member for Bagot as every other hon. member of this House. The law provides that when a vacancy takes place the Speaker shall issue a writ, and it was the duty of the Government to carry out the law without any notice from the Opposition. They should have done their duty, and carried out the law without any hon. member on this side calling their attention to the fact.

Mr. LANDERKIN. When the hon. member for West Quebec died, he died while the session was going on, and when somebody asked the Speaker if he issued his writ, some two weeks after the death, the Speaker said that he had had no official notice of the death, and could not issue his writ until he got notice from some hon. member of the House.

Mr. SPROULE. Could not any hon. member on that side as well as on this have given the notice, if that were necessary?

Mr. LANDERKIN. We want to have all the electors vote. We want to have them vote on the new lists.

Mr. SPROULE. Cannot the hon. member (Mr. Landerkin) restrain himself for a few minutes, or is he——

Mr. LANDERKIN. I have restrained myself for months, while you have been speaking every day.

Mr. SPROULE. I want to speak about the statement of the Premier that if an election were held now 25 per cent of the people entitled to vote would be prevented from expressing their opinion. But what about the other 75 per cent who are not represented and who cannot be represented until an election is held? There are about 4,000 people who cannot be represented if the hon. gentleman carries out the proposal he has communicated to this House. In one case a fraction of the constituency is disfranchised, but in the other case the whole constituency is left without a member to represent it on the floor of this House. One cannot but be amused at the hesitation now shown when contrasted with the precipitancy with which hon. gentlemen opposite brought on an election in Prince Edward Island. But in the latter case they thought that a representative favourable to them would be elected. Did they say anything about an old list in that case? No, it did not matter to them then. They were quite willing to test the feelings of the people in a constituency where they thought that the election would be likely to result to their advantage. But in this case, where it is by no means so sure that a supporter of their party would be returned, they are not so ready to appeal to the people. And I presume that that is the only reason, or at least the important reason, that prevents them from carrying out what the law contemplates. I take it that the law designs that a constituency shall always be represented in Parliament by some person. As soon as a representative dies or is taken from this House by being appointed to office or otherwise, it is intended that an election shall take place at the earliest day. I believe also that the Government should be prepared always to test the sentiments of the people as to whether or not they endorse their management of public affairs. But in this case they seem to be reluctant to do so. They put forward what might seem, under other circumstances, a reasonable plea. There is no doubt that the list is an old one. If that was the real reason, we should be much more charitable towards the Government than we are. But we believe that that is not the real reason, that they have a much more important one than that. They say, in the first place, they did not have notice. But, if they had wished to do their duty this difficulty could easily have been overcome. It was just as much incumbent upon any member on that side as it was on any member on this side to give notice to Mr. Speaker. But notice has been given, and Mr. Speaker has issued his warrant, which remains in abeyance. And why? Because the Government will not name a returning officer and fix the day for an election. And the reason, as we believe, is that they are afraid that the people would condemn their management of public affairs, and either they want to stave off the evil day, or they want to have an opportunity to exert influences which will enable them to snatch a verdict in their favour. Uuless they are able to give some better reason to the House and the country than they have given, I do not think they will be supported by public opinion in not bringing on this election.

Mr. MONK. I wish to add a word as representing a constituency in the province of Quebec. I do not think that the question is as to the duty of hon. members on this side or as to the duty of any hon. member of this House. I am not aware that there is any duty incumbent on any of us in regard to circumstances such as these. The question is as to the duty of the Government. I believe very strongly that you having issued your warrant, Mr. Speaker, the Government have no discretion, but it is its bounden duty to issue the writ. As I read the law, after proper notification has been given to the Speaker —and there is no special obligation upon us to fulfil that formality—the Speaker must issue his warrant, and then the writ for the election must issue. Section 8 of chapter 13 of the Revised Statutes of Canada says:

> If any vacancy happens in the House of Commons by the death of any member, or by his accepting any office, the Speaker, on being informed of such vacancy by any member of the House in his place, or by notice in writing under the hands and seals of any two members of the House, shall forthwith address his warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery for the issue of a writ for the election of a member to fill the vacancy; and a new writ shall issue accordingly.

It seems to me that, whatever may have taken place in the past, it is time for the Government to follow out this clear prescription of the law, and when Mr. Speaker's warrant has issued, to issue the writ immediately. Now, I will not indulge in any vain boast, after what has fallen from the lips of the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin), but I do think that the difference in the treatment meted out to the Prince Edward Island constituency and that meted out to the constituency of Bagot points to a fear on the part of the Government which is hardly in accordance with the words of that hon. member. If the hon. gentleman, when the Government has decided upon election in that county, will come down and see how the election is carried on, I think he will have reason to regret the boastful words he has uttered to-day. There is one circumstance pointed out by the hon. member for Terrebonne (Mr. Chauvin) which, I think, requires an explanation. He has pointed out, in the presence of the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe (Mr. Bernier) that, previous to the last general election, some agreement was arrived at between the hon. member for

St. Hyacinthe and our lamented friend (Mr. Dupont) to the effect that no contest should take place in either county. If that is a fact—and we are willing to hear the contradiction of the hon. member if it is not—it is a singular comment upon the failure of the Government to issue the writ immediately. That arrangement, if it was made, holds for the remainder of this Parliament. It seems to me that the fact that the lists in the county of Bagot are old is a reason which would apply equally to the Prince Edward Island constituency, in which an election was held. It seems to me, on the other hand, that the numerous electors of the county of Bagot have a right to be represented and should not be required to await the good pleasure of the Government, and that is an injustice to them to keep the writ from being issued. I would like to know from the right hon. leader of the Government when the Government intends to issue the writ. Do they intend to wait until the new Franchise Act is in force? And if so, will they issue the writ immediately after it comes in force? Or will they continue to exercise their discretion, which I think they have no right to do, and spring the election upon the country suddenly?

Mr. MARCOTTE. (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, in my humble opinion, the agreement entered into by the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe (Mr. Bernier) and the late member for Bagot (Mr. Dupont) ought not only to hold good for one or two sessions, but for the whole duration of this Parliament; and therefore, I think it would only be fair to adhere to that agreement entered into in 1896. The late Mr. Dupont and the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe were not the only parties to that agreement, but it was also sanctioned by the leaders of both parties, and it was understood that both elections were to go by acclamation.

Now, I am of the opinion that this agreement should be adhered to and the election that is to come off in the county of Bagot should go by acclamation. The reason why I insist on that point is not that we are afraid to appeal to the electorate, because I am quite sure that we will carry the county of Bagot, just as I had the pleasure of carrying the county of Champlain. The only difference is that we feel much more confident in the issue of the contest in Bagot than we did in Champlain, owing to the memory of the late Mr. Dupont, which is still cherished by the electors of that county.

I maintain that the agreement referred to should be adhered to. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Bernier) ought to give us the benefit of his opinion on that point, and I am satisfied that he will insist upon that election taking place by acclamation.

Mr. FOSTER. I have been waiting for some member of the Government to put in a plea for what the whole House must see and what the country will easily perceive is another illustration of the facility with which, now that they are in power, hon. gentlemen opposite break the promises which they gave, and set at naught every policy which they announced when they were striving to get into power. One wonders whether there are any stones left in that beautiful temple—that theoretical temple—which the hon. gentlemen erected with so much care during the seventeen years before they came into power, that are yet to be taken down.

One by one these gentlemen have given the lie to the professions they made during the 15 or 16 years they were striving to get into power. Each time they give the lie to one of these old professions, to one of these standard policies, each time they seem to give it with more indifference and with more callousness, as if they had lost all conscience themselves, and had come to the conclusion that the people were in much the same state as themselves, and took no cognizance of promises and pledges given by a political party. I think these hon. gentlemen are mistaken. They may have no political conscience themselves, but if they imagine that the electorate have no conscience, they will probably make a mistake. I should be sorry to think anything else. Now, these hon. gentlemen, for years and years, were advocates of the idea that by-elections should be brought on all at once, that when three or four vacancies occurred for any reason, there ought not to be an election in one case in this week, and an election in another case in another week. But the very first opportunity these gentlemen had of having by-elections after they came into power, they deliberately violated and repudiated all the pledges they had made in reference to this matter, coming first to those that appeared more favourable, and travelling from those to others that appeared less favourable. They were staunch defenders also of the principle that the people had a right to be represented in this House. The House of Parliament was supposed by them to be founded upon the idea that it was made up of the representatives of the various constituencies, and that it was a wrong against any constituency, any electorate, to keep them from having their representative in the House when the House was in session, or to keep them longer than the necessary time in having their representative for counsel and advice, and for meeting in counsel whenever Parliament might be called together. To-day the only excuse they can bring is that in other times the same thing was done by the Liberal-Conservative Government. We are not discussing that to-day, we are discussing the new Government, what was heralded as the new regime. And what do we find? That the only and best reason they can give in the person of my hon. friend who is now look-

ing at me, and in the person of my hon. friend who was here and is not here at present, was that it was done in the olden times, and done in a worse way than it is now. Does my right hon. friend who leads the Government base the action of his Government upon that? Does he consider that absolves him from the pledges and promises given by himself and his party, and adhered to through many years of opposition in this country? I do not think he does. I think the theory is a correct one, that he has no right to keep a constituency from being represented in this Parliament while Parliament is in session. Now, what is the hon. gentleman's excuse? His lame excuse, his halting excuse, stripped of its verbiage, was this: He kept the thing dawdling along for a month or two, and as it is now near the end of the session, the reason is all the greater that there is scarcely time for holding the election before the end of the session. I ask, as my hon. friend asked, Who is the guardian of the rights of the people of this House? Not any single member of the House. It should be the Government of the country, they should see that every constituency gets even justice, and it is even justice for every constituency to have its member here when the high court of Parliament is in session. It was not merely the duty of my hon. friend from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) to call the attention of Parliament to the fact of Mr. Dupont's death, it was the duty of the right hon. gentleman who leads the Government. In fact, with his theories, and they were correct as theories, it was his bounden duty to see that so soon as possible, decently after the death of the late sitting member, the electors of Bagot should have an opportunity to send their representative here, whether for the Government or against the Government. But we are asked to accept the paltry excuse that he could not act, forsooth, until the hon. member for Beauharnois had called the attention of Mr. Speaker to the fact of the demise of Mr. Dupont. On the 21st of April that was done, and the Speaker's warrant was issued. What happened? Why, has there not been an election? What is the reason that you have not to-day in the county of Bagot the contest in the last three days of its existence before its member should be elected? The reason is that the right hon. gentleman threw his whole length between the Speaker's warrant and the constituency, and obstructed the law from that day to this. Why, Sir, this House has absolved itself of its duty to the electorate the very moment the Speaker says he has issued his warrant for the election. What is necessary after that? The machinery to put the warrant into execution and to make the election sure. And what is that machinery? The will of the right hon. gentleman to name a man for returning officer, and to name a day on which the election shall take place. The hon. gentleman has obstructed the will of this Parliament, he has obstructed the main and plain teaching and intent of the law, he has thrown himself, for what reason I do not know, across the path which leads from the Speaker's warrant to the calling together of the people to vote for the man of their choice. To-day, if the hon. gentleman had not thrown himself in and obstructed the will of the people, obstructed the course of law, by refusing to name a day and to name a man, as I say to-day, the last day or two of the contest in the election, might have been on in the county of Bagot, and in three or four days more we might have had a gentleman from the county of Bagot to tell the right hon. gentleman how to do his duty—either from that side of the House, where it is sadly lacking, or from this side of the House where we try to do our duty, in a weak and feeble manner, I know, but still as well as we know how. Tired we are of that, because we have to tell these gentlemen their duty so many times, we have to warn them of their promises of only a few days ago as well as a few years ago. If the hon. gentleman had done his duty, the county of Bagot, if it were true to its traditions and had sent the same type and character of a man that it sent here before, I am quite certain that whatever side of the House he sat, he would tell the Government their duty and he would represent well the wishes of the people that he came to represent. The old lists, says my hon. friend. Has he just now taken such great care that 25 per cent of the people should not be disfranchised, when, as my hon. friend from Grey (Mr. Sproule) said truly, he is disfranchising the other 75 per cent? The 25 per cent is an enormous quantity in the eyes of my hon. friend when he does not want to do his duty, and 75 per cent is as nothing. But are the lists much older than they were when my hon. friend held his other by-elections that have been going on? How much older? Not very much, not sufficient to found an excuse upon. But as I said, the hon. gentleman's fault is this, that he has, from the 21st of April, thwarted the plain intent of the law in order to keep these electors in Bagot from being represented here. Is the fine Italian hand of the Minister of Public Works not at liberty just now so much as it will be after the session is over? Are there certain adjustments to be made in and around that county that cannot well be made now in the hurry and turmoil of the session? Is the hon. gentleman distrustful of the uninfluenced and unbought will of the electors of Bagot? Is he wating till all this hurry and turmoil of the session is over so that he may influence them, trusting to his Minister of Public Works, for whom, as he himself has said, nothing is too good, and before whom as he himself has declared before constituency after constituency in the province of Quebec, he bows down and worships as his better

than true friend, as his organizer, almost his creator, but certainly his strong and his pliable supporter? Where is the Minister of Public Works? I wish he were here that we might ask him why it is that he wishes to keep his Conservative supporters in the county of Bagot from having a chance to send some one here to this Parliament.

Why, as has been truly said, the hon. Minister of Public Works presents himself as a strong guarantee and makes a strong appeal to the confidence of a certain portion of the Dominion on the ground that he was chosen by the leader of the Government to represent the Conservative party in his Government and Council. He should be present to-day to hear what plea is put forward for disfranchising the county of Bagot in a mean and underhand way by throwing himself across the path of the Speaker's warrant from the Dominion Parliament and thereby keeping the electors from being represented here. Why is their representative not here? Simply because the hon. gentleman and his party have prevented his attendance. The representative could have been here next week and for the five, six or seven weeks subsequently to register his voice and vote, and to do what is still higher and better, to represent a free constituency in this Parliament. There is no reason to the contrary. These excuses are lame and halting, and the hon. Prime Minister has shown himself again to be an opportunist and time-server and nothing more.

The PRIME MINISTER. The hon. gentleman is quite right in supposing that we do not propose to bind ourselves to follow the precedents established by himself and his hon. friends when they occupied the Treasury benches. In former times it was the habit of hon. gentlemen opposite, and God forbid that we should follow it, in order to suit their time and convenience to bring on elections some months after and almost a year after a vacancy occurred, and they brought on the elections simply to suit their own time and convenience. They did this without any remonstrance, simply because they were masters of the situation, and they could so act without venturing even to give reasons for the course they adopted. On this occasion, when our action has been challenged as to why the writ has not been issued, we have given what should be to every hon. gentleman, a valid answer. If we held the election at this moment twenty-five per cent of the electors would be debarred from exercising the sacred right which they possess under British institutions. But hon. gentlemen will say, what about the remaining seventy-five per cent? The answer is obvious. The electors representing the seventy-five per cent will have the same right to vote then as they have now; but if you hold an election to-day, twenty-five per cent will not have an opportunity to exercise the franchise. That is the reason why it is necessary to wait for a few days or a week or so. Take the two vacancies which have taken place in this House during the present session. It has been our misfortune to lose two members of this House. Mr. Perry died in February. In March the writ was issued. By whom was notice of the vacancy given? Not by the Government but by the hon. member for King's (Mr. Macdonald), who expected that he would capture the constituency. As to Bagot, they were not so sure. They waited four or five weeks; they waited until the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) had had an opportunity of visiting the constituency, and having done so, he supposed the time was ripe, and the Speaker was asked to issue his writ. This was on 1st April. He had waited more than five weeks before he gave notice to Mr. Speaker. If we want to be technically correct in our action, a writ should issue immediately; but if we desire to act reasonably, it is better to wait until the new measure has been passed. Hon. gentlemen opposite say we are not implementing our promises. We are trying to implement our promises at all times; we are trying to remove anomalies that prevailed some years ago. We hope to have this law in force within thirty days, and as soon as the electoral roll of Bagot is ready, full and complete, so as to enable the electors to pass judgment on the conduct of the Government, we shall be only too happy to lay our conduct before them and ask them to pass judgment upon it. The hon. member for Beauharnois, talking a moment ago in a very cocky manner, said we were afraid to submit the record of our conduct to the electors of Bagot. For what reason? As has been stated by the hon. member for South Grey, on every occasion we have consulted the electors of Quebec the verdict has been such as not to render us afraid of consulting them again. We consulted them in Temiscouata; and what was the result? An election by acclamation. We consulted them in Rimouski, and the result was an election by acclamation. We consulted them in Quebec Centre, and the result was another election by acclamation. We consulted them in Drummond and Arthabaska, and the result was almost 2,000 majority. Later on we consulted them in Nicolet, and the Government were vindicated, the candidate who had been defeated by 30 at the former election, being returned by 300 majority.

Mr. BERGERON. Through what means?

The PRIME MINISTER. Yet the hon. gentleman talks about our being afraid of consulting the electors! I make no boast as to the probable result in Bagot, and I do not go so far as my hon. friend and say that we are going to carry that constituency. Bagot is one of the gerrymandered constituencies of the province of Quebec, one of the constituencies which was gerrymandered in 1892. The parish of Ste Pie, which gave a Liberal majority of 200, was detached from the con-

stituency, and the parish of St. Marcell, which gives a Conservative majority of 30 or 40, was added to the constituency. Thus it was gerrymandered, and I make no boast as to carrying it, but I am quite satisfied the verdict will be such that the Government will not only be supported but will receive proof of the increased confidence of the people. The hon. member for Terrebonne (Mr. Chauvin) made an appeal and stated that there should be an election by acclamation in Bagot and that a Conservative should be returned, because at the general elections there had been an understanding arrived at by representatives of the two parties that a Conservative should be returned. The hon. gentleman must be aware that the Government has nothing to do with the fact as to whether an election is contested or not, and that an election by acclamation is a matter entirely in the hands of the electors. The Government has no right, and it does not presume to dictate to the electors of Bagot what course they should pursue. If it is the will of the two parties in Bagot to return a candidate by acclamation, the Government will accept their verdict; and if they decide to have a contested election, the Government will also accept their verdict.

Mr. DAVIN. The right hon. gentleman has not met the case presented from this side of the House. Our contention is that an injustice has been done to Bagot by the right hon. gentleman preventing the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery issuing his writ. The right hon. gentleman, with his fine sense of humour, must have laughed at the position in which he placed himself the moment the sentence escaped from his lips, for he told us that when a certain Bill now before Parliament shall have become law, and when this House will have separated and Bagot has returned a member, then he will be most happy to lay his policy before the people of Bagot. The thing is perfectly absurd. The case that will appeal to the country is, that here we are entering—to use the language of the gentlemen in the press gallery—on the real business of the session and we have only got to the vestibule. The millions of dollars in the main Estimates have yet to be voted, and the complaint is that this Parliament is deprived of the counsel of the member that would be returned from Bagot. That is the grievance. The right hon. gentleman and others of his friends have referred to what was done by their predecessors in office. Suppose their predecessors did wrong, will two blacks make a white? I had hoped, judging from the language of the right hon. gentleman himself and judging from the language of the "Globe," that hailed him as the beginning of a new era; I had hoped that we should not see what we are seeing every day: Not merely a certain halting imitation of what was wise in the policy of the right hon. gentleman's predecessors, but a slavish copying of whatever was sinister. The right hon. gentleman professes to be greatly influenced by what takes place in England, and I will read to him from May what is the law in England with regard to the issue of writs:

> On the receipt of the Speaker's warrant the writ is issued by the Clerk of the Crown and transmitted through the post office, in pursuance of the provisions of 53 George III., cap. 89. Neglect or delay in the delivery of the writ, or any other violation of the Act is a misdemeanour, and in the event of any complaint being made the House will also inquire into the circumstances.

That is the law in England, and when our Parliament passed the legislation quoted by my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) it is perfectly clear that Parliament meant the same should take place here. I say to the Government: By the course you have taken you have confiscated the electoral rights of some 4,000 electors in Bagot, and while the weightiest portion of the business of this session is being transacted, the chair of Bagot is vacant here. Why, Sir, it is a perfect mockery of the right hon. gentleman to say that thirty days from now, when this House shall have dispersed, then he will be in a position to issue the writ for Bagot and then some 25 per cent of the electors will have the right to vote who have not that right now. Does he not see that according to the theory of all constitutional writers, even if this 25 per cent had not a vote they would be represented by the gentleman sent to Parliament by the 75 per cent. Sir, the position that has been taken by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House has not been impinged on by the right hon. gentleman, and the fact that we see him adopting one policy in the case of Prince Edward Island and a different policy in the case of Bagot, shows, I am afraid, that it is not a regard for the condition of the electors that induces his conduct, but a less worthy motive.

Mr. CHARLTON. It strikes me that the course taken by our hon. friends opposite in denouncing the Government in reference to this matter, is not warranted by all the circumstances of the case. It is the principle under free governments, that the representative of a constituency should be actually the representative of the electors, and the condition of the voters' lists at the present moment renders it impossible to secure a true representation in any constituency in the Dominion of Canada. We have a voters' list four years old; a voters' list that was two years old, through the negligence of the Conservative Government, when the last elections were held. The present Government have been seeking to secure a franchise law that will afford a voter's list calculated to give to the electors of any riding in this Dominion a voice in choosing their representative to this Parliament. I hold that it is perfectly proper and consistent with the requirements of public policy, that

the Government should refrain from issuing a writ until the franchise law now before this House can be made legislation and the time arrives when all the electors of that riding can have a voice in selecting their representative. In view of the fact that a real and just franchise law is about to be enacted, I would almost consider it an outrage on the rights of the people to hold an election that would be decided upon a voters' list four years old; decided upon a voters' list by which 25 per cent or 30 per cent and even 40 per cent of the electors entitled to vote under a fair law would be debarred from the exercise of the privilege of citizenship in this country. Our hon. friends opposite are making much ado about almost nothing, because the course of the Government in this matter is entirely justifiable. The Government will give to this country a fair franchise law as soon as the factious opposition that has been offered to the Franchise Bill will permit, and when that law is in operation the constituents of Bagot, or of any other riding, will have a proper opportunity of expressing their wishes as to their representative in this House of Commons. I hold that it is perfectly proper to wait until such time as every elector in that riding shall have an opportunity to get his wishes respected and to cast his vote.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) were seriously impressed with the views he has expressed, then he would be an earnest advocate of the English system which would involve this Dominion in a general election after this session should the Franchise Bill be adopted by Parliament. And the Prime Minister himself, if his right for the representation of the new voters be sincere and earnest; he would be prepared to take the House into his confidence in a very short time with reference to a dissolution of Parliament.

Mr. LANDERKIN. That is what you dread.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman says that would be absurd.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I said that is what you dread.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Not in the slightest. The Opposition is always ready for any accident of that kind, but, judging from certain things that have happened this session, I have no doubt that the Ministry are in no particular hurry to go to the people, certainly they are in no particular hurry to go to Bagot. I am told by those who ought to know as well as the Prime Minister, that the difference between the electoral lists would not amount to 25 per cent of the voters, but a mere 2 per cent.

Mr. BERGERON. At the most.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I rose particularly to call attention to one thing which this discussion has evolved to an extraordinary extent. I listened carefully to the Prime Minister. His answer, in large part, was his usual answer since his triumph, particularly in the province of Quebec. If we show him that he has treated with contempt his old promises and pledges, if we show him that he is adopting the practices of his predecessors which he most loudly denounced, his answer always is, and to-day was repeated: "We won; we are successful; we are endorsed; whether we keep faith or break faith, we are successful." That was his answer to-day. He did not deal with the very serious subject which comes up in this connection. He did not deal with the attitude he invariably took on such questions when sitting on this side of the House, and explain, as he ought to be able to explain, if he is now governed by any well-considered principle, how it comes that he is treating with contempt all the doctrines he announced when sitting on this side of the House. Not merely did he upbraid the Conservative Administration for delaying the issue of the writs and the appointment of returning officers and the fixing of polling days for by-elections, but he upbraided them because they were assuming to themselves the right to exercise a discretionary power beyond and above the mere selection of the returning officers and the fixing of a convenient day—because they were taking to themselves the right to say when, in the interest of the people, there should be an election. The right hon. gentleman to-day tried to find grounds for the exercise of that discretion which he at one time denied the Administration of the day. Has the right hon. gentleman forgotten the assistance he gave to a Bill introduced by a prominent member of this House, by which it was proposed to make impossible the steps he is now taking, for any cause or reason, no mattter whether good or bad, political or otherwise? Has he forgotten the active support he gave to that hon. gentleman's Bill, which, if carried, would have prevented him interfering with the election in Bagot for any reason whatever?

Mr. BERGERON. Get an answer to that.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I presume the right hon. gentleman has forgotten, or he would interrupt me and say he remembered it quite well. I will refresh his recollection. I refer to a Bill which was introduced into this House by an hon. gentleman whose absence and the reason for whose absence from the House to-day every one regrets. I refer to the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). The Bill of that hon. gentleman proposed to cut away from the Administration altogether the power to intervene between the Speaker's warrant for the issue of the writ and the holding of an election,

and the right hon. Premier supported that Bill.

Mr. BERGERON. By a long speech.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. At any rate, by a strong speech. The hon. gentleman cannot reconcile the views he propounded on this side of the House with the action he is assuming to-day, when he is adopting, as he then considered them, the very worst practices of his opponents. In those days he boasted that he was a democrat up to the hilt, ready at all times to throw himself into the hands of the people. To-day, while boasting of his victories in the province of Quebec, he is unwilling to let the people of Bagot say whom they wish to represent them in this Parliament.

Mr. McMULLEN. I desire to say just a few words on this point. I do not think any member who has sat in this House for many years will deny that as a rule the writ for the return of a member for a constituency should issue as early as possible after a vacancy takes place, and that rule should only be departed from when good reasons for the exception can be given. The rule is a good one, but it would cease to be a rule if it had no exceptions. I have sat in this House for sixteen years, and if during that time there has ever been a case in which an exception to the rule has been justifiable, it is the case of the county of Bagot. In the first place, the voters' lists of that county are now over four years old. In the next place, supposing we had an election in the county to-morrow, the new member would not at all likely reach this House in time to take his seat before the House rises. Moreover, the Franchise Bill has practically been passed through this House, it is going to the Senate, and in all probability will become law; and that Franchise Bill will enfranchise every man in that riding who is entitled to vote. The election can then be held, and the member elected will represent a constituency in which every man will have had the right to exercise his franchise, which is unquestionably a desirable thing. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat has said that after the passage of the new Franchise Bill, a general election should be held. At any rate, when a county is vacant, an opportunity should be given to the electors to exercise their franchise under the new law. I do not think there is any injustice done in that. The county of Bagot is suffering no inconvenience whatever. Had that county been vacant at the time the House met or immediately afterwards, and had it been kept vacant during the entire session, there would be some ground of complaint; but remembering the date at which the death of our hon. friend took place, which we all very seriously deplore, and considering the period which must necessarily elapse before an election could take place, the new representative of that county could not have been here more than a few days before the close of the session. In that constituency there is no doubt a large percentage of men from twenty-one to twenty-three years of age whose names are not on the voters' lists, and it would be exceedingly unjust to bring on an election without placing their names on the lists and giving them a chance to vote. I quite agree that the rule for holding an election as soon after a vacancy as possible should be sustained, but if ever there was a case in which an exception to the rule should take place, it is that of the county of Bagot.

Mr. COCHRANE. The hon. gentleman always has a particular case when he wants to go back on his previous record.

Mr. McMULLEN. Not at all.

Mr. CLANCY. We have been rarely treated to such an exhibition of special pleading as we have had this afternoon. The right hon. First Minister told us that he did not take as an example the conduct of the late Government. Well, I do not know that he would find a more striking example of what he and his friends have charged against the former Government than the course the present Government have taken to-day. Why should the writ for the election in Bagot be delayed a single day? One would imagine that there was some great public question before the country on which the Government desired to consult the whole electorate and have a full vote, which moved the Government to delay this election. But we know that no such reason can be given why the election should be delayed. It does not make one particle of difference, so far as the judgment of this House is concerned upon public questions, whether the election is held under the recent franchise or whether we wait for a revision of the lists. The hon. gentleman also must be aware that when he states that 25 per cent of the electors in Bagot would be disfranchised, if the election were now held, he is stating what is contrary to the facts. He does not know whether the new law will increase the number of voters there 5 per cent or not.

Mr. BERGERON. Not 2 per cent.

Mr. CLANCY. My hon. friend says not 2 per cent. I am told that the franchise of the province of Quebec is infinitely more restrictive than is the Dominion franchise, and the probability is that if the election in Bagot were to be held under the Dominion franchise law, there would be more voters on the list than under the law now proposed. After what we have heard this afternoon, the only conclusion which the people can come to is that a pretext has been urged for delay and not any reason. There is absolutely no reason but merely a pretext, and the pretext is that the Govern-

ment want the new lists. If they had not held an election in one of the counties of Prince Edward Island a few weeks ago, they might advance that pretext with some show of excuse, but we did not on that occasion hear the right hon. First Minister declare that the election should be held under the new lists. Yet the new Franchise Bill had then been introduced and distributed and was under consideration, and to have been consistent, the right hon. gentleman should have declared then that no election should take place in Prince County until the new lists were in force. What reason can there be for requiring the new lists in one case and not in the other The only reason that can be assigned for the course of the Government is that the chances of the Government electing one of their own supporters were infinitely greater in Prince County, P.E.I., than they are in Bagot. We have now the clearest evidence of the most utter inconsistency on the part of the Government, but it is only one more added to the long list of their inconsistencies. The only thing in which they are consistent is the keeping up their policy of inconsistencies since they came into office.

Mr. MOORE. I only desire to occupy the attention of the House for a moment. I understand the position taken by the Government to be this, that if the vote be taken on the old lists, a large portion of the electors of Bagot will be disfranchised. Well, under the Dominion franchise law, which is now about to be superceded by the new Franchise Act, $150 worth of real estate entitles a man to a vote. But under the present law of the province of Quebec, which is to be adopted under the new Franchise Act, it requires $300 worth of real estate in cities and $200 in other municipalities to entitle a man to vote, so that if the election in Bagot is held under the new law, a great many of the electors will be disfranchised, who would have the right to cast their votes under the present law.

Mr. BERGERON. I do not think that Parliament ever heard such flimsy reasons advanced as those which have been given by the Government for not granting the electors of Bagot a representative in this House during this session. The only argument advanced by the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) for delaying the election was that the Opposition did not ask for the writ sooner. But we are not here to rule this House. I, myself, when I found out that the Government would not order the issue of the writ, did, at the solicitation of some of the electors of Bagot, notify you, Mr. Speaker, that the county of Bagot was vacant. I did so, and on the 21st April you informed the House that you had already issued your warrant. Ever since then we have been pressing on the Government to bring on the election, as it was our duty to do, and as it was also the duty of hon. gentlemen on the other side to do, if they have any regard for what they used to say in the past. The hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) in his best bombastic style, declared that the Government would carry Bagot. I need only refer the hon. gentleman to what has fallen from the lips of his leader, who clearly indicated that, in his opinion, the Government would be defeated in Bagot, and the conduct of the Government gives convincing evidence of that belief. My right hon. friend, the leader of the Government, said what was not correct—and I am sure he had no desire to make an incorrect statement—when he said that I only called the attention of the Speaker to the vacancy after I had paid a visit to the county. That is not the case. I was in the county of Bagot at the funeral of our late lamented colleague, and since then I have not been in that county. The right hon. gentleman boasted of his successes in Quebec up to the present. That is a subject which he should not speak about. I think it is most humiliating for the Prime Minister or any man representing the province of Quebec in this House to remind Parliament of the elections which were held in that province since the general election. No doubt the result of the general elections of the 23rd of June was very humiliating to us, still we can explain that result, but when the right hon. gentleman tells us that he has since consulted the province of Quebec, he is making what he knows to be a most unfounded boast. He boasted of having carried the county of Temiscouata in which a vacancy occurred by the death of one of our colleagues, and of having carried it by acclamation. Does he want me to remind him of the circumstances of that election? Why, there was a quarrel in that county, which presented a most humiliating spectacle. The man who represents that county here does not represent its people. It was Mr. Pouliot who was nominated by an overwhelming majority, and the hon. Minister of Public Works went down there and promised that Mr. Pouliot would secure the county. But its present representative stood in spite of all that, and if Dr. Grandbois, who sat for that county for eighteen years in the Conservative interest, wanted to represent it, he would be here to-day. Our friends, however, for reasons peculiar to themselves did not want to take part in an election and the Government were not opposed. The county of Rimouski was opened by the appointment of Mr. Fiset to a senatorship, and the right hon. gentleman also boasted that he carried that county by acclamation. But why did he do so? Because our friends did not want to run an election. They did not see the advantage of making a fight in an immense county like Rimouski, and those who know the province of Quebec know that that county is not at all a sure one for hon. gentlemen opposite.

Now, my right hon. friend speaks of the county of Quebec Centre. The right hon. gentleman should never open his mouth about that constituency. The people have witnessed there one of the most scandalous transactions ever known in the history of this country. Why, the late member for Quebec Centre sat in this House for two years with a nomination as judge in his pocket. Hon. gentlemen opposite, who, for eighteen years when upon this side of the House, talked against the Government holding out promises of situations to members sitting behind them, have not a word to say when it is shown openly, clearly, notoriously before the country that for two sessions the man who represented Quebec Centre sat here with a letter from the Prime Minister himself promising him a position. And that gentleman succeeded in getting upon the Bench in Quebec—as some people say, he kicked himself upon the Bench. There was no contest in that county, our friends did not care to enter into an election in the face of the influences that were at work there. The Government of the province had just been carried to power by the same influences which carried hon. gentlemen opposite to power, influences which the people cannot account for. So here are three counties that the right hon. gentleman has boasted of carrying, but which, for reasons I have given, he should have been ashamed to mention. Then he spoke of Drummond and Arthabaska and the majority of 1,200 that he had there. But it had been carried before by about the same majority by the gentleman supporting hon. gentlemen opposite who ran on the 23rd June. There was an election there because the Conservatives wanted it, insisted on it—and they got it. But they did not lose a vote that they previously had.

Mr. BENNETT. How was that constituency opened ?

Mr. BERGERON. It was opened by another breach of the professions of hon. gentlemen opposite when in Opposition and the appointment to the Bench of the gentleman representing the constituency. Now, the right hon. gentleman speaks of the county of Nicolet. He went into that county himself, and he knows by what means it was carried. He knows that there was a quarrel between the representatives of different railways, each side anxious to get from the Government more than their rivals, while the Government held up before them the bribe which united them in support of the Government, with the expectation on the part of each side that they would be favoured in the granting of subsidies, of which, I suppose, we shall hear more before the end of the session. The hon. gentleman went through there with his henchmen promising subsidies to the men on both sides who were asking for them. There was an open row between the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) and the then member for St. Hyacinthe (Mr. Bernier). The men there said : We will work under Mr. Bernier, but if the Minister of Public Works puts his foot in the county, we will vote against you ; and so the Minister of Public Works remained at home. Yet the hon. gentleman knowing these circumstances speaks about public sentiment in Quebec being in his favour. Why, I repeat it, the men of my blood and my nationality must feel sorry that the Prime Minister has spoken of these by-elections that were held in the province of Quebec. We feel badly about them, but we feel all the worse to know that the facts are known to others outside. And now, by an unforeseen and most regrettable accident, the constituency of Bagot has been opened. The people there are not seeking for public favours, they are not after railway bonuses or public works or appointments to office. They are independent farmers, who will express an independent opinion. There is no way to bribe them. They are good, honest, respectable people. The right hon. gentleman speaks of the county being gerrymandered. He knows that it has not been gerrymandered so far as the local elections are concerned. And yet he knows that it was carried by Mr. McDonald, Conservative, by a majority of 75. That is not an immense majority ; it is not one that the hon. gentleman should be afraid to face if he believes in his own policy, if he believes that the people of the province of Quebec are satisfied with the way he has carried out his promises and administered the affairs of the country. Let him call upon the people of Bagot to say if they are satisfied. The right hon. gentleman speaks of twenty-five per cent of the electors being disfranchised owing to the voters' lists being old. He is not serious in that. He knows that there will not be more than two per cent of a change from that cause. And, as the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Moore) has said, there are likely to be fewer electors under the new proposed Franchise Law than under the old Franchise Law. This brings me back to what I said in the first place, that the Government know perfectly well that they could not carry the county of Bagot. They know that that county represents the province of Quebec, and that the province of Quebec has been shamefully deceived by the present Administration, and therefore the Government dare not appeal to the electors of that county.

Motion to adjourn negatived.

THE QUEEN VS. SKELTON ET AL.

Mr. DAVIN. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to ask the Solicitor General if he could give me the information he promised me the other day in the case of the Queen vs. Skelton ?

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). I promised that the hon. gentle-

man (Mr. Davin) should have an answer to his letter. I have no doubt that he will have the answer before many hours go by.

I.C.R.—CONTRACT FOR FARM GATES.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. With the consent of the House, I would ask leave to present a motion :

That the papers accompanying a return to an order of the House of Commons of the 30th March, 1898, respecting a contract for farm gates on the Intercolonial Railway, with one McNeill, of New Glasgow, be referred to the Committee on Public Accounts.

I sent notice of this across the floor to the hon. Minister of Railways, and he told me he had no objection to the motion.

Motion agreed to.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 138) further to amend the Companies Act.—(Mr. Fielding.)

THE ELECTORAL FRANCHISE.

Order read for consideration of Bill (No. 16) to repeal the Electoral Franchise Act and to further amend the Dominion Elections Act, as amended in the Committee of the Whole, was discharged.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). I move that the amendments as reported from the committee be not now further considered, but that the Bill be referred back to the Committee of the Whole for the purpose of considering suggested amendments to provide for the printing of the voters' lists by the Queen's Printer.

Motion agreed to, and the House again resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The intention is simply to provide for the printing of the voters' lists by the Queen's Printer. I have had a certain number of copies of the amendments printed and distributed among the members of the House, and it will be necessary, in order to understand the intention, simply to read the suggested amendments. The intention is to provide that within ten days after final revision of the voters' lists, a certified copy should be sent to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, whose duty it shall be to hand it over to the Queen's Printer for the purpose of having it printed. This shall take place every year after each annual revision of the list. Then these voters' lists in the hands of the Queen's Printer shall be accessible to all for the purpose of the election, and any copy of the list printed by the Queen's Printer shall be considered as an authentic copy of the list. This is for the purpose of avoiding the difficulties that have been pointed out during the course of the debate.

Mr. FITZPATRICK

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That list will be certified under paragraph 16, I suppose ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Who fixes the price of the list ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. We do ; it is provided for in the amendment. They are 10 cents a copy. The intention is to have this clause inserted after clause 9. I will now read the new clause :—

10. Within ten days after the final revision of any and every list of voters for the purposes of provincial elections, it shall be the duty of the custodian thereof to transmit to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, by registered mail, a copy of such list certified under the hand of such custodian, and having every alteration, addition or erasure therein identified by his initials. The fees to be paid for such certified copy shall be those fixed by the provincial law for furnishing such copies to applicants therefor, and if there is no fee fixed by the provincial law, shall be twenty-five cents for each one hundred names, including additions and descriptions, and fifty cents for the certificate.

(2) For the purpose of Dominion elections such certified copy shall be deemed to be the original and legal list of voters for the polling division for which the list of which it is a copy was prepared, so long as that list remains in force, subject, however, to such changes and additions as may subsequent to revision be made in such list under the provisions of the provincial law.

(3) It shall be the duty of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery immediately upon receipt by him of such certified copy of a list of voters to cause the same to be printed by the Queen's Printer, and he shall thereafter retain such certified copy of record in his office.

(4) Immediately after printing any such list the Queen's Printer shall send, by registered mail, four copies thereof to the sitting member for the electoral district to which the list belongs, and two copies to the defeated candidate at the last Dominion election therein, and the Governor in Council may by regulation provide for the issue to members and candidates of such additional copies as may be thought proper.

(5) The Clerk of the Crown in Chancery and the Queen's Printer shall supply copies of any lists so printed to any person applying for the same and paying therefor a price proportionately sufficient to cover the cost of printing the same, but such price shall not exceed ten cents for each copy of the list for a polling subdivision.

(6) All voters' lists printed by the Queen's Printer shall be authenticated by his imprint in the same manner as other parliamentary documents, and every copy of a voters' list bearing such imprint shall be deemed to be for all purposes an authentic copy of the original list of record in the office of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery.

(7) If, under the provincial law, any changes in or additions to a list of voters have been made since the final revision, it shall be the duty of the official having a record of such changes and additions, upon the request of any person presenting for the purpose any such printed copy of the list, and paying or tendering the sum of fifty cents, to make corresponding changes in and additions to such printed copy, and to certify under his hand as to the correct-

ness of such changes and additions, and such printed copy with such changes and additions, and so certified, shall be deemed to be for all purposes an authentic copy of the list of voters as the same exists and is in force at the time of such certification.

(8) The Queen's Printer shall keep standing in type every list of voters so printed by him until he shall have been furnished by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery with a duly certified copy of a later list for the same polling division, or of a later list or later lists showing some change in the polling division, whereupon he shall correct the same so that it shall correspond with such later list or shall make such other changes as may be necessary, and he shall then keep such list so corrected, or any new resulting list or lists standing in type, until he has been furnished with a certified copy of a later list or lists affecting the same, and so on, so that there shall always, as far as practicable, be kept standing in type a correct copy of every finally revised provincial list of voters.

(9) Every officer or person who under the provincial law is the custodian of any list of voters, or has the official record of any changes in or additions to any such list since the last final revision thereof, and who refuses or omits to perform any duty imposed upon him by this section is guilty of an indictable offence, and for each such refusal or omission shall incur a penalty of not more than one thousand dollars and not less than ..... dollars.

(10) So long as, and whenever for any reason, a certified copy of any list of voters as finally revised has not been transmitted to or received by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, pursuant to the provisions of this section, the original and legal list for Dominion elections shall be the same as that for provincial elections.

Mr. INGRAM. I would draw the attention of the Solicitor General to the fact that in cities and towns the registered list of voters will not be completed within the ten days after the final revision.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. In regard to difficulties that may occur in Ontario constituencies, I have not been able up to the present time to devise any scheme to overcome them. I should be glad to consider any suggestion made by hon. gentlemen opposite. I have asked officials of the department to take this matter into their consideration, but I must say that hon. gentlemen opposite have pointed out some difficulties that appear to be practically insurmountable as regards the cities and towns of Ontario.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I should like to inquire especially as regards this very long and important amendment, whether the hon. gentleman proposes to have the Bill reprinted when it comes out of committee and before the third reading is moved ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. That would be perfectly fair and right.

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

After Recess.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I wish to make an amendment in section 9 by inserting the words "six months" instead of "one year," this change being applicable to voters' lists. The amendment is made at the suggestion of the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Clarke).

Mr. LaRIVIERE. Could not the hon. gentleman make it three months ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. No.

Mr. CLARKE. I think six months would meet the case.

Mr. BENNETT. If the provision goes into effect it must mean this : there must be a provincial list and afterwards a federal list, which will mean doubling the expense. It will not make any difference to the people in cities because they have their local revisions, but it will be an important matter in the country districts.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. The lists in Manitoba are revised only once every four years. A voter must reside three months in the district. It was in order to meet this point that I suggested three months. However, I am prepared to accept six months, on the principle that half a loaf is better than no bread.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I now desire to call the attention of the committee to an amendment of some importance. In section 13 I propose to insert after the words "revising officer" the words "shall be guilty of indictable offence," so as to make the point absolutely certain that we are creating an offence here so that our right cannot be disputed. These are the only changes I have to suggest now. I may say it is understood that we are to have the Bill reprinted with these new clauses inserted and then it will come up for the third reading. In the meantime I understand that my hon. friend will consider the question as to how we are to amend the Bill so as to make it applicable for the printing of the voters' lists in the cities and towns of Ontario.

Mr. BENNETT. What is meant by that —the original list or the one that is printed ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The copy that is sent by the provincial custodian. The original remains with him, and he sends a copy to be printed by the Queen's Printer, and this copy, for the purposes of the election, is practically the original list.

On subsection 4,

Mr. BENNETT. My recollection of the old Act was that ten copies were given to each member. As these lists will be printed, I think the Solicitor General might see his way clear to permit the distribution of a greater number than one copy.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I am willing to accept any number the committee suggest, because it is intended to try to help those engaged in elections.

Mr. BENNETT. Let each member have ten copies.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). I think the same number should be sent to the defeated candidate as to the sitting member.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). No.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). Yes, because in the large majority of cases the defeated candidate will be the next candidate, and I think we can afford to put him in the same position as the elected candidate.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I am satisfied with that. Say twenty copies to each.

Mr. WILSON. Are these to be printed every year down here?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The type will remain standing, and each year the list, as we have it at the printing office, will be revised and corrected according to the returns sent in by the provincial officer. If a list is wanted for an election at any time, we shall have a correct copy right up to date.

Mr. WILSON. How long before an election will it be distributed?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I provide for that in another section. If the list is not obtainable in consequence of an accident, there is a provision that the last list available will be used. This is practically the old law in that respect.

On subsection 7,

Mr. BENNETT. What case is this to meet?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. In the Revised Statutes of British Columbia, chapter 67, section 11, provision is made for a list of voters called the register of voters, which is made up by the collector. It is provided in paragraph "c" of that section that after the list has been finally revised by the county judge any man may go before the collector and make a claim to have his name put on the list; and the collector, after putting a series of questions to him, and getting satisfactory answers, may put his name on the list. The collector then posts the list up, and if no objection is made to the name within two months, the man becomes a qualified voter. So that after the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery becomes possessed of the list, it is possible that other names may be added; and this is to provide that these names which are added by the collector may be put on the printed list here.

Mr. INGRAM. This section does not apply to any other province than British Columbia?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. No other that I know of.

Mr. POWELL. Might there not be a little conflict between this and the first subsection of section 10? That might be construed as a final revision.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I think not, because an application to the collector may be rejected by him. It seems to be almost optional with him whether a name should go on or not. I think that the final revision under the Act would be the revision before the county court judge.

On section "a."

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Is not that sentence a little wide, "Such other changes as may be necessary"?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Add the words "to make it so correspond."

Mr. INGRAM. If that becomes law, each member and defeated candidate will be entitled to a printed list each year.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I think that these words might lead to abuse.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I should bear in mind the suggestion. I do not care to alter the section now as it has been carefully framed, but if at the third reading, any verbal changes are required, we might consider them.

Mr. POWELL. In the case of a division of the list, is not that a list of the separate polling division that is made by the returning officer himself? There would be no printed copy of that subdivision, which is made on the eve of an election.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The only objection is the looseness of the phraseology, and we can easily remedy that later on.

On subsection 9,

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. This is a very important provision. I understand the hon. gentleman is going to make some change in clause 14 by which the returning officer is empowered to obtain voters' lists. The hon. gentleman had some doubt as to our jurisdiction to confer this authority. It imposes a duty upon a provincial officer.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I have not the slightest doubt myself, but I do not like to set my opinion against that of other gentlemen, and therefore I thought I could meet the difficulty suggested by practically creating an offence, although that is another thing I do not care to do.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. This is rather interesting, in view of the position which the hon. Solicitor General took

not long ago in connection with the Bill for the better observance of the Sabbath. The question arose as to whether we could impose this duty upon a provincial officer and make him liable to a penalty. To get round that difficulty, the hon. gentleman proposes to constitute the refusal of the provincial officer a crime; and, therefore, under our jurisdiction here to legislate as to crimes, it is suggested that the difficulty would be overcome. I think, however, that the position which the Solicitor General took a little while ago this session was that if we legislated on a subject-matter within the exclusive jurisdiction of the local legislatures, we could not snatch jurisdiction by making the neglect to carry out our law an offence. If we have not the jurisdiction to adopt clause 14 as it originally stood, this provision will not put us on better ground. The hon. gentleman may have some authority to which he can refer, but my recollection is that, so far as this general subject is concerned, it has come up only in connection with the judges. It came up, at any rate, in connection with an election case, when the question arose as to our right to impose duties on provincial judges, and it came up also perhaps in connection with the probate courts. In considering these cases, my recollection is that the courts proceeded largely upon the ground of the judicial character of those offices, and the spirit and intention of the British North America Act, under which, it was contended, that while these judges were constituted officers of provincial courts, they were charged with the duty of administering the laws of Canada, and I think the point was raised also that this Government paid them their salaries. It was held, I think, that as their office was established for the purpose of carrying out the laws of Canada, this Parliament could add to their judicial duties by imposing on them jurisdiction in connection with the laws of Canada, but I have no recollection of the courts going further than that. I know of no case, for instance, where the courts intimated that we might take to ourselves the officers of the local legislatures and add to their duties in a singular particular. This opens up a very interesting question, and of course one too large to fully discuss at this stage and in committee. The question probably will, in some form or other, yet come before the courts in connection with this very subject, because if we can go this far and take advantage of the machinery of the local legislatures and add to the duties of the officers of these legislatures, which they have to carry out under local legislation, it seems to me that the question of provincial rights is presented in an entirely new aspect, and it would be very difficult indeed for the autonomy of the local legislatures to be preserved. If in this roundabout way we can impose this duty upon officers paid salaries or fees, we can in the same way take complete charge of the whole machinery of any local legislature. I shall be glad to hear from the Solicitor General how it is that he thinks we can impose these duties upon these officers, in the first place, or how we can, by saying that neglect on the part of these local officers to do certain things for us, can fairly be made a crime.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. My own opinion is that the mere declaration on our part that this is a crime will not make it so. But after having conferred with some of the officers of the department who are of a contrary opinion I have come to the conclusion that it would be safer for me to defer to their opinion in a matter of this sort. This is not a new departure so far as the franchise law is concerned, because my hon. friend will remember that under the Franchise Act of 1885 we utilized the provincial machinery. Under section 15 it is provided that "the revising officer shall, as soon as possible after taking the oath of office obtain a certified copy or certified copies as the case may be of the last revised assessment roll or rolls," and so on.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That is our officer.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. By section 16 it is enacted that the registrar shall cause "one copy of each list to be posted up in the office of the clerk or other corresponding officer of each municipal or parochial, or other known territorial division." Under section 17 every sheriff, warden, clerk of the peace, treasurer, parish court commissioner, or other officer to whom two copies of the said list are to be mailed shall forthwith after receiving them post one up in a conspicuous place in his office, and so on. Thus it will be seen that the Franchise Act imposes duties on the local officers.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Is there a penalty imposed for neglect? I do not think so.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I am not prepared to say further than to draw attention to section 40 of the Franchise Act:

Every officer or person who is by any law the custodian of any assessment roll or list of voters prepared under the laws of any province, or of any other list or document, or any duplicate or certified copy thereof, which, under the foregoing provisions of this Act, the revising officer is required to obtain and use for the purpose of revising any list of voters under this Act, shall furnish the same, or a certified copy or copies thereof to any revising officer who applies for the same, and as by him required; and every such officer or person who refuses or omits to furnish the same to such revising officer within a reasonable time, upon being paid or tendered the cost of preparing the same, according to the fees or rates allowed therefor by the laws in force in the province to which such assessment roll, list or document relates, is guilty of a misdemeanour, and shall be punished accordingly.

Then Mr. Clement, in his work on the constitution, page 437 says :

It is, of course, open to the Dominion Parliament to utilize existing provinciai machinery, or to confer upon "boards" or bodies of provincial creation powers and authorities in relation to the enforcement of Dominion laws, but, quoad the duties imposed by Dominion legislation, the members of the municipal bodies or "boards" are not provincial officers.

I apprehend that that would cover what we are attempting to do even if we had not the precedent of the Franchise Act.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I think that the case of the Franchise Act stands upon the same footing, following the reading of the Solicitor General ; but I do not recollect that the point was ever raised or discussed.

Mr. POWELL. This matter received a great deal of discussion, I may say to the Solicitor General, when the Manitoba Remedial Bill was passing through the House, and there was not an hon. gentleman on that side who did not hold a very strong opinion on the matter. The hon. gentleman from Charlottetown (Sir Louis Davies) expressed a very strong opinion that this Parliament had no power whatever to impose obligations upon the Governor in Council in the province of Manitoba in relation to the school board. That opinion was also expressed very strongly by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). It was acquiesced in by Professor Weldon. It was assented to by the present leader of the House. It was acquiesced in by the present Minister of Justice. In fact, I do not know a legal gentleman who was opposed to the Bill but expressed in the strongest terms—or assented to the strongest assertions of those who expressed opinions—the opinion that we have not the power to do it. However, I think it must be conceded that the Dominion of Canada has the power to seize upon any person it likes and require him to perform any duty it sees fit. Because a person happens to be an official of the local legislature, it is foolish to argue that he loses the duties and obligations that attach to his citizenship in the Dominion. But the point my hon. friend from Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) raised, it strikes me, goes a little further than that. There is no doubt that under these decisions that have been given we have this power to impose a duty upon a provincial office. But the point is have we the power, not to single out the municipal officer and say that he shall do so and so—there is no question about our power in that way—but to meddle with the lists prepared under powers conferred by the local legislature. Suppose the local legislature should declare that no person should give these lists to the public until a certain day, and this Act came in and declared that a man should be punished if he did not give a copy before that time, there would be a plain clashing of jurisdiction, and this law would be ultra vires. But there is no use raising the point. This side is stopped from doing it by their action in the case of the old Act, and I suppose the matter will have to go.

Mr. WILSON. I may be dull, but I have not noticed any clause that says at what time these lists shall be distributed for an election.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. An amendment which has not yet been printed provides that they shall be distributed immediately after they have been printed.

Mr. CLARKE. I suppose this Bill will be reprinted before it is read the third time ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. That has been agreed to.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. In connection with the interesting point that was referred to a moment ago, if the clause we have been discussing is within our power, to constitute a crime on the part of a local officer by his failing to produce a document that he has prepared as an officer under provincial authority, it will be difficult to say that we could not make it a crime on the part of the provincial secretary to fail to produce any document in his possession or under his control when demanded—such as an Order in Council, for instance.

Bill reported and amendments read the first and second time.

SUPPLY—THE CASE OF JUDGE SPINKS.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies) moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I would like to call the attention of the Solicitor General to the fact that an official inquiry was held into the conduct of Judge Spinks in the province of British Columbia. I do not remember whether a motion was made and carried for the papers, but if an order was passed, I will be glad if the hon. gentleman would expedite the return of the papers. When his estimates are reached, I would like to discuss the subject.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). I am under the impression that there are no papers in the department connected with it. That is my information, but I will see.

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

(In the Committee.)

Fisheries Protection Service..... $95,000

Mr. SPROULE. What is being done about that Collingwood case, the Noble Brothers ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Nothing has been done. After I became Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Mr. Osler, the counsel of the Messrs. Noble, asked to have a hearing before me to make comments upon the evidence, and I said I had no objection. But after consideration he said he would leave the matter rest until he saw the decision of the Privy Council, inasmuch as the question of the Dominion right to control these fisheries, or the provincial right to control them, was pending before the Privy Council, and if it turned out that we had no rights in the matter at all, he would take some other course. I said, You can please yourself about that, and nothing of any kind has been done.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What has become of the tugs that were seized ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. They were handed back by my predecessor before I came in, and some kind of bond was given.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What was the decision of Judge Johnson ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It is a long time ago since I read it, and I could not tell you off-hand. I think the papers have all been brought down. The evidence was voluminous, and I have never mastered it.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I will refresh my hon. friend's recollection about that matter, so that he may look into it. Several years ago, when I was at the head of the department, these tugs were seized in the ordinary course of the duties of the officers who are instructed, as the hon. gentleman knows, to seize and confiscate boats that are used in violating the close season. These people were without license, fishing in the Georgian Bay waters, and thwarting the department. These vessels were ordered to be sold, and after I left the department they were given back to the Noble Brothers and a bond was given to answer in the event of an investigation, which had been granted to them, turning out against them. The hon. gentleman has said that this investigation, which they courted and which was granted to them, resulted in an adverse decision. In the ordinary course, the duty of the department would have been to take action upon that bond. I thought there ought to be a limit put to this indulgence of coming before the department through counsel. They had one investigation in my time which resulted adversely to them. After I ceased to be Minister, they claimed another investigation before a judge because they challenged the fairness of the officer of my department who was the first commissioner. They then failed to show any case before this judge, and as the hon. gentleman says, nothing has been done except to let counsel be heard at some time not yet fixed. A year must have passed since the decision of Judge Johnson was given. I recollect that the papers were brought down last session, consequently a long time has elapsed. If the hon. gentleman has agreed to hear Mr. Osler before finally dealing with the case, I think no more delay should be allowed. I speak on the matter rather from an interested position for this reason, that I was subjected personally to a great deal of abuse and misrepresentation, and was put in the position of a vindictive head of a department who desired to pursue these people unfairly. Public attention was called to the matter in so extraordinary a manner that boards of trade took the subject up. Boards of trade in different Ontario towns represented the matter, the press took the case up, and the department was very seriously criticised, and particularly the head of it. For that reason, indulgence, and it was great indulgence, was extended, largely on the ground of public interest, and the first commission was appointed by myself. Since then the people have shown extraordinary indulgence, and I should like before I depart this life to ascertain the result. I have no doubt whatever as to the result, even in the hands of hon. gentlemen opposite.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The question was raised as to who had jurisdiction, and whether we had any jurisdiction whatever. That was decided by the Supreme Court, and an appeal was taken to the Privy Council. I attended all the arguments before the Privy Council in this case. We hoped judgment would be given in November. It was the strongest bench that ever sat in the Privy Council of England, and we have been awaiting their decision, and it would be unfortunate for any action to be taken just now.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The parties will not press the case for a decision because they have got the boats and all the Government have got is the bond, whatever it may be worth. Unless the Government are active in the matter, it will not be pushed. Mr. Osler will never press for a hearing, especially with an adverse judgment.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I have no doubt whatever as to the result.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I wish to call the attention of the Minister to a case, in regard to which there has been some correspondence. I refer to the dismissal of David Ross, who for a long time had been in the service of the department in the county of Inverness, and who, in my time, was a very efficient and intelligent officer. He perhaps possesed more than ordinary intelligence for work of that

kind. He was overseer at East Margaree for eighteen years, and no charge was ever made against him either under one Government or the other. He remained in office for twelve months during the hon. gentleman's regime. On the 21st May, 1897, he was informed by the Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries that under an Order in Council dated 19th May, a reorganization of the fishery service in the county of Inverness was about to take place, and with a view to promote efficiency and economy his services as fishery overseer had been dispensed with. Of course, I understand exactly what a reorganization of that kind involves. It is an opportunity, and a very proper one, to get rid of inefficient officers and supply their places with efficient officers, but I am satisfied that neither the representative of the county of Inverness or any one familiar with Mr. Ross's work would declare that he was inefficient or inattentive to his duties. I am also satisfied, from my knowledge of him, that no report of that kind was made. I contend that in a reorganization men who are not inefficient should not be dispensed with. I should like to know from the Minister what the exact reason for his dismissal was, and who was appointed.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There was no politics in the matter. A reorganization has to be made, and I had to depend on the report of the member representing the county. His report was not that Mr. Ross was inefficient, but that he was getting old and was not very efficient.

Mr. BERGERON. An offensive partisan.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No. He was removed for the reason I have stated and another man was appointed.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The Government informed the House last year that they would act on the statement of representatives or of defeated candidates in the last Dominion elections, who took the responsibility of making positive statements that an officer had been guilty of acting as an offensive partisan. But surely the hon. Minister is not going to hand over to the most respectable member behind him the administration of his department, or the duty of deciding as to the efficiency of the officers who serve under him. The most humble man in the service is entitled to be judged on his merits, and it is a dangerous principle to suggest in connection with the efficiency of public officers that nothing more should be required than the statement of an hon. member who is not clothed with any responsibility whatever in that connection. I would be sorry to suppose that the Minister was going to dispense with the services of officers in the department simply because they may be represented by members of Parliament or any one else as being inefficient.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman misunderstood me. When I took charge of the department, I called on Prof. Prince to prepare a statement with respect to the standing and efficiency of every fishery officer in the department. That report was placed before me. Certain men he classified as very excellent and efficient officers, who did their duty well. As far as I can recall to mind, I have never allowed one of these men to be disturbed on the representation of any one. Then, there was a second class of men who were reported as fairly discharging their duties: some of them in a perfunctory way, but there was really no charge against them. They were there and pottering along as well as they could. In the third class were included inefficient officers who were not doing their duty satisfactorily and with respect to the third class, when the member for the county recommended a change and I found the man in the third class, as an inefficient officer I was ready to remove him.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. There is no practise that this man was classed as inefficient.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It is certain that he was not classed amongst the very effective officers.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Is the Minister in a position to say that?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes. I am in a position to say it for the reason that I never dismissed a man who was classed among the first effective officers. He was either classed as a fair officer against whom there was no positive wrong-doing charged, or he was among those who were utterly inefficient. When I went through the organization of Inverness County, I naturally and properly consulted my hon. friend (Mr. McLennan), whose local knowledge was of great service to me, and I took the benefit of his advice.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. If the hon. Minister tells me that this officer was reported to him as inefficient——

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I would not say inefficient; I say he came within one of the two classes.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. He was either efficient or not efficient?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. He was not classed amongst those who were reported as very effective and efficient officers. He may have been classed as fair; that is a man against whom no charge was made and who had just gone along year after year, and some of them—I do not say this man—did nothing but just make their returns. He may have been

amongst that class or amongst the inefficient.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I would ask the Minister to bring down before concurrence, such report as he has had against Mr. Ross.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not say it was against him.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Well, referring to him, because, from the hon. gentleman's point of view that is an entirely different position from acting on the representation of any hon. gentleman who has no official responsibility. I do not think the hon. member for Inverness—and that fortifies me in pressing the Minister for such report as was given him—I do not think the hon. member for Inverness would say that Mr. Ross was an inefficient or inactive fishery officer. My recollection of Mr. Ross was entirely official, not in any sense personal, and his reports were amongst the best that were sent to the department in my time.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I will take care to bring it down.

Mr. McINERNEY. There is a net increase of $5,000 in this item, and I would ask the Minister if he has increased the number of inspectors or overseers or guardians in the Dominion ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No. This increase arises almost entirely from the necessity for extra protection in the lobster service. Out of this vote a certain sum is to be paid for the building of two steam launches for the protection of the lobster fisheries.

Mr. McINERNEY. In the county of Kent there have been three overseers dismissed out of a total number of five. What is the intention of the Minister with regard to replacing these overseers who have been dismissed ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. In many places where we found the overseers unnecesary, we simply put an end to the office. I went carefully over all the maritime province overseers with the commissioner, and I found there were too many in some counties and the number was reduced. In the case mentioned by the hon. gentleman (Mr. McInerney) the number was reduced by three.

Mr. McINERNEY. The overseers who have been dismissed in Kent were in the most important fishing districts in the county, namely, Cocagne, Carleton, and the parish of St. Louis. At present, in the Dundas end of the county, near the town of Shediac, a gentleman from Wellington in the adjoining parish discharges the duty of overseer for the parish of Dundas. The same thing happens in the two most important northern parishes of the county, Carleton and St. Louis. A gentleman from Richibucto performs the duty of overseer in these two northern districts. From what I can learn, I do not think that system conduces to the proper discharge of the duties nor does it carry out the intention of the law in regard to overseers. It would be better if overseers were appointed in these three districts instead of simply having guardians there, and having the work of the overseers done from the adjoining districts of the county. I have heard particular complaints about it specially when I was home at Easter, and the people of these districts feel that they have not been rightly used in this regard. I bring the matter to the attention of the Minister thinking that perhaps when he looks into it he may do justice.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I shall bring it to the attention of Mr. Commissioner Prince. Of course in a matter of that kind I acted on his judgment.

Mr. BERGERON. In what class does the name of Mr. John Kelly appear ? He was formerly overseer for the Fisheries Department in the district of Beauharnois, and there never was any charge against him. However, Mr. Kelly was dismissed by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and I am anxious to know under which class he has fallen ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I think his district was changed.

Mr. BERGERON. Mr. Kelly was dismissed completely. He is a very good Conservative, and I suppose that would be enough to settle the question of his dismissal. I wish to ask the Minister if he has given strict orders about illegal fishing in the district of Beauharnois, which has in the past caused a great deal of disturbance, and which has almost depleted Lake St. Louis and Lake St. Francis of fish. I am under the impression that the Minister did issue very strict orders, but as I told him the other day in private conversation, I do not believe these orders are carried out. I understand there were two men appointed to replace Mr. John Kelly. One of them is Mr. DeWitt, and I know him to be a good officer, but I do not think he is allowed to carry out his instructions. No doubt he does everything in his power, but he is not obeyed, or rather the department does not give him the necesary backing. I was told the other day, on reliable authority, that the fishing with these destructive implements is still going on in Lake St. Francis and Lake St. Louis, and I call the attention of the Minister publicly to it. Who was the other overseer appointed to replace Mr. John Kelly. I know Mr. DeWitt, but I do not know the other ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I cannot give the names now. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergeron) was kind enough to bring this matter to my attention privately, and now that he has made public mention of it, I will speak to Mr. Prince, who has the matter under consideration. I am very much obliged to the hon. gentleman for having brought it up again publicly, and I will take care that Mr. Prince reads "Hansard" to-morrow to call his attention to it again. There have been some seizures there lately. The officers are showing a good deal of efficiency and activity.

Mr. BERGERON. My hon. friend, I have no doubt, has heard from the Minister of Public Works the reason John Kelly was dismissed, and who has replaced him. I would ask the hon. Minister to bring down the names of the present overseers.

Mr. TAYLOR. I notice that this vote is for salaries and disbursements of fishery inspectors, overseers and guardians. When the Minister of Marine and Fisheries assumed office he made the promise to this House that no officer of his would be dismissed without an investigation. A few days ago I submitted to the Minister two questions—one respcting Mr. Samuel Boddy, and the other respecting Mr. William Hicks, two fishery officers. Mr. Hicks had been in the employ of the Government for twenty or twenty-five years, and was a most efficient officer, and Mr. Boddy, a young and active man and a very efficient officer also, had been in the employ of the Government for ten or twelve yars. The reply I got in respect to Mr. Boddy was that he had been dismissed on the ground of economy and efficiency, and that his successor was appointed in the person of Mr. A. J. Flood. The ground for the dismissal of Mr. Hicks, given in the reply of the Minister, was inability to attend to his duties on account of old age, and alleged gross mismanagement of his district. I asked who his successor was recommended by, and the hon. Minister said by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. His successor was Mr. Sheldon Y. Bullis, of the village of Athens. Shortly after the general election Mr. Sheldon Bullis was a most offensive partisan and wanted a position, and I am credibly informed that he put up the sum of $100 and preferred a charge against the postmaster of the village of Athens. An investigation was held, and it was found that Mr. Berney, the postmaster, had voted in two constituencies—for my hon. friend the member for Brockville (Mr. Wood) and for myself in the county of Leeds. The fact of his having voted twice, of course, constituted a charge against him of being an offensive partisan, and he was dismissed. Mr. Bullis expected the appointment; but the Grit committee of the town met, and in place of nominating Mr. Bullis, they nominated another individual. This made Mr. Bullis very mad, and he was going either to burst the Government or to get an appointment somewhere, and the next man to be sacrificed was this old and faithful servant, Mr. Hicks, who had performed his duties so faithfully and well, that a few years ago the Anglers' Association requested the Government to increase his salary. Although his salary was only $75, he devoted the whole of his time to the duties of the office.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The salary was $125.

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes, it was increased at the request of the Anglers' Association, and he was given charge of Charleston Lake, a body of water devoted to the propagation of fish. But a place had to be found for Mr. Bullis, and Mr. Hicks was thrown out without saying by your leave, the Minister says, for inefficiency and old age. But he is just as smart a man as the man appointed in his place. I know both of them well, and I know that Mr. Hicks can outrun Mr. Bullis, because he weighs about 150 while the latter weighs 250. Mr. Bullis could not go out in a boat if he tried, for he would be in danger of overbalancing it. He wanted to show that he was doing something, however, and this is what he did. A few neighbours in the locality this spring, after the ice went out, took their guns and went out on the creeks to shoot suckers. Every person knows that suckers run up the creeks. Here is a complaint laid by Mr. Sheldon Bullis, charging that William Mackay "did unlawfully fish for, catch and kill fish by the use of firearms in the waters known as Foster's Creek"—a little stream that enters Charleston Lake, over which he had jurisdiction. This man was brought before Mr. Loverin, a Grit J.P. of Athens, and he fined Mr. Mackay $5, together with $1 for hearing and summons, $2.23 for constable's fees, 50 cents for witness and mileage, and another 50 cents for the use of the court room, making $9.23 fine for shooting one sucker. Mr. Herbert Hull, for the same offence, had to pay $7.95. Mr. Charles Hull $9.98, and Mr. Edward Tanner $2.25. In each case the fine had to be paid within ten days, or else the accused had to go to jail for thirty days. And the magistrate charges 50 cents for the use of the room to try the case in. It is the first time I ever knew a magistrate to make such a charge. This is the conduct of the fishery overseer my hon. friend appointed to succeed the old and faithful servant, Mr. William Hicks; he has brought up some respectable farmers on a charge of having gone out to shoot suckers. Another question I submitted with regard to the dismissal of Mr. Hicks was:

Did the Minister of Marine and Fisheries promise this House that no officer in his department would be dismissed without an investigation?

To that question the Minister answered no; but I am satisfied that it is known to every member of this House, and it will be found in "Hansard" that the hon. gentleman, standing in the place he occupies at present, made the pledge that no officer of his would be dismissed without investigation.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No, no.

Mr. TAYLOR. Now he says he did not make that promise at all; but there are hon. members here who heard him make it. I want to know now from the Minister what salary he is paying to Mr. Bullis, and what he pays to Mr. Flood?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I think I shall hardly be called upon to discuss the two cases which are sub judice; we had better leave the courts to deal with them. The hon. gentleman has undertaken to defend the parties supposed to be guilty of poaching.

Mr. TAYLOR. They are not.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. They have been fined by the magistrate and they have appealed. If it turns out on appeal that they have been improperly fined, well and good; but I am not here to censure the officer for having discharged his duty by prosecuting them. The men who have been appointed do not receive any greater salary than those whose places they took. They are appointed under the same salary.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I want to ask the hon. Minister of Marine what condition the fish hatchery of Sydney is in at present and who is in charge of it.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am sorry I cannot answer that question, but will be very happy to give the hon. gentleman the information at the very earliest moment.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I took the proper course in the earlier part of the session to get at this information, and the hon. Minister refused to give it to me. I put a question first on the Order Paper as to what parties were dismissed from positions in the fishery service.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. And I asked the hon. gentleman to move for the papers.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I acted on his advice. He said that the lists of dismissals would be too long and would entail too much work to be brought down in a short time and asked me to move for a return. I put a notice on the paper, but every time the notice came up, hon. gentlemen opposite called out "stand."

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Does the hon. gentleman say that there was a dismissal there?

Mr. McDOUGALL. Yes. I was prevented from either putting my question or my motion, and now the hon. gentleman is in his place and refuses the information.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not refuse the information. The hon. gentleman is entitled to it and will eventually get it. He will understand that while very desirous to give him every possible information, I cannot carry in my head the names of all these men. I have looked over the list most carefully of changes made, and I cannot see that there was any made in this case.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I think I am correct in stating that he dismissed every official in my county but one.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Give me the name of this one.

Mr. McDOUGALL. The man's name was William James Dunlop. He was in charge of the fish hatchery. I may remind the hon. gentleman that the fish hatchery is not doing the work it usually did a year or two before that.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not think it was running at all and that is what bothers me.

Mr. McDOUGALL. This man was in charge of the fish hatchery.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There was a man there paid for looking after a hatchery that was shut up and no longer in existence.

Mr. McDOUGALL. It was not shut up, and if I am correctly informed, there was a man appointed in his place.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No.

Mr. McDOUGALL. That is my information. The hon. Minister does not seem to be posted with regard to that case.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I was posted, but for the moment the hon. gentleman rather misled me I have a list here of every change and I see no such name.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Can the hon. gentleman give me any information about the dismissal of Burke and Hickey, McDonald and Quinan, fishery overseers.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. They were guardians, not overseers.

Mr. McDOUGALL. No, they were overseers, paid $120 a year. I am not referring to the guardians, although they were also dismissed.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. They were merely employed temporarily.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I know that, but those were permanent officials of the department. Take, for instance, the case of Mr. McDonald. I think he filled the position of fishery overseer for something like twenty years and so did Mr. Quinan.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. What McDonald was that ?

Mr. McDOUGALL. Alexander McDonald. Mr. Hickey was appointed only some five or six years ago, and is a young, active man. Burke was appointed six or seven years ago, and is also a very active man. They were all efficient officers.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Burke was the keeper of a lighthouse, was he not ?

Mr. McDOUGALL. No, the hon. Minister dismissed the keeper of the lighthouse also. That was J. P. Burke. This one is William Burke. I would like him to give some reasons for those dismissals.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I shall have to give the reason in each particular case. I told the hon. gentleman that I would bring down the information in each particular case, and I will give it to him to-morrow if he likes.

Mr. WALLACE. Why was it not brought down before ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It was not moved for.

Mr. WALLACE. The motion was on the paper, but the hon. gentleman was asked several times to let it stand.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I moved for the return on several occasions and the hon. Minister himself was the very gentleman who asked me to let it stand.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. My hon. friend is wrong.

Mr. McDOUGALL. It was the hon. gentleman who got up, in the first instance, when I put the question, and said that the list was too long and would entail too much work or something of that kind. That was the excuse. He refused the information.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman is not going to be denied the informatin. I want to give him all the information I can, but I thought the better plan would be to give it in the form of a return. I do not think it advisable to lumber up "Hansard" with a large number of names. I shall give him the return, and he will not have to wait any time for it.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I wish to ask the hon. Minister also with regard to the visit of Premier Murray from Nova Scotia and the Hon. Mr. Ross, a few days ago, to this city. I see by the papers that they were here on a delegation asking for an extension of the lobster fishing season for the Island of Cape Breton. Is that a fact ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes. They and a number of other gentlemen waited on me to ask for an extension of the lobster season, and I, as in duty bound, listened courteously to their representations and took a note of them. I called in my commissioner also to listen to them. We argued out the question, and I tried to show how utterly impossible it was to make a local extension without making it general. We thoroughly discussed the question, and I got a lot of information from them and from other sources. I have furnished the material part of that information to the inspector, and asked him to make a report. I expect shortly to have a report from Inspector Bertram, of Cape Breton, and from the other inspectors, and will not come to any decision until I get their report.

Mr. McDOUGALL. The hon. gentleman is not then in a position to say what he proposes to do.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I have not yet finally decided. I am bound to receive statements coming from influential public men, such as the Premier of Nova Scotia and Mr. Ross, and any person engaged in the lobster fishing industry, and shall give full weight to their statements in coming to a conclusion. There are strong reasons why, in a particular locality along Cape Breton, the time should be somewhat extended, but the difficulty is if you extend in one locality, you have to extend it in others. It is not a question that can be solved in half an hour, but is one that has worried me more than any other question that has come under my consideration.

Mr. McINERNEY. What reason did they give for the extension ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That the fishing does not begin as early there as in other places, and that the fish that come in there do not go to other places and that there is no dimunition in the catch along that coast. The ice coming down the coast keeps them from fishing in the earlier part of the season, and therefore makes the season a very short one; and unless some small extension be granted, they say it will be impossible for them to carry on the industry. They urge that we can grant the extension there without granting it generally. I have referred the facts to my officers.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I am strongly in favour of extending the season to the people of Cape Breton, in view of the position they occupy as compared with other lobster fisher-

men on the southern coast. We have ice up to the present, although this has been a fairly open season, and it is impossible for our fishermen to begin fishing.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Has there been any diminution in the size of the fish ?

Mr. McDOUGALL. None has come to my notice, and I have not heard anybody complain of anything of that kind. The hon. gentleman admits that the Premier of Nova Scotia and other gentlemen headed the delegation here in respect to this question. Did not the necessity for the influence of these people in respect to the extension of that season arise from the fact that he himself, when he occupied a seat on this side of the House found fault with the Administration then in power when they came before the House and made a proposition for the extension, on the ground on which it is now applied for ? If the hon. gentleman will look at his remarks in "Hansard," he will see that it was because of the position that he himself then took that it was deemed necessary to send this influential deputation. I suppose the hon. gentleman thought it of some political advantage to the Prime Minister of Nova Scotia, and when the change was decided on, that hon. gentleman was invited to come up here and ask for it.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I rather gather from my hon. friend's remarks that he supports the Premier of Nova Scotia.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I do. I believe that the lobster season should be extended in Cape Breton because the fishermen there are unable to begin their fishing as early as do those on the southern coast of Nova Scotia, and because the size of the lobsters has not been reduced by over-fishing or anything of that kind.

Now, I see it reported in the papers a few days ago that the local member for Cape Breton, after being up here and discussing this question with the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, went across to England to make some arrangement with regard to cold storage with a view to getting the assistance of the Government for pushing some scheme into operation for the shipment of lobsters in cold storage to Great Britain. I would like to ask the hon. Minister if that proposition was made by Dr. Kendall, the local member ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes, Dr. Kendall made the proposition to me and asked if I would submit to my colleagues the propriety of giving a small grant in support of a scheme to ship lobsters to England, in cold storage, pointing out that if this trade could be established it would be a great boon for the lobster catchers along the coast. I conceded that it would be a great boon if satisfactorily solved ; so great that it will hardly be measured in dollars and cents. He promised to obtain data showing how the scheme could be carried out. He thought that a few hundred dollars would be sufficient to make the experiment, and I promised that I would submit the matter for the consideration of my colleagues, and said I hoped to be successful in inducing them to agree to the appropriation of a small sum, $300 or $600, for this purpose.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I am glad the hon. Minister looks forward to helping this industry in that way. Would he tell me if there is, in connection with this proposition, any proposition as to how these lobsters would be shipped from Cape Breton ? There is no direct communication between Cape Breton and Great Britain, and I suppose the lobsters would have to be shipped to some shipping port such as Halifax.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I understand so.

Mr. McINERNEY. Why not Charlottetown.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There is no reason why not Charlottetown. But the suggestion came from a Cape Breton gentleman who had taken a good deal of pains to work out the details. I told him that it was impossible for the Government to take charge of such a scheme, but that I would submit to my colleagues the proposal to make a small grant in order to carry out some investigation and experiment, and I felt reasonably sure that it could be done. I shall be very well satisfied if it can be done from Charlottetown.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I cannot understand how the Government can expect, by any such grant as that, to cover the cost of collecting lobsters along 150 or 200 miles of coast of Cape Breton where the lobster fishery is carried on. I take it that it is in the gathering up of the lobsters and bringing them to a central point that the expense will be formed.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. But the experiment must be made on a reasonable scale. We are not going to collect and ship lobsters to Great Britain without first trying to find out whether it can be successfully done. A few crates can be collected and shipped in the first place.

Mr. McINERNEY. That is why I suggested Charlottetown. That city is the centre of a larger area in which the lobster fishery is carried on than any other place. Boats properly rigged could take lobsters out to the cold storage steamers. I would like to know whether the hon. gentleman intends to grant the pound-net licenses to Mr. Logie in the northern part of my county.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am afraid not.

Mr. McINERNEY. Has the hon. gentleman considered the inequality that exists in the payments to the guardians in the Miramichi River in the county of Northumberland and the guardians in the county of Kent? It seems to me that for a long time there has existed a decided inequality.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Is the hon. gentleman speaking of guardians or overseers?

Mr. McINERNEY. I think it affects the guardians more than the overseers. Can the hon. gentleman tell me what he pays guardians per day in the county of Kent?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There is a small sum fixed, $40 or $50 per year, depending on the district the guardian has to watch and the time he is engaged. That is generally settled by Mr. Prince. I have interfered to the very slightest extent with the salaries of the officers, except in discharging a number of them that were reported to me as unnecessary, and in cutting down a few of those that were, relatively to the others, over-paid. But so far as I know, there is no marked discrepancy between the payment made to the guardians in the hon. gentleman's county and those in the adjoining county of Northumberland.

Mr. McINERNEY. I think there is a great discrepancy between the payments made to the different officers.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. If the hon. gentleman will give me the names, I will examine closely into that. I think he is wrong, for I went over the names of every one with Mr. Prince.

Mr. McINERNEY. Take the case of Mr. Robinson, for instance, Mr. Abbott and Mr. Fraser.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Mr. Abbott is an overseer, and a very excellent officer.

Mr. McINERNEY. There is no better officer than Mr. Hanna.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. His salary was increased since I came in.

Mr. McINERNEY. I understand the guardians are now paid at the rate of $1.20 a day. In the county of Kent, when they only do a part of a day's work in one day and a part the next day, the two parts are put together and made one day, for which they are paid only $1.25.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman does not complain that I am paying them too much.

Mr. McINERNEY. No, I do not. But I claim, and I urged it on the previous Government, that these officers ought to be paid more in the county of Kent, because they do the same work as the men in the county of Northumberland who are paid three or four times as much.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman will hardly contend that the inland fisheries in his county compare with the fisheries in the county of Northumberland.

Mr. McINERNEY. No; I contend that the shore fisheries surpass them.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The same inspection is not required for the shore fisheries.

Mr. McINERNEY. I think it is, excepting salmon fisheries.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The salmon fishery is the great fishery.

Mr. McINERNEY. How does it compare with the lobster fishery, or the smelt fishery, or the mackerel fishery, or the cod fishery in the amount of revenue that is brought into the Government in the way of licenses? It does not compare at all. It is a nice fishery for men who go angling; but as a matter of commerce and revenue to the Government, it does not compare with the fisheries that I have mentioned.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I shall be glad to talk over with the hon. gentleman the relative payments made to these overseers.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I had not quite finished my questions with respect to the mission of Dr. Kendall to England. I would ask the Minister if the aid which he promised to this scheme of Dr. Kendall, is not given for the purpose of assisting that gentleman to take a trip to England?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No; I did not know he had gone to England at all.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I am quite certain that not a cent of any aid that the Minister will give in this way, if he only gives $500, will ever reach a fisherman on the island of Cape Breton. I feel positive of that.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I think I did not make myself understood by the hon. gentleman. I said an experiment was about to be tried as to whether lobsters can be sent home in cold storage to England. That experiment must be on a limited scale. I told the gentleman who came to me, that the department would not undertake that experiment and carry it out in detail, nor take the responsibility of its failure; but that if I had the assurance of men who would carry it out, and if the details were submitted to me and I approved of the scheme, I would re-

commend a sum of $500 or $600 towards the expense, to insure them against loss.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. A scheme in which private capital is invested ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes. I did not go any further than that. I have not yet submitted the matter to my colleagues. But if the hon. gentleman is opposed to this, I would be glad to hear his arguments against it.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I am not opposed to it, if the Minister can make it successful. But it seems to me an absurd thing to grant merely $500 or $600 towards the enterprise of these men, and that they must begin by sending a man over to England to ascertain whether cold storage for lobsters is possible between Nova Scotia and England.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I would like the hon. gentleman to understand that I told the gentleman who came to me that I could not give any aid, either to him or to any one else, who did not understand the business. But I told him that if an experienced lobster packer engaged in the enterprise, and I was assured that the scheme was bona fide, I would recommend a small sum to test the experiment in the first instance. That experiment cannot succeed unless the packer who undertakes it, sends somebody to England, not only to open up the market, but to see if these fish can be put upon the market in proper time. You cannot start a new industry in England without sending somebody there to look after it. I cannot understand the hon. gentleman. Is he opposed to the Government giving a small sum in aid of the experiment ?

Mr. McDOUGALL. I am not opposed to it at all. What I am opposed to is the way it is being done. Why not send a fisherman or competent man who is capable of going to the English market and talking about lobsters, instead of sending a medical doctor in order to reward him for the part he took as a candidate in the election against myself and my colleagues.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Oh, is that the objection ?

Mr. McDOUGALL. It is because of their admiration for this gentleman that they are aiding him to go to England with this scheme. Any man who knows anything about this fishery business knows that it is not necessary to go to England to ascertain whether lobsters can be successfully sent there in cold storage. It is absurd to make such a proposition. On the other hand, it would be equally absurd to say that there is no market in England for lobsters, and that a man has to go there personally to open up a market. In this way we are providing a trip for a man to England, and giving $500 or $600 towards his expenses. After he comes back he knows no more about it than he ought to have known before he went. Our poor fishermen will not get the benefit of one single cent. I would suggest to the Minister to assist this scheme in such a way as to help the fishermen in bringing their lobsters to a terminal point for shipment in cold storage to market.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Tell me how, in what way, except by opening up a market and finding proper connections at home.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Cold storage is already provided for, so far as the steamers are concerned, and all the Minister requires to do is to see about getting the lobsters from the fishermen to the point where shipment is made in cold storage. What I object to is that this thing is done under pretense of being an assistance to the fishermen.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. If the Government undertakes this, I suppose there will be another vote ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I said I had not submitted it yet to my colleagues.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I would call the hon. gentleman's attention to some valuable information that is in his department. Some years ago an experiment was made, sufficient to demonstrate the feasibility of such a scheme. If you can get the lobsters to the London market, there is no trouble at all in selling them, the difficulty is to get them across alive. In this experiment that has already been made and reported upon, while it was not a success, on account of the large loss of lobsters on the voyage, the remnant that were landed alive were so valuable on the market that they actually paid the expense. Of course there being no profit, the business was not followed up. The difficulty experienced was to keep the water at the temperature which the lobsters required. The point established was that the market for lobsters in England is the very best, and although very few reached the market alive, the sale of those few paid on that occasion the cost of the whole shipment.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I believe there are great possibilities in the enterprise.

Mr. GILLIES. I am ready to commend the hon. Minister for any effort put forward in making the shipment of live lobsters to England a success. It is a business capable of great expansion, and no doubt can be made successful if conducted on business principles. The proposed vote of $500 or $600 is, however, entirely out of proportion to the effort that must be put forward in that direction, and I am ready to support any reasonable sum which the Minister may think necessary to ask in order to carry

out any well digested scheme. It is certainly a subject that is well worth looking into, because if we compare the lobster business now with what it was a few years ago we will at once see to what proportions it has developed, and judging by the past, we can readily see to what proportions it may increase in the future. I therefore commend the hon. Minister for the step taken in this direction. As regards the party in charge, I doubt whether he is the proper one.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I have not put anybody in charge of it.

Mr. GILLIES. I am not going to say a word more on that point. I desire, however, to impress on the Minister the real necessity, and I have taken the opinion of experts upon this point, of extending the fishing season on the Cape Breton coast. Since I have been in Parliament, eight years, year after year it has been pressed on my attention, and I urged it on the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) when he was head of the department. I had great difficulty in pressing on that hon. gentleman the wisdom of extending the season, he contending, supported by his officers, whose actions I thought he was always too ready to defend, that it was not in the interest of the industry itself that the season should be extended. I pressed upon him the fact that the coast was subject to storms, that even after May a storm might come along and sweep away the traps and deprive the lobster fishermen of their season's work. I repeat that I always had great difficulty in impressing on the late Minister of Marine and Fisheries the wisdom and necessity of extending the fishing season; but the strongest opposition came from the present Minister himself, when sitting on the Opposition side of the House, and the strongest arguments that will confront him when endeavouring to make an extension were the arguments he used himself when in Opposition. However, I hope he will be able to knock over the arguments he then put forward. I must tell the hon. gentleman that I was considerably surprised to ascertain that he had been waited on by a delegation from our part of the province to advocate the very matter I am now seeking to impress on the hon. gentleman. I think he will find sufficient intelligence among the five members from the island of Cape Breton to show him in its full entirety the necessity for this extension, and it is entirely unnecessary for the hon. gentleman to call in any outside assistance from Premier Murray or William Ross or anybody else. The members from Cape Breton are quite competent and are ever willing to communicate to the Minister any grounds that can possibly be advanced for this extension, and in the future it will be entirely unnecessary for the hon. gentleman to call in any such assistance. If any such assistance should be volunteered the hon. Minister he can quietly tell the parties that the island members are ready and willing and able to put forward every argument that can be advanced in favour of the extension. I again ask the hon. Minister, in the interest of a class of people who deserve every care, that he will, if possible, give the extension now asked. The coast is a wild one, the calling is a precarious one, and the industry is one that should enlist the sympathy of the hon. Minister, as I am sure it will do, and if he grants the extension asked he will confer a great benefit on these fishermen, who should be the care of all enlightened governments.

Mr. MARTIN. I wish to say that any efforts made in regard to shipping fish in cold storage will have my support. The item is not now before the committee, but I hope the Minister will take up this question and introduce a scheme that will be beneficial. When the item comes up in the Supplementary Estimates, I trust the scheme will be a feasible one and it will be then discussed. What I desire especially at this moment to call attention to is the fish-breeding establishment in Prince Edward Island and the lobster hatchery. I wish to ask two questions, and to call the hon. Minister's attention to the hatchery at Duck River.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It was burnt down years ago.

Mr. MARTIN. I want to know if the Minister proposes to do anything towards rebuilding that hatchery. Also, I should like to know whether the Minister intends to do anything in regard to distributing fish fry in Prince Edward Island.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am sorry to say that I am not in a position to ask Parliament for money to rebuild the fish hatchery. It was built there many years ago, and burned down many years ago, and I do not think the necessity for it is such as would justify me in asking for the money necessary. As to the distribution of fish fry in Prince Edward Island, the rivers are sufficiently stocked naturally by the fish going up them, and if you can only prevent poaching the distribution of fry would not be necessary. There are some good trout rivers on the island, and if we can only protect them reasonably well there will be some good fishing. Last year in the main river, the Morell, we kept a patrol boat for four or five weeks at the mouth of the river with two armed men, and we succeeded in protecting that river, with the result that there was magnificent fishing during the season up the river. There is no necessity, in my opinion, nor in the opinion of the officers of the department for distributing fry there.

Mr. MARTIN. There is no doubt that poaching exists to some extent, and even fishing in the legal season has depleted the waters around Prince Edward Island. I question very much whether the opinion of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries that there is no necessity for the distribution of fry in Prince Edward Island is a sound one. Some years ago there was a distribution of fry and there was excellent fishing years afterwards. I would like that in this distribution of fry the province of Prince Edward Island should not be overlooked.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Is it the intention of the Minister to reopen the hatchery at Sydney?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No.

Mr. McDOUGALL. This hatchery has done a great deal of good and I cannot see why the Minister insists on closing it.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not insist on closing it. It was closed when I came into the department.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Yes, it was closed through an accident; but this hatchery was built at some expense to the country and it has done a great deal of good and should be reopened.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I will be very glad to talk the matter over with Mr. Prince.

Mr. INGRAM. Does the Minister exclude the press from investigations into charges against officers in his department?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. As a rule I do. I see no necessity for the press being present at departmental investigations. The officer incriminated is always present and represented, and I see no necessity for the press reporting the proceedings.

Mr. INGRAM. I understand the Minister to say that the officer charged is there himself?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes, always.

Mr. INGRAM. Then the Minister is not aware of all that is transpiring in his department, or that is done by the officers of his department.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Does the hon. gentleman tell me that any officer charged in my department was not allowed to be present at the investigation. I have read every investigation that has taken place and I do not think that occurred.

Mr. INGRAM. What I say is that when your local officer was charged, he was not in attendance at the investigation which took place, and which involved his position. Would the Minister consider it unfair that the investigation should take place if the officer charged was not present?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I would.

Mr. INGRAM. I have no desire to blame the hon. Minister for certain investigations which took place in my riding, but I wish to place on "Hansard" some of the facts with respect to the investigation in reference to the fishery overseer of the district of East and West Elgin, opposite Lake Erie. Mr. William Freeland is the fishery overseer there, and he was charged with allowing gill-nets to fish without paying a license, and without the sanction of the department. Mr. O. B. Shepherd, inspector of fisheries, Toronto, was instructed to investigate that charge in St. Thomas. Mr. Shepherd went there and Mr. Freeland was there, and the press wished to gain admittance but they were not allowed. Those who made the charge against the fishery overseer did not put in an appearance, and Mr. Shepherd discovered it was a trumped up charge for the purpose of annoying the fishery inspector, and I presume for the purpose of humbugging the hon. gentleman's department. Mr. Shepherd was so satisfied that the officer had done his duty that he paid no further attention, and I presume made a report to the department to that effect. Later on I find that certain charges were made which led the department to believe that an investigation was necessary in East and West Elgin with respect to fishery licenses in the district. The hon. gentleman wrote this letter to Mr. Shepherd on the 15th January, 1897:—

15th January, 1897.

My dear Sir.—A question has arisen with respect to the fishermen of Lake Erie opposite the counties of East and West Elgin, which requires investigation at your hands as soon as you can conveniently make it. I inclose you herewith a confidential memo. which I have received from Mr. George E. Casey, M.P., setting forth the grounds on which he urges that existing fishery licenses should be withdrawn from the parties now holding them. I would be inclined to act upon these grounds, but I want an investigation made by you so that the parties cannot allege that I acted ex parte or without giving them a hearing. You will, therefore, read the confidential memo., which, of course, you will keep for your private instruction, and return it to me with your report. You will communicate with Mr. Casey by telegram, and fix a date when it will be convenient for him to enter upon the investigation, and having made the arrangements you will proceed at once to St. Thomas and there place yourself in communication with Mr. Casey and Dr. Wilson.

I do not propose that this investigation should be a formal court, held with counsel on both sides, and all the paraphernalia and red tape of a court. The main feature is that the facts shall be obtained by you and the parties interested shall have full opportunity of putting their

case before you. I rely upon your tact, prudence and discretion in carrying this out, and hope to soon receive your report.

I will instruct the officers of my department to forward you the complete file of official papers relating to this matter, which you may produce or not as you deem desirable. Of course, you will allow Mr. Casey and Dr. Wilson access to this file when required. I do not want the matter to be mentioned to the press, nor do I want a newspaper controversy at all. I rely upon your tact in carrying this out without unnecessary publicity.

The part of Mr. Casey's memo. having reference to gill-nets will not require any comment from you.

I take this letter from a return brought down the other day and I find that a number of the documents in it are not signed by any person nor is this letter signed.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That is my letter.

Mr. INGRAM. Yes, I judge so. What I wish to bring to the attention of the Minister is this. I have no doubt the hon. Minister fully expected that the fishery overseer in that district would surely attend that investigation because in that district he had the carrying out of the instructions of the department. But instead of Mr. Freeland, the fishery overseer being present on that occasion, Mr. Casey, who represents West Elgin, was the chief pusher with respect to how the investigation should be conducted. Men who should have been present there, who had licenses in East and West Elgin, and who owned the nets, were not present at the investigation ; yet some of these same men were deprived of their licenses. Some of the documents which would have been important factors in the investigation, and which the overseer had full knowledge of were not there. I claim that had the fishery overseer been there, knowing all the facts in connection with the fishing licenses in East and West Elgin, he would have been able to show that Mr. O. B. Sheppard would not have been justified in making such a report to the department as he did make. At that investigation it was stated that certain parties were not the owners of their nets. I hold in my hand the bill of sale agreed to between Mrs. E. J. Treble and Mr. Hoover.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Who is Mrs. Treble—an American citizen ?

Mr. INGRAM. Yes.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. And it is alleged, I do not say with what truth, that these bills of sale were bogus—that the parties were really fishing for this American, though under their own names.

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. gentleman is quite mistaken about that.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Perhaps I am, but that is the allegation.

Mr. INGRAM. I know as a matter of fact that Mr. Hoover owned these nets, and I can prove by the documents and by a strong supporter of this Government, who formerly occupied a seat in this House, Mr. Coulter, that Mr. Hoover and his people are respectable people, owning a considerable quantity of land in the county of Haldimand, and well able to pay for the nets and the licenses. I say that if Mr. Freeland had been present on that occasion he would have shown Mr. O. B. Sheppard that the statements made by Mr. O'Brien and others should not have been taken with regard to some of the gentlemen who held licenses. I understand that some charges are made against the fishery overseer at Fort Burwell on Lake Erie. Mr. Sheppard, I understand, has been there and has investigated the charges made against him, and so far as I can learn, he has satisfied Mr. Sheppard and is still doing his duty. That being the case, it seems to me that the hon. gentleman should take some steps to prevent Mr. O. B. Sheppard from holding these investigations unless the officers engaged by the department are present to advise him in the interest of the department and in the interest of the fisheries which they are appointed to guard and control. I take this opportunity of expressing myself in this way, and during the next session of Parliament, as it is too late this session, I will take the opportunity of entertaining the hon. gentleman for an hour or two with respect to the contents of this return——

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I shall be very happy to discuss it with you.

Mr. INGRAM—to show, I was going to say, the rascality that has been practised. I want to tell the hon. Minister that some men hold licenses who have not a dollar to pay for them, who did not get them in the first instance for the purpose of fishing, but only for the purpose of trafficking and trading in them.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I want to say one word, otherwise the House might be under the impression that I had acted hastily and without proper evidence. Complaints were made to me some time ago that the fishery licenses in that localiay were monopolized by non-residents, men who had no business there, and who were only fishing for Americans under the guise of their own names. It was not a political matter at all. Hon. gentlemen on this side of the House pressed me to make changes, and others pressed me not to make changes. I did the best I could with the evidence before the department, and I came to the conclusion that an investigation by the local fishery officer would not

be sufficient—that he was too much mixed up with them. So I instructed the inspector for the province of Ontario, a gentleman not appointed by me, but who was in office when I came in, to proceed to this place and make a thorough investigation, and to keep himself unentangled as much as possible from local influences. He went there, made his investigation, and reported. The report is a very clear, business-like one. After receiving it, I received a deputation from Mr. Coulter, a former member of this House, on behalf of Mr. Hoover, who I must say appeared to be a very respectable gentleman. Mr. Hoover came down along with Mr. Coulter, and they pressed upon me that the report was unjust to him. I was also waited on by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), who also pressed upon me that the inspector's report was not quite fair to Mr. Hoover. I communicated again with the inspector, sent for him, went over all the papers with him; I spent more time over this case than any other case in the department, because I was waited upon by half a dozen deputations of Mr. Hoover and his friends; but I have not seen my way clear to alter the decision come to by the inspector of Ontario, who seemed to me, under all the circumstances of the case, to be very fair. I had a great deal of sympathy with Mr. Hoover, and if I could have seen my way clear to grant him a license under the circumstances, I would have done so; but a very strong argument on the part of the local residents is that the fishing belongs to their immediate locality and should not be licensed to people two or three hundred miles away—that they have the prior right. As my hon. friend says, the papers are very voluminous, and we shall have to take next session for the discussion of them, which will occupy a long time.

Mr. INGRAM. With regard to the fishermen engaged in fishing along the shores of Lake Erie, from Essex to Buffalo, these men, after supplying the local demand, had a surplus of fish, which they sent to Buffalo, where they were able to sell them at the highest price. Some of them traded necessarily with the fish dealers in Buffalo, who advanced them more than they were able to pay for with fish afterwards, and were compelled, in order to save their own, to take chattel mortgages on some of the nets and other paraphernalia used in fishing, with the hope that in the following season the fishermen would be able to pay their claims. It was by that means that two or three fishermen got involved with Mr. Treble. It is well known that Mr. Treble was a good friend of the fishermen along that coast. As a matter of fact, he came out thousands of dollars behind in his dealings with them. I say, therefore, it is hardly fair to abuse Mr. Treble, though he is an American, for having become involved in trying to help these fishermen along.

Mr. KAULBACH. I take this opportunity of bringing to the attention of the hon. Minister the dismissals of two fishery overseers in my county—two men of sterling worth, who thoroughly understood their business, and whose intelligence and knowledge with regard to the habits and locations of the fish could not be surpassed. I can not say too much in praise of their character, for it is far beyond that of the ordinary class of overseers. Mr. David Evans is a man of very great experience, who had been overseer for 12 or 15 years, in the eastern part of my county; the other is Mr. W. H. Solomon, a man of very great intelligence and knowledge as respects the habits and condition of fish and the fisheries, who made that subject almost entirely his study. He was a sort of theorist on fish and fish culture, and I consider it a crying shame to dismiss those men from office without any cause whatever. Before the election took place, I called upon them and said: You received your appointment through me, and I do not feel satisfied that men holding office should feel themselves entirely free from active strife, and I want you to do what you can for me. They both positively refused, and to my knowledge never used any influence whatever in my behalf, at all events in any public manner. They attended no public meeting that I am aware of. I never met them at any meeting, and I attended a great number, nor did I even find them outside at any meeting. At all events, investigations, I believe, were held, and nothing was elicited to show that they were, in the slightest degree, guilty of partisanship of any kind or description or any infraction of the laws or regulations of the Fishery Department. I feel that their dismissal is a severe blow to the interests of the fishing industry, and I am satisfied that it is exceedingly unfair for the department to have allowed itself to be led by influence from outside—the influence of office seekers—to deprive those parties of office. The salaries paid them were very small, and they both have told me that they are just as well without the position; but at the same time, I do not believe that it is right, in the interests of the public, to allow this sort of thing to be carride on. Who are the parties who received the offices rendered vacant by the dismissal of these men? They were the warmest and most earnest and most offensive partisans and the earnest workers of hon. gentlemen opposite at the time of the election. It seems to me that if one man is dismissed on a charge of partisanship it is certainly very wrong to replace him by another, who is a most earnest, active and unscrupulous partisan, as were the two men who were put in the places of those I have mentioned. I felt in duty bound to bring this matter to the attention of the hon. Minister. I am sure that if he knew the character of those two men, removed from office, or decapitated, if he

knew their integrity and sterling worth, and their fitness for the position of fishery overseers, he never would have thought of dismissing them at all. He must have been induced to act as he did by misrepresentation.

Reference was made with regard to aid to be given for the transportation of lobsters along the coast to marketable centres, by means of subsidies to steamers or in some other way, for the benefit of fishermen along the Cape Breton shore. I do not know how the hon. Minister would be able to draw the line of demarcation. I contend that if a favour of that kind is granted the fishermen on the shores of Cape Breton, that favour should be extended to the fishermen from Cape North to Cape Sable, and I therefore ask the hon. Minister not to overlook the county of Lunenburg, although its representative is not a supporter of the Government.

With reference to the extension of the lobster fishing season, I think that is a dangerous subject to handle. There are numbers of persons in my county asking for an extension, and there are also numbers who do not want the season interfered with. The lobsters are small now, and if you extend that season, we will have them exterminated altogether, or they will become so small that they will not be worth catching. It is a matter that should be gravely considered before anything is done.

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). The impression might be created, from the observations made this evening, that hon. gentlemen on this side took very little interest in the question of the importance of extending the season for lobster fishing in Cape Breton and Prince Edward Island. I think the hon. Minister will bear me out when I declare that gentlemen representing constituencies in eastern Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island, and myself in the Island of Cape Breton, constituted themselves into a delegation to wait upon the Minister and press upon him the necessity of this extension. While this was the case, and while the hon. Minister gave us every attention and promised to consider the matter, I submit that there was nothing derogatory to our position as members of Parliament that the same Minister should listen to a delegation from these localities, which delegation may be supposed to add to the information already given him by members of Parliament. It must be conceded that members of Parliament are not expected to know everything concerning what constitutes a successful prosecution of the fishing or any other industry, and, therefore, I do not consider that it is at all derogatory to our position that the hon. Minister should give respectful attention to a delegation coming from any part of the Dominion to urge upon him the necessity of pursuing this, that or the other course with regard to a certain industry. Since I have had the honour of a seat in this House, I have observed delegations from all parts of Canada with respect to the various industries, and I am sure that the representatives of the various constituencies from which these gentlemen came never raised any objection to any Minister giving a respectful hearing to these appeals. I therefore cannot see why hon. gentlemen here should object to a delegation coming from their part of the country with respect to so important an industry as the lobster fishing industry. For my part I can assure you, Mr. Chairman, and the House that I would be glad to see as many more delegations come from these localities in order to strengthen my hands and impress upon the Minister the importance of extending the lobster fishing season in the island of Cape Breton and in some parts of Prince Edward Island as well. I may say, with regard to the mission of Dr. Kendall to England, I had quite a long conversation with him before he started, and I find that he has very thoroughly studied the different processes of preserving fish.

And although he is a medical doctor, there is nothing in his profession to prevent him having a good knowledge of what is necessary in the preparation of so valuable a food as the lobster. But the difference between the proposition of Dr. Kendall and that of the hon. member for Pictou is that whereas the latter proposed that the lobsters should be shipped alive and boiled in England—for it is well known that lobsters for food must be boiled while alive—Dr. Kendall proposed that the lobsters should be boiled in this country and then chilled to such a degree as to preserve them until they arrive on the English market. Notwithstanding previous experiments, there is so much that is new in this that it was considered best, and I think wisely, to send Dr. Kendall on this mission.

Mr. MOORE. The discussion is getting somewhat monotonous and perhaps uninteresting; at the same time it may be both necessary and useful. I do not rise to criticise the Minister of Marine and Fisheries for the appointment of the late member for the county of Stanstead as the overseer on Lake Memphramagog, but what I wish to call his attention to is, that in the past the appropriations have not been sufficient to enable the department to give sufficient protection to the salmon trout in that lake. The poachers on either side combine and make it impossible for the men employed there to protect the fish. As this vote has been increased, and as a further appropriation may appear in the Supplementary Estimates, I hope the hon. Minister will be able to place in the hands of the overseer a sufficient sum to enable him to employ competent men, and that the protection will be better than it has been in the past. Under Mr. Mackenzie's Government a different course was adopted

from that which is now followed. The Government did not employ the men living near the lake. The men who are most useful in that business are the men who are accustomed to boating, and these are usually the poachers. And so the Government have been compelled to hire men who have been accused of poaching to guard the fish, and this has not given the moral support to the law that is necessary. Under Mr. Mackenzie's Government water policemen were sent out from Quebec. These men gave much more efficient protection than had been given previous to that time, or, as I think, than has been given since. But if the protection is to be at all efficient, a larger number of men must be engaged. Either the Government should give adequate protection to the fish and prevent poachers from taking them, or they should withdraw the form of protection, repeal the law and let the law-abiding people have their chance at the fish as well as the poachers.

Mr. CLANCY. I would like to ask the hon. Minister whether it is the inflexible rule to exclude the press and to prevent counsel from appearing in the investigations of charges against officers. I can understand that there are some cases that involve so little that one side must be prevented from hiring counsel, otherwise it would mean the hiring of counsel on both sides even where the questions involved are not worth it. But I am unable to see why the press should ever be excluded. I can understand why the hon. gentleman might well say to those who are asking questions on these matters that it is better to have the facts come down by way of return, because those whose heads have fallen into the basket have become so numerous that to spread the cases on "Hansard" would be a serious matter of printing. Though the employment of counsel is forbidden, I am satisfied that manifest injustice has been done in some cases. I wish to call attention to one case which Mr. Sheppard investigated. I am not making a charge; I only ask that a man should be heard, whether he has a good case or a bad one. Mr. Sheppard undertook an investigation. The man whose conduct was to be investigated lived two or three miles from a post office, and by some means he did not get the notice until the day after the investigation. He asked to have a rehearing, but I believe Mr. Sheppard reported against the re-hearing.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. What is the name?

Mr. CLANCY. This is the case of Mr. Pelletier, of Dover township. If there has been a miscarriage of justice, it arises through the act of the officials themselves. A report in that case was given against a re-hearing. Mr. Sheppard heard only one side of the case. I do not reflect upon the men who gave evidence, but it is only fair to say that they were men imbued with party feeling and the case came up just after a contest in which there was a good deal of party bitterness, and it was particularly unfair, under the circumstances, to hear only one side. I am not making any charge, but I think that in fairness this man should be allowed a re-hearing.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am obliged to the hon. gentleman for calling the matter to my attention. I think the case was referred to Mr. Sheppard to ask if the case demanded a re-hearing or not. I believe that he reported against it. Now that attention has been called to some facts which are worthy of consideration, I will make a note of the matter. If the man did not get his notice it appears plain that the investigation should not have been gone on with in his absence. I hope hon. gentlemen are now in a position to allow this item to pass.

Mr. FOSTER. There is another matter to which I would like to call the attention of the Minister. I asked him a question the other day with reference to a fascine fishery in Charlevoix County.

Mr. FOSTER asked:

1. Was any objection made by D. and A. Gauthier, of St. Irénée, Charlevoix County, to the reissue of a license for erecting a fascine fishery in front of D. Gauthier's property by one Paulémon Gauthier?

2. If so, what was the objection, and to what extent did it prevail?

3. To whom was the license granted, and on what grounds?

4. What is the rule of the department in regard to the licensing of fascine fisheries in front of properties owned and occupied, when applications are made by owners and non-owners?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). The answers to the hon. gentleman's questions are: as follows:—1. Yes. 2. The ownership of the property in which the fishery was set; their claim to the fishery was not admitted. 3. Mr. Paulémon Gauthier, who had been an occupant of the fishery for twenty years. 4. Other things being equal, if a license were granted the owner would get the preference; although the department does not necessarily recognize riparian ownership as carrying with it the right of such license.

I find from the correspondence that matters had progressed a little differently from what my hon. friend was probably aware when he made the answer. I have a letter of the 25th of August, 1897, from Mr. Gourdeau, the Deputy at Ottawa, to Messrs. D. and A. Gauthier, in which he says:

Referring to your letter of the 14th ultimo, stating that Paulémon Gauthier has a brush fishery in front of your property in the parish of St. Irénée, I am to inform you that on inquiry,

the department finds the facts to be as stated, and as you object to the setting of the fishery in front of your land, Overseer Bhereur, to whom I am sending a copy of this letter for his information and guidance, will notify Mr. P. Gauthier that his license for that berth will not be renewed another season.

This was in 1897. The allusion was to the issue of a license for 1898. Now, on that, the deputy, after thoroughly looking into the question, had come to certain conclusions, which I suppose were the conclusions of the department, namely, that an objection by a gentleman owning a farm to another person having a license in front of his farm and erecting a brush fishery was a good objection. It was acceded to by the department, and he said :

As you object to the setting of the fishery in front of your land, Overseer Bhereur, to whom I am sending a copy of this letter, will notify Gauthier that his license for that berth will not be renewed another season.

The objection, then, seems to have held good, and that Mr. Gauthier, not being willing that another person should fish in front of his farm, should have the preference, even though Paulemon Gauthier had the license of the fishery before, and as it seems for years before. On the 10th of January, in acknowledgment of a letter from Mr. A. Gauthier, one of these two gentlemen, he is written to by Mr. Gourdeau that the application for fishery licenses has been received, and will receive due consideration. The matter was not settled, evidently, and Mr. Gourdeau was written to again on the 8th of March. He acknowledges receipt of a letter from Mr. Anicet Gourdeau, of the 25th of February, relative to the application for a fishery license, and says that the matter would receive consideration. On the 9th of April, 1898, Mr. Hardie writes to Mr. A. Gauthier :

Referring to your letter of the 3rd of January last, applying for a fascine fishery license in the St. Lawrence River, in front of Lot 100 in the parish of St. Irénée, in the county of Charlevoix, I am to inform you that your request cannot be granted.

On the 9th of April, the same date, the same answer is made by Mr. Hardie to D. Gauthier, to the same effect, that his request for a license in front of his own farm could not be granted. Since that the license has been granted to Mr. Paulemon Gauthier, the very man to whom Mr. Gourdeau said, in answer to the full exposition of the subject by D. and A. Gauthier, was notified that his license for that berth would not be renewed for another season. Now, unless there is some very good reason indeed, it would seem fair that a man owning a farm should have the preference of erecting a fishery in front of that farm for the purpose of fishing. It involves, I suppose, some use of the frontier and certainly entering upon the property to a certain extent. Any way, I do not see any reason in equity or in justice why the owner of the farm should not have the preference for fishery. The department saw that in the same way, and they notified Mr. Paulemon Gauthier that his license could not be renewed. But I believe that Mr. Paulemon Gautheir is a very good Liberal, and Messrs. D. and A. Gauthier happen to be very good Conservatives, and in the end I suppose the exigencies of the party prevailed, the alien got the fishery license, and is going on there in front of the farm of Messrs. D. and A. Gauthier with his work, whilst the owners of the property itself have to look on and see the fish being taken out without being able to participate in the profit which I think should belong to them.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Personally, I am not aware of the facts in the case. But I beg to assure the hon. gentleman that so far as I know, politics have not anything to do with it at all. The reason I know that is this : I have been subjected to more pressure to cancel licenses that have been in existence for 20, 30 or 40 years along the shores of the St. Lawrence down to Gaspé, than on any other subject whatever, and I have invariably refused. The fact of the matter is these people have had for 20, 30 or 40 years licenses there, and I have not been able to bring my mind to concede to the pressure brought that they should be cancelled and should be given to other people, even although they are opposite the farms owned by the other people. The riparian ownership, other things being equal, ought to give a man a prior right, but if a person has fished there for 20 years, good grounds must be given me to induce me to cancel it. He acquires a vested interest, very valuable, out of which perhaps he and his family have been living for a quarter of a century, and to take it suddenly at one swoop and give it to the owner of the land, would be very often doing an injustice. I fancy some difficulty may have arisen from the absence of Commander Wakeham, who is always consulted upon these matters, and generally the department acts upon his advice. In 1897 he was away on the Hudson Bay expedition, and it is possible that the department may not have had the benefit of his advice at the time, but they would have the benefit of it in April, 1898, when he was here.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like the Minister to make a note of this case, and give at a later date information as to why the department changed its mind. I can see the justice of being very conservative in taking away from a man a right which he has been exercising for three or four years, which has been his means of living, or a part of his occupation. On the other hand, my hon. friend will admit that the man who owns the property has some rights in the matter, too.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. With reference to the hon. gentleman's Estimates, I want to mention the case of the lighthouse keeper at Cape Despair. He has been dismissed without inquiry, concerning which I do not want to embarrass this proposition, for offensive partisanship. I desire to call attention to the fact that he is an old man, that he has been twenty-seven years in the service, without having been guilty of any offence, except, if it is an offence, that of being a Conservative.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. What is his name?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER John Beck. He paid in regularly to the superannuation fund. He is now absolutely dependent on his friends for his support, and he applied, after the verdict had gone against him on the charge of active partisanship, for superannuation. He was told that having been dismissed for cause, his petition could not be granted. The Minister may not be willing to reconsider the case, but under the Act of last session, the Minister may be able to make full restitution of the amount paid in by him to the superannuation fund, with interest.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There is no question as to that. He will receive the amount with interest. I will make inquiry into the case.

Mr. BERGERON. I observe by some papers which I have in my hands, that the Department of Public Works has transferred to the Department of Marine and Fisheries a wharf at St. Anicet on Lake St. Francis. Is it to be the policy of the Government that all wharfs built by the Department of Public Works are to be transferred to the Marine Department?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It is the law.

Mr. BERGERON. How many wharfs have been transfered? I know many that have not been transferred.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. If the hon. gentleman will give me the names of any that have not been transferred, I shall be obliged.

Mr. BERGERON. I know a number. There is the wharf at St. Timothy, at Coteau du Lac, at the Cedars, at Isle Perreault, and the wharfs at Beauharnois. I could name a great many more for the hon. gentleman's information. The first letter on the subject, I find, according to the return, is dated 25th August, 1896, and is from Mr. Gobeil, Deputy Minister, to E. F. E. Roy, secretary, Department of Public Works, as follows:—

Please write to the Department of Marine, transferring the wharf at Ste. Anicet for their management.

The next is dated 28th August, 1896, and is addressed by E. F. E. Roy, secretary, to F. Gourdeau, Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries, as follows:—

I am directed to transfer to the Department of Marine and Fisheries, in accordance with the provisions of the Act, 40 Vic., chap. 17, the wharf at Ste. Anicet, Quebec.

Then there is the receipt by the Department of Marine and Fisheries, conveyed in a letter from F. Gourdeau, Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries, to E. F. E. Roy, secretary, Department Public Works, as follows:—

I have to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 28th inst., transferring to this department the wharf at Ste. Anicet, and in reply I am to request that you will be good enough to favour me with a sketch of the wharf referred to.

There is an acknowledgment of the Department of Public Works, signed Louis Coste, chief engineer, addressed to E. F. E. Roy, secretary, Department of Public Works:

I have noted the wharf at Ste. Anicet has been transferred to the Department of Marine, and I now return file 173409.

I see by one of the letters that the transfer was made in accordance with 40 Victoria, which is many years ago. For sixteen or seventeen years nothing has been done. The reason this transfer was not made is very simple. These wharfs were built by the Department of Public Works, and they proved most useful to the public and served a very good purpose. They are small wharfs, and allow the farmers and people along the river to use boats for the transportation of their provisions, which is a great deal cheaper carriage than by cars. In the old times the Department of Public Works built these wharfs and transferred them to the parish or municipality for public use, the parish or municipality taking care of them. The plan worked very well. They were free wharfs, no dues were paid, and the accommodation was very much appreciated by the public. In consequence of this transfer, I understand from the correspondence certain dues are to be charged farmers for the use of the wharfs. They have not been accustomed to pay dues. I am informed by outside information that the steamboats have been called upon to pay dues. At Isle Perreault wharf there was some difficulty in regard to this matter, and people almost came to blows. A row occurred with the owners of the boats, and at last they said they would pay the wharfage dues, but they would charge them against the farmers. That created another row. Do the Government intend to pursue this practice with regard to all the wharfs built by the Department of Public Works in the past, and do they intend to charge dues?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. How much has been collected as dues from the wharf at St. Anicet? The transfer was made on 25th August, 1896?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Only twelve months had elapsed up to 1897.

Mr. BERGERON. If it is the law and the object in view is to collect dues from the farmers, I want to know whether one cent of the dues has gone into the public treasury, or whether the money has gone into the pockets of the man who has been appointed, a partisan of the present Administration. I have already made inquiries on two occasions in regard to this matter. The Minister in the first instance stated that he could not answer the question; and on the second occasion he said he would take a note of it and give me the information. I have not heard anything since. I am still under the impression that not one cent has gone into the department, although I am told that Mr. Dupuis has collected over $200, for which he has not accounted to the Department of Marine and Fisheries. This is looked upon as a very undue charge upon the farmers using those wharfs, especially when the Government does not get a cent in return. The men in charge collect the dues and put the amounts in their pockets as their own salaries. That is why I call the hon. Minister's attention to the matter once more, and if he does not furnish me with the information, I shall be obliged to again call attention to it, because it is unjust and my impression is that the Minister does not intend, if this charge is levied on the farmers, that these officials shall simply collect the money for their benefit.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am much obliged to the hon. gentleman for bringing it up. I could not tolerate that an official should receive money and pocket it himself. It is a very serious charge against the man, and I should be very sorry to imagine it could possibly be true without making inquiries. I shall take care that an inquiry is made the first thing in the morning and I shall try and let the hon. gentleman know.

Mr. McDOUGALL. What has the Minister accomplished with reference to oyster culture in the Bras d'Or Lakes?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Mr. Kemp is down there now.

Mr. McDOUGALL. There was a boat employed there last fall which was owned I understood, by a particular friend of the Minister from Prince Edward Island.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Who was that?

Mr. McDOUGALL. I cannot remember the name now, but I know that he called at my place quite frequently when he was employed there. This man frequently came into my place and talked a great deal about his relations with the Minister, and the reasons why he got employment for his boat and all of that. It was very amusing to us to hear of his relations with the Minister.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Who is he?

Mr. McDOUGALL. The Minister must know him; I cannot recall his name.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It may be Mr. Paul Paoli; he is a very decent man.

Mr. McDOUGALL. He spoke very highly about the good points in the character of the Minister of Marine and of the reasons why he got this appointment. Does the Minister intend to spend any more money on these oyster beds at Bras d'Or?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Mr. Paoli's boat is not being employed this year.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Is this work going to be continued?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It will depend on what report Mr. Kemp makes to me.

Mr. McALISTER. Before this item passes I wish to refer very briefly to the dismissal of J. Albert Verge, fishery overseer for the counties of Bonaventure and Restigouche.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It was discussed at great length last year.

Mr. McALISTER. No. I asked for the correspondence last session, but when it was brought down it was too late to refer to it. I find in the first place that the complaint was made by Mr. Fauvel, then member for Bonaventure, in the following letter, dated October 2nd, 1896:

House of Commons,

Ottawa, 2nd October, 1896.

Hon. L. H. Davies, Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

Sir,—I have the honour to lay before you a request for the dismissal of four fishery officers in my electoral division, and I beg to offer my reasons to make valid a most reasonable and justifiable request.

1st. I will deal with M. J. Albert Verge, fishery officer, partly in my county and extending into the neighbouring one of Restigouche. During the recent electoral contest, Mr. Verge made himself specially obnoxious by making a personal canvass amongst the smelt fishermen and acting in his capacity of fishery officer threatened the non-renewal of their licenses, should they support the Liberal candidate, a most dangerous and effective canvass, and worse than any mandement from the hierarchy—the result was a minority instead of a majority in that locality for me, and in his place I will recommend Mr.

Charles Brown, of Escuminac, who, I am confident, will prove a most effective officer.

I have the honour to be,
(Sgd.) W. L. B. FAUVEL.

Now, any person who knows Mr. Verge would know that he would not make himself offensive to any person, for he is one of the most gentlemanly men you could meet in any community. He lives in my county, and not on the Bonaventure side, There are more smelt fishermen in the county of Restigouche than in Bonaventure, and not one complaint was made against him in the county of Restigouche that he interfered with them in any way. However, if Mr. Verge did go over to the county of Bonaventure during the campaign it was for a very short time indeed, and I believe he was not there for one day altogether. I am not prepared to say that he was not in Bonaventure, the chances are he was. Mr. Verge is a gentleman who would make no threats against any person as to refusing the renewal of his license if that person voted against the Conservative candidate. Mr. Verge did not receive any notice of a charge being brought against him, but merely a notice of his dismissal, and I state here that it was harsh and unfair to treat him in that manner. I find several letters from Mr. Verge written to the department after his dismissal denying the charge and offering to prove his innocence if an investigation were granted, but to the last of these letters no reply whatever was given. The Deputy Minister replies to one merely acknowledging the receipt of the letter without making any comments. In the face of these facts, it is only fair to Mr. Verge that an investigation be granted, and if upon investigation the charge is proved, then I for one will say nothing in his behalf. But until the investigation is granted Mr. Verge, I maintain that he has been harshly and unjustly treated. Mr. Fauvel, in making the charge did not say that he had personal knowledge of the alleged offence. In fact, I know he had not. I know that Mr. Verge did not see Mr. Fauvel during the whole campaign. Mr. Fauvel made that charge upon the strength of a complaint that was made to him, and that complaint was made by Mr. Charles Brown, the very man who was appointed in place of Mr. Verge. Mr. Charles Brown is one of the most offensive and active partisans in the county of Bonaventure. He is a delegate to every political convention held in the county, and since he was appointed fishery overseer, he has still carried on his electioneering practices. During the last local election and during the by-election in the county of Bonaventure, Mr. Brown was one of the most active canvassers in the county, and charges were made against him that he threatened to cancel licenses or to refuse renewals in the event of the fishermen not supporting his candidate.

Mr. FOSTER. Was he an officer at that time ?

Mr. McALISTER. He was an officer at that time and for several months before.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No such charge was ever made to me in the department.

Mr. McALISTER. Charges were made by parties over their own signature in the press. I do not know that they came to the Minister's notice. I am sorry I have not got the papers with me, but an address was presented to the present representative of the county of Bonaventure (Mr. Guité) after his election, signed by a committee of three, of whom Mr. Brown was one, congratulating him upon his election, and speaking in complimentary terms of the Government and commending their policy. There is another complaint which came to my knowledge. The present fishery officer in the district of Bonaventure, Mr. Forest, I think, when the by-election in that county was in progress in the winter of 1897, sent a notice to two or three fishermen, one of which I have seen, informing them that their licenses would not be granted for the next year. When I saw that notice last winter, I put a question on the Order paper asking the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if any authority had been given to this man to refuse licenses to these parties, naming them. The Minister answered that no authority, so far as he knew, had been sent, and that he had inquired of the officials in his department, and not one of them knew that any such authority had been sent. A short time after that the licenses were issued, the officer ascertaining that the matter had been brought up in Parliament. I think that such partisan officers as these are dangerous in a community ; they are injurious to the public interest, and I think an investigation should be held into their conduct. So far as Mr. Forest is concerned, I have no right to ask for an investigation, because he is not in my district ; but the jurisdiction of Mr. Verge extended over the county I represent, and I have a right to ask for an investigation in his case, which the Minister in all fairness should grant. If it is found that he took an active part in the election of 1896, and made threats against the parties who supported the Liberal candidate in the county of Bonaventure, that their licenses would be refused. I have nothing to say.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I feel a little awkward in speaking of this matter because of the fact that I acted on the personal and written representations made to me by Mr. Fauvel.

Mr. McALISTER. He had no personal knowledge.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. He not only said that he had personal knowledge—and it was a long time

before I yielded—but he told me that he was prepared to stand up in the House and prove his charges if they were challenged ; but he said he did not think any man would have the hardihood to challenge them. He wrote that letter stating that this man's conduct had been outrageously offensive. I understood that he spoke in the body of the letter from personal knowledge. However, he gave me assurances that he acted from personal knowledge. One reason why I yielded was that the cost of holding of investigations in that part of the country is something dreadful. Investigations which in the maritime provinces would cost $30 would involve a cost of $300 in the hon. gentleman's district.

Mr. McALISTER. I can inform the hon. gentleman that Mr. Verge is not a partisan in any respect, and I am satisfied that if the Minister knew him as I do, he would not have dismissed him without an investigation. As I have said, if an investigation is granted, and it proved that he acted offensively, then he has nothing to complain of ; but I am satisfied he did not.

Mr. GILLIES. I want to bring a matter before the Minister of Marine and Fisheries which I shall have no opportunity to bring on any other occasion. I wish to bring to his notice two dismissals among many which took place in my county, which I think he will find it very difficult to justify. From considerations within my own knowledge and from evidence which has been communicated to me and upon which I can rely, I think the hon. Minister should not have made these dismissals without further inquiry. I refer to the dismissal of two fishery inspectors in my county—Mr. Lenoir, of Isle Madame, and Mr. Duncan Cameron, of the St. Peter's district.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman is perhaps not aware that the papers in regard to these dismissals were brought down in a return to the Senate at the instance of Senator Miller. If the hon. gentleman wishes to discuss them, I would prefer that he would read the return, because I think he will find some evidence there, particularly in regard to Cameron's case, which will make him wish not to discuss it publicly. It was not politics that Cameron was dismissed for.

Mr. GILLIES. Was it politics in the case of Lenoir ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It was not politics in his case either.

Mr. GILLIES. Then it could not be on grounds of inefficiency in the case of Cameron.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No, but it was grounds of inefficiency in the case of Lenoir. It was for carrying on the sale of liquor without license under the Scott Act that Cameron was dismissed ; and if a man is breaking the law by selling liquor without license, it is perfectly absurd to keep him in a position where he is expected to maintain the law.

Mr. GILLIES. The hon. gentleman is not speaking with a knowledge of the facts, because the Scott Act was never in force in the county of Richmond. How, then, could he be selling liquor in contravention of that Act ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISERIES. Then he was selling in contravention of the license law.

Mr. GILLIES. Has the hon. gentleman made inquiry as to that ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I know that he was fined and paid the fine. I do not want any more evidence than that.

Mr. GILLIES. My hon. friend will not set that up as a justification for the dismissal of a competent fishery officer.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes, I will.

Mr. GILLIES. I am going to make this statement. Mr. Cameron was, for a long time before I ever came to this House, fishery inspector for the county of Richmond ; and when the present re-arrangement was made by the hon. member for Pictou, though Mr. Cameron did not support me at my first election, so good was his record as fishery overseer that I recommended him as such for the new district. I am not going to push this matter any further. My hon. friend gives me as reason for his dismissal that he was fined for selling liquor without a license ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes.

Mr. GILLIES. Notwithstanding the fact that he was a good officer in every respect, and filled the position satisfactorily for a great many years, the reason for his dismissal my hon. friend cannot give.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Inefficiency.

Mr. GILLIES. Was there any inquiry in the case of Lenoir ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No ; he was reported to me by Mr. Prince, the Commissioner.

Mr. GILLIES. What knowledge had Mr. Prince ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Mr. Prince is in constant communication with these men and has better knowledge than you have. He knows who discharge their duties and who do not.

Mr. GILLIES. If there was any communication from Inspector Bertram, I could understand it.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. In this case Mr. Bertram made no communication, but Mr. Prince has the reports of the department for years before him, and is in constant touch with these overseers and able to form a judgment whether a man is a competent officer or not. When I came into the department, I asked him to make out a tabulated statement of the standing of the different officers, and in that he said that Lenoir was an inefficient officer whose services ought to be dispensed with, and on that report I dispensed with them.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Do I understand from the hon. Minister that he considers it a sufficient reason for dismissal when he finds a man engaged in the sale of intoxicating liquors in a county where the Scott Act is in force ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I say that when a man is fined for breaking one law of the land, it is not my duty to pay him out of the public treasury for enforcing other laws.

Mr. McDOUGALL. If I can prove——

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am not taking any theories, but dealing with a case that has transpired.

Mr. McDOUGALL. If I can prove that the hon. gentleman appointed a man to an important position, who is engaged in the sale of liquor, in open violation of the Scott Act, would he promise me to dismiss him ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. When I see the evidence the hon. gentleman produces, I will pronounce judgment.

Mr. McDOUGALL. That is a case in point, and I will give the evidence if the hon. gentleman will promise to cancel the appointment.

Mr. POWELL. The hon. Minister announced his policy to-night with respect to these traps. I have been requested to make application for a license, and I would like to know if any further licenses are going to be granted ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No, I have refused to grant any more. The only two I did grant were granted after great pressure brought upon me.

Mr. GILLIES. Was there any one granted to Prince Edward Island ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes, for years, but they do not catch salmon. The reason they are not granted in New Brunswick is because they are at measurable distance of the mouth of the Great Salmon River.

Mr. POWELL. Those gentlemen who asked me to press their applications for licenses, informed me that a man in Prince Edward Island, who has a license, is not even a British citizen.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. He has been there for thirty years and is one of the largest fish merchants in the island.

Mr. POWELL. But is still an American citizen and cannot vote ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. He may be nominally an American citizen, but his sons are all there and they vote.

Mr. POWELL. I am told that just before the election he made a sort of turn in his political creed.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The license was not granted by me.

Mr. POWELL. But just about the time of the renewal of the license, there was a very remarkable conversion of that hon. gentleman in his political creed.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am sure that the person the hon. gentleman refers to has never changed his political opinions. For 25 years I have known him to be a consistent Liberal.

Mr. POWELL. Before the last election, the reports are to the contrary, and the case of the sudden conversion of St. Paul on the road to Damascus was not a patch to this man's sudden change of his political creed. The miracle which the hon. Minister worked in him just about the time of the election was something remarkable, and the conversion from Judeaism to Christianity was nothing compared to the suddenness of this translation from Toryism to Liberalism. There is another matter to which I would call the hon. gentleman's attention. Why is it that Mr. Monroe, fishery inspector, was dismissed ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I cannot recall the reason at the moment, but there was a reason. There were many of these dismissals. I remember the man and remember his dismissal.

Mr. BERGERON. So many were dismissed, you cannot keep track of them.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. A great many were dismissed but not for political causes. The hon. gentleman knows very well that if you have four hundred or five hundred officials, you will find lots of reason compelling you to dismiss them without having recourse to politics.

Mr. POWELL. Why was Robert Goodwin dismissed ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not remember him at all.

Mr. POWELL. And Mr. Deacon, of Chadiack ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. He was dismissed, after full investigation. for offensive partisanship.

Mr. POWELL. I wish simply to state the facts in Mr. Munro's case. I understand that the charges brought against him consisted of three. In the first place, he had taken his father to the poll to vote for me. The truth of this charge may be judged when I inform the House that his father was dead six years before that. The second was that he ceased to take the "Telegraph," and would not allow the old gentleman to feast upon the political literature dished up in that paper, but if he had an opportunity of reading the "Telegram" at all, he must have looked at it from the vast empyrean above this earthly sphere and read it at considerably long range. The third charge was akin to that. Whether they trumped up further charges, I do not know, but I will say that while without doubt Munroe is a Conservative, he was not an offensive partisan. He is one of the most respectable men in the whole county of Westmoreland, and he would come up to the full measure standard of any man in total abstinence even of the hon. Minister of Marine, for I do not think he ever tasted liquor in his life.

Mr. GANONG. Perhaps I can aid the hon. member for Westmoreland in determining the reason for some of these dismissals. Although I have been an employer of labour a great many years, I have never been forced to give as mean a reason for the dismissal of an employee as has been given by the department. I have been very hard-up many times, but never did I discharge an employee for the reason that I was too poor to pay him. But we had some dismissals in Carlotte County, and the only reason given was that sufficient appropriation had not been made to pay the salary. The hon. Minister will find that that was the reason given for the discharge of Mr. Martin on the island of Grand Manan. Also I believe another gentleman at Deer Island was dismissed. But the ink had scarcely dried on the dismissal before his successor was appointed. I supposed he has been living on faith and will continue to do so until this vote goes through. I would like to ask the Minister for a little information with regard to the Bay View fish hatchery. Does the hon. Minister consider that that lobster hatchery has been a success ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I can hardly tell the hon. gentleman. I have talked the matter over with Mr. Prince time and again. I do not think he has reached any more definite conclusion than I have. I have reached no conclusion in its favour.

Mr. GANONG. Can the hon. gentleman tell me how the distribution is made from that hatchery

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. If the hon. gentleman had brought it up when a previous item was under discussion the other day, I could have given the information, having the papers with me. I can only tell him that ninety million lobster fry were distributed from that hatchery last year, that the hatchery cost $1,697, and that the salary of the keeper is $450. The method of distribution is stated in the fishery report.

Mr. GANONG. I failed to find it. Was the distribution made on requisition ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I believe so.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The lobster fry are not distributed on requisition, I believe. They can only be handled by tugs and they are taken out by tugs around Northumberland Strait.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. If the hon. gentleman wants the information, I can get it for him.

Mr. GANONG. That is all I desire, and I shall be glad if the hon. gentleman will get me the information. I would like to ask the hon. Minister also on what principle licenses are issued for building fish weirs. I find from the report of Capt. Pratt that 309 licenses were issued in the district, but only two-thirds of these were built. I would like to know if it is possible for men, year after year, to tie up these locations for fish weirs without building them. There must be some principle which governs these matters. It does not seem fair to the people who are living by this industry that a man should be able, by paying $5, to continue to hold a fish weir idle that would give a living to from fifteen to twenty-five people. It takes eight grown men to work these weirs and take the fish out of them.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I suppose the hon. gentleman does not insist that if a man takes out a license for a fish weir he must perforce build it and keep it in operation. He may take out a license for five fish weirs and find that he will get more fish by building and working only one.

Mr. GANONG. But that gives the worst kind of monopoly against the interest of the fishermen at large. Merely because a man has money enough he can take out these licenses and build very few weirs.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not say that a man can do this because he has money enough. I say that if he takes out licenses from Capt. Pratt he has a right to them, and ought to be free to build and operate the weirs as he pleases. There has been no change in the system since I took office.

Mr. GANONG. That may be. But I bring this forward in the interest of the fishermen. I do not believe that it is just to allow a man on paying $5 a year to keep fifteen to twenty-five people out of the opportunity of making a living.

Mr. POWELL. Will the hon. Minister tell us at the same time what policy has been decided upon with regard to the oyster beds ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Mr. Kemp visits these different localities every summer and makes a report, and where he finds an oppportunity to plant a bed he plants it.

Mr. POWELL. But some of these beds are now in a condition to be worked. How is that done ? Are licenses issued ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Take the two beds that were planted in Prince Edward Island. They were doing remarkably well and we had them watched and kept them as preserves. Last year we gave notice to the licensed oyster men that the oyster beds would be open at six o'clock in the morning on such a day. The men went there and took out seven or eight hundred barrels of oysters in two or three days. After the beds had been fished sufficiently they were at once closed. The same principle will be applied this year to the Shediac beds.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I am informed that the Shediac beds have been largely spoiled by the poaching ; that. in fact, they have been so seriously injured that they are not in a condition to be fished.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The same information came to me. furnished by an apparently reliable person, and in almost the same language as the hon. gentleman has used. I communicated with the officer in charge and informed him that if I found that this allegation was true, I would not hesitate a moment to dismiss him. It would be criminal to allow such poaching. The officer wrote back that there was not a shadow of foundation for the charge and inviting investigation.

Mr. POWELL. Who is the officer ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not remember his name. It is a French name.

Mr. McINERNEY. Narcisse Leblanc.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman has not answered the question as to weirs. Is the number of weir licenses that can be issued in a year limited ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Not that I know of. The matter has been left largely to the discretion of Capt. Pratt. I have never interfered and have not until to-night heard any complaints of the exercise of Capt. Pratt's discretion. I must admit that I am not sufficiently informed to give the hon. gentleman the answer. I have not looked into the matter, because I have never heard of even the slightest complaint.

Mr. FOSTER. To limit the number of weir licenses and allow a man to buy more than he could use would be to establish a monopoly.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not think so.

Mr. GANONG. It is quite evident that there was some object for some one to take up 309 licenses in the county of Charlotte.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. You do not mean to say that one man or ten men took them all up ?

Mr. GANONG. No, there was a total of 309 licenses all taken out to build fish weirs, as only two-thirds of these were built evidently the other one-third was tied up for some purpose. Charlotte County is essentially a herring and sardine county. Nearly all the fresh herrings sold in Canada are exported from the county of Charlotte, and all the sardines, in fact, that are packed in America are virtually packed from fish caught in the county of Charlotte. One million cases were packed in Eastern Maine last year, according to the reports, and every one of these fishes went from our waters.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. What advice does the hon. gentleman wish to give the House ?

Mr. GANONG. I have had a good many inquiries, with which, however, I have not troubled the department, of people who have wished to build fish weirs, but when they made application to the overseers, they were told it was under license to Tom Jones, or somebody else, but so far, and for several years, no fish weirs have been built at these particular locations. It seems an outrage that people who have a disposition to take advantage of the possible output, should not be able to do so. Some of the best privileges along the coast are tied up by people who themselves have built fish weirs, and have an object in preventing other people from increasing the output. I only wish to draw out the general principles upon which these fish weirs are licensed. I think the department are not doing justice to the people at large in allowing a man to hold a license year after year without building

a fish weir on it, and without allowing anybody else to do so.

Mr. BERGERON. Does the Minister know whether the lobsters which are cured at the Magdalen Islands are labelled American lobsters or American-Canadian lobsters?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not know.

Mr. BERGERON. They are Canadian lobsters, of course, but they are put in boxes and labelled American lobsters, and sent over to the Boston market.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. What would be their motive?

Mr. BERGERON. Because Canadian lobsters sell better in the American market than American lobsters. I called attention to that some years ago, because I think it is anti-Canadian.

Mr. HUGHES. I would like to know the names of the officers whom the hon. gentleman has appointed as guardians in Victoria County?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman knows that guardians are different from overseers and inspectors. The names of the guardians are not placed in our book, they are temporary employees.

Mr. HUGHES. I think they should be there.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I will get the names for the hon. gentleman

Resolutions to be reported.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies) moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 11.55 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 11th May, 1898.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 139) to incorporate the Anglo-French Telegraph Company (Limited).—(Mr. Morrison.)

GANANOQUE DRILL HALL SITE.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). Mr. Speaker, I beg to move for leave to lay on the Table of the House a letter written to me by Lieutenant-Governor Patterson, formerly Minister of Militia, which was referred to on a recent occasion in this House, and which relates to the purchase of a drill hall site in Gananoque. On the last day that the matter was brought up, I sent a telegram to the Governor and received the following answer:—

Winnipeg, Man., 10th May, 1898.

Hon. F. W. Borden, Minister of Militia and Defence, Ottawa.

I have no objection to my letter re Gananoque drill shed site being brought down, and thank you for your courtesy in having withheld it pending my consent.

(Sgd.) J. C. PATTERSON.

The letter is as follows:—

(Private.) Government House,
Winnipeg, 19th December, 1896.

My dear Minister,—I have to thank you for your very courteous letter requesting to know what my intentions were with regard to the site of the proposed drill hall at Gananoque.

I visited Gananoque at the express wish of the late Sir John Thompson, when he was Premier, with a view to the selection of a new site, and after examination came to the conclusion to recommend to my colleagues the lot known as Turner's lot. I told Sir John about it on my return, and also my Ontario colleagues—certainly Mr. Haggart. As you are aware, the death of Sir John upset all our arrangements, and when Sir Mackenzie Bowell formed his Cabinet I declined to become a member of it. I only temporarily retained my portfolio at his earnest request. I did not feel at liberty then to take up any new work in my department. I formally retired a couple of months after, and during the greater part of the session of 1895 I was absent from Canada. Had I retained my portfolio I should certainly have submitted an amount for the purchase of the lot in question to my colleagues in my departmental estimates.

I consider that the late Government were to a certain extent bound by my action, but I am not prepared to say that this extends to you.

I trust that you are well, &c.

Believe me,
Yours very sincerely,
(Sgd.) J. C. PATTERSON.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the hon. Minister might treat this as a supplementary return, in which case it will not require a motion.

Mr. FOSTER. Is there anything that it fits into, so as to make it a public paper?

Mr. SPEAKER. Yes, an incomplete return, which was complained of by the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor).

Mr. TAYLOR. It is incomplete yet.

Mr. SPEAKER. It is more complete, I suppose. At any rate, it does not require a motion.

THE EDMONTON BRIDGE.

Mr. DAVIN asked,

What penalties, if any, have been imposed on the contractors for building piers and abutments of the Edmonton bridge?

If any penalties have been imposed, have they been paid ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). There were no penalties imposed on the contractors.

DREDGING AT GRAND ETANG.

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness) asked,

1. Whether it is the intention of the Government to dredge between the new piers at Grand Etang, Inverness County, this season ? If so, how soon ?
2. Whether the appropriation by Parliament in 1897 for the providing of a wharf at Whycocomah, Inverness County, is to be applied to that purpose during the present financial year?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). 1. It is doubtful if it will be possible to send a dredge to Grand Etang this season. 2. Steps are being taken by the department in that direction.

GOVERNMENT TELEGRAPH LINES—DISMISSAL OF INSPECTOR GISBORNE.

Mr. DAVIN asked,

1. Why was Mr. Gisborne dismissed from the position of inspector of Government telegraph lines in the North-west ?
2. Who has succeeded him ?
3. On whose recommendation was this done ?
4. Was Mr. Gisborne not efficient ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). 1. Mr. Gisborne's services were dispensed with. 2. John S. Macdonald. 3. Mr. Macdonald was recommended by persons in whom the Minister has entire confidence. 4. The Minister did not consider Mr. Gisborne efficient enough, and made the change in the public interest.

ALIEN LABOUR LAW—ENFORCEMENT.

Mr. CLARKE asked,

1. What officers have been appointed in the province of Ontario to enforce the Alien Labour Law ?
2. What is the date of the appointment of such officers, and where are they located ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The following are the agents who have been appointed by the Government under the Alien Labour Act :—A. C. Paterson, acting sub-collector customs, North Portal, N.W.T. ; H. Tennant, acting sub-collector customs, Coutts, N.W.T. ; J. A. McMartin, acting sub-collector customs, Huntingdon, B.C. ; A. Lawrence, acting sub-collector customs, Gretna, Man. ; T. J. Mather, acting officer, Gretna, Man. ; G. G. Allen, preventive officer, Emerson, Man. ; W. Mills, acting officer, Emerson, Man. ; W. F. McCreary, immigration commissioner, Winnipeg, Man. ; James Lawson, collector of customs, Fort Erie ; Robert Rush, provincial constable, Sault Ste. Marie, Ont. ; Arthur Boyle, collector of customs, Niagara Falls, Ont. ; Jas. H. Kenning, collector inland revenue, Windsor, Ont. ; F. Spain, Bridgeburg, Ont. ; W. B. McMurrich, Toronto.

POST OFFICE SAVINGS BANKS.

Mr. DAVIN asked,

What effect has the announcement made by the Finance Minister as to the rate of interest in the post office savings banks had on deposits ? Have deposits decreased ? Have withdrawals increased in numbers and aggregate amounts ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). In answer to the hon. member (Mr. Davin), I have to say that full returns have not been compiled for publication in the "Gazette" for the month of April, the only complete month since the Estimates were laid on the Table. So far it does not appear that the announcement made has had any appreciable effect on the deposits. By the returns already in, the withdrawals during the month exceeded the deposits during the month ; but this is usually the case during the month of April, money being withdrawn for use in business. By the returns of the chartered banks last published in the "Gazette," it is shown that the decrease of deposits in those institutions during the month of March last amounted to nearly $3,000,000.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—PORTER AT STELLARTON.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER asked.

Is J. H. Murray, formerly freight porter at Stellarton, in the service of the Intercolonial Railway ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). J. H. Murray is still in the service of the Intercolonial Railway, as porter at Stellarton.

S.S. "LA CANADIENNE."

Mr. CASGRAIN (by Mr. Bergeron) asked,

1. Was the SS. "La Canadienne" chartered last season of navigation by the Government ?
2. If so, to whom ?
3. For what trade ?
4. What was the rate the ship was chartered for ?
5. Was the charter money paid regularly ?
6. If not, how much was paid, and how much is due ?
7. What was the marine insurance placed on the ship, and how does the sum so placed compare with the valuation of the steamer in the Government accounts ?
8. When was the charter party signed ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). 1. Yes. 2. Robert Gillespie. 3. For carrying passengers and freight between Montreal, Quebec and

Gaspé and intermediate ports in Gaspé county. 4. $750 a month. 5. No. The "Canadienne" collided with the "Yantic" on 6th October. 6. None has yet been paid, but the Department of Marine and Fisheries secured itself by claiming a sufficient sum for payment of rental due from the subsidy earned by the steamer. 7. The sum of $11,500 payable to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. In the Government accounts the steamer is valued at from $20,000 to $25,000. 8. The charter party is dated 2nd August, and signed by Robert Lindsay.

THE QUEEN VS. SKELTON ET AL.

Mr. DAVIN asked,

Has an application been made to the Minister of Justice for a new trial in the case of the Queen vs. Skelton et al ? If so, has the application been accompanied by affidavits ? If so, will copy of the affidavits be laid on the Table ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Yes, the application has been made, but it was returned by affidavits, but the affidavits cannot be brought down until the matter has been disposed of.

REGISTRY OFFICE, REGINA DISTRICT.

Mr. DAVIN asked,

Will there be an item in the Supplementary Estimates for building a Registry Office and a Land Office for the Regina district ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). This matter is now under consideration.

EDWARD LINLOFF.

Mr. GILLIES asked,

1. When was Edward Linloff appointed a lockman upon the St. Peter's Canal ?
2. How long was he employed in the position of lockman ?
3. When were his services terminated ?
4. Was he efficient and did he given satisfaction while in the employ of the Government ?
5. Was Mr. Linloff dismissed ? If so, at whose request ?
6 Were complaints lodged against him ? If so, what were they, by whom laid, and were they investigated ?
7. Who was appointed to Mr. Linloff's position, and by whom recommended ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). 1. Edward Linloff was appointed lockman on the St. Peter's Canal in October, 1880. 2. From October, 1880, to the 7th March, 1898. 3. On the 7th March, 1898. 4. No complaint was made as to the manner in which he performed his duties. 5. Mr. Linloff was laid off as usual at the close of navigation and was not re-employed at the opening of navigation. 6. No complaints as to the manner in which he performed his duties were lodged against him. 7. William Murray, junior, of Point Micheau, was appointed in place of Linloff.

Sir LOUIS DAVIES.

BUOYS AT ARICHAT HARBOUR.

Mr. GILLIES asked,

Is it the intention of the Government or of the department during the present session to provide buoys for the western entrance of Arichat harbour, as pointed out by a letter of date 16th September, 1897, from Mr. Gillies, M.P., to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, to which the following letter was a reply :—

Ottawa, 25th September, 1897.

Sir,—In reply to your letter of the 16th instant to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, inclosing a letter from Captain Kelly relating to buoys for the western entrance of Arichat, I have by direction to inform you that the matter is receiving consideration.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

(Sgd.) F. GOURDEAU,

Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

Joseph Gillies, Esq., M.P.,

Sydney, Cape Breton, Nova Scotia.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). The department received an application for a bell buoy, but it has been ascertained that such a buoy is not necessary. The department is now awaiting a report respecting suitable buoys for the western entrance of Arichat harbour.

POSTMASTER, GRAVENHURST, ONT.

Mr. BENNETT asked,

1. Is J. P. Cockburn postmaster of Gravenhurst, Ontario ?
2. If not, was said J. P. Cockburn dismissed ? What was the age of the said J. P. Cockburn ? Was there any investigation or complaint ?
3. Who is now postmaster at Gravenhurst ? What is the age of the present postmaster ?
4. Upon whose recommendation was the present postmaster appointed ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). In the absence of the Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock), I beg to say in reply to the hon. gentleman :—1. J. P. Cockburn is no longer postmaster of Gravenhurst, Ontario. 2. He was not dismissed ; he resigned the office. His age is not known to the department. There was no complaint or investigation. 3. Mr. John A. Cockburn is now postmaster at Gravenhurst. His age is not known. 4. He was appointed on the recommendation of Mr. H. H. Cook, of Toronto.

LIGHT KEEPER, POINT JEROME.

Mr. GILLIES asked,

1. When was Joseph E. McNeil appointed light keeper at Point Jerome, St. Peter's, Richmond county ?
2. What was his age at the time of his appointment ?
3. Was he efficient and satisfactory in every respect as keeper of this light ?
4. Was McNeil dismissed ? If so, when and why ?

5. Were complaints lodged against him ? If so, of what character, and by whom were they laid ?

6. Who has been appointed as keeper to fill McNeil's place, by whom was he recommended, and what is his age ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). 1. On the 1st November, 1892. 2. His age was 49. 3. No. 4. Yes. By Order in Council of the 1st November, 1897, as charges of political partisanship on the occasion of the last Dominion election, on being investigated, were fully proved. 5. Charges were made by E. P. Flynn. 6. Mr. James McAskill was appointed as temporary keeper on recommendation of Mr. Joseph Matheson. Mr. McAskill's age is 53.

REBELLION CLAIMS COMMISSIONER.

Mr. DAVIS (Saskatchewan) (by Mr. Hurley) asked,

1. Was Thomas McKay, of Prince Albert, N.W.T., employed by the Dominion Government as a rebellion claims commissioner ?
2. If so, how long was he employed ?
3. What salary did he receive ?
4. Was he paid any money for expenses ?
5. Was he paid for Sundays ?
6. How much did he receive in all from the Government for salary and expenses during the time he was employed as rebellion claims commissioner ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). 1. Yes. 2. 645 days. 3. $15 per day. 4. Yes. 5. Yes. 6. $14,898.96.

QUESTION—CORRESPONDENCE.

Mr. CRAIG. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to make a request of the leader of the Government. A letter has been published in some of the newspapers dated April 7th from the Minister of Justice in answer to a letter, I suppose, to the Premier of Prince Edward Island, as to the powers of the provinces to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors. The request I have to make is that all this correspondence be laid on the Table of the House before the third reading of the Plebiscite Bill is moved.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). This is a matter as to which I cannot give the hon. gentleman an answer at this moment. I shall have to consult the Minister of Justice,

Mr. FOSTER. There should be no objection to bringing down this correspondence.

The PRIME MINISTER. I do not know the nature of the correspondence at all.

INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Mr. MILLS. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the Minister of Public Works when the return ordered by the House on the 30th March last and to which I have called attention several times, will be laid on the Table. I understood from the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries that it was already before the Department of Public Works and would be down in a short time, but I have not yet seen it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). I will ascertain the facts for the hon. gentleman and let him know.

MINING AND DREDGING LEASES.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to ask the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) if progress is being made with the returns ordered some two months ago as to the mining leases. I have before stated several times that it is a very important matter, and it is quite impossible, in my opinion, that the House can get through its business without having that subject thoroughly ventilated. I would ask my hon. friend to facilitate the bringing down of this return.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). I was under the impression, after the instructions I gave to the chief clerk, that all the available force of his office was at work on this return. But the chief clerk had misunderstood my instructions and his staff was engaged in preparing a return as to the timber licenses in the Yukon district. The return that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) has asked for will comprise about 8,000 to 10,000 pages ; and, in despair of getting it ready in time for the use of members of the House, I have had prepared, and now lay on the Table, a statement giving a schedule of all information that I think the House will require. Then, if any hon. gentleman will specify any particular application in respect of which he wishes the correspondence brought down, I will have the correspondence laid on the Table. This schedule gives the names of persons who have applied for leases to dredge for minerals in the submerged beds of rivers in the North-west Teritories, including the Yukon district, also for leases for hydraulic mining in the said territory. Leases for dredging portions of rivers in the Yukon district were issued under authority of an Order in Council dated 18th January, 1898, and the leases for portions of rivers in the North-west Territories under the authority of an Order in Council dated 29th July, 1897, and under this order, as amended. Copies of the said orders are annexed hereto, also forms of leases. No regulations have been framed for the issue of leases for hydraulic mining. One lease has been issued for hydraulic mining, in favour of Robert Anderson, under the authority of an Order in Council dated 12th January, 1898, annexed hereto. I think this will contain all the information that my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) or any member of the House will require, unless the correspondence with regard to any particular application is desired. If

any hon. member will be good enough to let me know, the application the correspondence with regard to which he desires, I will at once bring down the correspondence desired. I am not responsible for the fact that the correspondence has been so voluminous that it is next to impossible to bring it down.

Mr. FOSTER. May I ask whether the statement referred to takes in all the applications ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes, all the applications, whether granted or not.

Mr. FOSTER. With the post office address of the applicants ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. I beg leave to move, with the consent of the House, that the rule be suspended, and this be sent to the printer to be printed at once.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I have no objection.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I think I will object to that.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, your objection does not count.

Motion agreed to.

BRITISH COLUMBIA COAST—MR. COSTE'S REPORT.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask my right hon. friend if he could furnish the House with the report of Mr. Coste, who was charged with the important duty of collecting such information as he could in relation to the best points of communication on the coasts of British Columbia.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I shall have much pleasure in bringing down that report to-morrow.

NATIONAL MUSEUM.

Mr. BELCOURT. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to lay before the House a matter which I consider of great importance, not so much to the constituency I represent, as to the country at large ; and in order to conform to the rules of the House, I shall conclude by moving the adjournment. During the course of last session, it was my privilege to direct the attention of the House, and particularly of the Government, to a matter of very great importance, as I have said, not only to the city of Ottawa, but to the country at large—a matter of great necessity and of immediate urgency. I refer to the erection at Ottawa of a national museum. I had intended to ask the House to adopt the resolution which I have on the Order paper, calling for the establishment of such a museum.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. gentleman is out of order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman cannot take advantage of a motion to adjourn to discuss a motion he has on the paper.

Mr. BELCOURT. I do not intend to discuss that motion, but I wish to explain that I had intended at one time to move the resolution standing in my name ; but in view of the approaching end of the session, I propose to make now the remarks I intended to make on that motion.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman cannot at this stage drop or withdraw a motion which is on the paper. That cannot be done until it is reached.

Mr. BELCOURT. Then, I shall not withdraw the motion, but simply make the remarks I have to make on the subject.

Mr. SPEAKER. On a motion to adjourn it is impossible to anticipate a discussion upon an order which is already on the paper.

Mr. BELCOURT. I do not intend to refer to that resolution at all.

Mr. SPEAKER. If the hon. gentleman is not going to speak on the subject of the national museum, concerning which he has put a motion on the paper, he is at perfect liberty to go on, but otherwise he cannot.

MILITIA—ANNUAL CAMP DRILL.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I should like to ask a question on behalf of our militia officers, who requested me to do so, as to what portion of the militia will be called into camp this year ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA (Mr. Borden). It is my intention, if the necessary funds are voted, to drill the balance of the militia who were not drilled during the autumn of last year.

Mr. HUGHES. I would like to ask the hon. Minister if those who were drilled during the autumn of last year will be debarred from drilling during the autumn of this year ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA. Within the financial year, from the 1st of July last to the 1st of July next, we propose to drill all the militia. Those who were not drilled since the 1st of July last will be drilled before the 1st of July of the present year.

OAK BAY MILLS POST OFFICE.

Mr. McALISTER. I would like to draw the attention of the Postmaster General to

the fact that the correspondence that was brought down in the matter of the Oak Bay Mills post office does not include a telegram from Mr. Guité to J. I. Tarte. That telegram is referred to in the letter to the Postmaster General and I would ask the hon. gentleman to bring it down.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). I am not aware of anything having been omitted from the papers produced, but will have a search made for the telegram referred to, and if it is omitted, have it brought down.

GOVERNMENT HARBOURS, PIERS AND BREAKWATERS.

Bill (No. 135) further to amend the Act respecting Government harbours, piers and breakwaters, was read the second time, and the House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). I explained this Bill on its first reading, and it seemed to meet very general approval. It is to enable the department to lease the wharfs, from which very small revenue is derived, to the municipalities in which they are situated for a rental equal to annual average of three years' receipts.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Has the hon. gentleman any information on the point raised some time ago in regard to the Department of Public Works obtaining control of wharfs already built?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I have asked my department, and so far as they are aware, there are none. The department are under the impression that these wharfs had all been transferred, but in view of the statement made last night, the necessary official letters are passing in order to ascertain if any have not been.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

PROTECTION OF NAVIGABLE WATERS.

Bill (No. 136) further to amend the Act respecting the protection of navigable waters, was read the second time, and the House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. COSTIGAN. The consideration of this Bill affords me an opportunity of referring to another Act regulating the protection of navigable waters. The law as it now stands prohibits, from the 1st of May, the throwing of saw-dust into any of the rivers of Canada. We all remember that the saw-dust question occupied the attention of this Parliament for a good many years, and I am afraid we are not done with it yet. I do not wish to prejudice the claims of any mill-owner in Canada who object to the law because it is too stringent, from their point of view, but I wish to point out to the House that there is a class of mill-owners in Canada who have an exceptional ground of complaint. The object of the law as it stands to-day is to prevent the pollution and obstruction of navigable waters, and with that view, of course a very desirable object to attain, a Bill was passed prohibiting the putting of saw-dust in any of our rivers, and for the protection of the fisheries as well. The class of mill-owners I refer to who are prejudicially affected beyond others by the operation of that Act, are those who have their mills upon international waters; and they complain that it is very hard on them to oblige them, unnecessarily and in some cases at great expense, to comply with a law that really accomplishes nothing. They say, with great force, and it cannot be contradicted, that it is not sound policy to undertake to keep a river clear of saw-dust and of refuse when you only control one side of that river, and that it is unfair to the Canadian mill-owners on the Canadian side of the river to restrict them, while you cannot exercise control, and while, in point of fact, no control is exercised, on the American side of the river. Our mill-owners feel to-day that they have a sufficiently hard struggle in competing with the mill-owners on the southern side of the boundary. The effect of the law to-day is that on international rivers, the mill-owners on the other side continue to pour their saw-dust into the rivers, while, if this restriction were carried out and enforced against the Canadian mill-owner, he would have to go to great expense in order to prevent his saw-dust from falling into the river, while such restriction will accomplish nothing at all in the way of keeping the river clear from refuse. Therefore, I say their case ought to be considered; and while, as I said in the beginning of my remarks, I did not wish to prejudice the claims of other mill-owners in other parts of Canada, I do say that those holding properties on international waters have a fair claim to ask the consideration of this Government and Parliament to relieve them until such time as the authorities controlling the other side of the river will agree with the Canadian authorities to enact similar restrictions or regulations for the protection of the rivers. Then it will be quite proper for the citizens on both sides of the river to join in a united policy. But under the present condition of things, you attempt to enforce a law to keep refuse out of a river the practical result of which is that you

will only impose additional burdens upon our citizens, and you will accomplish nothing by it; because as long as the refuse goes in from the American side, you get no benefit at all from the restrictions you impose upon Canadians on the Canadian side. Now, speaking for the eastern section of Canada, this argument applies to the River St. John, following it down as far, I will say, as 15 or 16 miles below Woodstock, because above that point, the international boundary line which leaves the River St. John some four miles above Grand Falls, runs almost parallel with the river to Woodstock, and all the tributaries flowing into the St. John from the western side, come from the State of Maine, on all of which that are of any size, there are mills. Therefore, that part of the River St. John and the St. Croix River should be exempted until at least the American authorities join the Canadian authorities in making regulations for the preservation of the rivers. Until that time I think these restrictions should not be made operative against men doing business under the conditions I have just stated. I simply take advantage of the discussion of this Bill to bring this matter under the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and of the House, because I do think that to enforce that law against mill-owners situated as I have described, would be a hardship. I know from past experience that the department might not take a very active part in enforcing that law against these men, realizing that they are occupying such a position. But the Minister will remember that these men, since the 1st of May, are exposed, not to the officers of his department, but to any man who has any spite or ill-will against any mill-owner on these international rivers, and he can simply set the law in motion and fine them, and even close up their business.

Mr. ELLIS. While there is something in the contention which the hon. gentleman makes, there is no doubt whatever that in the case of every law it rarely happens that it operates equally or equitably upon every person. There is no doubt that the general object of this law is for the benefit of the country, and it is quite time that steps were taken, and that is not only the policy of this Government but it was the policy of their predecessors, to stop the pollution of the rivers and streams of the country by throwing saw-dust into them. And every one who has paid any attention to the subject knows that the fisheries in the rivers are very much impaired by the saw-dust and waste which goes into the river from the mills. If the Minister relaxes the law in one case—while there is something I admit in the contention put forward as regards the tributaries of the St. John River—the moment the Minister allows an exception in the case of one mill or a set of mills, he will be given reasons why he should make similar exceptions in all parts of the country. It seems to me, looking at the general advantage and taking into account the general benefit to the country, the hon. gentleman cannot very well make the exception referred to. I do not want to prejudice the mind of the Minister against making this concession, if he sees his way clearly to do so; but I can point out reasons why he should not enforce the law at the mouth of the St. John River, but I will not do so, because my mind is influenced entirely by the idea that the policy of the Government, enunciated long ago, should be carried into effect now.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I agree with the ex-Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Costigan) that a strong case should be made out for exempting these rivers over which this Parliament has not complete control. I have always been a strong advocate of the most thorough enforcement of the prohibition of the deposits of saw-dust in rivers frequented by fish, but I think that reason points out that the efforts of the Government should be confined to waters over which this Parliament has complete control. The hon. gentleman knows it is a matter of grave doubt as to whether in the case put forward and under the circumstances stated we can enforce the Act, when our people see foreigners committing these irregularities, they being people against whom the Government cannot proceed, and when, according to the laws of their own country, they are so allowed to conduct their business. In that event it would be much better that there should be no efforts put forward, and I do not think it reasonable that persons in Canada in a similar position should be proceeded against. I think every fair-minded mill-owner, however much he might dislike legislation of this kind, would not complain of proceedings not being taken in the case of these two international rivers, all these rivers that are not within the absolute control of the Government. I should like to see the Government adopt or carry out practically the course already followed. There have been no complaints made in that section of the country. Those waters were exempted under the old powers, but the complaint was made in regard to waters wholly in Canada which were exempted, and which indicated either special circumstances or an intention to give preference to a certain district. That was the cause of heartburnings, that it was which made the administration of the law more difficult in the old days. I do not recollect, however, that special exemption applied to the rivers mentioned, certainly not to the St. John and its tributaries.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The present Bill does not touch the question under discussion, but so

far from deprecating discussion, I invite it, and I am much obliged to hon. gentlemen who have introduced the matter. The importance of the question cannot be denied. It may be a very grave legal question whether the Act as it now stands does really apply to rivers over which this Parliament has not absolute control. That is a matter which will have to be considered, if a case should arise; but so far as I am concerned, I am strongly inclined to the opinion that there are overwhelming arguments in favour of the position which the hon. gentleman has taken. In the case of these international rivers, where our neighbours deposit saw-dust, it would be simply folly and useless to prevent our owners of saw-mills depositing it likewise. So far as this department is concerned, I have instructed the officers along these rivers not to take any action in regard to the mill-owners, but to report all the facts to the department; and before sanctioning the instituting of actions, I should have to be convinced, first, that it is clear the law covers cases of international rivers, about which I am not at present satisfied; and second, that it would be good policy to interfere to execute the law. I have no power to exempt the St. John River or any other river, the discretion which remains in the hands of the Minister has been withdrawn. But I must state that there are two conflicting interests on the St. John River, as the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Ellis) has stated, which are warring against each other. The people interested in the fisheries contend, and they are backed up by the officers, that this river, which was one of the finest fishing rivers in Canada, has to a large extent been depleted and destroyed by reason of the saw-dust and slabs deposited in the river, and that this river or the higher reaches of it would become, if this practice were prohibited, as valuable a fishing river as it once was. In that river saw-dust comes down a certain distance, and at each spring freshet it is carried still further down. I am entirely in sympathy with the expression of opinion given by the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper). I do not intend to enforce the law in respect to these rivers, where I think our right is disputable at least. There is a grave question of law which should be submitted to the Department of Justice as to whether any one could prosecute for infractions of law on international rivers over which the Parliament of Canada has not sole control; and even if we had sole control, I should consider it to be very poor policy to endeavour, as regards the owners of mills on the Canadian side, to enforce as drastic, a measure as that on our Statute-book. The hon. gentleman is not absolutely correct as regards all the tributaries of the St. John in the state of Maine, because most rigorous measures are taken on some of the tributaries to protect the fisheries from saw-dust deposits.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The law in the state of Maine permits the depositing of saw-dust.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Either that, or certain parties have obtained the legal right to the rivers. In that way they may be able to prevent the deposit of saw-dust in the streams. I can give the hon. gentleman the assurance that so far as the department is concerned it will proceed with the greatest care and caution, recognizing that the mill-owners have very large interests, and that they should not be jeopardized by hasty action on the part of any fishery overseer.

Mr. GANONG. In regard to the rivers in the state of Maine, within the last six months I have had a conversation with the engineer of the Department, Mr. Robinson, who was examining the waters of the St. Croix River, in respect to dredging it, and removing slabs and saw-dust deposits. He informed me that while the mills in Maine could not dump saw-dust in the navigable portion of a river, yet if a mill-owner built a mill one hundred yards above the navigable portion of the stream, or on a small tributary, he could deposit all his slabs and saw-dust in the waters of that stream.

Mr. McINERNEY. Why is the operation of this Bill limited to tidal waters?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. This is a Bill to prohibit steamers and other vessels from throwing ashes and refuse into waters of less depth than twelve fathoms. Harbour masters and others have brought it to the attention of the department that this practice has resulted in filling up the rivers. The Bill is to prevent that. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Ganong) brought up a question which is dealt with under another statute, because no doubt he thought he might take advantage of this opportunity to bring the matter before the House.

Mr. McINERNEY. This Bill does not say that the refuse shall not be thrown from vessels.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Certainly; I want to make it general.

Mr. McINERNEY. Then why limit it to navigable waters?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Because the existing statute covers the other case.

Mr. McINERNEY. I do not think chapter 91 does cover it.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

THE COMPANIES ACT.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 108) to further amend the Companies Act. He said: This Bill passed by the Senate amends the Companies Act under which persons obtain letters patent for incorporation. Under section 5 of the existing Act provision is made that a certain portion of the capital of the proposed company shall be paid up and deposited in a chartered bank to the credit of the company or of trustees for the purposes of the company. It has been pointed out that this provision may be evaded, and perhaps has been evaded, by paying the amount into the bank and afterwards drawing it out. The amendment proposes that the amount shall be paid into a chartered bank to the credit of the Receiver General who will see that it is afterwards applied to the purposes of the company, after the signing of the letters patent.

Motion agreed to. Bill read the second time, considered in committee, reported, and read the third time and passed.

THE OFFICER COMMANDING THE MILITIA—INCREASE OF SALARY.

The resolution adopted in Committee of the Whole on the 5th May, instant, respecting the salary of the officer commanding the militia, was reported and read the second time.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA (Mr. Borden) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 140) to amend the Militia Act.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

SUPPLY—MANITOBA SCHOOL QUESTION—ADDRESS TO THE HOLY FATHER.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I wish to call your attention to a matter which is not strange to the House. It will be in the recollection of hon. gentlemen that in the Speech with which His Excellency was pleased to open the second session of this Parliament, the following paragraph appeared:

> Immediately after the last session, the Government of Manitoba was invited to hold a conference with my Ministers on the subject of the grievances arising out of the Act of that province relating to education passed in the year 1890. In response to that invitation, three members of the Manitoba Government came to Ottawa, and after many and protracted discussions, a settlement was reached between the two Governments, which was the best arrangement obtainable under the existing conditions of this disturbing question. I confidently hope that this settlement will put an end to the agitation which has marred the harmony and impeded the development of our country, and will prove the beginning of a new era to be characterized by generous treatment of one another, mutual concessions and reciprocal good-will.

To that Speech from the Throne the House made the following reply, which was moved by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Russell), and seconded by the hon. member for Two Mountains (Mr. Ethier):

> We learn with satisfaction that immediately after the last session, the Government of Manitoba was invited to hold a conference with His Excellency's Ministers on the subject of the grievances arising out of the Act of that province relating to education, passed in the year 1890, and that in response to that invitation, three members of the Manitoba Government came to Ottawa, and after many and protracted discussions, a settlement was reached between the two Governments, which was the best arrangement obtainable under the existing conditions of this disturbing question: and we share His Excellency's hope that this settlement will put an end to the agitation, which has marred the harmony and impeded the development of our country, and will prove the beginning of a new era to be characterized by generous treatment of one another, mutual concessions and reciprocal good-will.

In the discussion of that paragraph in the Address, hon. members on this side of the House charged the members of the Administration with not carrying out the pledges which they had made to the people representing the minority interested in the Manitoba school question. In reply to that charge, the hon. Minister of Public Works took up the defence of the Government, in very strong language, and read to the House a document which he stated was a copy of a petition which had been forwarded by himself and some fourty-four other members of the Senate or of the House of Commons to the Holy Father on the subject of the interference of the Catholic hierarchy in the previous election in connection with this particular question. I do not propose to read the whole document, because I must say that I, as a member of the Catholic Church, felt pained, as I believe a great many other hon. members of this House did, to find that the hon. Minister would bring into this House a document containing such charges as were contained in that document. I also felt pained to find that the Administration, as shown by their subsequent actions, were unwilling to place on the records of this House, where they had placed that document, the reply which they had received to it. The document began as follows:—

> We, the undersigned, members of the Senate and members of the House of Commons of Can-

ada, and representing therein the Liberal party, present ourselves before Your Holiness as respectful and devoted children of Holy Church, to complain of the existence of a state of things which, if allowed to continue, might be extremely dangerous to the constitutional liberties of this country, as well as to the interests of the church itself, &c., &c.

The hon. Minister read the whole document to the House, and is on "Hansard" of March 30, 1897, and made very strong statements in regard to it, in addition to the strong language contained in the document. He told the House that a group of Roman Catholic public men belonging to the Liberal party took the means of securing the coming out to Canada of a papal delegate. He said, in reference to the hon. leader of the Opposition :

I thank the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) for having done so, because it has given us an opportunity of stating our case before this Parliament, before the British Empire, and before the whole civilized world.

He also said :

Sir, as I have said, I take the full responsibility of my signature to the document that I am now going to read.

He also said :

Sir, this document, I am not afraid of saying—I am proud to say—has been signed by forty-five of us. I say as a member of this Government that I signed it, and I am proud to say so.

What I complain of, and what I think hon. members of this House will agree with me in, is the injustice done to those venerable gentlemen in the province of Quebec by having a document of that kind circulated broadcast throughout this country, put on the publications of this Parliament ; and then, having thereafter received a reply from the Holy Father, as I maintain every member of the Catholic community in Canada did, they did not fulfil what was their plain duty, by placing that reply on the same records of this Parliament, which was the judgment of the Holy Father after hearing the charges and evidence. To do that would be only common justice to the humblest citizen in the land. That is my complaint, and the complaint of a great many people in this country, against the members of the Administration who signed that document and the hon. gentleman who read it to the House. They have refused to acknowledge having received the slightest answer to that document from the Holy Father. Sir, in the early part of this session I took occasion to put the following question on the Order paper :

Has the Government or the Minister of Public Works any knowledge of a reply being made to the document addressed to the Holy Father and signed by 45 members of the Senate and House of Commons, and which was read to this House by the hon. Minister of Public Works on the 30th March, 1897 ? If so, what is the nature of the reply ?

The reply made to that question, which was put by me on the 14th of February last, was made by the right hon. First Minister, and it was to the following effect :

The Government have no knowledge.

Feeling satisfied that the Government must have knowledge, or at least that the Catholic members of the Administration had knowledge, as every Catholic member of the community had, of the reply of the Holy Father to the representations made in reference to this question, I felt that it was the duty of the Administration, or at least the Catholic members of the Administration, to give us the answer across the floor of the House. I followed that by putting the following question on the 16th of February :—

Has the Hon. J. Israel Tarte---

This is the gentleman who took the full responsibility of the document when he read it to the House——

Has the Hon. J. Israel Tarte, a member of the Government, any knowledge of a reply being made to the document addressed to the Holy Father and signed by the said Hon. J. Israel Tarte and forty-four Senators and members of the House of Commons and was read by the hon. Minister of Public Works on the 30th March, 1897 ? If so, what is the nature of the reply ? If not, does the hon. Minister of Public Works expect an answer ? If not, why not ?

You, Mr. Speaker, ruled that question out of order, and justified the Government in not making a reply. I could not see the good reason for that, although it was my duty to obey your ruling, Sir. I could not see the reason, because of the fact that in the Speech which His Excellency was pleased to open the second session of this Parliament this question occupied the place of the second paragraph of that Speech.

Mr. SPEAKER. Unless the hon. gentleman raises the question of order—and I cannot see how he can raise it at this time—I do not think it is parliamentary to question a past ruling of the Speaker.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I am not questioning your ruling, Mr. Speaker. I said that, as was my duty, I submitted to your ruling. I simply said to you and the House what my own opinion was. Whether I was absolutely wrong in taking the position I took at that time or within my right.

Mr. SPEAKER. I may say that I gave the reasons for my ruling at the time.

Mr. McDOUGALL. And I submitted. I followed up the question by putting it in the form of a notice of motion on the paper in the following language :

For copies of all correspondence, letters, memorials, documents, &c., forwarded to the

Holy See, signed by the Honourable J. Israel Tarte, a member of the Government, or by any member of the Government, and forty-four or any other number of members of the Senate and House of Commons, and referred to on several occasions by the hon. the Minister of Public Works in the House of Commons during the session of 1897, and of all answers thereto received, directly or indirectly, by the Right Honourable the Prime Minister, the hon. Minister of Public Works, the hon. Solicitor General, or any other member of the Government.

I endeavoured to get that motion passed on several occasions, but each time it came up, the request was made from the Government benches to have it stand. On the 25th April, it was again reached, when undiscussed motions were called, but as my object in putting that motion was to have a discussion, and as it was then impossible to have it discussed before the close of the session, I withdrew it, and I see no other way of obtaining the object I have in view than by taking the course I am now adopting. The Government having refused to give the slightest information to this House of any knowledge on their part of a reply from the Holy Father with respect to the representations that were made to him through that petition and through other channels which the Administration, or certain members of it, made use of to reach His Holiness with respect to their complaint against the position taken by the Roman Catholic archbishops and bishops and clergy of the province of Quebec, I feel now that it is my duty to do that which the Government have refused to do, namely, to give to this House the answer which every Catholic in Canada received to those representations that were made to the Holy Father. In all communications between the bishops or other members of the Catholic Church in Canada and the Holy Father, the usual course followed is to send those communications and receive replies to them through His Eminence the Cardinal Archbishop of Quebec, and, therefore, the encylical which contains the reply of the Holy Father to the representations that were sent to him came through the administrator of His Eminence the late Cardinal Taschereau. It reads as follows:

POPE LEO XIII.

To Our Venerable Brothers, the Archbishops, Bishops and other Ordinaries of the Dominion of Canada, having peace and communion with the Apostolic See.

Venerable Brothers, Health and Apostolic Benediction:

In addressing you, as we most willingly and lovingly do, there naturally occurs to our mind the continual interchange of proofs of mutual kindliness and good offices that has ever existed between the Apostolic See and the people of Canada. The charity of the Roman Catholic Church watched by your very cradle, and she has never ceased since she received you into her maternal bosom to hold you in a close embrace, and to bestow benefits on you with a prodigal hand. If that man of immortal memory Francis de Laval Montmorency, first bishop of Quebec, was able to happily accomplish for the public good such deeds of renown as your forefathers witnessed, it was because he was supported by the authority and favour of the Roman Pontiffs. Nor was it from any other source that the works of succeeding bishops, men of great merit, had their origin, and drew their guarantee of success. In the same way, to go back to earlier days, it was through the inspiration and initiative of the Apostolic See that generous bands of missionaries undertook the journey to your country, bearing, together with the light of the Gospel, a higher culture and the first germs of civilization. It was these germs, rendered fruitful by their devoted labours, that have placed the people of Canada, although of recent origin, on an equal footing of culture and glory with the most polished nations of the world.

It is most pleasing to recall these facts, all the more so because we can still contemplate their abundant fruits. Assuredly the greatest of these is that amongst the Catholic people there is an ardent love and zeal for our holy religion, for that religion which your ancestors, coming, providentially, first and chiefly from France, then from Ireland, and afterwards from elsewhere, faithfully practised and transmitted as an inviolable deposit to their children.

But if their children have faithfully preserved this precious inheritance it is easy for us to understand how much of praise is due to your vigilance and your labours, venerable brothers, how much also to the zeal of your clergy, for all of you have laboured with unanimity and assiduity for the preservation and advancement of the Catholic faith, and (for we must pay this homage to the truth) without meeting with disfavour or opposition from the laws of the British Empire. Hence it was, that when moved by the consideration of merits, common to you all, we raised, a few years ago, the Archbishop of Quebec to the Cardinalite dignity, we had in view not only to recognize his personal merits, but also to pay a tribute of homage to the piety of all your Catholic people.

With the education of youth, upon which rest the best hopes of religious and civil society, the Apostolic See has never ceased, in conjunction with you and your predecessors, to occupy itself. Hence were founded in great numbers institutions destined for the moral and scientific instruction of youth, institutions which are flourishing under the guardianship and protection of the Church. Amongst these the University of Quebec, adorned with all the titles and enjoying all the rights which Apostolic authority is accustomed to confer, occupies a place of honour, and sufficiently proves that the Holy See has no greater preoccupation, nor desire than the formation of youthful citizens, distinguished by intellectual culture and commendable by reason of their virtue. Wherefore it was with extreme solicitude, as you can readily understand, that we turned our mind to the unhappy events which in these latter years have marked the history of Catholic education in Manitoba. It is our wish, and this wish is a duty, for us to strive to obtain, and to effectively obtain, by all the means and all the efforts in our power, that no hurt shall come to religion among so many thousands of souls whose salvation has been specially committed to us, especially in a country which owes to the Church its initiation in Christian doctrine and the first rudiments of civilization. And since many expected that we should make a pronouncement on the ques-

tion, and asked that we should trace a line of conduct and a way to be followed, we did not wish to decide anything on this subject before our Apostolic delegate had been on the spot. Being charged to proceed to a serious examination of the situation, and to give an account to us of the state of affairs, he has faithfully and diligently fulfilled the command which we have given him.

The question agitated is one of great and exceptional importance. We speak of the decision taken seven years ago by the Parliament of Manitoba on the subject of education. The Act of Confederation had secured to Catholic children the right of education in public schools, in keeping with their conscientious convictions: the Parliament of Manitoba abolished this right by a contrary law. By this law a grave injury was inflicted, for it is not lawful for our children to seek the benefits of education in schools in which the Catholic religion is ignored, or actively combatted; in schools where its doctrine is despised and its fundamental principles repudiated. If the Church has anywhere permitted this, it was only with reluctance and in self-defence, and after having taken many precautions, which, however, too often have been found unequal to parrying the danger. In like manner one must at all cost avoid as most pernicious those schools wherein every form of belief is indifferently admitted and placed on an equal footing—as if in what regards God and Divine things it was of no importance whether one believed rightly or wrongly, whether one followed truth or falsehood. You well know, venerable brothers, that all schools of this kind have been condemned by the Church, because there can be nothing more pernicious or more fitted to injure the integrity of faith, and to turn away the tender minds of youth from the truth.

There is another point on which even those who differ from us in all else will agree with us, namely, that it is not by means of a purely scientific instruction, nor by vague and superficial notions of virtue, that Catholic children will leave school such as their country desires and expects. They must be more deeply and fully instructed in their religion if they are to become good Christians, honest and upright citizens. The formation of their character must be the result of principles which, deeply engraven on their consciences, will impose themselves on their lives as the natural consequences of their faith and religion, for without religion there is no moral education worthy of the name, none truly efficacious, seeing that the nature and force of all duties are derived chiefly from those special duties which bind man to God, to God who commands, who forbids, and who has affixed a sanction to good and evil. Wherefore, to hope to have souls imbued with good morals, and at the same time to leave them deprived of religion, is as senseless as to invite to virtue after having overthrown its very foundations. For the Catholic there is but one true religion, the Catholic religion; hence in all that concerns doctrine, or morality, or religion, he cannot accept or recognize anything which is not drawn from the very sources of Catholic teaching. Justice and reason demand, then, that our children have in their schools, not only scientific instruction, but also moral teachings in harmony, as we have already said, with the principles of their religion—teachings without which all education will be not only fruitless, but absolutely pernicious. Hence the necessity of having Catholic teachers; reading books and text-books approved of by the bishops; and liberty to organize the schools so that the teaching therein may be in full accord with Catholic faith as well as with all the duties that flow therefrom. For the rest, to decide in what institutions children shall be instructed, and who shall be their teachers of morality, is a right inherent to paternal authority. When, then, Catholics demand, as it is their duty to demand, and to strive to obtain, that the teachings of the masters shall be in conformity with the religion of their children, they are only making use of their right; and there can be nothing more unjust than to force on them the alternative of allowing their children to grow up in ignorance, or to expose them to manifest danger in what concerns the supreme interests of their souls.

It is not right to call in doubt or to abandon in any way these principles of judging and acting which are founded on truth and justice, and which are the safeguards both of public and private interests. Wherefore, when the law in Manitoba struck a blow at Catholic education, it was your duty, venerable brothers, to freely protest against the injury and disaster inflicted; and the way in which you all fulfilled that duty is a proof of your common vigilance, and of a spirit truly worthy of bishops; and although each one of you will find on this point a sufficient approbation in the testimony of his own conscience, learn, nevertheless, that you have also our concurrence and our approbation; for the things which you sought and still seek to protect and defend are most sacred.

The difficulties created by the law of which we speak, by their very nature showed that an alleviation was to be sought for in a united effort. For so worthy was the Catholic cause, that all good and upright citizens, without distinction of party, should have banded themselves together in close union to uphold it. Unfortunately for the success of this cause the contrary took place. What is more deplorable still is, that Catholic Canadians themselves failed to unite as they should in defending those interests, which are of such great importance to all—the importance and gravity of which should have stilled the voice of party politics, which are of much less importance.

We are not unaware that something has been done to amend that law. The men who are at the head of the Federal Government, and of the province of Manitoba, have already taken certain measures with a view to decreasing the difficulties of which the Catholics of Manitoba complain, and against which they rightly continue to protest. We have no reason to doubt that these measures were taken from a love of justice, and from a laudable motive. We cannot, however, dissimulate the truth; the law which they have passed to repair the injury is defective, unsuitable, insufficient. The Catholics ask, and no one can deny that they justly ask, for much more. Moreover, in the remedial measures that have been proposed, there is this defect, that by reason of changed local circumstances they may easily become valueless. In a word, the rights of Catholics and the education of their children have not been sufficiently provided for in Manitoba. Everything in this question demands—and it is conformable to justice—that they should be thoroughly provided for, that is, by placing in security and surrounding with due safeguards those unchangeable and sacred principles of which we have spoken above. This should be the aim, this the end to be zealously and prudently sought for. Nothing can be more injurious to the attainment of this end

than discord. Unity of spirit and harmony of action are most necessary. Nevertheless, since, as frequently happens in things of this nature, there is not one fixed and determined, but various ways of arriving at the end which is proposed and which should be obtained, it follows that there may be various opinions equally good and advantageous. Wherefore, let each and all be mindful of the rules of moderation, gentleness and mutual charity; let no one fail in the respect that is due to another, but let all resolve in fraternal unanimity, and not without your advice, to do that which the circumstances require, and which appears best to be done.

As regards especially the Catholics of Manitoba, we have every confidence that with God's help they will succeed in obtaining full satisfaction. This hope is founded, in the first place, on the righteousness of their cause; next, on the sense of justice and prudence of the men at the head of the Government, and finally, on the goodwill of all upright men in Canada. In the meantime, until they are able to obtain their full rights, let them not refuse partial satisfaction. If, therefore, anything is granted by law, or custom, or the goodwill of men, which will render the evil more tolerable and the dangers more remote, it is expedient and useful to make use of such concessions, and to derive therefrom as much benefit and advantage as possible. Where, however, no remedy can be found for the evil, we exhort and beseech that it be provided against by the liberality and munificence of their contributions; for no one can do anything more salutary for himself, or more conducive to the prosperity of his country, than to contribute, according to his means, to the maintenance of these schools.

There is another point which appeals to your common solicitude, namely, that by your authority, and with the assistance of those who direct educational institutions an accurate and suitable curriculum of studies be established, and that it be especially provided that no one shall be permitted to teach who is not amply endowed with all the necessary qualities, natural and acquired; for it is only right that the Catholic schools should be able to compete in learning, culture and scholarship with the best in the country. As concerns intellectual culture, and the progress of civilization, one can only recognize as praiseworthy and noble the desire of the provinces of Canada to develop public instruction, and to raise its standard more and more, in order that it may daily become higher and more perfect. Now, there is no kind of knowledge, no perfection of learning, which cannot be fully harmonized with Catholic doctrine.

Especially Catholics who are writers on the daily press can do much towards explaining and defending what we have already said. Let them, therefore, be mindful of their duty. Let them sacredly and courageously uphold what is true, what is right, what is useful to the Christian religion and the state; let them do it, however, in a decorous manner. Let them avoid personalities; let them never overstep the bounds of moderation. Let them respect and religiously take heed to the authority of the bishops and all legitimate authority. The greater the difficulties of the time and the more imminent the danger of dissension, the more studiously should they endeavour to promote unity of thought and action, without which there is little or no hope that that which we all desire will be obtained.

As a pledge of heavenly gifts and a testimony of our paternal goodwill, receive the Apostolic benediction, which we lovingly impart in the Lord to you, venerable brothers, and to your clergy and people.

Given at Rome, from St. Peter's, on the 8th day of December, 1897, in the twentieth year of our Pontificate.

LEO P. P. XIII.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is the English translation of the encyclical which the Holy Father sent in reply to the representations that were made on this question, and with regard to the part taken by the Catholic hierarchy of the province of Quebec and other provinces of this Dominion upon the question. Acting under the authority vested in his Grace by the Holy Father, the Archbishop of Quebec has addressed a pastoral to the clergy and Catholic people of Canada. In doing so, that pastoral contains certain interpretations, divided into three parts, on the subject of the encyclical. The first part is with regard to the principles of the Church in respect to education; the second part regards the appreciation of all the events relating to the Manitoba school question from the law of 1890 to the present day; the third part deals with the duty of Catholics on all such questions in the future. I think that in view of what has already been placed upon "Hansard," I am acting quite properly in quoting to the House these interpretations.

PART FIRST.

Principles of the Catholic Church in the matter of Education.

In this first part, Leo XIII teaches:

1. That the parents above all, under the guidance and with the concurrence of the Church, are bound to provide for the education of their children and to assure them that kind of instruction which is proper and adapts itself to their religious belief. That is the reason why, in the laws of 1890 which afflicted our co-religionists of Manitoba, must be seen not only a violation of the federal fact but also a regrettable injury against the unforfeitable rights of the Church and of parents. "As to deciding," says His Holiness, "in what institutions their children shall be brought up, what masters shall be called to teach them moral precepts, that is a right inherent to paternal authorities."

2. Leo XIII energetically condemns, as he has already often done, mixed and neutral schools. Speaking of the latter, he says: "Must be shunned at any cost, as most pernicious, those schools where all beliefs are indifferently harboured and placed on the same footing, as if, in what concerns God and things divine, it mattered little to have or not sound doctrines, and to adopt truth or error."

3. Leo XIII defines the Catholic school, that which is held by "Catholic teachers, whose readers and text books are approved by the bishops," and whose entire system harmonizes with the religious wants and duties of the young pupils. Without these conditions, the school exposes Catholic children to the gravest dangers, and it is a sovereign injustice (the word is Leo XIII) to force fathers of families to expose thereto those whose care the Author of nature has confided to them. "When Catholics demand—and it is their duty to thus demand and claim—that the teaching of the masters agree with the religion

of their children, they make use of their own rights. And nothing could be more unjust, than to place them in the alternative either of letting their children grow up in ignorance or of casting them into a sphere which constitutes a manifest danger to their souls."

PART SECOND.

Appreciation of all the events relating to the Manitoba school question from the passing of the law of 1890 to the present day.

1. Since the law of 1890 constituted a real injustice towards the Catholic minority of Manitoba it was the duty of the bishops to take the defence of that minority. They did so, and Leo XIII is pleased to give them praise therefore in the following terms :—"Wherefore, when the new law inflicted a blow on Catholic education in the province of Manitoba, it was your duty, venerable brethren to protest openly against the injustice and against the injury that it had received, and the manner in which you have fulfilled that duty is a striking proof of your common vigilance and of a zeal truly worthy of bishops. And although, on this point, each one of you meets with a sufficient approbation in the testimony of his conscience, know nevertheless that we add thereto our assent and our approbation. For those things which you have sought, and still seek to guard and defend, are truly sacred."

2. All honest men, all Catholics especially, should likewise have been united in defending a cause the importance of which cannot suffer comparison with mere political interests. Unfortunately party spirit intervened to prevent the fulfilment of that sacred duty, and the Holy Father bitterly deplores it.

"What is more deplorable still," says His Holiness, "is that Canadian Catholics themselves did not succeed in agreeing to defend interests, the greatness and gravity of which should impose silence on the interests of political parties, which are of a far inferior order."

3. The agreement effected between the federal authorities of Ottawa and the provincial government of Winnipeg, an agreement to which they would like to give the name of settlement of the school question, is declared defective, imperfect, insufficient, and therefore cannot be accepted as an equitable solution of the question. "That which the Catholics demand," says Leo XIII, "and which they have—as nobody doubts—the right to demand, is far greater. To sum up the whole, the right of Catholics and the education our children in Manitoba have not yet been sufficiently provided for." It is, therefore, with reason that that agreement has been repudiated by the Episcopate, and that the Manitoban minority would not submit thereto.

PART THIRD.

Duties of Catholics and of all citizens regarding the question in future.

It is not enough to state the injustice committed and the insufficiency of the means heretofore proposed for the reparation thereof ; it is important to trace out a line of conduct for the future. And this is done by Leo XIII in the last part of his Encyclical.

1. Catholics are bound to strive to reconquer, by all legal means at their disposal, all their rights in their fullness. "Such," says the Pope, must be the aim in view, such the object to be pursued with zeal and prudence."

2. In this difficult struggle, in which all should have the same ambitions and the same desires : To render entire justice to the minority, if honest differences of opinion may occur, nevertheless these various sentiments, stated with all moderation and charity, finish by being effaced and blended in a certain manner into a common sentiment and a brotherly unanimity. The principle of such action, is the episcopal authority and direction, without which nothing must be done nor undertaken : Non sine consilio vestro.

3. The Catholics of Manitoba must be disposed, as they have always been, to accept, without ceasing to obtain entire justice, the partial reparation which they may obtain, provided, naturally, that they agree with the doctrines of the Church and cause to disappear from the schools the neutral teaching condemned by the Sovereign Pontiff.

4. The Holy Father, trusting in the excellency of the cause of the Catholics, expresses the hope that, owing to the equity and the real prudence we have a right to expect from our governments, owing also to the good-will and the spirit of justice of all Canadians, this thorny question will finish by receiving a thoroughly satisfactory solution. He also greatly relies, to reach this end, on the loyal and enlightened concurrence of journalists, whose task is so noble and so important, but who may worthily fulfil their mission only by respecting the rights of truth, of justice, of religion, and by obediently following the episcopal directions : Vereantur ac sancte observent episcoporum a uctorita tem.

5. As long as justice will not have been obtained, the Catholics will aid with their alms in the support of the Catholic schools of Manitoba, and they cannot perform a better and holier work. For our part, we desire that the "work of the Manitoba school-pence," approved by the Holy See, be encouraged by all the Catholics of our diocese.

6. The bishops must provide by their authority, and with the aid of those who direct educational establishments, that a full programme of studies be carefully and wisely elaborated and that such only be admitted as professors who are endowed with the qualities requisite for the functions of a solid and profoundly religious teaching.

Such, our dearly beloved brethren, is the Encyclical of Leo XIII, of which the official translation into French was sent to us by the Holy Father himself. What it declares, what it prescribes, what it counsels, we have just made known to you, in the fulfilment of the office of our pastoral charge, and we interdict, as most disrespectful to His Holiness, all contrary interpretations.

Nothing remains to us now but to appeal to that spirit of faith and submission with which we know you to be animated towards the Holy See. We are desirous to proclaim it aloud : We are above all political parties : We have no intention to be bound to any. What we desire is the triumph of a sacred cause and not the triumph of a party. And this triumph, we hope that all men of heart, all friends of justice and lieberty will help us to obtain it.

There is no question of coming back upon an unfortunate past ; this is the hour for a complete, entire reparation that we expect, and that hour, all sympathies, every noble courage, every generous kindenss must strive to hasten. Let public men therefore unite together and have recourse to the means that wisdom and patriotism shall inspire them to put an end to the violent state of things we are all enduring. They know the means of action authorized by the constitution. Let justice come from the Government of Winnipeg, induced to repair the injustice committed ; let it come to us from the Federal Government, by an efficacious and abiding law, as we have already demanded, or even, were it possible from

the Imperial Government we shall rejoice thereat, and the heart of the Sovereign Pontiff—we know it—will be consoled.

In the name of justice, in the name of that harmony that should reign among all the citizens of the same country, we invite Protestants—whom the diversity of belief does not prevent from being our brothers—to give us their hand and to work with us. Already many of their number, by what they have done in the past, have deserved our gratitude, of which we here offer them the sincere expression. All, such is our hope, will listen to our voice ; they will treat that small but valued minority of Manitoba as they would be treated themselves were they in their place.

We rely upon them, and—let it be known to them—the victory that we shall win will be theirs as well as ours, for it will be the victory of right and of liberty.

The present pastoral letter shall be delivered and published at the throne in all churches and parochial chapels or others, where public worship is held and in chapter in religious communities, the Sunday following its reception.

Given at Quebec under our signature, the Seal of the Archdiocese and the counter-signature of our secretary the 6th January, 1898.

L. N. ARCHB. OF CYRENE,
Administrator,
By order of His Grace,
B. Ph. Garneau, Priest,
Secretary.

My desire from the outset was to place within the reach of every man, woman and child who read the charge made by the Minister of Public Works in that document of 30th March, 1897, and the strong supplementary charges he made as to what was contained in that document—my desire was to place those documents I have read, the Government having refused to acknowledge them up to the present moment, within the reach of every one who has seen the document read by the Minister of Public Works. I feel that it was not my duty to do so, so much as it was the duty of the hon. gentleman who brought forward that document and its contents, and in view of the language with which he supplemented those contents before the House. I expected that one of his first acts after Parliament met was to come before the House and say that he had now an answer to the representations he and his colleagues made in regard to the Catholic hierarchy and what was considered to be an answer full and complete, and which it was his duty as a member of the Catholic Church if not as a member of the Government, to have laid before the House. I believe now, as I did at that time, that when the hon. Minister placed that document and the language with which he supplemented it on the pages of "Hansard," he placed there the greatest blot that had ever been put on the "Hansard" of this House. I submit that he aggravated this wrong by refusing to acknowledge the documents or what was contained in them in the form of an answer from His Holiness which I have read. Only a few days ago I asked a question in regard to the mission of Mr. Russell, the solicitor of the Government, to Rome, whose letter to His Eminence Cardinal Rampolla is on the records of this House—that letter which I submitted and asked the Government as to their knowledge of its contents. You, Mr. Speaker, know and every hon. member knows that the right hon. First Minister answered that question to the effect that he was not aware of the existence of any such document. That may be a very convenient answer for the First Minister to make, but those of us who are familiar with the manner in which communications to the Holy See are conducted, are unable to accept the answer made by the First Minister. I will not occupy the time of the House at greater length. I feel that I have accomplished what it was my intention to accomplish at the early part of the session, and which the Government endeavoured to shut off from the time I brought the matter before the House up to the present.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I have no observations to offer in reply to the remarks of the hon. gentleman (Mr. McDougall). I want simply to correct an impression which he should not have allowed to be conveyed. The hon. gentleman has asked the Government to produce any answer to the complaint made by certain Catholic members of Parliament with respect to the conduct of the Quebec hierarchy in the elections of 1896. He has read to the House the encyclical letter of His Holiness the Pope, dated 8th November, and the comments thereon by the archbishops and bishops of Quebec. He has insinuated that the documents had been sent to us. He knows that the documents were not addressed to us, they were addressed to the whole Catholic world. The Government have no knowledge of them officially, and the hon. gentleman should know that they were not in the possession of the Government.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I desire to say a word in explanation. The First Minister has said that I asked for the production of the papers. The initial step I took was to ask the Government if they had any knowledge of the existence of such papers. That was a matter which I thought certain members of the Government would have admitted to the House. The First Minister is not correct if he confines his statement to my having asked for the papers. My first step was to ask whether any member of the Government had any knowledge of the existence of such papers, and I was refused that information, after which I asked for the correspondence.

Mr. BERGERON. I had intended to speak on this question which my hon. friend has brought before the House to-day. I did not expect it would have been brought up so soon, but as I intended to bring the

matter up later, I might as well address myself to it now. The question on which my hon. friend spoke a moment ago, and which is still very fresh before the minds of the country, is an important one. It was important from the commencement by its very nature. It has become very important from the way in which hon. gentlemen opposite have worked it during the five years which the question was before the courts of justice in this country and in the old country. It was always important by the use hon. gentlemen opposite made of it. Some hon. members in certain parts of the Dominion using it in one way and hon. members in other parts of the Dominion using it in another way, but both designed to hurt the Administration then in power, which was doing everything in its power to settle the question, on which hon. gentlemen opposite were seeking to bring themselves into power, as their policy on everything else did not ensure them the confidence of the country. Under these considerations I am bound to consider this question a most important one. To my surprise since this session commenced, especially after the heralding of the settlement of the question by hon. gentlemen opposite had been used, questions have been asked in this House and asked somewhere else, and it has been asked if the Ministers have answered them fairly or not fairly, but they have answered in a way that leads me to believe that they wanted to evade answering truthfully to the questions put them. I myself asked in the House some time ago, whether any document signed "Wilfrid Laurier," the name of the Prime Minister, had ever been sent either to His Holiness the Pope or to the Sacred Propaganda in Rome—which Roman Catholics in this House will know is the political tribunal of Rome—touching the Manitoba schools. I was answered by the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) that he did not know that any such document had ever been sent either to His Holiness the Pope or to the Sacred Propaganda. Now, either the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) knew that there was such a document and would not tell me, or he did not know. Sir, what is the fact. When that question was put to the Government and answered by the Minister of Trade and Commerce, I had that document here which is entitled: "Document to Help towards a Knowledge of the Manitoba School Question, with explanatory Notes." Sir, that document was printed in Rome in 1896, and it is signed "Wilfrid Laurier," under date Ottawa, 23rd November, 1896. I repeat that the Minister of Trade and Commerce either knew of this document or he did not know of it. If he knew of it it was his duty to tell me that such a document had been sent to Rome, and if he did not know of it, what sort of a Government have we when the Prime Minister, forsooth, can have communication with a foreign Government—because the political Roman Government is a foreign Government—and his colleagues be completely ignorant of it. This document is a very important one; it is important because it does not convey what I consider to be the truth upon this whole question. For five years the Liberal party deceived the people of this country with regard to this question. In Ontario they tried to raise the fanaticism of that province by saying that the Conservative Government were under the thumb and the foot of the bishops of the province of Quebec; and in the province of Quebec, the Liberals under the banner and direction of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) promenaded through the province, declaring the Manitoba minority would never obtain justice because the Conservative Government at Ottawa was under the thumb and foot of the Orangemen of Ontario. They did that beautiful work in this Dominion, where for the sake of our welfare such questions should be avoided, and they went to the country, after preventing the Conservative Government from passing a Bill which had the sanction of the Manitoba minority. It may not have been a complete Bill, it may not have been as much as they wanted, but it had their sanction and it was accepted by them. As we know, the Liberals in this House in the session of 1896, knowing that Parliament expired by efflux of time, took advantage of that to prevent that law passing. I am repeating this which may be looked upon as ancient history, but it is necessary in order to explain what we find in this document later on, a document signed by the Prime Minister of Canada. The Liberals went to the country telling the people of Ontario that there would be no coercion of Manitoba, telling the people of Quebec that the Conservative Government did not want and never did want to give justice to the Catholic minority; telling them in Quebec that the Remedial Bill was a sham—and in one of his speeches in that province, the right hon. gentleman in his own constituency said that he would bring in a measure which would give more to the Manitoba minority than was ever promised by the Remedial Bill. The right hon. gentleman told the people that we would try conciliation first of all, sunny ways, for he was convinced in his soul that the soft heart of Mr. Greenway and the magnanimous heart of the present Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) would thaw under his benevolent eye. He told the people he would do everything in his power to obtain justice for the minority from the Manitoba Government, and if he did not succeed in that, he would then take hold of the constitution of the country and would see that the Roman Catholics of Manitoba would obtain complete and entire justice. You will see, Mr. Speaker, the very unfavourable circumstances under which the Conservative party had to appeal

to the electorate of Quebec, in view of the doctrine preached by the right hon. gentleman and his colleagues for the people of Quebec believed that if the right hon. gentleman would come into power he would give more justice to the minority than had been offered by the Remedial Bill. As the Liberal papers in the province of Quebec used to say: The Catholic Laurier would give more to the minority in Manitoba than would the Protestant Tupper. In view of these doctrines which were hurled broadcast through that province, it is a surprise to me that even a few Conservatives from Quebec are back in this House, for as I have said the people of that province believed in those declarations. But there was more than that. The right hon. gentleman himself stated, and his colleagues stated, and I heard it in the ten or fifteen counties which I had the honour to visit during the election: that as soon as Wilfrid Laurier was at the head of the Canadian Government he would have a commission appointed immediately at the head of which would be Sir Oliver Mowat. In our province, Sir Oliver Mowat was mentioned as the best man that ever lived in the province of Ontario, because although speaking English and not being of our faith, he was as good a friend of the Catholics as was Wilfrid Laurier himself. There were, of course, many in the province of Quebec who did not know that Sir Oliver Mowat, in 1863, had voted against separate schools, at a time when the Protestant Sir John Macdonald and the Orangeman Bowell were voting for them.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Bowell was not here then.

Mr. BERGERON. That was in the Parliament of old Canada; you were not there either.

Mr. LANDERKIN. No, but I understand it.

Mr. BERGERON. All this and more was promised by the Prime Minster to the people of Quebec, but has the Prime Minister carried out his pledge? To-day I hold the Prime Minister of Canada to his promise. Did the right hon. gentleman appoint a commission, at the head of which was Sir Oliver Mowat? He did not. He sent the Minister of Public Works there, and why? I was not present when the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) and the right hon. the Premier met after the elections. But I can imagine the conversation that took place between them. There is no doubt in the minds of those who were here at the time the right hon. gentleman, as leader of the Opposition, moved the six months' hoist. His idea was to carry the Protestant provinces of the Dominion. For the minority in Manitoba he did not care any more than he did the first day he sat in this House. But he wanted to obtain power, and on that question he wanted to carry the majority of the Protestant provinces of the Dominion. So far as Quebec is concerned, the Minister of Public Works had told him very often that with his French name and his reputation for eloquence, which is a great thing with our people, he could always carry enough members from the province of Quebec. But it was the other provinces that he had to carry, if he wanted to cross from this side of the House to the other side. Well, Mr. Speaker, on the evening of the 23rd of June, when these hon. gentlemen met and found that the right hon. gentleman was defeated in Ontario, that the province of Manitoba had given a majority against him, that the province of British Columbia had only given him a slight majority, that the maritime provinces, taken together, did not give him a majority, and that all his majority was in the province of Quebec; still, having a sense of all the responsibility that rested upon him, he said to his friend and mentor, "What shall we do? We are here by the grace of the majority of the province of Quebec; we cannot grant the minority any remedy; we have burned our vessels; we have prevented the only relief we could give to the minority; and what shall we do now?" And it seems to me I hear the Minister of Public Works, who is always full of expedients, saying, "Do not despair; I will go to Manitoba, and I will settle that question; I will say it is settled, my paper will say so, all the Grits will say so, and a great many people in the province of Quebec will believe it." That programme was carried out. Instead of the Government sending the Minister of Justice (Sir Oliver Mowat) to Manitoba, it was the Minister of Public Works who was sent; and what did he do there? That hon. gentleman for four or five years had been writing in his paper most violent articles against the then Administration, saying that it was under the thumb and under the feet of the Orangemen, that it would never render justice to the minority, that it was entirely sold to the province of Ontario.

An hon. MEMBER. It is true.

Mr. BERGERON. It is not true, and the man who says that knows it is not. The Minister of Public Works, having written these things, and said them everywhere went to the province of Manitoba, and he settled the question in what way? He met Mr. Greenway; he met Mr. Sifton, at that time Attorney General of that province. Did he go to the minority or to those who represented the minority, and had their confidence, and try to effect a settlement between the two? Because, Mr. Speaker, a settlement means something—it means an arrangement between two parties; it does not mean an arrangement with one party only. But the hon. gentleman went to one

side only, and gave them everything they wanted. As we shall see by-and-by from these documents, he never consulted the minority. But he wired from Winnipeg to the province of Quebec that the school question was settled and settled most satisfactorily; and "La Patrie" and other Grit papers in the province of Quebec joined in the tune, and said that the question was settled. Now, Sir, that settlement was not accepted by the minority. The minority complained: it would not accept the settlement. Those who represented the minority—who represented the majority of the minority, if I may so speak—refused to accept it. It is true, a few of the minority, who were employed by the hon. gentleman, or were promised some positions which they have been granted since——

Mr. FOSTER. Judgeships.

Mr. BERGERON. Yes, and we will come to that later. A very few may have declared themselves satisfied, like a gentleman named O'Donahue, who came before the Privy Council here and declared that he was satisfied with the way the school system of Manitoba was carried on. We know why; he only represented himself. But the majority of the minority expressed themselves as completely and entirely against the so-called settlement of the question by the Minister of Public Works. Appeals were made to the only quarter where those people could appeal. Then, we find this little document, prepared by those who had perpetrated the deal, who had deceived the province of Quebec, who had deceived the minority of the Dominion of Canada, who had deceived the minority of Manitoba, and who, trying to transfer their action to a higher plane, as they themselves admitted, sought to deceive the head of Catholicity, and to get something to put before the bishops, so that they could say, "We have settled that question, and there is the answer from Rome telling you to accept the settlement." But it did not succeed. If there is one thing that convinces me that the authorities in Rome have their eyes wide open, and are inspired, and know what kind of a judgment to render, it is the answer which Rome gave to the settlement of hon. gentlemen opposite. They were deceived, Mr. Speaker, and I am surprised that hon. gentlemen opposite did not succeed, for they had everything in their favour. They commenced by sending to Rome Father Proulx, the curé of St. Lin, in the county of L'Assomption, where the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) was born. Father Proulx went to Rome. I hope we shall find out some day, going through the Public Accounts, who paid all these expenses. Yesterday in the Senate, we got on the inside track a little way, but we will learn more later on. At Rome Father Proulx, as a priest, and a good priest, well received, tried to make the Papal authorities believe that the settlement was the best that could be made under the circumstances—that there was no doubt that the present Government had done everything in their power; that the Prime Minister of Canada was a Roman Catholic and a French Canadian, and that consequently it was better to pass over many things rather than expose his position; and that the Minister of Public Works, who had been sent to Manitoba, was the purest and most Catholic man in the whole province of Quebec. Well, Father Proulx did not succeed. Another gentleman was afterwards sent to Rome, Chevalier Drolet, an old Pontifical Zouave; and those who have been in Rome, and know the opinion held there of Pontifical Zouaves, will be able to realize how smart, how cute, it was on the part of the Government to send there Chevalier Drolet, covered with medals, which were won at Rome when he was there as a soldier—a man who had gained a good name there, and who was looked upon with favour by the two Governments of Rome, the religious and the political. Mr. Drolet was there a long time. He did not seem to very greatly succeed, for he was called back. What was to be done then? There is no doubt that the Prime Minister was saying to the Minister of Public Works: "That settlement of yours must be approved at Rome, or else we shall never be able to succeed in carrying the province of Quebec, upon which we are depending principally to keep us in power."

Mr. SPROULE. Is that the Drolet who has got so many mining licenses?

Mr. BERGERON. I do not say he got them for that at all. I make no reflection upon him for having got mining licenses. I was simply repeating the history of the whole question, so far as I know it. That is not all. Later the Solicitor General of Canada was sent to Rome as the representative of the Irish Catholics in the Government. He was sent there in conjunction with Mr. Russell, a very eminent lawyer of London, England, and the son of the Chief Justice of England, I may say in passing, the Government cast aside the old legal firm which had done at least 40 years of service for Canada, and gave its legal business to Mr. Russell. Mr. Russell was despatched to Rome with the Solicitor General, and according to current rumour, the Solicitor General was accepted in Rome as the representative of the Dominion of Canada and honoured with the title of Excellency. The mission of these gentlemen was likewise a failure, because shortly afterwards the right hon. gentleman himself, covered with the well-worn honours showered on him at the Jubilee, went to the Holy See. He went as a good Roman Catholic and knelt at the foot of the Pontifical Throne, and no doubt did all that was required of him as a good Roman Catholic, for which

I cannot do anything else than congratulate him. He there pleaded the cause of his Government. Did he succeed? I do not believe he did, if I read aright the mandement of the bishops of the province of Quebec, based on the reply of the Holy Father himself. What comes out of all this? It follows that the right hon. gentleman and his Government were carried into power on false pretenses and false issues, so far as the Manitoba school question is concerned, and I do not propose to go into anything else, because it would be very hard indeed to go into all the promises they made before they came into power and did not carry out.

After they had made a settlement, which was no settlement at all, after they had completely ignored the minority of Manitoba, they tried to deceive those whose support they required so that they might be able to tell the people that they carried out the promise which they had made to the electorate of at least a certain portion of the Dominion. That is not all. When my right hon. friend came back, the same tactics were pursued in the press, at any rate of the province of Quebec if not elsewhere, supporting the Government. That press claimed that everything that could have been done had been done, that it was impossible to do more, that the right hon. gentleman was perfectly satisfied, and that the bishops and clergy of the Roman Catholic Church were satisfied. Owing to the pressure made at that time upon the court of Rome by Mr. Russell and the Solicitor General, every bishop in the Dominion was instructed by the Holy See not to say anything upon the question, and not to direct their flock upon it until an answer was sent from Rome. The result was that in the election of Drummond and Arthabaska, whenever any one would open his mouth to speak on the school question, immediately the Liberal candidate and his friends would cry out: You must not talk about that, it is forbidden, the bishops have given strict orders that nobody is to talk about the school question until Rome has spoken. The same cry was raised in Nicolet and everywhere else, and the right hon. gentleman and the Minister of Public Works succeeded in this way in winning the by-elections. But I might add in passing that every Liberal candidate in the province of Quebec solemnly pledged himself to the people to submit to the judgment of Rome. They went further than any Conservative in this country would go, because we are not in the habit of doing bad things and then seeking afterwards to obtain the sanction of Rome, especially when we deceived Rome. These gentlemen, however, swore, from the first down to the last, that they would abide by the decision of Rome. I have in my hand this document of my right hon. friend, and I am very sorry that the right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce has always been in ignorance of it, because if there is one man in the Cabinet who should know everything, it is he who is looked upon as the best man in it; and the idea that the right hon. gentleman should have sent this to Rome and not tell his hon. colleague, surprises me very much indeed. There are many things which I have no desire to put in "Hansard," because they are in it already. There is the first judgment of the Privy Council.

Mr. WILSON. You will get them altogether, if you put them there now.

Mr. BERGERON. This is in French, and I would have to translate it. Then there is the second judgment of the Privy Council, which I shall not read either, because it is well known, and it would be very tedious work indeed to read, although I have it here in English. I think, however, it has been in "Hansard" before, and I shall not read it again.

The commencement of this document reads as follows:

PRELIMINARY REMARKS.

These various documents, scattered around, as they were, here, there and everywhere, are here combined in one single volume, in order to facilitate, for parties interested, a study of the Manitoba School Question, which for seven years past has caused but too much excitement in Canada, and still threatens to destroy for many a day civil concord and religious peace.

They are given, generally speaking, without lengthy comments; Roman perspicuity will certainly have no difficulty in realizing their full import. A few foot-notes have been added with the object, in most cases, of elucidating certain accompanying circumstances and certain extraneous conditions which cannot be surmised from the text.

It is in those remarks at the bottom of the pages and those explanations given of the text, that there is found a shading to deceive those to whom these papers were sent, as we shall see for ourselves.

To sum up all in one sentence, a perusal of the volume will show that the Judicial Committee of Her Majesty's Privy Council did not, in any sense whatever, order the re-establishing of the Manitoba separate schools.

That is not what the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) was preaching for five years.

That the Bill introduced in Parliament in March, 1896, by the Government of Sir Charles Tupper, and the settlement which he, at the time, caused to be submitted to the Manitoba Government, granted really and practically but a small part of their former school privileges or rights to the Catholic minority of Manitoba; that in relation to the said Bill, there was given in too many quarters——

There is a little hit at the hierarchy.

——especially in the province of Quebec, a religious direction most painful for the great majority of the Catholic population; and that the settlement just made by Mr. Laurier, the present Prime Minister of Canada, with the Mani-

toba Government, is more advantageous than that which was prepared by the Government of Sir Charles Tupper.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Will the hon. gentleman permit me to interrupt him ? I understood that he was citing a memorial written by myself. Does he pretend that this was written by me ?

Mr. BERGERON. It is signed in the right hon. gentleman's name.

The PRIME MINISTER. I do not know about that, but if it purports to have been written by me, I will qualify it as a forgery. I never wrote that.

Mr. BERGERON. I will come by and by to the last page, where the name of the right hon. gentleman is, and if he denies that, we will take his denial for granted until we have other authority.

The PRIME MINISTER. The hon. gentleman has said that I signed this document to Rome. I never wrote anything of the kind. The hon. gentleman may have something I have written—I have written a good deal upon this question—or that is signed by myself. I have written several memorials on that question, and the hon. gentleman may have one of them. But what he has been reading from at the moment and what he has given as written by me or dictated by me, I qualify as an absolute, entire, unmitigated forgery.

Mr. WALLACE. Or signed by yourself ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Or signed by myself.

Mr. BERGERON. It may be that this was written by somebody else. This document was ignored by the Minister of Trade and Commerce.

The PRIME MINISTER. That document was certainly ignored by the Minister of Trade and Commerce, because it was not signed or written or dictated by me.

Mr. BERGERON. This document certainly has not fallen from heaven direct into this House.

The PRIME MINISTER. Will the hon. gentleman kindly send me the document ?

Mr. SPEAKER. When an hon. member states that a document quoted as having been signed by him was not signed by him, another hon. member must accept that statement. The Prime Minister said that it was a forgery. Of course, the hon. member (Mr. Bergeron) may not agree with that fact, he may think that the hon. gentleman who states it has forgotten, but, for the purposes of debate, he should accept a statement of fact absolutely within the knowledge of an hon. member.

Mr. BERGERON. We have had this question before us for the last two years. We have been deceived with regard to the whole matter for the last two years. Why, it has been impossible to obtain the truth concerning the question and I——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. BERGERON. I shall show to the House that in another part of this building questions have been put or letters have been submitted as having been sent by the Government and they have been denied. But anybody reading these documents would know that they have not been forged. I ask the hon. gentleman, since he has perused the document, is that a document that he knows ?

The PRIME MINISTER. It is a document that I know perfectly well. I know perfectly well where it came from. It is a collection of documents compiled in Rome, in which is to be found a memorial prepared by myself, a sermon of Monsieur Lafleche, an opinion by Mr. Langelier, and so on. But the hon. gentleman stated a moment ago that I had penned certain things in that document. That is not the case. The hon. gentleman will find at the end, as I say, a memorial prepared by myself. I have it here.

Mr. BERGERON. Surely the right hon. gentleman does not want to hide behind flimsy excuses of that kind. Let us speak about this thing in a manly way. Here is a whole document. When I say that the hon. gentleman has signed it, he does not deny it. I do not say that the hon. gentleman sat down at his desk, and, with his nicest pen, wrote every word of this. But will he take the responsibility of this document ?

The PRIME MINISTER. No, certainly not.

Mr. BERGERON. He will not ?

The PRIME MINISTER. No.

Mr. BERGERON. The right hon. gentleman does not take the responsibility of what is in this document ?

The PRIME MINISTER. No.

Mr. BERGERON. The right hon. gentleman signed the last paper.

The PRIME MINISTER. Not at all. Be kind enough to let me have the document again. This is a collection of documents to help to the understanding of the Manitoba school question, with explanatory notes.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Where was it printed ?

The PRIME MINISTER. It was printed in Rome in 1896. Here is a table of the contents :

1. Judgment of the Privy Council. 2. Second judgment of the Privy Council. 3. Remedial Bill.

4. The opinion of Hon. Mr. Geoffrion. 5. Opinion of M. F. Langelier, advocate. 6. Letter of Father Lacombe to Hon. Mr. Laurier. 7. Peroration of speech of Hon. Mr. Laurier. 8. Collective letter of the Archbishops and Bishops of the province of Quebec of 6th May, 1896. 9. Sermon of Mgr. L. F. Lafleche, Bishop of Three Rivers. 10. Conference of Hon. Mr. Laurier on Catholic Liberalism. 11. Speech of Hon. Mr. Laurier on the Jesuits' Estates Bill. 12. Opinion of Mgr. Labrecque, Bishop of Chicoutimi. 13. Opinion of Mgr. A. A. Blais, Bishop of Chicoutimi. 14. Opinion of Mgr. Grand C. Vicar Marois. 15. Opinion of Mgr. N. Begin, Archbishop of Cyrene. 16 Opinion of Mgr. E. Gravelle, Bishop of Nicolet. 17. Opinion of Mgr. J. Cameron, Bishop of Antigonish. 18. Opinion of Mgr. Langevin, Archbishop of St. Boniface. 19. Opinion of N. Prendergast, advocate. 20. Opinion of M. Beausoleil. 21. Memorial of Hon. W. Laurier on the school settlement of Manitoba.

That is the table of contents.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BERGERON. I am at a loss to know what the hon. gentlemen are so proud of. Is this the right hon. gentleman's work or not?

The PRIME MINISTER. That is not my work. In that document there is a peroration of a speech I made on the Remedial Bill.

Mr. BERGERON. Is it correct?

The PRIME MINISTER. Of course it is. There is also a speech I delivered on the Jesuit Estates Bill.

Mr. BERGERON. Is that correct?

The PRIME MINISTER. Of course it is. I suppose that the sermon of Bishop Lafleche, which is also there, is likewise correct.

Mr. BERGERON. I did not put it there.

The PRIME MINISTER. Neither did I.

Mr. BERGERON. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am very much surprised, and I am very sorry, that in the House of Commons of Canada we should discuss matters in this fashion. We are discussing one of the most important questions brought before the people of the country for many years. Here is a document that has been printed in Rome.

Mr. LISTER. A collection of documents.

Mr. BERGERON. Let the chairman of the Drummond County Railway investigation (Mr. Lister) understand he is not to rule here. This document has not been printed here by the Conservative party of this country certainly. It is a document directed against the bishops and clergy of Quebec. It accords perfectly well with what the hon. Minister of Public Works wrote to Rome, when he sent this document signed by a long list of names, which I will read, to His Holiness Pope Leo XIII.:

Most Holy Father.—We, the undersigned, members of the Senate and members of the House of Commons of Canada, and representing therein the Liberal party, present ourselves before Your Holiness as respectful and devoted children of Holy Church, to complain of the existence of a state of things which, if allowed to continue, might be extremely dangerous to the constitutional liberties of this country, as well as to the interests of the church itself.

Your Holiness has already been made aware of the conduct and attitude of certain prelates and of certain members of the secular clergy who, during the general elections in this country, in the month of June last, intervened in a violent manner in restraint of electoral freedom, taking sides openly for the Conservative party against the Liberal party, and going so far as to declare guilty of grievous sin those of the electors who would vote for the candidates of the Liberal party.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BERGERON. It is a lie.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BERGERON. This statement is a lie.

Mr. SPEAKER. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergeron) is quoting from the speech of an hon. member of the House——

Mr. BERGERON. It is not a speech. I will explain. I know what you mean, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER. I understood the hon. gentleman was quoting from "Hansard."

Mr. BERGERON. It is something I find in "Hansard." It is a communication addressed to His Holiness the Pope, prepared by an hon. gentleman opposite and signed by himself and a number of others. I will read the names.

Mr. SPEAKER. I would suggest to the hon. member that he might find some other English word that will express his view of the case.

Mr. BERGERON. Well, Mr. Speaker, I am a French Canadian. If I were more familiar with the English language, I might express myself in other words. But I think, Mr. Speaker, everybody understood what I meant. I say that this statement——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. BERGERON. I am not surprised at hon. gentlemen opposite. I have no doubt that what I say hurts them. I say, Mr. Speaker, that in this document addressed to His Holiness Pope Leo XIII., when it says that the clergy "intervened in a violent manner in restraint of electoral freedom, taking sides openly for the Conservative party against the Liberal party, and going so far as to declare guilty of grievous sin those of the electors who would vote for the candidates of the Liberal party"—it states something that is not true. The person who wrote this designed purely and simply to deceive the person to whom it was addressed. The very contrary of this is the truth. If you go down to the pro-

vince of Quebec and ask the people there, you will find that if the clergy in the province of Quebec had done what some people thought they should have done, the result would have been far different. Now, it goes on to say——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. BERGERON. This is worth listening to, and hon. gentlemen opposite might as well listen. I have pretty good health, and can stand a good deal, and I intend to finish what I have to say, whether they like it or not. Their interruptions will only make it necessary for me to take more time. This goes on :

Sincerely attached——

I do not believe this is written by a Liberal. My conviction is that it was written by the Minister of Public Works, because he is in the habit of communicating with Rome. This is what he says :

Sincerely attached to the institutions of our country, which ensure to us Catholics the most complete liberty, we respectfully represent to Your Holiness that these democratic institutions under which we live, and for which Your Holiness has many times expressed sentiments of admiration and confidence, can only exist under perfect electoral freedom.

Far be it from us to refuse to the clergy the plenitude of civil and political rights. The priest is a citizen, and we would not, for a single instant, deprive him of the right of expressing his opinion on any matter submitted to the electorate ; but when the exercise of that right develops into violence, and when that violence, in the name of religion, goes to the extent of making a grievous sin out of a purely political act, there is an abuse of authority of which the consequences cannot but be fatal, not only to constitutional liberty, but to religion itself.

If, in a country such as ours, with a population consisting of persons of various creeds, and wherein the Protestant denominations are in a majority, Catholics did not enjoy, in all matters relating to legislation, the same political freedom as their Protestant fellow-countrymen, they would ipso facto be placed in a position of inferiority, which would prevent them from taking the legitimate part which they are entitled to take in the government of the country, with the possibility, moreover, of conflicts between the various groups of the population, which history shows to be ever fraught with danger.

Then again, an active and violent intervention of the clergy in the domain of political questions submitted to the people must, of necessity, produce against a great mass of the Catholic population a degree of irritation manifestly prejudicial to that respect which religion and its ministers ever inspire and command. Some twenty years ago——

That is why I think I see the hand of the Minister of Public Works.

Some twenty years ago, His Holiness Pius IX, your illustrious and lamented predecessor on the pontifical throne, acting through the Sacred Congregation of the Propaganda, deemed it his duty to put a stop to certain abuses of a similar character, and forbade the intervention of the clergy in politics. This prohibition was generally respected so long as His Eminence Cardinal Taschereau was able to guide the Church in Canada——

There is a compliment to Cardinal Taschereau who was dying, after they had heaped abuses upon him when he was in full health.

——so long as His Eminence Cardinal Taschereau was able to guide the Church in Canada, but since old age and infirmities have paralyzed his guiding hand, the abuses to which Your illustrious predecessor had put a stop, have begun again,——

By whom ? By the bishops of Quebec, and this is a point I want the House to understand. I want to show that this document which has been sent to Rome is independent of the other one I have mentioned :

——and threaten once more to create trouble among us, and to compromise, not only Catholic interests in this country, but the peace and harmony which should exist between the various elements of our population.

Again affirming our absolute devotion to the faith of our fathers——

I never saw anything so religious as a Grit when he is in need of some political favours.

Again affirming our absolute devotion to the faith of our fathers——

After attempting to deprive the Catholic minority of Manitoba of their rights and privileges.

——and to the Church of which you are the supreme head, affirming our respect and attachment for the person of Your Holiness,——

As long as he is on their side.

——our attachment to the interests of our country and to the Crown of Great Britain, its ægis and protector, we beg that Your Holiness will renew in our behalf the most wise prescriptions and prohibitions of your predecessor ; protect the consciences of the Catholic electors, and thus secure peace in our country by the union of religion and of liberty—a union which Your Holiness has many times extolled in those immortal encyclicals whose precious teachings we desire in all things to follow ; and, lastly, grant to the children of the Church now addressing Your Holiness the Apostolic benediction.

Yes, they needed the benediction. They needed many to cover their sins. Now, let us see who are those pious children that the Church of Rome has in this country, principally amongst the politicians :

Hon. Wilfrid Laurier, Premier of Canada ; Hon. Joseph Israel Tarte, Minister of Public Works ; Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick, Solicitor General ; Hon. R. W. Scott, Secretary of State ; Hon. C. A. Geoffrion, Minister without Portfolio ;—

They have put it here : "Minister of Cabinet."

——Hon. C. A. P. Pelletier, Speaker of the Senate ; Hon. J. R. Thibaudeau, Senator ; R. Préfontaine, M.P.; O. E. Talbot, M.P.; C. R. Devlin, M.P.; L. B. Brodeur, M.P.; L. C. A. Angers, M.P.; T. M. Guay, M.P.; F. Langelier, M.P.; C. Beausoliel, M.P.; R. Lemieux, M.P.; A. A. Bru-

neau, M.P.; J. A. C. Ethier, M.P.; D. Monette, M.P.; M. E. Bernier, M.P.; J. A. C. Madore, M.P.; P. V. Savard, M.P.; H. G. Carrol, M.P.; T. Fortin, M.P.; P. A. Choquette, M.P.; O. Desmarais, M.P.; C. J. Rinfret, M.P.; G. Turcotte, M.P.; J. H. Legris, M.P.; H. S. Harwood, M.P.; Joseph Lavergne, M.P.; H. Dupuis, M.P; C. Bazinet, M.P.; Joseph Gauthier, M.P.; T. Proulx, M.P.; N. A. Belcourt, M.P.; J. B. R. Fiset, M.P.; J. H. R. Bourassa, M.P.; R. M. S. Mignault, M.P.; A. Bourbonnais, M.P.; C. Pouliot, M.P.; Joseph Godbout, M.P.; A. M. Dechêne, M.P.

Now, these are the Catholic children that Rome has in the House of Commons of Canada, and they are obliged to give a certificate to show that they are good Catholics. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have read this to show that this document which has been signed by nearly every Liberal member sitting in this House, of the Roman Catholic faith, is merely preliminary to the document which was sent afterwards, and I am surprised to see that the right hon. gentleman seems either to be afraid of this document, or to deny its authenticity, although he accepted most of it, and would have been very glad, I have no doubt, if this document had never been put before Parliament, because we are now told that if anything of that sort had been seen either by His Holiness the Pope or by the Sacred Propagauda, everybody ignored it. I was reading the preliminary remarks, and had nearly finished when the hon. gentleman got up. I was speaking about the Tribunal. It says :

Thus, the highest tribunal in the Empire declares that the Manitoba legislature did not go beyond its powers——

This is a remark which is made by the writer, whoever it is, the man who has prepared this document. This is what he says at the end of the judgment of the Privy Council, on the 30th of July, 1892 :

Thus, the highest tribunal in the Empire declares that the Manitoba legislature did not go beyond its powers in passing the School Act of 1890 ; that the Act is intra vires, constitutional. One may think otherwise.

Now, I want to show the difference between this language which is put before Rome and the language used in the House of Commons in Quebec and in this House. The right hon. gentleman and his followers say : Why did not the Government of Canada veto the Act of the Manitoba legislature? I have heard the Minister of Public Works state in his most eloquent style that it would put an end to it, and why did the Government not do it when they had the power in their hands. The writer states :

One may think otherwise—one may deplore and strive to remedy the legal position created by that judgment ; but after all, practically, it must not be lost sight of. Dura lex, sed lex.

The language used by hon. gentlemen opposite when speaking before the Catholic electors of Quebec was not the same used when those gentlemen went before the Pope, and asked him to sanction the bad settlement they had made with the Manitoba Government. I pass over the judgment of the Privy Council of 1895. The right hon. gentleman admits it ; it is on record, and I want to come to the gentleman, whoever he was, who sent that document. He states further :

By this judgment the Privy Council does not reverse that rendered on 30th July, 1892.

That is the judgment which led the Dominion Government to come to the help of the suffering minority. Here is what is said by the writer of the document :

The first judgment decided that, given the kind of privileges guaranteed to the Catholics by the Manitoba Act in virtue of the law of custom existing prior to the union, the Manitoba Public School Act of 1890 is constitutional, and does not exceed the legislative powers of the provincial legislature in the matter.

Pleading in Rome against what we had been claiming here for five years in favour of the minority. Again, the writer says :

The second judgment declares that in view of the state of things created by the legislation subsequent to the union the Public School Act of 1890 affects the rights and privileges of the Catholics.

That is correct.

But be it noted that the Privy Council does not pronounce on the method to be adopted in order to remove those grievances.

I call the attention of hon. gentlemen to this : "The Privy Council does not pronounce on the manner to be adopted in order to remove those grievances." Members of the House who remember the four or five months discussion in 1896 can recall the utterances of hon. gentlemen opposite against the Orangemen of Ontario, etc., but this document says to the Pope, "The Privy Council does not pronounce on the methods to be adopted."

Secondly, it affirms that it is certainly not essential to re-enact and again put in force the provisions of the laws which established the separate schools.

This again goes to show that everything done by hon. gentlemen opposite during the last five years in this connection has been for political purposes, and that the representations made in regard to it in the province of Quebec were not the truth.

Thirdly, it is of the opinion that it would be good to preserve the system of public instruction contained in the Acts of 1890.

They were pleading before His Holiness the Pope that it would be a good thing that the system adopted in 1890 should be continued and preserved.

Fourthly, it suggests that the grievances of the minority would be removed are simply modifying and supplementing this system in a suitable manner.

This has been stated, not precisely in order to approve of each and all of the conclusions, but in order to set forth the position just as it stands before the public, and show that the obstacles confronting the statesmen who are striving to find a real, practical and effectual solution of the difficulty.

Those statesmen went to Manitoba to make a settlement with the Greenway Government, and they brought back Mr. Sifton, who entered the Cabinet, but they left the suffering minority in the position they occupied before. We have the Remedial Bill incorporated in this document. We all know its terms.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Read it.

Mr. BERGERON. We all heard it for a long time when it was under discussion in this House. I will, however, read the conclusions at which the writer of the document arrives :

To sum up : First, defect of the Bill——

He had to show that the Bill was bad.

——the appointment of a superintendent and members of the council of the separate schools by a hostile government.

They were working hand in hand.

Secondly, no government grant to maintain poor schools on the same level of capacity as rich schools enjoying such grant.

And the Government are going to ask Parliament to give within a few days $200,000 for public schools, and we know we could have done the same thing if we had obtained justice in regard to this Manitoba school question.

Thirdly, overcharging of compulsory taxes, really unbearable, when the heads of families would have been but few to support a separate school.

Those gentlemen who have read the discussions on the Remedial Bill, which continued for weeks and months, can see evidences of deceit all through this document.

Fourthly, parents left the option of getting rid of separate school tax by conforming to the far less expensive system of the public schools.

Fifthly, permanent danger of conflict between the separate council and the Council of Public Instruction, both being endowed with collateral powers to establish regulations on one and the same subject-matters

Sixthly, a complicated machinery, which in practice and even apart from the want of money, would have rendered impossible the working of the separate schools.

Seventhly, the absence of religious instruction for the children of those numerous, no doubt, parents who would have elected in favour of the public schools.

Eighthly, absolute control, definitively, by a hostile government over the separate schools.

Ninthly, impossibility of rendering the law better hereafter, since it was accepted as a final settlement of the school question.

And many other defects, but this is enough.

To complete these remarks, we refer our readers to the opinions following, which emanate from two learned jurists. The remarks and opinions given will, we feel convinced, suffice to prove that the Remedial Bill was sufficiently defective to permit at least a contrary opinion as to its merits, and that it could not be authoritatively declared that it must receive the votes of members and the approval of electors who were honestly convinced of its radical defects.

And still this bad measure, as they call it, was accepted by the Catholic minority of Manitoba, accepted by men representing that minority and by the Archbishop of Manitoba and by the bishops of Canada generally. There is here the opinion of " Mr. Alphonse Geoffrion, Queen's Counsel, professor of law at McGill University of Montreal," and in order to give a good certificate to my friend without portfolio, as he is called, he is described as " advocate for the Seminary of St. Sulpice." He will be very happy to know that he is set forth there as such a pillar of the church ; and he is further described as " Counsel for the Seminary of St. Sulpice, Montreal, and jointly with the Hon. Mr. Taillon for His Grace the Archbishop of Montreal in the action brought by the Canada ' Revue.' " a Liberal paper published in the province of Quebec. This document says further :

As Mgr. Langevin, Archbishop of St. Boniface, on 5th May, 1896, in a sermon delivered from the pulpit at Joliette, stated that he had seriously consulted judges who enlightened him on the constitutional and legal questions ; as, a few days later, from the pulpit of Laprairie, he repeated : " The legal part was a matter for lawyers, and I have consulted two jurists in Manitoba, men of each of the two religious persuasion and asked their opinion ; " as, in his sermons, he gives the substance of these consultations, it is well, in order to form a true idea of the constitutional and legal part of the question, to listen to jurists of the very highest standing, who hold a different opinion.

Surely hon. gentlemen will not believe that this document has not been sent by the right hon. gentleman or his Government. It is easy to see. I imagine that I hear the right hon. the Prime Minister's eloquent words in these sentences :

For that reason we quote here, as to the value of the Remedial Bill, the opinions of Mr. Geoffrion, one of the most eminent juris consults of the bar of Montreal, and of Mr. François Langelier, the most distinguished professor of law of the University of Laval, Quebec.

The Minister of Public Works and that eminent jurist were not good friends twenty years ago when the Minister of Public Works wanted to have him censured by Rome for holding liberal opinions.

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

After Recess.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 104) respecting the Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Company.—(Mr. Belcourt.)

Bill (No. 119) to incorporate the Dawson City and Victoria Telegraph Company.—(Mr. Morrison.)

NORTH AMERICAN TELEGRAPH COMPANY.

House resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 120) respecting the North American Telegraph Company.—(Mr. Hurley.)

(In the Committee.)

On section 7,

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The solicitor of the company would like to have this section struck out as being unnecessary. I think the committee will have no objection to that, because the original Act provides :

The head office and chief place of business of the company shall be in the city of Kingston, in the county of Frontenac and province of Ontario, but the board of directors may establish one or more offices in other places in Canada and elsewhere, and may legally call and hold board meetings at other places in Canada, as may be determined by by-law made from time to time.

I think that is the usual clause.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Clause 7 is entirely unnecessary.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Quite unnecessary. The committee would not grant the clause as amended in the original Bill, so that this is merely a repetition of the clause in the original Act of incorporation.

Section 7 struck out.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

SUPPLY—MANITOBA SCHOOL QUESTION—ADDRESS TO THE HOLY FATHER.

Mr. BERGERON. Mr. Speaker, when the House rose at six o'clock, I was speaking of the opinion given by the hon. member for Verchères (Mr. Geoffrion), one of the members of the Administration, and I was reading some of the remarks which accompany that opinion in the document of which I have spoken. I was down to this :

After having heard and studied these powerful and argumentative statements, it must be admitted that the efficacy of the Remedial Bill is, to say the least, doubtful, and that it certainly is one of those perplexed questions as to which one may have a personal opinion.

Mr. Geoffrion's opinion is taken from his speech, in Parliament, of the 4th of March, 1896.

Then, there is the opinion of Mr. Langelier, advocate, Queen's Counsel, Professor of Law in Laval University, Quebec, who has since that time been appointed a judge of the Superior Courts of the province of Quebec. His opinion will also be found in "Hansard," so I will not read it. There is published in this document a letter of Father Lacombe to the Hon. Wilfrid Laurier, at the time leader of the Opposition, which I believe, en passant, was a private letter, addressed to the right hon. gentleman on the school question. Father Lacombe is an old missionary, and having been in the North-west for many years, he was much interested in the minority having the rights and privileges which had been enjoyed by them for years ; and therefore he took upon himself to write this letter to the right hon. gentleman. For some reason or other that letter left the possession of the right hon. gentleman and was published, and these are some of the remarks which accompanied the publication of that letter, which again I find in the document signed at the end by Wilfrid Laurier.

The PRIME MINISTER. Mr. Speaker, I call upon the hon. gentleman to be careful of what he says. He says this document is signed at the end by Wilfrid Laurier. He knows very well that that is not the case. That book contains, among other things, a memorial signed by myself.

Mr. BERGERON. Does the hon. gentleman want to read the book once more ? He had it in his hands, and he acknowledges his signature at the end.

The PRIME MINISTER. The hon. gentleman has no right to speak in that way.

Mr. BERGERON. I am speaking of a document which at the end is signed "Wilfrid Laurier." Is that true or not ?

The PRIME MINISTER. It is not true. Mr. Speaker, this is a most miserable subterfuge. That book contains, among other things, a sermon of Bishop Laflèche, several speeches by myself, a memorial signed by myself, and because my name is at the end of that memorial, to hold me responsible, not only for that document, but for the sermon of Bishop Lafleche and everything else in the book, is most ridiculous.

Mr. BERGERON. I find in the index of this book a letter from Father Lacombe to Hon. Wilfrid Laurier. This letter was published in all the papers at the time. The hon. gentleman is very sensitive. I am speaking of a letter which has been published, and which the hon. gentleman acknowledges was written to him by Father Lacombe. Does the hon. gentleman acknowledge that ?

The PRIME MINISTER. That is not what the hon. gentleman was talking about.

Mr. BERGERON. Whether this document was written by one man or by another man does not matter to me. I am

reading the remarks which accompany the letter of Father Lacombe, as follows :—

This letter contains extraordinary things. A charge d'affaires, who claims to represent the bishops (what bishops ? the bishops of the North-west ? the bishops of the province of Quebec ? the bishops of the whole Dominion ? —this we have never learned), a man entrusted with this important mission, asks the leader of a great party to vote for a Bill which nobody knows, which he himself cannot as yet know, worst of all, which is not yet drawn up. This is astounding ; but more astounding still, he threatens that leader, if he does not comply with his request, with the opposition of the whole episcopacy, which, he says, will rise as one man united with the clergy ; and the episcopacy did not then know what the Bill would be.

After such a letter as this, which became public, and which Mr. Laurier did not answer through the press, after such an attempt to impede and suppress the liberty of a public man, without offering other motives of persuasion than threats, is it surprising that the leader of a political party, composed of Protestants as well as Catholics, should have felt bound to answer it, at least indirectly, with some warmth ?

Now, I come to the part, which the hon. gentleman has acknowledged as his own, the peroration of the speech of the Hon. Wilfrid Laurier, delivered in the House of Commons of Canada on the 3rd of March, 1896. I think it better to read that peroration, so that the House will understand that whoever made those remarks upon it was a friend of the right hon. gentleman, if it was not himself, and he denies that it was himself. This is what the hon. gentleman said in his peroration, and as I at the time had the honour of presiding over this House, I remember it well :

I cannot forget, at this moment, that the policy which I advocated and maintained all along has not been favourably received in all quarters. Not many weeks ago I was told from high quarters in the church to which I belong that unless I supported the School Bill, which was then being prepared by the Government, and which we have now before us, I would incur the hostility of the great and powerful body.

He there referred to the letter of Father Lacombe.

Sir, this is too grave a phase of this question for me to pass it by in silence. I have only this to say : Even though I have threats held over me coming, as I am told, from high dignitaries of the church to which I belong, no word of bitterness shall ever pass my lips as against that church. I respect it and I love it. Sir, I am not of that school, which has been long dominant in France and other countries of continental Europe which refuses ecclesiastics the right of a voice in public affairs ? No, I am a Liberal of the English school. I believe in that school, which has all along claimed that it is the privilege of all subjects whether high or low, whether rich or poor, whether ecclesiastics or laymen, to participate in the administration of public affairs, to discuss, to influence, to persuade, to convince,—but which has always denied even to the highest the right to dictate even to the lowest. I am here representing, not Roman Catholics alone but Protestant as well, and I must give an account of my stewardship to all classes. Here am I, a Roman Catholic of French extraction, entrusted by the confidence of the men who sit around me with great and important duties under our constitutional system of Government. I am here the acknowledged leader of a great party, composed of Roman Catholics and Protestants as well, in which Protestants are in the majority, as Protestant must be in the majority in every part in Canada.

Except in the province of Quebec.

Am I to be told, I, occupying such a position, that I am to be dictated the course I am to take in this House, by reasons that can appeal to the conscience of my fellow Catholic members, but which do not appeal, as well to the consciences of my Protestant colleagues ? No. So long as I have a seat in this House, so long as I occupy the position I do now, whenever it shall become my duty to take a stand upon any question whatever, that stand I will take, not upon grounds of Roman Catholicism, not upon grounds of Protestantism, but upon grounds which can appeal to the consciences of all men, irrespective of their particular faith, upon grounds which can be occupied by all men who love justice, freedom and toleration.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BERGERON. It must be pleasant to the right hon. gentleman to hear his words of two years ago still so well acclaimed.

So far as this Bill is concerned I have given you my views. I know, I acknowledge, that there is in this Government the power to interfere.

I want the right hon. gentleman to remember that.

There is in the Parliament the power to interfere, but that power should not be exercised until all the facts bearing upon the case have been investigated, and all means of conciliation exhausted. Holding these opinions, I move that the Bill be not now read the second time, but that it be read the second time this day six months.

That was two years ago, and we know what conciliation has been tried since then. Now, these are the remarks which accompanied that splendid peroration of my right hon. friend, when it was sent for the inspection of the chief of Catholicity.

Ten lines of this speech, divorced from the context, quoted without giving the letter of provocation which called for them, were condemned by His Lordship the Bishop of Three Rivers, as may be seen under No. IX.

Another attack on the bishops of the province of Quebec, and always from the same quarter.

Do the incriminated words mean that Mr. Laurier will ignore the teachings of Christianity in order to form his personal opinion in the conduct of public affairs ? Clearly not. But merely that when he addresses himself to Protestants in order to convince them, he will not appeal to Catholic dogmas which they reject—this is as plain as A, B, C. He will appeal to the motives of justice, liberty and tolerance ; and what can be more Catholic than these three motives ? It must not be forgotten that nearly two-thirds of the population of Canada is Protestant,——

That is the appeal made to Rome from that side.

——and that two-thirds of the members of Parment are Protestants. Will the Catholic religion compell a Catholic, under all circumstances, for the mere pleasure of showing off his faith, to use, language which will prevent him from attaining to the highest offices.

This shows the greed for power.

——in the state ? If so, it would be a disadvantage to be a Catholic, whereas in the eyes of the Church, it is an advantage. Evidently Mr. Laurier's words are susceptible of a different interpretation ; why not adopt it ? "Favora sunt ampliandi, odia restringenda."

Supposing that one were more struck by the bad interpretation of which the words might be susceptible—before condemning, in the name of faith, in the name of conscience, and as invoked in grave delinquency, the leader of a great political party, and causing incalculable harm to the party—should he not have been called upon to furnish some explanation.

That is addressed to the Bishop of Three Rivers, and we can see there that the right hon. gentleman was trying to explain to the Holy Father his peroration of the 3rd of March, 1896. This is followed by the mandement of all the archbishops and bishops of the province of Quebec upon the school question. This also I shall not put in "Hansard," as it is in there already.

Now, I come to another part of it. The person, whoever it is, who was commissioned to put this before the Pope took advantage of all the good things that the right hon. the Premier claimed to have done since he entered public life. Of course, he brought out the conference of the Hon. Wilfrid Laurier on Catholic Liberalism, which was given in Quebec on the 26th June, 1877. Amongst the remarks—and there are a great many remarks about this matter, in fact, the whole conference is explained nearly word by word, and I do not put it on "Hansard," because anybody can have the pleasure of reading it by turning up the speeches of the right hon. gentleman in the library—I find the following :—

In a single day Mr. Laurier has attained to the rank of a statesman, and has brought us back to the sound and sturdy notions which, developing from age to age, have made the constitutional system the model of all governments.

Now, I may come to a letter which was addressed to Mr. Tessier, lawyer in Rimouski, by the Bishop of Rimouski. And in the remarks which accompany the letter —the letter itself would not be important to the case—I find the following :

1. The greater number of the Catholic electors found (they showed it by their votes on the 23rd June, 1896) that Mr. Laurier had declared, at least implicitly, that he would follow the pastoral letter of the bishops.

This is sent over to Rome :

2. This principle, proclaimed by the high authority of the Sacred Congregation of Propaganda, is in no way impugned in this pamphlet ; accepting it to its ultimate conclusions, it cannot prejudice the cause herein presented, for it is not applicable in this matter. There has, in truth, been no law which the bishops have accepted.

I may say the right hon. gentleman knew perfectly that the Remedial Bill as presented to the House was thoroughly accepted by the Archbishop of St. Boniface, who at that time represented the minority which was aggrieved. I read further from this document which was put before His Holiness :

We repeat it, never have the bishops of Canada (and Canada does not consist merely of Manitoba and the province of Quebec ; there are also five other provinces : Ontario, British Columbia, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island, and four territories—Assiniboia, Alberta, Saskatchewan and Keewatin) taken as a whole, either by a collective pastoral, or by individual pastorals, or any other official document, make known to the Catholics of the country that they had, for the settlement of the Manitoba school question, accepted a law.

Now, considering that the Remedial Bill which was before Parliament did not become law simply because hon. gentlemen opposite prevented it becoming law, we must admit that they had the strongest ground for saying it did not become law.

Those who affirmed it misled—in good faith we would gladly think—but misled the electors ; and in an authoritative pronouncement (direction)——

This refres to the bishops' mandement—

——such an error of this kind is, it will be admitted, fundamental.

If such a law is accepted by all the bishops—by the majority of the bishops—let ambiguity be dropped, and let it be stated, and let us be told where, when and by what document.

The bishops will have a crow to pick with my right hon. friend.

By Père Lacombe's letter ? By Mgr. Langevin's telegram of 22nd February, 1896, made public on 12th March ?

This has been read in the House and it is unanswered.

It is stated therein that : omnes episcopi—approbare debent. If they are to approve them, they have not as yet approved of it, nor consequently accepted it.

The hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) laughs ; this is probably some of his Latin.

The telegram of the same Lord Bishop,——

—that is the Archbishop of St. Boniface—

——wherein he asks the House of Commons to pass the Remedial Bill in its entirety, as a final settlement of the school question ? The act of accepting that defective Bill as a final settlement is given here only as the desire and act of Mgr. Langevin alone.

So that the right hon. gentleman or the person who wrote this, states that the Archbishop of St. Boniface was entirely wrong.

The discourses of the Archbishop of St. Boniface at Montreal, at Laprairie, at Joliette and elsewhere ? Even though that conclusion might be drawn from his words, it will be admitted that that is not an adequate and sufficiently formal notification to bind the conscience of the Catholics of the whole country.

What a defender of the whole body of Catholics of this country.

The Conservative newspapers ? Of a truth they repeated it in every possible key.

There was, in the province of Quebec, the collective letter of 6th May, 1896 ; but after explaining to the faithful the true doctrine on the power of the bishops in politico-religious matters, and having given, in relation to the circumstances of the moment, sage council to the voters and candidates, this letter asks for nothing else than "a measure of a nature to afford an effective remedy for the evils from which the Manitoba minority is suffering."

Now, this document pleads before Rome that the mandement of the bishops never asked support for the Remedial Bill, but simply favoured "a measure of a nature to afford an effective remedy for the evils from which the Manitoba minority is suffering." But, this afternoon, when I read this document and said it was not true, I was told that I was using too strong a word. The document I read this afternoon said that the whole episcopacy and clergy of Quebec gave undue influence in favour of the Conservative party and the remedial measure before Parliament. This document says the very reverse. There is the answer to the document sent by the Minister of Public Works and signed by a number of hon. gentlemen opposite. The bishops, "after explaining to the faithful the true doctrine of the power of the bishops in politico-religious matters, and having given in relation to the circumstances of the moment, sage counsel to the voters and candidates." That is true. I repeat what I said. The episcopacy of Quebec, according to the opinion of a great many of us who knew the motives of hon. gentlemen opposite, did not go far enough, and I have here the proof of it from hon. gentlemen themselves. Nobody can have a word to say against the bishops giving "sage counsel" in these matters. There is not a man, no matter what his faith, who can object to the bishops giving such counsel to the voters and candidates. We are told here that the bishops' letter "asks for nothing else than a measure of a nature to afford an effective remedy for the evils from which the Manitoba minority is suffering." Could there be a more complete vindication of the bishops' mandement which has been decried in some other parts of the Dominion, than I have just read from this document signed by the right hon. gentleman himself ? There is also a circular of His Lordship Bishop Cameron, addressed not to his whole diocese, but to the single county of Antigonish. We are told that "a special promulgation made in this small corner of the globe"—but when the Grit candidate speaks there, they say it is the greatest country in the world—"is not sufficient to bind the consciences of the people of Canada." There is a slap at Bishop Cameron.

There are the letters of some bishops and parish priests to lay voters, stating directly, or in effect, that the Remedial Bill is the Bill accepted by the Bishop. Personal views and political leanings may very well be manifested in this manner, but it cannot in any sense impose upon the whole country, under pain of grievous sin, an acceptance whereof the duties and obligations shoud be promulgated by all or by each one of the bishops.

I repeat that my right hon. friend will have a great bone to pick with the bishops of this country, because this document makes a serious charge against them. Now, a gentleman who was formerly a member of this House, but who has unfortunately been taken away by death—I speak of Mr. Pouliot, the late member for Temiscouata—had a long correspondence with his bishop. I find in his answer what, in fact, is said by all the Catholics on the other side :

I think, my lord, that you are mistaken when you say that the Catholic Liberal members have not undertaken to support an effectual Remedial Bill which would be approved by the bishops, in accordance with the collective pronouncement of the bishops, for I have watched the newspapers since the promulgation of the pronouncement, and I have always seen the Liberal candidates declare that they were prepared to follow out the directions of the bishops in accordance with the mandement, and this in presence of their constituents.

That also is sent to Rome. Now, my hon. friend formerly represented Rimouski in this House, and who is now occupying a seat in another House, exempted from the turmoils of elections, Mr. Fiset, this is what he said to his bishop :

I am not aware that the bishops, collectively, have approved of the Remedial Bill introduced last session. I consider that the said proposed measure is not complete, and does not do full and complete justice to the Catholics of Manitoba,——

He is not satisfied with the Remedial Bill, he wants more.

——which does not prevent me from approving of the principle of the Bill.

But he voted against it.

My sincere conviction is that in the present state of the Manitoba school question, no one but the Hon. Wilfrid Laurier can settle it in a just and equitable manner.

What great expectations were held out to the people of Quebec ! We shall see by and by how they were realized. Now, I am

coming to the famous settlement of the Manitoba school question, between the local Government of Manitoba and the Federal Government of Canada, the great settlement which was arrived at by the Minister of Public Works and Mr. Sifton. It is not necessary for me to read the whole settlement, I will read the explanations of it given by the Government to His Holiness to make him approve of that settlement, if possible :

The advantages of the settlement arrived at between the Government of the Hon. Mr. Laurier and the provincial government of Manitoba.

Now, those who are acquainted with the terms of the settlement will find running through these explanations quite a distinctive shade of incorrectness.

1. Catholic schools equivalent to separate schools wheresoever the Catholics are greatly in the majority.

2. Catholic teachers in all sections where Catholic children number, 25 for the country, and 40 for the towns.

3. Catholic instruction in all schools, even though Catholic minority consists of but 10 children.

4. In all cases children forbidden to follow a system of teaching different from that selected by their parents ; consequently, in practice, Catholic children are forbidden to follow Protestant teaching.

5. Free admission of the priest, under the law, into the school for the purpose of teaching his flock the Catholic doctrine.

At what hour ? Half-past three o'clock in the afternoon.

Finally, the teaching of French where French parents desire it.

I pretend that is not in the settlement. It is a bi-lingual teaching English in the French language to a French boy, and teaching English through the German language to a German boy. But that is not teaching the French language nor the German language. Still, it is attempted here to convey the idea to the Court of Rome that there is in that settlement provision for teaching French where French parents desire it.

7. No increase of taxes on Catholics, while they secure to them both religious instruction, good school-houses and competent teachers.

Mr. TALBOT. Hear, hear.

Mr. BERGERON. The hon. member for Bellechasse will find out that they are more difficult to please over there than he is, because they did not accept this settlement.

Mr. TALBOT. The member for Bellechasse is all right.

Mr. BERGERON. He is all right to-night ; he may not be all right after the general election.

8. Simplicity in working of Manitoba School Law so amended, as compared with the complicated machinery involved in the Remedial Bill.

Mr. BERGERON.

9. Peace estabished in Manitoba in place of religious and political divisions.——

Created by hon. gentlemen opposite.

——which must have been continued and increased by the compulsory imposition of a law which was repugnant to the majority of the population.

This settlement was considered by the ultra-Conservative Protestant press to be so advantageous to the Catholics that it undertook against Mr. Laurier a campaign of fanaticism and detraction ; and, quite recently also, at Hargrave, in Manitoba, the ultra-Conservative Protestants burnt in effigy Messrs. Laurier and Greenway.

There must have been some other reason, surely.

In one word, Mr. Tupper's Remedial Bill promised more than it gave, and Mr. Laurier's settlement gives more than it seems to promise. We shall see now by the views of two prominent sincere and practical Catholics——

An hon. MEMBER. Whose letter is that ?

Mr. BERGERON. These are notes and explanations given to the Holy See concerning the settlement, in case the Holy See would not understand it themselves. But instead of explaining it correctly, there is a shade of incorrectness running through it. But they were not deceived over there.

We shall now hear the views of two public men, sincere and practical Catholics, men of thought, practical men, thoroughly skilled in constitutional questions, perfectly in touch with popular sentiment, and whose authority must be weighty in this matter, for they have long struggled and suffered, and made great sacrifices for the redress of the grievances complained of by the Catholic minority in Manitoba : Hon. Messrs. Prendergast and Beausoleil.

The sufferings of Mr. Prendergast are now assuaged, for he is now occupying a seat on the Bench somewhere in Manitoba. He does not suffer so much as he did. The sufferings of the hon. member for Berthier (Mr. Beausoleil) do not spring from that cause, but from the conduct of the Minister of Public Works towards him. He is still suffering, and he runs a great risk of suffering more. Now, both of these gentlemen are presented to His Holiness.

Mr. Prendergast was a member of the Manitoba Government when Mr. Greenway introduced the measure so justly complained of by the Catholics. He did not hesitate to throw up his portfolio and sacrifice many material advantages, in order to defend his co-religionists ; and has ever since been a skilful and intelligent exponent of their invaded rights.

That is not correct. In order to state the truth, the writer should have gone on to say that Mr. Prendergast swallowed the settlement in order to obtain a position on the bench. We do not see much reference to the hon. member for Berthier (Mr. Beausoleil) and there are not many compliments paid to him in this document which has been published under the eye or under the

instructions of the Minister of Public Works.

Now, I come to the memorial in relation to the Manitoba school question, which is signed, and acknowledged to be signed by the right hon. First Minister, and which I will ask permission to read. I will read the language of the hon. gentleman in the memorial, but I will omit references to the Act of Manitoba and other Acts which already appeared in public documents, and need not therefore be reprinted in "Hansard," also the petition signed by the bishops of the Dominion to the Governor General in Council, which has already been placed on the pages of "Hansard." I will read what the hon. gentleman penned :

MEMORANDUM.

In relation to the Manitoba School Question.

With an explanation of the reasons which induced the Liberal party to adopt a policy of conciliation which was finally accepted by that province.

This is trying to make the Roman court believe that this settlement prepared by the Minister of Public Works has been accepted by the province of Manitoba. But it has not been accepted by the minority, and that is what the hon. gentleman should have stated :

In order to form a correct estimate of the line of conduct followed by the present Government in the settlement of this question, it is of the utmost importance that the constitutional points raised during the discussion should be well understood.

Manitoba is one of the seven provinces constituting the Canadian confederation. These provinces have exclusive jurisdiction in relation to certain subjects, amongst which is education. That jurisdiction is subject to certain restrictions in those provinces (and in those only) where the right to separate schools existed prior to their entering into confederation.

Here appear sections of the Manitoba Acts. Then the memorandum proceeds :

In the year 1871, the Manitoba legislature passed a law authorizing the establishment of separate schools by the Catholics and the Protestants. In pursuance of that Act the Catholics established schools wherever their numbers warranted it, but of necessity in many sections of the country where the population is sparse, Catholics and Protestants united to constitute common schools.

My hon. friends from Manitoba can follow this and see whether the explanation is correct :

This state of things lasted until the year 1890, when the Manitoba legislature repealed the Act authorizing separate schools and established a system of national schools, for the support of which all denominations were taxed alike.

Under the constitution the Dominion Government has the power to disallow provincial Acts, within the year following their adoption. Immediately after the adoption of the Act abolishing separate schools, the Archbishop of St. Boniface, in his capacity as chairman of the Catholic section of the board of education, presented to the Governor in Council a petition asking for the disallowance of that Act. That petition was followed by others from Catholic laymen and their representatives in the legislature. These petitions not having been favourably entertained by the Conservative Government of the Day.

This is a blow at the old Administration :

His Eminence Cardinal Taschereau——

The cardinal, who had become so old, according to the hon. Minister of Public Works, that he was no longer useful.

——and the archbishops and bishops of the Roman Catholic Church in Canada united in order to present to His Excellency the following petition :—

Then appears the petition, which is already on record, signed by all the bishops of the Dominion. After reciting this petition, the memorandum proceeds :

This judgment was considered to be final by the majority of the people of Canada, and accepted by the province as confirming its contention that the Act which constituted Manitoba a province of Canada had given to no religious denomination the right to establish separate schools.

This is not what hon. gentlemen said when they were denouncing the late Government for not all disallowing the Act of the legislature of Manitoba.

The decision of the highest court was so clear that it seemed to leave no hope of reviving the claim of the Catholic minority.

But the Dominion Government, in its answer to the Catholic bishops in the month of March, 1891, while refusing to touch the Manitoba legislation, declared that if the Catholic minority did not succeed in the Courts, the constitution provided for them a further recourse to the Dominion Government in order to secure protection against the decision of the legislature affecting their rights and privileges in relation to education.

That was not quite so bad for a Conservative Government.

Hence Archbishop Taché again forwarded in September, 1892, to the Governor in Council, a petition recalling the answer given to the petition of 1891, and declaring that the time had come for the Catholics of Manitoba to demand redress of their grievances in pursuance of paragraphs 2 and 3 of section 23 of the Manitoba Act. The Dominion Government again refused to entertain the request for remedial legislation made by the Catholic minority, but decided to submit to the Supreme Court of Canada the question as to whether the decision of the Privy Council precluded any further intervention on the part of the Dominion Government. The Supreme Court of Canada decided that the judgment of the Privy Council was final, and that the Parliament of Canada had not the power to restore to the Manitoba minority its rights and privileges.

I may say here that it would have been an act of justice to have said that it had always been the policy of the Conservative Government to place the whole matter before the courts and act according to the decision of the courts, and so avoid arous-

ing political passions, which hon. gentlemen opposite had been sowing for five years in respect to this question. In justice this should have been stated in behalf of the Conservative Administration.

The minority appealed from that decision to the Judicial Committee of the Imperial Privy Council, and in the month of January, 1895 the court gave judgment on the points submitted. The conclusions of the Privy Council were expressed as follows :-

I need not read this portion because it is on "Hansard" already.

By the first judgment of the Privy Council, the court decided "That no right or privilege of the minority had been violated or affected by the Act prejudicially," whereas the second judgment expressed a contrary opinion, thus showing the differing and contrary opinions which existed amongst the Law Lords on the subject.

That is true.

In pursuance of that judgment the Canadian Government determined to hear the appeal of the minority, and decided that it was well grounded. The Cabinet passed an Orded in Council calling upon the provincial legislature to redress the grievance which the latter judgment declared to exist, intimating that in the event of a failure to comply with the request, the authority of the Canadian Parliament might be invoked in aid of the minority. The Manitoba legislature refused to accede to the demands of the Dominion Government.

He might have added, helped by the Dominion Opposition at that time.

This action of the legislature shows clearly that the province had determined to maintain its rights, and to resist any intervention on the part of the Dominion Government, and appeals were made to the Protestant element in the other provinces of Canada, asking them to support the position taken by the Manitoba Government.

Yes, appeals were made by the friends of the right hon. gentleman in the province of Ontario, principally :

During the Dominion session of 1895, the Government notified their supporters that remedial legislation would be submitted to Parliament, but no action was taken in that direction, and at the close of the session the Government declared that at the beginning of the next present Parliament would be called especially in order to deal with the question. In accordance with that declaration the Government submitted to the House of Commons during the session which opened on the 2nd of January, 1896, a Bill called the Remedial Bill, but which, in the opinion of many lawyers eminent in constitutional law did not enable the Catholic minority to establish their schools in opposition to the provincial and municipal authorities. Moreover, the Bill contained no provision whatever granting to the schools a share of the public funds of the province ; it being admitted that Federal legislation could not compel the province to take any money whatever from its treasury in aid of the schools of the minority, and it is acknowledged that without pecuniary aid the schools of the minority cannot be maintained.

The right hon. gentleman might have also said, that at that time the Government of Canada had money belonging to the local Government of Manitoba, in relation to their Crown lands, for educational purposes, and that it would have been feasible for the Federal Government, whether it was Conservative or Liberal, to grant a part of that money to the minority for the benefit of their schools. The right hon. gentleman forgot all about that.

While this Bill was before the Canadian Parliament the Manitoba legislature protested most solemnly.

The right hon. gentleman has now become the advocate of the Manitoba legislature who took away the rights of the minority, and for which minority he said he had been fighting in Parliament and the province of Quebec for five years.

The Manitoba legislature protested most solemnly, and on the 26th February, 1896, by a vote of 31 to 7, against the passing of the Bill, which had been introduced into the House of Commons of Canada, and urged several reasons in support of its opposition. The resolution concluded as follows :—

"That the said Bill is a futile but unjustifiable attack on constitutional rights of the legislature and people of all the other provinces of Canada, and a violation of the principle of provincial autonomy which is without a precedent in the history of Canada."

The right hon. gentleman continues :

Notwithstanding that Parliament met on the 2nd day of January, 1896, for the special purpose of adopting the Remedial Bill, the second reading of the measure was moved only on the 3rd of March, about six weeks only before the legal expiration of Parliament. The Opposition to the Bill was so strong that the consideration of its merits made but very small progress.

But the right hon. gentleman forgot to inform the Roman Court about how easy it is to speak against time in this House, and the hon. gentlemen opposite did speak against time for all they were worth.

And the Government finally withdrew the Bill.

Why did the Government withdraw the Bill ? The right hon. gentleman says :

And the Government finally withdrew the Bill, acknowledging thereby that they were unable to carry it, notwithstanding their very large majority in both Houses.

What does that mean, and what does the right hon. gentleman mean to imply by it ? He is seeking at the Court of Rome, approbation for his settlement, and he tells the Court of Rome that the Conservative Government withdrew their Bill in spite of their big majority because they found it was impossible to pass it. But the right hon. gentleman did not give the proper and the only reason, namely, that it was because of the expiry of Parliament, and the impossibility in view of the attacks and opposition of gentlemen opposite to carry through that measure in time.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Other hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BERGERON. Those who are clamouring on the other side of the House were not here in that Parliament, but those who were here cannot say to the contrary.

Mr. CAMPBELL. How many over there opposed it, too ?

Mr. COCHRANE. You did, anyway.

Mr. BERGERON. The right hon. the Prime Minister goes on to say :

Had Parliament adopted the Bill, or any other like it, the province of Manitoba would certainly have contested its validity,——

The right hon. gentleman is now giving arms to those he has been fighting against.

——and the consequence would have been another long period of agitation and turmoil, to the great detriment of the Catholic minority in the other provinces. The belief that any legislation of the kind would not bring about a final settlement of the question amply justified the opposition which the Liberal party offered to the Government Bill.

What a reason for the head of a Government to give the tribunal from which he wants approval of his Administration.

The agitation caused by this question had lasted for six years, and a strong Protestant feeling had arisen in all the provinces except Quebec against the granting of special privileges to Catholics.

By whom was that feeling provoked ? It is provoked by the friends of hon. gentlemen opposite in the province of Ontario, when we had the other cry to the contrary blown over the province of Quebec by the friends of the right hon. gentleman under the leadership of his Minister of Public Works.

The peace and harmony which had previously reigned between Protestants and Catholics throughout Canada were seriously disturbed to the great detriment of the Catholics, who are in a minority in all the provinces but one. The Conservative party had been in power during these six years, and the Government, in place of dealing promptly with the matter before the public mind became inflamed,——

Inflamed by whom ? Inflamed, Sir, by the hon. gentlemen opposite.

——allowed the question to drag along from 1890 up to the present time. Then it became manifest that the province of Manitoba was determined to oppose any Federal interference. It became the evident interest of the minority that the question should be settled on such a basis as to ensure the good will and approval of the Protestant majority, not only of Manitoba, but throughout the whole of Canada.

And the right hon. gentleman was asking the approbation of Rome upon the basis of such reasons as those.

The importance of an amicable settlement will become more manifest in considering the following facts :—

Mr. TAYLOR. Whose letter are you quoting from ?

Mr. BERGERON. I am quoting the memorial signed by the right hon. gentleman, the Premier.

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not wish to interrupt the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergeron), but I cannot possibly avoid noticing that the leader of the House has three or four times denied that he signed the document, and the hon. member (Mr. Bergeron) does not accept the denial. I cannot make the hon. member accept the denial, but I can say that unless an hon. member accepts such denial, it is usual for him to undertake to personally prove that he is right and that the other hon. member is wrong. In taking the responsibility of contradicting the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), that is the least the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergeron) should do.

Mr. BERGERON. I am willing with a great deal of pleasure to abide by the ruling of the Chair, but I wish to remark that I am now reading from a document which at the commencement of the discussion the right hon. gentleman acknowledged as being his own. The right hon. gentleman is there and if this is not his own document he can say so himself. This is a memorial signed by him and he has already acknowledged it.

Mr. SPEAKER. If the hon. gentleman is reading from a part of the document that the right hon. gentleman admits having signed, then, of course, there is no objection. But I understood that several times the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergeron) had been reading parts of the document which the right hon. gentleman denied having signed. If I misunderstood the hon. member (Mr. Bergeron), I regret it very much.

Mr. BERGERON. I am sure His Honour the Speaker misunderstood, because what I am reading now is what has been accepted by the right hon. gentleman as being his memorial.

The PRIME MINISTER. That memorial has been signed by me.

Mr. BERGERON. I am in order, then, Mr. Speaker. I continue :

The population of Manitoba at the last census was 152,506, of whom 20,571 were Catholics, disseminated over 90 different municipalities. The total number of Catholic schools in 1890 was but 97, and 28 of these schools were in the city of Winnipeg, at St. Boniface and at St. Norbert. In all the rest of the province there were but 69 schools. The number of children attending the Catholic schools of the province was 3,316, but the average attendance was only 2,267.

I want here to make a remark. The right hon. gentleman here gives a strong reason why the settlement should not be approved, when he himself shows how impossible it would be for children to have the tuition which he said he wanted to obtain for

them by a settlement; for he shows that at least 33 per cent less than the number on the books of the schools were in the habit of attending those schools. This shows once more that the settlement made by the Minister of Public Works for having a Catholic teacher for forty children attending in the cities and towns and for twenty-five children in the villages and rural districts was purely and simply a sham.

The PRIME MINISTER. The hon. gentleman does not know what he is talking about.

Mr. BERGERON. The right hon. gentleman is very courteous, I admit; but I cannot make a mistake, for I am reading what has been written by his own pen.

The PRIME MINISTER. The answer is this, that the settlement provided that where there were a certain number of children they would have a Catholic tutor, without the consent of the municipal authorities, and where a municipal authority provided for one, they would have one whether the number of children was forty, or twenty-five, or ten, or any number.

Mr. BERGERON. Here is what the settlement says:

In the schools in towns and cities, where the average attendance of the Roman Catholic children will be 40 or more, and in the schools of villages and rural districts, where the average attendance of such children will be 25 or more, the commissioners shall, if they are required by the parents or guardians of those children, employ in those schools at least one Roman Catholic teacher, duly qualified.

In the schools in towns and cities where the average attendance of children, not Roman Catholics, is forty or more, and in the schools of villages and rural districts where the average attendance of such children is 25 or more, the commissioners shall, if they are required by the parents or guardians of those children, employ at least one teacher not a Roman Catholic, duly qualified.

The PRIME MINISTER. Read the first condition now.

Mr. BERGERON. I have read everything that can be read upon that subject.

The PRIME MINISTER. Not at all.

Mr. BERGERON. This is the settlement of the right hon. gentleman, and what he says is that out of 3,000 children, only 2,000 go to school.

The PRIME MINISTER. Send it over, and I will show you what it says.

Mr. BERGERON. I am very glad to do so, because the right hon. gentleman has forgotten all about it.

The PRIME MINISTER. The first paragraph says there shall be religious teaching in the schools if a petition is presented in a municipality to the commissioners where there are twenty-five children in towns and ten in villages; and there shall be religious teaching also if it is authorized by a majority of the school commissioners, independent of the number of children.

Mr. BERGERON. Where is the point for the right hon. gentleman? There is no use playing on words. I have said that by the settlement it is compulsory to have Roman Catholic teachers in cities and towns where the average attendance of children is forty or more, and in villages and rural districts where the average attendance of children is twenty-five or more.

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes, and if religious teaching is authorized by a majority of the school commissioners, there shall be religious teaching, if there is only one child.

Mr. BERGERON. That is so far as religious teaching is concerned, but not other teaching. The right hon. gentleman knows that what is provided for where there are forty children in cities and towns and twenty-five in the country, is not religious teaching, but simply Roman Catholic teachers, to teach according to the programme of the public schools—nothing more. The right hon. gentleman has applied to Rome for approbation, and he knows it has been refused to him, just because the authorities at Rome have found that his settlement is not a just settlement or a true exposition of the desire of the minority in Manitoba. I continue to read this document:

It is, therefore, evident that half the Catholic children of Manitoba were of necessity obliged to attend the common schools, or to be deprived of the instruction that could be given therein. Considering all the circumstances, the Liberal party became convinced that the policy of coercion which had been adopted by the late Administration was not a wise one, and destroyed the peace and harmony which previously prevailed between the several Christian denominations throughout Canada; and, moreover, the Liberals believed that if the people of Manitoba were approached in a conciliatory spirit, that people would comply with the wishes of a Catholic minority and make to them such concessions as would satisfy their just claims.

Have they done so?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BERGERON. They have been approached with every possible conciliation that could be imagined. The right hon. gentleman has used all his conciliating powers, and he sent to Manitoba his right arm, the Minister of Public Works, who, I suppose, promised everything he could promise. Still, have the minority been granted what they wanted?

Mr. McGREGOR. They are satisfied?

Mr. BERGERON. No, they are not satisfied, and whoever says that says what is not correct.

Mr. JAMESON. They are satisfied.

Mr. BERGERON. They are not satisfied. I am coming to that later on. The document continues :

The Liberals consequently decided to adopt a policy of conciliation as the basis of their platform in their appeal to the people of Canada at the last elections. It is well to state that in that contest the Liberal party received the support of the majority of the electors in all parts of Canada.

That is not correct. The right hon. gentleman has not said there to His Holiness entirely what is correct, and he should not deceive those to whom he applies for approbation. The right hon. gentleman did not have a majority in the province of Manitoba, the province which was the seat of all this trouble. The people of the provinc of Manitoba gave a majority against him.

Mr. JAMESON. When ?

Mr. BERGERON. At the general election ?

Mr. JAMESON. Why, we have five Liberal members.

Mr. BERGERON. That was written on the 26th of November, when there had been no by-elections. At that time the majority in Manitoba was opposed to my right hon. friend.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. BERGERON. Yes. The maritime provinces did not give him a majority, and in the province of Ontario the majority was only one or two, when this was written. The only majority he carried on the 23rd of June came from the province of Quebec, and for the reason I gave before. This document continues :

The late Administration was defeated at the polls, and compelled to resign.

The late Administration, Mr. Speaker, was defeated at the polls and compelled to resign because the Prime Minister of Canada at that time did his duty. If the Prime Minister of Canada, Sir Charles Tupper, when he went to the country on the 23rd of June, 1896, had said that he dropped the school question, if he had declared that he was new in the country, having been only here three or four months, that he had nothing to do with the question, and could not be responsible for what had been done before, and if he had abandoned the rights of the minority of Manitoba and gone to the country simply on the general policy of his party, he would be sitting to-day in the place now occupied by the right hon. leader of the Government.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. BERGERON. The right hon. gentleman knows that I am telling the truth. The leader of the Opposition would not have lost any more seats in the province of Quebec than he did, if he had dropped the school question, and he would have carried the other provinces. And if he sits in opposition to-day, it is because he did his duty in standing by the constitution of Canada, and it came with very bad grace from the right hon. leader of the Government to denounce a gentleman for having lost power, when he lost it because he stood by the constitution of his country, which is the only guarantee for the Roman Catholic minortiy of the Dominion.

The late Administration was defeated at the polls, and compelled to resign. A new Administration was formed, with a Catholic as Prime Minister. The great majority of the electors throughout the whole country pronounced themselves energetically in favour of the conciliatory policy of the leader of the Liberal party.

I say no.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. I say no. I come from the province of Quebec, and I know what I am talking about when I say that the majority of that province which elected the right hon. gentleman to office, did so because they were convinced, after hearing him and his supporters, that if he came into power he would give the Roman Catholic minority in Manitoba more than the leader of the late Government was prepared to give them.

Some hon. MEMBERS. So he did.

Mr. BERGERON. He did not.

The total representation of the House of Commons is 213. Of that number 66 belong to the Catholic Church, and of that 66 Catholics 45 belong to the Liberal party.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BERGERON. If I were a Catholic Liberal, nothing in the world would pain me so much as the plaudits of hon. gentlemen opposite—applauding what I look upon as a political dishonour.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. BERGERON (reading),

The new Administration, of which Mr. Laurier is the leader, formed on the defeat of the Conservative party, is supported in the House by 45 Catholics out of a total of 66 Catholics, as just stated. Immediately after the formation of the new Administration, negotiations were opened with the Manitoba Government.

Negotiations were opened, not by sending Sir Oliver Mowat.

Concessions were secured from them which will, we venture to hope, give satisfaction to the minority and restore peace and harmony to that province.

Where are the concessions obtained from the Manitoba Government ? What has the Manitoba Government yielded to the Government of Canada, through its sunny ways

and the instrumentality of the Minister of Public Works? Nothing at all. The Manitoba minority are to-day in a worse position than they were then, because time has made it more difficult for them to obtain what they were clamouring for.

In pursuance of the negotiations concluded between the two Governments it is the Manitoba legislature itself which will effect remedial legislation.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that legislature has sat twice since then, and what have they done? Have they done anything? Let one man on that side get up and point to any law the Manitoba legislature has passed granting the relief which was promised by the First Minister, not only to the people of this country, but even to Rome. They have not done anything yet, and this is another point on which the right hon. gentleman deceived the people from whom he desired an approval of his policy.

The legislation enacts that there shall be religious instruction in the schools, so soon as the parents express a wish for it, and in places where the number of Catholic children attending the schools justifies it, the minority shall be entitled to a teacher holding their own faith.

But what will he teach? He will teach according to the books of the public schools —these schools out of which the Minister of Public Works made such capital in the past. Are they going to concede anything the minority want? No, they will have to adopt the system of the public schools which the Minister of Public Works is now perfectly satisfied with.

In districts where, owing to their being in the majority, the Catholics have heretofore had their own school commissioners, they shall continue to enjoy that privilege, which practically will give them as complete control of their schools as they have enjoyed before the abolition of the former system, with the further advantage of getting the Government grant for the schools, subject only to inspection, from time to time, and to the condition of employing only qualified teachers, while in the districts where Catholics are in a minority and where the schools are common, Catholics will be entitled to privileges which they did not before enjoy, namely, the benefit of receiving religious instruction, and in many instances of having a Catholic teacher.

This is the way the Court of Rome has been instructed on the settlement of the Manitoba school question.

There is no doubt whatever, but after the new system has been in operation for a certain period——

Yes, until a general election, I suppose.

——it will be found to work in a satisfactory manner, and that peace and harmony will once more reign among the people of Manitoba.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BERGERON. I never anticipated such a success, Mr. Speaker. I am not accustomed to be applauded on that side of the House. Now, this document is dated Ottawa, 23rd November, 1896, and signed "Wilfrid Laurier."

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BERGERON. And when some time ago in this House, I asked whether anything had been put before the Court of Rome, either before the Holy Father or the Sacred Propaganda, which is the political Government of Rome, any document touching upon the school question and signed in the name of Wilfrid Laurier, who is the right hon. gentleman himself—I was told by one of his colleagues that he had never heard of any such document. This is the way things are carried on by the Government of to-day.

The PRIME MINISTER. Does the hon. gentleman pretend I signed the document to Rome?

Mr. BERGERON. I do not pretend that at all, but I will tell the right hon. gentleman what I do pretend. I pretend that I have read a document which was printed in Rome and to which I find the name of the right hon. gentleman appended. I ask purely and simply the question: Has a document concerning the Manitoba school question, and signed "Wilfrid Laurier," ever been put before the Holy Father or the Sacred Propaganda? That is what I ask.

The PRIME MINISTER. The hon. gentleman has quoted from a book which is a compilation of documents intended to help to an understanding of the school question. Among the documents there is a memorial prepared by myself which he has just read; there is also a sermon of Bishop Lafleche; also the opinion of several bishops; also copies of three or four speeches delivered by myself at different times since 1877; also a letter from Father Lacombe; also two judgments of the Privy Council. This is the compilation that the hon. gentleman is quoting from. My memorial has found its way into that book as have all the other documents. My memorial found its way into that book just as the judgment of the Privy Council found its way into that book; just as the letter of Father Lacombe found its way into that book; just as the sermon delivered by Bishop Lafleche found its way into that book.

Mr. BERGERON. The right hon. gentleman will not get out of it like that. Here is a whole document——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. BERGERON. I do not mind these interruptions. We have plenty of time. Here is a document which contains a sermon by Bishop Lafleche. The right hon. gentleman knows that Bishop Lafleche did not send this to Rome. Here is a document which contains the opinions of the Hon. Mr. Geoffrion. Was it he, a colleague

of the right hon. gentleman, who has written this document ?

The PRIME MINISTER. I think not.

Mr. BERGERON. Members of this Government do not know what other members of it are doing. There is an opinion here of Mr. François Langelier. Did Mr. Langelier compile this before he went on the bench ? Here is a letter from Father Lacombe, addressed to the right hon. gentleman—a private letter.

The PRIME MINISTER. A public letter.

Mr. BERGERON. It was a private letter before it was published. There is a peroration from a speech of the right hon. gentleman, a good peroration, one of the most eloquent he has ever delivered, not such a peroration that he could not send to Rome. That is not sent without the knowledge of the hon. gentleman, or does he have somebody who does things which he should not do ? There are here a collection of the letters of the archbishops and bishops of the province of Quebec, and also a conference of the right hon. gentleman upon Catholic Liberalism. Has that been sent to Rome without his knowledge ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Certainly.

Mr. BERGERON. It has, certainly.

The PRIME MINISTER. Of course.

Mr. BERGERON. We shall find something else later on. Here is a speech of the right hon. gentleman. That has been sent without his knowledge, I suppose ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Certainly.

Mr. BERGERON. Well, certainly they will be happy to know that in Rome, to know that this has all been a sham and that the right hon. gentleman has never known anything about it. Here is the opinion of Monseigneur Lebrecque, Bishop of Chicoutimi ; here is the opinion of Monseigneur Blais, Bishop of Rimouski ; the opinion of Grand Vicar Marois, the opinion of Monseigneur Begin, the opinion of Monseigneur Cameron, the opinion of Monseigneur Langevin, Archbishop of St. Boniface. I admit the hon. gentleman is in first-class company. But all this is done without his knowledge.

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes ; certainly.

Mr. BERGERON. I see here also the opinion of Mr. Prendergast, the opinion of Mr. Beausoleil, and the memorial of the right hon. gentleman which he acknowledges. And it appears that this memorial has found its place in this document, and the right hon. gentleman never heard anything about it.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Was this document ever printed in Canada ?

Mr. BERGERON. No, it is printed in Rome. In the Imprimerie Befani—we will put it on "Hansard" in case we may have to refer to it later on—Rue Celsa 6, 7, 8, and printed in 1896. I did not make this document.

The PRIME MINISTER. Neither did I.

Mr. BERGERON. But I have not written anything in it, and my right hon. friend admits that he wrote this memorial in it, and surely he has had more to do with it than I had. If I am not mistaken the right hon. gentleman has a copy before him now.

The PRIME MINISTER. No, I have my own memorial here.

Mr. BERGERON. What I have read here is a correct copy of what the right hon. gentleman has before him ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. Now, of course, my right hon. friend will say that he does not know why this book has never been published in Canada, why it is that Canadians who, more than any others are interested in knowing what there is in these documents have not had the advantage of reading them. Now the point I want to make is this : Whatever the right hon. gentleman says, whether he denies this or not, whether he says he did not know anything about it or not, whether it has been sent to Rome with his knowledge or not, the whole of the school question by the Liberal party, from the very commencement since 1890 has been marked by deceit. The Conservative party have been sincere. Those Conservatives who were in favour of the proposed settlement (the Remedial Bill), said so openly, and those who were opposed to it said so openly. I do not blame those hon. gentlemen opposite who were not in the last Parliament, although, I suppose they knew all about it. But I do accuse those who have been here of insincerity and having used this question unfairly as a means of obtaining power. I say the hon. Premier has deceived the Catholic population of this country during the five years that this question has been before Parliament, and I say that the right hon. gentleman, in not putting this document before the country has deceived the Protestant population of Canada by withholding from them this means of judging whether he was right or wrong. What is the result of all this pleading before the Court of Rome ? I am as good a Roman Catholic as any one of those who have signed petitions to Rome, so good a Roman Catholic that I do not need to sign petitions to Rome to prove it. And I say it is an unfortunate day for Canada when the Government of this country has to go to the head of the Roman Catholic Church to make its bad policy on the school question accept-

able to the people of that denomination in Canada. The Conservative party have been trying whether in power or out of power to manage the affairs of this country so as to win the approbation of the best element of the population, and that best element is the clergy, whether Protestant or Catholic. But the right hon. gentleman, if he had made a good settlement of the Manitoba school question, one which would have satisfied the just claims of the minority, would he have had to go to Rome to ask the Holy Father's approbation of his policy? Not at all. But, having gone to Rome, having solicited the approbation of Rome, it was the duty of the right hon. gentleman to take the answer that Rome gave him. And what was the answer from Rome? The answer was that his settlement of the school question was insufficient, inefficient, and not acceptable. And he wanted to avoid letting the Protestant population of Canada know that he had been down on his knees seeking the approbation of Rome of a settlement which was not just to the minority in Manitoba. But, Sir, he is not the only one who ignores these things. In another part of this building some questions have been asked. I have here a question put to another member of the Government, and would call the attention of you, Mr. Speaker, and of the House to it. This question was put:

Whether the present Government or the Prime Minister or any member of the present Administration, has had, directly or indirectly, or is having, directly or indirectly, any negotiation, either with the government of Manitoba or any member thereof or with the Catholic religious authorities of Manitoba on the subject of the question called the schools question?

And what is the answer? Mr. Mills, the Minister of Justice, answers:

I may say in answer to my hon. friend, that the Government have not had any negotiations with the government of Manitoba or the Catholic religious authorities of that province on the subject called the school question, nor has it authorized any member of the Government to hold any such negotiations.

That is the answer of one of the Ministers. What does another Minister say?

The present Government had a conference with the Government of Manitoba, and they came to an agreement which was confirmed by the Manitoba legislature, and that is the end of it, so far as the public are concerned.

One answer was given on the 25th of April, 1898, and the other on the 2nd of May in the same year. The two Ministers gave two different answers. Now, another question was asked concerning Mr. Russell, who has been acting for the present Government since they came into power, and who accompanied the Solicitor General to Rome. There was a letter from Mr. Russell, dated at Rome on the 26th of November, 1897, and as it has been read, and I think is in the "Hansard," I need not read it again. What is the answer given in the Senate regarding this letter? Here is the answer, taken from the organ of the party:

Hon. R. W. Scott said that neither the Government or any member of the Administration had had any negotiations with the Holy See on the question, on the above or any other subject. He quoted Todd and Bourinot to show that a Minister of the Crown was not bound to answer a categorical question which dealt with a private matter between any member of the Government and the authorities of the Church to which he belonged. So far as the Government was concerned there had been absolutely no communications or negotiations of a public character.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as I said at the commencement, this is a most important question. It is this question which has put the right hon. gentleman in power, and it has not been settled yet. It is to-day in a worse position than it was when he came into power. The right hon. gentleman has deceived both the Catholic minority before the elections, and the Protestant majority since the elections. Whenever we ask information from the Government we cannot get anything reliable from them.

Mr. McGREGOR. The people are satisfied with us, anyway.

Mr. BERGERON. Some hon. gentlemen opposite will have great difficulty in explaining some things to their electors the next time they meet them. Now, I want to ask the hon. gentleman whether he did not call the Archbishop of St. Boniface to come down here and meet him after the last session. I think the right hon. gentleman can answer "yes" or "no" to that question. Perhaps he thinks it is safer not to answer. Now, I will conclude my remarks by saying that the present Government sought to obtain power on this question, and they did obtain it. Are they happy over it? They may say so. But, Mr. Speaker, whenever we go upon the streets of Montreal, out of ten Liberals that we meet, eight of them are dissatisfied with the present Administration. And for good reasons. The present Government, in seeking to obtain power, were not moved by any motive of the public good, they were not returned to power on any policy in the interest of the Dominion of Canada. The proof of it is that they have adopted the fiscal policy of the late Conservative Government. What have they done during the two years that they have been in power? They have dismissed public employees, but they have not accomplished anything in the interest of the country. Sir, this school question has put the Minister of Public Works where he is to-day; the school question has brought the Minister of the Interior into this House; the school question has given to the Liberal party a master in the person of the Minister of Public Works. But fortunately there is something above

every one of us. The Minister of Public Works is aiming at something, and everybody knows he cannot get it. But he is bound to stay here, and surrounded by men who have no confidence in him, if we may judge by the declarations of the Liberal clubs in Montreal. The clubs in Montreal have meetings every week where they pass resolutions asking the Prime Minister to get rid of the Minister of Public Works. But the Prime Minister cannot get rid of him, and I would advise him not to get rid of him. They have tried to pass the Drummond County deal, but they have not succeeded; they have tried to pass the Yukon deal, but they have not succeeded. They have been practising deception in everything that they have tried, and they will keep doing so until they go before their masters. The Minister of Public Works stated one day that the people of this country had changed masters. He made a mistake. He is the servant, not the master of the people of this country. It is the people of this country who are our masters. Hon. gentlemen opposite can enjoy what they call the sweets of office until they go before their masters whom they have deceived once, but whom they will not be able to deceive a second time.

ADJOURNMENT—DEATH OF MR. McCARTHY, M.P.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). It is my very sad duty to convey to the House an intelligence which perhaps is not altogether unlooked for, but which will be, at the same time, received, I am sure, with great sadness by this House. I have just been informed that our colleague, Mr. Dalton McCarthy, died a few minutes ago. Under such circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I am sure I am but anticipating the wishes of the House, and in this I have the concurrence of my hon. friend who leads the Opposition, in moving the adjournment of the House. We have just lost one of the most eminent men in Canada, one of the most important members of this House, a man who added dignity to public life, and who was an authority in his profession. Those who have been in the House in former years are aware that Mr. McCarthy held a unique position in this House. He had been for a long time a Conservative, he had differed somewhat from his party, though he had never been closely allied with the Liberal party. He had his own views and ideas, and of those who may have differed from him upon many questions, I am sure that no one who knew him, no one who heard him, but respected his character, respected his views and respected his opinions. The country has met with a great loss, the House has met with a great loss, and as I said a moment ago, I believe I am only anticipating the wishes of the House in moving that we proceed no further with this sitting, and that the House do now adjourn.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I rise to second the motion made in such appropriate terms by the leader of the House. It is but as yesterday that Mr. McCarthy was here in the enjoyment of all the health and vigour, both physical and intellectual, that we know characterized him. To-night he has for ever left this earthly scene. It shows us what shadows we are, and what shadows we pursue. I regret to say that my relations with that hon. gentleman were not of the intimate character of those of the leader of the House; but every member of this House cannot but recognize that the profession to which he belonged has lost one of its most distinguished ornaments, and we all long since recognized the great ability he brought to the discussion of public questions in this House. I believe his untimely and lamented death will be received with universal regret, not only in this House, but throughout the country.

Mr. WALLACE. In rising to move the adjournment of the debate, I wish to add a word to the remarks made by the right hon. the First Minister and the leader of the Opposition. During the last few years the late lamented member for North Simcoe and myself were brought more closely together than we had been for years previously, and as I became more closely intimate with him I was led to admire above all other qualities, his great earnestness and sincerity. He had strong convictions, which he followed out no matter whither the conclusions led him. I think this was one of his distinguishing features, and it is an admirable feature in any man's character. This country will sustain a very great loss by the death of this eminent citizen of Canada, because he set an example to Canadians of earnestness and uprightness in his public career. It is a singular coincidence that his death should have occurred when this House was engaged in the discussion of a question in which no member took a warmer or deeper interest than the late lamented member for North Simcoe. I wish to add my tribute to his worth and the loss which this House and country will sustain by his death.

Motion to adjourn the debate agreed to.

The PRIME MINISTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 9.55 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 12th May, 1898.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

NEGOTIATIONS WITH NEWFOUNDLAND.

Mr. RODDICK asked,

Is it the intention of the Government to reopen negotiations with the Government of Newfoundland with a view to bringing the island into confederation ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). In reply to my hon. friend, I beg to say that, in the opinion of the Government, the moment is not opportune to reopen these negotiations.

WORKS ON THE CORNWALL CANAL.

Mr. BRODER (by Mr. Taylor) asked,

What work is to be done on the upper entrance of the Cornwall Canal under the tenders asked for in the advertisement published by the Department of Railways and Canals under date of 8th April, 1898 ? Was not the improvement of this part of the Cornwall Canal completed under the plans of the late chief engineer of canals, Mr. Page ? If so, has anything since occurred to necessitate a change ? What is the estimated cost of the works proposed to be done, and what benefit will it be to navigation ? What is the reason for particular haste in the completion of the proposed new work ? Why is the lump sum of $17,000 named in the advertisement as the amount to accompany the tender, when it is found on inquiry and on reading the specifications that there are three separate contracts to be let, and therefore three separate deposits required, the amounts being $2,000, $5,000 and $10,000 ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). The work to be done on the upper entrance of the Cornwall Canal under the tenders asked for in the advertisement published by the Department of Railways and Canals under date of 8th April, 1898, is as follows :—

Approximate quantities of work—

340,000	cubic yards	earth excavation.
20,000	do	boulder do
3,300	do	broken stone protection.
1,100	lineal yards	bank preparation for stone protection.
2,000	lineal feet	fencing.

The improvement of this part of the canal was not completed under the plans of the late chief engineer, Mr. Page. The execution of this work is the carrying out of his plans. No change is being made from Mr. Page's plans. The department does not deem it advisable at present, and pending the receipt of tenders and award of contract, to make any statement as to estimated cost of the works. The object of the work is to allow large vessels entering the canal to clear themselves from the cross current and prevent their being carried over the Long Sault Rapids. The reason of having the work done at this period is to have a safe entrance for large vessels upon the opening of the canals for 14 feet navigation. The object of the $17,000 deposit security, is to secure the carrying out of the tenders for each of the three works covered by advertising, viz. : Cornwall, upper entrance improvement, $10,000 ; Hamilton Island section improvement, $2,000 ; St. Regis section of Lake St. Francis improvement, $5,000, each of which works may be contracted for with separate contractors.

ALIEN LABOUR ACT.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I shall complete the answer I gave to the member for Toronto (Mr. Clarke) yesterday with regard to the appointments of agents by the Government, under the Alien Labour Act. The following is the list of agents appointed under "the Alien Labour Act," and dates of appointment :—

W. F. McCreary, Winnipeg, Man.	23rd July, 1897.
James Lawson, Fort Erie.....	13th Sept., 1897.
Art. Boyle, Niagara Falls, Ont.	13th Sept., 1897.
Jas. H. Kenning, Windsor, Ont..	23rd Sept., 1897.
R. Rush, Sault Ste. Marie, Ont..	25th Sept., 1897.
A. C. Paterson, North Portal, N.W.T.....	18th Oct., 1897.
H. Tennant, Coutts, N.W.T....	18th Oct., 1897.
J. A. McMartin, Huntington, B.C.	18th Oct., 1897.
A. Lawrence, Gretna, Man.....	18th Oct., 1897.
T. J. Mather, Gretna, Man.....	18th Oct., 1897.
G. G. Allen, Emerson, Man.....	18th Oct., 1897.
W. Mills, Emerson, Man.....	18th Oct., 1897.
F. Spain, Bridgeburg, Ont.....	19th Apr., 1898.
W. B. McMurrich, Toronto, Ont..	11th May, 1898.

Mr. BENNETT. Is it the intention of the Government to put the Act in force on the north shore of the Georgian Bay, where, I am informed, a large number of Americans are now being employed ?

The PRIME MINISTER. The matter is doubtless under the consideration of the Department of Justice. I canot give an answer to-day, but will inquire.

GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS—AGREEMENT WITH MR. HARRIS, MANAGER.

Mr. FOSTER. Would the hon. Minister of Railways be kind enough to lay on the Table a copy of the agreement made with Mr. Harris, who was appointed manager of the Government railways. There is no opportunity now for making a formal motion as the session is so far advanced, and

I hope my hon. friend will have no objection to bringing this down without a formal motion.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I cannot lay any agreement on the Table, because we have none.

Mr. FOSTER. No agreement?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No. There are certain instructions accompanying the notice of appointment, which I shall be very glad to bring down. That covers everything.

CHARGES AGAINST LIEUTENANT COLONEL DOMVILLE.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence if he would, without formal notice, bring down copies of all charges made against Lieutenant Colonel Domville, commanding officer of the 8th Hussars. I understand that these charges were made and that the General refused investigation, and the only method now is to have the papers called for. I trust my hon. friend will bring them down without formal motion.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). I think that is a very unusual request to make. I may say to my hon. friend that I have not yet seen the charges to which he referred. I have heard that there were some such charges. I wish he would allow the matter to rest where it is, and I will be able to give him a reply.

DISMISSAL OF DR. ORTON AS INDIAN MEDICAL SUPERINTENDENT.

Mr. SPROULE. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to say that I hold in my hand a return to the order of the House of 18th April, 1898, for copies of all letters, papers and correspondence or reports between the Minister of the Interior or any of his departmental employees, and any Indian agent or agents regarding the dismissal of Dr. George Orton as medical superintendent of Indians in the province of Manitoba. I find that all the correspondence brought down consists of one letter dated Ottawa, 18th February, 1897, to the effect that Dr. Orton's services were dispensed with by Order in Council. This letter is signed by Hayter Reed, Deputy Superintendent, and addressed to E. McColl, Inspector of Indian Agencies in Winnipeg, Man. I know that there was more correspondence than this, and, therefore, the order of this House has been disobeyed, for what reason I do not understand. I do not think there can be any justifiable reason why all the correspondence should not be given to the House as I do not believe any of it was private. I would like to know whether the order of the House is to be obeyed or not?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). Mr. Speaker, all the correspondence has been brought down so far as I have any knowledge of, or so far as it is known to the officers of the department.

Mr. SPROULE. I know all the correspondence is not brought down, for I have copies of letters that have passed between officers of the department and Dr. Orton, and there is only one here, and that is a letter sent to Mr. McColl, inspector of Indian agencies, notifying him that by Order in Council Dr. Orton had been dismissed.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. All I have to say is that the order was sent to the Secretary of the department and he was told to send all the correspondence. When the return was prepared he was asked if that was all the correspondence, and he said it was. If the hon. gentleman will give me the information he has I will have the matter looked into.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). I would like to call the attention of the leader of the Government to an order passed on the 18th of last month in connection with the death of two young men in the west. I sent the note to the Premier with regard to the matter. The return has not been brought down so far as I know.

SUPPLY—MANITOBA SCHOOL QUESTION—ADDRESS TO THE HOLY FATHER.

The House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Fielding:

That Mr. Speaker do leave the Chair for the House to go again into Committee of Supply.

Mr. WALLACE. On a question of such importance as that which is now brought before the House, it is a matter for regret, I think, that there is no conclusiveness in the way the subject has been introduced for discussion, and also in the fact that we were not informed in advance that it would come up for our consideration. However, it is now here. We listened yesterday to the statements with regard to the Manitoba school question and the mode in which the Government had dealt with it. I was much surprised indeed that in the whole of the discussion yesterday the question was regarded largely, if not wholly, from the point of view of the interests of a certain church and by members of that church. I think it is a reason for regret that the debate did not take a wider range. In the observations I have to make to-day I shall speak, not as a member of any church or any sect or any denomination, but as a Canadian citizen, jealous of the rights that have been given to us under responsible government as Canadians and jealous of the rights that have been handed down to us as British subjects. British subjects all over the world have a freedom and liberty

enjoyed by no other people. The debate so far as it has gone, has disclosed facts which are disturbing if not alarming to those who value our freedom as Canadian citizens and British subjects.

The late Government of Sir Mackenzie Bowell formulated a policy with regard to this question, which, when brought before this House, was very fully discussed. A general election followed immediately afterwards. In that election the present leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper), then the leader of the Government, inherited this Manitoba school question as a legacy from his predecessor, and had, I must admit, a hard battle to fight. But he fought with his usual courage and ability, although, so far as the province of Ontario was concerned, he fought almost single-handed as a Minister. However, the matter was discussed very thoroughly before the country. By the consent of both parties it was really made the great issue before the electors in the general election of 1896. The result of the elections was that the present right hon. Premier received the confidence of the majority of the electors of Canada, and his policy with reference to the matter was approved of. So far as that went, a great many Conservatives, if they did not give hearty assistance to him in the programme he had laid down, gave passive assistance at any rate, and viewed with a great deal of composure the accession to power of the right hon. gentleman and his party. The right hon. gentleman laid down as his programme in this House and before the electors during the campaign that he was opposed to coercing Manitoba, that there were to be no separate schools so far as we were concerned and that the Government of the Dominion of Canada would propose no remedial legislation. Sir, that programme was fairly well carried out. We hear, particularly from the member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron), and the junior member for Cape Breton (Mr. McDougall) that different promises were made in other parts of the Dominion. With that statement I am not going to concern myself, particularly just now. If the right hon. Premier made promises different from those I have stated, he will have to settle with the electorate where those promises were made. I shall not discuss that matter now. Well, Sir, after having obtained the approval of the people of Canada for their settlement of this question, and after coming into power, this Government referred the matter to the province of Manitoba, and the question was settled by the people of Manitoba, as they had a right to settle it. Under the constitution the people of the province have control of educational matters. If the people of Manitoba choose to adopt a system of separate schools for the province, those of us who live in other provinces would have no possible right to object. If they choose to go back to the old system, it is quite within their right to do so. But they, while making some moderate concessions to the minority, refused to adopt the principle of separate schools. And we were told that there was a settlement of the case so far as the people of this country were concerned. We have the evidence in many quarters that that was the view expressed by the members of the Government in the House and out of it, and by their supporters as well. But immediately that that was done, what do we find ? That the Government who had displayed, at any rate, the courage of carrying out their pledges, turned round and adopted a different programme. Immediately afterwards we find them sending emissaries to Rome. The first one who went to Rome, as mentioned by the hon. member for Beauharnois, was, I think, Abbé Proulx. A number of other gentlemen went to Rome on the same business. Chevalier Drolet was sent to Rome, and I believe that our Solicitor General made one visit, if not more than one visit, to Rome.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). Only one.

Mr. WALLACE. Mr. Charles Russell, I am told, was sent to Rome on a special mission, to obtain the interference of the Pope of Rome in a settlement that had been made in the Dominion of Canada. Why, Sir, I thought this was a Canadian question, that it had come before the Canadian electorate for their consideration, that when the Canadian people had pronounced upon it, their will should be law, and that their will having been carried out, we had no occasion to go to a foreign potentate or to anybody else to obtain his approval of the course that had been mapped out by a majority of the Canadian people. But we find that we were mistaken. This settlement that we were told was a final settlement, a complete settlement, we are now told on the authority of this gentleman was not a settlement at all. Mr. Russell, in a letter which I have here, says :

> We do not solicit His Holiness to sanction as perfect the concessions obtained, but that in his wisdom he will be pleased to regard them as a beginning of justice. With the aid of time, and thanks to the patient work of persuasion by their compatriots, the Catholics of Manitoba may hope to obtain satisfaction.

That is the language of an agent of the Government, that is not a privately expressed opinion, but it is the authoritative opinion of an agent of the Government who was sent there, I presume, by the Government, who was doing Government work, and who was making those representations to His Holiness the Pope. Why did they do this ? Had the Government lost faith in themselves ? Were they not satisfied with the settlement that was made ? They expressed themselves to us as satisfied with that settlement, and that it was the conclusion of the whole matter, so far as they

were concerned. But we find that from that day almost down to the present day, negotiations have been going on, and going on in a way that I think should meet with the condemnation of every right-thinking Canadian. Last year it was stated to this House by the Minister of Public Works that a petition had been sent by forty-five legislators, members of Parliament and of the Government, and Senators. We are told, I believe, that these gentlemen signed that petition as private individuals. Mr. Speaker, there never was a more transparent farce than the pretense that they went as private citizens. They state in their petition that they are legislators. The first name on that petition, I believe, is the name of the right hon. First Minister; then come the names of members of the Government who signed it, and then other members of Parliament and Senators. This was an emanation from a political party, from the political party that administers the affairs of this country to-day, and they cannot dissociate themselves as private persons from their position as members of the Government and rulers of this country. I say, Sir, that they are primarily responsible to the people of this country for whatever act they do in that regard; they cannot separate their position as members of the Government, as rulers of this country and claim to go there as a number of private individuals. They were particular to tell His Holiness the Pope that they were there as legislators. In that petition, I believe, Sir Wilfrid Laurier signed his name as Premier of Canada. At any rate, others add their titles, so that they went there, not as private citizens. and they cannot pretend that they went there as private citizens. There was a Cardinal at Rome much addicted to swearing.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. FOSTER. Don't spoil a good story.

Mr. WALLACE. Who was admonished by his chaplain against such a bad practice. His reply was that he did not swear as a Cardinal but as a Prince of the Roman Empire. The chaplain said, then if you are damned for swearing as a Prince of the Roman Empire, what becomes of the Cardinal? And so I say that the conduct of these gentlemen in this respect is utterly indefensible as members of the Government. The leader of the Government is to be condemned utterly for the course he has taken. Now, Sir, in reference to that petition, we had a visit from the ambassador of the Pope last year, Monseigneur Merry del Val. His visit here was looked upon by many people in this country with great suspicion, and with a good deal of dissatisfaction as well, because the Canadian people recognize the fact that we are amply and abundantly able to regulate our own affairs without the interference of outsiders, no matter where those outsiders come from. But, Sir, what follows? The Government was sending their agent to the city of Rome under the pay of the Canadian Government, because we find from a statement given in answer to a question in the House some days ago, that Chevalier Drolet, who was in Rome many times on the business of the Government in this connection, has been very abundantly rewarded, not with regular fees, it is true, but with mining claims which disclose, in my opinion, a gross piece of corruption, and something that the Minister of the Interior will be called to account for before he gets through with this matter. This Chevalier Drolet receives, not a cash payment, because they could not very well manage that, but he receives a number of valuable mining claims in the richest mining district in the world. The Government propose to give Mackenzie & Mann those mining claims on the land, and Chevalier Drolet and some others of their friends those on the water. Between the two, there would be no very great wealth left in that part of our North-west Territories. Now, it appears that Mr. Charles Russell, who was their confidential adviser, went to Rome on more than one occasion to get the sanction and approval of the Pope of Rome for the course that a Canadian Government had taken in matters affecting the Canadian people. Now, I remember the right hon. Premier, on more than one occasion, in this House and out of it, telling the people of Canada that the model statesman, the man whom he admired above others, the man who was the best living exponent of British Liberal principles, was the Hon. Mr. Gladstone. I know that he has on many occasions given us the privilege of hearing political truths that were laid down by Mr. Gladstone. I regret that in this connection the right hon. gentleman has failed to read Mr. Gladstone's opinion concerning just such matters as the reference of this school question to the Pope of Rome, or that if he had read it, he has not taken the sound advice given by that distinguished statesman. Sir, what does Mr. Gladstone say about the Pope of Rome and his interference in civil matters? He speaks very decidedly upon that matter, and I will trouble the House with reading a quotation which I think very accurately states the position that the free Governments of Great Britain and of our own Canada should take with regard to any interference of that kind. Mr. Gladstone published a celebrated pamphlet some years ago on the subject of Papal infallibility. Part of it is as follows:—

Absolute obedience, it is boldly declared, is due to the Pope, at the peril of salvation, not alone in faith, in morals, but in all things which concern the discipline and government of the Church. Thus are swept into the Papal net whole multitudes of facts, whole systems of government, prevailing, though in different

degrees, in every country of the world. Even in the United States, where the severance between Church and State is supposed to be complete, a long catalogue might be drawn of subjects belonging to the domain and competency of the state, but also undeniably affecting the government of the Church, such as, by way of example, marriage, burial, education, prison discipline, blasphemy, poor relief, incorporation, mortmain, religious endowments, vows of celibacy and obedience. In Europe the circle is far wider, the points of contact and of interlacing almost innumerable. But on all matters respecting which any Pope may think proper to declare that they concern either faith or morals, or the government or discipline of the Church, he claims, with the approval of a council undoubtedly ecumenical in the Roman sense, the absolute obedienc, at the peril of salvation, of every member of his communion. It seems not as yet to have been thought wise to pledge the council in terms to the syllabus and the encyclical. That achievement is probably reserved for some one of its sittings yet to come. In the meantime, it is well to remember that this claim in respect of all things affecting the discipline and government of the Church, as well as faith and conduct, is lodged in open day by and in the reign of a Pontiff who has condemned free speech, free writing, a free press, toleration of non-conformity, liberty of conscience, the study of civil and philosophical matters in independence of the ecclesiastical authority, marriage unless sacramentally contracted, and the definition by the state of the civil rights (jura) of the Church; who has demanded for the Church, therefore, the title to define its own civil rights, together with a divine right to civil immunities, and a right to use physical force, and who has also proudly asserted that the Popes of the middle ages, with their councils, did not invade the rights of princes—as, for example, Gregory VII of the Emperor Henry IV, Innocent III of Raymond of Toulouse, Paul III in deposing Henry VIII, or Pius V in performing the like paternal office for Elizabeth.

This is the doctrine laid down by Mr. Gladstone. He says, further:

The state will, I trust, be ever careful to leave the domain of religious conscience free, and yet to keep it to its own domain, and to allow neither private caprice nor, above all, foreign arrogance, to dictate to it on the discharge of its proper office. "England expects every man to do his duty," and none can be so well prepared under all circumstances to exact its performance as that Liberal party, which has done the work of justice alike for Nonconformists and for Papal dissidents, and whose members have so often, for the sake of that work, hazarded their credit with the markedly Protestant constituencies of the country. Strong as the state of the United Kingdom has always been in material strength and its moral panoply is now, we may hope, pretty complete. It is not, then, for the dignity of the Crown and people of the United Kingdom to be diverted from a path which they have deliberately chosen and which it does not rest with all the myrmidons of the Apostolic chamber either openly to obstruct, or secretly to undermine. It is rightfully to be expected, it is greatly to be desired, that the Roman Catholics of this country should do in the nineteenth century what their forefathers of England, except a handful of emissaries, did in the sixteenth, when they were marshalled in resistance to the Armada, and in the seventeenth, when, in spite of Papal chair, they sat in the House of Lords under the oath of allegiance. That which we are entitled to desire we are entitled also to expect; indeed, to say we did not expect it would, in my judgment, be the true way of conveying an "insult" to those concerned. In this expectation we may be partially disappointed. Should those to whom I appeal thus unhappily come to bear witness in their own persons to the decay of sound, manly, true life in their Church, it will be their loss more than ours. The inhabitants of these islands as a whole are stable, though sometimes credulous and excitable; resolute, though sometimes boastful; and a strong-headed and stout-hearted race will not be hindered, either by latent or by avowed dissents, due to the foreign influence of a caste, from the accomplishment of its mission in the world.

Those are the sound views which should prevail with the right hon. First Minister, more especially as he has all his life proclaimed that Mr. Gladstone was the ablest exponent of British statesmanship and policy living to-day, or perhaps who has lived in the history of the country. But, Sir, what does he do? The Pope of Rome, so far as we know, has not thrust his intervention in this matter at all. If so, I am mistaken; but the Premier goes to the Pope of Rome, he sends his agents to the Pope of Rome. What does he say? Mr. Russell, in a letter I have here, and which I assume is genuine and authentic, says as follows, the communication being addressed to His Eminence Cardinal Rampolla, Secretary of State to the Pope of Rome:

Eminence,—I have just arrived at Rome once again, at the urgent request of the Catholic members of the Government and of the Parliament of Canada, in whose name I have already presented myself to you. Although I have come so far, I do not dare to present myself to Your Eminence, because I would not in the least like, at this moment, to seem to be bringing pressure to bear or wish to impede the complete liberty of His Holiness. Moreover, I know how busy Your Eminence is, and I remember with what patience Your Eminence has so many times before heard our representations on the subject of Manitoba, which, besides, Your Eminence now fully understands.

I should not even like to give you the trouble to read this letter if I had not been very particularly asked to go to Rome by those whom I represent.

Who are those he represents? The Premier of the Dominion and the Catholic members of the Government of the Dominion. He goes to Rome. What was the necessity of these visits to Rome? It was thought at the last election that the First Minister was given power to settle the question and that we, as Canadians, had the settlement of our own affairs. We were rudely awakened, however, when we found by these letters published the other day that the Prime Minister holds a different view from that which the people of Canada as a whole entertain on this subject. We are now told this for the first time, what we perhaps have sus-

pected and known in a general way, but the citizens of Canada are told now that their agent received in cash or sent in as bills no less than $12,000 for the short period he has been acting as Canadian agent, the principal portion of which has been for visits to the city of Rome. I do not indeed care what they represent, but I venture to say that the people will be called upon to pay expenses of Mr. Charles Russell in this matter. The people have no right to pay a dollar of this money.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL They have not paid any.

Mr. WALLACE. Accounts for more than $8,500 remain unpaid. Is it because these bills have to be covered up ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. That is not the case. There is not a single item in the account for visits to Rome.

Mr. WALLACE. Do you think there would be entered, trips to Rome, £100 or £200 ? They know better than that. Why were not the bills brought down before the Public Accounts Committee ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. They were. These accounts were asked to be brought down before the Public Accounts Committee by the hon. member for Pictou, and instructions were given to the Deputy Minister to produce them there.

Mr. WALLACE. So far as I know, those bills have not yet been produed.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The member for Pictou can state whether that is the case or not.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I have an idea, although of that I am not certain, that I asked for these accounts to be produced before the committee. I have not seen them, and I do not know that they have been brought down.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. One word of personal explanation. The hon. member (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) asked me if these bills would be brought down, and I told him that if he would drop a note to the Deputy Minister of Justice they would be produced forthwith.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I accept that statement fully, but I never wrote the note.

Mr. WILSON. The Solicitor General told the Deputy Minister of Justice to bring down the accounts of Mr. Russell to the Committee on Public Accounts.

Mr. WALLACE. The Solicitor General also asked me to write to the Deputy Minister and I did so immediately, but have received no reply, so that the accounts are either not down yet, or if they are we have not been notified as we should be.

Mr. FOSTER. The course always taken is that when a member asks for papers, and the order is made by the Public Accounts Committee, the secretary of the committee sends a note to the person asking for them notifying him that they have been brought down. The hon. member who asked for these papers has not yet got the notification and the presumption is that they have not been brought down.

Mr. WALLACE. That is the usual course, and I have received no notice that these papers have been brought down. But, Mr. Speaker, what I said was this : The Solicitor General is not going to present the accounts for the visit to Rome, because the Government have told us that the visit was on private business, but I can safely say that since these solicitors were appointed the legal agents of the Canadian Government in London have presented bills for £2,450, and I state that they have not earned £2,450 sterling in the service of Canada. This Mr. Russell says that he was fully credited on behalf of these members of the Government and of the Parliament of Canada, and I presume that hon. gentlemen opposite will not repudiate that statement. This gentleman has told the Pope of Rome that this is only an instalment of justice to the minority in the province of Manitoba, although we were told by members of the Government in this House that it was a full and final settlement and that so far as the Parliament of Canada was concerned it would no more be heard of here. But when the members of the Government of Canada and those supporting them in this House write to the Pope of Rome and send that emissary to him, they tell the Pope that the settlement of the Manitoba school question is only a first instalment of justice and that further justice will be done later on. Sir, this is an attempt to deceive the Canadian people who believe so far as the Government of Canada was concerned they would hear no more of this question, which as I believe should never have come before this Parliament. But there is another and a serious matter. Mr. Charles Russell in writing to Cardinal Rampolla, makes this statement :

> My instructions enjoin me again to renew to Your Eminence the desire which I had already honour to express to you, that His Holiness will be pleased to name a permanent delegate to Canada.

These gentlemen opposite may say—I do not know whether they will or not—that this refers to religious matters. Well, Sir, with regard to the religion of any hon. member or of any citizen of Canada we have nothing whatever to do ; nor have we the right to interfere in the smallest degree with the full exercise of his religion no matter what that religion may be. But, Sir, the Government will not dare to say that this is a religious question, because the Roman Catholic Church has her ministers, and her bishops

and her archbishops in Canada to attend to these religious matters, and the members of this Government would not dare to interfere in the appointment of an Apostolic delegate on purely religious grounds. What kind of a delegate is this? For what purpose is His Holiness the Pope of Rome asked to send a permanent delegate to Canada? Sir, it is with a view of interfering with our legislation in the Parliament of Canada or in the various legislatures.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. WALLACE. Well, he had better not. I ask some hon. member of the Government to explain what is the meaning of this permanent delegate to the Dominion of Canada and what are his duties to be, because we know that it cannot be in regard to religious matters that the members of the Government have asked the Pope to send a delegate here? For five hundred years, Mr. Speaker, the British people have protested against the interference of a foreign potentate in their internal affairs. Every dynasty, every century has seen conflicts in this direction, and the people of England in all these hundreds of years have been steady in their determination to conduct their own affairs as they desire. I believe, Sir, that the people of Canada are actuated by the same impulses, by the same love of liberty, and by the same determination to manage their own politics. The people of Canada will resent the appointment of a permanent delegate to this country from the Pope of Rome. We have no need of such an officer in this country. We are perfectly competent to manage our own business. We have enjoyed responsible government in this Dominion for fifty years, and although we may make mistakes we can correct them. This country has been governed in accordance with the wishes of our people. We have a greater amount of freedom here than any other country, not even excepting England herself. We have had liberty to pass our own laws as we think they should be passed, and, Sir, we will resent the appointment of a Papal delegate to interfere with the Canadian people in anything they may desire to legislate upon. Sir, I am surprised that the First Minister is giving his sanction in any way to such a proposal. It is wrong policy; it is something that will not be tolerated by the Canadian people. An American writer puts the position of affairs in a most comprehensive style and I will trouble the House with a brief quotation from him. This was not written within the last thirty or forty days since our friends to the south have become exceedingly friendly to Great Britain, but it was written about three years ago by a gentleman who, I believe, is a Roman Catholic himself and who recognizes the fairness of Great Britain and her just dealing towards every class of her subjects. He says:

Though the most Protestant, yet, confident in her strength, she is the most tolerant of nations; without question or price the refugee of any and of all countries finds shelter in England. There the socialistic Gentile, the hunted Jew, or the persecuted Jesuit can flee, and find a home and protection; none have ever been proscribed because of their "poverty," their politics, their race or religion—can any other nation boast a like freedom? Only one condition is exacted, "obey the law, for England is governed by law, not by mood or sentiment."

The writer of this is Mr. Edward Phelan, of Concord, Mass. I think it expresses accurately the attitude of Great Britain, as well as that of Canadians, and I think this Government has made a very grievous mistake in going outside of the Dominion of Canada and asking a foreign potentate to interfere in the regulation of our domestic affairs. As I have said, the people of Canada are amply able to transact their own business, and they will deal fairly with any class of our citizens. The minority in Canada, I care not of what religion that minority may be, will find that the majority will in all cases deal honourably and fairly, and more than fairly, with the minority. That has been the history in the past, I believe, in every province of this Dominion; and this Government who we were told had settled this question, immediately afterwards sent their agents and emissaries, one after another, to the city of Rome, for no purpose that can be commended by the Canadian people. The right hon. First Minister asked the confidence of the people of Canada to legislate on this matter; the people of Canada gave him that confidence, and he should have been satisfied with that, and not have gone out of our country for the sanction or approval of any foreign potentate. This country, Mr. Speaker, is governed by Canadians for Canadians, in the interest of Canada and the British Empire, and I say that we in Canada will always resent any foreign interference in our domestic affairs.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, before the debate is continued, I would like to say one word in reference to Mr. Charles Russell, whose name has been introduced. The hon. Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick), I have no doubt, has reason to say that he understood me to ask for these accounts, though I have never as yet had the slightest curiosity to see them, and have no recollection of having asked for them.

Mr. WALLACE. I asked for them.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I think probably some one else asked for them, but that is a small matter. The Auditor General's accounts, which were before the Public Accounts Committee, show only a small advance to Mr. Russell. But knowing Mr. Russell as I do, after a somewhat

long acquaintance too, it is right for me to say, lest I should be understood as suspecting him of any dishonourable conduct, that he is a gentleman of the highest standing in his profession as a solicitor in London, that he did excellent work for Canada at Paris, where he rendered the most valuable assistance in the conduct of the British side of the case, in connection with the Behring Sea question, and that he is the last man in the world whom I would suspect of doing anything that would reflect upon him either as a solicitor or as a gentleman. Nor do I believe that he would attempt indirectly to make any charge for services for which he was entitled to charge. He would render such an account, I believe, as he thought he was entitled to render, and then leave it, as other members of the profession do, for those to whom it was rendered to decide what they would pay. While saying that for Mr. Russell, while I am on my feet, and without the slightest reflection upon him, I may give this as my opinion of the significance of his visits to Rome. It is quite likely, as I view it, that Mr. Russell, having had a great favour conferred upon him in being appointed to the very distinguished and valuable position in London of solicitor of the Canadian Government at the hands of hon. gentlemen opposite, was doubtless ready to render a favour to those gentlemen, or any of them—the Solicitor General, for instance—at his own cost and charges, to do them a good turn, if asked. That he did them a good turn no one can doubt. At the same time I have not the slightest suspicion that he would endeavour to be paid out of the public funds if he were not entitled to make a charge. The extraordinary favour that is done him I do not grudge, except in one way. I would have been very glad, at the time I was a member of the Government, if I could have myself utilized his valuable services in London in connected with the public departments, but a firm of great respectability, who had been established for many years in London, the firm of Bischoff, Bompas & Bischoff, had acted as agents and solicitors for the Conservative Government and the old Reform Government of Canada for very many years; and much as I would have liked to have done Mr. Russell that good turn, so far as it was a good turn, I never could understand how, for no good reason, that firm could have been given up as they were, and another gentleman taken in their stead.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Mr. Speaker, I do not see that the question which has been introduced by the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron), and has afterwards been taken up by the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace), requires any remarks at all at my hands. I have only a very few words to say in answer to some insinuations which were made by the hon. member for Beauharnois, and afterwards repeated and extended by the hon. member for West York. It is quite plain and quite evident that the speech which we heard to-day from the hon. member for West York is a very apposite commentary on the speech delivered yesterday by the hon. member for Beauharnois.

Mr. BERGERON. Would my right hon. friend allow me one word before he goes further? The right hon. gentleman has spoken already, and I am very glad to hear him again. But I claim the same privilege afterwards.

Mr. SPEAKER. There is no doubt that both hon. gentlemen have already spoken on this question. If either wishes to speak a second time, the usual course is to do so on a motion to adjourn the debate.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I move that the debate be adjourned.

The PRIME MINISTER. I was going to say that it is quite plain and quite evident that the speech which we have heard to-day from the hon. member for West York is a very legitimate and apposite comment on the speech delivered yesterday by the hon. member for Beauharnois. The hon. member for Beauharnois yesterday thought it advisable, thought it opportune, thought it fitting, for reasons which I may just as well abstain from investigating, to endeavour to resuscitate the Manitoba school question; but it was evident to those who listened to him from first to last, by his innuendoes, his remarks and his comments, that he was carefully preparing a brief for the hon. member for West York, and giving that hon. gentleman the opportunity, of which he has now availed himself, of delivering a no-Popery speech on the floor of this House. The hon. member for Beauharnois yesterday pretended to advocate the cause of the Roman Catholic minority of Manitoba; but by the result which he has already achieved, it is plain and evident to everybody that his professed friendship was nothing but a betrayal—was nothing else than the kiss of Judas. To-day the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) took for the text of his remarks the speech delivered yesterday by the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron), and we have witnessed a repetition of the same tactics practiced for years and years by the Conservative party upon this question of the Manitoba schools, of having one speech for Catholic Quebec and another for Protestant Ontario. The hon. member for Beauharnois yesterday wanted to make it appear that I appealed to the Papal See. This is how he opened the subject:

I myself asked in the House some time ago, whether any document signed "Wilfrid Laurier," the name of the Prime Minister, had ever been sent either to His Holiness the Pope or to the

Sacred Propaganda in Rome—which Roman Catholics in this House will know is the political tribunal of Rome—touching the Manitoba schools. I was answered by the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) that he did not know that any such document had ever been sent either to His Holiness the Pope or to the Sacred Propaganda. Now, either the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) knew that there was such a document and would not tell me, or he did not know. Sir what is the fact ? When that question was put to the Government and answered by the Minister of Trade and Commerce, I had that document here which is entitled : "Document to Help towards a Knowledge of the Manitoba School Question, with explanatory Notes." Sir, that document was printed in Rome in 1896, and it is signed "Wilfrid Laurier," under date Ottawa, 23rd November, 1896. I repeat that the Minister of Trade and Commerce either knew of this document or he did not know of it. If he knew of it it was his duty to tell me that such a document had been sent to Rome, and if he did not know of it, what sort of a Government have we when the Prime Minister, forsooth, can have communication with a foreign Government—because the Roman Government is a foreign Government—and his colleagues be completely ignorant of it.

Now, there was the charge—I do not know that I should qualify it as a charge and I do not accept it as such—but there was the statement made by the hon. gentleman that I had sent to the Holy See a memorial bearing upon the Manitoba school question, and that my colleagues in the Government were not aware of it. I have only this to say in reply, that the hon. gentleman, before making such a statement, should have made himself aware of the facts. The memorial he read yesterday, and which is to be found in the volume he had in his hands, never was sent by me to the Holy See or to the Propaganda or Cardinal Secretary of State. I shall explain in a minute how and under what circumstances I wrote that document, but that I ever sent it to Rome is a statement which is not true. Not that I would not claim the right to send a document to Rome if I choose. I am a Roman Catholic and a British subject. I have no other temporal sovereign than Queen Victoria, but I belong to the Church which, in religious matters, acknowledges the supremacy of the Pope of Rome, and I would have been quite within my right if I had done so. I did not do so. I never appealed to any authority upon the Manitoba school question other than the authority of the Canadian people. I once, in the fall of 1896, signed an appeal myself, in conjunction with several of my fellow-countrymen and co-religionists, to His Holiness, Pope Leo XIII. I did it, Sir, not upon the school question, but upon other questions, and I shall read once more the petition which I sent upon that occasion, so as to convince every man here that in that appeal, which we sent to His Holiness, there was not even the remotest idea of the Manitoba school question. Here is the document :—

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

To His Holiness Leo the XIII :

Most Holy Father,—We, the undersigned, members of the Senate and members of the House of Commons of Canada, and representing therein the Liberal party, present ourselves before Your Holiness as respectful and devoted children of a state of things which, if allowed to continue, might be extremely dangerous to the constitutional liberties of this country, as well as to the interests of the Church itself.

Your Holiness has already been made aware of the conduct and attitude of certain prelates and of certain members of the secular clergy who, during the general elections in this country, in the month of June last, intervened in a violent manner in restraint of electoral freedom, taking sides openly for the Conservative party against the Liberal party, and going so far as to declare guilty of grievous sin those of the electors who would vote for the candidates of the Liberal party.

Sincerely attached to the institutions of our country, which insure to us Catholics the most complete liberty, we respectfully represent to Your Holiness that these democratic institutions under which we live and for which Your Holiness has many times expressed sentiments of admiration and confidence, can only exist under perfect electoral freedom.

Far be it from us to refuse to the clergy the plenitude of civil and political rights. The priest as a citizen, and we would not, for a single instant, deprive him of the right of expressing his opinion on any matter submitted to the electorate ; but when the exercise of that right develops into violence, and when that violence, in the name of religion, goes to the extent of making a grievous sin out of a purely political act, there is an abuse of authority of which the consequences cannot but be fatal, not only to constitutional liberty, but to religion itself.

If, in a country such as ours, with a population consisting of persons of various creeds and wherein the Protestant denominations are in the majority, Catholics did not enjoy, in all matters relating to legislation, the safe political freedom as their Protestant fellow-countrymen, they would ipso facto be placed in a position of inferiority, which would prevent them from taking the legitimate part which they are entitled to take in the government of the country, with the possibility, moreover, of conflicts between the various groups of the population which history shows to be ever fraught with danger.

Now, this is the document to which I appended my signature. There is not a word in it invoking the aid or support of His Holiness upon the Manitoba school question. The only thing of which I complain in it was the attitude which had been maintained by the clergy against myself in particular and the party with which I am acting.

Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman who last spoke, the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace), and I stand, upon many and many a question, religious and political, at antipodes. I need not go into particulars on that point. But, Sir, I never yet, at any time in my career, would allow any power to interfere with the legitimate exercise of the electoral freedom of the Canadian people. But when it came to this, that electors, poor men, farmers, labourers and so on, were ordered to violate their own

consciences, when they were told from the pulpit that they must not exercise the right of suffrage as they thought fit to do, when they were told that it was a grievous sin to vote for one party or the other—I care not at this moment which—what was I to do? Was I to allow these things to go on? Sir, as a dutiful Roman Catholic, I thought it my duty and the duty of those who were associated with me—not in the Government, not in Parliament, but in many walks of social life—to appeal to the head of the church to declare that we were not inferior to any other class of men, that we could exercise our civil and political rights just as our countrymen of the Protestant persuasion do; that the privilege they had we had. Why, Sir, if the doctrine which was preached to us had not been checked by the head of the church, we should have been but pariahs in this land. That is why we appeal to the head of the church to say that Roman Catholics were the equals of other men. The hon. member for Beauharnois stated, forsooth, yesterday that the Roman Catholic clergy had nothing to fear in the local elections. Sir, he has said that the members of the Liberal party had promised to the electors that they would be still more dutiful to the church than were their opponents. But, Sir, if the Roman Catholic Liberal candidates made any such promises, why is it, I want to know, that bishops and priests declared it was a sin to vote for the candidates of the Liberal party? I do not want to go into these questions. I do not want to discuss them here; I would rather discuss them in the province of Quebec, where the Roman Catholics have the majority. That is the place for this discussion. The question was not introduced here yesterday by me, but by the hon. member for Beauharnois, who, let me tell him, played a part of which he will have no reason to feel proud hereafter.

I repeat that I signed this appeal. The hon. member for Beauharnois yesterday alleged, and to-day the hon. member for York reaffirmed, that I had appealed to the Holy See on the Manitoba school question. The hon. member for Beauharnois said that I had written the memorial and had sent it to the court of Rome. Sir, he read that memorial yesterday. I have no reason to complain that he brought that document to light. I think that those who have perused it have not found, nor will those who peruse it in the future, find a word in it that can be objected to. I prepared that memorial in order to vindicate the course of the Liberal party in this matter and to set forth the reasons which had induced them to adopt, with regard to this question of the Manitoba schools, a policy of conciliation instead of a policy of coercion. I wrote that document and signed it on the 23rd November, 1896. I sent it to several friends and to several opponents, ecclesiastics and laymen, perhaps a dozen all told. It found its way to Rome, as the sermon of the Bishop of Three Rivers found its way to Rome. It found its way to Rome as the text of the decisions of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council found its way to Rome. It found its way to Rome as the letter of Father Lacombe found its way to Rome. But, Sir, when the hon. gentleman pretended that I had written that document and sent it to Rome, let me tell him that he had not mastered his own brief, that he had not read his own book. If he had studied that book, he would not have commenced by assuming, as he did, that I had prepared that book myself. Everybody saw that my hon. friend, when he began to address the House yesterday, thought that I had prepared the book from which he was reading. He was obliged afterwards to accept my statement that I had not prepared that book. That book is a compilation—by a friendly hand, that is quite evident—but a compilation as to which I had nothing to do. But, if the hon. gentleman had read that document he would have found on my own memorial evidence that would have shown him that I had not myself sent that document to the Holy See. I had the pleasure of perusing that document for a short time to-day. I am sorry that I have not it with me at this moment. It contained a note at the head of the memorial prepared by me. I beg pardon for quoting it, as it is too eulogistic for me to quote, but I must lay the evidence before the House:

> We will add no commentary to this memorial that the First Minister addressed to his friends and to his opponents, to all men of good-will, This document speaks of itself in calm dignity and candid frankness.

Had the hon. gentleman looked he would have found that on the very first page, the evidence that this document was not addressed by me to the Holy See, nor to any one in particular, but that it had been addressed, as I have just stated, to a certain number of friends and opponents, both lay and clerical, to explain why the Liberal party had adopted a policy of conciliation.

Now, I do not intend to say anything more. I see that it is the intention of the hon. gentleman to resurrect the Manitoba school question. I am quite prepared to meet him on that ground. If he chooses now or at any time, not merely to speak in more or less vaporous language, but to bring forward a motion and challenge by a vote the policy followed by the Government on this question. I am quite prepared to meet him and vindicate the policy that we have followed. Sir, we have effected a settlement of this question. Far be it for me to pretend that that settlement is perfect. But I say that so far as this Parliament is concerned, perfect or imperfect, there it stands. I am bound to say that it has been my

privilege since that settlement was made, to ask and to ask more than once, the Government of Manitoba to be generous toward the minority, to grant to conciliation what they would have refused to coercion. I am bound to say that this prayer has been well received by the Government of Manitoba, and that they have endeavoured to make many reforms so as to meet the legitimate demands of the Catholic minority in that province.

Mr. BERGERON. I desire to say only a few words in answer to the remarks of the right hon. gentleman, and as they will be chiefly personal to myself, I shall make them very short. Everybody in the House has been able to see the impression made upon the right hon. gentleman by what I said yesterday. He has declared that I had prepared a brief for the hon. member for York (Mr. Wallace), and that this afternoon the hon. member for West York spoke upon it. I want to say to the right hon. gentleman that neither directly or indirectly have I done so, neither on this occasion nor at any other time since I have occupied a seat in Parliament. I have only done what I thought was my duty, irrespective of the opinion of others, whether they sat on this side or on the other side of the House. Now, the hon. gentleman has spoken a word which I think comes with very bad grace from his mouth.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. BERGERON. Mr. Speaker, I understand that some of those hon. gentlemen opposite are not very well pleased with this discussion. I do not want to make any comparison, but we know that usually when anybody is lashed, they show it by jumping up. I do not think they will make their case any better by refusing to listen to me. If they do not like to hear me, they are not obliged to remain in the House. As I said, the right hon. gentleman has uttered one word which he has applied to me. He knows me, he has known me very well for many years.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. He ought to.

Mr. BERGERON. I will address my remarks to others at another time. I am now speaking to the chief. The right hon. gentleman has said that I have done the work of Judas when I spoke upon this question. Sir, I have never betrayed anybody. Who is a Judas ? It is he who betrays, and principally he who betrays his friends. The first one who bore that name betrayed his most intimate friend. The right hon. gentleman, when he was in Opposition, pretended to stand very firmly in favour of the Catholic minority of Manitoba, and he has betrayed them. I need not say any more than that. Now, Sir, the right hon. gentleman says that we are beginning again in the Parliament of Canada a discussion which was carried on in years gone by in which there was one speech for Ontario and another speech for Quebec. Sir, they have the patent for that kind of talk on the other side of the House. The Conservative party did not try for five years to raise discussion of that sort in any province of the Dominion. They devoted their efforts, while in power, to settle that question ; but it was the work of hon. gentlemen opposite to go into the different provinces and try to raise a cry which might land them in power, and they succeeded. But I find it queer on the part of the right hon. gentleman to attempt to give us lessons in this respect. We have always spoken the same thing on this side of the House, we have always held the same speech, whether in Ontario or in Quebec. The hon. gentleman has not done so. He has not said in the province of Ontario what he said in Quebec East, that after he had tried his sunny ways and found they were unsuccessful, he would take the constitution in his hands and give the Manitoba minority their rights and privileges. Now, the right hon. gentleman says that the document of which I spoke yesterday, was never sent to Rome by him. Sir, this is a childish excuse, it is unworthy of the right hon. gentleman as Prime Minister. Whether he took it there in his pocket himself, whether he sent it by mail, whether he sent it by his Solicitor General, or whether he sent it there by his lawyer, Mr. Russell, what difference does it make to the people of this country ? There was a document sent to Rome. Whether it was drawn up or not by the Minister of Public Works makes no difference to the people of this country. The people of this country wish to know why it is, and that is my justification for rising now, that during the three months we have been sitting in Parliament, every time we asked the Government to lay that document before the House, they have denied that there was any such thing. They are bound now to acknowledge it. The Prime Minister comes here and says from his seat in Parliament : I have never seen any document. It is true I had written a few confidential letters right and left, and a friendly hand—he admits that—has put that memorial of mine into a document which was delivered to the Holy Propaganda. But I had nothing to do with it, and it is quite natural that my colleagues did not know anything about it. Well, Sir, I am willing to let the people of this country say whether they will accept this explanation. The right hon. gentleman admits that he drew up a memorial, he admits that he sent that to some of his friends, even to some political opponents, as he said a moment ago. Why did his colleagues know nothing about it ? Will he pretend that this is a private document ? Will he pretend that this memorial, that he did not wish anybody to see except those to whom he had written it, will he pretend that some

of his colleagues dared to take that private memorial and attach it to a document that was put before His Holiness at Rome? If he pretends that, nobody will believe him. Now, the right hon. gentleman has been thinking this matter over, and he is surprised that I should have risen in this House and have mentioned that question. Why, Mr. Speaker, for six years we have been hearing about the Manitoba school question. More than anybody else, probably, I have heard about that question while I was sitting in that Chair from Monday afternoon at three o'clock until Saturday night at twelve o'clock, hearing and seeing hon. gentlemen opposite saying and doing everything in their power to prevent the Remedial Bill from passing this House, a measure, which, in spite of all they may say, was accepted by the minority in Manitoba, and by Archbishop Langevin, representing that minority. And knowing as I do in my conscience that hon. gentlemen opposite have never been sincere in their course upon the Manitoba school question, I would be recreant to my duty as a member of Parliament if I had not risen in this House and told those hon. gentlemen what I know about them, and given the proofs of it, as I did yesterday. Now, the right hon. gentleman knows one thing, and I know it too. He cannot declare here on his word of honour that he did not know there was a document put before the Holy See. He knows that his Solicitor General went to Rome. He knows that he had a paid lawyer in Rome, Mr. Russell, he knows that he went to Rome himself. I do not blame him for having gone to Rome. He said just now that he was a Roman Catholic, and he went there as such. I do not blame him for that. I have been there myself; but I did not go there to deceive the Pope, I did not go there to deceive the Papal authorities. The hon. gentleman tries to cover up his tracks. He says that he knows very well that in some quarters in this Dominion he will be charged with having taken both sides on this question. He thought he could get that settlement accepted by the Papal authorities, and that he could come down here at the same time and declare, as he has done, that he had nothing to do with it. Now, he has made a mistake on both sides. He has not succeeded over there, and here he will have to bear the odium in the minds of some portions of our population of having done what he should not have done. Now, in order to protect himself, he says: I could have gone to Rome as a Roman Catholic. Well, he did go; he says it was for some other reason than the Manitoba school question. We are bound to take his word, but it will be very hard for anybody in this House to believe that, under the circumstances, a settlement having been made which was not acceptable at Rome, the right hon. gentleman should have gone to a place which he knew would acquire him a good deal of credit in some portions of this Dominion, and that there he should not have mentioned the school question at all. He may say that he went there for some other purpose, but the people of this country may not be willing to believe it.

Mr. LANDERKIN. What did you yourself go to Rome for?

Mr. BERGERON. I went there to pray for you. Now, Sir, the right hon. gentleman has given the best proof that his arguments do not stand scrutiny. He has read that memorial which was sent to the Holy Father prepared by the Minister of Public Works, and signed by the right hon. gentleman himself. He said that he had a right to sign that, being a son of the Catholic Church. Let me tell the hon. gentleman that the deeper he goes into that question, the worse is the position in which he finds himself. He would have done better frankly to accept the position in the first place, and boldly said that all he did on this question was to get into power, and he has succeeded. But now he tries to cover up his steps, and puts himself in a worse position than he was before. Now, what does he say in this document that he signed:

> Your Holiness has already been made aware of the conduct and attitude of certain prelates and of certain members of the secular clergy, who, during the general elections in this country, in the month of June last, intervened in a violent manner in restraint of electoral freedom, taking sides openly for the Conservative party against the Liberal party, and going so far as to declare guilty of grievous sin those of the electors who would vote for the candidates of the Liberal party.

He has signed that. What do we find later on? We find these words in a letter, which I read yesterday and commented on, and I am surprised the hon. gentleman should not have thought of them before he rose and made a statement this afternoon:

> We repeat it, never have the bishops of Canada (and Canada does not consist merely of Manitoba and the province of Quebec; there are also five other provinces: Ontario, British Columbia, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island, and four territories—Assiniboia, Alberta, Saskatchewan and Keewatin)——

Then the letter goes on to say:

> ——taken as a whole, either by a collective pastoral, or by individual pastorals, or any other official document, made known to the Catholics of the country that they had, for the settlement of the Manitoba school question, accepted a law.

Now the right hon. gentleman knows that the bishops of Quebec, all the bishops of Quebec—the Minister of Public Works smiles, but he knows it is the fact—published a mandement prepared in such a way that when the people came out of church they would say: Did not the bishops say that we should vote for Laurier. That is the kind of mandement prepared by the bishops of Canada, and every hon. member from the province of Quebec

knows it. The right hon. gentleman says he stands by Canada. Yes; he stands by Canada when he is in Parliament. Did he stand by Canada when he was at Rome? The hon. gentleman knows this is a critical position, and he is trying to get out of it by saying, I stand by Canada. There is not a man in Canada who can move from one side to the other so quickly as the hon. gentleman, there is not a man in this Dominion who can change his views as rapidly as can the hon. gentleman on anything. I have heard his speeches on the hustings delivered before the farmers. Then he declared that as between the farmers and the manufacturers of the country, he was all the time behind the farmers, and he said so when talking about the tariff to manufacturers.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BERGERON. And the Grits cheered, as those hon. gentlemen do. In the manufacturing centres he declared that as between the great manufacturing classes and other classes, I stand by the manufacturers, taking off his hat to them.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BERGERON. I have heard the hon. gentleman declare that he was a democrat to the hilt, and still he comes back with decorations from the other side of the Atlantic. More than that, the hon. gentleman goes to the other side and comes back with the Cobden medal, and yet he is the head of a protectionist Government. This is proof of his capacity to have two ideas, to be on two sides. I have heard the right hon. gentleman very often say that he belongs to the English school, that he adheres to the principles of the English school. What are the principles of that school? He does not belong to the English school. He belongs to the school of the Minister of Public Works, and it is a mighty little school. When the Prime Minister declares that he belongs to the English school he forgets that if such were the case, he would not be permitted to keep a Minister who declared under oath that he had deceived Parliament. It is easy to say that he belongs to the English school, but it is not easy to carry out the principles. The right hon. gentleman has said that I shall feel sorry at having brought up this question. I have always in the past been able to stand by my opinions, and I will do so again. It would have been the privilege of any hon. member to have taken up this question, but the task happened to have fallen to me; I have done it, and I am very glad I have done it, because I have brought before the people the true facts in regard to the school question. When the hon. gentleman says—and I was passing over this point—when in fact the hon. gentleman complains about the bishops working against the Liberal party. I say they did not work against the Liberal party as a party. The hon. gentleman should have said there might have been some priests—I do not want to deny the charge—who spoke against the Liberals on the school question, but not against the Liberal party as a political party in the province. The right hon., gentleman when he signed that document should have given that explanation. The right hon. gentleman stated a moment ago that we on this side of the House want to resurrect the school question. No, we do not want to resurrect the school question. Why should we wish to do so? How could we do it? There sits the right hon. gentleman, supported by a large majority in this House, not one of which majority, from any province, would vote for the minority of Manitoba. They have been elected to stand by the right hon. gentleman, and they know well this motto "United we stand, divided we fall," and they will stand together. No, we do not want to resurrect the school question. We will allow to rest on the right hon. gentleman the odium of having illtreated the minority of Manitoba, in support of whom he spoke during five years in this House. We want only to place before the country the facts of the case as they are. The right hon. gentleman said a moment ago, turning to the faithful on his side of the House, the Manitoba school question is settled. It will remain settled by the right hon. gentleman, and he will stand before the country in the future entitled to any satisfaction he may be able to derive from such settlement.

Mr. SPROULE. I only want to add a very few words to what has already been said on this subject, because I do not consider it to be of very great importance to continue the debate at any great length. I desire to reply briefly to the First Minister, who started out by saying that there was an understanding between the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) and the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) and that one had prepared a brief for the other. I think the hon. member for Beauharnois has effectually refuted that charge, so I need not refer to it further. But I may say in regard to the position taken by the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace), that it is one which can be taken and justified by Canadian subjects throughout the broad domain of Canada, and it is that there should be no interference in the right of the state to govern the country, either from Rome or from any other foreign country. The objection I take to this document which was presented to His Holiness, and a portion of which was read by the right hon. Premier to-day, is this—and to it I think many members of the Reform party will likewise object—is that the following should appear at the beginning:—

We, the undersigned members of the Senate and members of the House of Commons of Can-

ada, and representing therein the Liberal party,——

The Liberal party to-day represents the Government of the country because it is the controlling power for the time being; but if it was only the Catholics of the Liberal party, as Catholics who were appealing to Rome, as the Premier says it was, then it should have been set forth in this document that the Catholics only were appealing to Rome, whereas it is set forth as if those appealing to Rome represented the Liberal party in the House of Commons and in the Senate, Protestants as well as Catholics. I should like to ask hon. gentlemen opposite the grounds on which they have stated that no effort had been made to invoke the power of the Pope to support them? Do they think their rights were interfered with and put in peril? If an appeal were made to the constituents at an election, in a Protestant constituency it would not be pretended that this document represented the Liberal party but only the individual members of that party who are Catholics. It is put forward as representing the Liberal party, and we have a right to hold to it as such, because the very words in this document set forth that it represents the members of the Senate and House of Commons of the Liberal party of Canada.

——present ourselves before Your Holiness as respectful devoted children of the Church——

The document does not say: "We, the Roman Catholic members of the Liberal party," but the document purports to represent the whole Liberal party, and it includes every member of that party no matter to what creed he may belong.

——to complain of the existence of a state of things which, if allowed to continue, might be extremely dangerous to the constitutional liberties of the country.

In this sentence they distinctly complain of an interference with the civil rights of the people; the rights of certain citizens of Canada to use the franchise. And, Sir, to whom do they make this complaint? They complain to His Holiness the Pope, that there is this interference with the political and civil rights of the people. What I take objection to is this: We have a law on our statutes to punish those who interfere with the civil or political rights of the people in that respect; we have a law to prevent intimidation of the electors by priests or laymen, and why, I ask, did they not invoke that law? If there was no law to punish those guilty of such interference, then, Sir, it was their duty to enact such a law, and under no circumstances had they the right to appeal for aid to a foreign potentate. That is the objection we take. We have nothing to do with the religion of the individual, but when the Parliament of Canada or the Government of Canada appeals to the Pope of Rome, or to any other foreign potentate to help them to redress political grievances within our own country, then, Sir, they are going beyond their rights as a Parliament, or as a political party, or as subjects of the Queen. We have nothing to do with the dispute between individual members and the authorities of their church, but when they invoke the power of the Pope of Rome to help them to stop interference in the political liberties of our people, then we have a great deal to say in the matter, and it is our duty to make a solemn protest against it. Sir, the people of Canada will hold the Reform party responsible for that appeal to Rome, because that document declares that it represents the Reform party, be its members Protestant or Catholic, and the Reform party to-day governs Canada. To that extent the appeal to Rome represents the Government and consequently it speaks in the name of the Government of Canada. It is to that we object.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) has been repeating over and over again: "That is what we object to," and his concluding sentence gives the keynote to the whole situation, for he says: "The Reform party to-day are governing Canada." That is really what he objects to; that is what all hon. gentlemen opposite object to, and that is what the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) objects to.

Mr. BERGERON. The Liberals did not get into power honestly; that is what I object to.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. member for Beauharnois has done a service to the Reform party and to Canada in bringing up this matter as he has, although in his speech of yesterday he indulged in many misconceptions of the facts before him.

Mr. BERGERON. How do you know?

Mr. CASEY. Because I have the common sense to understand, that when the hon. gentleman had to admit he misunderstood the fact, then he was labouring under a misconception.

Mr. BERGERON. Who has admitted that?

Mr. CASEY. The hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron).

Mr. BERGERON. I have not, Mr. Speaker. No one has yet denied what I have said.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. member (Mr. Bergeron) started out with the statement that the bundle of documents he held in his hand was one document, and that it was signed by the right hon. the Premier.

Mr. BERGERON. So it is.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman is getting back to his misconception. That bundle contained documents some of them

issuing from bishops, some from priests, others from different parties, and only one of the lot was signed by the right hon. the Premier, and yet the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergeron) pretended that the Prime Minister was responsible for all the documents.

Mr. BERGERON. Yes, and I say so still, and it is true.

Mr. CASEY. Then I take back my statement that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergeron) has corrected his misconception, for he is again trying to force his misconception on the House.

Mr. BERGERON. I know it to be true, and I have something else for another time that will prove it.

Mr. CASEY. I am very glad to hear that he has another misconception to present, because it all helps us. Whether the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergeron) did or did not prepare the brief for the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) with a deliberate intention that the hon. member (Mr. Wallace) should take advantage of it, rests with the conscience of the member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron), but the fact remains that the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) and the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule) have used the brief of the hon. member (Mr. Bergeron) and they have both made bitter anti-Popery speeches based on it. On the next 12th of July you will find in the celebrations all over Canada, that the hon. member for Beauharnois will be quoted as authority for the statement that this Government has been appealing to Rome, and that it was a very wicked thing for the Government to do. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergeron) will be celebrated in every Orange lodge in Canada; I hope he will be glad of his notoriety, and I hope it will do him good with his constituents, although on that point I have my doubts. Sir, it has not been seriously pretended by anybody—except by the hon. member (Mr. Bergeron), and that is not serious—that the Government, or the Premier, or anybody else made an appeal to Rome on the school question. The fact is that certain members of the Catholic Church, feeling that they had not been well used by those who locally wielded the power of that church in the province of Quebec, appealed to the head of their church against the local representatives. The ground of their appeal was, that those who had been taking certain steps against them were not acting consistently with the view of the church, and the appeal was from the local representatives to the head of the church. Now, Sir, what could be more proper, than for those who felt that their political freedom was in danger by the action of the local representative of the church, to appeal to the only power which could control the local authorities.

I say as a Protestant, as the representative of a peculiarly Protestant constituency, that no course could be more proper than that. My hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule), who spoke a few moments ago, has another remedy; he says you ought to fine the priests and put them in jail, instead of appealing to the Pope against them; and my hon. friend from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) sits quietly and hears him say that without a word of protest. For my part, as a Protestant, I feel like protesting against those words of the hon. member for East Grey. I cannot sit silent, like the hon. member for Beauharnois, and hear that proposal. I think the proper course is to appeal to the authority who can act on the hearts and consciences of those who are alleged to have offended, and to bring them to reason. As an hon. friend suggests, if the children have erred, the proper course is not to call in a policeman, but to speak to the father of the children, and ask him to correct their errors in a proper and parental manner. I, as an Ontario member, have nothing to object to in my leader signing that appeal to the Pope. I think he was acting quite within his rights. He was not doing a political or governmental act; he was simply asking for liberty for himself and his co-religionists in the province of Quebec. But before I sit down, I want to know who is going to make a motion on this subject. There is surely going to be a vote.

Mr. BERGERON. You would like to vote? We will give you a chance on your railway Bill.

Mr. CASEY. I would like to have a vote, but I do not think the hon. member for Beauharnois would.

Mr. BERGERON. You did not vote on the Yukon Bill.

Mr. CASEY. I always vote according to my convictions.

Mr. BERGERON. You did not vote on that. You flew away.

Mr. CASEY. I will vote on this question according to my convictions, as I always do.

Mr. BERGERON. You might fly again.

Mr. CASEY. When the hon. member for Beauharnois got up a second time, I felt sure that he was going to move a motion. When he sat down, I thought that the hon. member for East Grey was going to move it. We are now expecting that it may perhaps be moved by the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Clarke), the hon. ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster), or half a dozen other good Protestants or good Catholics on that side of the House. They seem to be agreed. The only natural outcome of the talk we have had, the opening of this great bagfull of wind, would be a strong no-Popery resolution, protesting against

Papal interference in the affairs of this country. If the hon. member for Beauharnois will not move it, perhaps some of his Orange friends will; or perhaps he would himself move something, taking the Catholic view of the case, for which his friend the hon. member for West York would be happy to vote. I am sure it would be perfectly easy to harmonize the hon. member for West York, the hon. member for Beauharnois, and all the others on that side of the House, on some motion on this subject; and we hope to see it done. Without that, the whole agitation is a mere piece of claptrap, a mere attempt to create a false impression in the country, and to maintain the old union that has been so successful on many occasions, between the lodges and those who pretend that they speak on the floor of this House for the Catholic Church, I do not think that union is fully cemented yet, and it will not be until they have united on a motion on this question.

Mr. McNEILL. Mr. Speaker, I did not intend——

Mr. CASEY. Ah, here is the motion now.

Mr. McNEILL. I did not intend to speak on this question, and would not have risen but for the remarks made by my hon. friend (Mr. Casey) opposite. I cannot avoid expressing astonishment at hearing a member of the great Liberal party of Canada announcing the doctrines which that hon. gentleman has laid down here to-day. I had always thought that the Liberal party, above all others, was the party that would have stood in the breach at all times against any attempt on the part of the ecclesiastical authorities to interfere between the people and their civil liberties.

Mr. CASEY. Just what we are doing.

Mr. McNEILL. And I should have thought that they would have been the party of all others who would have objected to its being laid down as proper that a foreign potentate ought to be called in to endeavour to secure those liberties for the people of this country which it is the duty of the Government to see that they possess. My hon. friend said that we objected because the Liberal party were governing the country in this regard; but I say we object because the Liberal party were not governing the country with regard to this matter. We object because the Liberal party laid down the reins of government, and asked the Pope to take them up for them. We object because we say that it is contrary to the whole tendency of the history of the people of England for centuries past, that we should recognize the Pope of Rome as having any right whatever to interfere with reference to the civil liberties of the British people. We say that we are able to protect our own civil liberties. We say that we do not require the Pope of Rome to come to protect our civil liberties for us. I do not desire to be understood as objecting to members of the Roman Catholic Church going as members of that church to the head of their church, if they have religious grievances. That, of course, no reasonable man would object to. But what I do object to is members of the Government of this country having gone to the Pope, as members of the Government did go on this occasion, and having requested that he should interfere for the protection of the civil and constitutional liberties of the people of this country. That is not a question of religion; that is a question of civil liberty, which I say the Government of this country are bound to protect, by the powers that are entrusted to them by the constitution of the country. As has been said, if the existing laws require to be implemented in that regard, then have them implemented. That is the objection we bring in regard to this matter, and I am astonished that any member on the Liberal side of the House, at all events, should have risen in his place, as my hon. friend did a moment ago, and said that he and the Liberal party endorsed the course which the Government had pursued in this regard.

Mr. GIBSON. He did not say so.

Mr. McNEILL. The hon. gentleman says that the hon. member who has just addressed the House was not endorsing the course pursued by the Government in this respect. I am very glad to hear that he did not, and I hope my hon. friend does not endorse it either. But I understood that he was endorsing it, and that is why I rose to speak.

Mr. GIBSON. You were read out of the party.

Mr. McNEILL. That has nothing to do with it. If the hon. gentleman has nothing better to say with regard to a grave question of this kind that to utter a childish interruption of that sort, I am sorry for him. I would like to know from the hon. gentleman who interrupted me (Mr. Gibson) whether he approves of the Government having asked the Pope to interfere to protect the civil and constitutional liberties of the people of this country.

Mr. GIBSON. Certainly not, but the Government did not do anything of the kind.

Mr. McNEILL. I may be able to convince the hon. gentleman that they did when I refer to the document.

Mr. GIBSON. The hon. gentleman asked me a question and I would like to ask him another. What authority is he reading?

Mr. McNEILL. The hon. gentleman says that the Pope was not appealed to.

Mr. GIBSON. No, I said they had not done so in their official capacity.

Mr. McNEILL. I am speaking of members of the Government who appealed to the

Pope and described themselves as "We, the undersigned, members of the Senate and members of the House of Commons of Canada, and representing therein the Liberal party." Whether you call that official capacity or not, I do not know, but I should consider it sufficiently official capacity. Then the appeal continues :

Your Holiness has already been made aware of the conduct and attitude of certain prelates and of certain members of the secular clergy, who, during the general election in this country, in the month of June last, intervened in a violent manner in restraint of electoral freedom,——

Does the hon. gentleman approve of an appeal to the Pope to protect electoral freedom in this country ? He said a moment ago that he did not. Will he repeat that statement now ?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes.

Mr. McNEILL. The hon. gentleman does not approve of it.

Mr. GIBSON. No.

Mr. McNEILL. I am glad he condemns the actions of the present Government in that particular.

Mr. GIBSON. I say that the Government never did appeal.

Mr. McNEILL. I say that members of the Government did, and you condemn their action.

Mr. McMILLAN. They did not do it as members of the Government but as members of the Catholic Church. You have garbled the document ; you did not read it all.

Mr. McNEILL. The hon. gentleman should not say that any member of this House garbled a document.

Mr. McMILLAN. The hon. gentleman read a part of the document and did not read it all.

Mr. McNEILL. I am reading that part which is necessary in order to bring out the point to which I am referring. I need not read a quantity of matter not material to the question we are discussing.

Mr. McMILLAN. But you did not read all that was material.

Mr. McNEILL. I will read the whole of this paragraph, if it is any benefit to the hon. gentleman

Your Holiness has already been made aware of the conduct and attitude of certain prelates and of certain members of the secular clergy, who, during the general election in this country, in the month of June last, intervened in a violent manner in restraint of electoral freedom, taking sides openly for the Conservative party against the Liberal party.

Does that make it any better for my hon. friend—taking sides openly for the Conservative party against the Liberal party ? I did not read that. It was not material to what I was endeavouring to show, and I do not think it strengthens the case of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. McMILLAN. But there is another portion you did not read.

Mr. McNEILL. I shall read it for the hon. gentleman's benefit.

——and going so far as to declare guilty of grievous sin those of the electors who would vote for the candidates of the Liberal party.

Now, I do not care what they say in any other part of the document, there is that statement which in itself shows that these members of the Government appealed to His Holiness the Pope of Rome, to protect the electoral freedom of the people of Canada, and I want my hon. friend to take back what he said, when he said that I was garbling the document. If he is so fair a man, as I believe he is, he will do so.

Mr. McMILLAN. When that document was read by the hon. gentleman, he read it to show that they had appealed as members of the House of Commons and of the Senate, but the whole tenor of the document shows that they appealed as members of the Roman Catholic Church to the head of that church to exercise his authority over his clergy in Canada and prevent their interfering with the exercise of civil liberty.

Mr. McNEILL. I am sorry that my hon. friend had not the courtesy to withdraw his charge that I had garbled the paragraph. However, it makes no difference. I have read the paragraph in extenso.

Mr. McMILLAN. I will not withdraw it, because you did not read the statement I have repeated.

Mr. McNEILL. I have shown the House not only that I did not garble, but that if I had continued to read, I would have made the case stronger against the hon. gentleman. He has, of course, not in the slightest degree met the point to which I was referring. The point is not that members of the Catholic Church had appealed to the head of their church, but that members of the Government asked the head of the Catholic Church to intervene here in Canada to protect the electoral freedom of the people of Canada. That is the point.

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend is mistaken there. The members who signed that petition did not ask His Holiness the Pope to protect the freedom of the people of Canada. The Parliament of Canada can do that. But they asked him to declare that political freedom was a part of their common religious belief and thus protect the consciences of Catholics.

Mr. CLANCY. Did anybody ever deny that ?

The PRIME MINISTER. It was denied in so many words, when people were told that it was a sin to vote in a certain way.

Mr. McNEILL. The hon. gentleman has not, as far as I can see, in the slightest degree, met the difficulty. The difficulty is this, that for centuries past there has been a struggle going on between the secular and the religious power in reference to just such matters as these. The bounds are difficult sometimes to define. It is sometimes difficult to define where the one ends and the other begins, but there is no difficulty at all in deciding that electoral freedom is something which is within the control of the secular authority; and when my right hon. friend endeavours to answer what I have said, I should like him to meet the point straight and squarely. I do not wish to copy my hon. friend from the other side, and to say that he deliberately failed to do so—I do not mean that for a moment—but I do mean to say this, that he has appealed to the Pope to interfere in a matter which, of all others, is one of the things within the control, and the sole control, of civil government, and something with which the Pope of Rome has nothing whatever to do, and something with which, I say, it is most dangerous to the liberties of the people of this country to ask him to interfere. I do not wish to take up the time of the House unduly, but I recollect having made some references to this matter during last session, or the session before, and I know there is another paragraph in this petition which brings the matter, if possible, even more clearly to the attention of any one who feels inclined to deal with a matter of this nature. Unless my memory deceives me, I shall find that paragraph, and when I find it I shall take an opportunity to call my right hon. friend's attention to the matter again. It is sufficient for my purpose that here in the paragraph I have read, unmistakably, the Pope is asked to interfere for the protection of liberties which it was the duty of the Government to protect.

Mr. BOURASSA. Mr. Speaker, I feel confident that all the members on this side of the House and most of the members on the other side had hoped that this third session of the present Parliament would have passed without having forced upon us a discussion of this kind; without having obliged us to listen once more to the passionate appeals to racial and religious prejudices such as we have heard in this debate. I have always been of the opinion that this was not the place to discuss religious matters. And I have always thought, as a citizen of the province of Quebec, and as a true friend, I trust, to the minority in Manitoba, that many of the discussions that were heard during the last Parliament should never have taken place. In this I do not wish to speak for only one side of politics. I hope this is the last time that this question will come before us as a political question. We have heard the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron), the supposed leader of the province of Quebec on the Conservative side. But, unfortunately, his intention expressed in the end of his second, or, we may say, his third speech, is not at all in accord with the beginning of his speech, and therefore I find only one explanation of all his speeches, and of the position he has taken yesterday and today; it is, that not finding any sufficient grounds for opposing this Government on business questions, or even on this very school question, he has decided to continue the policy of passionate appeals to prejudice, for which appeals there is no foundation. The Conservative party, in the course of its history, has very often resorted to such appeals. I do not, in speaking thus, include all the membership of the Conservative party, because I know that there were and are still men in that party who do not like that kind of appeal, or the policy that dictates them. Generally, when appeals of this kind were made, there were members of the Conservatives of Quebec wing who rode the Catholic horse, and members of the Ontario wing who rode the Protestant horse. The hon. member for Beauharnois has thought proper to ride both horses at the same time. I acknowledge that the hon. member has many of the qualities of a political clown, though he has not many qualities to assure him any other position in the political arena. But this time he has failed even in that. I suppose he was afraid that his friend and colleague the hon. member for West York would forget to ride the Protestant horse, and he would show him some movements of that animal to be practiced next time in Ontario. If anything is to be gathered from the long speech, divided into three parts, of the hon. member for Beauharnois, it was that the Liberal party has deceived the Catholic electorate of the Dominion, that they had deceived the Protestant electorate of the Dominion and that they had deceived the Pope. I do not think it is necessary to argue these points at any length. But, as for the first, I will say for myself, as a Liberal of the province of Quebec and a Roman Catholic, I can speak for the people of Quebec as well as can the hon. member for Beauharnois—and, I think, much better—and I can say that the Catholics of Quebec have not been deceived. We do not say that the settlement achieved by the right hon. Premier and his colleagues is a full and complete settlement. When we consider that such a question as the Manitoba school question had been treated on most unsound principles for five years, had been so handled as to develop racial and religious passions, we could not expect it to be settled altogether satisfactorily in the first instance. The Government coming into power had to settle the question so as to do substantial justice to everybody, and

not deceive anybody, and this has been achieved. I do not want to enter again upon the quarrels of the past. I think we have already had too many divisions between the two parties on this question. I do not pretend that all the members of the Conservative party were deceitful in their policy on this question. As to the hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper), I, a young man, do not wish to be understood as having said that he had pursued a deceitful course in this matter. I believe the hon. leader of the Opposition and some members of his party were sincere. But I believe that, by reason of the elements in his own party in different provinces of the Dominion, the hon. gentleman could not possibly have settled this question. If the hon. gentleman were not still in political life, I think that he, as well as Sir Mackenzie Bowell, could tell, with regard to this question, that it was impossible for him to achieve success, because he was in the midst of a nest of traitors. Supposing even that the Conservative party had been returned to power, and had sought to carry out their policy of putting into force remedial legislation, I believe that with the elements in their own party, and with the condition of public sentiment in the country, they could not have settled the school question, even after the Remedial Bill was passed. But these are things of the past, and we must face the question as it stands to-day. The first duty of the present Government on coming into power was to calm national and religious prejudices, before they attempted to do anything else—and in that they succeeded. There was also one special question to be considered, and that was the situation of the Catholic Liberals of the province of Quebec. The leader of the Liberal party, because of his attitude upon this question, had been represented in the province of Quebec as a traitor to his race and religion. Sir, I do not intend to bring up in this Chamber difficulties that arose between the Catholic clergy and the Liberals of the province of Quebec. This is no place to discuss such questions. This is not the place to discuss religious questions at all, and especially such religious questions as interests only the laymen and clergy of one particular faith. Sir, we have a right, as British subjects, to go where we like to settle matters of our own church. In saying that, I know I have not only the approval of Catholics but of independent Protestants in this House who wish this country to be free to everybody, of whatever creed or nationality. During long debates in this House we often boast about our country, about its size, its resources and its splendid growth. Everything we say should convince us that there is room for all kinds of people, but there is no room for national prejudices, no room for narrow views or for that kind of politics that the hon. member for West York has tried to impose on this House and this country for many years, and that, misled, I am sorry to say, by the example of the hon. member for Beauharnois, he has tried to impose on us again. The conduct of the hon. member for Beauharnois, the stand he has taken upon the question, would make me ashamed of my province, but that I know that the feelings expressed by him are not the feelings of the people in the province of Quebec.

Sir, I do not often trouble this House with the local politics of Quebec, but I think I may say that the province of Quebec is just as liberal and just as British as any other province in the Dominion of Canada, and we intend to keep her so. We say that in this matter the province of Quebec has not been deceived, and her people have given proofs of it time after time since the general elections. I will not attempt to answer the ridiculous accusation that the Catholic Liberals of the House of Commons and of the Senate have tried to deceive the Pope. The hon. member for Beauharnois spoke of the Pope in such a way as to please the member for West York (Mr. Wallace), but he must not think that the members of this House are so ignorant or so prejudiced as not to know better the character of Pope Leo XIII. Many Protestant countries are proud to entertain cordial relations with the Pope. There are good Protestants in this House, and there are also good Catholics, but I do not think there is a Protestant in this House that would accuse Bismarck, the late Iron Chancellor of Germany, of having betrayed the Protestant interests of Germany in favour of the Catholic minority of that Empire. When a dispute arose between Germany and the Kingdom of Spain upon a point of deep interest to the German people, to whom did Prince Bismarck apply to obtain a settlement of the question? He applied to Pope Leo XIII, and when judgment was rendered against Germany in favour of Spain, did you hear the official press of Germany crying out against the decision, and endeavouring to excite the feelings of the Protestants against the Holy See because the decision had been rendered in favour of a Catholic country and against a Protestant country? No, Sir. There is sufficient breadth of mind in Germany and in many other countries; there is sufficient breadth of mind in this country to enable the Protestants to realize the beneficent effect of the Papacy in this world. I do not say that the Pope should interfere between Catholics or Protestants in civil matters, nor has he attempted to do so. Sir, one of the great statesmen of France, one of the greatest philosophers of this century, who was a devoted Protestant and at one time Prime Minister of his country, Guizot, said once that the Catholic Church was a great school of respect. Let not my Protestant fellow-countrymen fear because we Catholics desire to exercise the right of going to the head of our church to

settle difficulties that may arise among ourselves. Let not our Protestant friends in this House be uneasy. The more we are attached to the Holy See as Catholics, the greater our respect for the rules of our church, the deeper will be our attachment. let me assure our Protestant friends, to the political authority of this Empire, the deeper will be our attachment to the civil rights of Canada and of Great Britain. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) made us a very fine offer, as he often does. Whenever we have difficulty with our priests he suggests that we should send them to jail.

Mr. SPROULE. I wish emphatically to contradict that, and I am surprised that the hon. gentleman should attempt to misrepresent what I did say. I said that in case of interference on the part of the priesthood with the political or civil rights of the people, we have laws upon our statute-book punishing such interference, and I asked why the Prime Minister did not invoke that law.

Mr. BOURASSA. Well, the hon. gentleman has explained himself much better on this occasion than he did before. He has simply said in fifty words what I made him say in ten. Sir, what is that interference which the clergy of Quebec have been accused of exercising during the last election? Certain bishops of the province of Quebec and some members of the clergy, took a certain stand in the last election, and held that Catholic voters could not vote for Liberal candidates. They based their interference upon the ground that it was the duty of Catholics to vote for remedial legislation, and that the just rights of the Catholic minority in Manitoba on the school question could not be restored to them unless some remedial legislation was passed. There was no division amongst the clergy of the province of Quebec or amongst the laymen, as to the rights of the Catholic minority, nor as to the duty of the Government to restore them in some way. There was no division upon that point then, and there is no division upon that point to-day. The only difference of opinion that existed was as to the interpretation of the constitution in regard to that question. Let me quote for the benefit of my hon. friend a letter that was addressed by Cardinal Ledochowski, Secretary of the Propaganda, to the bishops of the province of Quebec, in which he urged them not to ask the Dominion of Canada to do anything contrary to the sovereignty of the British Empire, or that would bring them into conflict in any way with their Protestant fellow-citizens.

Mr. BERGERON. Will you read the letter?

Mr. BOURASSA. I have only the French text of the letter, but I will read the paragraph, and afterwards give the translation:

Maintenant que, en vertu de la décision récente du Conseil privé de la Reine en Angleterre, le gouvernement fédéral est certainement pourvu de l'autorité requise pour traiter cette très grave question, il y a lieu d'espérer qu'elle trouvera enfin cette heureuse solution que réclament et les droits les mieux établis et le bien de la religion et de l'Etat.

Now that, in virtue of the recent decision of the Queen's Privy Council in England, the Federal Government is certainly provided with the requisite authority to treat this very important question, there is reason to hope that a solution will finally be found which will be in accordance with well-established rights, as well as with the welfare of religion and of the state.

A difference of opinion was manifested among the members of the clergy in Quebec as to the application to be given to that decision of the Privy Council. All that the Catholics of Quebec were asked to do was to vote for men who would put in force the judgment of the Privy Council. But we Liberals claimed the right to decide for ourselves as to what means should be taken to apply that judgment, and to secure to the minority the rights which we believed they had been deprived of. We claimed that liberty then, and we claim it now. I must apologize to the House if I touch upon certain points that are perhaps not interesting to all the members of the House, but I do so in order to explain what was our position. We have now the proof that our contention was good, because in the encyclical to which the member for Beauharnois has referred, it is stated in plain terms that we are at perfect liberty in respect to the means to be taken to procure a settlement of that question.

Mr. BERGERON. Is that settlement accepted by the encyclical?

Mr. BOURASSA. The hon. member for Beauharnois has treated that settlement with great severity. He has been more Catholic than the Pope. But I doubt his sincerity.

Mr. BERGERON. That is not an answer. I want to know from my hon. friend whether that settlement has been accepted by the encyclical issued by the Papal authorities?

Mr. BOURASSA. That settlement has been termed by the Pope in almost the same spirit as was expressed a moment ago by the Prime Minister when he said that he knew the settlement was not a perfect one, but that it was a settlement as far as the intervention of this Parliament was concerned.

Mr. BERGERON. Not at all. I want to show the hon. gentleman——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order; order.

Mr. BERGERON. The hon. gentleman allows me to interrupt him. I want to remind him that His Holiness the Pope, in

the encyclical which he has just mentioned, says that the settlement which has been come to is ineffective and unacceptable.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. He says nothing of the sort.

Mr. BOURASSA. The hon. gentleman must read the encyclical with a little more care. When he says that this settlement was inspired by the false disposition of this Government, of the Prime Minister and of the Liberals of Canada, he is flatly contradicting the words of the Pope, because the Pope says that this settlement was inspired by a spirit of justice. I do not wish to boast about my religious principles or my national attachment in this House or on the platform, but I say to the hon. member for Beauharnois that when the Roman Catholic Church is not satisfied with what has been given to her, she will be able to speak for herself and be heard as well as that hon. member. I am a firm believer in the Catholic Church and in the destiny of my race, because I know that in America under our British rule there is freedom for every creed and freedom for every race. I am a believer in the rule of my church, and if I am a firm believer in the future of my race it is because the politics and policy affirmed by the hon. member for Beauharnois and the hon. member for West York are not the policies and politics that are going to prevail in this country. I believe firmly that this school question will be settled, and settled on account of the position taken by this Government, a position which has been met by the good-will of the Greenway Government, which has given more since this Government came into power than during the whole time when hon. gentlemen opposite were in office. I hope this is the last we shall hear of this question, not because we are afraid of it or afraid of the position that we and this Government have taken. We are able to meet hon. gentlemen opposite in the province of Quebec, and there are members from the English provinces who are able to meet the hon. member for West York and the hon. member for East Grey on their no-popery platform. I trust that so long as this party is in power questions of this kind will be met in the same way. I think hon. gentlemen opposite include men of good-will, and I know that there are hon. members sitting not far from the hon. member for Beauharnois and the hon. member for West York who are also desirous that this question should be settled in a just manner, and that cries and appeals like those made during the last day or two will never be repeated in Parliament. I thank the hon. members for the kind attention to which they have listened to my remarks ; I had no intention of speaking so long, but I think I had to express the views of my fellow-countrymen in the province of Quebec on this question.

Mr. BERGERON.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. My views on this very important question have been expressed on the floor of Parliament and outside of this House so frequently that I feel it would not be right or proper for me at the present moment to take up more than a brief time for the purpose of expressing my views as to the question which has been brought up at the present moment. I ventured on a former occasion to express the opinion that unless justice were rendered to the minority, outside of any question or consideration of religion, outside of any other question than the constitutional one, which awarded to the different classes of the community rights that were prescribed under the constitution, this school question would be coming up time and again before the country and before Parliament. Sir, as a Canadian, as one who sincerely wishes to have peace and harmony exist between the different classes of the community, between the different nationalities which must shake hands over their difficulties and differences of opinion for the purpose of making of Canada the country which we Canadians would feel proud to see it become, I feel it is of the greatest possible importance that any question that could arouse divisions as to race, nationality and creed should be avoided. But questions of principle have to be discussed at whatever cost. The hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) seemed to me to be misstating the question altogether when he stated that it was not right or proper for the Pope to send out a delegate to decide between Catholics questions affecting Catholics alone. I do not believe the hon. gentleman has studied the question so thoroughly as to be able to express an opinion on this point. I can understand perfectly well that the people and hon. members could object to interference by the Pope in matters affecting the rights of citizens, the relations of the different churches one with another, and the position which as British subjects we have a right to hold irrespective of church or nationality ; but for the hon. gentleman, with his wide experience of the great and important control which is exercised outside of the Catholic Church, to tell me that the Pope cannot send out a delegate to Canada to meet the Catholics and discuss points of difference between them, is a misinterpretation of the meaning of the British constitution and of the rights of British subjects under the British Crown.

Mr. WALLACE. No.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I took down what I supposed was the hon. gentleman's expression of opinion, but if I am wrong, I am subject to correction, although I thought I understood him properly.

Mr. WALLACE. I said that with their religious concerns we had nothing to do and had no desire to interfere, but when they interfered with affairs of state, properly rele-

gated to the Parliament of Canada, then we have a right to interfere.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Let the hon. gentleman show me that the Pope or his delegate attempted to interfere with political matters, and I am prepared to say that I stand by the constitution; but I am not prepared to allow the hon. gentleman to tell me that as a Catholic I am to be subject to his dictation as to how and when I shall approach the head of my church. But I trace the trouble far beyond what hon. gentlemen have indicated. When public feeling was running high indeed, in the province of Quebec, especially, on this question, it was not the religious side of the question that was affecting public opinion in that province, but it was a belief that the French Canadian minority in Manitoba was not receiving what it was entitled to under the constitution. By such appeals were the people of Quebec won over to the Liberal party. I charge the right hon. gentleman and I charge his party with having attempted to blow hot and cold upon the question. It was impossible to settle such an issue except by a man of strong nerve, who would come forward as Sir Mackenzie Bowell and the leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) did, with a defined proposition like the Remedial Bill, so that the people of Canada from the Atlantic to the Pacific, Catholics and Protestants, would know how the grievances of the minority were to be remedied. The Conservative party were warranted in bringing in that Remedial Bill, because the highest judicial tribunal of the Empire had laid it down that the rights of the minority had been trampled under foot. The late lamented Sir John Thompson, at the outset insisted that every tribunal to which an appeal could be made should be appealed to, as to the power of interference by the Canadian Parliament. Sir John Thompson did not view it from a religious standpoint, but he viewed it as the guardian of the liberties and privileges of British subjects in Canada; he viewed it as the guardian of the constitution, and he held that it was the duty of the Canadian Parliament to carry out that constitution as interpreted by the Imperial Privy Council. If in the old French province of Quebec the rights of Protestants were ever invaded by such legislation as that passed in Manitoba, not I alone, but the public opinion of the Catholic majority in Quebec, would protect the rights of the Protestant minority. We believe that by reason of the concessions made to the Protestant minority in Quebec at different times, we have achieved the choice blessing of seeing Englishmen and Frenchmen, Catholics and Protestants, living side by side like brothers, and ignorant of any conflict because of divergence of religious opinions. Sir, the Protestants of the province of Quebec approved of the course of the late Conservative Government in this matter, as I have had ample opportunity to know during the election campaign. The Protestants of the province of Quebec felt that in fighting for the rights of the minority in Manitoba they were appreciating their own rights in the province of Quebec. They knew that in the province of Quebec the evil day would never come when the friendly feelings existing between Catholics and Protestants would cease. The policy of the right hon. gentleman was conciliation in Ontario, but in Quebec it was an entirely different thing. His appeals to the people in that province were couched in language like this: Can you understand that I, a Catholic, and the leader of a great party, if I come into power, would do less for you than those who are now at the head of the Government? Change of climate and change of entourage affected him so much in Ontario that when he spoke there his cry was: Hands off Manitoba. Don't interfere with the autonomy of the province. To the conduct of the right hon. gentleman I trace all the difficulty which has arisen upon this question ever since the hour it was first brought to the attention of the public. But the Prime Minister says that the Conservatives have revived this question to-day, and that they make a speech for Ontario and a speech for Quebec. If that be so, then it is the first time the Conservatives have ever followed his bad example, and if they have done so on this occasion, I am happy to say they do not frequently sin in that respect. The right hon. gentleman talked about the Remedial Bill as a policy of coercion. If to restore the rights of a minority in this country, under the authority of the highest tribunal in the land, if that is coercion, then it is a very strange thing indeed. I deeply deplore that this question should be brought up again, because it is one of those unhappy issues which may have an effect upon the friendly intercourse existing between the different nationalities in this country. But if it does come up again it is because of the vacillating policy of the right hon. gentleman, and because he did not carry out his promises. He went before the people and he said the Remedial Bill was insufficient, and that it was not comprehensive enough to protect the rights of the minority; and he said, "If the Liberal party comes into power, trust us with the destinies of the Manitoba minority, and we will give them full justice. The result of their coming into power was, of course, that the Remedial Bill was dropped. My hon. friend from Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) said that the leader of the Opposition could not have settled this question. I want to ask the hon. gentleman, with his experience of parliamentary practice and parliamentary history, whether the second reading of that Bill did not show that the Conservative party were able and prepared to settle that question.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. You did not settle it.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I am going to give you the reason why we did not settle it. It was because of the obstruction of the Liberal party, an obstruction unprecedented in the parliamentary history of any country. Parliament was just at its end ; it was impossible to extend it beyond a certain period, and taking advantage of that condition of affairs, the Liberal party stayed here night after night, offering us an obstruction such as had never before been encountered in our parliamentary history. Well, Sir, hon. gentlemen deceived the people of Canada on that question, and they came into power through that deceit, but let me tell them that I believe the very question on which they obstructed will be the cause why they will be hurled from power, and again sent to the left of the Speaker.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Hon. gentlemen may say "Oh," but these cries in Parliament have no significance. It is the people who decide ; it is when the voice of the people of Canada is heard in a general election that these great questions are settled. Now, with reference to the appeal which was made to the Pope, I am not one of those who consider that it is a heinous crime to consult the head of the Catholic Church upon matters affecting Catholics in Canada. I do not belong to that extreme wing of patriots. I belong to the people who believe that every man has a right to go to his own church, whatever that church is, and I would be the last man to interfere with any man in doing what he conscientiously believes to be right. The right hon. leader of the Government stated that he had nothing to do with sending that appeal to Rome. I was somewhat disappointed at that statement from the right hon. gentleman, and for this reason—I want to be perfectly frank. It is impossible for me to understand his position as the leader of a great party—that a document of that importance should be sent to Rome or anywhere else without being submitted to him and receiving his approbation. It is impossible for me to imagine that his followers and supporters, his henchmen who were fighting his battles, in Parliament and out of Parliament, would have drawn up a document of that importance, to be sent to the Pope, without consulting my right hon. friend. If I were in his position, I would feel much aggrieved if my friends and supporters had taken such an important move without consulting me. But that is a matter on which I hardly expect the hon. gentleman will be very more confidential with me than he was with my hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) who spoke yesterday, and whose speech I had not the pleasure of hearing. I conclude by saying simply this. Whether the right hon. gentleman uses sunny ways or whether he, like any other practical statesman, takes the constitution as we have it, and imposes upon one province or another which is violating that constitution, the duty of obeying it, and grants to the minority what the Privy Council of England has declared to be their rights. I believe that time after time, session after session, general election after general election, that question will come up again, because the people of Canada feel that one section of her people have not been treated with the fairness and equality which is enjoyed by other members of the community.

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

After Recess.

Motion (Mr. Campbell) to adjourn the debate negatived.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. The right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), who leads this House, in the course of his remarks, asked if it was the intention of the hon. gentlemen on this side of the House to resurrect the school question. We cannot have any such intention, because only a corpse can be resurrected, and the school question never died. The school question never died because it never was settled. It is true, Sir, that an attempt was made to reach a settlement, and I am satisfied that those who took part in the negotiations did their level best to arrive at a satisfactory arrangement. But they made a great mistake, at the very start of the negotiations, by not bringing in the party that was most concerned in the question. These negotiations were carried on ex parte between this Government and that of the province of Manitoba, while the minority was never consulted and was never asked to be a party to the meeting that took place on that question. But before discussing that question, I think that, without going into further details of the school question, which is well known to most members of this House, because it has been discussed on several occasions before, it is, perhaps, a good idea to begin ab ovo the history of that question. I am glad to see the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) in his place when this feature of the case is gone into. That hon. gentleman from the start took a great interest in the settlement of the school question. I must give the hon. gentleman credit for this—that when he started the movement in the province of Quebec towards the settlement, he was, as I believe, thoroughly in earnest. And I may add that, had the question been settled on the lines he advocated at the time, it would have been a most satisfactory settlement for the Roman Catholic minority in the province of Manitoba. As early as 1892, the hon. gentleman wrote, over his own signature, the following :

THE TIME HAS COME.

There is every reason to believe that our Winnipeg correspondent is well informed in connection with what transpires at Ottawa.

The Government and the representatives of the Queen are formally pledged by the report issued on the 21st March, 1891. That state paper bears the signature and the seal of the Crown. Parliament has acquiesced in the same.

It may, therefore, be said that our position, solidly grounded on its intrinsic value, is unassailable in the eyes of the civilized world. We are a minority protected by the constitution and special statutes, and the intervention of the federal powers has been solemnly pledged, should the proceedings instituted before the judicial tribunals by the Government on their own behalf prove inadequate for the future of our claims.

We decline to sally out of the citadel. Let the Governor in Council take action on the petitions which are now before them, and which will be soon followed by others to the same purpose.

The Greenway Acts should have been disallowed. The Government were afraid of the fanatical element in the elections of 1891.

They have pledged their word, in case the judicial controversy should prove a failure, to resort to the means put at their disposal by clause 22 of the Manitoba Act.

The time has come for them to redeem their pledge, and to mete out justice to a minority which demands nothing else.

Whether the separate school system finds favour or not with certain elements of the population, such is not the question at issue. The existence of that system is part and parcel of our political, national and religious patrimony. Whether or not that system is defective, it is our business to remedy such defects in it as we think fit.

Let them, if they like and if they can, despoil us of our rights to our schools through sheer violence and the club law; the whole responsibility for the consequences will fall upon the authors of that spoliation. As to securing our consent, we say—Never.

Yet this is what they are aiming at, this very hour. They propose to us to barter our rights for the appointment of a Catholic Prime Minister, Sir John Thompson. The question is as to whether the fact of having one of our co-religionists appointed to that position would be an unalloyed benefit to us. Be that as it may, we decline to favour or be a party to any ministerial combination, by the means of that school question.

I am aware my Conservative friends are paving the way to re-organization, which would bring into the Cabinet Mr. Meredith and Mr. Angers. Sir John Thompson would then become Prime Minister.

The Conservative party is powerful. They boast of a majority of 70 votes in the House of Commons. Will they flinch before the threats of any intolerant school which sets up as a principle that the majority are not bound to respect for their pledges and the constitution?

If Sir John Thompson is a man, now is the time to show it.

Is it true that the emissaries, presuming to speak on behalf of Ministers, are asking Archbishop Taché and other bishops for statements?

It is the Ministers' fault if we have to bear the consequences of the judgment of the Privy Council of England. Owing to the great confidence with which his ability inspired us, we have been led to make concessions the reckless character of which is now patent.

I do not wish to recriminate, I merely wish, in mentioning this fact, to explain why I cannot listen to any demand for composition.

(Sgd.) J. ISRAEL TARTE.

These are the views held by the hon. gentleman, and which he expressed in his organ over his signature, "La Canadien," October 28th, 1892. A little later, the same hon. gentleman wrote another article on the same subject, which he also signed. I find it in "Le Canadien," of 11th November, 1892. I am, of course, giving a translation of these articles which were written in French. This article is entitled "The Manitoba Schools," and reads as follows:—

The new Minister of the Interior, Mr. Daly, has declined to state his views on the question, when he told his constituents: "The Privy Council of Canada is called upon to exercise judicial functions on this matter, and it would be a breach of propriety to pronounce myself, before the parties have been heard."

Mr. Tarte then went on to comment on this:

I am quite ready to grant that it was scarcely reasonable to expect that Mr. Daly should, under the circumstances, define the policy of the Government. The appeal of the Catholics will soon be heard. The Greenway Government will reply, and the Governor General in Council will point out to the Manitoba Government what action he deems necessary to be taken by them in order to enforce the provisions of section 22.

But I may be allowed to say that the words "judicial functions" seem to be unacceptable. The Dominion Executive is the chief guardian of the constitution. And it is in such capacity that it is bound to interfere in the matter. The Government and the Parliament of Canada, under the Act of 1870, pledged themselves to see that the separate school system should be maintained in the new province which they were creating. Between the people of Manitoba and the Dominion the issue is not a question of fact; the good faith of the country is involved. If the authorized organs of the Dominion Government, that is to say, the Government and Parliament of Canada, have used dubious language, and not made clear their meaning in the drafting of the Manitoba charter of 1870, are the Catholic minority to suffer from it? Does that preclude the incontrovertible fact that a distinct provision has been enacted and a positive arrangement entered into with regard to the Manitoba separate school system?

The political question takes the lead and overshadows all the technicalities, all the quibbles through which Mr. Greenway tries to render illusory one of the fundamental principles of the Act of 1870.

That the phraseology of the Act is somewhat twisted may be surmised from the statement of the Privy Council to that effect. But, if so, the Governor General in Council, and, if needs be, the Parliament of Canada, should interfere in order to remedy this deficiency and make clear the meaning of the Act.

The newspapers which believe that the majority is right openly declare that the Manitoba Government will not comply with the decision of the Governor General in Council, and will defy the Parliament of Canada. We are not

surprised at hearing such language. We were quite prepared for it by the attitude of the "Mail" and its allies previously to the reception of the judgment of the Privy Council in England. Being satisfied that it would be adverse to their pretensions, they freely declared that they would disregard it. It is a matter of great concern to us that the sectarian feelings of these people should be known. The peace and harmony, and interests of the Dominion are of no consequence to those apostles, to those champions of national disintegration. I sincerely believe that there will be found in the House of Commons enough members ready to mete out justice to the minority, to maintain unsullied the fair name of the Dominion, and to inspire confidence in the honesty of the Government of the country, irrespective of the party which may be in power. We are called upon to decide whether the spirit of our constitution must prevail or else whether we will allow it to be infringed upon by ward politicians.

(Sgd.) J. ISRAEL TARTE.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Is that the Minister of Public Works?

Mr. LaRIVIERE. He was not at that time, but is now. These were, at the time, the opinions not only of the present Minister of Public Works, but of the leader of the Liberal party. These gentlemen did not then, as they do to-day, put in the shade their opinions, but came forward openly and boldly declared themselves in favour of the intervention of the federal authorities in the Manitoba school question in order to bring, if not an amicable settlement, a settlement by coercion, as it is called to-day, on the plea that constitutional usage had to be accepted, and that justice had to be rendered. Well, those principles I support to-day as I did at the time those articles were written by my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works. The only difference between him and me on this question is that while I upheld those principles in 1892, I did not change my opinion because at that time the friends I was supporting were in power, and I have not changed them to-day, while the friends of the hon. gentleman are in power. I have never changed my views in this matter, but have always followed the same course. But, Sir, a couple of years afterwards we had the honour of a visit in the province of Manitoba from no less a high personage than the then leader of the Opposition, the present leader of this House. The right hon. gentleman who now leads this House paid a visit to Manitoba in 1894, and he was approached on that occasion by the Catholic community of the city of Winnipeg. They laid before him the case of the Catholic minority, and after expressing his astonishment at the state of facts, he used this language, as reported in the "Cultivateur," another organ of the Minister of Public Works, in its issue of the 8th September, 1894:

The provinces have the power to decide the question of education, but if any right is violated, if any injustice is perpetrated, the minority has a remedy under the Canadian constitution. The appeal is provided by the British North America Act. If the case made out in your address is as I have just heard, I believe that the Catholics have the strongest reason to ask for remedial legislation. If I were in power I would have an investigation made, and if it was shown that the facts are as indicated, I would apply a remedy.

These are the words of the right hon. gentleman on that occasion in the city of Winnipeg, as reported in "Le Cultivateur," the Liberal organ of the Minister of Public Works at the time. Those were the opinions of the hon. gentlemen opposite before they came to power, before the general elections which brought them to the Treasury benches. I will not dwell upon what took place during the election; I will not repeat that promises were made of one kind in one part of the Dominion, and of another kind in other parts of the Dominion. That matter has been already fully discussed. But I wish to come at once to the negotiations that took place for a settlement. At the opening of this House, in the session of 1897, I gave notice that I would put the following questions to the Government, which I did on the 1st of April. They were as follows:—

His Excellency the Governor General having informed the House: "That after many and protracted discussions a settlement was reached between the two Governments which was the best arrangement obtainable under the existing conditions of this disturbing question" (the Manitoba school question), will the Government inform the House what were the propositions made to the Government of Manitoba, what concessions were asked for, and which of these, if any, were not granted?

On that occasion the Prime Minister gave me the following answer:—

The negotiations were verbal; there is no record of them. The papers connected with that subject will be brought down.

The only papers on that subject that were brought down was merely a copy of the agreement that had been arrived at between the two Governments. We could not get at the records of what took place on that occasion, we could not find who had negotiated, we could not find what instructions had been given by the Governor in Council to the parties entrusted with the duty of effecting a settlement on that occasion, we could not get at what took place between the delegates of this Government and those appointed by the local Government of Manitoba to deal with this matter. Everything has been concealed from this House, and that is one of the great complaints we have against this Government, that they would not take the House into their confidence and tell us what took place, not only on that occasion, but on several other occasions in connection with the Manitoba school question. Well, Sir, a so-called settlement was ar-

rived at. It was made the subject of a chapter in the local statutes of the province of Manitoba. I do not know that I need to put on record the whole statutes, which is well known to most members of this House. The statute, or the settlement, as it is called, is a very slight amendment of the law that existed before, and that was so much complained of, that is the law of 1890. It provides for religious teaching between the hours of half-past three in the afternoon and four o'clock in the same afternoon. That was provided before in the former law, but there is a different way of arriving at such teaching, namely, by petition from the parents, or by resolution of the school trustees. It provides also that when ten pupils in any school speak the French language, or any language other than English, as their native tongue, the teaching of such pupils shall be conducted in French, or such other language, and not upon the bi-lingual system. We must notice here that while it has been contended on several occasions that the settlement provides for the teaching of the French language in the schools, the law does not read so, and the explanations given by the Attorney General of Manitoba when the Act was passed confirm that view. The law reads: "Shall be conducted in French," that is if ten of the pupils are of that nationality. Now, when that Act came before the legislature there was, of course, a long debate upon it, the reading of which I will not inflict upon the House. But I will make a few extracts which will show the spirit of the settlement as interpreted by the Manitoba Government and as put before that legislature which accepted it. The Attorney General, Mr. Cameron, in the course of his remarks:

> Expressed a hope that the second reading, or at any rate a third reading of the Bill, would prove to be the final stage of what had been a very vexed and at times a very burning question.

Proving that he thought this settlement would be final, and should be accepted as such. He then discusses the Remedial Bill that was attempted to be pased in this House on a celebrated occasion we all remember, and he discusses also the mission of Messrs. Smith, Desjardins and Dickie to the province of Manitoba on a former occasion, when they were entrusted by the Federal Government with a mission to try and arrive at a settlement of the question. Now, Sir, this so-called settlement made by the present Government is considered by the Attorney General of Manitoba as a triumph. Here are his words:

> He regarded the terms of the settlement arrived at as a distinct triumph on the part of this legislature and government. This province was to be congratulated upon such a moderate solution of what appeared at one time to be a very great problem indeed.

He might as well have boasted that it was a triumph because he had at his knees the members of this Government praying for a settlement of the question. But their prayers were not very fretful, because they only brought a settlement quite unacceptable to those who were most concerned about it. Section 10 provides:

> That when 10 pupils in any school speak the French language, or any other language than English, as their native language, the teaching of such pupils shall be conducted in French, or such other language, and English upon the bi-lingual system.
>
> It is absolutely necessary, adds the Attorney General, that in French, German and Mennonite settlements the pupil should learn English by the best methods.

This puts an end to the contention of hon. gentlemen that the settlement provides for the teaching of French in the Manitoba schools. It now remains to ascertain as to how this so-called settlement was received by the Catholic population in Manitoba after its enactment. I have here a copy of a series of resolutions adopted at a public meeting held in the city of Winnipeg, where the English-speaking Catholics of that city protested most energetically against the so-called settlement. The report of the meeting is pretty lengthy, and I will not occupy the time of the House by reading it in full. But, Sir, the expressions used on that occasion were very energetic, and most of the resolutions were moved and seconded by leading citizens of Winnipeg, some of whom are strong Liberals, belonging to the party of hon. gentlemen opposite, who on that occasion did not fear to put aside their political proclivities and express openly their disapprobation of the arrangement arrived at between the Government of this Dominion and the local government of Manitoba. The fact of the matter is, Sir, that the city of Winnipeg occupies a worse position so far as the Catholic minority is concerned than any other part of the province. I have on another occasion stated in this House that the Roman Catholic minority of Winnipeg, besides having to support their own independent Catholic schools, which were formerly the public Catholic schools of the city, have to pay taxes for the support of the other public schools. Worse than that, Mr. Speaker. Their own school-houses, which they use to-day in order to keep their separate schools, are taxed to the extent of $300 for the support of the public schools in the city, from which they do not derive any benefit. I do not know any other province in the Dominion where such a state of things could occur. I know that in the great city of Montreal there are private school buildings, under no denomination, but belonging to private persons, that are exempt from taxation, owing to the fact that they are school-houses, and open to the public. But in the city of Winnipeg, under the existing law, even our Catholic schools, and when I speak of the

city of Winnipeg I wish to indicate that the same condition prevails in country places where there is a mixed community, are taxed for the support of the public schools, which sometimes are on the opposite side of the street, while the Catholic minority do not derive a single cent of taxation for their support from the Government. Has this so-called settlement altered the position; has any change taken place since the enactment of the law of 1897: are the Catholic schools of Winnipeg in a better position than they were before? It is true that in some of the country places where the Catholics form the controlling element, where they can elect their trustees, after having for eight years been compelled to support their schools out of their own rsources, without receiving any support from the municipalities or the government, to-day, owing to a relaxation of the school laws, those people are compelled to come under the law, not to accept the law, but to come under it, in order to save their schools from being closed. And because those things happen, and because the people are compelled to submit to the law or otherwise starve, I hear hon. gentlemen opposite say: The settlement is all right, the Conservative minority is satisfied with the law. There is a case cited in history when the people were compelled "to believe or die," and that is exactly the position of the Roman Catholic minority in Manitoba—they must accept the law or have no schools at all. That is the position we occupy under this so-called liberal and acceptable settlement arrived at by hon. gentlemen opposite. I have mentioned the protest entered by the Catholic minority of Winnipeg. In every parish, district, town and village in the province where there is a Roman Catholic population of any consequence, meetings were held, and similar resolutions were adopted protesting against the so-called settlement of the school question entered into between hon. gentlemen opposite and the local government of Manitoba. But besides the people themselves, the Archbishop of St. Boniface did not accept that settlement, and the encyclical letter which has been put on record by the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. McDougall) contains a reference to this subject, and I fail to see from it that this settlement is approved by His Holiness, to whom hon. gentlemen opposite have appealed on another subject. And while I am speaking on that question, I may say that I do not find fault with the Catholic members of the Liberal party for appealing to His Holiness on a question which they thought was one within the province and jurisdiction of His Holiness. What we may find fault with is that the ground on which they based their petition and memorial was not such as was represented by them. But, Sir, I fail to see that any one has the right to contest the propriety of any Roman Catholic member of this House appealing to the authorities of his own church if he so chooses. However, the contrast between the course pursued on different occasions by my hon. friends opposite when these very delicate questions are being discussed in this House, is very marked indeed. What a scandal they now try to raise from the fact that my hon. friend from Beauharnois prepared, as they say, a brief for the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace), and which brief has been used also by the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule) and the hon. member for Bruce (Mr. McNeill). Well, Sir, these gentlemen opposite were not so much scandalized a few years ago when these very same members worked in harmony with them to help them defeat the Remedial Bill. The right hon. gentleman and his friends were not scandalized to vote then with the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) and the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule) and the hon. member for Bruce (Mr. McNeill). They were not scandalized when they themselves during long sessions of this House acted on the instigation of the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) and scrupulously carried out the programme he had prepared for them. He was their leader at the time, but they did not feel scandalized because of that. These hon. members avail of the speech made by my hon. friend from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) to discuss a question that should not be introduced in connection with the Manitoba schools, but my hon. friend from Beauharnois has no responsibility for that. There is no foundation whatever for the allegation that my hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron), or I, or any others of us, are acting in concert with these hon. gentlemen, as the Premier and his colleagues acted in concert with them to defeat the Remedial Bill. In the course of some remarks made by the Prime Minister, he threw out this threat with reference to the so-called settlement of the school question: "Perfect or imperfect," he said, "there is the settlement and there it will stand." The right hon. gentleman and his Government, who were the first to support the Roman Catholic minority in Manitoba, who insisted on the then Conservative Government settling the question, now, that they have made what I would call in vulgar language, a botch of the settlement, come to us and say: "Perfect or imperfect, there it will stand." But my hon. friend from Labelle (Mr. Bourassa), in his very nice speech delivered this afternoon, had quite a different story, and his opinion was: We do not say that the settlement is full and complete. Well, what then? If it is not full and complete, do you mean to complete it later on? Surely that does not agree with the statement of the Prime Minister: Perfect or imperfect, there it will stand. Which of the two gentlemen are we to accept as the spokesman of the Liberal party? I am afraid that the Prime Minister has said what he means, because since

the very beginning of this question his action has been such as to warrant us in the belief that he never intended to arrive at a just settlement, that he never wished to go any further than some of his supporters would allow him, and that he never intended to act boldly and do justice to that poor handful of Catholics in the province of Manitoba. These hon. gentlemen opposite were bold enough in championing the rights of the minority when they were out of power, but since they have assumed the responsibility of office, they have given up the idea of seeing that justice shall be done to the Manitoba Catholics. Sir, the school question is not settled, and it will not be settled until the minority in Manitoba have got complete justice, and have restituted to them the separate schools to which, under the constitution, they are entitled.

ALIEN LABOUR LAW—ENFORCEMENT.

Mr. CLARKE. I take this opportunity to draw the attention of the First Minister to a telegram which I have just received respecting the appointment of an Alien Labour Law officer in Toronto. It will be within the recollection of the House that on Monday last the announcement was made by the Prime Minister that an officer had been appointed to enforce the law in that city, and the answer was made to-day by the First Minister that he was appointed only yesterday. This is the telegram which I have received:

Toronto, May 12.

W. B. McMurrich has gone to Muskoka. Will not return till next week. Flagrant infringement of Act still continues. Does Government not intend to protect us? Aliens should be deported at once if Act is to be effective.

(Sgd. D. CAREY,
Pres., Trades' Congress.
J. McFAYDEN,
Pres., Shoe Workers.
W. IRWIN,
Pres., Upholsterers.

I again draw the attention of the Government to the fact, that notwithstanding the statement made by the First Minister and some of his colleagues, so far the workingmen of the city of Toronto have not been given the protection which it was intended they should receive when the Alien Labour Law was put on the Statute-book.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). I would say to the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Clarke) that the statement made by the First Minister was quite correct, that Mr. McMurrich had been appointed to represent the Department of Justice in the city of Toronto for the purpose of enforcing the Alien Labour Law. Of course the Government do not, and the Government cannot undertake that their officers shall always remain in one particular spot. If the officer is absent, steps will at once be taken to see that some person is in residence there, able and willing to attend to the duties assigned to him.

Mr. CLARKE. I may say, with the permission of the House, that the gentleman who was appointed, had received no instructions in the matter from the Government up to yesterday. Whether they were sent last night or not, I cannot say; but as late as yesterday he had received no instructions as to the enforcement of the Act in that city.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am not aware that the hon. member for West Toronto can know of his own knowledge whether or not that statement of his is correct Of course, he believes it to be correct; but all the same his information may be incorrect.

Mr. CLARKE. Will the hon. Postmaster General state that it is incorrect?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I cannot say, for it is not in my department; but I am quite satisfied that instructions have been sent to Mr. McMurrich to act for the Government in connection with the enforcement of the law.

CLAIM OF CAMPBELL McNAB.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a word in connection with a claim which I understand has been presented to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies), and I do it simply at the request of the claimant, so far as my doing so may be valuable to him, and for the purpose of giving my recollection of the circumstances surrounding the matter. It is a small claim, amounting, I believe, to some $400, which is asked by Mr. Campbell McNab, of Rivière du Loup, for certain expenses connected with the repair of an old yacht that belonged to the Department of Marine and Fisheries. Unless my memory is at fault, as to any memorandum that may have been in the department at the time, and may be there now, the circumstances were these. This yacht was in a very bad state—indeed, was not utilized by the department at all. Mr. Campbell McNab had for some thirty years been giving his attention to the catching and destruction of porpoises in the Gulf. The destruction of these porpoises was of great value to the fisheries; and in connection with that enterprise, on which he had spent a large amount of money, he made the request to the department that we should allow him the use of this old boat, which he intended to put into condition. Of course, we had no authority to give him the boat, or to do anything further than I did; that was, practically to authorize him to use the boat. In fact, I may have gone further than that. I may have told him that the department would never want the boat, and that he could take

it and use it for the destruction of porpoises. I have no doubt I led him to believe that we would not take the boat back; or, at any rate, that if we had ever occasion to use it, we certainly would not take it back at his expense, or leave him to bear the expense he would go to in putting it into condition. I do not, of course, know what expense he went to; but he has told me that he paid out $400 odd upon it. I understand that the department now requires the boat, and all I want to say is that my recollection of the matter is that under the circumstances he would be fairly entitled to be paid the amount; and certainly, if I were in the responsible position, and wanted that boat back, after what had occurred, I would ask the necessary vote to reimburse him for the expense he went to.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). There is nothing at present on file in the department showing what action the Minister had taken. I assumed that the statements he had made to the party were verbal statements. I will take occasion to read the hon. gentleman's statements to-morrow.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION—TEMISCOUATA ELECTION.

Mr. GAUVREAU. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I rise to make a personal explanation. The hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) has made a statement on the floor of the House against which I wish to enter my protest, in my own name and on behalf of the county of Temiscouata which I have the honour of representing here. In his remarks on the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne, on the 11th February, the hon. gentleman touched upon the Temiscouata election. I did not deem it my duty at the time to protest against that statement, as I considered under the circumstances that silence was the best policy. But as the saying is "in spite of one, nature will always assert its rights," and I find that the hon. gentleman has again referred to the question in such terms that I cannot pass them over in silence. The hon. gentleman says that I am not the member elect, the representative of the electorate of my constituency, a contention so much the more extraordinary as I was returned without any opposition.

It is true that there were two Liberal candidates in the field, and whether the candidate who resigned acted with more wisdom than I did, I shall not attempt to say; at all events, Mr. Pouliot withdrew from the contest in a most honourable manner, after an agreement was arrived at and without any pressure being brought to bear upon him, and that is the reason why I was returned by acclamation. I may further say this, Mr. Speaker, that had we both remained in the field up to polling day, the Conservative candidate would have met with an overwhelming defeat, just the same as at the local election. I do not wish to take up the time of the House, but I could not allow to go unchallenged what I consider as a gratuitous aspersion on my constituents without entering a solemn protest against the statement of the hon. member for Beauharnois.

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

(In Committee.)

Ontario—Dominion Public Buildings—
Renewals, improvements, repairs, &c.. $10,000

Mr. FOSTER. We would like to know on what buildings this sum is to be expended.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). This is the usual vote; but I may give the names of the places which have made calls upon us: Amherstburg, Cayuga, Chatham, Cornwall, Galt, Goderich, Gananoque, Hamilton post office, Kingston post office and custom-house, London custom-house, London inland revenue office, London post office, Napanee public building, Niagara Falls public building, Pembroke public building, Peterborough post office, Strathroy public building, Walkerton public building and Windsor public building. In all these places we have calls made upon us, and during the fiscal year there will no doubt be other calls. That is only for the general repairs made every year.

Toronto Dominion Public Building—
Improvement, renewals, repairs, &c.... $7,000

Mr. CLARKE. Might I ask the hon. Minister on what buildings this is proposed to be expended, and whether any appropriation is to be made for the completion of the work on the new drill shed?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This sum has no relation whatever to the drill shed. The drill sheds are not under my control, but under that of the Minister of Militia. I only make the big repairs for the drill sheds. This appropriation is for the following purposes:—Examining warehouse, $1,704; custom-house, $650; inland revenue, $2,375; general post office and branches, $1,775; and there are $500 for incidentals.

Mr. QUINN. What are the incidentals?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is impossible to say. In every public building there are little repairs to be made every year.

Mr. QUINN. Does this item cover the expense of the clerk of works in each case?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It does not.

Mr. QUINN. So that we will not have any more dry goods clerks employed as clerks of works?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No; in the case of small works the caretakers are generally employed in that capacity.

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON. I would like to ask whether any provision has been made in the Estimates for the repairing of the Toronto custom-house? The wood work, outside and inside, and the iron work are in a most disgraceful condition, and have not been painted for twenty years.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This item will provide for the re-painting of the outside of the building.

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON. I am advised that the wood and iron work is in a most disgraceful condition. The iron work, in many cases is absolutely rusting away for want of proper attention on the part of officials. Do I understand that part of this appropriation will be devoted for that purpose?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, part of that appropriation is for the painting of this building.

Arnprior post office, custom-house, &c., under contract (lapsed amount)..... $4,900

Mr. CLANCY. A report was made to this department a few days ago, which we have not yet seen, but which I judge is not at all favourable in many respects. To what extent the report has gone I am not prepared to say, but it would seem to reflect unfavourably upon some person, whether the clerk of works or the Minister I do not know, but of course the Minister never does wrong. He always says he is extremely anxious and honest in these matters. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will explain whether it is his intention to retain the clerk of works sent there, and who, it would seem, is accountable for the work not having been constructed in some respects according to the plans and specifications.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. As my hon. friend followed the inquiry that was made in the Public Accounts Committee, he knows just as much as I do. I do not think that the department can be charged with any laxity in that work. Several of my officers went to Arnprior to visit the works on different occasions. After I heard the evidence of one of the witnesses, I sent Mr. Adams, one of the oldest officers in the department, to Arnprior, and he made a report. He was heard as a witness, and swore that the building was very well erected indeed and the work well done, but that some little defects existed, which will be remedied before the contractors are paid. I shall instruct immediately my officers to bring the report before the House.

Mr. CLANCY. No one knows so far how great those difficulties are. Of course the House has not the report, and it is easy to minimize the extent of the defects, but we had it clearly stated in evidence that material was used which had already been in use, and which would not have been allowed if it had been detected by the officers of the department. It was clearly stated also that that was contrary to the plans and specifications. The hon. gentleman says that the defects are very small, but if I remember rightly some other questions were asked Mr. Adams, and he replied that as he was not there he was unable to give the information wanted. I am not going to charge the hon. gentleman with not having sent the officers of the department to inspect the work But there is one thing that seems perfectly clear, and that is that the officer should visit Arnprior more frequently than in the past, or the clerk of works should be changed. I have not heard the hon. gentleman say who is to blame. He said it is not the officers of his department. Is it the clerk of works?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The defects found to exist will amount to $200 or $300, the chief architect tells me. Those defects will be remedied. Whether the clerk of works has done his duty, I am not prepared to say. I am going to investigate, and if I find that the man is not competent I shall dispense with his services.

Mr. WILSON. I should like to have some explanation of the dismissal of the caretaker in the town of Napanee?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If my hon. frend (Mr. Wilson) will permit me, I would suggest he will be able to discuss that dismissal when the item of $70,000 for caretakers comes up. I shall be glad to give him any information I have.

Mr. FOSTER. I attended the meeting of the Public Accounts Committee and heard some of the evidence that was given. I think the hon. Minister will agree with me that it is not the best plan to employ as clerk of works on important public buildings a man who is not a builder or at least a mechanic of some kind. I have no desire to prejudice this case, but I think that it was brought out that the gentleman who held the position was not a practical builder. He cannot know mason work as a builder knows it, nor can he supervise any part of the work with expert knowledge. Mr. Adams stated that lath had been put in which was not up to the standard. Had there been an efficient clerk of works this would not have been allowed to go in. As to the strapping, we do not know how much bad material has gone in, as it has been covered up. I think, as I have said, that the man employed as clerk of works in such a case as this should be a builder or a mechanic.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) is right. He knows as well as I do, that in the past, incompetent men have been employed in such positions, and I am afraid that in this case the man is not as competent as he should be.

Mr. TAYLOR. I presume that the hon. Minister of Public Works will admit that when he took charge of this work the foundation was partially built. He had a practical builder as clerk of works at $75 a month, a gentleman who was mayor of the town and contractor and builder all his life. The only charge against him was that there were several Liberals wanting places, and this gentleman had to be removed to make room for one of them. They appointed in his place a gentleman who was a clerk in a dry goods store, who, from information received, was very active in assisting the Liberal party in revising their voters' list and other work, and so had to be paid somehow at the country's expense. He was put on at $2 a day for Sunday and every day. At the same time he was permitted to attend to his dry goods store, coming over to the work now and again. During the time that Mr. Stafford, a practical man was there as clerk of works, the Government inspector was in the habit of calling once every month. But after Mr. Tierney was appointed the inspector called only once a year. Mr. Adams did not visit the work once from the time Mr. Stafford was put off until the other day. As he stated in evidence the other day the lathing was done and he could not tell what the strapping looked like, and could only make a cursory examination of the building as completed. The information we have is that this inspector was away sometimes a week at a time, but he was still drawing his pay, while strapping was drawn from a pile of cull lumber that had been thrown out to rot. Ten or fifteen loads were taken from that pile, both for binding timbers and strapping. As I understand it, until this investigation took place, it was supposed that this building was all right. Mr. Tierney had reported monthly, the money had been paid, and everything was satisfactory. I received a letter giving me some information with regard to the matter:

When Mayor Stafford was local inspector on the post office here, before 15th October, 1898, the Government inspector was in the habit of calling once every month. Since Tierney was appointed the inspector has called only once a year.

No work at all was done on the building from November, 1896, to May, 1897—the foundation only being built before that time.

From November, 1897, to 25th April, 1898, the building was practically closed up, except when one Baldwin McCreary, supposed to be caretaker, was occasionally around.

Yet Tierney was drawing his pay Sunday and every day, having got his position because he was an offensive partisan and must be paid at the expense of the country for the party services he had rendered.

The stonework on the inside is not plastered under the laths, which leaves the building cold, and the strapping to which the laths are nailed is taken from McLachlin's dump.

The archways over the doors and windows are falling in, and the contractor was cementing small stone around them on Wednesday last.

Tierney was down at the Quyon for some time this spring buying and disposing of the stock of O'Meara & Hodgins. He has been this last while back in Renfrew attending to the buying and selling of bankrupt stock.

That is a portion of the information I got, and when the matter was investigated, we found that the information I had received was correct in every particular. Mr. Stafford gave evidence, the carter who drew the stuff from the dump pile gave evidence. The contractor and clerk of works stated that nothing was taken from the dump pile and that first-class material was used. Yet, when the true evidence came, it was shown that this bad material had been used. The clerk of works made the statement that he had constructed several buildings, yet gentlemen who knew him well in Arnprior say that he has always been a dry goods clerk and that he could not have constructed such buildings. This is simply a case of getting rid of an efficient officer in order to find a place for a Liberal partisan who had assisted the Liberal party to get into power, even though a public building is put up so badly that it is already falling to pieces.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not see why my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) should try to magnify these things. The chief architect tells me——

Mr. TAYLOR. He has not been there.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. But he has received the report of a most competent officer, and he says that there are some small things about the buildings which will be remedied and which amount in all to about $200 or $300. These things may happen in the erection of any building. Now as to the inspection of the works, my hon. friend is altogether misinformed. There have been seven inspections by special officers since the work has been going on.

Mr. TAYLOR. I agree with that, five of them were while Mr. Stafford was superintendent, and two since.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Adams went there twice.

Mr. TAYLOR. Twice while Mr. Stafford was there, and once the other day.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Mr. Shearer, who is a very competent man, went once, Mr. Routhier, who is a very competent man went twice. I think the officers of my department have done their duty.

Mr. POPE. It is evident from the remarks of the Minister that the difficulty is that he has not got a man on the spot. I am surprised that so practical a man as the Minister of Public Works pretends to be, should have entrusted the construction of that building to a person who was not a competent builder in any sense of the word. Then he comes to this Parliament and says that although his officers from time to time visited that building and inspected it, between the times of their inspection, bad work is done, and the country is called upon to pay twice the same bill.

Kingston drill hall..... $10,000

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The site of this drill hall was the property of the Militia Department, and we are taking it over. The officers of my department, after several consultations with the Militia Department, have come to the conclusion that perhaps we will spend about $40,000 or $45,000. We have been as moderate as possible.

Major's Hill Park—To complete stone and iron fence $4,500

Mr. QUINN. We would like to have some explanations.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That park was transferred to the Governmen in 1885 by the city of Ottawa, and since that time it has been under the control of my department. We are building a fence which was begun two years ago.

Mr. POPE. Is that work done by contract ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, by day's work, under the supervision of a very competent man, and of the chief architect himself.

Mr. POPE. How is this stone obtained ? Do you go to the quarry and obtain it by day's work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The chief architect buys the stone, and then it is cut and put in proper place by day's work. The chief architect tells me that the work will cost about $14,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Is not this a well defined piece of work ? You are not tearing down something and taking out old stuff and putting in new ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We are building a new stone and iron fence along Mackenzie Avenue.

Mr. FOSTER. But you are going to do new work to the extent of $14,000 ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My chief architect tells me that the whole work when completed will have cost $14,000, including what we spent last year.

Mr. FOSTER. What you did last year you did by day's work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. What proportion of that still remains to be done ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. About $10,000 worth.

Mr. FOSTER. Now, I want to ask my hon. friend if that is keeping faith with the public, if that is the way he proposes to administer his department. There is a good excuse sometimes for doing things by day's work when you have to tear down and build up, because then no man can make an estimate. But this is clear. There is a certain kind of stone you want, a certain kind of fence that must be built, it is all done by specifications on plans drawn by your own officers. If anything can be contracted for, it is such a work as that, but the hon. gentleman is dilly-dallying along with his day's work and building $14,000 worth of stone fence. I do not know how he squares his conduct with the rules of his department and with the Orders in Council that have been passed. Little jobs may be done by day's work, but outside of that, the rule and the Orders in Council require that tenders shall be called for and the work contracted.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am asking Parliament to vote the sum of $4,500 because I want to do this year a certain piece of work which will not exceed that amount this year. I am not bound to spend $14,000, I shall not spend that sum, I want to build that work gradually. My hon. friend knows how estimates are prepared. You have to remain within a certain figure, your estimates must not exceed so much. The Minister of Finance sometimes finds himself out in his estimates. My hon. friend says : I do not want you to exceed such a sum this year. I am not violating the rule nor the Orders in Council. When I ask for $4,500 for a certain piece of work that will not exceed that amount, I am within the rule. I think I have not had a very long experience in the Department of Public Works, but I must say that the system of public tenders is not always the best. The ex-Minister of Finance will agree with me that on many occasions we have had a lot of trouble with public tenders. But I may say en passant that the rule does not apply in this case, because here I am asking for $4,500 for a specific piece of work that will not cost more than that.

Mr. FOSTER. If a man eats a carcase of mutton, he does not eat it at one meal but in sections. If a man puts up a building, he does it by sections, a part in one month and so on. Even sometimes it will take two years to repair a building or three years to finish it. But does the hon. gentleman justify his departure from the contract system by saying that he is going to spend $5,000 this year and $5,000 next year and

so on ? He is going to spend in the end the whole sum of $14,000, and he is going to do the work without its having been put up to public competition. He is in fact doing it by day's work, calling in men that he and his company in this city want to employ, the faithful, the rank and file who are to get the benefit of it. I have seen them—two or three men working for a few moments and then gazing around at the horizon, watching every person from the time he comes into sight until he disappears out of sight, attracted by every little new thing and making a new thing out of every old thing, and taking time for their work so as not to unsettle their bones or destroy their backs, with a proper number of men to oversee them. The hon. Minister is doing that. The hon. gentleman knows he has really given no excuse, but this is on a line with what he is doing straight through, and examples we shall call to his attention as we pass through the Estimates. The hon. gentleman is ignoring the principle of tender and contract, he is doing it in case after case, even after he had solemnly promised Parliament that the work would be executed by contract. That is what the hon. gentleman is doing, and the time has come when his colleagues should pull him up.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think the hon. gentleman is unfair. One of the greatest complaints made against me in this city is that I have not dismissed a great many Conservatives. I have dismissed some of them, but I have kept a great number. The hon. gentleman has stated that I am employing men at my own sweet will. I must protest against that charge. I have employed a good many of my political friends—it is my duty to do so as a Minister.

Mr. FOSTER. You are doing that part of your duty first-rate.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. But at the same time I have been fair and I have kept many Conservatives. There are men I would not dispense with, because they are good and competent officers, but at the same time I am trying, to the best of my ability, to do justice to my own political friends. It is my duty to do it.

Mr. BERGERON. When was the fence around Major Hill commenced ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. When the season opened I commenced the work, I did not lose much time.

Mr. BERGERON. I do not mean this year ; but when was the work as a whole commenced?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The first part was built by the city before Major's Hill was taken over by the department.

Mr. BERGERON. Since when did the hon. gentleman commence his own fencing ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I got a vote last year and spent it.

Mr. BERGERON. I understand it is not being done by contract, but by day's work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. Where did the department get the stone ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I understand that the chief architect got the stone from Hull, where there is a first-class quarry.

Mr. BERGERON. Is it the intention to put any railing above the stone work, or to allow the fence to remain as it is now ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My chief architect tells me he wants to put an iron railing around.

Mr. BERGERON. Has the hon. gentleman any idea where he will buy the railing, whether it will be bought by tender, or by pieces ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I cannot say now.

Mr. BERGERON. Will the cost come out of the $4,900 ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No.

Mr. BERGERON. Then this is simply for the stone work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, only for that.

Mr. BERGERON. Is it intended to carry the fencing beyond the Printing Bureau ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is intended to build 1,140 feet of stone fencing 5 feet in height.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. How many feet have been built by the city ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. About one-fourth of the whole.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What did the city pay for the quantity it built ? I understand the department is undertaking to build a fence of the same character as the city built, and we should know whether that work was done by contract or by day's labour, and what it cost.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It was built several years ago.

Mr. HAGGART. What did the part built last year cost per yard ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The chief architect cannot tell now, but I will bring the prices down.

Mr. BERGERON. The hon. gentleman had better let the item stand.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have no objection to allow it to stand.

Mr. WALLACE. What is the use of building this fence around the public park ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman will surely not say that a public park should not be surrounded by a fence. At present there is only an old board fence.

Mr. BERGERON. Fences are being taken away from all public parks. The fence around Viger Garden at Montreal has been removed.

Mr. McMULLEN. If the item is to stand, the House should be put in possession of the expenditure from the time we took possession of Major Hill park, for each year, up to the present time.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the item is allowed to stand, I would ask when did the department undertake to do this work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In 1885 the park and some of the approaches were taken over by the Department of Public Works, and since then we are bound to keep the park under that agreement.

Mr. FOSTER. Does that obligation to keep the park make it necessary to build a $14,000 fence ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Part of the fence was built and we had to continue the work. The old board fence there at present is disgraceful, and surely I cannot be expected to change the style of fence that has been commenced.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend is not justified in taking the hard-earned money of the people to build a $14,000 fence around a small park. Is this fence meant for defensive purposes ? If the hon. Minister wanted to be economical he could have built a nice fence there for one-tenth of the money.

Mr. BERGERON. It does not need a fence at all.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I cannot spoil the appearance of the park by making a sham fence. I took the advice of my architect that we should continue the fence in the same style in which it was begun.

Mr. WALLACE. Is it not fifteen years ago since that part of the fence was built ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not know.

Mr. MONK. I have seen that fence, and it is altogether useless, and when finished will cost a great deal to keep in repair. We are all aware that in the case of public parks, in Montreal and elsewhere, fences are considered quite obsolete, and they are taking them down. Here we are building a $14,000 fence which is altogether unnecessary.

Mr. BERGERON. We will have to pay to take it down again.

Mr. MONK. It reminds me of the fence around the Quebec Parliament Buildings, which cost $140 a foot. It is a perfectly useless expenditure.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. How many acres in this small park ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I cannot say. Every member of the House knows it.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Are the officers of the department not able to give the slightest idea of the extent of the park ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The chief architect says he is not able to tell now.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Can they give no idea of the extent of the park that they are asking $14,000 to fence ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. They do not know now.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It is a disgraceful thing that the officers have no idea of the extent of the property they want to fence in and take care of. If an ordinary steward or manager asked an individual owner for money to fence in a property that he could not tell the extent of or how much fencing was wanted, he would lose his position. I suppose they are ashamed to mention the acreage in view of the huge expenditure.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The size of the park has nothing to do with the money I am asking for.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Certainly it has. The size and the importance of the park should be considered in the cost.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We are not going to fence the whole park.

Mr. McNEILL. What length is the whole fence to be ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We will build about 1,140 feet this year, and I am asking $4,500 to build it.

Mr. McNEILL. What is the whole length of the fence for which $14,000 is asked ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not know. I am asking to build 1,140 feet this year.

Mr. McNEILL. Then, the Minister is asking $14,000 to build a fence the length of which he does not know.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am not asking that at all. Why does

the hon. gentleman say that? Let him look at the item.

Mr. McNEILL. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that the cost of this wall would be $14,000. Did my hon. friend say that or not?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I was asked about the cost of the whole work when it would be completed, and my chief architect told me that the whole work would cost about $14,000. Of that, I am asking from Parliament this year $4,500 to build 1,140 feet.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Is this to complete the fence?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, it is not to complete it.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Then it is extraordinary that the item should say: "To complete stone and iron fence." Now, we are told it is only going to complete about one-third of the stone, and none of the iron. I think the item should stand.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have no objection. Any man who has been Minister knows that the Minister cannot control all these details. I just give the answers that are given to me by my officers. There must be some misunderstanding here.

Mr. FOSTER. May I ask my hon. friend if he is the author of this idea of building a five-feet by two-feet stone fence there?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose it is the First Minister's idea, and that this is the first step towards the realization of the Washington of the North idea—to have all the public parks surrounded by stone fences five feet by two feet.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I believe the interests of Ottawa should not be altogether overlooked. My hon. friends make a great deal of fuss about this little item. This park is one of the ornaments of the city of Ottawa, and, instead of embarrassing me, I think hon. gentlemen should help me. Our properties here are national properties; and, without indulging in any extravagance, I think we are bound to do the right thing for the city of Ottawa, as nearly as possible.

Mr. FOSTER. If my hon. friend wants to do the right thing for Ottawa, why is he keeping the Maria Street bridge in the state it is in?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The Maria Street bridge will not be kept as it is.

Mr. FOSTER. But the Maria Street bridge has been kept as it is for months; and when the hardy soldiers, I think the Yukon detachment, were going over it the other day, they had to be sent over it in little squads. That bridge is not safe. What good to the city of Ottawa is a $14,000 stone fence five feet by two feet around Major Hill Park? If you are going to do anything for Ottawa, do it somewhere where it will help the people. Use this $14,000 to help the people of Ottawa to pay their high water rates and the high cost of fire protection; and put the bridges in repair, so that their wives and children will not be in terror of their lives when they cross them.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If the Maria Street bridge is in such a dangerous state, I want to know whose fault it is. The arrangement by which the Maria Street bridge was taken over by the Government was made in 1885, when my hon. friend was Minister of Finance, and since that time the bridge has been in the disgraceful condition in which I found it.

Mr. DAVIN. May I ask the hon. gentleman who designed the fence?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The fence was designed by the chief architect of my department.

Mr. DAVIN. The reason I ask is that I think it offends against all true canons of art. It is a hybrid monstrosity. It is composed of five feet high of stone, and then you have little iron rails. If the Minister had made a fence all of stone, there might be something to say for it or if he had made a fence all of iron, of an artistic design, it would appeal to the æsthetic sense of the people of Ottawa; but a fence made partly of stone and partly of iron, I must say—for I have seen it—is an unsightly thing. To spend $14,000 for even a handsome fence would be what my hon. friend would call a superfluity of naughtiness—certainly a superfluity of fencing; but to pay $14,000 for an unsightly fence, an ugly fence, a fence that offends against the canons of art—that seems to be carrying Ministerial perversity very far. What I should advise the hon. gentleman to do is to suspend operations, and get an artistic design of an iron fence that will be at once cheap and beautiful to look at. I venture to say that he could put up a fence much finer than the one he is now putting up for one-third the cost. A chief architect is not a man to design a fence. A chief architect is a good man to design a post office or a custom-house, but not to design a fence to surround a park. I agree with my hon. friend that the park is an ornament to the city. There is no pleasanter place than that park to take a stroll in; but the pleasure of walking through the grounds and taking a look over the river is dashed and disappointed by the disturbing effect of looking at a fence that offends against all the canons of art.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Last year I got from Parliament $4,500 towards this work.

Mr. FOSTER. Parliament had not got on to it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friends opposite are just as responsible as I am for this work. They have allowed me to go on with it without opposition, and it seems to me that it is rather late in the day now to take exception to it. They agreed to the work last year, and they did well. It is a useful and necessary work, because this Parliament will not expect that such an ugly fence as the one now around the park should be maintained.

Mr. McNEILL. Will the hon. gentleman say what his officers compute such stonework to be worth per perch or rod?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I cannot make up that calculation now, but will find out.

Mr. WALLACE. I do not believe there is any defence for this work at all. I was thinking that perhaps the reason for it was that the trees are now beginning to leave.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I never thought my hon. friends would be so unfriendly to the city of Ottawa.

Mr. TAYLOR. The Minister of Public Works informs the committee that last year 600 feet of this fence were built, which cost $5 per foot. This year he proposes to build 1,140 feet, and is asking $4,500, or $4 per foot. Why is this difference between the prices of the two years?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I shall bring down to-morrow the exact length of the fence.

Mr. POPE. And the size of the park?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, and the size of the city of Ottawa also if that will satisfy my hon. friend.

Mr. QUINN. And also information as to where and when the stone was obtained, and what quantity will be required and what arrangements were made for its purchase.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. Minister now shelters himself behind the position that we did not find fault with the item last year. His only reason for continuing this fence is that he found part of it built. Might it not be well for him to retrace his steps and not build any more. I think he must conclude that it was a mistake to have undertaken to build it all, because it is wholly unnecessary. We have reached the day when fencing of public parks is very unusual.

Mr. GILLIES. Fences of this kind are entirely obsolete except in small towns where there is danger of cattle straying into the parks or on penitentiary grounds, or something of that sort.

Mr. CLARKE. Why were not public tenders called for? I understand that last year the work cost $5 per foot, and this year it is expected to be done at $4.

Mr. POPE. The principle is laid down by the hon. Minister that we are responsible for every item in his Estimates, if we do not strongly oppose him. Does he intend to carry that out literally, because if he does he will be here a long time?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman is perfectly free, and I think I was only fair in stating that last year there was no opposition to that item.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. And no explanation of it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. None was asked for, and Parliament is just as responsible for it as I am.

Mr. POPE. Then we shall have to be particularly careful. There is only one more remark I wish to make in this connection, and that is with regard to the system which the hon. Minister says he has to follow in engaging the men to do the work. He says he must be true to his political allegiance. It has already been said by the hon. gentleman that he is in the Government to represent the Conservative element of this country, that he remains true to his early allegiance and is still a Conservative. He stated this in evidence under oath. Under those circumstances, I do not see what right he has to dismiss a single Conservative that may be employed in his department.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I may remark that the item under discussion hon. gentlemen have agreed to allow to stand, and there is nothing before the Chair.

Mr. POPE. The item is still before the Chair until allowed to stand. I wish to draw the hon. Minister's attention to the false position in which he has placed himself. I appeal to him on behalf of the Conservative employees in his department, and who are engaged in and about the city to maintain them in the service as he is bound to do, under the circumstances, and I shall be very much disappointed and surprised if I hear of any other dismissal by the hon. gentleman on account of the party dismissed being a Conservative, and if he engages others, I shall expect him to engage Conservatives rather than Liberals.

Mr. TAYLOR. Before the item stands, I want to draw the hon. Minister's attention to the information which appears in last year's Supplementary Estimates. He charges us with having voted this money last year without asking for information, but I find in the Supplementary Esti-

mates, page 5, this item: "Major's Hill Park, to complete stone and iron fence, $4,500." That is the information he then gave, and in giving it he misled the committee because he now asked for a further sum to complete it. And we gave him the money to complete the work. Now, he comes down for a similar grant for stone work; and this will not finish the iron work. Why did the hon. gentleman mislead the House last year by putting in the Supplementary Estimates this amount to complete the work? Let him explain to the House why he misled the House and let him go to the "Hansard" and see what he said on this subject last year.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) is very unfair. I did not intend to mislead he House. All those who have been Ministers know the Minister himself does not prepare the estimates. There has simply been a mistake.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend (Mr. Tarte) is a member of the council of Ministers and he must take his estimates into that council and every item has to be voted by the Council. And when he takes a wrong estimate there he is incurring a grave moral responsibility.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not intend to blame my officers, but in this case I can say that I did not do it myself.

Mr. FOSTER. You did it in Council. The doctrine of Ministerial authority must be maintained or the hon. gentleman will slip out of our control altogether. Before this is allowed to stand. I would ask the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) to take into his earnest consideration the great principle of letting work by contract, so that he may give us his views on it to-morrow.

Port Colborne building—Mansard roof for caretaker's quarters, &c..... $1,200

Mr. McCLEARY. How much money does the hon. Minister intend to spend on this building?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This vote is to make provisions in accordance with the estimate of the chief architect for replacing the old roof with a mansard roof and fitting up quarters for the caretaker in the attic. The appartments in the basement now occupied by him being extremely unhealthy.

Mr. McCLEARY. Has the work been completed?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. McCLEARY. Were tenders called for?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The architect made an estimate of the cost and applied to a contractor to know if he would do the work at that price. It would not be practical, in such cases, to call for tenders.

Mr. McCLEARY. Who did the work?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Messrs. Mackintosh & Griffin, of Woodstock, who were very strongly recommended to me.

Mr. McCLEARY. The reason I ask is because I cannot understand why the Minister should send to Woodstock to do this work when there are in Port Colborne plenty of mechanics, friends of the Government, who would have been glad to do it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The work has been very well done indeed. I am sure my hon. friend (Mr. McCleary) will agree with me on that point.

Mr. McCLEARY. Who recommended these gentlemen from Woodstock?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I cannot recollect exactly now. At any rate I am responsibe for it.

Mr. POPE. In a case such as this, does the department submit the work to more than one firm of contractors or only to one?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It depends. Where the work is for a small amount and we have a man whom we know or who is well recommended, we do not ask for tenders from several people for the work.

Mr. QUINN. I understand that it was estimated last year that this work would be done for $1,000. It now appears that it is to cost $1,200, an increase of almost 10 per cent over the cost estimated by the chief architect.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Some changes were made. The first estimate was made by Mr. Watts, if I remember right, but it was found that the plan did not cover all that was required.

Woodstock Public Building..... $5,000

Mr. FOSTER. What is to be the cost of that building?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The plans are not yet made. We have not taken any steps so far.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the site been obtained?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No.

Mr. HENDERSON. What is to be the nature of this building, is it for a post office or a custom-house?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It will be what we call usually a public building, a post office, Customs-house, inland revenue office, &c.

Mr. HENDERSON. I would like to draw attention to the suggestion I made to the

committee last year with reference to the public buildings in towns like Woodstock and smaller places. I think the present system is a great mistake. The putting up of a large public building necessitates the employment of a caretaker, and the money invested is too great in proportion to the revenue received. We should put up smaller buildings. Take, for instance, the county of Halton, which I have the honour to represent. It has five incorporated towns and villages. Now, I suppose the building in Woodstock will cost $30,000.

Mr. FOSTER. It is said it will cost $40,000.

Mr. HENDERSON. Well, let us put it at $30,000 to be within the mark. Instead of putting up one building at a central point in the county, let five buildings be erected at a cost of say $6,000 each. At the present cost of material, stone, lime, brick, lumber, and so on, and the present cost of labour, a building quite sufficient for the purpose could be bulit in any town even the size of Woodstock, at any rate in a smaller place, for not more than $5,000 or $6,000.

Not only a building sufficient for the purposes of a post office, but one in which the postmaster himself can reside, can be erected for $5,000 or $6,000. There is no question about that, if the Minister is economical in his expenditure. In that case we would derive a revenue; instead of giving an allowance to the postmaster each year for rental, we would obtain from the post master a rental for his residence. Certainly, in this way, great economy could be exercised, and then in every town and village throughout the province we could have a suitable building erected for public purposes. I hope that the Minister, before proceeding with the expenditure of such large sums in different counties, will take into consideration the plan of dividing that money up and expending it in a way that will give benefit to all the smaller towns throughout the country.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman comes a little late with his ideas of economy. I grant we should not expend too much money on public buildings, but the hon. gentleman has been for many years a supporter of a Government which were very careless of economy. I have here a statement showing the sums spent by the late Government on public buildings in Ontario. In Almonte there was a public building erected at a cost of $22,181; at Amherstburg, one at a cost of $27,306; in Barrie, one at a cost of $42,000; in Berlin, one at $30,351; one at Belleville, costing $44,125; one at Brantford, costing $23,681; one at Brockville, costing $52,000, and so on. So my hon. friend comes late in the day to preach economy. Still I agree that there is a great deal in what he says We must not erect public buildings too expensive, and I may add that we must not build too many.

Mr. HENDERSON. I desire to remind the Minister that only last year I drew his attention to this same circumstance and asked him then to take the matter into consideration. I do not think it is fair for him to shield himself by quoting the expenditure under the late Government. We all know that they were a very extravagant Government, and that the present Government came into power under the promise that they were going to be very economical. But now we find an entirely different state of affairs under the present Government from what we were led to expect. They are simply adopting the policy of the old Government instead of making any change, adopting the National Policy, for instance, and many other things. There is no change, no improvement. I think it is time the Minister should show some signs of change, and I hope he will drop some of these items this year; at any rate, as he has not expended any money on this Woodstock building, I hope he will leave it over with the view of practising greater economy at a future time.

Mr. QUINN. It seems extraordinary to me that we should be asked to vote a sum of $5,000 for a building when the Minister says he does not know whether it is to be a post office or a custom-house, or what kind of a building it is to be.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I said quite the reverse. I said it was a public building for all purposes, that is to say, for inland revenue, post office and custom-house. But I did say that the plans were not yet ready, that the site was not yet bought.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. If I understand the hon. gentleman, he is satisfied now that this building is intended to be occupied by all the departments represented in the town. I may say that I agree to a certain extent with the hon. member that economy ought to be observed in the erection of public buildings. As I understand it, true economy is getting value for the money expended, whether by Parliament or by a municipality. I would like very much to see a building erected in the town of Woodstock; at the same time I may say that unless the Government intend to erect a building worthy of the town, in keeping with the other public buildings, and with the business of the place, they can strike that item out altogether. We do not ask it as a favour. When the late Government were in power and were erecting buildings throughout the country, I, along with other members, called the attention of the Government to the principle that ought to govern the erection of public buildings in the Dominion. I may say right here on this first vote, that unless they are prepared to erect a building that

would be creditable to the place, and suitable for the purposes of the Government, for the officers who are to occupy it, we do not want it at all.

Mr. FOSTER. Where is Woodstock ?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I suppose that is quite in keeping with the general knowledge of the ex-Finance Minister. It often occurred to me that if the hon. gentleman knew something more of the important places in the Dominion, he would have more liberal views on many questions that come before the House. It is a little larger than Marysville, where they have a public building erected. It is a town that has the most business and affords the largest revenue of any town in the Dominion of Canada where a public building has not been erected, and is very much larger than a great many towns in which public buildings have been erected. I would not like to see one dollar improperly expended on a building ; all I ask is that the building, if erected, should be in keeping with the other public buildings, with the business buildings in the town, and one suitable for the purposes for which it will be used ; otherwise, we do not want it at all.

Mr. COCHRANE. I do not propose to find fault with this vote, but I disagree entirely with the policy propounded by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Sutherland), that he does not regard the expenditure of an enormous sum of money with any alarm so long as the Government get value for the money. I think we should erect public buildings on the line of economy so that more than one town should be able to get public buildings. We all remember how loud-mouthed those hon. gentlemen were when sitting on this side of the House, and how they found fault with the Government for extravagance in expending, as they said, such enormous sums of money in erecting public buildings in the towns and cities of this Dominion. During long years hon. gentlemen opposite denounced the Conservative party for erecting public buildings at different points on the ground that they were buying up constituencies, and now that those hon. gentlemen have reached the Treasury benches, after having preached economy so long, the reply made by the Minister is simply : You did it when in power. How absurd is such a defence. Hon. gentlemen opposite deceived the people by telling them that they were going to do business on different principles, and practice economy, and yet the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) is ready to vote for these grants. No doubt he sees some particular circumstances to justify his action in supporting extravagant votes.

Mr. McMULLEN. I did not rise to justify extravagance. No doubt Woodstock should have had a public building many years ago, and it would have been given to the town except for the fact that the constituency was represented by my hon. friend (Mr. Sutherland). It contributes $15,000 or $16,000 a year to the revenue. There are buildings in that town which cost from $40,000 to $50,000 each, and a building in proportion to the importance of the town should be erected. I wish, however, to see economy practiced, and not such a monument of folly erected as the post office at Napanee, where the clock cost $1,800 and the granolithic sidewalk $2,000, the total cost of the building being $54,000. I do not want to see that folly repeated. We want public buildings erected with care, prudence and economy. There is not a town in Ontario that needs a public building so much as Woodstock. It is a large and progressive town in the centre of one of the finest districts, and the only reason why it did not obtain a post office before is because year after year it continued to return the present member for the constituency. I agree with a good deal that has been said by the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson). I believe that in many places post offices could be erected for $5,000 or $6,000, which would be sufficient to accommodate the business. In some places hon. gentlemen opposite expended $23,000 to $30,000 on post office buildings that stand as monuments of disgraceful extravagance. I do not want the Government to pursue that policy, but I wish them to erect buildings carefully and prudently and not put up clocks costing $1,800 and expensive granolithic sidewalks around the buildings.

Mr. QUINN. What will be the total cost of the proposed building, and will there be a clock and granolithic sidewalk connected with it ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The plans have not yet been completed, and I am not able to answer the question.

Mr. SPROULE. The information given is not sufficient upon which to pass a money vote. The hon. gentleman has not stated the purpose for which the building is required, but the Minister asks simply a vote of $5,000 for a public building to commence operations. We have no statement as to whether it will cost $15,000 or $50,000. The hon. member for North Wellington does not care so long as the work is economically done ; but the committee should have information as to the probable cost. The hon. gentleman is willing to go it blind to-day, although when in Opposition no member was more anxious to obtain specific information as to the cost and the purposes for which a building was needed. The hon. gentleman now takes it for granted that the work will be done economically and wisely, although he does not know anything beyond the fact that the grant is for a public building. We have no Estimates as to the total cost of or the purposes for which the

building is intended, or any information to enable the committee to wisely vote money for such an expenditure.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Although the plans are not complete, the chief architect has put in my hands a statement, which perhaps may throw some more light on the subject. The estimated cost of construction is $16,000, internal fittings $3,500, heating $1,200, fencing and sidewalk $800, together with items for clerks of the works, incidental and travelling expenses, bringing the total cost up to $24,000.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the purpose for which it is to be used?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. For the post office, custom-house and inland revenue office.

Mr. SPROULE. There is much greater reason now for the passing of this vote in view of the information given than there was at the outset when the hon. Minister stated that he had no information. Woodstock is a very lively, active town, and entitled to a public building, especially if it can be made convenient and suitable for these purposes. As to the $800 for the sidewalk, I presume that work will be in keeping with the building.

Mr. GILMOUR. The Minister of Public Works need not be afraid to stand up in this case and say that he is going to put up an efficient public building in Woodstock. I know of no town between Toronto and Sarnia that is more progressive and has better prospects before it than has the town of Woodstock. I would be sorry to think that the Minister would erect a small and inefficient building in that town, and I agree with the member for Oxford when he says that it would be better to put up no building at all than to put up one not in keeping with the place, because Woodstock is going to grow, and grow largely. I agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Henderson) in what he has said, but I would point out that Woodstock deserves a substantial public building, and the remarks of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Henderson) will not apply to that town, and I do not think he will say that they do. For my part, I trust that the Minister will erect an efficient and suitable building there.

Mr. MACLAREN. I corroborate what has been said by my hon. friend from Middlesex (Mr. Gilmour) with regard to Woodstock. It is a flourishing town and it is deserving of a post office, and a good one. I can say for Oxford County that it is one of the finest counties in western Canada, excepting, of course, Perth. I have much pleasure in supporting this vote for the erection of a public building in Woodstock.

Mr. SPROULE. The danger now is that he will run up the expenses too high. Is this contract to be done by tender?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Certainly.

Rat Portage public building, the proper site given free of cost by municipality. $5,000

Mr. FOSTER. Where is the site?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It has been given by Mr. Scovills, and is 100 by 100.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What is the estimated cost?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. $24,000; about the same as Woodstock, but I hope it will be completed, fittings and heating, &c., for $22,000.

Mr. SPROULE. In the case of these towns where public buildings are being erected, has the Minister endeavoured to get free sites. Many towns in Ontario are willing to do that, and where a live town is getting a building of that cost it ought to be asked to give a site, or one at a very low price.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I tried that on several occasions, but I have not succeeded every time. I have been confronted by the fact that in the past that has not been done.

Public Buildings, Ottawa—Grounds—New sidewalks and footways on Parliament Square $9,000

Mr. DAVIN. Who is the contractor?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The Sicily Asphaltum Company of Montreal. When I came into the department I found that some of the paving in front of the building was done at a price of $2.65 per yard. I allowed the contractors to complete that part of the work, but as there was no appropriation, I did not continue it. Public tenders were called for and the lowest was from the Sicily Asphaltum Company at $2.19 per yard. I awarded the contract in the ordinary way and the work was splendidly done. It is one of the finest pieces of paving in Canada.

Mr. HENDERSON. I cannot agree with the Minister that it is one of the finest pieces of work in Canada. It is very inferior compared with what is done in the city of Toronto. It seems to be breaking, and to a large extent it is somewhat unsightly. I believe they used some kind of rock asphalt, but if they had used Trinidad the work would be more sightly and more durable.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The part of the work done under the late Government is all cracked, as the hon. gentleman says, but that is not my fault.

Mr. HENDERSON. I refer to the work in front of the building, which was done under the present Government, and it is a very rough piece of work indeed.

Mr. SPROULE. How much work will be done for which the Minister is asking an appropriation now ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No work is to be done ; this is to pay for work already done.

Mr. FOSTER. Is this $9,000 to pay for work already done ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. If the work is already done, this is not the place where the vote should appear. It should appear in the Supplementary Estimates for the present year.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I quite admit that from a strictly book-keeping point of view, my hon. friend may be right.

Mr. FOSTER. It simply swells my hon. friend's estimates for next year, and keeps down his estimates for this year. The worst of it is, if the men have done their work, why should you keep them five or six months out of their pay ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The Supplementary Estimates will be available at the same time as these. That would not make much difference.

Mr. MONTAGUE. That same remark applies to the Port Colborne work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. QUINN. Was the work done by contract or by day's work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It was done by contract, after public tender, and given to the lowest tenderer.

Public Buildings, Ottawa—Grounds—Removal of old sheds in rear of court-house building and erection of new green-house..... $5,000

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That vote was taken last year. Was anything done ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, nothing has been done yet.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Is the old greenhouse there ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What condition is it in ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is not in a very good condition, I am sorry to say. Public tenders have been asked, and I will take the House into my confidence.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I see that $1,000 has been spent of the $5,000 taken last year.

Mr. HENDERSON.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No. We hope before the 1st of July to spend $1,000.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Is the old building still in use as a greenhouse ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Has anything been done since last year ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, nothing.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman is not informed in instructing the House, for he got the vote on the 23rd of June, 1897, by assuring the House that the foundation of that building had gone, and had to be replaced immediately ; yet not a dollar has been used. His advice was very bad.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The advice was given to me, that the foundations were in a bad state.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The statements had no foundation.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I would not say that at all ; but the foundations were not in a good condition. They had been simply propped up.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Still, the hon. gentleman needed $5,000 at once, and he has not spent a dollar.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend knows better than that. He knows that every year there are revotes.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend was going to take the House into his confidence.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I was going to say that I asked for public tenders, and I am going to decide on these in a day or two.

Mr. FOSTER. Will this include the expense of tearing down the old building ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Then my hon. friend is doing by contract a piece of work which there might be a fair justification for doing by day's work, seeing that he is taking down an old building and constructing a new one ; but in constructing a fence the cost of which he could estimate by the cubic foot, he is doing the work by day's work. He is very virtuous in one case, but not in the other.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is no use in my hon. friend trying to draw any distinction between yesterday and to-day—I am always virtuous.

Mr. FOSTER. On what principle, then, does the hon. gentleman call for tenders for the greenhouse and not for the fence ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. As my hon. friend knows, the law obliges me to ask for public tenders for a work exceeding $5,000. In the case of the fence, I am asking only $4,500.

Mr. FOSTER. But my hon. friend could get out of that in a moment; he could just ask for $4,500 for this. Is the hon. gentleman simply trifling with the House?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am not at all.

Mr. FOSTER. It looks very like it. The hon. gentleman finds a law the intent of which is to have Ministers call for tenders and construct works by contract. He avoids that entirely by taking a vote for $100 or so less than $5,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, no.

Mr. FOSTER. The whole thing is a perfect farce, if the Minister is going to do that.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is no farce at all. These Estimates are not made by me. My officers come to me with their Estimates, I discuss those with them, and I take them as they are.

Mr. MONTAGUE. That does not agree with what the hon. gentleman said a little while ago, that the Minister of Finance told him he could have only so much money, and that he must decide how much he could have for this, and how much for that.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No. What I said was this. I was reproached for building a fence to cost $14,000. The ex-Minister of Finance was telling me I should ask for tenders. I said I was only asking Parliament to give me $4,500 for a specific piece of work.

Mr. SPROULE. Will the hon. Minister tell us what is going to be the full cost of this building?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I cannot say at the present time, but I hope the tenders will not exceed that sum of money. I have not yet decided on these tenders.

Mr. SPROULE. This is another case like the one submitted a while ago. I do not think the hon. Minister should commence a building without having some estimate of what the total cost will be. It is commencing an expenditure without any knowledge of what the end will be. It seems to me he should be able to submit to the House more information than that.

Mr. DAVIN. This is a violent defiance of the Gospel, which says that "No man goeth to build a house without counting the cost."

Mr. MONTAGUE. The Minister certainly has an estimate from his officers, because in discussing these matters in Council, the estimated cost is always inquired into.

Mr. TAYLOR. As I understand, the way they run matters in Council, each Minister is the boss of his own department, and does not require to go to Council at all. He simply makes up his mind how much money he wants, and it is all right. There is no Council about these items.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Will the hon. Minister tell me what the estimate of his architect is? Surely he must have that.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Because the tenders have not yet been adjudicated upon.

Mr. MONTAGUE. He must have had some estimate made before calling for tenders. Does the hon. Minister mean to say that he decides to call for tenders and let contracts without having an estimate from his officers?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not say that at all. I have an estimate of the work, but I do not think it would be wise to make it known.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. Minister has given an estimate in a case in which the tenders are not yet in, and surely there can be no objection to give it when the tenders are in.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. After consultation with my officers, they tell me there is no great objection to giving the estimate, but I am bound to say that there are times when to do so would be dangerous. Supposing after opening the tenders, I made up my mind that none should be accepted, I would have placed myself in a false position.

Mr. FOSTER. Not at all.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am not so sure of that.

Mr. FOSTER. In answer to a question put to-night, did the hon. gentlemen not say that the Woodstock post office was estimated to cost $16,000, and there are no tenders in for that contract.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I gave that information after a good deal of hesitation.

Mr. FOSTER. Every Minister has given it every year since confederation.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In the case of Woodstock, I said I thought it would cost so much, but I did not pledge myself, because it would be very unwise to do so. I shall, however, give the information in this case, although it may be unwise. The estimate of the chief architect that the greenhouse will cost $10,000.

Mr. MONTAGUE. What portion of that is for the removal of the old one?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The chief architect tells me that he has allowed in his estimate about $200 for the removal of the old shed, but the whole thing has been estimated en bloc.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The new greenhouse will then cost $9,800 ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. MONTAGUE. That is an extraordinary greenhouse. What did the old one cost ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS I do not know.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I think in all reasonableness, if we are to build a $10,000 greenhouse, we should have the items of that expenditure.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have no obpection to that, but I am surprised that my hon. friends should be astonished that the greenhouse for large public buildings, such as the Government buildings, should cost about $10,000.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I have no knowledge of what these greenhouses cost, but I think my hon. friend will admit that the amount must strike the committee as a pretty fair sum any way.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think it is a very cheap building. A good many private greenhouses cost more than that.

Mr. MONK. What is this $10,000 greenhouse for ? I am very much astonished at our having to spend such a large amount. In Montreal there are very few greenhouses that cost any way near that, even our public greenhouses. What are we going to do with it when it is built ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That greenhouse, which my hon. friend may see to-morrow, is intended to keep the flowers and plants in, which are used during the summer season on the Parliament grounds.

Mr. SPROULE. Where is the hon. gentleman going to put it ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That greenhouse has been maintained for years and is out of shape now. We have only to replace it. It is no new policy of mine. It will be on the site of the old one.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the size of the building ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It will be 130 x 20 feet, built of iron and glass on a stone foundation.

Mr. SPROULE. Is it to be the same site as the old one.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. Is the building to be removed to the shed in read of the Supreme Court.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Beside that greenhouse which is to be removed, there are old sheds which will have to be removed also.

Mr. DUGAS. Will not the foundation of the old greenhouse be used for the new one ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No.

Mr. GANONG. What is the expense of running the greenhouse ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That is included in the maintenance of the grounds for which there is an item of $5,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that by contract ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, it was given last year.

Mr. GANONG. Has the Minister ever attempted to find out for how small an amount he could have these plants furnished ? Here is an amount of $10,000 which at 3 per cent means $300 a year. There will probably be $1,200 of $1,500 more for maintenance. For this sum of say $1,500 a year a great many plants could be supplied.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think it is well to be conservative in these things, and I follow the policy that has been followed for years, except that I have practised some economy in maintenance.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I do not wish to criticise unduly, but I adhere to the statement that a building of the dimensions given by the hon. Minister will be extremely dear at $10,000, unless the hon. gentleman is going to build it in a very artistic way, which is not required by the nature of the case. I understand that it is to be a work of utility pure and simple, and for such a work this sum of $10,000 would be very large indeed.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. On that point I can only give the information I have received. The architect of the Public Works Department is a practical man and I act on his advice. The fact that he estimates an expenditure of $10,000 does not prove that we shall not get a lower tender.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I do not desire to cast any reflections on the chief architect because I think he is a first-class man. But first-class men may have ideas that are quite out of keeping with the economy that hon. gentlemen opposite promised us. The chief architect may be preparing a plan on a much more expensive scale than is necessary.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I instructed the architect to prepare plans of a substantial fireproof building, and that may be why it is more expensive.

Mr. SPROULE. I suppose you intend to raise all kinds of flowers in this greenhouse—including orange lilies. I understood the hon. Minister to say that the walls were to be of iron or stone.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The foundation walls will be of stone and the structure will be of iron.

Mr. SPROULE. What height does the hon. Minister propose the building shall be ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The foundation walls will be about 4 feet, I understand.

Mr. SPROULE. I suppose the building will be heated with steam.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. With hot water.

Mr. SPROULE. I suppose this estimate includes the cost of the heating apparatus.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There are boilers, of course, in the existing building.

Mr. POPE. They are old.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. But good. The present system can be used with some additions.

Mr. MONTAGUE. There is one greenhouse in the park and one on the Parliament grounds. Is it intended that the new building shall make it possible to do away with both of these ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The building I am asking for is only to replace the present building on the Parliament grounds.

Mr. SPROULE. For a building of 130 x 22 with foundation walls 4 feet high, it seems to me this is a very extravagant sum.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I give the estimate of the chief architect as it has been given to me. I am not an architect or an expert in this business. We may only hope that we shall receive a tender lower than the estimate.

Mr. SPROULE. There is a refreshing innocence about this proposal that we cannot but admire. This is for a greenhouse. But it seems to me that there is more green than house about it.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. When this item came down last year, there were really two purposes, which, I suppose, are still adhered to. The hon. Minister spoke a few moments ago about the desirability of meeting the wishes of the city of Ottawa as far as possible, saying this in order to disarm criticism about the fence. The hon. gentleman last year, asked for $5,000 for the removal of the old sheds in rear of the Supreme Court building. That was one object of the vote. The other object was the conservatory. The first as the hon. Minister knows, was a simple matter. He has stated that the old sheds can be removed at a cost of a few hundred dollars. But, ever since he took his vote the sheds have been in such a position as to make the whole surrounding of the Supreme Court most unsightly and disgraceful, an eye sore to the people who have to go to that court. It really means that the court is backed up into a back yard with sheds opening near the room in which the court is held. Though Parliament gave the hon. gentleman this amount of money in 1897 to handle that little job, he left it undone and undertook the building of a $12,000 fence in Major Hill Park. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if he has any idea when these sheds will be taken away if this item is voted.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Is not the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbet Tupper) a little unfair ? Those sheds were there for years and years while he was a Minister. For twenty years, I suppose, the sheds have been there, and they have been in bad shape for ten years. Perhaps I have not moved as quickly as I might have done, but the hon. member must not forget that I have not been in office for very long and that it is impossible for me to do everything at once. We have waited for ten years, and I think we might wait for six months more without any great danger to the public interests.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The sheds have fallen into a miserable condition. Last year the hon. gentleman told us he was going to move immediately. He pointed out that the foundations of the buildings were rotten, and he could not wait a month.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I instructed my officers to prepare the plans as quickly as possible. The chief architect and his staff have been overworked in preparing plans, and they could not get them ready any sooner.

Mr. SPROULE. Will the hon. gentleman be good enough to tell us if this greenhouse is the first instalment of the Washington of the North that the Prime Minister promised to the city of Ottawa ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. All the promises made by the Prime Minister in the past, as my hon. friends know, have been redeemed, and the promise that he has made to make this Capital of Canada the Washington of the North, will also be redeemed. All Canada will then be proud of the national aspect that will have been given to this city.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Does my hon. friend really think that his followers behind him believe that all the pledges of the Government are being fulfilled ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have not the slightest doubt of it.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Then all I can say is that this greenhouse is only half the proper size.

Mr. POPE. I wish to enter my protest against the expenditure of this much money on the greenhouse. It is at least double what is necessary for taking care of sufficient plants to ornament these grounds around the Parliament Buildings.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I think this expenditure is entirely too great, and my hon. friend ought to cut it in two. I have had the opinion of practical builders around me, who tell me that such a building as he is to construct, a fire proof, iron structure, with thoroughly good foundations, can be built for $5,400. I move that the sum be reduced to $6,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I was asked for the estimate of the chief architect, and I said his estimate was $10,000, but I added immediately that I asked for public tenders.

Mr. FOSTER. What are these gentlemen putting in tenders upon? They are putting in tenders upon plans and specifications furnished by the chief architect, and he has arranged these plans and specifications on an estimate of a $10,000 building. My hon. friend knows that the probabilities are that the tenders will be more rather than less, and tenders are asked upon these specifications. I want to know if my hon. friend is going to leave the matter in its present shape. He is a most interesting gentleman, is the Minister of Public Works. I have watched him with the greatest interest on such occasions as this, as upon others. He came out a little while ago with a great show of obeying the law. He said: Let all men understand that I am going to obey the law. The law is that if the work costs more than $5,000, he must ask for tenders, and the work must be done by contract. Behold the Minister of Public Works uphold the majesty of the law. What has he confessed. He had for another work asked a vote for $14,000. Did he not consider that the law in its spirit compelled him to give the work out by contract? Now, how did he avoid the law? By cutting it into three or four different pieces and making each part cost less than $5,000, so that in the course of three years the work would have been carried out in this way without contract. The hon. gentleman, however, must obey not merely the letter, but the spirit of the law. Does the hon. gentleman really think it is necessary to build a $10,000 greenhouse, with all the expenses attendant? He now lets out the care of the grounds by contract. How are these grounds laid out? Mostly in lawn, and that does not require much expense, and then there are bulbs planted, which form the large part of the late spring and early summer show. Outside of those features, the show of flowers on this hill is very small indeed. At Major Hill Park there is a larger show of flowers, but they are not of expensive kinds. They are composed of the good, old-fashioned common flowers, which make a good show, are substantial and are not very costly. Is it necessary to build a $10,000 greenhouse, with all the expense of carrying it on, in order to put out a few plants. It would surely be more economical to buy those plants each year. They could be purchased very cheaply, and of course the contractor would set them out. This proposed expenditure would cover the price of two or three farms such as many of our people would be very glad to own. Why should this country pay $10,000 for a greenhouse and $14,000 for a fence when these structures are not required, and there are so many works necessary in different parts of the country?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman has been kind enough to tell me that he takes a good deal of interest in me; I tell him that I take a great deal of interest in him. I also take much interest in what the hon. gentleman has done in the past, because to-day he is simply going back on the policy pursued by him and his associates. When did the Finance Minister agree to purchase plants outside? He never adopted such a course. I have already reduced the expense of maintenance of Major Hill Park and these grounds by $3,000 or $4,000. My experience is that when public contracts are opened tenders are sent in much below the estimates of the chief architect. I find that occurs every day, and still I do not consider the chief architect a very extravagant man. The estimated cost of the chief architect is $10,000, but I hope to obtain tenders for a less sum.

Mr. SPROULE. This seems to be an awful figure for this building. The building can be erected of either brick or stone. Suppose it is built of brick, there will be 2,430 cubic feet in the building, and that will give a 2-foot wall. The total number of bricks used will be 31,611. The cost would not be more than $12 per thousand in the wall, which will give a total cost of $379 to put up the walls, which will form the most expensive part of the building. This building is to be only twenty-two feet wide. The top portion is covered with glass; but when the most expensive portion of the building can be put up for less than $400, there is a wide balance between that and the amount this building is to cost, viz., $10,000. This seems to be the worst kind of extravagance. I should like to obtain the opinion of the hon. member for North Wellington upon it. If such an expenditure had been proposed to be made by a Conservative Government, the hon. gentleman would have gone over the province and told the people that it meant the cost of two big farms with brick houses and

frame barns, and that the Government were spending this amount to build a greenhouse in which to store a few flowers to meet the wishes of the people of Ottawa. Then the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McMillan) must surely consider this outlay extravagant. How could he defend before the farmers an expenditure of $10,000 on a greenhouse for such a purpose? If he could do so, he must have changed his views. There is strong justification for the amendment that the amount be reduced by one-half.

Mr. MONTAGUE. My motion may be somewhat out of order because the whole vote is not stated. I shall now propose an amendment that will suit the case. I am not taking this action in order to be captious, or in order to find fault with the officers of the department, in whom I have confidence. But $10,000 is a large sum to invest in a structure for this purpose. I am told by builders that $4,500 would do the work, and I am therefore giving a margin of $2,000. If a greenhouse cannot be constructed here for that sum, we had better go out of the plant business altogether. I beg to move that the item be amended by adding the following words :—

The cost of the removal of the old structure and erection of new greenhouse not to exceed $6,500.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I answered a question that I was not asked, and perhaps I should not have answered.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes. The estimate of the chief architect does not prove that I am going to ask $10,000. I am only asking $5,000 now.

Mr. SPROULE. But you are committing the country to an expenditure of $10,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. When I am asking for more money, then the time will come to complain.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. SPROULE, The proper time to protest is now when you are commencing the work. If you ask $10,000 now, probably the House would not give it to you, but you will come later on and say : We have spent $5,000 now and we must complete the work.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The course of my hon. friends opposite is very unfair, because I am only asking $5,000 here now.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The Minister should not say our course is unfair. I leave it to the judgment of any one of his colleagues whether this is not the time to protest against the expenditure of $10,000 which the Minister has assured us is the estimate of the chief architect. We propose to give $6,500, and that is enough in all reason.

Mr. MONK. For my part I protest against building this greenhouse at all. My experience as a school commissioner in Montreal where we have the administration of ten or twelve schools with large grounds around is that for $300 a year we can get all the flowers necessary for ornamentation, and I might add that we have thrown down the fences and opened up the grounds as is done in similar cases all over the world. I believe that all the flowers on the grounds around these buildings could be purchased for $200 a year. It is now proposed to construct a greenhouse that will cost $12,000 when it is finished, and which will be perfectly useless. And, Sir, as a defence or excuse the Minister has nothing better to tell us than that he is following the example of his predecessors. Sir, this Government has come into power with promises of economy and this is an occasion in which they can exercise economy. For my part I will take every opportunity to protest against such a wasteful expenditure of money as this.

Motion (Mr. Montague) negatived : Yeas, 26 ; Nays, 31.

Sarnia public building..... $5,000

Mr. SPROULE. Is this for the commencement of the new building ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the estimate of the cost of completing these buildings ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The same as for Woodstock and Rat Portage ; between $22,000 and $24,000.

Mr. HENDERSON. Is it the intention of the Government to purchase what is known as the Alexander lot ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have not made up my mind as to any site yet.

Mr. HENDERSON. It is strange that a vote of this kind should be asked for without the Minister knowing in what part of the town the building is to be erected.

Alexandria Reformatory $9,000

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Last session the Minister got a grant of $9,000 to wipe out the contract for the building of this reformatory. What was done with that money ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I thought that sum would be sufficient last year, but Mr. Bourque declined the offer that was made, and after a good deal of negotiation the department and Mr. Bourque agreed to refer the matter to arbitration. The result of the arbitration has been that $16,500 has been awarded to Mr. Bourque. Out of that sum he had received previously $2,500. The work was to be a very expen-

sive one. It was to cost about $800,000, and I made up my mind that it was better to make that arrangement than to go on with the work.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What the hon. gentleman said last year, when obtaining the vote of $9,000 was, that he had a confidential report; so that I suppose he was informed by his officers that $9,000 would cover the work that was done.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. At that time I had not gone very fully into the matter. However, I had recourse to the only means that was left to me, to refer the whole matter to arbitration.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Who were the arbitrators?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The arbitrators were Mr. Roy, of Montreal, who, I may say, belongs to the same political persuasion as hon. gentlemen opposite, and Mr. Lafontaine, one of the officers of my department. They agreed to the amount of $16,500.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Can the hon. gentleman tell us how that amount was made up?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Here are the details: To expenses connected with the McPhee quarry, the excavation and transportation of stone to the building, $2,749.50; to expenses in opening the Lochiel quarry and extraction of stone prepared for the construction, part of such delivery on the premises, and the balance being at the quarry, $4,247.55; to expenses connected with the purchasing of the McPhee and Lochiel quarries, and to pay judicial expenses incurred, $1,235; to 304,000 bricks delivered on site, $2,736; to excavations and concrete ready to receive the foundations, $1,469.75; to 1,800 feet of water pipe from waterworks to building to supply water for the works, $675; to preparations for the construction and purchase of derricks, $1,000; to travelling expenses, $500; to construction of stable, kitchen and office, $750; to stone dressed at the quarry of Mr. Alexander Robillard, Ottawa, and at the Hull quarries, $1,137.22; making a total of $16,500.02.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What was done with the material for which the Government had to pay?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The materials are still here. We will try to sell them.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Who made the confidential report which the hon. gentleman referred to when taking the $9,000 vote?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I really do not remember.

Mr. TARTE.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What is Mr. Lafontaine's position in the department?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. He is one of the assistant engineers. He is a very able man.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. How long has he been in the department?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. About a year and a half. He is a very capable officer and a highly educated man. He has studied in England, Belgium and France.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What is his salary?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. His salary is $5 a day.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. He is not on the permanent staff?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No.

Mr. WALLACE. Whose place has he taken?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There have been some changes. He has not taken the place of anybody.

Mr. WALLACE. He is an additional appointment, then?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend will find that I have reduced the expenditure by about $33,000.

Mr. MONK. In this case we are paying $16,000, and we have nothing at all. Is that it?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, it is that.

Mr. MONK. It is a very deplorable result.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will tell you all about it, if you would like to know.

Mr. MONK. That is quite enough to know.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. When the hon. gentleman took the vote for $9,000, he did not tell the House that he proposed to appoint as one of the arbitrators an extra clerk who had been in the department only a year. It was a year ago that this subject came up. It is usual, when appointing arbitrators on the part of the Government, to appoint men of experience in the service or from outside. In old times, when arbitrations were frequent, Mr. Page used to be the representative of the department of Railways and Canals, on account of his great experience and high rank, and I think the Minister was running considerable risk, as the result shows, in handing the interests of the department to this newcomer, instead of appointing a higher grade officer and one of more experience. The Minister says he cannot say who gave him

the confidential report on which his estimate of last year was based. I have no doubt it was his chief architect or some one else in high standing; and the difference between that estimate of $9,000 and this one of $16,000 is, I think, the result of the Minister's departure from the rule that has hitherto prevailed, in selecting arbitrators to look after the public interest.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The reason I chose Mr. Lafontaine was that he had a great deal of experience in public buildings. He has been a contractor in Montreal; he has erected a good many public buildings, bridges, etc.; and I thought it was better for me to appoint him, because he would not cost anything extra, whereas an outside man would have to be paid.

Manitoba—Dominion Public Building—
Renewals, improvements, repairs, &c.. $5,000
Portage la Prairie post office..... $8,000

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The Portage la Prairie building will be completed in a month. The contract was given on the 29th July, 1895. The total cost will be $49,568.91.

Mr. FOSTER. How much was expended on it before the change of site?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have not got that now, but gave it last year, and will turn it up in the "Hansard."

Mr. FOSTER. The history of this post office is a little peculiar. We had the promise of the hon. Minister that no change would be made until he had asked for a vote. He sometimes does not give the whole truth, and then afterwards gives as a reason for not telling the truth that he was afraid other people would lie if he did. In this case, he pledged the House two or three times that he would not remove that post office until he came down and asked for a vote with which to do it. Nevertheless after Parliament prorogued, he went to work and made the change. I think he promised about seven times, with reference to the lighting of these buildings, that he would call for tenders. Has he done so?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have done what I am convinced I will prove even to the hon. gentleman was right.

Mr. FOSTER. There is no arguing with the Minister of Public Works. After he distinctly pledges his faith, as a Minister, to Parliament, that he will do so and so he then goes and does the exact opposite, and when we tax him with it afterwards he wants to argue the question. The fact is we cannot quite tell, when the hon. Minister gives a reason for passing an estimate, whether he is giving the whole reason and will stick by what he said. The first thing he is bound to do is to keep his word with regard to the Estimates. In the first of these cases, he would not have got the vote at all unless he had made the pledge he did, and having made that pledge he had no business going outside it and then proceed to give the reason why he did so. When the House passes an estimate on a distinct understanding, that understanding should be adhered to. The House considered that the lighting contract matter should be given out by tender, and seven times the hon. Minister pledged himself that he would do so, but he then went to work and gave it out without calling for tenders. How are we to know that in the case of any single vote he asks us to pass, he is going to do what he tells the House he will? Now, this may be Machiavellian, but it does not seem to be a thing that ought to be supported.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I take in good part what the hon. gentleman has said.

Mr. FOSTER. I say it in sadness, you know.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I know that. I have all sorts of failings I know. But one thing I have never been accused of is failing to keep my word. I keep my word to the letter. If everything my hon. friend says were accurate I should have failed to keep my word, but what he says is not accurate, and I am going to prove it. The hon. gentleman has been a Minister and he knows that in matters of this kind circumstances alter cases. The case was settled and discussed last year, and I do not think my hon. friend is quite in order in going back to it. Last year I gave all the explanations in my power and they were accepted. Public pressure and sentiment was so strong that I felt bound to make the change. Now let us come to the gas and lighting contract.

Mr. FOSTER. I should suggest that my hon. friend leave that until we come to the item for it, it must be discussed. I merely sought to illustrate what was being done in this case by referring to the gas business.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am quite ready to wait until the item comes up, but I wish to protest against the charge the hon. gentleman has made. I am in a position now to give the figures the hon. gentleman asked for. The amount spent when the change was made was $8,860. Of course there is nothing of that lost.

Mr. FOSTER. There must have been something lost. Was not a portion of that for a foundation of the building?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend will remember that last year the House gave $5,000 additional to have the change made. That is all it cost, and I admitted it frankly last year. This site had been forced upon the Public Works Department, it was shown, when Mr. Boyd was in

the House, that the site upon which the building had been begun was chosen against the opinion of the chief architect, against the wish of the department and contrary to the opinion of practically all the people.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman changed it under political pressure.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No.

Mr. FOSTER. There was no other purpose. Mr. Boyd fought that out when he was in the House. The contract had been let and the building commenced, and Mr. Boyd faced an election after the site was chosen, and his majority was not less strong there than before. But the Minister of Public Works has introduced the principle that he may take any contract for a public building and change it, he may change the site on which a public building is being erected, and he can put his hand into the public Treasury and pay out thousands in order that he may yield to the pressure of his political friends. This is the principle he has introduced. He speaks of public pressure. Of course, there is pressure every side.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There was pressure from members of both political parties.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. I think this question has been often enough discussed in this House, and I do not know that lengthy explanations are necessary. The site for the post office at Portage la Prairie was selected when Mr. Boyd was the representative in this House of the constituency of Marquette. The site was in the extreme western portion of the town, in a position very unsatisfactory to the people.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The town is divided into two, is it not?

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Not now. It has changed greatly, and is consolidated into one town instead of being three as it used to be. This site was at the extreme western end of the business portion of the town. The site was extremely unsatisfactory not only to the majority of the people of Portage la Prairie but to the inspector of public buildings, who reported against the site which was, however, insisted on by Mr. Boyd and two or three of his political friends. There has long been in Portage la Prairie what is known as the east and west end pull, which was injurious to the best interests of the town. This, I am glad to say, has been much less a practical evil since the selection of the present site was made. The Minister yielded to the pressure of the town council, the board of trade and other residents of the town, and his doing so has had a very happy result. It has settled the position of the town for all time to come. So far as the $5,000 to make this change is concerned, while that may appear to be an extra charge upon the people, it is not really so. The citizens of Portage la Prairie subscribed over $5,000 and purchased a new site, which was well worth the money and presented it to the Government, so that the Government is well recompensed for the $5,000 expended on the change. This site is worth five or six times as much as the site originally chosen. The site secured by the hon. gentlemen opposite when in power was paid for at the rate of $75 a foot. I was present at an auction sale of property a few months afterwards, when the land immediately adjoining that site could not be sold for $20 a foot, while it was an impossibility to buy the land on which the building has been erecred for less than the $80 a foot which was paid for it. This is a most defensible transaction. It has removed a grievance which would have existed as long as the town stood. In connection with this matter great credit is due to the Minister of Public Works.

Hr. FOSTER. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Tarte) tell us the distance between this site and the old one.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. The distance is not very great. I do not know the size of Marysville, but perhaps the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) has never lived in a small town. If he has he would have known that it was a grievance for the residents at one end to be obliged to walk to the other for their mail.

Mr. McDOUGALL. And the smaller the town the greater the grievance.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. What the hon. gentleman (Mr. McDougall) says is quite true. We have no street cars, and in cold winter weather the citizens would have to walk from three-quarters of a mile to a mile and a half to get their mail. The post office always has the effect of attracting business about it, and this was felt as a grievance by some property owners.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The town council, the board of trade and a vast majority of the citizens applied for the change, and as the site was bought and would be presented to the Government, I thought the people who were so much in earnest should have their way and that I should not hesitate to make the change.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the distance between the two sites?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think about 800 feet.

Mr. FOSTER. I thought the distance was not very great, but when the hon. gentleman opposite (Mr. Rutherford) was speaking, and talked of it being in the extreme western end, I thought maybe I was wrong, and that perhaps there was a mile or two between the two situations. Can my hon. friend say who is right, he or the hon. gentleman

who has just spoken? I understood the Minister to say that the whole cost of the removal to the new site would amount to $5,000, whereas the gentleman who has just spoken, says it does not cost anything.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. What I meant to convey is that when I made the bargain I agreed to pay the contractors $5,000 additional, but in return I got the site. So that my hon. friend is correct.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. The site was worth $75 a foot when the hon. gentleman bought it, but the town has grown since, and it certainly ought to be worth more money now.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman said a moment ago it was worth only $20. He changes his argument to suit the time.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. That is the result of placing a Liberal Government in power. But when the Conservative Government were buying post office sites it cost $75.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I made up my mind that the $5,000 was well invested, that the public interest required me to make the change.

Public Buildings, North-west Territories.. $5,000

Mr. DAVIN. I want to know from the Minister why it is that so small a sum is asked for as $5,000; because he must know that the land titles office in the Regina district, with documents representing millions of dollars, is a most disgraceful building, not fire-proof; and if a fire occurred, all the valuable documents, the title of deeds of settlers in a vast district, would be destroyed. It is perfectly disgraceful. Here we have had to-night evidence that $14,000 can be squandered on a fence that may be properly characterized as a hybrid monstrosity; and $10,000 spent on a greenhouse not necessary at all. But here is a vast portion of the Dominion of Canada left by the hon. gentleman for two years without any attempt made to supply a building for the land titles office. Moreover, there is no building for the Dominion Lands Office. That office is at the present time held in a brick veneered structure that is rented. The hon. gentleman had in the Estimates the first year an item for putting up a proper building that would not only house the Dominion Lands Office, but also the registrar. I want to know why that is dropped, why that building was not proceeded with last year. The Minister of the Interior visited the Land Office, and I understand that he expressed himself as disgusted at the state of things there.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman should know that the small sum of money I am asking is for repairs only. He should know that in the main Estimates we never place items for new work, but only for work which has been begun. I do not know what the Supplementary Estimates will contain about public buildings in Regina, but if there is anything asked this year for that purpose, it will be in the Supplementaries.

Mr. DAVIN. In the Supplementary Estimates of the hon. gentleman the first session he had an item of $10,000 for housing these two offices, nevertheless nothing has been done. I want to know whether it is intended to put an item in the Supplementaries for building a house for the land titles office and the Dominion Lands Office.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The Supplementary Estimates have not yet been discussed before Council.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) says there is no place in Regina to keep the public records, and that it is a scandal to this country. Well, if it is a scandal to this country, it is a scandal to hon. gentlemen opposite. They have spent of public money in Regina alone, on public buildings, $365,000. I asked a return two years ago myself, and that return is to be found in the records of Parliament, showing that $365.000 has been spent in Regina on public buildings. If there is no place to keep the public records, it is a disgrace to the hon. gentlemen opposite. I want to say to the Minister of Public Works, I am not going to threaten him, but he had better be very careful in any estimate he brings down for public buildings in Regina. What has become of that $365,000? Where has it gone?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I may say that in spite of that vast amount of money spent in Regina, the member for Assiniboia is right in saying that there is no place for the safe-keeping of the public records.

Mr. DAVIN. I am glad to see that my hon. friend from Wellington (Mr. McMullen) is showing some of his former force and fire when he was the gutter of the Auditor General's luminous volume, and used to enlighten this House on the subject of economy. The hon. gentleman who a short time ago slunk out of this committee when there was a vote coming on, the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) now comes and lectures us in regard to expenditures at Regina. He says he will not threaten the Minister of Public Works. He can threaten no longer and the Minister need not fear him. The Government have him, and he is their very humble servant; the charge of his pistol is drawn; he is an extinct volcano with a vengeance. When the hon. gentleman rises and makes a criticism, we know that he is a toy with which children in the galleries might be amused, when he pulls his own wire and gives off a galvanic spark such as we have witnessed. Let me

tell him that the building where the land office was formerly was burnt down, but it was not burnt down under the same auspices as the Western Block here was burnt down, for it was destroyed a short time before the Minister came into office. The member for North Wellington has intimated that although $325,000 were expended in Regina, there is not a public building there fit to house the land titles documents. A land office was built there with that scrupulous economy which sometimes characterized the predecessors of hon. gentlemen opposite. It was a small frame building, and we were always looking forward to the time when that important department would be brought into the building I have spoken of, if it had not been burnt down. The Minister of the Interior, as well as the Minister of Public Works, is aware of the need that exists for a public building at Regina for the purpose of which I speak. With respect to the money spent there, the hon. member for North Wellington should remember that it is a town surrounded by a good farming country, where a court-house and post office had to be built, and it is moreover the Capital of the North-west Territories. It is also the principal seat of the mounted police and was the headquarters of the Indian Department when an Indian commissioner lived in the Territories instead of in Winnipeg. Among the buildings to account for the $325,000 expenditure, where a jail for the Territories, a court-house, post office, indian commissioner's office, legislative buildings, buildings for the Territorial Government and Government House, where at one time we thought the hon. member for North Wellington would be the presiding deity, but it is going to be the member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron). At this hour of the night, I will not pause to dwell on the enormity of a man like the hon. member for Huron sitting here, voting and speaking——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. DAVIN. I see I am out of order, and I will anticipate the chairman of the committee. Returning to speak of Regina, I may say that we have also barracks for 200 mounted police. Taking the scale of Estimates such as we have considered tonight, $10,000 for a greenhouse and $14,000 for a fence, partly stone and partly wire, it is astonishing that such a large number of public buildings should have been erected there for $325,000. The public needs require that we should have a proper building for the Land Titles' Office and for the Dominion Land Office, and I will ask the Minister of Public Works to disregard the threat of the hon. member for North Wellington, who I am sure has not a pistol in his revolver pocket, and provide means for meeting the public requirements in the matter on which I have commented.

Mr. DAVIN.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. gentleman has said that in Regina there is a Government House. We ought to have two Government houses there. One was built at a cost of $27,000. What has been done with that building?

Mr. DAVIN. It is there still.

Mr. McMULLEN. Then there was another Government House built, at a cost of over $40,000.

Mr. DAVIN. It is there still.

Mr. McMULLEN. Cherry blinds were sent there from Montreal at a cost of $19 a set. That is characteristic of the manner in which $365,000 have been spent at Regina. It would be better for hon. gentlemen opposite if all these buildings were burnt down as they are standing monuments to their folly. The hon. gentleman has twitted me about going to Regina. If there is one thing that would deter me from going there, it is the fact that the hon. gentleman resides there. I admit that I have met him in Regina. But joking aside, we cannot afford to spend money recklessly either in Regina or anywhere else. There should be a building in which to store the public records, and if there is not one there now, it is a disgrace to hon. gentlemen opposite who expended that large amount on public buildings.

Mr. POPE. I am much astonished at the remark made by the hon. member (Mr. McMullen). We voted on an item of $10,000 for the construction of a greenhouse which nearly half of the committee considered extravagant, and although the hon. gentleman was in the House when the item was being discussed and when the vote was about to be taken, he had not the manly courage to remain in the Chamber but sneaked out the back way.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. POPE. He complains of the cost of the shutters at Government House, but the cost of the greenhouse would have bought 800 pairs of shutters, and when the vote was being taken on that he left the House. It was a most inconsistent position for the hon. gentleman to take. For a man so well versed in parliamentary proceedings, he placed himself in a very miserable position indeed.

Mr. McMULLEN. Had I been in the Chamber I would have voted against the greenhouse. Call for a vote of this House, with the ayes and nays, and I will vote against it.

Mr. DAVIN. My hon. friend (Mr. McMullen) will have to reconsider his antipathy to being in a place where I am, because I intend to get to heaven, and if he

does not wish to be with me, then he will have to go below.

Mr. POPE. I should like to know why the hon. member (Mr. McMullen) left the House when the vote on the greenhouse was being taken.

Mr. McMULLEN. I did not leave because a vote was about to be taken. My hon. friend will not insist upon a response as to why I left ?

Mr. POPE. Certainly.

Mr. McMULLEN. Well, gentlemen have often got to leave the Chamber of this House. Hon. gentlemen may laugh, but I have been in this House for sixteen years, and I defy any man to say that I ever shirked a vote once.

Mr. POPE. Why did not the hon. gentleman protest against the greenhouse expenditure when he was in the House ?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order. That has nothing to do with the item under discussion.

Mr. POPE. But we are protesting against extravagant expenditure here, and we say the hon. member for North Wellington is helping us.

Mr. McMULLEN. There will be another opportunity of moving that that item be struck out.

Mr. POPE. I regret that the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) had to leave the Chamber under such painful circumstances when the vote was being taken.

Victoria Public Building—Treasury vault. $16,000

Mr. MONTAGUE. What about this vault ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This vault has been applied for by the Department of Finance.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Where does the estimate come from ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We asked for tenders and we accepted the lowest.

Mr. MONTAGUE. How many tenders were received ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Two ; Goldie & McCullough and J. J. Taylor.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Which got the contract ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. J. & J. Taylor.

Dominion Buildings, British Columbia—
Repairs, &c..... $5,000

Mr. BERGERON. What is this for ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is the ordinary vote taken every year.

Mr. BERGERON. Who is this estimate made out by ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. By the chief architect, on the report of the local officer, Mr. Henderson.

Mr. BERGERON. This sum is voted every year. It looks like a standing vote. Is the Minister sure that that amount of money will be needed.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am sure that $6,450 has been estimated for. We always try to keep down the cost of the repairs as well as we can.

Mr. MONK. This item of $16,000 for a treasury vault seems to me to be very large. I suppose J. & J. Taylor will only put in the doors ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. They will do the whole work, except the foundations.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In the original plan, a vault of a plain character was shown ; but we wanted a more modern vault, as considerable money is kept there, and a plan was made for a vault corresponding with those in the Eastern Block.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We asked for tenders from those who manufacture that kind of work.

Public Buildings Generally..... $9,000

Mr. INGRAM. I do not rise for the purpose of finding fault with this item. If anything, it is perhaps too small. I simply rise to point out to the hon. gentleman that some little repairs in the post office in St. Thomas are required, and have been for some time. So far as I am concerned, I am not particular whether the hon. gentleman makes the repairs or not. I simply wish to say that some parts of the building are disgraceful, and the department will be doing a good act by spending a small part of this sum to repair it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The chief architect tells me that there is something in the Supplementary Estimates for the St. Thomas post office.

Mr. BERGERON. What is this special item of $5,000 for ? We have a separate vote for each province, and we have this supplementary vote besides.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is the usual vote, which is taken for things that cannot be classified as works. For instance, it includes the travelling expenses of our officers, stationery, sundries, and so on.

Mr. BERGERON. To say it is the usual vote is no answer at all. It might have been bad in the past. The hon. gentleman speaks about stationery. That is something new, and needs some explanation.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If my hon. friend had been as careful of the public interest in the past as he is now, he would have found that the details of this expenditure have been given every year in the Auditor General's Report.

Mr. MONK. I do not think that is an answer to the hon. member for Beauharnois at all. We are told that it is expended on stationery. That is to me pre-eminently unsatisfactory. I do not intend to insist on the details now, but if this vote is asked for next year, I will ask for details.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am surprised at the hon. gentleman taking that position, as he is a man of experience, and knows that there are many little expenditures in connection with public buildings that cannot be estimated for.

Mr. INGRAM. I think this is an item that can be thoroughly justified. The public buildings we have in Canada are largely used by the public, and there must be many expenses resulting from the wear and tear of those buildings that cannot be provided for in the regular Estimates. In my judgment, the amount should be increased.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I frankly say that we are not getting enough. The explanations I have given of the item are the same that have been given for the last fifteen years.

Mr. BERGERON. That is not an answer.

Mr. MONTAGUE. What I understand the hon. Minister to mean is that the item given above for the premises are what he has estimated for, but that this item is to cover unforeseen repairs that may be required during the year. The vote, however, is misleading as it appears.

Mr. POPE. I think the hon. Minister will satisfy the committee by assuring us that there will not be any boodle in this thing.

Experimental Farms—New buildings and improvements, renewals, repairs, &c., in connection with the existing buildings, fences, &c..... $6,000

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This vote is to provide for the construction of a laboratory at the Central Experimental Farm and for renewals, repairs, &c.

Mr. POPE. What is the estimated cost of the construction of the laboratory?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am informed that it will cost about $6,000.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Is it intended to provide for the construction of a shelter for visitors?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No.

Resolutions to be reported.

Mr. BERGERON.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. MONTAGUE. What will be the business to-morrow?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We will take up the Post Office Bill and then proceed with Supply if we have sufficient time.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 1.15 a.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 13th May, 1898.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. SPROULE. Before the Orders of the Day are called, Mr. Speaker, I wish to refer to a portion of the report which appeared in the "Citizen" of this morning of what I said in the House yesterday. I have no doubt the error was unintentional, but it conveys a different impression entirely from that which I intended to convey and which I think my words would convey. The discussion was on the subject brought up by the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. McDougall). Speaking with regard to the petition which was sent to Rome by the parties who, it was said, represents the Reform party, this report says:

> Dr. Sproule strongly reprobated the idea of any interference in the affairs of Canada by any representative sent from Rome, as would be the case, doubtless, if a Papal delegate came to this country.

Now, I have only to say that I made no mention of a Papal delegate, nor have I the slightest objection to a Papal delegate or any number of them coming to regulate the internal affairs of the Church, which I have always understood to be the object of their visit and not that they were brought here to interfere with the rights of the people or of Parliament. The objection that I took was to application being made to a foreign potentate to assist the Government of the day or the party in power to secure to the people their civil rights. The right to use their electoral franchise freely without interference or intimidation, and to vote for whom they desire, is a right secured to the people by our laws; and it is the duty of the Government to enforce the law so as to maintain this right rather than to apply to a foreign power to do what the Government ought to do.

CONTRACTS FOR SUPPLIES FOR N. W. MOUNTED POLICE.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I called the attention of the Government recently to certain facts which seemed to disturb the Pacific Coast Canadian cities in connection with the instructions issued with reference to the granting of licenses at the passes ; and the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton), according to his promise, subsequently made a statement which confirmed in part the news that I brought before the House. I deem it my duty now to bring to the attention of the Government further information which is disturbing the Pacific Coast cities with regard to the transport of troops or munitions for troops, a subject which was recently referred to in the House and upon which no definite statement has been made. After I have drawn attention to a newspaper article I have here, all I would ask, at this stage, is that the Government would be good enough to make a statement of the exact facts of the case. All the information we at present have is that a contract was given to the Grand Trunk Railway, over its American connections, for taking certain supplies to the Yukon, and I do not think it was said that any of the troops were going by that route. But, in the Seattle "Post-Intelligencer" of May 5th, 1898, there is a sample of various items of news concerning the management of our affairs and transportation matters which, as I say, is not at all pleasant reading to those who are interested in the Canadian shipping ports :

WILL GO BY WAY OF SEATTLE.

Canadian Government Comes Here to Make Alaska Shipments.

Sifton Lets a Big Contract.

Arranges with a Local Transportation Company to carry to the mouth of the Yukon the latter part of May, 200 troops and 400 tons of freight—Are for Mounted Police in the Yukon Country.

The Canadian Government has entered into a contract with the Boston & Alaska Transportation Company for the delivery of 400 tons of freight and over 200 troops into the Yukon district of the North-west Territory. The entire shipment of freight will be routed by way of Seattle, and will be carried by the company's steamship Laurada, which leaves this city for the mouth of the Yukon the latter part of the present month.

While no information of a definite character has been received here concerning the intentions of the Dominion Government, it is known that a large number of troops and mounted police will be taken into the Yukon district this season. Supply stations will be established at Fort Selkirk and at Dawson, with possibly a third station somewhere on the Stewart River, which will be the rendevous of hundreds of gold hunters during the ensuing summer.

The fact that the Canadian Government found it necessary to come to Seattle to secure transportation facilities for this important shipment of supplies for the troops and mounted police is but one of countless incidents that have afforded proof of the absolutely supremacy of Seattle as the outfitting and transportation centre for Alaska and the gold fields of the far north. The contract with the Boston & Alaska Transportation Company was entered into on behalf of the Government at Ottawa by Dominion Minister of the Interior Sifton. Mr. Sifton's act constitutes an official recognition of a fact that has long been apparent to Alaska travellers and the public generally throughout the country, that Seattle is the terminus of practically all of the important steamship companies operating between the States and Alaska.

The Dominion Government will send its 400 tons of supplies for the mounted police and the troops to Seattle, where they will be loaded on the steamship Laurada. The shipment, it is understood, was taken at tariff rates, $200 per ton.

A Post-Intelligencer reporter, learning yesterday of the contract between the Canadian Government and the steamship company called at the offices of the company for confirmation of the story. General Traffic Manager Cronenwett was at first inclined to be reticent concerning the shipment. Finally, however, he admitted that the business had been secured by the company and that the freight was to be forwarded by steamer from Seattle to the mouth of the Yukon and thence up the Yukon by the earliest river steamers to be despatched by the company this season. Time is an essential element in the contract, said Mr. Cronenwett, and it will be the aim of the company to rush the shipment as rapidly as possible.

"Negotiations have been carried on between the representatives of this company and the Canadian Government for three months past," said Mr. Cronenwett. "These negotiations ended by the shipment being awarded to us. That is all there is in the story. You can be assured that the Ottawa Government would not have entered into the contract with our company had they not fully satisfied themselves that we were equipped to handle the consignment and to rush it through to destination upon an agreed schedule.

"We are gratified that the shipment has been routed via Seattle. This, of course, constitutes a recognition from a most valuable source of the fact that Seattle is the main port of departure for Alaska points. You can see that all of the influence we can bring to bear to fortify the position already occupied by Seattle in relation to the northern trade and transportation will be utilized to that end."

The value to Seattle of the contract made by the Dominion Government will appear when it is known that it has been the policy of the Dominion Government to patronize Canadian transportation lines exclusively. This is no more than natural. It is also recognized everywhere that the Dominion Government is constituted on business principles. The conclusion from these two propositions is that Minister Sifton found, after making a careful investigation of the facilities afforded for making the shipment at Victoria and Vancouver, that they were not to be compared with those of Seattle.

The Laurada, Capt. Scott, will sail for New Boston, at the mouth of the Yukon, about May 28.

I need not comment upon the importance of the statements contained in this article. I would ask that as soon as possible the Government should state exactly the full facts—we have only had them partially stated—

touching the arrangements for the supplies and what quantity of them will be shipped by this route.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). As far as the Department of Militia is concerned, I have very little to add to what I have already said. The hon. gentleman who has read this is, I think, to a certain extent, playing the game of the Seattle people who have inspired this article, by giving it the prominence which he has given it. However, I do not charge that he intends to do anything of the kind. Now, the facts are simply these: The Boston and Alaskan Transportation Company, as I said before, are carrying 250 tons of freight to Fort Selkirk for the Government of Canada. About one-third of that freight is taken on board steamer at Seattle; the remainder is going from Vancouver. Not a single soldier is going from Seattle or Vancouver on board those steamers, except two men who we think necessary to send forward with the freight in order to watch it and see that it is properly looked after. Therefore, the statement with reference to troops or a very large quantity of freight being carried that way, is absolutely without the slightest foundation in fact. The attempt on the part of this newspaper to boom the city of Seattle through misstatements of this kind, ought to be too transparent to require serious consideration. I have already authorized telegrams to be sent to Vancouver contradicting the statement, and I hope that we shall now have heard the last of this matter.

Mr. FOSTER. Would the hon. gentleman state what tonnage of the supplies goes by way of Vancouver, and whether those supplies are put on this company's boats there; also whether there are not British vessels which are plying from Vancouver and Victoria through the Yukon River to the Yukon district, and whether any negotiations were had with any of these?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I may tell the hon. gentleman that the quartermaster general, Col. Lake, has had charge of this whole matter. He was in communication with various transportation lines, including the two old established lines known as the Alaskan and the North American and others; and he was unable to find any line prepared to take freight to Fort Selkirk. The two old lines to which I have referred, would not undertake to carry a single pound of freight even to Dawson City, and we were really unable to make any satisfactory arrangement for the transportation of freight by any other company. Col. Lake, after taking every means to ascertain the capabilities of this company, recommended very strongly that arrangements should be made with them. I am not aware that any English companies were at that time—there may be now—in existence who would undertake to carry that freight. The report I have received is as I have stated, that this was the best arrangement which could be made. This company insisted that a certain portion of the freight should be taken over at Seattle, they wished to divide it between two of their boats; one of their boats was willing to call at Vancouver, and the other they did not think would go forward as rapidly as desired, and they did not wish that boat to call. Consequently we agreed that the smaller portion of the freight might be taken on at Seattle, that portion being shipped partly over the Grand Trunk Railway and partly over the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I want to say one thing about the other vessels not being available. Captain Irvine, of the Canadian Pacific Navigation Company, informed me personally months ago that he had had communication with the Minister of the Interior, in which he protested against a shipment, very early this year or in December, by some American line to the Yukon.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). The hon. gentleman is confusing different matters. That was in connection with a shipment from Vancouver to Skagway, with regard to which there was no question, and the voyage was very easy to accomplish.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I want to say——

Mr. SPEAKER. Hon. gentlemen are drifting into a debate.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I merely wish to make a remark which may be of importance to the Government. This information given to me was that having protested against these American vessels being called in to carry Government supplies from Canadian points to the Yukon, he received an assurance from the Minister of the Interior, that it would not occur again, and it had only occurred once when the department were in a great hurry, and were not aware of the facilities that the Canadian Pacific Navigation Company could afford.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Perhaps I may be permitted to say, in explanation of the hon. gentleman's statement, that the apparent neglect of the Canadian Pacific Navigation Company was due entirely to the fault of their agent. Inquiries were properly made for the purpose of ascertaining if the goods could be shipped by their boats in the first place, and their agent apparently misinformed Mr. White, the Comptroller of the Mounted Police, and I found, when inquiring into the matter, that Mr. White was not in any respect to blame, the fault lay

with the company and its agents. The transportation which the hon. gentleman has thus referred to, is an entirely different matter from transportation by way of the Yukon. Anybody that has a seaworthy steamboat can take freight to Skagway, but it is an entirely different matter to get a guarantee by competent parties to deliver goods in the Yukon district, covering the navigation of the Yukon River for 1,600 or 1,700 miles.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I wish to add one word in reply to the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper). The Canadian Pacific Navigation Company has been employed, as I stated before, to carry all the troops and the supplies that they were taking with them for some six months, to the Yukon. When we asked whether they would take our supplies by the Yukon River, they offered to do so at a price very much higher than the price we are paying, and they did not offer to give a guarantee of delivery at as favourable a time as we desired.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Will the hon. gentleman be good enough to let the House have the papers relating to this transportation?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. We would like to have all the papers in reference to this matter in the possession of the Government. I see a difference between sending stuff up by the Yukon and sending it to Skagway. But it is an interesting question, and the House would like to have all the papers.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Does the hon. gentleman want a statement of what has been done?

Mr. FOSTER. I think the House would like all the papers in connection with this transportation.

Mr. MORRISON. I rise mainly to make a suggestion to the senior member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper).

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member can ask a question of the Government, but he cannot make a speech.

Mr. MORRISON. I am asking the permission of the House to draw attention——

Mr. SPEAKER. This is not the time or place to draw attention, unless the hon. gentleman has a question to ask from the Government.

Mr. MORRISON. I desire to make a suggestion, and in order to make my remarks——

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman, I understand, wishes to move the adjournment of the House.

Mr. MORRISON. The suggestion I wish to make most respectfully is this: Let the extract which has just been read from the Seattle "Post-Intelligencer," be the last extract from an American newspaper read in this House and put upon the "Hansard," thus enabling it to be afterwards circulated throughout the country in the various newspapers. It has been several times done here. One instance was in the case of the "San Francisco Examiner," a paper that is known in journalistic parlance as a yellow journal; and another was the Seattle "Post-Intelligencer," which is not far behind it in that respect. They published interviews that never occurred, they published articles which have been read on the floor of this House and given an important prominence which they should not receive, but which were intended to get into the hands of the hon. gentlemen opposite, and for all I know are inspired from here.

An hon. MEMBER. From Ottawa?

Mr. MORRISON. I will not go so far as that. There is, of course, that inference to be drawn. The point I want to make is, that hon. members on both sides of this House should strongly deprecate this practice of reading similar extracts from Pacific Coast American newspapers. The Seattle "Post-Intelligencer" has shown how this matter can be worked. They got up a fake interview, pointing out that Seattle had been selected not only as the central point of shipment by the American people, but by the Canadian Government, as in fact the only point from which to tranship and start for the Yukon country. I do not think the hon. gentleman intended any such use should have been made of this article. But the effect is the same. Seattle is boomed from this House as being the only place from which people should start for the Yukon. It seems to me that the hon. gentleman would, perhaps, have accomplished more if he had not made any reference on the floor of the House to this article which appeared in a Pacific Coast newspaper, and I hope this will be the last time such interviews appearing in American newspapers will be quoted in this House. In making this suggestion, I make it most respectfully, and I trust the hon. member will understand that I do not mean to impute that he adopted this course with any ulterior purpose. There is the effect, no matter what the intention has been; and I believe in due course we shall see in the Seattle "Post-Intelligencer" a notice of this debate and the prominence given to the port of Seattle on the floor of the Canadian Parliament.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I shall without doubt take the advice of the hon. gentleman who has addressed the House for what it is worth, and no more. The trouble in this case, I am sorry to observe, has not appealed to the hon. gentle-

man's mind, because he should have been equally disturbed when, notwithstanding what the yellow journals may say or what the Seattle "Post-Intelligencer" may report, the Minister of Militia substantially endorses the head lines of the article, the important statement in the article I read to the House. Whether these articles will do harm or not from being read in this House, the hon. gentleman will agree with me that if he thinks them harmful, the fact that they are substantially true and are so represented by a responsible member of this Government, will surely do a great deal more harm. What is the main fact brought out by the "Post-Intelligencer" and confirmed by the Minister of Militia? The hon. gentleman admits that the article is injurious to Canadian interests, and the headings say: "Canadian goods will go by way of Seattle. The Canadian Government come here to make their shipments." The hon. gentleman tells us that this matter should not be stated openly, but it should be whispered: but there is the fact that the Minister of Militia states that it is true, that over 200 tons of Canadian goods are to be sent from an American port by an American vessel to a Canadian destination. The hon. gentleman will see, therefore, this is a matter to be deplored, and those journals are not wholly inaccurate in the statement made that our Government, above all other Governments, has chosen to send their goods by an American port and on board an American vessel at the very time when the Congress of the United States has made it impossible for their Government, if they ever thought of doing such a thing in that country, to use British vessels to carry American goods shipped from one of our ports to an American destination.

Mr. MORRISON. After what the Minister of Militia has stated, is it fair to assert that Seattle has been selected by the Canadian Government as the port of shipment?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That is the fact. This was stated by the Minister, and the hon. gentleman will explain in private to the hon. member what he said in public. It is a fact that 200 tons of Canadian goods and supplies have been shipped from that port.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). About 100 tons.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. There is, then, only this difference, as to whether the quantity was 200 tons or 100 tons. But the point is made by that newspaper at Seattle that the port has been selected for shipment of goods by the Canadian Government, and this has been done by a Government that has pretended for some time their willingness to adopt the policy of Canada for the Canadians. And yet the Government are doing what is beneficial to that city, and which hon. gentlemen well know, if they will not admit it, is detrimental to the rival cities of Victoria and Vancouver; and yet, forsooth, the hon. gentleman says that these facts should not be mentioned. This is the place to mention them with a view to prevent repetition, and instead of criticising any hon. member, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Morrison) should be willing to join in any pressure brought to bear on the present Government to prevent the recurrence of this state of things. Then the hon. gentleman, instead of criticising my remarks, should have come to my rescue and to the rescue, which is of far greater importance, of his own constituents; but he lectured the House and suggested a new mode of doing business. The procedure I adopted was the usual parliamentary method, and when the hon. gentleman has remained here a little longer, he will understand that if these matters are not brought up, as this matter has been brought up, the very evil, which he practically admits already to exist, will grow rather than decrease. So I would tender back a little advice to the hon. gentleman, and that is, to watch this Government, which he supports, a little more closely, and to help to advocate the interests of his own people and not be terrified from reading American journals in this House.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I have listened with some surprise to the hon. gentleman in his criticism respecting the loss of trade suffered by Canadian ports. This Government which the hon. gentleman criticised most severely went to a great deal of trouble at the early part of the session for the purpose of ensuring that a large amount of the trade should come to Canadian ports, and I think the House and country will learn with a very great deal of surprise that it is the desire of hon. gentlemen opposite that this trade should be done by Canadian ports. Judging by the attitude and the action of these gentlemen and their friends here and elsewhere, it might be very fairly assumed that it was the policy and the intention and the desire of these hon. gentlemen, that the trade should be driven away from Canadian ports rather than that it should come to Canadian ports. We endeavoured to tell these hon. gentlemen at an earlier period of the session what was going to happen if the policy of the Government was not carried out, and if the plans which we adopted for the purpose of securing this trade for the Dominion were not approved by the Parliament of Canada. But we were told in the most contemptuous terms that this was all a bugaboo, a creature of the imagination, that no such untoward results would follow, that there was no necessity for the railroad that we desired to have constructed, and that there were plenty of other ways of getting into the Yukon country. What happened? My

hon. friend the Minister of Militia (Mr. Borden) is called upon to secure the transport of his men and supplies. If our policy had been followed up, these supplies would have gone from Vancouver, a Canadian port, in a Canadian vessel, up the Stikine River and across a Canadian railway.

Mr. MONTAGUE. May I ask my hon. friend (Mr. Sifton) when this Stikine road was to be completed ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It was to have been completed by the 1st of September.

Mr. MONTAGUE. May I ask my hon. friend (Mr. Sifton) further : Did he intend to hold these supplies until the 1st of September ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes, Sir, that is exactly what it was proposed to do. The supplies that my hon. friend the Minister of Militia is sending by this transportation company are the supplies for the next year and a half for the militia, every pound of which would have gone over the Stikine and Teslin Lake Railway if it had not been for the obstruction to and destruction of that Bill.

Mr. MONTAGUE. May I ask my hon. friend another question ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Certainly.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I understand that this is only a portion of the supplies.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Only a portion.

Mr. MONTAGUE. How are the other supplies going ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The boat is going to call at Vancouver, but it is an American boat. I suppose that all this talk about the transfer of trade from Vancouver to Seattle amounts to this : That instead of the boat calling at Vancouver to pick it up at the wharf there, it is going to pick up the hundred tons off the wharf at Seattle. That is all it amounts to. But I will call the attention of my hon. friend to the real trouble. The real trouble is not that the boat takes 100 tons from off the Seattle wharf instead of the Vancouver wharf, but that it is an American transportation company which is carrying these provisions. It is Americans with whom we are compelled to do the business, and I can tell my hon. friends more, that when we required to get a supply of provisions for the mounted police force and for the officials of the Interior Department in that district for the next year, owing to the defeat of this railway Bill, we have been compelled to contract with the American transportation companies or else run the risk of our men starving to death during the next year. The hon. gentleman has now got the first instalment of the result of the policy in which he and his friends have indulged.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I was about to say, in not such forcible language as my hon. friend (Mr. Sifton) is able to do, but in substance, what he has stated.

Mr. SPROULE. The forcible language is not forcible argument.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I meant forcible argument. When I was asked to send a detachment of troops into the Yukon, we proposed to send the men up the Stikine River and across from Glenora to Teslin and with them a hundred tons of freight, being sufficient for their sustenance for perhaps six months. I have adhered to that part of our programme and our troops are going up.

Mr. MONTAGUE. When were you going to send them ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. As they are going now, without the assistance of the railway, because we intended to send them as soon as navigation was open. That part of our programme we have adhered to, and some 100 tons of freight with the 200 men will soon be on their way up the Stikine River to cross from Glenora to Teslin and thence down to Fort Selkirk. But it was also our intention to have sent forward at a later period 250 tons of freight over the Stikine Railway, which, if our policy had been carried into effect, would have been constructed and ready to take that freight after the 1st of September. That was our programme. When that railway policy was defeated by hon. gentlemen opposite, then, if we were to send these troops in there at all, we were compelled to take other means, and on account of the very great expense of sending this freight overland, we have accepted the best offer we could get and the only offer we could get, and we are sending the supplies on American ships a small portion from an American port. We have taken the best means at our disposal, in consequence of the defeat of the railway Bill, and hon. gentlemen opposite are entirely responsible for our being obliged to do so. But, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me an extraordinary thing that these hon. gentlemen should express such abhorrence at our sending—not American goods, but Canadian goods purchased here—over an American wharf into a boat which is the only means by which we can get these goods into that country. These are the gentlemen who a few years ago paid out lavishly the money of the Dominion of Canada to build a railway through the whole length of the state of Maine. These gentlemen opposite are remarkably virtuous now, but, Sir, their insincerity is so transparent that it will recoil upon themselves.

Mr. DAVIN. Before I deal with the extraordinary argument made by the Minister of Militia and the Minister of the Interior, I wish to explain to my hon. friend from British Columbia (Mr. Morrison) why we on this side are estopped by reverence from taking his advice as to our conduct of public business. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Morrison) advises us that we must not quote from American newspapers, but he forgets that we have an illustrious example in the Minister of the Interior, who made an elaborate argument in favour of this very Yukon Railway from an article in an American paper. And, Sir, as throwing a light on the more serious aspect of this little debate, I want to point out what that quotation by the Minister of the Interior was. On February 16th, the Minister of the Interior, in order to prove to the Canadian Parliament that his Yukon deal was a very good one, quoted from the New York "Commercial Advertiser" of February 4th. February 4th, mark you, was the day following the meeting of this Parliament, and therefore somebody or other must have been very anxious to post the New York "Commercial Advertiser" as to the policy of the Canadian Government. And, Sir, if we did not know, we could easily infer that there is a well-known journalist in the employ of the present Government who flits across the line and goes to Washington and goes to New York, and just at the right time places articles in American newspapers that can be quoted back by Ministers of the Crown in order to support any position they may take. It is not possible that without being thus posted the New York "Commercial Advertiser" could have been in a position to write the article that was quoted by the Minister of the Interior, and which will be found in "Hansard" of February 16th. Let me ask the hon. gentleman from British Columbia, who with great modesty began to lecture a member on this side of the House, who has been a long time in Parliament and a long time a Minister of the Crown, as to his parliamentary demeanour—how can we, with the example of the Minister of the Interior before us, take his advice? Does he not see that he has been rather inattentive, as has been hinted by the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper), to what has been taking place in this House, or he would not give this backhanded slap to the Minister of the Interior? Hon. gentlemen have with great self-gratulation seized on the fact that they have themselves diverted into American channels what should have gone through Canadian channels. They have seized on that as a means of reproving the Opposition for doing what? For asserting a policy which was endorsed yesterday in the Liberal caucus. Why, Sir, the Liberal caucus has endorsed the policy of this Opposition, which was to say that the Yukon deal, as stated by the Minister of the Interior, was a bad arrangement, an expensive arrangement, and was not needed, and that the arguments that were used to support it were not just. Take the arguments that have been used here to-day. They are precisely some of the arguments that were used to support that Yukon deal. What is it hon. gentlemen say? That if we had allowed them to build 150 miles of railway, forsooth, thousands of tons of freight would have been carried over thousands of miles of distance next September—freight that they now have to send in by a roundabout way. Why, Sir, the thing is an impudent invention, made in the effort to get an argument against the Opposition—an impudent invention by the Minister of the Interior to try to cover his ignominious retreat—a retreat in which he is flying, not before the Opposition merely, but before the arrows sent after him by his own supporters. Why, Sir, I would astonish the Minister of the Interior if I were to tell him what has been said to me in confidence by leading members of the Liberal party in regard to what the Opposition have done for the Liberal party.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Name.

Mr. DAVIN. I will tell you what was said to me by a leading member of the Liberal party.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Name; name.

Mr. DAVIN. Do not be too much alarmed. I will tell you what he said.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). I thought you said it was told to you in confidence.

Mr. DAVIN. In confidence as to his name.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. DAVIN. I will tell you what he said. He said: "The Liberal party ought to be thankful to the Opposition; they have got it out of a big hole."

Some hon. MEMBERS. Name.

Mr. DAVIN. There are gentlemen around me who heard that same gentleman say it. I will not give the name; the chances are that if his views are not attended to, you may hear from him direct without my giving his name. Now, I think I have pricked the contemptible bubble set afloat by the Minister of the Interior. That hon. gentleman's first elaborate speech consisted in blowing the same kind of impudent bubbles, and the moment they were touched by the leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper), the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster), and some others, they vanished into the thinnest of thin air. Reverting again to the hon. gentleman from British Columbia, not only did he strike between the eyes the Minister of the Interior for

his gross impropriety in quoting from an American journal to buttress up a Canadian Government's policy, but he struck at the leader of the Government. Why, Sir, the first time the leader of the Government announced his policy, he announced it through the medium of a Chicago newspaper. So that my hon. friend from British Columbia should be a little careful before he lectures this side of the House as to parliamentary demeanour. I have often given members on that side of the House good advice, and I would give a piece of advice to the Minister of the Interior and to the Minister of Militia (Mr. Borden, King's, N.S.) that however daring they may be, not to be quite so daring as to put forward childish arguments such as we have heard here to-day, that because a railway of 150 miles in a vast region had not been arranged to be built by the end of next September, therefore, they have to send by a roundabout way a portion of the trade going into the Yukon.

Mr. WALLACE. The Minister of the Interior said the country would learn with surprise that the Conservative party desired that these goods for the Yukon should go by Canadian ports. Mr. Speaker, that accusation does not require any refutation from any Conservative member of this House, because the history of the Conservative party in the past would give the lie direct to any such insinuation. Sir, what is the history of the Conservative party? That for eighteen years, during which they have been in power, they have constantly been building up Canadian industries and Canadian lines of communication with other countries, and looking after Canadian interests generally. What during that time has been the course of these gentlemen who are to-day on the Treasury benches? Commercial union was their programme until a few years ago. Suppose they had been successful in 1891 in having a policy of commercial union or unrestricted reciprocity, or whatever you may call it—it is all the same thing—adopted, and that policy were in force to-day; where would Canadian goods for the Yukon be? Not a dollar's worth of Canadian goods would go to the Yukon, because American goods would then come into Canada absolutely free of duty. Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of this House, and it has been called by other members, to the fact that the Government have not shown themselves alive to the importance of promoting Canadian business with that Yukon country. The customs authorities for a long time were doing nothing. They sent an agent to Washington in the person of the Minister of the Interior, who knew absolutely nothing of the customs business and the customs requirements, but who came back and said that he had made an arrangement, but we found that it was no arrangement, but that as month after month dragged along, the commercial ports of Vancouver and Victoria were sending telegrams here, day after day, complaining that the statements that had been made by the Minister of the Interior that we were to have customs facilities through American territory were not being carried out. The whole matter was neglected, and we hear to-day that the first instalment of supplies for our contingent going to the Yukon is going by American ports and in American vessels. We have Canadian ports, and why not have those Canadian goods sent from Victoria or Vancouver. Every move these hon. gentlemen make is in the interests of the American states and to the detriment of British citizens on the Pacific Coast and Canadian trade. When the hon. Minister (Mr. Sifton) asserts that the Conservative party are responsible for this, inasmuch as if we had consented to the building of this railway, this would never have happened, he is advancing what he knows to be an utterly sophistical argument. If we had consented that our law should be violated and the contract given out without public tender or public competition——

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman cannot refer to a past debate.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. Minister of the Interior did so.

Mr. SPEAKER. He touched upon it.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. Minister of the Interior, in his last statement, said that if the policy of the Government had been carried out, the road to the Yukon would have been built, and the Government would have sent our goods over that road, but, he said, that policy was defeated by the influence of the Opposition in the Senate. I was in reply giving the reasons why the Opposition opposed that policy, but as I have given them already or some of them, it may not be quite pertinent to the subject before the House to refer to them more than I have done. But just imagine 200,000 pounds or more of freight have, according to the Minister of Militia, been sent around by an American port in American vessels, when they could have been sent by a shorter and more speedy Canadian route, because if they had been sent to Vancouver, or better still, perhaps, under the circumstances, to Victoria, they would have been right on the route of those steamers which leave those ports for the Yukon, so that the whole course of the Government appears to have been in the interests of American business and to the detriment of Canadian interests.

Mr. McMULLEN. My hon. friend has tried to show that the history of the Conservative party, for the last eighteen or twenty years, shows that they continually patronized Canadian institutions and railways and Canadian industries. I want to draw my hon. friend's attention to the fact that when

the Department of Public Works, not many years ago, wanted dredges, barges and tugs, did they get them in Canada? No, they went to the United States. They sent Mr. Arnoldi over there, and he got all those dredges and barges from the United States, and hon. gentlemen opposite signed the bargain, and he got in addition to that "The Jolly Joe" as a gift for having placed the orders in the hands of Americans. Take another case. My hon. friend forgot that we built the Printing Bureau not many years ago when hon. gentlemen opposite were in power. Where did they get the machinery for that bureau? They went to the American side for it, and the Americans paid out, in order to get the order, commissions that were never accounted for and which constituted a loss to the people of Canada. Yet my hon. friend has the hardihood to get up and say——

Mr. SPEAKER. I am afraid that although the motion allows a large reference to the trade of the Yukon, it hardly covers the ground the hon. gentleman is entering upon.

Mr. FOSTER. He can go as far as a stone fence, but not the Printing Bureau.

Mr. McMULLEN. I was simply replying to my hon. friend who is responsible for any divergence from the subject before the House, and I must apologize if I am out of order. With regard to the question before the House, I contend that it is a matter of very great regret—and I believe the people of Canada as a whole regret it—that hon. gentlemen opposite did exercise such a powerful influence on the Senate as to secure the rejection of the Bill that would have brought about the construction of a railway to that country by the first of September next, without the cost of a dollar to the country, over which we could have done all the carrying freight of the Dominion to and from that section. If the hon. Minister of the Interior is compelled to utilize American lines, it is simply because hon. gentlemen opposite prevented the carrying out of a scheme that would have given us an independent line to that country. Hon. gentlemen opposite have got themselves into a very awkward position and so have the Senate, and they are now suffering in public esteem for the unfortunate course they saw fit to adopt.

If to-day this House were to pass that scheme and the Senate were to ratify it, and we were to ask the same men to carry it through, whom we asked three months ago, they could not undertake to do so, for they could not to-day, on the London market, finance the money necessary to do so, if they had all the territory offered them in that contract. Mr. Hamilton Smith made an offer, but could not secure the money to carry it out, and it was a great misfortune for this country that hon. gentlemen opposite should have prevented the carrying through of that scheme, which would have insured the construction of that road without cost to the older portions of the Dominion. We would have had all the advantages of an easy and favourable means of ingress and egress to and from that country, which is so desirable; but instead we have to build a wagon road and adopt other means of communication. The people of that country, as well as those going there, will bear in vivid remembrance the manner in which hon. gentlemen opposite prevented the carrying out of that contract which would have given the people of this country an easy and advantageous way of transport to and from it. Now these hon. gentlemen complain because we are compelled to utilize American lines and other Canadian lines, but they should not forget that they supported the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway road down to its connection with Seattle. I believe that a part of those goods went over the Canadian Pacific Railway to Seattle, and the other part went to Vancouver; and the transportation company, no doubt, in its own interest and for its own convenience, asked that part of the goods should be laid at Seattle and part at Vancouver, so as to enable it to transport them more rapidly, which is what the hon. Minister of Militia desires. It is much to be regretted that we have not under way the road we were so anxious to get constructed, the construction of which would have given employment to a large number of individuals and have resulted in a development of trade that would have been a credit to us and an advantage to the Dominion.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I do not intend to discuss with my hon. friend who has just spoken (Mr. McMullen) the question as to whether the policy of the Conservative party was a Canadian policy. That is a matter which is written in the history of this House and this country, and does not need to be discussed at this late day. There is one point, however, which I think ought to be referred to, and that is why, in the light of the subsequent discussion, the hon. member from New Westminster (Mr. Morrison) rose at all. He rose for the purpose of reading a lecture to my hon. friend from Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) for reading false statements from an American journal, and he was rather severe upon the hon. gentleman for having transgressed what he regarded as a good Canadian rule in that respect. Now, it has come out in the subsequent debate that the statements made in that Seattle newspaper are substantially true, and that consequently the strictures made by the hon. member for New Westminster fell to the ground, and I think that now he ought to express his regret to the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) for having severely criticised him. He ought to express regret to my hon. friend for having criticised his defence of the interests of the coast cities, which the hon. member for New

Westminster was sent here to defend, but which, I am afraid, he has deserted in this Parliament this afternoon. An extraordinary statement fell from the mouth of the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen). We have had various reasons why this American port was selected, and why the goods were shipped from Seattle instead of Vancouver or Victoria. In the first place, we were told by the hon. Minister of the Interior that it was impossible to ship them in any other way. Then we were told by the Minister of Militia that there was another reason, namely, the expense. And we are told by the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) that these two reasons were supplemented by another, and that was the desire to divide the carrying trade in connection with these Yukon supplies between the two gerat railways of Canada.

Mr. McMULLEN. No.

Mr. MONTAGUE. My hon. friend (Mr. McMullen) said this: That he supposed a Canadian railway, the Grand Trunk Railway, had applied for the privilege of carrying a portion of the supplies, that this had been granted by the Government, and they were allowed to deliver the supplies at Seattle.

Mr. McMULLEN. My hon. friend (Mr. Montague) misunderstood me. What I said was that the transportation company of the Pacific, no doubt in their own interest, had stipulated that a portion of the goods should be laid down in Seattle and a part in Victoria. I assumed that it would be a convenience to them that that course should be adopted.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Now, my hon. friend has not made his case any stronger. In the statement he has just made he has given a reason why the Minister of Militia should not have accepted the offer of this company, but why he should have accepted the offer of another company in competition. Surely it has not come to this, that an American transportation company can, at its bidding, control the Government of Canada? But that is what the statement of the hon. member for North Wellington amounts to, if it amounts to anything.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Montague) allow me to assure him that, so far as the transportation of goods up the Yukon River and into the Yukon district is concerned, we are absolutely—on account of the policy hon. gentlemen opposite have pursued—in the hands of American transportation companies.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Now, my hon. friend (Mr. Sifton) falls back on that very tender spot of his, that spot which is just as tender to the touch of hon. gentlemen behind him as it is to the touch of hon. gentlemen on this side.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It appears to be a tender spot with hon. gentlemen opposite; it worries them to have it mentioned.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Not at all. What are the facts given by the Minister of Militia? He has declared that these goods were delivered at Seattle and they were shipped from Seattle because better terms could be made. I fancy I am correct in stating that.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I said that the only arrangement I could make to get goods carried up to Fort Selkirk were by this company, and I said that the company required a certain portion of the trade to go to Seattle, as they were shipping in two steamers from the Pacific up to the mouth of the Yukon, and about one-third of the freight they required to go on board at Seattle. The remainder of it would go by Vancouver.

Mr. MONTAGUE. What my hon. friend (Mr. Borden) said, as far as I remember, is that he had made this arrangement because it was a cheaper arrangement—a cheaper guarantee for delivery. So, if my hon. friend's statement is correct, we have the competition of an American company submitted to in order to save a small expenditure on transportation of these supplies, and as an hon. gentleman beside me suggests, to injure the trade of the Canadian cities of the coast. As to the Minister of the Interior, I am sure that this House regards with some surprise the tone of severity, the tone of almost anger with which he dealt with this subject. That hon. Minister reaches out his hands in gestures of anger and gives us to understand that, so far as this conduct is concerned, it is a portion of the punishment which the hon. gentleman intends to inflict upon the Opposition as Canadians and upon Canadians generally, because his celebrated Yukon Railway Bill was rejected in the Senate. And we are told, Sir, that this is only a first instalment, that we are to apprehend still further punishment because the pet scheme of my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior was defeated in the Parliament by votes of Canadian Senators, who have a perfect right to express their opinion on every subject which comes before them. The Minister of the Interior says that these goods had to be sent by this route because of the defeat of the Stikine-Teslin Railway Bill. But I would remind him that, even if this Bill had been carried in this House, even if it had not been defeated in the Senate, the railway would not have been constructed at this time. So the fact of its defeat can have no influence upon the shipment of these goods.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I am sure the hon. gentleman (Mr. Montague) does not wish to misrepresent the matter. I think I explained that we are sending about 100 tons of freight for the troops now. This is in accordance with the original arrangement. This will be sufficient for some six months. But we have to send some supplies for a year from next autumn, and those supplies could have gone by the road from Glenora to Teslin if the Bill had gone through Parliament authorizing the construction of the road.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Then, I wish to remind my hon. friend, the Minister of the Interior, that another body has spoken upon this Yukon trade. I refer to the legislature of the province of British Columbia. This body has expressed preference for the route from the coast into the Yukon country by Teslin Lake. And this, to my mind, offers the severest criticism of the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. McGREGOR. Not at all.

Mr. MONTAGUE. "Not at all," says my hon. friend (Mr. McGregor). I fear that he does not go into the matter very carefully, having decided to support his friends in power under any circumstances. The question comes down to this—whether or not the Government have guarded in the strongest possible manner the interest of the Pacific Coast cities of Canada, whether they have used every advantage which was afforded them to increase the trade of those cities as compared with Seattle, Tacoma and other cities upon the American Coast. It is the opinion on this side of the House that they have not. It is the opinion of American newspapers that they have favoured American cities instead of Vancouver and Victoria, and, I think, we may well take the judgment of the newspapers upon a matter of that kind, a matter in which the interests of the two classes of cities are in conflict. I still say that the hon. member, instead of criticising the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) should have criticised the course the Government have pursued in adopting this policy rather than a Canadian policy.

Mr. MAXWELL. I do not rise with the intention of intensifying the feeling which has been generated with regard to this question. I am very glad to see and to recognize the interest which hon. gentlemen opposite are taking in the cities of the coast. It is not often that they have taken an interest in those cities. Their repentance is late, but it is better late than never. One would suppose, to hear their speeches, that these hon. gentlemen were the only individuals who knew anything about the feelings of the people on the coast. I happen to represent a coast constituency, and, perhaps, one which is as deeply interested in this question as any other. The trouble is, as I gather from the speeches made by hon. gentlemen opposite, that the Government have made some arrangements with an American company. Now, so far as my knowledge of hon. gentlemen opposite goes, I find that when Americans will serve their purpose, they are never slow to use them. What have we seen here but lately? A gentleman by the name of Livernash came within the precincts of this House. He was a newspaper man from San Francisco.

We all know how tenderly hon. gentlemen opposite nursed that gentleman, quoted him, almost went down on their knees before him, in order to extract from him something that might be used against the policy of the present Government. Not only so, but we are aware to some extent of the action of the Senate towards the policy of this Government with regard to the Teslin Lake and Glenora route. Well, I must say, as one representing the coast, and knowing something of the feeling of the people of the coast, that that policy was entirely endorsed by almost the whole people of the coast. That policy was recognized out there as being one thoroughly advantageous to almost every interest on the coast. Even the leading newspaper representative of the Conservative party on the Pacific Coast heartily endorsed the policy of the Government in this respect. I shall wait with considerable interest to hear the hon. member for Pictou, when he goes before a constituency on the coast and attempts to justify the policy of the Conservative party in rejecting the policy of this Government.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I may tell the hon. gentleman that one of his colleagues, the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. McInnes) will likely have an earlier opportunity.

Mr. MAXWELL. Oh, I understand all about that; we are all in the dark about that. I think I am on more intimate terms with the member for Vancouver than is the hon. member for Pictou, and I know exactly how he stands on that matter. We are all familiar with the action of the Senate, and we are aware that while they have rejected the policy of the Government, they have taken up that of another gentleman, and they have pushed his Bill through the House, a Bill which is, so far as the interests of the coast people are concerned, diametrically opposed to every interest they have. This is the man whom hon. gentlemen opposite are quoting, and still they tell us that they, and they alone, have the interest of the coast at heart, and that it is the interest of the coast that makes them speak to-day, because they feel that it is being sacrificed to the Americans. Now, I just want to say this before I sit down. I know something about Vancouver before the present day. I know what Vancouver was under the rule of the Conservative party. Why, we were in a state of stagnation; there was hardly

any business, there was little or no progress in Vancouver for four or five years. What is it to-day? Why, Sir, any man going out there to-day would hardly know that city. Business is going on with a rush, men have had to extend their premises, and we have out there at the present moment a scene of life, of activity and of bustle that perhaps cannot be eclipsed by any other city in Canada to-day. What is the meaning of all that? Why, it is the policy of the present Government. The hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) spoke of the action of the British Columbia legislature in reference to this railway. Why has the legislature of British Columbia taken such an interest in this route? Why have they granted a bonus of $4,000 a mile for building this road? Because the people of the coast are indignant that the policy of the present Government has been rejected, and now they demand of their own local government, over which they have, to some extent, control, that they shall do all they possibly can to carry out the policy which the friends of hon. gentlemen opposite have rejected. The people on the coast do not feel indebted to the hon. gentlemen one bit for the small interest they are taking in them at the present time. The policy of this Government to-day is making the coast cities full of life, full of bustle and full of excitement, and I believe that so long as this policy is continued, just so long will the coast cities enjoy a prosperity which they have never experienced before.

Mr. SPROULE. It seems to me the hon. gentleman should be the last man in this House to get up and make the speech he has just made. He speaks as if he were familiar with the coast. But I see that the hon. gentleman has just gone out of the Chamber, and I will refrain from saying anything of a man who cannot stand his ground.

Mr. MORRISON. I wish to make just one reference to the misrepresentation of a remark of mine by the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) and the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper). What I said was that I deprecated the action of hon. gentlemen opposite in making this House of Commons a medium of advertising the American Coast cities. That is all I said, that is the purport of my remarks, and by no twisting or turning could a meaning be attributed to those remarks which the hon. gentlemen have sought to put upon them. I did not intend to condone the patronage of American transportation lines or American seaports on the part of this Government or any other Canadian Government, unless a proper excuse could be shown for so doing. I am second to none in my advocacy of the patronage by this Government of Canadian seaports and Canadian transportation companies, and I wish to see Canadian money expended in Canada. I deny that what the Minister of Militia and Defence has done, or what the Department of the Interior has done, is open to criticism from either side of the House. I contend that the action adopted by the Government, under the circumstances was justifiable, and has been justified.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that he approves of that way of shipping these goods, because they could be shipped cheaper by Seattle?

Mr. MORRISON. Under the circumstances, after hearing the explanation of the Minister of the Interior and of the Minister of Militia and Defence, I certainly approve of their action, because there was absolutely no other course open for them. It was absolutely necessary that these provisions should be hastened forward, that no time should be lost. Owing to the action of hon. gentlemen opposite, directly or indirectly, other means of transportation into that country have been cut off, and unless steps were taken at this juncture in order to get around the Aleutian Islands into the Yukon, it would be too late to send such a large bulk of provisions into that country this year. I repeat that I entirely deprecate the habit of reading extracts from American newspapers which tend to advertise American towns as against Canadian towns. There is no analogy between the circumstances attending the reading of the extract from the Seattle "Post-Intelligencer" this afternoon, and the extract which was read from the "Commercial Advertiser," of New York. In the case of the "Commercial Advertiser," what was stated was a fact; in the other case, the statement was substantially untrue and misleading to the extent that it stated that the town in question was the only point recognized by the Canadian Government as a point of shipment. We all understand that the interview in the Seattle paper was not consistent with the facts. As regards the clipping from the Chicago newspaper, the circumstance is so fresh in the minds of hon. gentlemen present that it does not require to be controverted now and here. It was an instance of publishing an interview which, we are assured, never occurred.

Motion to adjourn negatived.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 141) respecting the Great Northwest Central Railway Company—(from the Senate).—(Mr. Morrison.)

ALIEN LABOUR LAW.

Mr. MONTAGUE. May I be permitted to inquire of the Government whether they will lay on the Table a copy of instructions sent by the Department of Jus-

tice to the officers appointed for the purpose of carrying out the Alien Labour Law?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). I will mention the matter to the Department of Justice.

DISMISSALS—INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I desire to call the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to papers he promised to bring down the day before yesterday. These returns refer to the dismissal of William James Dunlop, William Burke, Francis Pennock, Richard Hickey and Alexander Macdonald.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). I will take a memorandum of what the hon. gentleman requires.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I desire also to ask the Minister of Customs and the Minister of Public Works if they will be good enough to give me information which I endeavoured to secure from them respecting the dismissal in their respective departments in my constituency. If these papers are brought down, the work of passing the Estimates will be facilitated.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). There is a memorandum in my department referring to this matter, and I will make inquiries.

Mr. GILLIES. I ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries also to note that papers regarding Joseph E. McNeill, lighthouse keeper, have not yet been brought down.

Mr. QUINN. I draw the attention of the Minister of Customs to the fact that on 18th April a return was ordered of names of employees relieved from duty or dismissed from the Montreal custom-house from 13th July, 1896, to 1st March, 1898. Also, I desire to call the attention of the Minister of Railways to an order passed for the names of employees released from duty or dismissed on the Lachine Canal. These returns have not yet been brought down.

Mr. DAVIN. I wish to ask the Minister of the Interior if he will bring down the return respecting the Crooked Lake Reserve?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). I will make inquiries, and, if possible, bring it down to-morrow.

SUPPLIES FOR NORTH-WEST MOUNTED POLICE.

Mr. CLARKE. In regard to supplies for the Yukon country, I desire to ask a question from the Minister of Militia, or, in his absence any member of the Government who may be prepared to answer it. Is it a fact, as has been stated repeatedly, that part of the supplies forwarded by the Grand Trunk Railway, by the American route and in an American vessel, and shipped from Seattle, consists of rapid-firing guns and ammunition that may be used by the troops in the Yukon district?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). I will call the attention of the Minister of Militia to the matter.

THE POST OFFICE ACT.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock) moved second reading of Bill (No. 110) further to amend the Post Office Act. He said: In moving the second reading of this Bill, I desire to make a few remarks in regard to some of its leading features. One of the sections about which I think there can be no possible dispute proposes to afford free transmission of books for the blind. Another section proposes to decentralize, to a certain extent, the dead letter branch which is now centred at Ottawa. The reason for that proposition is in the public interest and is as follows:—At present under the Act, dead letter matter of all kinds, and mail that is not called for, has to be transmitted to Ottawa from the most remote parts of Canada, to be returned to the senders. Owing to the vast extent of the Dominion great delay is thus occasioned to the public, and at times serious loss, and it is proposed with due regard to the secrecy and safety that is observed in the dead letter office at Ottawa, to establish in certain cities and towns branches of the dead letter office so that the service may be performed from those centres. This will not involve any additional expense, it will simply mean that the work now done in Ottawa will at less inconvenience, I think at less expense, and to the great advantage of the public be discharged nearer the points of delivery of these dead letters. With regard to the other two propositions in the Bill, the one looking to the reduction of the 3-cent letter rate—the domestic letter rate as it is called—to 2 cents, and the other looking to the re-imposition of postage upon newspapers; inasmuch as these are to some extent companion propositions it is right that I should refer to them at some little length. I presume that no hon. gentleman would object in the abstract to the reduction of the rate from 3 cents to 2 cents. Public opinion favours the cheapest and freest possible communication by mail throughout all parts of the country, and I feel sure that no argument is necessary to commend such a proposition to the public favour. But one might reasonably ask what effect upon the revenue this reduction will have, and, therefore, upon that point I shall trouble the

House wth a few figures. Some days ago my hon. friend (Sir Adolphe Caron) inquired as to what effect on the revenue the reduction from 3 to 2 cents would in all probability have. and the evidence before the department, furnished by the accountant, a gentleman of long experience, is to the effect, that assuming that the volume of business does not increase or decrease it would result in a present loss to the revenue of $650,000 a year. That is assuming the worst phase of the question financially, but I shall endeavour to establish by precedents that a reduction in the letter rate is always followed by an increased volume of business, and upon that point I venture to give some statistics from Great Britain and other countries. For example, the letter rate in Great Britain prior to the tenth of January, 1840, was sixpence-halfpenny per letter. It was a mixed rate, but that was the average. At that time the rate was partly based upon the distance the letter was carried, and partly upon its contents. even the number of pieces of paper having to do with it, but the average rate was sixpence-halfpenny. On the 1st of January, 1840, the penny post came into operation. That reduction of the letter rate amounted to 84 per cent. and it apparently wiped out over four-fifths of the revenue of the department from carrying letters. In the year 1839, prior to the introduction of the penny post the revenue derived by the postal department in England was £2.390,763. and during the first year of the introduction of the penny post the revenue fell to £1,359.466. That was a loss of revenue of 43 per cent, but the number of letters carried in that year increased 122½ per cent. Year after year the revenue from this source recovered, and in 1851 it had more than equalled its former position, and since then, as we all know, it has assumed very great proportions. It is stated, with what correctness it is not for me to say, that Rowland Hill, who was instrumental in the introduction of the penny post, attributed the unpopularity of it when first introduced to hostile action on the part of officials and those who had to do with the administration of postal matters throughout Great Britain. However that may be, the recovery rapidly took place, and in the eleventh year of its existence the revenue was larger than it had been previous to 1840. In 1850 the Netherlands reduced their letter rate 50 per cent. The gross revenue of that country in 1849 was £112,547, and in the second year, 1852, the revenue recovered all that it had lost and a great deal more. In 1852 it had become £115,000, and in 1853 £120,000. That is, in the fourth year, the revenue had recovered, and had become 7 per cent better than it had formerly stood.

In the United States, prior to 1845, the average rate was between 12 cents and 15 cents per letter. It was a mixed rate, with conditions somewhat analagous to those that obtained in Great Britain. In 1845 the United States reduced their letter rate from between 12 and 15 cents to 5 cents per half ounce within a certain radius, and 10 cents per half ounce for letters going beyond that radius; the radius, I think, was 300 miles. What was the result on the revenue? Under the old rate, in 1845 the revenue was $4,237,288; in the next year, 1846, it fell to $3,489,199; in 1847 it had increased to $3,955,893; in 1848 it had attained the sum of $4,371,077. That is, in the third year after the change of rate, the revenue recovered and had attained a figure in excess of what it had been under the former rate of between 12 and 15 cents. Subsequently, in 1852, the United States reduced their letter rate from 5 cents to 3 cents. That was a reduction of 40 per cent. The change took effect in the year 1853. The revenue of the United States under the 5 cent rate in 1852 was $6,925,971. In 1853 the revenue fell about $1.000,000, the figures being $5,949,725. In 1854 the revenue recovered all that it had lost, attaining in that year the sum of $6,955,586. That is, in the second year of the change the revenue of the United States recovered the $1,000.000 which it had lost, and more, and in the following year, 1855. the revenue became $7,342.136. That is, in the third year it recovered not only all that it had lost, but it had become half a million dollars greater than it had been for the 5 cent rate.

Then I turu to France. In 1878 France reduced her letter rate from 5 cents to 3 cents. The result on the revenue was as follows:—In the last year of the old rate, 1887, the revenue was 113.934,424 francs. In the first year in which the reduction was in force, namely, 1878, the revenue fell to 96,139,309 francs.

Mr. WALLACE. Before the hon. gentleman leaves the United States, would he give us the result of the reduction from 3 cents to 2 cents?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I will come to that in a little while. In 1879 the revenue in France increased to 97,215,925 francs, in 1880 to 105,203,888 francs, and in 1881 to 115,214.953 francs. That is, in the fourth year after the change France recovered all she had lost, and her revenue had grown in excess of what it had been under the previous 5 cent rate.

Now I come to Canada. Prior to the year 1851 the domestic letter rate in Canada was 18 cents per half ounce. In 1851 the rate was reduced 66⅔ per cent, or from 18 cents per letter to 6 cents per letter. Our fiscal year ended then. as now, on the 30th of June. I leave out the year 1851, because in that year the statistics give us the revenues under the two rates; and I take the last clear year we had under the old rate, and the first clear we had under the new rate. In 1850, under the old rate of 18 cents, the revenue amounted to $362,065; in 1852, the

first clear year under the new rate, the revenue was $230,629, a loss of $132,000; in 1853 the revenue had grown to $278,587; in 1854 it had grown to $320,000; and in 1855 it had grown to $368,166. That is, in the fourth year after the change, the revenue had recovered all that it had lost, and showed a surplus besides.

Mr. WALLACE. In which of these years was the control transferred from Great Britain to Canada?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I cannot give the hon. gentleman that information.

Mr. WALLACE. Was it not in 1852?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am unable to say. A further reduction took place in Canada on the first of April, 1868. In the interval the rate had become 5 cents, and in that year it was reduced from 5 cents to 3 cents per half ounce. That reduction took effect on the 1st day of July, 1868. The revenue for the year ending the 30th of June, 1868, under the 5 cent rate, was $1,024,702; in 1869, under the 3 cent rate, it was $973,056, a reduction of about $50,000; in 1870, it had increased to $1,010,767; and in 1871, it was $1,079,768. That is, in the third year it had recovered all it had lost, and showed a surplus. The records also show that in the year succeeding the reduction in the letter rate from 5 cents to 3 cents, there was a most pronounced increase in the number of letters transmitted through the Canadian mails.

In the year 1868, under the 5 cent rate, the total number of letters sent through the mails—I am speaking always now of domestic letters—was 18,100,000. In the year 1869, under the reduced rate of 3 cents, the number of letters sent through the post office had increased to 21,920,000. In other words, the reduction in the rate of postage was followed immediately in the succeeding year by an increase in the number of letters of over 21 per cent, or a gross increase of 3,800,000. It might also be said that at the very time that the reduced rate from 5 to 3 cents took place in Canada, there was also a reduction in the letter rate from Canada to Great Britain from 12½ to 6 cents, and that alone accounted for a large portion of the $50,000 reduction which followed in 1869 the reduction in the rate that took place on the 1st of June of that year. My hon. friend from West York (Mr. Wallace) asked me about the United States reduction from 3 cents to 2 cents, and I shall now give him the information. In 1883, the United States reduced its letter rate from 3 to 2 cents per half ounce. At that time, the unit of weight in the United States was half an ounce. It was subsequently increased to one ounce, and we followed the same course. I may say that the increase in the unit weight in the United States from half an ounce to an ounce took place in 1885. The reduction in the rate from 3 cents to 2 cents per half ounce took place in the United States in 1883, and in 1885 the unit of weight was increased from half an ounce to an ounce. The following are the figures of the United States revenue for the five years following each reduction: In 1883, the last year of the 3 cents rate, the revenue was $45,508,693.

Mr. WALLACE. Is that the whole revenue?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think that is the revenue from the letters alone In the year 1884, the revenue was $43,325,959, a reduction of a little over $2,000,000. In 1885, the revenue was $42,560,844. It will be observed that that was the year in which the unit of weight was changed from half an ounce to an ounce, and that must have had, for the moment, an appreciable effect on the revenue. But notwithstanding the increase in the unit of weight and the reduction in the rate from 3 cents to 2 cents, the only result was a loss of revenue between 1884 and 1883 of something like $800,000. In 1886, the revenue was $43,948,423. In 1887, it was $48,837,609. Thus, in 1887, the revenue had recovered its former size, $45,500,000, and some $3,000,000 better.

Mr. WALLACE. What were the corresponding expenses of those years?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not think that bears upon the question of revenue. I am not prepared to say what the expenses of the United States were, but they have not managed their post office as successfully as Great Britain has managed hers.

Mr. WALLACE. Will the hon. Minister give us some figures from 1887 to date in the United States?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have not got their figures since. I do not think that that is material, because the statistics will show that since these dates, the volume of receipts has been continually increasing. I have taken the figures prior to those changes, during the changes, and for a reasonable period after the changes, and did not think it necessary to burden the record with further statistics.

Mr. WALLACE. The increase might be due very largely to the increased expenditure in extending the service.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I quite recognize that there are many causes which contribute to the increase of postal revenue. Where you have a great country with a growing population, no doubt there are many elements that affect the revenue advantageously.

Mr. WALLACE. I am told that the deficit of the United States last year was $11,000,000.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think it was $12,000,000, but I do not think that any person who is familiar with the working of the United States system attributes that at all to the letter rate. It is attributable by those who know, for instance, Mr. Loud, one of the greatest authorities in the United States, to the extravagance of the Government in connection with their railway mail service. The railway companies of the United States are charging the Government, I think, six times as much for carrying the mails as are charged for ordinary first-class express matter. I wish to speak with respect, of course, of the United States service, but I can quote, at least, the opinions of others, who say that the deficit in the United States is attributable to the extravagant prices paid for transmission of their mails. At all events, I venture to say that these statistics establish beyond all question that the reduction in the letter rate promotes an increase in the number of letters, in the volume of business and in the revenue, and at any rate it is essential to the interests of the country that there should be the cheapest possible mail communication, and for that reason the moment is one that should commend itself to the good sense of the people and meet with their approval, and I hope to the approval of this House. At all events, this change is asked for. Numerous appeals have been sent from time to time to Parliament in favour of this measure, and the time has almost arrived when it should become law. The question of ways and means necessarily has to be considered.

Mr. SPROULE. Could the hon. gentleman give us any information as to the number of letters that were carried through the Canadian mails? He tells us that in the event of making this reduction, there would be a loss.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The number of letters carried through the Canadian mails last year was 123,000,000.

Mr. POWELL. Has the hon. gentleman any statistics relating to the increase of revenue on domestic letters in Canada during these corresponding years? It may have been due to business inflation, and that may have been more marked than in the United States.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have not the figures for those years, I have given the hon. gentleman all the statistics that I thought bore upon the subject. I have covered a period prior to, during and subsequent to the respective changes. Now, as I was about to remark, as the question of ways and means has to be considered in conection with this change, I propose to invite the attention of the House to one matter that will assist on the early introduction of this change. I refer to the question of the re-imposition of postage on newspapers. In 1882, Parliament passed an Act providing for free transmission of Canadian newspapers. In 1889 the department ascertained the tonnage of free papers passing through the mails, and it amounted to 9,428,498 pounds. In 1891 the weight had increased to 11,108,835 pounds, an increase of 17 per cent in two years. In 1897, six years later, the weight of papers was again ascertained, and, for the year ending 31st December last, it amounted to 16,557,490 pounds. That is to say, the volume of newspapers offered to the post office for free transmission increased in two years, 17 per cent, and in eight years, 77 per cent, and there is reason to believe that it is increasing at an equally rapid ratio still. The sixteen and a half million pounds of papers carried free through the mails last year represent, at an average of ten papers to the pound, not less than 175,000,000 papers, distributed without cost to the publishers or subscribers and at the expense of the Government. During the same period, as I stated to my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule), the total number of letters carried through the mails was 123,000,000, representing a weight of about 5,000,000 pounds. The country paid for this service and for such other services as the Post Office Department performed, in round numbers, $4,197,000. The bulk of the service consisted in carrying 175,000,000 newspapers free and carrying about 123,000,000 letters, and performing other services at a charge to the country of about $5,000,000.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Five millions of dollars in what period?

The POSTMASTER GEENRAL. In a year. Now, the practice of the countries in regard to the carriage of newspapers may, to some extent, be instructive.

Mr. POWELL. Before the hon. gentleman passes to that point, may I ask him what is the anticipated revenue from this tax?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The re-imposition of the postage upon newspapers, at ½ cent per pound, if levied upon, say, 16,500,000 pounds, would amount to $82,000.

Mr. POWELL. But a large portion of them would be exempt under this Bill as being circulated within a radius of ten miles of the office of publication.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The exemption, if every publication coming within the class named in the Post Office Act, were free, would involve a reduction of about $17,000 in the revenue I have named. But, since that Bill was introduced, representations have been made to me which have led me to believe that it may be wise to reduce the class of exempted newspapers. If the suggestions which I propose to make in committee on that point meet with approval the reduction from the $82,000 of revenue

will not amount to the figure I have named, but will be represented by a very much smaller sum.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Perhaps the hon. gentleman would state what changes he proposes in his scheme.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It has been represented to me that it would be advisable to reduce the exemption contemplated by the Bill by limiting it to publications of a frequency not greater than weekly.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Then the dailies would pay ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The dailies would pay. I was about to give to the House some statistics as to the rates charged upon newspapers in other countries. In Great Britain, the rate is ½d. per copy, which is estimated at 6 cents per pound. In France the rate is ⅝ cent per 50 grammes, or 3⅜ cents per pound ; Germany, 5 cents per pound ; Austria, ½ cent per paper ; Belgium, 1½ cents per pound ; Denmark, 1¼ cents per pound ; Greece, 3⅜ cents per pound ; Holland, 1½ cents per pound ; Italy, 1·08 cents for daily papers ; Norway, 1·60 cents per pound ; United States, 1 cent per pound. I give now the rates in some of the British possessions : British India, 1 cent for four ounces or 4 cents per pound, ; New South Wales, local papers not weighing over 10 ounces apiece, free, local papers over that weight, 1 cent for 10 ounces or 1 6-10 cents per pound, all other newspapers, 1 6-10 cents per pound ; New Zealand, 8 cents per pound, 1 cent per copy ; Queensland, 1 cent for 10 ounces, or 1 6-10 cents per pound.

Mr. WALLACE. What is it in Great Britain ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Half a cent per copy, it would average about 6 cents per pound. There are a number of countires that afford free transmission, not British countries, some of which I will enumerate : Servia, Chili, Costa Rica, Honduras, the Bahamas, the Bermudas, and a number of small countries. Now I propose to refer briefly to the character of some of the papers that are being carried free at the expense of the ratepayers of Canada. When I introduced this Bill, the leader of the Opposition declared that the proposition to impose a postage upon newspapers was an attempt to tax knowledge, to keep the people in darkness, to prevent the circulation throughout Canada of information as to the doings and iniquities of this dreadful Government. Nobody took him seriously, he was not even serious himself. At all events, whether he was or not, I propose to refer briefly to the objects of some of these papers that are now being transmitted free through the post office. I do not know whether these characteristics that I am about to read describe all the newspapers and all their objects ; but they are prepared by one of the officers of the department under instructions to go through the newspapers and give me a summary that I might make use of, and which would fairly represent the general character of the papers that are now being carried free. The first that I find upon the list are papers engaged in advertising, chiefly for the promotion of the liquor trade and hotel business.

Mr. CLARKE. Where are those papers published ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The paper I refer to is described as the "Licensed Victuallers' Gazette," of Montreal.

An hon. MEMBER. You had better not read the names.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Of course, there is nothing in this list I desire to withhold. the hon. gentleman will find a return of those papers laid upon the Table. Some days ago I laid upon the Table a list of all the papers that are registered in the department, and entitled to free transmission. I think my hon. friend from Three Rivers (Sir Adolphe Caron) captured that return, and some of the members are not able to obtain access to it.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I did not capture it. Here it is.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. At all events, if hon. gentlemen desire detailed information I will give them the privilege of examining my own list containing the names of hundreds of papers of the classes to which I am about to allude. They are arranged alphabetically, accordng to the places of publication.

Mr. WALLACE. Will the hon. Minister give us the numbers of each of these different classes ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have not got it in that form. I was proceeding to give to the House information showing the objects of some of the publications that pass through the mails. Hon. gentlemen will find in the return that I have laid upon the Table all the information that I am summarizing here, they will find the number of pounds of each newspaper carried free through the post office, and will be able to understand to what extent the carriage of these papers becomes a burden upon the people. I find first here papers whose general object is the promotion of temperance, and publications on behalf of Sunday.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. And you put them alongside the "Licensed Victuallers' Gazette," that advertises strong drinks ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I say that the people of Canada are at present paying for the free transmission of papers

promoting temperance doctrines, and also advertisng strong drinks.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. So they balance.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The next class I have here are periodicals devoted to the interests of Sunday schools. Then we have papers promoting the sale of books, badges, medals, &c. Next is a paper called "Secular Thought," papers of that class, some of them relating to works on agnosticism. Then we have publications in the interest of agriculture, papers for the promotion of the sale of dental instruments, papers relating to fraternal organizations, insurance business, surgical instruments, drugs, patent medicines, patterns, banking, law books, stamp business, pianos and musical instruments, banking and insurance, bicycles, paints, painters' materials, railway guides, stationery, banking business, mining, fruit trees, horticulture, wheelmen's associations, mining and mining materials, printers' materials, building and contract business, homeopathic medicines, engineering, metal trade, dry goods business, manufactures, school books, confectionery, cigars, printing, tobacco trade, commerce, hardware. Those are some of the subjects that are specially treated by papers carried free through the mails at the present time. I think, Mr. Speaker, that the general taxpayer is not called upon to pay for the distribution of a large portion of the information that is supposed to be contained in any of these journals. They are private enterprises for the promotion of private gain. They are not purely philanthropic, but are engaged for motives of private gain, each one appealing to a special constituency. Of course many of them, and for that matter I may say the majority of them, are engaged in good work as well, but there is a business side to it. If they make money out of the business, that money goes into the pockets of the promoters of those publications, and what they make is made largely out of the taxpayers of Canada by reason of the free transmission.

Mr. WALLACE. This applies to only a portion ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Only a portion.

Mr. WALLACE. What proportion ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Well, I leave it to the hon. gentleman to analyse the returns that are laid upon the Table, and they will be able to draw their own conclusions. There has not been any classification made in that way. Hon. gentlemen will see by the return that some daily papers, ordinary journal publications, have a very large circulation, some weeklies have a very large circulation, and they will to that extent account for a large portion of the 16,500,000 pounds. But it is to be borne in mind that the total charge on the country is not merely for carrying papers through the mails, but it is for handling them at all points in the cities, on the trains and in transmission when received and delivered. There is a continuous expense from the commencement to the end, and the rate of increase will go on, and unless checks are applied and arrangements to increase the revenue are carried out, the burdens in the near future will become extremely onerous on the public of Canada. I have endeavoured in considering this measure to have as much regard as possible to existing interests. I conceive that to suddenly introduce a measure of this kind and to bring it into full force at once would perhaps disturb the financial arrangements of newspapers and publishing houses. As a rule, their year's subscription expires at the end of the calendar year, and this Bill having been placed before the public only a few weeks ago, if it became law the first effect will not be felt until 1st January next, and then there would only be a trifling imposition of ½ cent per pound. Six months will elapse before the other quarter of a cent takes effect, and I trust those affected by it will give the Government credit for having sought to introduce the measure in a way at least as little disturbing as possible.

Mr. CLARKE. I do not think the hon. gentleman has referred to the reduction asked in regard to drop letters.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have no proposal at present to submit to the House in regard to drop letters. Drop letters are local letters. We are now dealing with 3-cent letters, that affect the whole public. The drop letters are at present charged at 2 cents. That was the rate imposed some years ago by the last Administration, and while my own bent of mind favours at all times the reduction of the cost for postal communication within reasonable limits, I am not prepared at this moment to make any proposition in regard to rates on drop letters. I am aware there are two sides to that question. The public in cities enjoying free delivery, have to pay more at present. If it were proposed to have free deliveries in the cities at one cent per letter, probably those not benefited by the delivery would feel they were being unfairly treated. Whatever may be the reason that moved the late Government, for I presume there was some valid reason, they provided that cities having the benefit of free delivery should pay more than the farmers in districts who had to travel to the post office for their letters.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). Has the hon. Minister ever considered the matter of free delivery in the country ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I cannot say that I have given any serious consideration to that subject yet. I am aware

that in some countries free delivery takes place in the country districts. In Great Britain this prevails to a very large extent, but it is a different matter to adopt free delivery within comparatively small area, inhabited by 40,000,000 of people, than it is on a vast continent like Canada, and a sparsely settled country at that. I was about to refer to the connection between the imposition of this rate upon newspapers and the reduction of rates upon letters. I submit that the reduction of the rates on letters is a decided advantage, and that even if at times some people have to pay a little more for their newspapers—even admitting that argument—the subscribed will have had the advantage at all events of the reduced letter rates. An hon. member, when this Bill was introduced, spoke very sneeringly of the result of this change as regards certain classes of the people: what did they care for reduced letter postage; how many letters a year did they write, certainly not more than three or four. If a gentleman writes only three or four letters, he will save three or four cents per year. If the letter rate is less, he will probably write more letters; but whether he wrote three or four or more, he would get his letters forwarded at a lower rate and the newspapers would share the burden. That is my doctrine. I will be told that the revenue from the imposition of postage on newspapers will go only a short way to make up the deficit that will arise from the reduction of the rates on the letters. But however little it may be, the amount will go some distance, and if the number of letters increase, it will to that extent make it possible for the revenue of the department to overtake the expenditure and permit the introduction of reduced letter rates. As to the time when this reduced letter rate will be introduced, I may say that it will not take effect at once, but by Order in Council. When I took charge of the department there was a deficit for the fiscal year ending 30th June, 1896, amounting to $780,000. That deficit in the first year fell $200,000, and for the year up to 30th June last the deficit was $580,000. We are now closing another year, and in six weeks the exact result of the year's operations will be made known. I do not wish to speak with any degree of certainty as to the result, because there are yet six weeks of possible change; but I think I am not far from the mark when I say that the deficit of $580,000 with which we began this financial year will be reduced to $100,000 at the close of this year. Another six months will pass, from 1st July to 1st January, before the one-quarter of a cent on newspapers will go into effect. I expect that on 1st January next the department will be self-sustaining, the revenue will be equal to the expenditure, and we will start on 1st January next with a self-sustaining department, with no tax on the public except the tax paid directly for the use of the mail service; and if the House sees fit to adopt this measure, we will commence to impose postage on newspapers, and if the country becomes more prosperous even than it is to-day under the present Administration, if the volume of business increases, the revenue of the department will increase with that enhanced prosperity, and it will be possible when we introduce a rate on newspapers to effect likewise a reduction in the rate on letters.

Mr. SPROULE. May I ask the hon. gentleman, does he mean it will be self-sustaining, without charging any postage on newspapers?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes, I do; I mean to say that by the first day of January next, this department will be self-sustaining, without any revenue derived from the postage on newspapers, but it has to be borne in mind——

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. How are you going to make it up?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. By economy and by the improved revenues of the department.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. And notwithstanding the reduction that may take place on the letters?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No, Mr. Speaker. The reduction of the rate on letters will involve a loss on the letters, unless it is recouped by the increased number of letters.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Then you speak apart from that reduction?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes. Suppose the number of letters does not increase, then we would lose $650,000 by the reduction. But even if we did lose $650,000 by the reduction of the rate from 3 to 2 cents, is it not better to have a rate of 2 cents and a deficit of $650,000 than the old rate of 3 cents and a deficit of $780,000?

Mr. SPROULE. What increase in the number of letters would be necessary to make up the loss?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. We have to carry about eighty million or ninety million letters.

Mr. SPROULE. I make it 32,500,000.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I defer to the hon. gentleman's figures for the moment. At all events, I submit that the two measures are in the public interest. They are entwined together, and whilst the imposition of the rate upon newspapers will not pay the whole cost of this boon that will be conferred upon the public, yet, to the extent that it produces a revenue, it will aid to that amount, and it will be, I trust, a check upon the burdens that are cast upon the people to-day by the

bringing out of newspapers of a useless kind—fake newspapers some call them; I would not use such a term, I do not know the meaning of it. A constant demand is made upon the public to carry newspapers that succeed in getting registration, comply with the requirements of a newspaper set forth in the statutes, but which are nothing but agencies in disguise to promote private enterprise and private gain. Putting the matter on a business basis will, I trust, help to ward off some of these evils and make it possible for the country in the near future to have the advantage of the 2 cent rate without any extra cost.

Mr. BRITTON. I notice that under section 2 the Postmaster General has to decide what is a newspaper. Suppose it complies with all the conditions described in the Act, and he decides it is a newspaper within the meaning of the Act, I presume it is the intention of the Postmaster General that subsection "c" is to apply, and that in order to get the benefit of newspaper rates it must be delivered either to a bona fide subscriber or to a newspaper agent.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I may say that this Bill is a re-enactment, word for word, of the existing sections of the law, applicable to the status of newspapers, and declaring under what conditions they shall be entitled to free transmission. The only change in the section is the incorporation of the words which are necessary to carry out the reduction of the letter rate and the imposition of the rate on newspapers.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Would my hon. friend allow me to suggest that as this question of the reduction of the domestic rate on letters is under consideration and has a direct bearing upon the measure which the hon. gentleman proposed, but was unable to carry out, I think that would be an appropriate time for my hon. friend to give an explanation to the House of the authority under which he proposed to act, and as to what prevented his carrying out the arrangement in regard to the reduction of the rate on letters outside of Canada. What does my hon. friend propose to do in that regard?

Mr. FOSTER. It all bears on the question of revenue.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) has had sufficient experience in various positions to know that I am not free to make the communication to the House that he asks. He is quite aware that in negotiations between the colonies and the mother country, there are communications which for the time being are confidential. That is the position of affairs at this moment, as I announced to the House some time ago, when my hon. friend from Three Rivers (Sir Adolphe Caron) asked for certain papers. The time will come when all these papers will be made public, but this is not the time.

Mr. CLARKE. Did those reasons exist during the Toronto election last fall when the announcement was made by a responsible Minister of the Crown that the reduction would take place on the 1st of January, 1898?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That announcement was made then and it was intended to take effect at that time, but in deference to the request of the Imperial authorities, it was postponed in order that there might be a conference of the representatives of the whole Empire with a view to adopt a larger scheme of inter-Imperial preferential postage, and that is why it was deferred. I trust the result will be the carrying out of the announcement made in Toronto in November last.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not ask my hon. friend (Mr. Mulock) in regard to confidential communications between this Government and the Imperial Government, but it is due to the House that the hon. gentleman should do what he is perfectly entitled to do, namely, to state under what authority he proposes to act. He has explained what difficulties occurred, but the House should know on what authority he undertook to make that reduction in postage, and what subsequent steps were involved in connection with it.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) knows full well that differences of opinion may well exist in regard to the rights accruing under treaties, and under Acts of Parliament, or contracts. This is one of those cases in point, and we maintain our right to proceed in the direction named. This is not the time for us to make an announcement, in advance of the time when the subject would be one of controversy between the parties immediately concerned. The contracting parties will discuss that question, and it will be time enough for Parliament to deal with it after the contracting parties have considered it.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Will my hon. friend allow me to suggest that Parliament has the undoubted right to express its opinion in regard to a measure of that kind. I take the ground that the Postmaster General has no authority, the Government of which he is a member has no authority, to bind this country in regard to that which will affect the revenues of the country without taking the House into its confidence. Before he proceeds to make binding arrangements on Canada in that direction, he is bound to have the approval of this House.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I regret that the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) is so indignant at our endeavouring to cement in another way the unity of the Empire.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. We understand the hon. gentleman. He has been for years posing as the great advocate of Imperial union, the great advocate of loyalty in season and out of season, but now that he is in the cold shades of Opsition, there is nothing the hon. gentleman can do that he won't do, and nothing he can say that he won't say, in order to embarrass those who are carrying on the affairs of the country.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. Are you embarrassed ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No. I am not embarrassed. We have the right side of the case ; but I point to the hon. gentleman's futile efforts. The country will understand the tactics that have been resorted to, not only in the early part of today, and all through the session, with his Livernashes and his colleagues in the other House sending a new Yukon Bill, to strike a blow at Canada, to prevent us developing the country, and to transfer the whole Yukon trade to the Americans. I understand the hon. gentleman's tactics.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Which clause of the Bill does this come under ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That is what I would like to know—how it is in order for the leader of the Opposition to bring into this discussion a proposition that is not at all germane to the measure ?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Will my hon. friend allow me to answer him ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. If the hon. gentleman wishes to make a speech, he will have an opportunity afterwards.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not want to make a speech, but the hon. gentleman says he would like to know how it is in order. My hon. friend was making a speech to the House in regard to a proposed reduction of postage ; and, consistently with that, I suggested to him, without the slightest intention of irritating my hon. friend, that he should take this proper opportunity of explaining to the House what he proposed to do with reference to foreign or outside postage, as well as domestic postage. That has a direct bearing on the revenue, and I had no idea that in making that suggestion, I was doing other than giving my hon. friend an opportunity of making an explanation to the House that he would be glad to make, and that I maintain the House is entitled to receive.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Well, Mr. Speaker, if I misunderstood the hon. gentleman, I certainly would be the first to say so.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. You certainly have.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I accept the hon. gentleman's statement, and I cheerfully comply with that portion of his request. He now asks what we propose to do with regard to the postage between Canada and the Empire. Is that the question ?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Hear, hear.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That is a smaller question than the one the hon. gentleman pressed upon me before. I give the explanation cheerfully, although the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) fails to see what connection that has with the measure.

Mr. MONTAGUE. No. My hon. friend fails to understand me. The hon. leader of the Opposition asked a wider question than the question the hon. gentleman is referring to. He asked how the hon. gentleman came to announce the policy in Toronto, whether the policy then announced was now abandoned, and what course the hon. gentleman intended to pursue. These were three subjects that need not have raised the ire of the hon. gentleman.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. They did not raise my ire at all. I suppose there is one mouthpiece for the Opposition, and I suppose the leader of the Opposition is able to express his own views, and I will cheerfully give the answer to the question he has asked last, although it has no bearing on this question.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It bears on the revenue of the Post Office Department.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The law under which the revenue between Canada and the Empire is administered is not dependent on this Bill. It is dependent, so far as Canada is concerned, on the existing law on the Statute-book of Canada ; and, with regard to that, I would say that for my part I would rejoice if the conference could see its way to adopting a lower rate of postage between Great Britain and all parts of the British Empire. If that is not possible, I hope the conference will see its way to improve the postal relations between Canada and Great Britain. Our postal relations with Great Britain to-day, having regard to those existing between Canada and the United States, and having regard to the extent of our trade and commerce, and to our relations of all kinds with the mother country, are not as they should be. It is not in the interest of Canada that there should be 400 per cent higher rates of postage between Canada and Great Britain than between Canada and the United States. For 5 cents you can write a one-ounce letter to the United States and get an answer, and it costs 20 cents to write a one-ounce letter and get an answer from Great Britain. If postal communication is necessary to trade and commerce, if is is necessary to maintain

intimate relations between the old land and Canada, if it is necessary to keep the people of Canada in touch with the people of England, then by all means hon. gentlemen opposite ought to be only too glad to have any measure brought about that tends to promote such freer intercourse; and, if it is possible to reduce the rate so that in communicating with Great Britain, we shall be at least under no disadvantage as compared with communicating with the United States, that would mean a reduction from 5 cents per half ounce to 3 cents per ounce, which would result in a shrinkage in our revenue, assuming that there would be no increase of business from such reduction, of about $50,000 per annum.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Would the hon. gentleman permit me to put a question to him? Does the hon. gentleman recognize that the postal relations between all the parties to the Berne Convention are exactly the same? For instance, every party that has entered into the Berne Convention, is, by that convention, obligated to adopt the same postal rates as are imposed by the convention.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. For the reason I gave my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, I do not propose to discuss the legal points of the question.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. That is not legal.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have given the hon. gentleman all the answer I am at liberty to give him.

Mr. FOSTER. Will my hon. friend allow me a question? What I would like to know is this. There is considerable difference of opinion as to what the hon. gentleman proposed to do some four or five or six months ago with the postage between Canada and Great Britain—what instructions he sent out, and the like of that. Evidently, he met some difficulties in the way of his proposal. What was the hon. gentleman's proposal at that time, how far did he go to put the proposal into effect, and what were the difficulties he met? That was a matter of administration that has been attemped by a member of the Government; and in the eyes of the public of Canada and of this Parliament, we want to know how the hon. gentleman fared.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am glad the hon. gentleman is so interested in my administration.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker——

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have the floor.

Mr. FOSTER. If the hon. gentleman will just allow me—I think it will be for his benefit. I wish to enter a mild protest against any Minister of the Crown, when introducing a Bill, treating questions which are pertinent, and which any member of this House has a right to ask and get information upon, as an insult to himself and an impertinence. If the hon. gentleman takes that view, he will find that it will not be very healthy for him.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Mr. Speaker, I can well understand the hon. gentleman's question. I have no desire to withhold any information from him. Of course, I must assume that he is asking for information, although he doubtless knows the answer to everything he has asked as well as I do, inasmuch as everything that has been done up to this moment, except the correspondence, is in the possession of the public.

Mr. FOSTER. I am in utter ignorance of everything except the announcement in Toronto. I believe I heard of that.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I cannot answer all these questions at once; but hon. gentlemen know that the aim of the Government is, if possible, to bring about better postal relations between Canada and Great Britain and all parts of the Empire. Those changes must result in a reduction of the rates; and, if the rates, thus reduced, are followed by an expansion of business, it is not likely that there would be a loss of revenue; but, on the contrary, all experience tends to show that there would be a gain of revenue.

Mr. MONTAGUE. My hon. friend has not answered the question of the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster).

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I suppose that any hon. gentleman who has not had any question he put answered will be good enough to call my attention to it.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I do not know that any member of this House is not entitled to remind the hon. gentleman that he has not answered a question put to him.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman asked me if I had answered the question of the hon. member for York.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Quite so, and I am perfectly sure you did not, and your answer to me is an impertinence.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I must leave it to the House to judge as to whether the hon. gentleman is an authority on what is courteous or not.

Mr. FOSTER. You had better call it six o'clock, and you will be in better temper after recess.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am in excellent temper now. I regret that these reforms and improvements made in the mail service do not meet with the approval of hon. gentlemen who formerly had to do with the administration of the department.

Mr. FOSTER. Better take recess now.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No, I expect to finish before six o'clock.

Mr. FOSTER. I must say that the hon. gentleman cannot finish before six o'clock, if he is going to give me an answer to my questions.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Will the hon. gentleman repeat his questions?

Mr. FOSTER. I put three questions. The hon. gentleman understood, as a matter of administration, to do a certain thing some three or four months ago in reference to postage between Canada and Great Britain. He certainly knew the grounds upon which he proposed to act, and I think the House should know them. He knows the actions he took and the instructions he gave, and the House would like to know those actions and those instructions. He certainly bumped up against some difficulty, and the House would like to know what that difficulty was and whether it is still in the way.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. With regard to the first question, namely, by what authority I acted, I acted by the authority that every Government representing a member of the Postal Union has. That is a point of law subject to interpretation. As to what I did, we decided to reduce the postage to 3 cents per ounce letter between Canada and Great Britain and all the colonies, to take effect on the 1st of January. Steps were taken to announce that reduction. Among other points where it was announced, I understand from my hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Clarke) that it was announced in Toronto.

Mr. CLARKE. The hon. gentleman mentions my name and says he understood from me that it was announced in Toronto. The hon. gentleman's collector of customs made the announcement on the authority of the Postmaster, and it has not been contradicted since.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes, it was made on my authority. The third question is whether the change was suspended and at whose request. It was suspended, as I have said before, at the request of the Imperial authorities.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the hon. gentleman be good enough to bring down a copy of the Berne Convention so that we may have it for discussion to-night? It would be well if he would go a little more into details. What directions were issued to the different postmasters in the first place? And afterwards, when he found his scheme could not be carried out, what steps were taken to mitigate the condition, so that the letters would not go to the dead letter office?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have finished all I have to say, except to answer the last question, namely, what steps were taken to inform the postmasters to carry the change into effect and afterwards to suspend it. It was announced in the ordinary way and gazetted. Subsequently, when the Imperial authorities suggested the suspension, the postmasters were notified and the press also, and the English Government joined with us to prevent any inconvenience arising in the event of any letters being sent forward insufficiently prepaid. They gave instructions to their postmasters to see that none of the letters should be treated as insufficiently stamped in Great Britain, and we in like manner took the precaution of warning our postmasters in this country, that if any letters were insufficiently stamped in the first fifteen days of January, they were to affix stamps to the amount of the shortage. The total shortage amounted to $90, or thereabouts.

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

After Recess.

PRIVATE BILLS.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). I will ask my hon. friend from Centre Toronto (Mr. Bertram) and my hon. friend from South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) to allow Bills in their names to stand. The leader of the Government is not able to be here this evening, and, as these Bills will be the subject of some conversation which cannot very well take place in his absence, I make this request.

Mr. CLARKE. When will they come up again?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. On Monday.

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 137) to revive and amend the Acts respecting the International Radial Railway Company.—(Mr. MacPherson, by Mr. McMullen.)

POST OFFICE ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. CLARKE. I would like to ask the Postmaster General, before he closes his remarks in moving the second reading of this Bill, if it is his intention to make any change in the regulations respecting parcel post. I think that the parcel post service is being used to do work that properly belongs to the express companies of the country. I would ask if the attention of the hon. Minister has been drawn to the matter and if he intends to make any proposal respecting a readjustment of the rates of charge.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). Under the Post Office Act, power is given to the Postmaster General to fix the rate of parcel post, and, therefore, legislation is not necessary in order to deal with the matter. My attention has been called to the condition of the parcel post, the rates and other circumstances; and numerously signed petitions have been presented to the department raising questions of very far-reaching importance in relation to this service. I have not felt able to come to any conclusions yet with regard to these matters. The rates are such as have been in existence for many years. There are several classifications which appear to me to be confusing and most intricate; but I speak with hesitation on the point because I have had but a limited experience of the parcel post. But from what has been told to me by those who use the service, I believe that that branch of service could be very materially modified to the public advantage. But the hon. gentleman will see that when you commence to deal with the question of parcel post by reducing rates, increasing rates, altering weights, &c., what is to the advantage of one locality is against the interest of another. Therefore the subject is one that can only be dealt with after a very careful view of the situation and a consideration of all interests involved. Therefore, while I am of the opinion that there is room for reform or change in the public interest, I could not assume the responsibility as yet, of indicating in what direction the changes should take place.

Mr. SPROULE. Can the Minister give us any idea of the weight carried by parcel post and the revenue realized from it in the year?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am not able to give the hon. gentleman that information at the moment.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am sure we have all listened with a great deal of interest to the statement made by the hon. Postmaster General in explanation of the Bill which he has submitted to the House. I endeavoured to follow the hon. gentleman as closely as I could, and so far as I understand this measure, it is a proposal to change the postal rates in Canada from 3 cents to 2 cents, and to leave the charge on drop letters at the present rate. Am I correct?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The Bill is directed to the domestic rate of 3 cents, which is applicable to all Canada, and not to drop letters.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am glad to find the hon. Minister has, since its introduction, modified this Bill in regard to the postage rates proposed to be charged newspapers. I thought that proposal a very objectionable one, and I briefly stated my reasons to the House. Nothing that has fallen from the hon. gentleman has modified my objections to the proposal as submitted. It was stated by the Postmaster General that he estimates the reduction from 3 cents to 2 cents will involve a loss to the Post Office Department as matters stand of about $650,000 annually, and that eventually, when the charge on newspapers is brought into operation, it will involve an increase to the post office revenue of $62,000 a year. I think that is the general purport of the measure. I do not believe this measure is one that is in the interest of the country. If the post office revenue admitted of a reduction of the charges upon parties who mail letters of $650,000 a year, I think it could very well bear the amount proposed to be gained by the charge of $62,000 a year upon newspapers. I stated before that I regard the free circulation of newspapers throughout the masses of very great importance to the country. I regard the newspaper literature of this country as of the greatest possible value to the people. I do not suppose there is any country in the world where newspapers are more widely taken and read than in Canada. I may be wrong on that point, but my impression is that the statistics which the Postmaster General has given to the House abundantly prove the great value the people of the Dominion attach to their newspapers, and the rapid increase of the weight of newspapers carried by the Post Office Department affords the best possible evidence of the desire of the mass of the people to obtain newspapers. It is not merely a question of the small amount of charge on newspapers, but the fact that the people receive newspapers free of postage is one which has a most material influence in regard to popular subscriptions to them. People will subscribe for newspapers to secure information for themselves and their families when the newspapers have free postage, when with the smallest possible charge imposed they would not do so, because such would be attended with inconvenience and expense.

Some remarks were made in this House not very long ago on the question of manhood suffrage, and the ground was taken that manhood suffrage was not in operation in England, and that some parties, myself among the number, would be glad to see it adopted in Canada. But I believe the fact was lost sight of by the hon. gentleman who was speaking on the subject, that the question of the suffrage, when you come to its relative value, depends not exactly on the terms used to indicate the suffrage. Manhood suffrage in the Dominion of Canada is a far higher franchise than that existing in Great Britain to-day. And why? Because of the universal dissemination of knowledge in Canada, due to the fact that there is no country where the great body of the people of all classes and all parties

understand the political questions and political issues to the same extent as they do in Canada. There is abundant evidence that manhood suffrage in the Dominion is a far higher franchise than manhood suffrage in Great Britain, for the reason that there are tens of thousands of electors in the United Kingdom who go to the polls without having the remotest idea not only of public questions before the country, but if their lives depended on it, they could not state who is Prime Minister of Great Britain to-day. I give that as an indication of the great advance the people of Canada have made in intelligence, and the thorough knowledge which the mass of the people here have in respect to the political issues and all other questions of that kind, as well as general information, rests largely on the fact that newspapers have so largely increased in circulation until they now reach almost every individual in the country, and there is scarcely a family to be found that has not the advantage of receiving a newspaper in some form or other. Looking upon that as a great means of education in the country and for the dissemination of the most valuable information, I do not concur with the hon. Postmaster General in the opinion that it is a wise act to impose any obstruction to that great means of disseminating popular information which is furnished by and must depend upon the newspaper press of the country.

I am glad to find that since the few observations I made on this subject, the Postmaster General has modified his Bill and made considerable change in the incidence of the taxation proposed. But if he were in a position to say to the wealthy classes, to the great business houses and persons carrying on business in large volume, that it were possible to relieve them of $650,000 a year by the reduction in the postal rates, why should the Government for the sake of $62,000 tax the newspapers that go into all parts of the country and among all classes of the people.

If the Postmaster General will consider the question, I do not think he will find that the relief given by a reduction from 3 cents to 2 cents is going to be of much value to the great mass of the people. It is not the great mass of people who fill the mail bags with letters and postal communications, but it is the wealthier class, it is the business houses, it is the people who are engaged in carrying on valuable and lucrative enterprises. Why, Sir, where is the country that enjoys a cheaper rate of postage than Canada, with very few exceptions, such as the United States? Where is there a country in the world in which you can send a letter for a distance so great as that between Cape Breton in the east and Victoria in the west for 3 cents? The hon. Postmaster General knows that that is a very low charge, it is very much lower than the rate in the United Kingdom, where a penny is charged for sending a letter a few hundred miles. Here we send a letter thousands of miles for 3 cents.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Their penny carries a heavier letter.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes, but you cannot send a letter a few miles for less than a penny, while here you can send a letter of the ordinary size for thousands of miles from the Atlantic to the Pacific. Therefore, I have not heard any reason given by the hon. the Postmaster General why $650,000 should be taken out of the consolidated revenue of Canada for the purpose of reducing the already extremely low rate from 3 cents to 2. The Government are taking $250,000 out of the pockets of the people of all classes, even the very poorest, by the increased taxation on sugar this year, and I do not see why they should favour the wealthier classes, those who are best able to pay for their correspondence, by reducing the postage they have to pay on their letters, relieving them to the extent of $650,000 a year, while placing an increased tax of a quarter of a million dollars upon the poorer classes chiefly, in respect to such a necessity of life as sugar. It does not appear to me that this is a wise or just measure. The poorer classes of the people must have their sugar, and I certainly think the hon. gentleman is making a mistake in taxing their sugar to the extent of $250,000 a year, while reducing the rate of postage on letters chiefly sent by the people best able to pay the postage, to the extent of $650,000 a year.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Does the hon. gentleman think sugar should be made to pay its freight and newspapers go free?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I think it is a question of the adjustment of taxation, and the first thing the Government should consider is how to make their taxation bear in the most equitable manner. I say that if it is necessary to increase the tax upon sugar to the extent of $250,000 a year without any other object in the world except to increase the revenue, that policy, in my judgment, is not consistent with the policy of turning around and relieving the wealthier classes, I may say the wealthier classes, in respect to their letter postage, because this relief will chiefly enure, not to the masses of the people, but to the people best able to pay that $650,000 that you propose to take out of the consolidated revenue of Canada, while increasing the tax on sugar by a quarter of a million. I must say that, in my judgment, this is not a well-considered policy, and it does not bear equitably upon all the people of the country. But while offering this opinion, I do not propose to do anything to obstruct this measure, further than frankly

to express to the Government my views upon the subject. The Postmaster General has rested his whole case upon the weight that the department is obliged to carry. What becomes of that argument when he proposes to leave drop letters at the same charge as he is going to carry a letter from Vancouver to Cape Breton, some 4,000 miles? His whole argument falls to the ground. If it is a question of carriage, what becomes of that argument when a drop letter, which is not carried by the post office at all except it may be by a post office messenger, is left at the same rate of 2 cents? I say it is a monstrous charge, a charge of 2 cents for a drop letter while you propose to carry for the same price a letter 4,000 miles, indeed much further, when that letter is sent into the Yukon district, the distance will be vastly more. That is one of the things that appears to me to bear very unequally. Now, there are other gentlemen, notably my hon. friend the former Postmaster General (Sir Adolphe Caron), who are better able to deal with this question than I am, therefore I do not propose to say much more upon the subject. But I was much surprised when the Postmaster General proposed to give us, as I supposed, an overwhelming reason why these papers should be taxed. I thought he was going to read a list of yellow papers which were of such a monstrous character that they should not be carried through the mails of Canada. He started out with mentioning the "Licensed Victuallers' Gazette" of Montreal, and exhibited a well-feigned horror at the idea that this "Licensed Victuallers' Gazette" actually contained advertisements of intoxicating liquors. Well, I sympathize with the hon. gentleman, certainly, in his endeavour to do anything that would restrict the traffic in intoxicating liquors. But immediately after I found that the next deadly blow which he struck was aimed at the temperance papers that are circulated through this country for the purpose of stirring up the people to practice habits of temperance. I could not help thinking that the hon. gentleman certainly had failed to establish the fact that these papers that he wished to hamper and to hinder, were of such a baneful character as he seemed to indicate. In the next place, he attacked the Sunday school papers that are at present carried free, and worse than the Sunday school papers, he attacks the farmers' papers, the papers that the agricultural people of this country look to for information in regard to their important industry. I think the hon. gentleman was very unhappy in selecting temperance papers, Sunday school papers and papers connected with agriculture, as evidence of the necessity of this Government stamping with its disapprobation this class of papers, by refusing to carry them any longer free.

I shall not detain the House further in reference to this matter, but I must express my utter surprise at the indignation the Postmaster General exhibited this afternoon, when I ventured to remind him that the introduction of this Bill which reduced the domestic postage rate, afforded him a good opportunity of expressing his views in regard to inter-Imperial postage. I thought my hon. friend (Mr. Mulock) would be grateful to me for the suggestion, but to my astonishment he resented it as an insult, and poured down upon my innocent head a torrent of the most violent abuse to which I have ever listened in this House. He charged me with disloyalty to the Empire, because I was not prepared to deify him for having stultified himself by one of the most extraordinary acts ever committed by a Canadian Cabinet Minister. I hope that my hon. friend (Mr. Sutherland) will not distract the attention of the Postmaster General from what I am saying, because I believe the remarks I am about to make are worthy of all his attention, as well as the attention of the House.

Sir, if there is one matter more than another which the Parliament of Canada should be consulted on, it is a question involving the taxation of the people. Every member of this House and every intelligent man in the country is in duty bound to maintain the authority of Parliament over the taxes that shall be imposed or remitted, because you cannot remit taxation without imposing it in some other direction. The Postmaster General was very reluctant to tell us anything, but finally, he was induced to give some information about the great Imperial reform which he thought so important, that it had to be suddenly announced in the heat of a by-election by the Minister of Customs as one of the great claims to Imperial rank and status that the Postmaster General of Canada had. The Postmaster General told us that by reason of the celebrated "I, William Mulock" decree, $50,000 a year would be taken out of the pockets of the people of this country. He estimated that the reduction under the policy he tried to carry out would entail a loss to the revenue of $50,000 a year. By what authority did the Postmaster General of Canada do that? Where is the law to justify him, or the Government, during a recess of Parliament to put their unholy hands into the treasury of Canada and take out $50,000, for any purpose whatever that has not been sanctioned by the Parliament of Canada? Is that the idea that the Postmaster General has of his duties? If so, the sooner the Canadian Parliament is done away with, and the imposition and remission of taxation is handed over to the Government, the better. That act of the Postmaster General was not only without warrant of law, but it was in violation of every principle of parliamentary government. I am not now dealing with the wisdom of the act; I do not say for a single moment that if the Postmaster General came to the conclusion that it was in the

interest of Canada and the Empire that we should reduce the rate of postage on inter-Imperial letters, that he and the Government of which he is a member had not the right to ask Parliament for its consent to or dissent from the proposition. But, Sir, where is to be found the justification for an officer of this Government, for the Postmaster General of Canada, assuming of his own motion to take out of the consolidated revenue $50,000 a year for any purpose whatever. I doubt very much if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) could make a very strong case for his policy, apart altogether from the entire unconstitutionality of his conduct. But that is not all. The Postmaster General woke up one fine morning to find that he had made himself utterly ridiculous, that instead of being able to put his hands into the public treasury and do what he pleased with the money, he found Canada belonged to the Berne Convention, and that even by legislative enactment Canada could not regulate the postal rate outside of its own boundaries, although the hon. gentleman had tried to do it on his own account. What did he do next? The next thing he did was to issue an order to all the post office officials in Canada to steal. What do I mean by that? I mean, Sir, that not a post office in Canada can take a postage stamp and use it for any other purpose than that authorized by law, without stealing it. The Postmaster General therefore endeavoured to cover up his blunder by a second blunder worse than the first. He made himself still more ridiculous. Who gave authority to the Postmaster General to put his hands in the consolidated revenue and take out $90, the amount he tells us was lost to the country by his act.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. $91.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Well, it is $1 worse than I thought it was, and even if it was only a one-cent postage stamp, I deny the authority of the Postmaster General or of the Government of Canada to tell its officials to take a single postage stamp unless there be a law or the consent of Parliament to justify it. Sir, the position in which the Postmaster General has placed himself is calculated to bring into derision and contempt the Government of Canada. When the people find a Cabinet Minister without any more knowledge, without any more idea of what is due from him to the country he serves, it is not calculated to raise Canada in public estimation. I am not surprised that when the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) came to realize the position in which he placed himself, the very mention of it was enough to excite his ire and to call forth his abuse. Am I right or am I wrong when I say that the course of the Postmaster General in regard to the whole of this transaction was an insult to the Parliament of Canada and to the people of this country; because he assumed a position that cannot be assumed by any officer of the Government, under such circumstances without doing the grossest violence to those principles of parliamentary government upon which the free government of Canada is founded. The hon. gentleman intimated that in concert with Great Britain and with the Berne Convention, he was going to carry this out, and carry it further than he had originally proposed. I ask the hon. gentleman whether that is his position to-night? After what has happened, after he has learned that what he has done was a complete violation of parliamentary government, I ask him whether he proposes to allow this House to rise without settling this question—whether he proposes, without the authority of Parliament, to put a charge upon the consolidated revenue of Canada of $50,000 a year—he intimates that it will be a great deal more than that—for this purpose or any other. I do not hesitate to say that a Minister of the Crown who will take such liberties as that with the rights of Parliament deserves impeachment at the hands of Parliament. The moment that you concede that any Minister of the Crown, or all of them put together, have the power to put their hands into the treasury of Canada and use public money for which Parliament has granted no sanction, however useful, however good, however appropriate the object may be, it is a complete violation of the principles of parliamentary government and a contempt of this House. I do not intend, Sir, to occupy the time of the House longer, but it was due to the hon. gentleman, especially after he had intimated that he did not intend to give any information whatever on this subject to the House, but that he intended to carry this matter to a much greater extent than he had formerly contemplated, without any authority from this House—it was due to him and to this House that I should frankly state the view I held of that transaction, and the hon. gentleman will utterly fail in his duty if he contemplates making any change of that kind without asking the authority and sanction of this House to that change before he makes it.

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding the criticism to which the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) has been subjected, all I can say is this, that I have listened with considerable pleasure and interest to the statements made this afternoon by that hon. gentleman in moving the second reading of this postal Bill. What is more, I think that the Bill he has presented will commend itself to not only the business men, but the letter-writing public of Canada generally. His minor proposal of sub-dead-letter offices in different parts of the Dominon is to my mind an excellent idea, and one that will be received with a great deal of satisfaction by the business community. With regard to the sharp criticism on his action of some months ago

in making the announcement that the rate upon English letters would be reduced, allowing that he was premature in making the announcement and granting that the Postmaster General laboured under a misapprehension as to his powers and as to the terms of the Berne Convention, I do not know that the hon. Postmaster General of to-day committed as grave an error as the late Conservative Government did when they agreed to the entrance of Canada into the Berne Copyright Convention without coming down and asking the consent of Parliament to an agreement that has paralyzed a certain section of the printing, the paper-making and the book-making trades of this country. To be frank, Mr. Speaker, if there is one department of the Government that has shown some signs of life, reform, and progress, it is the department presided over by the Postmaster General. His proposals as outlined in the present Bill, and his promises as to the future in connection with the department, are enough to satisfy me that the department is being run on up-to-date lines; and, what is more, whatever the politicians may think, I believe that the public of Canada—the business community, the mercantile community, the letter-writing community, hold the opinion that I have expressed. One matter which worried some hon. gentlemen on this side of the House when this Bill was introduced, and which apparently worries them now—the matter which I propose to deal with—is the proposed change in the charge for the carriage of newspapers from the office of publication, and, consequent thereon, the adoption of the 2-cent rate for Canadian and American letters. Every one will be quick enough to admit that the adoption of the 2-cent rate will fill a long-felt want. I do not think there are many in this House, and I am certain that there are very few in the country, who will not agree that this proposal to make the newspaper proprietor contribute his share to the revenue for the carriage of his wares is a move in the right direction. There was good reason for the enactment of the old law that made the rate for the carriage of newspapers a cent a pound, and there never was even a semblance of sense or reason or any request for the repeal of that law. The truth is that its repeal was a mere whim of a gentleman of the Senate, who, anxious to pose in the niche of personal popularity, jollied through Parliament a measure that has cost this country in postal rates millions of dollars, creating a big deficit in the spending department, which has stood in the way of reform every time a reform was proposed. Popular judgment from the people direct, and not from the newspapers, will endorse this measure. If the people were appealed to to-morrow for their verdict, the universal sentiment of the public would favour the measure. Why should the newspaper maker have his wares carried free? The Postmaster General says the millions of Canadians can have a 2-cent rate on Canadian and American letters if he can impose a half-cent rate for newspaper carriage; and yet hon. gentlemen on this side of the House oppose the proposal, and insist that because the tax will take a few thousands of dollars out of the pockets of a few newspaper proprietors, the entire letter-writing public should stand a charge that clearly should come out of the pockets of those proprietors. We hear a good deal about newspapers being educators; but surely if the state educates the people right up to the door-knob of the university the people should be able to contribute towards the expense of their education after that. The primary object of a newspaper is not educational, but commercial. A newspaper is published to make money, and its educational influence is merely an incident in the business of making money.

To tell the truth, I feel, in approaching this question, a good deal like the late Artemus Ward when he was prepared to sacrifice all his wife's relations upon the altar of his patriotism. I am one of the fortunate newspaper proprietors who do not benefit to the extent of one hundred dollars per year by this free transmission through the post, and I would not suffer by more than that amount if Parliament should decide to withdraw the privilege. I mention this fact so that I may not gain too much glory by the self-sacrificing spirit I display in attempting to support the Postmaster General's proposals to make newspaper proprietors pay some part of the freight charges for the carrying on of their own business. There is good reason why some newspapers, having a large circulation, should agitate and plead for the free circulation of newspapers. The fact is that three newspapers in Montreal and three in Toronto get considerably over one-third of the advantage consequent on this free carriage of newspapers. The entire revenue expected from this source is about $82,000, and of this amount these six papers will contribute about $32,000. Last year, as the hon. Postmaster General has told us, and as the returns on the Table show, the public carried 5,000,000 pounds weight of letters, and the state paid for the carriage of these letters about $5,000,000. The newpaper proprietors of Canada had 16,500,000 pounds of newspapers carried for them, for which they did not pay one cent. Of this 16,500,000 pounds, about one-half the entire weight, or 8,000,000 pounds, was carried for three newspapers in Montreal and three in Toronto. Why should the Dominion be called on to contribute to the revenue of these newspaper proprietors? The free carriage of newspapers is a charge that should be borne by the newspaper proprietors and not imposed on the general public. Why should the Government be a silent partner in the newspaper business? There are thousands of postmasters throughout the country who are paid, so I understand, by commission, in different forms. These

postmasters have to handle these newspaper bags, open them and distribute their contents, and for this work, they do not get one cent. As to the handling of newspapers and the work it entails on the local post offices, I am advised, taking the Toronto office for example, that were it not for the work of distributing the newspaper in that office, its work could be carried on for one-half of the present cost. This means that one-half of the staff of the post office work for the newspapers and are paid by the Government. The spirit of this age is against exemptions of all kinds; and where it is possible, the Government should set a good example and relieve the general public to the extent that the expense should be borne by those who carry on such commercial ventures as newspapers. Scores of newspapers carried free, especially those published in the interests of benefit societies, are published in many cases to save a large expenditure in postage stamps and postal cards; and from a rough calculation that I have been able to make, from the returns on the Table, I believe that an amount of from $6,000 to $8,000 is saved to these societies alone by the free carriage of these papers published in their interest. Then there are some class or trade papers that send out tens of thousands of copies all over the country free. When you talk about the educational advantages of the press, I find that these newspapers look out carefully for financial results, because I find in one case that 31 pages out of the 46, and in another case that 46 pages out of the 68, are devoted to advertising. If the country is going to stand the expense of carrying on every business the product of which has an educational value, why my hon. friends from East Lambton (Mr. Fraser) and from West Lambton (Mr. Lister) could very well put in a plea for the chief product of that county. Coal oil has an educational value, because it sheds that light which guides Canadians in the pathway of knowledge. For the greater part of the twenty-four hours, newspapers without coal oil would have no more educational value than coal oil without newspapers. I think that the hon. Postmaster General has departed from the strict principle when he proposes to exempt newspapers circulated within a ten mile zone, but I am not inclined to quarrel with an exemption which my friends the publishers of country newspapers are to enjoy. It is true that the country newspaper is published with the idea of making money. I am glad to believe that the aim of its founder is, in many cases, realized; but the country newspaper is not the important and profitable commercial enterprise that profits to anything like the extent that the great newspaper enterprises do by free transmission through the mails. The country newspaper men are patriots and philanthropists, who benefit the country by benefiting the communities which they serve; and I think if the country is going to subsidize any class of business in the community with the free use of the mails, the country newspaper man should come first in the race for the favour. I believe that the withdrawal of this privilege will prove a positive benefit to every legitimate newspaper enterprise, especially to the publishers of weeklies and monthlies. The free use of the mails has been so much capital contributed by the state, as the Postmaster General has said this afternoon, to start the mushroom publisher in business. This standing offer of free postal service has been a business opening for every fakir. What is to prevent him starting out in the newspaper line and publishing a newspaper? He could find some job printer willing to publish the first issue on credit. The Dominion are willing to carry the entire first issue free of cost, so that a too generous Government and a trusting job printer created an enterprise which exploited advertising fields that should have been reserved for legitimate publications. The privilege now to be withdrawn, the free use of the mails has exposed the standard weeklies and monthlies to competiton from enterprises that would never have seen their first issue, if their founders had been called on to pay postage. With regard to religious weeklies and their cry for free postage. I do not believe that the rank and file of the Protestant denominations—and I use the word Protestant because it is on their behalf that this cry is raised—want state aid for the carriage of their newspapers. At the interview held a few weeks ago by the Postmaster General at Toronto, he quickly found that it was not the religious end but the business end of the equipment that was much in evidence. This was shown when he questioned the delegation. In one case, when a prominent publisher, supposed to represent a religious newspaper, was questioned, it was found that he represented a secular newspaper of very large circulation, and it was on behalf of the latter paper he was so anxious to have free circulation. Then many of these papers contain very few advertisements of Sunday school books and periodicals, but columns of advertisements relating to general trade, bicycles and patent medicines. I believe that no legitimate enterprise will suffer from the loss of this privilege. This free postal offer on the part of the Government has always been an inducement to fakirs to scour the advertising field to the disadvantage of established journals. They run in debt to the printer and typesetter and paper-maker and to the pressmen; and equipped with a first-class circulation liar, they gull and bleed the advertising public, who never know what they have lost until their money is all gone.

It just amounts to this, Mr. Speaker, and I am perfectly certain that it is the opinion of the country that this proposal of the Postmaster General is not only a reasonable

one, but a proper one. I look upon it as one of the best Acts introduced by gentlemen on the other side of the House. I think that if the country is carrying newspapers below cost, we are doing just as much as we are entitled to do. Newspapers are not charitable institutions, and there is no reason why they should be regarded as such by the Government or by the country.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. It is always a a great pleasure indeed to me, and I have no doubt to other members of the House as well, to listen to the hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Robertson). And when he discourses upon a question with which he is so conversant as that which is now before the House, it is all the more interesting to hear his views. The hon. gentleman has spoken of his philanthropy and his philanthropic views in so far as the newspapers were concerned. It is also a pleasure to learn that his philanthropic views and his interest as the proprietor of one of the most interesting newspapers in the country agree. The hon. gentleman has stated, very properly, that he is in favour of having the papers pay the postage the Postmaster General has decided to impose upon them. But, Sir, the hon. gentleman must remember that the new imposition does not extend within ten miles of where the paper is published. The hon. gentleman may not have considered that. But he knows that almost the whole of the enormous circulation of his paper would be within the precincts of this charmed circle. His competitors who extend beyond the ten miles would have to pay the tax, while he would stand practically untouched by it. Sir, there are two reasons which appeal to my judgment against the proposition of the Postmaster General. First, I fully agree that for a large class of the population of a country like Canada, the only medium of education, or at least, the most easily got at of all mediums of education, is the newspaper. The newspaper is ecclectic in its lessons to the people. It educates them on matters of trade and commerce; the farmers and many other classes it educates in matters of their own occupation it educates them in the laws of this country and in the work of this Parliament, where the great interests of the country are discussed. I think that Canada is rich enough now to make sacrifices in order to extend the education which the newspaper and the newspaper alone can give to the people of the country. But, there is another reason which strongly appeals to my judgment. If concessions of that kind are made, whether by one party or by another it matters little, it is a retrograde step to take away from the people the privilege thus conferred. That is one reason why I believe that this proposal is a mistake; and I believe that before long the belief that it is a mistake will permeate all ranks of the people. It will be looked upon as a limitation of the privileges which were accorded to Canadians. Sir, I agree with the Postmaster General that there are expenses connected with this advantage. But, Sir, you cannot confer benefits upon the people without expense. One occupying the position of Postmaster General cannot but realize that the conditions in Canada are different from the conditions in almost any other country. You have here a territory so large that when you compare it with other countries on the map, you feel it almost incredible that it can belong to one Crown and to one people. But in this territory you have a population of only about five millions of people. How can you assimilate the conditions of a country like Canada with those of a country like England, where you have forty million of people living within a limited area, so that they can have equal postal facilities with ourselves at only 50 per cent of the expense.

I shall attempt to be as brief as possible, but I desire to follow the Postmaster General in the propositions he laid before us and in the order in which he presented them. As to books for the blind, there can be only one opinion. The afflicted, God's afflicted, must be looked after before anybody else: and there cannot be any question whatever that the measure introduced by the Postmaster General, so far as that point is concerned, will receive the approval of Parliament and the sanction of the people. In dealing with other questions, I do so in no hostile spirit. I speak as one who has had occasion to study these questions, and who cordially believes that the Postmaster General occupies one of the most important positions in the Government. This is the department that goes ahead of civilization in every part of the Dominion. Before you can establish business, before you can work mines, before you can start farming, the first necessity of the country is to establish relations which cannot exist without the post office. Whether in the crowded city or in the distant mining camp or prairie farm, a man must be in relation to the outside world if the result of his labour is not to be lost for lack of remuneration. The Postmaster General's second point was the decentralization of the dead letter office. By those who have studied this question, this must be regarded as a matter of very great importance. If the scheme of the Post master General is going to be carried out, by establishing all over the country, in the various post offices, a branch of the dead letter department where letters may be opened, I think he will find that he is making a great mistake.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I suppose the hon. gentleman is aware that the system obtains in Great Briain.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Yes, the hon. gentleman is aware of that, and the hon.

gentleman is going to tell the hon. the Posmaster General wherein circumstances are different between Canada and Great Britain, though I presume the hon. gentleman, who seems to be quite familiar with every branch of his department, must also be aware of those circumstances. No political appointments are made in Great Britain, the system of promotion obtains there, and the various postmasters are selected from well trained officers who are promoted from one rank to another as occasion arises. Suppose the postmaster of Liverpool or the postmaster of Manchester dies to-morrow, his successor will be selected from one of the other post offices, or selected from the London post office. What is the result of that? My hon. friend must know that these men are invested with larger powers than postmasters in Canada. They are entrusted with the collection of minor inland revenues, they are men trained in every branch of their department, and I see no reason why such a man should not be authorized to open the correspondence of individuals, if any one is to be so authorized. The great security of the mail depends upon the absolute confidence which the people have that no letter can be tampered with in any shape or form. The system of appointing postmasters in England is altogether different from that which obtains in Canada.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I hope the hon. gentleman is not expressing his want of confidence in our postmasters from any experience.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I am expressing my views, as I never hesitate to do even when they do not accord with the views of the Postmaster General.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Perhaps the hon. gentleman does not quite understand what I propose, and an illustration may make the matter clearer. Supposing, for example, that a letter is deposited in Halifax without any address upon it, an ordinary error. The envelope is perfectly blank. Does the hon. gentleman see any objection to a scheme being devised by which an official in that office, or a branch you may call it, should be authorized to treat that letter as a dead letter, instead of sending it to Ottawa to be treated as a dead letter, thus saving a lot of delay?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I do not agree with that proposition, and I will tell the hon. gentleman why. I have pointed out the difference which exists in the system of appointing postmasters in England and that which obtains in Canada. Now, take one of our large cities in Canada. The postmaster is not supposed to take any personal interest in the departmental work, so to speak. He is not supposed to be an expert, or to have the knowledge and experience which are required from postmasters in England. Now, what would be the result if a letter were deposited, as the hon. gentleman suggests, in Halifax without any address? It will be opened by a clerk in the Halifax post office who may know the very people whose letter he is opening, whereas, under the present system, that letter is sent to the dead letter office at Ottawa. That office is under the control of a man of great experience, a man who has been trained to his work, and no letter is opened except under his supervision, or by officers who are known to be confidential men. These men open letters coming from Halifax, or coming from Victoria, coming from any other part of Canada, the writers of which they ignore absolutely. That is the point I wish to make. Now, if the hon. gentleman wishes to make a change, I think it would be much better, if a letter is insufficiently prepaid, to forward it to its destination and there recover from the receiver the postage which the sender of the letter neglected to place upon it.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Suppose there was no address on it, where would you send it?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The hon. gentleman will admit that it is very seldom letters are sent to a post office without an address.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The addresses may be difficult to decipher, but in those cases you send them up to Ottawa where you have a branch of your department, the clerks of which know no more about the man sending the letter, than if he lived in China. That is the great precaution which we must preserve. But, Sir, this is not a new question at all. The views I am expressing are not my own personal views only, they are the views of such men as Sir John A. Macdonald and Alexander Mackenzie. Now, I would like to draw the attention of the hon. gentleman to a discussion which took place in 1875, on the 9th of March, which will be found on page 533 of "Hansard." The question was still more complicated then than it is now. There were questions involving monetary interests, and the Posmaster General of that day, like the Postmaster General of to-day, wanted to alter the law so as to permit letters to be opened outside of the head of the department, who alone as the law then existed, could open a letter. Sir John A. Macdonald, referring to the clause, is thus reported:

> Referring to the clause which gave the Postmaster General authority to stop letters passing through the mails, on satisfactory evidence being given to him that persons were engaged in conducting any scheme for obtaining remittances through the post office by means of false or fraudulent pretensions, he said that it might be reasonable to give such power to the Postmaster General himself. He would possess the confidence of the House and the country. At the same time it was quite impossible that he could exercise supervision in all parts of the Dominion.

Suppose a scheme of a fraudulent character were being carried on on the Pacific Coast. and letters containing money were passing from Victoria B.C., to San Francisco, the Postmaster General could not act himself, and would have to delegate the power to the local postmasters, because it was quite apparent that the whole machinery connected with the mails between those two points could not be stopped in order that the letters might be forwarded to Ottawa. The acknowledged rule was that the Postmaster General could only delegate his authority to his deputy but the Act would be inoperative unless the Postmaster General should be able to delegate his powers to a great number of officials, and those powers were not such as ought to be vested in others.

That is a strong expression of opinion, and the reason urged by the Postmaster General of the day was a stronger reason than that urged by the Postmaster General of to-day, who says a letter not addressed may have to be sent to Ottawa. I am quite certain in the case to which I have just referred the interests were so considerable that it was from the standpoint of the whole people of Canada that Sir John Macdonald expressed, as leader of the Opposition, the views which I have just quoted. He continued :

The evidence of fraud might be satisfactory to the Postmaster General and yet prove fallacious, and a great loss might occur owing to letters being stopped while passing through the mails and there is no provision under which the sender could obtain any remedy. He quite understood the object which the Postmaster General had in introducing this clause into the Bill, yet he conceived it would be infinitely better that a few persons should suffer than that the public should lose confidence in the mails being safely carried.

The right hon. gentleman then stated a case well known to those who read the parliamentary history of England. He continued :

Hon. members would recollect the case of Sir James Graham, Postmaster General in England, who opened certain letters connected with the Mazzini affair. The matter was inquired into by a select committee, who, however, refused to report against the action that had been taken. In the course of the evidence he believed it was proved that there were direct incentives in the correspondence to assassination. The correspondence was further connected with secret conspiracies on the continent, yet Sir James Graham, although he was acting under the authority of law, never overcame the feeling which arose on account of that proceeding, and confidence in the post office was much weakened ; and not until the most solemn assurances were given by the Government that no such case would again occur was confidence renewed in the department. He believed that never since that day had a letter been opened in its passage through the British mails. For these reasons he believed it would be infinitely better that this clause should be dropped out of the Bill rather than the public confidence should be weakened in the post office.

Hon. Mr. Mackenzie observed that there were undoubtedly a great many difficulties connected with the granting of these additional powers to the Postmaster General, and therefore he would be inclined to advise his hon. friend to leave this section out.

I will not continue or read from the debate, but the result was that Hon. D. A. Macdonald, whom many of us recollect and who was a personal friend of my own, and who occupied at that time the position of Postmaster General, stated that seeing the feeling of the House and the expression of opinion given by the leader of the Government and by the leader of the Opposition, he agreed that it would be better to leave this clause out of the Bill. And the clause was left out. We must not legislate only for cases of letters which are not addressed. We want in a growing country like Canada to train and educate the people to have confidence in the institutions under which they live and lead the people to believe that a letter is sacred. When administering the department I frequently found letters in respect to which it was next to impossible to decipher the address, yet the long training of the men in the dead letter office enabled them to decipher almost the addresses on letters which came from any part of the world, and although it might take more or less time, the address was deciphered. Who is to blame for that condition of affairs ? The sender of the letter is to blame if he does not take the necessary precautions to have his letter reach its destination. Then why should we destroy the confidence of the people in the post office ? The people know that the Postmaster General, through his deputy as the officer appointed by him to superintend the dead letter branch, is responsible to the people, and that official can be brought to Parliament. If we are going to establish dead letter offices all over Canada I am quite certain the hon. gentleman will regret it. For this reason it is apparent that the system cannot be applied in any particular way. If the hon. gentleman thinks he will be able to surmount the difficulty by establishing separate dead letter offices all over the Dominion, I say the game is not worth the candle ; it would be a very expensive procedure to establish separate branches, whereas there is in Ottawa an office to which the letters may be sent. Under these circumstances I would ask the hon. gentleman to reconsider the matter before he agrees to change a system which has worked well, and in respect to which there have been no complaints. It is impossible to assimilate the conditions in Canada with the conditions in England. The civil service there is built on different lines, and while it works well in England it would be a complete failure in Canada. The Postmaster General, I believe, next referred to the reduction in the letter rate from 3 cents per ounce to 2 cents. That is a very simple question. It is a question whether we can afford it or not. When I was acting as Postmaster General the matter was brought up on several occasions. At the time Mr.

Morley was Postmaster General in the Government of Lord Roseberry, I had the pleasure of meeting the hon. member for East Toronto in London, and we had a long chat about these matters, which are of great importance, and I must admit that if this change could be carried out, it would be an advantage.

The question is one of revenue. I know that the Postmaster General is very sanguine; I know that he is predicting a great increase in the revenues of the country, but the hon. gentleman made a mistake before about the Berne Convention and I think the hon. gentleman is making a mistake now as to the probable increase in the revenue of the Post Office Department. In a country like Canada with its sparsely-settled localities, and with its remote regions to be supplied by mail, the mail service cannot be carried on cheaply. For instance, when Rossland was opened up there were only a few huts and I was asked to establish a post office there. It would cost us more than perhaps a dozen ordinary post offices in settled portions of the Dominion; but we could not expect the miners to carry on their business, nor could the trade of that country be developed without establishing a post office, and so it was done. There are many such instances which will occur throughout this Dominion. The Postmaster General tells us that next January is going to see an equilibrium between the revenue and expenditure of the Post Office Department. Sir, I venture to predict that he is mistaken, for I believe that it is an impossibility in Canada to equalize the revenue and the expenditure of that department for years to come. I do not say, that with the enormous resources of Canada, it will not be done some day or other, but I do say that even with all the energy of the Postmaster General and his ardent desire to make his department a success, the hon. gentleman will find it an impossibility to make both ends meet until the country is more thickly settled than it is now. The value of the ordinary 3-cent stamps issued to the public during the year ending 30th June, 1897, was ordinary stamps, $2,471,946. I ventured to ask the hon. gentleman the other day about the Jubilee stamps, and he told me it was impossible to discover what they realized, but it is quite apparent that any clerk in his department could have found it out with very little trouble, and the hon. gentleman should have given us the information. From the records of the department I find that the Jubilee stamps would amount to $208,134. That makes, according to my calculation the total issue of these stamps $2,680,080. The hon. gentleman knows that this can be fairly considered as being the revenue, because the value of 3-cent stamps used on other correspondence is balanced by the use of 1-cent stamps and 2-cent stamps and 6-cent stamps and 10-cent stamps on letters. For instance, it often occurs that you put a 2-cent stamp and a 1-cent stamp on a letter instead of a 3-cent stamp; moreover, the number of letters passing by mail in Canada during the same year was 123,800,000, the postage upon which at 3 cents would amount to $3,714,000, and making allowance for foreign and drop letters, the postage upon domestic letters may be taken to amount at least to $2,000,000, of which one-third, or we will say $650,000 would be lost by the reduction in rate of postage from 3 to 2 cents. The people of Canada will therefore see what they have to pay for this privilege proposed by the Postmaster General, because that $650,000 will have to be made up in some other way. The hon. gentleman has been rather anxious, and not unfairly, to show the deficits which he says existed previously, and the great reduction which has taken place in these deficits through his peculiarly successful administration. The deficit for the year ending 30th June, 1895, was $800,857, and the deficit for the year ending the 30th June, 1896, was $700,997.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman is mistaken in that. It was $780,000.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. If I am wrong I will be ready to admit it, but until it is shown to me that I am wrong, I must consider the figures which I have given to be correct. For the year ended the 30th of June, 1897, the deficit was $586,539.93. The increase in the expenditure of the Post Office Department for the year ended the 30th of June, 1896, over that for the year ended the 30th of June, 1895, was $71,363.83, and the increase for the year ended the 30th June, 1897, over that for the previous year was $124,467.04.

If the hon. gentleman could not urge the reason he has given for reducing the postage on letters, he would have no argument at all. His contention was that the reduction would increase the number of letters to such an extent as to make up the deficiency. Sir, that is a fallacy, as has been proved beyond the possibility of discussion by what has occurred in the United States of America. This point also came up when I was in England. A personal friend of mine, and one who takes a great interest in assimilating the postage all over the British Empire, Mr. Heniker Heaton, on several occasions discussed the matter with me. He took such an interest in the question that with me he interviewed some of the officials of the London post office, so as to be able, from a purely departmental standpoint, to ascertain exactly whether that was possible or not. I brought forward the reason which I am urging to-night. I expressed my ardent desire, as I am doing to-night, to see the reduction of postage, because it would be an almost universal benefit to any country; but the sentimental

side of the question disappears altogether in presence of the practical business considerations, which men occupying seats in Parliament and representing the commercial interests of the people, have to consider far and above the sentimental side of any question. We are here for the purpose of giving our earnest endeavours to the development of the country, and looking as carefully and as prudently as trustees do after the interests of the people confided to us. For that reason, however anxious we might be to reform and improve matters, we must halt before we give away the revenues of the country for an improvement which is in the right direction, but which in our financial circumstances, it is impossible for us to afford. The experience of the United States post office, I have said, proves my case. If that statement can be contradicted, of course, it will take away a great deal from the argument which I wish to submit. The excess of the receipts over the expenditure in the United States in 1883, before the reduction of the letter rate from 3 cents to 2 cents, was $2,691,992. The hon. gentleman gave some figures which I am free to confess, I could not follow, because I did not see exactly the basis on which he rested his argument. The excess of expenditures over receipts in the year ended the 30th of June, 1897, was $11,400,000. If these figures do not show that the fact of reducing the postage on letters does not increase the number of letters written in such a proportion as to make up the deficiency, I am prepared to give up my case. These figures can be verified by reference to experts in the United States, in England and in Canada, who have not only considered the matter from a departmental standpoint, but have written books bearing on the subject which can be found, I think, in the library. That is the reason why, anxious as I am to give every possible benefit to the people of Canada in connection with the postage upon letters, I say that at the present moment it is impossible for us to do so.

I wish now to pass to a question which to my mind is of the greatest possible importance to the people of Canada, and which affects the relations which exist between Canada and almost every portion of the civilized world. I was abroad when I read, to my astonishment, a paragraph in one of the leading dailies of London, stating that the Postmaster General had reduced the postage upon foreign letters from 5 cents per half ounce under the Berne convention to 3 cents per ounce. It was familiar to me, and familiar to every clerk in the Pose Office Department that in 1874 a treaty for the formation of a general postal union had been signed at Berne, in Switzerland. That treaty comprised nearly all the civilized nations of the world, and some which at that period were not regarded as ranking among the most civilized, but were fast growing into the family of nations, and were likely within a short period to become as important as they have become since This treaty did not include the British possession beyond the sea, but Canada, always taking the lead of the British colonies and always anxious to strengthen the link between herself and the mother country and obtain that position to which she is entitled among the commercial nations of the world, immediately applied to the Imperial Government to be included in that postal convention. The Imperial Government consented, and Canada was admitted to the convention that sat in Paris in 1878, and became a member of the universal postal union from the 1st of July, 1878. From that date, the postal business of Canada became assimilated to that of every nation which formed part of the postal union, and except by breaking up the treaty and withdrawing from the privileges of the postal union, no interference could take place with the postal rates, which had been adopted at that union, recognized as a treaty which bound together the nations that composed it. The convention of Vienna followed the convention of Paris, and at that convention other nations joined, always under the bond that they would obey the laws and regulations of the postal union and adopt the rates imposed. These rates are the only important portion of that treaty, because if it were not for the purpose of regulating the postal rates all over the world, there would have been no necessity for holding a convention at all. The convention of Vienna came into force on the 1st of July, 1892, and is still in force. Then the convention of Washington was held, to which Col. White was sent to represent this Government, and that convention will come into force in January, 1899. I am giving the facts, and I give the law regulations, which the hon. gentleman can read. I have in my hand the postal union containing all the regulations laid down. It is in French, because the discussions took place in French, but there is a translation into English, which I am quite sure the hon. gentleman would not require to use at all. But under this convention, a letter weighing more than half an ounce and less than an ounce would be, if prepaid, only three cents, liable to double the deficiency, namely, 14 cents, on delivery at destination, because it should have been prepaid ten cents. But the reduction which the Postmaster General, in his liberality, wanted to effect, and thus isolate himself splendidly from the whole civilized world, was not only a reduction in the amount to be paid but also a reduction by doubling the weight to be carried for the amount paid.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. If the hon. gentleman will allow me, at an earlier stage in his remarks he spoke of the condition of the departmental accounts for the fiscal year ending 30th June, 1896, and said the deficit was $780,000. The hon. gentle-

man called it about $700,000. I would refer him to the report of the department for the fiscal year ending June, 1896, and he will find in page xxxii, the following item :

Heretofore it has not been the practice to treat the amount expended under the head of Civil Government as a charge against the department, and were such practice adhered to the deficit of $1,027,529 would be reduced by $246,376, leaving the outside service stand $781,152.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I am not prepared to admit until I verify it for myself, but I think that the hon. gentleman would hardly bring that point when the Berne convention is under discussion, except he ignored that convention completely. He may fancy that he can discuss anything under it, but let me ask him, as a matter of fact, if, under that convention he was not as helpless as a new-born babe. He could not change the rate or the weight of postal matter under it, unless he broke through the treaty and the regulations laid down, which I shall read to the hon. gentleman, indicating the mode in which these things can be changed. The hon. gentleman I thought was somewhat—I will not say rash—but not just as prudent as he should have been when he said to-night that the fact of his not taking Parliament into his confidence was that there were negotiations going on with the Imperial Government. Sir, the Imperial Government is as helpless as the Postmaster General to interfere.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. What nonsense.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. If the hon. gentleman can show me, by any process of law or reasoning, that when Canada became a party to the Berne convention, he could negotiate with the British Government, I shall be much surprised. Mr. Chamberlain did not consider the question very long before he told the hon. gentleman that he was entirely at sea.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Does the hon. gentleman take the ground that there cannot be a modification consented to between two countries or more and applicable only to those countries, without the consent of all parties to that treaty ?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Certainly.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am very sorry that the hon. gentleman has been so long reading that convention without understanding it. That is not the meaning of the treaty.

Mr. FOSTER. Your reading of it was not accepted.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It was not the law under which the postal rates were changed between Canada and Newfoundland and Canada and the United States.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I do not know whether Newfoundland is in the convention.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am sure the hon. gentleman does not, but it is.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. If the hon. gentleman will keep his temper, and if he and I can get together, then, with his great experience and my desire to learn, we shall come to understand this convention, no doubt.

Mr. WALLACE. With the consent of the hon. member for Three Rivers (Sir Adolphe Caron) I would like to ask the Postmaster General a question. Did the Postmaster General have an Order in Council passed to reduce the postage to Great Britain, or was it done by him ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It was not done by Order in Council. I would just tell the hon. gentleman (Sir Adolphe Caron) that any two or more members of the convention——

Sir ADOPHE CARON. I am going to read the convention——

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. But the hon. gentleman has taken the ground that there can be no reduction without the consent of all the parties to the convention. That he may not be wandering in error, I would say to him that under the convention any two or more members can ameliorate the rates among themselves. There are conventions within conventions.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I have been so unskilful in my efforts to convince the hon. gentleman, that I have given up the task. But if I read the convention, the official document, surely the hon. gentleman will be satisfied. I am going just as far as it is possible for me to go, when the hon. gentleman wishes me to impart to him the information I have. I tried to say that under that convention, it was impossible for the British post office itself to change anything in the convention without the consent of the other parties, and the hon. gentleman would not let me finish. He must know that I would not make a statement of that kind without knowing what the effect of the convention is. Sir, I have that convention here printed for the information of the commercial nations of the world. I say that under this convention Great Britain, the mighty British Empire herself is as helpless as the Postmaster General of Canada who issued his proclamation beginning : " I, William Mulock "—and declaring so and so. He might have declared until he died, and it would have had no more effect upon the Berne Convention, or the Paris Convention, or the Vienna Convention, or the Washington Convention than if the hon. gentleman had never existed. I put this strongly for this reason that I feel that the head of one of the great departments of Canada telling the world that he, by his proclamation does

so and so has made Canada ridiculous. It indeed looks very despotic for a democratic country. The hon. gentleman says in his proclamation :

Now, therefore, I, William Mulock, Postmaster General of Canada, under and by virtue of authority vested in me, do hereby establish the rate of postage upon all letters transmitted by post from any point in Canada to the United Kingdom, or to any of the British possessions, as follows :—There shall be charged and paid one uniform rate of 3 cents per ounce weight, a fraction of an ounce being chargeable as an ounce upon all letters, as aforesaid, transmitted from any point in Canada to any point in the United Kingdom or British possessions.

And this regulation shall come into force and take effect——

Mr. COCHRANE. Why did not it ?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Because of Mr. Chamberlain. He told the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) that he could not fight the whole world by himself——

——come into force and take effect on, from and after the first day of January, one thousand eight hundred and ninety-eight.

Dated at Ottawa, this twenty-third day of November, 1897.

W. MULOCK,
Postmaster General.

Now, Sir, coincidents are very strange. There was an election going on, at that time and the "Globe," the organ of the Liberal party, taking into consideration, of course, merely the interests of Canada and not at all the fact that an election was going on, had the following :—

New Link of Empire.—Important Announcement at last night's Liberal Meeting.—Three-cent Postal Rate for Canadians throughout the Empire.—Sir Louis H. Davies and Hon. William Paterson at the Massey Music Hall.—Drummond County Railway and Crow's Nest Pass——

Well, I limit myself for to-night to postal matters and I shall drop the others.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The Drummond County question is rather hot just now, and you had better not touch it.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Indeed ? The hon. gentleman will see the diplomatic way in which Mr. Paterson announced this change to the electors of Toronto :

The other important announcement was by Mr. Paterson, who said that the Postmaster General had made arrangements by which——

Made arrangements, mind you, the Berne Convention notwithstanding.

——after January 1, letters not over one ounce would be sent from Canada at a three-cent rate to all parts of the British Empire. This further development along Imperial lines was greeted with an extraordinary demonstration of approval.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. So it was.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It will come out all right.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Tarte) was present, I suppose, and saw the reason for the enthusiasm.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I went later on.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The "Globe" says further :

The meeting was a decided success as a vote-maker, and the crowd cordially endorsed the sentiments—not much to look at, but fairly effective as sung—"that there'll be a hot time in the Centre when Bertram is elected."

Look at the queer coincidence. Just as Mr. Bertam was running, this announcement was made that the Postmaster General had abandoned the Berne Convention. All the world agreed to remain in except "I, William Mulock." There is another announcement of this reduction in postage, again under the heading "A new link in the Empire." But it would take up time uselessly to read these newspaper articles. I shall not inflict them upon hon. gentlemen who have already shown such kindness in listening to me. I call attention to these articles for no other purpose than to show that the head of the department was ignorant of the fact that he was placed in a position of impotence so far as interfering with the Berne Convention was concerned. Now, Sir, to show that I do not speak at all outside of the record, I would draw the attention of hon. members to the convention itself.

Now, I wish to draw the attention of hon. members to the convention itself. The postal convention selected Berne as the headquarters of the Postal Union, as it was thought desirable to choose a small commercial centre where no prejudicial influence might interfere with the deliberations of the union instead of one of the larger capitals. So it was decided at the first meeting that Berne, the capital of Switzerland, should be selected as the headquarters of the Postal Union. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman should have made himself acquainted with the proceedings of the union. He knew he was going to be made Postmaster General if his party got into power, and one of the first documents he should have read, the first information he should have acquired, was how to deal with the people who had entered into a convention with Great Britain and her colonies ; and if he could not have found that out himself, if he had retained the old and trusted Deputy Minister, who is still to-day as able a man as ever he was, his Deputy Minister would have instructed him how to proceed, and would not have permitted him to issue that pronunciamento, because it is nothing else. It is the personal declaration of a gentleman who has no more power to deal with that question than I have to deal with the Brit-

ish fleet in the Mediterranean. Now supposing the Postmaster General had wished to make a change in the postage of Canada, the convention tells him how to do it. It is printed in both French and English, so there could be no mistake about it. These meetings take place every year.

In the interval which elapses between the meetings, any postal administration——

Administration means in French the departmental authority in any country belonging to the Postal Union.

——of a country of the Union has the right to address to the other administrations belonging to it, through the medium of the International Bureau, proposals concerning the régime of the Union.

2. Every proposal is subject to the following procedure :—

A period of five months is allowed to the administrations of the Union to examine the proposals and to furnish to the International Bureau their observations, amendments, or counter proposals, as the case may be. The answers are tabulated by the International Bureau and communicated to the administrations with an invitation to declare themselves for or against.

That is common sense, the treaty cannot be destroyed.

Those who have not furnished their vote within a period of six months, counting from the date of the second circular of the International Bureau notifying to them the observations which have been received are considered as abstaining.

3. In order to become binding, the proposal must obtain :

1°. Unanimity of votes if they involve the addition of new articles or any modification of the stipulations of the present article, or articles 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 12, 13, 15 and 18.

These are technical matters affecting the various bureaus.

2°. Two-thirds of the votes if they involve a modification of the stipulations of the convention other than those of articles 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 12, 13, 15, 18 and 26.

3°. Simply an absolute majority if they affect the interpretation of the stipulations of the convention, except in the case of dispute contemplated by the foregoing article 23.

4. Resolutions duly adopted are sanctioned, in the first two cases, by a diplomatic declaration, which the Government of the Swiss Confederation is charged with the duty of preparing and transmitting to all the governments of the contracting countries, and in the third case by a simple notification from the International Bureau to all the administrations in the Union.

This is the official document. I have read sufficient to show that Canada was represented among the nations, who, by solemn treaty, bound themselves into a compact for commercial purposes in this universal union. I say there is not a clerk in the Post Office Department who does not know the value, and importance, and the terms of the Berne Convention, and the conventions which have subsequently taken place. I wished to bring this before Parliament in order to show that in selecting the hon. gentleman as Postmaster General, the Liberal Government have gibbeted Canada before the civilized nations of the world as having at the head of one of the most important departments a gentleman ignoring one of the most important conventions that affect the trade and commerce of the whole world. Sir, when I read in the papers, in London, the news of the action of the hon. gentleman, I felt a blush of shame when I realized that Canada had been made an object of criticism by the people who took part in the Berne Convention, as having ignored the very contract which regulated her intercourse with them. I have put this case briefly before Parliament because I considered it important to do so. Every point which the hon. gentleman has submitted in his scheme, the change in the postage, the decentralization of the dead letter office, all, I consider, are fraught with danger to the interests of Canada, and to the interest of the union. In expressing my views as I have done, I wish to say that I have not been moved by the slightest feeling against the hon. gentleman, but I have done so solely in obedience to what I considered my duty towards Canada.

Mr. FOSTER. I intended to ask the Postmaster General before he went away a question, but as he is gone, I will ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who is a lawyer, under what section of the Act does the Postmaster General presume to change the postage that already exists between Canada and Great Britain ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am not conversant with the statute, but I remember it was brought up once.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright) moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 10.20 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 16th May, 1898.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 142) to authorize the Quebec Harbour Commissioners to borrow money.—(Mr. Dobell.)

ST. LUC RIFLE RANGES.

Mr. MONK. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the Minister of Militia and Defence if proper precautions have been taken against accident at the St. Luc Rifle Ranges, which the newspapers have announced are to be reopened for practice this year. The hon. gentleman is aware that grave danger attended the practice on these ranges last year, in one instance it was accompanied by very grave accident. Such inquiry as I have been able to make, has convinced me that the fault was with the butts and not at all with the parties who are practicing there. I would like to know from the Minister if precautions have been taken to improve the butts so as to remove the danger of accident?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). The matter has been very carefully considered by the Quartermaster General and the Assistant Adjutant General of Artillery, who have charge of this particular matter, and I understand that they consider it safe, in a restricted way, to carry on the rifle practice this year, not for the general rifle shooting of the militia, but simply for rifle practice for the competition. They are taking the necessary precautions to make the range safe in that limited sense for the practices that may be necessary.

INQUIRY FOR RETURN.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would remind the Minister of Marine and Fisheries of my request for a statement of the dismissals in my county.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). They are being prepared; I am in hopes to have them to-day.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 113) to incorporate the Subsidiary High Court of the Ancient Order of Foresters in the Dominion of Canada.—(Mr. Landerkin.)

SUPPLY—NORTH-WEST SEED GRAIN INDEBTEDNESS.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. DAVIN. I wish to call the attention of the Minister of the Interior to a suggestion I am about to make. The Minister a few days ago, in reply to a question of mine, said the seed grain indebtedness of the North-west Territories amounted to $145,245. I wish to make him a suggestion about that matter. I do not think the argument is unfamiliar to him that the local government of the North-west Territories were entitled, taking the same basis for calculating the obligation of the Dominion to that government as is taken in respect to the provinces, to a much larger sum than it receives at present. A couple of years ago I calculated that the Dominion Government owed the North-west Territories $1,000,000; that is to say, if since 1883, or even later, the Territories had received all they were entitled to on the same basis as the provinces receive their subsidies, at the time I made the calculation, they would have been entitled to $1,000,000 more than they have received. In 1888, taking the population according to the last census, I showed the amount they were then entitled to was a sum which actually exceeded that which they at the present time, the North-west Territory Government, was receiving to carry on its affairs. In regard to the grain indebtedness—I do not know how the members of the North-west Government would regard my suggestion, but I think the people would be in favour of it—I suggest to the hon. Minister that he hand over this sum of $145,235 to the Government of the North-west Territories, and say to them: You are entitled to get from those who owe this sum for seed grain its equivalent in statute labour. I have discussed this matter with several farmers, some of whom never received seed grain, but who take a deep interest in those around them who did receive it, and with others who are not interested mainly on their own account, but because they became security for others, and they thought that if the suggestion I make to the Minister were adopted by him, it would prove a just and wise policy for the North-west, and besides it would be a practical one, because it would be a very easy way of collecting money which would otherwise not be collected. However, that is a matter into which I will not enter. I throw out the suggestion to the Minister, and I hope yet, because I think it would be the solution of a problem which no doubt has presented itself to his mind.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). The suggestion made by the hon. gentleman that the debt due to the Government of Canada for seed grain by farmers of the North-west Territories should be assigned to the Government of the North-west Territories, is one which I have not heard made before. I shall be very glad to take it up and consider it, but at the first blush I am not able to give an opinion on it.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. When the hon. gentleman is considering the suggestion in regard to the farmers of the North-west, perhaps he will also consider claims of Manitoba which have been outstanding since 1886,

with a view of taking them up and disposing of them, or else wiping them out.

ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I wish to call attention to a defect in a return brought down to this House in regard to the Royal Military College. The return I think is complete with the exception of item (c) : "The respective conditions of engagement as regards the duration of the staff of the Royal Military College." I should like if the attention of the Minister of Militia is called to this, and I have no doubt that the return will be completed in that regard before we take up the Estimates.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). I shall call the attention of the Minister of Militia to the request of the hon. gentleman.

ASSINIBOIA—INDIAN RESERVE CROPS.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). A few days ago the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) called my attention to the fact that a cerain answer to a return had not been brought down. The only return not furnished by the Department of Indian Affairs is that ordered on the 2nd inst., calling for the number of acres seeded in 1897, the nature of the seed sown and the amount of crops grown in each Indian reserve in the provisional district of Assiniboia during the year ending 31st December, 1897. I presume that is the return the hon. gentleman refers to.

Mr. DAVIN. Yes.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The practice in the department has been to have the information forwarded only at the end of the fiscal year, so that we have not now in the department the information asked. When the Order passed the House letters were written to the officers instructing them to send the information in. The practice which has obtained for several years of not sending the information to the department until the end of the fiscal year is a very bad one and should be reformed. I will see in the future that this information shall be furnished to the department at the end of the calendar year.

Mr. DAVIN. Hear, hear.

MANITOBA UNIVERSITY LAND GRANT.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. I would remind the Minister of the Interior that some time ago I moved for a return with regard to the land grant to the Manitoba University, and I have not yet been informed whether this return has been brought down.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). I will inquire about it.

Mr. LaRIVIERE.

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

(In the Committee.)

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Before we go on with the Estimates, I would remind the Minister of Public Works that he promised us some information with regard to the fence in Major's Hill Park.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). That item has been allowed to stand, but if my hon. friend wants to go back to it I will move that item be dropped for the excellent reason that the money has been spent and I do not want to vote it again.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I suppose that does not mean that the hon. gentleman will break his promise to give us information about it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The money is not wanted, but I intend to ask in the Supplementary Estimates for a small amount to complete the part of the stone work and the iron railing, and then I will give the information.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Would it be convenient for the hon. gentleman to give the information before the last days of the session, so that in the hurry it may not be forgotten ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will simply move that the item be struck out. There was some misunderstanding the other day. When I said that the fence would cost about $14,000 I meant not only the fence on Mackenzie avenue but the fence on St. Patrick Street as well. When in 1885, the park was transferred to the Government by the city of Ottawa, 963 feet of that fence on Mackenzie avenue was built, and last year I got $4,500 from Parliament to complete the fence on that avenue, and 525 feet were built. To complete the stone work will require about $700 additional, and the balance of the money will be applied for the iron railing. The whole thing will amount in the Supplementary Estimates to $3,886.50.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. So that instead of the fence costing $14,000 it will not cost $10,000 ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. When the chief architect gave that figure to me he included another fence on St Patrick's street which has not been decided on at all.

Mr. FOSTER. The cost of the fence will be about $16 a foot ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It will be about $11 a foot.

Mr. FOSTER. It is $8,000 for 525 feet and that is pretty near $16 a foot.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Quite so; and the iron railing on the whole length of 1,461 feet.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Does the hon. gentleman know what it cost the city to build the part of the fence already erected?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That was about twenty-five years ago; I tried to get that information and we could not.

Mr. McNEILL. What is the height of the masonry work?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. About three feet above ground and there is the foundation, of course.

Mr. McNEILL. At about how much per foot does the architect estimate the cost of that masonry work?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I cannot say.

Mr. McNEILL. Does the chief architect not know what the cost of the mason work is?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. About $9.89 per lineal foot, which is not a very big price, in the opinion of those who know what the work is worth.

Mr. DAVIN. I did not quite understand what my hon. friend said. Is he going to drop a part of this fence now?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am not going to drop anything at all. I am going to ask from Parliament $3,886.50 to complete the fence on Mackenzie avenue.

Mr. DAVIN. Of course one of my hon. friend's chief objects in building this fence is to enhance the ornamental power of the park to Ottawa.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Part of that fence was built already. I have said that about twenty-five times, and I now repeat it. The park was fenced, partly in stone, twenty or twenty-five years ago, by the city of Ottawa. In 1885 it was transferred to us. Part of it was fenced with boards and the boards are all out of shape, and we are asking for the sum necessary to complete the fence in stone, 526 feet.

Mr. DAVIN. Twenty-five years ago, the whole of Canada was in a state of darkness, compared with to-day, in everything artistic. My hon. friend says that the city council of Ottawa, a quarter of a century ago, when Ottawa was emerging from its tadpole condition of Bytown into the great city it is to-day, and which we know now is making progress towards being the Washington of the North, built part of a stone fence and also a wooden fence. My hon. friend must surely know that the view taken by the Ottawa town council, 25 years ago, as to what was a proper fence is hardly the ideal up to which he and his department are reaching at this time of day. He is the Edile of the Dominion of Canada, and surely he is not going to tell this Parliament that the plans and ideals of the Ottawa city council, 25 years ago, are those that are going to govern him now. It was late the other night, when I was trying to impress on his mind the fact that the fence was unsightly and of a hybrid character and lacked the unity which ought to belong to anything artistic. I may not have impressed my hon. friend to the extent it was certainly my desire to do. I should like my hon. friend to consider whether or not it is worth while going on with this fence, which, for the stone alone, will cost nearly $10 a lineal foot. I should like to ask him also what the railing will cost per lineal foot, because it seems to me, if we are going to pay a high price for a fence, we had better have something worth looking at. The object of my hon. friend is not to exclude animals from getting into the park, but really to build a fence that will not only be protective but will please the eye and in that way give the people some value for their money.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. To complete the stone work will require only $700 now, and it is rather late in the day to take the advice of my hon. friend, although no doubt he is a first-class artist in this kind of work as he is in the House. As to the railing, the estimate made by the department on 1,461 feet, amounts to $2,291.50.

Mr. HAGGART. The other evening, I asked what the cost per yard was of the work already done.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We tried to get that information, but the city authorities would not give us any.

Mr. HAGGART. I am talking of the work you did yourself.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have just given the information. I have said the stone work cost $9.89 per lineal foot.

Mr. HAGGART. Would the hon. gentleman ask his chief architect how many cubic yards in a lineal foot or how many parts of a yard?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There are about 16 cubic feet in a lineal foot, so the chief architect tells me.

Mr. HAGGART. Then this work is costing nearly $18 per yard?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not know what the calculation of the chief architect is. I did not supervise the

work myself. I hope that a Minister is not expected to supervise such work himself.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Go on the spot and see it himself ?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There never was a Minister, and there never will be a Minister, who could supervise all his work himself.

Mr. FOSTER. Not all of it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If hon. gentlemen opposite take the ground that the present chief architect, who has been 28 years employed in my department, is not a good officer, I have not a word to say. It is not for me to defend him. I kept him on and promoted him ; but if my hon. friends are right, I made a mistake.

Mr. HAGGART. What we want to know is this. The hon. Minister is doing this by day work, which is contrary to the Order in Council and to the argument made every time, when that side of the House was in Opposition, namely, that no work costing over $5,000 should be let except by tender. The Minister of Public Works has not done that, and we have the right to criticise in the closest manner this expenditure of $14,000, and show to the country that it has cost four or five times as much as it could have been done for by contract.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think the hon. gentleman should be consistent himself and not rise to speak of works done by day labour. I do not want to make any unpleasant references to works that he may have had done by day labour.

Mr. HAGGART. Do not spare me, but let me know what I have done.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend (Mr. Haggart) is a bold man, but he has done work in the past in Montreal, by day's labour, which has not proven to such a great success, and now, in discussing a small expenditure of $4,500, he should be more moderate. He is altogether wrong in this criticism. What is the duty of the Minister of Public Works so far as tenders are concerned ? The Minister is not obliged to call for tenders under the law. The only legal enactment in reference to this matter of public tenders on public works——

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Tarte) will allow me, I would ask : Although there may be no statute, would not the hon. gentleman admit that there is an Order in Council respecting contracts for over $5,000 ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is no law.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That is a law.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The only legal enactment on this point is found in the Public Works Act, chap. 36 of the Revised Statutes, in which it is provided :

> The Minister shall invite tenders by public advertisement for the execution of all works, except in cases of pressing emergency,——

Mr. FOSTER. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If I may be allowed to read——

> ——except in cases of pressing emergency, in which delay would be injurious to the public interest, or in which, from the nature of the work, it can be more expeditiously and economically executed by the officers and servants of the department.

In other words, the moment the Minister goes to Council and is authorized to do work by day's labour, he is perfectly within the meaning of the law.

Mr. HAGGART. Did the hon. gentleman (Mr. Tarte) go to Council and get that authority ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, because there was no reason for it. The expenditure was only $4,500.

Mr. DAVIN. But the real expenditure is $14,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is not a word of accuracy in that.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman's (Mr. Tarte's) own statement is that a work requiring an expenditure of over $5,000 must be given out by public tender. I venture to say he could get no opinion from the Solicitor General or Minister of Justice permitting him to evade that order by splitting the work into two and asking for a vote for only half the work. Such an Order in Council would be a perfect farce, if the Minister could get away from it by saying he would only undertake the work in sections. The Order contemplates the cost of the whole work, not the cost of a portion of it. In this case, according to the hon. gentleman's own statement, the cost would be over $15,000.

Mr. INGRAM. Are we to understand that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Tarte) has changed his views with respect to work by tender and contract ? A few years ago when in Opposition the hon. gentleman was opposed to doing the work by the day and favoured public contract. Has he changed his views?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There are works that can be better done by public tender and contract, and there are works that can be better done by day's labour. All those who have been Ministers of Public Works or Ministers of Railways

and Canals will agree with me that public tender is not always the best.

Mr. INGRAM. I am glad to hear the hon. gentleman say that the Government he criticised so severely was right in this matter.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Well, we need not discuss that on an item that I propose shall be struck out.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the item is struck out, I think we are entitled to an answer from the Minister of Public Works as to whether he proposes to cheat the law by this practice of taking the work in bits. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Tarte) the other evening was, for a moment true to the traditions of the Government, the old and long established traditions, and to the principle of an Order in Council passed long ago, when he gave as his reason for building the greenhouse by contract that it would cost over $5,000, and, therefore, could not be done by day's work. Now he has fairly well implied to-day that he does not consider himself bound to carry out that principle. I wonder if the Government intends to be bound by the declaration of the Minister of Public Works. I wonder if the Government intends to adopt the policy, from this time out, of calling for tenders for these public works only as they wish to do so. Are they going to take the ingenious and not at all honourable method of the Minister of Public Works, who, when he has on hand a work that will cost more than $5,000, divides it into sections of just less that $5,000, gets a vote for one section, and next session comes to the House and gets a vote for a few thousands more, always keeping within the $5,000, so as to cheat the practice and traditions of the department and Government, ever since the Dominion has been in existence? Having done this the hon. gentleman says that there is no law governing the case. Is the hon. gentleman bold enough to stand up in this House of Commons, and after thirty years' of administration in confederation, say that he is not bound by any law, and consequently not bound at all? He pledges himself to the House that he will not do so and so, and when the House meets they find he has done so and so, and he treats the matter with cynical unconcern. We have a right to know from the Minister of Public Works what his position is with regard to this matter. He read the law just now stating that in cases of pressing emergency, or in cases where the work could be better done by day's work, the Minister was not bound to call for public tenders. Here is a work in which neither of these things applies. It was a plain, straight piece of work, so much of a certain kind of stone to be built in a certain way—a work that any masonry contractor could do. There was no invasion threatened, nothing was going to tumble down or be injured if the wall was not built at once. So there was no urgency in the case. Yet he has gone to work deliberately and given this work out by day's work at a cost of $18 or $19 per yard, and has violated the intents of the law.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) has a habit which has not raised him very much in the estimation of the House and the country.

I do not deny the debating talent of my hon. friend. But there is one thing that I must tell him in a friendly way: He will never rise to the position of a leader of men unless he amends his ways, unless he gives up that habit of lecturing everybody. No man, however big he may be, can indulge in that kind of thing. The hon. gentleman cannot once rise in the House without lecturing somebody. He has no right to do so. We are just as good men as he is. Our social position, our political position, is just as good as his. Now let us discuss the hard facts of the case. If I am wrong, I will frankly admit it, but if I am right, my hon. friend will have to admit that the language he has used towards me is unfair. What are the facts of this case? I claim that there is no law, and there is no Order in Council, binding me to give by public tender a work of that kind. If the hon. gentleman will look at the Order in Council of 1880, he will find it states that no contract for any work over and above $5,000 shall be given without public tender; it does not state that no work costing more than $5,000 shall be given out without public tender, not at all, but that no contract over $5,000 shall be given without public tender. I did not give any contract over that amount. That is the spirit of the law. In other words, if the Minister of Public Works or the Minister of Railways and Canals were bound to such an extent that they could not do a certain work by day's work which, in their estimation, could be better done in this way, they would be in a most ridiculous position. They are bound only to this extent, that they cannot give a contract for a work of over $5,000 without asking for public tenders. I did not violate the law in this case, and I will not submit to let my hon. friend lecture me in that way.

Mr. FOSTER. Did my hon. friend not give a contract?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I did not give a contract, I simply gave the work by day's labour.

Mr. FOSTER. Then he could construct a work costing half a million dollars and get off on that same technicality.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If I made up my mind that it was better to carry out a work costing $50,000 without public tender, if, for instance, I thought

it better to apply to two or three able contractors and employ them to construct that work without asking for public tenders, I would then be obliged to go to Council for authorization. I could not do otherwise. But in this case, there was nothing of the kind done. In this case I simply erected a fence by day's work, and did not give any contract. So I am perfectly within the letter of the law, and the letter of the regulations.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend is something of a casuist—I hope that will not offend him. He stated in one part of his somewhat heated diatribe that we had better discuss this question. That would have been very pertinent for him at the commencement of his short speech, when he discussed my social position, my moral position, and different other positions. Now my hon. friend had better stick to his own text. If he goes into that sort of thing he may find that others can go into it as well. The hon. gentleman need not lose his temper and attempt to use language of that kind to a fellow member because he has criticised any piece of work that he is doing. That will not stop criticism, neither will the hon. gentleman stop my criticism, by accusing me of taking the wrong way to rise. I do not care to rise except in one way, and if I do not rise in that way I will not rise at all. My hon. friend should recollect that there are ways in which a man may rise disreputably. But my hon. friend is simply a casuist when he tries to get clear of this by saying that he did not give a contract. Why, he can get rid of calling for tenders, and can arrange to build Parliament buildings in the same way.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I could not give contracts.

Mr. FOSTER. All he would have to do would be simply to do as he has done here, not call for tenders, not give a contract to anybody, but to say to some able men: Go ahead and build this, put men on, and I will pay you by day's work. The hon. gentleman says there is no contract, but there is an implied contract, and he is not fulfilling the spirit of that Order in Council when he employs men by the day and pays them day's wages for doing the work, because that is an implied contract. The hon. gentleman has actually lowered the amount of work he called for in a work which he knew would cost more than $5,000, and has violated the intent of the Order in Counci.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am not bound to carry out by public tender any work, of even over $5,000, provided I can carry it out by day's labour; but I am bound not to give any contract of over $5,000 without a public tender, unless I am authorized to do otherwise by an Order in Council. But I am not making the law. The Order in Council to which I refer was adopted in 1880, and it has stood ever since. Now, on that point I think I am right, I am within the law. My hon. friend is altogether mistaken when he says that I attacked him. What I said was that our social position was as good as his—those are my words, and that our political position is just as good as his; and I said that he had no right to get on his high horse and say that we were deceiving everybody. That is no way for a man to speak who is a leader in this House.

Mr. DAVIN. What was the object of passing that Order in Council?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That was passed nearly twenty years ago, I did not pass it.

Mr. DAVIN. My hon. friend cannot get off that way. We have a perfect right to know from a Minister of the Crown what interpretation he puts upon a law that he is administering, although he does not seem to think an Order in Council is a law. I want to get from him what was the object of passing that Order in Council.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I did not ask for the Order in Council.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The question is one of far greater interest than merely pertains to this item. I asked the Minister of Public Works, who I thought was reading from an Order in Council, which he quoted, to allow me to look at it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I was reading from a memorandum.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman apparently has not the Order in Council in his possession.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have only a quotation from it.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I have it under my hand. It is the startling proposition laid down by the hon. gentleman that brought forth the caustic criticism of the member for York. It is a statement that he has made, surrounded by his colleagues, must be shared in by them or disallowed on the spot. The suggestion has been made that an Order in Council is a wholly useless thing. That Order in Council was passed for the purpose of protecting the public interest in the event of handing over a large work to be carried on by day's work without full consideration by Council, rather than by the off-hand exercise of discretion by the Minister, and the hon. gentleman has found this short cut to the advancement of his own peculiar ideas, that is to say, where the whole cost will undoubtedly run from $14,000 to $16,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Over $5,000.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The whole work will cost what I have indicated.

That is the law of the country. I would have to go to Council and consider their opinions, and then there would be the safeguard of having competition at the hands of the public. But the Minister decides that he will do the work piecemeal, $100 or $1,000 at a time. This, however, is only part of the work, and the object of the Order in Council would not be carried out, and could not be carried out if the Minister were permitted to subdivide the work. If there is any defence for the Minister it will not be found in the argument behind which he has endeavoured to shelter himself. The Public Works Act is important in this connection. It is mandatory, and it says:

> The Minister shall invite tenders by public advertisement for the execution of all work, except in case of pressing emergency in which delay would be injurious to the public interest, or if from the nature of the work it could be done more expeditiously and economically by the officers and servants of the department.

That requires some limit or definition for the protection of the Minister. In 1880, with that general law on the Statute-book, Council went further, and defined the cases in which it would be for the public interest to dispense with public tenders. Although I have not the order at hand, I can remember that it is applicable to public works, not to any part of a public work, not to any work divided into sections. But the Governor in Council gave the Minister this definition of the general language, that "where, from the nature of the work, it might be more expeditiously done by day's work," instead of using the language of the statute, "officers and servants of the department." Surely no hon. gentleman will agree that the Order in Council consents to the Minister cutting the work into sections so that no section shall amount to more than $5,000. I feel positive that this is a most flagrant interpretation of the Order in Council, and is in every sense against the public interest. We have not forgotten the extraordinary length to which hon. gentlemen opposite proceeded when sitting on this side of the House, when they did not stop to question whether we were acting within our rights and within our power, but they boldly attacked the Government for carrying out work, except in case of public emergency, when it was absolutely necessary, under any system except that of tender and contract. The present Minister of Public Works was one of the leaders in denouncing day's work in cases when it was necessary to expend considerable sums of public money, on the ground that negligence might be attributed to the heads of departments and Government employees in regard to not exercising that close scrutiny over expenditure which was possible at the hands of contractors. I have here a report of the observations of the Minister of Public Works when he was discussing a small work involving an expenditure of $700 when the Hon. Mr. Ouimet was Minister of Public works. The present hon. gentleman (Mr. Tarte) asked the Minister:

> Does the Minister intend to ask for tenders for that work?

The Minister replied:

> The engineer tells me he intends to carry out the work by day's labour.

The hon. gentleman then said:

> I should think the Minister's experience of day's labour was not very favourable

Later on in the debate the present Minister of Public Works said:

> The Minister may have the best intentions possible, but I am afraid that when the elections come on, neither he nor his chief engineer will always be able to do the best for the country. Now take the Pointe aux Esquimaux business. Suppose we have an election in a short time, the Ministerial candidate will manage to utilize the expenditure of this money on his own behalf, and a public work which the Minister intends to be carried out in the public interest will become simply an electoral engine. This is not right, and for that reason I would urge the Minister not to insist too strongly on the day's labour system.

That is a sample of the attacks made by the present Minister of Public Works on the Government of that day.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I did not say it was against the law.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman said it was against public policy. That is my point. The hon. gentleman is not only going against what he thought at one time was public policy, but he is proceeding in the teeth of the law. He is not able to obtain the opinion of the law department or of any of his colleagues belonging to the legal profession, that his action in undertaking this work, which is to cost over $5,000, is not a direct violation of the Order in Council passed and adopted under the Public Works Act. The hon. gentleman always saw opportunities for fraud, waste of money and corruption, and he continually pointed to the Act as a means of guarding against the system of day's work. In this case the hon. gentleman is not acting as a result of a change of opinion, but in this particular instance he has sought to make useless and absolutely void and of no effect the Order in Council to which he has referred, which attempted at all events, to limit the discretion, power and authority of the head of the department.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). I do not think there should be any difference of opinion on either side of the House as to how public money should be expended. It is within the knowledge of any hon. gentle-

man who ever had charge of a department——

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Permit me to cite, in order that the hon. gentleman (Sir Louis Davies) may appreciate our position, a statement of the Minister of Public Works in this debate. He said to my hon. friend from York (Mr. Foster):

> As my hon. friend knows, the law obliges me to ask for tenders for a work costing $5,000.

I think the Minister was then right in his interpretation of the law.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Everybody knows there are certain classes of work which can be more expeditiously performed by day's labour, performed under the eyes of the officers of the department. That class of work was done by the late Government and it must perforce be done by this and every other Government, for in some cases the nature of the work precludes calling for tenders. The statute itself provides expressly for this kind of work, for it says that if in the opinion of the Minister the work can be more expeditiously or economically performed by day's labour, the Minister has the option of proceeding in that manner rather than by tender. The hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) intimates that there has been an Order in Council passed which limits the discretion of the Minister in that regard, but a little reflection will show him that there ought not to be much difference of opinion on either side of the House as to what that Order in Council meant. Parliament votes sums of money for the construction of public works, and it votes them in detail. I take it that if Parliament votes more than $5,000 in a particular year for a specific work, the Minister would call for tenders to have the work carried out, but where Parliament votes a smaller sum of money than $5,000, Parliament votes it with its eyes open and with the knowledge that the law authorizes the Minister to expend it by day's labour. If, say, $1,000 is voted for a public work to be done within a year, neither by the statute law nor by the Order in Council passed in pursuance of it, is there any absolute necessity of calling for tenders. The Order in Council, as I construe it —I may be wrong, but that is my opinion— means that if the work costs over $5,000, then if the Minister thinks it might be more expeditiously performed by day's labour, and if Parliament votes more than $5,000 to do it for the year, the Minister must come to Council before he can dispense with calling for tenders. But if Parliament votes less than $5,000 for a specific work, the Order in Council does not apply, and the Minister proceeds then under the spirit of the law which says that in that case, he must take the responsibility of determining whether he can do it more expeditiously and economically in the public interest by day's labour rather than by tender. There ought to be no difference of opinion on that point, and I take it therefore that if this Parliament to-day voted $6,000 for a public work of any kind, the hon. Minister could not, under the statute, expend that six thousand dollars without calling for tenders, unless he was authorized by Council to do so. If Parliament votes less than $5,000 the necessity for going to Council and taking the opinion of his colleagues is dispensed with and the law relegates the responsibility to him as Minister of Public Works. The object of the law is that great public works involving the expenditure of large sums should only be carried on, after public competition has been invited. The hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) recalls the criticisms of members on this side of the House when in Opposition, against the Government policy of building public works— the Curran Bridge, for instance—involving over $100,000 expenditure, by day's labour. We said that was a direct violation of the spirit of the law and we condemned it severely. However, I do not want to rake up these old matters; I want to get to the general principle which the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) referred to, and to see if we cannot agree that there is a plain common-sense construction (in the public interest) to be given to the statute and to the Order in Council passed under it, so that when Parliament votes large sums of money, the Minister shall not on his own responsibility execute a work without calling for tenders. If it is over $5,000 he must go to Council to get authority to do it by day's labour.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. This is far too important a matter to be dismissed in an off-hand way. I am absolutely sure the Minister of Marine will not, on reflection, adhere to his criticism of my argument. Both sides will admit that the hon. gentleman has laid down a novel and I think an entirely unsafe test, because he has gone away from the language of the statute, and said, that the vote, not the nature of the work, is to govern.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Oh, no.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Over and over again the hon. gentleman (Sir Louis Davies) said that if the Minister asks for anything under $5,000 that is the test, and Parliament votes the money with its eyes open. If that were the case the Minister of Public Works would be justified in saying: I need only do that by day's work because Parliament has only given me under $5,000 to expend; it is only when the work is $5,000 or over I am obliged to ask for tenders.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. He would have to go to Council to be dispensed from calling for tenders in that case.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That was not the hon. gentleman's argument.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That is what I intended.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman (Sir Louis Davies) said more than once that this vote was to be the test. We on this side of the House contend that the vote has nothing to do with it; but that the nature and extent of the work governs, and Parliament, when it used the language spoke of the "nature" of the work. Very often a vote is taken here for $4,000 as an instalment on a work which every one knows will cost $20,000, and according to the argument of the hon. gentleman (Sir Louis Davies) the Minister can say that the vote being for, say, $4,000, it is outside the purview of the Act, and he could give out that work by day's labour, although it would cost $20,000 eventually. That is what the argument of the hon. gentleman amounts to; but I do not think that either side of the House ever contemplated that. In the case of the Curran Bridge, the hon. gentleman (Sir Louis Davies) will understand that the head of the department did not fly in the face of the Act or the Order in Council. The head of the department, right or wrong, went to Council, which exercised its discretion, right or wrong, and which, within the terms of the statute, authorized the construction of that bridge by day's labour. Our contention is, not that the Government as a whole cannot authorize the Minister to build this by day's labour, but that the Minister himself has no right under the statute and the Order in Council in existence, to evade the public policy they lay down, by saying that the law applies to work costing over $5,000, but that he can take votes on the instalment plan of less than $5,000, and then do the work by day's labour without any other authority than his own.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) has fairly stated my contention. I say that leaving the Order in Council to one side, the statute does not place any money limitation upon the manner in which the Minister shall spend the money. The question with the Minister, outside of the Order in Council, is entirely as to whether it would be in the public interest to spend the money by calling for tenders or to spend it by day's labour. When he makes that decision, he is responsible to Parliament for it. He may say: I chose to spend it by day's labour, because I thought that it would be more economical. Parliament would decide whether the policy is good or bad, judging it by the surrounding circumstances. But there has been a limitation placed upon the exercise of the Minister's discretion. That limitation is made by the Order in Council, which declares that should Parliament vote a sum of money exceeding $5,000, he shall not exercise his personal discretion in determining whether to call for tenders or not, but must consult his colleagues and get an Order in Council if he wants to dispense with tenders.

Mr. DAVIN. What the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) pointed out was that it was not the amount voted by this House, but the total cost of the work that was in question.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I have no hesitation in saying that if $6,000 or $7,000 were voted for a specific work, the Minister of Public Works ought not to expend that by day's labour, without first taking the opinion of his colleagues.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Does it make any difference whether the Minister asks $6,000 on a $20,000 job or only $4,000?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It makes this difference. When the Order in Council was passed, some arbitrary sum had to be agreed upon as that beyond which the Minister could not exercise his discretion, and the amount was fixed at $5,000.

Mr. TAYLOR. For the entire cost of the job, and not simply the expenditures in the financial year.

Mr. DAVIN. Does the Order in Council make use of the word vote at all?

Mr. COCHRANE. To show how fallacious that argument is, at any rate from a layman's point of view, supposing the Government decided to build a post office in my riding, which I think they ought to do, that would cost $16,000, the Minister of Public Works might ask for a vote of $4,000 in the financial year, and could spend that money by day work.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes.

Mr. COCHRANE. Our contention is that that is not the law, but that when a job costs $16,000, the Minister has no discretion to build it by day labour.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. You must not mix up the two questions of law and policy. The hon. gentleman may be perfectly correct with regard to the policy and quite wrong with regard to the law. Here is the statute:

> The Minister shall invite tenders by public advertisement for the execution of all works except those which, from the nature of the case, can be more expeditiously and economically executed by the officers and servants of the department.

Statutory discretion is there given to the Minister of Public Works. If he deter-

mines that the work can be more expeditiously performed by day labour, he can take that means, no matter what amount the work may cost, without being required to have recourse to any Order in Council. There was no limit in the statute. But then the Order in Council came in and put a limitation upon what was an unlimited discretion. This Order in Council provides:

No contract for any work over and above $5,000 shall be given without public tender, unless the reasons for so doing be laid before and approved of by the Privy Council.

If, therefore, the Minister of Public Works received $5,000 from Parliament to carry on a certain work, he could take upon himself the responsibility of determining whether he would have that work done by day labour or by contract, after calling for tenders, and without consulting his colleagues; but if the amount was $5,500, which he had to expend within the year, he had to go before his colleagues and get their consent before he could have the work done by day labour. You cannot lay down a hard and fast policy that must be applicable, under all circumstances, to all public works. The statute is very careful not to do that, because the experienced men who framed it saw that there might be public works, the construction of which, it would be better in the public interest not to let by tender. The restriction imposed by the Order in Council was one which experience shows was necessary to enable the members of the Government to control the larger works, so that the Minister should not have absolute control himself.

Mr. DAVIN. What is the date of the Order in Council?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. 23rd of March, 1880. You may condemn or you may not condemn the course taken in each individual case, but I submit that you cannot challenge the fact that the Minister has acted strictly within the letter and the spirit of the law.

Mr. DAVIN. He has not acted even within the letter of it.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The policy we are ready to discuss, but the legality is beyond doubt.

Mr. HAGGART. There cannot be much difference of opinion as to the meaning of the statute. It is clear enough and directory, that all contracts, no matter what amount, shall be given by tender. Then comes the exception, and that is limited to cases of necessity or economy.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. If the hon. gentleman were right in that, his argument would be stronger.

Mr. HAGGART. Let me read the statute:

The Minister shall invite tenders by public advertisement for the execution of all works, except in cases of pressing emergency, in which delay would be injurious to the public interest,——

That means, for instance, where there is a break in a canal, which will not admit of delay.

——or in which, from the nature of the work, it can be more expeditiously and economically executed by the officers and servants of the department.

Surely the hon. gentleman does not say that the building of a fence around a public park is a case that comes within the meaning of that part of the section?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am not sufficiently conversant with the facts to know whether it would be better to build that fence by day labour or by contract. But what I say is that the Minister has the discretion to build it by day labour and is strictly within the spirit of the law in so doing. Whether it was good policy or not is another question.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman says the limitation is put by Order in Council, which provides that no work shall be done without calling for tenders if the cost exceeds $5,000. The hon. gentleman says that no matter what the work may cost, no matter whether it may cost $50,000 or $100,000, if the vote asked for within the financial year does not exceed $5,000, then the Minister is at perfect liberty to exercise his discretion. I deny that. I state that if the work is to cost in excess of the limit of $5,000, the Minister has no longer discretion, but must go to Council and get an Order in Council to allow him to construct it without calling for tenders.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. When Parliament voted $4,500, it named a sum under which it vested the expenditure in the Minister and did not require him to go to the Council. If Parliament requires him to get the authority of the Council it will give him more than $4,500.

Mr. HAGGART. That depends on the wording of the Order in Council. If I remember it rightly, it says: If any work should cost more than $5,000——

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No, not "work," but "contract."

Mr. HAGGART. Even if the word "contract" appears, the difference is only a verbal one. In the case of a contract or work costing $5,000, the Minister has no discretion. What was the argument used again and again by the Minister of Public Works himself when he was on this side of the House? Even in the case of an expenditure for the repairing of a wharf, the Minister would be justified in not giving out the

work by contract? He said that even in the case of an expenditure of $700, the work ought to be let by tender. But we can see every day in Ottawa what the hon. gentleman is doing. We can see it in the statement he makes here to-day, authorized by the officers of the department, he is paying $9 per lineal foot, or $16 per yard, for the building of a fence. Is not that very statement sufficient to condemn this method of doing the work? Can there be any economy in it? Is it not notorious that the work could be done for less than that? But this is not the only case. Do we not see every day how the expenditure is being dragged out in the construction of the new roof for the Western Block? Does not every citizen of Ottawa know that that work is costing far more than is necessary? As we see these things as we have them forced upon our attention, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Tarte) must not blame us if we ask that the same principle shall be applied to him as he wished to apply to us. The hon. gentleman mentioned the Curran bridge. He knows, because he was in the inquiry, that public tenders were asked for on that work. We got a tender for the whole work from the Grand Trunk Railway, and thought we could get the work done in that way. But we found we could not get it done within the time required. Then I applied to Council for the authority to do the work by day's labour. But even then, for all the material furnished and even for the day's labour employed, tenders were asked. I complied with the law in every respect; but the hon. Minister (Mr. Tarte) is not complying with the law. I do not find fault with him now because he says that the system of tender is not the best that could be adopted for the construction of public works. I may agree with him on that point. But we have here a statute which is directory, and we have an Order in Council founded upon that statute. When in Opposition, the hon. gentleman contended that the expenditure of even a few dollars should be carried out by tender and contract, and we only ask him as a Minister to live up to the principle that he professed when in Opposition.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I have here a speech which will be interesting in view of what the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) has just said about the policy we have been discussing this afternoon, when he dealt with——

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not think I touched on the question of policy this afternoon.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. As to the policy of the Act in the broad sense, and what Parliament thought they had done when they passed it, here is the view he expressed to the House on June 18th, 1895:

What authority had they to pay the money?—— Speaking of the Government.

——The House did not vote the money. Where did they get the authority? I say they acted unconstitutionally and illegally What has been the law with respect to the construction of all these public works by contract?——

I call the hon. gentleman's attention to this, the first three lines were not wholly applicable:

——The Act lays down explicitly that these public contracts shall be given after tenders have been called for, public tenders invited by the Minister, and that except in cases of pressing emergency in which delay would be injurious to the public interest, these tenders have to be called.——

This is the policy, not dealing with the exceptions, which are dealt with later on:

——Now, we find the hon. gentleman, in the beginning of the construction of this work, deliberately ignoring the policy which Parliament has laid down for his guidance. He was bound to call for public tenders for the construction of that work, unless he did violence to the policy of the Government, as embodied in the several Acts of Parliament we have.

A little later on in his speech on work by day's work instead of tender, the hon. gentleman said:

But having violated the law in that respect, what did they do next? I charge the department that they violated that law, the policy of the law, in undertaking to do the work in the way they did. They were to build two little bridges, each about 235 long.

We have here a little fence, instead of two little bridges.

One would suppose that this was not a work to tax the engineering ability of the officials of the department, and as a matter of fact we have the statement made that previous to the work being given out most careful estimates had been made as to its cost. The moment the Minister dispensed with the calling of tenders and began the work by day's work, that moment he began to open the door through which fraud could be perpetrated.

That is the argument we used to-day.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Is that true?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I have no doubt of it.

Political influence then began to be brought to bear. Hon. gentlemen who wished to give employment to political friends and who found they could not give this employment if tenders were called found the door opened wide by the Minister himself by which they could pass through as many political proteges and friends as they liked, not tens or dozens, but hundreds of the political friends.

Now, the hon. gentleman thinks, whatever he may have thought of it in our case, that the gentleman who should open the door is the gentleman who believe that business is business.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think if ever there was a case in which the carrying out of a work by day's work was necessary, it is this, for the reason that the chief architect is on the spot and can supervise the work every day. Of course, I could very easily shield myself behind what has been done in the past, but I will not do that. I want to take direct issue with hon. gentlemen opposite and claim my right to carry out the work by day's labour whenever I find it is better in the public interest.

Mr. FOSTER. The last remark of the hon. Minister makes this a still more important question than it has been hitherto. This is a direct challenge to the principle of giving public works by tender and contract. We have the assertion of the Minister that in any case, no matter what, he will be guided by his own will and by his own whim, and if he considers it better that the work should be done by day's work, he will do it in that way.

Having estimated that a work would cost $14,000, he tries to get around it in this wise: He will take one year $4,500, spend it by day's work, and rely upon the strong legal opinion of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to see that he is upheld in the House. The next year he will come back and ask for $4,500 more, and put it on to the same work, and he will still give it out by day's work, and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will stand at his back. And so on, until he has compassed the whole work. Well, we have learned that the Ministry, as a whole, are going to back up their colleague in this way of administering his department, but I do not think the country will agree with them. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries, I think, makes a mistake in his argument in this: Neither the law nor the Order in Council have to do with the expenditure of a certain amount of money, they have to do primarily with the execution of a work, and if the work is to cost more than $5,000, the Minister is estopped. The Act says:

> The Minister shall invite tenders by public advertisement for the execution of all works.

Not for the expenditure of all votes. The Order in Council says:

> No contract for any work over and above $5,000.

It does not say: No expenditure of a sum of money over $5,000. This fence was estimated to cost $14,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, the estimate of the cost, as it was presented to me then, was $4,500. The item reads: "Major's Hill Park, to complete stone and iron fence, $4,500." Last year when that fence was brought to my attention and I was asked to sanction its erection, I remember well it was stated to me that the work would not cost more than this. At that time I did not contemplate building more than the part of the fence on Mackenzie avenue. I did not draft this item, it was drafted by my officers, and at the time I really thought it would not cost more than that. The fact is we have completed that fence with an additional expenditure for the stone of $700 only. There may have been a little mistake. At the time it was contemplated only to build the part on Mackenzie avenue. On Friday evening when I gave the estimate of the chief architect for $14,000, he was giving me an estimate for a fence on St. Patrick street, which is not my intention to build now. That is the whole case.

Mr. FOSTER. This is an exhibition which does not often happen in this House. How did we get the idea of a fence which was going to cost $14,000? From the Minister himself, as the estimate of his chief architect. This side of the House protested against building a fence costing $14,000, because that was the statement of the Minister himself based upon the estimate of his architect sitting beside him. What was the attitude of this House on Thursday night? It was that the expenditure of $14,000 for that work was useless and extravagant, we thought it was not needed, some thought there should be no fence at all. How was that rebutted by the Minister himself? By saying that having begun, it was absolutely necessary to finish it, or else we should have an unsightly and misshapen thing. That is how we got the idea that the whole fence was to cost $14,000 from the Minister himself. When we urged upon him to drop it, he argued that it having been begun 25 years ago and a certain part having been finished the remaining portion should be finished, and that $4,500 more was needed this year. But to-day the hon. gentleman comes down and throws the whole fault on his chief architect, saying that he did not make that estimate at all, but his chief architect made it under the idea that he wanted to finish the whole of it and had given him the cost of the whole. This is not an enviable position for the Minister to be in. He says that the fence that he had estimated for last year was to be completed, and therefore, the vote being to complete the fence, and being for only $4,500, he has not offended against the Order in Council or the spirit of the law. What did he state to-day with reference to that? That he only wanted now $700 more to complete this fence, and that therefore he was very close to his original estimate. Now, the estimate was to complete the fence, and on Thursday night he declared that that was a mistake due to the fault of his officers, and he plainly told us that it was impossible for him to make up all those estimates, for

him to write out the items. The hon. gentleman contended the other night that the wording was a mistake, that it was not meant to complete, that it was a fault of the clerk who penned the item. Now, he says: As I asked that $4,500 to complete, and as I completed the fence within $700, it is only a little matter. Did the hon. gentleman contemplate building the fence without finishing it? Is not the rail a component part of the fence? Is he going to leave it with only five feet of stone in height, and two feet wide, without any railing? The hon. gentleman told us to-day that he wanted $3,886 to complete that piece of fence. Where does the hon. gentleman stand? I leave him with the House and with himself for a quiet meditation on his attempt to wriggle out of the bad position in which he placed himself on Thursday night. Let me go on with the argument, and I want to press it. I contend that the law and the Order in Council speak of works and not of sums of money, and what is contemplated is that when a work costs more than $5,000 the Minister has no discretion to give it out by day's work. It is not that if a work will cost more than $5,000 and the Minister proposes to do it in two years and spend each year something less than that amount, he can do it by day's work under the law and the Order in Council. The Minister of Marine by his advocacy of this policy, and the last declaration made by his colleagues, shows that the Government propose to open this door very wide, this door which they deplored had been opened in years past. As a member of this House, I entertain the fear, even under such management as that of the present Minister of Public Works, that hon. gentlemen opposite are going to open the door very wide and give the Minister of Public Works the option of doing any work by day's work rather than by tender and contract, provided it can be divided into sections of less than $5,000, and in this way obtain the sanction of Council. I desire to call the attention of the Minister of Marine to the Order in Council and to the law. The second case in which the work can be done by day's work is "possible emergency." This has nothing to do with the present case. The other case is thus stated, "or in which from the nature of the work it can be more expeditiously and economically executed by the officers and servants of the department." This is, to my mind, the only ground on which an individual Minister can go to Council and persuade his colleagues to absolve him from calling for tenders and giving out contracts. The work, however, is not done by officers and servants of the department, but by hired men, under the supervision of the department. Every public work, however, is thus carried on; every public building is constructed under the supervision of the officers of the department. Does this come under the category either of a work called for by an emergency, or works that can be more economically done by the officers of the department? It is not pretended that such is the case. Here is a plain, new piece of work. There is no tearing down or the utilizing of old and constructing with old and new material. There could not be a more straightforward work than the building of a stone wall, of a certain specified quality of stone, so many feet wide and so many feet high, the construction to be supervised by the officers of the department. How does the hon. gentleman propose to act? Has he to decide whether the work shall be done more expeditiously and economically by the officers and servants of the department—is it left to his own idea or whim? Without pressing the matter further than it should be pressed, I look upon this as a most important matter, as I do also the declaration made by the Minister and apparently acquiesced in by the Government. Is this an attempt to break down the barriers entirely? Already they have attacked the Auditor General with a good deal of severity on the part of some Ministers, in which they recommended him to mind his own business and they have a particular idea as to what his business is—but they had quite different ideas a few years ago. Is this carrying out further the attack on the Auditor General. Let the Minister carry out the idea and the public will judge.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman has shown that he possesses a short memory, especially when it suits him. The hon. gentleman has criticised the fact that this work is being done by day's labour, the total cost of which will be a little over $8,000, and not $14,000. But the hon. gentleman a few days before the general elections and when he was Finance Minister gave out a contract for $3,600 for a portion of the work, he did not undertake it by day's work, but he gave out a contract contrary to the law. There was no appropriation of money voted by Parliament, and yet the country had to pay $3,600 for the first portion of the contract, which ultimately cost over $40,000. No tenders were invited, and he gave out a contract; and yet the hon. gentleman attacks me to-day for the fact that having obtained $4,500 to carry out a certain work, I have done it by day's labour. The hon. gentleman is not fair, but I must admit that in the task of splitting hairs there is no more able man in the House, for he can even make black appear white and white black. I explained that the statement in regard to $14,000 was a mistake, I having misunderstood a statement made to me by the chief architect, this work being confined to a fence in front of Mackenzie avenue. My experience in connection with the Conservative party in the past was that it never dealt with small is-

sues of this kind, and if the hon. gentleman thinks that the present Government is going to be defeated by such means he is much mistaken.

Mr. FOSTER. Sometimes we have to deal with small items. At page 5599 of the "Hansard" it will be found that several questions were put and several answers were given on this subject. The Minister of Public Works in answer to a question, said :

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The chief architect buys the stone, and then it is cut and put in proper place by day's work. The chief architect tells me that the work will cost about $14,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have explained that.

Mr. FOSTER. The "Hansard" proceeds :

Mr. FOSTER. Is not this a well defined piece of work ? You are not tearing down something, taking down old stuff and putting in new ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We are building a new stone and iron fence along Mackenzie avenue.

Mr. FOSTER. But you are going to do new work to the extent of $14,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My chief architect tells me that the whole work when completed will have cost $14,000, including what we spent last year.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. What I meant was Mackenzie Avenue and St. Patrick Street.

Mr. FOSTER. That does not appear by the contract. I then asked :

Mr. FOSTER. What proportion of that still remains to be done ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. About $10,000 worth.

Then I protested against a work which would cost so much being done by day's work, and the Minister said :

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am asking Parliament to vote the sum of $4,500 because I want to do this year a certain piece of work which will not exceed that amount this year. I am not bound to spend $14,000 ; I shall not spend that sum, I want to build that work gradually. My hon. friend knows how estimates are prepared. You have to remain within a certain figure, your estimates must not exceed so much. The Minister of Finance sometimes finds himself out in his estimates.

The whole conviction of my hon. friend was just in the line of my argument. Then he goes on and says later :

When the season opened I commenced the work, I did not lose much time.

Again :

The first part was built by the city, before Major's Hill was taken over by the department. I got a vote last year and spent it.

Mr. BERGERON. I understand it is not being done by contract, but by day's work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. Where did the department get the stone ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I understand that the chief architect got the stone from Hull, where there is a first-class quarry.

Mr. BERGERON. Is it intended to carry the any railing above the stone work, or to allow the fence to remain as it is now ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS My chief architect tells me that he wants to put an iron railing around.

Mr. BERGERON. Has the hon. gentleman any idea where he will buy the railing, whether it will be bought by tender or by pieces ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I cannot say now.

Mr. BERGERON. Will the cost come out of the $4,500 ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No.

Mr. BERGERON. Then this is simply for the stone work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, only for that.

Mr. BERGERON. Is it intended to carry the fencing beyond the Printing Bureau ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is intended to build 1,940 feet of stone fencing 5 feet in height.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. How many feet have been built by the city ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. About one-fourth of the whole.

I could go on and take up the time of the House reading exactly what the Minister said. The Minister was either entirely wrong the other night or he was right. If he was wrong, even if I am guilty of lecturing him, I should say that when he comes deliberately before the House to pass an Estimate, he should understand what this Estimate is for. If he was right the other night, he is getting out of a very small hole to-day in the allegation he is now putting forward.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend quotes from the unrevised "Hansard," that I said I was asking $14,500. I could not have said that, because the vote was for $4,500, and it is plain that that is the figure I spoke about. I referred a moment ago to the shortness of memory of my hon. friend (Mr. Foster). I stated that his Government gave out a contract just before the elections for paving around the Parliament grounds here, not only without tender, but without an appropriation from Parliament. I find out further that in 1894-95 when he (Mr. Foster) was Minister of Finance there were works carried on at Ste. Anne de la Pérade, amounting to $14,906, without tender. He was Minister of Finance then, and supposed to be the watch-dog.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Was there an Order in Council in that case ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There may be, but all the same, these works

were carried on by day's labour to the tune of over $14,000.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That is not the point.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Surely my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) was a sleeping watch-dog when that was done. I repeat that he has no right to lecture me to-day because I have done what every other Minister of Public Works has done before me.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. We on this side of the House do not deny that there can be good cases shown for work to be carried on by day's labour instead of by contract. The serious point now under discussion is that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Tarte) has been violating the law.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Then, if I am, I have violated it a great deal less than my hon. friends opposite have done in the past. I have not violated the law at all. If I did violate it, hon. gentlemen opposite have done worse when they were in power, but that, I admit, is no argument.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. gentleman has not only violated the law, but he has attempted to deceive this House and he has thrown the responsibility on his chief architect. I am satisfied his chief architect is a competent, capable man, but I do not think his chief architect put this estimate into his hand, which says: "Major's Hill Park—to complete stone and iron fence, $4,500." The Minister came before this House last year with an estimate for $4,500 to complete the stone and iron fence on Major Hill Park, and we understood that that $4,500 was, as it said, to complete the fence. Then, again, we have this year another vote of $4,500 to complete the fence. Does the Minister of Marine justify the statement in the estimate that this is to "complete" the fence? Has he investigated the estimate in Council, and did he think it was going to complete the fence, or was he deceived, too? Look at "Hansard" and see what the Minister says. The Minister is asked will this complete the stone and iron work, and he says it will do nothing of the kind. He deceives the House last year and this, by putting in the estimate that the $4,500 is to complete the fence. The Minister of Public Works, both last year and this year, put in the estimate that this vote was to complete the fence, but when he is asked to give explanations, he says it is only to do a portion of the work, and has nothing to do with the iron fence.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. When these Estimates were prepared months ago, the work was not then completed, and it was by an oversight that I did not move immediately that the item be struck out, because the money was spent then.

Mr. TAYLOR. Let me ask the Minister if this item passed Council and if all his colleagues agreed that this $4,500 was to complete the fence and to put the iron rail on it. This item was presented to Parliament, and we now find out that the Minister tried to deceive Parliament, as he must have deceived Council, if they approved of the item. I wish to know if this item ever went to Council, and if all the Ministers are in with the Minister of Public Works in trying to deceive the House and the country.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will not argue with the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) in any such contention as that.

Mr. DAVIN. Early in this discussion I asked the question: What was the object of passing this Order in Council? The hon. gentleman did not answer, and as he does not answer now, I presume that the object was to protect the public interests and guard against the misuse by a Minister of his position. In one of his answers last week, the hon. gentleman made an admission to which I call the attention of the committee. He said:

> The hon. gentleman has stated that I am employing men at my own sweet will. I must protest against that charge. I have employed a good many of my political friends. It is my duty to do so as Minister.

Well, the use of the public money in the employment of the hon. gentleman's political friends is not one of the objects the public have in view when voting moneys to be spent on public works. The hon. gentleman took a position to-day most dangerous to the public interest, and I rise simply to protest against it because it has been already destroyed by my hon. friends from York and Pictou. The hon. gentleman again and again told us that he was going really to evade the Order in Council and the statute, and that no matter what was said or done, he would spend the money as he pleased. And we have him stating, as he did last week, that he is spending the money for the employment of his political friends. In the interests of the country, I protest against that.

Mr. POPE. I would like to know from the hon gentleman how many acres there are in this park?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Fifteen and a half.

Item dropped.

Public Buildings, Ottawa, including ventilation and lighting—Repairs, materials, furniture, &c..... $75,000

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That was $94,000 in 1896.

Rideau Hall, including Grounds—Renewals, improvements, repairs, furniture and maintenance..... $17,000

Mr. FOSTER. What does the hon. gentleman propose to do?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The same as last year. I have put the vote at a little less, and find I cannot do better.

Mr. FOSTER. Does he give the maintenance of the grounds by contract ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, that is under contract.

Mr. FOSTER. What staff does the hon. gentleman keep at Rideau Hall ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Ten men. The superintendent is Mr. Hutchinson, at $90 per month. All the men are those that were there before. I have not put on any.

Mr. FOSTER. What does the maintenance of the grounds cost and who has the contract ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The same man has the contract as before, except that we give him a little less. His name is Sorley.

Mr. MONK. I find that amount excessive. Every year we are called on to vote this sum. The first year of this Parliament, the vote was $17,000, last year it was $18,000, and this year it is $17,000 for the maintenance of Rideau Hall. I do not know what was the rule which obtained in the past, but I find that sum altogether excessive. It seems to me preposterous that we should be called on every year to vote such a large amount. Last year we were told that considerable repairs were required—the completion of the ball room and the placing of a furnace in it, and I was prepared then to overlook the amount, but this year, unless we have other explanations from the Minister, I shall move that the amount be reduced to $8,000, which ought to be ample to maintain the grounds in proper order. The hon. gentleman mentioned a carpenter employed at $90 per month. That is excessive.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. He is chief of the staff.

Mr. MONK. If he is a carpenter, he is paid too much and whether the same men are retained or not, $17,000 is an outrageous amount for the maintenance of these grounds.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman has not been in public life very long, and if he will look back to the past he will find that the expenditure has always been at least that amount. I am surprised at the stand the hon. gentleman takes, coming from the city he does. As long as I am Minister of Public Works, I will not allow the distinguished persons who come from the other side to preside over this Government, to be forced to reside in a place not kept as it ought to be. This Canadian nation is wealthy enough to act decently towards its Governor Generals. I have no desire to go into any extravagant expenditure, but we must have some respect for our own dignity. We must have some pride in these matters. I say I have gone ino this question myself, and I believe that Rideau Hall cannot be decently maintained without spending a pretty large sum of money. Look at the past. In one year there was an expenditure of $25,000; in another, $29,000, and in another, $31,000. I have refused many requisitions made upon me, but I feel that I should fail in my duty if I did not take the stand I take now.

Mr. MONK. I do not yield to any man in my sense of the dignity of the Governor General's position or in my desire that the representative in Canada of Her Majesty should be treated in a proper manner. But I come from a city where we have a fair notion of business as well as proper respect for the Crown. The question is a simple one—whether we are not paying too much under this head. I agree that we should keep that residence in a proper state of repair. But no man of business, whether from Montreal or from any other city in the Dominion can convince me, unless he uses other arguments than the flimsy arguments used by the hon. Minister (Mr. Tarte), that this expenditure is reasonable. I am told that this item was a subject of continual criticism by hon. gentlemen on the other side when they were in Opposition. That does not surprise me. Unless the hon. Minister comes here like a business man—not like business is business man—and shows exactly how such a large sum is needed each year, I shall object. We have residences in Montreal just as well kept up as Rideau Hall is, without costing anything like this amount. They are kept up, and better kept up, for half the amount. Why, can the hon. Minister find me any House occupied by British ambassadors in foreign countries which require any such sum for maintenance ? Let him do so and I shall be ready to vote this item without demur. It is sheer waste.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) knows that I have been Minister for only a short time. Those who have preceded me have been members of his own party, and they expended large sums on Rideau Hall.

Mr. MONK. I expect you to do better.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman alluded to Montreal and to what he called a business is business man. Let me remind him that the fellow who used that expression has been landed in jail by me.

Mr. MONK. I think the hon. gentleman used the expression himself.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Tarte) is charging the late Government with having always brought down a larger

estimate than this. If he will consult the book he has in his hand, he will find that the estimate prepared by the late Government for 1896-97 was $14,100. The hon. gentleman himself came down last year with an estimate of $18,000, and there was a good deal of complaint. He promised he would go back to the old amount. Has he done so ? He proposes now a vote of $17,000. My hon. friend (Mr. Monk) has proposed to reduce this item to a reasonable amount, and I am satisfied that every member on this side will agree that it ought to be reduced so as to make it, at any rate, not more than that spent by the late Conservative Government. That Government maintained that house right royally, so much so that hon. gentlemen opposite found great fault. But these hon. gentlemen are seeing that amount and going a great deal better.

Mr. FOSTER. I see by the Auditor General's Report that $2,940 was spent for the care of the grounds and nearly $6,000 for simple carpenter work. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Tarte) said last year that there were heavy repairs to make and for that reason he required a large vote. But these repairs have been completed. I know that considerable repairs of a permanent character have been made. Besides there has been a very considerable purchase of goods, such as linen, and so on. It is there now, nearly new. What are the extraordinary expenditures called for next year ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My officers called in the chief of the staff and I tried very hard to have that item reduced, and I was convinced, as I say again, that it was impossible to reduce it. If hon. gentlemen will look over the expenditure of the past they will find that——

Mr. FOSTER. But the hon. Minister will see that there cannot be $6,000 worth of carpentering every year.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) has been Minister of Finance long enough to know what Rideau Hall is. If I had yielded to the requisitions made, the expenditure would have been double that which I propose.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. What has been the average expenditure ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In 1895, the expenditure amounted to $17,997. In 1896 the amount asked from Parliament was $13,861, and I found accounts due for about $4,000, which I was obliged to pay.

Mr. FOSTER. Was that $4,000 included in the vote of $18,000 ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. If the hon. gentleman had to pay back $4,000 out of $18,000——

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, I did not understand ; it was not included in the $18,000.

Mr. ROGERS. I have a notice of motion on the Order paper on this subject, but owing to pressure of other business I have not been able to reach it. I deem it my duty to say a few words at this juncture. This expenditure has been pretty well discussed in this House in years past, and also on public platforms throughout the country. This is a very grievous item in the eyes of many, and I cannot say but justly so. I think it can hardly be denied that too much money has been spent in the past on the maintenance of this residence. This, it seems to me is the most opportune time to make reductions. The term of the present Governor General is about expiring, and I see by the papers that he has sent in his resignation and will not be with us for another year. Another Governor General will soon be appointed. Last year I was assured that the expenditure was unusually high, and would not be so high in the future. I deemed it my duty not to object to expenditure which it might be fairly claimed the Governor General had been led to expect as representing privileges and emoluments in addition to his salary. But now that a new incumbent will enter upon the office, I think we should be perfectly justified in making reductions. Whatever action is to be taken should be taken now. In my opinion we should fix a sum to be expended, so that we shall know what we are doing, and give no ground for this continual raising of objections. I am sure it is an unpleasant duty for any member of Parliament to perform, and it must be humiliating for Their Excellencies to hear it. I think that we should fix now the yearly amount to be appropriated along that line. I do not like to go into details in this matter, but we all should know the amount in round numbers that has been expended in the past on the Governors General for salary and maintenance. We do not ask, we never have asked, that the salary should be reduced, we are willing to pay a royally good salary, and we feel that $50,000 a year is a royal salary to pay to a Governor General, especially when it is nearly all paid by about a million and a half of wage-earners. We find that about $65,000 have been annually expended for the last thirty years under that head. We have paid for the last thirty years for the salaries of Governors General about $1,500,000 ; for secretaries and contingencies, about $550,000 ; for building and repairs since confederation, over $600,000 ; for furniture, $120,000 ; fuel and light, about $200,000, or an average of $114,000 for the last thirty years. That is really an appalling amount to pay for that office. I think we have paid about $65,000 annually since confederation in connection with Rideau Hall over and above the salary

of the Governor General. Besides that, we have to pay an enormous amount for the salaries of the various lieutenant-governors of the provinces, about $71,000 annually, not to speak of another very large sum for their maintenance. This subject has been often discussed on platforms among the farmers, and the general feeling was that previous Governments had promised us that the amount should be reduced from year to year. We feel that the people are paying too much for government in general. We know it costs over $60 a year for every family of five to pay for governing this country, that is, including Dominion, provincial and municipal governments. I think it would be well to take some action at this time along the line of allowing a stated sum annually to the Governor General for maintenance of Rideau Hall. We do not want to be parsimonious. It is said that we cannot get good men to come from the old country, either English or Irish noblemen to govern us unless we pay them a good royal salary. It occurs to me that it should not be considered any great sacrifice for a nobleman to come to this country as Governor General for five years. He comes to a beautiful country to live in, with a salubrious climate. We treat him with due honour and respect, in fact, we really treat him with much more reverence and respect than he receives in his own country. That is all right. It is human nature for a man to like to be made something of, and I think Canadians have done their duty in that respect. I am pleased to say that that respect has been well deserved by those who have occupied that high position in the past, and particularly so by the present Governor General. I think it is too much to ask the hard-working and struggling masses of the people to pay more than $50,000 a year for salary and maintenance. Let them be restricted to a certain amount, and they can do the best they can with it. No doubt there would be much more care exercised in the expenditure. In looking over the items for the enormous annual supplies furnished to that house, I think there must be something radically wrong. It may be said that a certain amount is required for social functions and entertainments. I do not see wherein the people derive any benefit, directly or indirectly, from that expenditure. My observation is that it is a great evil, inasmuch as it leads to extravagance in the civil service. We remember the Bill that was introduced a little while ago by the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) regarding the seizure of the salaries of public officials. The reason urged for that Bill was that a good many public officials would not pay their debts, which, I think, is due to the unfortunate circumstance that in trying to keep up style, and to make a respectable appearance at these social functions, they spend more than their income. There is something radically wrong in that respect. For my part, I am not able to get up on the hustings and vindicate this expenditure, nor will I attempt to do so. The farmers are the classes who will chiefly object to this expenditure, and who have a better right than they to do so? I want to know who pays the great proportion of the taxes of this country if it is not the farmers. They pay indirectly, at least, nine-tenths of the whole taxation of this country, and I think they have a right to complain of such extravagance, and they do complain. The manufacturers, the merchants, the mechanics, the salaried men, have means of expressing their discontent; they have their organizations, their combines by which they can make their wishes known. Manufacturers, however, if they are compelled to grant an increase of wages, can form a combine and increase the prices of their products; they can seek to buy their raw material cheaper and sell their product dearer. That is a power they possess in the country and make good use of that power. A farmer is not able to do this, for he has to send his products to the markets of the world and meet general competition. I move that this item be struck out.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Perhaps I may be able to give the committee some interesting information in regard to Rideau Hall. Some hon. members are astonished at the large sums the Government are obliged to spend in maintaining the buildings and grounds. Rideau Hall is a very large establishment. The grounds cover 85 acres. There are 2 acres of flower gardens, 4 acres of vegetable gardens, 47 acres in grass, 32 acres in wood. The buildings cover 89,500 square feet. The roof covers 96,500 square feet. The carpet required is 4,118 square yards, oilcloth, 340. There are 570 lights. The drainage covers one mile and a quarter; the pavement extends over 4,420 square feet of block, and 9,220 of plank walk. There are 22,400 feet of fencing. The gravel road has a length of 2,131 feet. These buildings and grounds have to be taken proper care of, and it is not a sinecure to take charge of this large establishment.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose all the officers and employees of the Minister of Public Works are good and capable men. If so, the vegetable garden, covering 4 acres, should raise enough vegetables to supply a small city. What is the total quantity of vegetables grown in these 4 acres?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman must not forget that the employees are the same as under the old regime.

Mr. FOSTER. Then the hon. gentleman is not able to give the year's growth of vegetables?

Mr. MONK. I regret that these discussions occur annually, but I still maintain

that with an expenditure of $10,000 or $12,000, we should be able to maintain the Vice-Regal residence in a proper manner. I move that the item be reduced from $17,000 to $12,000.

Amendment to the amendment (Mr. Monk) negatived: Yeas, 19; Nays, 46.

Amendment (Mr. Rogers) negatived.

Item agreed to.

Telephone Service—Public Buildings, Ottawa $5,000

Mr. FOSTER. There is an increase of $1,000 in this vote; that requires some explanation?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am obliged to increase the number of telephones here, as the use of the telephone has increased everywhere else. The use of telephones has become so general that every one must have them.

Mr. FOSTER. I trust that because every one wants them the Minister will not give way to that appeal. This matter of telephones is one that is very easily abused, and I think the Minister will find it easy to keep the amount down to $4,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I really could not do it.

Mr. FOSTER. What new telephones are there?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will give the number of all the telephones. Department of Public Works, including Rideau Hall, Dominion Police, Ottawa River Works, 20; Railways and Canals, 5; House of Commons, 9; Senate, 1; Marine and Fisheries, 3; Secretary of State, 3; Stationery and Printing, 4; Post Office, 4; Government House, 2 private telephones; Finance and Auditor General's Office, 6; Agriculture, 4; Militia and Defence, 7; Justice, 4; Privy Council, 5; Inland Revenue, 4; Customs, 2; Interior, 11; Trade and Commerce, 2; Exchequer Court, 3; in all, 99.

Mr. HAGGART. Where are the nine telephones in the House of Commons?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Office of the Speaker, office of the private secretary of the Speaker, Distributing Office, office of the Printing Bureau, Library of Parliament, messenger's room, residence of the Clerk, House of Commons, residence of the Law Clerk, Journal office.

Mr. HUGHES. Is there one in No. 16?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If my hon. friend wants one in No. 6, I will accommodate him with pleasure. I know the room; I was there several times.

Mr. FOSTER. How much do those telephones cost?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. $35, except private telephones, which are more expensive. The two private telephones in Government House, I am told, cost $130.

Mr. FOSTER. If they cost $5,000, there must be a great deal more than ninety-nine.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have just made that observation to my Deputy Minister.

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

After Recess.

The House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I move that the item be reduced to $4,000. After looking over the list I made up my mind that $4,000 would be sufficient, and it is the same amount as last year.

Mr. INGRAM. Are there not more than 99 telephones?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not think so.

Mr. INGRAM. Instead of having an extra telephone down here, which is not doing any good, you might send one around to No. 6.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have no objection to giving one to No. 6.

Mr. MONK. The hon. Minister told us that if we wanted to resuscitate the Conservative party we would have to apply our minds to larger problems than these, but in the absence of larger problems, the hon. gentleman puts before the committee a number of smaller ones, and perhaps in the multiplicity of this lies the chance of our resurrection. It seems to me that we have a very large number of telephones. I do not say this in any spirit of carping criticism, but 11 telephones in the Department of the Interior strikes me as an extravagant number.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman must remember that the Interior Department is located in the East Block and in the Langevin Block, two separate buildings, which may explain why they have so many telephones.

Major's Hill Park..... $3,500

Mr. MONK. Is this connected with the fence?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, it is for the maintenance of the grounds themselves. The whole thing is given by contract, except an amount of $1,000 or thereabouts.

Rent—Dominion Public Buildings..... $18,000

Mr. MONK. What are the details of this?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We are obliged to rent all over Canada buildings for post offices, custom-houses, and so on. This is the usual amount.

Salaries of engineers, firemen, caretakers, &c., of Dominion public buildings..... $70,000

Mr. HUGHES. Are there any changes in the departments ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, several—some through death and some were discharged. I may say that I have practised a good deal of economy, but still the number of caretakers will increase. I am keeping the cost, however, at the same level.

Mr. CARGILL. What is the cause of the change in the caretakers at Walkerton ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Mr. Maclean was discharged and replaced by Mr. Gibson. I do not remember exactly the reason for his discharge, but I know that I made some little economy there. The old caretaker was being paid $33.33 a month, and the new one gets $29.15.

Mr. CARGILL. I thought all those caretakers got $400 a year.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Nearly in every case where I have made a change, I have succeeded in making a saving. I have tried to arrange a new system as far as possible. I am trying to have the postmasters, wherever possible, take charge themselves of the buildings, and in such cases we pay them very small amounts. Instead of paying $400, I have several to-day to whom I pay only $200 and $300.

Mr. INGRAM. Those caretakers have a good deal of power in the matter of repairs and ordering stuff. Is there any check on it ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. They do not make repairs without being authorized. I do not know of any case where a caretaker has made repairs without asking for authorization.

Mr. INGRAM. They are not very economical. The prices of the articles they get are not low.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. They have no latitude. They report such repairs as are in their opinion necessary, but unless authorized, they do not do anything. The prices of the articles they get are checked by the chief architect after close scrutiny.

Mr. CARGILL. What is the name of the caretaker of the Walkerton public buildings ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Thomas Gibson.

Mr. CARGILL. Is he related to the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson)?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not know ; I did not ask him for his certificate of baptism.

Heating—Dominion Public Buildings—Fuel, &c..... $55,000

Mr. INGRAM. Are tenders asked for the supply of coal for these public buildings all over the Dominion ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. INGRAM. Is there any system in which the coal dealers in the localities in which the buildings are located have an advantage over or are given a preference over others ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No. We advertise for tenders and always accept the lowest.

Mr. INGRAM. In what papers are the calls for tenders published ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In such a case as this we would put it in all the leading papers of the locality.

Mr. INGRAM. My reason for calling the hon. gentleman's attention to the matter is that I have heard coal dealers complain that they had not seen the advertisements for tenders.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am surprised at that, seeing the advertisements are in so many papers.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Is this vote for public buildings throughout the Dominion ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. McDOUGALL. It appears under the head "Ont." I suppose the same applies to the item for salaries of caretakers, &c. The heading "Ont." misled me. I desire to ask the Minister a question with regard to caretakers. May I do so now ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Certainly.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I should like to ask why the Minister dismissed the caretaker in the public building in North Sydney, and also the caretaker in the public building in Sydney ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I find that in the case of the building in North Sydney the caretaker was Mr. McEacheran. He was earning $33.33 a month. Alexander Greene, who has been appointed in his place receives $29.16. There is some economy there.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Did the hon. Minister ask Mr. McEacheran if he would accept the same salary ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Was not that a wrong to Mr. McEacheran ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS I know that there must have been some reason for his dismissal.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I think it is a very unfair way to treat Mr. McEacheran who has been for years a very satisfactory janitor. He is a perfectly sober man and a good man in every way. If the Minister desired to effect economy by reducing the salary, he should have asked the holder of the office if he would accept less, instead of dismissing him. What does the hon. Minister say with regard to the janitor in the public building at Sydney ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I find that Mr. McNeill was the caretaker there. He received $33.33 a month. The new caretaker is Mr. Keefe whose salary is $29.16—again a small economy.

Mr. McDOUGALL. But did the hon. Minister ask Mr. McNeill if he would accept less ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I did not. I know there must have been reasons for dismissing Mr. McNeill.

Mr. McDOUGALL. There was no good reason. He was dismissed simply to make room for a man who wanted a position. If that is the rule to be adopted, few public servants will hold their offices long, because applicants will soon appear. Mr. McNeill was placed in the position eight or ten years ago, perhaps more. He gave up a farm and business to take the position, and expected that he would continue to occupy it while he was fit for the service. And now the Minister turns him out on the street and appoints another man, justifying the change on the ground that the second man accepts the place at a few cents a month less than Mr. McNeill received.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's). I would ask the hon. Minister his reasons for dismissing the caretaker in the public building in Montague, P.E.I.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I know that there were complaints against him, though I cannot remember what they were. He did not discharge his duties as well as we had a right to expect. The position is a very small one.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's). What wages does the man receive who has been appointed ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I could not give him less than his predecessor received, as the salary paid was only $13.33 per month.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's). I have no doubt that the man appointed may be a very good man. But I venture to say that there is not a caretaker in a Dominion public building anywhere who is more careful of the public interest than the man who was dismissed. He was a perfectly steady man, always at his post, and did his work to the satisfaction of everybody. I know him intimately, he lives alongside of me, and I see him every day when I am at home. He took extraordinary pains with the little office he was filling there, and he was quite competent for it in every respect. I am quite sure nothing like political partisanship could be charged against him because, although I think he voted for myself, I do not believe any man living knew how he was going to vote when he went to the poll. He always attends to his own business, and if he is now being displaced by another man who is a political partisan, it is not in the public interest, although I do not know on whose recommendation it was done. I am confident it was done to please a political friend down there who has not the interest of the public so much at heart as he has his own interest.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Who made the recommendation for this change in my county ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I decline to state. I take the responsibility of my action.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Certainly, and I hold the Minister responsible for his action, and I hold him responsible for not doing what he ought to do when he refuses to give information to this House as to why he dismissed a public official. He should tell this House who made this recommendation, or on whose recommendation he made the dismissal. It is not enough to tell us that for the purpose of reducing the cost of a few cents a month, he made the change on behalf of a political friend. With regard to these two men, they were not in the least offensive to anybody. I do not know whether they voted for me, I believe they did, and that is all I can say about it. It is an outrage against these men for the Minister to refuse to give the information to this House on which he dismissed them.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not think I am obliged to give the names of those who gave me the information in cases like this. It is a very small matter, after all. I have not discharged any man before taking good care to look into his case. At any rate, I do not remember the particulars of this case. I cannot keep all these things in my head.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Will the Minister promise to bring down the papers ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not think that in the case the hon. gentleman refers to, there was any written communication made to me.

Mr. McDOUGALL. That is a very curious statement for the Minister to make. He is

unable to carry in his head the particulars in regard to these two cases, yet he is able to tell the House there was no written correspondence. I am satisfied there was plenty of written correspondence. The Minister would not have acted as he did if there were no written correspondence.

Mr. MACDANALD (King's). There is a great deal to be said in favour of giving information of that kind. A man is dismissed from his position, and he blames one and another, and makes bad friends of one and another; whereas, if he knew the men who sent his name forward for dismissal, he would only blame those who were really the authors of his dismissal. If a man takes upon himself the responsibility of recommending a person for a position, he should not be afraid to come forward and take the responsibility therefor. Now, with respect to this man who was dismissed at Montague, he was a thoroughly competent man. I could get every man, I believe, on either side of politics, with the exception of one or two interested parties, to give him a thorough recommendation. I believe that he did his duty in his position better than nine-tenths of the officials that occupy such positions in other parts of the Dominion. I hope the Minister will be able to furnish the name of the party who recommended the dismissal of Mr. Lambert, at Montague, and who recommended the appointment of his successor.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will look into the matter and see if there are any papers.

Mr. KAULBACH. If the Minister had any reasonable ground for the dismissal of an officer, he should have no hesitation in giving those reasons. When an officer is dismissed, the fact is a reflection upon him, people suspect that he has been dishonest, that he has, perhaps, been purloining the property of the Government, and he is looked upon with reproach by his neighbours and the public generally. I think it is due to the party who has been dismissed that some reason should be given for the dismissal.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I would not dismiss a man accused of dishonesty without giving him a chance of defending himself.

Dominion Immigration Building—Repairs, furniture, &c..... $2,000

Mr. INGRAM. Where is that building situated?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That word should be "buildings." It is to cover small repairs on all the Dominion immigration buildings all over Canada.

Mr. INGRAM. Then that would mean the buildings at Port Arthur, Brandon, Winnipeg, Calgary and Regina, on which last year the expenditure was only $582. Why is it increased this year to $2,000?

Mr. McDOUGALL.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman is wrong in his figures. It is the same sum every year, and that is what I found it when I came in. It is for all the immigration buildings.

Mr. INGRAM. I see in the Auditor General's Report an item of $582.32 for repairs to immigration buildings. That is the previous year.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The department is not bound to spend every cent of that vote.

Harbours and Rivers—Nova Scotia—
Judique, new wharf..... $4,000

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I should like to obtain some explanation as to the condition of the pier at Arichat. What has been done during the last season?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Repairs have been made, and the breakwater has been strengthened on the sea ward side.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Are these repairs to be done by contract or day's labour?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. By day's labour.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). Will this expenditure place the work in almost as good a condition as it was formerly?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What has been the total expenditure?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Up to 30th December, 1897, $30,397.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Under the heading of Harbours and Rivers, Nova Scotia, I notice omissions, especially in regard to several important works needed in Cape Breton.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman must remember the Supplementary Estimates have not yet been brought down.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I desire to call the Minister's attention to some of these requirements, so that they may be provided for when the Supplementary Estimates come down. Cow Bay breakwater, for example, is a very important work. Last year some work was done on it, and it should be continued. A work was also asked for some time ago at Gabarouse. The Minister has all the information in the department. There is a large fishing settlement, and owing to the lack of harbour of refuge, many boats and considerable property have been lost. I hope in the Supplementary Estimates this work will be provided for. It will be a great deal better to grant $10,000 for this work than for a greenhouse in Ottawa, or $12,000 or $14,000 for a stone fence around

a portion of the park here. At the place I have named there are eighty or a hundred fishing boats employed. These have to be pulled up on shore, or in the case of the larger vessels they have to go to Louisburg or some other port. I hope the Minister will at least make a grant to commence the work. I also call his attention to the wharf at Cape Big Pond, a part of which was carried away. A survey has been made and a report forwarded to the department. I shall be glad if the Minister could inform me as to the result of these surveys. Is it the intention of the Minister to provide for improving the harbour of New Campbellton in the county of Victoria. While the wharf is in that county, the people using it belong to my county. They are engaged in the coal industry, and they require this work carried out. It was promised two or three years ago, and I hoped last year to see an item in the Estimates. I shall be glad if the Minister will tell me if these works will be proceeded with.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman was a supporter, and a powerful supporter, of the late Government, and has sat for many years in this House. He appears to have somewhat neglected his duty in the past, or he would have attended to this matter. I believe he claims to represent the fishermen, and he must be aware that several of these wharfs remained unrepaired for years. I am surprised that the hon. gentleman has not given more attention to the interests of his constituency in the past. He will not save his neck by speaking in an unfair way of the greenhouse here. My hon. friend (Mr. McDougall) has been supporting that very greenhouse at more expensive cost. He won't save his neck.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I quite understand the source of the Minister's promptings in regard to what should have been my duty in past years. I call his attention to the fact that he will find in his own office a report prepared under the instruction of the Government in power previous to 1878, and that report is to the effect that the cost of building the breakwater at Gabarouse would amount to $100,000. In view of that report being in the department it was a difficult matter for myself or for any one else who ever had the honour to represent that constituency, to get the Government to understand that that report was not reliable. It took me a good many years to convince them, but, meanwhile, the Government was providing heavy expenditures in the county of Cape Breton, and during these years I could not be unreasonable enough to expect the Government to provide for every public work necessary in that county. During that time I got the Government to make a new survey, and if I remember aright the engineer of the Public Works Department reported that about $20,000 would build a satisfactory pier or breakwater at that place. It was the intention of the hon. gentleman who preceded the present Minister to provide for that work shortly before the Conservative Government went out of power. For these very good reasons the hon. Minister should take this work into consideration. If the Minister will take steps towards building that work for these people, so far as my party are concerned, we are quite willing to give him the benefit of every vote in that district of the county, if that is any encouragement to him. We can get all the votes that require to bring us here, and no matter whom the people of that district support, I want the work done there because it is greatly needed.

Mr. KAULBACH. I hope the hon. Minister will not give me an answer similar to that which he gave to my hon. friend (Mr. McDougall). I want to bring to the notice of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Tarte) three public works in my county. I applied last year and the year previous for repairs to two public wharfs, one known as Sawpit Wharf, near my town, another known as Young's Landing, about two miles from the town, and also repairs to another public work known as Tancook Breakwater. All three require a certain amount of repairs, and I feel sure that if the Minister would see for himself the need for those repairs he would not hesitate to give an adequate amount to meet the necessary expenditure. Last year I got a smile from the hon. Minister and also a nod, which was taken by me as an affirmative that he was going to look after these works. I gave him an invitation to visit the county, and I should be glad to receive him very cordially. With his smile and his twinkle of the eye I came to the conclusion that my request was going to be granted. I trust I will have the hon. gentleman's visit, and something in the Estimate this year.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Unless something goes wrong, I will certainly go down next summer, and I assure my hon. friend that I will give attention to his statement.

Cribbon's Point—Repairs to wharf..... $400

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Last year the Minister spent $1,552.42, according to the Auditor General's Report, on repairs to this wharf and he is now asking $400. Was the work last year done by day's labour?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Will this complete the repairs?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Judique—New wharf $4,000

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What is the condition of this work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is under contract, let by public tender. Simmons & Berkley, of Gibson, N.B., were the lowest tenderers and they got the work. The contract was let on the 4th of April last and the work is to be completed 18 months from date of contract.

Morden—Repairs to wharf $500

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. There was expended on repairs last year $1,963. Was that done by day's labour ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes ; it could not be done otherwise.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What repairs were done last year ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have not a description of the repairs made last year. The notes placed before me are with regard to next year. During this year the sum of $1,963 was expended in repairing a gap of 121 feet in the pier.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I understand the whole cost will be $2,400, of which $1,900 has been spent and $500 asked for.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, with the $1,900 spent last year, the whole cost will be about $2,400.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What was there to prevent that being put up to public tender—filling a gap with stone, involving an expenditure of $2,400 ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is perfectly impossible to make repairs by public tender in a work of that kind, because you take a piece of timber out and then find you have to take five or ten pieces out.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman lays down the general rule that in repairs, you cannot call for tenders. Does he not take into consideration the value and the character of the work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I spoke in a general way. From experience, we find it is quite impossible to let these repairs by tender. When you call for tenders, you must know exactly what work requires to be done, and in the case of repairs, you cannot tell in advance.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I understand that as a general rule, but now we have a concrete case. The hon. gentleman tells us that this work is the filling in of a gap in a wharf. Do I understand him to say that his officers reported that it could be done cheaper by day work and that he acted on their advice ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I acted on the report of Mr. Dodwell, confirmed by the report of the chief officer.

Mr. MAXWELL. Do I understand the hon. member for Pictou to object to day labour ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I would be sorry if the hon. gentleman so understood me, but I am not responsible for his understanding. The question was whether this was the kind of repairs that ought to be done by day work, instead of calling for public tenders.

Mr. MAXWELL. Do I understand that the hon. member for Pictou wants it done by contract instead of day labour ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. In most cases, it is in the public interest to do so.

Mr. MAXWELL. I do not think so. The labouring men of the country do not so understand it, but are unanimously in favour of day labour. We had experience in Vancouver where we spent the sum of $80,000 in the extension of schools, a part of which was let by contract, after calling for tenders, and a part by day labour, and the day labour plan was the cheapest. I have not the slightest doubt that where day labour is employed, and wisely superintended, it is in the interests of the labouring classes and the public as well.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman, however, will find little support for that view, as he puts it, in this House. That is a subject, however, into which I am not now going. There are cases where day labour is absolutely necessary, but the system of tender is the one recognized by the Minister of Public Works.

Mr. MAXWELL. It is time it is changed.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Well, the Government have not adopted his view, and the system of tender is at present the law of the land. If the hon. gentleman wants that amended, he will probably move a resolution to that effect at an early day, and the whole subject will be discussed.

Margaree—Extension of pier..... $4,000

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That work is under contract, and the contractors are Reed & Chisholm. The price is $3,775, and the work is now going on. The contract was signed on the 25th February last, and the work has to be completed twelve months after the signature of the contract.

North River—St. Anne's Wharf at Seymour's Point..... $2,000

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We are just asking for tenders for that work and they are not yet in.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What is the estimated cost ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. As the tenders are not in, I do not think it will be advisable to give the estimate of the engineer.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman used that argument the other night, and then abandoned it. It is a departure from the usual practice.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman will not find that any predecessor of his took that ground. It is the first duty of a Minister, when asking for a grant for public works, to inform the House of his estimate of the cost. It is absurd to suppose that this House will vote, at the mere request of the Minister, instalments without knowing how much the whole work is to cost. All I want is an approximate estimate. I see that this is a revote.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In this case, I pledge myself to Parliament not to ask any more than $2,000, so that this Parliament knows exactly what it is voting. Those $2,000 will complete the work, and it would be very unwise to give the estimate.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I entirely differ from the hon. gentleman. Such a suggestion has never come from the Treasury benches before. The hon. gentleman says this is all he intends asking Parliament for in connection with this work. Will he give me a full description of the nature of the work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. 360 cubic yards of stone, 940 lineal feet of timber. Also creosote piling, floor stringers, &c.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. How much creosote piling ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. 1,116 feet.

Mr. POWELL. Does that mean 1,116 feet of piling or enough to make 1,116 feet lineal measure ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I understand that it is 1,116 feet of piling.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Where is this work to be done ?

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). In Victoria County.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). In the district usually known as St. Anne's.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What has been the cause of delay in carrying out the work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There has been a question of right of way, the chief engineer tells me. The hon. gentleman might look at the plan I have here. Knowing the locality he will probably understand it better.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. As I understand it, the right of way to be got is over Donald McLeod's property. Does this estimate of $2,000 cover the right of way ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The right of way is estimated to cost $35. It has been stated to me and my officers now tell me that $2,000 will cover the whole work.

East Ragged Island—Wharf..... $2,500

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Where is that ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In Shelburne County.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The sum of $2,500 is required for this wharf. The total length will be 170 feet and the width of the main portion twenty feet. There will be six feet of water at the outer part at low water, spring tide.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What is the object of a wharf with six feet of water ? Is it to be used by boat fishermen ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is a place where vessels of light draught resort. An appropriation of $1,000 was made last year on local representations that this would be sufficient. But the engineer who went to examine the place reported that to spend $1,000 there would be to waste money, as the wharf would not hold. So, no action was taken until Parliament could be asked for an additional sum.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What port is nearest to this point ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Lockeport is the nearest important point. It is several miles away. This is a fishing locality.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. To what extent ? What number of people will use the wharf ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I could not say exactly. The whole neighbourhood is inhabited by a fishing population. But, of course, after you leave Lockeport the population is rather sparse.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Will this amount buy the site, pay for the approaches and complete the work ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Eastern Passage—Boat harbour..... $2,000

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is the eastern passage near Halifax.

Mr. POWELL. What is proposed to be done ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The money is to be spent for dredging.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What depth of water is to be got and what will the work cost ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I understand that $2,000 will cover the whole cost of the work. I cannot give the hon. gentleman the depth of the water at the moment. But according to the estimate, 10,000 yards of material has to be removed to make a channel for small craft.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. There is no trouble about the small craft coming in. This channel has been used by blockade runners in times gone by.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The work is being done on the report of the local engineer, confirmed by the chief engineer. I understand that about seven feet of water is to be had by this dredging.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Why does the hon. gentleman call it "boat harbour" ? It seems to me that it would be better, for the sake of having the Supply Bill accurate, to call it "channel or boat harbour."

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have no objection.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Shall the item be amended so as to read "Eastern channel —channel or boat harbour" ?

Item amended.

Meteghan Breakwater—Repairs $1,000

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Can the hon. gentleman explain how that stands ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is required to rebuild a portion of the outer end of the breakwater which has been damaged. During last year a sum of $2,100 was spent in rebuilding a reinforcement block along the outer side of the L of the breakwater.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Can the hon. gentleman tell how much has been spent so far ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Up to the 31st of December, 1897, $22,526.55.

Windsor Harbour—Shear dam, training dykes and deepening channel, River Avon $4,000

Mr. POWELL. Would the hon. gentleman please explain that item ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This amount is required to complete the work commenced last year. It has been undertaken after a careful survey. The work is being done by day's labour, it cannot be done otherwise. Every time that I can obtain a good clerk of works, I find it is a great deal better to do these small works without tenders. If you call for tenders, on many occasions, a small contractor will not pay his men or will not pay his material. That often happens, and we have a lot of trouble.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I do not agree with the hon. gentleman, but we need not argue that. What is the primary object of this ? Has it to do with the channel, or is it for protection ?

Mr. HALEY. The wharfs have been filling up with mud. The hon. gentleman is well acquainted with that port and acquainted with its requirements. There is a large export of gypsum and lumber from Windsor. In consequence of building a bridge across the river, the long span of which is on the Windsor side, the mud settles in and destroys the channel on that side. The channel has been filling up with mud for a long time and vessels of large size cannot load at the wharfs and get away after being loaded without waiting for spring tides. The hon. gentleman knows that a large amount of products are shipped at this point. A portion of the railway appropriation has been for some years used to keep this wharf clear by taking the mud out of the channel. A large amount of money has been spent in shovelling up the mud. It was thought best, instead of taking money from the railway appropriation to build shear dams on the opposite side of the river, throwing the ebb tide upon the Windsor side. Mr. Dodwell and Mr. Shewan estimated that it would cost about $3,300. In consequence of the shifting quicksands on the Falmouth side as they put down their caissons, it kept sinking down. They were compelled to stop work on account of the appropriation being exhausted. This year Mr. Dodwell estimates that $4,000 will do the work. They want to extend the dams further across the river so that the swift flowing tide will cut in and take the mud out with it. It has cost the Government a great deal of money in past years simply for dredging or shovelling out the mud.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Is there marsh on the opposite side of the river ?

Mr. HALEY. There is marsh on the Falmouth side, a dyke marsh. The incoming tide is cutting in on this dyke. Some of the marsh proprietors think that the shear dam is going to let the water in and cut the dyke still more ; but the engineers think the dykes will be protected by the building of the dams. If something had not been done on that dyke the bridge and everything else would have been in time destroyed. Vessels often have to lie a week or ten days before they can get out at all. The work is a very necessary one, and it is being done fairly well under the direction of the engineer who

is proceeding by day's work, under his own careful inspection.

Mr. POWELL. Would not the difficulty have been overcome by projecting those wharfs further out into the channel ?

Mr. HALEY. That was left to the engineer to decide. Mr. Dodwell would not act on his own responsibility, and he sent for Mr. Shewan, who has a good reputation as an engineer, having had a long experience in the tidal rivers of New Brunswick, and the Government could not undertake to extend private wharfs, to reach deeper water, and the cost would have been very much larger. I have confidence that the amount now to be voted will complete the work and give sufficient water on the Windsor side of the river. It is important to proceed with this work in the interest of one of the most important shipping ports in Nova Scotia.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I know the place to which the hon. gentleman refers, and I can understand the importance of this work ; but from the statement of the hon. member for Hants (Mr. Haley), I take it that this is at the best an experiment. It may not be carried out for $4,000, and yet it may result in a complete job, the action of the water doing a great deal itself. But the Minister seemed to intimate that there was no trouble about it, that the work was not an experiment and that $4,000 would complete it.

Mr. HALEY. So far as the work has gone, that has been the case. According to the report of Mr. Dodwell, the work is not long enough.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. When the chief engineer, supported by other engineers, makes representations to the department, I feel bound to accept them.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I am not saying that the hon. Minister should not do so ; but I fancy they reported that the work was in the nature of an experiment. Mr. Dodwell apparently had to call in another engineer, which was a very reasonable action on his part. The work is of a novel character, and from the very clear and very full explanation given by the hon. member for Hants, it is evident there is an element of experiment about it, which does not hurt it, however, in the least. But the Minister should have taken the House into his confidence and given hon. members a full explanation of the work and what it was hoped to accomplish, instead of simply stating that the work would cost $4,000 and no more.

Mr. HALEY. Provincial engineer Murphy came there and examined the work, and stated that in his opinion they were going to have more money than was necessary to do the work.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). I have seen this work, and know something about the deposit of sand in tidal rivers. I do not think it can be called an experiment. No doubt the work will result in making the improvement expected, but there may be some doubt as to the amount of money required. To that extent it is experimental. Even if the cost were three times the amount estimated, it would pay well. The hon. member for Pictou suggested that the wharfs might have been extended. That would have been a very expensive job and would cost many times more than the present work, and then it would not necessarily be permanent. If this work is carried out, no doubt it will make a permanent improvement, and no further expenditure would be necessary, as would be the case either if the wharfs had been extended or we had built a further pier.

L'Ardoise—Repairs to breakwater..... $3,500

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. How does this work stand ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is a pier already there, to which we are going to make some additions. These include a concrete wall, rearranging, covering stones and repairs. The work is situated in Richmond county, on the side of St. Peter's Lake. A breakwater was built in 1876-77, but was almost entirely destroyed. It was reconstructed in 1891-93. The work is 400 feet long.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Is this work undr contract ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have not yet made up our minds. The total amount necessary to complete the work is the sum asked.

Whycocomagh—wharf $2,000

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. How does this work stand ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have bought a wharf from the estate of Mrs. Catharine Macdonald, for which we have paid $3,000. The reports of the engineers are to the effect that $1,000 will be needed to repair the wharf, which will then be a first-class structure.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. When was this wharf bought ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In April last.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman got an appropriation from Parliament of $4,000 to build the wharf. Am I right in understanding that instead of building a wharf, he bought a wharf ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes. We found it to be better policy to

buy that wharf, which is nicely located, instead of paying more money. The whole trade can be carried on there. A full report from the local engineer has been received.

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). Perhaps I may be permitted to give a short history of this matter. I think the hon. gentleman opposite found difficulty in landing there on one occasion, and he had to land at this very wharf. The chief engineer gave instructions to the resident engineer to go to Whycocomagh for the purpose of erecting there a wharf to cost about $4,000. Mr. Milledge being resident engineer, visited that place and found that the late Government had dredged a pretty deep channel in Whycocomagh Bay, and that the only good location for a public wharf was where the Macdonald wharf was built. He applied to the Macdonald people with a view to purchase the wharf, and an arrangement was come to between the Macdonalds and the engineer, and they agreed that the wharf with approaches was one worth at least $3,000. This agreement between the resident engineer and the Macdonalds was submitted to the Government and the Government approved of the proposition and agreed to take the Macdonald wharf, which is a substantial structure, as part and parcel of the new wharf at Whycocomagh. A new block is to be added to the Macdonald wharf in order to make it supply the public as a federal wharf. The hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) himself has seen that steamers frequent that bay and that the only place of landing was the Macdonald wharf. The addition of sixty feet which the resident engineer proposes to build in addition to that wharf will make it a very commodious structure. From the engineer's report which I have examined, it seems that the whole structure can be finished within the $4,000.

Mr. POWELL. How far is it from Baddeck?

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). Twenty-five miles.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I do not know to what my hon. friend (Mr. McLennan) refers when he suggests that my experience was anything but pleasant in Whycocomagh. The only recollection I have is that of being pleasantly received and well treated when I was there. But, Mr. Chairman, this is an extraordinary case and requires a fuller explanation. There was, I am informed, considerable fear entertained by some of the residents in this district that instead of their obtaining a suitable wharf at a proper point, Mr. James Macdonald, the member for the county in the provincial Parliament and a strong Liberal, acting as guardian for this Macdonald estate, would be so fortunate as to divert this money for a purpose which while beneficial to the estate would not be as beneficial to the community as was desired. I was given to understand—of course in all this I merely speak what was said to me—that when the present member for the county (Mr. McLennan) urged upon the Government this grant he had no sinister motives whatever in connection with that private property or with the acquisition of this tumble-down wharf which is now landed upon the hands of the Minister; but that this was an afterthought, and to such an extent were the difficulties increased, that instead of spending the $4,000 which Parliament had put in the hands of the Minister for a proper wharf at a proper place, his hand was stayed by local influences and this very thing has occurred while Parliament was sitting, which certainly a portion of the people, at any rate those who have represented the matter to me, were fearful should come to pass. Apart wholly from whether it is a desirable thing or whether the merits are on his side, it does seem to me an irregularity that the Minister should ask for a grant of money to build a wharf for the accommodation of these people, and then during the session of Parliament, but with no authority whatever from Parliament, buy an existing wharf, in the face of the express wish of Parliament as contained in the Supply Bill that a new wharf should be built. It appears to me that this is an improper diversion of the money voted. It is one thing to ask the House to sanction the purchase of an old wharf to be patched up and improved, and another thing to ask for a grant of money to build a new wharf. If the Minister had stated that this old wharf was in existence many questions would arise as to the necessity for this Parliament interfering at all, for it is not a usual thing to build Government wharfs where private wharfs exist, and there must be exceptional reasons to justify it. A petition was sent to the hon. gentleman from the district, very influentially signed as it seems to me from the document which I hold in my hand, and as I read that petition it does not appear that the views originally pressed upon the Government by the representative of the county, no doubt speaking for the people of the district, are altogether met by this little arrangement to purchase this wharf which Mr. Macdonald had charge of. The petition was presented some time in January last, and is as follows:—

> The Petition of the undersigned, electors of Whycocomagh and surrounding districts, humbly showeth:
>
> 1. That since, at this last session of Parliament, a grant of $4,000 was made for the building a public wharf at Whycocomagh, the trade of the port is such as to require the building of the said wharf at the earliest possible date.
>
> 2. That when the said wharf is built it be placed at a point where at least 18 feet of water can be had so as to enable the St. Pierre and Newfoundland steamers to call and take and discharge freight.

3. That in the opinion of the undersigned the only suitable location for such wharf is a short distance south and east of Neil McKinnon's Brook, a property surveyed and reported on by the Government engineer some years ago.

The hon. gentleman from Inverness (Mr. McLennan) will know where that is, I do not.

4. That the building of said wharf at deep water as above stated will benefit to a large extent the business men and farmers of Inverness county as a whole, as their shipping to St. Pierre, Newfoundland and other ports could be done direct from the port of Whycocomagh more conveniently and at much less cost.

5. That this wharf be built as above requested, at deep water, since an easily and passable and comparatively level road could be built at small expense from wharf to Main Street through Whycocomagh village.

6. That a suitable warehouse be built on or near said wharf for the purpose of storing freight, inwards and outwards.

7. Your petitioners earnestly request that the wharf be built on site above mentioned, firmly believing that no property north of this site in the village would serve the interests of the general public; and further request you to order the building of public wharf at Whycocomagh on the site as above stated, since your petitioners are of the opinion the amount of the Government grant for the purpose is ample to cover all expenditure involved in granting this your humble petitioners' request.

Signed at Whycocomagh, Jan., 1898.

This petition is signed by L. S. McKeen, merchant, Neil McKinnon and a great many others. The hon. gentleman who represents the county no doubt has seen this and also the Minister of Public Works.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have seen it.

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). How many names are there from Whycocomagh?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I cannot tell that at once.

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). There is 3,000 of a population there.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. All the names except those on the first page seem to be those of Whycocomagh. I will read the names if the hon. gentleman desires. They are:

L. S. McKean, Neil McKinnon, P. A. McLean, Duncan Carmichael, W. D. M. Dougall, Thos. Mitchell, James McKinnon, Peter McKinnon, Angus A. Gillies, John A. McDougall, Lanchlin Gillies, Duncan Livingston, A. E. Waters, J. C. Waters, D. J. Waters, Arch. McDougall, A. B. McKay, Murdo Gillies, George Bishop, A. A. Munro, J. H. B. McIntosh, Malcolm McAuley, Duncan McMillan, Peter McKinnon, Robert Frizzle.

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). Now, there it is. The hon. gentleman is giving the name of a man who lives fifteen miles away from Whycocomagh.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Is that the only one the hon. gentleman challenges?

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). My hon. friend has finished with Whycocomagh, and he has read a petition supposed to come from a locality containing 3,000 of a population.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I defer, of course, to the hon. gentleman's knowledge of the locality, but he will find that this petition does not pretend to come from Whycocomagh alone. It is the petition of "the undersigned electors of Whycocomagh and surrounding districts." These people are speaking of the county as well as the particular spot to which reference is made in the petition.

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). My hon. friend will not contend that the county of Inverness is dependent on the one port of Whycocomagh. There are many other ports there.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. If the hon. gentleman desires to inform the committee that these people are all wrong in their views, of course it is his right to do so. So far as I am concerned, I am not able, from local knowledge, to contradict him, beyond saying that here is a petition which seems to be on the very lines upon which the hon. gentleman proceeded and on which the Minister of Public Works was led to take action a year ago. Certainly, a year ago the records of the Public Works Department will not show any suggestion that this wharf was to be located on the Macdonald estate. It was never suggested to the Minister of Public Works that the scheme was to buy a tumble-down wharf belonging to that estate. The hon. gentleman went at that time upon the lines that this petition covers, and, if I recollect right, it covers the historic fact as well that there had been an investigation and official reports as to the proper site to be selected; and what seems to be the irregular and extraordinary course taken of turning this vote for the construction of a new wharf into the purchase at $3,000 of this tumble-down wharf of the Macdonald estate, is worthy of consideration. Has the hon. gentleman any report from his officers as to the value of this wharf and the depth of water at the end of it?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I received a petition similar to the one just read, and before coming to any decision, I exacted a complete report from the resident engineer, Mr. Milledge. His report was to the effect that it would be less expensive and better to buy the Macdonald wharf than to build a new one. In view of that report, I had no hesitation whatever. As to the point that we are violating the spirit of the vote, my hon. friend is wrong. If he will look at the item itself,

he will find it reads simply "Whycocomagh wharf," and moreover I do not see what difference it makes. Supposing I were to spend $1,000 or $2,000 more in building a new wharf, surely I would not have acted as a Minister should. The depth of water is twelve feet.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. At the site suggested it would be eighteen.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am told twelve feet now, but will look at my notes again. My hon. friend will pardon me for not having all these details, because they are pretty hard to keep in mind.

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). The resident engineer, Mr. Milledge, was in the service of the Government, of which my hon. friend from Pictou was a member many years, and I am surprised that he would suggest that so old and faithful a servant would swerve from the path of duty and base a report on my advice or that of James Macdonald or any other person. I am sure he has a better opinion than that of the professional and personal standing of Mr. Milledge. I may again say that Mr. Milledge was instructed by the Department of Public Works to go and find the best site for a wharf in Whycocomagh Bay. He went there untrammelled by any instructions further than that. I read his report, and am not afraid of any reference to it. He examined three sites—the one indicated in that petition, the one on the Macdonald site, and one on another site opposite the Bayview Hotel. He found that the channel dredged out by the late Government came nearest the Macdonald wharf, and therefore determined that the public wharf should be built there. He also reported that not only was it nearest the channel, but that it would be in the heart of the village. The site indicated in the petition is quite a distance out of the village of Whycocomagh. The engineer reported that it would not be advisable, in the interests of the village and the surrounding country, to build a wharf so far out of the way of the shipping portion of that locality. He, therefore, reports to the chief engineer advising the Government to purchase the Macdonald property. Now, could the hon. gentleman from Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) condemn the Government for taking a portion of the $4,000 to purchase the right of way to the wharf. Certainly not, for he knows it is the custom to apply a portion of such grants in this way. This $3,000, then, includes the right of way, it includes a warehouse, which the petitioners wish the Government to build, it includes the whole property, right of way, wharf and all. The greater portion of this wharf is stone and cannot be considered as "tumble-down." Some parts of the wooden portion of the wharf are out of repair. I say again I do not believe Mr. Milledge would go out of his way for the sake of either the Dominion or local representative of the county, or anybody else.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. This is a poor system for the discussion of estimates—to bring in some official and suggest that he be knocked about from side to side of the House. I am not as extreme as the hon. gentleman thinks, and to show that that is the case, I would suggest that, as the Minister has a report, he should give me an opportunity to see it before concurrence; or better still, lay it on the Table. Outside of the irregularity that I suggest in connection with the plan, it really comes to a question which the people in the locality can settle with the gentleman who takes the responsibility, the hon. member for Inverness (Mr. McLennan)—the question of the advantage of having a wharf in comparatively shallow water or having a wharf in comparatively deep water. I would merely suggest that the hon. Minister bring down the report before concurrence.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have not the slightest objection to doing so. As to the deep water, on looking at my notes again I find that the extension we are going to build for $1,000 will give us a depth of 12½ feet.

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). When it is considered that this whole course has been pursued on the suggestion of the resident engineer, the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) cannot be surprised if I attached so much importance to the position in which he placed himself.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. All I wish to protest against is that any criticism I offer should be considered an attack upon any officer, particularly as I explained that I had no personal knowledge of the case. What depth of water will there be in the channel leading to the wharf?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I could not say.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What additional expenditure does the hon. gentleman expect to put upon this?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Not one cent more.

Port Joli, repairs to wharf..... $1,800

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There are three blocks here. On two of them we spent $300 last year to put them in repair. We now ask $1,800 to repair the third, and cover all three and make a wharf.

Port Latour, breakwater, &c..... $4,000

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to build a breakwater to provide safe anchorage.

Mr. POWELL. What county is that in?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In Shelburne County. We have not moved very fast in this work. I will see what we can do later on.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Is there no plan for this yet ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, we have been so busy, we have not been able to do everything.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Then why does the hon. gentleman want the money now ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Because I hope to be able to make some progress in this matter.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. But the hon. gentleman asked for the vote last year. Why was nothing done ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). Perhaps I may be allowed to make an observation. In this work, and the one covered by the next item, "Clark's Harbour—breakwater, &c., $5,000," the engineer who visited the locality has reported that the work will involve very considerable expense. Up to the present moment I have not felt at liberty to ask the Minister of Public Works to proceed. I think in this case the estimate was $14,000. While I am glad to have the money revoted, and I would urge that the work be not proceeded with unless we could get a modified plan.

Mr. POWELL. Where is Clark's Harbour ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Both Clark's Harbour and Port Latour are in Shelburne County.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What does the hon. Minister of Public Works consider the limit to which he would go ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I could not say very well——

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. Minister of Finance has spoken of $14,000 for the work and says that unless a modified plan can be had nothing will be done. Would the hon. gentleman consider $10,000, for instance, a reasonable sum ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have no intention of asking the Minister to make a contract for that work in excess of $10,000. Unless we can get both the works named on some modified plans, we shall be obliged to leave them over until we have more resources. They would be really useful works if we could get them.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The object is to protect the boats in landing ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, to protect the fishermen.

Mr. KAULBACH. My hon. friend from Queen's and Shelburne (Mr. Fielding) has been so well treated by the Minister of Public Works that, as I am a near neighbour, I desire to express the hope that he (Mr. Fielding) will give the Minister of Public Works a hint not to allow me to be left out in the cold.

Harbours and Rivers, Prince Edward Island—
General repairs to piers and breakwaters. $6,000

Mr. MACDONALD (P.E.I.) Has the Minister of Public Works any information with respect to the wharf at Annandale ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have instructed our local engineer to send us a report as to the state of the different wharfs, but that report is not yet in. This vote is the ordinary vote taken every year.

Souris, strengthening of breakwater.... $15,000

Mr. MACDONALD (P.E.I.) Will the Minister be good enough to give us information with respect to this expenditure ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This work is under contract. A part of this money is to pay the balance of the work contracted for by Messrs. Heney & Smith, and the balance to complete the work by day's labour. There is a part of the work that the engineers report could be better done by day's labour.

Mr. MACDONALD (P.E.I.) Have you any information with respect to the work that was done by Heney & Smith ? Is it standing well ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The engineer reports that the works are standing very well.

Mr. MACDONALD (P.E.I.) There was a contract let by the previous Government on this work, previous to the contract with Heney & Smith. I think that contract was let to Messrs. Mellish & Whiteman. A good deal of time was lost between the time of the tender being accepted and the signing of the contract in the most important season in which to construct the work, that is, in the spring and summer season. I think there was about six weeks lost between the acceptance and the signing of the contract, during which the contractor was not able to proceed with the work. Then the fall storms came on and destroyed altogether some of the work that he had already constructed. In that way I think he has a strong claim on the Government for damages, or for compensation for the loss he sustained. That great storm broke a further portion of the breakwater, and the whole work was thrown over to the following year, and the contractor sustained heavy loss on account of the delay. The fact is that he lost many thousand dollars by it. I think, knowing as I do all the circumstances, that he has a strong and valid claim in justice to compensation for the delay that occurred, owing, not to any fault

of his, but to the Government not promptly giving him authority to go on with the work at the season of the year when he could have accomplished it very easily.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not remember that the case of Mr. Whiteman has been laid before me. When representations are made to me, I will take the hon. gentleman's statement into consideration.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I remember well the case my hon. friend refers to. I had personal knowledge of the matter, and I inspected the work that he did, and examined the facts stated in the petition that he presented to the Public Works Department. With respect to his claim for damages, it is one of those cases that no doubt has some merit, because he was prevented by causes over which he had no control from completing his work, in fact from commencing his work at the time he hoped to be able to commence it. But the difficulty I saw was in determining that the department at Ottawa were in any sense to blame for delay in the commencement of the work. When my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works was down there last year, I spoke to him with respect to Mr. Whiteman's petition, in fact I waited upon him personally, and talked the matter over with him in the presence of his engineer. The matter was the subject of a good deal of investigation and inquiry, and I was in hopes at one time that the Minister of Public Works might have seen his way clear to recognize the claim of the petition to some extent. But it does not appear so far that he has been able to do so. I would very cordially endorse the statements made. To a large extent they are within my own personal knowledge as being correct. I think it is one of those meritorious claims which have no legal foundation, but which I think may very well be considered by the Minister from an equitable standpoint. There is no doubt he lost a tremendous lot of money, and from causes for which he was not personally responsible. But whether the department sees its way clear to recognize their liability to indemnify him, is a matter to which the Minister will no doubt give every consideraton.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will be glad during recess to give more attention to the claim of Mr. Whiteman than I have been able to do. I remember now discussing this matter with the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and my officer, but having been very busy I have not been able to attend to it. But during recess I will be glad to discuss this matter again.

Mr. MACDONALD (P.E.I.) I am not able to say whether he has a strictly legal claim on the Government; but as my hon. friend has just now said, there is no doubt it is a case of great hardship. In the first place the delay between the acceptance of the tender and the signing of the contract, which was carried over for a month or six weeks, occurred just at the time of year which would have enabled him to complete the whole contract before the fall storms came on. He is not a political friend of mine, although I do not suppose that would have any weight with the Minister. Still, I know the particulars of the case, and I think he has a strong claim in justice to the reasonable consideration of the Government.

West Point Wharf..... $7,400

Mr. POWELL. How much is that going to cost altogether?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That work is under contract, the contractors are Macdonald & Moffett. The amount of the contract is $9,500, which is the total cost of the work. The total cost of the work will be $9,500.

Mr. POWELL. Is that a new work?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The money is required for repairing and extending existing works, which when completed will be 325 feet long and 30 feet wide.

Mr. POWELL. What will be the depth of the water at the end of the pier?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Six feet at low water mark.

Mr. POWELL. For what purpose is the wharf used?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It is largely used by fishermen.

Tignish, repairs to breakwater..... $7,000

Mr. MACDONALD (P.E.I.). Is this amount required altogether for repairs?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The work is under contract, and the amount asked will cover the cost of the whole work.

Mr. MACDONALD P.E.I.). I desire to call the Minister's attention to the breakwater at Campbell's Cove. This is one of the most important fishing sections on the north shore, where there are practically no harbours; and in view of the large fishing interest involved, it is important that the breakwater should be kept in a state of repair.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will take note of it and see what can be done.

Belfast, approach to pier..... $500

Mr. MACDONALD (P.E.I.). For what purpose is this money required?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is required to extend the pier at Belfast.

Brae, breakwater..... $1,000

Mr. POWELL. Where is this work situated ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is near Egmond Bay. The amount is required for repairing and extending the breakwater originally erected by residents. It is 300 feet long and 20 feet wide.

For purchase of creosoted piles for general repairs to wharfs, piers and breakwaters $2,000

Mr. MACDONALD (P.E.I.). Has the hon. gentleman arranged to purchase creosoted piles ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have not bought any yet, but we intend to buy them.

Mr. MACDONALD (P.E.I.). Was lumber of that kind used in the repairs to the Souris breakwater ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Under the contract these piles have been used.

Mr. MACDONALD (P.E.I.). Although the cost of this wood is considerably more than the ordinary wood of the country, where the worm in our country is so destructive, it will be found more economical to use more of this class of wood in pile work.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I quite agree with my hon. friend.

Mr. POWELL. Has the Minister considered the propriety of having the work of creosoting wood carried out under the direction of the Government? If this wood had been used in the case of Cape Tormentine pier, $30,000, $40,000 or $50,000 might have been saved to the country. Owing to the large expenditure which is constantly occurring under this head it is very important that our river and harbour works, in localities where the worm is at all active, should be constructed of creosoted timber.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have been looking for information on this subject for the last few months. I asked Mr. Dobell, before he went to England, to get information there ; but we have not found on the other side of the water exactly what we want. I think we should have creosoting works under our direction. They would cost in the neighbourhood of $30,000, but it would be money well invested.

Red Point Wharf, repairs..... $1,000

Mr. MACDONALD (P.E.I.). Where is this wharf situated ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. On the south of Hillsboro' River.

Mr. MACDONALD (P.E.I.). Was it taken over from the local government ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Some years ago it was taken over—in fact, it was repaired by the Dominion Government before it was taken over, and then it was taken over absolutely. It is nine miles up the river on the south side, and is an important point.

Mr. POWELL. There is one work to which I desire to call the attention of the Minister of Public Works. It is a very celebrated work ; it is a work that last year was pressed on the attention of the Government and was imperatively demanded to be immediately constructed. It was to save the destruction of a very important harbour on the Northumberland Straits, the harbour of Summerside. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) i see is very self-sacrificing indeed ; he is possessed of the true spirit of altruism, because he allowed the Minister of Finance to have no less than four harbours provided for his county, while the Minister of Marine has not only asked for none in any part of the county he represents, but he has actually forgone the pleasure of seeing a vote for this large work appearing in the Estimates. I would ask if the urgent necessity for the placing of that work in the Estimates last year has passed away, or whether the mind of the Minister has been changed in respect to it, its urgency or whether the work is so costly that the Government think the country cannot afford to carry it out ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I may say to my hon. friend (Mr. Powell) that, so far as I am concerned, I have not ceased to recognize the great importance of that work, and so much so that plans were prepared by the chief engineer of the Public Works Department and tenders were called for. We did suppose originally that the work could be done for $60,000 or $70,000, but when the tenders were opened we had only one tender within reasonable limits, and when that tenderer was called upon to carry out the work, he withdrew. The work was offered to the contractor next above the lowest tenderer, and he also withdrew ; and we found we could not get the work constructed at anything like what we thought a reasonable sum.

Mr. MACDONLD (P.E.I.) Would the Minister say about what was the amount ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The tender was under $100,000. In conjunction with my hon. friend from East Prince (Mr. Yeo), who for the first time this session I do not see in his seat ; I do not remember ever having seen the hon. gentleman absent from the Chamber before——

Mr. MACDONALD (P.E.I.) He was called away by telegram ; his sister is dead.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am very sorry to hear that news. In conjunction with that hon. gentleman (Mr. Yeo) I called upon the Minister of Public Works, and he was kind enough to give instructions to his chief engineer to revise the specifications in order to see whether he could not reduce the probable cost to within those limits, that in the island at least we thought it ought to be reduced to. We had an idea that this work should not cost anything near so much money, and the chief engineer did revise his estimates. The great cost consisted in importing stone from Nova Scotia, because it was found that the island stone which had been used in filling up would not stand the sea and the water. The chief engineer did make a revision of his estimates, and put in some other stone to be taken from quarries along the line of the Shediac Road, Wallace and Pugwash, and other places. When we received the new tenders, with the reduction as we thought in the probable cost, these tenders were much larger than we expected. The matter has not been decided even now, and my hon. friend (Mr. Tarte) has given me the assurance that he will recommend to his colleagues the insertion in the Supplementary Estimates of a reasonable sum, sufficient to assure the public who are deeply interested in this work that the Government bona fide intend to proceed, if it can be done at anything within reasonable limits. I am not one of those who are prepared to recommend an extravagant expenditure of public money, and I may say that my hon. friend from East Prince (Mr. Yeo) and myself have waited upon the Minister of Public Works a great many times, and upon the chief engineer, and have gone over his estimates in the hope that we may get the cost down to such a sum as from our standpoint in the maritime provinces would be reasonable. So far we have not succeeded, but I am very well satisfied with the assurance the Minister of Public Works gives me, that he will recommend to his colleagues the insertion of a reasonable sum in the Estimates in the hope that we may get that work built.

Mr. MACDONALD (P.E.I.) What is the object of the work ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman knows that Summerside is the second harbour in Prince Edward Island, and the channel is not deep enough to admit of the passage of the larger class of steamers, such as the "Stanley." The "Stanley" has gone in and come out, but she touched once. The channel is a little narrow and slightly tortuous. The belief among the engineers and those who have studied the question is, that if the harbour is protected by this breakwater and the entrance is reduced, then the tremendous rush of water will deepen it two or three feet, and thus afford anchorage and protection not only to ordinary sized vessels, but to vessels having the large draft of the "Stanley" when her tanks are filled. The belief is that the building of this breakwater from the lighthouse, which is situated at the south side of the entrance of the harbour, into the point, would so narrow the water that the rush would clear the channel out so as to afford the necessary depth.

Mr. MACDONALD (P.E.I.) I would ask the Minister of Public Works whether the experience of the officers of his department would lead him to believe that a structure of that kind in a place such as Summerside Harbour, would have the effect referred to by the Minister of Marine. I am rather inclined to think, from the nature of the bottom and the whole shape of the harbour, that there will be little if any benefit obtained from confining the waters. I must say that I think Summerside harbour has at present all the water that the necessities of the place require. It has a sufficient depth for all purposes, with possibly the exception of the "Stanley" when she is loaded down with her tanks filled for going through heavy ice, but there is no necessity for her going to Summerside while thus loaded down. People will be saying curious things about these matters, and they say that there must be a little politics in this. I do not know whether there is or not. Again, they say this thing is going to be staved off and that there will be another amount put in the Estimates when an election comes on. I do not know how much truth there is in that, but people will talk that way, you know. I dare say that the people of Summerside have been anticipating this work for some time, and no doubt it would be to their interests to have it, but whether it will really be in the interests of the harbour and of Summerside generally is quite another matter. The hon. Minister knows that in former years we had very large ships visiting our ports in the island, but the conditions have been altered in that regard, and at the present time we do not require as great a depth in our harbours as we did many years ago. While it would be perhaps well enough to construct that work if the cost is not excessive, it is a serious question as to whether an expenditure of $150,000, as I understand some of the tenders were, or even $100,000, would be warranted under the circumstances. At least that is my opinion, and I am just telling you of the way people talk.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am in hopes that there are no politics in it, because the construction of this breakwater has been a matter which came before successive Governments one after another. The late Government determined to build it, and this Government, after close examination, decided that their

determination was in the interests of trade and commerce; and my hon. friend knows that although the harbour is a good one in itself, it is exposed absolutely to the south-west winds. In addition to the scouring which the hon. gentleman speaks of, which would be the practical effect of the construction of the breakwater, it would entirely protect the harbour from the south-west gales; and as the harbour is protected naturally from all the other gales, it would thus be rendered perfectly safe. Being the second harbour in the island, and perhaps the one from which the greatest export trade goes in the summer months, it is one that nobody would say should be disregarded. I am sure that my hon. friend, although he comes from the other end of the island, would not look with a jealous eye upon a reasonable expenditure in this regard. I quite agree that we must be very prudent and careful, and the best evidence my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works has given of that, is that he has not accepted any of the tenders, because they were of an amount that he thought excessive.

Mr. POWELL. I think this harbour should be safely left to the course pursued by Governments heretofore. It has been always admitted as very desirable to build this breakwater, but it has never been built. The ends of justice and the interest of all parties would be best served if that course were continued, and the present Government were to follow closely in the footsteps of their predecessors. I must congratulate the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries upon one fact: I do not think he would expend money on this breakwater needlessly or waste the public money for mere political purposes. I must congratulate him also on the fact that he advocated public improvements in his own constituency on their own merits and does not try to buttress himself with useless expenditure of public money in making four or five artificial harbours and erecting post offices that seem to be designed as tombs of decaying towns and to have been erected for no other purpose that I can see. I congratulate him in pursuing, in this respect, a course somewhat different from that taken by some of his confreres in the Government.

While this breakwater will never be built and is entirely unnecessary, I would call his attention to the great desirability of having a harbour on the Island side of the straits between Cape Traverse and Tormentine. The present harbour at Cape Traverse is of no use whatever. It is constructed in a place where the sand, owing to the shore wash, fills in around the end of it, so that a few weeks after it is dredged, it is utterly impossible for a vessel to get near it. The English engineers, in dealing with such a case, are in the habit of sinking tubular piers at considerable distances, and the wash comes between these piers, carrying the sand or silt along, and then at the outer end, probably a couple of hundred yards distant, they construct a solid pier, which is used for the purpose of mooring vessels. In this way the loose sand is washed between these tubular piers, and passes on to another portion of the coast, and the outside pier remains accessible to vessels at all time and requires no dredging. I would call the attention of the hon. Minister of Public Works to the great desirability of building a new pier. The money expended on the old one heretofore was absolutely wasted, so far as the purposes of large vessels are concerned, and any addition to that pier will also be a waste of money. Whether it is desirable to go further up the coast and construct a harbour at Carleton Head and then deflect the railway to that harbour, I am not sufficiently acquainted with the locality, although intimately with the coast, to say. The expenditure of a few thousand dollars there would afford a very good pier for the "Stanley" or the successor of the "Stanley," if it is decided to have an ice boat with more power crossing between the capes in winter and this seems to be the only available route there is. I do not know if the matter has received the attention of the department, but it certainly should. The amount that would be required to construct a breakwater at Summerside, if spent instead at Carleton Head, would construct a good artificial harbour on that side of the straits. As regards the money to be wasted in connection with the Summerside harbour, I am very familiar with that harbour, having been in and out of it, in the early part of my life, hundreds of times. The construction of this breakwater is not at all necessary. In the first place, at low water this reef, the hon. gentleman spoke of, is almost entirely dry, and any body who knows the elementary principles of sea or wave action knows that a reef with eight or nine feet of water on it and a great lagoon inside, extending a couple of miles, affords ample protection to vessels under all circumstances. It is a magnificent harbour with better protection than almost any harbour on the coast. It is easy of access, and the expenditure of $100,000 or $50,000 on it would be an absolute waste of money.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have not much to add to what my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has said. He knows the place very well and has spoken with full knoweldge. I can only say that this work has given us a great deal of anxiety. The chief engineer himself went down to inspect the place with the view of changing the plans, so as to reduce the cost if possible. After his visit we called for new tenders, but we still find the cost of the work very great. At the same time, I cannot lose sight of the fact that Summerside is a very important harbour, and there is no doubt whatever that

the reports from the department would justify us in the belief that the building of that breakwater would vastly improve it. It would protect it very much.

Mr. POWELL. It is sufficiently protected now.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Moreover it would create a scour so that the inside of the harbour would be kept clear. As to the other questions to which my hon. friend from Westmoreland (Mr. Powell) has alluded, that has received the attention of the department in the past. Mr. Shewan made surveys and reports which I would be very glad to let my hon. friend see; but I understand that the cost of the work would be very large. We cannot build in that part of the country without spending much money, I am sorry to say.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There are two things in which I agree thoroughly with my hon. friend from Westmoreland (Mr. Powell). These are that money spent by the late Government in the construction of the wharf at Cape Traverse was so much money thrown into the sea, and that any extension of that wharf would be money equally wasted. It is possible that a pier, built after the style in which they build piers in England, up at Carleton Point, a few miles further to the west, might possibly be well spent; but the estimate for the work would amount, not to $100,000, but $250,000; and I have never been able to bring myself to the point of recommending to the Government any such work. In addition, it would necessitate a branch railway from the present line, and altogether the expenditure would amount to $300,000 or $400,000. And even when you had completed the work, it would be only an experiment. Nobody has been able yet to solve the problem as to whether winter navigation can be carried on there with steamers. My hon. friend rather sneered the other day at the little effort I made last year in that direction, and the impression has gone abroad among many people that we tried the experiment of endeavouring to cross there in the winter in the same way as between Georgetown and Pictou, namely, by smashing up the ice. That was not the idea, as I explained. The idea was to test whether the statements made by residents of the locality that the tides meeting there on the south side of the island left an open place through which the steamers would pass was a tenable one or not. If the theory was sound, no doubt a small steamer could test it. But suppose you went to the expense of $200,000 or $300,000. I may explain that I do not shut my mind against it. The matter may be worth considering. But after you test you have no guarantee that you can run steamers there. It might be useless. The idea of the Summerside breakwater, if it could be built for a reasonable sum, a sum somewhat less than $100,000, is that you could cross from there to Tormentine. The distance is not much greater than by the existing route, running around by Sea Cow Head. If you could build a breakwater at the end of which the steamer could lie, it is possible, and perhaps even probable—for practical men to entertain the idea—that you could carry on winter communication between these ports. Personally it is well known that my opinion is that the best route is between Georgetown and Pictou. But I am not going to shut my eyes to that fact that other men who have as good means to judge as I have, and who are, perhaps, more competent to judge, entertain that opinion.

Mr. POWELL. What does Capt. McElhinney say?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am not sure but I think Capt. McElhinney's opinions are on record. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Powell) will recollect that one view we entertained and had before us was the possibility and even the probability of this breakwater offering a safe harbour, at the end near the lighthouse, and might solve the question of winter communication. And this is an exceedingly important problem for Prince Edward Island. I am glad that the Minister of Public Works has given the matter so much attention together with his chief engineer. I know that they are trying to devise some specification which will bring the expense within reasonable limits. If the expense can be brought down to a reasonable sum, I shall urge strongly that the work be carried on.

Mr. POWELL. So far as the hon. gentleman's criticism of the previous Government's expenditure is concerned. I have nothing to say. It is no part of my intentions to defend the expenditure of the previous Government. But I would not assent to the proposition of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that it was an unwarrantable thing to expend public money for services in their nature experimental. The late Government were trying to kill two birds with one stone. In the first place the object was to have a pier for the purpose of interprovincial communication, and the second to afford facilities for the people of the vicinity for boats landing for fishing and other pursuits. It is true that it was in part an experiment, and, like the hon. gentleman's experiment with the "Petrel," it was a failure. But these expenditures, though the experiments do fail, are not monstrously indefensible. These experiments have to be tried. As to the failure of the boat, no person who knew anything about the matter would expect anything else.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. What did Capt. McElhinney say?

Mr. POWELL. As I am informed, Capt. McElhinney was told to procure the best boat he could for the trial. But the best boat he could get was not one built specially for the service, and any one who knew the nature of the service and considered her character, must have known that she would fail. She had not the drag, she had not the build. Boats for such service are constructed to run up on the ice and break it down. But she was not built that way. I am not reflecting on Capt. McElhinney or upon the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, for I am willing to say they did their best under the circumstances. But I am sure that Capt. McElhinney will tell you, I hear that he said so, it was not the boat that he would wish. It was the best available. There were none available that had the features necessary for this route.

Mr. MACDONALD. I would like to remind the hon. Minister of a petition sent forward from the people of Grand River in my county, for an addition to the wharf at Chapel Point, a block and span. This petition was sent last year to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and was handed, I believe, to the Minister of Public Works. I had an interview with the Minister of Public Works on the subject, and he took it in a kindly way. I trust that in the Supplementary Estimates an item will appear for this work. It is a district that has no other public works to bother the Minister about. The section is a prosperous one and there is a great deal of produce shipped even from the existing wharf, which does not offer the accommodation necessary in the short season in the autumn. This is on a river which freezes very early, and more accommodation is needed on the wharf.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I shall be glad to take note of the remarks my hon. friend has made.

Harbours and Rivers, N.B.—
Shippegan Harbour—Extension of protection works and repairs to same.... $4,000

Mr. POWELL. What work has been done ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman knows the locality better than I do. We had to repair the jetties. We have already spent nearly the amount voted last year, $2,000. I have not heard any complaint as to the work.

Mr. POWELL. Will this vote complete the work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No. It will take between $7,000 or $8,000—perhaps even more. My hon. friend (Mr. Powell) knows that this is a very important work, and I am glad to be able to say it is being carried out in an able manner.

Cape Tormentine, repairs to breakwater..$8,000

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That wharf has cost $238,000. Unfortunately it has not been built at all as it should have been, that is to say, with the proper kind of timber, and it is nearly destroyed. At the same time, I have not made up my mind to rebuild it, and all we are doing is merely to protect it from being totally destroyed. With this money we propose to throw stones around the portions which are most eaten away on the outside, just to keep it up.

Harbours and Rivers—Maritime Provinces Generally—General repairs and improvements to harbour and river works..... .... $10,000

Mr. McINERNEY. Is it the intention to do anything to protect the breakwater at Richibucto harbour ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The engineer tells me that to build a wharf would require some $150,000. So far, I have not been able to make up my mind to spend that vast amount of money immediately.

Mr. McINERNEY. That means the construction of a new breakwater on the south side. But what I wished to call attention to was repairs to the old breakwater on the north side of the harbour. That was built at considerable expense some years ago, partly under the Mackenzie Government, and that breakwater is in a very bad state of repair. I think Mr. Lafleur, the engineer of the department, who was down there a few years ago on a hydrographic survey, would have knowledge of what I am saying. The top part of the breakwater is rotting away, the covering is nearly all rotted away, and unless something is done in a short time, the whole thing will have to be built over again at a very large expense, while a moderate sum now would keep it in fair repair. I would hardly expect the Minister to spend $150,000 just now on that harbour, although I could show him, as I attempted to show the former Government, that a very large coasting trade is done at that port. I may say that in the figures I produced in 1893 to Mr. Ouimet, the predecessor of the hon. gentleman, I showed that there were more entries inward and outward at Richibucto than at Chatham, Dalhousie and Campbellton combined. There are also quite a number of seagoing vessels visiting that port. The trade of the port has been very much injured on account of the dilapidated state of the breakwater there.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. A few weeks ago a deputation from Richibucto called at my department and made representations to me of two different kinds. First, they represented that the old breakwater might be repaired ; secondly, that the

harbour requires a good deal of dredging. I understand that the harbour is filling in nearly as quickly as it is cleaned out. I am glad my hon. friend has reminded me of the matter.

Mr. McINERNEY. I heard of the deputation being here, and I was glad to see that on the deputation were the ex-president and the present president of the Conservative Association of the county. I suppose that did not at all prejudice the consideration that the hon. Minister gave to their representations. But I do not think that the harbour is filling up, because there is about the same depth now that there has been for a few years past. I think if proper protection was given at that harbour, and a moderate breakwater built at the south side of the harbour, the depth could be very much increased. From what I learned a few years ago, I think that the view held by Mr. Coste, the chief engineer, is that there should be a breakwater on the south side of the harbour, and a small extension made of the present breakwater on the north side. If that were done at a moderate expense, I think the harbour would be very much improved. I hope the Minister lent an ear to the representations made to him by the deputation that called upon him a short time ago. I know they are very respectable gentlemen. One of them carries on one of the largest shipping industries in the county, and he is a man whose word can be relied upon—Mr. Jardine. The other gentleman, I understand, is a lawyer who has moved over to Fredericton, but he has considerable interest in that county. I hope the Minister will take what they said into consideration, and also what I now say on behalf of that harbour. It is the chief port in the county, and nothing has been done for it for a number of years. I made protestations to the late Government in favour of the harbour, but they paid little attention to them.

Mr. GANONG. I notice that in the items for New Brunswick the Minister has not included anything for repairs on the breakwater at Wilson's Beach, in Charlotte County. The hon. Minister cannot accuse me of the same fault which he charged upon my hon. friend from Cape Breton, of not calling the matter to his attention. In November, 1896, I called his attention to it, and have done so at least twice since that time. It is a very important matter for the people in that vicinity. There are no doubt six or seven hundred fishermen in the immediate vicinity, and it not only serves these people who are living in that community, but some two or three thousand people who are dependent on it to some extent, many of whom occasionally use it. It is the most important point on that part of the coast on the Island of Campobello, and it is the only protection for several miles for all their vessels. Whatever reports the hon. gentleman may have from his engineers, I prefer to take the opinions of the people who are most interested. They have felt during two or three years that this breakwater was in danger of being carried away, and then no protection would be afforded to the shipping. I consider the residents know better than the engineers about the tides and winds in the vicinity. I can assure the Minister that there is nothing of a political nature in this, for I found the Liberals very thick there, 40 or 50 too thick.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The Supplementary Estimates have not yet been brought down, and if anything can be voted, it will be inserted there. We have not completed the report as to the state of affairs there. Hon. members on both sides of the House know that the Government cannot comply with all the demands made upon them.

Mr. GANONG. I will admit that statement. But if the hon. gentleman will look over the records he will find that for many years the county of Charlotte has not been a very expensive one, in fact, very few dollars have been expended there on public works. Of course, the county has been in Opposition for some time, and is so still. I believe there is also a petition in the department form Letite, a very large fishing village, which has obtained steam communication. It has, however, no pier, and it would be a great advantage if a reasonable sum were voted to assist the residents. I desire also to ask the Minister if he has had any surveys made in the harbour of St. Andrew's. In September, 1897, I drew attention, first, to the desirability of having the upper passage dredged, and if I am correctly informed, a Government officer went there during the past season. I do not know whether he made a practical examination or simply looked the ground over. This is a work that should be carried out, as a great amount of shipping goes down the river, and so long as the harbour is in its present condition vessels have to make a detour of several miles to get to the lower passage, and at some conditions of the tide it is difficult for vessels to get through that passage. If the upper passage was dredged so that it could be used at half tide, even if not at low tide, it would be of great advantage to shipping in the river but should be made passable at low water.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have received several communications on the subject. I attach great importance to St. Andrew's harbour. I had intended last year to visit the maritime provinces, but I found I was unable to do so. I intend to visit these provinces during the present year, and St. Andrew's will be one of the harbours to which I will give attention. Meanwhile I will take a note of it.

Mr. McINERNEY. Is it the intention of the Minister to put anything in the Supplementary Estimates for harbour protection at Richibucto ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. They have not passed Council.

Mr. McINERNEY. I might make my question more specific, and ask what is the Minister's present intention in regard to the question ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I should not like to make an announcement now.

Mr. McINERNEY. Surely I have a right to ask if the hon. gentleman is putting any amount in the Supplementary Estimates for this work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. All I can say is that representations have been made to me, and I have listened to them with the greatest care.

Mr. McINERNEY. Surely they will not have precedence over representations made by the member for the county.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I always listen to my hon. friend with pleasure, and I have listened to his representations to-day, together with representations made a few days ago. They have created a very good impression on my mind.

Mr. McINERNEY. The information I desire is whether it is the intention of the hon. Minister to put any amount in the Supplementary Estimates with respect to harbour protection at Richibucto ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It would be discourteous to my colleagues to give that information now. Moreover, His Excellency has to sanction these expenditures.

Mr. McINERNEY. I am not asking what the Supplementary Estmiates are going to contain, but the present intention of the Minister.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I may answer that I am full of very good intentions.

Mr. McINERNEY. The hon. gentleman knows that a certain place is paved with good intentions. If Richibucto harbour could be improved by good intentions, it would be all very well. Is it the Minister's intention to have any dredging done this summer ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My mind is in the same condition ; I am very well intentioned.

Mr. McINERNEY. This is a matter of some importance, and should not be treated as a joke by the Minister. I do not think the people there will be willing to treat it in that way. I should like to know and the people want to know, whether any work will be done at that port.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). The matter has not been forgotten, and the hon. gentleman does not require a promise.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is not customary to give information of that kind before the Supplementary Estimates have passed Council.

Mr. McINERNEY. It is not necessary to know whether there is anything in the Supplementary Estimates or not. What I ask is this, does the Minister intend to have any dredging done at Richibucto this summer ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The question has been put before, and I have listened carefully to the representations made. I cannot say more than that.

Mr. POWELL. In regard to the remarks of the hon. member for Kent (Mr. McInerney), this is not a laughing matter for the people of Richibucto. There must certainly be the bones of one hundred or one hundred and fifty square-rigged vessels on that reef. Owing to the peculiar formation of the harbour and the tendency to fill in, which the Minister of Public Works seems to have studied, vessels have never been able to take their full cargoes inside. They finish in the open roadstead, and when a north-east gale comes on, vessels are in a very critical condition indeed. I was born and raised there, and I have seen four or five square-rigged vessels go ashore in one storm. I can enumerate thirty or forty vessels in my own experience which pounded themselves to pieces on that reef. And when he said that you might dig the place out and it would fill up again, he states what is the literal truth. I have seen vessels go there ashore at the tip top of high water and come off at low water. It is a kind of floating sand, almost a quicksand, and I do not think dredging does a great deal of good.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It gives some relief temporarily.

Mr. POWELL. It may, but what is required is some means of diverting the current and letting the water do the work. If the water could be got to bear upon the same principle as the wind is got to bear in clearing snow out a railway cutting, the engineer would be successful. The great trouble is that the engineers have not studied the matter but have simply prepared their plans in Ottawa without knowing the condition and have gone down there time after time making useless expenditures of public money. It wants some one to study the action of the current and the sand, and with the experience gained in this way a few thousand dollars may do a great deal of good. I sincerely trust attention may be

given the matter, because it means probably the loss of two or three vessels in a season if a storm should come while they are in the roadstead. I would like to ask the hon. Minister if he has received any petition from the inhabitants of Port Elgin, county of Westmoreland, for dredging the Gaspereaux River and Port Elgin Harbour. If the hon. gentleman is coming down to the province of New Brunswick, and if he would consult my wishes, so far as I am concerned I would much rather have him during the ensuing summer inspecting that harbour than during an election campaign, as I last had the pleasure of seeing him in Westmoreland County.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. So far as Richibucto Harbour is concerned it would require the extension of the "Jettey" and the building of another so as to create a channel, as we have been obliged to do in several places. That kind of work has a very good effect but it would cost a very large amount of money. I intend during my visit next summer to give particular attention to that harbour because I see it is of very great importance. I do not exactly remember what kind of a petition I received from Port Elgin. I am very fond of Westmoreland County. I have been very well received there although I am sorry to say I was not successful, but nevertheless I am very glad to see my hon. friend (Mr. Powell) in the House.

Mr. McINERNEY. If the Minister visits Richibucto Harbour he will see there is great need for harbour protection there. There was a large dredge sent there last summer; she was there nearly the whole summer long and I am here to state to the Minister that she did not do one yard of dredging on the Richibucto bar. She came there pretty early in the summer, and I myself saw her aground on the bar at fair tide. Those who made representations to the Minister to have that sort of boat sent to Richibucto, certainly made false representations, because a large dredge like that is practically useless there. More than that, the officer in charge told me while the dredge was aground, that they could not dredge on the bar, and that all they could do was to go outside the bar and dig a hole where dredging was not required. Only a light draft dredge is suitable for the purpose at Richibucto. The gentlemen who made the representations to get the large dredge to Richibucto last year—and I believe they took her away from Yarmouth where she was doing good work—simply debited the harbour with a full year's work and no good whatever resulted. I make representations in this House with some degree of responsibility, and the representation I make is, that if the Minister intends to do any dredging there he should not take his information from people who are not responsible, who perhaps want a little job carried out, who do not represent the people: but that he should take his representations from one who is responsible to the electors of the county. I tell him that what is required there is a light draft dredge, and not a heavy dredge to waste the whole summer doing nothing.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am glad to receive suggestions from my hon. friend (Mr. McInerney), but at the same time I would not pledge myself not to receive representations from his electors. The electors of a county have a right to be heard by every Minister, and I intend in future hearing the electors of my hon. friend as I would the electors of any other hon. member of Parliament. The dredge "Canada" worked at Richibucto for a few weeks last summer, and I think the work gave a great deal of relief.

Mr. McINERNEY. Not a particle.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Men who are engaged in business called on me and they told me that the dredging last year gave a good deal of relief.

Mr. McINERNEY. Not a particle.

Mr. GANONG. I would be happy to see the Minister of Public Works visit Charlotte County so that he may see how self-secrificing we are on the St. Croix, when we simply ask him to do a little work at St. Andrews. It was only a few months since I had the privilege of talking with the engineer of the United States Government who was on the St. Croix, and if I mistake not there has been correspondence between the United States Government and our Government with regard to the dredging of that river. The estimate made by the United States engineer was $300,000 of which they concluded they should pay $200,000, leaving $100,000 to the Dominion. We are not making any such claim as that at the present time, but if the Minister will come down and look after St. Andrews, that is all we will ask him to do now.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I should certainly like to visit St. Andrews.

Grand Rivière, repairs to wharf..... $800

Mr. BERGERON. Is not that a new wharf?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is an old wharf.

Mr. BERGERON. I think I remember that it was only finished two or three years ago.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It was built under the late regime by Mr. Atkinson, and we are obliged to strengthen it now. I think this small sum will put it in good shape. It is done on the report of Mr. Breene, who is our resident engineer.

General repairs and improvements to Harbour, River and Bridge work..... $10,000

Mr. MARCOTTE. (Translation.) I would like to ask the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) whether he has included in this appropriation a certain amount for the repairs required on the River Ste. Anne ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). (Translation.) No ; those works come under a special item.

Mr. MARCOTTE. (Translation.) May I ask the hon. Minister whether he is going to place a sum in the Supplementary Estimates to provide for this work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. (Translation.) I am not free to give any information to my hon. friend as to the nature of the items which the Supplementary Estimates will contain.

Mr. MARCOTTE. (Translation.) Am I to understand that those appropriations will provide for new works only ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. (Translation.) Not exactly; the Supplementary Estimates provide for works of different kinds.

Mr. MARCOTTE. (Translation.) It is of the highest importance to the parish of Ste. Anne de la Pèrade that a certain amount should be voted this year, as that locality is threatened with very serious dangers and is liable at any time to suffer almost irreparable damages resulting from landslides on the upper part of the River Ste. Anne, above that locality, and, in fact, almost at any point on that stream. I have no hesitation in saying that if a sufficient sum were placed in the Estimates to provide for the protection of that locality, no better use could be made of public money. It should be desirable to put an item in the Estimates for those repairs, and I do not think a large sum would be required.

Some works have already been carried out by the Dominion Government on that river ; but, unfortunately, those two upper piers, where they are now located, are a real nuisance, as a strong current is formed between those works and the mainland, which causes considerable landslips on the banks of the river. On these grounds, I ask the hon. Minister of Public Works to place an item in the Supplementary Estimates for repairs to those protection works on the River Ste. Anne.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. (Translation.) We have already made an expenditure of $22,000 on the River Ste. Anne for those protection works, although, they are, properly speaking, not Dominion works. Now, I am informed by the engineers of my department that, in order to carry out the necessary protection works at Ste. Anne and elsewhere, a considerable outlay would have to be incurred. I am not ready to give my pledge in that respect to the hon. gentleman. As I said, those works are not Dominion works, and therefore the Government cannot be expected to undertake such protection works along all the banks of the rivers from the waters of which damages and injuries may result. Were we to pursue such a course, it would require much larger estimates than could be placed at our disposal, to meet the wants mentioned.

Mr. MARCOTTE. (Translation.) Last year an item of $5,000 was put in the Estimates, and I think it would only be fair to place a re-vote in the estimates for this year, so as to cover the expenditure for those repairs. In my opinion, it would not require a large sum to secure an efficacious protection to that locality. Some expenditures have already been made, but, as I said, the works so far carried out do more harm than good, as a considerable current is formed between the banks and the piers, which causes landslides. Those landslides could be obviated by adding a wing to the two piers already built, which would not involve a very large expenditure.

Mr. BERGERON. Would the hon. Minister explain why he put last year an amount of $5,000 in the Estimates for that work at St. Anne's ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I did so because I thought that that sum could be spent in a useful manner, but after more careful examination of the situation, we concluded that it would require a vast amount of money to complete the work. As I have just explained in French, those works are not of a federal nature. The Government has already spent $22,000 for protective works at Ste. Anne's, although they were works that properly should not have been done by this Government. You must draw the line somewhere. If my department is to take charge of protecting the coasts of all the rivers and streams that cause damage, we would require a very large amount of money indeed.

Mr. MARCOTTE. (Translation.) The hon. Minister of Public Works says that such works would involve a considerable outlay. In my humble opinion—and I am free to confess that I am not perhaps a very competent judge in matters of this kind—if an additional wing were built, it would obviate the landslides on the banks of the river. At all events, I would be quite satisfied with a revote of $5,000. Besides, I may draw the attention of the Minister to the fact that an appropriation of $5,000 has previously been placed in the Estimates to provide for those works, that materials have been prepared in anticipation of those repairs, and that the farmers at Ste. Anne de la Pèrade have already done considerable work, piling up stone, in the hope of being reimbursed

by the Government. When I say that those people are dissatisfied, the hon. gentleman may believe that I am not exaggerating in the least. A vote of $5,000 would be quite sufficient, and the ratepayers of Ste. Anne would be quite satisfied. With such a sum of money, permanent protection works could be carried out. Let therefore the hon. Minister place that revote in the Estimates.

Mr. MONK. When can we expect some announcement from the Government with regard to the harbour works in Montreal? The hon. Minister is aware that representations have been made, from time to time, to the Government, and plans discussed by the harbour commissioners and the department. I see in these estimates very considerable sums for the building of wharfs and the improvement of harbours generally in far less important places than Montreal. We have been very patient in Montreal, and it seems to me that we ought to have now some announcement from the Government.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This question is now engaging the earnest attention of the Government. The harbour commissioners and other important citizens of Montreal have called repeatedly on us this year and last, and I have myself given a great deal of attention to this important question. We have not yet been able to come to any decision. I need not tell my hon. friend that I attach just as much importance as he does to the Montreal harbour. The position of affairs is this. I have still in hand at the disposal of the harbour commissioners a sum of about $750,000 out of the amount that this Parliament in 1896 authorized the Government to advance to them. The amount then authorized was $2,000,000, out of which $1,000,000 was immediately taken to pay the floating debt of the harbour commission. Out of the other million, about $250,000 was spent in works that have been going since in that harbour. If the harbour commissioners would go on with the amount of money that they have in hand and the $750,000 that the city of Montreal voted for protective work, they could do a good deal of work. There was some difference of opinion between the harbour commissioners and myself as to the plans to be adopted, but I am glad to say that these have been settled, and we have come to an agreement as to the plans to be carried out. But I am not in a position to say this evening what the policy of the Government will be.

Mr. MONK. Might I ask the hon. gentleman what is the plan the Government has finally decided to adopt?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The plans agreed upon are what we might perhaps call a compromise scheme. My engineers, after consultation with eminent engineers from England and the harbour commissioners, came to an agreement with the harbour commissioners, according to the plan now in my department, and I shall be very glad to show it to my hon. friend, if he will do me the honour of calling at my department on any day.

Mr. BERGERON. Will the policy of the Government be declared before the end of the session?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It will.

Mr. BERGERON. My hon. friend has said that he understands the importance of the work. In Montreal the people are very anxious to know, before spending any more money, whether any decision will be come to. I understand that there was a difference of opinion last year between the Minister and the Commissioners as to whether the harbour would be where it is now or lower down.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That was not the point of difference at all.

Mr. BERGERON. There was some difference of that sort, was there not?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The point of difference was as to the width of the basins between the piers to be erected. My contention was that as the size of the ships was growing larger every year, it was necessary to give more width than would have sufficed twenty years ago, when the ships coming into Montreal averaged 5,000 or 6,000 tons only. To-day there are steamers visiting Montreal of 10,000 and 12,000 tons burden, and the size is increasing every year. The difference of opinion arose on that point, but I am glad to say that it is now settled.

Mr. BERGERON. I am very glad to hear that, because last summer one of the Montreal newspapers, and an organ of the hon. gentleman, the Montreal "Witness," mentioned that certain gentlemen, of whom the Minister of Public Works was one, and the present Mayor of Montreal another, wanted to bring the harbour down to Ruisseau Mignon. This old scheme we heard of in Montreal very often, and I ask now whether the harbour is to be built down there or whether it is to be dug where it is now?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The plans on which we have agreed do not bear at all on the improvements at Hochelaga. They have no connection with them whatever. We have agreed on the plans for the works in the centre of the harbour leaving the other scheme in abeyance.

Mr. BERGERON. The work will be going on this summer, if the harbour is there, will it not?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No doubt. I stated a moment ago that the harbour commissioners are perfectly free to

draw on the Department of Public Works whenever they like. I have still at their disposal, as I said, about three quarters of a million dollars. Within a day or two past, I have received a request from them to allow them to go on with certain works, to which I will give my attention to-morrow, I think.

Mr. BERGERON. I wish to revert for a moment to the question raised by the hon. member for Champlain (Mr. Marcotte), and to express my opinion for what it may be worth, that the Minister of Public Works might have stated very truthfully that the $5,000 put in the Estimates last year was put there in view of a certain election taking place in that county, and the election having been lost, the $5,000 had to disappear from the budget. I would like to ask the hon. Minister what is to be done with this vote, $10,000. It is a very dangerous vote. We vote an amount in blank, so to speak, which they can use as they please. I think it will be very interesting to the House to know what the department intends to do with it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This vote has been given annually from time immemorial.

Mr. BERGERON. That is why I am afraid of it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is no reason to be afraid. It is intended to cover unforeseen expenses—small repairs, and so on.

Laprairie—Works in connection with ice piers—Dredging steamboat channel.... $5,000

Mr. BERGERON. When will these works be finished ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My deputy tells me that the department hopes to complete this work next year. As the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergeron) knows, these are very important works.

Mr. BERGERON. I am not opposing the vote. I know the importance of the work. But it seems to me that it takes a long time to finish these works.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We will be able to complete them next year.

Mr. BERGERON. For this amount ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No.

Mr. MONK. Is this for the main channel or for the channel leading to Laprairie ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There are two kinds of works, protection works, begun years ago and to be completed this year, and dredging to get an additional depth of water for the boats plying between Laprairie and Montreal.

River Richelieu—Belœil Channel guide piers $5,500

Mr. BERGERON. When will that be finished ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It will be completed with this vote.

Mr. BERGERON. Is the hon. gentleman building a bridge at that point ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We had the guiding piers, between which we placed booms to guide the boats passing through. These piers were destroyed, and we have replaced them with cribwork—permanent work.

Mr. BERGERON. Who has been doing the work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have been doing it by day's labour.

Mr. MONK. Would not the hon. gentleman have done better to have called for tenders and given a contract ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will tell my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) our experience in this case. The late Government asked for tenders for this work. Mr. Beaulieu, of Lévis, tendered. When I took office I found that he had not paid for his material, he had not paid his men, he had simply given up the work.

Mr. BERGERON. Had he made a deposit?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes ; of a small amount.

Mr. BERGERON. Did the hon. Minister keep it ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes. But the contractor did not do the work.

Mr. MONK. I am afraid my knowledge of this case does not altogether tally with that of the hon. Minister. This man, Beaulieu, if I remember right, tendered for this work for what the department is paying, $11,500, offering to do it for $4,000. He failed, it is true. But there were other contractors. There was a perfectly solvent contractor who tendered for $7,000, which is considerably less than the work is costing us now. Even with that tender in his possession the Minister goes on and does the work by day's labour, spending $11,500. And, more than that, if I am correctly informed, there have been claims for damages filed in the department to the amount of $3,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. MONK. Not about the tenders.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes ; the tenders were for piling work—different altogether from the work we are doing now, which is cribwork.

Mr. MONK. Do I understand that these claims for damages are not going to be entertained ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have given a good deal of attention to

these claims, and my opinion is that instead of having done damage we have improved the property in front of which we worked.

Mr. MONK. I quite agree with the hon. Minister. I am pleased to hear him make that declaration.

Mr. CLARKE. I am desired to ask why tenders were not called for this work? Is it the policy of the department to carry out works of this kind by day's labour?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am sorry the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clarke) did not hear the statement I made a moment ago. I said that tenders having been called for by the late Government, Mr. Beaulieu tendered at a ridiculously low price, and could not carry out his contract. It was decided by the late Government to do the work by day's labour, and I have simply carried out the course decided upon by my predecessor.

Mr. CLARKE. I understood the hon. Minister to say that this was cribwork, and different from that ordered by the late Government. Is this work being done by contract after public calls for tender?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We did not ask for tenders.

Mr. CLARKE. Is it contended that this work can be done as cheaply and as well by day's labour as by contract?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My experience is that when we can find a good clerk of works, the work can be done by day's labour much cheaper and better than by tender.

Mr. BERGERON. Who is the clerk of works at that place?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Mr. Bernard. The work has been carried out under the direction of Mr. Lafontaine.

Mr. MARCOTTE. (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, I wish to direct the attention of the hon. Minister of Public Works to the fact that he had promised the hon. member for Berthier (Mr. Beausoleil), the hon. member for Nicolet (Mr. LeDuc), and myself, last session, that he would send out an engineer to make a survey, in order to find out the best means to prevent the ice damming up in the River St. Lawrence, and the flooding of the lands on the banks of the river in the counties of Berthier, Nicolet and Champlain, and the considerable damages resulting from it. I see nothing in the Estimates so far, in this connection. I have already communicated with the hon. gentleman on the subject, and I was informed that some body was surveying the St. Lawrence; but in my opinion, it would require a special survey to be made by a technical man, if we are to prevent the damming up of the ice which causes, every spring, such damages. I hope the hon. Minister will look into the matter, and should he decline to do anything for the county of Champlain, let him do at least something for the counties of Berthier and Nicolet.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. (Translation.) I may remind the hon. gentleman (Mr. Marcotte) that last year I obtained from the House an appropriation of $25,000, to provide for surveys which will bring about the solution of the problem he has just mentioned. This year, those works are carried out under the supervision of Mr. Lafleur, the head architect, acting for the department.

Lower St. Lawrence—Removal of rocks.. $3,000

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The Government has a wharf at Port Daniel, in the county of Bonaventure, which requires some repairs.

St. Irénee—Repairs to and extension of wharf to shore..... $3,900

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to carry on a work which was begun years ago, and is intended to carry the wharf to the shore. Previously, there was a pier which did not reach the shore. I may say that this work is carried out by day's labour at a cheaper cost than any other work. It is being done by Mr. Girard, a very able carpenter and practical man.

St. Anicet—Wharf-wing or return at outer end, and repairs..... $1,500

Mr. BERGERON. What does the hon. gentleman intend to do there?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Last year Parliament gave a vote of $3,000. We bought materials for $1,500, and with the remaining $1,500 we intend to construct the works.

Mr. BERGERON. Who asked for that wharf?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. All the citizens of that locality.

Mr. BERGERON. Does the Minister take it upon himself to say, that this wharf was asked for by the citizens of St. Anicet?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. Was there any petition to that effect?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I remember that the member for Huntington (Mr. Scriver) called upon me himself, and urged upon me the importance of this work. I may add that this work was begun under the late Administration.

Mr. BERGERON. The hon. gentleman is entirely mistaken. This extension of the wharf was not at all asked for by the citizens of St. Anicet. If the hon. gentleman will visit that place he will find that every one, except those who are working on the wharf and making money out of it,

are opposed to it, and look upon it as money spent for nothing at all. I will not say that the hon. member for Huntington has not asked for the wharf, but I would be glad to hear him say so himself. The person who has asked for it is Mr. Dupuis, a lawyer from Montreal. But the clerk of works there who has been appointed and paid so much a day, is his brother, the postmaster of St. Cunegonde. The Minister says that some materials have been bought. From whom were they bought, and what kind of materials were bought ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have bought timber and other materials. I cannot say where.

Mr. BERGERON. Were they bought by tender?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, they cannot be bought by tender, small things like that. Farmers bring their logs and timber, and the clerk of works buys the material at the best price he can. The hon. gentleman says Mr. Dupuis is postmaster at St. Henri, and that he is conducting the works at the same time. Well, I must say that Mr. Dupuis has been appointed postmaster only lately, because to my knowledge he was conductor of the works before being postmaster.

Mr. BERGERON. I do not want the hon. gentleman to think that I am contradicting him, I see he is not well posted. The man who is conductor of the works there, or at least, who is timekeeper or clerk, is the postmaster at St. Cunégonde ; but the man who was appointed by the department is his brother, and bears another name. But it is the postmaster of Ste. Cunégonde who does the work and receives the money.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I was sure that I never appointed a man who does not live there.

Mr. BERGERON. I call the attention of the Minister now to the fact that the man who is clerk of works there is the postmaster of St. Cunégonde ; and his brother, Mr. Dupuis, the lawyer, is the man who has asked for this work, and nobody else. Now, I would like to ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if he has had a report from the man who keeps that wharf, and who is another Dupuis, of how much dues have been collected last year on that wharf, and how much has come into the public chest.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend is mistaken when he says that it is Mr. Dupuis himself who has asked for that work. I state here that it is the hon. member for Huntington (Mr. Scriver) himself who has urged upon me the importance of going on with the work. He called at the department several times, and he also wrote to me about it.

Mr. BERGERON. I know how anxious the hon. gentleman is that the public money should not be spent uselessly, but I can tell him that the people of that parish are entirely opposed to it, and look upon this expenditure as money wasted.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I promised to bring down a return in answer to the hon. gentleman, and I have this statement :

With reference to Mr. Bergeron's inquiry in regard to the wharf dues collected at St. Anicet, a letter has been received from the wharfinger, in which he states that during the past season he collected $41.50. It appears that under a misapprehension of his duties, he expended the greater part of this amount in purchasing lumber and repairing the wharf, and he states that he has only $7 left to deposit. Instructions have been given him that he is not to use any portion of the collections in future, but to forward all to the departmnet. This man was only appointed in September, 1896, and is consequently not familiar with the duties of the office.

Mr. BERGERON. I am very much obliged to the hon. gentleman for the explanation. What pay does he receive ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Twenty-five per cent of the amount he collects.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is according to the law.

Mr. BERGERON. Of course, I am obliged to accept the report made by the Minister. My information is that he received $200 ; also that he expended $37.50 for material, in spite of the vote of $3,000. I desire to call the attention of the Government to this matter, as it is a public scandal that the postmaster of Ste. Cunegonde acts as clerk of the works at St. Anicet, and that the whole expenditure of the money is in the hands of the Dupuis family now.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No. I appointed a man there who is a brother of the postmaster of Ste. Cunegonde.

Mr. BERGERON. Then the clerk is not the postmaster, but his brother ; at the same time, it is the postmaster of Ste. Cunegonde who is doing the work.

St. Roch des Aulnaies—Wharf..... $1,000

Mr. MARCOTTE. (Translation.) Where is St. Roch des Aulnaies ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. (Translation.) It is in the county of L'Islet. St. Roch des Aulnaies is a thriving parish in the lower region of the St. Lawrence. This is to provide for the building of a wharf.

Anse à Beaufils—Improvements of entrance to harbour $1,000

Mr. BERGERON. Where is this work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. On the coast of Gaspé. It is a re-vote.

Mr. BERGERON. Has nothing been spent ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. $600, and I am going to spend $1,000 more.

St. Jean des Chaillons—Improvement of harbour $5,000

Mr. BERGERON. For what is this expenditure intended ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is to continue the work that was begun last year. St. Jean des Chaillons has a large brick industry, millions of bricks being manufactured there every year. As the water was shallow, the hon. member for Lotbiniére urged on me the importance of improving the harbour, and $5,000 is asked. The work will take one year more.

Mr. BERGERON. Will the amount be $10,000 ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It will require $15,000 to complete the work.

Mr. BERGERON. How is it being done ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. By dredging. We are renting a dredge from Mr. Cameron on the same conditions as previously.

Mr. BERGERON. Is the dredge leased by the year ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We rent the dredge and put a crew on it.

Point Claire—Wharf..... $4,000

Mr. MONK. I am glad to see this work once more in the Estimates. When does the Minister intend to carry out the work, of which there is much need.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We intend to carry it out immediately. We have entered into an agreement with the Grand Trunk Railway Company ; it is not yet signed, but we have exchanged letters. We are going to obtain the use of the Grand Trunk wharf at an annual rental, which will be less expensive than building a new wharf. With the amount of this vote we will be able to repair it and put it in first-class shape.

Mr. MONK. Will it be done this year ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. During the next fiscal year.

Mr. BERGERON. Who owns the wharf ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The Grand Trunk Railway Company. It is an old wharf, and the engineers of the department consider it the best that can be obtained. I applied to the company and they agreed to the terms offered.

Isle Perrault—Addition to wharf, north side $2,500

Mr. BERGERON. Some work there is very much needed. I have myself asked in years past that certain stones, which lie at the north corner of the wharf should be removed, as they are very dangerous to navigation. Is this amount for the purpose of removing them ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is an old wharf that belonged to Leduc. We bought it for $500, and are going to repair it. This wharf is in the north channel opposite Ste. Anne.

Mr. BERGERON. Isle Perrault wharf proper is on the lake. I have called the attention of the Minister in the past to stones lying at the corner of the wharf, which are very dangerous. I think these boulders could be removed at comparatively little cost, and if the Minister is able to do so, he will render great service.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am told by the chief engineer that it would require two or three thousand dollars to do the work my hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) is speaking of. I have instructed my officer to take note of the hon. gentleman's suggestion.

Mr. BERGERON. I would be very glad if the Minister would do so, because I have been told by navigators that $300 or $400 would put it in perfect order.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We never know where we are when we begin dredging.

Rivière la Pipe—Wharf on Lake St. John, near mouth of river..... $2,000

Mr. BERGERON. Where is that ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is a flourishing little parish in the Lake St. John district. Things are booming in the Lake St. John district now, and I am glad indeed to be able to give some encouragement to the brave settlers who are, so to speak, building up a nation there.

Ste. Anne de Sorel—Ice piers..... $3,600

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I would move for leave to strike out the words "St. Anne" in that vote. As hon. gentlemen from Quebec know Ste. Anne and Sorel are adjoining each other, and I do not know where I will locate the piers yet.

Resolutions to be reported.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES moved the adjournment of the House.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. What business will be taken up to-morrow ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We hope to be able to take the Franchise Bill, and possibly some other Bills, and then go on with the Estimates.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 12.10 a.m. (Tuesday.)

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 17th May, 1898.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

INDIAN ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 144)) further to amend the Indian Act. He said : The first section of the Bill amends section 33 of the present Act so as to provide that Indians not engaged in the pursuit of agriculture may be liable to statute labour. The second section amends section 38 of the present Act so as to give the Governor in Council power to dispose of dead and fallen timber without a surrender having been obtained from the Indians. The third section provides that a surrender may be attested before a justice of the peace as well as other functionaries specified in the law as it stands. The fourth section provides that the holder of a license to cut timber on an Indian reserve shall not have exclusive possession as at present. The object is to enable the department when a person has a license to cut one kind of timber to give to another person a license to cut another kind of timber. The law at the present time gives the first holder exclusive possession and thus prevents the Government giving another person permission to cut another kind of timber. The fifth section amends the procedure in cases of seizures of timber for violations of the law when cut on an Indian reserve. The present law is embodied in the following section :—

All trees, logs, timber or other product thereof seized under this Act, shall be deemed to be condemned, unless the person from whom the same are seized, or the owner thereof, within one month from the day of the seizure, gives notice to the seizing officer or nearest officer or agent of the Superintendent General, that he claims or intends to claim the same, and in default of such notice, the officer or agent seizing shall report the circumstances to the Superintendent General, who may order the sale of the same by the said officer or agent.

If notice is given, the Superintendent General has no power to order the sale. Of course that is not a proper method of proceeding in the case, because in addition to giving the notice the claimant should go on and prove title to the timber. The amendment is proposed so that the parties shall go on and in addition to giving notice shall proceed with the proof. The sixth section provides that Indian funds may be used, in addition to the other purposes for which the Indian fund may now be used, for the purpose of making surveys on reserves where deemed necessary, and making compensation to Indians for any interest they may have in lands taken from them. The eighth section gives the Superintendent General power to stop payment of annuity to any Indian parent of an illegitimate child and apply the same to such child. The ninth section gives power to the Superintendent General to deprive any Indian woman who deserts her husband and family and lives immorally with any other person of the annuity of such woman and devote the annuity to the support of the family. The tenth section contains a provision for reducing the number of chiefs and headmen from the proportion of one to thirty to two for each two hundred.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 145) further to amend the Railway Act. He said : This Bill is for the purpose of meeting what seems to be a defect in the existing Railway Act. It is not sufficiently clear and explicit that power is conferred on the Railway Committee of the Privy Council to prevent discrimination between a railway and steamship company as against a steamship company alone. That is all the Bill provides for.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

NORTH-WEST IRRIGATION ACT AMENDMENT.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 146) to amend and consolidate the North-west Irrigation Act of 1894 and 1895. He said : The Bill is one to consolidate, as the title indicates, the present laws on this subject. There are some changes of an unimportant character relating to procedure, but the principal changes are, first, to give those persons who have constructed irrigation works without authority until July next to obtain licenses, and second, to centralize the administration of the work under the Act at Regina under the authority of the Commissioner of Public Works of the North-west Government, and to provide for the filing of documents in his office, instead of with the agent of Dominion Lands where the works are situated. It also provides for the publication of notice in a newspaper published in the neighbourhood of the works, instead of in such a newspaper, as the "Canada Gazette," as at present, and to empower the Minister to deal with irrigation applications without going to Council in certain cases. There are also a number of minor amendments with regard to procedure which can be explained when the Bill is in committee.

Mr. DAVIN. Did I understand the Minister that a clause in this Bill relates to an officer resident in Regina ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The provision in the Bill to which I refer is a provision that the original applications and proceedings which are taken for the purpose of obtaining the right to divert water and make use of it, shall be taken through the office of the Commissioner of Public Works at Regina. The same control of the department will be retained over them, but the preliminary proceedings will be taken by the local authority.

Mr. DAVIN. That is Mr. Dennis.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes : He is the deputy.

Mr. DAVIN. Is Mr. Dennis partly a Dominion officer and partly a local officer ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. He will be. Under this scheme he will be paid a small additional amount by the Department of the Interior for doing this work.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY—SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) presented a Message from His Excellency the Governor General.

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message, as follows :—

ABERDEEN.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons, Supplementary Estimates of sums required for the service of the Dominion for the year ended 30th June, 1898, and in accordance with the provisions of "The British North America Act, 1867," the Governor General recommends these Estimates to the House of Commons.

Government House,
Ottawa, 17th May, 1898.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved that His Excellency's Message, together with the Estimates, be referred to the Committee of Supply.

Motion agreed to.

CHIGNECTO SHIP RAILWAY.

Mr. LISTER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to call the attention of the Government to an article which appears in to-day's Montreal "Gazette," and which is as follows :—

It is reported from London that the Laurier Government has promised to revive the subsidy for the Chignecto Marine Railway. The news, if confirmed, will cause some surprise. The Government party, when in Opposition, not only denounced the scheme, but denounced it with

reason. There is no reason to believe that the railway in question will be of any public value, and as the contractors failed to fulfil their obligations, there is no ground in law or justice, for giving them money they did not earn by executing the works in the time specified.

I would ask the Government : Is there any truth in the statements contained in this article ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Mr. Speaker, the information conveyed to the Montreal "Gazette" which has just been read by my hon. friend (Mr. Lister) is altogether inaccurate. I have reason to believe that the information as published in London is quite the reverse of what is conveyed to the Montreal "Gazette." The fact is that the Government have had for some time before them an application by the bondholders and other parties connected with the Chignecto Railway to have the bonus which was given at one time, revived. The Government after giving careful consideration to the application has come to the conclusion that the public interest demanded that this bonus should not be revived.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would like to ask my right hon. friend who is leading the House, whether at this moment he is not under an engagement to the bondholders and parties interested in that work, that the Government will reconsider their decision in regard to furnishing some compensation to the company.

The PRIME MINISTER. I may say to my hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) that the Government has been approached by the bondholders to consider the propriety of giving them some compensation in the event of the Government coming to the conclusion that the bonus cannot be revived. I told the bondholders at the time the application was made, that we would give that question our best consideration. I may say, confidentially, though, that we have intimated some views in that respect to the bondholders. We have been asked to reconsider the matter and the matter is still under consideration.

Mr. OSLER. I am very glad indeed to hear the Prime Minister suggest that the Government may take into consideration the claim of the bondholders in connection with that road. I think it is due to the honour of Canada that something should be done for the bondholders.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman cannot make a speech at this stage ; he can only ask a question.

ELECTORAL FRANCHISE ACT.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick) moved third reading of Bill (No. 16) to repeal the Electoral Franchise Act and to further amend the Dominion Elections Act.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Before the motion is put, Mr. Speaker, I shall move to recommit the Bill to Committee of the Whole for the purpose of adding an amendment. After the prolonged discussion that has taken place in reference to this measure, it is not my intention to detain the House at any great length, but all parties will frankly admit the immense importance of the legislation that is now under the consideration of the House. I am very glad to recognize that the hon. the Solicitor General who is in charge of this Bill has shown so much readiness to give fair consideration to a number of important amendments that have been submitted for the consideration of the committee. Not only with the alterations that have been made at the suggestion of hon. members on both sides of the House and which have been accepted by the hon. Solicitor General, but with the amendments which have been made to the Bill as first introduced on the motion of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fitzpatrick) himself, the House will agree with me that the character of the measure has been changed in a very material respect. The main and fundamental principle of the Bill, as I understand it, is the adoption by this House of the franchises, whatever they might be, at the time of a general election, or of any election for this House, of the various provinces. In whatever province an election for this House takes place, whether in the case of a general election or a by-election, the candidates will be elected upon the franchise then existing for the election of members to the local legislature. I do not intend at this stage to go into a reconsideration of the grave objections that were made on this side of the House to the adoption of this principle. I may draw the attention of the House, however, to the very important fact that the modifications proposed by the hon. Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick) himself very materially changed the Bill and the objections to it. He has, by one amendment, provided for the placing on the lists the names of electors who were not included in the lists for the local elections. This, the House will at once see, is a very substantial and important modification, and one in which hon. members on both sides were agreed in adopting. He also made another change, and a very important one, and that was the introduction of an amendment to meet the possibility of a local legislature, after the local elections had taken place, materially changing the franchise, so that the change would operate in the election of members to this House. I quite agree with the hon. Solicitor General in the opinion that there was good ground for the adoption of so important a change, and thus providing against such a contingency as far as possible. I trust that the same spirit in which the hon. gentleman has accepted suggestions from this side will actuate him with regard to the amendment I propose to submit, and that the Government will sustain him in adopting it, because I believe it is one which will commend itself to the sense of fairness and justice which should certainly characterize a measure of this kind, that has to apply to all parties and all sections of the country and to members of this House, upon whatever side they may sit. The amendment I propose is for the purpose of giving in the provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Manitoba the same protection that the electors in the province of Ontario and Quebec will enjoy under this Bill, namely, the right to appeal to a judge when the franchise is taken away from any person who is entitled to enjoy it or be given to any person who is not entitled to enjoy it, upon the mere ipse dixit of any party who holds his office at the pleasure of the Crown and is therefore the nominee of the Government of the day. In the provinces of Ontario and Quebec, as the House is well aware, those entitled to enjoy the franchise have the right to appeal to a judge, should their names be wrongfully left off the list. Each elector, who believes that his name has been improperly left off the list, can appeal to a judge, who holds his office independent of the Government of the day, and is thus protected, in the best manner, against being improperly deprived of his franchise. I believe, therefore, it will commend itself to the approval of hon. gentlemen on both sides and of the Solicitor General and the Government, that the people in the provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Manitoba should have the same security for the proper exercise of the franchise as under this Bill will be enjoyed in the larger provinces of Ontario and Quebec, but not in the smaller ones I have mentioned.

I do not intend to detain the House at any great length upon this matter, but I shall give, as briefly as possible, two evidences of so strong a character as to leave no doubt in the mind of any hon. gentleman who will approach the subject in an impartial spirit, that the electors in these smaller provinces should have the same security in the enjoyment of the franchise as is possessed by the electors of Ontario and Quebec. I take, first, the province of Manitoba, and shall read to the House the affidavit of a gentleman, who was at one time a member of the Manitoba legislature, and an affidavit which, I think, only requires to be read, and will not require a word of comment to be added to it, to show that such a protection as I am now seeking for the electorate in Manitoba will not be obtained under this Bill, and we will not be in a position to obtain at an election in the province the candid expression of opinion of those entitled to cast their vote :—

Dominion of Canada.
Province of Manitoba.

In the matter of Emerson Voters' List.

I, David Henry McFadden, of the town of Emerson, in the province of Manitoba, veterinary surgeon, de solemnly declare that :

1. I was first elected to the provincial legislature of Manitoba in the year 1892, by a majority of fourteen votes, as representative for the electoral division of Emerson.

2. The aforesaid constituency of Emerson was represented by one James Thompson from 1888 to 1892, and who, in 1888, was elected by a majorty of fourteen.

3. The aforesaid Thompson was my opponent in 1892.

4. Donald Forrester, barrister, of Winnipeg, was appointed registration clerk and W. E. Perdue, barrister, Winnipeg, revising barrister for the Emerson division, to revise the voters' list previous to the last provincial election.

5. The said registration clerk opened an office at Emerson according to the terms of the Election Act of this province. Every night I had a clerk go to this office and make an exact copy of the list as it was from day to day altered or added to, and continued this rule up to the last day for receiving applications to be put on the list. Late in the evening of that day I had the said list completed as it was made out by the registration clerk.

6. When the list was printed and distributed, according to the provisions of said Act, I found thirteen names on the printed list which were not on my copy of the list, the names being as follows:—

Poll No 10.

No on List.

13. Campbell, Arch.
48. Leith, Alex.
May, Chas.
62. McEwan, M. W.
White, Wm.

Poll No. 11.

14. Hargrave, P.
22. Munro, Alex.
34. Pullar, James.
47. Singer, Joseph.

Poll No. 12.

42. Lister, Fredk. R.
46. McDonald, J. C.
47. McKievor, D. W.
57. Turner, Joseph.

as appears by the revised list of electors of said electoral division of Emerson now produced and shown to me and marked as exhibit "A."

I at once made diligent inquiries as to these particular voters and as to their right to be placed upon the said electoral list, but could find no evidence that the said voters or any of them ever resided within the electoral division of Emerson. I then made application to the registration clerk to have these names struck off the said list of voters.

As to the description of residence of these individual voters, it was limited to townships, no section or other particulars being given in the list as to where these parties or any of them resided. I had summonses issued by the revising officer and placed them in the hands of responsible parties, actual residents and familiar with all other actual residents in the several townships quoted in the lists, with instructions to make every endeavour to serve these individual voters.

At the court of revision the parties whom I had so instructed to serve said summonses appeared, and stated that they could not find any of the said voters to effect service of said orders; and further stated that they could get no information that the said parties, or any of them, resided in the townships set opposite their respective names in the said list of voters. None of the parties sought for attended the court of revision, and when application was made to strike their names off the said list, the said revising barrister, the said W. E. Perdue, ruled that he would not strike them off the list until it was shown that they had been individually served with a summons to attend the said court, and he allowed all the said names to remain on the list as finally revised and the said names still remain on the list as bona electors of said division, although they are not now and never have resided in said electoral division.

Amongst the names struck off the said list of electors was the name of Donald Forrester,, the registration clerk. As he resided and practiced his profession of barrister in the city of Winnipeg, application was made to strike him off. When challenged, he admitted his ineligibility, and the revising barrister had, therefore, no alternative but to strike his name off, which was done.

And I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing it to be true and knowing it is of the same force and effect as if made under oath, and by virtue of the Canada Evidence Act, 1893.

(Sgd.) H. H. McFADDEN.

Declared before me at township of Emerson, in the province of Manitoba, this 1st day of April, A.D. 1897.

(Sgd.) W. W. UNSWORTH,
A Notary Public,
in and for the province of Manitoba.

Sir, that statement requires no comment from me. There is the oath of a gentleman who was formerly a member of the legislature of Manitoba, showing that——

Mr. LaRIVIERE. Mr. McFadden is still a member of the legislature.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am very much obliged to my hon. friend (Mr. LaRiviere). This gentleman is still a member of the legislature, which shows his responsible character. You have here the proof that the law is such as to allow the most monstrous fraud that it is possible to imagine in regard to elections, a case that would be utterly impossible if an appeal were allowed to a judge, for no person holding the responsible position of a judge, when it was proved to him that this was a bogus list, that no such persons existed, would leave the names on the list to have these imaginary people personated by any one who chose to do so on the day of the election. No language that I can use would add the slightest force to the arguments as to the right, the unquestionable right, of the voters of Manitoba, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick to have that same protection in regard to the franchise that will be enjoyed under this law by the people of the provinces of Ontario and Quebec.

Now, Sir, I will read a letter received from a gentleman in Nova Scotia bearing upon this point. It speaks volumes, and requires no word of mine to add to its weight or authority. This is an extract from a letter written to me by Mr. J. G.

Dunlop, who was formerly sheriff of the county of Victoria, N.S. It is as follows :—

Dear Sir,—The lists of this county were cooked so that between 350 and 400 Conservatives were left off the list, as no one expected an election. Then they sprang the election. I am credibly informed it was the case in all the other counties. I was sheriff of this county for ten years, and because I did fair and would not do crooked work for the Liberals, I was dismissed, and a man put in who has now to answer to a court of law for his crooked work.

He did away with the revisers' lists in two districts and made two new lists after cutting some 70 Conservatives off, and it is into the hands of a man like this that the pure Liberals want to put our lists.

Would any hon. gentleman in this House say that we in Nova Scotia do not require protection, the same protection that will be enjoyed under this law in Quebec and Ontario, when you have the evidence of a gentleman who held the position of sheriff, a position which is in the gift of the local government from year to year, and who states that he was dismissed after ten years' service because he would not cook the election lists to suit his masters, and that the present sheriff is now arraigned before the courts of his country for his disgraceful tampering with the lists and his violation of every principle of justice in the election that recently took place in that province.

It is not necessary that I should detain the committee, as this subject has been so fully and amply discussed, and as we are now at a late period of the session and are anxious to get on as rapidly as possible with the business before us. I merely lay the facts succinctly before the House to show the justice of the appeal I now make to hon. gentlemen opposite. And I say frankly that I do not expect that this appeal will be in vain. I believe the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) who leads the House and his friends and colleagues in the Government and the Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick), who has charge of this measure, will admit that it is a fair and reasonable proposition and one which we may confidently hope will be accepted by the House.

Before I sit down I wish to say to my hon. friend the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt), who quoted in support of the Government and in favour of the adoption of the local franchises the precedent of the convention to prepare a constitution for the Australian provinces, that I hold in my hand the Bill which has been agreed upon, and I find that that Bill has the same provisions as the British North America Act. The section of the Australian Bill is as follows :—

Until the Parliament otherwise provides, the qualification of an elector for member of the house of representatives shall be in each state that which is prescribed in the law of the state as the qualification of the electors of the most numerous house of parliament of the state ; but in the choosing of members each elector shall vote only once.

So that precisely the same protection that the Confederation Act provided for the adoption of such a Franchise Bill as would be approved by the Parliament of Canada, is provided in the scheme of confederation which has now been agreed upon, and is being submitted to the people of Australia. Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the following amendment :—

Notwithstanding anything in this Act, or in any Act heretofore enacted, or hereafter to be enacted by the legislature of any province, there shall be in the provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Manitoba, for the purposes of revising and amending the voters' list to be used in the election of members for the House of Commons an appeal from said lists as prepared by the registration clerks and revisers to the respective judges of the county courts in each of the said provinces for the different counties in which the polling divisions for which such voters' lists have been prepared are respectively situate.

Such appeal may be, at the instance of any voter or person entitled to be a voter in the polling division, the voters' list for which is appealed from on all or any of the following grounds, viz.: that the names of voters are through inadvertence or otherwise omitted from voters' lists or wrongly stated therein, or that the names of persons are through inadvertence or otherwise inserted in the voters' list who are not entitled to be voters, and shall be made to the judge of the county court at any time within twenty days after the voters' list as first made up shall be filed with the officer who, under the law of the province, has the custody of the same, and notice of such appeal shall be given in form " C " in the schedule hereto annexed, by posting the same up in at least three public places within the polling division, and by publishing the same for at least ten days previously to such appeal in some newspaper published in the county and circulating in the said polling division ; and if no newspaper is published in the county, then in a newspaper published in the nearest county having a newspaper published therein, provided that in the case of an application to strike off names from the voters' list, such notice shall be mailed, duly registered, with postage prepaid, at least one week previous to such appeal, to the address of such person or persons, if known to the appellant. The judge shall hear the appeals on affidavits, or if requested by the appellant or by the person opposing the appeal on evidence viva voce under oath, and may make an order in writing directing that the name of such person as voter shall be struck from or added to said list, and in case of more than one appeal from the same voters' list, the judge shall embody in the one order the results of his adjudications in respect to all such appeals, and such order shall be filed with the officer who has the custody of the said voters' list, who shall, in pursuance of said order, strike off from or enter upon said list the names of persons as voters, and such voters' list, so amended, shall be the voters' list for the polling division.

" C."

Province of ....., county (or city) of.....
Polling division (or subdivision) of .....
I hereby give notice that on the .... day of ....., A.D. 1...., I intend to apply to the

judge of the county court of ..... at ..... to have for the purposes of elections of members for the House of Commons of Canada the voters' list for polling district (or subdistrict) ..... amended by (adding to the same the names of the persons mentioned in schedule "A" or striking therefrom the names of the persons mentioned in schedule "B," or by changing the names A. B. C. D. &c. to E. F. G. H. &c.)

Dated at ..... this .... day of ....., A.D. 1...

(Signed) X. Y.,
Appellant.

Schedule "A."
Schedule "B."
Schedule "C."

Subsection "c" of section 5.

The voters' list shall, except in the provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Manitoba, be those prepared by the several polling divisions so established and which on the sixtieth day next preceding the day fixed for the nomination of candidates for such Dominion election were in force or were last in force under the laws of that province for the purpose of provincial elections, and in the provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Manitoba shall be the voters' list as amended under the provisions of section .... of this Act, which were prepared by the registration clerks or revisers for the several polling divisions so established for the purposes of provincial elections and were filed at least sixty days previous to the day fixed for the nomination of candidates for such Dominion election with the officer having by law the custody of the same.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Although I do not share all the views which have been expressed by my hon. friend, I have no fault to find with the manner in which he has presented his case, nor with the motives which have inspired the amendment which he has placed in your hands. I may tell him at once that it is in no captious spirit, but for very good and substantial reasons, that the Government cannot accept the amendment, because the acceptance of this amendment would simply do away with the whole principle of the Bill which we have adopted so far. My hon. friend has acknowledged the great ability and the perfect courtesy with which my hon. friend the Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick) has conducted this measure up to the present time. My hon. friend the Solicitor General has been most anxious to meet all the suggestions that have been offered from the other side. Let me say at once that many of the suggestions which have been made were valuable, and those that we have adopted have made the Bill more acceptable than it was at first. The question of the franchise under which the members of this House are to be elected, is one of very great difficulty, as we all know. It is no use to recriminate at this moment, but we are all agreed that the old franchise that this law is to replace, was not satisfactory and had been found unworkable. The new law we hope will be more workable and more acceptable, but still it has to be put to the test, and though we have great expectations from it, I am far from pretending that it will give full and absolute satisfaction. But time alone will test its usefulness, and it was in this view that we accepted many of the amendments which were offered on the other side. There would be the same disposition to accept this amendment as was manifested on previous occasions where amendments were offered which we thought were real improvements of the Bill. But I beg to suggest to my hon. friend, and to those hon. gentlemen who sit opposite, that in my judgment, at all events, it is very questionable whether we have power to introduce such an amendment into the Act. We have certainly power to take the provincial lists as they are made, and to adopt them as our own; but I question very much whether we have power to interfere in the preparation of the local lists and to impose conditions which are not imposed by local legislation as to the manner in which they are to be made. This is a question which, in my judgment, is one of great moment and of some difficulty. I do not press it strongly, however, because I apprehend that there may, perhaps, be a difference of opinion in this regard. But there can be no difference of opinion, at all events, upon this point, that even if we had power to pass such an amendment, its adoption would create great confusion. You would have a set of lists prepared for local elections, and by this amendment you would introduce federal legislation to take effect at a certain time, which would take away the lists from the local jurisdiction and bring them under federal jurisdiction as to the method of their preparation. I submit to my hon. friend that this consideration alone shows that the amendment would undoubtedly and inevitably lead to very great confusion. Now, I am free to admit that the system which prevails in Nova Scotia, in New Brunswick, and in Manitoba for the matter of that, is not as complete as I would like to see it. In the province of Quebec I have lived under a system which has prevailed for many years, and which has given the right of appeal to the judicial authorities in respect of the preparation of the lists; and I must say that so far as my experience goes, it has worked well and satisfactorily. I believe the same system has prevailed in the province of Ontario, and it has also worked well and satisfactory. But I have yet to learn that the system existing in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, which has prevailed for the last forty years, and has received judicial sanction and authority, has not given satisfaction to the people of those provinces. There is this consideration, however, that I would like to offer to my hon. friend who has moved this amendment. The people of the provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick have had the same system of preparing their lists for something over forty years, and if I am correctly informed, during

those forty years there have been no substantial changes, at all events there has been no change whatever calculated to improve the preparation of the lists in the manner which he has now suggested. The local lists are prepared by the sheriffs appointed as judicial officers.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Would my hon. friend allow me to say one word? It is only comparatively recently that the sheriffs have been appointed by the Government of the day. The sheriffs were formerly appointed by the judges, and, therefore, the law that has existed down to a recent period, was quite different from the present law.

The PRIME MINISTER. I do not question the hon. gentleman's argument, it may be that the appointment of the sheriffs by the local government does not afford the same security to all classes that was afforded previously. I have no argument to offer upon this point; but, at all events, I have this to say to my hon. friend, that no attempt has been made to introduce into the preparation of the local lists the change which it is now sought to introduce here. The people of Nova Scotia, and of New Brunswick also, have their local judge, which is the ultimate court of appeal in each of these provinces, where they may take their grievances to be remedied. And I have no doubt that if the people of Nova Scotia find the present system not satisfactory—the system which has given satisfaction hitherto—if they thought that the sheriff being appointed by the executive authority did not give them the same security as in former times, when the sheriffs were appointed by the judicial authority, they will undoubtedly, in the exercise of their rights as citizens of a free province, introduce legislation in amendment to that legislation. But it may be said that their efforts would be unavailing, because the party suffering would not control the legislature. That may be so at the present time. But when any grievance exists in any legislature, governed under British institutions, the minority is never slow to avail itself of any opportunity to offer amendments to remove it, although the minority may be sure that its efforts will not succeed, but be rejected; a minority will never fail to bring grievances to the attention of a legislature, though they are satisfied their efforts will be prostrated, because the minority will do so simply for the purpose of affecting public opinion and affecting it in its own direction. I am therefore forced to the conclusion that as no efforts have been made either in the legislatures of Nova Scotia or New Brunswick in the direction indicated by my hon. friend, the law has been found satisfactory to the people of those provinces. If any difference now prevails, if it turns out that grievances exist now which did not exist then, the remedy will be in the hands of the local legislature. So much for New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. The hon. gentleman stated a few moments ago a case of abuse in Nova Scotia. I might say to the hon. gentleman that it is impossible to devise a law which will not be abused in some way or other and there will be infractions of it, there will be parties trying to perpetrate frauds under the law; and a case of that kind will not force the conclusion that the law was necessarily bad and unsatisfactory. If there were a series of abuses such as would influence the public mind, popular opinion would remedy it, because the means are at hand; but if you adduce one case or another case, I say you cannot form a judgment thereon. Moreover, I have reason to suppose from information given to me, that there is another side to this story in the case of Manitoba and also as regards Nova Scotia, that there is another version of the facts. Be that as it may, we have come to the conclusion that the best method we can adopt as regards the preparation of voters' lists for the elections for this House is the adoption of the local lists. We stand by that principle, and before we depart from it, we must give it a fair trial. I only ask hon. gentlemen opposite to give this law a fair trial. It may be that it will not answer the purpose; it may be that we shall be the first to be deceived as regards its operations. If we are so deceived, then it will be open to hon. gentlemen opposite to attack the Act and present something which should not be the law existing before, nor the law as it will exist henceforward. For my part, I say this, and repeat it, that though I have very great confidence that this new law in the future will give satisfaction, I can only express a hope and not a certainty. Time alone, experience alone, will prove whether it is wise or unwise. My belief is that it is wise, and we should give it a fair trial; and for that reason I am sorry to come to the conclusion that I strongly entertain the hope that this amendment will not be adopted.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). I desire to say a few words in reply to the leader of the Opposition, who has stated some occurrences alleged to have taken place under the Manitoba Election Act as an argument in favour of the proposition to give an appeal to the judiciary under the present Bill. For myself, were it not for the technical difficulty of making such a provision in connection with our statutes, I would not see any objection to permitting such an appeal. The objection referred to by the leader of the Opposition is an objection, not due to a desire on the part of the Government that there should not be the same right accorded to Manitoba, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick as is given to the other provinces. So far as Manitoba

is concerned, I have lately been informed, I do not speak with any degree of positiveness, but I believe it to be a fact, that the government there, at the request of the leader of the Opposition, have agreed to amend the Election Act so that an appeal to the judiciary should be given under their Act. The probability is that such an amendment will be made. But apart from that, I desire to advert to the substance of the declaration the leader of the Opposition has read in order to show how false is the appearance of truth which that declaration presents to the House. If the House will for one moment consider the facts, this will be obvious, and the facts will appear to be as follows: W. E. Perdue, a member of the Manitoba bar, was appointed by the Government of Manitoba as revising officer. He went and held a court of revision. He was an officer of the Government and legislature of Manitoba. The list was revised, and an election was held on that revised list. The gentleman who made the declaration was elected and became a member of the legislature of Manitoba. The legislature has held several sessions since that time. If this Dr. McFadden had any grievance against the returning officer who revised the lists on which he was elected, this revising officer being an officer of the legislature of Manitoba, where was the proper place for that gentleman to bring his complaint? Was it not in the legislative assembly of Manitoba, of which he was a member, and of which the revising barrister was an officer? I hesitate not to say that if this gentleman had brought before the legislature a proper statement, such as the leader of the Opposition has submitted here, if at the first session of the legislature after his election had taken place, he had presented such a statement and demanded an investigation, that investigation would have been given. I was a member of the legislature myself at that time, and I say that at the session of the legislature which followed the election no such demand for an inquiry was made.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Do I understand the hon. Minister to say that Mr. McFadden has never brought this matter up in the legislature of Manitoba?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The hon. gentleman is trying to put something into my mouth which I did not say at all.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes. I think I can make myself perfectly clear in English, and what I said was that if this gentleman had brought before the legislature of Manitoba a statement of facts such as the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) has brought before this House, and had supplemented that by a demand for an investigation, he would have been given the opportunity of investigating these facts before a committee of the legislature. What I say is, that he did not demand any investigation. Let me point out that Mr. Perdue, the revising officer, was a resident of the city of Winnipeg; the legislature was sitting in the city of Winnipeg; the town of Emerson, where this nefarious occurrence is said to have taken place, is only 60 miles from Winnipeg; the matter could have been brought before the legislature; a committee could have been appointed, Mr. Perdue could have come there with the records of his court of revision in his hands; the witnesses could have been brought and the facts could have been found beyond the possibility of a doubt. That was the proper place for this complaint to have been made, and that is the proper forum in which the investigation should have taken place. What do we find? We find that this gentleman asked for no investigation. He apparently is not sure enough of his case to submit it to an investigation, but we find that he sends down an ex parte declaration, a thousand miles or two thousand miles away, to be read in the absence of Mr. Perdue, the revising officer who is attacked in this declaration. I have only to submit that to the sense of fairness of hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House in order to show that it is an entirely unfair attack made on Mr. Perdue, and an attack made under such circumstances as to lead us to place no confidence whatever in the statements made.

I have this to say so far as Mr. Perdue is concerned. I do not remember having ever heard of this charge until this declaration was read in this House, but I have to say that Mr. Perdue is a gentleman who stands in the front rank of the Bar of Manitoba. He is a man of the most absolutely unblemished name, and there is not an hon. gentleman in this House who can claim to be the superior of Mr. Perdue in propriety and rectitude of character. I have never heard any person on either side of politics say anything else about Mr. Perdue, and I have no hesitation in saying from my knowledge of that gentleman, simply from my knowledge of his personal and professional character, that there can be no possible foundation for the statement, that in the discharge of any such duty as was imposed upon him by the Government of Manitoba, he had acted otherwise than as a responsible officer ought, and with complete impartiality and complete observance of the proper principles which should actuate, and did actuate him, in the discharge of these duties. Further, I have no hesitation in saying that so far as Mr. Perdue is concerned I can readily say for him that at any time he would be prepared to meet, and in fact to court, any investigation that might be ordered into his conduct as revising officer.

My hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) went a little further and he said: Such a thing as

that which is alleged to have taken place, never could take place if an appeal were given to the judiciary; if the revising officer were a judge. I will tell my hon. friend that that has taken place year after year in the province of Manitoba; not in fourteen cases, not in fifteen cases, but in hundreds of cases; the Dominion voters' lists in that province are stuffed with hundreds of names; and in the case of the city of Winnipeg with thousands of names, that cannot be got off the voters' lists because there is no means of finding these men; there is no way of finding the persons to whom these names are supposed to apply, and, consequently, it is an absolute impossibility to get this Dominion list purged. The constituency of my hon. friend from Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) is a special case. Upon the voters' lists of that constituency, there are thousands of names that have no business to be there, and my hon. friend (Mr. Richardson), even with $25,000 of expenditure, could not get that list even reasonably accurate and reasonably fair under the present law. The hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) says that such a thing as he alleged could not happen in Manitoba if there was an appeal to the judge. I will tell my hon. friend what happened before a judge. I know perfectly well what my duty is as a member of this House in speaking of a judge; I am not going to reflect on the judge, but I will state the facts as I know them to be and I will leave the members of the House to draw their own conclusion. This happened: When the members of the Liberal party went before a county judge who was the revising officer under this Dominion Franchise Act, and proved that they had served subpœnas upon men who were improperly upon that list, the judge held he would not strike them off because it could not be proven that the parties served had been shown the original subpœna in each case. That is what he held. Now, Sir, every lawyer in this House knows that there is an old technical rule of law which says that when you serve a man with a subpœna you have got to prove that you handed him a copy and that you showed him the original.

Mr. DAVIN. Who was the judge?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Judge Walker, the present county court judge of the eastern judicial district. Every lawyer knows the old rule of law, that you have got to show that you not only handed a copy to the witness but that you showed him the original. Now, Sir, it was held in the electoral court of revision in the city of Brandon, by Judge Walker, that he would not, and he did not, strike the names off the list, because the bailiff who served those persons, although he identified them and proved he handed them copies of the subpœnas, could not swear that in every case he had shown these people the originals. I have now shown to my hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) what has happened under his law; the law which we are seeking to repeal. I have challenged him, and I do now on behalf of Mr. Perdue challenge him, that Mr. McFadden or any one else may bring an accusation in the proper quarter where Mr. Perdue may have an opportunity of answering it, and it will be answered by Mr. Perdue.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The argument of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton), if there be an argument in the observations of the hon. Minister, was answered by himself in advance, when he said that after all these things that have happened in the province of Manitoba, the Government of that province was now forced to recognize the necessity of a judicial revision of the electoral lists. The Minister's resistance to the suggestion that we should put it beyond question that in all the provinces of Canada there shall be a judicial revision of the lists, was an appeal to us to take into consideration the fact that in Manitoba at any rate, they were to have the benefit that undoubtedly follows from such a judicial revision. I can understand the excitement of the hon. Minister (Mr. Sifton) in reference to Mr. Perdue and his high opinion of that gentleman, for has not this revising barrister, this former Attorney General of the Manitoba Government, been conducting for some months past, some very interesting financial operations in connection with the Minister of the Interior, Mr. Perdue drawing on the Minister of the Interior, and the hon. gentleman cashing the drafts; the hon. Minister obtaining the money from the exchequer of Canada, too, to meet the drafts of Mr. W. E. Perdue. Of course I have no doubt that the high encomium paid Mr. Perdue, the drawer, by the hon. Minister of the Interior, the drawee, will be reciprocated fully by the drawer, in connection with these transactions, taking the position of drawee. The hon. Minister of the Interior made a rather lame defence to this House, because he did not try to refute the statement that the disgraceful facts mentioned in the McFadden case had been brought to the attention of the legislature, but pleaded that no formal appeal had been made to the legislature of Manitoba for a commission of inquiry. But that, of course, cannot affect in the slightest degree the importance and relevancy of the case in connection with this matter. Here we have the undeniable fact that in the provinces of Ontario and Quebec and British Columbia, an appeal is allowed and the Minister of the Interior tells us that the province of Manitoba proposes to follow suit. The justice and propriety of guaranteeing an appeal was admitted by the leader of the Government himself this afternoon when he said that his individual preference was for the system which obtains in the province of Quebec. In

those provinces where the appeal exists, there have been no scandalous cases brought to light. I do not think it is an answer when hon. gentlemen opposite say that in the other provinces such cases have been few, because the complaint has been general, and the facts warrant the supposition that there could be many cases brought up in those provinces, where, as in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, the sheriff who is the existing court of appeal, is appointed by the Government of the day and practically at its mercy. The First Minister, in resisting the appeal of the leader of the Opposition to make uniform that beneficial system which obtains in the larger provinces, went chiefly on the ground that the proposed amendment is contrary to the principle of the Bill. But the hon. Solicitor General will tell him that he did not hang so tenaciously to the principle of the Bill, but that there were clauses introduced into it with the approval of the Government that are as much inconsistent with the principle of the Bill as the proposed amendment. There are clauses for the protection of the federal voters from any attempt on the part of the local legislatures or authorities to tamper in any way with these lists. For instance, there is the check that is provided in clause 5 of subsection "c," defining the particular lists of the province that shall be taken so as to prevent any province recklessly or improperly bringing a list into force specially for the purpose of a federal election. The Solicitor General candidly admitted that such possibilities should be prevented, and the House went very generally with him in his attempt to prevent their perpetration. We, therefore, in that case admitted, so far as the principle is involved, that we should have some control of those lists—call them provincial lists or what you like. Then take the clause protecting this House against vexatious legislation or legislation which we might consider improper in a local legislature. By that clause this House has put around federal electors a safeguard, which will protect certain officers who are disqualified in some of the provinces, from being at the caprice or wish of a local legislature disqualified in Dominion elections. Take also subsection 4 of the same section which contains a special clause with regard to the disqualification of certain classes of people—for instance, prisoners in jail, and so on. That clause gives us control over these features of the electoral lists; take, for instance, also clause number 9, which is an extraordinary clause. I am not attacking it, but showing how much has been conceded and to what a very little distance, if any, the First Minister would have to go if he gave us what he says to-day is a right and proper thing, and how very little it would invade upon the principle involved in this Bill if he accepted the amendment now proposed as he has those I have already mentioned. Take clause 9. That clause provides that where the provincial lists are more than a year old, and in other certain events, new lists shall be prepared, under the direct authority and supervision and machinery of this Parliament.

Then, of course, I need not, I suppose, at this stage, as the question is pretty fresh, refer to the other objection, at great length, of the First Minister, as to our doubtful powers with regard to this amendment of what he calls a local list. Permit me to say that it cannot be called an amendment of a local list. It is simply an amendment of a list which we make a federal list, and which is to be used only for federal purposes. The amendment is careful as to that. It does not pretend to interfere with the provincial lists, as such, in any particular. Otherwise the hon. gentleman's objection would be well taken. But the hon. gentleman will see that it is his own Bill which is making use of work done for provincial purposes, adopting under the principle laid down by the Solicitor General and much discussed in this House, some of that work and appropriating it for Dominion purposes. We add to the preliminary list, so to speak, or we change that list for federal purposes and for federal purposes only. We do not interfere, by the proposed amendment, with the local procedure for local purposes and we cut off no appeal or recourse and do not pretend to do so. They may go to the sheriff as they do now in Nova Scotia. Our work cannot be considered in any respect as affecting the provincial lists for provincial elections. So that we do not interfere with the local lists. It is misleading to call them local lists in connection with the federal election. We simply take the work done for provincial purposes and adopt it for federal purposes. If, of course, the hon. gentleman wishes to suggest doubts that have already been expressed as to other features of the Bill, much of his criticism made on this score would far more apply to clauses and provisions that have received considerable attention and which the Solicitor General himself admits form interesting subjects for discussion; but the hon. gentleman in this Bill has made a tremendous plunge in the opposite direction from the line of his argument as regards this point, and we do not want to go a jot further, as far as the principle of the Bill is concerned, than he has gone in section after section of the Bill. The hon. gentleman says we must trust to the provinces for amendment, and he discussed at some length the methods the minority had of obtaining redress. Well, if we would stand by that doctrine, there are several clauses in this Bill that are wholly unnecessary now. Because the answer to the suggestions that have been successively made, so far as the Solicitor General was concerned, if consistency be a jewel, would have been the answer of the Prime Minister to-day. He would have said: You must use your influence in your different provinces to have

these principles carried out, we stand simply and solely on the provincial lists. But that principle has been already thrown to the winds in the discussion of this Bill. Consequently, I submit, nothing that has been said before to-day makes the position of the Government inconsistent with that taken by the Opposition and with this amendment. A great deal of satisfaction would be felt throughout the country, I am sure, if both the political parties could feel that when such a concession as this had been asked at the hands of the Government, the Government have been willing to grant it. I think it would do not a little good in connection with the relations of the parties, and would improve the feeling in the contests that are to take place in the future, be the results of those contests what they may.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). As the motion of the hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) was based, to some extent, upon the condition of affairs in Nova Scotia, I ask to be permitted to make a few observations on that phase of the question. I intend to vote against the hon. gentleman's motion and shall ask the House to vote against it. This motion proposes to make an entirely useless addition to the election machinery of Nova Scotia. There is no province in the Dominion in which there is greater respect for judicial authority than in Nova Scotia. But I am sure I am justified in saying that there has been no general feeling among the people of the province that it is necessary to invoke the aid of the judicial authorities in connection with the revision of the electoral lists. I regret that the hon. gentleman has repeatedly attacked the Nova Scotia system of revision, because, to some extent at all events, he is responsible for it. The system had its foundation in an Act passed as long ago as 1863. The hon. gentleman was not responsible for the passing of that Act, but he was responsible for keeping it on the Statute-book for a number of years, while he led the Government of Nova Scotia, so that it passed on to his successor. A system of revision was created by that Act which has continued, with slight changes, to the present day. Prior to that time there was universal suffrage; but by the Act of 1863 a restrictive franchise was adopted. The Act provided for revision of the list by revisers appointed by the session of the county. We had no municipal government in Nova Scotia then, and revisers were appointed by the magistrates forming the county sessions. I think I am right in saying that there was no complaint against this system down to 1879, and no widespread objection of any kind raised. The revisers, appointed locally, were the final court of appeal in the preparation of the electoral lists. In 1879, Sir John Thompson, being then the Attorney General of Nova Scotia, introduced a county incorporation Act, whereby the system of municipal government was applied in the province. So satisfactory was the system of revison at that time, that Sir John Thompson was content to turn over the duty of appointing the revisers, along with the other duties of the sessions, to the municipal councils. From 1879 until after the Government of Sir John Thompson went out of office, that system continued, and no complaint was made that it was not satisfactory. There was no appeal. The revisers formed the final court. That continued down to 1889. I had the privilege of filling the position of Prime Minister of the province in that year. We were revising the franchise law. There was no general complaint that the system was a bad one, but it was represented that in a few cases the revisers had acted as partisans, and it was suggested that there might be some sort of appeal. Under the system which had existed since 1863, the sheriffs were assigned certain duties in connection with the electoral lists. They had to make up, at certain stages, lists of electors not resident in the respective districts. It seemed but reasonable, therefore, that their duties should be enlarged and that they should be called upon to sit in appeal in the revision of the lists. The provision for appeal to the sheriff was not made with a view to having a widespread system of appeal. As in the case of many another court of appeal, the benefit was not so much in the number of appeals that might be heard as in the fact of its inducing the lower court to give greater consideration than they might otherwise do to the matters brought before them. The effect was to warn the revisers that if they acted in a partisan manner there was a tribunal to which there might be an appeal. Experience has shown that there were comparatively few appeals. I have no statistics on the subject, but, speaking from memory, I can say that comparatively few appeals were taken in Nova Scotia under that system. This goes to show that while the system of appeal was useful to some extent, there was no very great need of it at that time. But the hon. gentleman said that the sheriff is a partisan officer. He says he is now appointed at the whim of the Government, and is appointed from year to year. I desire to point out that neither of these statements is correct. The sheriff is not appointed from year to year. He is not appointed at the whim of the Government; or at all events he does not hold his office by the whim of the Government; nor is he at the mercy of the Government, as the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) said. The sheriffs were appointed, prior to 1883, in a manner pointed out by the leader of the Opposition. They were appointed by an antiquated system by which the judges and representative of the Government met

at certain times and produced a list and picked out one name. That system was out of date, and in 1883 a law was passed by which the sheriffs were appointed directly by the Government of the day. But they were appointed not to hold office at the whim of the Government, nor were they appointed from year to year. They were appointed as permanent officers of the Government, and, as it is termed, during good behaviour. And good behaviour, interpreted in the light of sixteen or seventeen years' experience, has shown that the sheriffs in Nova Scotia hold office by a tenure which is no less lasting than that by which the judge of the county court holds his office. In the first place, the sheriffs were not appointed in a partisan way. Many of the old sheriffs of that day were Conservatives, and in nearly every case they were re-appointed under the new system, and continued to hold office until the day of death or resignation. And at this day, after fifteen years, there are, I am certain, three or four sheriffs who were appointed by the Conservative party, and who continue to hold office at this moment. So it is evident that there was no desire to treat these officers as under the whim of the Government or at the mercy of the Government. My hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) has produced a letter or declaration. I made a statement at an earlier stage of the discussion on this Bill that no sheriff in Nova Scotia had been dismissed under the existing system. I wish to correct that statement. During the years when I had the honour to occupy the office of Prime Minister, no sheriff was dismissed after appointment in 1883. But since I retired one sheriff has been dismissed. He was appointed by my Government and was a Liberal. He was dismissed from office by the Liberal Government a few months ago for gross misconduct. And that sheriff is the man whose letter has been read by the hon. leader of the Opposition. The hon. gentleman will fail to show a case——

Mr. McDOUGALL. May I ask the hon. gentleman what was the man's misconduct?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am willing to tell the hon. gentleman privately, but I do not think I would be doing a service to the gentleman who has lost his position by proclaiming his misconduct on the floor of the House. I will tell the hon. gentleman, at the close of the sitting, what his misconduct was; but I do not wish to go further now than to say that though he was dismissed for misconduct, it had no relation whatever to any political charge. The dismissal occurred only a few months ago, after my retirement from the Government of Nova Scotia; he was dismissed for good and sufficient cause, and I do not care to say more than that. Therefore, it will be seen that when the hon. gentleman brings on the floor of the House to-day a letter from a dismissed sheriff and quotes that as evidence that this system is wrong, I think he has failed to make any case against the system. I have pointed out that the system has been in force for years, and that there was no complaint. I do not say that it has never been suggested that we should have the system which is proposed to-day, with an appeal to a county judge. But if gentlemen, at an earlier stage of discussion, thought such an appeal was necessary, experience has showed them that it was not necessary; and speaking again from memory, I think I am correct in stating that down to the time when I retired from the leadership of the Government of Nova Scotia, since this law has been placed on the Statute-book, I do not think that any proposal was ever made in the legislature to adopt the system of an appeal to a judge. I do not think any complaint ever was made against the present system. So, in short, I contend that this is entirely unnecessary; there is no grievance in Nova Scotia; both political parties recognize the fact that that system, in the main, is a good one. I will not say that a sheriff cannot be found who is a partisan sheriff, as I will not say that a county judge cannot be found in Canada who is a partisan county judge; but I say that the sheriffs generally in the province of Nova Scotia are gentlemen who will compare favourably in character and standing, and in all that goes to make a good citizen, even with the judges of the land. They are good citizens and good officials. Hon. gentlemen opposite have stood up, one after another, and acknowledged that as respects the sheriff of their particular counties they had no fault to find. I believe if there had been any grievance in this respect we would have heard of it again and again in the legislature of Nova Scotia. If it be true, as I have pointed out, that the system has met with no general complaint, if it be true that all parties are content to operate that system, if there has been no substantial grievance in Nova Scotia, I fail to see any reason why we should introduce this new and unnecessary piece of machinery. A few words more and I have done. If it be stated that any one sheriff has acted in a partisan manner—I suppose you can find such a case just as you can find a partisan judge—the machinery of the law provides ample means for bringing that sheriff to justice. If a sheriff fails to do his duty by putting on a name improperly or leaving off a name improperly, he is liable in every such case to a penalty of $200. If a sheriff, in his capacity as returning officer, shall fail to copy a list correctly and sends it to his deputy returning officer in an incorrect form, he is liable to a penalty of $50 in the case of every name so omitted; and these penalties can be recovered in the supreme court or the county court by any person

who takes the trouble to sue for them. Therefore, there is ample machinery provided by which a sheriff can be punished for misconduct, and I think if there were any such cases the gentlemen who are interested in seeing the law sustained, would have taken those cases into court and would have seen that justice was done in the proper way by appealing to the judges, not to act as revisers of electoral lists, but to carry out the law which is now on the Statute-book.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). There is one point that should perhaps be brought out in connection with what my hon. friend the Minister of Finance has said in reference to the part taken by sheriffs in Nova Scotia in making up the electoral lists. He says they have always taken the same part in the preparation of the lists, because it was their duty to decide in what part of the county a non-resident should vote. At the time they were given that power they were not the appointees of the local government, they were then practically appointed by the judges of the province. But in 1889, when the Liberal Government of Nova Scotia constituted them practically the revisers of the electoral lists, they had become the appointees of the local government, and to a certain extent must be admitted to be liable to this objection, that they are, to a certain extent, at the mercy of the local government of Nova Scotia. I would like to remind the Minister of Finance, when he speaks about the perfectly secure position occupied by the sheriffs and their immunity from attack on the part of the local government, of some investigations into the conduct of officials which were held in Nova Scotia while he himself was leader of the government of that province. I think he will not have much difficulty in recalling to mind investigations into charges made against registrars of deeds and other officers whose only crime, so far as I know, was that they were Conservatives, in which cases the most unfair and petty attempts were made, and sometimes successfully made, to dismiss those men from office. I do not think it well to take up too much time of this House in dealing with purely provincial questions, but I may say that my hon. friend will recollect certain investigations which were made into the conduct of registrars of deeds and prothonotaries in the province of Nova Scotia, which show that the legislature and government of that province were not altogether, as they should be, above the rather improper work of bringing pressure to bear upon officials. That government occasionally put one out of office and put another in merely because the man removed was a political opponent. Another point made by my hon. friend was this, that while the Conservative Government were in power in Nova Scotia they did not alter the legislation then existing. I am sure I need not recall to my hon. friend the fact that while the Holmes-Thompson Government were in power they were perfectly helpless to complete any legislation whatever which seemed undesirable to the Liberal party in the province of Nova Scotia.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Does my hon. friend mean that they attempted to change this Bill and were prevented?

Mr. BELL (Pictou). Not in this particular; but I do say that they attempted to change the Bill in reference to one particular which my hon. friend must remember. The Holmes-Thompson Government tried more than once to remove the disqualification imposed upon Dominion officials, and they were summarily put out of court by the action of the legislative council.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is not the question, but I would like to discuss that.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). It is certainly a cognate question, because it was an amendment to the Electoral Franchise Act of the province of Nova Scotia. The disqualification of some members of the civil service of Canada certainly affected the franchise of the people of Nova Scotia. In respect of that matter, the Holmes-Thompson Government tried repeatedly to remove the disqualification, and the legislative council showed itself to be a most partisan body, because it did not, in many cases, even condescend to discuss these Bills which came before it, but kicked them out of the council without an apology, without any semblance of decency even, always acting as a most partisan body. The Holmes-Thompson Government were actually prevented from legislating, and never had any power to amend the Franchise Act of that province. The Senate of Canada sometimes treats the measures of this Government promptly and vigorously, but at least they always do the Government the courtesy of discussing the measures that they send before them. I have known in the province of Nova Scotia, an important Bill that had occupied the time of the lower House for weeks, to be dismissed in twenty minutes by the legislative council, whose members laughed at the ease and facility with which they could undo that which was done in the lower House. Another thing the Minister of Finance said was that the majority of the sheriffs of Nova Scotia were Conservatives.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, I said a large number were, and some still are. I have not made a count to know which are in the majority.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). I think it will be found that a very small minority of the sheriffs are Conservatives.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. After fifteen years, there are four there yet.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). There are four out of eighteen sheriffs, and it would be unlikely indeed that there they should all be Liberals. The Conservatives were only four years in power, they had not during that time the opportunity of making appointments, because during their administration the sheriffs were appointed by the judges. How many Conservatives have been appointed sheriffs in Nova Scotia since 1873?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I rejoice to say not one.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). Not one, and furthermore the Minister of Finance is glad to say that such is the fact. When we find an hon. gentleman occupying the position of the Minister of Finance capable of expressing gratification over his position as a bitter partisan, and the fact that Nova Scotia is governed from a partisan standpoint, then I need not say another word. We must accept all the statements in the light of statements made by an hon. member who is proud that not a sheriff has been appointed by the Government of which he was formerly a member, except he adhered to the party to which the hon. gentleman belongd.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Will the hon. gentleman tell me when on a vacancy occurring during the time he was a member of the legislature supporting the Government and the Conservative party, the then Government ever appointed any Liberal?

Mr. BELL (Pictou). During that period the judges had the appointment of the sheriffs.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). The hon. gentleman himself in the course of his speech, explained the manner in which the judges were selected and the antiquated process followed.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Not by the judges alone. The representative of the Government also sat with the judges.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). The hon. gentleman knows that the sheriffs were not Government appointees. He has already explained how they were appointed. The Conservatives were in power from 1878 to 1882. In 1883 the Act was passed which enabled the local government to appoint sheriffs. The hon. gentleman was a member, and a very prominent member, of the legislature of Nova Scotia at that time. So all these points raised by the hon. gentleman fall to the ground, and yet the hon. gentleman has expressed pleasure over the fact that the Government of Nova Scotia, of which he was at one time a member, is of a grossly partisan Government.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Did I say that?

Mr. BELL (Pictou). The hon. gentleman did not say that, but it follows from what he stated. The hon. gentleman expressed gratification that the Government of Nova Scotia, following the course he adopted, administers the affairs of the province, not in the interest of the province, but in the interest of the Liberal party. Not one argument has been advanced against the proposition of the leader of the Opposition, that if no harm could occur to the Government of Canada, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Manitoba should be given the same privilege as was accorded to the other provinces. The only semblance of argument was presented by the leader of the Government, and that conflicted so grotesquely with the acceptance of amendments and the changes made in the franchises of different provinces that I was surprised it should be advocated by the leader of the Government here today.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Is the hon. gentleman able to say whether or not at any time this has been made a grievance against the local government of Nova Scotia and whether any attempt has been made to remedy the grievance by seeking to give an appeal?

Mr. BELL (Pictou). So far as regards this particular point, it has never been attempted. But I have already explained why this was not done. During the Thompson Administration it was attempted to amend the Franchise Act in regard to qualification and other matters, and in each case the proposition was summarily and contemptuously rejected by the legislative council. In that body there was always an overwhelming majority of Liberals, and we did not attempt to pass any legislation which might give the Conservatives any advantage or even fair-play.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Was there in later years any attempt made to bring it up as a grievance?

Mr. BELL (Pictou). Yes, but not in regard to the appeal.

Mr. DAVIN. Does the Solicitor General share the doubt of the Prime Minister and the Minister of the Interior of the power of this House to interfere with the lists in the way proposed by this amendment?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I shall have occasion to express my opinion in a few minutes. Allow me to wait for a little while.

Mr. DAVIN. I thought it desirable to ascertain whether the legal adviser of the Government shares the doubt of the Prime Minister and the Minister of the Interior, because I was under the impression at the earlier stages of the discussion that the Sol-

icitor General held that this might be done, and it was desirable to have something like this done. We have now had the statement of the hon. Minister of the Interior that it was desirable, but he expressed a doubt as to whether we have the power to intervene. In regard to the main points which have been dealt with fully by the hon. member for Pictou, I do not want to say anything. I desire to point out, however, that the Minister of the Interior never replied, although he attempted to do so, to any position taken by this side of the House. Take the affidavit read by the leader of the Opposition. That affidavit was not merely an attack, certainly in the main it was not an attack in regard to Mr. Perdue, but it was an attack on a system. If it was an attack on any individual, it was an attack on Mr. Forester, registration clerk. There is paragraph after paragraph detailing what was done, and it is quite clear the real iniquity that is brought to light by that affidavit is the fact that certain names in polling divisions 10, 11 and 12 were put there by Registration Clerk Forester, who bears a very different reputation from Mr. Perdue. When Mr. McFadden went to Mr. Forester in his character of registration clerk, to remedy this grievance, he could get no satisfaction. What did Mr. Perdue do? He actually did the very thing that Judge Walker is assailed by the Minister of the Interior for doing. The Minister of the Interior, as is the manner of defence invariably followed by hon. gentlemen opposite, not to defend what they did, but to say that some one connected with the Conservative party had done the same, said Judge Walker refused to take a certain course and he gave a reason. And it was precisely the same reason as Mr. Perdue gave. What those who desire to have an appeal to the judge want is, that when a revising officer takes the view adopted by Mr. Perdue, there should be an appeal to a judge. Again with respect to the argument of the Minister of the Interior, that the Dominion lists are stuffed, it may be said that such a statement affords no argument that the other lists will not be stuffed. If the Dominion lists are stuffed it is a great evil and should be remedied. But, Sir, what is the statement the Minister made? He turned around to the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) and appealed to that truthful person as a supporter, and he asked him whether in his constituency thousands and thousands of stuffed names were not on the list? Why, how many names are on the lists that elect the member for Lisgar? If the statement of the Minister were true there would have to be millions. It shows the utter looseness of assertion that characterizes the Minister of the Interior whenever he speaks in that excited and theatrical manner which he adopts when he favours us with anything like a speech in this House. The position taken by the hon. leader of the Opposition remains entirely unimpaired. The arguments made by the Prime Minister have been completely answered by the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper), and I certainly think if we are to be guided by the weight of argument we ought to adopt the amendment proposed by the hon. leader of the Opposition.

Mr. MILLS. I desire to call attention to one point that was referred to by the Minister of Finance in his statement as to the effect of appeals to the sheriffs in Nova Scotia, and the reasons why the sheriffs were appointed. The Minister of Finance said that the franchise law of Nova Scotia obtained in that province as far back as 1863. With all due deference to the Finance Minister, that is not correct. There was a new franchise altogether made by the legislature of Nova Scotia in 1889 and a most intricate franchise it is; a franchise more intricate than the Dominion Franchise Act which it is now sought to repeal. When they put that Franchise Act upon the Statute-book of Nova Scotia it was brought home to the legislature that the revisers should not be the court of final revision, and so an appeal was given to the sheriffs. The Minister of Finance to a certain extent was right when he said that the appeal to the sheriff would have the effect of keeping the revisers in check. But, Sir, when these revisers understood that the sheriffs to whom the appeals were given were as strong partisans as they themselves, they knew that the check was only a farce. If there were an appeal to a judge, then there would be a real check upon the revisers, and they would know that their actions would be considered in a judicial spirit according to the facts. As I have pointed out, the appeal to the sheriff has no check whatever upon the revisers, because the revisers regard the sheriffs as partisan, and as a fact the sheriffs were appointed in a partisan manner. I am astonished at the Minister of Finance stating to this House that the sheriffs of Nova Scotia were not appointed in this way. If my memory serves me right, the very law that made the sheriffs was conceived in a partisan spirit for the purpose of turning out Dr. Robinson, the sheriff in the county of Annapolis, and appointing as sheriff Peter Bonnett. The present Attorney General of Nova Scotia when he brought this law before the country referred to these sheriffs as "eighteen good men and true," and these words being clothed with the significance put upon them by the Attorney General have become a burning scandal in the province of Nova Scotia. The idea of referring to these sheriffs as non-partisan is absurd. When we ask this House that an appeal should be given to a judge, it is nothing more than right, and it is nothing more than what has been granted to the other provinces in the Dominion of Canada. It would be unwise and unjust if the right of appeal to a judicial authority is not accorded in the provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Manitoba.

Mr. FOSTER. We have the implied promise of the Solicitor General that he has something to say before the debate ends, and he refused to answer the question of my hon. friend (Mr. Davin) on the grounds that he would leave the question open until a little later. We would be glad to hear from him now.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I think the matter has been fully discussed.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend (Mr. Fitzpatrick) will surely answer the question put by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin).

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The amendment can hardly be accepted by the Government at the present time. What would be the effect of this amendment if it were adopted ? The effect would be for us to declare that in so far as the provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Manitoba are concerned, they do not deal honestly with their voters' lists. That is to say, that we have confidence in the lists made by the other provinces, but in so far as these provinces are concerned we cannot place in them the same amount of confidence as we place in the others. It would not be fair for us to take that position in this House. Now, with reference to the question put by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) I have got to say, that if the case was put in the way in which the Prime Minister put it, namely, that this amendment had for its effect to interfere with the lists made by the provinces, and to give an appeal which would affect the lists made by the provinces to be used for provincial purposes, it would be unconstitutional.

Mr. POWELL. The two objections that seem to have been brought to this amendment are, first, the one raised by the right hon. leader of the Government, that it is unconstitutional, and secondly, that raised by the hon. Solicitor General, that it is a declaration of want of confidence in the people of the provinces.

To deal with the second in order first, I deny that this is a declaration of want of confidence in the people of the provinces. You will observe, Sir, that the amendment takes the list as made up by the officials of the municipalities in the different provinces. As that list is filed with the secretary-treasurer or other official being the proper custodian thereof, we adopt it and take it as a basis, and so far as the province of New Brunswick is concerned, we propose by this amendment simply to allow the appeal to be had from that list to a judge of the county court to remedy any defects in it of commission or omission. There is no interference in any way with the machinery of the provinces in the making up of the lists, and as the appeal is solely for Dominion purposes there is no constitutional aspect of the question whatever arising for discussion. The right hon. leader of the Government evidently had the impression that, in some way or other, we were tampering with the local lists as made up for local purposes. But this is not the case. We are simply taking the list as compiled and completed by the local officers, and we appeal from that list, not for local purposes but for the purposes of the Dominion election. A good deal has been said with reference to the excellence of the local lists. Well, there is a complete answer to that. If these lists are perfect, then an appeal is not going to change them. If there be nothing in them to perfect, then the appeal will work no change and the lists will remain as they are. If they do wrong to any one that wrong should be remedied. And we rest satisfied, from the character of our county court judges, that no changes will be made in the lists unless the law warrants and the facts require them.

I direct my remarks particularly to the province of New Brunswick. There we have virtually no appeal. While a good deal has been said to the effect that if the Acts were defective and the cause of injury to the individual voters or the respective political parties in that province, attempts would have been made to have these Acts amended by the legislature. Now, the last Act touching upon the franchise in the province of New Brunswick was passed only last winter, and no opportunity has therefore been afforded any person to apply for any amendment. And that is the Act with respect to which the greatest amount of complaint must necessarily be raised. To point out again what I have pointed out before in this House, in New Brunswick the municipal officers prepare the lists as best they can. Each list is filed as a matter of record, and after that not an individual whose name is left off, not any man who is aggrieved by anything done, can apply for an appeal; but it is only the sheriff who can do so, if he thinks proper. That is absolute wrong. There is no principle of law, no principle of justice which would deprive a man of the right of appeal on his own motion, and allow the sheriff of the county to be the judge whether that man is to have an appeal or not. It is against this outrage that I protest. It is useless to say that because all laws are broken, there is no necessity for perfecting them. If that were the case, there would be no attempt to perfect any law which had been broken. In New Brunswick the sheriffs are reputable men, and I am not going to say anything against them; but in politics they are no more than human. I have in my mind's eye a very celebrated trial which came before a court in Westmoreland. Special jurors were called; 100 were summoned. It was in reality a political trial, and I might also say that the prisoner was charged with a

very serious offence indeed. The prosecution was virtually a political prosecution, and under those circumstances, of the whole 100 people who were summoned as jurors—I am not charging the sheriff with being actuated by any improper motives—but it so turned out that only sixteen out of the 100 were Conservatives, and in a political trial the prisoner was put on his defence with almost every individual of the 12 jurors a strong Liberal. It turned out that the prisoner was found not guilty, but the result has nothing to do with the procedure of the trial or the sense of wrong which the prisoner justly experienced. This is the matter in a nutshell. We are simply asking that in New Brunswick, as in other provinces, the individual voter shall be the judge whether he shall appeal or not, and that the sheriff of the county shall not be the judge to decide whether the individual shall have the privilege of appealing.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think that the hon. Solicitor General was very definite in the answer that he made to my hon. friend. I think he gave an answer by way of a negative, if I may be allowed to draw an inference. My hon. friend asked a very distinct question. He asked if the Solicitor General was of the opinion, as law adviser of the Crown, that the passage of this amendment would conflict constitutionally with the principle of the Bill and consequently be inadmissible. My hon. friend's answer to that did not advise the conscience of this House very much. I think he stated that if the position taken by the right hon. First Minister were correct, the amendment would be inadmissible; but he left on my mind the impression, by inference, that he did not agree with the First Minister in that contention. Whether he did or did not, I think that, considering we are so eager for information and look for authoritative information from the legal representative of the Government in this House, he scarcely did his duty by us. He certainly did not answer the question of my hon. friend.

The other points have been dealt with. I do not think there is very much in the contention that we must be estopped from legislation here because some one may infer that if we do we will be throwing a slur upon the honesty of the provincial governments which have not risen to the standard of the Governments of Quebec and Ontario. I do not think that is a good reason why this House should not legislate. We are legislating here with the idea of making the law as perfect as we can. We have the admission of the right hon. First Minister himself and of the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton)—though that is not so important—that the systems in Ontario and Quebec are in this respect ideal ones. They were strongly approved of by the First Minister. The First Minister, in fact, expressed regret that every province did not come up to the same standard, and he held out the hope that the legislatures of those provinces would of themselves come up to that standard. And the Minister of the Interior declared that such was the intention of the provincial government of Manitoba. But they may not, and suppose they do not, what position are we then in this House? We are in a position in this House that, in passing legislation on a subject in which our power is unquestioned—and it is certainly unquestioned so far as the Solicitor General is concerned, and he is the Government law adviser of the House—we acknowledge that an appeal to the county court judge is right and proper and marks the ideal system, and yet we refuse to enact the principle that hon. gentlemen opposite themselves dare not deny to be the correct and true principle. I do not think we ought to be stopped from putting this in the law unless it is shown to be, unless it can be shown that it is entirely unconstitutional. And if this is shown conclusively we have a still more grave subject to discuss, and that is, whether this Dominion Parliament will place itself in such a position as to submit itself to provincial legislation which is not of the best type and may be of a very vicious type. To my mind, the principle has been entirely given away. The right hon. leader of the House began this discussion upon a certain ground, the ground that the provincial legislatures were the source, and the only proper source, of legislation on this subject. Had he and the Government stuck to that, they would have been on ground unassailable, so far as logical correctness is concerned. But, Sir, they have contravened that principle, and they have acknowledged before the House in the legislation they have proposed that, after all, though the provincial legislatures are the proper sources of legislation in this matter, those local legislatures must be interfered with. They have said to the local legislatures: You have not constructed the lists on the right principle, so we will add to the lists by certain enactments in this House, and we will have the Dominion list, not a copy of the provincial list, but an extended provincial list, because the provincial list is imperfect and unjust, and we as a sovereign power have extended that list in order that it may be more just. Now, as they have contravened the principle of leaving the matter entirely and solely to the provincial legislatures, it is only a question of how far they will go. They have gone some distance, why not go further, especially as they themselves acknowledge that this covers a principle which is correct and which works out exceedingly well in practice in the provinces of Ontario and Quebec? There is no logical ground left for hon. gentlemen opposite. There is no

ground of consistency. They have estopped themselves because they have already interfered with the provincial lists and interfered with them in an important particular. But, what strikes me in all this is the humiliation of the thing. Here we are, a sovereign Parliament, dealing with the basis of our own existence, to wit, the franchise upon which our members are elected. We admit here amongst ourselves that a certain principle is correct, and ought to be adopted. And yet we are kept from adopting it simply because some say: Well, the local legislatures know best about this matter; they may be wrong, and if they are wrong, let them suffer the wrong. And one province or two or three provinces may be allowed to vitiate the whole principle of the franchise; and this Parliament, which lives upon that franchise, is going on confessing itself entirely inadequate to the revision of this law, entirely inadequate to putting it upon the right basis. I say it is humiliating for an independent and paramount Parliament to place itself in that position The right hon. gentleman who leads this Government boasted that he had made Canada a nation in a day. I believe that history will record it to his disadvantage that, if by consequence of coming in at the right moment so as to reap the benefits of the labours of others, he did something to consummate a policy in which this country strongly believed and has aided the development of Canada and seemed to justify his boast, empty though it was, he has made a retrograde step in introducing this separatist and disintegrating feature in the public life of Canada. The idea that a Dominion Parliament, paramount and sovereign, cannot say what its basis of franchise must be, that it must admit that the principle is right and yet must declare that it will not be put into practice, out of mere deference to a provincial and inferior legislature, and to do that on no logical grounds—I appeal again to the Solicitor General—to do it on no logical grounds, for he himself has introduced and has had passed in Committee of the Whole amendments to this Bill which contravene the absolute rights of provincial parliaments to fix the franchise. If the provincial legislatures knew best, the provincial legislatures must have done what was best when they disfranchised Dominion officials. But my hon. friend has put in a clause which enfranchises Dominion officials, contrary to the enactment and the wish of the provincial legislature. In that way, he has gone contrary to his opinion; and, in saying that we must follow their legislation, he has no logical ground to stand upon. This is no more against provincial rights, no more against provincial franchises. In fact, not as much, for the hon. gentleman will see that in a former amendment of which I speak, he has actually added to the number of voters, but in this amendment, if it were adopted, he would simply be making sure that the man who had the right to vote under the provincial franchise should have his name on the list and the man who had not the right should have his name struck off. Therefore, where is the logical and honest ground on which this can be denied? I believe the country will see very clearly the point which is in issue between us. Every man will admit that, other things being equal, there is safety in allowing a citizen to appeal to a court of law in such instances. Hon. gentlemen opposite, as a party, year after year contended for that principle and contended for it very strongly. To-day, when we ask that that principle be applied in this Bill, the hon. gentlemen not only refuse the right principle, but they go back upon their record, they go back upon their own confession and leave us to the will or the caprice of the local legislatures. So long as I have a seat in this Parliament I will contend that it is essentially necessary for the dignity and best government of Canada as a nation that she shall have uninterrupted and absolute control of her own franchise. And I believe that the great majority of the people of this country will not be satisfied to have it otherwise. Again, I think the Government would have done a useful thing for this country and would have kept its position and that of its supporters logical and consistent, and would have made itself square with public opinion, if it had allowed the plea of the Opposition, which is simply that, in the last resort, the voters' lists shall be subject to the revision of a competent court of law.

House divided on amendment (Sir Charles Tupper):

YEAS:

Messieurs

Bell (Addington),	Maclean,
Bennett,	McAlister,
Bergeron,	McDougall,
Carscallen,	McInerney,
Clancy,	McLennan (Glengarry),
Clarke,	McNeill,
Cochrane,	Marcotte,
Craig,	Martin,
Davin,	Mills,
Dugas,	Morin,
Foster,	Osler,
Ganong,	Pope,
Gillies,	Powell,
Guillet,	Robertson,
Haggart,	Rosamond,
Hale,	Seagram,
Henderson,	Sproule,
Hodgins,	Taylor,
Ingram,	Tisdale,
Kaulbach,	Tupper (Sir Charles),
Kloepfer,	Tyrwhitt,
LaRivière,	Wallace,
Macdonald (King's),	Wilson, and
MacLaren,	Wood (Brockville).—48.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Bain,	Joly de Lotbinière (Sir Henri),
Bazinet,	Landerkin,
Beausoleil,	Lang,
Bernier,	Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Bethune,	Lavergne,
Blair,	Lewis,
Borden (King's),	Livingston,
Bostock,	Logan,
Bourassa,	Macdonald (Huron),
Bourbonnais,	Mackie,
Brodeur,	McClure,
Bruneau,	McGregor,
Burnett,	McGugan,
Calvert,	McHugh,
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd),	McIsaac,
Casey,	McLellan,
Champagne,	McLennan (Inverness),
Choquette,	McMillan,
Christie,	McMullen,
Copp,	Madore,
Davies (Sir Louis),	Malouin,
Davis,	Mignault,
Dechêne,	Morrison,
Dobell,	Mulock,
Douglas,	Oliver,
Edwards,	Parmalee,
Ellis,	Pettet,
Erb,	Proulx,
Featherston,	Richardson,
Fielding,	Rinfret,
Fitzpatrick,	Rogers,
Flint,	Rutherford,
Fraser (Guysborough),	Savard,
Fraser (Lambton),	Scriver,
Frost,	Semple,
Gauthier,	Sifton,
Godbout,	Snetsinger,
Graham,	Somerville,
Guay,	Stenson,
Guité,	Sutherland,
Haley,	Talbot,
Harwood,	Tarte, and
Heyd,	Tolmie.—88.
Hurley,	
Jameson,	

Amendment negatived.

PAIRS:

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Angers,	Casgrain,
Campbell,	Kendry,
Carroll,	Quinn,
Dyment,	McCormick,
Penny,	Ives,
Wood (Hamilton),	Gilmour,
Macdonell (Selkirk),	Roche,
Russell,	Borden (Halifax),
Hutchison,	Klock,
Cowan,	Montague,
Bertram,	Reid,
McInnes,	Earle,
Gibson,	Corby,
Hughes,	Fisher,
Domville,	Prior,
Britton,	Bell (Pictou),
Ratz,	Broder,
MacPherson,	Caron (Sir Adolphe),
Beith,	Roddick,
Lister,	Tupper (Sir Charles Hibbert),
Yeo,	Monk,
Leduc,	Moore,
Chauvin,	Fortin,

179

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. members for West Hastings (Mr. Corby), Pictou (Mr. Bell), North Victoria (Mr. Hughes), and Terrebonne (Mr. Chauvin), have not voted.

Mr. HUGHES. I paired with the Minister of Agriculture. Had I voted I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. CORBY. I paired with the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson).

Mr. BELL (Pictou). I paired with the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Britton).

Mr. CHAUVIN. I paired with the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Fortin).

Mr. BOURASSA. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I call your attention to the fact that the hon. member for Charlevoix (Mr. Angers) has not voted.

Mr. ANGERS. (Translation.) I paired with the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain.) Had I voted, I would have voted against the amendment.

On the main motion, third reading of Bill.

Mr. CLARKE. Before this Bill is read a third time, I would like to draw the attention of the House and of the right hon. Premier to the discussion which took place in committee upon the 9th section of the Bill, having reference to the adoption of the provincial registration lists. That section provided that the lists of manhood franchise voters, if not more than twelve months old, shall be used for elections of members to this House. I think, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. the Solicitor General was so much impressed with the fairness of the suggestions made from this side of the House, that he promised to give them his most favourable consideration. But I see that there is nothing in the Bill as reprinted which indicates that any attention has been paid to our remonstrances. It is a fact that if the Bill passes in its present shape, and if an election for members of this House is held, say, ten or eleven months after a manhood franchise list has been prepared and used, in some cities this province, hundreds if not thousands of manhood franchise votes will be disqualified. I can speak specially for the city of Toronto; I think it is no exaggeration to say that thousands of manhood franchise voters will be disfranchised if the provincial manhood franchise list on which they vote for the election of members of this House, is ten or eleven months old; and especially will that be the case if the months of April and May intervene between the registration and the period at which such election is held. The Solicitor General was good enough to say that he would consent to a reduction of the time during which the provincial registration lists would hold good, from twelve to six months. That would remove a portion of the evil, but not all of it. Before moving an amendment to the third reading, I would

like to ask the Solicitor General if it is the intention to comply with what was conceded to be, when the Bill was in committee, a most reasonable request? The provincial Act under which this registration is made, and the forms in connection with the Act, not being in harmony with the body of the Act itself, it is a most unjust procedure to ask that the provincial registration shall apply, as it is intended to apply under this section 9, to election of members of this House. I would like to ask the Premier if it is the intention to carry out the pledge made by the Solicitor General that the age of the provincial registration lists shall not be permitted to be more than six months?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The difficulty suggested by the hon. gentleman for Toronto (Mr. Clarke) is a very real difficulty which arises under the Manhood Suffrage Act of Ontario. Taking the law as it stands, in so far as the enactments are concerned, coupling those with the oath, it is necessary that a man should reside in the province for twelve months, within the electoral district for three months, and within the subdivision for the thirty days immediately preceding the election. Now, it is possible that an election may take place eleven months after the voters' lists have been made, and in that event the difficulty pointed out by my hon. friend would exist. He suggests that we have a revision of the voters' lists in the event of an election taking place more than six months after the local lists have been made. I think the Government ought to adopt that sugestion.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. I may say that the same trouble exists with respect to Manitoba, where the lists are only prepared once in four years. There also a man to be qualified has to reside within the province for a year, and within the electoral district for three months. That is the reason why, on a former occasion, I asked the Solicitor General to make it three months, but when he suggested six months I agreed to accept the suggestion because it was less than a year. A year is really too long, and especially in Manitoba where the population is increasing very rapidly, and where the people are moving to and fro more, perhaps, than in any other province, before they settle down definitely. In those cases, if the time is left for a year, I am sure that in every constituency many men will be disqualified who otherwise, under this amendment, would be able to vote. Therefore I very gladly support any amendment in that direction.

Mr. HUGHES. Sometime during the progress of this Bill through the House, I took the liberty of drawing the attention of the Prime Minister and the Solicitor General to the fact that under the present law of Ontario, a number of names that undoubtedly will always be left off the list, would be disfranchised were these lists accepted here. I understood an amendment was prepared, and I should like to ask if it is the intention of the Government to have that amendment added to the Bill. The amendment was this: That after the list was printed and circulated here, any man whose name was found to be off the list, should be eligible to vote, on his making a declaration.

The PRIME MINISTER. I do not think we could accept the amendment of my hon. friend for Victoria (Mr. Hughes). We had better leave that to the local legislatures, who are quite competent to deal with that little grievance. I understand that there is something there to be remedied, but I think that we had better leave it to the local legislatures. With regard to the amendment suggested by the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Clarke), as it has been adopted by the Solicitor General, I move that the Bill be not now read a third time, but that it be referred to the Committee of the Whole with instructions to amend section 9 by striking out the words "one year" and inserting instead "six months."

Mr. INGRAM. I am exceedingly sorry that the leader of the House moved any amendment. I would have no objection to it if it were confined to the cities of Toronto and Hamilton, each of which has two or more electoral districts, but to have it apply to county towns and cities it would not do. It will apply to county towns and cities such as London, Hamilton and Ottawa. In Ontario we have two systems of franchise. Under the one system a candidate in every one of the counties starts out in the early spring and does not finish his revision of the lists until the election takes place, whenever that may be. He starts out by revising lists from number one to three in municipalities in which the system applies. But the revision is not complete then so far as the candidate is concerned, because every one who resides in a county town must engage in a warfare over the registration. I want to appeal to hon. gentlemen who have not taken much part in the discussion of the Franchise Bill, every representative from Ontario, from whose county town he will receive complaints if this amendment should become law, to consider this question. I say, moreover, in regard to passing a Franchise Act as it is now being considered, it appears that we must adopt it because we have committed ourselves to it as the basis of a vote on the plebiscite. Had that not been the case, I would have suggested this Bill remain over until next session, giving each member an opportunity of going over it very carefully during the recess and having conversations with revising barristers and others who have had experience in registration and revision of lists, and then we would have been in a position to have secured a perfect Bill next session. I am sure the Solicitor General will admit that

this is a crude Bill, and will not give satisfaction. It is stated that we in Ontario have an ideal system of franchise. We have nothing of the sort, but we have a cumbrous system, one that is not appreciated even by hon. gentlemen opposite or by supporters of the Hardy Government. They have discovered its weakness, but have not been able to remove all those weak points. Last session the legislature considered amendments and adopted certain changes which were in the right direction, but several more amendments are required to be introduced into the system. I call attention to the fact that the period of registration is entirely too short, that much friction will be caused, and that by embodying this registration system in the Act the House is embodying all the weak parts in the present law. Hon. gentlemen will find, if unfortunately we have an election, that this will prove a very unworkable Act, and I therefore call upon hon. members who represent constituencies in which there are county towns, and cities outside Toronto and Hamilton, to support the proposition to allow one year.

Mr. CLARKE. I do not desire to complicate the law or to make it too expensive. I expressed a wish to shorten the period as regards Toronto and Hamilton. If those cities were excluded, and the great injustice that would be done could be obviated, I would be much obliged to the Government for showing that consideration.

The PRIME MINISTER. I wanted to meet the wishes of my hon. friend. If he is not satisfied with the amendment, I do not want to press it upon him.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. Will the hon. gentleman leave the amendment to apply to Manitoba ?

The PRIME MINISTER. No ; I ask leave to withdraw my amendment.

Mr. CLARKE. I do not understand that the hon. Prime Minister has not consented to the suggestion made. I simply pointed out that a great injustice would be done under the former clause as regards Toronto and Hamilton. If the hon. gentleman would make his amendment to apply only to those two cities or to cities with over 25,000 inhabitants, he would be complying with what I submit is a very reasonable request.

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

After Recess.

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON. In the absence, and on behalf of the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Clarke), who before recess suggested an amendment to clause 9 of this Bill, making the age of voters' lists six months instead of twelve, I desire to express his regret, a regret in which I also share, that the right hon. the first Minister cannot see his way clear to accept the amendment as applying to the cities of Toronto and Hamilton. While many of us recognize the difficulty in the way of the application of this amendment to country constituencies, it is to be regretted that it cannot be applied to the larger cities. If the right hon. the First Minister is determined to withdraw the amendment which is suggested, we can do no more than urge our protest. At the same time we hope that the right hon. gentleman and the Solicitor General may be relied upon to make such representations to the Liberal Government at Toronto, as will adjust, not only this difficulty, but many other difficulties of equal importance to both political parties, in the working out of this Franchise Act.

Mr. MACLEAN. I hope that the view just put forward by the member for East Toronto (Mr. Ross Robertson) will have some weight with the Government, and that they will try to meet the suggestions made by him and by the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Clarke). Those who know the city of Toronto know that a voters' list 12 months old will disfranchise a great number of people. In the large cities of Ontario a great many young men come in from the country, remain for a comparatively short time, but they are willing to register and they seek an opportunity of doing so. The policy of the Liberal party is to register as many men as possible and enable them to vote, and in pursuance of that policy hon. gentlemen opposite should adopt this suggestion which is on the lines of progressive legislation, and on the lines of the principles that Liberals contend for.

The PRIME MINISTER. This amendment to section 9 is intended to apply to these constituencies in Ontario in which there is registration, and when there is registration this Bill provides that if the registration has taken place more than 12 months before the time for a Dominion election, then new lists will be prepared ; if it be less than 12 months, then the old list will serve. That is the Bill such as it is framed now. I understood my hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Clarke) to ask that six months should be substituted for 12 months, and I was agreeable to that on the advice of my hon. friend the Solicitor General. But I understood that objection was taken by my hon. friend from East Elgin (Mr. Ingram) and others to that amendment. So far as we are concerned we are quite willing to meet the views of hon. gentlemen opposite on this point. I may say to my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean) that several complaints have been made of the law such as it exists in the province of Ontario with regard to registration, and we have under-

taken to call the attention of the Ontario Government upon this point, so as to have the law amended in the sense just now suggested.

Mr. INGRAM. I did not object to the amendment applying to the cities of Toronto and Hamilton, but I objected to it applying to the province generally. Hon. gentlemen who have experience of the Registration Act of Ontario will bear me out that if this Franchise Bill was amended to read that in cities over 45,000 inhabitants the registration shall take place every six months, that would simply confine it to Toronto and Hamilton. The great hardship in the city of Toronto and Hamilton is, that many of the very best residents leave during the summer months for the Island, or for Muskoka, and being absent from the city temporarily they are disfranchised under the present law. By making it six months it perhaps would not affect them to the same extent.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not think the Act would apply to those who absent themselves for a few months in summer. The provision in the Act which allows lumbermen and others to be temporarily absent would perhaps apply to those as well.

Mr. TISDALE. The Act only applies to those mentioned.

Mr. SPROULE. Those who are away at college and at military service and so on are provided for. The people referred to by my hon. friend (Mr. Ingram) are only temporarily away and are usually back every week or so and it seems to me the Act would not apply to them. But even if it does, it appears to me that it is no greater injustice to them than it would be to the hundreds of persons who live in the other towns and cities of Ontario where revision would not take place under this amendment, who would come under the old law.

While it might be reasonable perhaps in Toronto and Hamilton, where there is greater need for it than in the other cities, still a list not more than a year old cannot be regarded as an old list. Suppose you make the amendment apply to Toronto, you leave out such places as Ottawa, Kingston, St. Thomas, Owen Sound, Windsor, Peterborough, Port Hope, Stratford, Winnipeg and all those large cities which stand exactly in the same position. It seems to me that you could scarcely with propriety make such an exception in favour of Toronto and Hamilton and leave all the other towns in Ontario and Manitoba as well.

There is another feature. It takes a great deal of work to revise the list in these towns and cities. During the last revision, a great many friends of the Reform Government, in the town of Peterborough for instance, said that the worst Franchise Act they had to deal with—the old Franchise Act for the Dominion or the local—was nothing at all compared to the revision of the lists in the towns under the new registration system. If you increase that work and have a revision every six months, you will be inflicting a large amount of onerous work upon people which they should not be called on to do.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I understand that the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Clarke) has withdrawn his suggested amendment as to the six months. The whole difficulty we found ourselves face to face with is this, and it resulted not from the Act, properly speaking, but from the form of oath required to be used by one of the sections. The Act itself is all right, but under the form of oath No. 17 a man is required to swear that he has been a resident of the district continuously and is then actually residing in the district and has been continuously a resident of it since 30 days before the registration took place. The provision of the Act does not require that, but the form of oath does. I have not had an opportunity of consulting the Prime Minister on this subject, but I would suggest that he should call on the Ontario Government to so amend that form of oath as to make it conform to the terms of the statute, which would avoid all the difficulties that have occurred. And if it does not please the Ontario Government to amend the oath, we can consider it next session and meet the difficulty by an amendment which I would not like at present to make, because once we begin to interfere with the oath we do not know where we may end.

Mr. MACLEAN. Will you undertake that there will not be an election ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Suppose there is, the only places where there will be any difficulty will be Toronto and Hamilton, where they have separate election divisions. It will not apply to Ottawa or other places where they have either one member or a whole city vote for the two.

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON. Does not the Solicitor General mean including the polling subdivisions as well as the district ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Under the statute, in order to get on the list, a man must have lived in the province twelve months, in the electoral district three months, and in the polling subdivision 30 days. But these all apply to a time anterior to the making of the electoral lists, according to the statute. But then the oath intervenes, and requires a man to swear that he has been continually a resident of the district up to the time he cast his vote, and there is nothing in the statute requiring that. If the oath were made to conform to the statute the difficulty could not occur.

Mr. BENNETT. There is the question that a voter in the province of Ontario

must take the oath that at the moment of voting he was a resident of the district, in order to carry out the idea of one man one vote.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. That is right so far as other districts are concerned, but I cannot see the reason when you have the manhood suffrage registration Act.

Mr. OSLER. I do not wish to swell the talk on this subject, I am quite sure the Solicitor General has realized the difficulty we labour under in Toronto, more especially. We have a floating population in Toronto, which moves from one division of the city to the other, and out to Muskoka and other summer places, and the oath in its present form would disfranchise thousands of these voters. I am sure the Government do not wish to have an Act that will have that effect. If the difficulty can be remedied, I do not care how that is done so long as the injustice is removed. We have the promise of the Government that if the local government will not consent to change the form of oath that they will change it next session, and for my part I am quite satisfied to take their promise on that point.

Amendment (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) withdrawn.

Mr. SPEAKER. The motion now before the House is that the Bill be read the third time.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. On one or two occasions I have called the attention of the hon. Solicitor General to the fact that the province of Manitoba is in quite an exceptional position, inasmuch as there we have the lists prepared only on the eve of a local election, which means that they are prepared only once every four years. The lists now in force for the local elections in Manitoba are three years old, and if under the provisions of this Bill these lists have to be revised, if they are over a year old, they should be revised at the nearest date possible to an election, so as to give the franchise to all those qualified to vote when an election takes place, which should be the intention of this Bill. The revision of the lists should be in accordance with the statute, because as in the province of Ontario, in order to be qualified to vote one has to reside a year within the limits of the province, and only three months within the limits of the electoral district in which he is living and qualified. I do not suppose that an amendment to make it necessary to revise the list three months before an election would be accepted. But some compromise might be arrived at. In fact I was led to believe—not that I was promised—that such an amendment would be made. If my hon. friends from Ontario cannot agree in their own case, I should like to suggest that the following amendment should be made :—

That the order be discharged and the Bill be referred back to Committee of the Whole with instructions to insert the following words after the word "year" in the eighteenth line of clause 9 :—"in any one province except the province of Manitoba, and six months in the said province of Manitoba."

That would leave it a year in any other province, and six months in the province of Manitoba.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. LaRivière) say that if a man is on the electoral list in Manitoba and the electoral list happens to be eleven months old, he would not have the right to vote ?

Mr. LaRIVIERE. Yes, he would have the right to vote.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. This clause will not affect Manitoba in the direction pointed out. If a man is on the list in that province and the list is eleven months old, it will still be available for the purposes of the Dominion election. If this list is more than twelve months old and an election is announced, of course, a list will be made in accordance with the terms of the Manitoba law which provides that the voter must be twelve months resident in the province and three months in the electoral district. This does not affect the hon. gentleman's constituents.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. I admit that if a man's name is on a list twelve months old, he is not disfranchised. But there will be many qualified to vote whose names are not on the list. To make the intervals as small as possible I propose this amendment. The law allows a man to become an elector on three months' residence. I would prefer three months under this amendment, but failing that, I suggest six months as a compromise.

The PRIME MINISTER. I do not think we can accept this amendment. The difficulty is one which is common to all lists. In most of the provinces the lists have to be made at a certain period. In Quebec they have to be made in March and come into force in April.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon, but we are discussing lists that are made periodically, but not at determined times, as in the province of Quebec. The case, in Quebec, is not the same as that of provinces where the lists are prepared periodically.

The PRIME MINISTER. I only gave this as an illustration. The hon. gentleman's objection to the Bill is that as a list eleven months old is allowed, those whose names have become qualified to be electors within the eleven months will not have their names on the list. But this applies to all provinces. I use Quebec as an illustration. As the lists are prepared in March if an election takes place in the March following, the list will be eleven months old, and, of course, a certain number of people qualified to vote will be

disfranchised, such as young men who have become of age during the eleven months. But you cannot devise a system that will wholly overcome this difficulty. We have come to the conclusion, and I think rightly, that the system that will do justice to the largest number will be a system of lists prepared at certain periods. It is true that those who become qualified after the preparation of one list and before the preparation of another cannot vote. But this is inevitable.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. The hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) will see that that is an accident——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. LaRivière) has already spoken.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. I thought I had yielded the floor, Mr. Speaker, to the right hon. leader of the House. I was about to say: It would be by mere accident that the list in Manitoba would be available for our elections because it is only made once in four years. If the list is more than a year old, let us take the best steps in order to bring it up to date, if possible.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. You make a new list.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. Well, but, why not shorten the time so as to have the list as close up to date as possible? But, if the right hon. gentleman will not accept the amendment, I shall not press it.

Mr. DAVIN. I wish to say a few words with regard to the third reading.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I see by the Speaker's notes that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) has already spoken.

Mr. DAVIN. I have not spoken on the motion, but on the amendment. I think that the discussion to-day has emphasized what a very crude, self-conflicting, immature and undesirable measure this is. Take, for instance, the confession we have heard from the hon. and learned gentleman. He asks us to accept the franchise in the province of Ontario in regard to which the oath that the voter is to take is not the oath that would really go on all fours with the statute. He admits that that is an undesirable state of things but asks us to accept it. Now, Sir, during the discussion language was held by some hon. gentlemen on the other side, that it would be a very wrong thing for the Senate to throw out the Bill, and the idea was suggested that threats were made from this side. Indeed some persons out of doors used the argument that the Senate would be going outside its function if it were to interfere with this Bill. Well, I have to say that on the face of the Bill it offends, in my opinion, against the constitutional Act under which we carry on the government of this country. But, if that were not the case, we have the precedent before us in the Senate of 1885, when the Hon. Mr. Scott moved the six months' hoist of the Franchise Bill of that day. And you will find that Senator Power, on that occasion, used the constitutional argument. But we have the "Globe" of May 14th actually blaming the Senate because it did not throw out the Bill of 1885. We have the following in an article in the "Globe" of May 14th:

> No iniquity ever passed under the late Conservative Government was frustrated by the Senate. Did the Upper House exert itself to protect the people when the Franchise Act of 1885 was passed, acknowledged by all to be indefensible?

So that here we have the "Globe" of a day or two ago actually laying down the principle that the Senate of Canada would be discharging its duty as a second Chamber if it were to reject a Franchise Bill. So much for the position taken up on the opposite side of the House, that it would be very wrong for the Senate to touch this Bill, which, for my part, I think is a very bad one. I do not make these remarks to suggest to the Senate that they should throw out the Bill. My purpose is merely to show that this paper, the leading organ of the Liberal party in Ontario, has become utterly inconsistent in its utterances, as it has, I am afraid, become entirely lost to the moral standard up to which it acted in the old and great days of George Brown.

Mr. GANONG. I must admit that since the introduction of this Bill, I appreciate the kindly manner in which the Solicitor General receives suggestions from hon. members on this side of the House; and I believe that if he had had greater power, he would have made the concessions that are required in the provinces of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. No better evidence of that can be afforded than the fact that within a few minutes, on the floor of this House, the First Minister states that in order to make this law agreeable to the province of Ontario, in order to do away with some incongruities in the Ontario Act, they will solicit the Government of Ontario to make such changes as will suit that province. Now, I ask the Solicitor General if he would act as kindly towards the provinces of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. Will he and the First Minister agree this evening to solicit the Government of New Brunswick to grant us the concessions that we ask in regard to an appeal to the county court? In fact, I think I may appeal also to the Minister of Railways and Canals, who possibly still has some little say in the provincial affairs of New Brunswick. We have heard the Minister of Railways and Canals and the First Minister say that in no case have the people of New Brunswick found fault with the election law of that province. It is true there have not been a great many objections made to it, but that there have been some grievances there is no question. It is said by hon. gentlemen opposite that as that law

has been in existence for forty years, it must be held to be satisfactory. The conditions in that province, especially during late years, have been somewhat dissimilar to those of other provinces in which federal politics have been an issue; and I think I am able to inform the Minister of Railways and Canals why the amendment was made to the law of New Brunswick in 1897. I question very much if anybody in the House to-day knows the reason of that beside myself. Occasionally names have been left off the lists, and there has been no right of appeal, as the hon. gentleman knows, by which they can be put on. But it chanced that in the parish of St. Stephen, in 1896, not one single name, but a whole sheet of names was left off the list; and the late lamented Hon. James Mitchell, who was then Premier of the province, took the matter in hand and gave those people the right to the franchise. The people themselves appealed to the sheriff, but he was powerless to do anything for them, and for that reason this amendment was made to the Election Act in New Brunswick to cover the case of those thirty or forty names that had been left off the list. It is evident to me that there have been causes of complaint against the local Act. All the people of New Brunswick want, in fact all the great mass of the voters in this country want, is an honest election law, whatever the politicians may desire. At present in New Brunswick the sheriff has power to revise the list. I have nothing to say against the sheriffs of New Brunswick. The sheriff in my county is a Liberal, but I believe he is a good, clean, straight man. I do not think there is a man in our county who can find any fault with Sheriff Stewart. But the appointments are annual appointments, and no one can tell from year to year who we may have as sheriff the next year. As we have had lately a coalition government, the sheriffs have not had any occasion to take sides in politics. But if this law goes into effect, I think there is not a man in New Brunswick but must admit that it will force the sheriffs to go on party lines, and in such event the appointees of the government, whether the government be Liberal or Conservative, are more than likely to favour their own side. I do not wish to detain the House any further than merely to call attention to that defect in the New Brunswick Act.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the third time and passed.

THE POST OFFICE ACT.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock) moved that the House resolve itself into committee on Bill (No. 110) further to amend the Post Office Act.

Mr. FOSTER. I wanted to ask a question of the Postmaster General, I was just going to say the decapitator general. I asked the question from his colleagues on Friday evening after the hon. gentleman had left, but could not get an answer; in fact, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries stated that he could not give me an answer, or something to that effect. I would like the Postmaster General to give his authority in law for the contemplated change, which he supposed was an absolute change, in the rate of postage between Canada and Great Britain and the British possessions. The hon. gentleman, as I understand, doubled the weight and decreased the rate, and in doing that he made a change, of course, in the revenue, and moreover actually took it upon himself to change the rate of postage. I would like to find out what the hon. gentleman's warrant in law was for so doing.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman asked me the question on the motion for the second reading of this Bill. I stated then, and I think I was correct, and I repeat it now, that this is a Bill not having to do with foreign but with domestic postage, and therefore the inquiry is not germane to this motion. I gave the hon. gentleman an answer on that occasion, and that answer is on record. Further than that, I am not at present in a position to go.

Mr. FOSTER. I must press for an answer to the question with all the power that I have. I do not recollect that the hon. gentleman gave me an answer, certainly, that he gave any definite answer; if he had, I should not have asked the question a second time. The hon. gentleman says that this Bill deals with domestic postage, and therefore declines to answer. But I do not think it is a stretch of the right of a member of this House, in view of the statement which has been made by the Postmaster General of what he proposes to do with reference to foreign postage, to ask that we should have this information in discussing this Bill. I think when the question is asked with respect to the executive action of a member of the Government, the ground on which he took that action is a matter under consideration, and ordinary courtesy, to say nothing of the question of the rights of a member, demand an answer. I must appeal to the hon. gentleman the leader of the Government as to whether I am not to obtain that information.

The PRIME MINISTER. The hon. gentleman has certainly the right to ask the question, but this question is not germane to the question under consideration. My hon. friend has given a fair answer to the hon. gentleman, in stating that this Bill belonged only to domestic postage. The hon. gentleman asked a question in regard to foreign postage.

Mr. FOSTER. I think I have the right to press for an answer with respect to an executive act by a member of the Government. I asked upon what authority of law the hon. gentleman founded it. I submit that I have a right to an answer to that question.

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend has answered it over and over again. He said the question is not germane to the subject under discussion. The subject under discussion is domestic postage, whereas the hon. gentleman asks, where is your authority for having done an act on a certain question. My hon. friend has answered, and the hon. gentleman is well aware that there is another way of proceeding, to put a question on the paper.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I suppose after all this unusual action on the part of a member of the Government having charge of a Bill is significant. The fair conclusion to draw from the attitude of the Postmaster General was that he had not any authority. I suppose that is how the public understand it, in view of the course the hon. gentleman has taken, withdrawing from the position he had assumed and inducing his deputy to manage the retreat for him. He was not equal apparently to that part of the task, and that is the real attitude which the hon. gentleman seems to occupy. It is impossible for him to say that he had any authority to do an act from which he had soon to withdraw and abandon very quickly. But I hope the Prime Minister will not sanction the attitude of a member of the Government in restricting so closely and in such a spirit inquiries concerning public matters. This has to do with the Post Office Department and its revenue, and the Bill now before the House covers that head; it is a Bill to amend the Post Office Act, and it affects the postal revenue and the administration of the post office laws. The question could hardly be ruled out of order, and no question of order has yet been submitted to the Chair. The adoption of such a course as is indicated would preclude criticism from this side of the House. I do not think it would be ruled out of order; certainly my recollection extending over a certain number of years is that no similar case can be mentioned where a member sheltered himself from questions relating to his department by pleading that the particular clause before the House was confined to a particular subject in his department. Hon. members will remember the wide range the discussion on railway subsidies took when the means of carrying elections was debated, and many other cases in which the discussion covered a very wide field, and though perhaps out of order, it was allowed to continue. The hon. Minister has to meet this question sooner or later, and he would be in a better position if he met it at the earliest possible moment.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I spent several hours on it the other day when in Supply.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I have looked over "Hansard" and have here the observations which the hon. Minister made, but they do not cover the point. He did not go into an examination of his legal authority and power. I do not think any statement has been made by the hon. gentleman in that regard, and the country will expect from him a definite statement on this matter, and he should avail himself of the opportunity to submit the best case he can to the people. If he has made a mistake, let him admit it; and if he has bowed to some exigencies, of which the country knows nothing, he should explain the facts.

Mr. FOSTER. I had not the least idea——

The PRIME MINISTER. The hon. gentleman has already spoken and we are not in committee.

Mr. FOSTER. If the hon. gentleman wishes to raise the question——

The PRIME MINISTER. I do not object to discussion, but we will be in committee within a few moments, and the discussion will come on more properly then.

Mr. FOSTER. When we get into committee, we will be told on every item that we must confine our remarks to the item. I rose with the very best spirit possible to repeat a question which I asked the Government the other night, in the absence of the Postmaster General, and I thought he would have replied to that question.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I think the hon. gentleman has already made a speech, and he cannot make a second speech now.

Mr. FOSTER. I rose to ask a question.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Some observations were made by the hon. gentleman

Mr. FOSTER. A member has to make observations sometimes to make it plain to the Postmaster General

Mr. TAYLOR. On Friday night, when discussing this question, the hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Ross Robertson) thought it necessary to eulogize the Postmaster General, and he did so to a very great extent, while at the same time he paid a very doubtful compliment to other members of the Government by stating that the Postmaster General had shown some life in the management of his department. That hon. gentleman apparently had some interest in this little Bill, because he is a newspaper publisher, and this Bill makes provision for postage on newspapers.

I want to ask the Postmaster General why in this Bill he is drawing a zone of 10 miles. I suppose it will take in the constituency he has the honour to represent so that his constituents will receive

their papers free. I do not know whether my hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Ross Robertson) will benefit by this arrangement or not, but the Postmaster General just now stated to the ex-Minister of Finance that this Bill simply dealt with local postages. While I am strongly in favour of a 2-cent letter rate I do not want it to be made at the expense of the farmers of this country who read newspapers, nor do I want it made at the expense of the rural population who will be deprived of the postal facilities they have enjoyed for many years. The Postmaster General replied to me the other day that during the past year he had closed 169 post offices, nineteen of which had been reopened, leaving 150 that were closed in the rural districts during the year.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. But I added that a great many more had been opened.

Mr. TAYLOR. The Postmaster General added that 250 had been opened, but under the late Government a larger number than 250 were opened every year and very few, if any, were closed. I know that the Marble Rock post office in my constituency served fifty families, but the postmaster was a Conservative and the mail carrier was a Conservative, and the only way the Postmaster General could dispose of them was to close the post office, and he did so. These fifty families have to travel miles to the nearest post office for their mail, and although he gives them a reduction of a cent on their letters, some of them have to spend a whole day going to the post office. I have received two letters from prominent men in my constituency in reference to the postal service the Postmaster General is now giving in that county. Mr. R. Harvey, miller, of Lyndhurst, writes as follows :—

George Taylor, Esq., M.P.

Our people of Ellisville, Long Point and Sweet's Corners are all up in arms about the change of mail routes. It is a shame to withdraw the daily mail from that section. Mail going to these post offices now lays over in Lyndhurst from Friday until Monday. Here are three cheese factories and a well-settled community of intelligent people placed in a worse condition than if they were in the backwoods.

For years these people enjoyed a daily mail but now they have got it only twice a week. On that route where there are four cheese factories and a thickly-settled community, they are worse off for mail service now than if they were in the backwoods. If my hon. friend (Mr. Mulock) is saving a little money in the post office he is saving it by giving the farmers of this country a very poor mail service. Another gentleman from the same place writes me as follows:—

Mr. George Taylor, M.P.

The questions you asked the Postmaster General and the answers you received give me reason to think it might be well to ask the Postmaster General why the people of Lyndhurst, Sweet's Corners, Long Point, Ellisville and Seeley's Bay were deprived of their daily mail, after enjoying this service for one and one-half years, it is a grievance to lose it. This route is thickly populated, with four cheese factories doing a large business—my own factory brought $11,000 into the neighbourhood last year, and it is an average factory. The township clerk resides on this street, and the change deprives him of the use of the daily mail for the township business. The Postmaster General gives us a tri-weekly, which is no use to us, as it comes on the wrong days and starts from the wrong end of the route. Starting from the point of delivery it starts in the morning before the mail of the day has arrived, then we don't receive that day's mail till the next trip, which is sometimes four days old—take from Friday till Monday ; in fact, it is the worst mail service that can be invented.

I hear the same complaints from one end of my constituency to the other, and I fancy it is a fair sample of what is taking place throughout the Dominion. We have one mail service coming from Seeley's Bay to Gananoque, leaving there in the morning, meeting the trains at Gananoque and taking the mails back. The Postmaster General, in order to get rid of the Tory who had the contract, changed the service at great inconvenience to the people. If the reduction the Postmaster General is making in the mail service has the same effect throughout Canada as in the constituency I have the honour to represent, then I can say that the saving is in the wrong direction, and the farmers of this country will not appreciate his depriving them of the service which they have enjoyed for many years.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I must join issue with the statement made by the right hon. the leader of the House, that the question asked by my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) was not germane to the subject under discussion. I do not think the right hon. gentleman can have been attending to the debate, or else he would not for a single moment take the position that because this is a measure in reference to domestic postage, the question of inter-Imperial postage does not apply. I will tell the right hon. gentleman why. The Postmaster General has submitted a Bill to this House for the avowed purpose of making a reduction upon the domestic postage in Canada, which he assumes will cause a loss of revenue—if there is no material increase in the number of letters carried—of $650,000 a year, and in connection with the introduction of that message he has been good enough to inform the House that the proposed change which he had been prevented from making by finding that he had not the necessary authority, would have caused a further reduction of $50,000 a year in the postal revenue. If the right hon. gentleman had heard the Postmaster General make to the House that statement which deals with the subject of reducing the postage rate not

only in Canada but outside Canada, I cannot believe that he would say that the question of my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) was not entirely germane to the subject under discussion. It is impossible to discuss in a satisfactory manner public questions in this House if hon. gentlemen occupying Cabinet positions assume that this House has not the right, that the humblest member in this House has not a perfect right, to demand the fullest information and explanation in reference to everything that touches the revenues of Canada in connection with the post office or any other department. I would give to my hon. friend another and I think a most conclusive reason why this question is entirely germane to the subject under consideration, and why it is incumbent upon the Postmaster General to enter into the fullest explanation, and that is, he has informed the House that he intended to carry out the object he then had in view and probably to go a good deal further. That was the statement made by the Postmaster General on that question of inter-Imperial postage, the postage between Canada and the other portions of the Empire. I assume that the Government have now had their eyes open to the despotic power which the Postmaster General unfortunately thought he was clothed with, to deal with the question of inter-Imperial postage without consulting his colleagues, without any Order in Council, because he has admitted that he had no Order in Council authorizing him ; and it is time that the right hon. gentleman, finding he has colleagues who are so entirely ignorant—I use the word advisedly —of the duties with which they are charged as to commit the Government to these gigantic errors, should give some little attention to this question, and refuse his support to the Postmaster General when he undertakes to tell the House that he will not give them information absolutely necessary to its consideration of the question of postage reduction. In submitting this Bill to the House, the Postmaster General was bound to give the fullest and most complete information as to what he proposed with regard to the postal revenue of the country. Does my right hon. friend sustain the Postmaster General in his contention that he can put his hand into the consolidated revenue of Canada and take out $50,000 a year without the permission of Parliament ? I am sure he will give no countenance to so monstrous and unparliamentary a proposition. I am sure he will not say that any member of the Cabinet, or the whole Cabinet, could have any right, particularly when Parliament is in session, to intimate their intention to deal with these large and important questions without any reference to Parliament and absolutely refuse to Parliament the information as to how they propose to deal with them. I am not saying one word as to the policy of the proposal which the Postmaster General undertook to carry out. But I say it is a question for Parliament, and not for the Postmaster General to consider, and that he is bound to consult Parliament and to obtain its support before carrying out any suggestion of that kind. I am sure that my right hon. friend will not say that my hon. friend from York (Mr. Foster) has at all gone outside of his right as a member of this House in asking for the fullest information from the Postmaster General. I regret very much that such an attitude should be assumed by the Government. I am satisfied that no Government, where parliamentary institutions exist, would undertake to maintain such an attitude in the face of Parliament. No man is so deeply interested as the Postmaster General in putting before Parliament at the earliest moment, a full and complete explanation of what he undertook to do but found he had no power to do. He is bound to justify his position on that bench. He has no right to sit on that bench for a single hour in face of his inability to give some reason for the extraordinary proceeding he undertook to carry out. The only thing that can justify hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches in asking for the support of their followers is their ability and readiness to give the most full and frank explanation to this House on matters of importance, the first opportunity they have of doing so. The proper moment to give that information was when the Bill was introduced dealing with the postage question. It is impossible, in dealing with the question of postal revenue and charges to draw a line between foreign and domestic postage. It is a question of the effect on the revenue of the country. Whether the policy proposed is sound and just, I am not going to discuss now, because we have not reached that point. But these hon. gentlemen are bound to give the fullest explanation, when they propose to make a charge upon the consolidated revenue of Canada that does not rest upon it to-day. I am sure my right hon. friend will not disagree with me but will admit that if we are to do the business of Parliament in a creditable manner, we will have to do it upon lines altogether different from those laid down by the Postmaster General.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I do not think there is a feature of the Bill before the House which can possibly commend itself to the approval of the people. The Postmaster General undertook to tell us that he found it necessary to cancel contracts and close post offices in order to reduce expenditure and decrease the deficits in the department. Our experience in the country on these changes brought about by the Postmaster General is that they have been brought about at the cost of the convenience of the people, who look to this mail service being conducted in an efficient manner. We find to-day, in sections of the country where the mail service used to be carried regularly by continual stage lines, the mails carried in two-horse wagons are now carried on a two-wheeled buggy or on

horseback or on foot, and broken up into two or three or more separate services. When a serivce is carried on in that way, it is evident that it cannot be satisfactory The hon. gentleman now comes before the House and proposes to impose a postage on newspapers. The imposition of a tax on newspapers means a tax on knowledge. Many who now receive newspapers cannot continue to receive them, because the publisher must charge this tax upon the newspapers he distributes and so increase the price to the subscriber. The hon. Postmaster General laid on the Table of the House a statement prepared, as I understand, on the basis of the circulation of the newspapers of this country, and showing the extent to which the newspapers would have to pay postage under this Bill. I was amused, after examining this statement on Friday last, to hear the remarks of the hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Ross Robertson). That hon. gentleman publishes a paper in Toronto, the "Telegram." The other papers published in that city of which I took note were the "World," the "News," the "Globe" and the "Mail and Empire." I find that on the basis of the calculation made by the Postmaster General, the "Telegram" would have to pay postage to the extent of $161.46. But the "World" will have to pay $2,304.86; the "News," $2,557; the "Mail and Empire," $3,755. Yet the hon. gentleman from East Toronto praises the hon. Postmaster General for this Bill. It is no wonder the hon. gentleman has words of praise for the Postmaster General for a measure which discriminates in favour of his own paper as I have shown. The effects in some other parts of the country will be as follows: In Nova Scotia, the Halifax "Chronicle" will be affected to the extent of $422; the "Halifax Herald," $437; the "Presbyterian Witness," $63; the "North Sydney Herald," $63; and the "Eastern Chronicle," $48. Coming to Montreal, I find that it will affect the "Star" to the amount of $12,187; "La Presse," $8,269; the "Witness," $2,406; the "Gazette," $602; "La Patrie," $839; the "Herald," $642 "La Minerve," $267. Other newspapers throughout the country will be affected in the same way. The Postmaster General will hardly venture to say that this tax upon publishers will not affect the people. And I am sure that, in the face of this statement, the words of the hon. member for East Toronto will not save the head of the Postmaster General. In the imposition of the tax, I cannot see why special favour should be shown to those people who live within ten miles of the office of publication. This means that the longer it takes the newspaper to reach the subscriber and the older it is when it reaches him, the more he has to pay for it. Those living at a distance from the office of publication will be forced to do without the reading of newspapers in a great many instances. The people who live in cities and towns, where delivery is made at the expense of the people, get their mails delivered at their very door. The poor man who lives 20 miles out in the country will have to pay for the delivery of the mail matter of the wealthy man who resides in the city, though, perhaps, he himself must go three or four miles every time he wishes to mail or receive a letter. For these reasons I cannot support the Bill of the Postmaster General.

I have a word or two to say with regard to another feature—the dead letter feature. If there is any part of the mail service that we should insist upon having properly conducted, secretly and without injustice to the public, it is the dead letter service. At present a letter which is not delivered to the person to whom it is addressed, reaches the hands of a confidential officer in the Post Office Department here, is opened, and, if the writer can be identified, it is returned to him. This Bill proposes to put this machinery in the hands of every Tom, Dick and Harry throughout Canada. Take, for instance, the city of Halifax. There is scarcely a man in Halifax who writes letters but is known to the post office officials there. If a letter is mailed at Halifax which, for insufficient address or other reasons must be treated as a dead letter, it is opened there and by a person who is almost sure to know the writer. What confidence can we have that the duties of this branch are discharged in a confidential way. This letter may find its way into the hands of an official appointed in the same way as some of those to whom we may have had to call attention within the last few days, not recommended by any responsible person. At present, a letter, no matter from what part of Canada it comes, finds its way through the proper channels into the hands of the responsible official at Ottawa. There is no disadvantage in sending it to Ottawa, except the delay, and that is only a few days at most. This feature of the Bill will be most injurious and most unpopular, in fact, there is nothing in the Bill to commend it to the good opinion of anybody in this country. I have not heard anybody say a good word for this Bill except the hon. member for East Toronto, and I have give the House the reasons why that hon. gentleman approved so strongly of that measure. The hon. member for East Toronto praised the Postmaster General in these words:

> To be frank, Mr. Speaker, if there is one department of the Government which has shown some signs of life, reform and progress, it is the department presided over by the Postmaster General.

The hon. member, I think, will not find many people in this country who will agree with him. If there is any man in this country charged with the responsibility of conducting the affairs of government, who has given the strongest possible evidence

of being an imitation of the bull in a china shop, it is the Postmaster General. Look at the step that was taken by him with regard to the Imperial postage. He went into that question without examining it. Look at the way he deals with contractors, with postmasters, dismissing $10 postmasters because they dare to go to the poll and vote, as he supposes, for some one who is opposed to him in politics. A postmaster is dismissed who keeps his office in the most convenient place in the district, and another one is appointed who keeps his office where the people have to go several miles further. So it is with every part of the work undertaken by the Postmaster General; and I therefore move that the debate be adjourned.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I do not wish to be at all severe with the Postmaster General, but it seems to me a very extraordinary procedure on his part to refuse to reply to the questions which were properly submitted to him, according to the rules of the House, and which are of the greatest possible importance to the country. Now, why is it that in England, as in Canada, the administration is divided into several departments? It is in order that the head of each department, possessing the confidence of the people, may be able to acquire the experience necessary to administer the affairs of his department, and be able to reply to such questions as my hon. friend from York has put to the Postmaster General. We are here for the purpose of obtaining information, and it is impossible, under the constitutional system which obtains in Canada, for the hon. gentleman to sit there and refuse to reply to the question which has been put to him by the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster). Sir, I would ask also how it is that the hon. gentleman should attempt to change, without consulting Parliament, and regardless of the Berne Convention, the rate of foreign postage. I have discussed on a former occasion the terms of the Berne convention, and how the hon. gentleman violated those terms, or proposed to do so, in his famous order, I pointed out to the hon. gentleman that this was a treaty entered into, not by Canada alone, but by all the powers who were parties to that convention, and unless you break the convention in accordance with the procedure indicated therein, it is impossible for the hon. gentleman to attempt—to say nothing of carrying it out—because I knew he could not carry it out—but to attempt to change the postage upon foreign letters. Now, there is much more harm done by the course taken by the hon. gentleman than would appear by those who have not thoroughly gone into the matter. The Postmaster General, finding out his mistake, issued to the postmasters all over the Dominion an order to make up the deficiency which existed as between the rate of the Berne Convention postage and the new rate which the hon. gentleman ordered to be placed upon foreign letters. He knows that the postmasters all over the country have to account to his department, and his department to the Government, and the Government to the country for postage stamps, as postage is a matter affecting the revenue. For instance, a postmaster comes to the department from the country and asks for $100 worth of postage stamps, and he gets them. But what occurred after the hon. gentleman issued his new order breaking up the Berne Convention? The hon. gentleman knows that it was opening the door to any number of frauds. It was impossible for the department to check the postage which was going from that department, and which had to be accounted for by the postmasters throughout the country. For this reason, the hon. gentleman issued an order stating that the deficiency between the 5 cents per ounce (Berne Convention rate), and the 3 cents per half ounce (the Mulock rate), should be made up. Now, how could the hon. gentleman check the amount of postage which the postmasters would choose to call postage, which they paged to make up the deficiency in consequence of the order given by the Postmaster General? Postmasters from the country come and get $100 worth of postage stamps. The Postmaster General, at the end of the month, when the report comes in, says to the postmaster: What has become of the $100 worth of postage stamps which I gave you? They may say we have spent $50 to make up the difference between the letters which should have paid 5 cents and those which were mailed at the rate of 3 cents per half ounce. Those men may not have put a one cent stamp on any letter deficient in postage, and still it is impossible for the hon. gentleman to find out whether they had paid or not, and consequently a man might be able to put $50 in his pocket without the Postmaster General being able to trace it. The hon. Minister has made a mistake, and why should he not admit it. He has made more than one mistake. He made a great mistake in depriving himself of the valuable advice of his deputy, who had been trained almost from childhood up in the Imperial post office, and who knew every branch of the service and every technicality. The hon. Minister wanted to surround himself with political friends, and he did so. I have nothing to say against the present incumbent of the office, except one thing: he was a medical man, who may have been a very excellent doctor, but he knew no more about the great and complicated Post Office Department than if the hon. gentleman had taken a child from the street and put him in there. The old deputy would have prevented the hon. Minister interfering with the Berne Convention, and would have shown him the impossibility of interfering with a signed

treaty, which was recognized by the whole civilized world, and he would have told the hon. Minister the danger he was incurring in issuing a personal order telling the postmasters: I have made a mistake, but I am going to let you make up for that mistake by using the money of Canada to put stamps on letters without accounting for them to the country or to the department. That is a point the importance of which cannot be exaggerated. It is impossible for any man who has been so long in Parliament as the hon. gentleman and myself to ignore this fact, that if this policy can prevail, if a Cabinet Minister can issue an order handing over the revenue of Canada without reference to Parliament, the sooner we close these parliamentary halls and allow a committee of hon. gentlemen opposite to run the country, the better it will be, for we will save a large amount of money and obtain as much information as we have secured to-night. The hon. member for York, N.B. (Mr. Foster) asked the Postmaster General if he would be good enough to tell him, according to his own light and view, upon what ground he acted when he issued that order. That is a fair question. The hon. Minister should be quite pleased that the hon. member had given him an opportunity of explaining this extraordinary proceeding on his part. But he will not take it in good part; he sits there and will not give any information. Why should not the hon. Minister furnish to Parliament openly and in a manly way full information? The hon. gentleman has found out he made a mistake, and he has made a larger mistake in permitting postmasters, irresponsible to any one except himself, to pay money from the public chest, to use the money of Canada for making up the mistakes which the hon. gentleman has committed. This Bill, I say, is unworkable. The decentralization of the dead letter office will cause more trouble, more annoyance to the public and business men than can be imagined, and it is impossible for me to believe that the hon. gentleman in the large commercial centres, such as Montreal, Toronto, Hamilton and Quebec should allow clerks in the post office to open the correspondence of commercial men, and after reading it return it to the man whom the letter had been addressed. I am making these observations from my sense of duty to the commercial community and the department over which I presided for a good many years. At the present time the dead letter office in Ottawa is presided over by a man who is thoroughly known as being a confidential man and is educated in his branch. He has under him clerks who open letters coming from points from Halifax to British Columbia, and those clerks do not know the people whose names are signed to the letters. But look at the difference between the present system and that proposed. Take the city of Montreal. The postmaster there is not supposed to be a technical man; he takes very little personal interest in the business of the department. Hence half a dozen young clerks would be opening letters from great commercial houses to see whether they should be sent to this or that man. If they are sent to the dead letter office at Ottawa one difficulty at least is avoided: the letters are not placed in the hands of people who know the men connected with the business treated of in the letters. I do not wish to make a motion in this matter, and I do not wish to do more than express my opinion to the Postmaster General that if this Bill had been kept over until next session, when the hon. gentleman and his new deputy would have had time to acquire experience in the department, to take up these questions and deal with them in a practical manner, it would have been a wiser course to have adopted, for hon. members must come to the conclusion that this Bill is unworkable, and I think the Postmaster General should be the first to abandon it.

Mr. FOSTER. I am sorry to be obliged to take up a little time to give reasons why the debate should be adjourned. I cannot understand how any leader of a Government could do a thing so inexpressibly stupid as to stand by one of his colleagues in flatly denying information to a member of this House. I have sat in Parliament a good many years, I have studied parliamentary history, and I have always proceeded on the assumption that the people's representatives had some rights in this deliberative body, that it was one of the bounden duties of the committee, which led and administered for the time being the Government of the country, to give the people's representatives the information which they asked and which they thought should be acquired.

What are we met with to-day? We are met with this position set up by the Postmaster General, and behind him stands the right hon. gentleman who leads the Government: that it is just within the will of the head of a department whether he shall treat a member of Parliament as a human being or not, whether he shall treat him as the representative of electors just as good in point of morals, in point of position and in point of ability, as the hon. member who, for the time being, has the executive charge of a department; whether he shall treat him as having rights in this House, or whether a despotism all the more despicable in this nineteenth century shall be set up by one member of the Government, and shall be displayed towards a free and independent House such as this is, in a country like Canada. I protest against it, Sir, and I state again that I do not see how any leader of a Government could have been led for a moment into doing so expressly stupid a thing as to stand at the back of one of his colleagues in a position of that

kind. Now, Sir, what is the position? This hon. gentleman who is Postmaster General seems to think that when any question is asked, or when any information is required, somebody wishes to prod and taunt the person who sits in that seat. Not at all. The person is altogether too insignificant to have so much of the attention of the House drawn to him as that. Fortunately we have a Postmaster Generalship in this House, and it is the Postmaster Generalship that attracts this attention, and if the gentleman who is the Postmaster General for the time being makes the mistake of thinking that everything is directed against him as a person, and does not have to do with the department as a department, it is a mistake that must be condoned in some persons, but it is all the same a mistake and a fault. Now, Sir, I am going to give reasons, and they will be somewhat lengthy, as to why I think this debate should be adjourned. The right hon. gentleman who leads the Government was present the other night, and he heard the debate going along by question and answer, and discussion on this very point that I have asked for information about to-night. Was domestic postage the only thing that was talked of for the four or five hours during which this debate lasted. No, Sir, but cognate with that the whole question of the power of the Postmaster General was discussed, the whole question of his administrative action—no, of his administrative blunder into which a child fifteen years of age should not have been led—was discussed and thoroughly discussed. And both of these subjects went together as cognate subjects, and neither on the part of my right hon. friend who leads the Government, nor on the part of any member of this House, was there any cavil as to whether the House was within its right or not in discussing this question. Why, Sir, here is a gentleman who proposes a tremendously important Bill to this House. When he proposes a Bill to this House, I do not suppose that it is wisdom from on high that has come down and embalmed itself in the two or three clauses of the Act. I suppose it is an emanation from the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) himself and his advisers. But as to his advisers. The hon. gentleman got rid of one of the best of his advisers, one of the oldest of his advisers, a man who knew the post office business of this country from A to Z, by long and practical experience as well as by an apprenticeship which few men in this country have had. But the hon. gentleman who took for the time being the Postmaster Generalship of Canada did not want any peculiar and technical knowledge in his department. A man who was a medical officer in his own county, a man who had supported him strongly, could be pitch-forked right into that position, and because the fiat of such a man as the Postmaster General went forth, could be invested immediately and absolutely, with all the knowledge that was necessary to conduct the Post Office Department of Canada in its relation to all the postal countries in the world. Well, Sir, when this hon. gentleman brings down a Bill I have to remember that he has denuded himself of his best counsel and advice, and so I am not predisposed to take his measure as being the exponent of all the wisdom that is possible in post office matters. Again, Sir, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) has put himself in a false position, a most unenviable position, a most humiliating position, before this House and before this country as an administrator. He pretended to do a thing which he had not the power to do, which he could not do, which he did not do, and which up to this date he has been powerless to do. How do I know but that the same crass lack of knowledge is incorporated in this Bill. I am suspicious that it is. I think it is well that this debate should be adjourned until we should know just all about the sources of information on which was based the executive action, or proposed executive action, of the Postmaster General. What did he propose to do? "I, William Mulock," proposed to do something. The Government of Canada did not propose it. How do I know? I know it from the hon. gentleman's own lips, for he said there was no Order in Council authorizing him. How do I know? I know it because I asked his colleague, the lawyer of the party—outside of my hon. friend the Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick), who is the official lawyer of the party, but is not in the Cabinet, as the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is. I know it because the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, an able man and an able lawyer, had to answer me, that he knew really nothing as to the ground upon which the Postmaster General acted. The same despotic feature ran through all this. Oh, no need of a man who is versed by twenty or thirty years of knowledge in the Post Office Department for advice and counsel. No need of the counsel of the Justice Department of Canada. Am "I, William Mulock," not a lawyer myself? No need of consultation with thirteen gentlemen who might be presumed to be every one of them just as full of knowledge as myself. "I, William Mulock," propose to turn the Postal Convention upside down, and to say what shall be the postage that Canadians shall pay for their letters; to say how much shall be taken away from the revenues of this country, and "I, William Mulock," will do it at my own sweet will. "I, William Mulock," tried to do that, but "I, William Mulock," soon found the length of the tether by which he was bound, and his contemplated action did not take place? Now, Sir, does the right hon. gentleman who leads the Government pretend to tell me that when an official of that kind brings down

a proposition to this Parliament, that we have not the right to ask him to explain the blunder he made. Or, if he did not make a blunder, to be kind enough and condescending enough to get off that almighty pedestal that he stands or sits upon so much of the time and condescend to inform poor, weak, frail human creatures like myself and other members of Parliament, as to the ground upon which he did it. Is that a question which should not be asked? Is that a piece of information which we should not have? The leader of a Liberal Government refuses to Parliament an answer to a question as to the administrative action of one of its members; refuses in that high and mighty and airy way as much as to say: What dust are you made of that you should ask a question of that kind from me, William Mulock? So I say, Sir, that before the hon. gentleman is entrusted to go into committee with this proposition he should give us some explanation as to that other proposition which proved so abortive. Why? For another reason, Sir. The hon. gentleman does not propose to make decisive legislation. He proposes to go on and to say that on a certain occasion and under a certain conjunction of the circumstances, "I, William Mulock," may reduce the postage rates from 3 cents to 2 cents. I do not trust you members of Parliament behind me and you members of Parliament on the other side to say when this should come into effect and when the rate should be two cents. Oh, no; "I, William Mulock" am the man who is to state that. And "I, William Mulock" keep that back to some indefinite time, about the time when there is an election, I suppose, in Centre Toronto, about the time that some stress of circumstances, political and in a party sense, arises, whereupon out will come that proclamation, thundered in Bonaerges tones by the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson), who is the Postmaster General's locum tenens, in the meantime, to carry out his behests, when this stress of circumstances comes on. On this ground we have a perfect right to know why it is and on what ground it was that the Postmaster General proposed his Act which culminated in a blunder. And the right hon. gentleman who leads this House—a man who has declared that he is a Liberal of the Liberals, after the school of the English Liberals—stands up at the back of this recalcitrant Minister in his refusal to inform Parliament when it requires information. This is more than mortal blood can stand. It is more than the Opposition have bargained for. It is more than a Liberal Government ever should allow; and I am surprised that there is the amount of quietude that there seems to be behind the Government benches on an important matter of principle like this. I had no design at all of entering into this interesting discussion. I had no design other than finding out what the grounds were upon which this was done, but I found a lion in my path, and I must needs give certain arguments yet to show why I think that lion should be removed.

Here is another argument. The hon. gentleman, who to-day is Postmaster General, is a man of fads. He has so demonstrated himself, and I am not certain but that he was just making a bid for effect when he put that proclamation of "I, William Mulock" forth on an admiring public. I recollect the time when that same gentleman used to hunt with the hare and run with the hounds. I recollect when he used to go around the concession lines with the Patrons and declare that every economy the Patron was in favour of, he, William Mulock, was in favour of and much more. I have heard him declare, in the choicest vice-chancellor language, that the Governor General's salary was too big and ought to be made smaller. I have heard that hon. gentleman thunder upon this subject; I have heard him play to the gallery upon it. "I, William Mulock," the apostle of economy, will preach my gospel, not amongst poor men, but in high places, and not even the Queen's representative shall daunt me, William Mulock. I will go right into the vice-regal residence and beard the lion in his lair, and reduce the salary of the highest functionary in the land. "I, William Mulock" for the sake of economy, out of my love for the dear Patrons, and my adhesion to high principle, which have always been and shall always be my high characteristics, will do this. More than that, this hon. gentleman thundered many times against the extravagance of paying Cabinet Ministers $7,000 a year and travelling expenses. He declared that this country ought to be run by Ministers who would be willing to take $4,000 a year—and they would be expensive at that, if they were of the type of "I, William Mulock," so far as the administrative business of this country is concerned.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I do not think the hon. gentleman should refer always to the hon. Postmaster General by name.

Mr. FOSTER. I am simply making a quotation, and a most excellent quotation.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman made a quotation once from the proclamation issued by the hon. Minister, but he is continually referring to the hon. Minister by name, apart from the quotation.

Mr. FOSTER. And I do not propose that any Speaker in any House shall tell me how often I shall use a quotation.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman should withdraw the expression he has used with regard to the Speaker. He has not the right to refer to the Speaker in any such manner.

Mr. FOSTER. I shall withdraw any expression that grates on your feelings, Sir, but I would always ask you to remember that there are bounds beyond which, even as Speaker, you should not pull up a member.

Mr. McGREGOR. The hon. gentleman ought to keep himself within bounds.

Mr. FOSTER. I hope my hon. friend will do so and not interrupt. I make the amende honourable to you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, with perfect heartiness, if I have offended what you think is proper parliamentary decorum, but I do hold to the opinion that it is rather hard lines to pull a member up for using a quotation.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I allowed the hon. gentleman several times to make the quotation he did. But now he is applying the name of "William Mulock" to every phase of the political life of the hon. Minister, and I do not think that is in order. I therefore ask the hon. gentleman not to continue using that expression, and I think that, as an old parliamentarian, he will observe my ruling.

Mr. FOSTER. I have always prefaced the words "William Mulock" with the word "I," and would not so far forget myself as to leave out that "I," because I think the three go together in a very intimate sense, and therefore I have quoted them together. There was a time when the hon. gentleman, who is now Postmaster General, thought that Cabinet Ministers would be right rarely well paid if they got $4,000 a year, and if there were a great many less of them. And I think the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) was rather a good seconder to the present Postmaster General on that line and those principles. I shall not go any further in giving the different fads that the Postmaster General, before he became a Minister, held up to the admiring gaze of his friends in the country. All of them I have called fads—why? Because as soon as the hon. gentleman got into a position of power, where he could give life to them, if they were really held as principles, we found him utterly and entirely silent with regard to every one of them. Not a single one has he ventured to put into enactment or call into life since he has become the powerful member of a powerful Government, so that I am led to the conclusion that the attempt of the hon. gentleman to put in force the low postage rate to Great Britain and British possessions was also in the line of playing to the gallery, and that in his desire and haste to play to the gallery he forgot to look at the plainest dictates of the law. What I asked the hon. gentleman was why he proposed such action, the grounds upon which he proposed it. I have gone very carefully over the Post Office Act. I suppose that the Postmaster General is bound by the law as well as every other member of the Administration. I find that in the Post Office Act, as far as I can see it as a layman, it is laid down absolutely what shall be the postage upon letters and parcels and the like in the Dominion. I find that three cents shall be the postage for a letter anywhere in Canada, and I do not find that the Postmaster General, within the bounds of this Act, has any power or authority to say that that postage shall be other than three cents for half an ounce, as the laws lays it down here.

Does the Post Office Act give the Postmaster General the power to change the postage on domestic letters? If so, all I asked was that the Postmaster General should point it out. Does the Act give him the power, of his own motion to change the postage upon letters which go from Canada to Great Britain. I cannot find it within this Act; and I asked the Postmaster General if it exists there that he would kindly point it out. Now, I find that, in the first place, as regards the rate of postage, that this Post Office Act declares what the rates of postage are and, in no case does it give the Postmaster General, so far as I can find out, any authority to vary these rates of postage of his own motion. I find also that, with reference to foreign postage outside of Canada there is this clause:

> Notwithstanding anything herein contained, all letters, newspapers and other mailable matter passing by mail between any place in Canada and the United Kingdom, any British possession, or any foreign country, shall be liable to such charges and rates of postage on being posted in Canada, on delivery therein, and be subject to such regulations and conditions as are agreed upon under any arrangement made by the Postmaster General for the transmission, despatch, receipt and delivery of the same, and contained in any regulation made by the Postmaster General in pursuance of such arrangement.

Now, I am not a lawyer, but I take the plain meaning of that to be that the Postmaster General cannot make regulations or fix the rate of postage as between Canada and Great Britain or any foreign country, except in pursuance of an arrangement by himself, as Postmaster General of Canada and representing Canada, with England, with the British possessions, or with the foreign country. Now, Sir, the circumstances point to the fact that there was no arrangement made by the Postmaster General; and the very moment that Great Britain heard that he proposed of his own motion to make a change in the postal rate, that very moment the British Government, through Mr. Chamberlain, and its Post Office Department cried a halt. Now, there are other powers given to the Postmaster General under the Post Office Act. If there is, the Postmaster General can point it out. If it exists, what objection had he to point it out and save this whole discussion? And, if it does not exist, why should he not in a

manly way acknowledge it and say, I was a little too hasty; my motives were good, but I based my action on a mistaken idea of the powers I possessed. Now, I asked the Postmaster General if he would bring down a copy of the Berne Convention, and copies of the instructions he sent to the postmasters of Canada when he attempted to put this clause into operation. Is that information that this House ought to have? Is a member outside of his rights when he asks for such information? There was a motion made for it and for all the correspondence with Great Britain as well. But the whole motion was denied because the negotiations, the hon. gentleman said, were still on. That could not cover the instructions the Postmaster General sent to postmasters in Canada which we have a right to see in order that we may know how far they went. Nor does it cover the instructions which cancelled the first instructions. We wish to see how far they went. We wish to see also the instructions to enable postmasters to keep out of difficulties the too confiding letter senders sending insufficiently prepaid letters. We have a right to all this. Does any member of the Government dispute that right? Why are these papers not here when this Bill is being discussed, when, a few days ago, when the discussion was up before, we asked for this information. Will the right hon. gentleman who leads the Government back up the Postmaster General in refusing to give us the instructions he sent, in trying to carry out the arrangement he made, to the postmasters of this country? Amongst those would be instructions with reference to what should be done with unpaid or insufficiently paid letters. I find, with reference to such letters this clause in the Act:

> Whenever letters or other mailable matter are posted for places without the limits of Canada, to which stamps for prepayment are affixed of less value than the true rate of postage to which such letters are liable, or when stamps for prepayment are affixed to letters addressed to any places, as aforesaid, for which prepayment cannot be taken in Canada, the Postmaster General may——

And here are his powers. He may do what?

> ——may forward such letters charged with postage as if no stamp had been thereto affixed; and when any letter or other mailable matter is posted in Canada without prepayment, or insufficiently prepaid, in any case in which prepayment is by this Act made obligatory, the Postmaster General may detain the same and cause it to be returned, when practicable, to the sender.

Is there any other authority for the Postmaster General with reference to insufficiently prepaid letters. If there is, I asked for it. If it exists, why could not the Postmaster General give me the information and save all this discussion? But my opinion is that there is no authority. What did the Postmaster General do? He issued orders to take the revenues of Canada to which he had no right, for which he had no Parliamentary appropriation, for which he had no Governor General's warrant—and they have been pretty easily obtained within the last two or three years—without having any money current or under the statute that he could devote to that object. He absolutely interfered with the moneys of the country, with the postage stamps which are the moneys of the country; just the same, Sir, as if he had been the Finance Minister and had presumed to go down to the printing and engraving office or into the offices of the controller of currency and direct how $200 or $300 worth of these bills should be disposed of. He had no more right to lay his hand on a single postage stamp than he had to lay his hand on a dollar bill issued as part of the currency of the country. That is, I cannot find any clause of the statute under which he had the right. But he did lay his hands on the postage of the country—to a small extent, he says. And he treats it with an air of cynical carelessness. It might be $90 or $100—it was $91, to be exact. But if the Postmaster General, as a member of the Government, could lay his hands on the revenues of the country to the extent of $91, why, Constitutional Government is a myth in this country under the present regime. And the next thing we shall have, when we get a person so minded at the head of the Finance Department—I cannot think such a thing of my hon. and genial looking friend the present Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding)—will be that he will lay hands on the dollar bills and five dollar bills that are the currency of this country. He could do one just as well as the other. Why not? If there is any authority whereby he can dispose of the postage stamps of the country to the extent of a single dollar, any differently than from what I can—that is, go and buy them and then do what he likes with them—why cannot the Postmaster General tell us what his authority is, and save all this discussion?

He refuses to give the information in either the one or the other. Now, if there is any authority—I am speaking now to the Solicitor General, my brother jurist, high enough up in the profession to draw me with him—and I want to ask the Solicitor General if there is any authority for the Postmaster General interfering with the postage of the country, and if there is not, what he proposes, as the legal custodian of the Government, to do about it. Will he prefer a bill of indictment against the Postmaster General? If any clerk were to embezzel $25 of his employer's money, he would be hauled before the court. Will the Solicitor General tell me what difference there is between that and the Postmaster General laying his hands upon the postage stamps of the country and disposing of them as he thinks best? If there is any authority in law, why cannot the Postmaster General tell us where it is

to be found? Why should he keep me here speaking, and keep hon. gentlemen listening, when, by a single citation of authority, he could stop all this discussion and satisfy my laudable curiosity, a curiosity in which I propose to persist until I find the reasons and grounds of the action of the Postmaster General in this matter. I say again that it is the right of every member of Parliament to have information with reference to the executive acts of the Government, so far as it is asked reasonably, and I have asked in no other way. I have asked him for the authority for disposing, by his own act, of the postage stamps of this country to the extent of $91—to be exact, as the hon. gentleman says. There are 8,000 post offices in this country. How is he to tell just how many postage stamps have been put to the use of paying the insufficiently prepaid letters which, under his proclamation heralded everywhere, the people were sending for 3 cents per ounce instead of the old rate? What I want to ascertain is the authority of the Postmaster General for interfering with the postage stamps to any amount. He has no more authority over the disposition of the postage stamps than I have. He is the head of his department, and the law is superior to him, and unless the law gives him absolute right to take $91 worth of postage stamps, he has no more right to do it than I have. I want to know from the Solicitor General when he is prepared to bring down that Bill of indemnity in order to get the Postmaster General out of the difficulty which it seems he is in. Now, Sir, finally and lastly, in the sunniest way of conciliation, I appeal to the right hon. gentleman who leads the Government, to put a stop to this despotic policy of the Postmaster General, and to advise him to treat the members of this House as fellow-men, to explain to him that when we ask for information which is within our right, it is the best and quickest way of getting business through to give that information.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am not at all surprised that hon. gentlemen opposite criticise so fiercely the general course of the Postmaster General. If there is any Minister in the Government that deserves the unanimous thanks of the people of this Dominion for the manner in which he has handled the department over which he presides, it is the Postmaster General. When we compare the manner in which that department was handled under the control of hon. gentlemen opposite with the manner in which it is controlled now, it is clearly evident that a masterhand now presides over that department, and that its affairs have been well handled down to this moment. Intimations have been made to this House with regard to the reductions that have been made in contracts that were let by hon. gentlemen opposite, contracts which, when they came to be revealed, were a positive scandal to hon. gentlemen opposite, contracts where mails were let at $25,000 a year and reduced to one-third of the amount; in other cases where they were let for $7,000 a year, and reduced to about one-third the amount. Contracts were given throughout the Dominion to individuals that were the heelers and followers, and servants of hon. gentlemen opposite, in return for services rendered. And now that these contracts have been placed upon an honest and fair basis, let by open competition to the lowest tenderer, and that the department has been cleansed of impurity and extravagance, and placed upon such a creditable basis, it is no wonder that hon. gentleman opposite assail the Postmaster General so fiercely. The ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) has laboured for nearly an hour to extract from the Postmaster General the reason why he took a certain course with regard to a certain matter, and under what authority he acted. He says that the Postmaster General put his hand into the Dominion treasury and extracted $91 of the people's money for an improper purpose. Now, let us go back a little, and look over the history of this country. Let us go back to the time when the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) was Minister of Finance of this Dominion. I remember when this House laboured a whole night we tried, we coaxed, we urged the Minister of Finance of that day to give us an account of the moneys that he had himself spent in England in placing upon the market the last loan that he placed. Still he sat upon his pedestal of dignity, and for hours and hours refused to give us any information, and we have never learned to this day what became of the thousands of dollars he spent when he was there. But to-night he thinks he has got the Postmaster General on a mere paltry sum of $91, and insists that the Postmaster General put his hand into the Dominion chest and extracted and misapplied that money. My hon. friend says that when we sat on this side of the House we urged that there should be a reduction in the salary of Ministers. So we did, because we thought that the Dominion were paying too much for the services that were rendered by the late Government. But now, when we come to consider the improved condition of things in this Dominion, I think the people of this country are of the opinion that the Ministers of the present Government deserve every dollar that is paid to them. Why, Sir, the people would rather pay each one of the Minister $7,000 over again, than allow the hon. gentlemen opposite to take their places.

In view of the fact that our receipts were declining and shrinking, and there were evidences right and left of poverty, $7,000 was an excessive salary to pay each Minister who was so poorly handling the affairs of the country, and bringing about the conditions that prevailed, and $4,000 would have been too much for the country to pay

as reaping no advantage from their services. An improved condition has been brought about, particularly in the department presided over by the Postmaster General, and there is not a Minister, I do not exclude even the First Minister, who has merited more fully the thanks and gratitude of the people for his efforts to put the department on an efficient basis than the Postmaster General, who has saved the country $600,000 or $700,000 a year, and who has intimated that if he is spared to conduct the affairs of the department and carry out the reforms instituted he will make the department self-supporting in less than a year and a half. That is why hon. gentlemen opposite are "going for him" so bitterly. They feel that the hon. gentleman has made a record by the reductions he has carried out and the exposures he has made, and they feel moreover that the manner in which he has handed the department is a standing condemnation of the manner in which they handled the departments when in control. The people know, and they are viewing with approbation the efforts made by the Postmaster General and other members of the Cabinet on behalf of the public, and it is not much wonder the ex-Finance Minister worked himself into a frenzy over this matter. The hon. gentleman declared that $91 had been misappropriated; he said the Minister had misappropriated $91. Will the hon. gentleman, even years afterwards, at this late stage, get up in his place and tell us what he did with that money for which he never accounted to this House that he expended in placing a loan on the London market? Will he make that explanation now? It was more than $91, more than $191, more than $291. Where did it go? Did we ever get a voucher for it?

Mr. FOSTER. Will the hon. gentleman allow me a moment?

Mr. McMULLEN. I will take the hon. gentleman's answer with satisfaction now.

Mr. FOSTER. I will tell the hon. gentleman what I will do with him. If he will demand the very same from the leader of the House for the $7,000 given him in the last estimate, or if he will ask the opinion of the present Minister of Trade and Commerce, who sat down on him and some other inquiring minds with the declaration that Minister's expenditures in making loans were not to be inquired into, and bring all these matters out, I will come up to time.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. gentleman should remember the adage that people who live in glass houses should not throw stones at their neighbours. The hon. gentleman has had a history that is not by the square and plumb line. He has not followed the principles he has enunciated to-night. If he had a clean sheet, he could perhaps give advice to other men. But who gives him the right to rise and make insinuations and charges. All Ministers are liable to make errors. I do not know whether the Postmaster General made an error or not. I have to say this, that the evidences of ability and statesmanship, the manner in which he handles his department to the satisfaction of the people of the country, the manner in which he has cleaned out that stable of corruption which he found in the department and purged and purified it, and placed it on an economical and proper basis, and is determined to make an earnest endeavour to render it self-sustaining—these facts should offset a little inaccuracy connected with the expenditure of a paltry $91. The ex-Finance Minister has made a great to-do over very little, and if hon. gentlemen opposite think they are going to make an impression on the electors by adopting and pursuing such tactics and causing a row over a miserable matter of this kind, they are very much mistaken.

Mr. BENNETT. To hon. members on this side of the House who have been for some time past anxiously looking forward to the prorogation of the House, it is a matter of deep regret that the senatorship for Ontario has not been filled. So long as the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) is a suppliant for the vacancy which exists, so long may we expect him to come to the rescue of the Postmaster General, because the people of Ontario know the gift of that senatorship lies with the Postmaster General because it is in his district. It is really amusing to the House and must be so to the public to see the contortions, if I may so call them, of the hon. member for North Wellington. It will be remembered that when the Yukon Bill came down there was a vacancy in the Lieutenant-Governorship of the North-west Territories, a position which naturally would be in the gift of the Minister of the Interior, and no hon. gentleman on that side came to the rescue of the hon. Minister more earnestly than did the hon. member for North Wellington. Why, that hon. gentleman was in advance of the Bill being presented, he advising that it should be passed, and he did so while the Minister of Justice in the adjoining Chamber told the Senate that perhaps they might not be expected to pass the Bill then before this House. But the dream of a Lieutenant-Governor's position passed away from the hon. Minister. I do not know what was the objection raised by the Minister of the Interior. Perhaps he thought the hon. gentleman would not with courtly demeanour grace the position, and so he has given it to the hon. gentleman whom we see opposite smiling to-night, and who during the past two weeks has been receiving congratulations from members of the House.

Mr. CAMERON. The hon. gentleman is barking up the wrong tree again.

Mr. BENNETT. I never said it was the member for West Huron. I never imagined that that democrat of democrats would grace such a position, the man who stood in this Parliament for thirty years, who from his place had inquiringly asked who certain gentlemen in the Cabinet were, making it appear that they were utter strangers to him, that they were unfit for their position, and that he, the member for West Huron, should grace one of those positions.

Mr. CAMERON. I never said such a thing.

Mr. BENNETT. It is quite true he never will—it was never intended he should do so. If it is a fact that the hon. member for West Huron is not to be Lieutenant-Governor for the North-west Territories, then a lot of congratulations have been wasted on the hon. gentleman. Whether he is to be Lieutenant-Governor or not, there is one thing certain, and it is that the hon. member for North Wellington is not to be, and now he is not an aspirant for the vacant senatorship in Ontario which practically lies in the hollow of the hand of the Postmaster General. So to-night we hear the remarkable statement of the hon. member for North Wellington that the acts and deeds performed by the Postmaster General should be heralded and applauded. Does the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) applaud the idea that one of the most capable Deputy Ministers in the whole service should be superannuated when at the same time there was another Deputy Postmaster General drawing superannuation allowance. It is a notorious fact to-day that no Government supporter outside of the House will say that he honestly believes that the superannuation of Col. White can be justified. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) tells us to-night that it was right and proper that the efficient postmaster at Kingston should be retired to the superannuation list, and a man his senior in years placed in his position. I could see the gleam of laughter on the faces of hon. gentlemen opposite as the hon. member (Mr. McMullen) thundered away in defence of the Postmaster General, for every one knows that the goal of the ambition of the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) is the Senate, and that he is after that Ontario vacancy which so many to-day are now in quest of. If the hon. the Premier wishes to curtail discussion in this House, he will relegate the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) to the Upper Chamber. It was not the sum of $91 that was in question to-night, but it was a question of principle, and as we know the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) is a stranger to principle. He called it a paltry sum of $91, and in discussing paltry matters he was entirely at home, for was he not the gentleman who searched through the Auditor General's Report to find the cost of laundrying the towels at Rideau Hall, and denounced the expenditure. Was it not his eagle eye that discovered how many napkins were used in the household of a previous Governor General; was he not always to the fore in discussing paltry and trivial expenditures? I do not wonder that his colleagues laughed at him to-night. Now, Sir, I can see no reason why the Postmaster General should not place the House in possession of the information asked for by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster). The Postmaster General must come down to his position as a servant of the people. He must realize that he is not any higher and mightier than any other member of this House. While the hon. member for North Wellington was speaking of the great value of the present Postmaster General, I noticed the sardonic smiles that floated over the faces of hon. gentlemen opposite, who wondered what train of circumstances had placed that hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) on the front benches, while they have been relegated to the back, and when the Postmaster General was receiving his well merited castigation from the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster), I noticed that it was not relished half so well on this side of the House as it was by some hon. gentlemen on the other side. The questions asked the Postmaster General are pertinent to the administration of his department, and if he wishes to have this Bill passed, if he wishes to have his Estimates passed, if he wishes to have every matter that comes within the purview of his department passed, he cannot expect that it will be approved by this House unless he changes his manner, nor can he expect to receive the same treatment from gentlemen here as they extend to other Ministers, who act in a courteous manner, and whom gentlemen on this side of the House assist rather than retard in the conduct of public business.

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend (Mr. Bennett) has spoken somewhat feelingly, and in this I cordially agree with him, upon the advisability of having prorogation at some early date. The season is far advancing, and I suppose it is the wish of members on both sides of the House that they may be enabled to give up their attention to public business and return to the management of their private affairs. We are making no progress to-night. Here is a Bill which has for its object the reduction of the postage. I think it is a worthy Bill, but whether gentlemen opposite agree or do not agree with it, I think we might expect from them that they shall discuss the Bill upon its merits. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) refuses to discuss the Bill upon its merits. He has found, as he says, a lion in the path, but I think the expression "lion" is too dignified, because in my opinion he has found nothing greater than a herring which he himself has placed there.

My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) says he will not consent to discuss the Bill on its merits unless my hon. colleague the Postmaster General gives authority as to what was his authority for endeavouring to reduce the inter-Imperial postage rate. If my hon. friend the Postmaster General will agree to give my hon. friend from York (Mr. Foster) the information he wants upon this point, then the lion which he sees in the path will be removed, and he will be disposed to proceed with the Bill. Let me say that my hon. friend from York (Mr. Foster) used rather severe language, which was hardly parliamentary, but I am not disposed to quarrel with him upon that at the present moment. I want to proceed with this measure if possible, and I am disposed to ignore the expressions, more or less eloquent, of which my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) made use. But my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) appears to be of the opinion—and that is all there is in it after all—that he has got my hon. friend the Postmaster General into a corner from which he cannot extricate himself. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) tells us that he has gone through the statute in vain to find the authority which the Postmaster General had for acting as he did when he endeavoured to reduce the inter-Imperial postage, and he (Mr. Foster) appealed to me, in his more sunny ways as he said, to ask my hon. friend (Mr. Mulock) to remember that he had better treat members of this House as human beings. Well, we are all human beings; we are all fallible, and we all have our little errors, and I could only have said to my colleague the Postmaster General that if he finds he has acted without any authority the only thing he could say was: Well, I made a mistake, have had a moment of weakness, and I shall not do it again. That is all I could ask my hon. friend (Mr. Mulock) to say, and if my hon. friend has no authority for his action, he could say that. But to my hon. friend from York (Mr. Foster) I will say this. He endeavoured to speak in grandiloquent terms a moment ago upon the duty of a Government, and above all a Liberal Government, giving information to the House. It is the right and privilege of every member of this House to obtain information from the Government. Nobody denies that; but I would remind my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) that under the parliamentary rules which govern this House, although a member is entitled to have information upon a matter of public interest, that information cannot be obtained unless the member asks for it in the proper time and the proper manner as provided by the rules.

Now, I submit to my hon. friend that in a Bill simply to reduce the postage upon letters and provide another method of levying postage upon newspapers, any question concerning the attempt made by the Postmaster General to reduce the postage upon Imperial matter, is not one that affects it. It is rather late in the session for my hon. friend to move for the information required, but when we are in supply he can ask for it, and no doubt the Postmaster General will then be able to give to him; and he would be within his rights in asking it then, but I do not think he is now. If the Postmaster General is not ready to give the information at this moment, I would suggest to my hon. friend that he should avail himself of the opportunity when we are in Committee of Supply to ask for that information and allow us to proceed with the Bill before us on its merits.

Mr. FOSTER. The object of putting a question on the paper or making a motion, but particularly putting a question upon the notice paper, is that no member of the Government shall be taken unawares. I do not suppose my hon. friend will argue that the Postmaster General has been taken unawares in respect of this question. My right hon. friend must remember that the Postmaster General to-night did not plead inability to give the information, but absolutely and unequivocally refused to give it.

The PRIME MINISTER. I did not so understand him.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not want to press the matter any further than it really went; but if my hon. friend will recollect it as far as it went, he will find that the Postmaster General absolutely refused, and refused, as members of this House think, in an arrogant way to give the information required. My hon. friend knows that we had a notice on the paper calling for all information with reference to this matter, but the Government pleaded that as negotiations were going on, it was impossible to bring down the information. Does my right hon. friend think it is right to press the technical view that if I want that information there is a certain way in which I may get it. Does he not think that in all fairness and for the proper despatch of business, the Postmaster General, who is conversant with the question and has studied it up fairly, should at an opportune time like this, simply give an answer to our question. If the right hon. gentleman or the Postmaster General thinks that I asked that question with the idea of interfering with the progress of business, I say that nothing was farther from my thoughts I simply wanted the information because I thought we should have it as we were on the subject of the postal rates.

The PRIME MINISTER. Just a word of explanation. We are all liable to see things, perhaps, as they are not and apt to make mistakes. When my hon. friend from York accused the Postmaster General of having given an arrogant answer, I must say that he did my hon. friend an injustice. I am quite sure that the Postmaster General had no intention of giving anything but a simple

and courteous answer. He was not ready to give the information at the moment it was asked for, but no one will pretend that in the case of any act done by the Government or any member of the Government, in the discharge of his pulic duties, the House is not entitled to the fullest information, and if my hon. friend persists in having the information, he is entitled to have it.

Mr. DAVIN. Surely after the discussion we have heard and the very elaborate explanation, the apology, in fact, which the right hon. Prime Minister has made for the Postmaster General, the fittest and most graceful thing that should be done by that hon. gentleman would be to give the explanation which the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) asked for and to which the First Minister admits he is entitled. My right hon. friend, in a very graceful and yet apologetic manner, feeling that the Postmaster General has not got that Chesterfield turn of mind which distinguishes his leader, feeling that the Postmaster General had made a mistake, gave him a very broad hint that he should give the information. Now, the other afternoon, when the Postmaster General was introducing his Bill, I greatly admired him. He developed on that occasion an amount of personal grace and suavity that does not generally belong to him, but an extraordinary transformation took place in the course of an hour or two, for when he came back from dinner, after recess, you would not have recognized in him the kindly graceful member of the Ministry we had to deal with in the afternoon. I would ask the hon. gentleman to revert to the mood in which he was that afternoon. It is the best one to adopt by a man who wants his estimates through or his Bill advanced. I must compliment the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) on the fact that on this occasion he rose to a height of eloquence I never knew him to reach before. As a rule he does not skim along the ground as an orator, nor yet can he be said to soar into the empyrean, but rather keeps that middle flight that a large and well known bird, which is very grateful on our Christmas table, adopts when migrating to the south or north. He keeps the middle flight, as a rule, but to-night, under the influence of whatever motive—whether it was the motive that somebody attributed to him or not, whether it was his ambition glowed at the thought of being able to do what I am told some member of the Upper House do, treat the "hon." before their name, not as if it belonged to the office but as if it belonged to their own personality, and no doubt when my hon. friend goes to the upper House we shall have on his card "the Hon. James McMullen" and that certainly is a thing to fire any one's imagination—to-night I say he rose very high in defending the Postmaster General. But how did he defend him? He absolutely had not a word to say for the Postmaster General, but fell into the very same trick that hon. gentlemen opposite adopt whenever they have to defend any of the indefensible positions they are so perpetually taking up in this House. What do they do, Sir? They cease entirely defending the ramparts behind which they fight, they say not a word for these things of which we accuse them, but they begin to show that something was done by members on this side long ago or in remote years. Why, what has the action of the ex-Finance Minister (Mr. Foster) when he went over to negotiate a loan, to do with the question we are discussing now—whether it is proper for the Postmaster General to spend $91 of the public money as he did? We are asking by what authority he did it, and he takes shelter in ignoble silence. What sort of defence is it then, for the hon. member for North Wellington to say: Years ago, when the ex-Finance Minister went to London to negotiate a loan, he spent some money, and—I submit to your ruling, Mr. Speaker, as to whether this is parliamentary—though I, James McMullen, sitting on the opposite side of the House—but I fear that would be unparliamentary, so I ask the House to imagine that I say that, and I put it in this way: The hon. member says that though, I, the hon. member for North Wellington—James McMullen understood, you know—when I was in Opposition, night after night did excruciate the ears of the House of Commons, night after night with unsparing and ruthless hand did I murder the Queen's English in denouncing the ex-Finance Minister, yet I could not extract any information from him about the expenditure of that money any more than one can extract blood from a turnip—to use an elegant figure that, I believe, the hon. member for North Wellington is partial to in his figurative moments. Well, now, the fact that a man so accomplished in parliamentary rhetoric as the hon. member for North Wellington, the bare fact of a man who can run the whole gamut of parliamentary fence, should feel obliged to have recourse to such a pitiful ruse as this, show that the position taken by the Postmaster General is one that cannot be defended for a moment. I will give my hon. friend from North Wellington credit for one thing—I have seen him dare things that no man with only ordinary social courage would venture upon. But to defend squarely the attitude of the Postmaster General is beyond the courage of the hon. member for North Wellington. And take the Prime Minister. Has there ever sat in this Parliament a man who was more ready to rush to the defence of one of his colleagues? Why, that is the cardinal fault in the hon. gentleman, that is the cardinal element in his character that will drive him to ruin and defeat—that he is ready to stand by colleagues that Parliament and the country do not wish him to stand by. Had he abandoned some of his col-

leagues who have acted in such a way as to forfeit public confidence, he would have stood higher in the public estimation. That is a gallant feature in the hon. gentleman's character, but a Prime Minister can carry gallantry too far. He is ready to stand by colleagues who—to use the language of the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) regarding the Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair), even after they have been made respectable will not remain respectable. I am using euphuistic language, Mr. Speaker, and not the free language into which the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, in his frank moments occasionally drops. But even the Prime Minister who stands by his colleagues refused to stand by the Postmaster General. He apologized for that hon. gentleman. Spare him now, the hon. gentleman said, and on another occasion the information will be given. It was the language of entreaty, the language of supplication. Let him now go on with his Bill, he said, and I promise that on the occasion of Supply he will give this information. Why, is Parliament to be trifled with in this matter? Is this not the time, when the Postmaster General brings forward his Bill, that he should give us an explanation, if he has one, or, if, as the Prime Minister has hinted, he has no explanation, if he is ever to make a confession, he will have to get down on his marrow bones and say: Yes, I made an egregious Minister of myself—I do not use the monosyllabic word that came into my mind, because I remember that I am speaking in Parliament—I made an egregious Minister of myself when I brought forward this proposition. I made a great mistake. I had no authority for what I did. The time will come when the hon. gentleman will have to do that. It will be a great thing if now or at any other time we forced the Postmaster General to do that, because it would be a guarantee to us in the future, that others would not act in the same manner.

Now, I wanted to facilitate the passage of this Bill and to hurry on the session to its close. Therefore, on the second reading, I did not speak. I was asked by a distinguished friend on this side if I was going to speak. I said, No: anything I have to say I can say when the Bill is in committee. But now that I have been forced, by the extraordinary exhibition that has been made on that side of the House, and especially as the Prime Minister has made an apology for his colleague, and, having referred to that, I will say something with regard to this Bill. The hon. Postmaster General in explaining this Bill, argued from the analogy of the United States and England. Well, the hon. gentleman will admit that the analogy of the United States is against him. In fact he did admit, and gave a partial explanation And as for the analogy of England, where is it? They have to deal therewith a dense population whereas ours is relatively a sparse population. So, I do not think he has made a case for his Bill that has been satisfactory to the critical eyes of the country, looking at the effect this Bill has on the revenue. Now, let me say a word on a point which I consider of very great importance, and that is the effect of this Bill on the newspapers of the country. I will appeal to the Postmaster General to spare from the whip of his Bill the whole of the country press.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. What do you mean by the country press?

Mr. DAVIN. I mean the local papers. Take the local papers in Manitoba and the North-west. The local paper is the voice, so to speak, of the public conscience, of the public consciousness of each of the little local centres where the paper is published. As was said by the hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Robertson), there cannot be the least doubt that the local paper everywhere fights a hard battle. Some men who publish great papers in Montreal and Toronto, make fortunes out of them, but there is no fortune to be made out of the local paper. The amount the hon. gentleman is going to get is very small, but still the change will seriously hamper and weigh upon the resources of the local press. Now, in regard to the great city papers, I know something about newspapers, and I tell the hon. gentleman that he is going to interfere in an ineffective way with those city newspapers. In the first place, the amount which he is going to charge them is not enough, if he is going to charge them at all. In the next place, many of them, instead of using the mail, will use the express, and there is no balance whatever between the amount that the hon. gentleman is likely to get from the arrangement that he is making, and the amount that he will lose in other directions. Now let me say this, speaking generally of such reforms as the present one. This is on a par with the so-called reform made by the Minister of Finance in regard to the post office savings banks. I am glad to know we have his assurance that he is not going to carry out that policy to its full length, and I hope we will get a statement from the Postmaster General that he is not going to carry out to the full length his policy in regard to newspapers, that is embodied in this Bill. But speaking generally of these reforms, they show a want of sympathy with large portions of the public who may be called the poorer portions; they show a want of sympathy with the working classes, with the men who earn their bread by the sweat of their brow; but on the other hand, they show a sympathy with the rich and powerful who need very little commiseration from this House. If we had a population of thirty or forty millions, the reduction of postage from three to two cents might be a good move. But to compare such a reduction

with a reduction to a penny postage, or to a two-penny postage, from sixpence or or sevenpence on letters—why, there is no comparison at all. I shall be only too glad if the Postmaster General finds his department will be paying its way by the first of next January; but I am sadly afraid that his prognostications will prove as foundationless as his assumption of power in the celebrated proclamation, the first line of which has been rung to so much advantage in our ears by the ex-Minister of Finance, and the sound of which, I was sorry to see, had been a little painful to your own auricular sensations.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I listened to the right hon. gentleman, and did not fail to observe that we have had a discussion that might very well have been avoided. The Opposition, however, has a duty to perform, and it was to make as strong a protest as possible against the refusal of a Cabinet Minister in charge of a Post Office Bill to answer questions and give explanations in regard to post office administration. Let me show briefly how indefensible the position of the Postmaster General has been. A large part of the debate that took place at the last stage of this Bill, was over this ground in regard to Imperial postage. The ex-Postmaster General dealt very fully with it. But before he touched the subject, the member for York put this question to the Postmaster General:

I put three questions. The hon. gentleman undertook, as a matter of administration, to do a certain thing some three or four months ago in reference to postage between Canada and Great Britain. He certainly knew the grounds upon which he proposed to act, and I think the House should know them. He knows the actions he took and the instructions he gave, and the House would like to know those actions and those instructions. He certainly bumped up against some difficulty, and the House would like to know what that difficulty was, and whether it is still in the way.

There is a request in plain language for definite information as to how the mistake came about, if it was a mistake, or upon what authority the Postmaster General was going. Now, this is the answer the Postmaster General at the first stage of the debate, vouchsafed to the House:

With regard to the first question, namely, by what authority I acted, I acted by the authority that every Government representing a member of the Postal Union has. That is a point of law subject to interpretation. As to what I did, we decided to reduce the postage to 3 cents per ounce letter between Canada and Great Britain and all the colonies, to take effect on the 1st of January. Steps were taken to announce that reduction.

Now, that answer was ambiguous. The Postmaster General himself will see, upon reflection, that there was very little information given to the House beyond that which had been in the press of the country. The point upon which the Postmaster General was ambiguous was the authority which he presumed that every Government had in taking the action that he wished, in his name, the Canadian Government to take. That is a point of law subject to interpretation. The Postmaster General did not remain in, apparently, to the end of the discussion, and on the conclusion of the speech of the ex-Postmaster General, the member for York, in order to make the matter clearer, said:

I intended to ask the Postmaster General, before he went away, a question, but as he is gone, I will ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who is a lawyer, under what section of the Act does the Postmaster General presume to change the postage that already exists between Canada and Great Britain?

That was made necessary, as the House will see, from the answer which the Postmaster General gave in regard to this subject. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries realized the importance of the question, but took no objection to it whatever, but simply confessed:

I am not conversant with the statute, but I remember it was brought up once.

That is to say, the Minister of Marine, looking at the section of the statute under which the Postmaster General thought he could act, made that statement. To-night it strikes hon. members on this side of the House as a most extraordinary and improper proceeding that when this subject is referred to again, and the Postmaster General happens to be in his seat, he should not be as courteous to the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) as was his colleague.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That is not fair.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I am referring to "Hansard," and I suppose I am unfair because the facts put the hon. gentleman in a very unfavourable light, and yet I do not want to put him in a more unfavourable light than the hon. gentleman placed himself.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think the hon. gentleman misunderstands me. He says that I was discourteous, as the hon. member for York, N.B. (Mr. Foster), stated. It is customary for hon. gentlemen to so charge me. I think they charge me unfairly. I was so charged to-night, unfairly. I gave a fair reply, and I thought a perfectly courteous answer to the hon. member for York, the same as I am giving to the hon. member for Pictou. I cannot help being so charged—I do not intend it, and I did not intend it to-night.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I did not say the hon. gentleman, in his manner, was discourteous—it is not necessary to insinuate anything of the kind—but he

gave a firm, flat and stubborn refusal to answer a question that the Minister of Marine would have answered, if he had been able to lay his hand on the statute and the section; and the hon. gentleman, if he wished to treat this House with parliamentary courtesy should have answered that question if he could. For instance, does the hon. gentleman think it is improper for me to put a question, not in the language used by the hon. member for York to-night, for I will let that pass by, and to ask what Act and what section did the hon. Minister consider gave him the power to issue the proclamation that has been referred to? Will the hon. gentleman answer that question?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I must say to the hon. gentleman that he must take the discussion to-night where it was left off the other evening. When I had moved the second reading of the Bill, the hon. member for York, N.B., and the leader of the Opposition both raised the question as to the matter of Imperial postage. I stated then, and I think in as fair a way as I am trying to address the House now, that I did not feel the subject of Imperial postage or any action I had taken or attempted to take was involved, and that the Bill before the House involved two leading propositions: one the reduction of the postage on domestic letters, and the other, imposition of postage on newspapers; but out of respect and in order to be courteous to the hon. gentleman, I gave certain information to the leader of the Opposition, and I endeavoured to give it to the member for York. The hon. member for York asked me three questions, and he subsequently reduced them to one. I answered that one question, and I endeavoured also to satisfy him in regard to the question which the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) is now asking me. I gave my answer and it is reported in "Hansard," and I cannot answer at this stage more than what I stated then. If I am asked the question a hunderd times I can only answer it a hundred times, and give no further information, for that is all the information I can give the hon. gentleman now.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I ask the hon. gentleman if he can answer the question which the Minister of Marine said he was not conversant with, that is, the section of the statute under which the Minister assumed that he had power to act in connection with that proclamation?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman, I am sure, is quite aware that the power to vary foreign rates in no way depends on any Canadian statute.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I was not aware of it.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The right to vary the foreign rates depends on the spirit and meaning of the Berne Treaty. It is a treaty to which most of the civilized countries of the world are parties, and that treaty is such that all parties to it can make changes as they like. Further, and this does not appear to be known by the ex-Postmaster General, any two countries or any smaller portion of the whole union, may within themselves have a convention. So, under that provision the United States and Canada can by consent, by any form of consent, and it does not require the bringing together of the different countries, vary their own rates. Great Britain and Canada can between themselves vary their rates: Canada and Great Britain have between themselves varied the rates. As regards Newfoundland, I do not know whether the rate is fixed by the union as a whole or by arrangement between Newfoundland and the Dominion of Canada. Now that each country has exclusive right to the ownership of all rates connected within its own territory, there appears no valid or legal objection to any country limiting or varying the outgoing rates of postage, which constitutes its own property, whether the loss may be great or small. Whether that is a proper inference to draw from the treaty is a matter of opinion. The hon. member for York the other night asked for a copy of the Berne Treaty. I am now speaking for the information of that hon. gentleman, who said he had asked me to produce a copy of the Berne Treaty on Friday, and I had not the courtesy to produce it. The House adjourned at fifteen minutes past six, and I proceeded to the department for the express purpose of obtaining a copy of the treaty. The treaty is in French, and is in the custody of the secretary of the department, Mr. LeSueur. The department was closed, and I had to make my arrangements to leave Ottawa at ten o'clock to attend Mr. McCarthy's funeral, and there was no person in my department whom I could get to find Mr. LeSueur to procure the treaty. That is why I did not have the treaty to hand the hon. gentleman after I came here at eight o'clock.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I am free to say that if the hon. Minister, three or four hours ago, had been good enough to make the explanation he has offered now, we would have been so much further ahead, and the discussion which has taken place would have been entirely unnecessary and needless. The hon. gentleman has told us where the trouble lies. The question of interpretation is not, as his colleague and perhaps others suppose, connected with the Canadian statute.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. If the hon. gentleman will look at the debate of Friday in "Hansard," he will find I express-

ly stated it was a question of interpretation.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I read that in "Hansard." The trouble arose in regard to an aswer to a question put when the hon. Postmaster General was out of the House, and we could not exactly tell where the difficulty in the interpretation occurred. Of course the Minister of Marine was not fully versed in the subject as the Postmaster General would be, and there was some difficulty in connection with the statute. I altogether disagree with the Postmaster General in his opinion as expressed to-night, that he can act under the treaty without regard to the statute. Even if his interpretation of the treaty be right it will be necessary, first that the treaty sanctions the course that he takes, and above all that this Parliament has put him in a position to act. Under no clause of the Post Office Act could he take the course he proposed if the treaty would prevent it, and we have this fact, that acting under the authority conferred on him by the Act and his view of the treaty, he took the course he has explained, but in connection with that he unwisely did not consult others to see whether that course had been upheld by the parties to the Berne Convention, and by the Imperial authorities. The trouble is that the Imperial authorities did not agree with him in the interpretation of that convention. The hon. gentleman, I take it, does not recede from his view, but a power over which he has no control has made it necessary for him to take that course.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I may tell the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) that the question as to whether I am right or wrong is reserved.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I understand.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. And what is more, some of the parties to it have consented to the arrangement. Some of the portions of the Empire are quite prepared to make the arrangement, but we hope to be able to bring in a larger scheme.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I understand, and that is most valuable information. It is information of the greatest interest in connection with the hon. gentleman's department, that although the action was taken prematurely by him he feels sure still that he was right, but nevertheless those not agreeing with him have made it necessary for him to retreat for the time being. Of course those who sympathize with the object the Postmaster General has in view will be delighted if the other parties to this treaty so act as to enable him to carry out his wishes. So far as I am concerned, and so far as this Bill is concerned, the matter can very well stand there.

Mr. MULOCK.

Motion (Mr. McDougall) to adjourn debate negatived.

Motion (The Postmaster General) agreed to, and the House again resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. CLARKE. I would ask the Postmaster General at this stage of the Bill, if he has given the question of the rate of postage on drop letters his consideration. It is a notorious fact, that while it may be contrary to law, there are agencies established in the city of Toronto, and I presume in other centers of population, which will promptly distribute letters for a certain distance at a much smaller rate than now charged by the postal authorities. It seems to me that the enormous increase of business in such a city as Toronto would amply justify the department in reducing the drop letter rate from 2 cents to 1 cent. I would ask the Postmaster General, in view of the fact that a representative delegation waited upon him last fall and that he promised to give this his best consideration; whether he has yet come to a conclusion on the matter. I would also ask the Postmaster General if he has given his attention to the more rapid delivery of letters specially stamped, in the large cities. I believe it is customary elsewhere that when an extra stamp is put on the letter it is expeditiously delivered by couriers or bicyclists. It is a matter that might well engage the attention of the Postmaster General, and I would like to have his opinion upon it.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. As to the question of the more rapid delivery of letters specially stamped, I have decided to bring that system into force, if possible, on the 1st of July, and the special stamp to be placed upon such letters is now in the course of preparation.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clarke) will come to my department to-morrow, I will be very glad to have his advice as to the fitness of some of these stamp designs submitted to me.

Mr. MACLEAN. What would the rate be?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It would probably be 10 cents. With regard to the question of reducing the drop letter rate, I have not yet been able to formulate a scheme or to arrive at a conclusion. I have not at all lost sight of the matter but I have felt that the reduction from 3 cents to 2 cents is of more general concern as it applies to rural as well as to city districts, and I thought it more proper to first deal with this general feature of the postage before taking up a matter which is to some extent local. I myself, as a resident of a city, appreciate

the fact that the 2 cent rate is regarded as very onerous, and I believe that some large business concerns resort to private delivery because of the drop letter rate being so high. Although I have not arrived at any decision, I will tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clarke) that I have not lost sight of the matter.

Mr. MACLEAN. If the Postmaster General is desirous of making money in his department, he can make more by delivering city letters at one cent than he is now making at the 2-cent rate, because he will find that business men will use the post office to a far greater extent than at present.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. On that point I contemplate having statistics taken, extending over a considerable period of time, so as to ascertain exactly how a change like that is likely to turn out. At present I have no idea what would be the loss to the revenue by the reduction.

Mr. CLARKE. The revenue derived from the Toronto post office is far in excess of the expenditure. There must be a profit of $150,000 to $200,000 in the operation of that office. I am perfectly satisfied that if the drop letter rate were decreased from two cents to one cent, there would be an increase in the revenue, which would more than compensate for the increased outlay necessitated by the large number of letter carriers. It is contrary to the spirit of the time that the rate of postage on drop letters should be so excessive that merchants and others find it more profitable to employ agents, commissionaries or boys to distribute their letters from one end of the city to the other. I am credibly informed that in some establishments this distribution is made at an average cost of one cent a letter. In view of the reduction the hon. gentleman has made on the rate for letters distributed generally throughout Canada, he ought to give this matter special attention, and I feel sure business men would substantially appreciate the reduction, and the receipts of the department would substantially appreciate as well.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. While it is quite true that the revenue of the Toronto post office is greatly in excess of the expenditure, it must be borne in mind that the expenses charged against city post offices, or for the matter of that, all post offices, do not show the proportion of expenditure properly chargeable against them. For example, we pay in round numbers $2,000,000 a year to railways, steamboats and couriers for carrying the mails. None of that is apportioned against any of the offices, so that it would be a mistake to suppose that the difference between what is charged in the Estimates as the expenditure and the gross revenue of the postage business gives the accurate result. You would have to apportion against the benefits a proper proportion of the charges for services outside of Toronto, but which earn part of the revenue for Toronto.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. Minister says that about $2,000,000 are paid to railways, steamboats and couriers. How much do the railways get?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. About $1,000,000.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I fully agree with the Postmaster General in what he has said that we should pause before changing the rate of postage on drop letters. The matter came up when I happened to be Postmaster General, and I went into it pretty thoroughly. We could not at that period afford to make the change, however desirable. It must be recollected that in the large cities like Montreal and Toronto we have a delivery which is equal to the delivery in the city of London, Eng. I think the Postmaster General will bear me out in stating that we have got in the Toronto and Montreal a delivery every hour exactly as in the city of London. That is a very great boon to the commercial community, but it costs money, and the Postmaster General will not be able to give these advantages and reduce the postage upon drop letters, at least we could not, within the period of time when the matter was brought under my consideration and when I looked into it with the ardent desire of meeting the views of the commercial community. I am quite sure the Postmaster General is right in stating now that he is not prepared to give an answer to the question put to him as to the reduction from two to one cent on drop letters. The deficiency would be very much more considerable than hon. gentlemen who have not gone into the state of the account would believe.

Mr. MACLEAN. I would like to direct attention to two things. First, the still further improving of the transmission of parcels by post, and second, taking up the question of the state assuming all the telegraph lines of this country. The postal department in the old country has taken over the telegraph lines there, and furnish altogether a much better and cheaper service than before the transfer. I believe the time is fast coming when this country ought to take over the telegraph system and administer it as a portion of the Post Office Department.

Mr. FOSTER. I think that it is a doubtful venture which the hon. gentleman is going to undertake when he reduces the postage from three to two cents at this time. I have always thought that, taking the Dominion of Canada with its long distances and sparse population and the certainty of new openings which are constantly cropping up and which must be served, that we probably have the cheapest postage of any country in the world. My hon. friend seems to contemplate with great equanimity the loss of $650,000 of postal revenue. I do not

know whether the Minister of Finance contemplates that loss with the same equanimity or not I must say that if I were a Minister of Finance, I would not be disposed to look on it with levity. Starting out from the ground that our Canadian postage, taking the distribution of the population in the country, is very cheap, a letter being carried from one end of the country to the other for three cents, I take the other ground that the great mass of the people will have comparatively no alleviation by the reduction from three to two cents. The great mass of the people are not constant letter writers. The heavy letter writing is done by the commercial classes, and is a machinery of commerce, and commerce has always been able to pay reasonably for the machinery which the country puts at its disposal. So that you are not going to give the great mass of the people any boon for which there is a pressing necessity, and you are not relieving, when you take one cent per letter off from the great commercial enterprise of the country, these great enterprises to any considerable degree, and you cannot be charged at present with taxing them too much for the reasonable accommodation you give them.

Now, the Postmaster General must admit that if he is going to make both ends meet with the two-cent postage, which will reduce his revenue by $650,000, he can only do it in two ways. First, he must have a great growth in the number of letters written. Now, that depends very largely on the density of the population. In a country such as Great Britain, if, at one time, they have a 3d. postage rate for carriage over that comparatively small area and with a dense population, and that is reduced to 2d. or to 1d., you will have a rapid increase in the revenue, because of the immense impetus that will be given to letter-writing. But you will not have that in this country to anything like the same extent. It may be said almost absolutely that nobody in Canada who wants to write a letter is deterred by the fact that he has to pay 3 cents postage, nor will the people go into writing letters to a much greater extent because the rate is reduced to 2 cents. The amount put upon the face of a letter to carry it is a mere bagatelle. Therefore, I do not look for a large increase in the postal revenue by reason of a growth in the number of letters written. The other way to reimburse the Post Office Department is by what may be called economy in other branches of the service. These economies are of limited amounts. On the other hand, the call of the people will be, year after year, for increased accommodation. Vast stretches of country are opening up, and these newly opened sections are most expensive to be served by post. You may depend upon it that people will not rest content, if these extensions are refused on being told that the reduction of letter postage is given as a reason. Our agricultural country will also demand better facilities and more frequent transmissions of the mail, and they also will not accept the 2-cent rate as a reason for the refusal of them. They will say it would have been a great deal better to have left the rate at 3 cents and to have sufficient funds to give the accommodation. The hon. gentleman may make economies, or what he calls economies, in reducing the frequency of mails. In some places that are now receiving mails three times a week, he may try to satisfy the people with a delivery twice a week. But will the people be satisfied? I dare say that throughout the length and breadth of the postal service, my hon. friend may find that mails are being delivered three times a week where a delivery twice a week or even once a week would be enough. These instances, I venture to say, are very few indeed. On the other hand, the call from all parts of Canada is for quick transmission of the news, and that quick transmission of news under our system, can only be made by the doubling up the postal service, and that will double the cost. The hon. Postmaster General may make economies also by reducing the amount he pays for the carriage of mails. But I call to witness every representative of a rural district, and ask him to take his own experience, what he knows of the carrying of mails by rural carriers, and say if in nine cases out of ten they are not carried below cost or about cost. The carriers get a little ready money, but they are more out than in, in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred. Of course, some of the great contracts are taken up by able carriers, and there may be some little profit in the work. But the majority of country routes are carried at about cost, or even below cost. The Postmaster General will not be able to screw these people down for ever to carrying mails at rates that do not pay them the cost and charges they are put to. Again, in connection with what my hon. friend said a moment ago, there will be a call for a swifter service. The idea of a bicycle service is coming to the front. This will cost money, but the people will demand these improvements, and there is no point in which pressure is more natural or stronger than in respect of the rapid carriage of letters and newspapers. No Government will ever be able to refuse improvements in this respect to the people. And, if there is one service more than another that we must be generous with it is the postal service, and that has always been the policy of Canada. Cut off $650,000, and add on the other side the little you will get out of the newspapers, and you still leave a tremendous hole in your revenue. You will tie the hands of the future Postmasters General and prevent them from giving these improved facilities to the people, or you will burden the finances of the country with an immense deficit for the postal service. The Postmaster General

has made calculations and he has made prophecies. His calculations may be correct; it remains to be seen whether his prophecies prove true or not. I am afraid they are too rose-coloured. He must recollect that in times of prosperity—and we have been going on the up grade now for three or four years—there is always an expansion in the postal revenue to a certain extent. The growth of population will be gradual. I am afraid the hon. gentleman is banking too much on that increase and on extraordinary sources of revenue. Why, last year, he received four or five hundred thousand dollars, if I am not mistaken, from the Jubilee issue of stamps. That is an extraordinary revenue which he cannot count upon for another year. The question arises whether the collection of revenue in that way should ever have been perpetratd. It has been done, but certainly it cannot be repeated. So, I say, it strikes me that the Postmaster General is entering on a doubtful course. He evidently regards it as doubtful himself, because he does not make the legislation absolute. He makes it permissive, providing that at such and such a time, if he sees fit, he can reduce the letter postage.

It is not legislation which would lead the House to suppose that now, at a time when we make the legislation, the country is in a position to stand it. Then, if he is going to impose a postage on newspapers, I see no reason why any newspapers should be exempted. Let the postage go fair and square upon all newspapers, with no ten mile zone. If he puts a newspaper postage on, it must be for reasons. If it is because the newspaper business is a business arrangement, and therefore should pay, every newspaper is a business arrangement in one way or another. If it is because he thinks the Post Office Department ought to be reimbursed for carrying newspapers, why, all newspapers are heavy in proportion to their weight, whether they are temperance newspapers or religious or business newspapers. Then, again, what are the moral and religious papers nowadays? Why, your great dailies have their religious parts, their social parts, their scientific parts, and perhaps a wider carriage may be doing even more good than the exclusive religious newspaper, which has a comparatively smaller circulation. On these counts, therefore, it seems to me it would be the part of wisdom to go slow. In this matter of dropping the letter postage, once down you cannot bring it back; it will tend lower down instead of going further up. You never can raise it no matter how great the hiatus may be between your expenditure and your revenue. Then, again, in what position does my hon. friend put our newspapers in competition with those from the United States?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Had you not better wait until you get to that clause?

Mr. FOSTER. It probably might be as well, but I was discussing the whole as a matter of revenue. Whilst you may get some revenue from taxing Canadian newspapers, there is another thing to be considered: Whether you are not interfering with and hampering the business newspapers in Canada that are in competition with business newspapers from across the line and from other foreign countries. Every one of those newspapers that start from the United States under lessened rates of postage must be carried in this country.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. They are not carried under less rates.

Mr. FOSTER. They are carried under the rates that are given in the United States.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not know what the hon. gentleman means by lesser rates.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend does not charge anything for carrying those in Canada.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes, we do; we carry American papers, and they carry our papers. We perform a service for them, and they perform a service for us. We do not charge anything for carrying American letters in Canada, because they carry Canadian letters throughout the United States.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend will see that newspaper work is a business, and that letters do not come under that category. The man who is publishing a family newspaper in Canada will have to pay postage upon it, whilst family papers that come in from the United States and compete with him, are carried free bcause this country gets nothing for carrying them.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. They pay 1 cent a pound.

Mr. FOSTER. Where?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. In the United States.

Mr. FOSTER. But they do not pay anything more from this extra toll the hon. gentleman is putting upon Canadian newspapers. I argue that, as compared with the position to-day, when you put a postage upon Canadian newspapers, you are handicapping the Canadian newspaper business to that extent in competition with its rivals from abroad. That may be a very serious handicap, and it may have a wider range than my hon. friend thinks. It may affect the employment and business of this country to a large extent. I am somewhat in sympathy with the idea that a newspaper ought to pay for its cost as it goes through the mail. I do not see why a paper, which is a business venture, which is full of advertising work, should not pay its cost of

carriage in this country, at least. There is a large sentiment in favour of having newspapers go free as a means of diffusing knowledge, but I think that the business view ought to be taken into account as well, and these are really business ventures. The question is whether more is being charged on the newspapers than will actually cover the cost of carrying them. These are the few strictures that I wished to make upon the Bill—I did not speak upon the second reading—and it is with a view of calling attention to the fact that the argument is not all on one side in this matter, that I have made these remarks.

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON. I would call the attention of the Postmaster General to the fact that a large proportion of the American newspapers that enter this country come by express, and that a proportion of these papers are remailed in this country. Do they not pay a rate per pound?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes, if re-mailed.

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON. They pay one cent per pound in the United States when mailed to Canada, and many of those that come from the United States are re-mailed. One of the largest news companies in Toronto re-mails American and British newspapers, and on these they pay a cent a pound.

Mr. ELLIS. That applies also to our own papers, if they are re-mailed, as the hon. gentleman terms it. He is speaking of papers that are mailed, not re-mailed. But if you re-mail a Canadian newspaper, you pay postage just the same.

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON. The application is not the same. There is a large number of papers re-mailed that enter this country from the United States by express and by post; they are re-mailed by large institutions like the Toronto News Company.

Mr. ELLIS. Then those papers are mailed for the first time. The hon. gentleman is using a phrase which is not correct.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think the class of foreign papers mailed in Canada have to pay 4 cents a pound, or one cent for four ounces. There are three classes of rates on papers: There is a rate of 1 cent a pound on Canadian publications, but not posted at point of publication. Then, there are free papers, being posted at the point of publication Then the 4 cents per pound and 1 cent for four ounces on papers not published in Canada.

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON. The expression "re-mailing" is perfectly correct. There are a large number of papers that come from England by post that are re-mailed in this country.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The argument does not apply to the present case in Canada. The only way in which papers can be circulated without paying postage, is when they are sent from the place of publication. If newspapers are sent from the United States through an express company, and are circulated in Canada, naturally they have to pay postage. When the postage was abolished on newspapers, it was on the condition that those papers would be sent abroad to the public from the place where they were published.

Mr. WALLACE. I think that the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) was a little too anxious about this 2 cent postage. I do not believe that we are going to have any 2 cent postage. It is not proposed to have it definitely, but the Postmaster General is to take the power so that when it suits his convenience, or when any little fake business springs up like that pretended reduction of postage to Great Britain just before by-elections, or some important political crisis comes along, then the Postmaster General can make a declaration and cancel it after the election is over. I do not think we should take this question of a reduction from 3 cents to 2 cents very seriously. If we did, we should give a great deal more consideration, and the Postmaster General should give more consideation than has been given to it and more information than the hon. gentleman has condescended to give to the House in relation to this matter. The hon. gentleman proposes to wipe out $650,000 of the revenue. He has given the House a lot of figures, one-sided and incomplete, of the business of the United States, showing the income from year to year had increased. But the population and business have likewise increased. The hon. gentleman, however, did not tell us of the financial feature of the 2-cent postage from 1887 to 1897, that there was a deficit of more than $12,000,000 in the United States of America. We are now starting in with a deficit. But the hon. gentleman has told us he will reduce it. I venture to say it will only be a temporary reduction. The sale of Jubilee stamps and other sales have brought the revenue and expenditure nearer to a parity. The proposal to strike off $650,000 of revenue is one which the ex-Minister of Finance has properly characterized. We contribute liberally to the revenues of the post office and enable the department to open up post offices in new settlements and establish a daily instead of weekly mails; but under the policy of the hon. gentleman the expansion of the postal system will be paralyzed in this country for many years to come. The hon. Postmaster General has stated that by 1899 the revenue will meet the expenditure under a 3-cent postage. We do not want William Mulock to order that this shall be done. We wish Parliament to say when a reduction from 3 and 2 cents is to go into force. This power rests with Parliament, which should not hand it over to an irresponsible Minister,

whose judgment has not proved to be good in the past. In regard to the absurd proposal to put postage on newspapers, I remind the House that the hon. the Postmaster General stated the other night that the circulations of newspapers were getting enormous and intolerable, and unless a check was imposed on newspapers they would become very onerous. The hon. gentleman should be glad of the enlightenment and progress manifested by the people. He should be delighted to know of the progress of the country, that intelligence has increased and newspaper circulations increased. But the hon. Minister says that this advance must be checked, and he proposes to do it. He says that the publishers of newspapers should bear a full share of the burdens of the department. If that is the conclusion at which he has arrived, why does he not propose to carry it out? He states that the expenditure last year was $4,800,000 in the Post Office Department, and that $2,400,000 was incurred on account of newspapers. Does the hon. gentleman propose that this sum should be recouped to the department by the newspapers? No; he proposes to impose postage amounting to $82,000, but making a reduction for newspapers circulating within ten miles he allows 21 per cent, reducing the net revenue from this source to $65,000. So with a total expenditure of $2,400,000 he proposes to meet it by imposing a tax on newspapers from which he will receive $65,000, and thus he proposes also to meet the deficit of $650,000 for loss of revenue as between 3 cent and 2-cent letter postage. I do not believe this proposed newspaper tax is a proper one under the present conditions. Parliament decided about a dozen years ago to have free transmission of newspapers through the mails, and that system has worked satisfactorily.

Even the figures mourned over by the Postmaster General would have caused a statesman to be glad because they indicate the intellectual progress of the people. Another serious objection to this Bill is that it discriminates in favour of American newspapers and against Canadian newspapers. It should be so arranged that Canadian literature would be freely distributed among our Canadian people, but this Bill proposes to give a greater advantage to United States papers than they now possess. I would give them less. To-day we have free circulation for our own papers, and we circulate the American papers, too, and the Postmaster General says there is reciprocity in that. There is no reciprocity practically. While the advantage is mutual with regard to the letters the argument is entirely all the other way in the case of newspapers, because more than ten United States newspapers circulate in Canada for the one Canadian paper that circulates in the United States. It is a jug-handled policy and eminently unfair when applied to newspapers. The United States newspapers pay in the United States, but they do not pay Canada one farthing and they have the free use of our mail service for their circulation. Our Canadian newspapers are circulating loyal literature and literature in the interest of Canada, but by this Bill there is a tax placed on the Canadian newspaper while the American newspaper goes free from any point in the United States to any point in the Dominion. That clause of the Bill should be struck out; there has been no demand for it, and there is no necessity for it. We are obliged to have machinery for the conveyance of letters through the mails, and if there was not a newspaper circulated through the mails in Canada we would still have to maintain our mail service. The circulation of our newspapers requires only a little additional work and accommodation. This Bill is doing no good, it is creating dissatisfaction, it is unfair to the Canadian newspaper in competition with the American newspaper, and it should be hung up for a year or for an indefinite period. The Postmaster General comes here with a flourish of trumpets and announces that he is going to make a number of changes, but he is simply turning the Post Office Department upside down without doing any good to the people. We may fairly ask the Postmaster General to stay his hand as he was obliged to do in the case of the reduction on inter-Imperial postage. I suppose there never was a more flagrant case of a member of the Government telling us as he did the other night, that this was not the act of Government but was done on his own sweet will, without probably his even asking the consent of the Premier or the other members of the Government. He proposed by that one measure to reduce the revenues of the country by $50,000 a year, something that no Minister or no Government ever before attempted without the consent of Parliament. This Parliament and this Parliament alone has the power to impose and remit taxes. No decree of the Postmaster General sitting in his office and thinking he is ruling the universe by his proclamations could do what the Postmaster General intended should be done in that case. This whole Bill is in line with that proclamation; it is absurd from beginning to end. The first section says that the postage on letters within Canada shall be reduced from three cents to two cents, but it is only a pretense. It does not say that this shall be the law when the Governor General assents to the Bill. Unlike the section with regard to the postage of newspapers, it is not to become law at a fixed date, but it will become law when political exigencies may require it, just as in the Centre Toronto election when the Postmaster General authorized the Minister of Customs to announce in his usual silvery tones, that there would be a reduction in the inter-Imperial postage rate. The second clause of this Bill is an absurd one to commence with. It imposes a tax

where we had no tax before, and when the necessity of that tax has not been made apparent to the House. It is onerous, it is worrying, and it will bring in very little revenue. It is not bringing in one tithe of what the Minister himself says the cost of handling this portion of the Post Office Department amounts to, so that the first and second clauses should be struck out. The third clause, which is for books for the use of the blind, might remain. The dead letter proposal is another equally absurd clause. The only clause I can see that should be retained is that providing that books for the use of the blind shall be free from Canada postage, under such regulations as from time to time may be made in that respect by the Postmaster General. That should be the whole Bill.

Mr. MACLEAN. As a newspaper publisher, I am willing to pay my share of the postage tax, if Parliament so determines, but I wish to have the same treatment meted out to every newspaper in the country. I do not believe in discriminating against the large morning dailies in favour of the weekly or religious papers. There ought to be fair treatment all round, and I call upon the Postmaster General to give us that equal treatment. With regard to this matter of the Order in Council, I object to the Government taking power to put this law into force whenever they like. They might do so purely for the purpose of carrying a by-election. They ought to come down with their statistics, and show how much the real cost of the post office is and what the revenue is, and then leave Parliament to pass an Act to reduce the postage, if the condition of things warrants a reduction. But the Government by this Bill say that on some future occasion, if they find things satisfactory, they will put it into force. That is not in accord with the true principle of British legislation or Canadian legislation. Something was said about this proposal being in favour of American newspapers, and there is a great deal to be said in support of that contention. It is a fact now that American newspapers are becoming the rivals of Canadian newspapers in a way never dreamt of before. The whole of Canada is now threatened with being flooded by cheap newspapers from the United States which ridicule the British system of Government and praise American institutions to the detriment of our own. The yellow journals of the States are now sold on the streets of Toronto at nine o'clock every night. They do not go through the post office, but if they did I am sufficiently of a nationalist to say that Parliament ought to deal with what threatens to become a very serious evil, namely, the preference given by our laws in many directions to the distribution and circulation of American newepapers in the country. I am willing to pay my share of the postage tax but on the condition that every publisher is treated in the same way. There are three or four papers in Toronto and as many more in Montreal who would bear the great portion of the tax.

Mr. RICHARDSON. What about Winnipeg?

Mr. MACLEAN. They will suffer in the same way. It is not fair to tax a business simply because it happens to be a large business concern. We have a Liberal Government, the members and supporters of which have been preaching for years no discrimination, and yet here is a proposal to discriminate in favour of weeklies and religious papers.

Mr. POWELL. When this matter was up for discussion the other evening, the Postmaster General gave us some interesting statistics, which furnish food for thought. At the same time, I do not think he went into these statistics just as fully as he should. The histories of postal arrangements in different countries all show that as a general rule, the reduction of the postage has not met with a permanent loss of revenue. It is equally true that people who look into these matters have settled down to the fact that the limit to the rule is about three cents on a letter; and when in the United States there was a decrease in their postal revenues, a few years ago, consequent upon the reduction of the postage from 3 cents to 2 cents; that result was according to the United States statisticians, due to the fact, that the limit had been reached and the rule had ceased to operate. I would call the hon. gentleman's attention to a comparison between the United States and ourselves. In the United States, in 1884, according to the statistics which the hon. gentleman gave us, the postal revenue was about $43,000,000. At that time a reduction in the rate was made. In 1887, the revenue increased to $48,000,000. If the Postmaster General will examine the statistics of Canada during the same years, he will find this striking fact, that if you add to the increase in Canada a proportionate allowance for their greater increase of population in the United States as compared with Canada, the increase in revenue there is less than the increase of revenue in Canada? That shows the hon. gentleman is not likely to reap the increase of revenue he anticipates. Why it is I do not know nor does anybody else, but it is evident that a three-cent rate is the limit of the operation of the rule if increased revenue from decreased rates. If he has reached the limit, the action of the Government is unjustifiable for two reasons. It is unjustifiable as respects the reduction on letters, and, in the second place, as regards the imposition of a tax on newspapers. It is universally admitted by every one who has studied the question, it is a universal canon of political philosophy—and no man would be more familiar with that than the learned

Chancellor of the University of Toronto—that the correct principle of taxation is to impose the burden according to the ability to pay. It is universally recognized throughout the civilized world that there is no better index of the financial progress of a nation than the returns of its postal arrangements, and consequently the imposition of postage is a burden which bears on the people according to their ability.

If that be true, and it is true, what is the result? By lessening the tax, if you can call it a tax, we are reducing the burden on the rich man and in all probability shifting it to the shoulders of the poor. As an illustration, I had occasion, about three or four months ago to inquire into the postal revenue of one of the largest centres in the county of Westmoreland. It turned out that six people or firms paid much more than half the total revenue of the place. If we are reducing the cost of the transportation of letters, that amount must be made up from the consolidated fund or some other source, which simply means that we are making an inequitable distribution of the tax where we had an equitable distribution before—if we may call these postal rates a tax. Coming down to the question of the newspapers, what do we find? It does not make any difference how rich a man is, one or two newspapers satisfy him, and he must be very poor if he does not want one newspaper. You are violating here one of the first canons of taxation; taxes should be imposed according to the ability to pay. The Postmaster General says that it is inequitable that newspapers should be carried free. At first blush that seems perfectly sound: it seems fair that if newspapers are carried by means of the postal facilities afforded by the country, they should contribute towards the maintenance of the postal facilities. But that is a very misleading proposition, and misleading for this reason—that if we, the people of Canada are putting money in our own pockets in that way we are not doing it in some other way, and if we are not doing it in that way, we are doing it in another way. If we do not pay into the consolidated fund by taxing newspapers, we pay it in some other way. And by doing it as the Postmaster General proposes you violate the wholesome rule of government that you should distribute the burden according to the ability to bear. And if the burden of this tax—calling it a tax—is to be put upon the subscribers and not upon the publisher, you come in conflict with another very important rule, not a financial rule but more important, as there are more important considerations in this country than financial considerations. There can be no greater considerations than the enlightenment of the people. If you tax the newspaper, it may not be a matter of importance to the members of Parliament, but it is an important thing to people in the back settlements, and they are the people who most read the papers. And an increase in the price of their paper to them means a great deal, or they think it does. For this reason, I would vote against the passing of the Bill, with the exception of the clause, which I agree with my hon. friend from West York (Mr. Wallace) is a very good one—that relating to the case of the blind. This is not a case of the blind leading the blind and both falling into the ditch, but of the blind leading the blind and both going on terra firma. The Postmaster General, throughout this legislation, has certainly shown a special aptitude for blundering, and he must not feel sore if that aptitude has been the occasion of attack from this side. If he will amend the Bill, and the best way to amend it is to throw it out except those provisions that are really of an eleemosynary character, he could win more general support for it.

Mr. HUGHES. I do not intend to offer captious criticism of the Bill, but as we are discussing the clause generally, I would like to call attention to the provision for this ten-mile zone. In thickly-settled districts the ten-mile limit would cover the range of the ordinary country newspaper, which is what the hon. Postmaster General desires. But in sparsely-settled districts, which, I think should be regarded as most entitled to consideration, a limit of ten miles would not be of nearly so much benefit as a limit of five miles would be in many other districts. I have taken the liberty of explaining this matter to the Postmaster General. If he is determined to press on the clauses of this Bill—I would be very much pleased to see him withdraw it, for the session at any rate, and I think by the time another session comes around, second thoughts would have given him a great many new ideas—I think that it will be an injustice to the papers published in districts that are not so thickly settled as the frontier districts. That limit should be extended very materially and a greater radius than ten miles allowed. Now, as to newspapers from the United States re-mailed from Toronto, while some come in that way, they are not one per cent of the newspapers coming from the United States which drive a certain number of Canadian papers out of circulation. I am aware of this fact, because I have taken magazines and papers published in the United States, and used to get them forwarded by the booksellers. But in order to save the postage in Canada, the suggestion was made that they should be mailed direct from the office of publication and expense thus saved. These papers come in by express very often. Papers from Toronto also are frequently sent by express or even freight, being carried in the baggage cars and dumped off at the stations along the line and thus distributed through the country. So this proposal will not affect the large newspapers. For instance the Toronto "Evening Telegram"

will not be injured by this law. I have reason to believe that, in fact, it will be very largely benefited. These newspapers are sent out by express to the country towns. The country newspapers would really be killed off and the rural districts would be left at the mercy—of course at the tender mercies of the city papers. I would ask the Postmaster General—I do not know whether or not he has the figures here—what is the cost of running the mail service, say on one line between Toronto and Montreal?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hughes) mean the amount paid to one railway?

Mr. HUGHES. Yes.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Twenty-five thousand dollars a year, I think, is paid to the Grand Trunk Railway for one postal car alone. I think that the rule is $160 per running mile paid on the Canadian Pacific Railway main line between Montreal and Toronto, but there are different rates for different lines according to the supposed amount of service performed. I do not vouch for the accuracy of the amounts I have given, for I speak from memory. I may say the rate from Carleton Junction to Ottawa, over the Canadian Pacific Railway, is $320 per mile, per year, a very high rate indeed and one that will properly stand reducing, I think.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Before the clause is adopted, I would like to say a word. Being a newspaper publisher myself, and connected with a paper which has a large circulation in the province of Manitoba and the North-west, the tax will fall very heavily upon us. On that account I would not like to offer any opposition to the Bill, because my position might be ascribed to personal motives. But I may say that it seems to me that this proposal with regard to the ten-mile zone should be withdrawn.

I think the papers throughout the Dominion ought to be put exactly upon the same basis. So far as I am personally concerned, I would not offer any opposition to paying postage on papers that are sent out of the country; though I must confess that in view of the fact that a policy has been adopted for many years of free postage to newspapers, it is certainly a hardship on the newspaper proprietors. In consequence of the reduction of postage the proprietors reduced the price of their papers, and at present newspapers are sold at the very lowest possible price, and it will be impossible for the publishers to raise the price to subscribers. In view of that fact the loss will fall entirely upon the newspaper publishers, and not upon the general public. With regard to carrying religious papers free, I think that is a mistake.

Mr. HUGHES.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is only proposed to carry weekly papers within the limit of the zone.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The Bill does not so provide.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have an amendment on that point.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I gathered from the remarks of one hon. member that the intention was to carry religious papers free. I think, of course, that they should pay postage as well as others, because they are commercial enterprises, and make money out of advertising.

Mr. ELLIS. As a newspaper proprietor, I am indifferent entirely to the question of the tax, but as a matter of policy I think it is very objectionable. The Conservative party may fairly argue that it was they who brought in a measure to carry newspapers free of postage throughout the country, and now the Liberal party are going to impose a tax. Well, if I were a Conservative I could easily show that nothing has been a greater benefit to the press of the country than taking off the postage. They might fairly claim that the vast improvement which has taken place in the press of this country for the past 15 years is due to the fact that they gave increased facilities for circulation to the newspapers in this way, and there is no question that the newspaper press of Canada has made wonderful progress during the last 15 years. While a weekly paper may not seem of great importance to a man living in the city, yet these weekly papers have done a tremendous amount of good work for the people. They are circulated in the most remote parts of the country, and are an important means of educating the people, and keeping them in touch with public affairs. More than that, the weekly press of this country has furnished to the daily press in the large cities some of the brightest men in the newspaper profession; and the newspaper profession in Canada has furnished the press of the United States with some exceedingly able and capable men. Moreover, in our literature in every department, in science, in morals, in art, the weekly newspaper has contributed men capable of dealing with all these subjects. Now, there is another consideration that I may mention. There has been no demand whatever for this change. It might be readily argued that the newspapers, being in the hands of newspaper men, would not have hesitated to ask for this change if they had desired it. If there were any demand for such legislation as this, it would be made at the hustings, we would have heard of it in our political canvasses, but we have heard nothing of it at all. I am in accord with the view that the newspapers should pay the cost of their transmission through the mails, and that would be all right if that had been the policy, and it was

now being continued. I contend that the Liberal party is making a great mistake in putting this tax upon newspapers at the present time. Of course we will have to take the responsibility for it. I presume if it came to a vote, I would have to vote for it, or else not vote at all, on the ground that I am personally interested in the question. But I wish the Postmaster General could have seen the matter in a different light. I know it is claimed that at certain seasons of the year some newspapers load up the mails with special editions of various kinds, and thus cause a great deal of extra labour to the post office officials. I know that in the Post Office Department there is a feeling against the press just because it gives them so much trouble. I think the enterprise which some of these papers display on occasions such as the Queen's Birthday, the 1st of July, Christmas, and so on, is a most creditable thing to the press of the country. We know that many poor people in the country, who are not able to spend a dollar in little decorations, are yet able to buy 25 cents worth of these illustrated newspapers published at certain seasons of the year, with which they decorate their little homes. I think this tax will have the effect, at any rate, of repressing that enterprise to a considerable extent. I presume the Postmaster General cannot be influenced in this action by a desire to get revenue. That is quite apparent, because it is illogical to suppose that while he is taking revenue off letters he is seeking to make it up by putting a tax on newspapers. Therefore I must attribute the move to the hostility of the officials of the department to the press.

Mr. GILLIES. Can the Postmaster General tell us how the subsidy paid by the Government of Canada to railways for the carriage of the mails compares mile for mile with that paid by the United States Government?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It would be impossible for me to give minute statistics, because there is no general scale, either in Canada or the United States. The rate varies over different railways, according to circumstances. I can only say that the general opinion prevails in the United States, except in railway circles, that the railway companies in the United States are enormously overpaid, and I should think it a most unfortunate thing for Canada if the rates obtaining in the United States were regarded as a precedent to be followed in Canada.

Mr. GILLIES. If the rates paid in the two countries were somewhat alike, I should say that the reduction the Minister is making by this Bill would be a most unfortunate move. Having looked carefully into this Bill, I must say that there is nothing in it that commends itself to my mind. A question of this kind that affects the people so universally as does any subject connected with the Post Office Department, permeating every rank of life and going into the utmost corners of the Dominion, should be approached in a non-partisan spirit. That is the spirit I desire to bring to bear upon the discussion of this question, and it is the spirit I have exercised when examining its principle and provisions in detail. I fail to see there has been any public demand for this reduction, and that the Postmaster General put forth any argument whatever to sustain him in asking that this Bill be carried through, when it involves a loss admittedly of $640,000 annually to the postal revenue. If the department loses this sum, it must obviously be made up from some other source, and the hon. member for Westmoreland correctly laid down the principle when he said that taxation should be imposed in the way by which it could be most easily paid. It is apparent that with this loss of revenue the service of the department must suffer, and that post offices in remote sections will be lopped off on the ground of economy. The people will suffer, and the circulation of intelligence will be diminished. The Postmaster General in trying to make an argument by instituting a comparison with the United States, landed in a most unfortunate position. In 1883, the reduction from 3 cents to 2 cents was made in the adjoining country. From that time there has been an annual deficit, the amount for the year ending 30th July, 1897, being $11,400,000. The year before the reduction was made there was a surplus to the credit of the department of over $2,000,000. The committee will see that if the United States suffered to that extent by the reduction, and the Postmaster General is not able to give us a comparison of the railway rates charged, Canada must have a larger deficit proportionately. This must follow owing to the conditions of the country. The United States and Canada have each territory covering about 3,600,000 square miles. In the states there are 75,000,000 of people, whereas in Canada, with a like territory, there are only 5,000,000. The cost of transportation to supply our 5,000,000 is almost equal to that necessary to supply the 75,000,000, and if the United States have a deficit in one year of $11,400,000, it is quite clear Canada must have a larger deficit in proportion. The Postmaster General further endeavoured to sustain his position by instituting a comparison between the conditions in Canada and in Great Britain in 1841, when penny postage was established. The conditions, however, do not bear any comparison. In 1841 postage in Britain was almost prohibitory, no less than 1s. 6d. being charged for a letter sent from the north of England to London. That is one reason why the conditions cannot compare. Another reason for the great increase in the postal re-

venue in Great Britain after the introduction of the penny postage was that prior to 1841, the circle allowed to exercise the franking privilege was an exceedingly large one, including 640 members of the House of Commons and about 400 peers. Those were manufacturers, importers and professional men with large business connections, and they were permitted to frank their letters and parcels and other mail matter, not during the session only, but during the whole year. The Bill introduced in 1841, when penny postage was established, abolished the franking privilege. No person now is allowed to frank, even during the session of Parliament, not even members of the House of Commons or peers, or members of the royal family, and even Her Majesty the Queen has to pay letter postage. When the franking privilege was abolished, the postal revenue necessarily largely increased. That is an additional reason why the conditions of England do not correspond with the conditions here, and do not warrant the Postmaster General in concluding that there will be an increased revenue by reducing the postage from 3 cents to 2 cents.

I am entirely opposed to the second clause, because, in the first place, it is a retrograde step. In the lower provinces we had no newspaper postage until confederation, and then it was imposed in accordance with the practice in the other provinces and continued until twenty or fifteen years ago, when on account of a universal cry from all parts of the country it was abolished by the Government. The removal of the postage on newspapers was a lessening of taxation upon people who could ill afford to bear taxation, and to return to newspaper postage is a mistake. If the Postmaster General feels bound to impose postage on newspapers, then there should be no exception. He will find himself very much worried by this ten mile zone, and he had better, if he imposes postage at all, abolish all territorial limitation. You have no right to say that a man who lives within ten miles of the office of publication that he shall get his newspaper free of postage, and that a man who lives near the next post office must pay. That is an undue and indefensible discrimination. The third clause of the Bill was approved by the hon. member from West York (Mr. Wallace). I am as good a friend of the deserving blind as that hon. gentleman, but I am opposed to the principle of exemption in its entirety. If we are going to aid any institutions, I contend that it is better to do it by a fixed grant than by exemptions from taxations, because if a grant is made, then the people would know exactly what they are paying. I am also opposed to the principle contained in the fourth clause with regard to the Dead Letter Branch. It has been the object in all countries to studiously regard the secrecy of communications passing through the mails, but the very moment you increase the facility for opening letters then you lessen that secrecy. At present you have but one dead-letter office for the Dominion, at Ottawa. The official in Ottawa who opens the letters knows neither the sender nor the receiver, and he is not interested in the contents of the letter; but if you establish local agencies with authority to open letters, then the official would know the sender or the addressee, his curiosity would be excited to read the letter, and consequently the secrecy which should prevail is abolished. I am opposed to that proposal, lock, stock and barrel.

Mr. CLARKE. I have not yet heard an explanation from the Postmaster General as to the principle on which he exempts country newspapers. I shall be glad to assist the Postmaster General in making the revenue and expenditure of his department equalize, but I must tell him that the imposition of postage on newspapers, after they have been carried free for so many years, will be looked upon as a retrograde movement. For my part, I cannot see why a newspaper printed in any town or village of Canada should have the exemption which is not accorded to newspapers printed in cities. These small newspapers are published as business enterprises, and why should they not contribute, according to the weight sent through the mails, to the revenue of the country just as the larger newspapers do?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER. That discussion will come up on the next clause of the Bill, and as there are certain amendments to be moved, it will perhaps be more convenient to discuss these questions when we come to the clauses bearing on them.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The question of the member for Toronto (Mr. Clarke), is a perfectly reasonable one, and I would ask him to allow me to offer him that explanation on the next clause of the Bill.

Mr. WALLACE. The undesirability of this Bill has been effectually proven by several hon. members, and yet we have been offered no explanation in defence of it. Not one of the hon. gentleman's colleagues has attempted to defend it. If the hon. Postmaster General has nothing to say, I think we ought to adjourn, and perhaps at the next sitting of the House he will be able to present reasons in reply to the statements made from this side in opposition to the Bill.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The principle of the Bill was disposed of on the second reading, and now we are working at the details.

Mr. WALLACE. At that time there were no criticisms on the Bill, and the hon. Minister gave very meagre and inadequate reasons for it. When quoting the revenues of the United States, he did not quote the enormously increased expenditure required to produce that revenue. But suppose the hon. gentleman did explain the Bill, that

does not dispense him from making further statements in the House when the details are criticised.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) before he went away to-night, came to an understanding with the Government that we should reserve the clause respecting the dead letter office, and that the remainder of the Bill would probably then go through without further objection, and we have been expecting that that arrangement would be carried out.

Mr. WALLACE. Was it made across the floor of the House to the knowledge of the members ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. member for York asked what we would agree to, and we made that suggestion, and he concurred in it.

Mr. WALLACE. Did he or the Minister of Finance inform the House of it ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No.

Mr. WALLACE. Then the House is not bound by it.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. When the hon. member for York left, he told me that the understanding was as the Minister of Finance has explained it, of course subject to the consent of the other members of the House.

Mr. MARCOTTE. (Translation.) At this stage of the discussion, I am not going to take up the time of the House at any length, the more so as this subject has been pretty well threshed out. Still, I deem it but right to call attention to the fact that nobody ever complained about the 3-cent letter rate being too high. But this Bill, if carried into effect, will inflict a great loss on the revenue, and when the public realize that they must pay additional taxes in order to make up the deficiency in the revenue, then their eyes will be opened and they will no doubt, be grateful to the members of this House who have opposed, in the public interest, this clause of the Bill now before us. I am bound to oppose this clause to the utmost of my power, and I deem it my duty to protest against such a clause, as in my opinion a 3-cent letter rate is not too high considering the quick transmission of news under our system. I do not think that the relief given by a reduction from 3 cents to 2 cents is going to be of much value to the great mass of the people. It is not the great mass of the people who fill the mail bags with letters and postal communications; because as a rule the poorest classes of the community do not send many letters, but it is the wealthier classes who contribute the most to the postal revenue and it is upon their shoulders that this tax falls. As to the newspapers, which are one of the greatest educational means this country possesses—and the hon. gentlemen know that nowadays there is scarcely a family to be found that has not the advantage of receiving a newspaper in some form or other—I venture to say that the subscription price will certainly be increased if the Minister reimposes upon them a tax of one-half cent a pound.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER. (Translation.) The hon. gentleman should confine himself to the first clause of the Bill.

Mr. MARCOTTE. (Translation.) With all due deference, Mr. Chairman, I must say that the two first clauses of the Bill are so co-related one with the other, that it is almost impossible to speak to the first without touching upon the second.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER. (Translation.) The hon. gentleman should keep to the clause before the committee. The principle of the Bill being carried, the question is now on the first clause, and the hon. gentleman should confine himself to that clause.

Mr. MARCOTTE. (Translation.) It is almost impossible, in dealing with the revenue question, not to touch upon the second clause of the Bill, because the two first clauses, as I said, hang together a good deal. However, Mr. Chairman, I bow to your ruling.

Section agreed to.

On section 2,

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I announced that I intended making some changes in this clause. One is that the free circulation shall be limited to newspapers published not more frequently than weekly. The other is that the point of publication need not necessarily be in the centre, but the publisher may have the option inside a circle twenty miles in diameter or ten miles radius. In some cases the office of the publisher may be on the lake shore, so that the ten-mile radius would give only half a circle as the water took off the other half. I propose to have a circle that will be optional to the publisher.

Mr. CLARKE. Upon what principle is that exemption given to papers printed in any particular part of the country ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The rate of half a cent a pound will carry newspapers the full length of this Dominion. It is not every paper that goes very far, but the papers that become a charge upon the country and really put the country to the expense are those publications, not having a local circulation, but a widespread circulation throughout the country. They are a burden on the country, because they involve handling and carriage on railways and in various other ways. But with regard to mere local papers, which have a small circulation, a very considerable portion will be distributed in the village of the publisher and a very small proportion sent by mail.

I propose, at all events, to allow these papers to be placed in the local post office, where there is no free delivery. It will cost nothing to the public to call for the papers at the post office if they so desire, and the few taken in the mail bags for a short distance will be such a mere bagatelle that it can be hardly said that they occasion any exepnse to the public at all. Take the circulation of 1,000, not more than one-half of that would find its way into the mails. Five hundred papers would not weigh 50 pounds, I presume. Once a week those papers would be handed over to couriers, making a trivial parcel for each courier. I am not aware of any rate small enough to levy on that class of mail matter, considering that there is a charge of only half a cent a pound to carry papers to the remotest parts of Canada.

Mr. HUGHES. Is there anything in this clause to exempt church papers, temperance papers, &c. ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No, the clause reads, "if the publication is of no greater frequency than once a week." All papers of that class are on the same footing.

Mr. CLARKE. I have every desire to aid the Postmaster General as far as I can in carrying the Bill through. But I think the explanation he gives is not entirely satisfactory. If the fact that these newspapers are only carried a short distance is any reason why they should escape the taxation imposed on newspapers, that argument should apply with all the greater force to drop letters. The drop letter in the city should not be taxed as much as one would be called on to pay for a letter sent from one city to another. If the principle is to be asserted of compelling newspapers, on the ground that they are business enterprises, to pay the cost of carriage and distribution through the mails, the principle should be applied to all. If the papers published in towns or villages are to be exempted from this tax and delivered free within a radius of five or ten miles, why should not the same apply to newspapers published in the cities ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No distinction is made.

Mr. CLARKE. If no distinction is made, a great objection is removed. Still, I think it would be fair to make them all pay.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I would appeal to the hon. gentleman who leads the House (Sir Louis Davies). We have adopted the principle of the Bill and passed the first clause. Now, the hon. Postmaster General is submitting amendments which must involve a great deal of discussion. I think the committee should rise and report progress and we should adjourn.

Mr. MULOCK.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I would ask my hon. friend (Sir Adolphe Caron) to lend his influence to carry out the agreement as far as possible. These are small amendments and they were explained by the Postmaster General some days ago. They were thoroughly understood by everybody. Under the arrangements the committee will still remain. We shall report progress and ask leave to sit again, reserving one clause, which will allow every opportunity for discussion.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I do not think these amendments can be considered as small amendments, and as to their having been explained, I have never heard of them before. I do not wish to interfere with the progress of the Bill. But I submit a proposition which must appeal to the hon. gentleman's judgment. He has just heard my hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Clarke), who has given reasons which show that these amendments cannot be passed without a good deal of discussion. I do not wish to delay the Bill.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I mean exactly what I say. Hon. gentlemen opposite have a majority, and they will pass their Bill, of course ; but we are not going to permit amendments like these to pass without discussing them as they should be discussed. We have made good progress, and in the very interest of shortening the discussion, I think that it would be well for the committee to rise and report progress, and that we should adjourn now. I think it is altogether in the interest of shortening the discussion which may follow, that we should now adjourn the debate.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Perhaps it would be well for us to understand now whether the arrangement arrived at with the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) is to be adhered to. If it is, then I suppose we are free to proceed with the Bill without holding any part of it over ?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I consider that we are carrying out the agreement entered into with the hon. member for York. He stated that if we passed the first clause, the clause with reference to the dead letter office would be reserved ; but he never mentioned that the Postmaster General was going on with the second clause, and would introduce amendments which had never been mentioned, and which I, for my part, am not prepared to accept without having proper time to look into them and to discuss them.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. member is not aware that when the second reading of the Bill was moved, the Postmaster General stated that he intended to introduce certain amendments, and he men-

tioned them ; therefore, they are not sprung upon the House at all. I am satisfied that the hon. member for York was aware of these amendments when he made the arrangement. The arrangement was that we should pass this Bill except the one clause.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I must say that these amendments were never mentioned to me. I remember the Postmaster General spoke of introducing amendments, but I had never seen them.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I may be permitted to read what I said on this point on Friday night last :

> But since that Bill was introduced, representations have been made to me which have led me to believe that it may be wise to reduce the class of exempted newspapers. If the suggestions which I propose to make in committee on that point meet with approval the reduction from the $82,000 of revenue will not amount to the figure I have named, but will be represented by a very much smaller sum.
>
> Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Perhaps the hon. gentleman would state what changes he proposes in his scheme.
>
> The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It has been represented to me that it would be advisable to reduce the exemption contemplated by the Bill by limiting it to publications of a frequency not greater than weekly.
>
> Sir ADOLPHE CARON. Then the dailies would pay ?
>
> The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The dailies would pay.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. That shows that the hon. gentleman indicated that he intended to propose amendments which I considered to be of great importance, but they were not discussed.

Mr. WALLACE. Besides that, if any such arrangement was come to, it was made between certain individuals, but unknown to members on both sides of the House. We are not bound in any way by that. We have now before us very important amendments on the second clause, and I think we can fairly ask the Government, after having passed the first clause, to let the committee rise.

Mr. FRASER. I think a communication from the ex-Minister of Finance, who ought to be accepted under all circumstances to represent the Opposition, should be enough for any party. Are we to understand that the leader of a great party for the time being, when he makes an arrangement with the Government, does not represent anybody but himself, and that each man can get up and say : Because I was not consulted, I will for the time being constitute myself a leader ? Really, it shocks one's views of what parties should be.

Mr. WALLACE. You look shocked.

Mr. FRASER. I am, when objection is raised by an hon. gentleman as against his leader. I appeal to the hon. gentlemen opposite that an arrangement having been made to reserve one clause, and that the rest of the Bill should be put through committee, that arrangement ought to be adhered to.

Mr. WALLACE. We never agreed to it.

Mr. FRASER. The hon. gentleman can talk for himself, and if he reads himself out from the direction of a leader and constitutes himself sole leader, then the Ministry must always consult him.

Mr. WALLACE. He is in this position, that he is not looking for judgeships, or anything of that kind.

Mr. FRASER. If the hon. gentleman makes that remark to me, he makes the biggest mistake of his life.

Mr. WALLACE. I make it with regard to myself.

Mr. FRASER. If the reference has any meaning, it is directed to me, and the meanness of the remark could only come from the hon. gentleman himself. I can tell the hon. gentleman also that he is looking for far more than I am. He has constituted himself a sort of leader, and expects to have the reins of leadership fall into his hands.

Mr. WALLACE. I may say, Mr. Chairman, that I will not accept lessons in propriety from the hon. member for Guysborough. I do not think that he is well qualified to lecture this House on that matter. As for saying that I constituted myself a leader, or that I said I would constitute myself a leader that is absolutely untrue, I never said anything that could be twisted so as to have that meaning. Now, with reference to the agreement, we had that matter discussed some weeks ago, and the leader of the House, at that time the Minister of Trade and Commerce made the statement that those agreements come to without the knowledge of the members on both sides of the House were not very satisfactory or proper ; and that in future arrangements would be made across the floor of the House to the knowledge of all the members who were here. We are told that some arrangement had been made by which the Bill was to go through, but we were not told, and the Minister of Finance was not told that two important amendments would be proposed, one changing the centre of the circle where the radius of ten miles was to be counted from, which is a very important matter as regards Toronto. It is true that the Minister gave answers to the late Postmaster General and to the hon. member for Pictou, but they were answers that were exceedingly indifferent. Besides these amendments, the clause under consideration is important. If the Minister wants to discuss it to-night, I have no objection, if he can give all the information required. Each newspaper was to be carried for one-twen-

tieth of a cent, but a letter accompanying it, passing over the same route, handled by the same carriers and officials, was charged three cents. We are entitled to an explanation from the Postmaster General on this point, specially in view of the fact that he has stated that newspapers should pay their share of the cost to the department the same as letters. The cost of newspapers to the country he places at about two and a half millions, and he now proposes to raise a revenue from the newspapers of $65,000 to meet the loss. I should like to know if the Postmaster General intends to give the explanations to which we are entitled ? The member for Cape Breton urged very clearly objections to every clause of the Bill. The hon. gentleman objected to the clause regarding books for the blind on the ground that Parliament should not make any exceptions. I thought there was one clause which I could support, but I am satisfied of the force of the objection raised by the hon. gentleman and the Bill must go by the board, and the efforts of the Postmaster General must be left to fructify and produce something more justifiable and reasonable than the present Bill, which has nothing to recommend it. The radius of ten miles provided for in the amendment is not reckoned from the place where the newspaper is published, but from some place ten miles distant, and it is the most absurd arrangement that could be conceived.

Mr. CLARKE. Do I understand from the Postmaster General that the ten-mile radius was to apply to all weekly papers printed in Canada ? I draw his attention to the fact that if the 31st line of the section remains in, that exemption will not apply to weekly newspapers printed in the cities ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think it will.

Mr. WALLACE. These amendments are so complicated that it would require a man of great genius to have an adequate idea of the increased work that would devolve on the post office to keep these accounts from day to day, and to keep track of the radii of these various circles. It would be absurd to think of passing this Bill without having it printed so that the whole thing could be read consecutively. Why does not the Postmaster General in his Bill carry out his pledge that he would make the newspapers pay their way ? He is not making them pay more than about one-fortieth of the expense he says is involved in doing the newspaper work through the post office. Not a single pledge has he redeemed, and we want to know the reason why.

Mr. CLARKE. Will there be a general discussion permitted on this clause respecting the dead letter office, which is reserved —a general discussion on all the provisions of the Bill.

Mr. WALLACE.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) came to an arrangement with us, that all the clauses of the Bill should be passed except that relating to the dead letter branch.

Mr. DAVIN. I did not understand that.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have no objection to allowing a full discussion on anything in the Bill, but of course there will only be one clause open.

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) said you would only go to the second clause.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. I am sure that we have not been improving the time very much to-night. It seems rather strange that men who are supposed to come here and discuss matters in a business-like way, should spend so much time talking about nothing. The hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) has spent over an hour in mere trivialities. I do not wish to be hard on that hon. gentleman, but if he has any aspirations to the leadership, I can assure the other members of his party that if he should succeed in obtaining his object, he will lead them a merry dance. There will not be anything too serious or solemn in the Opposition. He has a great fund of humour, and to-night has given full vent to it ; but if he keeps on after a while his party and the country at large will not take him seriously. If he has any aspirations, it would do him good to bear in mind the words of Burns :

> Oh wad some power the giftie gie us
> To see ourselves as ithers see us.

To come down to the discussion of the second clause of the Bill, I think that all the members who have given this Bill any serious consideration are agreed that the efforts of the Postmaster General to make ends meet in the department are praiseworthy and deserve the commendation of all those thoroughly interested in economical government.

Now, the question of newspaper postage is a very important one. There is no doubt that the newspaper is a great factor in our modern civilization. The great city newspaper is one of the most important educators we have. But, while I have nothing at all to say against the large city daily or weekly, while I do not wish to criticise them in any way, at the same time, something must be said on behalf of the small country weekly paper. Now, the defence made for the reservation in favour of the small paper by the Postmaster General was not deemed quite satisfactory by the member for West Toronto (Mr. Clarke). He asked what reason could be given for making any distinction between one newspaper and another. The reason given by the Postmaster General was that the weekly newspaper had a small circulation and only a small proportion of the copies printed would be required to be carried by the mails at all, and then, only for

short distances. There is still another reason why an exception should be made on behalf of a country paper, and that is because it is an absolute necessity. There is no doubt that in any community which is advancing and growing as it ought to do, it is absolutely necessary to have a good, live local paper which the people can use for advertising and for other purposes, as they cannot use the large city paper. Now, it is well known to all who have had experience of papers of that kind they are not at all remunerative. They are very hard to keep going. The financing of such papers is a very difficult matter and every consideration possible ought to be shown them in order to keep them in existence and encourage them in their work, for they have a work of their own apart altogether from that of the city paper. Now, the charging of postage on such papers would be a very serious drawback. As a matter of fact, the income from such a paper is very seldom more than enough to keep the editor alive. He has to finance very carefully to keep his paper going at all. If he had to take the price of postage out of his subscription price, he would suffer very greatly. I am much pleased to see that the Postmaster General has admitted, in this clause, the priniple that an exception should be made in favour of the country paper. But this does not go far enough. While, in some portions of Canada, no doubt, a radius of ten miles would be a fair constituency for a small country weekly, in many portions of the country, where settlement is sparse, these rural papers have to extend over a very much wider area. I am sure that in Manitoba and the North-west Territories, a radius of ten miles would not be nearly enough for papers of the class I have described. I approve, to a great extent, of the amendment which was so much ridiculed by the hon. member for West York and which was so incomprehensible to his great and massive intellect, but which, a business man who wished to discuss it seriously and wished to bring out the points of the Bill could grasp in a couple of minutes—I approve it as far as it goes. But it does not go far enough. I would move in amendment, that this section 2, be amended, that in the thirty-fourth line the word "ten" be struck out and the word "twenty" be inserted. I think that a radius of twenty miles is the smallest possible radius that we could be expected to accept as a fair measure of justice to the country weekly newspaper. And I may say that such an amendment would meet with the hearty approval of the rural public throughout Canada. I think this is the proper step to take and I hope the members of the committee will give it their support and that the Postmaster General will accept the amendment.

Mr. KAULBACH. I do not wish to unduly prolong this debate but I desire to contribute a word or two by way of comment in disapproval of a portion of clause 2 of this Bill. I am not anxious to look unfavourably on this Bill of the Postmaster General. Still, I do feel that it is a hardship upon the local newspapers to be compelled to pay the postage that is proposed by this Bill. A radius of ten miles would amount to nothing at all, as it would be insufficient so far as this zone is concerned as respects distances. I would suggest that newspapers should be carried free in the counties in which they are published. There would be a line of demarkation clearly defined, but where is the Postmaster General to find a line by simply making a ten mile radius. If the exemption within ten miles allows newspapers to be carried free of postage to a certain house just on the defined line, it would be pretty hard that postage should be charged on a paper of a neighbour living only a few yards beyond that point. We should not hamper the publisher of the local paper as he has a hard struggle to have ends meet, and it is the only medium that the people residing in a country section are able to use for the publication of their local matter. I hope the Postmaster General will accept the suggestion I make.

Mr. DAVIN. How would it work?

Mr. KAULBACH. I will explain. Suppose a paper published in my county, Lunenburg, has a radius of about 25 miles. The free carriage of that paper would be confined to the county of Lunenburg. The same would apply to other counties. There are many counties much larger than mine, such, for instance, as that of the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) and the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dyment). These are very large districts or counties, but still I do conceive that this will give them too much latitude. It looks to me as if it would be greatly hampering and restricting education in putting this postage rate on local papers. To make this discrimination between city and town seems to me radically wrong and contrary to the interest of the public generally. I am confident that there will be no objections in the country to the suggestion I have proposed, and I hope it will be regarded with favour by the Postmaster General.

Mr. DAVIN. I agree with the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Rutherford). But he would see clearly that that amendment would entail large expense upon the department. Therefore, I move in amendment to that clause to insert after word population in line 34: "Where the population of the place does not execced 2,500." And in line 36 to insert: "In the case of newspapers published in places having a population of over 2,500." It is easy to see that the proposition of the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Rutherford) would entail large expense on the department. My proposition will relieve the department of great expense, and effect the purpose that he has in view.

Mr. POPE. I must say on behalf of country newspapers that this ten-mile limit or fifteen-mile limit is a mistake. It may answer for small constituencies, or it may answer for populous constituencies which have several centres of population where there are many newspapers published. But it will not answer in the constituency that I represent, which has only one newspaper, and which is 75 miles long and 35 miles wide. I ask the Postmaster General to consider favourably the case of those weekly papers which are taken by thousands of people in Canada and who take no other papers. I trust that the revenues that he expects to receive from the carriage of newspapers will meet his anticipations. I would ask the Postmaster General to leave over for further consideration any of these amendments that affect the circulation of weekly newspapers.

Mr. McMULLEN. With respect to making this system apply to counties, a place of publication might be on the boundary line of a county or two counties. In that case the definition of the counties would not meet the requirements of the local press. If the hon. gentleman would extend the distance from ten to twenty miles, it would, I think, meet with general approbation.

Mr. POPE. If twenty miles were adopted, there was no reason why twenty-one miles should not be equally applicable. When limitation with respect to the circulation is entered on, difficulty at once arises. It is evident the hon. gentleman has not given the matter consideraion, and in fact it has not received full attention from the committee. This arrangement will affect newspapers that are weekly, both as regards time of publication and their financial condition. I ask the Postmaster General to give the matter some serious consideration.

Mr. MARCOTTE. (Translation.) The clause which is now before us is of such importance that I deem it my duty to give my views on the question. Everybody knows that the newspapers are the real educators of the people. It is the best means the people have of informing their minds and increasing their knowledge of public affairs. The newspapers are certainly a medium of education for the people. I believe that the fact that Canada can boast to-day of having a better informed population among all classes is attributable to the wider circulation of the newspapers. The newspapers are a medium of education for the people. Now, Sir, what does the clause of the Bill now under consideration propose to us? This clause strikes a most potent blow at the dissemination by the press of most useful knowledge and information, and I regard it as an attempt at the suppression of one of the greatest educational means this country possesses. Moreover, I hold that this measure is most unfair to the trade of the country. The trade interests will certainly suffer from the imposition of a tax which is bound to hamper and restrict the circulation of the press and particularly that of the leading organs of the public opinion. I am not ready to admit that the newspapers which are supporting the policy of the hon. gentlemen opposite always tell the truth, but there are other newspapers from which the people of this country obtain accurate and reliable information. Now, I say that those newspapers should have as free a circulation as possible. I hold that the proposition to impose a postage upon newspapers is an attempt to tax knowledge against which I am bound to protest, to the utmost of my power. Moreover, this measure will also result in a considerable loss to the revenue of the country, and thereby swell the deficit; for, in spite of all the credit which the hon. gentlemen opposite are constantly claiming, there will certainly be another deficit this year, as the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) himself had to admit. The existence of such a deficit leaving no room for doubt, and when I consider that this new Bill is going to inflict a loss on the revenue, what, I ask, will be the outcome of all this, and what will become of the country? With such a policy, we will soon have to face direct taxation, a most undesirable thing. Now, instead of curtailing the public revenue, instead of limiting the circulation of the press and preventing their reaching the mass of the people, thereby circumscribing the dissemination of knowledge and information, as the Government are doing by the imposition of a postage, the House ought to vote down this measure. All those who are interested in the prosperity of this country ought to oppose the passage of this Bill, even from the trade standpoint, as the newspapers are a means of disseminating much useful knowledge and information in reference to trade matters.

I see there is also a clause under which a certain portion of newspapers would be exempt, as being circulated within a certain zone. But hon. gentlemen are not agreed even on that clause, as some propose to exempt newspapers circulated within the ten-mile zone, while others are in favour of a twenty-mile limit. At all events, I look upon this measure as unfair, as it limits the circulation of newspapers.

Mr. Chairman, this measure, to my mind, is not calculated to promote the prosperity of the Dominion; on the contrary, I regard it as a retrograde step, in so far as it takes away from the people a privilege conferred on them and hampers the dissemination of useful information among the mass of the people. This imposition of half a cent per pound is a pretty high tax. The publisher will have to charge this tax upon the newspapers he distributes, and so increase the price to the subscribers; so that the trade interests and the industries of the

country will be affected by it, to a considerable extent. The weekly publications would have less to pay, or perhaps nothing at all, and would benefit to that extent of this provision of the Bill, while the dailies would have to incur a very large expenditure. Is it fair, I ask, thus to interfere with the free circulation of newspapers, by re-imposing a postage rate upon them? I think the Bill does not go far enough in exempting newspapers circulated within a radius of ten or twenty miles. Why should we not maintain the system now existing? Those who enacted that system were as broad-minded and as devoted to the interests of the country as the hon. gentlemen now in power claim to be. We have a system which gives satisfaction to the general public, and I see no reason why we should hamper and restrict the free circulation of newspapers outside of a ten or twenty-mile zone.

The hon. gentlemen opposite climbed into power on a liberal platform. Now, I ask, are the hon. gentlemen acting in a liberal spirit, when imposing a tax upon newspapers and restricting their circulation within a radius of ten or twenty miles? Such a departure from their liberal professions would be most deplorable. Let us, then, not interfere with the wise policy of the Conservative party in that respect; let us not deprive the great mass of the people of the means of increasing their knowledge of public affairs, so as to enable them to inform their minds in reference to public questions and to give their support to the best Government in the general interests of the country. It would be a retrograde step to take away from the people the privilege conferred on them and our plain duty is to maintain the actual system which is certainly the best yet devised.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I wish to say a few words in answer to the propositions made by the hon. members for Lunenburg, Macdonald, and Compton, and to express my desire to meet their wishes as fully as possible. With respect to the proposition made by the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Kaulbach), that county lines should be the limits of free transmission, I thought that would not give as much satisfaction as a radial system. Many papers are published, not in the central portions but in remote portions of a county. The constituency of a newspaper may be largely in an adjoining county or counties, and in that case the county limits would not meet the requirements of such newspaper. Then as regards the provinces. The population is of the same character in adjoining provinces near the boundary line, and a newspaper might have a constituency on both sides, and to adopt a provincial limit, would exclude a large number of subscribers. Looking, therefore, at the subject from a general standpoint, it will be found that the great bulk of subscribers are within a certain geographical distance of the point of publication. To meet their view, I thought the zone system the most desirable. In the United States the county system prevails, but how far it has satisfied public opinion, I am unable to say. The hon. member for Macdonald suggested twenty miles. That would give a diameter of forty miles, a very large exemption. If, however, the hon. member for Lunenburg and other hon. gentlemen will be satisfied with a middle course I will move that fifteen miles be inserted instead of ten miles. Taking it all in all, this change will no doubt make it satisfactory throughout the country.

Mr. WALLACE. Will a weekly newspaper in Toronto be delivered free to subscribers there?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. We never delivered newspapers free in the place of publication. This half cent limit does not apply to residents in the place of publication. Such a change would involve the appointment of an army of letter carriers.

Mr. POPE. While I should like to see everything absolutely free, as being in the best interest of the country and for the advancement of public thought, still, in view of the fact that the Minister has a majority behind him, speaking for myself I should be glad to accept the proposition made.

Mr. KAULBACH. I certainly must offer a word of acknowledgment to the Minister for the kind consideration he has given to my request. I would certainly like the provision to cover 20 or 25 miles; but if the hon. gentleman thinks he cannot go beyond his amendment, must accept the inevitable.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think I will have to adhere to the fifteen-mile limit.

Mr. DAVIN. I do not think that is enough. Did my leader, Mr. Pope, say that was enough?

Mr. POPE. It is not a question of enough, but it is about all we can get.

Mr. DAVIN. That is not the question. I want all country papers exempted.

Mr. KAULBACH. If the Minister would make it twenty-five miles, I think that would be acceptable to all, even my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin).

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Kaulbach) is very winning in his ways, and if this is positively the last time of asking, we will make it a radius of twenty miles.

Mr. DAVIN. Twenty-five miles would not do in the North-west Territories. A paper published in Regina will sell 150 or 200 miles away. I move the following amendment:—

To insert in clause 2, line 34, after the word "publication" the words 'or the population of the place of publication does not exceed 2,500," and in line 36 to insert after the word "if" the words "in the case of newspapers published in places having a population of 2,500."

Amendment negatived.

Mr. WALLACE. Does the amendment of the Postmaster General provide that the office of publication is within that area?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes. The paper is to be posted at the place of publication.

Section 3 agreed to.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. We will pass section 4 and consider section 5.

On section 5,

Mr. WALLACE. We would like to have an explanation of this.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Section 39 of the Civil Service Act provides a form of examination that is not always apt. I think that when it comes to a man working in a post office or doing mail service, his examination ought to be confined strictly to the work he is asked to do. He passes a proper entrance examination, and, therefore, I do not think he should always be liable to pass a promotion examination.

Mr. WALLACE. Would not the same rule apply to other departments; the Customs Department, for instance?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes, I consider it ought to be more general.

Mr. WALLACE. And more especially to the Inland Revenue Department, which is more technical than any other.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes, I consider it ought to be more general.

Mr. WALLACE. Then why not amend the Civil Service Act in that respect instead of making the rule apply to the Post Office Department alone, where the reasons for the change are less forcible than they would be in the Department of Inland Revenue. Mind you, I quite agree with the principle the Postmaster General has laid down, but it should be made general.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I quite agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Wallace) that it ought to be made general, but at present I am only dealing with the Post Office Act, and the rest of the members of the Government have not had an opportunity of studying out the requirements of the staff and the various officers of the department. It would be a mistake to have one needed reform stand over simply to enable a lot of others deemed desirable to be brought into effect. Once a man has passed the necessary examination and entered the service, thereafter the efficiency of his office work depends upon his discharging the technical work which he is engaged in, stamping, sorting, handling the material and so on. I do not think it is fair to be eternally holding over the heads of members of the service the bugbear of an examination on undefined subjects.

Mr. MARCOTTE. (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, this clause provides that clerks employed in post offices, mail couriers, and so on, shall be hereafter examined on the work of the post office, by such persons as are, from time to time, designated by the Postmaster General. When those employees discharge their duties properly, and there is no complaint about their office work, I do not see any reason why they should be obliged to pass such examinations. But this may be an attempt at exempting certain persons from passing their entrance examinations.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The only way we could test them is by examining them. In the railway mail service, we have adopted a system with great benefit. The number of mistakes made in the sorting of letters by the railway mail clerks has fallen to a most marked extent since we adopted the plan of competitive examinations. There is no way short of an examination to ascertain whether or not an officer is discharging his duties properly.

Mr. MARCOTTE. (Translation.) To tell the truth, it may be that, after having passed such examinations, they are less liable to make mistakes in the discharge of their technical work; still, I am of opinion that these competitive examinations ought to be limited.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. (Translation.) To what?

Mr. MARCOTTE. (Translation.) This examination should be confined strictly to the work the employee has to do. For instance, a clerk doing mail service should pass one or two examinations, after which he should be exempted from any further test. I do not think it is fair to be continually holding over the heads of members of the civil service the threat of an examination. There ought to be a limit of age, beyond which a man, say fifty or sixty years old, should be exempt from passing any examination. One or two examinations ought to be a sufficient test of a man's abilities. It requires a certain amount of work to prepare those examinations. It would only be fair to specify the number of examinations to be passed by an employee. That is the course which is followed in other walks of life. For instance, physicians and lawyers are not subjected to any such competitive examinations. I would have a limit fixed for the civil service employees just the same as with lawyers and physicians. I am afraid the hon. gentleman is aiming at exempting those employees from their entrance examination.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. (Translation.) No.

Mr. MARCOTTE. (Translation.) The Civil Service Act provides for different kinds of examinations, such as qualifying and promotion examinations.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. (Translation.) After the entrance examinations are passed.

Mr. MARCOTTE. (Translation.) Well, those examinations are a necessity. There is a certain amount of technical knowledge which those employees require in order to discharge properly their duties. Such examinations are calculated to raise the standard of the civil service. Those employees form an important class of the community and, in my opinion, if the standard of education for the civil service were raised, it would save the Government considerable expenditures. Let us take, for instance, the Railway Department. I think that the employees who wish to enter that branch of the civil service ought to possess all the technical knowledge of the work they are to be engaged in.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. (Translation.) I think the hon. gentleman had better confine himself to the clause now under consideration. He is referring to railway matters, which are not germane to the matter before the committee.

Mr. MARCOTTE. (Translation.) I am speaking to the clause. I was just showing that entrance examinations were a necessity, and I took, to illustrate my argument, the Railway Department, and I said that the employees in that branch of the civil service ought to have the required technical knowledge. In that way, the Government would not be obliged to give contracts to outsiders and to contractors. If the Government employees had all the technical knowledge required for the discharge of their duties, it would prevent combines and monopolies being formed with a view to compete against the Government, which is one of the grievances the hon. gentlemen opposite often complain of. Moreover, if those employees had the required technical knowledge, it would obviate another evil which is rampant in this country; it would put a stop to the too numerous applications of place-hunters. On these several grounds, I hold that every applicant for a civil service position ought to be subjected to a very severe test, and that he should pass a thorough examination before entering the civil service. As I said, were such a policy to prevail, it would obviate very serious evils and the members of the Government, instead of being beseiged by place-hunters, would only have to tell the applicants: "Pass your examination, and show us that you are qualified to fill the position you are applying for." In that way, there would not be seen so many party hangers-on and place-hunters looking for civil service positions. I cannot support clause 5, because, in my opinion, it is merely a veiled attempt at imposing the burden of an examination on men of experience and otherwise well qualified for the discharge of their duties, while it seeks to exempt from it those who wish to enter the civil service.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I assume that the arrangement made by the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) has been abandoned, and therefore it would be quite in order for us to take the other clause, but I prefer to yield a point and reserve the clause.

Mr. POPE. It is only a dead letter clause.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think the arrangement was a dead letter.

The Committee rose and reported progress.

Mr. POPE. Will the hon. Minister of Finance be kind enough to tell us what will be the business to-morrow?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. An arrangement was made to name a day for a discussion of the motion of the hon. member for Bruce (Mr. McNeill), and that will be the first order for to-morrow. I move that the House do now adjourn.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 3.13 a.m. (Wednesday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 18th May, 1898.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 147)—(from the Senate)—to amend the Canada Evidence Act, 1893.—(Mr. Fitzpatrick.)

BRIGADE CAMP—THIRD MILITARY DISTRICT.

Mr. GUILLET (by Mr. McCleary) asked,

When and where will the brigade camp or camps for the third military district be held?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). The two military districts, Nos. 3 and 4, have been united for some years for the purpose of camp. This year there will be two camps, one at Kingston and the other at Belleville.

Mr. FOSTER. They will be disunited this year?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes, for this year.

LIEUT.-COL. R. Z. ROGERS.

Mr. GUILLET (by Mr. McCleary) asked,

What was the reason that Lieut.-Col. R. Z. Rogers, who recently retired from the command of the 40th Battalion, was not transferred to the infantry reserve of officers ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). Lieut.-Col. R. Z. Rogers was not placed on the reserve of officers because at the time of his retirement the regulations did not admit of it. Since then the regulations have been modified and now Lieut.-Col. Rogers is eligible and will be placed on the reserve of officers.

MARTIN LAMBERT, OF MONTAGUE, P.E.I.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's) asked,

What are the grounds on which Martin Lambert, caretaker of the Dominion public building at Montague, P.E.I., was dismissed ? At whose suggestion was he dismissed, and who recommended his successor ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). Mr. Martin Lambert's services were dispensed with for the efficiency of the service. His successor was appointed on the recommendation of people in whom I have entire confidence.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved :

That when this House adjourns this day, Wednesday, it stands adjourned until Friday, the 20th instant.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Would my right hon. friend be able to say what he proposes to do when we adjourn on Friday ?

The PRIME MINISTER. I am very much in the hands of the House with regard to that. We might perhaps sit on Saturday if it would be convenient to my hon. friends on the other side.

Hon. MEMBERS. Yes ; no.

The PRIME MINISTER. I see there is some difference of opinion about that. We might think it over and come to some conclusion on Friday.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Hear, hear.

Mr. McDOUGALL. To those of us who come from a long distance and find it impossible to get home, except perhaps once during four months, it is rather hard that we should have to postpone the business of the House on Friday evening, as we often are obliged to do, because a large number of the members go home. I think we should at the last of the session get a Saturday to transact business.

Mr. BORDEN (King's).

The PRIME MINISTER. The Government is anxious to consult the wishes and the convenience of the House in that respect. There is a great deal in what my hon. friend (Mr. McDougall) has just said. It is rather unpleasant, to say the least of it, for gentlemen who live at a great distance to have these repeated holidays. To-morrow is a holiday and the House cannot sit. But, if it be equally convenient to replace to-morrow by sitting on Saturday the Government would perhaps be able to meet that view.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. We are all anxious at this period of the session to facilitate the business of the House and to learn as far as we can what prospect there is of prorogation.

The PRIME MINISTER. The Supplementary Estimates for the current year were brought down yesterday, and the Supplementary Estimates for next year will be brought down, I hope, on Friday. Then we will be able to state to the House what other measures we have to bring, and probably we can anticipate prorogation. I trust as soon as we have brought down all the Supplementary Estimates to be able to take two sittings each day after the 24th of May.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Hear, hear.

THE LATE SPANISH AMBASSADOR TO WASHINGTON—HIS PRESENCE IN CANADA.

Mr. CHARLTON. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to direct the attention of the right hon. leader of the Government to the fact of the presence in Canada of Senor Polo, the late Spanish ambassador to Washington, and the members of the Spanish embassy. These gentlemen have been in Canada since the outbreak of the war between Spain and the United States, and it seems from recent developments that they are actively engaged in attending to affairs connected with the war. A day or two ago a man by the name of Downing was arrested as a spy in Washington. His actions and communication were traced——

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member must confine himself to asking a question unless he moves the adjournment.

Mr. CHARLTON. I do not wish to do so unless it is absolutely necessary. This man committed suicide, and his communications were traced to the Spanish Minister and members of the Spanish embassy. A number of Spaniards have crossed from Canada to the United States and are now under the surveillance of the American police authorities. It seems to me we have in Canada a combination of diplomatists belonging to Spain and recently from Washington, who are carrying on operations of some character here, and I apprehend there might be

danger of our position as a neutral power being compromised by the action of these gentlemen. I wish to call the attention of the right hon. leader of the Government to the condition of affairs, and ask whether the matter has come under his consideration, and whether any steps are proposed in the premises.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I must say to my hon. friend that the attention of the Government has not been called to the presence of the late Spanish ambassador at Washington, who is now and has been for some time in Canada. My hon. friend is aware that the British Government and nation has always been the refuge of refugees under any circumstances. So long as the Spanish ambassador does not abuse the hospitality of this nation, this Government does not conceive that it is in any way bound to take notice of his presence. He is treated as every other citizen would be. During this unfortunate war now taking place between the United States and Spain, it is the intention of the Government—and it is our intention not only from our own inclination but the positive orders of the Imperial authorities—to keep absolute neutrality between the contending parties. We are taking every precaution possible so that the neutrality laws shall not be violated, either in favour of the United States or Spain.

Mr. MACLEAN. I may say that I had the pleasure of meeting the Spanish ambassador in Toronto and conversed with him and some of his friends; and as far as I could gather, they were most careful not to violate the laws of neutrality or to say anything that could in any way be offensive to the Americans, and I can see no reason why they should not be allowed to enjoy the privilege of living in Canada as long as they saw fit.

ALIEN LABOUR LAW.

Mr. McCLEARY. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to draw the attention of the Government to a subject that has been already once or twice brought to its notice. I refer to the Alien Labour Law, and if necessary I will conclude the few observations I have to make with a motion to adjourn. When this House and the Government undertook to put on the Statute-book of this country an Alien Labour Law, it appears to me that we should have gone into the work with a great deal more heart and thoroughness than we did. There was either necessity for such a law, or there was no necessity. If there was no necessity for it, then we should have not bothered with it at all; but if there was a necessity, then we should have devised such a law as would meet the requirements of the case. It is unnecessary for me to argue the necessity of such a law, because that is admitted on all hands. The leaders of both parties have declared that they are in entire sympathy with such a law. Indeed, the right hon. leader of the Government, after he had formed his Government, declared in Ontario, during the by-elections, that he would have placed upon the Statute-book a law, word for word and line for line, with the American law in force against Canadians. But instead of this, we have had put upon our statutes a law merely in name, so far as I can learn, and I am interested somewhat, representing as I do a border constituency. We have put upon the statutes something merely to be played with and not intended to be seriously enforced. The other day, in reply to some hon. member, the Government brought down a return of the names of the officers appointed by it to enforce this law. I do not know what instructions were given other officials, but I know that in my county, although I have not seen either of the gentlemen appointed at Fort Erie or Bridgeburg as to what instructions they had from the Government, they are encumbered by the lack of definite instructions. Yesterday I had a letter from a workingman—and there are no politics in this matter and ought not to be—stating that he had looked for work on the stone quarry opened in my county, and he found there some 150 Italians imported from Buffalo, and he could not get any work. These Italians are employed under contract, because every man of them has to give $2 to get the job before he comes across. This man tells me that the officer appointed to enforce the law does not do his duty, and does not know what to do because of lack of instructions from the Government, so that we are labouring under the disadvantage of having these men imported, who are not only foreigners to Canada, but who just colonize in Buffalo and sell their labour. They bid against our Canadian labour, and yet we have no means of enforcing the law; of if the law can be enforced, the officers there do not get the backing they should from the Government. I want just to repeat what I said with regard to the law not being enforced in the county in which I live. Not only have we this difficulty so far as labour is concerned, but our railway employees make a great deal of complaint. One of the largest railways in this country, the Grand Trunk Railway, in which millions of dollars of the people's money have been invested, and from which we never expect a single dollar—this railway company, whenever it has the opportunity, removes a Canadian and puts on an American in his place. Only a few weeks ago two or three prominent men, who had worked their way up from the bottom, were removed from the positions they had and Americans brought in to take their place. I do not presume that this Parliament has jurisdiction over the Grand Trunk Railway; but if we en-

forced the labour law as we should, these people would not be allowed to act in this way towards their Canadian employees. I think this is a very opportune time for the Government to take action. They should either amend the law in force to-day or else enforce fully, freely, rigidly and sufficiently the law as it is. I believe that every member on this side would assist the Government in passing a Bill that would meet the case. If the present law requires amendment, and in my opinion it does, and if the Government will undertake to amend it so as to give our Canadians the protection they should have, every hon. member on this side will help the Government to pass the amendment and make the law of some use.

Mr. COWAN. What amendment would you suggest?

Mr. McCLEARY. I would suggest not having so much red tape as we have about the law to-day. We should have our magistrates on the spot empowered to instruct the officers that might be appointed by the Government to enforce the law, and have in the law what would meet the requirements of the case.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). If the hon. gentleman will allow me, I would like to ask him a question. Referring to the statement he made that the Grand Trunk Railway were adopting a system of discharging Canadian employees for the purpose of making places for citizens of the United States, I suppose the hon. gentleman speaks from personal knowledge. Would he be good enough then, to give me the names of persons so discharged, and of persons so employed, their occupations, or in what capacity they are or were employed. This done, the matter could be looked into.

Mr. McCLEARY. I shall be glad to give the hon. Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair), the information he asks for. I do not wish to give it off-hand, but I know that I shall be able to furnish it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is a very grave statement.

Mr. McCLEARY. I may say, as the hon. Minister has called my attention to this matter, that, although I go home every week, and though I never go home without having conversations with the railway men of the different sections, Toronto, Hamilton and Niagara Falls, every time I have gone home complaints have been made to me in this regard. I can get the hon. Minister the information he wants. This is an opportune time to seek a reciprocal relation with the United States in this matter, if we wish to have it. The people of Great Britain and Canada are, I believe, in hearty sympathy with the people of the United States in their present unfortunate position of war with Spain. While we are supposed to be neutral and are neutral, still Britain's heart, like the Canadian heart, beats in unison with the people of the United States. But, notwithstanding this, I am free to declare that there is an undercurrent of feeling, and not a small one or a weak one, in the breasts of Canadians, that we would like to see the United States get a little bit of a spanking to begin with, and why——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. McCLEARY. Surely, I am free to say that. And why is it? Because the United States have not treated us decently——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. McCLEARY. They have not. Some hon. members seem to think we ought not to say that. I think that I ought to be straight, honest and frank and square in this matter. That is my feeling and the feeling of the constituents I have the honour to represent—that we have been treated indecently and in a manner in which no Christian nation should treat another, particularly another speaking the same language. I do not take a second place to any man in my attachment to the Anglo-Saxon race and my belief in their superiority. Nor do I doubt more than any other man what will be the outcome as between Spain and the United States. But I am expressing the underlying feeling of Canadians, that we have not been treated right by the United States. And, while we look for, and pray for their ultimate success, we do want to receive at the hands of the United States better treatment than we have received in the past. I hope the Government will see their way clear, as I suggested, either to amend the law or enforce it, so that it will be of some use to the people of this country. I beg to move the adjournment of the House.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I sincerely hope my hon. friend (Mr. McCleary) who has just taken his seat, in his utterances, which, at the moment called forth some expressions of dissent, speaks his own personal feeling and not the feeling of his party. I would rather hope that upon the present occasion, though we are bound to be neutral and must be neutral in the present difficulties between the United States and Spain—I should like to believe that, if there is a feeling at all, apart from our sense of neutrality and of our duty as neutrals, it is a feeling of sympathy for those who are our neighbours and who share the continent with us. With regard to the subject matter which has been brought to the attention of the House by my hon. friend, I have only this to say: The hon. gentleman has been good enough to refer to the attitude I at one time took on this question. I stated on more than one occasion—and I do not desire to recall the words I made use of—that I looked upon this

American Alien Labour Law as a most unfortunate measure; that I hoped it would be repealed; and if it were not repealed, then I should feel it my duty to ask Parliament to pass a similar law, line for line, word for word. I took this position, not because I thought the American law was a good one, not because I approved of such a measure, but simply because I thought this the best means to bring to the attention of our American neighbours the hostile character of their legislation. A measure was introduced last session in this Parliament, and, during my absence in England, was passed. It was not made so stringent an Act as I thought it would be, it was not made so stringent as I intended it would be, but I have not to pass judgment on this matter at the present time. I have only this to say to my hon. friend (Mr. McCleary) —even if the law is deficient and if it had to be amended, I would ask Parliament not to choose the present moment to amend it. At this moment I would deprecate, and I think everybody ought to deprecate that at this moment, when our neighbours are engaged in war, any action should be taken by this Parliament which ever so remotely looks hostile to them. For my part I would rather submit to some inconvenience, to seeing the law a little deficient, even if it were deficient in my own judgment than at this moment, when it is possible that the mother country and the American nation may assume more friendly relations than they have ever assumed before—I say it would be much to be deplored, much to be regretted that the Canadian Parliament should do ever so small an act which would impair what we expect to take place. Now, with regard to the law which is, it may be, deficient. If it is deficient we must take it as it is at the present time. I agree with my hon. friend, however, that the law as it is should be put in force, not because I particularly favour it, but because it is on the Statute-book and ought to be enforced, whenever it is possible to have it enforced. I was glad to have the testimony of my hon. friend from Essex (Mr. McGregor) a few days ago on this subject, to the effect that an appointment of an agent at Windsor had had the effect of bringing a better state of things in Windsor and Detroit; that Canadians could go to work in Detroit and American workingmen could come over to work in Windsor. Now, that is what we want. We do not want any measure of hostility between the two nations. The Americans are free to come and work in competition with us, provided we have the same freedom to go and work against them. There may be some points on the frontier where American officers are over-zealous, where they overstep the mark and where it is possible an unfortunate state of things exists. At corresponding points upon the Canadian frontier, we have our own officers and our own agents. Whether or not they are sufficiently instructed, I am not prepared at this moment to say. I understand from my hon. friend (Mr. McCleary) that in the section in which the hon. gentleman's constituency is situated, in the Niagara peninsula, he finds that the officers are not properly instructed.

All I have to say to my hon. friend in this regard is that he should call the attention of the Minister of Justice at once to that condition of things. If the officer which we have appointed in the Niagara Peninsula does not do his duty, if he is not properly instructed, if, in the opinion of my hon. friend, he abstains from doing certain things which he ought to do, I think my hon. friend would do well, in view of his own convictions and in the interest of his clients, to call upon the Minister of Justice and ask him to give further instructions. I do not say that the Minister of Justice will follow the advice of my hon. friend, but if he does not do so, it will be for good and sufficient reasons, I imagine. Therefore, I would rather that my hon. friend, instead of bringing the matter before this House, should call upon the Department of Justice and endeavour to see that the law is properly observed. But I have only to repeat, as I said a moment ago, that in view of the events transpiring at the present time, we should proceed very cautiously and with great prudence in this matter.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I rise for the purpose of expressing my entire acquiescence in the sentiments which have just fallen from the leader of the House. As you, Sir, well know, and as the House knows, I have on various occasions expressed strongly the view that it was absolutely necessary in the interest of Canada that we should take a firm stand in the protection of our own people against any aggressive action or laws that were calculated to operate injuriously to Canada. No person has pressed that view upon the House more strongly that I have myself. Some time ago, during the present session, I drew attention to the great disparity that existed between the way in which Canadians are treated in the United States who are engaged in mining industries there, and the treatment accorded by Canada to citizens of the United States when coming into any part of this country. I have witnessed with great pleasure a measure recently introduced into the Senate of the United States of America, and which, I trust, if it has not already become law, will become law at a very early date, providing that Canadians shall have all the rights and privileges in Alaska that are accorded in the Canadian Yukon to citizens of the United States. I hail that step with great satisfaction as the beginning of what I hope will be fair, kindly and reciprocal legislation operating upon parties engaged in industries on both sides of the line. I must say also that,

witnessing, as I have done with unqualified pleasure, the great degree of rapprochement which has recently taken place between Great Britain and the United States of America. I entirely agree with my right hon. friend that the present moment would be a most inauspicious one for us to take any such action as has been suggested, even when, under other circumstances, we would be warranted in taking it. In my judgment the kindly feeling that has been generated and exhibited so largely, not only on the part of Great Britain and the various portions of the Empire, but on the part of the most intelligent and important citizens of the United States of America, is indicative of a better state of things in the future than has heretofore existed. I believe it is in the interest of both the United States and of Canada that the most cordial commercial and social relations should exist between the two countries. While we are bound to respect that complete neutrality that has been proclaimed by the parent state in reference to the unfortunate war that now exists between the United States and Spain, nevertheless I feel that we cannot forget that the people of Canada, as of Great Britain, are but one branch of a great English-speaking family, and that the interests of peace, the interests of civilization and the interests of the world, would be promoted by the most cordial co-operation between the two great nations.

Mr. SPROULE. In saying a few words on this question I do not wish to be understood as saying anything that might be construed into an unfriendly feeling towards the United States. But I recognize that the ends of friendship will best be attained when each nation secures to their own people their full rights. Within the last two days, in connection with this labour law business, there was brought to my notice circumstances that exist in the Georgian Bay district, which I think ought to be looked into by whoever has been appointed in that district to carry out the Alien Labour Law. If there is an agent in that district whose duty it is to look after the enforcement of the law, he is evidently not doing it; because I received a letter yesterday from a friend of mine, and this is what he says relating to a portion of country where labourers come in from the United States:

I have just returned from Byng Inlet, where I have been working for a short time for the Holland & Emory Lumber Company, who own and operate lumber mills there. The company have over thirty Americans in their employ, in fact all the best positions are filled by aliens, to the detriment of Canadians. They have charge of the most important positions, such as foremen in the mills and lumber yards. They are now putting up a large shingle mill, and they have Americans here to run it. The United States boats and barges coming for lumber bring over workmen, machinery and supplies, and land them after night, and to the best of my knowledge, no report is made to the customs. The steam barge "C. F. Curtis," of Buffalo, arrived there on Sunday, the 8th instant. She landed eight passengers after dark that night; they left the vessel separately, so as not to attract the attention of the customs. Teams were drawing away the machinery, steam pipes and fittings, all night, and the customs officer had no knowledge of what they were doing, as he did not go aboard until Monday morning.

This writer further says that every official in that district is instructed to wink at violations of the law. I do not know how it is, but it would seem if such a state of things could not go on without its being known in the locality, and whoever is charged with the duty of looking after these things, should be more alert. This writer says that it does not do for a man who is entrusted with the duty of enforcing the Alien Labour Law, to go and notify these men to leave, because they leave for a short time and then come right back and go to work, perhaps in the same camp, or other camps in the locality, and they are working on the same as usual. To make law effectual at all, these men must be deported from the country, as Canadians are deported from the United States when they go there to work. The leader of the Government says we should not do anything that might be construed as hostility against the United States. Now, I do not understand that protecting our own rights should be regarded as hostility. When we treat them quite as well as they treat us in the same line, our conduct should be regarded as no more hostile to them than theirs should be regarded as hostile to us. If their acts must be regarded as hostile, why should they treat us in such a manner? Then I say if we do no more than they do, our conduct towards them should not be regarded as hostile. An hon. member said he was glad to be informed that at Windsor they allowed Americans to come in from Detroit and labour in Canada, as Canadians went over from Windsor and found labour in the United States. If that same condition of things existed in the Georgian Bay, we would not have the same ground of complaint, because Canadians could follow the raw material that went over there and get employment, and could share with the Americans in the labour of manufacturing that raw material. But the same condition does not exist as regards Canadians receiving admission to the United States, in Michigan, when they follow the raw material which leaves their own country, as exists with respect to the Americans who are allowed to come here and take away labour from Canadians. I have been requested to call the attention of the House to this matter, and if a gentleman has not been appointed there to look after the Alien Labour Law, I trust the Minister of Justice will see that one is appointed at an early day, and will give him instructions to do his duty in the same way as do American officers at

Niagara or any other point along the frontier.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. There was an understanding with the House that to-day was to be given to the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) to move the resolution which he has long had on the paper, and I am very much afraid that this discussion, if protracted, will materially interfere with carrying out the agreement made by both sides of the House. I merely mention this to hon. gentlemen who may desire to say something on this subject, and to suggest that they should be as brief as possible.

Mr. CHARLTON. I only intend to occupy a very few moments in replying to some points made by hon. gentlemen opposite. I must express my very great gratification at the tone of the remarks made this afternoon by the leader of the Government and also by the leader of the Opposition; and I feel doubly grateful from the fact that my own position in these matters is in a measure justified by the attitude taken by the leader of the Opposition this afternoon. The remarks of the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) are directly antagonistic to the position and remarks of his leader, and I must characterize them as being, under the circumstances, in somewhat bad taste.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman can put them with the bad-taste speches he has delivered in this House for many years.

Mr. CHARLTON. The hon. gentleman is quite at sea with respect to the facts, or alleged facts, he presented to the House.

Mr. SPROULE. I may say to the hon. gentleman that I hold in my hand a letter from a man that I believe to be reputable, honest and truthful; and I let the facts stand for themselves.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman can make a personal explanation when the hon. member for North Norfolk has concluded.

Mr. CHARLTON. I was about to say that when the Ontario Government last fall made a condition that no alien labour was to be employed by lumbermen in Ontario and that the supplies should be exclusively purchased in Canada, American lumbermen very freely agreed to conform to that regulation, and I believe they have very faithfully done so. I do not think the information which the hon. gentleman presented with respect to Holland & Emory is well founded. I do not believe any considerable number of Americans, or any Americans knowing the facts, are so acting.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not care what you think, but there are the facts.

Mr. CHARLTON. The hon. gentleman is rather peppery. It is very difficult for employers having men in camp to ascertain what is their nationality. Many represent themselves to be Canadians, and possibly the employer may be imposed upon. But these lumbermen have very good and sufficient reason to desire to conform faithfully to the law, because the penalties under it are very severe, and they are desirous of satisfying the Ontario authorities, and I believe they intend to do so, and to the best of their ability they have done so. I know that Canadian labourers are employed in Michigan mills and lumber camps to a great extent, and there is not the slightest impediment to their going to Cheboygan, Alpena or Bay City or other Michigan points and obtaining employment. I believe, moreover, that where one American is employed in the Georgian Bay district a dozen Canadians are employed in Michigan.

With respect to the statement made by the hon. member for Welland (Mr. McCleary) as to the treatment extended to us by the United States, it is to be borne in mind that the Alien Labour Law of that country was not designed to apply to Canada; it was designed to apply to Bohemia, Hungary, Poland and some other European countries where abuses existed, and it was not called into existence and was not designed primarily to go into effect against Canada. Canadians are in high favour in the United States, both men and women; they secure employment readily, their services are sought after and they secure some of the very best positions in the country. With respect to the enforcement of the Alien Labour Law against Canadians, I am informed, and I believe correctly, that Mr. De Barry, the Alien Labour Commissioner in Buffalo, never enforced it against Canadians except where he had been informed by trades unions in Canada of the coming of labourers, and I believe it was on account of information furnished by Canadian trades unions in every case that the action of the labour commissioner at Buffalo and other places was taken. There is no disposition and no desire in that country to enforce this law against Canadians, and they have not done it in any case except where the matter was brought officially to their notice and it was necessary that some action should be taken. I repeat, that this law was not designed against Canada, but it was designed against other classes of foreigners altogether.

With respect to the assertions of the hon. member for Welland in regard to the Grand Trunk Railway, and the substitution of Americans for Canadians by the new management, the hon. gentleman was unable to name a single instance when challenged to do so by the Minister of Railways.

Mr. McCLEARY. I am prepared to give names.

Mr. CHARLTON. The list the hon. gentleman will be able to prepare, after consideration, will be a very meagre one.

Mr. McCLEARY. It will be a truthful one.

Mr. CHARLTON. I travel as much as does the hon. gentleman. I come in contact with conductors, brakesmen and other employees. The complaints made are not so much because of Americans being substituted for Canadians, but the complaints arise generally in consequence of such arrangements being entered into as that recently made by the Wabash Railway, by which the Air Line has been placed under American management. Of course the Americans bring over locomotives and employ their own men. But the argument that the new management of the Grand Trunk is detrimental to the interests of Canada is quite erroneous, and the present management of that road is very active and up to date. It is now recognized to be one of the best managed roads in America, and there are no well founded charges to be brought against this management. I think the hon. gentleman, particularly in his remarks with regard to the management of the Grand Trunk, was entirely unfair, and his remarks were unwarranted by the facts of the case. I do not desire to detain the House. I rose merely to correct the statement made by the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule), for his remarks are almost entirely destitute of foundation. The hon. gentleman did not purposely make them, but I believe he has been imposed upon in presenting statements which, I believe, from my knowledge of the case, are not well grounded or founded in fact.

Mr. SPROULE. I can only say in reply to the hon. member that the gentleman from whom I have received the letter I have known for twenty years, and I believe he is as honest, truthful and sincere as is the hon. member for North Norfolk. The information given, he says, he can prove by twenty or thirty men in the employ of the company. With respect to the other point, I may say that two men from my own locality, who live within three miles of the village, went to the United States and were compelled to return owing to the Alien Labour Law, and they spoke to me about it, saying such injustice to Canada should induce us to pass a similar law prohibiting their workmen from coming into Canada to take employment. Is that not sufficient evidence to satisfy the hon. gentleman? It is sufficient to satisfy my mind. I know these men to be honest and truthful, and I believe my allegations of facts to be absolutely true and correct.

Mr. CLARKE. Recognizing the fairness of the suggestion made by the hon. leader of the Opposition, that by mutual arrangement this day, or a portion of it, was to be given up to the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) to address the House on a very important question, I shall endeavour to make my remarks as brief as possible. I desire to say that with every sentiment given expression to in the House this afternoon regarding the advisability and desirability of promoting the friendliest possible relations with the great nation to the south, I am entirely in accord; and I hail, as I believe every British subject hails, the rapprochement taking place between these two great nations, the United States and the motherland. I feel sure that if unity of purpose and action can be brought about by the statesmen of both these countries, then the welfare of the great masses of the people will be substantially promoted. But, Mr. Speaker, while holding these views and having these aspirations, and desirous of seeing the people of Canada, as a portion of the British Empire, living in the friendliest possible relations with the people of the United States, it seems to me that we ought not to forget the duty we owe to the Canadian people and especially to Canadian workingmen. We in this Parliament should endeavour to discharge our duty towards our own people fearlessly, but of course without giving offence. My hon. friend from Welland (Mr. McCleary) has given instances which have come to his personal knowledge of the non-enforcement of the Alien Labour Law which was put upon the statutes of Canada by, I believe, a unanimous vote of this Parliament last session. The right hon. the Premier tells us now, that in his absence the Bill was emasculated and the Act probably not as strong as he would like it to be, but I respectfully draw attention to the fact that this is the first time the right hon. gentleman has given us that information. This question of the enforcement of the Alien Labour Law has been brought before the House several times during the present session, but we were not advised until to-day that there were evidently mistakes and defects in the law; and so far as we are aware no steps have been taken by Government to remedy these defects. I myself took the course suggested by the Prime Minister, of drawing the attention of the Minister of Justice to the condition of affairs existing in the city of Toronto. It has been said that in border towns where workmen pass and repass from Canada to the United States and vice versa, friction takes place, but the city of Toronto is an inland city and the strike which unfortunately has taken place in that city, and into the merits of which I do not propose to enter, has given an opportunity of proving the inefficient character of this Alien Labour Act which was passed at the instigation of the organized labour of Canada for the purpose of protecting Canadian workingmen against the unfair competition they were subject to owing to the adoption and enforcement of alien labour laws by Congress and by the various States of the union. The workingmen of Toronto who are at present on strike have appealed time and again to have the Alien

Labour Law enforced, but they have not been successful in their appeals. I hold in my hand a memorial which I received last night. That memorial is signed by representative workingmen who are in political sympathy with hon. gentlemen opposite, and the declaration to which they have attached their signatures sufficiently striking and of sufficient importance, it seems to me, that I should ask the time of the House to read it. The memorial is as follows :—

Toronto, May 16, 1898.

E. F. Clark, M.P., House of Commons, Ottawa, Ont.

Dear Sir,—As representing our various trade and labour unions we beg to lay before you, sir, the following facts relating to the working of the Alien Labour Act passed at the last session of Parliament :—

This Act is openly violated every day in the city by the J. D. King Company and by the Gold Medal Manufacturing Company. Statutory declarations from the very men who have been brought over by these firms from the United States under contract, and whose expenses of transportation and other expenses have been paid by Mr. King and Mr. McMurty, have been made and sent to the Department of Justice in Ottawa. Mr. J. D. King, jun., admitted in the Police Court here that he was employing a foreman brought from the United States in violation of the Act, and refused to answer when I asked how many men he had in his factory so procured in violation of the law.

The Dominion Government have appointed the agent ostensibly for the enforcement of this Act, but after careful and persistent effort the workingmen of Toronto, who are daily being injured by the law being broken with impunity, cannot accomplish anything through this agent. His appointment means nothing. His powers are confined to reporting to the Government, but he has no authority to bring actions for the penalties provided for by the Act, nor has he even power when the clearest proof of violation of the Act is given him, to deport the workingmen brought into this country in violation of the law. The writers have placed in his hands the most positive proof possible, but he can do nothing. In fact, as at present "enforced" the Act in Toronto is absolutely no protection to workingmen.

Sir, if this Act means anything, if Parliament is not simply playing with us, giving us the form but denying us the substance, we demand the instant deportation of these men brought in from the United States in violation of the laws of Canada. If this were done the strike in both boot and shoe trade and in the upholstering trade would soon be over, but the continued cause of the friction between employers and employed is that foreign superintendents are appointed who enlist an army of foreign labourers in the United States and import them wholesale into this country. If the workingmen of Toronto are not to go on chasing a shadow, we ask that these aliens be instantly deported in accordance with the terms of the Act passed, as we were led to suppose, for our protection.

Sir, we have read assurances in the daily press from members of the Cabinet that this Act is to be enforced. We ask, do these gentlemen mean what they say ? For, unless something is done quickly, we shall be forced to come to the conclusion that Mr. J. D. King speaks truly when he boasts that the Government do not intend to do anything to him.

In conclusion, we ask on behalf of the workingmen of this city for the protection the law is said to afford, and for the instant deportation of workmen brought into this country in deliberate and direct violation of the law of Canada.

Thanking you, sir, for your efforts on our behalf, we are,

Respectfully yours,
(Sgd.) D A. CAREY,
Pres. of the Trades and Labour Congress, Canada.
E. W HOLMES,
President, Toronto Trades and Labour Council.
JOHN McFADYEN,
President of the Boot and Shoe Workers' Union.
PAUL RICHTER,
Secretary.
FRANCIS MARMELL,
President of Plumbers' Union, Toronto.
ROBT. HAVERSTOCK,
President, Cigar Makers' Union.
W. IRWIN,
President Upholsterers' Union.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that the statements contained in this memorial submitted by these gentlemen who know whereof they speak, are of sufficient importance to induce the Government to take some steps to give them the protection which it was intended the Alien Labour Law should afford. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) said that the American Alien Labour Law was not designed or intended to injure or to operate specially against Canadian workmen. I hope that may be the case ; but the fact remains that since these laws have been put upon the Statute-books of several States of the Union, Canadian labourers and Canadian artisans have suffered very much from them, because in many of the frontier cities agents have been appointed and given carte blanche to deport Canadians who from time to time crossed the line to obtain employment in the States. I can surely appeal to the sense of justice of the members of this House, that Canadian workingmen who have a quarrel with their employers should not be completely handicapped under the Canadian Alien Labour Law as it is at present administered in the city of Toronto. As I have said before, the disputes between employers and employees might be better settled by mutual concessions on both sides if this law were enforced; but when the employer is permitted to bring foreigners into Canada to take the place of the strikers, the relations between employers and employees are embittered and an amicable and satisfactory settlement is rendered all the more difficult. It must be remembered that the men out on strike in Toronto—and the question as to whether they were justified or not in going on strike is not one with which I will deal now—are prevented by the enforcement of the Alien Labour Law which obtains on the other side from seeking employment at their craft in the United States. Their position is a deplorable one, and I appeal to the Government to give some definite instruc-

tions to the officer appointed to enforce the Alien Labour Law in Toronto and prevent the continuance of the harsh condition of things now existing there with respect to these men who are out on strike. I do not desire in any way to strain the good relations which now exist between the people of Canada and the United States, and the motherland. I believe we should endeavour to promote by every means in our power, an alliance between these two powers, but I hold that we will be only doing simple justice to the toilers of this country by seeing that the statute for their protection is made effective. That Act, which was put on the statutes ostensibly for their protection, either should be enforced or repealed. If it is found inadequate to accomplish its object, it should be amended in a fair and reasonable way, at the earliest possible moment, without regard to the opinions of people living under a foreign jurisdiction. I hope that in the near future we shall have a practical and effective labour law put on the statutes. Not that I believe in such legislation, but because I have come to the conclusion, as the right hon. First Minister did twelve months ago, that this Act was a last resource, and that the Parliament of Canada, in view of the enforcement of the American labour law, was compelled, in defence of Canadian workmen, to enact a similar measure. I hope that in the near future all these alien labour laws will be removed from the statutes of both countries; but in the meantime we can best bring about the removal of these laws from the United States statutes by enacting and enforcing a similar law on this side of the line.

Mr. FRASER. I cannot allow one of the remarks of the hon. member for Welland (Mr. McCleary) to pass without at least entering my protest. There is one thing I am sure that this House will recognize, and that is, that the statement made by the right hon. Prime Minister, and upheld and supported by the hon. leader of the Opposition, ought to be a matter of congratulation to every Canadian. It had the right ring about it, and I am sure that if the hon. member for Welland had heard his leader before he spoke, he would not have made the injudicious remarks he did. Here is a nation to the south of us engaged in war; and for practical purposes I do not see very much difference between this House and the Imperial Parliament, in so far as any remarks are made relating to that war. When we find Mr. Chamberlain's course so criticised because he said what was true, namely, that the conduct of Russia had not been of such a character as to lead the British people to always believe what the representative of that country said, and when the Russian Government called the attention of Great Britain to that speech and demanded an explanation, we may judge what would be thought if a member of Parliament in England rose in his place and said that the feeling of the people of Great Britain was that they would like to see the Americans get a licking at first, get whipped just sufficiently to humiliate them for a little time, and then succeed afterwards. Suppose some hon. gentleman rose and said the same thing about Spain, what would be the result? The war is in actual operation and I rise to make my protest, as a member of this House, against any remark of that kind, lest the Americans might conclude that the hon. gentleman who made it represented anybody but himself. I admit that our American neighbours have done many irritating things, but we cannot forget that a large number of our people are in the United States and have received great kindness at the hands of the American people. And for one I am not going to allow a statement such as was made by the hon. gentleman to be made in Parliament, without entering my protest. It is very unfair to make a statement of that kind in Parliament. There are many sentiments which hon. gentlemen may feel, but to which it is better not to give utterance. And I am sure the hon. gentleman will see himself that he made a great mistake when he gave utterance to such a statement. I believe that there is a universal disposition in Canada to-day to follow in the lines of the statement made by the right hon. First Minister and endorsed by the leader of the Opposition, and we cannot better our own position, or stand higher in the estimation of the republic to the south of us or of Great Britain by saying which would indicate an underground feeling that made us desire that in the first engagement our neighbours should be defeated. It is in equally bad taste as if we gave expression to the wish that Spain, with which we have no connection and very little sympathy, should win in the first instance.

Mr. TAYLOR. I desire to bring to the attention of the Government a letter which I have received from a gentleman living in British Columbia. Were it not that this day was set apart for the discussion of the resolution of my hon. friend from Bruce (Mr. McNeill), I would feel bound to occupy the attention of the House for some considerable time, because, as is well known, I have had a good deal to do with the Alien Labour Law. Last year, when the Bill was reported by the special committee to which it had been referred, I signed the minority report. I said then, and am glad to hear the right hon. First Minister corroborate my statement, that the Bill was practically unworkable and not what the Government promised it should be. Now, I find that admission made by the leader of the Government to-day, although I see in the Supplementary Estimates a sum to be voted for the purpose of enforcing the law in British Columbia. Judging by the answers which

we got to our questions the other day, there has not been a case yet under the Act nor can there be one, because the law is practically unworkable. The Bill which I introduced last session was so mutilated as to become unworkable. The letter I have received is from a Liberal of 45 years standing, who formerly resided in the county I represent :—

Mr. G. Taylor, M.P., Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—I herewith beg to inclose you a clipping from a Vancouver, B.C., paper, which explains itself, and for the truth of which I can vouch for, as I have lived in the Kootenay for five years, but it is not half told. The C.P.R. have a boat line which employs about 300 men, that has been built and operated entirely by Americans. We elected H. Bostock on the strength of his and Laurier's pledges, but their pledges, we find, are no good. They promised an Alien Labour Bill, but the one made is not worth this bit of paper. The people here of all parties denounce the late Teslin Lake railway deal, and the Yukon regulations in general, and the allowing Americans to take mineral claims. I believe in Canada far Canadians. I have been a Liberal for forty years, but not the kind that Laurier and Sifton are. Their doings are enough to make the bones of Alexander Mackenzie turn in his grave for shame, but they will make many Liberals turn at the next election.

Hoping the inclosed resolutions will help you in the good work you are doing for the Canadian people, and if you need any more information from this part of the country, address M. Soper, Nakusp, B.C., formerly of Kitley, Leeds County.

I remain,

Yours fraternally,

(Sgd.) M. SOPER.

Mr. LANDERKIN. What is the name ?

Mr. TAYLOR. M. Soper.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I thought it was something soapy.

Mr. TAYLOR. In my constituency and that of my hon. friend from Brockville (Mr. Wood), the Sopers are amongst the most prominent families, and they are all Liberals. The hon. member for Brockville will corroborate my statement. The gentleman who wrote this letter was a Liberal until he went out to British Columbia. I have on the Order paper a notice of a Bill to amend the law. It is letter for letter the American law, and I wanted the Government to take charge of it and put it through ; but I agree in what the right hon. First Minister has said, that under the complications existing between the United States and Spain, now is not the proper time to stir up any matter that will have any irritating effect. If the law which this Government put through the House, and for which it is responsible, will meet the wants and requirements of Canadian workmen, let them go on and enforce it. and vote all the money necessary to do so.

Mr. HUGHES. In all the districts in the province of Ontario bordering on the fringe between the timber and the farming districts, there are many young men, who, in summer, work on the farms and in winter work in the lumber camps. In the county I have the honour to represent, especially, there are a great number of these young men. They have been accustomed to seek work in winter along the line of the Ottawa, Arnprior and Parry Sound Railway and on the north shore of Georgian Bay and Lake Superior. A few years ago a large American company came in and established a fine mill at Fenelon Falls. Contrary to their agreement they brought in American workmen. They had men—I do not know exactly what to call them—employed to bring in men from the American lumber camps. These parties would bring men in at reduced rates of fare. charge them full fare and stop it out of their pay. Then, in a month or so the men would be dismissed in order that they might be hired at a low rate, and if they refused the terms others were brought in to fill their places. The consequence was that the country was overrun with these poor fellows, walking out because they had not enough money to pay their way on the railways, and pestering the country people for food and shelter. There was one instance, I maintain, in which an Alien Labour Law should have been brought into force, for every one of these men was brought in from the American lumber districts under contract. To-day, I understand, there are three or four thousand—quite a small army —of American workmen in the lumber camps along the north shore of Georgian Bay and Lakes Huron and Superior, driving out this class of Canadians to whom I have referred and who, have hitherto looked to the lumber camps as their winter harvest at all events. I draw the attention of the Government to this case as an example, not that I believe in alien labour laws, but because our young men who desire to seek work in Wisconsin and Michigan lumber camps, are met by the American Alien Labour Law. This is a question of reciprocity. Our young men used to go in and work there until this Alien Labour Law was brought against them, and I contend that American workmen seeking employment here should receive similar treatment. Under the present circumstances I endorse the words that fell from my hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) in relation to the good feelings that ought to exist, and I believe do exist between Canada and the United States. The war of 1812 was not brought on by the American people but by a small ring in Congress. There will be always rings, large and small, in connection with any Congress or with any Parliament. At the present time I believe the heart of the American people beats warm for the British Empire and Canada. You remember the words of Burke, that five grasshoppers in a meadow will make more

noise than a hundred oxen grazing peacefully. So five anti-Britishers or jingoes in one country, shouting against Britain and trying to twist the British lion's tail, will make more noise than five hundred thousand loyal Americans whose hearts are true to the good feeling with the motherland. I believe that to enforce the Alien Labour Law at the present time would be doing the United States a good turn. Who are all these men who are crossing the lines at the present time? Cowards, Sir, afraid to face the music and fight the battles of their country against Spain. I maintain that in enforcing the Alien Labour Law and driving back these men who are shirking their duty we should do the United States as well as Canada a good turn. We should keep out this competition with Canadian labour, and we should drive these men back to join the ranks ready to go to the front and do their duty to their country. We have no right to allow these people to come in here, so long as they do not allow our people to go there. Any young Canadian who chooses to go and enlist as a soldier to go to Cuba and fight the battles of the United States is not met by an officer at Buffalo or Detroit and told that he must not come in under contract with United States to fight for that country. On the contrary they are all welcome. I maintain that the United States should extend the same courtesy to our workingmen and to all classes when they go into that country as they do to the young fellows who go from here to volunteer in the American army. If they do not give us fair treatment, let us meet them as they meet us. But I know that a great part of that country is friendly to Britain and I trust it will long continue so.

Mr. McCLEARY. I feel it to be a duty I owe to myself to speak a few words in explanation, having brought this matter up for discussion. I would not have brought this question before the House at all had it not been that I am a representative of a border constituency and have had this matter pressed upon me until I felt that it was clearly my duty to call attention to it. Now, as to what the right hon. leader of the House says as to hostile legislation, I deprecate and would deprecate as much as any other member, any position taken by public men in this country that would seem to indicate that the people of Canada were antagonistic to the great republic to the south of us. Our interests are one in regard to the war that is going on. And if any word I happened to drop during my first remarks led any to believe that my sympathies were not all with the enemies of the United States I was misunderstood, absolutely and entirely misunderstood. What I intended to say, and what I did say, was that while Canada is enthusiastic and hearty in her sympathy with the United States, it could not be denied that that sympathy was somewhat measured by the past conduct of the United States towards Canadians, and I would not be ashamed to say that if I were standing in the Capitol at Washington. I do not deem it hostile legislation that we should seek to protect the interests of the workingmen of this country. I have a letter in my desk at this moment that informs me that Mr. DeBarry deported four Canadians from the city of Rochester across the river to Fort Erie. If the United States wants our sympathy, our cordial and hearty sympathy, why should she allow Mr. DeBarry to go on with that kind of business? The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) who, not only when he felt that that sympathy should be given to the United States, but on former occasions when Canadian interests should have been paramount, unless he has been much belied, has sympathized with the Americans, says that this law was intended as against foreigners, Bohemians, and so on, and not against Canadians. But I desire to call attention to the fact that Canadians are the only people it is enforced against to any extent. I have no apology to make as a Canadian standing here to vindicate the rights of the workingmen of this country, and to ask that this Parliament, representing the people of Canada, should protect the interest and welfare of Canadian labour. I have just one word more to say before I sit down. The hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) called me to task for the manner in which the question was brought before the House. Let me tell the hon. gentleman that I am not here to take lessons from him as to my deportment or as to the manner in which I shall bring questions before this House. Of course he wishes to show his attachment to the United States at this time. It is all very well to spread himself in that way, I have no objection. Our sympathies run largely on the same line as his own. However, I want to repeat that I have no apology to make for bringing this matter before the House, other than an apology to the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) in taking up so much of the time which was promised him to-day for the discussion of his motion in reference to preferential trade with Great Britain.

Motion to adjourn, withdrawn.

PREFERENTIAL TRADE WITH GREAT BRITAIN.

Mr. McNEILL moved:

That it is advisable that customs arrangements be effected between the United Kingdom and her colonies by which trade within the Empire may be placed on a more favourable footing than that which is carried on with foreign countries.

He said: Mr. Speaker, in introducing this

motion I desire to say to the House that I do so in no spirit of controversy. I do not think I need to assure the Government of that, because I think they will admit, one and all of them, that I have no desire to introduce this matter in a spirit of controversy. I think, perhaps, hon. members on either side of the House scarcely recognize as fully as they should, the attitude that has been assumed by those who for years past have been working in the cause of Imperial unity. We have one and all, whether we were members of the House or not, felt that these great Imperial issues ought to stand far above any consideration of party politics. We have all of us striven as far as possible to hold these great Imperial issues above party politics; if we have not always succeeded in doing so, it is not, at all events, because we have not striven to do so. Take my friend Col. Denison, for example. I do not know what Col. Denison's politics may be, I question if he has any party politics. I should be inclined to think that if he has voted at all of late years, he has voted Conservative. But Col. Denison is a gallant soldier, and an honest and upright gentleman of a school which is, perhaps, rarer in these days than we could wish it to be. I am convinced of this, that it would be simply impossible for Col Denison to say or do anything which would wound the great cause for which he has worked so strongly and so well, either for any party consideration or from any personal motive whatsoever. I have made that remark because of something that has been said in reference to Col. Denison in this House on another occasion. So far as my own position is concerned, I may say that I am prepared to give my support, whatever it is worth, to any body of men, by whatever name they may be called, in the promotion of a policy which I believe is intended to promote, and which I think will promote, Imperial unity; and I am prepared to give my opposition to any body of men, by whatever name they may be called, who, in my judgment, are endeavouring to thwart or to delay that Imperial unity—that is my position. I consider that the question of the continuance of our Empire far transcends any question of party politics, and that it is the greatest issue that can be discussed by any British Parliament.

Now, I think, Mr. Speaker, it must be gratifying to all those who have at heart the welfare of the Empire and the promotion of Imperial unity, to observe the great strides that this cause has made during recent years. One might talk a long while on that subject, there are so many evidences of it, and so many interesting subjects connected with it; but I have no desire to prolong my remarks, and I will only say a word or two with regard to some of those evidences of this progress which we see in our own country. Now, who a few years ago could have expected to find the Imperial authorities and the authorities of Canada joining hand in hand to subsidize steamship communication between the different parts of the Empire? Yet we see that. We see that lines have been established across the Pacific by the Imperial Government joining hand in hand with our own Government. We have every reason to believe that we shall soon have a line joining more intimately Canada with the heart of the Empire, across the Atlantic. I believe that the hon. gentleman who has been carrying on these negotiations was, perhaps, at one time not so orthodox in his views with reference to this fast line as I, at least, should have liked to find him. I believe he was inclined to worship at the shrine of false gods, of a very inferior kind of deity, which could only get up a speed of seventeen or eighteen knots. However, the hon. gentleman, I think, has seen the error of his ways and has come to a better appreciation of the true condition of things, and he is now, I believe, perfectly orthodox. I believe he is now prepared to worship what he believes to be the most magnificent deity of this description that ever walked the waters. I have very little doubt that the hon. gentleman will succeed in letting us have shortly, through his efforts, a fast line of a class of vessels superior to anything which has ever been afloat on the ocean, if we can accept the views of the experts of the Admiralty and other experts well known to shipping men. For my part I do not withdraw from the position I held in reference to this matter last session. I do not blame the hon. gentleman, I do not blame the Government for the course they have taken in this respect. I think it was a great temptation to any Government if they believed they could save two and a half million dollars on the contract. If this contract goes through (and I think the hon. gentleman is deserving of all credit for the board he has succeeded in bringing together) we shall see upon the Atlantic a fast line service established by the assistance of the Imperial authorities. This co-operation of the Imperial authorities with the colonies in establishing better means of communication between the different parts of the Empire is a great stride in advance on the line of Imperial unity. I hope soon to see a cable service across the Pacific established in the same way.

We have further evidence, Sir, of this advance along the line of Imperial unity in Canada to-day. It is only a short time ago since those of us who were working in this direction and supporting these views, which I am endeavouring to put before the House to-day, could find support for our aspirations only among members on one side of this House. It was only among members on the Conservative side of the House a few years ago we could find any countenance for our

Imperial aspirations. Now I am happy to say the leaders on both sides of the House seem desirous to prove to the people of this country that they are equally desirous of promoting the policy of Imperial unity. We had the other day another most gratifying evidence of the recognition of the force of this Imperial sentiment in the announcement made by the hon. Finance Minister, when he told this House that our friends in the West Indies, who are at present in such sore straits, were to receive the full and unconditional benefit of the British preference. That may to some perhaps seem to have been an extreme step to take. I believe it may fairly be open to criticism on the ground that an attempt should have been made to secure from our West India friends at least as good terms for Canada as they are likely to give to the United States as the result of the negotiations at present being conducted with that country. Under ordinary circumstances that criticism could scarcely have been successfully rebutted. The circumstances, however, are not ordinary, the circumstances are most exceptional. The circumstances are these: our friends in the West Indies are suffering to-day, they are literally and absolutely on the very verge of ruin, ruin brought about mainly by what does seem to me to be the insane worship on the part of certain politicians in the mother country of something which they are pleased to call free trade, but which is only trade with the greater and better part, of the freedom—the freedom of selling—taken out of it. The result is that our friends in the West Indies are, as I have said, in the most desperate straits. How far they would be able to meet advances on our part, how far they would be able to make reductions in their duties, which might impair the position of their revenue at the present time I am unable to say; but I most gratefully acknowledge the recognition of the Imperial sentiment which was made in the speech of the hon. gentleman in respect to this matter, the sincerity of which is proved by his putting into operation this clause in favour of our friends in the West Indies. I hope and believe that the course which has been taken by the Government of Canada in this regard will be greatly appreciated by our friends there, and I hope and believe it will tend to the ultimate advantage of our fellow-subjects in the West Indies and of the people of Canada. This, I say, is a gratifying evidence of advance along the line of Imperial unity.

Then, we have another evidence. Last year we had an offer of reciprocity made by Canada to all the world; an offer of reciprocity which incidentally and temporarily gave a preference to the mother country; but only incidentally and only temporarily. This year we have that offer of reciprocity converted into a true British preference. That also, Sir, is a great advance along the line of Imperial unity. I am not now going to enter into any discussion of that matter; a great deal may be said about it. But, nevertheless, there is the fact that we have now got a true British preference. We must recognize these evidences, but while we recognize them, and while we recognize them with gratification and the utmost pleasure, we cannot close our eyes to the fact that nothing has been done by the present Government of Canada in the direction of obtaining for the people of Canada a preference in the markets of the mother country for their products; a preference in that market, Sir, which will not only be beneficial to Canada, but which, inasmuch as it will enormously develop the resources of Canada and attract population to her shores as nothing else can do, must also materially benefit the mother country herself. I say, Sir, we cannot but view with regret the fact that nothing has been done by the present Government of Canada in this regard. It is scarcely necessary for me to elaborate the proof that it would be beneficial to the people of Canada to have a preference for their products in the greatest market of the world. It is scarcely necessary for me from this side of the House, to elaborate the proof on this subject when the right hon. gentleman who sits before me has not only stated before he went to England, that this would be a great boon to the people of Canada if it could be obtained, but since his return from England, has stated publicly in Toronto that any man would be an idiot who was not in favour of getting such a preference for Canadian products in the markets of the United Kingdom. That every farmer in Canada should get a preference in that greatest of all markets for everything he has to sell to the people of the United Kingdom, that he should get a preference over his foreign competitor, is surely something that it is not necessary for me to argue would be an advantage. And, Sir, this advantage would not be confined by any means to the agricultural classes of this country. The preference would also advantage the Canadian lumbermen, the Canadian fishermen, the Canadian fruit-grower, the Canadian pork-packer, the Canadian produce merchant; every one of these would be advantaged and enormously advantaged, by the adoption of such a policy.

Why, Sir, what has been the condition of things in Canada for years past? The condition of things has been this: We here, a comparatively small population, have been lying alongside a great and wealthy country to the south of us, a country which before Canada was confederated at all, had accumulated enormous wealth and built up immense industries, and a country in which is offered to our citizens sources of employment at remunerative wages. I myself think that in many cases, where our people have gone to the United States, they would have been very much better to have

stayed in Canada where their prospects, although they might not to them seem so brilliant, were more secure and certain. Many of them, as we know, who have gone to the United States have come back to Canada again and have discovered that after all they can do better here than there. Nevertheless, that wealthy country to the south of us has been acting as a magnet, drawing our population there. Give us preferential trade, and what shall we find? Just as soon as it is declared that north of the boundary line every man who has anything to sell in the markets of the United Kingdom shall have a preference there over his foreign competitors, shall get a free entry for his goods into that great mart of the world, while every man south of the line shall have to pay a duty to get his goods in there; just so soon as that fact is established, the whole condition of things is changed. No longer is the magnet in the south, but Canada becomes the magnet and draws the population north. What farmer, what lumberman, what man that desires to trade with the mother country will go to the south of the line where he has got to pay a duty to get his products in the British market, if by coming to the north he gets his goods free of duty into that market. Few men will do it, and as I say, Canada will then become the magnet. Therefore, it is that I need not elaborate that argument, because it is proven by the mere statement of it.

Now, Sir, I have brought forward a resolution here to-day in reference to this preferential trade, and I have framed that resolution purposely in the widest terms possible, in the most general terms possible, so that every man who is in favour of preferential trade may be able to vote for it. All that the resolution affirms is, that some degree of preference, be it little or be it much, should be given to British goods in all British markets over foreign goods. That is all it says. There is no proposal made to give effect to the preference. The resolution is simply the affirmation of the bare principle, and I say that any man who is in favour of any kind or description of preferential trade within the Empire can support this resolution. All details are purposely excluded from it, so that the man who is in favour of absolute free trade within the Empire can support this resolution, and the man who is in favour—if there be such—of not reducing our duties at all in favour of the mother country, but giving a preference by raising our duties against foreign countries, he also can support the resolution. There is nothing stated in this resolution except the affirmation of the broad principle, that some kind of commercial union, some kind of Zollverein, if you like to call it so, on the basis of preferential trade, is desirable. We ask for nothing, nothing whatever, in this resolution. I do not want hon. gentlemen to run away with the idea that this resolution should be opposed because it is asking for something. It is asking for nothing; it is a simple affirmation of the principle that it is desirable that we should have preferential trade. It is for the mother country to give it or not to give it; we are not asking for it; we are informing the mother country of what our views in regard to this matter are: That it is the opinion of the Parliament of Canada that such an arrangement is desirable. Therefore, I do not want any one to oppose this resolution on the ground that it asks for anything. It deliberately avoids asking for anything or suggesting anything further than that a commercial union on the basis of preferential trade is desirable. I am embarrassed to know how to discuss this question, very much embarrassed, because I can hardly imagine upon what ground it can be opposed.

I will venture this assertion: that there is not a man in this House except, perhaps, one, who will rise in his place and who will say that he disapproves of preferential trade, that he disapproves of such an arrangement as would give to the people of Canada an advantage over foreigners in the markets of the mother country.

Mr. CHARLTON. Who is that one member?

Mr. McNEILL. I say, I doubt very much if there be even one hon. member in this House who is prepared to rise in his place and say so; and if I have misrepresented any one, if I have been too sanguine in that view, if I have misrepresented the views of any hon. member in this House, I should be glad that he would rise in his place here and now and put me right. I do not see an hon. member, not one, who is prepared to rise in this House and to say that he is not in favour of such a policy. I say, Sir, that is what I expected to find, because there is not an hon. member in this House who does not know full well that if he were to rise in his place in Parliament and deliberately say that he opposed an arrangement of this kind, he would run the risk of having committed political suicide. I am glad to find that it is just as I expected, and I want that fact to go abroad, I want that fact to be known in England, I want it to strengthen there the hands of the great statesman who has worked so wisely for this cause; I want his hands strengthened by the knowledge of the fact that there is not to be found one man in the Canadian House of Commons who will rise in his place and say a word against this policy of preferential trade within the Empire. And, Sir, even if we cannot have this resolution passed, at all events I have elicited that fact.

Now, Sir, we are told sometimes that it is useless to apply for this preferential trade. That is an argument that I used

often to hear advanced by my old friend the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies). It is useless because we never can get it, the people of England would never dream of doing such a thing as to give the colonies preferential trade. Well, to those who have given any consideration to this question, to those who have endeavoured to discover what the opinion of the people of England really is, it seems simply amazing that any member of this House should oppose a resolution of this kind on such grounds. I will grant you, Mr. Speaker, that the course pursued by the right hon. gentleman when he was in England last year did much to stem the current of public opinion, which was then setting so strongly in favour of this policy. The right hon. gentleman went there as the First Minister of Canada. He was supposed to voice the views of the people of Canada on this matter. As the Duke of Devonshire said, he spoke, not as the representative of one self-governing colony, but of eight self-governing colonies; and when it was found that these eight self-governing colonies of British North America, that had been the special advocates of this policy of preferential trade, had come to the conclusion that its advocacy was an error and that inasmuch as it bore the taint of protection, it was to be regarded as a thing accursed, it is not surprising that its particular friends in the mother country, who had been fighting so steadily and strongly our battle, became discouraged. Why, this was done at the very moment when Mr. Chamberlain had summoned the Premiers together to discuss the question of a closer union of the Empire; and our friends on the other side were amazed and dazed by what seemed to them this lightning-like desertion to the ranks of the enemy of all the hosts of the Dominion, on the very edge of battle. What could be urged upon the Imperial Government in favour of preferential trade when Canada, its special advocate, had denounced it by the mouth of her Prime Minister. Our friends were naturally utterly confounded. Our opponents were as much encouraged and strengthened, and their opinions became of greater weight with the public. A very considerable portion of the newspaper press speedily fell under their control, and the "Times," which had been writing in favour of this policy, and which, as we all know, specially prides itself on being a reflect of the public opinion of the day, came out against the policy, and many other journals followed suit. I admit all that. I admit that a very great check was put upon this movement by the course then pursued. But although the policy received a check, I do not for one moment believe that it has been placed beyond our reach. Far from it. Because after all we must remember that the check which was effected in England was largely the result of a complete misapprehension. It was the result mainly of the misapprehension that the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) was voicing the views of the people of Canada in this regard. But the right hon. gentleman himself has done much to remove that misapprehension by stating that he was misunderstood, and that at the very time when he was supposed to be opposing this policy of preferential trade, he was pursuing a course which he believed was calculated to promote and advance it. The pendulum has consequently swung back again, and public opinion in England has reverted largely to the original position it occupied before the visit of the right hon. gentleman, and we find that the London "Times," —as it is the most important so it has been one of the first exponents of public opinion in England to recognize this change in the condition of the public pulse. Last fall and summer it was advocating nothing but free trade pure and simple. In January last it published the most remarkable article, from which, with the consent of the House, I will read a short extract. It is an editorial article, and will be found in the "Times" of the 19th of January:

> In his speech last night, as the guest of the Liverpool Chamber of Commerce, Mr. Chamberlain naturally and properly dwelt mainly upon the larger questions of commercial policy which now engage the attention of Her Majesty's Government. It is not in purely colonial questions alone, but in everything relating to our vast commercial enterprises, that a great change of opinion has taken place within the last two decades. Just as it was the custom to think that the less we had to do with the colonies the better for all concerned, so people were accustomed to suppose that trade and commerce were always capable of looking after themselves, and were much better without assistance from the state. By a very common mistake people mistook the result of peculiar and exceptional circumstances for the permanent order of nature, and rules of conduct which worked well so long as we maintained an enormous industrial start came to be regarded as true for all time. The erection and worship of fetishes is a weakness of human nature which civilization hardly seems to modify, and certainly has not eradicated. The fetishes of the Manchester school are no longer universally believed in under penalty of denunciation for impenetrable stupidity, but they still sway a considerable number of persons whose ideas lost their elasticity some fifteen or twenty years ago. The younger generation has happily proved more ready to profit by the lessons very freely supplied by events and the deliberate policy of other nations.

That, I think, to those who in this House have imagined that the people of England are still wedded to their old-fashioned views on free trade, will come somewhat in the light of a revelation. I have other extracts here, and while I do not want to weary the House, there are some important extracts which I think I must give the House. Now, "Invention," an illustrated weekly review, published in London and, I understand, a very popular publication, says this:

Patriotic feelings would lead us to see a nation banded together by a strong Imperial federation, the stepping stone to which lies in the Imperial Zollverein, discussed by the congress which has been sitting in our metropolis. From a practical commercial standpoint such a union would be of inestimable benefit both to the mother country and to the colonies, which are her offshoot. What we wish to secure is: First, that the goods which are imported by the United Kingdom from any portion of the Empire shall enjoy preferential treatment over like goods which may be imported from foreign countries; secondly, that exports from the United Kingdom to any other portion of the Empire shall receive the same preferential treatment; thirdly, that intercolonial trade shall be similarly treated in the matter of tariffs.

That is, I think, a pretty clear enunciation in favour of preferential trade. Then the "Saturday Review" said:

Half a century ago England did really enjoy industrial supremacy. We banked and manufactured and carried for the whole world. At such a moment the theory of free imports wore a very plausible appearance. We knew that other nations must come to us for manufactures. We, on our side, were rather short of corn for the time. Opening our ports meant admitting corn, not manufactures. The fatal blunder lay in imagining that this state of things would continue. In the fifty years that have intervened betwixt 1846 and 1896 foreign nations have borrowed our money to make their railroads and telegraphs, they have copied our process of manufacture, and they have built their mercantile fleets, until London has ceased to be the bank of the world, until there is not a market where foreigners do not run us neck and neck, and until, by means of subsidies, the carrying trade is rapidly passing from British to foreign bottoms. The British manufacturer now sees himself hoist with his own petard.

That is the view expressed by that important publication. Then I have a very remarkable quotation from the "Textile Mercury," published in Manchester, the very heart of the Manchester school. I will ask the attention of my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) to this. Recollect that this paper is published in Manchester, and I understand, it is one of the most widely circulated papers of its class:

The "Mercury" summarizes its review of the former and present conditions of trade in England as follows:—

The conclusions naturally to be drawn are the following:—

1st. That free trade is theoretically a correct principle.

2nd. That experience has proved that the world cannot be brought to adopt it

3rd. That its partial adoption, as in this country, where it resolves into a system of free imports only, may or may not be advantageous according to conditions and circumstances.

4th. That its adoption in 1846 and its maintenance thenceforward, say until 1875, was an almost unmitigated advantage.

5th. That since 1875 it has been a diminishing advantage, which has now almost altogether ceased.

6th. That the time has arrived when the country should review its commercial relations with other countries and their relations with it.

7th. It would then find that circumstances have changed so greatly that the present system is no longer an advantageous one to maintain, owing to foreign countries having adopted our mechanical systems of industry, and to their becoming more and more able to dispense with our manufactures—the medium in which we should pay for their productions.

8th. That the condition of many of our industries proves the injurious results of the present policy.

9th. That a system of Imperial federation should be established,——

That means commercial Imperial federation, I presume.

——by which the different parts of the Empire might sustain one another in preference to foreign states, so many of which have long cherished sentiments of hostility to this country.

The details of this policy should receive the immediate attention of statesmen with a view to carrying it into effect at the earliest possible time.

Here is another extract which I have much pleasure in reading. It will be gratifying to the hon. gentlemen opposite, and I do not wish to hold it back. Says the "British Trade Journal":

The Empire cannot be federated commercially except by a tariff against the rest of the world, and the question now is: what are the colonies prepared to do in the matter? Unless sacrifices, which may be very nominal, are made on both sides, Imperial federation may be put on one side. Are the people in the colonies prepared to differentiate in their tariff in favour of British manufactures against similar goods from foreign countries, and are the people of this country ready to differentiate by a duty, however small, in favour of the colonies and dependencies, and against the rest of the world? The governments of the colonies should move in the matter, if the chambers are really in earnest. * * * They should, in the first place, pass Bills imposing lower duties upon British than upon foreign goods. They should enforce such duties. * * * If the colonies wish the people of this country to use their produce in preference to that of foreign countries, they must show in a practical way a readiness to give advantageous terms to British manufacturers.

That, I say, I have no doubt, will be gratifying to hon. gentlemen opposite, as they will say they have done so.

The colonists cannot,——

This is very clearly recognized——

The colonists cannot, for the sake of their revenue, do away with their tariff. The most they can do is to show, as the German Emperor has recently discovered, that blood is thicker than water, and that they are prepared to treat the mother country in a spirit of generosity. Then they can rest assured that the claims of the colonists for more favoured treatment in this country will come with a force which no Government here will be able to resist.

But you will observe that it is the claims of the colonies (i.e., what they ask for) that are referred to. Then I have here an extract from the "Pall Mall Gazette":

Truly, Bradford has grounds for consternation. * * * The other lesson taught us is the need of cementing and furthering trade relations within the Empire The United States have made it plain that they intend as far as possible to be a self-contained commercial unit. Other nations are following the same path. Let England—greater England—do likewise. Let her federate her magnificent Empire in a customs union, and she can afford to go her own way, heedless of the tariff walls which other countries build around their borders. Whether we like it or not, it is a fact that in the future we shall have to look to the colonies, and not to foreign countries, for extended trade, and seeing how great are the prospects of growth in the colonies, commercial as well as patriotic considerations must incline us to regard the prospect with pleasure. At the same time we have no guarantee that even those markets will be ours. Mr. Chamberlain's Jubilee Blue-book demonstrated that the foreigner was steadily, and in some cases swiftly, creeping into the greater markets of England. Yet we can stop the encroachment. It can be done to some extent by the adoption of better business methods on the part of our manufacturers and merchants, but only completely by the founding of a customs union for preferential trade within the Empire.

So says the "Pall Mall Gazette," admittedly one of the most important organs of public opinion in the United ingdom, or in the Empire. Now, this blue-book referred to was the report by the governors of colonies to Mr. Chamberlain in reference to the trade relations of those several colonies, a report which he asked from these governors and which they furnished to him. There is to be found in the "Times" of Wednesday, 15th September, an article summarizing the contents of this blue-book published by the Colonial Office and containing these reports to the governors. I have made a short précis of this article; any hon. gentleman can see the article itself by referring to the "Times" of the 15th of September. I find these facts contained in that article:

From returns furnished to Mr. Chamberlain by the governors of colonies, it appears that according to the trade returns, while colonial imports increased in all from 1884 to 1894 by a little over 1 per cent, their foreign imports increased about 20 per cent.

That is from the trade returns.

But there is an opinion in the colonies that the importation of foreign-made goods has increased in a larger ratio than is shown by the trade returns, which notice only the port of shipment. In Queensland the general foreign percentage, as shown by the trade returns, is 13 per cent; but in 23 out of 64 articles the estimated annual percentage ranges from 50 to 90.

That is, of foreign goods.

In particular classes of goods the foreigner now in some cases does more than 50 per cent of a trade which a few years ago was admittedly British. In Cape Colony the United States have in the decade increased their trade in wagons and carriages twenty-fold, holding now 50 per cent of it. The United States have now 80 per cent of the trade in hammers with Victoria. In Tasmania the United States and Germany have now 62½ per cent of the trade in implements of industry; while in New Zealand, Germany has secured for herself a monopoly of the musical instrument trade. In other cases the foreign manufacturer has practically ousted his British competitor.

In the proceedings which took place at that great congress of the Chambers of Commerce for the Empire last year, there is a great deal of interesting information to be found with reference to the real condition of public opinion in England on this question. I think if hon. gentlemen will look at it, they will find that the representatives of English Chambers of Commerce who spoke on this subject, were about equally divided in opinion. There was about an equal number who supported preferential trade within the Empire, and who opposed it at that meeting. The expressions that were made use of by many delegates there were most remarkable, and throw a great deal of light on the opinion and feeling in England on this subject. I am going to read a few sentences on that subject, as I think it would be a pity not to give them to the House.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the date of that congress?

Mr. McNEILL. The 9th of June, 1896. Now, the representative from Birmingham, Mr. Tonks, president of the Birmingham Chamber of Commerce, says:

It is evident, as Mr. Chamberlain himself pointed out, that the chambers of commerce of this country are divided. There are those, perhaps, who believe in fair trade, and others who would go in for absolutely free trade. A line of demarcation has been presented this morning.

There we have the remarkable fact that this question has made such progress in England that the Chambers of Commerce are divided on the subject. Then you will find that the representative of the Warrington Chamber of Commerce made this remarkable statement:

Firstly, I may say that I have not the horror of British workingmen which some of our friends at this end of the room seem to entertain. I come from Lancashinre myself, and I have the honour of being chairman of a workingmen's federation, and I may tell you that every member of that organization is strongly in favour of preferential duties.

That is the language of Mr. Arthur Bennett, honorary secretary of the Warrington Chamber of Commerce. Then there is this very remarkable statement made by the representative of the Middlesborough Chamber of Commerce:

Three years ago I brought before the associated chambers of commerce in London on behalf of my chamber, a resolution which dealt with the question of preference of trade.

That resolution was not carried, but an examination of the votes given upon it displayed

this important and pertinent fact, that the great industrial centres of the country, voting through their Chambers, were strongly in favour of that resolution, while smaller towns were not in favour of it, and hence it was lost.

I think these utterances are sufficient to convince any hon. gentleman who desires to discover the facts in respect to this matter, that there is a very strong sentiment in England in favour of preferential trade, and that this sentiment pervades the great centres of industry in England.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. And is steadily increasing

Mr. McNEILL. And is steadily increasing, as my hon. friend states. In face of that proof, I would ask hon. members of this House if it is not just a little bit too thin, as our friends to the south would say, to suggest that this resolution should be opposed because there is no chance of our ever obtaining preferential trade in the mother country; and whether it is not also just a little too thin to say that England will never tax the necessaries of life to please the colonies. Why, Sir, who ever suggested she should or would tax the necessaries of life, to please the colonies merely? We have always maintained that this policy is as important and would be as beneficial to England as to the colonies, and it seems to me that persons who put forward such an argument as that are not friends of preferential trade; it looks to me rather as if they were enemies of preferential trade in disguise when they set up such a palpable man of straw that the uninformed may imagine something real and important has been knocked down. No one has suggested that England should tax her food for the mere purpose of pleasing the colonies. When hon. gentlemen say that England will never tax the necessaries of life, they seem to forget that at the present moment she taxes the necessaries of life, many of them enormously. She taxes tobacco, tea and coffee to an enormous extent. The taxation levied on those goods alone is equivalent to a duty of between 15 and 16 per cent on imports of every sort and description from all the colonies of the Empire. So it is quite plain that by a distribution of the duties small preferential duties could be imposed in favour of the colonies without adding to the burdens of the poor man in England in the slightest degree. As I mentioned, I remember years ago, as long ago as 1888, at a meeting I had the honour to address in Paris, Ont., "I do not think the workingman of England would be much more hurt by a duty on sealskins than a duty on his tea." But hon. gentlemen talk as if this was a thing that must tremendously oppress the workingman.

Then we are told that England would never consent to put a duty on wheat. I will take the liberty of reading a few words from an article which appeared in the Sheffield "Telegraph" as long ago as October 13, 1892—and we know what progress has been made since then—written after I had the honour of addressing the Chamber of Commerce of Sheffield. The article says:

> It is essentially a poor man's question. All the rubbish talked about a cheap loaf will be exposed in the days when there is nothing to buy the cheap loaf with. "Dear bread" is a mere bogey used by the unfair traders, the worshippers of the old world fetish, to frighten the foolish. No one proposes to do anything which would make bread dear; but even if it were so, and the loaf was raised an infinitesimal part of a farthing, the better wages would far more than compensate for the difference. It is a poor man's question. Every day brings us nearer to the time when, unless we make a complete change in our fiscal arrangements, the workingman will have no wage to buy bread, cheap or dear.

That is what the Sheffield "Telegraph" said before this movement had made anything like the progress it has made recently, and the "Telegraph" is a paper having a large circulation and possessing much influence in that section of the country. During the same visit I had the honour of addressing a meeting of the Federation of Conservative Workingmen's Associations of the two great counties of Cheshire and Lancashire, which sent delegates to their quarterly meeting at which I was asked to speak. We had a magnificent meeting attended by most intelligent delegates, and the resolution in favour of preferential trade was carried unanimously, there not being one dissenting voice. At the general meeting of the Conservative Central Association of England, held subsequently, this question of a duty on wheat was brought up, and one of the delegates stated that in order to test the feeling among workingmen on the subject, he had the question submitted to a vote at a meeting at which 323 workingmen were present; 320 voted in favour of a duty, and only three dissented.

While I was in the mother country last fall I had occasion to look into the condition of the trade of England and the trade of Germany comparing them together in relation to trade with other European nations, and I will state in half a dozen words the result of that investigation. I found this condition of things existed:

The export trade of the United Kingdom and Germany with certain European countries compared in millions of the coin of the foreign country named.

1892 to 1895.

With Russia—	
United Kingdom, trade increased.....	32⅔
Germany, trade increased.....	78
Denmark—	
United Kingdom, trade increased.....	2½
Germany, trade increased.....	18

Belgium—	
United Kingdom, trade increased.....	11½
Germany, trade increased.....	31¼
France—	
United Kingdom, decrease.....	74
Germany, trade increased.....	27
Austro-Hungary—	
United Kingdom, almost alike in.....	
Germany, increase about.....	3
Switzerland—	
United Kingdom, trade increased.....	6
Germany, trade increased.....	47
Italy—	
United Kingdom, decrease.....	10
Germany, increase.....	*
Spain—	
United Kingdom, decrease.....	40
Germany, increase.....	12
Holland—	
United Kingdom, decrease.....	30
Germany, increase.....	40

* 200,000.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think hon. members of this House will agree with me when I say that these are deplorable figures. And in view of these figures, and in view also of the fact that England is to-day very largely dependent upon foreign countries for her food supply; and in view of the fact that at this present moment Russia has placed an embargo practically upon wheat, and in view of the fact that the price of a quarter of wheat has gone up in England to between 40 and 50 shillings, and that the whole country is being agitated from one end to the other in reference to this food supply; for any one who reads the papers will see there is this agitation and that there is actually a proposal to establish granaries in England for storing up wheat and that the people of England are now becoming fully alive to the fact that they are in peril because they are dependent upon foreign nations for their food supply; I say, Sir, that in view of all these facts, it is not surprising that this question of preferential trade within the Empire has assumed gigantic proportions, and it is not surprising that we find such a statesman as the Duke of Devonshire, perhaps the most cautious of British statesmen of the first rank, taking so serious a view of the necessity for drawing closer together the different parts of the Empire. What did the Duke of Devonshire say in Liverpool, and, if I mistake not, in the presence of my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), in reference to this matter? The Duke of Devonshire said this:

> I am only seeking to show you what has been one of the causes why a great change has come over public opinion in these matters, and why colonial expansion and colonial consolidation are now regarded, not as they were, as a policy of a doubtful principle, as a policy which was perhaps to be shunned, but as a policy which is essential to the maintenance of our continued prosperity.

"A policy which is essential to the maintenance of our continued prosperity!" And this tremendous announcement on the part of the Duke of Devonshire was, we find, received with great applause by the sober-minded members of the Chamber of Commerce of Liverpool.

Now, I want to ask any hon. member of this House, I care not what side he may sit on, I want to ask him, whether in view of the fact that the people of England have come to regard this drawing closer together the bonds which unite the mother country and her colonies as something which is essential to the continued prosperity of Great Britain, I want to ask any hon. member of this House, whether the people of England are going very long to allow—except indeed it may be those whose minds, as the "Times" says, have lost their elasticity—whether they are going very long to allow, what the "Times" describes as fetish worship, to stand in the way of this thing which they deem essential to the maintenance of their continued prosperity. And I would like to ask him further, in view of that statement of the Duke of Devonshire, whether or not it is reasonable to ask that this House should declare itself to be in favour of a policy for drawing the Empire closer together, in the manner referred to in this resolution. I want to know, whether it is unreasonable to ask that this House should declare that it is in favour of such a policy as this, in view of the utterances of the Duke of Devonshire on this subject. I think, Mr. Speaker, that those who are responsible for the shaping of the destinies of this country, so far as men may shape the destinies of a country, are in duty bound to see to it, that they take immediate steps for the purpose of drawing closer together the various portions of the Empire by adopting a policy which, as I will show in a moment, another great English statesman considers to be that most likely to affect the result we all ought to have at heart, and which I hope we all have at heart. Now I want to say a word with regard to that other English statesman. I want to call the attention of the House to the utterancets of the statesman who has risen to a due appreciation of these great issues that are presented for the consideration of the Colonial Secretary of a sovereign whose sway extends over one-fifth portion of the habitable globe. How does Mr. Chamberlain regard this question? Does he regard it as a matter of comparative insignificance? Does he dismiss it with a good-natured and passing gibe, as something which would no doubt be very pleasing to the colonies; or does he view it as the Duke of Devonshire views it, as something of the greatest possible importance, and something which will not only be beneficial to the colonies, but which will strengthen the whole Imperial fabric? Let me quote from the words of Mr. Chamber-

lain, spoken before the Congress of Chambers of Commerce, to which I have already referred. Speaking of the other proposals that were before the Congress, Mr. Chamberlain says:

> My Lords and Gentlemen,—These proposals are of great and pressing importance, but they are, I was going to say, dwarfed into insignificance in comparison with other proposals which will also be put before you and which are intended to secure the commercial union of the Empire,—

All these other proposals, Mr. Chamberlain says, are dwarfed into insignificance. In another portion of his speech he says:

> Well, gentlemen, in my personal opinion, this is a question which dominates all other Imperial interests, to which everything else is secondary, and which is at the root of the problem with which we have now to deal. The establishment of commercial union throughout the Empire would only be the first step, but it would be the main and decisive step towards the realization of the most inspiring idea that has ever entered into the minds of British statesmen.

That is how Mr. Chamberlain regards this question. I do not think I said too much when I said the other day that Mr. Chamberlain regarded this question as the most important which could engage the attention of a British Parliament. I want to ask again any hon. member on the other side of the House whether he does not think that Mr. Chamberlain will be prepared to make very lage concessions indeed in order to secure what he considers of such transcendent importance, this commercial union of the Empire. Is it not reasonable to expect that he will? We know very well what the basis of the proposal made by Mr. Chamberlain was. It was very well laid down by the right hon. gentleman himself before he went to England. It is preferential trade on the basis of a revenue tariff. That is the suggestion which Mr. Chamberlain made, but he did not say that it was a hard and fast proposal. He told us distinctly that it was not, that it is no cast iron proposal, but simply a suggestion thrown out for the purpose of provoking discussion. What I understand Mr. Chamberlain's view to be is this: He says in effect: I am prepared, for the sake of free trade within the Empire, to impose duties upon foreign goods imported into the Empire, thus giving preference to the produce of the colonies, but I recognize that absolute free trade within the Empire is an impossibility. He says:

> It is evident that in any arrangement as to general free trade within the Empire, exceptions must be made in the cases of articles that are chiefly taxed for revenue purposes.

I wish hon. gentlemen to bear that in mind. Therefore, Mr. Chamberlain, while he tells us that he desires free trade within the Empire, does not tell us that he considers absolute free trade within the Empire to be essential. On the contrary, instead of saying that free trade is essential, he says it is evident we cannot have absolute free trade. Then, again, I understood him to mean this, that we must approach this question from this point of view, namely, that the goal we are to have in view is free trade within the Empire, as nearly as possible, and that unless we approach the question in that spirit, he does not think we shall be able to make much progress. In his speech at the Congress of the Chambers of Commerce, he emphasized the free trade side of the question still more strongly if possible, but took special care to point out that there may be exceptions. He said he was not going to discuss those exceptions, but he called special attention to the fact that there may be exceptions; and I want to urge upon hon. members opposite this consideration, that Mr. Chamberlain, in speaking of free trade, does not mean absolute free trade as we regard it, because he took the resolution moved by the hon. member for Toronto and carried at the Board of Trade at Toronto and accepted it as a basis for negotiations. He said: I regard this as free trade; but that resolution specially said it was only to be free trade in so far as that was compatible with the raising of revenue for the purposes of government. Therefore, Mr. Chamberlain's meaning of free trade is free trade as far as possible, consistent with the necessity of raising revenue within the Empire. I do not deny that any one who desires to discuss this question fairly must admit that, in all probability Mr. Chamberlain desires to go much further in the direction of free trade than many of us would be prepared to go. But is that any reason why we should not negotiate? Is it any reason why we should refuse to consider this question? We have arrived at a basis for negotiations. The principle of preferential trade is accepted by Mr. Chamberlain—the very thing which we heard time and again in this House would never be accepted by the Imperial authorities. The very thing which my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) told me repeatedly across the House would never be accepted, is to-day accepted. We have the principle accepted and approved of by the Colonial Secretary himself. Is not that a basis for negotiations? Are you to say simply because you think Mr. Chamberlain may be inclined to go further in favour of free trade than we are, that we will not discuss the question at all, that we will not negotiate at all, that we will not try to obtain what my right hon. friend described as a great boon for the people. Is that any reason? Surely it is an enormous stride in advance to have the principle that we were contending for accepted by the Colonial Secretary, who is for us, in this matter, the Imperial Government. What can be alleged in excuse for not proceeding with

this matter? We have the principle admitted, and there is nothing but the details to arrange, and we say we will not discuss the details, we will not proceed at all, notwithstanding the great advance we have made. I do not deny that the arrangement of the details of so great a matter must be difficult. But is that any reason why we should not negotiate, why we should not endeavour to meet the Colonial Secretary's views in this matter?

Surely not. I am quite satisfied that the people of this country will not regard that as a good reason. When the principle is accepted, when we have the basis of negotiation, when there is nothing but the matter of details separating us, why, in the name of Providence, should we not negotiate? And why, especially should a Government, yearning for free trade, refuse to negotiate? Hon gentlemen opposite have not refused to negotiate at Washington under circumstances not nearly so propitious. From this side of the House they have urged upon us over and over again that the Conservative party were not nearly anxious enough to negotiate at Washington, when there seemed to be no hope whatever for favourable negotiation there. I think, Mr. Speaker, and I venture to say that the country will think so too, that hon. gentlemen opposite might just for once try the effect of negotiating in London for preferential trade within the Empire—just for once.

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

After Recess.

THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 81) respecting the Montreal and Southern Counties Railway Company.—(Mr. Préfontaine, by Mr. Légris.)

Bill (No. 97) to incorporate the North Shore Electric Railway Company.—(Mr. Préfontaine, by Mr. Légris.)

IN COMMITTEE—SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 139) to incorporate the Anglo-French Telegraph Company.—(Mr. Morrison.)

PREFERENTIAL TRADE.

Mr. McNEILL. Mr. Speaker, when you left the Chair at six o'clock I had been calling attention to the fact that the principle of preferential trade had been accepted by the Colonial Secretary. I had also called attention to a statement which I deemed to be one of very great importance, made by the Duke of Devonshire. I felt at the time I was referring to his statement that I was not expressing very clearly what I meant to say, and I should like to endeavour to express more definitely my meaning now. The Duke of Devonshire said that the expansion and the consolidation of the colonial Empire was, in the opinion of the people of England, essential to the maintenance of their continued prosperity. I do not think that any one will deny that the adoption of preferential trade by the mother country, and the giving to the colonies an advantage over foreign countries for their products in the greatest market of the world, would have a tendency to the expansion of the colonial Empire of England in the sense in which the Duke of Devonshire used those words, that is to say, in the increase of their population and the development of their resources. That being so, it seems to me that the people of England will not long allow any mere fetish worship, as the "Times" calls it, to stand in the way of carrying out a policy which they deem to be essential to the continuance of their own prosperity. I was referring also to what Mr. Chamberlain had said, and I think it may be well that I should quote Mr. Chamberlain's words in his famous speech at the Canada Club dinner, so that there may be no misapprehension as to what his attitude in regard to this question really is. I see that my hon. friend (Sir Louis Davies) has what I presume is the authorized edition of Mr. Chamberlain's speeches; and I hold in my hand also a copy of Mr. Chamberlain's speech, printed by permission of the author. Now, Mr. Chamberlain said on that occasion, having discussed the question at some considerable length:

> My fourth proposition is that a true Zollverein of the Empire, with a free trade established throughout the Empire, although it would involve the imposition of duties against foreign countries and would be in that respect a derogation from the high principles of free trade, and from the practice of the United Kingdom up to the present time, would still be a proper subject for discussion, and might probably lead to a satisfactory arrangement, if the colonies on their part were willing to consider it.

That, hon. gentlemen will see, is a pretty strong statement from the Colonial Secretary of a free trade country.

> It has been assumed, in Lord Ripon's despatch, and in many other documents, that the colonies must necessarily refuse to consider a proposition of this kind because it would interfere with the necessities of their revenue, that they are obliged to rely upon indirect taxation for the funds by which their administration is carried on, and that they could not enter on such an agreement as this without providing ways and means by methods which, at present, at any rate, are altogether unpopular in many of our colonies. I am not convinced of the truth of that statement, and I want especially to point out that the advantages of such a proposal are so great to the colonies, as they would undoubtedly lead to the earliest possible development of their great natural resources, would bring to them population, would open to them the enormous markets of the United Kingdom for their products, their food, their timber, their sugar. The advantages, I say, are so important that it appears to me

that the colonies themselves would be bound to give to any suggestion, of this kind at all events, a careful reconsideration.

My second point is that we are dealing with an entirely exceptional state of things, and that we cannot, even if we wished, imitate exactly the German Zollverein. We are not conterminous countries; we are countries, as I have said, separated by thousands of miles, in some cases, and the circumstances of our different countries vary so considerably that it is evident that in any arrangement as to general free trade within the Empire exceptions must be made in the case of articles that are taxed chiefly for revenue purposes. For instance, we cannot admit free trade in spirits or in tobacco, and to any gentleman who has any experience other articles will suggest themselves, which in one part of the Empire or another are the subject of strictly revenue duties, and might, by common agreement, be excluded from any such arrangement. But the principle which I claim must be accepted if we are to make any, even the slightest, progress, is that within the different parts of the Empire protection must disappear, and that the duties must be revenue duties, and not protective duties in the sense of protecting the products of one part of the Empire against those of another part. It seems to me that if that principle were adopted there would be reason for calling a council of the Empire, calling representatives from the different states forming the Empire; and although the subject would be one of enormous difficulty and the greatest complication, still with the good-will that exists and the ultimate goal in view, I cannot but think that something like a satisfactory and a workable arrangement might be arrived at. (Cheers.) And although in such a case the principles of free trade would lose something in their application to the dealings between ourselves and foreign countries, advocates of free trade must remember how much they would gain by its extension to all the states which form the British Empire, states which, after all, whatever may be said of their present position, more likely to develop and increase in prosperity and population and wealth and power and commerce than any of the foreign states with which we have relations.

And then he says:

I want not to lay down a course of policy which must be followed, but I want to provoke discussion.

That is the statement made by Mr. Chamberlain at the Canada Club, a speech in which he states most distinctly that in any arrangement for general free trade within the Empire exceptions must be made in case of articles chiefly taxed for revenue purposes. In his speech before the Congress of the Chambers of Commerce of the Empire, Mr. Chamberlain, as a matter of course, deals with this aspect of the question, and what I want specially to call attention to at the present moment is this, that Mr. Chamberlain accepts the resolution of the Toronto Board of Trade as something which will be likely to form a basis for the settlement of this question. I want to read what that resolution was, as I had not got it at hand before six o'clock. The principal clause reads as follows:—

Resolved,—That in the opinion of this Congress the advantages to be obtained by a closer union between the various portions of the British Empire are so great as to justify an arrangement as nearly as possible of the nature of Zollverein, based upon principles of the freest exchange of commodities within the Empire, consistent with the tariff requirements incident to maintain the local government of each kingdom, dominion, province or colony now forming part of the British family of nations.

I should like to read to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries what Mr. Chamberlain said with respect to that resolution:

We have, therefore, if we are to make any progress at all, to seek a third course, a course in which there shall be give and take on both sides, in which neither side will pedantically adhere to preconceived conclusions, in which the good of the whole shall subordinate the separate interests of parts. And I admit that, if I understand it correctly, I find the germs of such a proposal in a resolution which is to be submitted to you on behalf of the Toronto Board of Trade. What is that resolution? I hope I correctly explain it. The resolution I understand to be one for the creation of a British Zollverein or customs union, which would establish at once practically free trade throughout the British Empire, but would leave the contracting parties free to make their own arrangements with regard to duties upon foreign goods, except that this is an essential condition of the proposal that Great Britain shall consent to replace moderate duties upon certain articles which are of large production in the colonies. Now, if I have rightly understood it, these articles would rightly comprise corn, meat, wool and sugar, and perhaps other articles of enormous consumption in this country, which are at present largely produced in the colonies, and which might be under such an arrangement wholly produced in the colonies, and wholly produced by British labour. On the other hand, as I have said, the colonies, while maintaining their duties upon foreign imports, would agree to a free interchange of commodities with the rest of the Empire, and would cease to place protective duties upon any product of British labour. That is the principle of the general zollverein; that is the principle which underlies the federation of the United States of America; and I do not doubt for a moment that if it were adopted it would be the strongest bond of union between the British race throughout the world. (Cheers.) I say that such a proposal as that might commend itself even to an orthodox free trader. It would be the greatest advance that free trade has ever made since it was first advocated by Mr. Cobden, to extend its doctrines permanently to more than three hundred millions of the human race, and to communities, many of which are amongst the most thriving, the most prosperous, and the most rapidly increasing in the whole world. On the other hand, it would open up to the colonies an almost unlimited market for their agricultural and other productions. Of course the details of such a scheme would require the most careful examination. There may have to be exceptions made to the principle, although I believe the principle itself must be adopted if any progress is to be made at all. But I am not going to discuss fully these exceptions on the present occasion.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. gentleman has not read all the extract.

Mr. McNEILL. I am not going to read it all. The hon. gentleman will read that portion of the speech which he has before him, to support the branch of the argument he desires to put forward.

Mr. McMULLEN. You did not give the whole of it.

Mr. McNEILL. I have read that portion I require for the point I am making; I shall have to read some further portions afterwards. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries has the speech in his hand, and he will read that portion which he thinks it is important to read. I have taken up almost enough of the time of the House by reading extracts already. The hon. gentleman, on a former occasion, took me to task for what he was pleased to describe as "garbling" of a speech of Mr. Chamberlain. He proved that, how? By reading a portion of another speech delivered by Mr. Chamberlain, and by stating from his place and on his responsibility as a member of this House that I had read all the sentences he had read down to a certain point in that speech, and that I had broken off and left out the rest because it did not suit me. But I did not read one solitary word of that which the hon. gentleman quoted, and I read from another speech altogether. Yet the hon. gentleman had the audacity to rise and charge me with "garbling" as he called it, the speech, and to prove it he read a quotation from another speech delivered by Mr. Chamberlain. I will now proceed with the argument I was addressing to the House, after that little excursion into other matters. I was calling the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, at the time I was interrupted, somewhat unnecessarily, I think, by the hon. gentleman, who had on a former occasion deliberately misrepresented me in this House, to this fact: that when Mr. Chamberlain speaks of free trade he is not using the term in the same sense in which my hon. friend uses it, because I have read to my hon. friend the resolution of the Toronto Board of Trade, which distinctly states that they propose a Zollverein on the principle of free trade so far as is consistent with the raising of the necessary revenue and this resolution was accepted by Mr. Chamberlain as a free trade resolution.

I now pass away from that subject and proceed to deal with another aspect of the question. I asked before the House rose at six o'clock, why should we not negotiate? Well, we are told from the other side of the House why we should not negotiate. We are told by the other side of the House that we shall never obtain this preferential trade by any kind of negotiation or bargain. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) told us that if we obtain this preferential trade at all, it will be obtained by reason of some great wave of Imperial sentiment which will pass over the Empire and give us preferential trade. I am very glad to find that my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) and the members of the Government recognize so fully as they seem to recognize to-day, the force of this Imperial sentiment. I do not think that any member of this House who has been good enough to follow the discussions in which I have taken any part in reference to this matter will accuse me of not givng weight to the sentimental side of the question. But, Sir, I venture to think that what was said by the Duke of Devonshire more correctly describes the probable course of events than what was said by my hon. friend the Minister of Finance. The Duke of Devonshire, in Liverpool, said this: "The future of the Empire depends, I believe, in almost equal proportions upon considerations of an Imperial and a sentimental character." My hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) does not agree with the Duke of Devonshire in his view, if he thinks that the future of his Empire, so far as this is concerned, is to be affected by sentiment alone. I venture to think that the words of the Duke of Devonshire are more nearly correct than those of my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding), although I agree with him in believing sentiment to be a great force. I think he will find that however great the force of sentiment may be, self-interest will have a good deal to do with the determination of this question, and when hon. gentlemen opposite tell us that if we ask for a quid pro quo we are doing something that is discreditable, I cannot agree with them.

Mr. FOSTER. A huckstering spirit.

Mr. McNEILL. Yes, as my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) says, when hon. gentlemen opposite tell us that to ask for a quid pro quo implies that we approach the mother country in a huckstering spirit, I do not agree with them. I think you may offer advantages for corresponding advantages in return, not in any huckstering spirit, but in a spirit of the most generous friendship and good-will. I say further, Mr. Speaker, that the resolution which was passed by this House in 1892 was framed in no huckstering spirit and was passed in no huckstering spirit. That resolution, Sir, was framed in a spirit of the most devoted loyalty to the best interests, not only of Canada, but of the mother country. And I believe that every member of this House who supported that resolution, supported it in that spirit; and from my point of view at least, the policy which was then propounded to this House by that resolution, was vastly more beneficial to the interests of the mother country than any mere reduction of duties by us in her favour can be. And why do I say so? I say so because the future of the mother country is with her Empire. Her self-governing colonies are but outlying portions of British soil. Their people are her people. Their prosperity is her prosperity. By developing their resources,

she is building up her own power. Every deserving immigrant attracted from foreign territories to their shores is added wealth and strength to the mother country herself. The growth of Montreal and Toronto is as important for her as the growth of Liverpool and Belfast. If she maintains her empire, the future is filled for her with splendour and glory, and she becomes, of necessity, the great peace-compelling influence of the world. If, on the other hand, through any outward circumstances, she fails to maintain her connection with the colonies, she shrinks to the stature of a third rate power. And, Sir, with her congested population, her dependence upon a foreign food supply, her crippled and restricted trade, as it then would be, her future is not one of splendour and glory, but, in such an event, must be a future that cannot be contemplated with composure by any loyal subject of the Queen. I say, Sir, that that can be no adequate policy of preferential trade which ignores these considerations.

I contend that the policy of the resolution of 1892 would go to build up the resources of Canada, would attract population to her shores, would increase her resources prodigiously, and by doing so would strengthen enormously the mother country and enormously increase her influence. On the other hand, I say that the policy that has been adopted by the present Government will, I very much fear, not tend to develop the resources of Canada. I very much fear that the bald reduction of 25 per cent in duties will have a tendency, in place of developing the resources of Canada to check their development and to impede the progress of some of our industries. You are, by adopting that policy, giving to the mother country, not a preference in an increasing market but in a restricted market; whereas, by adopting the policy of 1892 you are giving to the mother country the advantage in a market which would increase to an extent and with a rapidity which has never been realized, perhaps, by any hon. member in this House.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Was any action taken upon that resolution of 1892 by the Imperial authorities?

Mr. McNEILL. Yes.

Mr. LANDERKIN. What was it?

Mr. McNEILL. Calling together a conference of the Empire.

Mr. LANDERKIN. What was the result of that?

Mr. McNEILL. The results of that were very important.

Mr. LANDERKIN. What importance?

Mr. McNEILL. One of the results of that was the passing by that conference of just such a resolution as I am proposing to this House. As the hon. gentleman (Mr. Landerkin) has attracted my attention to that, I may tell him something more. I may tell him, that had it not been for the policy pursued by his Prime Minister it would not have been necessary to move this resolution to-night.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Do you think it is absolutely necessary now?

Mr. McNEILL. I do think it is very necessary now; I think we have been obliged to retrace our steps; that is what I think.

Mr. LANDERKIN. You had four years to act upon it, and why did you not do something then?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. McNEILL. Now, we are told when we speak of approaching the mother country in reference to this matter, that it is ungenerous to attempt to enter into negotiations with the mother country. That statement is almost too ridiculous to need any reply, but assuming for the sake of argument that it has been put forward seriously, I will just call the attention of hon. members on this side of the House to the view that was taken in England of that resolution of 1892 which offered a quid pro quo.

The "Times" the very morning after the resolution passed, described our action as "a most encouraging sign of loyalty and goodwill." The Sheffield "Telegraph" spoke of it as "the magnificently chivalrous offer of Canada." Under these circumstances and knowing how our action at that time was regarded by our friends and kinsmen in the mother country, I think we can afford to hear, with some degree of equanimity the criticisms which are passed upon it nowadays by hon. gentlemen who at that time proposed a very different course. And I think when we remember that course which was pursued by some hon. members at that time, we can estimate at their true value these criticisms to which I have referred. But I ask again, why should we refuse to negotiate? Why should we fold our hands and refuse to move in a matter which is of such transcendent importance to every man, woman and child in Canada and to our kinsmen in the mother country. Mr. Chamberlain, I want to tell the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, virtually notifies us to take this question up. In the Canada Club speech, he asks us to "better our offer." Before the Congress of the Chambers of the Empire, he said:

I only want to impress upon you my personal conviction that if a proposal of this kind came to us from the colonies, backed by any considerable support on their part, it would not be met by a blank refusal by the people of this country. I say, gentlemen, if it were proposed to us by the colonies, because I do not consider it would be either wise or practicable that a proposal of this

kind should come in the first instance from the United Kingdom. We know how strenuously the colonies cling to their own independence, to their own initiative. If they desire, as we desire, and as we believe they do, this closer union—if they are willing to make some sacrifice of their present arrangements and convictions in order to secure it—let them say so.

This resolution simply asks that hon. gentlemen shall say so. I have one other reference to make, and that is to Mr. Chamberlain's statement, and I am very sorry the right hon. First Minister is not here at the present moment, because I would like to base a question upon this extract. This also, I think, is evidence that Mr. Chamberlain wishes the colonies to take this matter up. Speaking of commercial relations, in his interview with the Premiers, he said :

In the meanwhile, however, I may say that I note a resolution which appears to have been passed unanimously at the meeting of the Premiers in Hobart, in which the desire was expressed for closer commercial arrangements with the Empire, and I think it was suggested that a commission of inquiry should be created in order to see in what way practical effect might be given to the aspiration. If that be the case, and if it were thought that at the present time you were not prepared to go beyond inquiry, if it were the wish of the other colonies of Canada and of the South African colonies to join in such an inquiry, Her Majesty's Government would be delighted to make arrangements for the purpose, and to accept any suggestions as to the form of the reference and the character and constitution of the commission, and would very gladly take part in it.

There is Mr. Chamberlain's suggestion made to the Premiers, and now I want to ask this Government whether they took any steps to have it carried into effect. I think the people of this country are entitled to an answer. I suppose the First Minister is the most proper member of the Government from whom to ask information on this question.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We will not interrupt the hon. gentleman's speech.

Mr. McNEILL. I should like to have an answer, and the people of this country are entitled to an answer.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman indicated that he wishes the Prime Minister to reply.

Mr. McNEILL. I see five or six of his colleagues here, and it is not to be presumed that action was taken without their knowledge. Does any one of them know if any such action was taken ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman knows that the suggestion of Mr. Chamberlain was made in the presence of the Prime Minister.

Mr. McNEILL. That does not matter for my purpose.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I would merely suggest to my hon. friend, as he is very courteous and reasonable in all his demands, that it would perhaps be proper for the First Minister's colleagues to wait until he comes as he may be able to make a more definite and complete answer than any of his colleagues could possibly make.

Mr. McNEILL. I am very much obliged to my hon. friend for his complimentary remarks, but I do not ask for any lengthy statement. I simply want a reply "yes or no." I only ask whether any member of this Government knows if any such action was taken in support of Mr. Chamberlain's suggestion. It is evident that no member of the Government does know of any such action or they would say so, and it is well that the country should understand this.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have almost done, and I am sure the House will be heartily glad to hear it. I want, however, to call attention to another speech of Mr. Chamberlain, the most recent and perhaps the most important he has made on this subject. It is the speech which he delivered in Liverpool, only a few days before the opening of this session. But before I read an extract from the speech, I would ask to be allowed to read an extract from a very much less important one—one that I delivered last fall at Larne during my visit to the mother country. Larne, I may inform some of the members of the House, who perhaps may not know, is the Irish terminus of the short sea passage between Great Britain and Ireland. I was asked to deliver an address there on the subject of Canada and the Empire, and I called the attention of the audience to the sort of country that this Canada of ours is. The report thus reads :

He had been asked to say something about Canada and the Empire, and he would ask them to be good enough to remember that when he spoke of Canada he spoke of half the continent of North America, a region that was almost equal in area to the whole of the continent of Europe. One-sixth greater than the United States, exclusive of Alaska and which in wealth of mineral resources, in wealth of forest, in wealth of fisheries, and in its possibilities for successful agricultural pursuits was probably equal at least to any six of the great European nations added together, if they left out Russia. * * * *

Having called attention to that fact, I said this : He wanted his audience to be good enough to project their minds into the future and to endeavour to picture to themselves that vast area, with the teeming millions that it was capable of sustaining ; he would ask them to consider to what majesty of power and wealth this great country must attain if she be not hindered by the interference of jealous or hostile powers. He wanted them to remember that the people of Canada were simply saturated with loyalty and affection for British institutions, for the people of these islands and for the Sovereign of this realm, and he wanted them to ask themselves whether under those circumstances it might not after all be worth their while to make some sacrifice in order

to assist in the developing of the measureless resources of Canada, in order to secure for themselves now, the lion's share of her great future trade, and in order to cement and weld into an indissoluble union that half continent with the parent state. But when they made such a suggestion as this they were told by some people, "Oh, why do you speak of trade with the colonies The trade of the colonies is so small as not to be compared with our foreign trade" ; the trade of the colonies is not after all so insignificant as some people suppose. But let that pass, and let sentiment be laid aside too, although sentiment is the vital force of the Empire. He asked them to look at this matter from a business point of view. Was his business to look at the trade of the moment only ? Did the successful business man conduct his affairs on that principle ? Did the buyer of stocks consider the profit of the moment, and not look to the future? Did any successful business man refuse to take cognizance of future possibilites, probabilities, certainties ? Is it or is it not true that if the Empire endures, Canada must one day be as populous and powerful as the United States are today? If that be as certain as that the sun would rise on the morrow above the horizon with a round disc, what should we think of the statesmanship which ignores it, and is incapable of looking beyond the moment in reference to the trade of the colonies ? He said that evening, as he had said before, that the man who takes his view of our colonial trade, though he may be a skilful statistician, a nimble enumerator, or even an astute financier, is so far as the great tides of Empire are concerned, stone blind.

Now, I will read what Mr. Chamberlain said at Liverpool :

> Our policy is to bind the colonies closer to us by all means in our power, and, if not now, yet to pave the way for a future union which will be closer than anything that is now practicable. We shall not attempt—that would be foolish—we shall not attempt to put pressure upon our colonists to go one step further than they themselves desire to go. It is not for us to take the initiative. We would rather follow the lead ; but what I think we have already accomplished is to convince them that wherever they live, however far their home may be from the centre and from the motherland, we at any rate are prepared to meet them more than half way in any approach which they may make to us in any desire which they may express for closer union ; and, gentlemen, it will come, if not in our days, then in that of our successors. In what form I know not—it would be foolish to attempt to predict. It may be in the shape of commercial union—of the Imperial Zollverein, which I do not think to be so absurd as do some political economists.

Then he goes on to say that it may be in the form of an Imperial Council, and he proceeds :

> But, in whatever way it may be presented to us we shall not be deterred, either by the economic pedantries or selfishness which is a virtue with some politicians, from giving favourable consideration to any proposal which our brethren across the seas may make to us And in such a consideration I for one do not believe the English people will keep a strict account of profit and loss—that they will seek to be assured of a present pecuniary gain in return for so much concession on their part. No ; I think they will look, and look wisely, rather to a future time when we shall find our reward ; and that the splendid isolation with which our foreign critics sometimes taunt us will be transformed into a closer alliance of the British race, and when the sons of Britain throughout the world shall stand shoulder to shoulder to defend our mutual interests and our common rights.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is the utterance of Mr. Chamberlain. He tells us there that his policy is to draw closer to the colonies. He tells us, further, that he is prepared to meet the colonies more than half way in any proposal that they may make. And, in order that we may not be deterred from making a proposal by this bogey of free trade of which we have heard so much, he tells us that he will not allow any pendantic considerations of that kind to deter him. Then he gives the coup de grace to that which has been the stock argument with those who oppose preferential trade in this country—that England will never for the sake of the small trade of the colonies impose a duty on foreign imports and interfere with foreign trade, which is much greater—he tells us distinctly that he, for one, does not believe that that will weigh so much with the people of England ; he tells us that in his opinion they will not be governed wholly by considerations of present profit and loss, but will look to the future for their reward. He therefore, I say, gives the death blow to this which has been the staple argument in this country with those who oppose this policy. That is a statement made by Mr. Chamberlain, as I say, a few days before the meeting of this House. I, do not desire to suggest that the statement Mr. Chamberlain made was made in response to the speech I made at Larne. I believe a copy of that speech was sent to Mr. Chamberlain. But he is a very busy man, and may not have read it. This, however, I do say, that had he read that speech, I should have desired no more favourable answer to the appeal I made than these words I have quoted from the speech he made in Liverpool. I believe that every Imperialist will thank Mr. Chamberlain from the bottom of his heart for the brave words he spoke in favour of this policy on that occasion. Emboldened by what Mr. Chamberlain said, I have ventured to put this motion on the motion paper and to ask the House of Commons of Canada to support it. I think that every hon. member in this House will agree that if this resolution be supported and carried in the House, it will enormously strengthen the hands of Mr. Chamberlain who is supporting this policy for us in the mother country. It will enormously strengthen his hands to be able to say to the people of the mother country that the eight self-governing colonies of British North America, in Parliament assembled, have approved of the policy of commercial union of the Empire based on the principle of preferential trade. I think the resolution I have

put on the paper is a very moderate resolution. I think I would have been justified in moving a very much stronger resolution, a resolution calling on the Government to take immediate steps to meet these suggestions of Mr. Chamberlain. But, though I would have been justified in moving such a resolution, I preferred to move a resolution as to which there could be no cavil, as to which there could be no misapprehension, a resolution simply declaring that we approve the principle of preferential trade, simply declaring that we agree with the Colonial Secretary in believing that preferential trade would be beneficial to this country. For my part, I am unable to understand how any Government that is really in favour of preferential trade can oppose this resolution, because it is simply a resolution setting out that preferential trade is desirable. I do not understand how any Government that is not determined to oppose preferential trade can do otherwise than support this resolution. It is rather a curious thing, Mr. Speaker, that this happens to be the anniversary of the day of the founding of the good city of St. John, N.B., the day when some 3,000 men arrived there, preferring exile and hardship under the flag of England rather than their own hearths and homes where the flag of England had been hauled down and another flag had usurped its place. This is the day which has been appointed by the Prime Minister for the discussion of this question; and it does seem to me that it will be a somewhat singular coincidence if this is the day selected by the Government to stab this great British policy.

Mr. McMULLEN. In replying to my hon. friend from North Bruce (Mr. McNeill), I desire to say, in the first place, that it would be well if all the speeches delivered by Mr. Chamberlain on this very important question were submitted to an impartial judge and a careful and well-outlined decision come to as to what Mr. Chamberlain really did mean, in order to enlighten hon. gentlemen opposite. My hon. friend from North Bruce appears to labour under the impression that Mr. Chamberlain pointed to a condition of things as between the colonies and England that foreshadowed a return to a protective tariff, a return on the part of England to the condition of affairs of fifty or sixty years ago. I deny that, taking all the statements and speeches of Mr. Chamberlain, there is one single speech to show that, or that, putting them all together you can extract from them any indication whatever that he, as a great statesman in England, speaking on behalf of the Government of which he is a member, held out the inducement to the colonies that England was in a spirit or temper to return to the principle of protection.

There is no doubt that England is very anxious to cultivate friendly relations with her colonies, and that she would be willing to do anything in her power to secure more intimate trade relations with them than have existed in the past. But, Sir, if there ever was a wrench given to the friendly relations that existed between the mother country and ourselves, it was given in 1878 when hon. gentlemen opposite adopted a protective tariff, and carried out that principle up to a recent date. The hon. leader of the Opposition took part in the adoption of that principle, and he was surrounded by gentlemen who were willing, year after year, to slap England in the face by putting increased duties on English goods; notwithstanding that many remonstrances, my appeals were made to the Government of Canada with regard to the manner in which we were striking at English trade. We know that every Chamber of Commerce, the Ironmonger's Association, and boards of trade throughout England, protested through their Government against the manner in which Canada was treating English goods. But nothing would move hon. gentlemen opposite, they kept on in their policy of protection, and the result was that now, when hon. gentlemen find themselves in Opposition, they are loud in demanding that better trade relations with the mother country should be adopted. I am sure there is not an individual in Canada who would not be rejoiced to see the mother country give us advantages in her markets over the outside world; but in face of the course adopted by England, of the enormous improvement in her condition as a nation, in wealth and prosperity of every kind, on the right hand and on the left, it is folly, it is worse than folly, to expect her to reverse the policy under which she has attained to such enormous proportions as a nation, that is to say, the policy of free trade. When England adopted free trade in 1846, her debt was something like 850 millions sterling. She was paying a higher rate of interest on her national debt than she does now. We know that since that time she has largely reduced her national debt, it is now something like 900 million dollars less than it was then. We know that she has paid the enormous expenses of the Russian war, the Indian mutiny, and many other troubles, she has paid this all from revenue, and her condition today is better than it ever was in her history. Now, all this has been accomplished under a system of free trade. The increase of wealth in England is something marvellous, it is stated to be something like 750 millions sterling yearly, she is growing so much richer every year. Now, to expect that England would be willing to part with that system that has brought her forward in the race of nations, and to go back to the principle of protection, is something that I do not believe Mr. Chamberlain ever would consent to, or that any English statesman would dare to risk his standing

as a public man in openly advocating. I believe England would be very glad to see the colonies unite with her under a system of free trade, and I believe that is what Mr. Chamberlain was driving at all the time—that is what he said, that he would be very glad to see the colonies come in and adopt free trade. But any other principle Mr. Chamberlain declared he would not touch with a pair of tongs, he would not think of asking England to return to the old policy, to impose a duty upon her breadstuffs, her flour and her meat that she gets from the colonies and from the outside world, in order to give the colonies advantages that we asked in return for advantages that we are disposed to give her. I believe that is what Mr. Chamberlain intended, and I would commend to hon. gentlemen opposite an article that appeared in to-day's "Globe," containing an extract from the "Saturday Review." I will read only a portion of the article:

> The "Review's" remarks narrowed the controversy down to this point: Did Mr. Chamberlain mean that the colonies should adopt free trade absolute, as Henry George would have defined free trade, or did he mean "free trade as it is in England," this is, a strictly revenue tariff, under which a large revenue is raised? Even on the latter supposition it would still be nothing else than a fiscal revolution for Canada to abandon all duties except those on spirits and tobacco, tea, coffee and dried fruits. It would mean the adoption of direct taxation and it would men also that the industries of Canada would require to come down to a free trade basis.
>
> Mr. Chamberlain's version of the incident was given during a debate on South African affairs in which Canada came in by way of illustration. Mr. Rhodes had proposed that certain tariff favours should be shown to Great Britain in Rhodesia. Mr. Morley, criticising the position of the British Government, said: "A new departure has been taken, and now my right hon. friend and, I presume, hon. members behind him assent to a proposition which is nothing more or less than a proposal which it was reported the right hon. gentleman said 'he would not touch again with a pair of tongs.'" Mr. Chamberlain replied: "That is a different thing altogether. That was a mutual and a reciprocal arrangement under discussion with the colonial Premiers that the colonies should make a differential duty in our favour and that we should make a differential duty in their favour. That is totally different from the present proposition, which is that the colonies should make a differential duty in our favour without demanding anything in return."

I think that clearly explains what Mr. Chamberlain meant when he was discussing this question with the colonial Premiers, and the several speeches that he made on the subject. My hon. friend complains that the present Government have made no effort to secure preferential trade. Well, Sir, I think the Premier when in England took the best possible steps that could be taken to secure preferential trade with Great Britain. We know that one of the chief obstacles to the attainment of that end was the Belgian and German treaties, and by the course the Premier took he secured the disallowance of those treaties that for years had stood in the way of more extended trade relations with the mother country. Every person who is acquainted with what took place in England when the Premier was there, frankly admits that the course he took was the only course possible to bring about the change that was so desirable. We know that Col. Denison, of Toronto, who was in London, declared over his own signature that had the Premier adopted any other course than he did, the disallowance of the Belgian and German treaties never would have taken place. We have also the testimony of the Hon. Edward Blake who, I believe, of all men outside of this Chamber, has a warm heart towards Canada, and anxiously desires the progress of this country. That gentleman, in a recent visit to Canada, made a speech at Strathroy in which he went over all the utterances of Mr. Chamberlain on this important question, and pointed out the difference between what Mr. Chamberlain really meant and the interpretations that have been put upon his speeches by hon. gentlemen opposite. Mr. Blake clearly showed that no intelligent man, reading all the utterances of Mr. Chamberlain upon this question could come to any other conclusion than this, that the only ground on which the Home Government would consent to concessions being made, would be that we should receive from here goods free of duty, or under the same tariff as she receives goods from us, or virtually that a condition of things something similar to that existing between the northern and southern states of the union should prevail between Great Britain and her colonies. That is the principle the hon. gentleman wanted carried out. Any one who knows the financial position of Canada at the present moment is aware that this would be an utter impossibility. We have considerable national debt, we have to provide for the interest thereon and to meet our annual expenditure, and we have no means of doing this except by a tariff. If we were to abandon our present fiscal system, and adopt the tariff that prevails in England at the present moment, nothing could possibly prevent direct taxation, and we certainly would have it. And who is responsible for that debt and that position? Hon. gentlemen opposite. They heaped up the debt so high as to preclude the possibility of any policy in the direction of free trade in the lifetime of the youngest person within the hearing of my voice, because this country must have a revenue, we must pay the interest on the debt and provide for the expenditure. There is no one who would not rejoice if we could bring England to see that it is to her interest to give advantages to Canada in her markets as against the outside world, and

undoubtedly it would be a great boon conferred on the Dominion. It would help to secure increased prices for our commodities. But when we come to consider the enormous quantity of food products which England imports annually and the limited quantity sent by Canada and the colonies, we must acknowledge that it is impossible to ask her to slap in the face those who furnish the larger portion of her trade. The Dominion supplies only one dollar out of every thirteen dollars of food products imported. In 1897 she imported food products to the value of $633,252,282, of which we sent the value of $51,385,318, or one out of every thirteen she used. What are we asking the United Kingdom to do? To place a duty on the goods represented by those $13 and give Canada a free entrance to her markets in return for the small advantage we are giving her. I do not think England, possessed of all the wisdom and statesmanship she has shown during fifty years, will turn back the clock of time for half a century and adopt a policy she rejected, a policy which she had good cause to reject, in favour of the present policy under which she has made such marvellous progress and become so immensely wealthy. Without obtaining to preferential trade, how are we to secure in the English market a preference for our products? We have already made a step in the direction of securing it. The action taken by Canada in reducing its tariff in favour of the mother country has created a very kindly feeling towards Canada. I do not think there is in the entire Empire a province or colony whose action is more appreciated than that adopted by the Dominion under the present tariff. We there showed a disposition to give the mother country advantages in our markets. How are we to secure a return for that concession? The only way is to produce a first-class commodity, and send it there. We can rest assured that with the consumers of England Canadian products will obtain a fair show in the English market. Lay our cheese or butter on any counter and let a British artisan come in, and let the seller point out American cheese, Belgian cheese and Canadian cheese. The customer will naturally say that he desires to give the preference to Canada. He will say: I am a mechanic and am manufacturing and producing articles for shipment to Canada, and I want in return to give Canada the preference. And he will take the Canadian before the American cheese.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am satisfied that the action of the First Minister will have that result; it will give Canada the preference, and that is what is occurring to-day simply because Canada has shown by the rearrangement of her tariff that she desires to give England advantages in our market over any other country. Hon. gentlemen opposite held the reins of power during eighteen years. During all that time, overflowing as they were with loyalty, and I am not challenging their loyalty or the loyalty of the mover of the resolution, and although they had the advantage of the assistance of the ex-Finance Minister, they never on a single occasion proposed to give an advantage to England such as the present Government proposed when they came into power. Yet they are prepared to criticise this Government for not having taken advantage of what they, in their simplicity, imagined was an offer, an idea which Mr. Chamberlain never intended to convey, and because we have not made more rapid strides in the direction of securing preferential trade with England for our products. I contend that if hon. gentlemen opposite would in a spirit of fairness consider the conditions under which preferential trade could be obtained, they would not for a moment construe the utterances of Mr. Chamberlain in the sense in which they are interpreted by the hon. gentleman opposite. That hon. gentleman has garbled those statements. I have read very carefully Mr. Chamberlain's utterances, and while in some portions of the speech you will find that he came very close to recommending the principle of giving our products a preference in the English market, still if the line of argument is followed to the end, you must come to the conclusion that he did not intend that England should adopt the principle of protection. There were three courses suggested. First, that we should adopt free trade, pure and simple, as it is in England. That we could not accept. Then there was the proposition by the conference at Ottawa, that we should give certain concessions to the mother country in return for concessions received from her, and be prepared to impose a protective tariff against the outside world. Mr. Chamberlain declined that proposition, and stated distinctly that that was a principle he could not possibly accept. Then there was the proposition in favour of establishing a Zollverein as in Germany, under which there would be free trade within the Empire. We know perfectly well that Canada is not in a position to accept such an offer. Where in any speech did Mr. Chamberlain say that the English people were willing to go back to protection and tax the food of the people in order to give the products coming in from the colonies advantages in their markets, and tax the outside world on the products sent to the mother country? I have never been able to gather from the utterances of that hon. gentleman that England was prepared to do anything of this kind. The leader of the Opposition is looking at me very seriously. I earnestly hope if there was a speech delivered by Mr. Chamberlain in which the declaration was made that England was ripe to return to that principle, I

earnestly hope the whole speech, not a garbled statement of it, will be read, in order to satisfy the House and the country as to Mr. Chamberlain's intention in this matter. But even supposing he did make such a declaration, that right hon. gentleman is only one member of a Government, and a powerful Government, and while I admit he is a very important and leading man, sometimes a Minister of the Crown in England, as well as in other countries, speaks in advance of the sentiments of the Cabinet of which he is a member. I do not suppose Mr. Chamberlain ever intended anything of the kind suggested, if he did, I believe he spoke in advance of the Premier of the Cabinet of which he is a member, because I do not think that Cabinet ever intended anything of the kind.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). He never said so.

Mr. McMULLEN. I believe he never said so. We know from what we have seen recently that there is a strong probability that an Anglo-American alliance may be entered into, and possibly has been entered into by this time. Does any hon. gentleman think that in view of such an alliance, England would turn around and put a duty upon the products of the United States while she would give the products of her colonies free admission to her markets. England would not entertain any such proposition, and I am quite sure that no treaty arrangement would permit it. The opponents in England of any semblance of a return to the principle of protection, have distinctly laid down that while such a policy might tend to raise the price of corn and wheat and other products, the moment that occurred the landlords would raise the rents, and the condition of the people generally would be no better than it is at the present time when the rentals have been reduced to a great extent. We know very well that England will never return to protection. We may urge that she should give her colonies advantages, but I am afraid we will urge in vain. England has progressed to a wonderful extent under free trade, and the people of England will never turn their backs upon a policy under which they have reached such a position of wealth and power. On the other hand, we know that England is greatly exposed, that she has to maintain an enormous navy, and that she is receiving a very large proportion of her food supplies from hostile countries. It was these considerations which led to the thought that England might try to supply herself from her colonies to a larger extent than in the past, and that is the only thing that could possibly induce her to give Canadian products an advantage in her markets. We all earnestly hope that our great North-west will develop rapidly, and that we will in the near future have a vast export of wheat and other products from that country. We know that the facilities for placing our goods on the English market are getting better every year, and when we have a fast Atlantic service which my hon. friend (Mr. Dobell) has been negotiating about, these facilities will be still greater enhanced. We can accomplish that, but we cannot accomplish anything in the direction of inducing England to part with her free trade policy, the benefit of which she has enjoyed for fifty years and which has made her the great country she is. We would be glad to have preferential trade, but in my opinion there is no possibility of getting it under existing circumstances.

Mr. OSLER. It is to me very extraordinary to find that the resolution of the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) is not enthusiastically endorsed by every hon. member in this House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. OSLER. There can be no question that preferential trade is the grandest aim of this country if Canada is to remain an integral part of the great British Empire. No man in this House dare get up and say that the leading idea in his mind is not that Canada is to remain a part of the British Empire, and that she is to share in the greater prosperity that must come to that Empire as the years roll on. Now, Sir, preferential trade must come as one of the necessities of an alliance between Britain and her colonies. We all know that some years ago, the idea of preferential trade was scouted by the Liberal party, and indeed I might say by most of the people of Canada. It was said to be the visionary dream of enthusiasts. I must confess with all humility that years ago I had the idea myself, that we could never attain the grand goal of the Imperial federationists, but as I have more carefully studied the matter and gained greater experience I have arrived at the conclusion that so far from preferential trade being a visionary ideal, it is absolutely the only real foundation for our hopes of a united Empire. Why, Sir, within the last few months there has been such an object lesson presented to us on this very subject, that I am surprised that any man in this House can possibly not be an enthusiastic supporter of the principle. Take the red map which shows Great Britain's position all over this world, and what do you see ? You see a cross marked in one part of the globe, and in another part of the globe and all over the globe, which indicates that there Great Britain has a coaling station, and it is these coaling stations which give England her greatness to-day. I venture to assert that before five years from this date, that red map will be marked with other crosses which will announce to the world that there England has a granary. Now, Sir, in order to make England absolutely secure in herself, that granary must be filled from the productions of British soil. Preferential trade will come as surely as the sun rises because it is a necessary consequence of the

maintenance and the continuance of the British Empire. I had the privilege of attending the congress in London in 1896, when the Toronto Board of Trade resolution was put before that congress suggesting that a combination should be made between the different parts of the British Empire in the nature of a Zollverein. That had been discussed at the Toronto Board of Trade for many months, and it had been accepted as part of that idea that each colony should be entitled to make its own taxes, but whatever those taxes might be, they should be lower on goods coming from Great Britain and her colonies then on goods coming from any other part of the world. I believe that that formula adopted by the Toronto Board of Trade commended itself to the Right Hon. Mr. Chamberlain. He said that the Toronto resolutions formed a germ out of which some scheme for preferential trade might arise.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). Does the hon. gentleman wish to inform this House that the presentation of the Toronto board of trade's case was accepted by the chambers of commerce ?

Mr. OSLER. No.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). Certainly not.

Mr. OSLER. But I will say this, and the hon. gentleman was present at the time, that if the Toronto board of trade resolutions had been put before that congress, as I wanted, if no compromise resolution had been put, which the London Chamber of Commerce forced us to accept, the Toronto Board of Trade resolutions would have been accepted by four-fifths of the members who were at that congress at the time. One after another of those who spoke first at that congress got up and said : We must have free trade, because if not Manchester goods will suffer. Another gentleman got up and said : Oldham and Bolton will suffer if we do not have free trade. But when we got out of Manchester, when we got out of Oldham and Bolton, when we got away from the mayors who looked as if they had never been out of these places and the little municipal councils they represented, one after another of the members of broader Great Britain—from the south of England and the north of Scotland—got up and said : We believe in a broader Great Britain, we believe in broader ideas than those represented by Manchester and Bolton and Oldham. And I say, without hesitation, that if the Toronto resolutions had been submitted, they would not have been carried unanimously, because there would have been strong opposition, but three-fourths of all the members of the chambers of commerce represented in London would have voted for them. And I defy anybody but a strong bitter free trade partisan to deny what I say. The resolution that was accepted was that it was enormously in the interests of Great Britain to frame some resolution to bring the colonies and Great Britain together, that they might trade and interchange more freely with each other. I was very strongly against submitting any substitute resolution ; but Sir Albert Rollit, chairman of the London Chamber of Commerce, and Sir John Lubbock strongly pressed that we should frame a resolution that would be accepted by everybody.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). The hon. gentleman must remember that Lord Strathcona moved an amendment himself to the resolution brought forward by the hon. gentleman, and that even that was not accepted, and it went back to the London Chambers of commerce.

Mr. OSLER. The resolution he moved was withdrawn, and as I have said, one of these whitewash milk and water resolutions, that do not mean anything at all, was submitted, and it would have been a great deal better if it had not been presented. And I say without hesitation that a broad, straight resolution calling for increased intercourse between the different portions of the Empire in the nature of a Zollverein, would have been carried by a three-fourths majority. We discussed in Toronto thoroughly the meaning of that resolution, and it was decided that Canada and all the colonies had the right to fix their own tariffs, without interference in any shape or way, but that whatever tariff Canada or any other colony imposed on any particular line of goods, the colonies and the mother country should pay a lower duty on such goods than was charged to the outside world. I believe that that is the ideal and the practical business result that will come before very long.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Hear, hear.

Mr. OSLER. Now, free trade is a sort of fetish.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. What is the distinction between that tariff and the present one ?

Mr. OSLER. A great deal. You are giving a preference to Great Britain and getting nothing in return. But let me tell you this, that when I was president of the board of trade, so convinced was I that Great Britain will come to us and see the necessity of reciprocating, that rather than delay the matter, I was prepared, as a Canadian, to give Great Britain a preference before she gave it to us, believing that she will give it to us in the end. Free trade was the god of the hon. gentlemen on the Government benches for eighteen years. My hon. friend from North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) says that Great Britain will never give up her free trade. But what do we witness today ? We see here a number of the great men of Canada who preached free trade for eighteen years, but who gave it up without a struggle. Without saying by your leave or apologizing in the least, they abandoned

it completely, and are to-day as strong protectionists as can be found in the country.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Nonsense.

Mr. OSLER. And if they were not, they would not sit on those benches another session. It is a slow growing idea, that change from the theoretical plan to the practical working-out. Great Britain has been a free trade country because she had all the wealth and requires all the products of other countries, but she is beginning to feel now, from day to day, that Germany, France and the United States are competing with her, making cheaper goods, sending in cheaper machinery, and competing with her in the markets of the world, and before many years Great Britain will turn from a free trade country pure and simple—as she is now supposed to be but is not—to a protectionist country. What does Great Britain do to-day? She taxes her tea, but why not take the tax off tea, which is not grown in her own colonies or in her own country, and put it on wheat grown in the Empire, especially when the tax will not affect the living of one individual in Great Britain. The fad of free trade is that you must have everything cheap. Well, we have had everything cheap for three or four years, and to-day everything is dear. Flour is to-day 40 per cent dearer than it was three years ago. Oats, peas, potatoes, horses, everything we purchase, is dearer to-day than it was three years ago, and will any hon. gentleman opposite say that the times are not better. Free trade and cheapness, the fad of Adam Smith and Cobden, is being washed out of existence every day. I believe that the last man of the English-speaking race to take the Cobden medal and think it an honour, will be found to be the leader of the Government to-day. I do not believe that another man will ever rise in the English-speaking race who will take the Cobden medal and think it an honour.

I do not propose to make a long speech. In my opinion, the speeches are far too long in this House, and I would like to see a law preventing any man from speaking longer than ten minutes, under a penalty of a fine of so many dollars for every minute he exceeded the limit. I hope, however, not to lay myself open to too heavy a fine for the length of my remarks to-night. We have had reference from the Government side to the fast steam service. Well, I should say that has been the slowest service ever inaugurated. It started years ago and we have not yet a ship made or a contract let or anything at all but the agreement on paper. Fast service—great heaven! I venture to say that the hon. Minister who smiles so blandly over there will cross the Atlantic twenty times and back at the expense of Canada, if he remains in power that long, and not once will he cross in any steamer of this fast line. It is the slowest line, so far, that has ever been known, and I believe it will continue to be so slow that it would not overtake a snail.

Mr. Chamberlain, in his speech at London, spoke rather hesitatingly as to free trade. There is no doubt that it came to him as a sort of shock that he, the advocate of free trade, should say anything that would in any way show that he had lost faith in the ideal of the Liberal party of Great Britain. Notwithstanding he distinctly led his hearers to believe that, in some way or other, a method would be found to get all the colonies and all parts of Great Britain together so that they could interchange traffic on more favourable terms than would be offered to any outside parts of the world. He left that distinctly on the minds of all who attended that Chamber of Commerce. I myself paid great attention to all that was said there, and I came away with the firm belief, with the distinct feeling that the idea of free trade had been weakened in Great Britain, and that in a few years the weakening that had only been expressed in a sort of frightened manner, would be expressed in a bold and business-like manner. I was as much impressed with that as I am with the fact that the present Government have entirely abandoned their ideas of free trade, notwithstanding the tirade the Minister of Finance made against protection in his Budget speeches in the last two years. Listening to him denouncing protection as the one evil that was grinding down the poor people of the countries where it prevailed, you would have thought that he was about to say: At all costs, I will sweep away this terrible evil. But when it comes down to practice what does he do? After making a strong speech for free trade, he goes on and protects at least his friends very much more than they were protected before. I believe that within three or four years from now, if we as Canadians choose to stand to it, we shall have preferential trade within the Empire, and our wheat and all the other things we grow will be admitted to Great Britain and to our sister colonies under a preferential tariff as against all the world.

Mr. BAIN. Whatever may be the political sentiments that divide us in our domestic affairs, occasions arise when we feel that, the relations that constitute us a part of the British Empire are of intense interest to us all. And when my hon. friend (Mr. Osler), who has just spoken, drew attention to the red spots dotted over the map of the world indicating where Great Britain, with the pluck and energy which has made her what she is, had located colonies, we felt that here again her treatment of her colonies entitled her to the name of Mother of Free Nations. And, considering the growth of this colonial Empire, we cannot but feel that we can trust the statesmen who have piloted the Empire for so many years to do the fair

and equitable thing between herself and these free nations, when the time came for her to take action on her own behalf or theirs. These men have the capacity and the enterprise to plant colonies over the wide earth and to keep the friendship of those colonies. Is there another nation on earth that can show the same relations to her colonies as Great Britain can? The older continental nations in years past have been able to show immense areas of fertile virgin country under their control. Where are those colonies to-day? One after another, under the vicissitudes of time they have passed from under their control—that which they gained they were not able to keep. And to-day, Britain's greatest daughter seems to be fairly in the way to take away the last of the colonial possessions of one of these grand old kingdoms, the kingdom that discovered this continent, and at one time, called the greater part of it its own. So, I may be forgiven when I say that, whatever may be the sentiment that we hold with respect to free trade or protection, we have this strong distinctive belief, that the men who have planted these colonies and developed these resources and given these colonies free institutions and the right to control their own affairs, can be safely trusted to work out the destiny of the relations of Great Britain and these colonies without any dictation from us. Sir, did these hon. gentlemen opposite ever think for a moment how large a figure they make in the trade of the mother country. My hon. friend (Mr. McMullen) put it, I thought, in a very pointed way. Thirteen dollars out of every hundred—in other words, we calmly ask the mother country to peril $87 of her trade to make sure of the other $13. My hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Osler) says that the political party now administering the affairs of Canada has abandoned free trade, and is now extreme protectionist. I would like to have him come up to Toronto and to some of the western constituencies and make proclamation of his creed on these terms in the next election. How far will he be able to carry his constituents with him? When my hon. friend the Finance Minister brought down his tariff last session, was this the kind of sentiment we heard from hon. gentlemen opposite? Did they then tell us that we had abandoned our political principles and become protectionists? Not at all. And to-day they realize the difference between the tariff as promulgated by the Finance Minister and the sentiments enunciatd by the hon. leader of the Opposition. But, in this matter, I claim to support a Government that is practical; and I say this emphatically and without fear of contradiction—that if the mother country is to face the keen competition of Germany, France, the United States and other countries that are developing their resources with all the energy they are capable of, pushing forward their trade everywhere, she must do it by not being handicapped, by not loading herself with burdens to benefit her colonies and to make dear production at home. Do the men who are talking here think for a moment what the effect would be upon the teeming millions of Great Britain, who depend upon the world outside for their daily bread, if one farthing were added to the cost of the loaf? And how long would any statesman hold his own in the face of the immense consuming population if they felt that steps had been taken which resulted in bread being made dearer by artificial means?

Where would British trade and supremacy be in face of the keen competition that our friends opposite tell us she has to face, and that she will have to face in the future as we and her other colonies develop our resources? Why should they not develop their resources? Does the Anglo-Saxon race contain within itself the whole ambition of the wide world? Were I a Russian, were I a Turk, I should have that strong national feeling for my own country and my own home that would lead me to desire to see her in the front ranks of the nations. Why should not that sentiment inspire a German or a Frenchman to do their very best? Then why should the mother country, the mother of free nations, proceed to embarrass herself by loading up her resources at the very fountain head, in face of that keen competition? Let us remember that $87 out of every $100 of her trade is done with other nations, and that she makes money like every other nation by handling the products of those other countries, and making her ports the trading ports of the whole world. They say to us that England offers us no advantages in return for what we do for her. What have we ever done for Great Britain? We taxed her products just as we tax those of the United States, of the Germans, and of all other nations; and until this Government came into power, we never made one iota of difference on behalf of the mother country, while she opened her ports freely to us, as she did to all the rest of the world; and every country that could produce the best and cheapest article, commanded that market. I say that on these lines the action of this Government has been commendable, and I have no desire to restrict the credit to this Government so far as agricultural products are concerned. But I say that action is an object lesson to my mind more important than the question of discussing the time when British statesmen will clog her progress for the benefit of her colonies. When we do the best we can and put our natural products on the English market in the best possible condition, when we offer the best quality of cheese, the finest grade of butter, the finest wheat the world produces, and put them on her market in the

best condition, then we have a guarantee that the English dollars will come to our pockets, and come in a legitimate process. I am no stickler for the term of free trade, or the term of protection; whatever policy will best conduce to the interests of my country shall have my approval. But I say this, that if the time ever comes when in the minds of British statesmen they can rearrange their relations and offer her colonies a preference over other nations, we will be only too glad to join in carying out that arrangement. But I think the first step towards procuring such action is not by saying to the mother country, as hon. gentlemen opposite were doing; Give us protection for our products and we will do something for you. We did not act in that way, we said to the mother country: You have been kind to us, and we propose to make a discrimination in favour of your products. The result was that we found the best road to the mother country's regard, and the best evidence was the denunciation of those treaties with Belgium and with Germany that hon. gentlemen opposite had laboured in vain for years to induce the Government of the mother country to accomplish. Sir, I think the Government have done more during the short time that they have been in power, to secure to us a better standing with the mother country than all the patriotic talk of hon. gentlemen opposite was ever able to accomplish; and if the time comes in the future that Great Britain proposes to extend further benefits to the colonies, we will not be found backward in reaching out a hand to the mother country, and giving her fair and equitable relations. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I feel that the resolution does not exactly express the sentiments that should be expressed by this House, and I have pleasure in moving this amendment:

That this House will at all times favour every practical means of developing inter-Imperial trade and expresses its satisfaction with the action already taken by the Government in that direction.

Mr. SPROULE. This is the chicken hatched out by the hon. gentlemen after all their incubation. Now, any practical difference between that amendment and the one moved by the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) it would take a Philadelphia lawyer to find out. The resolution of my hon. friend reads:

That it is advisable that a customs arrangement be effected between the United Kingdom and her colonies by which trade within the Empire may be placed on a more favourable footing than that which is carried on with foreign countries.

Where is the difference? This House will at all times favour every practical means for that object; and yet this House won't make a plain, bald statement that they are prepared to favour it, or that they desire it. All the resolution states is that it is desirable. Both the hon. member for South Wentworth (Mr. Bain) and the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), who spoke against this resolution, admitted that they were in favour of it if it could be accomplished. If the time comes, says the hon. member for Wentworth, when we can get it, I will welcome it. And yet he won't make the bald statement that it is desirable to have it. He admits it would be valuable, but he will not accept a resolution which asserts that it is desirable to have it. The member for North Wellington, while talking loudly against the resolution, said that if we could bring England to see the advisability of giving us this advantage in her market, it would be a great thing, and would be endorsed by everybody; yet he will not say that it is desirable that we should have it, as this resolution says. Now, is that not mere hair-splitting, making a distinction without a difference? The hon. gentlemen argue along a certain line in favour of a certain principle, and then they turn round and abuse a resolution which affirms the very thing they profess to desire. Now, Sir, I feel that the hon. member for North Bruce is entitled to the congratulations of this House for the able and intelligent manner in which he presented his subject. Having examined his resolution somewhat critically, I am of the opinion that every member of this House could accept it without the abandonment of principle. There is nothing in it which every Canadian in this country cannot endorse and support—if you leave party politics out of the question, and if the resolution was moved anywhere else than in the House of Commons. Will any Canadian say that it is not desirable that we should have closer trade relations with the mother country? If there is anything that binds the various portions of the United Kingdom together more closely than the United Kingdom is bound to foreign countries, it is the commercial and social relations that exist between the mother country and her colonies. Then is it not desirable that we should live under more favourable social and trade relations with the mother country than already exist, or than exist between the mother country and foreign countries? I think it is. I have reason to believe that every hon. gentleman in this House, if he would consult his own feelings, would be inclined to support this resolution; but because events that have transpired within the last few years have tended rather to retard the coming of the day when we could have those closer relations, hon. gentlemen opposite say they are not prepared to accept that abstract statement which otherwise everybody would be inclined to accept. While distinctly Canadian, it is not unjust to the mother country. If there is one thing that influences humanity more than another it is the self-interest of our nature. I think Horace Greeley said: "Is not all the world looking out for Number One?" In harmony with the law of our nature,

which means the interest of self, we should, like every individual and country, look after that which is for our own self-interest. What does this resolution mean? In seeking to do what this resolution says it is desirable to accomplish, we would be distinctly doing something in the interest of ourselves and our own country. Then, if for no other reason, should we not support this resolution? My opinion is we should. If, while acting in the interest of ourselves, we would be inflicting some distinct injury to the mother country, then I could understand opposition being offered by those who might otherwise be expected to support it. But we would not be doing any injustice to the mother country because the signs of the times indicate distinctly that that eventful day is approaching as rapidly as it can come, and that we are measurably within reach of the time when that principle will be carried out within the British Empire. In this age every country is on the alert to secure for her subjects special advantages by treaty or otherwise in the markets of the world. Then should we be behind the times either in enterprise or in desire? Is it unreasonable that we should desire to change the commercial relationship between ourselves and the mother country if it would improve our position and give us advantages in that market which foreign countries would not possess? Is it not natural, is it not in harmony with the enterprise displayed in this age of progress that we should seek large markets, and make arrangements giving us advantages over every other country, and do everything possible that would be directly advantageous to our people who have goods to sell in foreign markets? Then, should it not be our duty to be on the alert in promoting the interests of the Canadian people and try to secure advantages which we do not already possess? Why should not Canada try it? This resolution says it is desirable we should do so. Yet we find hon. gentlemen opposite are not prepared to try it, although in the next breath they say that every one would welcome it, but there is no chance to obtain it. What is our great need to-day? Better markets. We are trying to get these markets north, south, east and west. Yet this resolution looks to securing better markets. The signs of the times indicate that if we take advantage of the occasion and act as we should act, there is a strong probability that in the near future we will be able to secure better markets to the advantage of Canadians, if we only make an effort to do it. Would such an arrangement secure us better markets? If it could be shown and satisfactorily demonstrated that such an arrangement would not secure better markets, I could understand hon. gentlemen opposing this policy; but there has not been a single word said by hon. gentlemen opposite in defence of the ground that it would not secure better markets, in fact, they have tacitly admitted that it would do so, because the arrangement would apply to a country in which we sell most of our produce. If duties were placed on the goods of other countries which supply $87 worth out of every $100 worth of the products sent to England, surely that would give some advantage to this country, which supplies the other $13. Then, this policy would give us better markets. No one contends it would not, and therefore I am justified in assuming that it would give us better markets if we succeeded in securing its adoption. If it would secure better markets, why do we not seek to get them? Why do we not advocate the principle and uphold it at all times, and in the language of the resolution declare that it is desirable we should have it and aim to secure it. We are not concerned with the question whether or not it would be suitable for Britain, though that in itself is a matter of some importance. But it does not so much concern us; it is not for us to attempt to prove that it would be unsuitable for Britain and therefore they should not accept it. If Britain accepts it and will produce the ways and means, and at the same time give us this concession, why should we not attempt to get it. It is not our place to urge that the conditions of England are opposed to it, for if the mother country shows a disposition to accept it, in all fairness to Canadians we should try to get it. If we have paid attention to what has transpired in the mother country during the last few years, we know that the signs of the times point plainly and unmistakably to the fact that the feeling in Great Britain is growing stronger in favour of this principle. What is Britain's position to-day? With the possibility of war in the east, with war looming up in the west, what would be the great problem that Great Britain would be obliged to solve if she were brought face to face with other countries in war? As the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Osler) has pointed out, she wants coaling stations all over the world to supply her vessels so as to keep them going and maintain that great navy that is the standing terror of the world to-day. Not only does she need those coaling stations, but she also requires food supply, and that too furnished within the British Empire. That food supply can be furnished within the Empire is undoubtedly true, when we consider the illimitable acres of land lying open to be tilled requiring only immigration and colonization to enable Canada to supply Britain with food products in time of war. If it can be accomplished, is it not desirable to hasten the time? If an arrangement were made with Great Britain, the stimulus given to agriculture in the various parts of the Empire would be such that within a reasonable time the colonies would supply food

products to keep the Empire going. If we do that, we solve two of the great problems in the interest of Britain, and we enable her to hold her supremacy on sea and land, which undoubtedly she will maintain in the future. At the present time, I say that above all things we should endeavour to solve these problems. Is the attainment of our ambition as set forth in the resolutions possible and probable? No one who has closely observed what has taken place of late years in England can fail to come to the conclusion that it is not only possible, but probable, if we work for it. The conduct of hon. gentlemen opposite within the last few years has, however, done more than anything else to retard that eventful day. Why? Because instead of asking for it at the opportune time, when the right hon. Premier was over in Britain, and when this question was engaging the attention of the people there, he threw cold water on the scheme, and said the people of Canda did not require such a change, that it was not in Canadian interests, and was distinctly against the interests of the mother country; that what we gave we gave freely and asked nothing in return. That very act has retarded the day when we might have hoped to have reciprocal arrangements entered into between the mother country and the various parts of the Empire which would have given us better trade within ourselves, rather than hand it over to foreign countries. The only outcome of that demonstration and that great event which benefited Canada was the denunciation of the treaties. The right hon. leader of the Government is entitled to some credit for whatever he did to secure that end, because that is one step towards the accomplishment of the result which we desire. But since we have achieved that result, a step in the right direction, it has opened the door to the adoption of the other principle, and we can now present a united front and submit our request to the mother country, the unanimous request of this House, which we hoped to obtain by this resolution, and, in the words of the resolution, "it will go a long way towards strengthening the sentiment and bringing nearer the moment when we may hope to attain our ambition in that direction." One of the obstacles placed in the way was the reduction of our tariff. Why did hon. gentlemen reduce it as regards England without asking anything in return?

She did not in her dire necessity require us to do it, but we did it of our own free will, or in other words we threw away a valuable asset that we might have bartered for some other valuable consideration in return. That Sir, was not desirable in the interests of the Canadian people, nor was it calculated to secure that preferential trade which the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) says would be beneficial if we could obtain, and which the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Bain) says, would do Canada good if we had it. To my mind it is a great pity that we gave away that which if properly managed might have enabled us to secure what we aim at by this resolution. The whole conduct of the Government during the past two years has rather tended to prevent preferential trade, and so we cannot hope to advance this policy while they are in power. I believe, Sir, that Cobdenism is dying a natural death, and that the day is not far distant when Cobden medals will be of little value. They may be an ornament to those who like such decorations, but to the practical people of the world they will be regarded as of no value. It is a fact that in every gathering of farmers, or workingmen, or merchants during the last few years in England, they have declared in unmistakable language that the day of Cobdenism is over, and that the era of some kind of fair trade or protection, as against free trade, is fast arriving. It is true that our Prime Minister has accepted a Cobden medal, but I have often thought that that is the one act in his life which he ought to be most ashamed of. I do not see him display it very frequently when he goes to gatherings in Canada, and I am inclined to the opinion that he would gladly bury it in oblivion and welcome the day when the public men and the press of this country would not refer to it. Sir, the British race is coming closer and closer together as the years roll on, and those who will not give that growing unity a helping hand will in days to come be regarded as the enemies of the British nation. I hold that these hon. gentlemen who are now opposing this resolution will be written down in history as guilty of an act which is not to their credit. If I know anything about the sentiment of the Canadian people I believe it is distinctly in favour of the principle laid down in this resolution, and distinctly against the policy pursued by hon. gentlemen opposite in regard to this question. The hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) told us that if ever there was a time when there was a strain given to the friendly relations between Canada and the mother country, it was when the protective policy of 1879 was introduced, and he argued that in formulating that policy we had done an act of unkindness to the mother country, as well as an act of injustice to Canada. Is it not strange that when his friends assumed the Government of Canada and had it within their power to remedy that injustice, they did not attempt to do it. There is no logic in the statement of the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen); he is either insincere or he is dishonest.

An hon. MEMBER. Or both.

Mr. SPROULE. Yes, I believe I might go so far as to say both. If he is sincere, then he is derelict in his duty, because since

his Government came into power he has sustained and defended practically the same tariff as was introduced in 1879, and which he has told us was unkind to England and unjust to the Canadian people. Why does he not to-day endeavour to change that policy of protection in the direction of free trade? He has the power if he wishes to use it. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) told us that the Right Hon. Mr. Chamberlain would not touch this preferential principle with a pair of tongs. But when did Mr. Chamberlain say that? It was after the Premier of Canada had told him that Canada did not want it, and that Canada gave the advantage to England of her own free will and without wanting anything in return. At that great conference which was brought together for the special purpose of considering this question of bringing the colonies closer together by extending mutual trade advantages which were not given to the outside world, the Premier of the most important colony of the Empire told Mr. Chamberlain that it was not in the interests of Canada and it would be against the interests of England to have preferential trade, and it was not until then that Mr. Chamberlain made the statement that he would not touch it with a pair of tongs. Mr. Chamberlain's object has always been to meet the wishes of the colonies as far as possible, and how could he then speak in favour of this principle when the Premier of Canada told him this colony did not want it. Up to that time Mr. Chamberlain believed that Canada desired it and that Canada had asked for it, but in view of the statement of the right hon. the Prime Minister he could not favour it any longer. The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) told us that if we could make England see the advisability of giving us this advantage in her markets, it would be a great thing for us and would be endorsed by every one. Well, this resolution of the hon. gentleman (Mr. McNeill) says that preferential trade is a desirable thing, and yet the hon. member (Mr. McMullen) will not endorse the resolution. What fine reasoning powers the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) must have to satisfy himself that while he believes preferential trade is desirable, he can consistently vote against the resolution which says that it is desirable. The hon. gentleman is not consistent with himself. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) also told us that the British colonies only supply the mother country with $13 worth of products out of every hundred dollars worth she consumes, and he argued from that, that England would not countenance preferential trade. But surely the hon. gentleman did not think of the consequences which preferential trade might bring around in this direction. With our vast wheat lands in the North-west, it would be impossible for any one to estimate what the results would be. We have in that region a vast extent of fertile lands, and it would be no very great task for us to bring it under cultivation and settlement so as to supply all the food that England requires, and which to-day is being supplied by foreign nations. If we had some special advantage in the English market which would give the stimulus of a better price, population would flock into the North-west Territories, the land would be cultivated, and England supplied with all the products she needed from that portion of her Empire. The hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Bain) said that it is utterly impossible for us to get preferential trade, and then he is inconsistent enough to move an amendment to the resolution, stating that we would all like to have it. Now, the resolution of my hon. friend (Mr. McNeill), to which that is an amendment, distinctly states that we desire preferential trade, and yet political partisanship is so strong that he will not approve of the resolution, because, I presume, it comes from an hon. member on this side of the House. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Bain) says we are in favour of preferential trade, but yet he will not go so far as to tell the peple of England that we desire it. There is no logic or common sense in his action. Now, Sir, there is another circumstance which has attracted my attention since this debate commenced. Here is an important resolution before the House and yet most of the Cabinet Ministers are absent, notably the Prime Minister. I apprehend that he is not here because he either dislikes or is afraid to open his mouth upon this subject at the present time.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. He is not well.

Mr. SPROULE. I am sorry to hear it, because I would be very much pleased to hear his opinion of this resolution, but there are other members of the Government here. Have they given this House the advantage of their opinion on it up to the present? So far as I can see, they are fighting shy of it, whether in view of their past record or whether they are afraid to commit themselves I cannot tell. But they should have sufficient moral courage to express their views on any question in which Canada is interested. If they are afraid to do that, they are unworthy of the position they hold. The signs of the times point strongly in the direction of inter-Imperial trade, and if we tell the British people, as well as Canadians, that we will support every effort in that direction, I believe that we will hasten the coming of the day when the end we desire to attain will be achieved.

Mr. McNEILL. Might I just say a word with regard to the amendment moved. The first part of it seems to cover the ground of the resolution, and as the mover of the resolution, I should be perfectly satisfied to accept the first part of this amendment. But as regards the last part, hon. gentlemen will see at once that it could not be accepted by this side of the

House. I am sure that what we desire on both sides, in a grave question of this kind, is that we should arrive at some kind of unanimity, as it would be of great advantage to Canada and the Empire to have a unanimous expression of our opinion on this question. Could not hon. members allow the latter part of this amendment, which is absolutely foreign to the subject, to be dropped, and then take the first part and let us unanimously agree to it. It is impossible that we should express our approval of the policy which the Government have pursued with regard to this matter in every respect. Although in some respects, I do approve of what they have done. I cannot say that I approve of it altogether. If my hon. friend would strike out the latter part of the amendment, we would have a unanimous vote.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). I am sorry to say that I cannot accept the suggestion. We think the latter part is the most important. We have not the slightest doubt that we have greatly benefited the cause of inter-Imperial trade, and we think that now is the proper occasion to affirm it.

Mr. McNEILL. My hon. friend must understand that that is a matter of dispute.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. We think that the majority of the people in the country and the majority of this House will endorse that view.

Mr. McNEILL. No doubt my hon. friend will have a majority behind him to endorse his view, but why should there be deliberately tucked to the resolution something which hon. gentlemen know must prevent unanimity in this House? If they desire to promote this policy, they must certainly know that a unanimous vote of this House would strengthen the hands of those in England who are in favour of it. If hon. gentlemen insist upon tacking to this resolution a clause which they know it is absolutely impossible for me on this side to accept, they must stand before the country in the position of men who are deliberately endeavouring to prevent a unanimous expression of opinion.

Mr. DOBELL. If the hon. member for North Bruce will allow me I think I shall be able to show him why we cannot allow our amendment to be cut in two but that it must be presented as a whole. When I learned that a day was set apart for this discussion, I thought that probably that party politics might be laid aside and that we might have a discussion of this great question, in which we are all warmly interested, without bringing into it any political strife or party feeling. I really thought that we were going to have a sort of off-day or holiday, and if I have any fault to find it is that the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) took rather the lion's share of the holiday. I think he might very well have used the pruning knife, especially in those remarks in which he devoted considerable time to misrepresent my statements concerning the fast line steamers.

Mr. McNEILL. I assure my hon. friend that I had no intention of misrepresenting him in any way.

Mr. DOBELL. I accept the hon. gentleman's disclaimer at once, but the facts are there. I should like at first just to draw attention to the remarks made by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule). He expressed some astonishment at the small egg that was the result of the very eloquent and perfect speech of my hon. friend from Wentworth (Mr. Bain). I do not think I have ever listened to a more finished and convincing answer than that which was made to the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) by my hon. friend from Wentworth. The hon. member for East Grey asked if this amendment was the egg the hon. member for Wentworth laid. Well, the difference between my hon. friend's egg and that laid by the hon. member for North Bruce is this. That of the hon. member for North Bruce was an old nest egg, and before I have done I intend to show that you might sit on that egg as long as you like and it would never fructify. But our egg has got the germs of life in it, and if you only give it time, it will develop into a good sized rooster. My hon. friend from North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) abrogates for his party the entire responsibility of advancing Imperial confederation. He covers all the ground, and sought to make out that his side of the House alone were supporting this movement. Let me carry the hon. gentleman back about twenty years ago and show him very briefly that this scheme of Imperial federation or inter-Imperial trade first originated with the Dominion Board of Trade who made an effort to form a league to draw closer trade relations between Great Britain and her colonies. A conference was held in London, the result of which was a reiteration of the opinion that it was desirable to draw closer the trade relations between Great Britain and all her colonies. But even at that early stage, there was considerable difference of opinion, and one section of that conference split from the remainder of it on the ground that we were not sufficiently pronounced in our views. The dissenting section wanted us distinctly to advocate protection and discriminating duties. We were not prepared to do that, and the consequence was that a considerable number of members left and formed what was known as the Fair Trade League. We had no sympathy with that Fair Trade League, and it died a natural death after some years of existence. The Right Hon. Mr. Foster shortly after issued a pamphlet which was very widely circulated and of very great

value, and afterwards laid down the foundation of the Imperial Federation League, I can only express the great regret I felt when Mr. Foster was taken away from his sphere of usefulness in this life and Imperial Federation lost a very strong supporter.

But at that time, the real difficulty we found in the progress of the federation scheme was that we saw that England would not listen to anything that interfered with her free trade policy; and I remember well reporting to the Dominion Board of Trade that it was useless to offer suggestions that would interfere with the maintenance of that policy by Great Britain. It was while attending that conference, followed by the meeting of the Associated Chambers of Commerce, that I drew attention to the wording of their resolutions. Those resolutions having reference to treaties between Great Britain and Ireland and France or Germany or other countries were framed as follows. in all treaties between Great Britain and Ireland, with France or other countries. There was no reference made to the colonies. The chairman was challenged to say where the colonies came in. It was pointed out that the colonies had no power to negotiate treaties themselves, and it was asked where the colonies would come in. Were they foreign countries, or were they left out altogether? From that time to the present the words "Great Britain and Ireland and her colonies" were inserted in all these resolutions. And I claim that to-day the colonies of Great Britain exercise a much greater influence in the councils of the nation. Now, I am not going to detain the House by following the progress of Imperial federation. I will only mention one fact in its history which happened three or four years ago, and that is the schism which occurred in the central organization in London. A large number of members wanted to insist that Imperial defence should take precedence of Imperial trade, and we opposed this. It ended in the break-up of the central organization and the re-formation of the league in the city of London under the title of Federation League, the word Imperial being dropped out of deference to Australian colonies which is now carrying on the work. Our contention was then, and is, that if we developed trade interests between the colonies and Great Britain, the defence of those interests would be voluntarily tendered by the colonies when needed. But to advocate a tax, no matter how small, for the maintenance of the Imperial marine and land forces, not for the defence of Canada itself, but of the Empire, would not be received with favour by this country, and we realized, to-day, that the development which we are forced to carry out in making new railways, deepening our canals and opening up our new territories, taxes to the utmost the resources of this country, and it would be foolish to advocate a further tax for the defence of the whole Empire, until the necessity for such a tax was laid upon us.

I admit, Mr. Speaker, that very little progress has been made in England in this Imperial federation scheme. But gradually the mother country and the colonies have been coming closer, and the mother country has been advancing upon lines that would enable the colonies, when they are prepared to take their part, to have more extended relation amongst themselves and to enter into negotiations for closer union with Great Britain. Now, this brings us to the real point at issue between us and the hon. gentlemen opposite. And here is where I find the nest egg that has been taken hold of by the hon. member for North Bruce, because his resolution is almost a counterpart of the one carried in Ottawa.

Mr. McNEILL. It is the same, word for word.

Mr. DOBELL. I thought so. Now, let us, for a moment, look at the result of that resolution and how it was regarded by Mr. Chamberlain, who has been so freely quoted to-day. This is what he said——

Mr. McNEILL. I do not wish to interrupt the hon. gentleman. But, in his reference to what Mr. Chamberlain said on the occasion he refers to, will the hon. gentleman please remember that Mr. Chamberlain explained that he coupled the resolution with the views of those at the conference. That is an abstract resolution, but Mr. Chamberlain speaks of the views of the supporters of it. I took care to say I was moving that as an abstract resolution.

Mr. DOBELL. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McNeill) said that he made no proposal to give effect to this resolution, and that it does not ask for anything. That is one reason why I say it is an addled egg and there is no life in it. Now, Mr. Chamberlain admitted that this was a declaration of a definite principle with no definite plan. He pointed out that it would involve a most serious disturbance of the trade of the United Kingdom, it involved an imposition of a duty upon food and raw material, the tendency being to increase the cost of living and the cost of production, which would put them in a worse position in competition with foreign countries. He also pointed out that Great Britain would get a very small consideration in the shape of a preference of 2½ per cent, or it might be 5 per cent, on this whole trade from the colonies, 95 to 97½ per cent being with other countries. What, then, he asked, is the proposition we are asked to consider. He said it was a very startling proposal which it was impossible to adopt. Now, I ask if anything my hon. friend (Mr. McNeill) read gave the impression to the House conveyed by that which I am reading. I am giving an exact abstract of Mr. Chamberlain's speech.

Mr. McNEILL. My hon. friend will understand that Mr. Chamberlain was not referring to the abstract resolution at all, but to the proposals that had been made in favour of preferential trade; and in the course of his speech he referred to a proposal which he supposed I had made in favour of preferential trade. But the proposal he thought I had made was not the proposal that I did make.

Mr. DOBELL. I will just finish what Mr. Chamberlain did say. He said that it was a very startling proposal, and one which it is impossible for us to adopt, and he added that although, if sufficient advantages were offered to him, he had not such pedantic admiration for ultra free trade that he would not consider a deviation from the strict doctrine of free trade, but that at the present the colonies are offering no sufficient quid pro quo to cover the certain loss and risk to Great Britain in the revising of its present commercial policy. And he finished his argument on this point by saying:

> We may fairly ask our fellow subjects in the colonies to better their offer.

Mr. McNEILL. Hear, hear.

Mr. DOBELL. I say "hear, hear," too, because I think that it is a point that hon. gentlemen opposite have lost sight of. Now, I come to challenge an expression of the hon. member for North Bruce when he spoke on the Address on the opening of the session.

Mr. McNEILL. I would ask, Mr. Speaker, if it is in order for the hon. gentleman to refer to that?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Dobell) wishes to discuss a matter which has been the subject of a former debate it would be irregular. But I understand that he will not go so far as to discuss what took place at a former debate.

Mr. DOBELL. I will read an extract——

Mr. McNEILL. From what?

Mr. DOBELL. From what the hon. gentleman (Mr. McNeill) said.

Mr. McNEILL. In that debate? Mr. Speaker has said that the hon. gentleman was not allowed to do so.

Mr. DOBELL. I understood I was not to debate the matter. However, I will not proceed with that part of my argument. I suppose I may not say what fell from the lips of my hon. colleague the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) when he charged the hon. member (Mr. McNeill) with needlessly wasting the time of Parliament. Now, my belief is that the moment our Premier came in close contact with the strong and settled views of the people of Great Britain, he saw that preferential trade was a question too difficult to take up. But he volunteered at once that we were giving Great Britain a reduction of 25 per cent in our customs duties, and asked nothing in return, or rather said we would exact nothing in return. He did not say he would not be prepared to receive it if it were offered. But we had so long acted in an extreme way in the tariff we put upon British goods while they were receiving our goods free, that we made this reduction of 25 per cent and did not exact anything in return. I believe the reason was that he saw that Canada had wilfully for years been throwing away all her advantages by her high protective tariff, and that she failed to realize that if she wanted really to avoid corruption, extravagance and isolation, she must adopt a freer trade, and freer trade alone will give her not only larger markets, but will free her from much of the evil that a protective tariff necessarily entails upon any country. But in one short sentence our Premier did more to bring about inter-Imperial trade than all the speeches at all the conferences had done before.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I was extremely sorry to hear the remark across the floor of the House from the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) who explained the absence of the First Minister in consequence of his not being very well. I feel, Sir, that it would be extremely improper to bring this debate to a conclusion in the absence of the right hon. gentleman who leads the House, and who occupies so very conspicuous a position upon this question. I should feel myself a great delicacy in discussing this question in the way in which it would require to be discussed, in his absence. It is under these circumstances, therefore, that I rise for the purpose of moving the adjournment of the debate in order that we may have the advantage of the presence of the Prime Minister when its discussion is resumed.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Mr. McNEILL. I would be exceedingly sorry if any hon. member on the other side of the House thought I had misrepresented my hon. friend who addressed us a moment ago, and who said that I had in some regard misrepresented him. I do not know in what respect I did so, certainly it was not my intention; and I should be glad if the hon. gentleman would tell me in what regard I misrepresented him.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. As we must rise at twelve, I do not propose to hold the House any longer, especially as some hon. gentlemen, I believe, were sitting here until an early hour this morning. I beg to move that the House do now adjourn.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 11.15 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 20th May, 1898.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

THE RELIEF OF JAMES PEARSON.

Mr. SUTHERLAND moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 147)—from the Senate—for the relief of James Pearson.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. With the consent of the House, I move that this Bill be placed on the Orders for second reading this evening. I suppose there will be no objection.

Motion agreed to.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 148) respecting the transport contract between Her Majesty and the Winnipeg Great Northern Railway Company.—(Mr. Blair.)

SALARIES OF JUDGES.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick) moved that the House resolve itself into Committee, on Monday next, on the following proposed resolution :—

That it is expedient to amend the Act respecting the judges of provincial courts and to provide as follows :—

That the salary of an additional judge of the Court of Appeal for Ontario shall be $5,000 per annum.

That the salaries of fourteen puisne judges of the Superior Court of the province of Quebec, whose residences are fixed at Montreal and Quebec (including the judge to whom the district of Terrebonne is assigned), shall be each $5,000 per annum.

That the salary of an additional judge of the Superior Court of Quebec shall be $4,000 per annum.

That the salary of an additional judge of the Circuit Court of the district of Montreal shall be $3,000 per annum.

That the salary of the judge of the Supreme Court of the Yukon Territory shall be $4,000 per annum.

That on and after 1st July, 1898, the salaries of the judges and junior judges of the county courts of Ontario, other than the judge of the County Court of the county of York, shall be each $2,000 per annum during the first three years of service, and after three years of service each $2,400 per annum.

That on and after the said date the salary of the judge of the County Court of the county of Halifax shall be $3,000 per annum.

That on and after the said date, in Prince Edward Island, the salary of the judge of the County Court of Queen's County shall be $3,000 per annum, and the salaries of two other county court judges each $2,000 per annum during the first three years of service, and after three years of service each $2,400 per annum.

That to each of the judges of the Court of Queen's Bench in the province of Quebec, for attending the said court for a part only of a term, or for the purpose of disposing of cases already heard, or for attending for the performance of any other judicial duty, or attending at Montreal or Quebec at the written request of the chief justice or judge performing the duties of chief justice for the purpose of conference and délibéré as to appeals heard, there shall be paid, for travelling allowances, $6 for each day's absence from his place of residence, provided that three days' absence at least shall always be allowed.

That to each of the judges of the Superior or Circuit Courts attending as such, at the request in writing of the chief justice or judge discharging the duties of chief justice in the district, any court held at any other place than that at which he is directed to reside, for each day he is absent from the said place of residence, there shall be paid, for travelling allowances, six dollars ; but no travelling allowance shall be granted to any judge requested to sit in review under the first section of the Act of the Legislature of Quebec, 61 Victoria, chapter 20, unless it is certified by the chief justice or judge discharging the duties of chief justice in the district that the attendance of such judge was necessary by reason of illness, incapacity or absence of one of the judges resident at Montreal or Quebec, as the case may be.

That to the judge of the Supreme Court of the Yukon Territory there shall be paid such travelling allowances as the Governor in Council determines.

That to each judge of a District Court in the province of Ontario there shall be paid, for travelling allowances, an annual sum of $500.

Motion agreed to.

DEATH OF RIGHT HON. W. E. GLADSTONE.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). Before the Orders of the Day are called, it becomes my duty to call the attention of the House to an occurrence which, although expected for some considerable time, will, I doubt not, be received with profound sorrow, not merely by this House but by the country at large as well as by all nations and countries in which the English tongue is spoken. The House is aware that yesterday the Right Honourable Mr. Gladstone closed a long and practical life after a very severe and painful illness. I need not say to this House that, literally for generations, the name of Gladstone has been a household word all through the British Empire. I need not tell this House that during an extremely long period Mr. Gladstone has occupied a position of the highest importance in the councils of the British Empire, and I believe I am correct in saying that, since the death of the Duke of Wellington the death of no Englishman has attracted equal attention to that of Mr. Glad-

stone. Mr. Gladstone was a great deal more than merely a parliamentary leader. It was only one of the many notable gifts that he possessed that he was, perhaps, the greatest parliamentary orator of this century. Besides being a man of magnificent gifts, he has been, throughout his life, according to his lights and to the best of his knowledge, the champion of all that he believed to be good and right and honourable throughout the world, and particularly the champion of the oppressed wherever he conceived that oppression existed. I think we should be simply obeying the feeling of the great majority, in fact the whole of the people of Canada, if we were to add our tribute to the tribute already being paid in the British House of Commons by friend and foe, by political opponents not less than by political supporters, to the memory of Mr. Gladstone. Sir, he has died, as every one knows, full of years and honours, after a life protracted far beyond the ordinary span, up to the very end of which he continued in full vigour of his faculties, and continued, by reason of the remarkable personality he possessed, to exercise a commanding influence over the mind of the English people. Perhaps, under the circumstances I should best meet the wishes of the House if I were to suggest that the should most fittingly honour his memory by appointing a committee of this House to prepare an address of condolence on the less which the Empire and the world at large has sustained in the death of Mr. Gladstone. If it meets the wishes of my hon. friends on the other side, I will conclude by submitting the motion for the approbation of the House, as follows :—

That a committee composed of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, Sir Charles Tupper, Sir Richard Cartwright, Sir Louis Davies, Sir Adolphe Caron, Mr. Costigan and Mr. Mulock, be appointed to prepare a resolution of condolence on the death of the Right Hon. Mr. Gladstone, and report the same with all convenient speed.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. Might I suggest that some of the western members be added to that committee. I would suggest Mr. Davin as one and also some member from British Columbia.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am quite certain that the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright), who is leading the House to-day, has rightly interpreted the feeling of the House and the universal feeling of the people of Canada in proposing the resolution which is now in your hands. The world recognizes the fact that probably the most conspicuous man of the present century has now passed away. Nature endowed Mr. Gladstone with the highest intellectual faculties, and these, with his indomitable energy and untiring industry exercised throughout a long life, made him, as I have said, probably the most conspicuous person in the world in connection with all the great public movements that have effected mankind in general. He was noted not only for his remarkable intellectual power, but for his ripe scholarship, so that he was, perhaps, above and beyond any other man in the world possessed of the greatest amount of knowledge covering the widest range of subjects who has appeared in any country. Not only has his life been one of untiring industry, but the position he has occupied for more than half a century has made his words and actions of the utmost importance to every portion of the civilized world.

No person's views have been studied, no person's opinions have been watched with greater or deeper interest, and I think we all recognize that not only the British Empire but the civilized world has, by the passing away of this great man, lost one whose position was of transcendent importance. I am quite certain that, as an orator, Mr. Gladstone would be recognized everywhere, not only throughout the British Empire where the English language is spoken, but in all countries, as a man who occupied a distinguished position as an orator. Oratory has perhaps been best defined by the expression that it consists in feeling the truth and speaking it; and I may say from personal experience that I believe it was absolutely impossible for any man, whether he agreed or disagreed with the opinions and sentiments expressed by that great man, to listen to him upon any important subject without arriving at the conclusion that every word he uttered came from the bottom of his heart and that he believed most implicitly in the truth of what he said. As I have said before, I am satisfied that the hon. gentleman who is leading the House (Sir Richard Cartwright) has rightly expressed the sentiments of this House and the people of Canada in taking measures to mark the deep sense of all Canada in reference to this great event and to join with people of all countries and all nations in testifying to the family of that great man the deep and unfeigned sorrow that Canada feels at the termination of his long and useful life.

Motion agreed to.

POST OFFICE ACT.

The House again resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 110) to amend the Post Office Act.—(Mr. Mulock.)

(In the Committee.)

On section 4,

4. The subsection substituted for subsection 1 of section 44 of the said Act by section 10 of chapter 20 of the statutes of 1889, is hereby repealed and the following is substituted therefor :—

"44. Except as in this Act otherwise provided, letters or other articles which, from any cause, remain undelivered in any post office, or which, having been posted, cannot be forwarded by post,

shall, under such regulations as the Postmaster General makes, be transmitted by postmasters to the Post Office Department, or to such other places as the Postmaster General directs, as dead letters, there to be opened and returned to the writers or senders on payment of any postage due thereon with three cents additional on each dead letter to defray the cost of returning it, less, in the case of insufficiently prepaid letters or other mailable matter posted in Canada, such amount of postage as has been prepaid thereon ; or such dead letters may, in any case or class of cases, be otherwise disposed of as the Postmaster General directs."

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I do not rise for the purpose of dealing specially with the clause now under the consideration of the committee, but I may say—and I say it for the purpose of shortening discussion—that I concur very much in the opinions expressed by the ex-Postmaster General, the hon. member for Three Rivers (Sir Adolphe Caron) in regard to this question of the dead letter office. There is very great objection to altering the policy which has been long adopted, not only in this but in other countries, and in favour of which we have the opinions of such high authorities as the right hon. Sir John A. Macdonald and Mr. Mackenzie. The subject had been fully considered, and I would be very glad if the hon. Postmaster General would drop this clause and take further time for consideration of the question. It is admitted that considerable convenience would be experienced by the public in having this centralization to a certain extent qualified, but looking to the great importance of maintaining the secrecy of the post office, as far as possible, I would submit to my hon. friend whether it would not be wise, after the very strong statements that have been made in opposition to that clause, to take further time for the consideration of the question. No great injury could possibly result from taking a little further time, and the secrecy of the post office service is such a fundamental and essential part of it, and the sentiment in Great Britain is so overwhelmingly strong in regard to everything that exposes unnecessarily to the general public the contents of letters which pass through the mails, that I shall be very glad if that matter could be thoroughly considered before it was finally adopted. The fact that letters are sent from Victoria, Halifax and Great Britain to Ottawa and are opened, where absolutely necessary, by the parties charged with that duty, under the immediate direction of the hon. Postmaster General, gives a great security to the general public against the misdirection of a letter or anything of that kind leading to an exposure of its contents almost in the immediate locality in which it is written. The parties here being, as a rule, strangers to the localities in which these letters were written, the difficulty is absolutely minimized, but I am afraid that the change proposed will lead to a good deal of anxiety on the part of the public. I cannot see that this is an important feature of the Bill now before the House, and if my hon. friend will consent to delay it for further consideration, I think he would be consulting the feelings of a great many members on both sides of the House and of a very large portion of the most intelligent people in Canada. I will not say more because I do not want to prolong discussion. I regret that I was not able to be present the night when this Bill went into committee in the first instance, but I understand that the hon. Postmaster General who then consented that there should be the fullest latitude given in discussing any portion of the Bill without particular reference to the clause before the House. I am anxious to shorten the discussion as much as possible and will therefore simply read to the House a portion of a letter which I have received from a very eminent divine, and which speaks so strongly and clearly upon a point in the Bill to which I took exception, that I will content myself with simply reading it for the information of the committee :

> The Postmaster General admits the principle of exemption by granting the country weekly press free use of the mails within the zone system of ten miles from the office of publication.

I may say frankly that I think the alteration which the hon. Postmaster General made in the Bill as first submitted removed, to a certain extent, the objections raised, but not completely.

> This embraces, in most cases, very nearly the entire circulation, the denominational and Sunday school periodicals from the very nature of their constituency, scattered as it is over the entire country, are unable to take advantage of this exemption.
>
> I beg to call your attention to the hardship which Sunday school papers especially will endure if thus discriminated against. They encounter very keen competition from certain American publishers who, possessing a very large market in the United States, can reduce their cost of production to a point which is impossible for us, with our limited circulation, to reach.
>
> Moreover, all the material which enters into the composition of Canadian papers, presses and printing machinery, even the paper itself, which is much cheaper in the United States than in Canada, are heavily taxed, whereas, the finished American manufactured article is admitted free of duty and carried by the Canadian post office throughout the length and breadth of the country.
>
> It may be said that the United States will also carry Canadian papers free, but the fact remains that with their larger market and greater facilities to manufacture, we cannot circulate our papers to any extent in the United States.
>
> Moreover, the American Sunday school papers to which I refer, very naturally inculcate loyalty to the institutions and civil polity of their own country, and not unfrequently are hostile to the institutions and polity of Canada, and opposed to its British connection. They thereby become,

as a leading Canadian publisher has said, "the most subtle and persuasive propaganda of anti-British sentiment which can be conceived." What I object to is the practical discrimination of the Government against the loyal and patriotic papers of Canada in favour of foreign periodicals in which American spread-eagleism is often offensively prominent.

I beg to inclose a specimen copy of a Queen's Birthday number of one of our Sunday school papers, which I have the honour to edit. In these papers love of Queen and country, of the old flag and the glorious British Empire, you will observe, form a staple theme.

I proposed to the Postmaster General to limit his exemptions so far as it concerns the religious press to denominational Sunday school periodicals having absolutely no advertisements, and mailed directly to the secretary or superintendent of the Sunday schools in packages of not less than five or ten. This will grant a slight exemption of less in all than two or three thousand dollars to the Sunday school periodicals issued by the three leading Protestant denominations of the country,—the Methodist, Presbyterian and Anglican. In the body which I have the honour to represent (the Methodist Church) we raise a special fund of nearly $5,000 a year to distribute these papers, either free or at greatly reduced price, to poor schools in remote and destitute parts of the country which are unable to pay their small cost. To impose a tax amounting to several hundred dollars in addition we feel would be a great hardship to our schools and to our publishing house. Some of these papers are published actually below cost, and the others at the smallest possible margin above cost.

I would feel greatly obliged if you would use your powerful influence in the House in resisting what a very large proportion of the religious denominations I have mentioned will regard as an injustice.

I won't add a word to that, it speaks for itself, but it points out the very important fact that under the proposed arrangement the religious periodicals, both Protestant and Catholic, of Canada, will be discriminated against in favour of periodicals of the same class coming from the United States of America. I need not point out that the American press, having an enormous circulation, and being able to publish at a much lower rate than can be done in Canada, have great advantage by having a free circulation in Canada, and without having to pay large taxes upon all the material they use, and these come into competition with our papers handicapped by this proposed charge. I think the advantage of circulating our own papers in preference to those of any foreign country, will commend itself to every member of the House; and I should be very glad if, late as the period is, the Postmaster General could give consideration to that point.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I can take no exception to the manner in which the leader of the Opposition has addressed himself to this clause, and to the other clause of the Bill to which he alluded. First, with reference to the decentralization of the dead letter branch: The work of the dead letter branch is not confined to letters, but it deals with a large quantity of matter other than letters. The hon. gentleman argues that decentralization will in some way that I do not yet understand, though I understand the point he has sought to make, interfere with the secrecy of the post office.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The more people that have to keep a secret the more difficult it is to keep it.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is not supposed that a great number of people will have to keep a secret. I presume that if a dead letter is dealt with in Winnipeg, it will not be dealt with by any more people than it is dealt with in Ottawa. But the hon. gentleman cites the precedent of Great Britain. I do not know why he alluded to Great Britain. He thought that the experience of Great Britain would guide us, and I agree with him there. But there are many offices throughout Great Britain where dead letter matter is dealt with.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I referred to Great Britain as a country in which the secrecy of letters and the sacredness of the post office are maintained to an extent that perhaps does not exist in any other country in the world.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Well, that is a general statement. I have no doubt that in Great Britain they respect the mails: I do not know that they respect the secrecy of the mails any more in Great Britain than they do in Canada. In both countries law and practice compel the preservation of the strictest secrecy of the mails. But in Great Britain dead letters are dealt with at various points. There are three leading return dead letter offices, and in connection with each of these leading offices, are branch dead letter offices: and the work of dealing with dead letters takes place at a great many points throughout the United Kingdom. The same system prevails in Germany—I have not extended my researches beyond those two countries. So that if we take the practice of England for our guide, we shall only be following out the course that this Bill suggests. There will be no violation of secrecy by the decentralization. A man is just as honest if he is engaged in this work in Winnipeg as in the department at Ottawa. It may be that some of the officers at Ottawa will be sent to these other points, and I do not think it is fair to assume that an officer will become dishonest merely because his place of residence is changed. One point the hon. gentleman makes is that an officer, in some manner, in a local town, say Toronto, will be acquainted with the writers, or have some local interest in the writers, and thus have a local knowledge of the work itself. It does not follow that Toronto letters will be sent to the Toronto

dead letter office; it does not follow that Vancouver letters will be examined in the Vancouver office; it does not follow that Victoria letters will be examined in the Victoria office.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I thought that was the scheme.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The scheme was to have different examining points throughout the Dominion, and not have nearly a million pieces gathered from all parts of the Dominion sent into Ottawa, to the great delay and inconvenience of the public, and oftentimes to loss. It is proposed to have several examining points. The details of the scheme will be such as will absolutely safeguard every interest as effectually as every interest is safeguarded to-day. Last year I find, by looking at the reports of the dead letter branch, that there were sent for examination there 875,000 pieces, in all.

Mr. FOSTER. How many of these were letters?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I presume the point of secrecy which the hon. gentleman makes is based on the supposition that an officer in a city, say Toronto, would have some local acquaintance with the writers, or the addressees, and in that case might be interested in knowing what was in those letters, or taking cognizance of their contents. But of the 875,000 pieces examined at Ottawa last year, I find only 189,465 ordinary dead letters originating in Canada. There may be some other registered letters originating in Canada, but of these 875,000 pieces of mail matter, over 330,000, approaching one-half of the whole, consisted of parcels, post cards, books and other materials, about which there is no special secrecy.

Mr. WALLACE. And members' speeches.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. And members' speeches. So that more than one-half of all the pieces so dealt with is of the nature I speak of. Now, at present great loss and inconvenience at times accrue to persons sending matter through the mails which does not promptly reach its destination, and hon. gentlemen have only to look at the last report to see a list of the articles that found their way to Ottawa, and the delay in dealing with which must at times have occasioned much loss. For example, 27 bills of exchange, 1 bond, 457 cheques, 187 drafts, 808 money orders, 73 orders, 243 promissory notes, 540 receipts, 37 certificates, 2 salary warrants, 5 various certificates. Delaying the transmission of these documents has no doubt occasioned loss to the persons interested, and when one looks through the table of contents of parcels and observes the miscellaneous list of goods of all kinds sent to Ottawa, gathered from points hundreds and thousands of miles distant, and conveyed at great expense and inconvenience to be dealt with here, I fail to see any argument to meet at all events, that branch of the proposition. I now come to another point. If there are 875,000 pieces to be treated, it means the maintenance at Ottawa of a large number of officials, occasioning and producing delay in their treatment, all of which might be largely avoided if a system of treating those dead letter pieces were adopted at various points in the country, whereby much delay would be avoided and very much less red tapeism adopted in connection with the matter, and at the same time public convenience and public interest it in the same spirit and in the same way, proposed to depart from the spirit and letter of the law that has guided the dead letter business in the past, but to deal with it in the same spirit and in the sams way, although perhaps at different places. I think the proposition is one that should commend itself to the House; it is based on precedent, and it is based on precedent which we can safely follow. With regard to the proposition contained in the letter which the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) read, that certain branches of denominational literature should be exempt from postage, I may say that I received a communication similar to that which the hon. gentleman read. I had the advantage of meeting the writer of that letter with a number of others and hearing the subject thoroughly discussed. I subsequently received a communication about the matter, and gave it the fullest consideration I was able to bestow, so that my answer is not given on hearing the subject discussed for the first time, and this is not the first time that I have given expression to the opinion at which I have arrived. I have expressed a similar opinion to the writer of that communication. He asks that certain kinds of denominational publications should be exempt from postage on certain grounds. The first ground is that papers are made to pay duty on their material. But that is a matter to be dealt with by the customs laws of the country. If the customs laws are bad, let them be changed, but it is in that direction that amelioration, if any, should be directed. It is argued that denominational papers of Canada are being discriminated against in favour of American newspapers of the same kind. The American publisher is obliged to pay 1 cent a pound on his newspaper sent through the mails, and although they come to Canada there is no further rate exacted here, and under this Bill the publisher will be obliged to pay half a cent per pound. It is an erroneous presentation of the case to say that we carry American or other mail matter free. We do not do so in the true sense of the term. We perform a certain service, and in return other countries perform a like

service for Canada. They carry our newspapers free and letters free, or at all events, on the same terms. On letters posted in the United States that country retains the value of the stamps, and the letters are carried into other countries without further stamps. In like manner, letters posted in Canada travel free through the United States and other countries, we retaining the amount of the postage. The country is on the whole opposed to a system of exemptions. Exemptions which involve public expenditure are against the spirit of the times, especially those exemptions which involve aid to one of the denominations. Speaking for myself, I do not hesitate to say that I think the time has passed when state aid should be given to denominations. If, however, state aid has to be given to carry Sunday or denominational newspapers, Protestant or Catholic, let it be given directly and in such a way that the public will know in what form it is presented and given, and then we will see whether public opinion will endorse or not propositions to grant state aid. If, for example, postage of a denominational paper involves a cost of $1,000 to secure its free distribution, if we exempt that church from the payment of the $1,000, we practically give that church $1,000. Under a correct system of book-keeping and financial calculation, it would be preferable, if it were desired to grant exemptions, to grant exemptions straight by passing a vote of money. If Parliament is prepared to meet an issue of that kind, let some one submit a proposition, and when he has expressed his views on the subject, let it be voted on; but do not let us allow ourselves to permit a vicious system to be covered up by a system of bonuses or exemptions from legitimate obligations. For that reason alone, I am unable to give my support to the request of the hon. leader of the Opposition. I am aware it is urged that the imposition of postage upon denominational journals published in Canada may perhaps check the circulation of those newspapers. That remains, however, to be seen; I doubt it extremely. The several denominations will rise to the occasion. At all times when a crisis has occurred and it has become necessary to face the situation, we have seen strong, vigorous, able and willing men ready to meet it. No doubt, the flourishing churches of to-day are those which receive no state aid, and inasmuch as in this country public opinion has pronounced against state aid, I think we would be making a retrograde movement if we now proposed to grant state aid to denominations in circulating publications and papers issued in the interest of any special denomination. For these reasons, I think the clause should be adopted and the Bill carried.

Mr. WALLACE. I think the Postmaster General has altogether failed to meet the objections offered by the leader of the Opposition. In the case of papers and letters which are coming in from the United States he says that an erroneous opinion prevails that we are carrying them free from the United States. But his whole argument was with respect to letters. We admit that as regards letters the arrangement is a reciprocal one, and that it is practically no injustice in carrying United States letters through our mails because perhaps a corresponding number of letters from Canada pass through United States mails. But the Postmaster General cannot say that the same rule is applicable to newspapers, because twenty or thirty newspapers will come from the United States as compared with one sent from Canada to the United States, and therefore we are performing more than our share of the work. We say it is a gross injustice, as was pointed out in the letter read by the leader of the Opposition, that papers loyal to the United States should be sent here and circulated free throughout Canada, which may be injurious to Canadians, and more especially is this the case in regard to American Sunday school papers circulating among the children. We should endeavour to inculcate a spirit of loyalty among our people, but instead of doing so, the Postmaster General is giving free transmission to American papers and taxing Canadian papers, thus making an unjust discrimination against our publishers.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. How are they free from the United States?

Mr. WALLACE. Because they have the use of the Canadian mails, and the Canadian Government are not receiving a farthing for circulating those newspapers throughout the Dominion.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. We do.

Mr. WALLACE. In what way?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The United States perform a similar service.

Mr. WALLACE. It does not perform an equal or similar service for us.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. How does the hon. gentleman know that?

Mr. WALLACE. American newspapers published in the large centres of the United States are sent into Canada, and are circulated throughout the smaller towns, especially of Ontario. The Toronto newspaper circulates through the smaller towns and villages of Ontario, but those small towns and villages do not send their newspapers into the city of Toronto in the same proportion. The city of New York with its millions of inhabitants supplies newspapers to the smaller cities of the United States, and to the cities and towns of Canada as well, and the Postmaster General by his legislation is encouraging the circulation of

this American newspaper literature which had better be curtailed. The Minister says that this is state aid for denominational papers, but we say, give that aid to all newspapers which had done so much in the past to increase the circulation of Canadian literature. Unless the Minister succeeds in making the newspapers pay their way this law should not be passed, but he himself has admitted that the rate to be charged will not pay one-fortieth of the expense which the transmission of newspapers through the mails entails.

Again, Sir, there is a very strong objection to this dead letter clause. I am opposed to giving to the Postmaster General —in speaking of the Postmaster General I do not refer to the present incumbent of the office; he will not always be Postmaster General—I am opposed to giving any Postmaster General the power asked for in this clause. The Postmaster General at his own sweet will can issue an order that any post office can be made a dead letter office. Suppose an election is coming on he could put machinery in motion under this clause, which would enure to his political advantage and to euchreing his opponents. The secrecy of letters transmitted through the mails should be jealously guarded. I say that this change should not be made because there is no necessity whatever for it. If it is done at all it should be done by Order in Council and not by the will of any Minister. Under this present Government we are met with too much power being exercised by the heads of the departments, and it would conduce to good government if most of these executive acts were done by Order in Council. What is the delay at Ottawa under the present dead letter system to which the Postmaster General refers to? He has a very large staff here and there should be no delay. The dead letter office should be conducted in the same manner as our savings banks and other institutions, and the dead letters that come in one day should all be dealt with that same day before the officials leave the office. I would ask the Minister what is the greatest delay in the case of dead letters coming into the office? Suppose a dead letter comes into headquarters to-day, when is that letter disposed of?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am not able to go into these details, but I say that the present system provokes delay from the very nature of the case. Suppose a letter is received at Ottawa which is not addressed at all.

Mr. WALLACE. That is very unusual.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. On the contrary it is quite usual. Or suppose it is indistinctly addressed. Then the latter is opened and correspondence takes place and a notice may have to be sent a thousand or three thousand miles away. If the person written to does not reply within a reasonable time a communication is sent to the writer if he can be discovered, and great delay occurs before the letter can be treated. I am not saying that the officials are dilatory in taking the initial steps, but on account of the distance in many cases the delay occurs. I may say that the system I suggest in this Bill was adopted eight years ago with regard to Victoria, B.C., and has been in force there since, without there being any legal authority for it whatever.

Mr. WALLACE. I can quite understand that in the case of Victoria and perhaps another point, the system proposed might be found useful. The Minister must remember that five-sixths of the population of Canada is within thirty-six hours reach of Ottawa, and, therefore, any long delay can only occur in a very small percentage of the correspondence.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. My hon. friend has conceded the principle as regards Victoria, and it has been already adopted there ex necessitate rei. If my hon. friend is desirous of being reasonable with me in this matter——

Mr. WALLACE. I always was.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I hope so. Are there not other points to which he will concede the principle? It was only contemplated to have this in force in cities, and for that matter I am not desirous of having it even in small cities.

Mr. WALLACE. In the case of Victoria, and one other place. I do not think there would be much objection to this clause.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Would my hon. friend object to it in regard to other mail matter than letters?

Mr. WALLACE. I do not think so.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Would he allow it in regard to letters coming from abroad?

Mr. WALLACE. I think all letters should be treated the same way.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Then I will meet the hon. gentleman's wishes as far as I can. Supposing that a part of the clause is admitted—as regards other than letters, newspapers, parcels and post cards?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Hear, hear.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Then allow it with regard to letters not originating in Canada, and I will go further and put the points in the Bill.

Mr. FOSTER. That would be far preferable.

Mr. WALLACE. I cannot just see why the hon. Minister makes a distinction be-

tween letters originating in Canada and those originating outside.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There is no local knowledge here of those originating outside.

Mr. FOSTER. Is not Ottawa really the most central point to which to send foreign letters? If my hon. friend would adopt the suggestion of taking letters from the general clause and then name his points, he will go far to meet the view of the House. There need not be many points named.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman will allow me to have Victoria and Winnipeg and then say Halifax.

Mr. WALLACE. Halifax is only thirty hours from Ottawa.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Take Halifax, Winnipeg and Victoria for the treatment of all letters foreign as well as domestic. If that is agreed to, let me have the fullest power with regard to the treatment of all those.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. gentleman should have the regulations made by Order in Council, so that his colleagues may know what is going on in the department, as well as the whole country.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I propose this amendment :

Provided always that with regard to letters, the only places other than Ottawa to which the same may be so transmitted and be dealt with as dead letters, shall be the cities of Victoria, B.C., Winnipeg and Halifax, subject to such regulations as may be approved of by the Governor in Council.

Mr. SPROULE. That will conflict with the first portion of the clause, which gives the power to the Postmaster General.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. In order to make it uniform, we will substitute "Governor in Council" for the "Postmaster General," where the latter appears in the clause.

Amendment agreed to ; clause as amended agreed to.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose there is no use making an appeal to the Postmaster General to make his legislation decisive, and instead of leaving it permissible, to state the time at which the Act will come in force.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I would like to meet the hon. gentleman, but he will see that it is hardly possible just now. Whilst there is every encouragement to believe that the revenue will in the near future enable the Government to bring clause 1 into force, still we cannot undertake to look into the future and name the exact date when the revenue will attain that very satisfactory condition ; but when we get the full benefit of the Bill, I trust we will not be far from the time when the clause can be put into force.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. Minister said that he expected the revenue and expenditure would meet by the 1st of January next.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I hope so and expect so.

Mr. WALLACE. That would be necessary before the law comes into force ? Is that the idea?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not say necessary, but it is a very important circumstance.

Mr. WALLACE. Then there is no difficulty in fixing the precise date?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not know that I can tell exactly when that happy time will arrive.

Mr. WALLACE. Why not ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I cannot look so far into the future with certainty.

Mr. FOSTER. That is why I, for one, should be very much better satisfied if the hon. gentleman did not attempt this legislation until he could see his way clear to put it into force. There may be some argument in favour of permissive legislation, but it is a vicious principle to introduce the permissive feature into legislation generally. The hon. gentleman introduces this important measure without the least idea that he can bring it into force within a short time. He will not tell the House that there is any particular time when he can bring it into force. He bases his hope of doing so on the prospect of a balance between revenue and expenditure. It would seem to me better, in important legislation of this kind, that Parliament should know what it is doing. The opinion of the Postmaster General as to the proper time to bring this Act into force, as to the financial condition that justifies such a step might not be approved by the House. As this will involve questions of revenue to the amount of $650,000 it seems to me preferable that a time should be stated when this Bill shall become law. And if, looking at the present and as much of the future as you can discern, the hon. gentleman cannot see his way to a definite conclusion, it would be better to reserve this legislation until the state of the country is such as to justify him in asking Parliament to enact it and make it definite and decisive. What do you do by such a measure as this ? You raise the hopes of the whole people that they are going to have two-cent postage. That is used to the advantage of a political party—it is a fair advantage to take if you once get the legislation on the Statute-book. But suppose it turns out that you cannot bring this law into force—you have raised hopes only to dash them to the ground. I do not think a deliberative body should

legislate in that way. My hon. friend (Mr. Mulock) knows that he cannot bring this legislation into force—at least he feels certain that he cannot—before next session of Parliament. Why, then, does he propose it? Why not wait until next session of Parliament? If then the revenues of the department are such as, in the opinion of the House, to justify such a measure, Parliament could then legislate with its eyes open. As it is, we are legislating to put a sort of weapon into a party man's hands, which may or may not be used. But aside from that, it is a vicious principle to leave public affairs, especially where heavy matters of revenue are concerned, subject to the will of an individual, so to speak.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) is perhaps not familiar with the Act that his Government left on the Statute-book. The Post Office Act already vests in the Postmaster General power to vary, reduce or increase the rates on all mailable matter, with the exception of letters and newspapers.

Mr. FOSTER. I am quite aware of that, but I am aware also that letters and newspapers, letters especially, are the things we are talking about.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The principle is involved in section 9 of the Post Office Act, subsection E, which provides that the Postmaster General may, subject to the provision of the Act, establish rates of postage on all mailable matter, "not being letters, newspapers, or other thing hereinafter specifically provided for." The Act specifies rates upon letters and upon newspapers, but I think these are the only rates that are fixed by the Act. As regards the enormous transactions, outside of these, covered by the Post Office Act, the Postmaster General has power to fix the rates.

Mr. HAGGART. That is only for postal conventions.

Mr. FOSTER. For parcel post.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. This is altogether without reference to the postal conventions, and refers to domestic matters within our own control. And since that Act came into force—how long that may be I do not know, but for years I see the present Act is 38 Victoria—the Postmaster General has power to vary, reduce or increase the rates on parcels, and so on, thus affecting the revenue. The principle is embodied in the Act.

Mr. FOSTER. It may be in the Act, but that does not affect the argument I make. I do not think my hon. friend will say that in these matters that affects the revenue.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. This section that I have quoted affects the revenue.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, but not largely.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes, largely.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, I am going on the general principle that in these matters which affect the revenue, the House and the country ought to know what it is doing.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Why did you not repeal that clause when you were in power?

Mr. FOSTER. Does my hon. friend mean to say that because a thing has existed for a certain time it must exist for ever? When we find a certain state of things existing, then is the time when an opinion may be revised. I am not arguing this as affecting one party more than another. I am stating a principle which I think is sound, and I think my hon. friend (Mr. Mulock) must agree with me. Why should he, as Postmaster General, have power to vary the revenue of the country to the extent of $100,000 or $200,000 whenever he chooses to make a proclamation?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Parliament has said so.

Mr. FOSTER. I cannot help that. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) think it good principle to embody in legislation?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) assented to it all the time he was in office.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) assents to many things that he would not see carried out to the full extent. He has taken under his control the revenue of the post office. Under this Bill, whenever it pleases him, he can reduce the revenue by $650,000 or $700,000, whether the House thinks it a favourable moment to do so or not. I say that this is not a principle that should be carried out to any such extent.

Mr. HAGGART. The principal object the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) has referred to was to allow changes with regard to parcel post with foreign countries. It is a necessary power for the Postmaster General to have.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think the hon. gentleman is confusing this with section 29.

Mr. HAGGART. In order to make a postal convention affecting the parcel post between us and a foreign country, the Postmaster General must have jurisdiction over the parcel in its carriage in this country. If I remember rightly, when Postmaster General, I made an arrangement with Japan for the interchange of parcels. The hon. Postmaster General will notice that this does not apply to newspapers or letters, but simply allows the Postmaster General the right, which ordinarily he exercises by

Order in Council, for making arrangements with foreign countries for the interchange of parcels.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) is confusing two different sections of the Act. Under section 29, the Postmaster General has power to regulate the rates on all mailable matter to foreign countries, subject to any right of interference that either party would have. But section 9, to which I referred, is wholly limited to domestic mailable matter——

Mr. HAGGART. I see that it gives the Postmaster General pretty wide power.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think so. I believe that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart), when Minister in charge of this department, changed the registration fee.

Mr. HAGGART. Yes.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Very well. The hon. gentleman when in charge of the department raised that fee under the power that this section 9 gave him, without reference to Parliament at all.

Mr. HAGGART. If I remember rightly, I made a recommendation to Council to raise the rate on drop letters in cities and towns, and increase the rate of registration, and also to reduce the rate on letters from 3 to 2 cents. My colleagues adopted the proposition to raise the rate on drop letters, but declined to adopt the other proposition.

Bill reported.

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 147) for the relief of James Pearson.—(Mr. Sutherland.)

SUPPLY—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I would ask the hon. gentleman who is leading the House, if he is in a position to state, as the Prime Minister promised to state to-day, what the position of public business is ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). I am afraid I shall have to ask the hon. gentleman to wait until Monday. Some matters which we had hoped to decide have been interfered with by reason of the rather sudden illness of the Prime Minister. As the hon. gentleman will easily understand, I am hardly in a position to give him information to-day.

Mr. MAXWELL. Is it the intention to sit to-morrow ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. We do not intend to sit to-morrow. I may say to my hon. friend that I am afraid no progress would be made by sitting here to-morrow. It is not from any desire to idle on the part of the members of the Government, but as the hon. gentleman well knows, Saturday is practically the only day that the Government have for considering certain important matters they have to bring before the House.

Mr. FOSTER. The Government is behindhand with their measures.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I think the hon. gentlemen, when they were on this side of the House, found it very necessary to keep Saturday until a late period.

Motion agreed to.

(In the Committee.)

Harbours and Rivers, Ontario—
Improvement of Collingwood harbour.. $30,000

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). This work is under contract. The amount paid to the contractor up to the 31st of December, 1897, was $20,000. The estimated expenditure up to the 30th of June, 1898, is $29,382. I am asking to-day for $30,000 to go on with the work.

Mr. FOSTER. How much is the whole work to cost ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The full amount of the contract is $144,960. It is for solid dredging.

Mr. WALLACE. Does this contract include the making of the harbour as well as the channel ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, it is only dredging the channel.

Mr. SPROULE. I understand that the channel, if dredged according to these specifications, will not be at all suitable, because the depth of water was calculated from high water mark. I am told the water is 18 inches below the high water mark. I understood a deputation was here in the winter asking that the channel be made deeper. What decision has the Minister come to with regard to that ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. A deputation came to me a few months ago to represent that when the data were taken for this proposed work, the water was higher than it is to-day. I went into the question fully with the late lamented member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), and we considered a number of reports as to the cost of the additional depth that it would be desirable to have. I may say that I did not yet see my way clear to agree to giving that additional depth, as it would require too large an amount of money.

Mr. FOSTER. How much ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Over $100,000. To give 20 feet on the whole width of the channel as provided in this contract, will cost much more than that.

Mr. SPROULE. Could you not reduce the width of the channel and still give the required depth of water without its costing so much ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. When I say $100,000, I mean a decreased width. But I have not been able so far to make up my mind. The death of our friend has interfered with the negotiations to a certain extent. When the session is over I may take up the new proposals, but I cannot promise to do so.

Mr. SPROULE. What depth will this expenditure give, according to the contract that is now let ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. About 18 feet in the outside part of the harbour, and 16 feet inside.

Mr. SPROULE. That is free from the present water level, not from high water mark ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Quite so, at the lowest water mark.

Mr. HAGGART. If I remember rightly, we are to receive a certain sum of money, to be contributed one-half by the Grand Trunk Railway, and the other half by the town of Collingwood for these improvements ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have received from the town of Collingwood the sum of $13,000 for their share of the work up to date.

Mr. SPROULE. They were to give $15,000, were they not, and the Grand Trunk Railway $10,000 ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The Grand Trunk Railway agreed with the town to give the town $10,000. It is for the town to settle with the Grand Trunk Railway. So far as we are concerned we have only to deal with the town, and they have been willing to pay their share, and as I have just said, have paid $13,000 already.

Mr. SPROULE. Have you any knowledge whether the town is getting that from the Grand Trunk Railway ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That I cannot say ; that does not concern us.

Mr. SPROULE. Did you make the provision that the town, in entering into the contract, were to furnish $25,000 ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have nothing to do with the Grand Trunk Railway, our deal is a straight deal with the town.

Mr. SPROULE. Have you made provision that in the event of this expenditure going on and you furnishing a certain depth of water, the town shall give $25,000 ?

Mr. TARTE.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Certainly, that is our agreement.

Mr. FOSTER. When do you propose to have it finished ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The chief engineer tells me it will take two more seasons to complete. The work is going on in a very satisfactory manner.

Mr. WALLACE. This contract is for $144,000 to complete. Some further work takes $100,000 more, as I understand the Minister ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It has been proposed to us to give an additional depth, and that additional depth would cost over $100,000.

Mr. WALLACE. How much will that give ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It will give 20 feet. That is all that is proposed in addition.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to say with regard to that harbour that it is a very important one, and if they had the proper depth of water they would do a much larger business than they can do at present. It is always a great hardship to people in any part of Canada when, by their enterprise and knowledge, they prepare to do a large business, and find themselves unable to do it for want of proper accommodation.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I quite recognize the great importance of Collingwood harbour, having visited it myself. I am glad to see that the people of that town have given evidence of public spirit in contributing so much money for this work. I shall be only too glad to do everything in my power to help them promote the progress of their town.

Mr. FOSTER. Was the work consecutively and diligently looked after last season ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, no breaks.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What was the extent of the work carried out during last season ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. 37,000 cubic yards were excavated last year; the amount paid was $20,000.

Rainy River—Improvement of navigable channel $15,000

Mr. FOSTER. No doubt the hon. gentleman is aware of the condition of Rainy River at the present time, and that navigation is practically at a standstill.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. I understand that four or five steamers proceeded to their first trip,

with provisions, machinery and passengers, and it was a cause of the greatest moment that they should find their way up the Rainy River. They, however, found it impossible to make the trip. I do not know whether the hon. Minister has been dilatory during the past season or not, but I wish to put before him, as strongly as I can, that the development of the district is absolutely dependent on the speedy betterment of Rainy River.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That work has given me great trouble and anxiety. Mr. Lafleur made a survey some years ago. Last year I sent Mr. Fraser there with a view to carrying out the necessary improvements. The engineer has reported that by dredging and removing rocks, we might possibly decrease the depth of water instead of increasing it. It was suggested that the most feasible system would be to build a dam, but when the cost was estimated at $100,000, I thought the matter over a little. This morning a deputation from Rat Portage waited on me and made representations similar to those put forward by my hon. friend. I resolved to send Mr. Fraser back there, and he will leave to-morrow. He will have in his service practical men, and he has instructions to make everything in his power so as to give the best service possible during the season.

Mr. FOSTER. Is he going to make another examination and report, and to further dilly dally ? These miserable engineers are continually reporting, and one tears up the report of his predecessor. A man with a business head and possessing authority and power could put the matter into shape at an early day ; but the engineers report and report, and every one, as I said, tears up the report of his predecessor. The Minister will have to decapitate a lot of the engineers, and send up some men with common sense and have the work done.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have seen Mr. Fraser and given him instructions. I think he will be able to give good navigation to a depth of four or five feet during the season. I may add that the deputation, which was composed of leading men, agreed to the measures I suggested.

Owen Sound Harbour—Dredging, &c.... $10,000

Mr. SPROULE. What is the condition of the work ?

Mr. WALLACE. Why is there only $10,000 in the Estimates in this case when $30,000 appears for Collingwood harbour ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think possibly the Supplementary Estimates may supply the deficiency.

Mr. WALLACE. I know something of the promises made by the Government in regard to this work at Owen Sound, and I do not think they are fulfilling those promises. Perhaps, however, the Minister of Customs is satisfied with the amount.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not see any item in the Estimates for the dry dock promised at last election, which work was to give employment to so many poor men. I remember walking with some friends of hon. gentlemen opposite who were speaking of the active time that would prevail while building the dock, and the number of men that would be employed. I have been watching from year to year to see if any item would appear in the Estimates for this purpose, and the people of Owen Sound have been watching, too. Could the Minister of Customs state when this item is likely to be forthcoming ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The Minister of Customs has enough to do looking after his own department, and I think I can attend to the public works. I quite recognize the great importance of building a dry dock on the lake. The hon. gentleman should not, however, insist on the Government spending too much money at one time. We require to do the right thing at the right time.

Mr. SPROULE. If the hon. gentleman had taken the money spent in the elections and expended it on a dry dock, it would have been built years ago.

Mr. HAGGART. What is the cost per cubic yard of the work at Collingwood and Owen Sound. I see at Collingwood it is about 55 cents per cubic yard.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. For the Collingwood work we gave a straight contract to Boon & Armstrong, of Toronto. At Owen Sound we are dredging with hired dredges, as was done under the late Administration.

Mr. SPROULE. Hiring dredges by the hour ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, as before.

Mr. SPROULE. Who own the dredges there now ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The Owen Sound Dredging and Construction Company.

Mr. SPROULE. Does the Minister know the dredges that are employed ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not remember the name of the dredge, it belongs to the company. It is the same dredge that was hired under the late Government and has a capacity of 1,000 yards.

Mr. SPROULE. There are two dredges belonging to that company, No. 4 and No. 9, and if you are hiring No. 4 dredge at $20 an hour you are throwing away money.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We are paying $8 an hour the same as was paid by the late Government.

Mr. SPROULE. How many cubic yards do they dredge in a day ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Between 800 and 1,000 yards a day on an average. The dredging there last year cost between 12 and 14 cents a yard.

Mr. SPROULE. If my memory serves me, I figured it out that it cost 18 cents a yard.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Fourteen cents was the highest last year.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Tarte) stated that there were 37,500 yards excavated at Collingwood last year and there was expended $20,000. If that be so, it cost over 50 cents a yard.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In Collingwood the work is done by contract. When I came into the department Boon & Armstrong's tender was in, and it was so low that the chief engineer had reported against it, and the Minister did not give out the work. I decided that, provided Boon & Armstrong could give me proper security, I would give them the work at the price which was previously considered too low.

Mr. HAGGART. Is the contract let at a fixed price per yard ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We are giving a bulk sum for the whole work. At Owen Sound the dredging is in sand, but at Collingwood it is solid rock or hard-pan excavation, and is very different.

Mr. HAGGART. I was correct in my statement that you were paying 50 cents at one place and 14 cents at the other.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There can be no comparison made between the work done at the two places.

Mr. SPROULE. It may be said, in justice to the Minister, that the excavation at Collingwood is shale rock in some places and solid rock and hard-pan in others. As the contract is let at a lump sum, and if the contractors are responsible parties and do the work properly, I suppose it does not matter the cost per yard.

Toronto Harbour—Works at eastern entrance, &c..... $20,000

Mr. CLANCY. Is that work done by contract or day's work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The dredging work is done by a hired dredge for which I am paying $8 an hour under the same conditions as the work was done by the late Administration. The other work has been carried on by day's labour, under the direction of an old officer, Mr. Temple, and I think the work is very successfully carried out by him.

Mr. CLANCY. I want to ask whose dredge is engaged and whether the person having the contract last year is the owner of the dredge. Is the same person engaged this year and upon what terms ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The same man, Mr. Phin, has been engaged and he has done very good work.

Mr. CLANCY. Is Mr. Finn the owner of the dredge ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I cannot say. All I know is that I have hired the dredge from him and that he delivered the goods.

Mr. CLANCY. When did the Minister first make the arrangement with Mr. Phin ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My officers think the contract was made in July last, but I cannot give the exact date now.

Mr. CLANCY. When the contract was first made with Mr. Phin, was it for one year or more ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We entered into an agreement with Mr. Phin for the season, and I have renewed the contract for this year.

Mr. CLANCY. Was there any understanding last year that the contract was to be renewed this year ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There was no understanding. I told Mr. Phin last year that if he carried out the work in a satisfactory manner I would be glad to give him the privilege of continuing.

Mr. CLANCY. Has the Minister any application to do the work for less than $8 an hour or for a certain price per day ? I am informed the Minister has an offer to do the work for less.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I did not receive any offer.

Mr. CLANCY. Was such an offer made to the department by any person ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The officers tell me they did not receive any offer.

Mr. CLANCY. I understand that Mr. Phin is a varnish manufacturer of Brantford, and is not a gentleman who has any knowledge of that work at all. I am informed that he is not a dredge man in any sense, and did not own the dredging plant that was employed last year. The information I have is that this work was offered to be done this year by the dredges engaged last year at a very considerably less sum than what Mr. Phin is now getting. The hon.

gentleman says he does not know whether Mr. Phin was the owner of the dredge or not. Will he say whether the same dredges and scows are employed this year that were employed last year?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. As to whether Mr. Phin is a practical dredge man or not, does not matter much. He does not work the dredge himself; and provided I am supplied with a dredge suited for the work, I do not care whether the man who supplies it is a lawyer or a banker or a doctor. It is not the same dredge that was at work last year. My officers inform me that the dredge employed this year is the property of Mr. Phin but personally I do not know.

Mr. CLANCY. Now we have some information. The hon. gentleman was very innocent a moment ago as to who was the owner of the dredge, but at last we have found it was Mr. Phin. Perhaps he will be able to tell us who were the owners last year.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We do not know that.

Mr. CLANCY. Possibly there were other parties who would do the work for less, and the department is not bound to live up to a cast iron rule of paying six or seven or ten dollars an hour, when they can get the work done just as well and cheaper.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Any man who would offer me a dredge for six dollars an hour, with the experience I have, I would look upon with suspicion, because I would certainly conclude that the dredge was not a good one. I looked all over for dredges, because there were many calls made upon me, and was not able to find any good ones for less than $8 an hour. We have not received any other offer to my knowledge.

Mr. CLANCY. Supposing it was the same dredge. If the hon. gentleman paid $8 for the dredge last year, it must have been a good one, and he had no right to reject it this year. If it turns out that there has been any offer made to the department, whether wanting in form or otherwise, the hon. gentleman should not reject it, if it was more favourable than the one he accepted, and particularly if the same dredge was offered as did the work last year. The hon. gentleman would have to show, as a reason for his rejection of the offer, that the dredge had become worthless.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I can only repeat that no offer came to the department, to my knowledge. My officers tell me that they did not receive any.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the hon. Minister enunciates a very baneful principle when he says he will give the contract to any man for dredging, no matter whether that man be a painter or a doctor or anything else, and no matter whether he has dredging plant or not, because when a man enters into a contract, it is his business to furnish the dredge. We are told that the man who furnished this dredge is a painter and does not own any dredging plant, and it may be fairly assumed that he is not the kind of man to contract with for that kind of work. I am informed that the same practice is followed in Owen Sound. Men who owned the dredges and who could not get any work from the department, because they happen to be Conservatives, were obliged to transfer their dredge to other parties. Judge Barron, who was then in Lindsay, and Dr. Horsey, who was the defeated candidate in North Grey, entered into a contract with the Government to supply dredges, and then negotiated with other parties to obtain the dredges from them, and these other parties had to consent to this arrangement because they could not themselves get any work from the Government. The principle is radically wrong. It is not one that will be endorsed by any business man, and I am surprised that the Minister of Public Works, who is always so desirous of doing what is exactly right and straight, should have adopted it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I cannot see for the life of me what there is in the argument of my hon. friend. What does it matter whether the owner of the dredge is a lawyer or a doctor or a philosopher, provided the dredge is a good one and does the work well. I do not object very much to good Reformers offering me dredges. Our Tory friends had a very long day, and they must not complain if some of our friends have a little show now. I intend giving them a little show when I can. Of course when a good Tory offers me better conditions, I shall accept them, but all things being equal, I shall give the preference to a Reformer.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not object to giving the contracts to Reformers, but I do object to the Government, when they have to let contracts for public works, failing to take the ordinary precaution that every business man would exercise of ascertaining whether the party who tenders has the experience and knowledge necessary and the plant required to do the work. It seems to me that before the Government give a contract to any man they should ascertain whether he has the necessary plant, because otherwise he is liable to fail in his contract and the country will suffer. Take the present case. A man comes along who has no knowledge of dredging whatever or of any kind of public works, but whose life has been spent in painting, and he offers to take a contract for dredging a harbour, would it not naturally suggest itself to the hon. Minister that this man, who has neither the experience nor the plant, is not the proper kind of man

with whom to enter into a contract. If I am correctly informed, the parties who owned the dredging plant were obliged to part with it for whatever they could get, because the Government would not give them work, and that work was given to others, represented by whom? By Judge Barron, who was appointed under this Government, and Dr. Horsey, the defeated candidate for North Grey. And then it was said: There is no use in making an application unless the party who makes it is recommended by the member for the riding or some other prominent Reformer who satisfies the Minister of Public Works that he is a suitable party to do it. What would that mean? It would mean that no Conservative could be recommended, and that a Reformer would get the contract whether he had a plant or not. So the parties who owned this plant were obliged to part with it for what they could get, because they could not get work under the Government. I am informed that the same thing happens in Toronto where a contract is given to a painter who has no dredge and by whom the work is farmed out, while the parties who have the dredges cannot get the work to do. I would not object that a Reformer should be chosen in preference to a Conservative, other things being equal, but I do object to the choice being made as it has been made.

Mr. KAULBACH. I desire to inform the Minister of Public Works that I think his memory is a little defective—he will pardon me for saying so. Last year I made an application, and the year before that, and the year before that, and I do not know for how many years previous to that, for a dredge to be sent to the harbour of Lunenburg and two other points in my county, the La Have River and Mahone Bay. These places need dredging very much indeed. The harbour of Lunenburg particularly needs it. And I venture to say—and I challenge contradiction—that there is no harbour of equal importance so much in need of dredging as the harbour of Lunenburg. We have belonging to that harbour alone over 100 vessels, and, belonging to the county, we have upwards of 300, and a finer class of vessels cannot be found. But very often shipping is prevented from coming to said harbour of Lunenburg because of the lack of sufficient depth of water. Now, I think I am not making an unreasonable request when I ask the Minister to remember the applications I have made and now repeat by way of reminders. I think that the Minister will surely not fail to give us the use of the dredge this season. I think I am safe in saying that Yarmouth has the use of a dredge every year. That harbour might be in a position to claim the dredge on the principle of possession being nine points of the law. My hon. friend from Yarmouth (Mr. Flint), I think, will endorse my views in every particular. There is not a port, outside of Halifax that has a larger quantity of shipping or a larger number of vessels or more urgently needs the service of the dredge than Lunenburg. I hope the hon. Minister will not look upon my appeal otherwise than as an honest one, that he will not look upon it with political feeling—I know that does not actuate him as far as I myself am concerned, at least I venture to assume that, and I think I am right in saying so. I trust he will grant the request I reasonably make which he will see is simple justice.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Kaulbach) knows me well enough, I am sure, to know that my memory is not short. But I may tell him to remember that dredges are short. In Nova Scotia I have only three dredges, and I have here a list of twenty-five places requiring dredges.

An hon. MEMBER. Get more dredges.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. But when I ask for money for more dredges, hon. gentlemen find fault with me for that.

Mr. FOSTER. Maybe Mr. Phin has two or three more dredges.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. He supplies good dredges.

Mr. FOSTER. They usually keep them on hand in tailor's shops, you know.

Mr. KAULBACH. I think I have the floor, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Bain). I would remind the hon. gentleman (Mr. Kaulbach) that this is an item for Toronto harbour.

Mr. WALLACE. We have heard from the hon. Minister of Public Works that it does not make any difference who comes along and wants work, the only qualification for getting it is that he must be a good Reformer. I think the Minister of Public Works might recollect for a moment that he is the servant of the people of Canada and not their master just yet. Though they may have seemed to endorse the policy that business is business, but they will have a reckoning with these gentlemen before very long. What are the facts? Last year the Minister of Public Works had a dredge at work that he said was doing effective work. They paid $8 per hour. They could have engaged an equally good dredge at $6 per hour. Did they do so? No, Sir, they gave the contract to this Mr. Phin, who has no dredge, agreeing to pay him $8 per hour. Why not adopt the principle that should be adopted in all public works, of letting out this work by tender and contract? If the Government can get the work done at $6 or $5 per hour, why should they not take advantage of these prices. But, no, Sir, Mr. Phin is a valuable member of the party and subscribed liberal-

ly to election funds and the work must be given to him although, as in the case of Owen Sound harbour quoted by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), others who have dredges are refused employment.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. They were not refused employment.

Mr. WALLACE. They were refused.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I say they were not.

Mr. WALLACE. I know what I am talking about.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not think so.

Mr. WALLACE. But the Minister of Public Works does not know what he is talking about. These men were refused employment. They had to dispose of their dredge to a combination of politicians who held the contract and simply farmed it out. This man has to do the work and the politicians get a large percentage, a good many dollars a day out of it. The Minister is doing the same thing in Toronto, and, no doubt, every place else where this department has to spend a dollar.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am glad to see my hon. friend (Mr. Wallace) so full of virtue. I have known him for a long time, and always as a supporter of the late Government—except when he was kicking. Sometimes he kicked hard, He was a virtuous man, no doubt, in past days. Of course, all the dredges hired under the late regime were hired in the same way and at the same prices as now.

Mr. WALLACE. Not a bit of it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, every bit of it. I know all about it. No tenders were asked and no contracts given, but my hon. friend did not show such indignation then.

Mr. WALLACE. Will the hon. gentleman permit me to tell him that Toronto harbour was let by contract.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The dredging was let along with the other work.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh; take it back.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will not take anything back. The hon. gentlemen were very willing that this system should be carried on under their own regime.

Mr. HAGGART. Business is business.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, but the business of the hon. gentlemen is getting smaller every day. If he goes on the same way, if he is here during the next Parliament, he will be even smaller than he is now. But, coming back to the point at issue, I desire to say that Mr. Phin is supplying me with a first-class dredge. The only crime that hon. gentlemen find in him is that he is a good Reformer. That is no crime. Provided the dredge is a good one, I do not seek to learn whether he is a painter or whether he is as good a doctor as my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule). If that hon. gentleman gets a dredge and comes to me to get work for it to do, I will not ask whether he is a doctor or not. The person has nothing to do with it any more than the clerk has to do with the goods he sells—the customer judges by the goods. As I say, Mr. Phin has done good work, and I will not refuse him work because he is a Reformer.

Mr. SPROULE. Either I am wrong or the hon. Minister is wrong. The information I have, and it comes from a party who owned the dredges, is that, after reconnoitering down here as to whether they could get employment for their dredges or not, they came to the conclusion that they could not; but that this employment would go to some Reformer recommended by the member for the riding. We all know who he is—the hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson). These gentlemen had this plant on their hands and, believing they could not get work owing to their being what they were—they were not active politicians but they were Conservatives—they were obliged to part with it at what they believed to be a very much reduced valuation, and it was passed over to friends of the Government who could get the work, and who got this contract. The defeated candidate for the riding, Dr. Horsey, and Mr. Barron, who was then a very active politician, was up there and some other Reform friends, who took over this plant, but they would not have taken the plant were it not for the fact that the parties who owned it could not get the dredging and, therefore, were obliged to part with their property.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I never declined to give them the work.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not know whether he did or not, all I know is this: My information is to the effect that after coming down here and trying to find out whether they could get the work, they went away under the impression, from whatever source, that they could not get the work, and, therefore, they disposed of their plant. Now, with regard to the other feature, I repeat that in my judgment the duty of the Government, whenever they have public works to give out, is to ascertain whether the men who tender are able to do the work properly, otherwise they must expect trouble. Suppose a man proposes to take a large contract from the Government to build a railway, what should the Government do? Ascertain whether that contractor has the ability to carry out the contract, whether he has experience, whether he has the plant,

because if not, although he may put up a deposit, the Government may expect trouble; therefore, they would not be justified in giving a contract to that man. Now, can it be expected that a tailor or a painter is fit to take charge of a dredging job the same as a man who has been at it for a lifetime, or a judge, as in the Owen Sound case, or a lawyer who has never done anything in that line of business, or a doctor, as in the case of Dr. Horsey, whom I know very well, a very respectable man, but who has no knowledge whatever of contracting? This gentleman would not pretend to do any work of that kind were it not for the fact that his friends were in power, and he seems to have some pull which the Conservatives have not who own that dredging plant. Therefore, the plant passed to him, though at a reduced value, and the others who owned that plant are obliged to part with their property at a reduced value because they could not get the work. I say that is not fair. I do not mind any party favouring their own friends, other things being equal; but when they use the public money for the purpose of helping their own friends, without satisfying themselves that the parties who get the work are able or likely to do it satisfactorily, then the Government are acting on a very unsound principle.

Mr. McCLEARY. Not only can it be truthfully said of the Minister of Public Works that he is a modest man, but he is also a courageous man; because if he happens to do something in the interest of the public he takes credit for it, and when he does something that is questionable, he says he will do it again. This matter of the Toronto dredging is a subject that has created a good deal of interest in Toronto, among both Conservatives and Liberals. I am satisfied that if the Minister of Public Works will refresh his memory, he will find this matter has been before him on more than one occasion. He says he is short of dredges; I say he is a little short of memory this afternoon. From what I can learn of this transaction it stands in this way: Mr. Phin, who was a political friend of hon. gentlemen opposite, looking for some assistance from his party, thought that he ought to get the job of dredging Toronto harbour. Under the late Government that work was always done by contract, Murray & Cleveland having done the work as being the lowest tenderers, for years. Mr. Phin, who knows as much about dredging matters as a pig does about astronomy, as the saying is, gets a job for dredging Toronto harbour and is paid at the rate of $8 an hour for his dredge. It costs him to hire his dredge $19 a day, and I am informed that he netted every day last year something over $30 for himself personally, although he knew nothing about the work. Now, with regard to the Minister's memory again. When he says he has received no communication from other parties that they would do this work, I think he must have forgotten the fact, and if he would leave this item over he would be able to refresh his memory.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My officers here say they have not received any communication; I have not received any to my knowledge.

Mr. McCLEARY. Then there must certainly be a misunderstanding somewhere. Of course we have to accept the Minister's statement that he has not received any letters from any party offering to do the work.

Mr. SPROULE. Would the Minister tell us how many cubic yards they took out in Toronto?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Last year they took out between 700 and 800 yards a day; this year the dredge is of larger capacity, and they are taking out between 800 and 1,000 yards.

Mr. SPROULE. There is a little device that dredging men sometimes resort to whenever they want to show a good number of cubic yards taken out. When they get in a soft place they dredge down deeper than is required, and when they get in a hard place they do not go so deep; the consequence is that there is not a uniform depth, some places are high and others are lower. Is the inspector appointed by the Government or by the city?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In Toronto the work is under the immediate supervision of Mr. Temple, who has been on those works since their inception under Murray & Cleveland. The work is carried on all right.

Mr. HAGGART. There is a more serious objection than all this. When these hon. gentlemen were in Opposition they pledged themselves that if they got into power all these works would be let by contract. Here is an expenditure of $20,000 asked for during the year; how is it that they do not let it by tender as it had been previously let by the old Government? Mr. Jones at one time had the contract, and Mr. Murray had the contract for dredging the harbour at Toronto for so much per yard. When the hon. gentlemen get into power they farm out the dredging to their friends, to tailors and painters, at so much per hour. The practice is a vicious one. It may be necessary in some cases to let out the work by the day, where the dredge has to be moved from one harbour to another, and where there is only a small portion of work to be done, 500 yards or 1,000 yards. But here is a work going on continuously from year to year, and the only safe course for the Minister to take is to ask for tenders from every one in the country, and find out how cheaply he can get it done. Never mind if it costs money, the principle

adopted by the country is that every man has a right to tender for a large quantity of work like that in question, and if a particular individual can do it more cheaply than others, he has a right to obtain the contract. The principle is embodied in the Order in Council and in the statute, the latter of which makes it declaratory as regards works exceeding a certain amount. Certainly the Order in Council applies to work involving an expenditure of $20,000, and I suppose the work altogether will reach from $75,000 to $100,000, and there the principle is laid down that if the work exceeds a certain amount, tenders must be asked for and the contract given to the lowest tenderer.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend is altogether wrong when he says that some of the dredging work in Toronto harbour in past days was carried out by contract. Murray & Keefer had a large contract, not for dredging alone, but for building two large dredges. The work was given out by contract. But if the hon. gentleman will go back to past days he will find that under the late Administration a great deal of dredging was carried out in the same way as I am now carrying it out. We simply dredged the channel in Toronto harbour, and that could not be done by contract. The channel is filling, and Mr. Temple, an experienced officer, has charge of the work. I take issue with the hon. gentleman as to the question of principle. I say that public works are often better executed when carried out by day's labour than by contract, especially when there is an able engineer to superintend the work. That is obvious, for the engineer has no interest in making money out of a contract, but seeks to gain a reputation for himself. The labouring classes have approached me on several occasions already and asked me not to give out work by contract when it can be done by day's labour, and the labouring classes have to be taken into consideration. Starting from that standpoint, I say that whenever I find a work can be better carried out by day's labour than by tender and contract, I will adopt the former method.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). Does the hon. Minister lay down that as a principle for his future guidance ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). Will the hon. gentleman do so when he finds it better, in his own judgment, that it should be done by day's labour ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I would not say that by my judgment alone. The hon. gentleman is aware that an Order in Council was passed in 1880, which compelled the Minister to go to Council when he wants to do work by day's labour.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. Minister says he is doing this work by day's labour. Is he doing it by day's labour ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No.

Mr. FOSTER. That was the argument, however, the hon. gentleman used. The hon. gentleman now has spread himself on the broad bosom of the labouring class, as if he were conferring some great favour on that class. They have nothing to do with this work. What are the facts ? The hon. gentleman had $20,000 for dredging.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS Not for dredging alone.

Mr. FOSTER. How much for dredging ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I observe from my notes that the whole dredging was to cost about $24,000 on the several works.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, the whole dredging work was to cost $24,000. What would seem to be the plain duty of the Minister under the circumstances ? It was not an expenditure of $5,000, but a work involving an expenditure of $24,000. If any work was contemplated to be covered by the Order in Council, it was such work as this. The hon. gentleman did not call for tenders, but he hunted up some of his friends. Did the hon. gentleman give several of his friends the option of doing this work and ask them for their figures at so much per hour ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman has lost sight of the fact that in Toronto harbour we have not a straight contract for dredging to give out. We had certain dredging requiring to be done, work running over a whole season. The channel is filling up, and there is a certain amount of dredging to do to keep it clear. This could not be given out by contract ; it belongs to a different class of work. When I spoke of $24,000. I referred to the whole cost of the work.

Mr. FOSTER. We agree, at all events, that this is not a straight contract. The hon. Minister says he is doing it by day's work rather than by contract.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am doing it by contract.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. Minister states in one moment that he is not doing it by contract, and another moment that he is doing it by contract. The hon. gentleman has, however, entered into a contract with one man, and he did not call for tenders. The hon. gentleman has violated the spirit in which public works have been administered in this country for many years in not asking for tenders and not carrying the work out by contract. When the work reaches $5,000 the Minister has to go to

Council to be relieved of his responsibility, and this can only be done on one or two pleas, either that it is an abnormal work and cannot be done by contract, or that the work is of great urgency and necessity. Neither of these two claims is put forward in the present case, and while the hon. Minister may be doing the work by contract, he is not doing it by tender and contract. Suppose a gentleman from another country visits Toronto harbour. He looks over it and sees the vast amount of business that is being transacted, and he is told that the harbour is being completed by the Canadian Department of Public Works. If he should ask who is doing the dredging the answer given must be: a painter in Toronto. The inhabitant of another clime will be overwhelmed with wonder as to the business capacity of the Dominion Government, which when it requires a large quantity of dredging to be done in the harbour of Toronto, confers with a painter and gives him so much per hour for doing the work.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). But suppose the man is not a painter?

Mr. FOSTER. Will the hon. Minister tell us what the man is?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. He is not a painter, but is a large contractor.

Mr. FOSTER. He is a painter.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. He is a large contractor.

Mr. FOSTER. Contractor, what of?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Public works.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, now.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. And before. He is a member of a large contracting firm. I let the hon. gentleman go on, but I did not want the ex-Finance Minister to fall into the same mistake.

Mr. FOSTER. I think we have information just as good as the information of my hon. friend (Mr. Paterson). The fact is, this man is not a mechanic of any kind at all. He does not own a dredge. He is simply a man who has given extraordinary services of late to the Liberal party. He is a man who does not understand dredging himself, has no dredging plant and does not follow that kind of work. But, in order to reward Mr. Phin for his political services, my hon. friend (Mr. Tarte), without calling for tender, says to him: You can have the dredging at the old rate of $8 per hour? Mr. Phin takes the contract, and then he casts around him for some one to do the dredging and he gets hold of a man who does own a dredge, and he hires him to do the work. Both men make a profit. The man who has the dredge, and who works it is quite willing to do the work for the Government at the amount Mr. Phin pays him, for he would rather be paid by the Government than by Mr. Phin, but in that case you see there would be no farming out the work, and there would be no payment for political services rendered, and so Mr. Phin steps in as a middleman between the practical man who owns the dredge and does the dredging and the Government which pays; and Mr. Phin pockets a very neat sum per hour, and a very neat profit per day, and is in the way of richly recouping himself for what arduous services he has given to the Liberal party. Does my hon. friend (Mr. Tarte) stand up here to-day and justify that system before the country? Is that the way he is going to carry out the public works of this country? There are Ministers in the Cabinet who do carry out the spirit of the law, and do carry out the traditions of government, and when they have $15,000 or $20,000 to spend they ask for tenders and give the work by contract. Take the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright), for whom I believe my hon. friend (Mr. Tarte) some time ago professed a very ardent friendship; went so far as to write a letter in the public press in which he eulogizes the Minister of Trade and Commerce, in which he declares that the world does not rightly judge the Minister of Trade and Commerce, that they had an idea that the Minister of Trade and Commerce has been morose, and a little sour, and a little on the off-side of humanity; and the Minister of Public Works has got at the soft heart of the Minister of Trade and Commerce and finds that the milk of humanity bubbles warm and plenteous from him. Now, if the Minister of Trade and Commerce has a contract to give for a steamship service he does not go and find a tailor or a painter and say to him: for party services rendered I will give you so much for this contract and you can get a man who owns steamers to run it. No, he puts an advertisement in the newspapers, accepts the lowest tender, and the money is expended in that way. But the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) does not do that. Business is business with the Minister of Public Works. He picks out a good party man; he makes him farmer-general; he gives him a good, sound percentage upon every hour's work done, and the fact is that my hon. friend (Mr. Tarte) is giving to this gentleman (Mr. Phin) some two or three dollars an hour.

Mr. TAYLOR. Three dollars an hour clear profit.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Phin walks around; he does not supervise the job, for that is done by a Government inspector; he pays so much to the man who does the dredging and he pockets the difference. Sir, there should be no middlemen in this matter. My hon. friend (Mr. Tarte) should carry out business on business principles, as they are

recognized in the public policy of the country, and not the kind of business principles which that rather fresh and verdant gentleman propounded in the Montreal district, when he put upon paper that phrase now so notorious and renowned.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I never did that.

Mr. FOSTER. The public is very discerning, and it has fixed that phrase upon my hon. friend (Mr. Tarte), and it will always fix it on him.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) fixed it, but the other fellow who tried to fix it has been fixed in jail, and if we did not take him out he would be there still.

Mr. FOSTER. And the discerning public pities the poor fellow who went to jail, and has fixed this phrase on my hon. friend (Mr. Tarte).

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. And the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster), in spite of fixing it, has not been able to make much progress in Quebec. In every county in which I have met him, he has been licked out of his boots, on the very principle that business is business, politically speaking.

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

After Recess.

LAKE BENNETT AND KLONDIKE RAILWAY AND TRAMWAY COMPANY.

Mr. HAGGART moved that the amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 31) to incorporate the Lake Bennett and Klondike Railway and Tramway Company, be concurred in.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I think that it would be as well that this should stand, if the hon. member is not particularly anxious that it should be dealt with at once.

Mr. HAGGART. No; I thought it was only a matter of formally concurring in the amendments.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There is one amendment made by the Senate which it would be scarcely possible to concur in.

Mr. HAGGART. Let it stand.

Mr. SPEAKER. The order stands.

MONTREAL ISLAND BELT LINE RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. BELCOURT moved that the amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 105) respecting the Montreal Belt Line Railway Company, be concurred in.

Mr. SPROULE. What are the amendments?

Mr. BELCOURT. Subsection 2 of section 1 is amended. The section originally read "A duplicate of the said deed of sale, duly ratified and approved." The words "duly ratified and approved" are struck out by the Senate. In section 5, subsection 1 of section 22, the last words "towards the St. Lawrence River" are struck out by the Senate. In subsection 2 of the same section, after the word "section" in the last line the words "of this Act" are added by the Senate, and this is done to prevent misunderstanding, because the word "section" is used both as referring to a section of the road and a section of the Act.

Amendment concurred in.

TORONTO AND HUDSON BAY RAILWAY COMPANY.

On the Order for consideration of amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 77) to incorporate the Toronto and Hudson Bay Railway Company,

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). There is a section added which appears to make a material change, and as it affects a number of sections in the Bill, I think it would be as well to let this Order stand until we can consider the amendments more fully.

Mr. SPEAKER. The order stands.

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 147)—from the Senate—for the relief of James Pearson—on division.—(Mr. Sutherland.)

SUPPLY.

The House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Toronto Harbour—Works at eastern entrance, &c..... $20,000

Mr. CLANCY. What was the date of the renewal of the contract had last year for the dredging with Mr. Phin?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It was renewed last month. I may say that I followed in this case the precedent set by the late Administration. I have got a list of some of the dredges hired on the same conditions. The "Nitsdale," owned by Mr. Cameron, was hired for ten or twelve years on the same condition, $8 per hour. The "Arnoldi," a dredge owned by Allan & Fleming, was hired for years at the same rate. The dredge at Port Arthur, which be-

longs to Marks & Macdonald, did a good deal of work at the Kaministiquia River at $8 per hour, although it was a very poor dredge indeed and did not dredge more than 200 yards per day. Also a dredge owned by Mr. McNamee.

Mr. CLANCY. If the Minister of Public Works were as apt to follow the good example of his predecessors as their bad ones, he would not have so many accusations brought against him. Would the hon. gentleman give us some further information as to the reasons why this work was let without tenders being called for.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I stated the case very clearly this afternoon. I said there was some heavy work carried out in Toronto Bay by Murray & Cleveland, and to build the jetties some dredging had to be done. The whole thing, jetties and dredging, was given by contract to Murray & Cleveland, and in this case I followed the precedent set by the late Administration.

Mr. CLANCY. Then we do not understand that the work was more difficult, but the same class of work as has had to be done in other cases.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I did not say that the work was more difficult but that, so far as Toronto was concerned, it was of a different character.

Mr. CLANCY. I understood the hon. Minister to say that the dredges used for last year dredged from 800 to 1,000 yards per day.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No; I said last year the capacity of the dredges was between 700 and 800 yards, while this year we have a better dredge.

Mr. CLANCY. Are we to understand that this year more work will be done at $8 per hour owing to the increased capacity of the dredges?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC W[illegible]S. I am so informed.

Mr. CLANCY. These dredges, employed at $8 per hour are supposed to be of a certain capacity.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is no fixed rule now any more than under the late regime. I stated this afternoon, and it is perfectly true, that I am hiring about the same dredges as before. Dredges are very scarce. If I could find more, in some of the provinces, I should be very glad indeed. Generally I do not think we have any dredges that are doing less than 700 to 800 yards a day.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. This afternoon the hon. member for East Grey worked himself up into a state of considerable excitement over work in Toronto harbour, but he did not seem to be well informed of the facts. He told us repeatedly that this gentleman whose name was under discussion was a painter.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Even if he were.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Yes, even if he were—but I would like to point out how little these hon. gentlemen know of the matter they criticise so severely.

Mr. SPROULE. If the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) does not want to misrepresent me, I may tell him that I said I had noticed the statement in the newspapers that this man was a painter.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Are we to understand, then, that the hon. member for East Grey consumes an hour or so of the time of the House making statements based upon newspaper reports? And, as to the newspaper report, I suppose that if it is shown to be wholly foundationless in one point it will be regarded as not very reliable in others. The hon. member for East Grey, in his criticism running over an hour said that this job had been let to a painter.

Mr. SPROULE. I did not criticise it twenty minutes. That is a stretch of imagination on the part of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson).

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The hon. gentleman said time and again that this work was let to a painter. That was the effect of his argument and I have no doubt that "Hansard" will show that that is the case, for I listened to the hon. gentleman very patiently. Then the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) made a tailor out of him, I think, and that is the line of criticism that has been followed. I have only to tell these gentlemen that the engineer of the department has a record of what is done every day by these dredges and the officers of the department are interested in seeing that value is got for money paid. At the same time I only point out that these hon. gentlemen, relying upon information as to this man's business——

Mr. SPROULE. Is he a painter?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Not to my knowledge.

Mr. SPROULE. I guess the hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson) does not know anything about it.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I have known him a great many years. How long has the hon. gentleman known him? I do not think he is a painter. Certainly he did not paint the hon. gentleman's face red this afternoon when he worked himself up into a state of excitement over this matter. I am not aware that Mr. Phin ever had a paint brush in his hand. I know that he is a member of a large contracting firm and has been connected with this kind of busi-

ness for months and years. I think the hon. member for Welland (Mr. McCleary), who sits beside the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule), will be able to give him some information about it.

Mr. McCLEARY. How many years has he been contractor ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I do not know. But it was some time before he undertook dredging. I think the hon. member for Welland will agree to that. If I am not mistaken, he is a member of a firm that had a very large contract in connection with the Sarnia tunnel. I believe that the hon. member was a member of a contracting firm that tendered—unsuccessfully, it is true, but still tendered—for some specially heavy work on the canals. I mention this to show that the gentleman has been connected with a contracting firm and that it is in his line to take contracts in connection with public works. When I have given the hon. gentleman that information, he will see how far wrong he was in his criticism based upon newspaper reports. And, if he was so wholly mistaken upon that point, the doubt may possibly enter his mind whether his other criticism was sound. I mention this to set the hon. gentleman right, as his objection seemed to be that this work had been given to a painter, he may feel easy in his mind to know the work had been given to a contractor.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not see that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson) has succeeded in enlightening the House very much. He says this gentleman is a contractor. But we find men now taking contracts who were not known as contractors before, but who now get the farming out jobs and so find it worth while to start business as contractors. The hon. gentleman seemed to think that I was wasting the time of the House in trying to elicit information. But he took up a good deal of time and gave us no information either about the contractor or about this job.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I gave correct information.

Mr. SPROULE. I fail to see where it came in. He discredited the reports of the newspapers. I said that I had seen the statement I gave in a newspaper and that if it was correct we might fairly call upon the Minister of Public Works to know whether he considered this a sound way of proceeding.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The hon. gentleman said that it was correct and proceeded on that assumption.

Mr. SPROULE. I emphatically deny that assertion.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I think I can disabuse the minds of hon. gentlemen opposite as to this man. As this discussion has taken place in Parliament, the public might get the impression that Mr. Phin was taking contracts and farming them out, getting work that he was not qualified to do or entitled to get. I wish to say most emphatically that this gentleman is well and favourably known as a man and as a business man throughout a wide circle. He is a man of good business ability and in good financial standing, quite responsible for his work and well able to perform it. If the other Ministers are as successful in getting men of the character of Mr. Phin, I do not think they will make a mistake in choosing them. This gentleman's people live in the adjoining county to my own. I am sorry that neither of the hon. members for Waterloo are present. I have no doubt that they, one on one side of the House and one on the other, would speak highly of this gentleman. As he has been connected with large works as my hon. friend (Mr. Paterson) has said, some of the largest in the province, under the large railway companies, and, I think, under the previous Government, he is a man who is quite entitled to tender for work and worthy to do work for the department so long as he lives up to the rules and regulations. He is thoroughly qualified and responsible for his work.

Mr. SPROULE. Did he own any dredges ?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. He must have owned dredges or he would not have taken the work.

Mr. SPROULE. I understand the Minister to say that he did not own them.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. My hon. friend ought to know that the firm of which he was a member owned a good deal of plant, and was in a good financial position. Whether a dredge belongs to that plant, I do not know. I am speaking of my own knowledge covering a number of years when I say that I do not know a young man in the country to which he belongs who is more favourably known than Mr. Phin. I do not know about the particulars of his business, he does not live in my constituency, but I do know that his reputation as a business man is of the best. Hon. members have been misinformed altogether if they have heard any information derogatory to the standing and character of Mr. Phin as a business man, or in any other respect.

Mr. SPROULE. Nobody said anything against his character, he may be the most respectable man in the world, we never questioned that. The contention we put up was this : There was a large amount of work to be done, and the principle heretofore followed has been that such work should be let by tender and contract. In this case tenders were not called for, the contract was given to a man, and the Minister of Public Works admitted he was not

aware that he owned a dredge. Therefore, I said that the work must have been farmed out. I also drew attention to the fact that a man who is taking a contract should be at least expected to own some plant suitable for doing work of that kind.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Provided he could get a dredge. What do I care who owns it.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman means to be extremely lavish with the country's money, perhaps more so than if it was his own. But I say that on business principles, if he wanted to save public money he should have called for tenders and let this work out by contract. I say nothing about the integrity of this gentleman, but my information is to the effect that he was not in the habit of doing this kind of work, that he did not own any plant for that kind of work, and we now learn that the work was done, not by contract, but by day's work. Therefore, we have to assume that the work was farmed out, and there was not as good value given for it as might have been obtained if it had been let by tender.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend has been supporting for 20 years, under a previous Government, the very system I am now following, and he never said a word against it.

Mr. SPROULE. If the hon. gentleman will take the trouble to inform himself, he will find that several times I objected to the principle I am now condemning.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman should have made a motion denouncing his friends for doing what he is now denouncing. He is now indignant because some Liberals have got a contract. My hon. friend must try and realize the fact that the Government has changed; Tories are no longer in power to give contracts to Tory partisans exclusively. In the past Liberal contractors could not get any contract. It is only the chances of war.

Mr. CLANCY. Hon. gentlemen opposite are not going to cover this up so easily. We have heard from the lips of the Minister of Public Works this afternoon that a considerable work has been let by the hour without giving a shadow of reason why the rule heretofore followed has been departed from in the case of the Toronto harbour. Before the committee passes this item, the hon. gentleman should give a reason why he has departed from the rule heretofore followed of letting similar work by tender. This dredging work there involves an expenditure of several thousand dollars, and the hon. gentleman has let that under pretext that dredges have been employed elsewhere by the hour, and that is all the excuse he is able to offer. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if it is the custom of the department to let a contract without inquiring whether the contractor owned the plant necessary to do the work. I care not whether the man be a tailor or a painter—and here let me say that it is no reflection upon a man to be a tailor or a painter. Either occupation is wholly respectable. But our contention has been that this work was farmed out to a man who had no personal experience and had no plant. What were the results? We had from the hon. gentleman this afternoon that the dredges were placed where they were supposed to take out from 700 to 800 yards a day. We find that this man only took out 571 yards a day, costing something over 14¼ cents a yard. Now the hon. gentleman is confronted with three things, to which I wish to draw the attention of the committee. One is that he either closed his eyes deliberately, or he forgot what his duties were when he was letting a contract, if he did not ascertain whether the contractor had a dredge or not. The next is that he has given no excuse for departing from the rule of letting work by contract rather than by hour's work. The next thing is that the work, instead of costing 10 or 10½ cents a yard, has cost something over 14 cents. Neither the hon. gentleman nor his friends can side track this matter by saying that we on this side of the House desire to reflect unfavourably upon any man in this country because of his calling in life. That was not the intention, as the hon. gentleman knows very well. Let me say to the Minister of Customs that a man may be silently a member of a contracting firm, he may have his money in it, he may be a painter or a tailor, and have nothing to do with the work.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. He was one of the most active members.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. He had possession of a dredge there.

Mr. CLANCY. He went and employed a dredge belonging to another party, but he owned none himself.

Mr. MAXWELL. Referring to the utterances of the hon. gentleman who has just sat down (Mr. Clancy), his contentions seem to be two: First, that the Department of Public Works had made a mistake in giving this contract to a man who was not supposed to own a dredge. I don't think there is anything particularly wrong in that.

Mr. CLANCY. That was not it at all.

Mr. MAXWELL. The hon. gentleman complains that the department did not make an investigation when they gave the contract, to find out whether this man had a dredge or not. I say the department has no business to inquire into that matter at all. If a man gets a contract for dredging he can easily get a dredge to do the work with. I know from experience that during

the reign of hon. gentlemen opposite it was very difficult for certain men to get a contract at all, hence there was no inducement for them to provide themselves with a plant because there was no possibility of getting employment. With respect to day's labour, I am very anxious to get hon. gentlemen opposite placed on record in regard to this particular point. I fail to see why it should be a crime for the Minister of Public Works to give employment in this particular way. I have no sympathy with contracts, nor with putting up a contract for tender, for I consider that course both detrimental to the department and to those who tender. I stand here thoroughly in sympathy with day's labour, and I believe it is desirable in view of all the facts of the case. So far as the working classes are concerned, they are practically a unit in asking the Government to have work done by day's labour instead of by contract.

Mr. CLANCY. I am sure the hon. Minister must be gratified to find shelter under the wing of the hon. gentleman who has just spoken. The hon. gentleman may play a Chinese role in British Columbia and another role here ; but I tell him that we have just as much light now as we had before he addressed the committee. What experience has he had in public works to be in a position to rise here and lecture hon. members as to what should be done ? He says that, according to his sweet will and pleasure, a certain course should be followed. That may be, but the hon. gentleman will not influence the committee much by that. I have not complained because the contractor did not own a dredge, but when in such circumstances a man is without a dredge and tenders for work, what does it suggest ? It suggests that the man is not acquainted with the character of the work to be done. He may farm it out. The case is one that requires explanation from the Minister rather than from the hon. member who has become his champion.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentlemen opposite are marking time. I do not complain, and I take it good-humouredly. I know what it was in the past and what it is now. I have not much to add to my former statement. Hon. gentlemen have referred to the contract held by Mr. Cleveland, but that is not parallel with the present case. Mr. Cleveland had a contract for certain improvements, and there was some dredging connected with the work. The fact as to whether a contractor owns or does not own a dredge is to me a matter of no importance. I consider the question one of the dredge, not of the man, and I would have been prepared to have taken another man who had the same dredge. Mr. Phin is a good man and has a good dredge. As to the method followed, I say it has been followed in past years. I have given the committee the names of several dredges that have been hired year after year on the same conditions, and in such work I am going to follow the same system.

Mr. HAGGART. Speaking of the job, to use the term of the Minister of Customs, I think it is a suitable one, the Minister of Public Works has said he is going to do the same thing again.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Why did you do it ?

Mr. HAGGART. The law is directory as to what course shall be pursued. The hon. gentleman says that this course has been pursued, and that is sufficient justification. I deny that we ever came down to a bald proposition of this kind when the work was known to amount to $24,000, and it would appear as if there were some other circumstances involved. Under the late regime the work in this particular harbour was let by contract, and the hon. Minister knows it. He says, however, there is a distinction between the work now being done and that which was formerly executed. I deny it. The hon. gentleman stated that this dredging was of a particular character, and was really special work, and was connected with dredging foundations for some cribwork. What difference is there between that work and the work done by Jones, Cleveland & Murray in connection with the harbour work ? The hon. gentleman said they could not find out the exact quantities of the work, because the bottom of the harbour was shifting. Was it not shifting in the other case ? The hon. gentleman must remember that it is not justification to plead the action of a previous Government. The excuse he gave was that the dredges required to be moved from place to place, that there was a small quantity of work to be done at one place and perhaps a larger quantity at the other. But the hon. gentleman does not venture on an excuse of that kind, but he states boldly that the late Government did it in the past and he intends to continue the system. That is no answer, however, to make to this committee. There must be some excuse shown for hiring dredges from day to day to carry on the work in the harbour, and no excuse has been offered in this case. This is a direct and palpable violation of the law. How the Minister of Public Works secured the passage of these expenditures by the Auditor General, I cannot understand. There is one way in which he can secure it. He proposes to make a report to Council and get the authority of Council to override the Auditor General. It will be time enough to talk in this way when he gets the authority of the Governor in Council, but he should remember that he is not supreme. The hon. gentleman takes under his patronage the Conservatives. He says he has not dismissed any Conservative from

office. He must remember that he is only, after all, a servant of the country, and that a poor Conservative has as many rights as any man in the community. The hon. gentleman appears to think that he is in the Cabinet for the purpose of protecting the rights of Conservatives. He is there to carry out the law, and not to do extensive work of this kind by day's labour. The accusation was made against the late Government that works of this kind were used as a means of corruption. We did not do work by day's labour if we could possibly avoid it. When the hon. gentleman has been longer in office, he and his colleagues will find that the proper course to pursue is to carry out public works by contract, and that a system of favouritism is injurious to themselves and to the country. The hon. gentleman, if he expects to get large votes of this kind passed by the House, must promise that when it is possible to carry out the work by contract, it will be done according to law and as the Order in Council directs.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman is evidently losing his memory, and I observe that hon. gentlemen opposite seem to be losing their memories daily. At Kingston during the last ten or twelve years the late Government spent between $6,000 and $7,000 a year in day's labour on work of the very same kind that we are now carrying on. If I were going to give a list of all the work done by day's labour by the late Administration, it would be a long list. In New Brunswick, right under the eye of the watchman of hon. gentlemen opposite, the ex-Minister of Finance, there have been hundreds of thousands of dollars spent on day's labour without tender and contract. The customs house at St. John cost $200,000 by day's labour, and yet hon. gentlemen opposite rise in indignation and state that I am doing a wrong act. I am doing just what it is necessary to do. If we had enough dredges I would only be too glad to work them, but not owning dredges I do not find any better mode than the one followed by the late Government.

Mr. FLINT. I charge the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) with evading the great issue which was raised in this debate by the hon. member (Mr. Sproule) and the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy). Why should we get down to the paltry question as to whether this work should be let by contract or day's labour, when these hon. gentlemen raised the great issue as to whether the contractor was a tailor, a tinker, or a painter ?

Mr. SPROULE. Not at all.

Mr. FLINT. That is the great issue before us and the ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart) should not draw away the attention of the House from that important phase.

Mr. HAGGART.

Another great issue raised by these hon. gentlemen was that the Minister of Public Works, before accepting a tender, should know all about the man who tenders, not only his occupation in life, but as to whether he owns the plant or not. The emphasis with which the hon. member for Bothwell dwelt on that point shows the importance which he attaches to it, and I trust the committee will not be drawn away into side issues by the ex-Minister of Railways. As to whether this work should be done by contract or day's labour, the answer of the Minister (Mr. Tarte) will suit for the present, for if any great reform is to be introduced in the prosecution of public works it should be settled by formal resolution of the House, so that the whole question can be considered in the light of the history of the past and the practice of the present. The Minister has stated that this work has been done according to the practice in vogue when he entered office, and the hon. gentlemen opposite should be the last to make any criticism in that respect considering the large number of bad examples they have given, despising the very noble and exalted principles just announced by the ex-Minister of Railways.

Mr. CLANCY. We are obliged to the hon. member (Mr. Flint) for lecturing us, but I think the House will conclude that he knows as much about this question as he does about Yarmouth bloaters. The fact is that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Flint) has been asleep and he does not know what has been transpiring. The Minister of Public Works has not answered the question raised by us when we charged him with not being able to give any reasons why he departed from the rule of letting this work by tender. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Tarte) laughs, but his laughs and sneers do not answer the question, and they do not go for much in this House. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Tarte) stated this afternoon, as recorded in "Hansard," that these dredges were supposed to do 700 or 800 yards a day for the $8 an hour. Let us see what answer the Minister previously gave to a question of this kind. On the 14th February last, page 502 of "Hansard," Mr. Clarke asked :

1. What sum was expended by the Government in 1896 and 1897, respectively, for dredging in connection with the works for the protection of Toronto harbour ?
2. Was the work of dredging awarded each year by public tender ?
3. What was the price paid per yard for dredging in 1896 and in 1897, respectively ?
4. Name and address of the person or persons by whom the work of dredging was done in each year ?

And the Minister of Public Works answered :

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). 1. Nothing expended in 1896 for dredging in Toronto harbour. In 1897 the sum of $5,310.26 was expended. 2. The work was not awarded by

public tender. 3. The price paid the contractor was at the usual rate paid by the department for work of that kind, namely, $8 per hour actual working time. The contractor worked from the 29th June to the 26th November, dredging 37,214 cubic yards, the cost per cubic yard being 14½ cents. 4. W. E. Phin, Brantford, Ont.

Why does not the Minister tell us the reason that these dredges only got out slightly over 500 yards per day, when he says they should have got out 700 or 800. It was only a supposition that they should do that much work, because, as a matter of fact, Mr. Phin got $8 an hour of ten hours a day for putting out slightly over 500 yards. If the Minister (Mr. Tarte) cannot set up any better defence than that made by the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint) he will have some difficulty getting his estimates through this House.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. How does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) figure that out?

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Phin was paid $8 an hour for ten hours a day, and the work done according to the statement of the Minister amounts to 14½ cents per yard. The number of yards taken out was 37,214 and the sum paid $5,310.26, which is over 14 cents a yard.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. What I said and what I meant to say was that the dredge had a capacity of between 700 or 800 yards, but any man who has experience knows that a dredge does not do the same work every day. One day a dredge would do a great deal of work, but the next day when it got to more difficult material it would do less. I think my hon. friend will agree with me that 14 cents a yard is not a very high price. He will remember that the Connolly contract in Quebec was 35 cents a yard, and 14 cents is very cheap.

Mr. CLANCY. What did Murray & Cleveland get?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. They got 12 cents a yard.

Mr. HAGGART. And it was a very good price for that sand dredging. It does not cost more than 10 cents. Does the hon. gentleman say that the late Government built the St. John's custom house by day's labour?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. HAGGART. The Minister is mistaken.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am not mistaken.

Mr. HAGGART. The St. John Custom House was burned and the Minister brought down an estimate to the House of the amount that would be required to repair it. The chief engineer of the department furnished an opinion to the Minister which he read in the House, to the effect that is was impossible to know exactly what work would be required and to draw out specifications of the work to be done. When he got his vote, he said that he intended to repair the walls and put a roof upon the building by day's labour.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman's Government spent $74,983 in 1889-93 by day labour in St. John.

Mr. HAGGART. He got the authority from Parliament.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. But he did it by day labour.

Mr. McDOUGALL. But not until he got the authority of Parliament.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In 1893-94 the late Government spent $113,000 by day labour again on the same building, and I have here a complete list of all the work done in the past by day labour. Hon. gentlemen opposite carried out works by day labour to a much greater extent than I am doing.

Mr. McDOUGALL. The hon. gentleman must remember that this precedent does not apply. In the case of Toronto Harbour, he was bound by statute to let that work by tender; whereas in the case of St. John's, before a dollar was spent on day labour, special authority was got from Parliament, and that authority was given because it was found impossible to make an approximate estimate of what it would cost.

Mr. SPROULE. The defence of the hon. Minister is that he has followed the precedents set by the late Government, and does not defend the principle. But when in Opposition he condemned that practice, although now in power he follows it. Two wrongs cannot make a right. If the practice was a bad one under the previous Government, it is equally a bad one now.

Mr. CAMPBELL. What about those who justified it in the past?

Mr. SPROULE. We are now dealing with the present, and if the practice was wrong in the past it cannot be justified now. With reference to what was said by the member for Yarmouth, it is evident that a man which is not possessed of the knowledge requisite to do certain work successfully, is not likely to be the best man to do it. The hon. Minister says that he did not know whether Mr. Phin had the dredging plant or not, but we have heard it over and over again given as a reason why lower tenderers were passed over and the contract given to higher tenderers, that the parties who put in the lower tender had not the plant or experience to warrant the belief that they could do the work successfully and the Government were afraid that they would be obliged to take the work off

the hands of these parties. I have always regarded that as a sound reason. Another reason given for refusing the lowest tender was that the parties did not put up a deposit as a guarantee that they would do the work faithfully. In this case, there was no deposit put up, and you have not even the other guarantee that the parties had the experience and the means of doing it. The Postmaster General has followed out carefully the principle of giving everything by public tender. He told this House that he cancelled nearly 300 contracts for carrying the mails, and he gave as a justification for his action that public competition had not been invited. If the principle is a correct one as regards the carrying of the mails, the contracts for which amount to about $100 or $200 each, it surely ought to be adhered to in a contract involving an expenditure of $30.000 or $40,000. The country is fully impressed with the opinion that when a large amount of work has to be done, tenders should be called for, and when the hon. Minister departs from that principle without having any special reason for doing so, he is taking a course which the country will not justify. How much has been spent up to the present on this work

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Since confederation $1,073,000, and before confederation about $25,000.

Mr. SPROULE. What amount will be required to finish it, and how long will it take ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The total estimate is about $80.000 outside of the groins that we had to build last year. We built two or three groins last year and will have to build two or three more this year. They will cost about $1,800 each. We have had a great deal of trouble in strengthening the two jetties, which were unfortunately built in quick sand, and that is the reason why we have been obliged to do so much dredging. We were obliged to dredge around the west pier because it is tumbling down, but my officers have found out a way of strengthening the work.

Mr. HAGGART. There was $20,000 expended last year ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. When these estimates were made the work was under contract to Mr. Luke Madigan for $50,999. Mr. Madigan did not progress very favourably, but we allowed him to go on and helped him as much as we could. But he ultimately gave up the work, and that is the position to-day. When my estimates were prepared, he had not given up the work and we estimated we would spend $23,000 this year, but we have spent much less.

Mr. HAGGART. Then you have not asked for tenders to finish it ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am glad the hon. gentleman has given me the opportunity to explain. When Mr. Madigan's tender was received, the chief engineer told me that the work could not be done for this amount. Mr. Madigan gave the Canadian Pacific Company as a reference, he having done work for them. After I had received information about Mr. Madigan I gave him the contract, in spite of the protest of my chief engineer who said that the tender was too low to enable the contractor to carry out his work. I visited the work that was under contract, and finding that it was not going on as rapidly as it should, I remonstrated with him. A few months after he gave up the work. I have letters from him dated 19th March and 23rd March, and also a certificate from his medical adviser, which I will show my hon. friend if he desires it.

Mr. HAGGART. No.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Poor Madigan is not in a position to carry out any work now. This is a case where the lowest tender should not have been accepted.

Mr. HAGGART. How much has the hon. Minister paid on progress estimates ? And has the department become responsible for payment for materials bought and for labour ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The total payments made to Mr. Madigan were $5,078. To assist Mr. Madigan in getting the material we became responsible for $1,963.63, making a total of $7,041.63. The value of the work finished by the contractor is $8,917.20. He has left materials on the ground to the value of $1,007.25. We have also security of $3.101, a total of $13,025.45. So, we are fully protected. He has left the work with $5,984 to his credit and we have claims for wages, $1,148.82, and for materials, $253. There are other accounts, but we are not responsible.

Mr. SPROULE. I can tell the hon. Minister that there are some accounts for labour that are not yet in.

Mr. HAGGART. The appropriation for 1897-98 was $53.000. The hon. gentleman only asks for $33,000 this year. This, I suppose, means that $20,000 has been expended.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend must not forget that these are our Main Estimates and were made some time ago, at a time when Mr. Madigan had the contract and we thought he would continue. Of course we will not pay that now.

Mr. HAGGART. I shall probably understand the hon. gentleman if he will tell me what he estimates the work will cost now.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I really cannot say. Mr. Madigan tendered

for about $51.000 in round numbers. He tendered too low, no doubt. The House was sitting when he gave up the work, and I have not been able to go fully into the matter. I will see what we can do when the House rises. This is one of the cases where the lowest tender should not have been accepted, and shows that the Minister should sometimes have more latitude than he has at present.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. Minister must see that when he comes and asks for a vote he should state how much is required to do the work. I presume that the $53.000 voted last year was the amount required to do the work The Minister says it is so, because the contract was in the neighbourhood of $51.000. I suppose the rest is for superintendence, and so forth ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Quite so.

Mr. HAGGART. In other words, $53,000. Now he comes down to $33,000, of which he states he has expended in the neighbourhood of $7,000, or perhaps a little more, including liabilities of $10,000 or $11,000, say $43.000. The House has a right to expect an estimate as to how far this $43.000 will go towards the completion of the work. The engineer must have given an estimate of the work. What was the amount he said would be necessary to complete the work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Perhaps the hon. gentleman would like to know the amount of the other tenders above the tender accepted of $50,999. These were the amounts of the other tenders: $66.840, $68.500, $69,831, $70,845, $73,794, $77.249, $88.491, $88.890, $90.000, $98.540, $99,450, $99,499, $105,900. So the hon. gentleman will see that the highest tender was just a little more than double the tender which was accepted.

Mr. HAGGART. First of all, you give us the amount required to do the work, then you have a statement of the amount required each year.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman will understand that it would not be in the public interest for me to give the estimate of my chief engineer.

Mr. HAGGART. I do not want anything that will be an information to intending contractors. But the hon. gentleman should ask for a general vote, and an amount to be expended this year. He should ask for a vote of $80,000, of which $33,000 is to be expended this year.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I I have no objection to giving personally to my hon. friend the information, but I could not give it publicly.

Mr. HAGGART. There is no need of that. Is he going to let this work by tender ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Certainly.

L'Orignal—Re-construction of wharf..... $6,000

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The work has being going on last year, and is nearly completed. There is a great deal of trade there.

Port Burwell—Improvement of harbour, provided interested parties expend a sum of $50,000..... $25,000

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I move that the words " provided interested parties expend $50,000 " be struck out.

Mr. HAGGART. Explain how it was that interested parties were going to give $50.000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. When I asked for that vote last year we expected that some parties from the United States interested in the coal trade, would share in the construction of the work, but they have notified me that they cannot do so. As Port Burwell is a very important harbour, I thought well to ask for this vote without any conditions. We have spent large sums of money on harbours which are much less important than Port Burwell.

Mr. HAGGART. I think this was a case where a coal company intended to make a terminus. They were building barges and large steamers on the other side of Lake Erie, and it was principally for their accommodation that this deepening was to be done. They were to have paid a large portion of the cost, and we were to supplement it by $25.000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I did not hear that they were building boats. At any rate they notified me that they could not go on and fulfil their pledges. This $25,000 will put me in a position to do the work. I want to inspect the place myself as soon as the session is over.

Mr. CLANCY. This is a considerable sum in view of a pledge by other parties to spend $50.000. This seems to be entirely disproportionate to sums that have been expended elsewhere. Could the hon. gentleman say if these parties are benefiting in any sense by the expenditure of this $25,000 ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That money was not asked for in the interest of private parties. We want to help build that harbour so as to facilitate the coal trade.

Mr. CLANCY. In the case of Collingwood Harbour, I think that when a vote was asked for last year the citizens of Collingwood, or some other parties, were to contribute a certain sum. Now, this is a parallel case. A departure in one case would be unfair to the other, and a departure in both

cases would not be keeping faith with the House.

Mr. CHARLTON. I may be permitted to say a few words in reference to the matter to which this vote relates, as this expenditure comes, not exactly in the riding I represent, but my riding is largely interested in the matter. Port Burwell has been one of the most important ports upon the north shore of Lake Erie, and the Government formerly exepnded a large sum of money there in improving that harbour, and they made a good harbour of it. The work had been allowed to fall into bad repair, and the harbour was not available for the use of a large class of lake craft. Aside entirely from any questions associated with this matter, the harbour of Port Burwell ought to be improved. That section of the Lake Erie coast has received very slight consideration from the Government, and this harbour is a public work of importance. It is peculiarly so now since the construction of a railway line from Port Burwell to Tilsonburg, connecting with an air line of the Grand Trunk Railway, and that line is being continued to the Michigan Central, and is nearly completed to that point. When completed, as it will be in a short time, it makes connection between Port Burwell and two of the railway lines of the peninsula of Ontario. It is the intention to continue the line further north to connect with the main line of the Grand Trunk Railway and with the Canadian Pacific Railway at Woodstock. The late Government promised a vote for the improvement of this harbour to the extent of $25,000, and the intention of that Government was to expend the money. It would have been a judicious vote, and the Government would have been fully justified in making the appropriation, and would undoubtedly have made it, had it continued in power. When application was made, after a change of Government, for this vote, the parties promoting the application were the gentlemen engaged in the construction of this railway line to which I have referred. A part of their scheme was and still is to establish a ferry of steamers carrying coal-laden cars, connecting the line terminating at Port Burwell with railway lines upon the south shore of Lake Erie.

Mr. HAGGART. What is the name of the port on the other side ?

Mr. CHARLTON. There was a proposition to connect at Ashtabula, another proposition to connect at Black River in the neighbourhood of Cleveland, and this point has advantages over any other point on the north shore of Lake Erie in respect of distance to these American coal ports. The parties promoting the road at that time expected to carry out their scheme of construction of these coal ferry steamers as well as the construction of the road, and were willing to have this condition made, that they should expend $50,000, the sum which was supposed to be necessary to make the coal slips and all appliances for carrying on this coal transfer business. Last summer the gentleman who was the soul of this enterprise and furnished most of the capital died suddenly, and his death disarranged to a considerable extent the plans of the company. They will be able to carry on their scheme beyond doubt, but it would be detrimental to their interest and to the public interest to suspend the work upon the improvement of the harbour itself ; and there is no reason why this vote should be made contingent for the time being on the expenditure of any other sum of money, because the harbour should be opened, and when it is opened these gentlemen can make the additional arrangements, which the death of the principal promoter render necessary to carry out the original enterprise. Aside entirely from the fact that this coal road terminates there, and is to be extended to Woodstock, the port is required as an outlet to Tilsonburg and other towns in the immediate vicinity, and is required moreover as a port of refuge, it being near the upper end of Long Point. I hope the item will be allowed to pass without criticism or contention, because I do not believe there is a single item in these Estimates so little open to criticism as the one now under consideration.

Mr. HAGGART. Have they built the boats for carrying over coal ?

Mr. CHARLTON. They are not building the boats now. I understand the promoters of the road from Port Burwell to Woodstock, which is practically completed to the Michigan Central road, are engaged in negotiating with Mr. Heinkoopin, who controls two boats there. The object is to induce him to put one of the boats on this route, and it is expected this arrangement will be consummated when the port is made ready for the reception of the boats.

Mr. HAGGART. What is the depth of water intended to be obtained ? Will the hon. Minister also state if he has obtained the assent of the Governor General to the alteration of this item, as it is virtually an increase.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am not asking any larger sum this year than was voted last year. So I do not think it necessary to obtain the permission of the Governor General.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman may not be asking more money, but the sum was granted last year under the condition that certain other partes would spend $50,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If I require to ask more money next year, I will obtain the assent of the Governor General.

Mr. HAGGART. The item last year was "$25,000, improvement of harbour, provided interested parties expend a sum of $50,000." I have not heard that the hon. Minister has obtained the consent of the Governor General to change the amount, which is an increase, because the condition is struck out.

Mr. CHARLTON. The expenditure of $50,000 was to be made for the purposes of the railway company, for building slips these being connected with the coal companys arrangement, which was entirely disassociated from the regular and legitimate work of improving the harbour for the admission of vessels. The two things were distinct. The object of the vote of $25,000 is to make the harbour and construct piers and slips required to carry on that particular branch of business in the harbour.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not think the point raised by the ex-Minister of Public Works is well taken.

Mr. HAGGART. How much money will be required to complete the work?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have not made up my mind in regard to the work. $25,000 were in the Estimates last year, and I ask for that sum now. I am going to visit the place and see what can be done.

Mr. HAGGART. Will the hon. gentleman bring down the Governor General's consent to-morrow?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If I want more money, I will bring down the Governor General's assent.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman should be able to give us an idea as to what the expenditure will be in the future. This may be a very necessary work, but it is a very unusual proceeding to vote a certain amount simply because it has been promised before. The committee has a right to obtain some further information.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. All our plans have been changed. Parties interested were to spend $50,000, and we were to contribute $25,000 for certain harbour works. There are certain improvements to be made in order to obtain sufficient depth of water at the wharfs. Before undertaking the work I propose to have new plans prepared, and will give my best attention to the matter.

Mr. CLANCY. As the hon. gentleman is going to change his plans, possibly he may be able to cut down the amount required under the changed circumstances. It is all very well for the hon. gentleman to make promises, but the committee cannot be expected to pass money votes based on them. It is much to be regretted that while the hon. gentleman admits that the plans will be changed, he is unable to state the probable expenditure. It is an unusual proceeding to ask votes of public money under the circumstances stated.

Mr. CHARLTON. I hope the hon. gentleman will not borrow trouble in regard to this matter. Here is a port on Lake Erie which requires to be improved. There is a new line there connected with two other lines of railway——

Mr. CLANCY. The point I was making was that the whole cost of the work should be stated. No one has raised any objection to the work proposd, which may be a very proper one. So the hon. gentleman will probably save time if he will not answer contentions which have not been put forward.

Mr. CHARLTON. It is estimated by parties interested that $25,000 will be sufficient to open the port. Probably if any further sum is requird, it will be a very moderate one.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman will give us his promise on this work, as on the others, that it will be let by tender?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is no doubt about that.

Thornbury—Repairs to wharf..... $1,000

Mr. WALLACE. I would like some explanation of this item?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This amount is to complete the repairs of the wharf, which were commenced last year. We have all the material on hand.

Mr. WALLACE. Is some dredging required there?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is dredging required to give 12 feet of water.

Mr. HAGGART. This seems a small sum. Why do you not take sufficient to do the work properly?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The engineers have reported this sum is sufficient.

Port Stanley, repairs to piers and dredging $11,000

Mr. HAGGART. Give some explanation of that.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This vote is required for the reconstruction of both entrance piers and dredging the entrance to the channel, and also in order to make a turning basin inside the harbour.

Mr. HAGGART. I hope the Minister will have this money spent and get the work done. It is the terminus of a railway and they are anxious to have it completed.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will. The city of London is much interested in it.

Mr. HAGGART. Will the work be let by contract ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My officers tell me that some repairs there cannot be done by contract. I suppose the main work will have to be done by contract, but I cannot pledge myself now as I do not know sufficient of the work.

Mr. HAGGART. What is the estimated cost ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. $16,000.

Mr. HAGGART. Surely that is sufficient for the Minister to get the work done by contract. Has the Minister any suggestion from the chief engineer for a new plan by which the harbour would be prevented from drifting up as it has done before ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Mr. Coste made some suggestion about changing the course of the river, but so far we have not come to that conclusion.

Mr. CLANCY. How much was expended out of last year's vote ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. $1,900.

Port Stanley—Assistance towards harbour improvements..... $10,000

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This vote is to grant assistance to the Lake Erie and Detroit River Railway Company to the amount of one-third the estimated cost of constructing a suitable slip. We did not pay it last year because the company did not go on with the work. When they do, the money will be paid.

Mr. HAGGART. What is the estimated cost of the slip ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. $30,000, and this is one-third.

North Bay—Pile wharf..... $15,000

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have asked for tenders but we have not adjudicated upon them yet.

Mr. HAGGART. What is the estimated cost ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Not more than $15,000. Tenders have been asked.

Meaford—Pile work and dredging..... $8,500

Mr. CLANCY. Will this amount cover the whole work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. A contract has been given to Mr. Sparling for $2,500, and the balance is requisite to extend the inner harbour by dredging from 13 to 14 feet at low water, from below the old bridge towards the new bridge.

Mr. HAGGART. I suppose you have a report in the department that this can be made a good harbour ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS Yes.

Mr. CLANCY. Does this complete the work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It will complete the work. It is by tender.

Lake Manitoba—Opening of additional outlets to prevent overflow of lake, and maintenance of same at proper level for navigation purposes..... $25,000

Mr. DAVIN. This requires some explanation.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The work has not yet been begun, but I intend going on with that work as soon as possible.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman has a curious way of expressing it. "Opening of additional outlets to prevent overflow of lake and maintenance of same at proper level for navigation purposes." It looks as if the hon. gentleman were afraid the water would get too high in the lake for navigation purposes.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. What my officers meant to say was that the lake overflows at certain times and covers the adjoining lands.

Mr. HAGGART. Then it is a work purely for local purposes—to regulate the overflow into the neighbouring country.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That is part of the work, of course. We want to construct works which will keep the water at a certain depth and improve the lake for navigation purposes.

Mr. HAGGART. How is the hon. gentleman going to do that and what is the estimate of the total cost ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I shall not spend a cent more than this. I have not made up my mind as to the process. Mr. Coste, my chief engineer, is away and I therefore cannot give as much information as I would like, but it is a work to which he has given his personal attention. This is only a revote from last year.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. Have any soundings been made in the lake. It is a very shallow sheet of water, and I know it overflows on some sides, especially the east side, but the question is if the water is taken away from the lake, will not that injure navigation instead of improving it. The water is very shallow, and the lake is not navigable except in the centre, and there are very few approaches where a wharf can be laid down

in order to facilitate navigation. The lowering of the water will be a mistake.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. The intention is not to lower the normal level of the lake, but the channel of the river has become closed up by boulders, which are carried in by the ice, and the channel of the outlet is silted up. The object is to make an additional outlet so as to maintain the lake at its normal level. There is no question of lowering the lake but of keeping it within proper bounds.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. The complaint is that it overflows, and the present work is to prevent this.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. If the lake is kept at its normal level it will not overflow.

Mr. HAGGART. But the hon. gentleman must understand that if you take obstructions from the mouth of the river to keep the lake at its normal level you will have to put these obstructions back again or have a system of locks or dams.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. The lake is a natural receptacle for the drainage of a very large section of country; and after a series of wet years, the number of rivers flowing into the lake being so much in excess of the outlet from it, the water accumulates in the lake, and the object is to make an additional outlet so that the extra water which flows in will be allowed to flow out. By taking proper precautions and not getting below the level of the bed rock, the water will be maintained at its normal level.

Mr. HAGGART. It will be a very nice job to dredge it so exactly at the outlet as to keep it at its normal level at all times of the year. It will be requisite not only to deepen the outlet but have some means of regulating the outflow by wier or dam.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The engieeer will settle that question.

Mr. HAGGART. When the hon. gentleman comes down for a grant, he should be in a position to give all the information required.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My chief engineer is away.

Mr. HAGGART. Then he should have left you a written brief.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman has had a whole year, and he is just as much destitute of information as he was last year. He has, therefore, no excuse as he would have if it were a new item.

Mr. HAGGART. That may lay over until immediately before an election, and the hon. gentleman may then get the work done by day labour. We must have his promise that he will not wait until an election and will not have it done by day labour.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will promise not to wait until an election comes on but go on with the work this year.

Mr. HAGGART. Here is $25,000 which he asks us to spend and which he can draw on at his leisure. He should be prepared with estimates and plans and everything before asking the vote. He must give us the promise that if he does expend this sum, he will invite tenders.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If I do the work at all, I will do it by contract.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Will the hon. Minister promise that he will keep his promise?

Resolutions to be reported.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright) moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. HAGGART. What will be the business on Monday?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The resolution concerning judges salaries, a few little Bills, and then the Estimates.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 10.15 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 23rd May, 1898.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

THE QUEEN'S BIRTHDAY.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved:

That when the House adjourns this day it stand adjourned until Wednesday, the 25th instant.

Motion agreed to.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 149) to authorize certain contracts with steamship companies for cold storage accommodation.—(Mr. Fielding.)

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 141)—from the the Senate—respecting the Great North-west Central Railway Company.—(Mr. Morrison.)

INQUIRY FOR RETURN.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I beg leave to call the attention of the Government to the fact that two weeks ago the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies), whom I do not see in his place, promised to bring down

a statement of the officials of the department in my constituency who had been dismissed. That promise was repeated on several occasions since, but not implemented, so far as I know.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). If the hon. gentleman (Mr. McDougall) will kindly send me a note of the matter, I will call the attention of the department to it.

THE QUEEN VS. SKELTON ET AL.

Mr. DAVIN. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to call the attention of the Government—though I do not see the Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in his place, to the fact that early in the session, I had an interview with the Minister of Justice respecting the case of the Queen vs. Skelton et al., and I told him that I understood that application was to be made to him for a new trial. He told me that at the time no application had been made. I asked him if I should be notified if the application was made, and whether I should have an opportunity to see the affidavits and if I should be heard before the Minister came to a decision. The Minister told me definitely that nothing would be done ex parte. Well, time passed on, and the first thing I heard after that was that Mr. Skelton had been here in Ottawa. Then I spoke to the Solicitor General about the matter. However, on Friday week I saw the Minister of Justice, and he promised to give me a copy of the affidavits. He told me then that he had had communications and that he would hear me. I said: What could I say unless I have the papers before me? He told me he would let me have a copy of the affidavits. I have never had a copy of the affidavits yet. I saw the Minister of Justice informally on the right of the Chair on Friday, and I said: I have not received a copy of those affidavits. He told me the papers had been mislaid, but now I should have them. Since seeing the hon. the Minister of Justice on the right of the Chair, I have received a telegram from Battleford saying that a new trial had been granted. I must say I feel I have something to complain of. However, what I want now is, before the Estimates of the Department of Justice are brought up, to ask the Solicitor General, or as he does not seem to be in his place, to ask the right hon. leader of the House (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) whether all the papers will now be laid on the Table?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I think my hon. friend (Mr. Davin) has been misinformed in being told that a new trial has been granted. I am not aware that such a thing has taken place, and I do not believe it has. The hon. gentleman asked me if the papers would be laid on the Table. I cannot give him an answer upon that point until I have consulted the Minister of Justice. I may say, however, that if the matter has been disposed of by the Minister of Justice, I can see no reason why the papers should not be laid on the Table. But the hon. gentleman will understand that if the matter is still open, I cannot say that the papers will be brought down.

Mr. DAVIN. I suppose that I should put the matter in this form: First, to ask whether a new trial has been granted, and if so, will the papers be laid upon the Table?

The PRIME MINISTER. I am not aware that a new trial has been granted, but I will inquire.

INQUIRY FOR RETURN.

Mr. GILLIES. I desire to ask the leader of the House, as I do not see the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) in his place, when the papers relating to the dismissal of Joseph McNell, Point Jérôme, St. Peters, will be brought down? The hon. Minister promised some time ago that they should be brought down, and I have had an intimation from an officer in the department that they are ready.

WESTERN ASSINIBOIA AND THE IMMIGRATION HAND-BOOK.

Mr. DAVIN. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to draw the attention of the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) to a portion of his hand-book, and, to put myself in order, I shall conclude with a motion. The matter to which I wish to refer is one of very great importance to the North-west Territories, as the House will see. If there is a misrepresentation of some of the most successful parts of the Territory appearing in the hand-book; "The official hand-book of information relating to the Dominion of Canada, 1897; published with the approval of Her Majesty's Secretary of State for the Colonies, by the Government of Canada," it will be seen to be a matter of great importance, and if there is such a misrepresentation it should be repudiated at the earliest possible moment by those who are acquainted with the facts, and I venture to say, by the Minister of the Interior himself, the moment he finds out what it is. I have a copy of the book here, and I read from page 84 where, under the prominent heading "Western Assiniboia," I find the following:—

The western two-thirds of Assiniboia is almost entirely composed of open plains, which, with the exception of the localities immediately adjoining the towns of Regina and Moose Jaw, and in the vicinity of the Wood Mountains and Cypress Hills, described more fully further on, are devoid at present of settlement, and unsuited to agriculture without the aid of irrigation. In the districts near Regina and Moose Jaw, and in the valley of the Qu'Appelle River, to the north of these towns, considerable settlement has taken place, but the success attending farming opera-

tions has not been encouraging. This portion of the district is on the borderland between the humid and arid portions of the Territories, and while the soil is of an exceptionally fertile character, the liability to drought renders grain-growing precarious, and owing to scarcity of water supply irrigation cannot be resorted to as an aid to crop production in the manner practised in other parts of the plains region. The vast extent of territory in this part of Assiniboia is broken in two places by marked ranges of hills which rise to a considerable height above the general elevation of the plains.

Now, Sir, for the moment, that is sufficient to read. But the hon. gentleman who is at the head of the Department of the Interior and who is familiar with the North-west Territories, must know that that is a most damaging as well as a most unjust represensation of the country from the east of Qu'Appelle station to the west for something like forty miles, of Moose Jaw. Last year, as the hon. gentleman knows, was a dry year as compared with other years. The precipitation of rain last year was not as great as usual; yet what is the fact as regards north and south of Moose Jaw, north and south of Regina and north and south of Qu'Appelle station, and north and south of Balgonie? In the region specified by this misrepresentation in the hand-book of the Department of the Interior some of the best crops in the whole of Canada were grown. It is here said that the success attending farming operations has not been encouraging. Why, Sir, I venture to say that we have some of the most successful farmers in the North-west Territories around Moose Jaw, north of Pense, near Stoney Beach, north of Regina and north of Qu'Appelle, and around Balgonie. In that district immediately around Regina, the farmers last year, in addition to what they banked at their credit for the purpose of setting out loans, have placed in the Montreal savings bank $100,000. I have here an account of the shipments from those points last year. We shipped from Balgonie, 131,214 bushels; from Moose Jaw, 220,233 bushels; from Regina, 135,177; from Qu'Appelle, 157,525—all in one year. I know as a fact that those farmers had not emptied their granaries when I got this report, which is that of the Canadian Pacific Railway. In addition to this amount of wheat you have the large amount that has gone to feed the people of those points. The shipments from those points amounted altogether to 644,383 bushels, of their own produce. Then, of general produce there were sent away from Balgonie, 77 tons; from Regina, 162; from Qu'Appelle, 174; total, 413 tons. It seems to me these facts demonstrate that this paragraph in the hand-book is a misrepresentation. Now, further, the writer of that paragraph is not aware evidently that the farmers in those regions had to learn how to farm. The system that is pursued in the east would not do in that part of the country. We admit that as compared with portions of eastern Canada, the country is dry, but after an experience now of fifteen years, we entirely deny that that part of the country is too dry for successful arable farming. Now, what is the secret of farming successfully in that portion of the North-west? The secret is summer-fallowing. Perhaps that word would be misleading to intending settlers in the North-west. An incoming farmer into the North-west Territories, in order to farm successfully, has to have June fallowing. June fallowing accomplishes two things. In the first place, it prevents the weeds seeding; in the next place, it keeps the June rains in the ground. If the hon. gentleman who is at the head of the Department of the Interior would go over every bit of this district, referred to specially by me, which is here pronounced unfit for arable cultivation, he would find the finest wheat fields ever seen, and side by side with these wheat fields, only moderately rich crops of wheat. If he asked the farmer who would be accompanying him: How is it that this field is ready to give thirty to thirty-five bushels to the acre, and other fields alongside will not produce more than twelve or fifteen bushels? The answer invariably would be: At first they used to practice summer-fallowing, but after a while it was found that if they had summer-fallowing, fallowing right into the fall, the results were not the same as when the fallowing had been done in June or July. Our farmers had not learned, if I may use such a phrase, the trick of the country, but now they are doing better. Then you can to some extent produce the same results as the precipitation of rain by keeping the snow from drifting; that will have the same effect as rain moisture. If the snow is kept from drifting, when the spring sun comes, instead of the sun striking on the land, from which the wind has swept the snow away, it melts at least a portion of the snow, because it must be admitted that a considerable portion of the snow, lying sometimes two or three feet deep—some of that will evaporate, but some of it will melt, and this moisture will go into the ground. The frost in many parts goes deep into the ground, and the rain that falls in the autumn is actually kept by that frost in the ground, and when summer time comes the roots of the crop are moistened, not merely by the rainfalls of that summer, but by the moisture that is drawn from below up to the roots. Now, if that description is true given in the hand-book, the best thing that can be done is to abandon all this region; but I know that the description is misleading, I know that it is not correct. The success of the rural farmers, the Browns north of Regina, the Carsses in Qu'Appelle valley, and others who have put in fifteen years of labour, prove that description to be incorrect. The Cullums, north of

Regina, made a clear profit last year of $10,000. These men are thus making money, their properties are to be seen with comfortable houses, with stables as fine as are to be found on the Model Farm. These same Cullums have as fine stables as are to be found in any part of the country. Now, such a description is depreciatory of the property of these people, and I bring it to the attention of the Minister of the Interior in order that it may be corrected. Whoever wrote that pamphlet was, in my opinion, quite misinformed. Then, there is the report of Mr. Dennis, in the blue-book of 1897. I have the highest opinion of Mr. Dennis as an engineer, and any one reporting as he does here as an engineer, would not controvert the position he is taking up, that is to say, he is writing as an engineer, as a scientific man, and is not supposed to take account of the agricultural conditions, because that was not his business. His business was, I suppose, to speak about the rainfall. That was his principal topic in a paper on irrigation. I want to point out, however, that this, too, is misleading and will have to be corrected, and it is not only misleading as regards those parts of the country to which I am referring, but it is misleading in regard to a large portion of Alberta. However, what I am chiefly concerned with is the hand-book, which has been circulated broadcast. I see that Lord Strathcona, our High Commissioner, refers to the fact of the book having been largely circulated in England and elsewhere, and I think this is the gravamen of the fault that the Department of the Interior has committed. I will call attention to what is in the blue-book. On page 24 we read :

> Commencing at the intersection of the International boundary with the second initial meridian (longitude 102°) and running thence northwesterly, following very closely the line marking the westerly limit of the bluff country and the eastern limit of the great plains proper until the South Saskatchewan River is reached about the north boundary of Township 33. From thence the boundary is deflected rather more to the north, crossing the north branch of the Saskatchewan River in Range 14 west of the 3rd meridian, and extending as far north as Township 50.
>
> From thence the boundary runs about thirty miles to the west, and thence turning to the south-west, runs in that direction to the north boundary of Township 30, in Range 27 west of the 4th meridian and from thence west to the Rocky Mountains.

This appears under the head "Boundaries of the Arid Region"; and within those boundaries both the Government and the Canadian Pacific Railway have been selling lands, and the Government have allowed people to take up homesteads there, where the land, of course, by implication, is considered to be fit for cultivation as homesteads. The report continues :

> This portion of the Territories comprises an area of 101,340 square miles, and its relation to the remaining portion of the Territories and the boundaries of the region will be more readily understood from the map covering this report.

Here is the map accompanying the report. I showed the map to a gentleman who is largely interested in the North-west, and he was perfectly amazed that such a map, without any qualification whatever, should be sent out from the Department of the Interior. The arid area is made to run up, as I have described, to east of Qu'Appelle it goes north into the Saskatchewan, and then comes right down a little north of Calgary. That is calculated to do a great deal of harm, and I think I have only to bring it to the attention of the hon. Minister to lead him to take steps to have the wrong done to the portion of the territory in his charge alluded to and the wrong done to the property owners, the settlers, in that region, corrected. I may say, in passing, in regard to the irrigation reported on here, that I am very glad to see that work is being done in this direction ; and I am the more glad because as will be seen by "Hansard," when I first proposed that steps should be taken to irrigate certain portions of the North-west, I was told from an official source at that time in this House that I was depreciating the country. The truth of the proposition laid down, that irrigation would be useful in certain parts of the territory, has already been proved, and I am very glad to see that the Government are going on still further with the work. This is a very different matter from characterizing portions of the territory, which have proved fruitful, where men have got rich in farming, and could not be induced to remove so satisfied are they with their prosperity, as being within the arid region, including the four great centres of Regina, Moose Jaw, Balgonie and Qu'Appelle. I beg to move the adjournment of the House.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). I presume the House without argument will acquit me of any desire to disparage any part of Canada ; and the House will also at once acknowledge, I think, the difficulty of preparing a descriptive hand-book of Canada which will be accurate and at the same time satisfy the desire of the inhabitants of various portions of the country. It would be a comparatively easy matter to issue a hand-book of indiscriminate praise for every portion of the country ; it is when an attempt is made to describe the country and tell the truth, which is the most necessary element in connection with immigration and an immigration policy, and convince the people that the information supplied is the truth, that difficulty arises. The greatest possible care has been taken in the preparation of the book to which the hon. gentleman refers, and he has indicated in his own speech that the information which is displayed here is the result of inquiries and studies

made by the scientific officers of the department. I will not for a moment dispute what the hon. gentleman states when he says that from his personal knowledge the account given of western Assiniboia is not as favourable as it should be, in order to be in accordance with the facts. No one is more delighted to hear the hon. gentleman's testimony as to that fact than I am. I will endeavour before the second edition goes to press to secure accurate information in detail and correct the text in any portion of the hand-book which appears to be incorrect.

Motion to adjourn negatived.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

On the Order,

That for the remainder of the session the House shall hold two sittings on each day, one from 11 a.m. until 1 p.m., and the second from 3 p.m. until the hour of adjournment, and at each such sitting Government Orders shall have precedence.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I do not propose to move this motion to-day; I think I will leave it to the next sitting of the House, on Wednesday. My reason is that the House is entitled to a declaration from the Government of the business which it proposes to bring down and proceed with. Unfortunately on account of my absence from my usual duties, and being confined to my house for the last few days, I am unable to make the declaration to-day, but I will do so on Wednesday.

Mr. SPEAKER. The Order stands.

DOMINION LANDS ACT.

Bill (No. 130) further to amend the Dominion Lands Act (Mr. Sifton) was read the second time, and House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 3,

Mr. DAVIN. What class of immigrants does this provide for?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The demand for this legislation has been made by a number of farmers now residing in Manitoba, who desire to move into the Territories and work upon the co-operative plan. The application was made last year, but I left the matter over, and after giving it a good deal of consideration, I think it is possibly worth while to try it. It will do no harm, and we will make an attempt to see if it can be worked out in this case.

Mr. DAVIN. It is to meet the case of settlers who have been for some time in Manitoba?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes.

Mr. DAVIN. Are they the Gallicians?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No; they are Canadian farmers. It is not intended specially to apply to new settlers but of course it may do so.

On section 6,

Mr. DAVIN. Why is the Minister of the Interior making this change with regard to the second homestead?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The old clause found in section of the Act of last session to amend the Dominion Lands Act combined the two cases of the settler who had procured his patent for his first homestead and then entry for his second homestead, and the son of such a settler. It has been found that the combination of the two cases in the one clause makes it almost impossible to interpret the section intelligently in a variety of cases that arise. The section as amended by this Bill practically gives the son the privilege of earning his patent by living with his parent, so long as the parent is a farmer living upon a farm in the vicinity.

On section 7,

Mr. DAVIN. Why is the hon. gentleman changing the wording here?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I have to move that section 7 be amended to read as follows:—

Subclause 10 of the said clause 38, as amended by section 4 of chapter 29, of the Statutes of 1897, is hereby amended by striking out the words "or has a pre-emption" in the third line thereof, and by substituting for paragraph (a) thereof the following:—

(a) That he has fulfilled three years' residence within the meaning of this clause.

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) introduced a Bill last session the principle of which I proposed to adopt, and the law clerk of my department adopted practically the wording of my hon. friend's (Mr. Davin's) Bill, but I found that it gave rise to some difficulty in the interpretation. This amendment I think will remove the difficulty and will carry out what my hon. friend (Mr. Davin) meant.

On section 8,

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. This clause has been suggested by the board of examiners to provide for the case of provincial land surveyors of British Columbia, who are desirous of becoming land surveyors of the Dominion. The board say that under the law they are compelled to undergo an examination which is more onerous than the board consider necessary, and they have drafted this section.

On section 9,

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I move that in the first blank, being line

39, the words "six months" be inserted, and in the next line, the word "years" be struck out, and in the next blank the words "$100" be inserted, so that it will read "not exceeding six months, or to a penalty not exceeding $100."

Mr. DAVIN. Will the hon. gentleman explain the object of this?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The hon. gentleman knows the enormous amount of difficulty that has arisen by reason of the posts being stolen, and it is to be regretted that a more stringent law was not adopted to prevent such an offence.

Mr. DAVIN. I am glad to see this legislation at last introduced, because it was undoubtedly a great grievance to have the land marks removed; but how will the hon. gentleman deal with those who are the greatest sinners in this respect? Our experience is that the Indians, when they move about in the summer, take up these posts and use them as firewood.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I was not aware that the Indians are in the habit of doing that, but I do not think it would be a difficult matter to deal with, if the agents were given instructions to look carefully after it.

On section 10,

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I notice in reading the report that I did not state accurately what the effect of this section is. At present the Act permits a person to homestead a quarter section or any portion less than a quarter section, but the land homesteaded must be all in the same parcel. He could not take two legal subdivisions not connected with each other, and this section provides that he may do that.

On section 11,

Mr. DAVIN. What lands does the province propose to give back to the Dominion Government and what land is the Dominion Government going to give in exchange?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There has been a system of exchange of lands going on between the Dominion and the province of Manitoba for many years. It has risen principally in this way. Ever since the province has been entitled to swamp lands, settlers have gone on these lands and then would apply for homestead entries. The settler would be told that the land belonged to the province, and he could not get a homestead entry for it. In many cases, the province agreed to give the lands back to the Dominion, and the Minister of the Interior gave the settlers homestead entries for it and gave the province other lands of equal value. There has been an exchange of that kind going on between the Minister of the Interior and Manitoba for many years past. In addition to that, there have been a couple of cases—one in particular—in which the late Government transferred lands to the province of Manitoba and the Canadian Pacific Railway had it down in their books as forming part of their land and had sold it to settlers. An exchange becomes necessary in such cases. Another case is that of the Spruce Bush, which lies south of the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway in the neighbourhood of Calgary and Melbourne. There, in order to preserve the timber, we are exchanging with the provincial government, giving them lands in other parts, so that all the Dominion lands would be in one place, and the pro-provincial lands in the other. Otherwise, it is almost impossible for the officer to protect the timber.

On section 12,

Mr. DAVIN. This bears on a matter we have discussed to-day—the arid lands. I would like to understand how the hon. gentleman will carry out this policy. Suppose it should happen that some men have settled on lands actually arid, and have got out patents. I presume, in cases of that sort, there is clear justice in their demanding the right of entry a second time for a homestead. Does the hon. gentleman mean that in the case of any persons who have settled on lands which he thinks are arid, he would give them equivalent homesteads elsewhere? That might prove to be of a proper policy. I think that where lands are proved to be arid it is good policy and common justice to the incoming settler to withdraw them from settlement.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The hon. gentleman is perfectly right in principle. I have had cases before me a number of times. I have had cases in which men have proven that they settled on lands on which nobody could possibly make a living, and in every case in which the certificate of recommendation had not been actually signed and delivered, I have permitted the settler to make another homestead. And I have been strongly pressed to amend the Act so that I might permit another homestead, even in cases where the patent had been issued, but I do not see how I could go so far as that. If a man who has been upon the land for three years and has actually received his patent may come to the Government and say: This land is no good; I cannot make a living on it, and so get another homestead. I cannot see how there would be anything in the nature of finality in the administration of Dominion lands. I think that if a man has had three years to make a trial of his land, and after that time, has decided to prove up and take out his patent, that must be considered as final.

Mr. DAVIN. I agree wth the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton). It would not be wise to go so far as to allow a man who has

taken out his patent to say: I will give up this homestead and enter again. It would lead men, the moment they had a whimsical desire to go elsewhere to make an excuse of saying that their land was no good. I would not ask the hon. gentleman to go so far. I think he is right in allowing a man who has entered but who has not taken out his patent and finds he cannot make a living on the land he has chosen, to re-enter.

On section 13,

Mr. DAVIN. Is not this rather going back on the liberal spirit of our legislation in regard to settlement?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No: I will explain. In the early days, particularly in the province of Manitoba, a large quantity of land was sold to private parties. These sales are known in the Department of the Interior as "old time sales." The land was sold on very favourable terms, and men bought a quarter or half section, sometimes even two or three, and made one payment. The Government has been a very indulgent creditor, and these sales have stood for years with very little paid. In a great many cases, it is perfectly evident that the people have no intention of carrying out the sale in a bona fide way. I have waited about two years before taking decisive action, and I have come to the conclusion that, in a great majority of cases, these sales must be cancelled, and this land again thrown open for settlement. I do not think it would be in the public interest to allow the land to be simply sold again to speculators who would undoubtedly be the purchasers if the land were put upon the market. I wish to have it disposed of on settlement condition, so that it shall get into the hands of parties who are prepared to live on it and cultivate it. At the same time there are choice pieces of this land, near to the towns, within easy reach of the conveniences of civilization, and it seems to me that, in some cases at least, there ought to be a price of a dollar or two an acre put on the land in addition to the settlement duties. I have no doubt it will be quickly taken up if such a price is fixed. I cannot say I have come to a very positive conclusion as to the price, but I think I ought to have power to require a payment, even if not a large payment in some of these cases, particularly where the land is specially valuable, and to do that, such legislation is required as is provided in this clause.

Mr. DAVIN. I understand that what the Minister aims at is that it shall depend on his own judgment whether this payment shall be made a condition or not.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It will depend on my judgment, as in the case of all Dominion land. The Minister of the Interior has power to put a price upon Dominion lands within certain limits. In that way, I have power to fix the price for these lands under the existing law and do not require any additional legislation for that purpose. But I wish the power to bring this land under the homestead conditions, so that when I sell the lands I may at the same time make the sale conditional upon settlement. This clause is not to give me greater power with regard to the price of the land, but to enable me to require settlement duties.

Mr. DAVIN. There is only this point—that the great thing is to get in good settlers. I have long been of opinion that the view taken in regard to the incoming of the settler, that the Government should make money out of him, is a mistake.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin).

Mr. DAVIN. The real way for the country to make money out of the settler is to bring in the settler, to get the taxes he pays and the benefit of the enrichment consequent upon his labour.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. These lands will be taken up almost altogether by people in that country who know where they are, people, who, in many cases, have been watching these lands for years.

On section 14,

Mr. DAVIN. What squatters are these that this clause aims at?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The provision now in the Act with regard to the removal of persons who are unlawfully in possession of Dominion lands is not satisfactory. Of course the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) understands that the Government ought to have proper means of ejecting people who are in possession of Dominion lands if they deem it necessary to do so. There are occassionally cases in which persons take possession of Dominion lands and refuse to vacate. This simply provides a summary method of procedure against them if it is deeemd desirable to eject them.

Mr. DAVIN. What does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) intend to put in the blank in line 40?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. "Thirty days."

Mr. DAVIN. I would like to know from the hon. gentleman whether this is aimed at settlers who happen to take up land before survey?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No; the Act expressly recognizes them. This is only for the purpose of being used in case some person is wrongfully in possession of Dominion lands, and, though noti-

fied by the officer under the direction of the department to get off the lands, will not do so. Of course, we could bring an action of ejectment against him and put him off, but that would be expensive and troublesome. Every Crown Lands Act ought to have a provision of this kind, and they nearly all have.

Bill, as amended, reported.

THE POST OFFICE ACT.

Order for third reading of Bill (No. 110) further to amend the Post Office Act,

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock) moved that the Order be discharged, and that the House again resolve itself into Committee of the Whole with instructions to add the following amendments :—

Subsection 1 of section 9 of the Post Office Act, chapter 35 of the Revised Statutes, is hereby amended by adding thereto the following paragraph :—

(s) Make regulations providing that in the case of mail matter which bears upon the cover thereof the name and address of the sender, and which may be mailed unpaid, the postmaster at the office of mailing may notify the sender thereof of such non-payment and allow him to supply the short postage for the purpose of being affixed thereto by the postmaster, and that in the case of imperfectly addressed mail matter which indicates on the cover the sender's name, the postmaster may afford the sender an opportunity of enabling the postmaster to complete the address.

He said : At present a letter that is wholly unpaid is transmitted to Ottawa. For example, on Saturday I received a complaint from a Premier of one of our provinces that a drop letter addressed to him in the city where he resides, instead of being forwarded to him, was forwarded to Ottawa under the present law, the postmaster, I suppose, holding that he had no power to do otherwise than send it to the dead letter office. This amendment proposes to allow the postmaster to use a little common sense, and to apply to whoever is the sender, and get a stamp to be put on. The second part of the amendment provides that the postmaster is allowed to perfect an address if he can do so. Another amendment is this : On Friday last the House agreed to three points outside of Ottawa being treated as dead letter offices, namely, Winnipeg, Victoria and Halifax. On conference with the officers of the department, I am satisfied it would be advisable to establish at least one in Toronto, which is a very large centre, and if possible, another in Montreal. These are both important railway centres, Toronto especially being the centre for all the western part of Ontario, and the mail matter of that region would only be delayed by transferring it to Ottawa. I do not propose that dead letter matter in any of these offices shall be dealt with by the officers connected with the local staff ; but they shall, for this purpose, be treated as members of the inside service in order that they may be more directly under the control of the department here ; and, if necessary, to make additional appointments, assuming that we shall have to transfer some of the officers from the centre to outside points. In other cases it may be sufficient to transfer the members of the local outside staff to the inside staff so that they shall be amenable directly to the department at Ottawa.

Motion agreed to, and the House again resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

On the amendments,

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Was there not an understanding the other night that the places to be treated as dead letter offices, should be limited to three cities ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes, in a sense ; but I do not think a great deal of importance was attached to the number. The Bill as presented to the House asked that the Postmaster General might be allowed to indicate the number of offices without their being named ; and when the point was taken that that gave too much power, because he might select some small towns, and that the person opening the letters would have too much local knowledge, I then expressed my willingness to name the points, and in a way I referred to those remote points. But since then, in conference with Major Walsh this morning, I have satisfied myself that we ought to have at least Toronto for the accommodation of all the dead letter matter west of Toronto, instead of sending that down to Ottawa to be treated as dead letter matter, thus involving a delay of several days.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Unfortunately some of the hon. gentlemen on this side of the House who took a prominent part in the discussion which led to what was tantamount to a settlement, are not here now ; and I would suggest, when these amendments are reported, that the Bill, instead of being read the third time as is usually done, stand over until those hon. gentlemen are here.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am quite agreeable to that.

Mr. HUGHES. Is it not the case that in the United States the territory is divided up into dead letter districts ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think not. But in Great Britain they have sixteen examining points all the way from Aberdeen in the north to Cork in the south.

Mr. DAVIN. I will remind the hon. gentleman that what took place was this : He

will remember that an hon. gentleman, who takes a prominent part in our debates, was objecting strongly to accepting the proposal of the Postmaster General, and the leader of the Opposition turned round to him and said: Oh, well, we will accept that. That looks to me very like an agreement.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am willing to adopt the suggestion of the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) and allow the matter to stand that his friends who take an interest in it, may be here.

Bill, as amended, reported.

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES ACTS.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton) moved second reading of Bill (No. 131) further to amend the Acts respecting the North-west Territories.

Mr. DAVIN. There is one clause in this Bill that seems to aim chiefly at providing for a perambulatory banc for the North-West Territories. The hon. gentleman will remember that last year when there was a Bill before the House providing for that, I gave him my views about it in private, and he seemed to agree with them. The consequence was that he struck out the clause, but now I see that clause reappears in this Bill. I think he will agree with me that, from what we know of the effect of having a central judiciary, from its good effect upon the country and good effect upon the profession, it is not desirable to introduce the principle of a perambulating banc in the North-west Territories. Why should we not have the system continued that has already existed, and have the Bench sitting in Regina? I know there are one or two persons who consider that lawyers should not be brought to Regina, but that the judges should travel everywhere over the Territories. I do not think that is advisable. It is impossible to provide a good library in every part of the Territories. A good library will be required, in order to make judicial proceedings effective, at Edmonton, Calgary and Moose Jaw, and I hope the hon. gentleman will reconsider this portion of the Bill.

Motion agreed to. Bill read the second time, and House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. DAVIN. I understand why the hon. Minister is making this change; but I think the House generally has not paid very much attention to the provision, and I would ask the hon. Minister to explain what he wants to get rid of by the amendment.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I explained when I introduced the Bill that section 1 was for the purpose of permitting of the correction of an error which crept in last session when amendments to the North-west Act were being passed. The term "Lieutenant-Governor in Council," under the old Act meant the Lieutenant-Governor acting by and with the advice of the assembly; but under the new constitution, the term "Lieutenant-Governor in Council" means the same as the Lieutenant-Governor of the province, that is, the Lieutenant-Governor acting with the advice of his Executive Council. The clause relating to education in the old Act provided that the Lieutenant-Governor in Council might make orders; and therefore, when the changed interpretation came into force, that section being unaltered, the power of the legislature in respect to education was undoubtedly left to the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, instead of to the legislative assembly. The change is a most necessary one, and the explanations I have made is all that is needed to show the committee the effect of this clause.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I quite understand the necessity for that amendment. In connection with the subject, however, I would like the Minister of the Interior to explain his idea of the effect of the Constitutional Act, so to speak, which came into force last October, as regards the position of the Lieutenant-Governor of the Territories, and particularly in connection with the issue of permits for the sale of liquor, as to how far that is under the government of the Territories, or whether the Government consider the Lieutenant-Governor there acts under direct instructions from the federal authority?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The change which was made in the Constitutional Act of the North-west Territories of course placed the Lieutenant-Governor in the position of being very much the same as the Lieutenant-Governor of one of the provinces, an officer who could act only by advice of his council. Under the amendment, the Executive Council of the North-west Territories claim that everything which the Lieutenant-Governor is empowered to do, he must do with the advice of his council. I am not sure that interpretation is correct. I do not think any lawyer would say the question was free from doubt, but the view I entertained was that, inasmuch as the power to issue permits in respect to liquor was a power inserted in the Act in former days when the Lieutenant-Governor was practically an executive officer clothed with power he could exercise without advice, that when the power was in the nature of the exercise of a police regulation, in the absence of anything express or positive it might be considered that the power of the Lieutenant-Governor remained as it was before. I would not say that opinion is without doubt correct; I would not say it is

free from doubt, and I may add that the Government of the North-west Territories entertain a very strong opinion in the opposite direction, I thought it better not to have any conflict in regard to this matter, and the Government of the North-west Territories agreed with me on the subject, and when Mr. Haultain was here some time ago, it was arranged between us that no permit for taking liquor into the Yukon district should be issued except such as would be without any objection whatever, such cases as application made for taking in a few gallons for private use, in respect of which I thought it was perfectly proper to allow him to exercise his own discretion, and therefore in the meantime any such permit has been issued by the Lieutenant-Governor on the advice of the Executive Council. It was part of the understanding that no permit should be issued for liquor that could be made use of in a commercial way. The effect of the understanding is that the matter remains in abeyance until the Act relating to the government of the Yukon district, which the Government are about introducing, receives the royal assent, and the matter will there be dealt with and removed from doubt. I may say that the arrangement between the Government of the North-west Territories and the Government here is perfectly harmonious, and Mr. Haultain and myself both agreed that the arrangement suggested was the best one in order to avoid dispute.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I have not looked sufficiently into the question as to warant me in giving any opinion as to the technical interpretation of the legislation in regard to that question. But my recollection is, that the understanding last session was, when the Act relating to the government of the Territories passed through the House, that the Governor in Council was to have complete control, and that if there was authority, as the hon. gentleman has suggested, over the Governor by this Government, it was 'casus omissus.'

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I take the same view myself, and if I were compelled to assert a view, I would assert that view. If I were compelled to act in hostility to the other Government, I would take that view and insist that it was correct; but I would prefer not to be forced into that position.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. This is the observation I have reference to and it confirms the statement made by the hon. gentleman, that it was his intention to give the same powers to the Governor in Council as are exercised in any province. At column 4110 of the Debates of 1897, I find the following:—

On section 2,

2. The paragraph lettered (c) of section 2 of the said Act is hereby repealed, and the following substituted therefor:—

Mr. SIFTON.

"(c) The expression 'Lieutenant-Governor in Council' means the Lieutenant-Governor of the Territories, by and with the consent of the Executive Council of the Territories, or in conjunction with the Executive Council of the Territories, as the case may be."

Mr. FOSTER. What is the difference?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). We are simply bringing the definition of Lieutenant-Governor in Council in the Territories into line with the definition of Lieutenant-Governor in Council in the provinces.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. You are taking away the personal action of the Lieutenant-Governor and making him act with his Council.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes.

So that was the intention. My object is to suggest to the Minister of the Interior that this would be an opportunity, in connection with this Bill, to remove all doubt and to settle that question, and settle it on the line which I understand, according to the arrangement between the Federal Government and the Government of the North-west Territories, on which they are jointly acting. It seems to me opportune to deal with the subject.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. That is worth considering. I shall ask that the committee have leave to sit again, so that I can think it over.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Very well.

Mr. DAVIN. This clause of course emphasizes the fact that in regard to the Yukon, in the opinion of the Minister of the Interior, the Dominion Government had the authority to advise the Lieutenant-Governor, and the Minister will remember that on several occasions when we asked him as to who gave authority to have liquor taken into the Yukon, in regard to thousands of gallons, the Minister replied: that it was the Lieutenant-Governor; but ultimately, in answer to a question put by myself, asking who told the Lieutenant-Governor to give authority, it turned out that the authority came from the Minister of the Interior.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I thought the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) knew that all the time.

Mr. DAVIN. I probably suspected it.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I thought the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) knew that as a matter of course, because before I took office an arrangement had been made between the Lieutenant-Governor of the North-west Territories and the former Minister of the Interior, under which arrangement it was settled, that no permits should be issued for the taking of liquor into the Yukon except upon the authority of the Department of the Interior. That fact was quite notorious and I think everybody else in Canada knew it, because I got, I sup-

pose thousands of letters, certainly hundreds, asking me to give authority to issue permits. The Act of course expressly states that the Lieutenant-Governor issues the permit, and the fact that I received the letters proved very conclusively that it was a matter of common knowledge that it was through the Department of the Interior the permit would issue.

Mr. DAVIN. But we never really have had an explanation from the Minister (Mr. Sifton) as to why he allowed these thousands upon thousands of gallons to go into the Yukon; and he might tell us, in passing, why he did it. It was a most extraordinary thing to give a man in Manitoba the power to take in this large quantity of liquor.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I have not got the statement under my hand at the present time, but I have no objection to discuss it at any time I am prepared with the documents.

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) has given us the figures, but he has not given the people of the country the explanation as to why he gave these permits to such a number of private individuals. My information is that those private individuals multiplied the quantity, and took in many times the amount they got permission to take in.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I hope the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) would not hold me responsible for that.

Mr. DAVIN. No; but it shows the character of the men to whom the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) advised a great officer of the Crown to give permission.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I venture to say that not a single one of the persons or corporations who got the permits, has taken in as large a quantity as he was authorized to. I am, of course, making that statement without absolute mathematical knowledge.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. At all events there was a kind of a hot time in Dawson City.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I have said that I did not make the statement from mathematical knowledge, and the only way I could prove such a statement would be by getting a return of the amount taken in. I venture to say that as to the persons who received permission on my direction, having made application to the Department of the Interior, none of them up to the present time, has taken in as much as he was authorized to take in by the permit.

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. Minister can easily explain why he directed the Lieutenant-Governor to give permission to these private parties to take in large quantities of liquor. With regard to what the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) says, I have read reports from every part of the Yukon district, and especially from Dawson, saying that at every turn there was a saloon. Where did that liquor come from?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Not under any permit issued by me or my direction. It went in under proceedings that were taken before I took office.

Mr. DAVIN. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) was lavish enough in directing to have thousands of gallons go in.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I do not think that has done any harm there yet.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. You think it has not materialized there?

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) does not know how quick his friends are. Our information is that his friends actually took in the quantity allowed, and took in a great deal more, and made a large amount of money out of it.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Which particular friend do you refer to?

Mr. DAVIN. That Manitoba friend.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The gentleman from Oak Lake?

Mr. DAVIN. Yes; I think that one.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I do not think he has had an opportunity of taking in any.

Mr. DAVIN. Does the Minister know all about him? He seems to be very familiar with these whisky pedlars. What we do want to get from the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) is an explanation as to why it was that he, in charge of the Yukon, and having the responsibility, asked the Lieutenant-Governor to give permission to take in that whisky. Does not the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) see that under the question I am putting, it does not matter whether the whisky has gone in or not, but what I want to know is, why the Minister was moved to ask the Lieutenant-Governor to give the permits.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I can appreciate the hostility of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) to liquor, and I have no objection to giving the explanation as to how this took place. The arrangement that I found in vogue when I took charge of the department was—this I was informed by the late Deputy Minister, Mr. Burgess—was, that the Department of the Interior gave direction what liquor was to be taken in there. In the first place, the department had decided that it was impossible with the police force then in the district, to undertake to keep liquor out absolutely, and they then decided they would allow a certain amount of liquor to go in upon the direction of the

Department of the Interior. First, permits had been granted—and now I speak from memory—to the two transportation companies, the Alaskan and the North American, and an application came before me to renew these permits. When that application came before me I simply said: How much did they get the year before; I was told: and I then said: You can renew the permit for the amount they got the year before. Subsequently, some parties applied for leave to take liquor in. A man named O'Brien came with a letter from Inspector Constantine recommending that a permit should be given him, saying, if I recollect aright, that the liquor business was carried on there, that O'Brien was a respectable man, and he was recommended to the good offices of the department. It was simply upon that letter a permit was issued to Mr. O'Brien. There were two or three other cases of applications having been made, amongst them this gentleman from Oak Lake, who seems to have excited the hostility of my hon. friend from West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin). I granted two or three permits. I could not see there was any special reasons why, if the liquor business was going to be carried on in the Yukon district, it should be confined to two American trading companies, and I do not see now why it should be confined to the two American trading companies. The only question was, whether the amount for which I granted the permit was an excessive amount. I do not think any one would say that if there was going to be liquor allowed into the Yukon district, 10,000 or 12,000 gallons would be an excessive amount for thirty or forty thousand people. Therefore, I feel that I am not open to any severe criticism in that respect. I subsequently found that applications were coming from all over the country for permits to take liquor into the Yukon district, and I simply sat on the whole thing, and I said I would not issue any more. That has been followed consistently since with the exception of a few cases to which I referred before, in which the applications were not of a commercial nature: that is to say, in the sense of a desire on the part of the applicant to use the permit for commercial purposes, and in these cases a few permits were granted for a small amount, five or six gallons. These permits are shown on the returns brought down to the House.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I heard from one source, I think it was in the House but I cannot find the reference, not as the Minister of the Interior puts it, that this practice had existed of issuing these permits on the part of his predecessor, but that the Lieutenant-Governor had himself claimed the right to issue permits, and had issued permits to those two companies in particular.

Mr. SIFTON.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. That was since, I think, speaking from memory, the companies got the Lieutenant-Governor to issue the permit after I had refused. The late Deputy Minister, Mr. Burgess, told me that was the arrangement that had been made, and an application was made to me on behalf of these two companies in the first instance. I said to renew their permits for this year for the same amount as last year. For the reasons I have given, I subsequently gave a permit to Mr. O'Brien and to two or three others, and amongst them to one firm on the recommendation of Mr. Turner, the Premier of British Columbia, who wrote me recommending the parties as responsible. From information I have got since, the Lieutenant-Governor of the North-west Territories apparently issued permits after I had ceased to allow any further requisitions to go forward, and I think he must have issued permits to the two companies which had applied to me and been refused, because when they came again, after I had given directions for the first time, some months later, I said I would not issue any recommendation in their favour because I had decided not to issue further recommendations until I knew more clearly what sort of administration we were going to have in that country, and I think they must have got their permits from the Lieutenant-Governor of the Territories without any knowledge by the Department of the Interior. I do not know that any other explanation is necessary.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. Minister is not able to say that his predecessor issued any permits in the Yukon territory?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. When the matter came before me I referred it to the late Mr. Burgess, who was then Deputy Minister. He explained to me what I have stated. I never looked back to see when or where the permits had been granted. I had been told that permits had been issued the year before, and I said to renew them for the same amount. When the return came down, I found that they had been given about the time of the change of Government, and that the officers in the department must have issued the requisitions. Probably, therefore, the late Minister of the Interior did not know anything about it.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That seems to be the idea. For instance, on 30th March, I see in "Hansard" that the hon. Minister, referring to one of these permits, stated that a permit to take 1,000 gallons of whisky into the Yukon district had been issued by the Lieutenant-Governor of the North-west Territories. I suppose the hon. gentleman, in referring to the custom anterior to his taking office, referred

to the power the Government of the North-west Territories claimed to have to issue these permits regardless of the Minister of the Interior.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. All the permits were issued by the Lieutenant-Governor of the North-west Territories, as I explained to the member for Assiniboia. It did not occur to me to say that the permits issued by the Lieutenant-Governor of the North-west Territories were issued upon my recommendation. I did not imagine that anybody in the House did not know that.

Mr. DAVIN. Of course, in that case to which my hon. friend from Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) refers, that is the only case in which a Minister of the Interior told the Lieutenant-Governor to issue a permit for 1,000 gallons of whisky. That was done at the instance of the Minister of the Interior. He has the honour of being the first Minister of the Interior to have recommended permits to issue.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I suppose that, technically speaking, that is correct. The explanation I have to give to the House will show that what I endeavoured to do was to follow exactly the practice which I had been told had been followed in the department. I was not aware at all, until I saw the return, that the permits had been issued at a time when, it will appear from a political condition then existing there was probably no Minister of the Interior. The Minister of the Interior then probably did not give it his personal attention. I was under the impression, from what Mr. Burgess told me, that that was the practice which had prevailed for two or three years before, but I cannot say that he said so.

On section 2.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. When this Bill was being introduced, I said that this section would be struck out. It is for the purpose of repealing subsection 2 of section 14, which was a validating clause, and I thought at the time that to repeal the validating clause would probably affect the validity of the ordinances which were validated by it; but on giving the matter more careful attention, I am satisfied that there is no danger of that and therefore the clause shall stand.

On section 3.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. With regard to my hon. friend's position as to a perambulating court, it is true that that clause was introduced last year and I withdrew it at my hon. friend's request, being always desirous of meeting his suggestions. When I introduced this Bill, I said that this change had been recommended by the judges of the North-west Territories. I was wrong in that. I have examined the correspondence, and I find that it was introduced at the request of Mr. Haultain, the Premier of the North-west Territories. While there may be a great deal in what my hon. friend from Assiniboia says regarding the undesirability of having a perambulating court, yet it seemed to me that in reality the local government of the Territories are the proper parties to decide where and under what circumstances the court shall sit. The facts as stated to me by Mr. Haultain, are as follows, and I might suggest that Mr. Haultain can have no possible purpose to serve except that of the public interest. Residing as he does at Regina, his local feelings, if he has any, would naturally incline him to the idea that the court should not move from Regina, but the fact that he has pressed the matter on my attention twice and on the last occasion urged very strongly that this clause should be introduced, indicates that the public convenience there would be served very much by the passage of this legislation. As he stated the case to me, the litigation which the court has to deal with comes very largely from the district of Calgary. The appeals which are entered for hearing before the full court are taken largely from the district of Calgary. Mr. Haultain says that it has happened and does happen that the business of the court sitting at Regina comes, at certain sittings, almost entirely from Calgary, and the lawyers have to come down there at considerable expense, and in his judgment public convenience would be better served by permitting the court occasionally to hold sittings at Calgary. I do not fancy that there is any suggestion that it should go to any other place than Calgary, which, next to Regina, is the leading place in the Territories, and I can see no harm in permitting the Government of the Territories, who are responsible to the people of the Territories and know very much better than we can possibly, what the public convenience requires, to exercise the responsibility of deciding as to whether the court should move to any other town for the purpose of holding sittings or not. In every province, the provincial authorities decide where the courts shall sit, and practically we are, in a modified way, giving the Government of the Territories the power to decide as to the method in which the local convenience of the people will best be served. I do not consider myself possessed of sufficient local knowledge to express a very strong opinion, and I put my advocacy of the clause entirely upon the ground that the local government are the best qualified persons to decide as to whether this power shall be exercised or not. In any case it is not an innovation of a serious character and cannot possibly do anybody any harm. I have no doubt that it may possibly, if used to any considerable extent, conflict with the desire of the judge who happens to sit at Regina, but it will not be likely

to conflict with the desire of any of the other judges, because they are all resident district judges and have to travel to the full court in any case.

Mr. DAVIN. Of course I attach the greatest possible weight to what my friend Mr. Haultain urges on the Minister. He is the head of the local government, and of course is in touch with the people, and I have the greatest possible respect for what he says. Nevertheless if I were in the assembly with him, I would differ with him on this point. I do not think it is in the interest of any parties that the change should be made. However, I am not going, when the head of the local executive urges this on the Minister, to fight it here in committee. But I express my opinion and that remains unchanged. The one point that I made is a very serious one. If the court is sitting in banc at one place, the Government could have a first-rate library there; whereas the Government cannot afford to have a good library at Calgary, another at Moosomin, another at Moose Jaw, and another at Edmonton.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. As a matter of fact I think they are as well equipped at Calgary as they are at Regina, perhaps better.

Mr. DAVIN. I doubt that. But I know the Executive take an interest in having this clause, and if they do, I shall certainly not fight it.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Can the hon. Minister say what additional amount will be required for travelling expenses? The present grant for travelling expenses is $3,000.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It will be so trifling that I can hardly make an estimate. The district judges now have to travel to the place where the court sits in banc. It will simply mean that when the court sits in Calgary the judges will have to travel there instead of to Regina, and so on.

On section 4,

Mr. DAVIN. Will the Minister please explain the object of this section?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It is to remove the disqualification which now prevents an employee of the Dominion Government from sitting in the legislative assembly of the Territories. This has also been introduced at the request of the Territorial Government. They say, and I can perfectly understand it from my experience in the west, that the difficulty of legislation there arises from the difficulty of getting first-class men to contest the different ridings for the assembly and spend the necessary time to attend to legislation. As the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin), of course, knows, there can be no party question in this as affecting the Territories, because they have no party government there. Men have been shut out of the assembly because they were holders of some petty office under the Dominion Government, for instance, a postmastership which yields, perhaps, $25 or $30 a year. I can see no reason in the world why a man who happens to hold an office under the Dominion Government should not represent the district in the assembly, if the assembly wants him to. Of course, if the assembly disqualifies a man on the ground that he holds an office under the Dominion Government, we have no objection to that, but I doubt if we ought to disqualify him. Under this section, the assembly will have it in their own hands. If they desire to disqualify a holder of an office under the Dominion Government from sitting in the assembly, they can do so; but he would not be disquaified by Dominion legislation.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That raises the very important question how far this Government ought to go.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I mentioned before that there might be a difference of opinion.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The question is how far the Government should go in permitting its own officers to enter legislatures of the different provinces. If you permit it in the Territories, it will be somewhat difficult to refuse similar privileges in the other provinces. And yet it seems to me a business that would tend to affect the proper discharge of the duties of these officers. We have legislation now on our Statute-book which renders it impossible, under certain circumstances, for officers of the Dominion Government having a certain salary to do any other work, the object being to keep their whole time for the service of the Government. I do not know whether the Minister of the Interior is able to say at the present time what the policy of the Government would be with regard to giving permission to their employees to enter the political field in any of the territories or provinces. Of course, that policy could be adopted irrespective of this clause.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There can be no doubt that salaried officers performing important duties could not be permitted, in justice to the Government, to devote their time to politics. The cases it is desired to cover are the cases of persons who hold offices for which they get very small remuneration, which could not, under any circumstances, give a man a living. And, of course, so far as the Government is concerned it would not permit an officer who held a salaried office which was supposed to afford him a livelihood to enter upon the discharge of legislative duties. Having that view, I do not think any seri-

ous difficulty could arise, because the Government would carry that view out. I do not feel very strongly wedded to the clause myself, and if my hon. friends on the other side object to it, I shall not insist upon it.

Mr. DAVIN. If it is to meet the case of postmasters only, they could be specified. But, I may say to the hon. Minister that in such cases they generally transfer the offices. Where a postmaster is elected to the assembly, he transfers the office to his sister or daughter.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. That is the way they have in the Territories.

Mr. DAVIN. Yes, that is a way they have. I think it would be better to specify the officers. For instance, it would be convenient to have the agent of the Dominion lands a member of the assembly. Take the case of Mr. Pearce, who was resident in Calgary—I do not know whether he is still resident there—he is an important officer and it would be undesirable that he should be a member of the assembly. We pay him $3,000 a year, I think, and he is a good officer.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The present state of affairs has not caused any serious difficulty heretofore, and I presume the people in the Territories can get along for another year while we have time to consider the matter. I move that the clause be struck out.

Section struck out.

Bill, as amended, reported.

LAND TITLES ACT, 1894.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 132) further to amend the Land Titles Act, 1894.

Mr. DAVIN. This is a very important matter, and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) while introducing it did not fully explain the changes. I think he ought to tell the House what he proposes.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I did not explain the Bill on second reading. I said that it would be better, as it was a complicated Bill, to explain it in Committee of the Whole.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and the House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 2,

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The clause which this section amends is the clause which defines the word "instrument," and the words "or affecting" are inserted after the words "relating to." The object is to widen the interpretation of the word "instrument." It has been suggested and contended that the words "relating to" require local description in order to make them applicable. So, unless the instrument has local descriptions, it would not come within the definition of an instrument. So, the words "or affecting" are put in for the purpose of covering such instruments as caveats, executions and satisfactions of judgment.

On section 4,

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. This is the old clause:

> The registrar shall not receive or enter in the day-book any instrument except an execution against lands, caveat, mechanics' lien, transfers by a sheriff or municipal officer, or orders of a court or judge.

The words "or municipal" are left out. Then we insert "transfers on sale of lands for taxes or certificates or orders of a court or judge." The result of the amendment is that transfers on sales of lands for taxes, certificates, or orders of a court or judge, are registered without the production of a duplicate. The words "municipal officer" are struck out because they practically have no municipal officer there. It is really the officers of the school districts who perform the duties.

On section 5,

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The legislation of last session or the session before, gave the Lieutenant-Governor of the North-west Territories power to deal with the closing and alteration of road allowances. Then, the question arose as to the conveyance of land which had formed a part of the road allowance before the change took place. This is a provision to cover that.

On section 9,

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. This is rendered necessary by the difficulty that arises owing to the fact that it has been held that a mortgage given by a settler was not an assignment within the meaning of the Dominion Lands Act, so that when the registrar comes to deal with an application for a certificate of title under the Real Property Act, he may find a mortgage there given by a man who had no right to give it, and yet it is of record in the office, and he has to take notice of it.

On section 10,

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The effect of sections 10, 11 and 12 taken together, is to amend the Act so as to take away the special provisions in the Act for foreclosing a mortgage or incumbrance, and to leave the mortgagee or incumbrancee a remedy with the Supreme Court of the North-west Territories, so that the practice will be uniform. This provision has been strongly recommended by the judges who

find that double system of procedure is extremely inconvenient.

On section 21,

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The latter portion is not very well worded. I move to amend by inserting in line 32: "The practice and procedure for obtaining such orders and giving such security, and the practice upon which the same may be granted, shall be as nearly as may be the same as upon an application for security for costs." I wish to provide that the principles upon which the court shall act in granting security for costs, shall be the same as in ordinary cases. I do not want to change the principle, but I want to leave the court to deal with the case under this Act as in an ordinary case.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I do not think these words improve it. "Practice and procedure" are covered by a large part of the section, and apply to the whole.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. My law clerk took the view that this amendment should be made. The court is given power to make an order for security for costs. Now, supposing a man makes an application that the opposite party shall give security for costs. There are certain principles on which the court acts. It does not ordinarily give such an order except on certain specified lines. If, for instance, a person against whom an order for security is applied owns real estate within the jurisdiction of the court, security will not, in some of the provinces, be demanded. There are a number of special holdings in respect to security for costs, and what I desire is that the section should make it perfectly clear that the court shall apply the same principles in this case as in cases of ordinary litigation. The hon. gentleman indicates that "practice" covers it.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That is the difference between practice and procedure. Procedure would be insufficient, but practice is the application of principles, and principles would thereby govern the granting of these orders. Practice seems to involve the principles of procedure.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Very likely the words "practice and procedure" would cover the point, but I do not see any harm in adding the words of the Minister of the Interior. I call his attention to the words, "may in his discretion." We know how the word discretion is used by judges, but I am not so sure as to the interpretation in a statute of this kind. It might give the judges a wider discretion than the language in the subsequent sections of the Bill would indicate.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. My view is that if the words, "in his discretion" were properly interpreted, it would not make any difference. As, however, they appear to be surplusage, I move to strike them out.

Section, as amended, agreed to.

On section 22,

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. This section is for the purpose of removing doubt that arose from the fact that the local legislature deals with property and civil rights and we deal with real property as set out in the Territories Real Property Act. The local assembly has passed a Creditors' Relief Act. There are four judges on the bench, and two have decided that this does not affect claims on lands, because, they say, the Dominion has not changed the powers of the legislature in regard to such claims, and therefore the Act of the legislature is ultra vires. Two judges hold that the Act is good, and consequently there is a deadlock. There seems no reason why the legislature should not have the right to settle the question of priority.

On section 23,

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. This is to permit the registration of an estate less than an estate in fee simple.

On section 24,

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. This section provides that plans may be registered, not covered by the formalities of certain Acts.

Bill as amended reported.

LAND GRANTS TO NORTH-WEST MILITIA.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton) moved second reading of Bill (No. 123) to make further provision respecting grants of land to members of the militia force on active service in the North-west.

Mr. DAVIN. What class of volunteers is this intended to relieve?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Those who were entitled under the special Act to land warrants.

Mr. DAVIN. I did not know there was a single case remaining to be met.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It is just to extend the time; the time ran out.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, considered in committee, and reported.

THE INDIAN ACT.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton) moved second reading of Bill (No. 144) to amend the Indian Act.

Mr. DAVIN. The Minister of the Interior should now explain the changes which

be effected in the management of the Indian Affairs in the North-west and Manitoba, and especially ought we to have an explanation of why he removed the Indian Commissioner from a central part of the North-west Territories to Winnipeg. In the North-west Territories you have practically six treaties as against two in Manitoba; you have far more Indians in the Territories than in Manitoba, and there will be by and by further Indian treaties in the Territories. In fact, I believe the Minister is contemplating entering into treaties now with bands of Indians who are yet outside and all of whom are in the North-west Territories. I cannot for the life of me understand why the Minister removed the Indian office from a central point in the Territories to Winnipeg. I could understand his deciding—although I would not have approved of it—to abolish the commissioner's office altogether and to manage the Indians direct from Ottawa, but that he should retain the office of Indian commissioner and then bring the commissioner away from the midst of the Indians, to Winnipeg, is what I cannot understand. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) knows very well the character of the Indians, and that the Indian requires to be placed in touch with the great Ho-go-man, as he calls him, the head man. Now, if the chief of the Blackfeet or the chiefs of other bands in the North-west want to come in contact with the Indian commissioner, they will have to travel all the way to Winnipeg, instead of, as they used, either go west or south or east and concentrate in a central spot in the Territories and there meet the commissioner. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) brought down some returns I asked for, but owing to the fact that the year given is the fianancial year and not the calendar year, the returns did not give the information I wanted. I may say to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) that his plan has not worked well, and that in his own departmental report there is evidence that the change he made has not been satisfactory. If the Minister will turn to the report of Mr. Forget, the Indian commissioner, he will find that Mr. Forget admits in that report that he cannot supply the statistics that are necessary, and he says that in certain reserves there has not been the same success as that which characterized the management of Indians in the previous years. It could not fail to be otherwise, because in order to effect a small saving, and also in order, I fear, to confer political advantages on the heads of persons who were not obnoxious to such treatment, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) has made changes, or rather Mr. Forget has made changes at the Crooked Lake Reserve that last year resulted in having no crops, and Mr. Forget himself admits that the cattle have decreased in number. I am told that there is a very uneasy feeling among the Indians of the North-west Territories, and I point out to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) that it is not in one year that the fruits of his policy will be seen, but a year from now or two years from now, after it has been seen what the effect on the Indian is of not being subjected to careful surveillance, as has been the case in the past. I say, that on the face of the departmental report of the hon. Minister, things are not satisfactory. But even suppose we had not that evidence, we should still be face to face with the anomaly, that in the matter of the management of Indian affairs in the west, the Minister brings the head man, the man controlling the Indians from being in their midst to being at the edge as it were of the whole Indian population. I think we ought to have from the Minister an explanation of the changes he made.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). I have not under my hand the detailed statement of the changes in the administration of Indian affairs in the Territories. That I regret, but I will have no objection when the Indian estimates are before the House, or at any other convenient time to discuss the matter. So far as the removal of the Indian commissioner's office from Regina to Winnipeg is concerned, I may say that that was done solely because the Indian commissioner said he could do his work better from that point. I can imagine no better reason than that.

Mr. DAVIN. Do I understand my hon. friend (Mr. Sifton) to say that Mr. Forget said and reported he could do his work better from Winnipeg?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes.

Mr. DAVIN. I have been informed that what he reported to the Minister was that he could do his work better by coming down to Ottawa.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. That is not correct: at least I have not the slightest knowledge of any such report. Whether Mr. Forget suggested that he should come to Ottawa or not I cannot say, but it is possible that in the voluminous correspondence there might be some such suggestion that would escape me. Mr. Forget never suggested as far as I am aware that the work of the office of the Indian commissioner could be better discharged from Ottawa than Regina, but he did specifically recommend that he should be placed at Winnipeg, on the ground that his work could be more advantageously and conveniently and effectively be done from Winnipeg than from any other point. The fact is, that while at Regina he would be nearer to certain tribes of Indians, he would not be nearer on the average to the Indians under his charge. In this matter we should speak from the standpoint of

railway communication rather than actual distance, and in that sense Winnipeg is the most central point from which to reach all the Indians under the commissioner's charge. It seems to me that the commissioner's statement, that he could do his work more conveniently from Winnipeg is well-founded, and it is natural that such should be the case. It did not so seem to me when he made the recommendation, and I accepted his suggestion, believing it would increase the efficiency of the work, and I am inclined to think it has. The particular changes to which the hon. gentleman refers, the reorganization of the service in the North-west Territories, did not take effect until too late to have any effect on the crops for the year; so that I do not think my hon. friend's opinion on that point can be considered conclusive. As to the loss of cattle, I refuse to be held responsible for a loss which took place on one of the reserves, which has been referred to before in this House. It took place upon a reserve, owing to the lack of foresight of a gentleman appointed by the late Government and not by mine, and I could not be held responsible in any way except for keeping him in place rather than dismissing him.

Mr. DAVIN. If the hon. gentleman will allow me, I will read what Mr. Forget says:

> On the whole the past season has not been favourable as that of the preceding year. The crops, for some unexplainable reason, have been lower, and the condition of the stock generally for beef purposes has not been quite so good. Good prices, however, have been the rule.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. What year is that report for?

Mr. DAVIN. For the year ending 30th June, 1897.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. That is when the change came into effect. The reorganization took effect just at that time, so it could not have caused the loss.

Mr. DAVIN. It took effect, I think, some time before.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and the House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I explained this section when introducing the Bill. Section 33 is that section of the Indian Act which provides for the imposition of statute labour or road work ordered upon an Indian reserve. It provides that the duty of performing this labour may be imposed upon the Indians on a reserve engaged in the pursuit of agriculture as their principal means of support. The amendment will strike out the words limiting the imposition of this duty on those Indians who are engaged in agriculture, so that all the Indians on a reserve may be rendered liable for the performance of their duty.

On section 2,

Mr. DAVIN. Would the hon. gentleman explain how this will work? I understand it to prevent any Indian applying to have a lease made. The whole band will have to consent to the lease.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There is a specific form in which the lease is given. It is given by a council meeting. The only effect of this amendment is to add to the old law and allow the Superintendent General to dispose to the best advantage, in the interests of the Indians, the wild grass or dead timber. If an application is made to him to purchase the dead timber on a survey, he may sell it, for the benefit of the Indians of course, but he need not get the consent of the council. I want to avoid going through the formality of getting the authority of the Indian council to sell dead timber or wild hay on a reserve.

On section 6,

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. If the hon. gentleman will look at the fifteenth line on the third page of the Bill, in section 6, he will see that the effect of this is to re-enact the old section and re-insert therein the words commencing in line 15, as follows:

> For surveys, for compensation to Indians, for improvements, for any interests they have in land taken from them.

The effect, therefore, is that the Governor in Council may, subject to the general provisions of the Act, make use of the Indian funds which belong to the band for these purposes in addition to the others mentioned in that section. For instance, at present the law is just the same, except that we have not the power to use the savings of the band for surveys or compensating the Indians for lands taken from them. We may use the funds at present for the management of the reserve, and for the construction or repairs of roads, bridges, ditches, waterworks and so on, but we cannot authorize the expenditure for surveys. Sometimes the survey of a reserve is most necessary, and it has happened in one or two cases that a few Indians have obstructed the passage of the necessary resolution, in order to prevent surveys, without which a considerable number of the Indians on a reserve could not get on satisfactorily. For that reason it was deemed desirable that the Government should have power, in a particular case in the interests of the band, to expend what may be necessary. It does not affect any reserves except those in the older portions of Canada.

Mr. DAVIN. Was Mr. Pontin paid out of the moneys of the Indians?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Dealing with Indians funds—some of the

bands in the older portions have had funds to their credit.

On section 9,

Mr. DAVIN. This is very important, because it makes a change in what might be called the constitution under which the chiefs work.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. At present they have one chief for each thirty, and we want to make two for each 200. The number is altogether too large.

Bill reported.

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

After Recess.

GREAT NORTH-WEST CENTRAL RAILWAY.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). Before any other Order is taken up, Mr. Speaker, might I ask permission to have the second reading of Bill (No. 141)—from the Senate—respecting the Great North-west Railway Company proceeded with. There was a misunderstanding. I asked that it should stand over; but I think that every purpose will be served if the second reading is taken, so that the Bill may go to the Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines. Possibly, there might not be another opportunity. If there be no objection, I should like this to be taken up.

Mr. McISAAC moved second reading of Bill (No. 141)—from the Senate—respecting the Great North-west Railway Company.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and referred to Committee on Railways, &c.

MILITIA ACT AMENDMENT.

Bill (No. 140) further to amend the Militia Act, was read the second time, and the House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. DAVIN. What is this allowance? Do I understand an additional sum of $2,000 as an allowance to be paid to him?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA. Yes.

Mr. DAVIN. What is that for?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA. The resolution upon which this Bill was based was carried in the House after a full discussion. I suppose my hon. friend (Mr. Davin) was not in the House at the time. The attention of this Government was called by the Imperial Government to the fact that the General commanding the militia in this country is paid a very much smaller salary than in any of the other colonies although his duties are considerably more important, as he has a larger number of men under him. The Militia Act, of which this is an amendment, provides that the Major General Commanding shall be paid a salary at the rate of $4,000 per annum in full of all pay and allowances. That portion of clause 37 is changed by this Bill to read "And shall be paid a salary at the rate of $4,000 per annum, and in addition thereto, and, in lieu of allowances, such sum, not exceeding $2,000 per annum, as is determined by the Governor in Council."

Mr. DAVIN. Of course, then, this sum is in addition to his pay.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA. Yes.

Bill reported, and read the third time, and passed.

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT.

Bill (No. 145) further to amend the Railway Act, was read the second time, considered in committee, and reported.

THE GENERAL INSPECTION ACT.

Bill (No. 128) further to amend the General Inspection Act, was read the second time, and the House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. The object of the first clause of this Bill is to institute compulsory inspection in the matter of raw hides, potash and pearl ash; and I may say here that my intention is not to press the adoption of that part of the Bill. I felt justified in introducing it from the number of petitions received from the boards of trade of all our principal towns as well as from associations and corporations; but since the Bill has been introduced I find that it has given rise to very serious opposition on the part of dealers in raw hides and of butchers. I think that at this late stage of the session, especially as it appears to me evident that the public may, to a certain extent, have been taken by surprise and did not expect that this year we would re-establish compulsory inspection, I will not ask the committee to adopt that clause, but will beg leave to strike out of the Bill all those parts that relate to compulsory inspection. At the same time the public will be warned that another year,

if I am spared and it is my privilege to preside over this department, it is my intention to bring this measure up again because I think there are strong reasons in its favour.

Motion agreed to.

On section 2,

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. We have in every large city, and in some smaller ones, official inspectors, but as inspection is not now compulsory, certain individuals assume the privilege of inspecting, especially in case of fish, and take it upon themselves to mark the quality as first, second, third, and so forth, to the great detriment of honest traders, and of those who suppose, when they see those marks, that they are official marks upon which they can rely. In order to prevent that, I am asking the committee to allow me to devise means by which every certificate of inspection, as well as every mark and every stamp of inspection, shall bear such an official character as can be given to it, by the presence of a crown and the initials of the Queen, for instance, and there is a penalty provided for imitating those marks. I have become convinced that, until we can restore compulsory inspection, there must be some official marks to enlighten the public so that they may know that an article has really been inspected by an official inspector. When it is remembered that the official inspectors are only appointed after having passed an examination before the board of examiners qualified in the different branches of trade, to which the examination is applied, one can see that there is a real value to be attached to their inspection. The Bill had provided for a penalty of $1,000.

Mr. DAVIN. That is too large.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I agree it is far too large, and I propose, in the last line but one, to strike out the words to the end of the clause, and to substitute the following words: "The penalty provided for by section 21 of said Act for each such offence." That penalty is $40, which I think is sufficient.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). No doubt the object which the hon. gentleman desires to attain by the last portion of this section, is a very worthy one, but I would venture to suggest to him that it might not answer the purpose for which it is intended. The object, so far as I understand, is to prevent people from being misled by marks which purport to be official marks. The last clause of this Bill only provides a penalty in case particular marks, that is to say, the official marks, are counterfeited; but it would be quite possible for persons to put on marks not being official marks, but being of such a character as to mislead. If packed in barrels and sent to foreign countries with marks of that character, the same injurious results might follow as prevail at the present time. I suggest, therefore, that the scope of the latter part of the section should be widened, if the hon. gentleman desires to remove any evil.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. If exporters really want to have inspection marks of any value, this result can only be attained by adopting a set of official marks with the Crown and "V. R.," as indicating that the goods have been inspected by official authority. When exporters and dealers are informed that all goods officially inspected must bear the marks of the Crown and the initials of Her Majesty, that will in a large degree prevent promiscuous inspection which every exporter considers he is entitled to carry on. It is very difficult to pass a law prohibiting a manufacturer from marking his goods No. 1, 2 or 3 on the barrel or package. But I want intelligent people, especially those in the trade, to learn what the official marks are, and then they will understand whether the goods have been officially inspected or not, and if the packages are not stamped with the Crown and V. R., as required under the Bill, people will soon learn that the goods have not been inspected by the official inspectors.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The question of compulsory examination is one that has evidently received very careful attention from the Minister of Inland Revenue. I am very glad he has taken the position of postponing compulsory inspection, at all events until next year. He will require very full and reliable information before he asks Parliament to deal with this subject in that manner, although he may prove correct in coming to the conclusion that compulsory inspection is desirable. I have had some experience on this subject. During my administration of that department we had to change the law. We had to change the inspection on some articles from compulsory to voluntary. We found that the system worked best with voluntary inspection. Where we adopted compulsory inspection and arranged to pay fees for such inspection, we found the inspector in many cases looked upon his office as a revenue-producing office, and he was in many cases careless as regards the inspection he made, and was most interested in collecting the fees. The result was that it was a tax on the public for which they received no benefit. There was really no bona fide inspection. The view then taken by the department was that if the inspection were made voluntary and proper machinery were supplied for carrying it out, it would be to the interest of the inspector to make a satisfactory inspection and show that it was of some value to the trade. The hon. gentleman in providing for special marks has taken a step in the right direction; and I think the law will work well in that respect. When the public know

that an official inspection has been made, by seeing certain marks on the barrel, this inspection will give certain character and value to the goods, not only in this country but in foreign countries to which they may be exported, and the public will be glad to avail themselves of it. There is a good deal of force in the remarks made by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Borden). I do not wish to press the point. The hon. Minister has stated that care will be taken to educate the people as to the marks that will designate an official inspection. That is no doubt true here, but the exporters of fish to other countries may take longer to learn that an inferior article may go out branded No. 1, and thereby injury may be done to our trade in foreign countries. It was under these circumstances that the member for Halifax suggested that the clause should be made a little wider in its scope.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. That, I am afraid, will be tantamount to compulsory inspection. If we say that merchandise shall not be exported unless it bears certain marks of inspection, that is practically establishing compulsory inspection, which the ex-Minister of Inland Revenue found so objectionable. I think this is the best measure we can adopt at present.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). My remarks were not made so much with respect to placing signs Nos 1, 2 and 3 on packages as with regard to the easy manner in which the law could be evaded. Probably if "Canadian inspection" without the "V. R." were placed on a barrel, or the "V. R." without "Canadian inspection" no conviction could be obtained. I, therefore, suggested that the clause should be amended so as to make it wider and afford the protection desired.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. We expect that all merchants engaged in the trade will look at the marks, and will soon learn to distinguish those which are official. I confess it there are many difficulties surrounding the question, but it is admitted on all sides, I believe, that this is a step in the right direction.

On section 3,

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I move that this section be struck out, as it refers to compulsory inspection. I may be accused of taking people by surprise if I press it, and I do not think it would be quite fair to go on with it at the present stage of the session. There is no doubt that the inspection of potash and pearl ash is one of those scientific operations which can only be carried on satisfactorily by persons with some knolwedge of chemistry. For instance, the first quality must contain 75 per cent of pure alkali, and the second quality 55 per cent, and so forth, and it would be very difficult for an inexperienced person to calculate the exact amount of alkali contained in it.

Section 3 withdrawn.

On section 4,

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. The first line of section 21 of the general inspection law says that every person who "with fraudulent intent" does a number of things therein enumerated as forbidden shall be subject to a penalty. I move to strike out the words "with fraudulent intent," because it would appear that in every one of these forbidden Acts there is necessarily a fraudulent intention, but it is necessary, if we are to protect the revenue, that we should not be compelled to prove it. It is very difficult to protect the revenue and to protect the public, and these difficulties are greatly increased by leaving in the words "fraudulent intent."

Mr. DAVIN. That is calculated to work harshly in regard to persons who might be perfectly innocent. A child might obliterate one of these inspection marks, or a servant girl might use a package without obliterating the inspection mark, and so be subject to this penalty.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. There is certainly something in that suggestion, but unless in the case of a child any person who would do any one of those acts forbidden by the statute would undoubtedly do it fraudulently.

Mr. DAVIN. If you leave out the words "with a fraudulent intention" section (d) would read, that every person who uses for any purpose any old package bearing inspection marks would incur a penalty for $40. The thing seems ridiculous.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. It is a fraud that is perpetrated continually in the tobacco trade.

Mr. DAVIN. Yes, when it is a fraud.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. They take an inspected package and put things in it when they are not inspected, and if we are to protect the revenue such an amendment as this would help us.

Mr. DAVIN. You cannot make a crime out of a perfectly innocent act. There must be a fraudulent intent.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. If there is any very strong reason to the contrary I would not press it, but I ask my hon. friend (Mr. Davin) to remember the great difficulty we have to contend with. In the case of illicit distillation we would never be able to convict if we had to enter into the intention of the party. It is enough in that case to find the illicit still.

Mr. DAVIN. The onus is on the accused to prove that he did not do it fraudulently, and not on the Government.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. If we find a still in a house or a shed the persons who own the place will tell the officers that they do not know what use it was for, and then when they are told that its possession exposes them to a penalty, they will say that some enemy of theirs placed it there. In the eastern townships and along the boundary line there are a great many people who call themselves pedlars and who sell American tobacco, but if we had to prove that they smuggled that tobacco we would often find it hard to obtain a conviction. I do not consider I am exposing innocent persons to punishment, but it certainly seems that every one of those acts prohibited by clause 21 is of such a fraudulent nature that the Crown should not be compelled to prove that there was an intention to commit a fraud.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The last observations of the hon. Minister seem to show that this clause is most dangerous. He says that the mere fact that they do it is evidence of fraudulent intent, but he does not wish to prove the fraudulent intent in a court of law.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. No.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It does seem to me that this is a most dangerous provision. It would be easy for the department to obtain a conviction if the hon. gentleman's clause were adopted, but that is a very dangerous reason for adopting this kind of legislation. It puts the public in a position that I do not think they occupy in any other country in connection with such legislation. The law has hitherto made the Crown prove the fraudulent intent, and it seems to me that that is the line on which all such legislation proceeds in any civilized country. The hon. gentleman speaks of pedlars. He wants to get after some pedlars. In the case of Queen vs. Dart in Nova Scotia, the result of the executive action in that case was to put pedlars in a terrible position. A pedlar was shot and killed, and the man convicted of killing him was allowed to go at large by the exercise of the clemency of the Crown, and I believe that the only two other pedlars who happened to be abroad in the county took the first train and left it, if not the province. Now, the hon. gentleman intends to punish pedlars who happen to have done a certain act, even when he is unable to prove fraudulent intent and even if there be no fraudulent intent.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. How can there be no fraudulent intent? How can that be done without fraudulent intent?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. If that be the case, then there is no need to strike out those words. If the mere doing of the thing is evidence of fraudulent intent, then that is all the proof that the hon. gentleman will require, and he need not strike out these words.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If the hon. gentleman will look at clause "d," he will see that if a farmer takes hold of an old flour barrel and uses it for the purpose of taking potatoes to market, he will be liable to a penalty of $20, under the Act, if those words be struck out. The hon. gentleman is doing away with the necessity of any fraudulent intent, and not simply with the necessity of proving it. It might be desirable to throw the burden of proof on the defendant by some suitable clause, but it would never do to take away the necessity for the existence of the fraudulent intent, and that is what the amendment will do.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. It will be seen that when the Bill was introduced, this did not form part of it, and since my hon. friends on the other side, with their legal knowledge, say that the mere fact is evidence of fraudulent intent, and that no other proof would be required, I would ask that this clause be struck out. I would move therefore to strike out these words.

Bill reported, and read the third time, and passed.

SUPPLY.

The House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Experimental Farm..... $75,000

Mr. MONTAGUE. Will the hon. gentleman explain any change?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). I am very glad indeed to give any explanation hon. gentlemen opposite would like in regard to this item. It is one which not infrequently involves some discussion in the House and one which certainly is of the greatest interest to the country. It is one also to which I have myself given a good deal of attention, both before and since coming into office, and yet I must frankly say that I have not yet been able to do all that I hoped with regard to these farms. The work that was going on has been of the utmost value to the country, and I felt that there were other things in my department which needed my own personal attention more urgently perhaps than this work, and therefore I allowed it to continue on pretty much the same lines on which it had proceeded, with one or two exceptions.

I cannot say that there is any definite change in policy, except as regards the Nappan farm. I visited that farm soon after I came into office, and found a condition of affairs there with which I was not at all satisfied and which I did not consider could be continued to the advantage of the

maritime provinces. It seemed to me there was abundant opportunity to establish a good dairy farm there. As the hon. ex-Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Montague) knows, there is at Nappan a dairy station as well as a farm. We are running a creamery there under Prof. Robertson as dairy commissioner. The stock on the farm was not dairy stock. It was a mixed lot of animals, and some of them had been detained beyond their usefulness and service. I therefore directed that a large number should be immediately disposed of, and I purchased a considerable number of first-class animals, and sent them down to replace the other stock. Besides, I have given directions that on that farm the chief attention and work of the farm should be devoted to dairying. With the little acquaintance I have had with the maritime provinces, especially with the provinces of Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island, which I know a little better than I know the province of New Brunswick, I have been convinced that there is opportunity for great dairy development there. I found that in these provinces the attention of the people was being turned to stock and stock-keeping. While not wishing in any way to hamper the development of beef-raising and making in these provinces, I perceived, as I thought, that stock-raising had been, perhaps, a little more advanced than the dairying had been, and I thought that if it was possible to establish a good model farm at Nappan, it would perhaps be the best thing that could be done for the farmers of the maritime provinces. That has been going on, and, I trust, under the management of Mr. Robertson, whom I sent down to take charge of the farm, it will be carried on successfully, Mr. Robertson having been for years a well known expert in dairying and keeping dairy stock. As regards the farms in the west, I may say that there is practically no change. I have not, since coming into office, been able to visit the western farms. It was my good fortune, during last Parliament, when I was not in the House, to make a trip to the west, and I took occasion, being interested in these matters, to visit these farms. But since coming into office, I have not found time to make a trip to the west. Following conversations I have had with the managers of the farms, some slight changes have been made, but the work has been going on largely on the lines on which it was previously carried on.

At the Central Experimental Farm here, there are one or two things to which I had better allude. First, I would speak of the fact that last autumn tuberculosis was found in the herd at the farm. I regret to be obliged to state this fact. It was an unfortunate fact, but I thought that, having discovered it, it was best to face it, and take steps to rid the farm of that dread disease. We tested the animals there, and disposed immediately of those which were found diseased, a large number, I regret to say. I also had the animals at the other farms tested, and found at Nappan no diseased animals, and, in the western farms, only two or three at each farm. Here there were no less than twenty-six diseased animals out of a total of fifty-five head, speaking from memory. Of course this immediately reduced the stock upon the farm, and up to the present I have not altogether replaced that stock. I had to buy a few animals, but not a very large number, up to the present time. I had the barns and stables thoroughly cleansed and disinfected, in such a way as, I believe, to prevent the building retaining any of the germs of the disease. The only other thing that it is necessary for me to detail at this stage is the fact that the horticulturist resigned his position, and I took occasion to promote Mr. William Macoun, who has been in charge of the forestry and of the arboretum there, to the position. I have not added to the staff, but in view of the vacancy thus created, I propose, as soon as I can find a suitable man, to appoint an agriculturist at the farm, who will take especial charge of the farm, the treatment of the soil and the stock, and make that an especial feature, and relieve Prof. Saunders, the director general of the farm, of some of the work he has had to do personally in that regard. I am satisfied that this will be an advantage to the farm, and I have the full concurrence and sympathy of Prof. Saunders himself in this action. I may say that, in consequence of the condition of the stock at Nappan, and the loss of stock here, I shall have a small amount in the Supplementary Estimates of this year for the purchase of stock. Otherwise the expenditure at the experimental farm has been kept within the bounds, and I trust that the work upon it has been carried on in as thoroughly an efficient manner as it has been in the past. Of course, if there are further questions that any hon. gentleman desires to ask me, I shall be only too glad to explain anything further in connection with the work.

Mr. MONTAGUE. In view of what the hon. Minister has said concerning the appointment of an agriculturist, I should like to ask whether he has yet considered seriously the appointment of a bee expert. I have previously called the attention of the hon. gentleman to what I regard as the importance of that subject. There can be no doubt, I think, of the value of sending out literature with regard to bee-keeping through the sections of the country which are adapted to this industry, as almost all our provinces are. I quite understand that the previous Government did establish an apiary branch there, but, I am sorry to say, they did it in a somewhat half-hearted fashion. They placed it in charge of Prof. Fletcher——

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Mr. Fixter has it in charge.

Mr. MONTAGUE. That is the farm foreman, but I think it is under the oversight of Prof. Fletcher; at least, it was; I cannot say how it is at the present time. Suppose we were to take the statement of the hon. Minister that this branch is in charge of the farm foreman. Now, I do not think that that is paying as much attention to bee-keeping as might be done with advantage to the Canadian Experimental Farm. I know that this is a matter which the bee-keepers all through the country are exceedingly anxious about. I may say that the hon. Minister (Mr. Fisher) will remember that this has been called to his attention a number of times, not only in the press representing that branch of agriculture, but by bee-keepers all over the country. I think that last year the hon. gentleman gave us somewhat of a promise, or shadow of a promise, that he would do something in this direction, and I hope that this time he will be able to give us the promise that something definite will be done. The Government are fairly liberal, I think, in dealing with the public service generally and with public money, and I do not think they should refuse to accede to the wishes of the people representing an important, even though relatively small, branch of agriculture, which has its representatives in almost every province of the Dominion, and which contributes a great deal to the income of the farmers of Canada. I cannot speak too strongly upon that point, because I know how thoroughly alive the bee-keepers are to the importance of having some attention paid to their industry, so as to secure for them the benefit of experiments, as has been done in dairying and other branches of agriculture that have received attention at the farm.

As to the questions of policy, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fisher), it will please the hon. gentlemen on this side of the House to know, is pursuing the same policy as the previous Government. He has not found time to disturb it. That being the case, I fancy there is very little for us to criticise in the hon. gentleman's vote or the manner in which he is carrying on the farm. I would like to ask whether he intends to have the experiment stations in various parts of the country. In another place, I believe, there was a discussion on this point, and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fisher) expressed a favourable opinion upon that work.

I must say that I differ with some gentlemen who spoke on that point, and I would support the hon. gentleman if he would ask for a vote, small in the beginning, but growing larger, for the purpose of doing experimental work in connection with the various farms in the several provinces of the Dominion. I see the Minister of Finance smiles, he always smiles when money is asked for, but he smiles with an approving smile when the Minister of Public Works asks for money. Money has been spent by the Minister of Public Works in building fences and greenhouses that might have been more wisely spent by the Minister of Agriculture in making experiments for the people who are really the wealth producers, or at least the great portion of them, in the Dominion of Canada. I think if the hon. gentleman will take up that work he will find that the farmers would take a deep interest in it, and he would be performing for almost every section of the country what he is attempting here, I believe, with very fair success in other branches. I do not see any reason, with an expenditure of 40 millions—or will it be when we hear the total, 42 millions, the Minister of Finance might be able to tell us—I do not see any reason why a few thousand could not be spared from the Estimates of the Minister of Public Works to make a few experiments for the farmers of Canada in connection with the illustration stations. I know the Minister of Finance is generous, I am sure the Minister of Public Works is generous where public works are constructed, and I would also ask him to be generous to the farmers of Canada who, notwithstanding any opinion that may be expressed as to the wisdom of this course, I believe are fully in accord with the action of the past Government and of the present Government in making experiments upon as wide a scale as possible for the advancement of agriculture. There are other points to which the hon. gentleman has referred which I regret equally with him, particularly the disease which broke out among the herds at the Central Experimental Farm. I am glad that he found no disease in the eastern provinces; but I hope that will not be taken as an excuse, as some hon. gentlemen has suggested, for moving the whole experimental farm to the eastern provinces. May I ask the Minister of Agriculture to give me an answer upon these two points: As to the apiary, and as to the illustration stations. Then I may ask him as to how many animals he purchased for the farm at Nappan?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. In answer to the hon. gentleman, first, about an apiarist at the Experimental Farm, I may say frankly that I have not yet reached the point where I feel that I can make such an appointment. As the hon. gentleman knows, there is a fixed vote for carrying on the Experimental Farm, and before I am able to add any particular expenditures such as he has alluded to, I should have to provide for cutting off something else.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Better increase the vote.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The vote is the same as it has been. I hope in the course of this season to be able to cut off a considerable amount of expendi-

ture on various items at all the five farms, and if so, I may then consider the question of the appointment of an apiarist, or of doing something else to extend experimental work in connection with these. But I do not like to charge the farms with that expenditure until I can see my way clear to doing it in some such way as I have suggested. As regards the proposition of what Professor Robertson and myself have called illustration stations, and of experimental stations in different parts of the country, I may say that this question was brought up in the Committee of Agriculture a short time ago, but in a tentative way, for the purpose of sounding the opinion of the members. I am satisfied in my own mind, that a good deal of good might be accomplished by some such work. But I may say frankly that the scheme has not yet been proposed or worked out to that point where it can be put into immediate practice, and I have not at the present moment come to a conclusion as to whether I can do anything during the next season. The hon. gentleman will see that such a work as this could not be taken out of the vote for experimental farms, in fact it was not the intention that it should be done entirely in connection with the experimental farms, but rather under the control and management of the dairy commissioner who has done such able work in what might be called the illustration stations in dairying all over the country. In fact the idea grew out of the success of Professor Robertson in illustrating the best dairy methods for the people in the different provinces of the Dominion. We hope, if this work is undertaken, that, commencing in a comparatively small way, it will grow, not as a charge upon the revenue of the country, but in efficiency and advantage similar to the splendid dairy work that Professor Robertson has inaugurated in days gone by. The hon. gentleman has asked me for some details about the purchase of animals for the Nappan farm. The prices paid do not come into the report of this year, the purchases were made late in the fall. I can say, however, speaking from memory, that we sent down to the Nappan farm some 20 cows, bought chiefly in the neighbourhood of Huntingdon, in the province of Quebec. Amongst them, however, were two thoroughbred Guernsey cows bought in the United States, along with a thoroughbred Guernsey bull and one or two Ayrshires bought in Canada, all thoroughbreds. The rest of them were grade animals sent down from this part of Canada. We also bought two or three Guernsey cattle for the central farm, one or two of which are to be sent to the west this spring, either to Brandon or Indian Head. The total number purchased is about 25 head. The prices paid for the grade cattle were in the neighbourhood of $50 to $55. The cows were cows coming in, as it is called, that is to say, going to calve or having just calved in the fall of the year. I think I may say they were good animals, and the prices paid were what I consider reasonable prices. They were purchased mostly by Mr. Robertson, the new manager of the farm at Nappan, who is considered an extra good judge of stock, one of the best judges of dairy cattle, I suppose, in the Dominion of Canada at the present day. They were purchased from different people, two of the grade cows in the neighbourhood of Ottawa, and all the rest in the neighbourhood of Huntingdon and Chateauguay. Most of them were Ayrshires, there being a large number of this breed kept in the neighbourhood, and of an excellent quality.

Mr. CLANCY. I agree with the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) that the expenditure on these experimental farms is entirely too small. Take, for instance, the Central Experimental Farm at Ottawa. I had the pleasure of visiting that only a day or two ago, and I am not making this criticism in a vein of fault finding, when I say that I think the time has come when we have completely outgrown the state of things that can be produced by the money now voted by Parliament for purposes of this kind. I think the Minister of Agriculture will agree with me that a considerably larger sum could be expended in a most useful work at the Experimental Farm. Now, in looking over it, I became persuaded, not that the money was badly spent, but that there was not enough money spent. Take, for instance, the swine: the hon. gentleman will know himself that there is not a variety, there is not the kind the farmers would expect to see there. The building is entirely too small, it is one wanting entirely in facilities for carrying on such a work as would be applicable to a city like Ottawa, and which, from its location, would do a great deal of good. I hope another year the Minister will considerably increase the vote, for I believe no money is so well spent in Canada as in the expenditure on the work being carried on at the experimental farm now. With respect to the experimental stations, I do not quite agree with the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague), that that project can be carried out. I quite sympathize with those who hold the view that work of that kind might produce good results, but I think the farmers will see, and the Minister of Agriculture himself will see the difficulty of undertaking a work of that kind with a view to reach the masses. I imagine if the grant can be increased for the central farm, so that more seed can be sent out for experimental purposes and returns obtained by the department here, more benefit will be accomplished and the mass of the people will be reached more readily. The fact is, you must have every man engage as an experimentalist in order to obtain success. You will never reach the masses until you can

get each man to undertake these experiments for himself and make an intelligent return to the Department of Agriculture. A very great deal of useful work has been done by the Agriculture College at Guelph in regard to the distribution of seed. They have there what is called an experimental union. Seed is distributed, and every recipient is supposed to make a return of the results obtained during the year. It is easy to lay down a cast-iron rule with respect to the manufacture of cheese and butter, but the committee will see the difficulty of laying down any such rule with respect to farming. The rules must bend and yield to all the different conditions that obtain on a farm. It would be impossible for any intelligent farmer to conduct operations on two farms and obtain precisely the same results unless the conditions were exactly similar, which would not prevail, and these results could not be obtained by following a cast-iron rule. Experiments on one farm might be very useful, but they might not apply to an adjoining farm, owing to the conditions not being the same. But if we distributed large quantities of grain, and that is the reason why I wish a considerable increase in the expenditure, each person receiving it would become an experimentalist, and excellent results would be obtained in educating the mass of the farmers and bringing about that condition of pride and thrift which our farmers must require in order to farm successfully to-day. The time has passed when our agriculturists can follow the old style and succeed. They must adapt themselves to every new method. They must produce the highest quality of products at the least possible cost, and the margin of profit will depend on the results. I hope the hon. Minister another year will be able to ask a larger sum for distribution of grain, and will adopt measures to secure a larger number of reports. The total cost of bulletins last year, I observe, was $718, a sum which the Minister will agree with me is altogether too small. People look forward with interest to receiving these bulletins, but, as they are issued on a comparatively small scale, I am afraid they are not doing much benefit. The total expenditure on seed grain distribution was $1,700. I should like the hon. Minister to explain on what principle the seed grain was distributed from the central farm?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman is entirely in error in thinking that there were fewer bulletins issued during last year than the year before. There were more bulletins issued.

Mr. CLANCY. I was not making any comparison, but simply stating that there were too few issued.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I fully appreciate the value of the bulletins, and I have made a great effort to get out as many as possible. I think last year we sent out seven bulletins, a considerably larger number than ever before, at all events, more than have been sent out in several previous years. I value very much this method of obtaining information, and it is very important they should be sent out to the farmers, because a great many men will read a short bulletin of eight or ten pages on a certain topic, when they will not read the annual report and pick out the pages referring to their own special subject. Those reports are sent out in accordance with a mailing list. During six or seven years no revision of this list was made, but I had it thoroughly revised last year. The list now amounts to near 55,000 names, and all the publications of the experimental farm are sent to every one of these individuals as soon as they are issued. The hon. gentleman may not be aware of the fact, but in addition to these reports the Agriculture Committee of the House sometimes orders special editions of evidence for the information of farmers. They have ordered sometimes the whole farm report. I think that is not judicious; but the different officers appear before the committee and give evidence, touching lightly and pointedly on the particularly salient features of their year's work, and this evidence is taken down verbatim, and when published is sent out by the committee through members of the House.

The hon. gentleman asks how the seed grain was distributed from the central farm. I have changed the method a little this year. I investigated the matter and found a very small number of reports were sent in by those who had received the grain. This grain is sent out in three-pound bags, and a certificate is sent by the same mail, inclosing a form which the receiver of the grain has to fill up and return to the farm. In this form, details are asked as to the amount of land covered, the nature of the season, the amount of crop harvested, and general remarks as to the result. We found unfortunately that only 20 per cent of all the grain sent out was reported upon. I thought this was a very unfortunate and at the same time, a very startling fact. I, therefore, had a very careful examination made of the list of persons who had received grain. I found that grain was sent out to persons whose names appeared on the list furnished either by members of the House or by societies, and from those persons very few reports were received. In many cases, especially in the lists furnished by members of the House, the persons were not farmers or even gardeners, but were men like blacksmiths, tailors, merchants, and all sorts of people; as a matter of fact some of the members simply marked their voters' lists and asked us to send farm bulletins and seed grain to those people. I therefore instructed Professor Saunders during the past winter to send out a circular to all members

of the House and of the Senate and every person who had been on the list, stating that no one would receive seed grain who did not make a personal application to show bona fides. The result is that we have sent out between 24,000 and 25,000 samples instead of 37,000 last year; but of those who made personal application most of the individuals had made reports previously, or I would prefer to say that the number includes practically all those who had made reports previously, and we cut off a large number of those who had not reported. I feel that in order that this distribution of seed grain be effective and useful and justify public expenditure, we should obtain some reports and not simply leave the matter in the hands of individuals who may happen to obtain samples of the grain. I took this method of trying to reduce the waste, and I hope and believe a considerable reduction of the waste will ensue. As a matter of fact, in consequence of the circular asking people to make personal application to us a larger number of personal applications were made this year than usual. I felt that any one who took the trouble to make a personal application after receiving a circular of that kind, would be more likely to be incited to make a report, which is really what we want. As soon as I can see a way clear of utilizing the public money to the advantage of the farmers I shall not hesitate at all in asking Parliament for such a sum as shall be needed, but until I do see my way clear, I do not think it would be quite fair for me to ask the House to vote the money. I trust that by cutting down a large number of small unnecessary expenditures here and there, perhaps in some way economizing, but in no way hurting the efficiency of the experimental farms, I may be able to extend and improve them and make them larger and better than they have been in the past. Such at any rate shall be my effort.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman will see that the seed grain must be distributed in the country, and the results cannot be accomplished in a year and must be attended with many failures before it reaches the 50 per cent which would be a very fair showing. I would suggest to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fisher), that he should send circulars to those who receive grain asking them for their reports. Those who are acquainted with the methods of farmers generally, know that some are careless of correspondence, and I know of no expenditure that would be more useful than the small sum required to send out circulars asking those who receive the grain for their reports. I am glad the hon. gentleman has seen the inutility of sending seed grain to persons who are not engaged in agriculture or even gardening. The moment the Minister can get the farmers to make personal application for the seed grain, and to make prompt reports to the department, a great work will be accomplished. We know that occasionally a man may be disappointed in the grain, that the conditions may have been against his success, and the probabilities are he will be discouraged from sending in any report. I hope that whatever expenditure the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fisher) cuts down he will not cut down the expenditure on seed grain distribution and other matters connected with it, and in obtaining prompt reports from those who receive it, but that on the contrary it will be his policy to increase it.

Mr. KAULBACH. My desire is that the agricultural interests of the country may be advanced in the best possible manner, and there is no better way calculated to promote scientific farming than by showing to the people of Canada the results obtained at the Central Experimental Farm at Ottawa. I quite agree with some hon. gentlemen, that the expenditure in this direction is small and that perhaps we could accomplish greater and more beneficial results with the money at present voted, but I certainly agree that if we can obtain beneficial results we should not lessen the expenditure. When I visited the Central Experimental Farm a few days ago, the thought occurred to me that the lessons to be derived from such visits should be utilized as educators throughout the Dominion. I wish to offer some suggestions, not with a view of criticising but with a view of helping in the work. I do not think that the farm should be a mere experimental farm, but on the contrary that visitors, whether members of Parliament or any one else, should have an opportunity of seeing a model farm as well as an experimental, both as regards the character and convenience of the buildings as well as the mode of conducting the work and the keep of farm stock.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Is the hon. gentleman speaking of the farm here?

Mr. KAULBACH. I am speaking of the Central Experimental Farm at Ottawa. I do not wonder that the cattle in the barn on that farm became diseased, because during my visit, I found that the aroma from the silos was most objectionable, and the atmosphere inhaled by the cattle from day to day certainly most injurious to them. The barn itself is not so constructed as in my opinion to be of advantage to the farm. They cannot produce as much manure with cattle in a barn on the ground floor. Although the floor is cemented and all the liquids retained, still I believe that if that liquid were allowed to go into the solid manure, it would produce more beneficial results to the farm. I quite agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Clancy) in his remarks about the piggery, and I believe that improvements could be made in that direction in a variety of ways. I am not going to step aside in respect to my views with re-

gard to the position of a farmer. I am a farmer myself, and as extensive a one as there is in the county of Lunenburg, and as agricultural matters come before me frequently, I think it only right I should make reference to them in this House. With regard to the distribution of seed grain, I have known the results to be very beneficial to persons receiving them in the county of Lunenburg. They have found the grain distribution from the Experimental Farm to result most profitably to them, and instead of repeating the old seed from year to year they have put in new varieties with good results. I believe that the art and knowledge of agriculture might be advanced very considerably if a greater number of reports of the Experimental Farm were circulated. At present the number distributed is too limited, and for the last few years I have been unable to get such numbers of these reports as I considered necessary in the interests of the country. If the vote is at present too limited, then I would suggest to the Minister of Agriculture that he should increase it so that we may spread the knowledge of agriculture as widely as we possibly can. I believe in agricultural stations in the different districts in this Dominion, say one in the smaller provinces and two in the larger provinces. The Minister referred to them as illustration stations. I believe that they would be excellent educators for the agriculturists, and they would advance the knowledge of farming more rapidly than by having this one central experimental farm alone, to which only members of Parliament and a comparative few others have access. If at these experimental stations a farmer could see with his own eye what is being done, it would be a better educator than even the distribution of books and reports. In this way the farmers of the different sections of the country, by travelling a comparatively short distance to a station would see for themselves practical farming operations carried out in the most scientific manner, and with such lessons so acquired would show good practical results on their private farms in a very short time. With views of this sort, if they could be carried out, by employing additional hands, I feel satisfied that we are doing an excellent work, and that the money so granted by the Government could not be expended in any better way.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I was very much interested in the reference to the apiary, and if the Minister of Agriculture has serious intentions of developing that line of farming, I could refer him with confidence to the Minister of Finance and the Premier of Nova Scotia, who would recommend him a man most suitable to take charge of anything of that kind in the province of Nova Scotia. I rose particularly to ask why it became necessary to dispense with the services of Mr. Forrest, who was the man in charge of the Nappan farm ?

Mr. KAULBACH.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. When I need an apiarist, I shall be very glad to apply to the Minister of Finance and would be very happy if I can find one in Nova Scotia to do the work. I may say, incidentally, that we sent the other day several swarms to the farm at Nappan, where Mr. Robertson, the new man, is an expert in bee culture as well as dairying. With regard to Mr. Forrest, when I went to Nappan first, after taking office, I found the stock in a condition which did not reflect credit on the Government or the farm. I had a long talk with Mr. Forrest, and came to the deliberate conclusion that he could not carry out the work I wanted done at Nappan, and therefore requested his resignation. I need a man there who is an expert in dairying, and on whom I could depend to carry out the plans and arrangements I wish to make. I did not think Mr. Forrest could do so, and I chose a man who seemed to me eminently competent for that purpose.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Were the animals diseased ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, but they were in bad order, badly kept and badly handled.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Was Mr. Forrest called upon to make an explanation, and what was his explanation?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I could not find any explanation that would justify the condition in which the animals were. I was informed by him and the herdsman in charge of the barns, that he had been feeding the cattle a large quantity of grain in the months of June and July, when there is abundant pasture, and the cattle are out on grass, and in the fall of the year, when the grass is short, he had no grain to feed them with. A man who will do that is not fit to take charge of a farm.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Was there any investigation or was it just the hon. gentelman's own impression that induced him to dispense with Mr. Forrest's services ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There was no inquiry. I discussed the matter with Professor Robertson, and acted on my own responsibility.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Was Mr. Forrest heard at all ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I wrote to him asking for his resignation, and he wrote back that he would not resign, and I then dispensed with his services.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. He was not asked for any explanation ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not think so.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I think that that was very summary treatment. Of course all I know of Mr. Forrest is the reputation he has had for many years in that county, which is a county where farming is pretty well understood. He is a man of more than ordinary intelligence and who has held very responsible positions, and even if he had not occupied in times past these responsible positions, it seems to me that even the humblest man in the service is entitled to a fair hearing or to be called on to show such cause as could be shown for the state of things which the hon. Minister says existed. There is no case that one may put that is not open to some explanation. It occurs to me, taking the Minister's own statement, which I do very frankly, that Mr. Forrest was dealt with very summarily indeed. He was asked for no explanation and given no opportunity to remove the bad impressions which the Minister had formed. I speak of this simply for this reason. Mr. Forrest has never communicated with me, directly or indirectly, and I was at a loss to know why his services were dispensed with, because I know the man. I know him to be a man of good practical ability, who has filled very important positions, parliamentary and otherwise, and who stood well with the department. He is a man who was well liked and well thought off, and whose character is above reproach. Under these circumstances, I am surprised that the hon. Minister has no other statement to make than that he formed a bad impression and summarily called upon the officer for his resignation.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have no reproach to make against Mr. Forrest's character or position or anything of that kind. I believe that these are just what the hon. member has said. I was dealing with him simply as a man in charge of a farm. I went there and examined the affairs along with Professor Saunders, and the condition was such as required certainly an explanation. I talked over it all with Mr. Forrest at the time. I spent a whole day discussing everything with him in connection with the stock and the barns and everything else. I pointed out that what I considered to be the condition of affairs, and if he had any explanation to make he had there an ample opportunity of making it. I did not act hastily but came back to Ottawa and discussed the whole situation very seriously with Professor Saunders, the director. I gave Mr. Forrest certain directions to carry out, and he carried those out as I told him. I have no fault to find with the manner in which he carried out my directions as regards the sale of the stock, but at the same time it appeared to me, on the face of it, that he was not competent to carry out the work that I wished in connection with the stock. From what he said himself and from what occurred at the time, I felt justified in asking for his resignation. In asking for it, I explained that that was the reason. He offered no explanation in his reply, but merely said that he was satisfied. He could do as well as anybody else, and declined to resign. Under these circumstances, there was nothing for me to do but to put a man in charge who could carry out the work satisfactorily. I do not wish in any way to reflect on Mr. Forrest's character or conduct in any other position he occupied. My own belief is that he was quite competent to carry on the farming which had been carried on at his own farm, but that was not the kind of farming I wish to have carried on. I am still of opinion that a change was necessary in the public interest and the interests of the farmers of the maritime provinces who may wish to visit that farm and see the operations going on.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Did any one make a complaint before the Minister went to the farm? Did he hear any dissatisfaction from any quarter?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I cannot say that I did, except from Professor Saunders. He was not satisfied with Mr. Forrest's conduct before I took charge, and I fully discussed the matter with him. When I took office, I discussed the different branch farms with Professor Saunders, and the only farm on which he made adverse criticism was that at Nappan.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Did the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan) discuss Mr. Forrest's case before that action was taken?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Not a word. He was present when I went to the farm, but until then I never had communication of any kind with him about Mr. Forrest or the farm at Nappan. It was my own opinion entirely on which I acted, without any prompting from the member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan) whatever.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Who was put in his place?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Mr. Robert Robertson. He came from the county represented by the hon. member for Compton (Mr. Pope).

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Is he a brother of Professor Robertson?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, nor any connection of his in any way whatever. He is a young man, who was born, I think, in the county of Huntingdown, or in that neighbourhood. The first time I came in contact with him was a good many years ago, when I was acting as judge in a provincial farmers competition in the province of Quebec. I visited his farm and was struck with admiration of the way in which it was managed and the condition in

which it was. Shortly afterwards he was chosen by the Quebec Government—the allies and friends of hon. gentlemen opposite—to take charge of the Quebec stock at the Chicago exhibition. He went there in charge of the Ayrshire stock of the province of Quebec and took 11 out of 14 prizes. He swept the boards with his stock. He was afterwards chosen to take charge of the Quebec model farm at Compton and managed it for a couple of years. He resigned that position to buy a farm in the neighbourhood of Compton, and was on it, when I asked him to take charge of the farm at Nappan. He is well known as an Ayrshire breeder and a capable stock man, and has been a judge and competitor at all the great fairs in the Dominion of Canada, and invariably has shown his stock in splendid order and carried off a very large portion of prizes.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Had the hon. Minister any recommendations for anybody in the province of Nova Scotia to take Mr. Forrest's place ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I cannot say that I had.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Did the hon. gentleman make any inquiries ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, I consulted various members of the House and various members from the province of Nova Scotia, and they agreed with me that it would be well to send such a man as Mr. Robertson to take charge of the farm.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What was the objection to Mr. Blair, the assistant ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. He is not a farmer, but a horticulturist.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Is he not the assistant superintendent ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, he is a horticulturist.

Mr. MONTAGUE. What salary does the new man receive ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The same salary, $1,400.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I must say that when Mr. Forrest was appointed to the position of superintendent of the Nappan Farm, he came very highly recommended. If I caught the remarks of the hon. gentleman correctly, he stated that the condition of the farm——

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Only the condition of the stock.

Mr. MONTAGUE. It rather created a prejudice in the minds of hon. gentlemen. Of course, the hon. gentleman will remember that Mr. Forrest was in charge of the farm for only a very short time, and he will see that Mr. Forrest could not be held responsible for the condition of an institution in connection with which he had been only a very short time indeed. All I can say is that he came to me very highly recommended indeed, as a very skilful farmer, and one in whom the people of Nova Scotia would have a great deal of confidence. I regret, under these circumstances, that the hon. gentleman felt it necessary to dismiss him.

Mr. TALBOT. I would ask the Minister of Agriculture whther, as his staff is now constituted at the Central Experimental Farm, the French-speaking people of the province of Quebec are able to derive much benefit from the lectures that are given throughout the country, as they would derive if some of the lecturers were fluent in the use of the French language. I am informed that in the other provinces of the Dominion, Prof. Saunders and other gentlemen of the Experimental Farm, have been in the habit of delivering lectures to the people. I am not aware that this work is being done in the province of Quebec among the French people, where, however, it would be of great utility. I would like to know if it is intended to take steps to remedy that evil.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman is misinformed in stating that this kind of work is not being carried on in the province of Quebec. As a matter of fact, Mr. J. L. McMurray has been nearly all this winter making trips in the province of Quebec and delivering lectures in various localities. He is a very practical man in connection with farm work, thoroughly understands it all, and has a gift for addressing public audiences which makes his lectures very acceptable and useful. Perhaps some hon. gentlemen in this House have heard him, certainly many of them have reported to me, in consequence of his going out at my request and under my instructions to visit their counties, that his lectures have given a great deal of satisfaction. I may also say that Mr. James Fletcher, the entomologist, is a good French scholar, and has delivered addresses in the French language at various places. There is an impression abroad that there are not many French-speaking employees on the farm. I have a list of Frenchmen on the farm, and I can assure the hon. gentleman that this impression is not a correct one. As a matter of fact, there are some five or six men connected with the central offices of the farm who are French by race and by language. There are in the barns and about the farm half a dozen more who are also French. I am now looking for an assistant chemist, and I have one or two applications, but I have decided that the new assistant must be a Frenchman. Under these circumstances, I can assure the hon. gentleman that the French language and the French people are fairly represented,

and that anybody going to the farm who wishes to have explanations in French will be entirely satisfied on that head. Now, in regard to the remarks of the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Kaulbach) about the barns and the piggery of the farm, while I am not at all responsible for the plan of those barns and of the piggery, I agree with him in some of the reflections that he made upon those buildings. The cattle stable is not at all what I would like. I am not, however, in a position to make radical changes that would cost a great deal of money; that barn has already cost a very large amount, and it would be a serious business to make a new barn. Some changes in the stables will be made soon, which, I trust, will to a certain extent obviate the objections which the hon. gentleman has taken in respect to ventilation and the sanitary condition of the buildings. So far as saving manure is concerned, the barn is satisfactory. The cattle are so bedded constantly by absorbents, that none of the manure is lost. We have found, after careful experiments, that when the green manure is taken immediately from the barn to the fields, it is the most valuable as a fertilizer. But I think I can say that no manure is lost there which can be saved.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Will you use gypsum in the stables?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes.

Mr. KAULBACH. I am glad my hon. friend agrees with my views with regard to the barn and piggery on the Central Farm. Whilst I am on my feet, the hon gentleman will permit me to supplement my remarks with a word or two further. I am anxious that the Central Experimental Farm should extend its branches, and that one of them may find its way into the province to which I belong. The Minister, I think, knows sufficiently of the geography of my county to know that it is situated about half way between Cape Sable and the Strait of Canso, very centrally placed indeed, and well adapted for a central farm. Now, I am ready to help the hon. gentleman to carry out the views I have expressed, and I think he will be willing to help us with a small expenditure there, which will be much more profitable than a great deal of the expenditures that are made throughout this Dominion. I will pledge myself to give him a good farm in my county, very centrally situated, not far from the county of Annapolis, and away from the seaboard, in one of the best farming districts of my county, where fine farms are to be found extending from the centre of the province down to the sea. I am anxious to see a thorough practical farmer brought into the county I represent; and I can pledge the hon. gentleman that I will aid him to superintend that work so far as I am able free of expense, and will give him all the ideas I have been able to gather from my own practical knowledge of farming. This offer will be open any time the hon. gentleman chooses to accept it. I want to see men brought into the county who will be educators to our farmers in all the various operations conducted on a farm, so that they may learn how to obtain the best crop from the least amount of labour; in other words, that they may learn something of the mysteries of agricultural chemistry and profit from results.

Mr. TALBOT. Is not this Mr. McMurray the hon. Minister mentioned a mere corresponding clerk on the farm, drawing a very small salary, and not a man of much experience there?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Mr. McMurray is not chief of the department. He is one of the clerks, and very competent to do the work which has been referred to.

Mr. TAYLOR. I do not think it would be fair to my hon. friend from South Huron (Mr. McMillan) who, I am sorry to say, is not in his place to-night, to have this whole item passed now. I think that one item in it should be allowed to stand until he is present and also until my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) is here. I know that both these gentlemen wish to take part in discussing this subject. It is very refreshing to hear the discussion from this side of the House to-night compared with what we used to hear two or three years ago when gentlemen opposite sat here and we upon the other side. I understood the Minister to say that the amount voted this year is the same as it has been—$75,000—but that out of that large sum, he cannot see his way to save a sufficient amount to establish bee-keeping. When hon. gentlemen sat on this side they used to criticise this item and say that the experimental farm should be self-sustaining and that this money was squandered. But from gentlemen now in opposition we hear quite the contrary. They say that the Government should ask for more and extend the work. But the Minister is simply trotting along in the old track that his predecessors followed, spending the same amount of money and doing the same work; and yet cannot save a dollar to branch out in the direction of a new industry. My hon. friend from South Huron has a charge to bring against the Minister, I believe, and I should like to hear him. In justice to him and also to my hon. friend from East Grey who has also something to say, I think a part of this item should be left so as to carry on the discussion. I think we should have an opportunity of hearing the musical voice of the hon. member for South Huron criticising this expenditure to see how it will compare with the criticisms we heard from him when the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) had charge of the work.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. These hon. gentlemen will have an opportunity to be heard on concurrence.

Mr. TAYLOR. Perhaps that will do.

Printing and distributing reports and bulletins of farms..... $4,000

Mr. KAULBACH. I might suggest to the Minister the printing of a larger number of reports for circulation than has been done in the past. They are grand educators.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We are revising the list, and perhaps we shall be able to add some names.

Mr. MONTAGUE. How many tobacco bulletins were sent out?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. They were sent to all the people on the list, about 55,000.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Are you making any experiments in tobacco growing at the Farm?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, a crop is being grown; but then the main experiment is with regard to the curing of tobacco. There is not much trouble about growing it.

Mr. DAVIN. Do I understand that a farmer who wants to get a bulletin must make personal application?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, that was said about the seed grain.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The hon. gentleman said circulars were sent out notifying some one, I do not know whom, that personal application should be made for grain. To whom were the circulars sent?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Members of Parliament and Senators.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I received none.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. One was posted to you.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I got none.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. One was posted to you.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I did not get one.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I can only say that Professor Saunders assured me that they had been sent out in the early part of the winter to every member and Senator.

Mr. DAVIN. How many bulletins are placed at the disposal of every member of Parliament?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. None. The bulletins are sent to those whose names appear on the mailing list of the farm. Any member who wishes to get names upon the list has only to send them in.

Mr. CLANCY. As to the tobacco bulletins, a general distribution is not of much value, because there are only a few sections in which tobacco is grown, and in those sections we cannot get them. I have only three and I have had applications for thousands I may say. I would like the Minister to consider the issuing of a new edition.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) would be astonished at the number of parts of the country from which we have received inquiries about tobacco growing. It is important that these bulletins should be sent to many different portions of the Dominion. Several thousands were left after distribution took place and applications have been received every day since then.

Mr. CLANCY. I know that parties applied and could not get them. As I say, I received only three.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) must know that many of the 55,000 sent out went to his own county, as there are many in that county whose names are on the list. I am sorry now that there were not eight or ten thousand or even fifteen thousand extra copies printed. But there were not, and the type has since been distributed, so the bulletin cannot be reproduced without setting the type again. It may be necessary to do that. I think the supply is not yet exhausted; it was not a day or two ago.

Mr. CLANCY. I think the hon. gentleman will see the necessity of revising the mailing list——

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We have been revising it for the last year. It is practically a new list.

Mr. CLANCY. By using a mailing list, these bulletins are often put in the hands of persons who simply cast them aside. In a special bulletin of this kind, I think the members of the House should be given more control of the distribution, as they would put them in the hands of persons who will make good use of them. So far as my constituency is concerned, I would ask to have none sent in this way, because I am sure that three-quarters of them will go wrong, being sent to persons, who will not make good use of them. I am not finding fault, but calling attention to the results of the present method. I should like to have more of the bulletins, as I have so many applications for them.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think I can let the hon. gentleman have more.

Mr. McDOUGALL. What means does the hon. gentleman take to revise the list? Where does he get the information with respect to parties in the constituency to enable him to strike off some names and put on others.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The list is made up of those who apply for the bulletins of the farms and those who ask for information. Hundreds and thousands of letters are received from people all over the country asking to have their names put upon the list, and this request is complied with. Any names sent in are also put on. Then we ask postmasters all over the country to return publications sent out from the farm that are not taken from the post office, and when they are returned the names of the parties to whom they are addressed are struck off. If any member of the House chooses to send in names that he wishes to have put upon the list, the names are added. Members constantly send in names.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I sent in a list of names, but I understand that during this revision they have been struck off.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not think so.

Mr. McDOUGALL. The parties have not received anything from the experimental farm for some time.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I I will inquire into that.

Mr. MONTAGUE. It would be well for the Minister to consider whether he would not give to the members representing agricultural constituencies a certain number of these bulletins. They go through the mails free, even when the members are at home. There is a great deal in what has been urged that the member representing a district, from his local knowledge, is better able to distribute these bulletins where they will do the most good than any officers here, even with a revised list; for, as the hon. Minister himself says the list must grow imperfect in a short time. I would suggest sending to each member forty or fifty copies of any special bulletin that may be prepared.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That is a good suggestion.

Mr. MONTAGUE. With regard to experiments on the farm with regard to curing tobacco. I suppose the hon. Minister would have the result published in the next annual report.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Perhaps in a bulletin.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I think that would be preferable. The Experimental Farm Report is pretty late in getting out, and these experiments, if successful and such as to encourage the farmers in various sections to go into tobacco growing, should be put into the hands of the farmers without unnecessary delay. Then the Minister will give thirty or forty copies?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes.

Dairying service	$30,000
To promote the establishment of creameries in the North-west Territories.....	$5,000

Mr. MONTAGUE. Is the system the same as that followed last year?

Mr. McLENNAN. When this item was before the House last year, I asked if the Minister could not encourage dairying in the Island of Cape Breton, somewhat after the manner in which it was being encouraged in Prince Edward Island. The Minister at that time said he was not in a position to do anything in regard to encouraging dairying in the Island of Cape Breton, but in the coming year he would see what could be done. I should like to hear from the hon. gentleman whether anything has been done in the direction of encouraging dairying in the Island of Cape Breton.

Mr. CLANCY. Where is the $30,000 generally spent?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I will, in the first place, reply to the remarks of the hon. member for Inverness (Mr. McLennan). Last year I did hope to be able to do something for the encouragement of dairying in the Island of Cape Breton, because I had understood there was a good opening for development, somewhat similar to the development which has occurred in Prince Edward Island, and which has been so successful. Last winter, with this object in view, I took occasion to send, first, the officer of the department who has charge at Nappan Dairying Station to Cape Breton, to hold some meetings there; and later on I sent another of the employees for the same purpose. I carefully examined the reports which those officials made to me, and I took occasion to obtain through Prof. Robertson all the other information I possibly could in regard to the prospects and conditions of affairs in Cape Breton. After very careful thought, and somewhat reluctantly, I came to the conclusion that it would be better in the interest of progress that a little preparatory work be done before undertaking to establish any creamery on that island. I trust, however, that in the fall and before next spring at all events to be able to do still more of that preparatory work, and if there is any way possible by which I can succeed during next season in helping to establish and promote the creamery industry there, I shall certainly carry out any scheme that can be formulated to that end.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Had those officers instructions to put themselves in communication with the local representatives, with a view to ascertain what could be done in the different constituencies of the island?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I communicated with the secretary of the

provincial Government agricultural department, who knows a good deal about the Island of Cape Breton, and he was kind enough to offer to accompany my officers and make the necessary arrangements for holding the meetings.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Is it not customary for the Minister to communicate with members for the island, and advise them of the steps proposed to be taken ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not think it is.

Mr. McDOUGALL. The hon. gentleman, I believe, has not communicated with any of the members representing those constituencies ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I have not been communicated with, and I represent a very large farming constituency.

Mr. McLENNAN. I regret to say that it is my impression that the secretary of agriculture of the Nova Scotia provincial Government does not know a great deal about the agricultural capabilities of the Island of Cape Breton, as he is comparatively a stranger to the island, and I must say that the members had a right to be consulted in this matter. I must complain that I was not consulted. To send those officers with a stranger to guide them is like the blind leading the blind. If merely reading lectures in a few towns near the railway constitutes preparatory work, I regret that in my opinion it is not a step very much in advance. I stated here a few weeks ago that delivering abstract lectures to farmers with respect to dairying and scientific farming was waste of energy, because those people have no means of having these lectures properly demonstrated to them. I therefore regret that the department has not seen fit to take more vigorous steps by way of demonstrating those lectures, somewhat as has been done in Prince Edward Island. In that island this system has been most successful, and as regards the Island of Cape Breton, which we may call a neighbouring province, I do not see why it should not succeed there. I therefore feel that greater attention should be paid to this important industry in our midst. I say again that I should have at least been communicated with, especially as I have the honour to represent a very fine agricultural constituency to which these gentlemen were strangers. I only hope that the Minister will prosecute the preparatory work which he wishes to put the people through with more substantial vigour than he has shown during the past year ; otherwise, we will rightfully come to the conclusion that we have not been properly treated in this matter.

Mr. FISHER.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman has not yet explained where the $30,000 were expended.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Out of this vote, Prof. Robertson's own salary and the various salaries and travelling expenses and printing at the head office are taken, this amount being about $11,000 annually. In Quebec last year there was a grant made to the dairy school at St. Hyacinthe, and the salary and expenses of J. P. Chapais, assistant dairy commissioner, are taken out of the appropriation for Quebec. Besides last year there was an inspector of creameries, Mr. Leclerc, whose salary came out of this item. In Prince Edward Island, there were two travelling dairying instructors. Until last year the Dominion Government ran several cheese factories and creameries there ; but the position of affairs has improved to such an extent that we felt that we could withdraw from the management of any individual creameries, but the two travelling instructors were kept at the dairying establishments there. In New Brunswick there is a dairying station at Nappan, and Mr. Hopkins travelled and had a school there during the winter. In New Brunswick we had a travelling instructor and inspector part of the summer. In the working of the creamery there a deficit of $6,000 occurred, which came out of this vote. We had a special vote last year for the North-west Territories, to aid in the establishment of creameries in the North-west ; but to carry them on, as at several of the creameries, the quantity of milk was so small that the establishments did not pay for the manufacture of butter there, expenditure had to be incurred. This explains the different expenditures coming out of this vote of $30,000.

Mr. CLANCY. I understand that as regards the North-west creameries, the money advanced is being repaid gradually.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That is the capital.

Mr. CLANCY. Is a portion taken out of this sum to make up any loss ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes ; but next year hardly any sum will be required, the progress made has been so satisfactory.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Does the hon. gentleman propose to go into any new district ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, we propose to establish two new creameries, at Saltcoats and at another point.

To promote the establishment and maintenance of creameries in the North-west Territories.... ....$5,000

Mr. DAVIN. Why is this vote decreased $10,000 ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am asking for $10,000 in the Supplementary Estimates, so that it is really the $15,000 vote.

Mr. DAVIN. Very well.

For cold storage on steamships, on railways, at warehouses, and at creameries, and for expenses in connection with trial shipments of products, and for securing recognition of the quality of the same outside of Canada..... $85,000

Mr. MARTIN. Has the Minister been able to make any arrangement for cold storage in steamships with regard to Prince Edward Island ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I may tell the hon. gentleman in confidence that there will be a vote in the Supplementary Estimates for a steamer running from Prince Edward Island to England.

Mr. MARTIN. Has the Minister made the arrangement for a steamer calling at Charlottetown ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTUR. I have not yet succeeded in making the arrangement, but we propose to vote the money and I am in communication with two steamship companies proposing to make an arrangement with them. I have a telegram from one of them to-night, which I hope will lead to results.

Mr. CLANCY. Why is there a reduction of $15,000 in this item ? Is the Minister satisfied, from a year's experience, that there has been such rapid growth as to warrant a less sum being asked for this year, or is the hon. gentleman economizing in this direction ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am practising economy, but not such as will in any sense interfere with the efficiency of the service. The reason for the reduction of this vote is, that out of the vote of the year before I was able to pay last year's payments to several steamers, and this current year I am able to pay for some of this year's steamers so that I will not have to pay for these steamers out of this vote. I was able to do several things more cheaply. The payments to the steamers have been less in every instance than we had calculated upon. The machinery has been put in at a lower price than we feared it would be necessary to pay, and consequently the payments to steamships have been less. The railway service has been found to be so much availed of that the deficit which we guaranteed to make up has been very small. Besides that, not so many creameries will ask for the first bonus of $50 this year. The arrangement was that the creameries should have a bonus of $50 the first year and $25 for two following years, and this being the second year a large number of them will be paid $25 instead of $50. The expenditure is consequently less, but the efficiency is not less than last year.

Mr. MARTIN. I wish to remind the Minister (Mr. Fisher) that last year he told me across the floor that he had been making arrangements with steamers to call at Charlottetown, but it did not amount to anything. I hope that this year he will be a little more successful.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I hope so.

Mr. MARTIN. It is a little hard on the province of Prince Edward Island to see that every other part of the Dominion is provided with means to ship its products in cold storage, while in that province where agriculture is perhaps the main occupation of the people, no such facilities are given. I am afraid the Minister of Agriculture will get the name of slighting that province. If I mistake not, during the first part of the session, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fisher) told me that he had correspondence with some steamboat owners, and he expected definite results would be arrived at. We are now near the end of the session, the shipping season is well on, and yet no arrangement has been completed. I am very much afraid that the matter may be a failure this year also, and I hope that the Minister will not come down with the story next year that he has been unable to complete the arrangement. There is no doubt the arrangement can be completed if the Minister is zealous enough.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I sympathize with the hon. gentleman (Mr. Martin).

Mr. CLANCY. I would ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fisher) with regard to the warehouse service. I am sure he has already seen that at the outset it is a difficult thing to meet the public wants in that direction, and in cutting down the vote, if there is money saved in one quarter, it might be usefully expended in another with regard to giving the people along the line of railways greater facilities than they now enjoy.

Cattle Quarantine..... $30,000

Mr. LaRIVIERE. I wish to ask some information with regard to the changes that have been made at the Emerson quarantine station in Manitoba. Since the number of cattle in quarantine have been decreased in consequence of the change in the arrangements, I wish to ask if the expenses have decreased in proportion.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. In consequence of the arrangement I made with the United States, by which we practically did away with detention at the frontier, the expenses on quarantine stations in Manitoba and the North-west have largely decreased. I was able practically to do away with most of them, just simply re-

taining the services of a few officers on call, and as we had some buildings at Emerson, I had to keep a caretaker.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. Notwithstanding the decreased expenditure you are asking the same amount this year as last.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. This vote should be for animal quarantine, and not simply cattle quarantine. The expenses have been largely increased, partly in consequence of hog killing, and partly in consequence of our taking over the work in British Columbia. We have had to do a great deal of work in British Columbia which formerly was not done at all. We are getting a great many calls for the inspection of animals, and demands on the time of the chief inspector and his assistants, which have increased the travelling expenses and general expenditure very greatly.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. What are the reasons of the change in the staff at Emerson from the inspector down to the stableman ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There were statements made in regard to their conduct in the election which required a change.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. On account of what ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Partisan conduct in the election.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. Which election ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The election of 1896.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. I did not know the news would travel that far so soon.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The understanding was to allow one item on immigration to stand, and that the question generally could be discussed on that.

Mr. DAVIN. If it is understood that the whole matter of immigration can be discussed on the one item, there will be no objection.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That is the understanding.

Expenses of Committees, sessional and extra clerks, &c..... $14,200

Mr. MONTAGUE. What is the total number of sessional clerks, messengers and pages ?

Mr. SPEAKER. Twenty-five sessional clerks, the same as usual, about 45 messengers, and 20 pages.

Books for Library of American History.. $1,000

Mr. MONTAGUE. Is any of that amount to be given to Mr. Kingsford ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That matter is under consideration and may be mentioned in the Supplementary Estimates.

Mr. DAVIN. I hope it will be considered favourably. I think that really that work of Mr. Kingsford is one that may well meet with some recognition on the part of the Government.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I quite agree with the hon. member for Assiniboia. There can be no doubt about the value of the material which Mr. Kingsford has collected, particularly for future reference. I hope the Government will see fit to give it a small grant.

Mr. CLANCY. How many volumes ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Nine volumes, and he purposes issuing a tenth.

Excise $451,776 25

Mr. MONTAGUE. There is nothing for Li Hung Chang in this ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Some hon. gentleman wanted to know some days ago what the rat traps were for that we had purchased and whether they had anything to do with Li Hung Chang. I may explain the case. There is a proverb which says that the rats deserted the sinking ship. There were no rats when we came into power. I do not know whether they had all left just before, but if so, they had evidently recovered confidence, for they came back in multitudes.

Mr. MONTAGUE. And as the hon. gentleman (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière) felt that the ship might sink, he bought the traps in order to retain the rats.

Culling timber..... $19,350

Mr. CLANCY. What is the reason for the increase of contingencies here ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. The timber trade made such advance last year that, up to the 31st March last, we had collected $12,373 against $6,300 in the same time last year—more than double the amount. To get the specifications ready in time we had to employ extra clerks.

Adulteration of food and fertilizers, and the administration of the Act respecting fraudulent marking..... $25,000

Mr. CLANCY. It would be well for us to have some little explanation of this item. It is not a large one, but it is very important.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. This includes the expense of all the analyses made, and of the reports and bulletins that are issued every month. There are no new features in connection with the item.

Customs $983,780

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I think there will be no objection to the passing of this item, on the understanding that the committee is to have full liberty of discussion on other items of the Customs, and to be free to take up any matter whether relating to these items or not.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Certainly, we will reserve any item that hon. gentlemen may wish.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It is not that, but that we should be free to discuss any item of customs.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, the customs matters may be discussed on other items of customs than this. There will probably be something in the Supplementary Estmates which will open the same field. I think we have done a fairly reasonable day's work, and we are much indebted to hon. gentlemen opposite for their help.

Resolutions to be reported.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved the adjournment of the House.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. May I ask if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) is able to say what is likely to be the order of business for Wednesday—or is that too far ahead for him to know ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is some difficulty about it. I think that if the Solicitor General (Mr. Fitzpatrick) returns we may take up the motion which he has on the paper respecting the salaries of the judges. But I would not speak of that with too much certainty. It is our expectation, as stated by the right hon. the Premier (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to announce on Wednesday generally what we propose regarding the business of the session, and that may affect the business of Wednesday. Failing other matters, we will take Supply.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 11.15 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 25th May, 1898.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

NORTH-WEST CENTRAL RAILWAY—QUESTION OF PROCEDURE.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I wish to call attention to what appears to me to be an irregularity in the Votes and Proceedings. I was present on Monday, the last sitting of the House, when Private Bills were called, and when Bill (No. 140) from the Senate was reached, the Prime Minister asked that it should stand. I had been spoken to by gentlemen who were interested in the subject matter of the Bill, and had the Prime Minister not made that request, I should myself have asked the House to permit it to stand. It appears that subsequently, after Bill 140 was dealt with, as appears on the Votes and Proceedings, the member for Antigonish (Mr. McIsaac)—so I was informed, I was not present at the time—moved, seconded by the hon. member for Yale (Mr. Bostock), with the unanimous consent of the House, that this Bill be read the second time, which was done, and it was referred to the Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines. The attendance in the House was very small. I was present during nearly all the proceedings, and had been asked to bring to the attention of the House certain facts, by the gentlemen who were interested in the Bill. I have looked into the procedure, and while it may be technically right to do this kind of thing, it is certainly out of the ordinary course. A question might be raised in regard to the regularity of the procedure ; but I happen to know there are several hon. gentlemen in the House who have been spoken to as I was, and if any of them had been present, I am certain some of them would have mentioned that this was an important Bill, and that it was desirable that various matters should be stated in connection with it before it was referred to the committee, but no opportunity for that was afforded. I notice in Sir John Bourinot's work, page 374, in speaking of the subject of the power of the House to do almost anything by unanimous consent, it is said :

> In the Canadian Commons, in more than one case, it has been attempted to take a notice of motion out of its place, and give it priority, which, of course, could not be allowed. See ruling in Canadian Hansard, 24th March, 1885, when it was proposed to give precedence to a Bill without notice.

Without wishing to insist too much on these technicalities, and as I have not had an opportunity to consult the precedents, I would like to move that the order for the second reading of Bill (No. 140), from the Senate, and its reference to the Railway Committee, be discharged.

Mr. SPEAKER. I may mention with reference to this matter that my recollection is that we had passed through Private Bills, and that order stood at the request of somebody.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Of the Prime Minister.

Mr. SPEAKER. We were proceeding in a later order, I think, and the Minister of Railways and Canals mentioned that, with so many orders standing on the paper, unless it was referred now to the Committee on Railways, it might at this stage of the session fall through altogether. Then a motion was put by me, an expressed and dis-

tinct motion, that leave be given to take up the second reading of this Bill, and that motion was unanimously carried. Then the question of the second reading was put by me and carried, and the Bill was referred to the Railway Committee, so that the procedure was most carefully gone through. I must say that I can see no irregularity in it. Of course, if hon. members interested were not here to object, it cannot be helped. But the motion the hon. gentleman has moved now is, I suppose, the only way out of the difficulty.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). If my hon. friend were to allege, as I do not understand that he did, that a substantial injustice had been done to somebody, or to some parties interested in this Bill, there could be no objection at all to his motion. I remember distinctly the facts as they were stated a moment ago. When this Bill was called, it had been the intention to have it referred to the Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines; but after a conference, I think, by both sides of the House, it was agreed to let it stand. I was approached afterwards by the Minister of Railways and Canals, who represented to me that unless this Bill was sent immediately to the Committee on Railways it might lose an opportunity of being considered during the present session. My view was that as it was a private Bill, perhaps the parties interested might be taken by surprise if it were now referred to the Committee on Railways. But as I understood, at least that was the impression that was conveyed to me at the time, that the parties interested were agreeable to have the Bill sent up to the Committee on Railways so that they might there have an opportunity of discussing the conflicting interests involved in it. Unless, therefore, some interests may suffer, I would suggest to my hon. friend whether it would be advisable to take the proceeding which he now asks us to take. The Bill would come up again, necessarily, this evening at eight o'clock, and might be taken up and referred again to the Committee on Railways. I would ask him whether it would serve any purpose to persist in this motion, although I have no objection, so far as I am concerned.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPPER. I would not like to press this motion upon a mere technicality. But in answer to the right hon. gentleman, I may say that while I am not fully conversant with the facts in the case, one of the counsel in the case who is resident in this city, and was engaged in the discussion of the question before the Privy Council in England touching the Great North-west Central Railway Company, informs me that he was very anxious that certain facts should be put before the House before this Bill was referred to the committee. His statement briefly was this: That much of this legislation is in connection with a litigation which has reached the Privy Council in England; that although a judgment of the Privy Council suggesting legislation has been given, this legislation has sprung up very quickly, before even the reasons for the judgment have been framed, although the mere outlines of the judgment have been given so that a formal judgment could be drawn up—such is my information. Under these circumstances it was premature, and might prejudice the interests of the parties for Parliament to deal with legislation that has become necessary on account of a judgment of the Privy Council before that judgment can be understood and fully discussed—those were the statements. The observation was also made to me that the Bill was introduced to the Senate only a few days ago, that it came from that House to this in the dying hours of this session, and not only was this procedure adopted yesterday, but a notice was actually posted in this House for the Railway Committee before the Bill had been read, the rules requiring a notice to be posted a certain time. Therefore, there is a danger in this extreme haste to the interests of the parties, and there were many, there were several counsel interested before the Privy Council representing various parties, creditors, sub-contractors and others. The danger is, therefore, that if this Bill is proceeded with so hastily, the Railway Committee may have charge of it before these parties are able to be heard. The gentlemen who spoke to me about this, desired that before the Bill was referred to the committee, the question should be discussed as to whether the Bill should be read the second time.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I think, perhaps, I am more directly responsible for the procedure which has taken place in connection with this Bill than any other member of the House, and I did so after a good deal of consideration—in other words, I took the course I did after a good deal of consideration. But I may say, without knowing that the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) was desirous of opposing the Bill taking its second reading, that I was aware from day to day that the Bill was standing over at the request of the Premier, and I spoke to him on the subject, pointing out what seemed to me to be rather an objection to our refusing to allow the Bill to go to a second reading. I have been advised from various sources, and by various members of the House, that they had strong objections to the Bill passing, and I felt myself that it was one to which very strong objection could be taken.

Seeing that this had been dealt with by a committee in the other Chamber and been very considerably amended, I thought it should be considered by the Railway Com-

mittee of this House, and it would be taking an exceedingly extreme course if we refused to allow the matter to be discussed before the proper committee. I have no doubt allegations will be made on the one hand against the Bill and controverted on the other, and this House will not be in a position to deal on sound principles or in a correct way with this Bill on the motion for its second reading, in view of the contradiction that will arise on both sides until the discussion has taken place. It seems to me that the Railway Committee is the proper tribunal before which this hearing should take place, I did not think, and I am of that opinion now, that it would be at all proper, in view of any discussion which could take place here, to refuse the second reading of the Bill. There is nothing in the Bill, on the face of it, so unsound in principle but that on being amended or considered fully by the committee, it might possibly be permitted to pass; but that is all a fair matter for consideration by the committee. I would suggest to my hon. friend now whether it would be desirable for him to press this motion, seeing that if this course were taken it would not be in the interest of the Bill, because my own view at present is against the Bill, but it would enable the parties to obtain a fair hearing before the usual committee which deals with this subject. I would assure the hon. gentleman that there is not the slightest disposition to hasten legislation. I may be found as strongly opposed as is the hon. gentleman to the Bill, for I have no preconceived views in regard to it, but after the Bill has been considered by the committee and we have arrived at the facts, I will be in a position to advise the House as to whether it should be proceeded with further or not.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The danger in that proposition simply is whether the Bill could be taken up to-morrow by the committee or not. My hon. friend will see that it is largely a question of notice. I am informed on very good authority, by the solicitor, that there was a notice for hearing to-morrow actually on the paper of the Railway Committee before this Bill received its second reading. It would meet the case if the Bill were not taken up until regular notices had been given, that is to say, the regular notices as to the second reading of the Bill and its references to the committee.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It was quite impossible that this notice could have been given at a time indicated, because there was no reference to this special Bill but there was the general call of the committee. If the Bill goes before the committee, I shall be as ready as my hon. friend to insist that it be not taken up until the parties interested have had the fullest opportunity of being heard.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I would ask the leader of the House, under these circumstances, to withdraw the motion.

Motion withdrawn.

PLACER MINING IN YUKON TERRITORY.

Mr. MONK asked,

1. Are all claims entered for placer mining in the Yukon Territory reported to the Department of the Interior?

2. How many claims have been reported as entered to date?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). Owing to the slowness of communication between the Yukon and Ottawa, it is exceedingly likely that a large number of claims have been entered before the Gold Commissioner recently. Up to and including 30th March, 1898, 9,777 claims had been entered.

POSTMASTERS IN PROVENCHER, MANITOBA.

Mr. LaRIVIERE asked,

1. Who were appointed postmasters in the electoral district of Provencher since the 1st of July, 1896, and what are the names of their respective post offices?

2. Why are not the new appointments recorded in the "Official Postal Guide" of January, 1898?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). The following postmasters have been appointed in the electoral division of Provencher since the 1st of July, 1896:—

Name and Post Office.	Date of Appointment.
Ernest Savard, La Broquerie....	4th Feb., 1898
D. H. McLean, Emerson.....	30th June, 1897
Noé A. Dumaine, Isle des Chênes	3rd Dec., 1897
H. L. Fast, Kleefeld.....	3rd Dec., 1897
Rodolphe Coté, LaRochelle.....	30th Mar., 1898
Jos. A. Houle, Letellier.....	9th Feb., 1898
Joseph Richard, Loretto.....	7th Oct., 1897
Thos. S. Wilson, Rosewood.....	15th Jan., 1898
J. N. Camyre, St. Adolphe	30th Mar., 1898
Alfred Leveque, St. Boniface....	15th Jan., 1897
Louis Berard, St. Joseph.....	17th Sept., 1897
Johann Braun, Grunthal (new office)	1st Feb., 1898

2. All of the above appointments made previous to 1st of January, 1898, (the date of sending the Guide to press) appear in the Official Postal Guide of January, 1898.

RATES ON GOVERNMENT TELEGRAPH LINES.

Mr. BETHUNE asked,

1. How many miles of Government telegraph lines are there in the county of Victoria, Nova Scotia?

2. How many in Inverness County?

3. What are the through and local rates in each of these counties?

4. If there is a difference in the rates, what are they, and why the difference ?

5. Will the Government make the rates over their telegraph lines in the counties of Victoria and Inverness uniform ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). 1. 130¼ miles with a twenty-knot cable to St. Paul's Island. 2. 63 miles. 3 and 4. The through and local rate between North Sydney and Meat Cove is 25 cents per ten words and 1 cent for each additional word. On the line between Mabou and Cheticamp (Inverness) the through rate (on business exchange with the Western Union Telegraph Company) is 15 cents and 1 cent, and the local rate is 25 cents and 2 cents. The through and local rate on the Meat Cove line was, prior to 1892, 25 cents and 2 cents, but in readjusting the rates to the Magdalen Islands, with which that line also connects, it was changed to 25 cents and 1 cent. A lower rate was not considered warrantable, because of the length of the line being over 100 miles. At the time the Cheticamp line was built (in 1887) the former rate of 25 cents and 2 cents was applied to it as on the Meat Cove line ; but in view of the comparative shortness of its length, the exceptional rate of 15 cents and 1 cent was fixed for through messages. No dissatisfaction was expressed with this arrangement, and it has continued undisturbed up to the present time. 5. The attention of the department has been called to the advisability of a uniform rate being established and the department now has the matter under serious consideration.

POSTMASTER AT ST. CYPRIEN, P.Q.

Mr. BERGERON asked,

1. Was there an investigation held upon the postmaster at St. Cyprien, county of Napierville?
2. Who was the commissioner ?
3. How much did the investigation cost ?
4. What was the result of the investigation ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). 1. Yes. 2. Mr. Wilfrid Mercier, advocate, Montreal. 3. $40. 4. The postmaster was relieved of his office.

CUSTOMS OFFICER AT BATH, ONT.

Mr. WILSON asked,

Who is customs officer at the village of Bath, Ontario ? When was he appointed ? By whom was he recommended, and what is his salary ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). Mr. David T. Rowse is sub-collector of customs at the village of Bath. He was appointed on the 13th day of May, 1898. His salary is $150 per annum. Mr. Rowse was recommended to me by parties in whom I have confidence.

CUSTOMS COLLECTOR AT NAPANEE.

Mr. WILSON asked,

Is Thomas E. Anderson the collector of customs at Napanee, Ontario, also gas inspector, and collector of inland revenue ? If so, what amount is he paid in each case, or for each of these offices ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière). Mr. Thomas E. Anderson, collector of customs at Napanee, acts for the Inland Revenue Department, in the collection of excise duties, and is paid a commission of five per cent on his collections up to $3,000. If the amount collected in any one year exceeds that sum, a salary is paid according to the following scale :—

Over $3,000 and up to $5,000—$150 per annum.
Over $5,000 and up to $10,000—$200 per annum.
Over $10,000—$250 per annum.

Mr. Anderson does not fill the position of gas inspector at that place.

CARETAKER, PUBLIC BUILDING, NAPANEE.

Mr. WILSON asked,

1. Who is caretaker of the public building in Napanee, Ontario ?
2. When was he appointed, and by whom was he recommended ?
3. What is his salary, and has he to take care of all the offices for his salary without any extras ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). 1. Robert Webster. 2. He was appointed on the 1st April last, and was highly recommended by people in whom the Minister has great confidence. 3. $400 per year, the same as his predecessor received, for which he has to take care of all the offices without any extras.

BERTHIER POST OFFICE.

Mr. BEAUSOLEIL (by Mr. Sutherland) asked,

1. Whether it is true, as stated in " La Gazette de Berthier," on May 13th instant, that the Dominion Government have definitely acquired the Huguenise property at Berthier, with a view to converting it into a post office ?
2. If so, when was the acquisition effected ?
3. From whom ?
4. What price was paid or agreed upon ?
5. Are the buildings on the property such as are required for the post office, and if so, what sum will require to be expended for repairs and fitting out the office, and when can the postmaster enter into possession ?
6. Is the property held under lease or otherwise, and if under lease, how many years has such lease to run ?
7. What is the yearly rental and the amount of the capital it represents ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). 1. Yes. 2. Deed is not yet

completed, but authority has been obtained by Order in Council of the 14th April last, to make the purchase. 3. From the Huguenin and Hénault estates. 4. Price agreed upon, $3,200. 5. It is expected that a sum between $1,000 and $1,200 will be sufficient to do all that is required to provide commodious quarters for the post office, &c., and it is hoped that the postmaster will be able to enter into possession by the 1st of July next. 6. No. 7. None.

SUPPLIES FOR YUKON MILITARY CONTINGENT.

Mr. BRODER (by Mr. Taylor) asked,

1. What supplies and quantities of each have been contracted for with the Government by H. N. Bate & Sons, of Ottawa, to be furnished to the Yukon military contingent this year ?
2. What is the value of such supplies furnished or to be furnished by said firm ?
3. Was it understood in contracting for these supplies that Messrs. Bate & Sons could purchase them, or part of them, in the United States ? If so, what proportion of the whole consignment was purchased in the United States ?
4. Will the goods so purchased in a foreign country be admitted into Canada free of duty ?
5. Was there a general call for tenders for purchasing these supplies ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). The following supplies in part, and the quantities, which I will give approximately, have been purchased from H. N. Bate & Sons : Tinned meats, 88,000 pounds ; biscuits, 43,000 pounds ; flour, 138,000 pounds ; peas, 3,500 pounds ; evaporated vegetables, 6,500 pounds ; rice, 10,000 pounds ; evaporated apples, 8,400 pounds ; evaporated fruits (prunes, apricots, peaches), 17,400 pounds ; lard, 7,900 pounds ; sugar, 21,000 pounds ; tea, 5,200 pounds ; salt, 4,700 pounds ; pepper, 300 pounds ; baking powder, 900 pounds ; candles, 3,000 pounds ; soap, 250 pounds ; tobacco, 3,000 pounds ; matches, 26 cases. In addition to these supplies a quantity of canned fruits, extracts, pickles, pipes, &c., were obtained to supply any of the men who might desire to purchase them. I am not able to give the value, but it is approximately $30,000. 3. There was no understanding as to where the goods should be purchased. I am not able to give the proportions purchased in the United States. 4. If any goods were purchased in a foreign country they would pay the duty. 5. There was not a general call for tenders ; that is, there was no advertisement in the newspapers, but tenders were asked for and received from several firms.

FOURTEEN-FOOT NAVIGATION—BETWEEN LAKE ONTARIO AND MONTREAL.

Mr. MACLEAN (by Mr. Taylor) asked :

When will the fourteen-foot navigation between Lake Ontario and Montreal be completed ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). It is confidently expected that the canal between Lake Ontario and Montreal will be sufficiently completed to be open for traffic at the opening of navigation in 1899.

COMMISSIONS IN THE PERMANENT FORCE.

Mr. TYRWHITT (by Mr. McDougall) asked,

1. What qualifications were required from subaltern officers before being granted commissions in the permanent force on 1st July, 1896 ?
2. What qualifications, if any, are required at the present time ?
3. Did the Major General commanding the Militia recommend or approve of these changes ?
4. How many officers have been appointed to the permanent force since 10th July, 1896 ? How many are graduates of Royal Military College, Kingston ?
5. Did the General Officer commanding the Militia recommend any of the officers appointed to the permanent force since 10th July, 1896 ? If so, how many, and what are their names ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). 1. Long course certificate. 2. Long course "Grade A" certificate. 3. Yes. 4. (a) 13 ; (b) 1. 5. (a) Yes ; (b) one, Lieut. and Capt. C. M Nelles. The General Officer commanding recommended especially Lieut. and Capt. Nelles ; he approved of all the others before their names appeared in the "Canada Gazette."

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Could the hon. gentleman give the name of the graduate of the Royal Military College that was appointed ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Bennett.

INSPECTOR OF LIVE STOCK.

Mr. CLARKE (by Mr. Taylor) asked,

Has Mr. John Sheridan, of Toronto, been appointed inspector of live stock ? When was he appointed ? What is the nature of his duties ? What salary will he be paid ? What territory will be included in his jurisdiction ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). Mr. John Sheridan, of Toronto, has not been appointed inspector of live stock, but he was appointed an honorary commissioner on the 5th November, 1897, to report to the Department of Agriculture from time to time in regard to the facilities, arrangements and practices connected with the shipment of live stock in Canada for export. He is paid no salary at all, and his territory will include all the channels of communication for export.

EDMONTON BRIDGE.

Mr. DAVIN asked,

1. Did the Department of Public Works get quotations from the Canadian Pacific Railway

for freight rates for carrying stone from any point in Manitoba to Edmonton ?

2. Have any estimates been paid to the contractor for building the bridge at Edmonton ?

3. Has the cement bought by the contractor for the purpose of making concrete for the construction of Edmonton bridge been tested ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). 1. Yes, a quotation was obtained from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for freight rates for carrying stone from Stoney Mountain, Stonewall and Selkirk, and the quotation given was 40 cents per 100 pounds for minimum weight of 30,000 pounds per car. 2. No. 3. Yes.

DUTY ON LAFRANCE FIRE ENGINE.

Mr. MILLS asked,

1. At what figures were the Lafrance steam fire engines purchased by the corporations of Ottawa and Montreal last autumn, and this spring respectively, entered at customs ?

2. Was there any difficulty or difference of opinion between the shippers and the Customs Department in connection with the value for duty at which either or both of these fire engines should be entered for duty ? If so, how was the difficulty adjusted ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). The Lafrance fire engine for the corporation of Ottawa was entered for duty at a value of $3,550, and the value was raised on appraisement to $4,200, and duty paid accordingly. The Lafrance fire engine for the corporation of Montreal was entered provisionally at $5,000, pending adjustment of valuation, which was finally fixed at $4,500, and duty levied accordingly.

THE CASE OF JOHN. E. TANNER.

Mr. RUSSELL asked,

Whether the attention of the Government has been called to the case of John E. Tanner, a British subject, mate of the British schooner "Ida," of Halifax, Nova Scotia, who is stated to have been forcibly taken off his vessel by an armed boat's crew from the Spanish warship "Criolla," on the 5th May, 1897, at Fajardo, Porto Rico, on a charge of having injured a lighterman named Manuel Santana, and to have been there detained without any trial or examination until the 2nd July, when he was set at liberty, and if attention has been called to it, and the matter has been investigated and the facts are as stated : Whether any claim has been made on the Spanish Government for compensation for this wrongful treatment ; and whether Messrs. G. P. Mitchell & Sons, the owners of the schooner "Ida," have submitted a claim for expenses incurred in endeavouring to obtain the release of said John Tanner, also for detention of their vessel at Fajardo for seventeen days, and for damages for loss of market through detention of vessel ; and if so, whether a settlement of these claims is being pressed for by Her Majesty's Government ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). The attention of the Government was called to the case of John E. Tanner, mate of the schooner "Ida," on the 26th May last, and a few days later cable communication was had with the Imperial Government on the subject. On the 14th June, various affidavits furnished by Messrs. G. P. Mitchell & Sons were forwarded to the Colonial Office, accompanied by an expression of the desire on the part of the Government of Canada that the matter might be fully inquired into and justice rendered to all parties concerned. In the month of August following, a statement of the claim of the owners of the schooner "Ida," arising out of the imprisonment of the mate, was forwarded to the Colonial Office. These documents were acknowledged and the Government informed that the Foreign Office had been requested to procure from Her Majesty's consul at Porto Rico a full report on the affidavits which this Government had sent home in June last. Her Majesty's Government, the despatch stated, would defer action in regard to these claims pending the receipt of that report. Nothing further has been heard on the subject, but I may say that the attention of Her Majesty's Government has again been called to the matter.

SILVER LEAD SMELTING.

Mr. EARLE asked,

1. Have the provisions of the Act intituled : "An Act to encourage Silver Lead Smelting, 1895," been made effective by regulations ?

2. If so, when did the regulations go into effect, and what amounts have been paid out under them ?

3. If not, is it the intention of the Government to make such regulations as will make the Act effective ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). 1. Regulations were passed, under date of the 12th of July, 1897, to make effective the provisions of the Act to encourage silver lead smelting. 2. The regulations went into effect from the date of the Order in Council (12th July, 1897), but as yet no amounts have been paid under the provisions thereof, for the reason that the department has not received from all the smelters the compliance with the regulations, or details of the work done. 3. It is not the present intention of the Government to change the regulations, as it is not apparent that any change under the terms of the Act would be more effective.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE HOUSE—GOVERNMENT BUSINESS.

On the Order for Government Notices of Motion,

That for the remainder of the session the House shall hold two sittings on each day, one from 11 a.m. until 1 p.m., and the second from 3 p.m. until the hour of adjournment, and at each such sitting Government Orders shall have precedence.—(Sir Richard Cartwright.)

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Mr. Speaker, as two important committees have been called for to-morrow morning, the Committee on Public Accounts and the Railway Committee, the Government does not think it would be advisable to commence the morning sitting of this House to-morrow. Therefore, this motion will stand for to-day, but my hon. friend (Sir Richard Cartwright) will move it to-morrow afternoon in order to have it take effect the following day. I will take advantage of this opportunity to say that the Government has no further legislation of any importance to bring to the attention of Parliament this session. The only legislation which will be submitted this session will be upon the following subjects :—(1) To authorize the issue of bonds by the Montreal Harbour Commission ; (2) To give effect to the judgment of the Court of Exchequer in reference to the Dominion Atlantic Railway Company ; (3) To rectify an error which has crept into the interpretation of the Act passed a few years ago to settle the account between the Government of Manitoba and the Government of Canada ; (4) To confirm an Act and agreement about the boundary between Canada and the province of Quebec ; and last, if possible, one or two purely departmental measures respecting Customs and Inland Revenue.

NEW REGULATIONS ON THE GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY.

Mr. WALLACE. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to call the attention of the Government, and more especially of the Minister of Railways, to what is considered by railway employees to be a very important series of regulations that we are told will go into effect on the Grand Trunk Railway on the 1st of July next. The following is contained in a circular issued by the Grand Trunk management :—

> The following rules and regulations for the government of the transportation department of the Grand Trunk Railway system having been adopted by the Directors of the Railway Company and approved by the Governor in Council of the Dominion of Canada, will take effect at 12 o'clock noon, on Friday, 1st July, 1898.
>
> The attention of employees is directed to the extract from the Railway Act included on pages 117 and 118 of this book.
>
> (Sgd.) F. H. McGUIGAN,
> General Superintendent.
>
> Approved,
> CHARLES M. HAYS,
> General Manager.

These regulations, it is stated, have been approved by the Governor General in Council, and it is further stated by the railway employees, who are the parties most immediately interested, that very many of them are very arbitrary. For instance, one requires the employees to be on top of the box cars on all up grades. They say that it will take an hour to get up some grades, and that, in the inclement weather we have in winter, with the thermometer down below zero, it would be very cruel to compel them to stand on top of these cars for an hour. I am told further that the general tendency of these regulations is to Americanize our railways.

Mr. SPEAKER. I suppose the hon. gentleman will conclude with a motion.

Mr. WALLACE. If necessary, I will conclude with a motion to adjourn. They say that these will Americanize our system of railways, and that the Canadian rules and regulations which have been in vogue on our Canadian railways, particularly on the Grand Trunk Railway, provide greater security for the passengers and the employees than is to be found on any United States railway, and that therefore the changes proposed, and which have been approved by the Governor General in Council, do not give as much security to the travelling public and the trainmen employed. That is the statement made by the railway employees. If so, I think that the Government, in sanctioning these regulations, which will revolutionize the system in vogue, have committed a mistake. That is the opinion of the railway employees. These employees had a warning given them some five weeks ago that the new regulations will go into effect on the 1st of July, 1898. I would like to call the attention of the Government to the fact that the effect of these regulations which they have sanctioned, will be very injurious, in the opinion of the 30,000 men employed on those railways, to the employees and dangerous to the travelling public. I hope that the statement here made is not correct, and that the Governor General in Council have not, without more careful consideration, approved of those changes which will revolutionize the entire character of our railways, and make them more American in their management. The Grand Trunk Railway is now under the management of Mr. Hays, and those he has brought from the United States, and those regulations will enable them to bring over a number of others to control one of the greatest railroads of our country, to the detriment of public business and the injury of our Canadian workmen. I have received a telegram from the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean), who had intended to be here and to have called the attention of the House to this matter, but who was unable to be present. If this report be true, I hope the Government will reconsider the matter and see that the interests of the trainmen of the Dominion are amply protected. I move that the House do now adjourn.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). My attention has already been called to the matter alluded to by the hon. gentleman. Some days ago I had

a communication on the subject from a gentleman who is not a member of this House, but who appears to be very much interested on behalf of the railway employees, and since then I also heard from the hon. member for West Elgin on this same subject. In point of fact, it is quite new to me. It was quite new to me when mentioned by my first correspondent to whom I have just alluded. It was new to me, perhaps, in a sense, but should not have been entirely new, because in the way of formal routine it had gone through my hands. Early in February last an application was made in the usual way by the Grand Trunk Railway to my department for the approval of certain new regulations, or rather a body of regulations, some of which, it was said, were in amendment of the previous regulations approved by the Governor General in Council. These regulations were examined by the officers of my department in the usual way and recommended to me for submission to the Governor General in Council, as being only changes in minor particulars of the former schedule of rules. The regulations were therefore approved as is usual and customary. Since then, however, I have been advised by the correspondent to whom I have alluded to some time ago—he does not state when, perhaps a year ago—the Grand Trunk Railway were contemplating some changes in their regulations, and had communicated with the right hon. First Minister and myself, informing us that some such movement was in contemplation, and asking that before the action of the Grand Trunk Railway was endorsed by the Governor General in Council, those opposed to it might be heard on the subject. I must confess that the statement that such a request had been made to me was not according to my own recollection. I really do not carry in my mind that any such formal or informal request had been made to me, nor was the right hon. First Minister able to recollect that any such request had been made to him. I would be very sorry, however, to question the accuracy of the statement, because it might very well be that in the pressure of work the matter had not impressed itself on my mind.

Mr. WALLACE. Is there any correspondence on file?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It has not been stated to me that there is, and if there had been any communication, I think without doubt it would have been regularly filed and have attracted the attention of the deputy head of the department, who would then have mentioned it to me when the subject came to be dealt with. However, as the matter now stands, I am quite unaware of what the nature is of the objections made by the employees to the existing regulations. I cannot think that my hon. friend has fully informed himself either in respect of the nature of those changes, and I think it would be premature, in the absence of reliable data on which to form an opinion, for either myself or my hon. friend to assume that what has been done is objectionable or in the nature of revolutionary changes. I think it would be well for us to fully possess ourselves of the facts before we reach any conclusion, assuming that the newspaper reports are correct or that the Grand Trunk Railway Company has made itself subject to any criticism on account of what they have done. I have already given assurance that the subject will receive my immediate attention, and it is my purpose to give it my immediate attention; and if there has been anything done calculated to inflict injury on the employees of the road, by reason of these regulations having been approved of, proper steps will be taken to redress their grievances. The hon. gentleman and those interested in the subject may rest assured that it will not be lost sight of.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. Minister says that I should have acquainted myself with the facts and should not have relied upon what appeared in the newspapers. What I saw in the newspaper was the statement that the rules and regulations submitted by the general superintendent have been approved of by the Governor General in Council, and I assume that to be correct.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is correct.

Mr. WALLACE. These have been approved by the Governor in Council. Then, as to whether they are oppressive or not, I have here a representation made by the trainmen. This is not by the newspapers or by myself, but by the men employed, the men whose lives are at stake and who are interested therefore in these rules and regulations. They have received these rules and, having read them over, they condemn them, because, as I have already pointed out, they make the traffic more dangerous for the men and more dangerous for the passengers. Besides, they have the effect of introducing the American system into Canada, and the men claim that there is no system—on this continent, at any rate—that gives greater safety to the travelling public and to the employees than the Canadian system. Therefore, the Government should have been slow to consent to any changes. But the Minister of Railways tells us that these rules came up before his officers in a casual way; they were looked at in a casual way, and, when they came before him——

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I suppose the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) desires to state correctly what I said. I said these were looked at by my officers in the usual way.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I think the hon. Minister said in a routine way.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I said I passed it through in a routine way, because I did not pretend to understand the details of these matters. They are looked at and reported upon by the Deputy Minister and his officers as carefully, I have no doubt, as any other matter that comes before them.

Mr. WALLACE. At any rate, the matter came before him in the usual way for approval and was forwarded to the Governor in Council.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. And the hon. gentleman assumed from this that they were scarcely looked at at all.

Mr. WALLACE. I gathered that from what the Minister said. I do not wish to misrepresent him. The Minister gave the House to understand that this was considered a matter of very minor importance, and, in the rush of business that was going on, did not receive the consideration to which it was entitled. The hon. Minister was not seized of the importance of the matter. That is what I gather from what he said, and I think his words will fairly justify that interpretation. But this is an important matter. It is important for the safety of the trainmen and of the travelling public, and it is an important matter if the Minister has consented to a change in the regulations which will Americanize our railways and work to the injury of those railways and their Canadian employees.

Mr. HUGHES. I have taken occasion to look into this matter in the town in which I live, which is a large railway centre; and I find that the regulations bring about a certain change in signals, and that until the men get thoroughly posted in the new system, there is a possibility of accidents. But, presuming the men get used to the changes, I think there will be no trouble whatever. While some of the men in the town in which I live feared at first that the changes would be undesirable, now that they have examined them they are unable to point out anything very seriously wrong with the new rules. This is a good deal as it was when Mr. Hays became the general manager of the road. As was natural, Mr. Hays brought in a number of officers accustomed to his system of running a railway to take charge of important positions on the road. The cry at once went out that every conductor and every trainman was going to be dismissed and replaced by a Yankee. But I can say that in our whole district not one man on such account has been dismissed. On the contrary, Mr. McGuigan, Mr. Hays and the chief engineer, have watched the men, and wherever they have found a deserving man in that district, they have not only retained him, but, in many instances, they have advanced such men to very high positions in the service, taking advantage of every opportunity to give the local officers promotion. Besides, in some cases—I was going to say many, but I can say at least in some cases—they have taken men from our system and put them on the general system of the company even in Michigan, giving them good positions. I have examined the rules carefully, and the only danger that I can see in them will arise during the time when the men are learning the new system of signals. It is possible then for accidents to occur, as the signals differ from those that the men have been accustomed to.

Mr. CASEY. I had a notice on the paper of a question on this subject, which, I believe, was allowed to stand at the request of the Government.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Casey) was not here.

Mr. CASEY. I was not aware that it was coming up to-day or that this discussion was coming up. Without asking for a categorical answer now to the question I proposed to ask, I would say that I have heard complaints from the railway men in the district where I live that changes were made in the rules of the service calling for longer hours than necessary for the performance of the employees' duties, and, therefore, not only oppressive to the men, but inconsistent with the safety of the public as well. There have also been complaints about the change in signals which has been referred to. It stands to reason that sudden change of methods of signalling is apt to cause confusion and accidents. My object in the questions I desired to ask was simply to have the whole subject ventilated. No doubt, when I have an opportunity to ask the questions, the Minister can give a full statement with regard to it. I can quite understand that a matter of this kind should pass the department in a routine way, as has been mentioned, without anybody's attention being called to it. But I was also given to understand that some of the employees of the Grand Trunk Railway had asked, through certain representatives of their own, to be heard before the Minister, or whoever should hear them, on the subject of these rules. I hope the Minister will be able to give a full explanation when he comes to answer the questions. I have no doubt these rules are subject to such modifications as an expert would decide to be in the interest of the public and of the men, as well as of the railway company. Of course, the Government's control of these rules has been largely nominal at all times, for the simple reason that nobody in the department was a railway expert in this sense. But what I would suggest is that in the future, before such rules and regulations are approved of, those interested on the other side of the question,

the employees, should be heard. I think this course would lead to more general satisfaction.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I am glad that my hon. friend from West York (Mr. Wallace) has brought this matter to the attention of the Minister of Railways and the House. Whatever the Minister of Railways may think of this subject, I can tell him that there exists a very strong feeling among the men on the Grand Trunk against the adoption of these new rules. I represent a constituency which forms the head of one of the largest divisions of the Grand Trunk Railway, and I know whereof I speak when I say that changes in the rules that have been approved by the Governor in Council, are extremely unpopular with the men they more particularly affect. Now, I hold in my hand a resolution passed by a very important body of trainmen strongly protesting against the adoption of these changes, which, it appears, the Minister of Railways has approved. Whatever may be said in favour of the new system—and it does not appear that any person in this House has examined the system sufficiently to pronounce upon its merits——

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Do you think they would be able to pronounce upon it if they had examined it?

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I daresay that my hon. friend from West Elgin (Mr. Casey), who has paid a good deal of attention to legislative matters of this kind, would be able to give a pretty fair opinion. Besides, there are railway men in the House, the hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Ingram) and others. Yes, I do not hesitate to say to the Minister of Railways that there are members of this House who, on carefully examining the two systems of rules and comparing them, and taking into consideration the fact that the system in vogue in this country has proved, so far as I know or have ever heard, less injurious than the system adopted in the United States, could give us an opinion that would be of value. I have been told by railway men that the system in vogue in this country is better for the safety of employees and passengers than the system in vogue in the United States. But I submit to the Minister of Railways, in all fairness, that when adopting a change so important as this, at all events the large representative body of men known as the legislative committee of the trainmen should have been consulted. In these days, Mr. Speaker, large corporations have to be a little more carefully watched than in the days of old. We have had some instances, not only in the present session of this Parliament, but in recent years, to show a grasping tendency on the part of some corporations. And we know that the best solution of the difficulties that arise between corporations and the employees is conciliation. We know that the principle of arbitration is always best. I submit, Sir, without wishing to say anything more on the subject, that before the Governor in Council was asked to approve of these rules, the representatives of the other side of the question should, at least, have been given an opportunity to present whatever objections they might have to the adoption of these rules.

Mr. McNEILL. I wish to say one word in regard to this matter. I think the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) deserves our thanks for having brought this important subject to the notice of the House. The travelling public are deeply interested in this question, and it is evident that we would have no protest from the railway employees unless they had a grievance. It is a serious matter for the employees of a great corporation to come forward in this way, knowing that they do so at a certain risk, and I am satisfied there would be no such application unless there was a grievance. But I would like to call the attention of the hon. Minister to what my hon. friend from West Elgin (Mr. Casey) referred to, the fact that the employees are called upon to serve too long hours at a stretch. I called attention to that in the House some little time ago. I venture to think that it would be desirable that this House should limit by legislation, if necessary, the number of hours during which railway employees should be kept at work. I recollect when, a good many years ago, a great deal of attention was called to this subject in the old country, a good many accidents had occurred, and when the matter came up and was investigated, it was found that these accidents arose largely from the fact that the men were utterly worn out, that they were not in a condition to discharge their duties in such a manner as was necessary for the public safety.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My hon. friend will allow me to say that no doubt he is aware that in many branches of the railway service some legislation would be required to prevent men from working too long hours by their own desire. They are, perhaps, more desirous of working long hours than the railway companies desire them to work, because they get paid by the time. Therefore, in the legislaton which my hon. friend has in mind, this fact would have to be taken into consideration.

Mr. McNEILL. I am not standing up in the House to discuss the interests of the employees as against the corporations, nor of the corporations as against employees, nor do I desire to make political capital with one class or the other. I am speaking now in the interests of the public as well as of the employees; and if it be ne-

cessary to limit the number of hours that employees should work at a stretch when they do so voluntarily, then let it be done. It is clear to any one who chooses to think of the matter that engineers and others who work too long at a stretch, can only do so with the greatest possible risk to the public safety. I do not know the particulars of these new regulations that have been introduced, but I think we do know that heretofore we have been far more free from railway accidents in Canada than have our friends to the south of the line, in proportion to our population and to the number of trains that are running. If there is any likelihood of a system being introduced in Canada that would make the risk of accidents greater than heretofore, then it becomes a very grave matter, and one that deserves the serious consideration of the Government. I would urge upon the Minister to take up this matter seriously, and also to hear what the employees themselves have got to say on the subject.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There is not the slightest objection to that, in fact I am desirous of doing so.

Mr. CORBY. When in Toronto this week I was informed by a number of drivers and firemen that they had not yet received the new rules, although they are going into force on the 1st of July. I also had a conversation with conductors who complain that they are not getting time enough to study those rules if they are to go into force on the 1st of July. When it is remembered that many of these railway men have been working for the last 25 years under certain rules, the Government should be very careful to safeguard the public interest when they propose to enforce new rules in 30 days, because if the engineers and firemen received the rules now, they would only have 30 days in which to learn them. Representing, as I do, a large railway centre in the city of Belleville, the changing point between Brockville and Toronto, I must say that I think the men ought to have a fair show, they should have a chance to come down here and air their grievances, and should have been heard by the Minister of Railways and Canals before that Order in Council was passed. I am told on good authority, and by the men themselves, that they had a direct promise from the Minister of Railways and Canals that before that Order in Council was passed, they would be allowed to be heard with reference to their grievance. It may be said also that these men, who are earning their daily bread in working for the Grand Trunk Railway, are afraid to come here publicly and represent their interests; therefore, I say that we, their representatives, should stand up and protect them; and I, for one, irrespective of the Grand Trunk Railway or anybody else, propose to stand up here and urge what I think is fair-play in the interest of the railway employees. In the hope the Minister of Railways and Canals will appoint a day and allow the men to send a representative here and put their case before the Government, and if they have not been properly treated, I think the Government should rescind that Order in Council.

Mr. McMULLEN. I earnestly hope that the Government will move very cautiously in lending their sanction to any radical change as between the railways and those employed. Before the Government sanctions rules that apparently are to come into force on the 1st of July, I think an opportunity should be given to the trainmen to present their arguments on behalf of the reforms that they desire. Of course it could not be expected that the Government should send an invitation to any organization to come here and present their arguments. However, I concur with some hon. gentlemen opposite in the belief that the organization of trainmen should be allowed a reasonable opportunity of making any objections to any new rules before the Government grant their sanction to those rules, so as to protect the rights of individuals. We know well that all railway managers are anxious to get as much as they can out of their hired labour, and we cannot find any fault with that. But the rules should be so fairly adjusted, the scale should be so fairly balanced between the employees and the corporations that injustice should not be permitted to exist, and that the railway men should not be subjected to harsh treatment or obliged to work too long hours. I quite agree with what the Minister of Railways and Canals has said with regard to the men desiring to put in long hours so as to draw larger pay. Conductors and brakesmen are generally paid by the hour, and they are anxious to put in more than ten or twelve hours a day, in some cases they would work 18 hours if they could get paid for that time. It is the duty of the railway company to see that men are not permitted to work more than, say, 12 hours, because if they do, the company is running a great risk, and the public safety is also endangered. We know that accidents have occurred by reason of the fact that trainmen have virtually fallen asleep at their post, and sometimes even loss of life has occurred thereby. Some protection should be given to the public in that regard. I do not know whether the new rules are imposing upon skilled labour more onerous duties than such labour was subjected to before, but I hope that in any new rules to be enforced, skilled labour will be protected against any injustice being done.

Mr. DAVIN. I wish, as representing a large number of railway men, to add my

voice to the considerations that have been urged on the attention of the Minister of Railways and Canals in regard to this important matter. The Minister of Railways and Canals is under a mistake in supposing that on all occasions the railway employees prefer to have long hours even when the company would prefer that they should work a lesser number of hours. I remember that ten years ago I brought this matter to the attention of the House, and particularly to the attention of the hon. gentleman who is now leading the Opposition, when the Conservative party was in power; and I pointed out that the conductors and engineers on the Canadian Pacific Railway in the North-west were running distances and running for hours, inconsistent with efficiency, inconsistent with health, and inconsistent with safety to the public. The result was that the Canadian Pacific Railway changed the distances and changed the hours. I think it would be wise for the Minister of Railways to postpone final decision until the men interested were heard, and in doing so he would be acting on a precedent set by the Conservative Government. A few years ago, when Sir John Thompson was Prime Minister, a very important change was about to be introduced by legislation in this House, and although the legislation had matured and had gone, I think, through all its stages in this Chamber, nevertheless when some hon. members, among them the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) went to Sir John Thompson, he allowed us to introduce a large deputation of railway men, and the result was that the legislation did not go through at that time. I hope, because this is a matter in which the public is deeply interested and in which justice is concerned as well, the Minister will hear the men before finally putting this Order in Council into operation, in fact, I think they should have been heard before the Order in Council was passed.

The PRIME MINISTER. This question is certainly one of very serious importance to the whole community, not only to the railway men but to the people at large; but I am afraid it has been discussed by some hon. gentlemen opposite under somewhat of a misapprehension. The rules which are now complained of have been approved by the Governor in Council; they have been approved in the ordinary manner and under ordinary circumstances, and this is not the first time that rules of this kind have come before the Governor in Council for approval. From time to time the rules have to be changed, and when this occurs they are submitted to the Governor in Council and are sent to the Minister of Railways, by him they are referred to the experts of his department, and if they are favourably reported on by those experts, the rules are sent to the Governor in Council for approval. This is the procedure which has been followed in this instance. I am not aware that on any occasion the railway men have been consulted as to those rules. This, however, is a progressive age, and what has been done before may not be followed to-day, and I think it would not only be proper but quite valuable that the men who have formulated the rules should be consulted. There has been some misapprehension in regard to this matter, because I was quite astonished to receive a few days ago a letter from a friend who takes an interest in railway men, stating that I had given a pledge that the men would be heard. I have no recollection of having been interviewed on this question; of course, the matter may have passed from my memory, but I do not think so, and I have not the faintest recollection that I was approached either in an interview or privately as to this particular matter. But however that may be, the character of the rules is so important that the other side of the question should be placed before the Government. Of course, there are two sides to this question, as on every other question. The men who are going to operate the road may find fault, and they may be right in doing so; on the other hand, it cannot be supposed that the company have not good reasons to have these rules put in force. I do not say whether one side is right or wrong, it is impossible to pass judgment unless a man is an expert. But I must take exception to the statement of the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) that these rules were objectionable owing to their tendency to Americanize our railways. It is not a good objection on the floor of this House to present against these rules that they are liable to Americanize our roads whether the rules are good or bad, and the fact that they are endorsed by the United States is no reason why they should not be adopted in this country, if they are intrinsically good. Moreover, my hon. friend insinuated that this change was proposed because the manager of the Grand Trunk Railway is an American. I do not think this objection can be sustained. Mr. Hays is not the first American imported from the United States to manage our railways; there has been other precedents and no fault has ever been found with such precedents. But I think we may on this occasion cast aside these considerations; the subject is too serious to be treated in this way, and it must be treated on its merits. In this progressive age every citizen has a right to be heard whenever laws are proposed to be passed by the Parliament of Canada or the Government of the Dominion which would affect in any way his position in the country. The Government is quite disposed to act according to this view.

Mr. HAGGART. I have not seen the rules that have been approved, and I doubt whether if I had seen them, I would have been able to state whether they were right

or wrong. These rules are dealt with by the head of the department in a very perfunctory manner, and they are sent to the experts of the department, and if approved, the Minister recommends them. But what I desire to remind the hon. Minister of especially, is that a deputation of trainmen waited upon me when I occupied the position of Minister of Railways. The trainmen heard that the rules were likely to be changed. They asked me, before the rules were changed or approved by the Governor in Council, to be allowed to present their opinions on the question. I gave that direct promise to the deputation—I remember it perfectly well. I sent to the head of the department, and instructed him that as regards any new rules, they should not be recommended to Council for approval until communication had taken place with the trainmen. I think in this case the trainmen should have been consulted before new rules had been put into operation.

Mr. SPROULE. There is one point worthy of consideration. The First Minister stated that no man except an expert could pass an opinion on this subject under consideration, and this was a reflection on some members of the House, especially the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace), who had expressed his opinion regarding them. If that is the case I submit that the parties who are best able to give the necessary information, and who are in fact experts, are the men doing the work, and they should have an opportunity of being heard before these rules are put into force. There are two objects sought to be attained in having these matters submitted for the approval of the Governor in Council. One is that they may not be lightly passed and injury done, where perhaps it was not intended to be done; and the other is that the parties interested may have notice and give their views and present their side of the question. In this case, as I have said, the operatives of the road are really the experts. The railway companies have had an opportunity of expressing their views, and so far as is disclosed in the discussion, the railway men have not had the opportunity of presenting their case. As the hon. member for Brockville stated, in these days we adjust our differences by conciliation and arbitration, and this certainly applies to differences of opinion existing between employers and employees. The great corporations lay down cast iron rules, and in these cases it is becoming more and more important that both sides should be heard before conclusions are arrived at and acted upon. Only the corporations and employers had an opportunity of presenting their views with respect to the wisdom or otherwise of some of the rules crystallized into law by Order in Council before they became law. This course should be followed in this and all other cases, and before these rules come into operation it is the duty of the Government to withhold them for the time so as to give this large class of the community an opportunity to express their approval or disapproval to the rules, in so far as they may affect their side of the case.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr Blair). I may perhaps say one word in view of the statement made by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart). I quite accept his recollection of what took place when he was Minister of Railways, and I have no doubt at all in my own mind that he is correct in that statement; but it is only fair to the deputy head, who was also the deputy under his administration, to say that he has no recollection whatever of having been asked to make any record, nor did he make any record of the request of the committee of trainmen made upon the ex-Minister of Railways. The deputy has sent me a memo. over his own signature, to the effect that there is no record whatever in the department of the railway employees having asked to be heard before any regulations or new rules should be approved. It is, therefore, quite clear that it has entirely escaped his memory as it did mine. If either of these gentlemen or any of them spoke to me on the subject I have no recollection, and in view of their statement I would be sorry to say they did not. The matter went through, as the ex-Minister of Railways has stated, quite in the usual way. I wish to be understood distinctly as by no means intending now or then to treat this matter lightly. I recognize its importance and I should be extremely well pleased at any time to afford the fullest opportunity to this body of men, or any other which may be connected with railroads, to be heard before any regulation is approved which may in the slightest degree affect their interests. I will be very glad indeed to afford every facility, as I always endeavour to do in the general discharge of the duties of my department, to any persons who wish to be heard with regard to any action which the department may take.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I do not know what took place between the late Minister of Railways and the permanent head of the department, but I think I introduced the deputation that represented the trainmen to the late Minister of Railways and Canals, and at that time it was supposed that the Grand Trunk Railway Company were about to issue new rules; indeed the deputation thought at that time that these rules had already been submitted to the Department of Railways. I remember very well the answer given by the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Haggart), namely, that he had not yet heard of the intention of the Grand Trunk Railway to introduce new rules, but he made the promise in my presence that when the rules should be submitted to the department for approval, the committee of the trainmen would be notified and given an opportunity of presenting any objections

which they might have to the adoption of these new rules. There is no necessity for my repeating the opinions which have so often been expressed here to-day as to the importance of the matter which has been brought to the attention of the House. Although the Prime Minister seemed to have been perhaps a little misinformed in regard to that, or perhaps misunderstood it, there has been no intention to decry Mr. Hays, the general manager of the Grand Trunk Railway, who though an American, has undoubtedly shown great ability in connection with the management of the road. That, however, has nothing to do with the question as to whether the men who are employed under him and whose lives are at stake, as well as the lives of the public in their hands, should be consulted upon so important a question to them and to the public. The Minister (Mr. Blair) states that he is quite willing to see that the men are consulted when such an important matter as this concerning their interests is in the hands of the department, but the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) will see that the rules have now been adopted by the department, and the point which was taken by the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule) was not answered, namely, the question as to whether the Minister now saw any means or any way of giving the trainmen or their representatives an opportunity of expressing their opinion, or of showing up what they believe to be deficiencies in the present rules. Nor did the Minister reply to the other point suggested by the hon. member for Hastings (Mr. Corby), who urged that greater time should be given for the men to become acquainted with the new rules. These are two points of importance and really they are the kernel of the discussion.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I prefer not making any definite statement on the subject, further than if it is possible to afford an opportunity for reopening the question, I shall be very pleased to do so.

Motion to adjourn negatived.

NOTICE OF MOTION—MR. HUGHES.

Mr. HUGHES. On page 7 of the Routine Proceedings of the House will be found a notice of motion of mine. My recollection is that on a previous occasion it was agreed with the consent of the First Minister that this motion should be dropped from the Order paper, but there appears to have been some misunderstanding about it. I would like to have the motion dropped as I want to speak on it when we go into Supply. If I cannot manage to get it out of the way, I will have to get around it.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I am quite sure my hon. friend (Mr. Hughes) can manage to get around it and relying on his powers in that direction, I do not think it would be advisable to let the motion drop, because if we do it for one we will have to do it for others, and as we want to reach prorogation——

An hon. MEMBER. When ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Whenever it pleases gentlemen on the other side of the House.

Mr. FOSTER. In order to hasten that desirable day I call the attention of the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) to the fact, that three months ago an order of the House was passed on my motion, for all the papers in connection with the winter service between St. John, Halifax and the old country, and the return has not been brought down yet.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). I am almost certain the papers are prepared. I will inquire immediately.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I call the attention of the Minister of Militia to the fact that he promised to bring down the papers connected with the shipment of supplies and ammunition to the Yukon, via Seattle or over the Grand Trunk Railway.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA (Mr. Borden). I thought, perhaps, the information could be given in Supply.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The understanding was that the Minister would bring down the information before we discussed the item in Supply.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA. Very well.

THE CASE OF MR. FREEMAN HALSTEAD.

Mr. HENDERSON. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to draw the attention of the right hon. the First Minister to an article which appears in the Toronto "World" of yesterday, and also in a great many other newspapers. It has reference to a matter which I brought to the attention of the Government about ten days ago, and in regard to which the hon. Minister of Marine (Sir Louis Davies) very kindly took action. The following is the article to which I refer :—

Halstead begins his Term.—Canadian Sentenced at Porto Rico.—Sent to the Penal Camp.

St. Thomas, Danish West Indies, May 23.—The British steamer "Aldborough," Captain Farrant, which arrived at Porto Rico on May 6, from Mothil, Scotland, reached this port from San Juan de Porto Rico yesterday morning. She reported that Mr. Freeman Halstead, Canadian, the newspaper correspondent for the New York "Herald," who has been sentenced to nine years' imprisonment for taking photographs of the fortifications of San Juan de Porto Rico, has been conveyed to a convict camp in order to undergo his sentence.

I draw the attention of the First Minister again to this matter, more particularly as the young man herein referred to, up to the year 1890 resided in the county which I have the honour to represent, and his friends live there still and have been in communication with me, asking me if the Government would be likely to take any further action than they did a week ago when they kindly made inquiry as to what the result of the trial in Porto Rico was. I therefore ask the right hon. the First Minister if his attention has been drawn to this matter, and if he thinks it possible that the Imperial Government may be communicated with, with a view of inquiring into the matter as to whether the sentence of Mr. Halstead is not altogether too harsh, and whether steps would not be taken, perhaps, to secure the release of this young Canadian who has so unfortunately got into the toils of the Spaniards at this critical period ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I am sorry I cannot give my hon. friend (Mr. Henderson) any information today further than we had the other day. My colleague, the Minister of Marine, has the matter in hand and is attending to it. My hon. friend may be quite sure that the Government will neglect no opportunity of giving him every satisfaction with respect to these important matters.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE HOUSE—GOVERNMENT BUSINESS.

Sir CHARES TUPPER. Before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I would like to draw the attention of the right hon. leader of the House to the fact that while he was good enough to inform us that it is not the intention of the Government to bring down any further measures this session, he did not refer to another matter, which has an important bearing on the adjournment, and that is the slaughter of the innocents. What measures now on the paper does the Government intend to drop or proceed with ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). We have no intention of dropping any other measures on the Order paper.

COTE ST. LUC RIFLE RANGE.

Mr. MONK. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I feel it my duty to call once more the attention of the hon. Minister of Militia to the state of affairs existing at the Cote St. Luc rifle range. Perhaps the best way in which I can inform the Minister of what has taken place is to read a communication I have just received from a number of farmers who live in the vicinity of the range. It is as follows :—

The people of Cote de Liesse, residing in the vicinity of the military ranges of Cote St. Luc, request me to call the attention of the Government very earnestly to the manner in which they are treated by the military authorities conducting the military exercises at Cote St. Luc. The accident which happened last autumn, and an indemnity for which has not yet been paid, ought nevertheless to have been sufficient warning to the Government with regard to the exercises which are now going on in that place. Lt.-Col. Gordon and his confrère, Mr. Vidal, told us last year that they were surprised nobody had been killed on the Cote St. Liesse road, which is within range of the firing, and they were evidently right because last Saturday, the 21st May, the men who were working on Mr. Larose's farm—Mr. Larose is the man who was wounded last year, and is still unable to work—heard bullets whistling past their heads to such an extent that they had to give up work. They were about one arpent from the public road. What makes this more intolerable is the fact that the militia officers have warned the following farmers, Messrs. Mason, A. Groulx, B. Groulx, Jos. Larose (the victim of last year's practice), Art. St. Aubin, Hubert St. Aubin and others, that henceforth there will be exercises on the ranges twice a week—every Wednesday and Saturday, the whole day until 7 p.m.—and that during this time they will have to abstain going to their fields and have to keep their animals in their stables or otherwise the militia authorities will not be responsible for any accidents happening during these two days. This notice was given them in French and English, and they were told that this state of affairs would last until the fall. Now these farmers ask themselves what they ought to do. Can they remain in their fields during these two days or must they abstain from work during the two days mentioned in the notice ? They desire to protest against this state of affairs, and wish their grievance to be brought to the notice of the Government.

I am sure that the hon. Minister is not aware of this state of affairs, and that when it is brought to his notice, as I deemed it my duty to do on the reception of this notice, he will see that such an intolerable state of things is put an end to at once.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). I am very much obliged to the hon. gentleman indeed for calling my attention to this matter. He is quite right in saying that he is sure I was not aware of any notice of this kind having been given. I was certainly not in possession of any information except what I gave the other day. I would ask the hon. gentleman to be kind enough to send me that letter or a copy of it, and I promise to bring the matter before the officers of the department at once.

CROW'S NEST PASS RAILWAY COMMISSION.

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON. I desire to ask the Government when the report of the commission appointed to inquire into the treatment of the workmen on the Crow's Nest Pass Railway will be brought down to the House ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I am sorry that I cannot give any information to my hon. friend to-day on this subject. I thought I would have been able to do so, but I find that I have not the information at hand to-day.

BELL TELEPHONE COMPANY.

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON. Have the Government yet taken any action with regard to the petition of the Bell Telephone Company for advanced rates ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). No ; no action has been taken.

THE COLONEL OF THE 8TH HUSSARS.

Mr. FOSTER. I asked the hon. Minister of Militia a few days ago for the papers in connection with some charges against the Colonel of the 8th Hussars, and he said he would be able to give me an answer later. Has he yet made up his mind ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). I think that as the matter is not yet disposed of it would be very undesirable to bring the papers down now. I may tell my hon. friend that the position is this. Charges were made against the colonel commanding the 8th Hussars by the senior major. They went before the General, and the General reported that they had better not be proceeded with, and advised the senior major to that effect. The senior major did not see fit to accept that advice, and the matter now comes under my notice. I have not had time to look into it, but as soon as the session is through, I shall take the matter up.

Mr. FOSTER. I am very glad to hear my hon. friend say that. I made the inquiry largely in the interests of all parties and of justice, I think. I happened to have seen a copy of the charges, and they are charges which I think no militia officer should lie under. I do not know what motived the course of the General commandant, but I know that the charges have been made for a considerable length of time, and, if I mistake not, arrangements were made at one time for hearing them. There was delay, however, and afterwards the suggestion was made by the General that the matter should be allowed to pass over, but I submit to my hon. friend that a charge of that kind ought not, in the interests of the force or any officer of the force, be allowed to be passed over.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Perhaps I ought to add that a certain limited investigation was made and that certain documents, some bank receipts, were asked for, and the General reported that, so far as he had gone, he thought the charges were not sustained and advised the senior major to withdraw them. I have only looked at the papers cursorily, but as I have said, the matter has now come before me officially and I shall look into it.

GALICIAN IMMIGRANTS.

Mr. DAVIN. I wish to call the attention of the Government—and I am sorry the Minister of the Interior is not in his place—to what seems a very serious matter respecting immigration to the North-west Territories. Attention is called to it in an article in the "North-wester," of 23rd May. The article is as follows :—

THE GOVERNMENT'S TREATMENT OF SETTLERS.

The trick which has been played upon the last batch of Galician immigrants by the officials of the Immigration Department here was a disgraceful one, and cannot be too strongly reprobated. The Galicians may be undesirable as settlers, but if the Government will insist on bringing them into the country it should at least keep faith with them and treat then, not as brutes, but as human beings. A large number of the last consignment came here with the intention of joining their friends already settled here at Edmonton, Dauphin and Yorkton. The immigration officials has formed a scheme for locating a colony at Saskatoon. Upon their arrival here, those who had decided to locate near their friends in the Yorkton, Edmonton and Dauphin districts, declined to be shipped off at the whim of the commissioner to Saskatoon. Taking advantage of the ignorance of these people, the commissioner led them to believe that their luggage was being checked to the destinations they respectively desired, and by this means induced them to embark on the train which was to take them to Saskatoon. It is not surprising that, when, failing to arrive at their desired destination, these people discovered the trick played on them, they were violently indignant, and that the immigration agent in charge of them had to appeal to the North-west Mounted police to protect him. It is altogether likely that the Government will have to pay the expense of bringing these people back to the districts to which they originally intended to go. It is altogether likely, also, that the Government, owing to its delay in locating them, will now have to provide them with provisions, as it had to do in the case in previous shipments ; for, although these were alleged by the Immigration Department to be a more wealthy class than any previously sent out, they only possessed on an average $25 per head. But whether the people are ultimately located where they desired to go to, or whether, owing to their poverty, they are compelled to remain far from their friends in a district they dislike, they will not soon forget the dishonourable and high-handed manner in which they have been treated by the Canadian Government. This is, unfortunately, not the first instance of such conduct on the part of the immigration authorities. Last year, it will be remembered, similarly brutal treatment was employed to force settlers to comply with the whims of the Immigration Commissioner. On that occasion, they were locked in the cars and were brutally beaten back, and were otherwise maltreated when they attempted to escape. It will also be remembered what a pitiful tale of bad

faith on the part of the Government's agents the Galicians who were starving at Yorkton last winter had to tell. They had been lured into immigration here by delusive promises as to what the Government would do in supplying them with stock, implements and provisions, in addition to giving them their homesteads. These unscrupulous methods on the part of the Immigration Department cannot fail to have an injurious effect upon immigration generally. If the reports of the way in which these settlers have been treated served merely to check Galician immigration, the consequences would not be very serious, for the country is better without these immigrants than with them. But foreign immigration agents will cite these breaches of faith and acts of high-handedness as illustrations of what all settlers coming to Canada may expect at the hands of the Government, and thereby many really desirable settlers will probably be lost to the country. It is high time that the Government should do something to reform the methods of the immigration service.

Sir, I think it is very desirable that we should have an answer from the Government as to the serious charge made in this article.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier. My hon. friend (Mr. Davin), I am sure, will agree that it is not possible for the Government to give any answer to a newspaper article, which may be true or may not be true, but upon which it is not possible for the Government to take any action. If the hon. gentleman will warrant that the statements made are accurate, the Government will at once inquire into the matter. But he will see that it it hardly fair to expect a statement with regard to an article which gives no names of officers impugned, or to expect the Government to take action upon such a vague statement. All I can say is that we have no report, so far, of such maltreatment of immigrants as is reported there to have been inflicted upon the Galicians. All the information we have received is that the Galicians are a most desirable class of immigrants.

DISMISSALS IN CAPE BRETON COUNTY.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I wish to call the attention of the right hon. the First Minister to a matter I referred to on Monday—the promise made by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) to bring down to this House certain papers in connection with dismissals of officials in the county of Cape Breton. On the 10th May the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries promised to bring the information before the House. He said :

I shall have to give the reason in each particular case. I told the hon. gentleman that I would bring down the information in each particular case, and I will give it to him to-morrow.

But to-morrow the information was not brought down, and on the 13th I called the Minister's attention to the fact, and the following discussion took place :—

Mr. McDOUGALL. I desire to call the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to papers he promised to bring down the day before yesterday. These returns refer to the dismissal of William James Dunlop, William Burke, Francis Quinan, Richard Hickey and Alexander Macdonald.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). I will take a memorandum of what the hon. gentleman requires.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I desire also to ask the Minister of Customs and the Minister of Public Works if they will be good enough to give me information which I endeavoured to secure from them respecting the dismissals in their respective departments in my constituency. If these papers are brought down, the work of passing the Estimates will be facilitated.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). There is a memorandum in my department referring to this matter, and I will make inquiries.

On several occasions since I have been promised the papers and the right hon. the Prime Minister promised on Monday the papers would be brought down. The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries has gone out of the country, and I would like to know who has taken charge of the department, and if I can get a promise that will be fulfilled.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). I do not know how far the hon. gentleman's (Mr. McDougall's) question goes, and whether the memorandum I have here, furnished me by the department, covers the information desired. But I will send it to the hon. gentleman and he will be able to see whether it covers what he wishes, and if not, I will be glad to discuss the matter with him with a view to procuring the information for him.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I wanted a copy of the names of the officers dismissed in my county, the names of the parties appointed to their places, the reason for dismissal in each case, &c. I wanted, in fact, all the papers connected with these dismissals and appointments—the usual information in a return of that kind.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This memorandum gives the names of officials, date of dismissal and names of parties appointed, but there are no other papers. I will send the memorandum to the hon. gentleman and see how far it meets his wishes.

MILITARY COLLEGE EMPLOYEES.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask the Minister of Militia if he would kindly supplement a return he brought down with regard to the class of employees in the Royal Military College. I find that item "C," which in the Order of the House covers "the respective conditions of engagement as regards duration," and I do not find anything in this return on that point. In the absence of the Minister of Militia, the hon. Minister of Marine and

Fisheries told me that he would call attention to the point.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries sent me a note informing me what the hon. gentleman wanted, and I handed it to my deputy, and supposed that the information had been sent in. I will make another inquiry to-morrow and see that the information is brought down.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I would ask to be permitted to call attention of the hon. Minister to the statement just placed in my hands. There is no information here beyond that I gave to the House myself, as to the dismissal of these people. I cannot understand the Minister undertaking to trifle with the intelligence of the House by presenting such a return as this.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. McDougall) had better discuss the matter in fair terms. I handed him the memorandum sent me by the department. If it does not cover the ground, if the hon. gentleman will be good enough to give me the page of "Hansard" in which the information he asks for is described, I will undertake to give him the information to-morrow or tell him the reason why.

THE PLEBISCITE ON PROHIBITION.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher) moved third reading of Bill (No. 121) respecting the prohibition of the importation, manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the Bill is read the third time, I take the opportunity of again very shortly trying to impress upon the Government, as I tried on one or two occasions before, that the securing of a fair vote as well as the comfort and best interest of the electorate as a whole would be furthered if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fisher), for the Government, would give some definite information as to the time when this plebiscite is supposed to take place. My hon. friend may probably have noticed that there is considerable call for this from the public. The people think they should have information on this point. If this is to be a vote upon which any definite results are to hang, it is very necessary that there should be the fullest discussion of the questions involved, and that the electorate should not in any way be taken by surprise. I think it is also unfortunate if, now that the Bill has been put into shape, there should be any long delay. My hon. friend knows what it means in any election contest, and especially in a contest of this kind; so I hope that before we read this Bill the third time, he will be able to make a definite statement as to when the vote will be taken. I urge this in the interests of the temperance people particularly, who, I know, feel strongly on this point.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) wishes me to make a statement. I shall be glad to say a word, at all events. Since the Bill was passed through committee, the Government have received a number of communication with regard to the date of the vote. These communications expressed very little difference of opinion. The writers of all seemed to be perfectly satisfied with the statement which was made either by the right hon. leader of the Government or myself at the time the Bill was read a second time, viz.: that the election would take place as early in the fall as would meet the convenience of the people, consistent with their harvesting operations. I may say further that the Government will give due notice; so there can be no reason for uncertainty and no danger that the people will be taken by surprise. Notice of certainly six weeks or two months will be given, so that there may be abundant opportunity to prepare for the vote.

Mr. FOSTER. It should be at least two months.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think so myself; I will say two months. I think that this announcement ought to be sufficient and ought to meet the views of the hon. gentleman. He cannot expect, I am sure he does not expct, that we should to-day name a date, but the announcement I have made is entirely in accordance with the views of the Government.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I regret very much that I was unable to be present during the discussion which took place in reference to this important measure, and, therefore, have not had the advantage of knowing more precisely the position in which it stands. The proposal to take the opinion of the electorate of Canada is of course a very novel proposition. It is not one, I believe, that has ever before been resorted to in the Dominion of Canada; but I presume the Government have arrived at the conclusion that it was desirable to adopt this course after having given it very careful consideration. The question itself is surrounded with a great many difficulties, and my object in rising now to make a few observations, is for the purpose, if possible, of clearing away some of those difficulties. I am sure every member of this House will agree with me in the opinion that the public who are called upon at great expense and great personal inconvenience to deal with this question in the form in which it is proposed, should have some clear and definite idea of what the result of these proceedings is to be. The Minister of Justice has given the opinion, as I see it stated in the press, that it is in the power of every

province in the Dominion of Canada absolutely to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors within such province. Under these circumstances the very important question arises, and one to which the present Government have given a great deal of attention in regard to other matters, of how far it is proposed by action of this Parliament to override and overrule the opinions of a province in regard to a question on which the Minister of Justice declares the legislature of any province now possesses the absolute right to act in such a way as to enforce prohibition within the bounds of that province. That is one question, and a most important question, and I would like to ask the right hon. gentleman who is leading the House, and the Minister of Agriculture who is in charge of this measure, to ask them for my own information and for the information of the country, how far it is proposed that the decision of the whole electorate of Canada shall operate to override the pronounced opinion in another direction of any particular province of the Dominion. Is it intended to coerce an individual province by the power of the Dominion Parliament on a question in which, as I have just said, the Minister of Justice has given his opinion that the legislature of a province possesses, under the law and under the constitution as interpreted by the Committee of the Privy Council, the right absolutely to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors within the bounds of that province. Another question, and one of vastly more importance, is that the Government should state to this House, as I think they are bound to state, for the information of the House and the country, under what conditions they propose to carry out by law of the Dominion Parliament, a verdict of the country when that verdict shall be rendered by the result of the plebiscite. Before the people enter into this struggle, both those who are strongly in favour of prohibition and those who are opposed to it, are, I hold, entitled to know what the result of the vote is to be, whether, in case a bare majority of the whole electorate decide in favour of prohibition throughout Canada, the Government, in that event, are prepared to say now to the country, as I hold they are bound to say whether they will carry that verdict into effect by legislation of this Parliament. I say that before the people are called upon to incur this great expense involved in a plebiscite, they should be informed whether they are endeavouring to accomplish something which will be bootless in the end, they should be informed how far, in the opinion of the Government, a favourable vote should preponderate, or whether a bare majority in favour of prohibition would be taken by the Government as a mandate to pass a prohibitory law. I hope I will not be thought by my right hon. friend to be unreasonable in asking from the Government an explicit statement, first, as to the question of provincial rights, as to the question of whether in case there is a majority in the whole Dominion in favour of prohibitory law, and a majority in any one province against it, it is intended to enforce such a law throughout the whole Dominion, to enforce it in a province which, by a large majority, may have declared its hostility to such a measure. The second question is, whether, in case only a bare majority supports a prohibitory enactment, the Government will take measures to enact a prohibitory law and enforce it, either throughout the Dominion, or only in such provinces as may, by a majority of the electors, have declared that they are in favour of it. A third question is, what must be the preponderating influence and how great the majority must be, in order to warrant the Government in undertaking to deal with prohibition. We are all, I believe, sincerely desirous of doing everything possible to promote the cause of temperance throughout the Dominion; we are all, I believe, fully alive to the great advantage that the propagation of temperance principles, the inculcation of such principles, would be to the whole country. But as my right hon. friend knows, there is the greatest possible difference of opinion upon the question of how far a prohibitory enactment is practicable, how far it would be effective in promoting the great object aimed at. I regret very much not having had it in my power to be present when this subject was discussed, and I must ask the House to excuse me in bringing this subject up at this late hour, although I have done so as briefly as possible, in order to present the reasons why I think the Government should make an avowal of their position on the points I have mentioned.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). My hon. friend, in putting to me the questions which he has just set forth, ventured the expression that I would not think him unreasonable. I am sorry to say, Mr. Speaker, that, with every desire to think well of my hon. friend, I consider his questions at this time most unreasonable, and he can scarcely expect me to answer them at this moment. My hon. friend said a moment ago that the object we all had in view was to promote the great cause of temperance. I believe this is the object which is animating every one of us, whether we are in favour of this Bill or not, whether we may vote in this plebiscite for prohibition, or whether we may vote against it. But my hon. friend will permit me to remark that on this occasion he is more Catholic than the Pope, and more prohibitionist than the prohibitionists. My hon. friend is asking me at this moment to answer questions which no one of the many temperance organizations who are actively engaged in promoting prohibition, have yet asked the Government to pronounce upon. I say to my hon. friend that the temperance societies, at whose instance especially this legislation

has been brought forward, have, in all their representations upon this subject, agreed that the consequence of this vote should only be taken up to be dealt with after the vote has been taken. My hon. friend asks me what will take place in case another thing takes place, what will happen if the vote shows a small majority in favour of prohibition, and what will happen if, on the contrary, it shows a large majority against Let me ask my hon. friend this question: What will happen if there is no majority at all? Of course the whole matter would drop. But that is one of the possibilities which we have to bear in mind when we are called upon to pronounce an opinion beforehand. The people may pronounce a verdict for or against prohibition. If they pronounce against it, the matter ends at once, and therefore there is no occasion to trouble ourselves with the consequences of such a contingency. But if there be a majority for prohibition, whether large or small, then it will be the duty of the Government to consider whether the time has arrived for the Dominion Parliament to place such an enactment upon the Statute-book. I have only this to say to my hon. friend, that, after the will of the people has been ascertained, if the Government does not then perform its duty, it will be open to my hon. friend to call the Government to a very severe account for failure to perform that duty. My hon. friend remarked that he was not present when the matter was discussed on a previous occasion. If he had been present on a previous occasion he would have remembered that the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) took the Government to task and contended that every promise made should be implemented and every responsibility fulfilled.

Mr. FOSTER. I did not take such a large order as that.

The PRIME MINISTER. The hon. gentleman does not do himself justice. He has only to ask the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron), who on that occasion pronounced some words that he would have preferred not have heard him utter. When the time comes for the Government to perform its duty, after the expression of the public will has been given, then we shall be able to give an answer to the question of my hon. friend.

Mr. CRAIG. I suppose the great art of a politician is to be able to conceal his views. I am not a politician, at least I am not a politician on this question, and I do not think I am a politician on other questions, because I state my views very clearly to the House when I state them at all. I should have been glad if the Prime Minister had given his views as to the question of majority, as to what majority might lead to the introduction of a prohibitory law, if any majority could do so. The hon. gentleman has not done so; but I will give my views, and I believe they will express his views also. We must admit that this question is a most difficult one to politicians. But it is a most difficult one without regard to politics, this question of prohibition, and men who are strong temperance men and who differ in politics agree that this is a somewhat difficult question to settle. There are three classes in the community who hold three different views on this question. The first class is opposed to prohibition, for different reasons. Some because they are interested in the business financially. Some because they do not believe in curtailing a man's liberty. I know strong temperance men who are nevertheless entirely opposed to prohibition in any sense, for they believe it is curtailing a man's liberty to say that he shall not drink so and so. Then there is a second class, those who would like to see prohibition, but do not think it practicable. I believe these people form a large class of the community. There is another class who say prohibition is right and is practicable. This class, and here I differ with the Prime Minister, who think prohibition is right and practicable, did not ask for the plebiscite vote; they have not asked for it, they do ask for prohibition. I am confirmed in this opinion by the result of a meeting held upstairs, when people belonging to this class declared they were not responsible for the plebiscite; that as it was offered to them, they should try to make it a success, but in their opinion the country is now ripe for a prohibitory law. The first class say the country is not ripe or ready for prohibition and that a prohibitory law could not be carried out; and another class says we do not know whether the country is ready or not. This latter class wanted the plebiscite, and in answer to their request the Government have granted the plebiscite vote. Some people, again, say that the Government are not honest in desiring prohibition, that this is another effort to get rid of the question; that the Government simply state they do not know whether the country is ready for prohibition or not; and they give a plebiscite so that the question will be put off a few years longer. We know that it has been put off for a few years in other ways previously, and now the present Government have a chance of disposing of the prohibition question in this way. I am going, however, to give my views plainly on the question, and I believe they are the views of the Prime Minister, although I do not expect he will tell us so. The question is, will this plebiscite vote settle the question of a prohibitory law? I answer that this depends to a very considerable extent on the largeness of the vote and the majority given. A couple of weeks ago I asked the First Minister what he would consider a majority, whether it would have to be a majority of the votes cast or a majority of the total votes on the list. Of course I did not get an answer, and I did

not expect an answer, but I gave the hon. gentleman a chance to make a reply. The right hon. gentleman asked me about the point, as I said I held an opinion, and I gave my views frankly and fully. I said I believed that if any Government endeavoured to pass a prohibitory law it should be with a majority of the voters on the list in its favour. Some hon. members laughed and said that the Premier had roped me in, that I had let him out of the hole, and so on. Those are my views, however, and they have been my views for years, and I wanted to state them here so as to show that I am not sailing under false colours, either with the temperance people or others, and I wanted to show where I stand. In order to prove that these views have not been adopted by me lately, and have not been adopted since I rose to discuss the question, and not put forward at the moment, in the innocence of my heart, I wish to read a short extract from a speech I delivered on February 24th, 1896. I then said :

I claim that the prohibitory law must have a great majority behind it, not only of those who vote, but of all who have votes in this country. It was a great weakness in the Scott Act that it required for its adoption only a majority of the votes cast. It would have been far better if it had required a majority of the votes of all those entitled to vote, because in some cases very little interest was taken in the elections, and the majority of the vote was not represented. The law must have a great majority behind it to be effective. It is no use placing such a law on the Statute-book by a bare majority—in fact, I would be opposed to it. While I am in favour of prohibition, I do not want a law placed on the Statute-book unless there is a great majority in favour of it. It is claimed by those who have studied the question that the great majority of the people are in favour of such a law.

I have read that extract in order to show that in 1896, when I voted in favour of prohibition, I thought as I think now. I have adopted no new views to suit the present occasion, because those were the views I held then, and I expressed them plainly. I stated that I was satisfied that if only a small vote were cast, that fact would show the people did not want prohibition. I will now read a short selection from a newspaper, which is a strong prohibition paper, the Montreal "Witness." It appears in its issue of May 13th, 1898. It seems there was a meeting of the advocates of the plebiscite, and one of the speakers was Rev. Dr. Rose, and the "Witness" endorses the stand he took on that occasion. Hon. members will see the position he took from the extract I now read, which is as follows :

The prohibition rally at Knox Church last night was an inspiring occasion. There should, however, not have been either sitting or standing room left to spare in the church. Dr. Rose said truly that the people of Canada might rest assured that they would certainly get prohibition as soon as they wanted it, plebiscite or no plebiscite. They might think they wanted it, but when they wanted it enough to vote against their party for it ; when they were willing to risk the loss of friendship or of business rather than the loss of it ; when they were interested enough to be on hand when the question was at issue, then they would get it. If they did not want it they would not get it, plebiscite or no plebiscite. The Government only wanted to know the will of the people, and when it was assured of that it would certainly obey the mandate. We may rely upon it that politicians are watching every gauge of public opinion and drawing their conclusions, and those prohibitionists who are missing when heads are being counted cannot escape the responsibility of being to that extent counted in the negative.

That is just the view I take. If the people are in favour of prohibition, they will take the trouble to go to the polls and vote in favour of it ; if they do not want it, they will neglect to go to the polls and vote in favour of it. Unless a majority of the people expressly declare they want prohibition, it is no use for any Government to pass a prohibitory measure, and if a majority of the people do not vote in favour of it when they have the opportunity to do so, then I say that is proof they do not want it. If there is a substantial majority given in favour of adopting such a measure, then the temperance people may justly ask for a prohibitory law ; and that is where the whole question rests. If a majority vote in favour of prohibition, by giving a large majority when the poll is taken on the plebiscite, then I hold no Government should refuse to grant the temperance people such a law. I believe that, but I believe just as well that if we find a minority of the people voting in favour of prohibition, then, I believe, we will find no Government bringing in a Bill of this kind, and I would not be willing to support such a Bill under those circumstances. I approve of the plebiscite as an opportunity for the people to express their views on this question. I think it is a good thing to have the question brought to this point, and I give the Government credit for doing it at this time. Whether it is a political dodge or not I do not care. We have had this matter argued out over and over again. Some say the moment is ripe for prohibition, and some say it is not, but now we will have that question at all events settled by the plebiscite. I say, Sir, it will be settled in favour of prohibition if we find a majority of the people of this country going to the polls and recording their votes in favour of prohibition. I cannot do better than to read to the House the conclusion of that speech which I made on a previous occasion, because it expresses the sentiments which I have to day :

Let me say in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, that I would like to see prohibition brought about. I believe it would be of great benefit to this country, but, Sir, I want to see it done intelligently. I want people to do it with their eyes open. I want it to be done with a proper guarantee that it will be enforced. I want it to be done with

a due consideration of all the objections that are urged against it. I hold that it would be a great evil, and that it would retard the progress of the temperance cause for many years, if a prohibitory law were passed in one Parliament and repealed in the next. In order to prevent that, I wish that careful consideration should be given to this matter. As I said before, it should be done intelligently, and above all, it should be done with a great majority of the people behind it. If it is done in that way, and if the Bill is drawn carefully, and with a due regard to these considerations, then, Sir, it will be a success. I hope to see the day when such a prohibitory law will pass this Parliament ; but unless it is such a law as I have indicated, I am not anxious to have a prohibitory law at all.

As I had not an opportunity of speaking on the second reading, I thought it only right that I should express my views at this stage of the Bill, because I am in favour of temperance ; I am a total abstainer myself, and would do a great deal to see a prohibitory measure passed. But at the same time, as I have already said, I do not want to see a prohibitory measure placed on the statute-books if it is not going to be enforced, and I am satisfied it would not be enforced unless a majority of the people are behind it.

Mr. FLINT. I do not desire the Bill to pass its third reading without making a few observations in connection with some of the points raised in the discussion this afternoon. I quite agree with the line taken by the right hon. the leader of the House in declining to be drawn into a discussion of the contingencies brought before him by the hon. leader of the Opposition and his hon. colleague from York (Mr. Foster) ; because as every hon. member can see, any opinions expressed by so important a member of this House as the leader of the Administration upon collateral and subsidiary points in connection with the prohibition movement, would to that extent complicate and tend to cloud the operation of the public mind in dealing with the question which the plebiscite will bring before it. No doubt, that naturally and quite in consonance with human nature, there will not only be temperance feeling so-called, raised in connection with the further progress of this matter, but to a large degree party and political interests are necessarily mixed up in it, and it is advisable from every standpoint that to the very greatest possible extent political and partisan feeling should be removed from a question such as this. And, Sir, should the Government be so ill-advised as to sketch beforehand, either in greater or less detail, what they would do under certain contingencies, they would be placing a political and partisan weapon in the hands of both parties to be made use of to further complicate a question which all parties seem to have agreed should be kept as far as possible apart from these considerations. My own views have been given at great length in previous Parliaments upon the main features of this question, and those views I believe obtained their principal importance from the fact that they were supposed to represent, and I believe did in the main represent, the views of prohibitionists generally throughout the country. In regard to the course pursued by the Administration, it will be remembered that the precise method of deciding this question that has now been adopted was not in accordance with my own original idea. The question is two-fold. In the first place : is the country ready and prepared in a proper way to support any Administration and any Parliament which would bring forward and pass a prohibitory liquor law ? The secondary question, and one of immense importance is this : is this Parliament ready to enact a prohibitory liquor law ? And, Sir, while as the result of the plebiscite we may have evidence given us as to the state of the public mind throughout the Dominion, yet this second question is not by that necessarily settled. We may have evidence to a greater or lesser extent as to public opinion throughout the various provinces upon prohibition in an abstract way, but that does not give us evidence as to the position which Parliament, as a Parliament, will take in connection with it. The ground that I have always assumed since I began a careful study of this matter has been, that the proper method by which prohibition should ultimately crystallize into the form of law would be by public education, by the manifestation of the public will at parliamentary elections, and that in each electoral district throughout the Dominion, from time to time, there should be such an overwhelming manifestation of public feeling in favour of prohibition so that members of Parliament would be elected, pledged and determined to support and enact such a law. And although the public opinion which will be pronounced this autumn will be of great importance and value, yet the second question to a large degree remains unanswered. It may be possible that the majority of the whole electors will express their views in favour of a prohibitory liquor law as asked in the plebiscite question, and at the same time it is quite possible, and in my opinion highly probable, that the majority of Parliament may dissent from the view of the majority of the electors. In what position are we placed in that contingency ? It would be just as reasonable to ask the Administration to say what it would do under such circumstances as it would to ask the Administration to say what it would do in the other contingencies sketched by the hon. gentlemen opposite. I think the duty devolving upon the prohibition party throughout the country at present is to take one step at a time, and to bring all their energy, all their enthusiasm, and all their strong faith in the sound principle of prohibition to bear in the approaching plebiscite campaign so as to produce upon the public mind, and upon the minds of public men,

as far as that evidence can influence their minds, the strongest possible impression of the desirability of enacting a prohibitory liquor law. And, after the vote has been taken, then it will become the duty of Parliament as well as the duty of the Government—for I do not consider it to be solely a question thrown upon the shoulders of the Government, but a question to be faced by Parliament as a whole—to consider the relation in which they stand to this question, and to assume their duty as parliamentarians and as gentlemen desirous of properly representing public opinion, and so conduct themselves as to speak and vote in a manner to strengthen the hands of any Administration which may attempt to carry it through.

Mr. KAULBACH. The question of prohibition pure and simple, in my opinion, is very important, and should be discussed purely on its merits without party bias or restrictions, that the electorate throughout this Dominion may have the opportunity of reading and discussing all comments pro and con, so as to be better prepared to vote intelligently on the question when submitted to them at the polls. By some the plebiscite is spoken of as an excellent device to divert the energy of the temperance people from the Ministry for a time by way of postponement, till a something else can be thought of to further postpone—whether there is anything in it or not I cannot divine —but it is to be hoped the Government are sincere and would not tolerate a thought of that kind.

Both political parties are pretty well a unit on this great question now exercising the minds of the temperance body. I, as one, claim to belong to the temperance party, and am in sympathy with their effort thus put forth, and proud to be able to say I am sincere, having ever shown my allegiance to the cause by my living example, as well as by my devotion to its claims, and never expect to make a deviation therefrom by word or act, as I have seen and heard too much of the improper use of alcoholic drinks that intoxicate, and the effects on the part of those enslaved by the resistless and craving appetite for the abominable use of it. By the excessive use of strong drinks I know of domestic homes having been rendered desolate for the want of bread, and the other necessaries of life for home comfort, wives forsaken and almost driven to destruction, children neglected, families homeless, Christian and religious training and observances disregarded, homes devastated, life and property destroyed, law placed at defiance, and an untimely end, and a premature grave reached, and all through worthless and dissipated husbands lacking the strength to refrain from the use of strong drinks. I may say that there are cases of husbands by their example bringing wives and children to follow in the use of the abominable evil, whereby misery and the worst of trials have been encountered, and as a consequence crimes of the most henious kind perpetrated, hence I would never think of doing anything by word or act but what would serve to promote and encourage this project of prohibition to a successful end, and remove the poison, if possible, except for medicinal purposes, entirely from reach.

The right hon. the leader of the Government admitted that he believed prohibition would be defeated in Quebec, which if the case is as he believes, then I say he should have been the last to think of giving Quebec a franchise with advantages over the other provinces of the Dominion, by means of which they, as voters, will have as many votes as they possess property qualifications, or, in other words, the prohibitionist voter in Nova Scotia will find his one vote for prohibition more than counterbalanced or offset by the three or four votes of some anti-prohibitionist in Quebec. I ask if this is right or just ? I am not a pessimist, but I have a proof here that the Franchise Bill giving one province advantage over another, is radically unjust, and if it will work injuriously to the temperance party in this plebiscite vote, it must work unjustly in every other vote, Quebec having the advantage over the other provinces every time—cannot hon. gentlemen opposite see for themselves the injustice they are doing the other provinces and redress the wrong. Why not run on the principle one man one vote ? Was the Franchise Bill placed by the Government in advance of the Plebiscite Bill with a view of defeating this measure ? It certainly appears to me somewhat like it. I say, give the plebiscite a fair chance, and let us deal with the subject like men.

I cannot agree with the hon. Minister of Agriculture, who is the promoter of this Bill, and poses as the champion of the temperance cause, when he says that the subject of prohibition "is relegated to the people and to the hustings, where the question is to be threshed out," meaning that we are not supposed to discuss it here, but in the country and at the polls. I say we should express our views here in this Chamber, by a free and unbiassed discussion showing the sentiments of either side, the pros and cons.

We are told complications may arise of a constitutional character preventing prohibition being carried out, or such difficulties may offer as to bar the possibility of an Act of this kind becoming workable. If such condition of affairs is liable to occur, or if there is even a doubt, why not consult the Minister of Justice, or some other expounder of the law on constitutional questions. We have numbers of lawyers in this House and some very good ones, surely they should possess sufficient acumen to give a definite answer and thereby remove all doubt or uncertainty as to our course of action. Until such is done, what is the use, and where is the sense in our asking a vote

at the polls, on the abstract principle of prohibition, or this initial step being taken now, at the cost of several hundred thousands of dollars, at least a quarter of a million of dollars, to the people of this country, probably get an affirmative answer, and then, perhaps, be told that there are grave constitutional questions involved, offering difficulties, and in consequence matters cannot proceed further. I say, face the difficulties first, let us hear what they are before the expense of a plebiscite is incurred, which appears to any reasonable mind as business, and we are then certainly in a better position to fight it.

We have had expressions of opinion, from hon. members in this Chamber, that we should meet this question fairly and squarely, in a business-like manner, not in a fault-finding spirit, in a measure, but free from all friction and political bias, and free and unfettered from all complications of a constitutional character as referred to, then I feel the temperance body in fighting this battle would have an easy victory, as they would be inspired with the feeling of having right on their side and fighting for a noble and just cause, which if entered into with indomitable courage and perseverance, must result satisfactorily and meet all our expectations.

I must certainly, and in all sincerity say, that I consider the Government are taking an expensive and unwise course in calling for a plebiscite now, without first satisfying themselves as to any and all complications and difficulties that may present themselves in the effort to bring about the desired end.

We have had plebiscite appeals in a number of the provinces, Nova Scotia included, also a Royal Commission throughout this Dominion, both at a heavy cost, without anything having been accomplished, and now we are told we are te have a plebiscite again in the face of a refusal from the right hon. the leader of the Government to give a straightforward answer to a direct question, as to "whether the country can have the assurance given them, that if the plebiscite is taken and results in showing a majority for prohibition, the Government will at once bring forward a prohibitory Bill and submit it to Parliament next session." This question having been submitted by the ex-Minister of Finance to the right hon. the leader of the Government, was answered as follows, in these words :—

> The Government, when they have the will of the people before them, will have to take such steps as will give effect to the will of the people. There is the question of revenue to be considered : there is also the constitutional question to be considered ; there are different questions which will have to be considered.

Now, in the face of an answer of this sort, so indefinite, I ask, is it honest to incur all this trouble, all this expense to the tune of several hundred thousand dollars, and then be told that it cannot be carried out ? I say, remove the difficulties first, or satisfy all minds that they can be overcome, and then face the question squarely like men.

Or put the straight question of prohibition now squarely to this Parliament, yeas and nays. Or dissolve the House and appeal to the people and let the answer come in that way. This is economy and business as well. We are not even told, if this plebiscite means the majority of the electors of the entire Dominion, or only a majority of the votes polled to decide the question. Surely the country is entitled to better satisfaction than they have at present. Now, in conclusion, may I venture to ask as to whether it would not be well for the hon. Minister in charge of this Bill to use the word "alcoholic" cider, instead of "cider." I do not desire to unduly press this suggestion, neither do I wish to eliminate the word cider from the Bill as one of the restrictions, but I am impressed with the idea that if this change is not made, or the distinction shown, that it will be the means of defeating the object intended.

A very large number of the farmers and orchardists in Nova Scotia manufacture cider from the pure juice of the apple, without any adulteration, or additions of alcohol, and I feel that if the hon. Minister is sincere in his effort and really wishes the plebiscite a success at the polls, he will accept my suggestion and make this change.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the third time and passed.

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

After Recess.

THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 130) further to amend the Dominion Lands Act.—(Mr. Sifton.)

Bill (No. 132) further to amend the Land Titles Act, 1894.—(Mr. Sifton.)

Bill (No. 133) to make further provision respecting grants of land to members of the Militia force on active service in the North-west.—(Mr. Sifton.)

Bill (No. 144) to amend the Indian Act.—(Mr. Sifton.)

Bill (No. 145) further to amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Blair.)

SONS OF ENGLAND BENEFIT SOCIETY.

Mr. BERTRAM moved that the House resolve itself into committee on Bill (No. 122) to incorporate the Supreme Grand Lodge of the Sons of England Benefit Society.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). Before this Bill is passed, the attention of the House should be drawn to the circumstances under which it comes before

us. This is a Bill to incorporate a fraternal society which is conducting what is called the assessment system of insurance. Some years ago, I believe, before I had the honour of being a member of this House, there was considerable discussion from time to time on the subject of assessment insurance. I believe that some privileges were granted to these companies in former years, which perhaps would not be granted to-day. However that may be, I think that it was in 1895 that an amendment was made to the Insurance Act, which provided that hereafter any of these companies seeking incorporation should be obliged to make a deposit and to come under the provisions of the insurance law with respect to inspection, &c. From that time up to the present, I believe, no company has been incorporated for this purpose. One company applied to Parliament for incorporation, but, in consequence of restrictions placed in its charter, the Bill was withdrawn. This year two companies made application, one the company named in the Bill now before us, and the other named the Ancient Order of Foresters. When these Bills came before the Committee on Banking and Commerce there was very considerable discussion, and the whole subject of assessment insurance was threshed out at considerable length. My own judgment, after consulting with the Superintendent of Insurance, was that it would be good policy not to press either of these Bills upon the House this session. There has been one or two disastrous failures of assessment companies during the last two years, and these two, I think, have tended to create a wider interest in the question. I submitted to the committee that it might be a wise policy to defer action on these Bills for the present, in the hope that we could agree upon a Bill governing all such companies.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The other Bill has been passed ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes. The committee thought it best not to wait but to deal with the Bills on their merits. In the case of the first, the Ancient Order of Foresters, the promoters of the Bill agreed to certain amendments which were suggested by the insurance department, and which, though they did not make the Bill entirely satisfactory to the department, did remove some of the objections urged against it. The most important amendment was that the promoters agreed that, as respects the new business of the company, the rates charged should be sufficient to create a reserve according to the standard accepted by the insurance department. As respects the existing business, they were free to carry it on, on the rates previously agreed upon; but, as to the new business, they bound themselves by the amendment with respect to creating a sufficient reserve. With that amendment and others of less importance, the Bill was passed. It was proposed that the same conditions could be attached to this Bill. But the promoters of this Bill were not prepared to accept the same conditions and so the Bill does not stand exactly on the same footing. Though I should prefer that the whole matter should be deferred for another year, in the hope that we could come to a general understanding on this matter, yet, as the other Bill is passed, I would be prepared to support this if the same amendments were made in it as were made in the other. But I am informed that the promoters say they would rather withdraw the Bill than accept these amendments. I desire to state exactly how the matter stands, so that those who were not present in committee will understand that this has been a matter of considerable importance, and that the Bill we are asked now to pass is not exactly on the same footing as the Bill that was passed a week or two ago.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I regret that the Minister of Finance has offered a protest, though a somewhat mild one, to the passage of this Bill. We are all, I am sure, very willing to join with the Government in any effort which they may make to make investment in insurance, of whatever kind, as safe as it can possibly be made. I was one of those who sought, some years ago, to take away from one of the insurance companies the privilege of making a wider range of investments than is allowed to life insurance companies under the general Act. I regret to say that those of us who took that view were unsuccessful at that time. It must, however, I think be apparent to the House that a distinction must be drawn, and that a distinction is drawn in the public mind, between the benevolent and benefit societies and regular life insurance companies, which take a large amount of money from the public. This is a different class of insurance. It is confined more especially to the middle classes of people, to the masses of the country, if I may say so. Perhaps, when we come to look at it in that light, we should be willing that the strings should not be drawn quite so closely around this association as they are around the regular life assurance companies, to which I have already referred. Those of us who are supporting this Bill only ask that it receive the same sort of treatment extended to other associations of the same kind. We only ask that this society which, as the hon. Minister of Finance knows, is already doing business in the province of Ontario under a provincial charter, shall not be placed at a disadvantage in competition with other societies of that kind. The hon. gentleman has stated that this Parliament has already incorporated societies of this class. If I remember correctly, the Independent Order of Foresters was incorporated by this Parliament a few years ago, I think, in 1889.

The Orange Order was incorporated in 1890; the Catholic Mutual Benefit Society was incorporated in 1893, and the Woodmen of the World was incorporated the same year. Now, these societies are practically the same sort of societies as the one that seeks incorporation under this Bill, and to place any greater restriction upon the Sons of England than is placed upon the societies to which I have referred, as the hon. Finance Minister knows, and as this House will clearly appreciate, will be to place this society at a disadvantage as compared with their competitors in this class of insurance. It is true that in 1895 an amendment to the Insurance Act was made requiring a deposit of $50,000 with the Government. But the hon. Minister of Finance knows that that was found quite unworkable. And, as he is well aware, the Foresters' Bill was put through Parliament this year with that requirement left out. I am quite aware that it is the intention of the Government, as announced by them, to introduce a general Bill, which they have promised in a short time, under which all these companies shall be allowed to operate. That is a wise policy, and I hope that the Government will introduce that Bill at the earliest possible moment. I hope that it will throw around these societies the greatest possible safeguards with regard to the investments in them of the small funds of the people who use them as insurance companies. I am sure that when the hon. Minister of Finance introduces this Bill, he will find that those who are supporting as well as those who are opposed to the Bill now before us, will join him in an honest, conscientious effort to make that Bill as perfect as possible, in order that all these safeguards may be thrown around these societies. But, Sir, until that Bill is introduced and all the societies are compelled to operate under it, I want to press the claim, and I think it is an equitable one, and one which will appeal to the sense of justice of this House, that this society should have no disability placed upon it that is not placed upon any society with which it competes in the insurance business. Now, with regard to the clause which the hon. gentleman refers to as placed in the Foresters' Bill, he states that a clause has been placed in that Bill which will compel them, on new insurance, to charge the rates of the old line companies. To my mind, you cannot justly compel a society of this kind to take that jump in a day.

There is no doubt that these societies would gradually work up to that standard, they are going up as the years pass by, and as experience shows that it is safer to come nearer to the standard of rates which the old line companies have adopted. But I submit that it is impossible to compel a company to make such a change and to make it successfully in a day, more particularly when they are entering into competition every day with societies that are operating under charters which have no such clauses, and, therefore, which have a great advantage over this society which has such a clause in its charter. Now, Sir, this company will go on and do business, whether this Bill passes or not. It does business in the province of Ontario, it will continue to do such business, and to my mind no public good will be served by placing this society under disabilities under which other societies are not placed. I hope the Minister of Finance will not press his objection to the Bill. In it are interested a very large number of people who belong to that society, who look to it as their national society, and who are exceedingly anxious that this Bill should pass: they largely take the risk themselves, and they are doing a magnificent work in Canada. Having in view particularly the fact that the Government intend shortly to introduce a general Bill under which all these societies shall be compelled to work, I think this Parliament could very well afford to pass the measure now, and let them go upon the same plan as others when such a Bill is introduced.

Mr. HEYD. I desire to say a few words in connection with this Bill, and I do not want to occupy any more of the time of the House than is absolutely necessary. Sympathizing, as I do, with these benevolent institutions, and believing that there is a large field for their successful operation, the remarks that I will make are not at all in an antagonistic spirit. But I desire that the benevolent institutions that go into the business of life insurance should go into it at least partially equipped to carry out their obligations successfully. Members of the House that are not members of the Banking Committee, are probably not aware of the animated discussion that took place before that committee when the Ancient Order of Foresters' Bill was before them. That was a society which, from a financial standpoint, is much stronger than the one that now seeks a Dominion charter. Their rates were materially higher, and if it was ever safe to grant a charter to an institution, it was safe for the Government to grant one to the Ancient Order of Foresters. The men who had charge of that Bill were exceedingly anxious to raise the standard of their institution to a safe basis and, therefore, in order to get the assent of the Government, they were willing to accept certain modifications of their Bill whereby they agreed to raise their monthly rates so as to make the sum that was likely to go to a deceased person, at least assured. Therefore, their Bill, which is almost similar to the one which is now before us, was amended in clause 10 to read:

Will accumulate and maintain a fund which shall never be less than the reserve or re-insurance value of such policies or certificates computed according to the standard provided for in the Insurance Act.

Now, at that time the Ancient Order of Foresters were assessing their members at the rate of $10.92 per annum, whereas this present society assesses its members only $8.04. At another age they assessed their members at $15.24, where the Sons of England only assess theirs at $9.60. At the age of 40, they assessed at $18.24, where the Sons of England only assess their members at $11.28. At the age of 44 the Ancient Order of Foresters assessed their members at $21 a year, where the Sons of England only assessed their members at $11 a year. The result of that is that at the end of a man's expectation of life the Ancient Order of Foresters would, at the age of 25, have a sum of $1,124 for the security of that individual; at the age of 35, they would have $1,031; at the age of 40, $1,011; at the age of 44, $982, subject to the expenses of management. These high figures did not, however, cause the Government to feel justified in conceding to their request, and before they could get the Government's assent they had to consent to have the rates materially raised. Now if we compare the conditions that exist in this society that now seeks incorporation with those that exist in the Ancient Order of Foresters, we find that at the age of 25, at the end of a man's expectation of life, there are $828 waiting for him; at the age of 35, $649; at the age of 40, $631; at the age of 44, $525, when the obligation is that they are to pay this man $1,000. These figures are also subject, I presume, to working expenses. It is also true that the Sons of England can make three additional assessments: they are not compelled to do so, but they may do so, and if they do that, they will have, for a man aged 44, at the end of his expectations, $636, where they promised to pay him $1,000. And yet it is said that we are arbitrary if we do not consent to give them a Dominion charter in order that it may be used in the outlying provinces to further the aims of their institutions. Now, I am a sympathizer with benevolent institutions, I recognize the good they have done in the past and that they will do in the future, if they confine themselves within proper and safe lines. But when any benevolent institution starts out with the assumption that they can pay a man $1,000 at the end of his expectations of life, and only collect $636 from him, they are bound ultimately to fail in their objects. Therefore, I look with considerable alarm at the attempt made to get Dominion incorporation to continue such a state of things as I have enumerated. It has been said that the benevolent societies cannot successfully carry on a life insurance business. I do not think that is true. I do not see why, under a proper and economical management, they could not successfully compete with the ordinary life insurance societies of the day, because their expenses are so much smaller than those of the ordinary life companies that they are able to reduce materially the rates they charge. The last speaker gathered from the remarks of the Minister of Finance that the Government will compel these societies to raise such a sum as to equal that of life insurance companies. That is not at all necessary, because the expenses of life insurance companies are so immeasurably larger, that a benevolent society can carry on its work of life insurance under their ordinary management at a much cheaper rate, and, therefore, they can successfully carry on the business of life insurance. I have looked over the returns of the various Canadian life insurance companies doing business in Canada, and I find that out of ten companies there are only two that do not expend more than 20 per cent of their entire premium incomes, one spends 25 per cent, two spend 30 per cent, one spends 33 per cent, two spend 40 per cent, one 42 per cent, one 43 per cent, and one 48 per cent of their entire premium income in the management of their business. Now, if a benevolent society can conduct its affairs in a more economical way, they can come up to the requirements of the Government without at all levying such a large annual assessment upon their members as is levied by the ordinary insurance company. I think that the Sons of England are engaged in a good work, a patriotic work, but it is doubtful whether they are justified in asking us to incorporate their society in order to do business in the various provinces of the country when we know, and they know, that they are not securing from its members an adequate sum of money to enable them successfully to carry out their objects. How a society can honestly and consistently induce members to join it and promise to pay them $1,000, when they only have $500 to do it with, is something I cannot comprehend. Because the Ancient Order of Foresters were willing and consented to have their annual premiums raised in order that they may be absolutely safe, I vigorously supported their Bill. They consented to accept the amendment suggested by the actuaries of the department, and having done that, they put their society upon a safe basis in so far, at least, as all their future business is concerned. Is it safe for us now, when we have taken the first step forward in the right direction, to go back to the old principle that we know is wrong, though it has obtained for the past few years? It has been urged here to-night that because the Government has given a Dominion charter to several institutions, therefore, it is right that it should be extended to this one. The question, I fancy, for us to consider is, was it right for the Government in days gone by to give charters to institutions that could not implement their promises? And if it was not right, is it right for us to continue that custom to-day? If they have engaged

in the past in a business that is likely to prove unprofitable to the people who have identified themselves with these societies, and we are trying to provide a remedy, is it a desirable thing to go back to a condition of affairs that we now condemn? Would it not be far better for members of the House to be governed by the opinion of the actuaries of the department in this particular case rather than oppose the provision to establish insurance in connection with these benevolent societies on a surer financial basis, and insist that all companies securing Dominion charters must come up to that standard? It is very easy to say that the Government intend to bring in a general Bill to regulate these benevolent institutions. When the Government realizes that over half a million members are interested in these societies, that it is not very easy to bring in a Bill without giving great offence, they will hesitate about bringing a measure which would have the effect of increasing existing rates. The Government have already adopted these measures in the case of the Ancient Order of Foresters, and they have established a precedent in that case; and it would be wise to insist that after this time all societies obtaining Dominion charters, shall at least submit to the rates laid down for the Ancient Order of Foresters to make them absolutely safe. Those who contend that the Government are properly insisting on raising the rates so as to make the institution safe, will be met with the reply that other societies are doing business at half the rates, and therefore those societies will secure all the new members while they do not get any. We cannot help this, and are we going to throw any obstacles in the way of these societies being brought up to the basis which the actuaries of the department consider safe, and at the same time allow other societies to do business at half rates? I regard all these benevolent societies, unless they change their methods, as absolutely unsafe, and it is necessary they should be placed under Government control. I look with dread on the fact that after having established a precedent, the next application should result in the House falling back on the old methods adopted and returning to the old rates, a course of action which is bound to lead to disaster. Many of the societies have failed because they have been doing insurance by taking five cents where they promised to pay ten cents, and it is impossible to manage business successfully on such a basis. Hampered as these institutions are by brotherly love and friendly feeling, probably the medical examination is not so rigorous as that of other life insurance societies, and it is only by imposing reasonable rates that the insurance can hope to be paid when death overtakes one of the members. I take it that immediate claims will certainly be paid, but that within a very few years such institutions must come to an end, and I hope the House will put its foot down so as to prevent incorporation of societies by the Dominion to provide life insurance, unless they possess financial backing which will enable them to carry out and fulfil their obligations. It may be said that the action suggested will prove a great hardship to this institution now under consideration. It will not be a hardship. On the contrary, it will be a benefit, for they can no longer induce, I will not use the word entrap, people to join the society to obtain a thousand dollars when they can practically only calculate on paying five hundred. The institution can still go on and do business under its provincial charter as in days gone by, but it will not have the stamp and imprimatur of the Dominion Government. These societies will not be able to say, as no doubt has been done in days gone by, that they have a license from the Dominion, and that means something to the minds of ordinary men. To those familiar with legislative matters, it does not convey very much, for such men know how little it means by a Dominion charter, but by obtaining such charter people are led to believe that their interests are absolutely secure, that the Government are looking over these organizations and are watching the provisions made to carry out the company's obligations, when nothing can be further from the law. What we desire above everything else is to protect our families, and if we remove all the safeguards we are unable to do so. I trust, therefore, the House will stand by the actuaries of the department, and unless the hon. gentleman consents to adopt the amendments, which were practically enforced on the Order of Foresters, and probably not unwillingly on their part, the Bill should be permitted to stand over till another year; and if the Government bring in a general Act, which they claim they will be prepared to do, and which probably they wish to do without recognizing the difficulty and hostility it will meet with and the serious consequences that will result from an interference with the business of 500,000 or 600,000 ratepayers, then this Bill may be proceeded with. In the meantime these companies, which are endeavouring to secure business at one-half rates as compared with those of other companies, are bound to come to grief. I understand that already some of these institutions are taking steps to increase their annual assessment so as to make them more safe than they are now, but until they come up to the standard fixed by the Government with respect to the Ancient Order of Foresters, and which was forced on that order a few days ago, this result will not be obtained. We have established the precedent that all the institutions should come up to the standard. If we depart from it now, we may as well open the

door wide and let these societies come in and do business when and where they will, whatever results may ensue.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). I want to say a word or two in regard to the point taken by the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Heyd). I was not present during the discussion of this particular Bill in the Banking and Commerce Committee, but I was present at the discussion of the Bill of the Ancient Order of Foresters. After very considerable debate it was agreed by the commitee that the provision to exact $50,000 of deposit might be waived in the case of that society, but at the same time as it had been clearly and distinctly stated by the actuaries of the department that the terms on which they were proposing to issue insurance were such that they could by no possibility secure the payment of the insurance for the sum proposed, unless in the event of a very large number of lives lapsing, it was decided that they should be called upon, if required by the actuaries of the department, to raise their rates to such a point as would afford reasonable security to the parties insured. That proposition, after a good deal of debate, was accepted, as the hon. gentleman has stated, by the Ancient Order of Foresters. Now, as I understand it, all the Finance Minister asks is that these two Bills apparently for precisely the same object and purpose, shall be placed on the same footing. I cannot admit it is of the slightest importance in dealing with this matter that bad Bills have under former Administrations or in former sessions of Parliament been permitted to pass this House. The duty of the House in this matter is plain and simple. It is to provide, so far as it can, that every society which receives the sanction of a Dominion charter shall be capable of fulfilling the promises which it holds out to the insurers. That is an exceedingly rational and reasonable position to take. I have not heard any hon. member deny the truth of the calculation submitted by the Department of Insurance, though it went the length of stating that the rates demanded by this particular society could not, in the nature of things, afford a sufficient and satisfactory guarantee. We are doing no injury to these gentlemen by asking them to conform to the obligations placed on the Ancient Order of Forsters, on the contrary. My hon. friend contends that we are endeavouring to do the greatest possible service to every man who is a member of this society. There is no use disregarding this simple fact, that it is entirely impossible, unless a sufficient rate is levied, to give adequate security to the members of the society. I am perfectly aware that these societies have most excellent objects, and they can afford to do insurance at considerably cheaper rates than old line companies because they are not put to anything like the same expense in secuding business. We do not propose, nor does the Finance Minister ask the House, to insist on the rates paid to the old line companies. All he dieires is that such rates shall be required from this society as shall make the insurance safe. The House will do well to remember that there is no sort of doubt that any society which obtains a charter from this House will be believed by the great body of people, in spite of any clause inserted in the Act or any addition made to the policy, to be specially under Government inspection, and it is in part for the purpose of securing this advantage that these companies come before this Parliament. This society can go on operating in Ontario, and when my hon. friend the Finance Minister has time to introduce a general Bill applicable to these societies, we will be able to give them incorporation under a general Dominion charter. But, in the meantime, I put these two points to hon. members on both sides of the House, because this is in no respect a party question: we have within the past few days inserted certain clauses in the Bill respecting the Ancient Order of Foresters, and the House having done that within the past week or ten days, is it prepared to go back on its own record and pass another Bill containing different clauses and powers placing this particular society on a totally different footing? It seems to me that would be a very injudicious and indiscreet mode of legislating, and the House must pay some regard to the declaration of my hon. friend that the actuaries of the department, having carefully examined into the matter, declare that the rates now exacted by the society are not sufficient to guarantee safety to the insured. The House will take a serious responsibility on itself, in my judgment, if they persist after that declaration, in refusing to so amend the Bill as to put it on all fours with the Bill of the Ancient Order of Foresters, which this House has passed.

Mr. TAYLOR. Because one act of injustice has already been done that is no reason why the House should do a second injustice. The hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) and others who have spoken in opposition to this Bill speak of it as an insurance company, but we do not view it in that light. It is a mutual benefit society. I belong to numbers of such societies, and we pay a certain sum per year, and they are good while they last. The hon. Minister of Finance said that two or three of these companies have already met with disaster. Be it so: no person lost anything. My hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) may insure his house in a fire company, he pays his insurance by the year, and at the end of the year if his house does not burn he is glad of it, but his money has gone all the same. We go into these mutual benefit societies, we have the association of the society, we pay a certain sum monthly and if during the year we happen to drop off our family re-

ceives $1,000. If we do not die, then at the end of the year our money is paid and we are alive and we are glad of it. That is the way the great majority of people who go into such societies look upon the matter. We do not look upon it as providing a life insurance for all time to come. We look upon it as doing mutual good, and were it not for such societies, many a poor widow and family would be left helpless on the world, and the standard insurance companies would have stood on one side because none of the mechanics and working people would be able to avail of them. I say that the Government would do an injustice to these benefit societies by bringing them up to the standard of regular life insurance companies, and they will be doing an injustice to the Sons of England if they do not allow them to operate in the other provinces of the Dominion as well as in Ontario.

Mr. CLARKE. The Minister of Finance has stated very correctly and fairly the position that was assumed before the committee and the action that was taken there. I heartily agree with what has been said respecting the advisabilty at the earliest possible moment of passing a general Act and compelling all these assessment organizations to come under its operation. One of the advantages that will obtain, if this Act is passed to-night, is that the members of this organization place themselves publicly on record as being agreeable to come under the operations of this general Act whenever it may be passed.

Mr. MONTAGUE. That is expressed in the Bill.

Mr. CLARKE. That clause is embodied in the Bill. If the House in its wisdom declines to pass the Bill this organization will go on doing business. It is not contended that there will be any increase made in the rates that are now charged, and our position will be no worse at the end of the 12 months than it is to-night. At the same time it is hardly fair to say, that because the Ancient Order of Foresters accepted the suggestion of the superintendent of insurance, therefore the gentlemen who have charge of this Bill should do the same thing or the Bill should not carry. It was distinctly stated before the committee that these gentlemen had no authority to bind the organization which they represent, that a meeting of their supreme body would of necessity have to be called and this proposition of the inspector of insurance submitted to them, while in the case of the Foresters, the gentlemen in charge of that Bill were in a position to act for their organization. I say deliberately, that I think the Ancient Order of Foresters were wise in accepting the suggestion of the superintendent of insurance and agreeing that in all future business they shall write a sufficient fee shall be charged to enable them to put up the reserve. But, Mr. Speaker, when the Ancient Order of Foresters first came to Parliament they brought down a similar Bill to this, and it was because the gentlemen having charge of the Bill were empowered to act for the society that they were forced, as my hon. friend from South Brant (Mr. Heyd) says, to accept the suggestion made by the superintendent of insurance. I believe that this organization whose Bill we are now discussing charges a higher rate than any single organization—with the exception of the Ancient Order of Foresters—which has received special recognition from this Parliament in the past. Taking into consideration the amount of insurance the Sons of England have written their position is sounder and stronger than almost any other mutual benefit organization in existence, and if they are given this Act of incorporation, with a clause by which provision is made that they will come under the general Act when it is passed, I am satisfied they will raise their rates as the other organizations have done, to a standard sufficient to enable them to put up the reserve. It seems to me that this society is not asking anything unreasonable when it asks for the same legislation that has been passed time and again by this Parliament and made applicable to friendly benevolent associations similar to this. The work done by this society has been most commendable, and it will be strengthened in its efforts by this Act of Parliament. Its members will be given a warning that when the general law to be passed in the near future by this Parliament comes into operation, they shall come under the operation of that Act, and they will commence to prepare themselves at once for the necessary increase of rates which will have to be made in view of the contemplated legislation. The matter was fully discussed before the Committee on Banking and Commerce, and I am safe in saying that the feeling of that commitee was, that in view of the intention to introduce a general law, and in view of the fact that privileges such as this society asks for have been granted time and again by the Parliament of Canada, it was not unreasonable to give them similar privileges. I hope that under these circumstances the House will see fit to advance the Bill a stage to-night, because, knowing as I do many of the gentlemen connected with the Sons of England in an official capacity, I am satisfied that they will be the first to avail themselves of the general law and to increase their rates to enable them to live up to it. I hope this Bill will pass to-night.

Mr. BERTRAM. The arguments of the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Trade and Commerce show the necessity for a general law being brought in at the earliest possible moment, but until that is done, it is my opinion that all these bene-

volent societies should be placed on the same footing. A number of other benevolent societies throughout the Dominion are able to do business under a Dominion charter, and the Sons of England society are simply asking to be at liberty to do business on the same basis. No remedy can be found to deal with societies of this nature until a general law is passed, and until that is done the Sons of England should be allowed the same privileges as other fraternal societies throughout the Dominion.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I am going to vote for this Bill, and I wish to offer a few remarks to the House. I agree with what my hon. leader (Sir Richard Cartwright) said with regard to protecting the people in insurance companies, yet I disagree with him in one material point in reference to the legislation which is now asked for. I object altogether to having these benevolent societies coming under the Insurance Act so far as making a deposit is concerned, for we know well that their rates are not sufficient to provide for the reserve required by companies that are licensed. While they are under inspection by the department, yet when they are issued a license, every one who knows anything at all about insurance knows that these companies are not charging a sufficient rate to provide the reserve. As I said in committee, I do not believe that any of these associations that have been incorporated by this Parliament should be allowed to do business under the General Insurance Act. But, Sir, having incorporated these companies, I agree with the hon. gentlemen who have spoken, that there is no reason why they should not be allowed to do business, and yet I differ from the Finance Minister and his department, as I do not think they should be issued a license to do an insurance business and allowed to make any deposit, because as my hon. friend put it, the Act of incorporation itself gives them a standing in the country that they should not have, but it makes it a great deal worse when they receive a license to do business, and are able to say to the public that they have a deposit and are in the same position as ordinary and regular insurance companies, when they are not. Under all the circumstances I propose to vote for this Bill.

Mr. McMULLEN. I do not think that we ought to go on chartering companies of this kind simply because we have done so in the past. We have an inspector of insurance, to whom we pay a large salary in order to furnish us with information on the question of insurance companies, which will enable this House to act in the general interest, and we ought to be very careful before we legislate contrary to the information thus obtained. The hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) argued that these companies only charged small premiums, which in reality only covered the risk for the year, but we know that there are many who contribute from year to year and look forward to their heirs obtaining a certain amount at their death, and we should be very careful to do what we can to prevent such people being disappointed. We know what great hardships have resulted from the collapse of the Massachusetts Mutual Insurance Company, which absorbed in its downfall another Canadian mutual company, and we have heard rumours recently of financial embarrassments gathering around certain mutual associations supposed to be very powerful. Some of these companies have largely increased their rates, and many of their members have in consequence ceased contributing, having lost confidence. When we give a Dominion charter to one of these companies, we place it in a position of being able to go before the public and point to the fact that it has obtained such a charter, and consequently must have met the approval of the insurance department of the Government. This in itself will be looked upon as a guarantee of the soundness and responsibility of the organization, and therefore should not be given without most careful consideration. I have no objection whatever to encouraging mutual insurance companies, but while we have a department of insurance and an inspector of that department, we ought to be guided in a great measure by their reports. I believe that the insurance inspector has declared that the financial basis on which these companies stand is not sufficient, and that consequently those who join them in the expectation of being able to leave at their death a certain sum to their families, may not find their wishes realized. At present there is about $50,000,000 of insurance in fraternal associations in Ontario alone. No one would say that we should go on receiving further applications for associations of this kind without attempting to exercise some control over their operations and protect the public, as far as possible, against the collapse of such societies. The hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) spoke of families that would have been turned out on the road without a cent, had it not been for the fact that the heads of these families belonged to some of these associations. While that is the case, I believe there are as many other families who have been seriously disappointed owing to the fact that they were unable to collect from those associations the sum they hoped to be able to receive when overtaken by misfortune. I think it would be well that the Government should at once introduce a Bill that would reach all those associations and place them all on an equal footing. That is unquestionably desirable; and if this Bill now before the House be passed, I hope the Government will come down not later than next session with a measure dealing with all mutual insurance companies, and which will have the effect

of putting them all on a sound basis, so that those who contribute may safely count on receiving something in return. A very serious responsibility rests on the Government in the matter, and the sooner they act, the sooner will they receive the gratitude of the people and earn the respect of those disposed to invest their money in mutual companies.

House divided on motion of Mr. Bertram:

YEAS:

Messieurs

Beith,	Lewis,
Belcourt,	Macdonald (King's),
Bennett,	Macdonell,
Bergeron,	MacLaren,
Bertram,	MacPherson,
Bethune,	McCleary,
Borden (Halifax),	McClure,
Burnett,	McCormick,
Bruneau,	McDougall,
Calvert,	McGugan,
Carscallen,	McLellan,
Casey,	McNeill,
Clancy,	Madore,
Clarke,	Marcotte
Cochrane,	Martin,
Corby,	Mills,
Craig,	Monk,
Davin,	Montague,
Dupré,	Moore
Earle,	Morin,
Ellis,	Morrison,
Featherston,	Oliver,
Foster,	Penny,
Fraser (Lambton),	Powell,
Frost,	Préfontaine,
Ganong,	Quinn,
Gibson,	Ratz,
Gillies,	Richardson,
Gilmour,	Robertson,
Guillet,	Russell,
Guité,	Savard,
Hale,	Snetsinger,
Haley,	Somerville,
Henderson,	Stubbs,
Hughes,	Sutherland,
Ingram,	Taylor,
Jameson,	Tupper (Sir Charles
Kaulbach,	Hibbert),
Kloepfer,	Turcot,
Lang,	Wilson,
LaRivière,	Wood (Brockville),
Lavergne,	Wood (Hamilton), and
Lemieux,	Yeo.—85.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Angers,	Heyd,
Bain,	Hurley,
Bazinet,	Landerkin,
Bernier,	Legris,
Blair,	Macdonald (Huron),
Borden (King's),	Mackie,
Bourassa,	McGregor,
Bourbonnais,	McIsaac,
Campbell,	McLennan (Inverness),
Champagne,	McMillan,
Choquette,	McMullen,
Christie,	Malouin,
Copp,	Mignault,
Dobell,	Monet,
Erb,	Pettet,
Ethier,	Proulx,
Fielding,	Rinfret,
Fisher,	Rogers,
Fitzpatrick,	Rutherford,
Fortin,	Scriver,
Godbout,	Sifton, and
Harwood,	Tarte.—44.

Motion for Committee agreed to.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hour for private Bills having expired, the House will proceed with other business.

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES ACT.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton) moved third reading of Bill (No. 131) further to amend the Acts respecting the North-west Territories.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. When this Bill was in committee, the hon. gentleman said he would take occasion, before the third reading, to consider the suggestion that was made to the effect that the time was opportune to deal with the point that had arisen with regard to the powers of the Government of the Territories. Has he dealt with that or given up the idea of framing a clause to meet the point?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. In reply to the hon. gentleman, I may say that the Minister of Justice has introduced a Bill in the Senate which will deal with the point to which my hon. friend has referred.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the third time and passed.

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Public Works chargeable to income—Harbours and Rivers—
British Columbia—Columbia River—Improvements above Golden..... $5,000

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to ask the Minister of Public Works what he proposes to do with this money. He might also say what work was done there last year, if any.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). This money is required to continue the improvement of the Columbia River. The dredge "Muskrat" has been working there, removing rocks and snags. The same work will be continued this year.

Mr. FOSTER. What work has been done there—what value?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The total value of work done on the Columbia is $89,133 up to date. The report of the Department of Public Works, page 99, contains a good deal of information on this subject.

Mr. HUGHES. How far above Golden is it proposed to give proper navigation ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Ninety miles.

Fraser River—Improvement of ship channel $20,000

Mr. FOSTER. Is this for the prosecution of the same kind of works ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

General repairs and improvements to harbour, river and bridge works..... $3,000

Mr. HUGHES. What are these works ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Throughout British Columbia generally. This cannot be provided for in a more specific manner.

Columbia River—Removal of rocks above Revelstoke $2,000

Mr. FOSTER. Is there navigation above Revelstoke ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes. This is for the same work as in the other case—removal of rocks and snags.

Columbia River—Improvements in Narrows between Upper and Lower Arrow Lakes $5,000

Mr. FOSTER. I desire to ask the Minister, as I do not find anything in these estimates with regard to the Kootenay River, if he proposes to do anything to improve the navigation of that river between Fort Steele and the Great Northern Railway. There is an important stretch of river there, and the only means of navigation that the East Kootenay country has up to the present time. The navigation is of the most tortuous kind, and a certain amount should be spent in improvements, so that the river would be navigable for a considerable part of the long season that they have. That portion of the navigable waters of British Columbia has been almost entirely neglected. It is stated by navigators there that the expenditure of a not-over-large sum of money would make the river navigable for the greater portion of the season. As I understand it, and as it appeared to me going down the river, the difficulty is that this water in the main part of the stream widens out and the channel is continually shifting. The opinion is that by a number of inexpensive sheer-dams, or something of that kind, the water could be kept from forming new channels and dissipating itself. If this could be done, the navigability of the river would be much improved. There is one most dangerous point where several shipwrecks have already taken place, and where the rocks must be blasted out. That would be a pretty expensive improvement. I am told that the United States authorities are quite willing to do their share of the improvement of that part of the river. This is a most important section of the country, and it is dependent upon this river for navigation.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I received a deputation of gentlemen representing the mining interests of that district. They made about the same statements as have been made by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster). I sent Mr. Roy to make a survey and we have received a report from him.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the nature of that report ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not recollect just now. I hope to deal with this matter in my Supplementary Estimates.

Mr. HUGHES. I would like to ask if anything is to be granted out of these appropriations for British Columbia to any private concern ? Are all these public works ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. They are all public works.

Mr. HUGHES. Then these items now under consideration are in British Columbia?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. They are all for public works in British Columbia.

Harbours and Rivers generally..... $5,000

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Does that mean works all over Canada ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, this vote covers all Canada.

Mr. EARLE. I would like to ask the Minister if any portion of this vote is to be applied to complete the work undertaken in the Fraser River ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No. The estimate to complete the work of the Fraser River will reach a very large amount indeed. It is a difficult problem to deal with, and we are doing all we can with the small amount placed at our disposal every year. But to complete the work as we would like, would require a much larger amount of money. We are doing from year to year as much as possible to protect the work already done, which I may say in passing has cost about $600,000.

Mr. EARLE. I understood that when an engineer was sent to British Columbia it was for the purpose of making a survey and estimate of the cost of accomplishing what could be accomplished on the Fraser River. As I understand it, the great difficulty there has been that the work is being done in such a tedious manner by small votes, that it is carried away year after year, and the money is being wasted ; whereas, if a larger vote was given and the work was undertaken as a whole and carried through, it could be done successfully. I was in hopes that this session we would have a report

from the engineer sent up there for that purpose.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This $20,000 that we voted a moment ago is to continue the work in the channel. As my hon. friend knows, when these works were undertaken, we had only between 10 and 11 feet of water; we have now over 20 feet of water, which proves that the works have been carried on very successfully. We are now constructing works to prevent the river from cutting through Westham Island and passing behind our works. I may say that no part of that work has been carried away.

Mr. GILLIES. In what particular parts of the Dominion is it proposed to spend this amount?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Wherever it is wanted. Suppose, for instance, that a harbour suffers damage which we cannot now foresee, we will then take out of this amount the sum necessary to make repairs.

Mr. FOSTER. In answer to the question as to where this general vote was to be spent, the Minister of Public Works says it is to be spent all over the Dominion, and where there is a hole knocked out of a harbour, this will put the hole in again. Now, the Minister will be surprised to learn that not a dollar of this money goes for anything of that kind. He will be surprised to learn that last year, out of that vote, he spent much of it for such items as these:

Beaudry & Cie., subscription to "Annales de Construction" for 1897....	$ 4 02
Belanger et Cie., drags $10.50; Durie, J., & Son, sundries, 40c.....	10 55
Dunod, Chs. and P. Vicq, Paris, France, subscription to a periodical (voucher not received).....	6 57
Eimer & Amend, New York: 1 Anal. balance with weights, $112; platinum crucibles, 25 CC, 26 at 58c; 30 CC, 30.1 at 58c.; sundry apparatus, $58.79	203 33
Fligg, W. H., repairing Smith-Premier typewriter.....	3 25
Gaillard, Jules, Montreal: "Annales de la Construction," $8; "Annales des Ponts et Chaussees," $8; "Annuaire des Marées de France," 1894, 42c.; 1895, 42c.....	16 84
Gauvreau, L. P., C.E. and D.L.S., Quebec, copies of old plans.....	61 00
Graves Bros., 1 set copper heating boxes, $13; Miller & Kennedy, rubber gloves, $2.....	15 00
Pritchard & Andrews, repairing centennial dater.....	1 25
Riehle Bros., Testing Machine Co., Philadelphia: brass sieves, No. 20, $2.25; No. 30, $2.50; No. 200, $9; box, 30c.....	14 05
Smith, F. E., Ottawa: patent drawing tables, 3 × 4 ft., 2 at $45; patent roller stools, 2 at $5.....	100 00
St. Laurent, Arthur, removal expenses from Winnipeg to Ottawa, Jan., 1897: packing, etc., of furniture, $50.70; freight charges, $123.75; storage of furniture at Ottawa, 1 month, $3.50; board, etc., of self and family in Winnipeg, $18.90; railway fares, $79.50; sleeping car, $16; meals on dining car, $14.50; porter and cab, $2.50; hotel expenses in Ottawa, $9..	$ 318 35
Freight charges: Can. Express Co., $17.75; Dom. Express Co., $12.60..	30 35
Stationery Office, Ottawa, $1,146.75; Queen's Printer's account, $440.51..	1,587 26
Travel of Ottawa officials.....	755 65
Salaries at Ottawa.....	273 72

There is a vote which is taken entirely under false pretenses, and when the Minister attempts to explain it, he gives to the House the idea that this $5,000 is to be spent in actual public works wherever there is a deficiency, while in fact it is to pay travelling expenses and little odds and ends which ought to be charged under contingencies.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In connection with public works?

Mr. FOSTER. But my hon. friend sees that the whole spirit of an estimate that he is taking, is that it is for public works and not for travelling expenses, or for contingencies in connection with public works. That is the aim of the vote, and he covers up, under an item which professes to be for doing public works in Canada, contingencies which ought to be voted in contingencies, or for travelling, or for something where it would be explicitly stated. I would advise my hon. friend that it would be a fairer way of putting the estimate to vote this for contingencies, and let the House know what it is voting. The House is led to suppose that it is putting $5,000 into the Minister's hands for public works, when that is not the case.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am asking this money for the same purposes from which it has always been voted when my hon. friend was Minister of Finance. If he will look at the report of the Auditor General in the past, as my officers inform me, he will find that the vote has been just the same amount. The vote has always been applied for the purpose of repairing damages. What my hon. friend has read over is easy to understand. There are travelling expenses, there are a lot of things connected with harbours and rivers generally, and to this item all those expenses are charged. I think it is only fair. Suppose, for instance, one of my officers went to inspect a harbour, it would be only fair to charge the amount of his expenses to this item, because they have not otherwise been provided for. At any rate, I say again that this sum has always been voted in that way.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend feels that he is standing on solid ground when he says "I do just the same as he does." But if he will look over the history of this appropriation, he will find that while for a number of

years there was this general vote that had been expunged, and there was no general vote, although it has crept back now. The whole object of putting estimates before this House is to let the House know what they are voting the money for. That is why we have votes for contingencies for each special item of work, and the contingencies of a department are voted as contingencies, with the idea that they take in all the contingencies. My hon. friend says that he must have travelling expenses. You take your travelling expenses from every work that is conducted in this country. If an engineer goes to a particular work, his expenses are charged to that work. This $5,000 is over and above all that.

The MINISTER OF PUBILC WORKS. Not always.

Mr. FOSTER. That is the rule, that is the way you get your travelling expenses, that is the way you pay your clerk of works—out of the vote given by Parliament for that particular work. But I want to repeat that these are really contingencies and travelling expenses, and they should be so exposed.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I must take issue with my hon. friend. There are a great many surveys wanted at places for which no money have been voted.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman did not take a dollar for surveys out of this vote last year.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It was expended in a general way. I must again say that I simply pursued the same system as had been followed in the past.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I do not think the officer who advised the Minister was candid. The hon. member for York has explained how the vote has been irregularly dealt with, and that a change of system is required. We will not agree that it is always a satisfactory answer for the hon. Minister to say that there has been an abuse of long standing and it was simply continued. The question is whether this is a proper way of keeping the account, that the amount voted generally for harbours and rivers should be expended on contingencies. I do not think the Finance Minister would agree that the vote on harbours and rivers generally should be used for departmental contingencies.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The report of the Auditor General for 1895-96 shows that this item was expended by the Conservative Government for the same purpose as it was expended last year. The details appear at part II., page 157, and the items include telegraphic service, express charges, travelling expenses and similar expenditures.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That, however, was not a proper system to follow.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am very glad my attention is now called to it.

Mr. GILLIES. The question is whether the system in regard to the expenditure of this $5,000 for harbours and rivers generally is a proper one and should be continued, for if it is irregular it should be discontinued. I now direct the Minister's attention to item 161, which is a vote for 1897-98, $115,000, Harbours and Rivers, Nova Scotia. Now, only $38,500 appears for this purpose. Why has this large reduction been made in the service?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman had better wait until the Supplementary Estimates come down.

Mr. GILLIES. I may not be here at the time. Item 161 last year shows $2,000 for a breakwater in my province (L'Ardoise—repairs to breakwater). That sum has not been expended. I had considerbale trouble in inducing the Minister to put that sum in the Estimates. During the season I met the Minister in Montreal and urged the necessity of making the expenditure. He promised it should be done, but it has not been carried out. The Minister is well aware that there was a by-election pending during the whole of last season. I now ask the Minister why this amount of $2,000 was not expended on that work after it had been voted by Parliament, instead of the work being allowed to go to pieces and washed away by storms on the Atlantic.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The reason I did not expend the $2,000 was because the engineer reported that the sum was insufficient. This year I have placed $1,500 additional in the Estimates, so as to be able to carry out the work. That is my only motive.

Mr. GILLIES. I am not referring to the hon. gentleman's motives, but I have my own opinion in regard to it. The hon. gentleman last year stated, on the report of his engineer, that $2,000 would be sufficient for the work. How did it occur that the engineer so rapidly changed his mind? When was the report received stating that this amendment would be insufficient?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not remember the date. The report came in that the amount was not sufficient, and I thought it better to wait and obtain an additional sum. I therefore put $1,500 additional in the Estimates.

Mr. GILLIES. If the work had been proceeded with in last July, and the $2,000 expended when it had been voted by Parliament, it would have been amply sufficient, as was reported by the hon. gentleman's

own officer. But the expenditure was not made then, for some reason well known to the hon. gentleman, and still better known to some of his colleagues; the work was allowed to go into disrepair, and then, of course, this amount was not sufficient. I am glad, however, to find $1,500 additional in the Estimates. When will this amount be expended?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. So soon as we are ready to go on with the work in a successful manner.

Mr. GILLIES. I hope the season will not be allowed to run by before the work is entered upon. There is no by-election pending in the county now. This work is a work of great necessity, and it is a crying shame that it was not done last year in consonance with the desire of Parliament that granted the money.

Mr. CLANCY. I had consoled myself with the idea that this $5,000 was probably intended for improving the navigation of the River Sydenham, but I see nothing in the Main Estimates nor in the Supplementary Estimates so far for that work. The character of the soil is such up there that unless the work is done in one season it might almost as well not be done at all, and unless the work is continued this year what was done last year will be utterly worthless. The navigation will not be much improved unless a dredge is sent there and these bars taken out in one season. Probably there is more trade done in the way of shipping on the Sydenham than on any river of its size in Ontario, and I do not know of any port from which there is so much shipping comparatively as from the port of Wallaceburg. I hope the hon. gentleman will continue the work this year.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My attention has been called to this work and I am confident that when the Supplementary Estimates come down my hon. friend (Mr. Clancy) will not have much to say against the manner in which I will deal with the question.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Is it the intention of the Minister to expend any of this grant on repairs to Main à Dieu breakwater in Cape Breton County? About three years ago an examination was made of the breakwater and an estimate obtained of what it would require to repair the damage done. It is only a small amount but that breakwater originally cost $15,000 or $20,000, is of great importance to the people of that coast, and unless it is repaired this year the whole breakwater may be lost.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will have a note taken of the statement of the hon. gentleman, and we might take a few hundred dollars out of the general vote to repair the damages.

Mr. SPROULE. I wish to draw the attention of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Tarte) to the harbour of Thornbury, a vote for which was passed the other night. He has very kindly provided $1,000 to repair the wharf there which was very much needed, but I am told by the people that a little dredging is badly required. It is almost impossible for them to get in and out with the small boats unless there is some additional dredging done, and if the Minister should provide a small sum of money for dredging at that harbour it would be appreciated very much by the people. I wish to say a word with regard to Meaford Harbour. The people were very glad to notice an item last year for that harbour but unfortunately the money was not spent. The work is very much needed there, and I hope the Minister will not allow the season to pass by without making the expenditure. If he does that, and spends a few hundred dollars for dredging at Thornbury, the people will be very grateful.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Unfortunately we are short of dredges and I cannot do dredging without dredges. As far as Meaford is concerned the work is under contract.

Mr. SPROULE. The people are quite satisfied with the Minister making a reasonable effort to do this work, and they appreciate the difficulty of his not having dredges. I call the atention of the Minister to it in the hope that he will find a dredge by some means this season.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I quite understand the request of the hon. gentleman.

New dredging plant..... $60,000

Mr. FOSTER. What plant is to be built next year?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is $25,000 for a new hull for elevator dredge No. 9, which is now at Kamanistiquia River; machinery for the same dredge $10,000; new boiler for tug "Trudeau" $3,500, new tug $21,500.

Mr. FOSTER. Are these being built by contract?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We build them in Sorel. We have a ship yard there, and in spite of what my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) said the other evening I am quite sure we are carrying out the work cheaper there. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) takes great interest in that, and I would be glad, when we have a little more time, if he would go privately into that expenditure.

Mr. FOSTER. I paid a good deal of attention to that for a number of years, and it is a perfect sink hole. Is the hull to be built of iron or wood?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Wood.

Mr. FOSTER. Are you building the hull in Sorel to send up to Kaministiquia ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No. I made a mistake in that. The hull will be constructed at Port Arthur.

Mr. HUGHES. Where is the $21,500 tug to be built ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In Sorel.

Mr. BENNETT. Where are the old boiler and engine of the tug "Trudeau" ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. They are still at Midland.

Mr. HUGHES. What became of the dredges employed at Owen Sound harbour, a year or so after the general election in order to recoup a number of friends of the Government ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not understand what my hon. friend means.

Mr. HUGHES. The Minister of Public Works employed a dredge pumping water there, where it was doing very little work, in order to recoup some political friends who were buried at the last general election. One came from away down in my county—a lawyer engaged in dredging at Owen Sound. Is there a dredge there yet ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, the same as was there before.

Mr. HUGHES. Does the Government own it ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, we hire it by the hour, as has always been done.

Mr. BENNETT. With reference to the boiler and engine of the tug "Trudeau," is it intended to place these in a new dredge ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am asking a sum of $3,500 for a new boiler. As to the machinery in the old tug, we will use that as much as possible.

Mr. BENNETT. Is it intended to bring up the hull to Midland and place the machinery in it there or take the machinery down to Sorel ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. These are details on which I cannot give informatioin just now. The chief engineer will have to decide all those details.

Mr. BENNETT. When the machinery was removed from the "Trudeau" last fall at Midland, were any offers made by any persons there to build a tug ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not remember receiving any. My officers do not remember receiving any either, but it may be that there were some.

Mr. BENNETT. I must say that the Minister has been hardly fair to the ship building industry of Georgian Bay. There have been very large steamers built on the shores there, and yesterday a very large tug was launched at Mildand 140 feet in length, and it seems rather out of the way, with the machinery of the old tug lying on the shore, that you should not have built the hull there for it, where it could have been built just as cheaply as at Sorel. If the machinery has to be shipped from Midland to Sorel, that will be a large bill of expense. And if the new hull is to be towed from Sorel by way of the Welland Canal and up Lake Erie to the Georgian Bay, that will entail a large amount of expenditure which might be avoided. I have reason to believe that certain parties at Midland were very anxious to build a hull for the machinery.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We are fairly equipped at Sorel to build dredges, and so on, and we take advantage of our own equipment to build our own dredges. I would have been very glad to build elsewhere, if it had been found practicable, but as we have a ship yard of our own in Sorel, we build there as much as possible.

Mr. HUGHES. There is $10,000 machinery for the Kaministaquia dredge. Where is that to be built ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In Sorel.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Where do you get the boiler ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We generally ask for tenders for the boiler.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Are you going to ask for tenders in this case ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I suppose so, unless I can buy in a better way.

Mr. HUGHES. Is the hon. gentleman fitting up this dredge with machinery and boiler by some private concern down in Sorel?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, we have a ship yard of our own in Sorel and we do the work ourselves.

Mr. MONK. There is no bolier-making in the ship yard ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No.

Mr. MONK. In that case, it would be far better for the Minister to pledge that tenders will be called for the construction of these engines. It is unfair that work of this magnitude and cost should be entered into without calling for tenders.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We are equipped in Sorel to make the machinery, but we do not make boilers.

Mr. MONK. Does the hon. gentleman intend calling for tenders for the boiler ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS I have not yet made up my mind.

Mr. FOSTER. This is the time when Parliament would like to know. When the Minister is asking for the money, he should have his mind made up and tell the people's representatives how he proposes to spend it. Is it to be done in the same way as this dredging in Toronto harbour—by farming it out to some painter or varnisher ? This is over $5,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is $3,500. The machinery is $10,000. The machinery will be built by ourselves in Sorel in our own ship yard.

Mr. FOSTER. Where is the hon. gentleman going to get the boiler for the Kaministiquia ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The old one is good.

Mr. FOSTER. And the $10,000 is for machinery ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, we are going to build that in Sorel.

Mr. FOSTER. Is the hon. gentleman equipped there for making all the machinery ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, except a few pieces.

Mr. FOSTER. Does my hon. friend think it is economical, when he is going to put a dredge into the Kaministiquia harbour or Owen Sound or Meaford, to build it in Sorel and tow it up there ? Would it not be more economical to build the hull where the dredge is intended to work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have just stated to my hon. friends that we are going to build the hull at Port Arthur. As for the machinery, we are equipped at Sorel in our own ship yard, and I am going to build it there. For the tug "Trudeau." we require a boiler for which I am asking Parliament $3,500.

Mr. HUGHES. Has the hon. Minister taken any steps in relation to the construction of the hull in Kaministiquia ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No.

Mr. HUGHES. I would like to know the dimensions of that dredge. $25,000 seems an extravagant amount for a hull for a dredge.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. When the hon. gentleman is Minister of Public Works, he will learn that dredges cost a great deal more than that. I am very sorry I have not got the dimensions here.

Mr. HUGHES. The Kaministiquia is a very small river, and I should imagine that an expensive dredge.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This dredge has been used in the port of Montreal, in the St. Lawrence, and it is a pretty large dredge.

Mr. BENNETT. What is the estimated cost of the new hull for the "Trudeau" which is being built at Sorel ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is being built by day's labour at our own shops and I cannot give the cost at present.

Mr. BENNETT. What is the estimated cost ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am told by the acting chief engineer that she will cost about $7,000 or $8,000.

Mr. BENNETT. If the Minister will get from his officers the dimensions of the "Trudeau." I think he will find that that price is rather high for a hull of that size.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have to rely for these details on the statements of my officers, and this year I am placed in a more difficult position because my chief engineer is absent, though he is well replaced by Mr. Lafleur. If the chief engineer were here I could give more complete information as to these details.

Mr. BENNETT. What will it cost to tow the hull up to Midland and place the machinery in her ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It will not cost much, because we have tugs of our own which will take it up there.

Mr. BENNETT. A tug for this purpose will cost $40 or $50 a day. So that this hull, which, I am satisfied, should not cost more than $5,000, will involve a charge of about $1,000 to take it to Midland.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No.

Mr. BENNETT. How much will it cost ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am told that $200 or $300 will land the hull at Midland.

Mr. BERTRAM. I may say that, in my judgment, as to the question of the relative cost of building at Sorel and Midland, you must bear in mind that the Government shipyard at Sorel must be kept going. It is most important that it shall not remain idle. And if they can build at Sorel at first cost, having the equipment there, they would save more than it would cost to transport the hull from Sorel to Midland.

Mr. BENNETT. Let me tell the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Bertram)

that two tugs were built in Midland this winter, one about the size of the "Trudeau" and the other much larger. Those who know anything of the prices of timber will agree, I think, that timber on the Georgian Bay is less than at Sorel. As to the argument that the Government have a shipyard at Sorel and must keep it going, I can only say that if the keeping of the shipyard at Sorel is contingent on the building of a tug like the "Trudeau," it was bad judgment to start a shipyard there. I do not blame the Minister, this mistake having been made apparently, by his officers. But the fact is that, having machinery at Midland, they are constructing a tug at Sorel to put it into. Now, the alternative is presented to them of transporting the machinery from Midland or transporting the hull from Sorel.

Mr. HUGHES. If I understand the matter aright, the Government has established the new shipyards at Sorel. I would like to know when this was done?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It was transferred to the Government when the Government took from the harbour commissioners of Montreal the ship channel.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Has the Government bought new machinery recently?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, such an establishment must always be buying machinery.

Mr. MONTAGUE. What has been bought this year?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Not a great deal.

Mr. HUGHES. I wish to understand when the Government went into this business of ship building.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The transfer of ship channels was made in 1889, and the works have been going on ever since.

Mr. HUGHES. Building ships?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Building and repairing dredges and doing all the Government work.

Mr. MONK. It seems to me that $7,000 or $8,000 for the mere hull of a tug is very expensive. I would like to hear from some member of the House who has knowledge of this business. I do not see the object of continuing what the Minister calls the ship yard. I did not know that we had more than a repairing yard at Sorel.

Mr. MONTAGUE. You can buy a tug on the Welland Canal for $5,000 or $6,000.

Mr. McGREGOR. Some old one.

Mr. MONTAGUE. No, good tugs. I should like to hear from the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Bertram) on this point.

Mr. BERTRAM. There are tugs and tugs. We have built tugs that have gone over $30,000. A lumberman cannot get a tug, substantial and fit to do his business for less than $20,000. I cannot say as to the reasonableness of the price in this case unless I know the size. The cost of machinery is a very serious item. The more power you want, the higher will be the cost.

Mr. MONTAGUE. What would a whole tug of these dimensions cost?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is 85 feet long.

Mr. McGREGOR. What is the beam?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. eighteen feet.

Mr. McGREGOR. And the draught?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Seven feet.

Mr. BERTRAM. I think that $8,000 for a tug of that size is a little high.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I cannot give the exact figures. I cannot attend to all these details myself.

Mr. MONTAGUE. My hon. friend from Centre Toronto I fancy would take the contract for about half.

Mr. BERTRAM. No.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Just about.

Mr. BENNETT. Since the hon. Minister cannot give the House the information, I can add something about this tug "Trudeau" having seen it for a number of years. That one may judge of the strength of the machinery I may say that the machinery did not do violence to the hull, and the hull was 25 years old. I can tell the Minister that there is a tug, very much more powerful than the "Trudeau" was, and larger, being 95 feet long, lying at Midland, and this tug the Minister could have bought for $5,000 complete with her power. I know her owners, I know they would have been glad to dispose of her at $5,000. From what I have been able to hear, I think a fair price for a hull similar to that of the "Trudeau," would be $3,000. And the hon. Minister of Public Works can hardly gainsay that he will be at an expense of upwards of $1,000 in taking this new hull up through the St. Lawrence locks to Lake Ontario through the Welland Canal and Lake Erie, into Lake Huron and down to Georgian Bay. I say the Minister has been ill-advised by his officers in building this dredge at Sorel, instead of asking for figures on the Georgian Bay, either at Midland, Penetanguishene, Owen Sound, Collingwood, or any other points where tugs are built much more cheaply than at Sorel, and a large saving could have been effected At Midland there is a firm in the business of building tugs; they built one tug similar in size to the "Trudeau," 140 feet in length,

during the past winter, and would have been only too glad to undertake the construction of this tug.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I gave that figure because one of my officers has given it to me, but it may cost less. The hull is nearly completed now.

Mr. HUGHES. By what authority does the Minister complete the hull without getting a vote from this Parliament for the purpose?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I got a vote last year for the hull: I do not ask for anything for the hull now. I am only asking $3,500 for a new boiler.

Mr. MONTAGUE. If the hull of the tug has been built, the hon. gentleman can tell us what it has cost.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, because it has been built by day's labour.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Does the hon. gentleman do his business in such a way that he cannot tell what an article costs?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman has been a Minister himself, and he knows well that it often happens that no one can tell how much a certain work will cost.

Mr. MONTAGUE. In connection with these articles that are built there, does the department keep an estimate of what each article costs? Is the work done and the article charged up to it?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The work is done under the direction of Mr. Howden, who is the superintendent, while it is under the general direction of the chief engineer. We can give an account of every cent that is spent there.

Mr. BERGERON. Speaking about the yard in Sorel, has the Minister come to any arrangement with the McCarthy estate?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, I am sorry to say that we have not been able to come to an agreement with the McCarthy estate. We have been negotiating with them. The department has been renting grounds there for years, and we hope to be able to come to some arrangement soon. There has been some correspondence about it.

Mr. BERGERON. On which side of the river is it?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. On the same spot as it has been since 1889. The department has been trying to buy it, as I explained a few nights ago.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Will the hon. gentleman, at a later stage, give us the dimensions of the tug, the cost of the hull, and the cost of the machinery that he intends to put in it?

Mr. BENNETT.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Certainly.

Mr. BENNETT. I am surprised that the hon. member for Essex (Mr. McGregor) should be so neglectful of the interests of the ship-builders on the Erie in his part of the province. They will not be pleased to know that the Minister is building tugs down in the lower provinces and bringing them past their door, and the hon. member for Essex laughs at it.

Mr. McGREGOR. He will take care of himself.

Mr. BENNETT. If report speaks truly, that hon. gentleman is to be taken care of by the Government soon. My hon. friend who represents Muskoka (Mr. McCormack) is the owner, or part owner, of the tug I refer to, the tug "Signal," which, I am informed, they would willingly sell for $5,000. He furthermore tells me that the tug "Signal" is ninety-five feet in length, a larger tug than the "Trudeau," and draws ten feet of water, and the hull of the "Signal" was built for $3,500.

Mr. BERTRAM. Can you tell how old it is?

Mr. BENNETT. I have not yet looked at its teeth.

Mr. BERTRAM. When was it built?

Mr. BENNETT. About two years ago. Now, the Minister must admit that he is constructing a tug which could have been built on the shores of the Georgian Bay at several points, for much less than $3,500, and he will find that before he gets through towing it up from Sorel to the Georgian Bay, he will have been at a further cost of at least $1,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have not much experience in ship-building, but I know there are good tugs and bad tugs.

Mr. McGREGOR. On the other hand, a boat drawing ten feet of water might not suit the purpose required by my hon. friend. They require a boat of light draught. The hon. gentleman opposite exaggerates when he talks of the cost of towing this boat from Sorel to the Georgian Bay. There are boats going up the rivers and lakes almost every day, and $150 or $200, at the outside, will tow this boat from Sorel to the Georgian Bay. It can be hooked on behind one of the propellors and towed up the river and lakes. It is not necessary to send a tug after her.

Mr. MONTAGUE. What is the draught?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. About eight feet.

Mr. HUGHES. Does the Minister propose to ask for tenders for this dredge to be built in the Kaministiquia River?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not know whether I will build that dredge by day's work or by contract. We have one dredge that has been built by contract which does not give much satisfaction, and we have been obliged to make a lot of repairs.

Mr. HUGHES. When the hon. gentlemen now in power were in Opposition, they were very strict in requiring that all these jobs should be done by tender, but now that they are in power, they seem to have changed their policy. I would like the Minister to see his way clear to ask for tenders so that others than his friends might have something to say in the construction of this dredge.

Dredge vessels, repairs..... $30,000

Mr. FOSTER. Is that all done in Sorel, too ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. GILLIES. The hon. gentleman told us that there was a scarcity of dredges in the lower provinces, and that he could not do one tithe of the work required. I would like to know if he proposes to have any dredges constructed for those provinces ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have several dredges in the maritime provinces ; we have the " St. Lawrence," the " Canada," the " New Dominion," the " St. Edward," the " George Mackenzie " and the " Cape Breton." I admit that there is a great deal of dredging required in the lower provinces.

Mr. GILLIES. The dredges he has just enumerated have been in the possession of the department for years.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman is wrong. The " Cape Breton " was built one year ago.

Mr. GILLIES. But that was begun before he came into the department, and sent down to St. John. That dredge was built to replace a dredge lost a year ago in the Gulf of St. Lawrence, so the department is not one dredge better off as regards the lower provinces than it was formerly. The coast line of the maritime provinces, extending from the Bay of Fundy to Baie des Chaleurs, is many hundreds of miles in extent, and no comparison can be made between that coast and the inland waters of the other provinces. In view of the fact that there was urgent necessity for dredging in the maritime provinces, I cannot see what justification the Minister can have for not asking votes for the construction of new dredges to be used there, while at the same time large votes were asked for other parts of the Dominion.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have explained that large sums are required for repairs to dredges in the maritime provinces and elsewhere.

Mr. BERGERON. Where is the line of demarcation to be drawn between new dredges and repairs ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have applied for $60,000 for new work and $30,000 for repairs.

Mr. BERGERON. Then this amount of $30,000 is to be given for work to be done at Sorel ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No. It is partly for work to be done at Sorel in the shape of rebuilding scows and other work, and partly for repairing dredges in the maritime provinces, and also for making some repairs in Ontario.

Dredging—Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick..... $60,000

Mr. McDOUGALL. Where does the Minister propose to expend this amount in the maritime provinces ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The dredge " St. Lawrence " is working at Yarmouth. There is certain work to be completed, which will take a few weeks. The dredge " Canada " is at Barrington, and will go from there to some other point. The " New Dominion " will dredge in the St. John River. The dredge " Mackenzie," now at Wallace will go to Arichat. The " Cape Breton " will work in St. John harbour.

Mr. McDOUGALL. We are now discussing expenditures for the current year. On what work does the hon. gentleman propose to spend this amount, after 1st July ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We estimate that $60,000 will be necessary to keep the dredges working during the whole year. As to localities, we have not made up our minds altogether, but I have stated some localities where the dredges are at work.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Surely the hon. gentleman does not base his estimate on the necessity of keeping the dredges working, but on the necessity of certain work being done. I want to know the works on which the dredges will be employed.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is quite impossible to give the exact quantity of work required to be done at certain places ; but it has been estimated by the local engineers, that this sum will be required to keep the dredges at work during the season. As to work, there is plenty to be done.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I think it has been customary for the Minister to state the particular places where work will be done during the year.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have already given the names of some of

the localities where the dredges are going to work.

Mr. KAULBACH. I hope the hon. Minister will not forget to notice my remarks as to the necessity of dredging in the county I represent. I trust he will consider these points of more importance than all the other works in all the other provinces.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I should be only too glad to send dredges all over the Dominion, if the department possessed them.

Mr. KAULBACH. The hon. gentleman promised a year ago that this work would be done, and I trust I will not be disappointed.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The hon. Minister has made no promise in regard to the Magdalen Islands, but no dredge has been sent there for twenty years, and I would ask the hon. Minister, in the name of my constituents, to send a dredge there this summer.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will take a good note of the request of my hon. friend, but I have no dredge available at the present time.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I hope the hon. Minister will be glad to make a note of the fact that I called his attention to dredging required at New Campbellton.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I should be glad to send a dredge there, if I had one at liberty.

Mr. McGREGOR. In 1896 the late Administration sent a dredge to my county to dredge out the river, and on election day removed the dredge. I want 300 feet more dredging done on Bell River. Before the hon. Minister attends to the demands of hon. gentlemen opposite, I trust he will see that our requests are met.

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). I desire to call the attention of the Minister of Public Works to a very important work in my county concerning which I have spoken to him more than once, and I am very sorry to see that he has not made any provision for it. In the year 1896 during the election, the late Government took $25,000 to erect two piers for the purpose of affording a boat harbour at a place called Grand Etang, in the county of Inverness. The late Government spent $18,000 of that money and the present Government $7,000. The two piers were built, and all that now remains to make that a very commodious harbour for the fishermen along that coast is to remove a small mound of gravel between these two piers. I would like to get the ear of the Minister for a moment while I am speaking about this work. For the past two years the Minister of Public Works has given assurances to me from time to time that the work would be attended to, and I accordingly of late said little about the matter; but now that he has recited those other places without mentioning this work I feel that he has overlooked it. I remember that last year he particularly assured me that this dredging would be attended to, and I hope that he will spare one of his dredges this year for a few weeks to work in the good old county of Inverness. In view of the large amount of money spent on these piers it would be a great pity that they should be allowed to rot before that boat harbour is made available for the fishermen there.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The estimate is that the work to which the hon. gentleman refers will cost about $5,000. I would be very glad indeed if Parliament would give me all the money required to do all these works, but that is impossible. I am ready to carry out any amount of work, but I must have the money. I will be glad to do all I can in this case. Part of this dredging will have to be done by hand, and part by a dredge, and I will take note of my hon. friend's request and if there is any possibility of sending a dredge there I will do so.

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). I would like to get some more definite assurance from the Minister because I had a similar assurance to that last year and no good came of it. The people whom I represent will hardly be satisfied by my telling them a second time that the Minister said this work will be done.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am very sorry indeed I am not in a position to give a more positive assurance to the hon. gentleman (Mr. McLennan).

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). How long has that dredge been working at Wallace Harbour? If my memory serves me it was there at the time of the general elections in 1896; it was there last year, 1897, and is going to be there in 1898. I would like to know how Wallace Harbour occupies so much of the time of one of the dredges?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think it is a very good policy when once a work is started to complete it. When I send a dredge to Inverness County I will do all the work that is to be done there.

Mr. QUINN. The member for Inverness (Mr. McLennan) has not considered the subject thoroughly, or he would have seen that so much has been done for the Ministers. Take, for instance, the county of Shelburne, that it would be impossible for him, an ordinary member, to expect his request to be granted. To listen to the hon. gentlemen for Inverness (Mr. McLennan) one would imagine that he was a Cabinet Minister. He forgets that he must be contented with second or third or fourth place after

the Ministers get through with public works.

Mr. BENNETT. Or a post office.

Mr. QUINN. Yes, I understand that the Finance Minister has got a post office in Shelburne, but the hon. gentleman from Inverness (Mr. McLennan) must be contented with less. The Cabinet Ministers are so weak in their constituencies that thousands of dollars must be expended in their counties before the rank and file of the party are attended to.

Mr. GILLIES. I sympathize with my friend from Inverness (Mr. McLennan) because I know that the work which he has called to the attention of the Minister deserves every consideration. I have already called to the attention of the Minister of Public Works that we require more dredges in the lower provinces, but he has been sitting there year after year and he has not done anything in that respect.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have not been here very long.

Mr. GILLIES. You have been there three sessions, and you show no improvement, and it is about time for the Minister to try his 'prentice hand in that direction. The harbour of refuge at Fourchie in the eastern part of Nova Scotia deserves his most earnest and immediate attention. The Minister has some acquaintance, I hope, with the geography of that interesting section of the county, and if so he will know that from the harbour of Louisbourg on the eastern coast up to St. Peter's harbour, a distance of sixty miles, there is not a single harbour of refuge for a ship or a boat except the small breakwater at L'Ardoise. That section of the country is inhabited by fishermen where hundreds and hundreds of boats are pursuing their precarious avocation, and the hon. Minister will understand how necessary it is to have a harbour of refuge on that iron-bound coast. Fourchie is twenty-two miles west of Louisbourg and thirty miles east of St. Peter's, and for that whole distance there is not a place for a boat or a vessel to find shelter. The late Government sent a dredge there which did considerable work, but last year the Minister of Public Works took the dredge from there in a summary way and sent it to Wallace, in the county of Cumberland, the coast of which is dotted with harbours and not so much in need of dredging. The Minister's engineer can tell him that there is no comparison between the needs of Wallace and the needs of Fourchie and that other place to which my hon. friend from Inverness (Mr. McLennan) called attention. I think the Minister is deserving of censure for not having asked Parliament for a vote for the construction of more dredges for the maritime provinces, but scarce as are the dredges under his control, I would ask that some of them be taken away from those points where they are not really required and sent to places where there is urgent necessity for them. The Minister of Finance can have a public building at Liverpool in his county, and he can have dredges at Lockeport and Barrington where they are not required.

In the county of Shelburne, surrounded as they are with harbours and the coast indented with places of shelter, compare them with the counties of Inverness or Richmond, and they fade into insignificance. I would ask the hon. Minister to take the advice of his responsible officers who are, I know, conscientious men and good officers, and not yield to the importunities even of a Minister. If he would talk the matter over with his officers for half an hour and discuss the necessities of the places to which the hon. member for Inverness and myself have drawn his attention, he would not fail to do them justice. I ask him now if it is really his intention to do what he promised last year, namely, to have further work done at the harbour of Fourchie. I do not ask him to consider my political exigencies, but to let them weigh for nothing in the balance, and he can have all the votes, if he will only send a dredge there. If the hon. Minister will do so, he will do an act that will reflect credit on himself and the department, and be an act of justice to a very deserving and large class of people.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am much surprised indeed to find that my hon. friends have discovered that there are not enough dredges in the maritime provinces.

Mr. GILLIES. We discovered it long ago.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Then, they should have acted long ago. I have given to the maritime provinces one dredge more than they ever had before.

Mr. GILLIES. The hon. gentleman is entirely mistaken. The construction of the dredge "Cape Breton" was provided for by the late Government before he was ever sworn in.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. What is perfectly true is that there is one more dredge working in the maritime provinces than there was previously. We have not sufficient dredges, and consequently are unable to do all the dredging required. The port to which the hon. gentleman refers may be very interesting, but there are others just as interesting, and from which petitions are pouring in upon us. I can only promise that I will work the dredges every day in the year, if that be possible, and shall be very glad indeed to do work wherever required.

Mr. GILLIES. The hon. gentleman is wrong in saying that there is now one more dredge in the maritime provinces than there

ever was before. The dredge "Cape Breton" was built to take the place of a dredge lost down there years ago. The number now in the lower provinces is the same as it was ten or fifteen years ago.

Dredging—Quebec and Ontario..... $60,000

Mr. BENNETT. Where is it intended to expend the moneys in Ontario?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not think our programme is mapped out for next year. This sum is required to pay the working expenses of our dredges. My hon. friend knows that I am now dredging at Midland, and will complete the work to be done there. The engineer estimates the working expenses of the dredges for the whole year, and then we map out a plan.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Do you know where you are going to send them?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Our plan is not made up.

Mr. BENNETT. I hope the hon. Minister will be able to answer the House that there will be all the necessary dredging done at Midland. I understand that the work under contract at Goderich has been abandoned by the contractor; and in view of an early election at that place, I was informed that as the contractor, Mr. Madigan, had thrown up his contract, the work was to be undertaken by day's labour. Is it intended that any part of this money is to be expended at Goderich?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Not a cent. This amount is asked for the working expenses of our dredges. If I wanted to do some special dredging at Goderich, I would have to apply for a special vote.

Mr. MONTAGUE. There was a contract at Goderich harbour which was thrown up. Is it intended to do the work by day's labour?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. At Goderich we have a contract to rebuild the long pier and will ask for tenders. I stated that two days ago.

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). How much is to be spent in Ontario and how much in Quebec?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. As equally as possible.

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). It is somewhat surprising that the hon. Minister should expect us to pass these Estimates without some idea of where the money is to be expended. Surely he has made some estimates as to how much he proposes to spend in one place and another, and we should know where this money is to be spent. I have been here some years, and never saw Estimates passed in this way before. I do not ask for small details, but surely the hon. gentleman has made some estimate of the expenditure, and should put us in possession of these facts. Or does he intend to get the money voted and then spend it wherever an election is coming on? If not, let him give us the information.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I thought I had made that point very clear indeed. To work our dredges requires a certain amount of money, but as to the places where they will work, I am not in a position to say. There are some places I can mention, such as Midland, where one of the dredges will work the whole season. We will also do some dredging in Belleville, but our plans for next year are not made. Numerous applications are made every day. From these we will choose those where work is most necessary. I think we cannot do more than that.

Mr. BERGERON. How many dredges are there in Ontario and Quebec at work now?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There are on the St. Lawrence four dredges, and in Ontario we have the "Nipissing," "Queen," "Ontario," "Charlie" and "St. Louis."

Mr. BERGERON. In Ontario?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, that one is in Quebec.

Mr. MONTAGUE. There are certain harbours for which there are special estimates. It is not intended to spend any of this money on these harbours—Collingwood, for instance.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, this is a special vote.

Mr. MONTAGUE. It is not intended to spend any of this on Collingwood?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No.

Mr. INGRAM. There are two or three constituencies in which there are liable to be by-elections very shortly. It would be well to understand if there is to be any public money spent in them, over and above the money estimated now. Take Goderich, for instance.

Mr. BERGERON. Why should there be a vacancy there?

Mr. INGRAM. I understand that the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Cameron) is to be Lieutenant-Governor of the North-west Territories.

Mr. BERGERON. Does the Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) know that?

Mr. INGRAM. I understand that the friends of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cameron) are about to meet to nominate a candidate for the constituency. It would be well to know if any other expenditure for public works is to be made there. Then

there is Collingwood harbour, $30,000. I notice that Port Stanley has $10,000 for assistance towards harbour improvements and $11,000 repairs to piers and dredging also. I should like to know if any portion of this $60,000 is to be spent there ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Not one cent.

Mr. INGRAM. Last year $50,000 was spent dredging Quebec and Ontario. What proportions was spent in each ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Of the $50,000 spent last year up to the end of December, $17,169 was spent in Quebec and $24,912 in Ontario.

Mr. INGRAM. This amount was for the work done by the Government dredges ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, and by dredges hired.

Mr. INGRAM. I find in the Auditor General's Report that the hon. gentleman is paying $8 per hour for dredging. Is it not a fact that this can be done for $6 or even $5 per hour ? And is it the intention of the hon. Minister to continue paying $8 per hour ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We had a long discussion on that point when my hon. friend (Mr. Ingram) was not in the House. I said that in hiring dredges at $8 per hour, I was following the policy that had been followed in the past. It may be that the system can be improved. After the remarks made in the House I shall go carefully into the question, and I may make improvements for another year.

Mr. INGRAM. I would like to ask further if it is not a fact that when a Government dredge is hired out to a private company or to an individual, the charge made is $50 a day ? Why is it then, that the hon. gentleman is willing to pay $8 per hour or $80 per day when he hires a dredge ? The inconsistency of the thing is most remarkable to me, for the Government has some very good dredges, probably better than any private dredges they can employ.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I know that when we are applied to by a private corporation or person to do dredging work, we only charge the actual expenditure, and that is the reason why the charge as my hon. friend says, $50 a day. But I would again remind him that in paying $8 per hour, I have followed the policy I found established in my department.

Mr. INGRAM. I understand the hon. gentleman to say that he has not an estimate of the dredging he proposes to do in the different harbours of Ontario and Quebec for this sum of $60,000. I think it would only be fair, at least, to hon. gentlemen on this side, that a statement should be given to the House as to the manner in which that amount is proposed to be expended in the province of Ontario. We expect a large number of local elections to take place between now and another session, and if it is going to be in the power of the hon. gentleman to expend this money in harbours wherever he chooses for the purpose of promoting the election of his friends, I think it will be a very unfair thing to do. The hon. gentleman has been charged, whether rightly or wrongly, with going round the country and stating to the people that various works were required, and he would do all he could to see that they were made. I think it is only fair that we should know where this money is to be expended before these local elections take place.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There are many calls made upon us, and I will have to judge of these calls to the best of my ability. My hon. friend is altogether wrong in supposing that I will do this work for political purposes. I never did that, and would not do it. But there is one thing I will certainly do, I will not forget my political friends. When work is required to be done in a good Liberal county, I do not see why I should not do it. My hon. friend reproached me with going into the fair province of Ontario and stating that there were important works to be done there. It is true, I went up there and I was well received, I found a progressive people, and I promised to do what I could to promote their progress.

Mr. INGRAM. I did not charge the hon. gentleman with making this statement, but the public press of the country charged him with doing it. As for myself, I owe many thanks to the hon. gentleman for doing his duty by the constituency I have the honour to represent, where I find he is going to spend $46,000 in improving a harbour.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that these dredges were let out at $50 a day.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I said that when a private person came to us and asked for a dredge to repair a wharf,-&c., we only charged them the actual working expenses, and sometimes less. That varies according to the size of the dredge, it is usually $50 or $60 a day.

Mr. MONK. The Minister has declared his willingness to improve upon the system followed by his predecessors. A valuable improvement would be to come before us every year with a definite programme as to where this dredging is to be done. We are asked to make the Minister the absolute arbiter as to where this $60,000 shall be spent, we are altogether in the dark what he is going to do with it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am very sorry I did not make myself understood. So far as Ontario is concerned, I

said I was doing work at Midland and some at Grenville, some at Whitby, some at Bowmanville, some at Newcastle. We have quite a number of applications.

Mr. SPROULE. In order to know how much money the Minister requires, it is necessary to know how much it costs per day to keep these dredges running. I think the Minister said there were nine dredges in Ontario and Quebec. If we knew how much it would require to keep them working, we would be able to say about how much money he would require to use. My information is that it costs about $25 a day to keep a dredge running, or $20 if you supply the wood. I think $20 or $25 is a fair thing. If we had this information we would know whether the amount the Minister asks is enough or too much to keep these dredges employed for a reasonable length of time. I think the Minister could easily give us the information, because he has his engineer at his hand.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is out of the question to say what the working expenses of a dredge will be. The working expenses of a small dredge like the Nipissing, for example, would amount to between $50 and $60 per day, including fuel, a tug and two scows. Dredge No. 9 will cost a great deal more than that, between $60 and $70, as the engineer tells me.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. gentleman says that there are nine dredges in Ontario and in Quebec. In what harbours are they working now ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The "Nipissing" is now at Whitby, the "Queen" at Belleville.

Mr. HUGHES. Is not the Whitby harbour owned by a private corporation ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think it is, but the dredge is not yet at work there. But if we refuse to allow the dredges to work in every harbour which is not owned by the Government, it might lead to serious trouble. Some of those private harbours which belong to corporations could not be dredged except by our own dredges. The dredge "Ontario" is now at Amherstburg, we have one dredge at Midland, and the No. 9 is on the Kaministiquia River.

Mr. McNEILL. The hon. gentleman speaks of private harbours. The harbour of Southampton is not a private harbour, it is a harbour of refuge. The hon. gentleman's attention was directed to that matter, I think, frequently, long ago. Has anything been done there in the way of dredging of late ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I I hope that when the Supplementary Estimates come down, my hon. friend will see that I have not forgotten the representations he has made to me.

Mr. TARTE.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Is the dredge at Whitby working ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Not yet.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Is the dredge at Midland working.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think they are not working now.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Is the dredge at Amherstburg working ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The dredge on the Kaministiquia ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The dredge at Belleville ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The dredge there is under repairs, it will be ready in a short time.

Mr. MONTAGUE. So there is only one dredge working in Ontario, and that has no hull.

Mr. HUGHES. In his statement, does the hon. Minister take into account the dredge "Otonabee," on the Trent waters ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That belongs to the Department of Railways and Canals.

Mr. HUGHES. Has he put in a sum for clearing the Scugog River from Lindsay to Lake Scugog, which belongs to his department ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am not yet in a position to answer my hon. friend.

Mr. HUGHES. Are there any negotiations pending in regard to the sale, leasing or transfer of the Kingston dry dock ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. None whatever.

Mr. HUGHES. Has any proposition been made to the Minister ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No.

Mr. BERGERON. Where are the dredges intended to be employed in the province of Quebec ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The "St. Louis" and another dredge are working on the St. Lawrence, and one will be taken to Yamaska River. No. 1 is working near Pointe aux Trembles.

Mr. BERGERON. Is there any dredge on the Chateauguay River ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Why are the dredges not working in Ontario ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Some of them are undergoing repairs. One will shortly be working at Belleville.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Are the dredges in Ontario manned ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Then they are manned and doing nothing ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, many of the men are doing repairs.

Mr. MARCOTTE. (Translation.) What is the name of the dredge that is working at St. Jean Deschaillons ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). (Translation.) "Nithsdale."

Mr. McALISTER. Is it the intention of the Minister to send a dredge up the Restigouche River, part of which is in Quebec and part in New Brunswick ? Some dredging was done there two or three years ago, but the dredge was taken away and the work never completed. Dredging is very much needed.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Restigouche is on the map, on the programme for this year. Whether we will be able to reach it, I do not know.

Mr. McALISTER. Then we may expect the dredge up there this summer ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We hope so.

Mr. McALISTER. Part of the work will be for the benefit of the county of Bonaventure, which sends a supporter of the Government, and part for the county I represent, and between the two we should be able to get this dredging done.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It would not make any difference because the member for Bonaventure supports the Government. I take a deep interest in the hon. member for Restigouche.

Mr. TAYLOR. Did I understand the Minister to state that the average cost of each dredge is $60 a day ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I said the working expenses of some dredges were between $50 and $60, and that the cost varied, depending on the size of the dredge.

Mr. TAYLOR. I understand the Minister to say that there are nine dredges in Ontario and Quebec ? At an average of $60 per day the cost would be $540, or $16,200 per month. Taking the working time at seven months, this would mean an expenditure of $113,400. That shows how honest the Minister is in giving figures to the committee.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman has proved by these figures how little he understands what he is talking about.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. Minister has misled the committee in stating that the average expense was $60 per day. The dredge "Queen," including the crew on both dredge and tug, averages only $30 per day.

Mr. MONTAGUE. How much does the Minister intend to charge a company or town owning the harbour where dredging is done ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We do not always make a charge. The hon. gentleman will remember that a great deal of dredging has been done in harbours owned by private corporations and towns.

Mr. SPROULE. We should have more information in regard to the cost of running a dredge. Does the Minister include repairs in the cost stated ? Take the dredge "Challenge." How many are required to work the dredge, without the tug ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I cannot be expected to possess a complete knowledge of all these details. If the officers of my department have deceived me in the past, I am sorry, but I am sure they have not done so. I am asking the same vote as in past years. During the last twenty years I have heard in the House and in the press gallery these items discussed, but I never remember such close inquiries to be made. It is, however, the right of hon. gentlemen to make them. There are twelve men on the "Challenge" and tug and scow.

Mr. SPROULE. At what wages ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. $80 for the engineer, $50 for the cranesmen, $30 a month for the fireman, $25 for deck hands, $25 for scowmen, $30 for cooks, $50 for wheelmen, $50 for tug engineer, $30 for tug firemen.

Mr. BERGERON. The hon. gentleman is simply continuing the policy of his predecessors ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have dredges and must work them.

Mr. BERGERON. For twenty years the hon. gentleman has watched from the press gallery similar inquiries in Supply, yet he continues the same policy as was formerly pursued. It is, therefore, no use to have a change of Government. The hon. gentleman expended $17,000 in Quebec and $24,000 in Ontario ; where is the balance ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I said we spent that sum up to December last. We have two months till July.

Mr. BERGERON. But I understood that work had not been commenced ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is going on.

Mr. BERGERON. Is there any amount for dredging at Berthier ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is a special vote for that.

Mr. BERGERON. And also, I suppose, a special vote for dredging the St. Lawrence channel. This amount then is for the nine dredges working in Ontario and Quebec ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. And to pay for some dredges that are hired.

Mr. BERGERON. But the Minister is simply following the custom adopted and followed by the old Government.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have made it my duty to take everything that was good wherever it came from.

Mr. BERGERON. And the Minister is spending more money than the late Government did.

Mr. SPROULE. As I figure out the wages account it would amount to less than $20 a day. What is the cost of fuel ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I cannot say just now.

Mr. SPROULE. Do those dredges use wood or coal ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. All of them burn coal.

Mr. SPROULE. Can the Minister tell us what is the cost of the coal ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not know I never measured it.

Mr. SPROULE. I did not ask that, nor do I expect the Minister can give the information at a moment's notice, but I presume he can get the information from his officers, and the House should know it. My information is, and I believe it to be correct, that if costs between $20 and $30 a day to keep these dredges going. I take it that the cost of repairs is not included in this item, and that this is for paying the wages and cost of fuel and such things. We should have the information in detail about these things.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Before concurrence I will give the details of the expenditure of each dredge.

Mr. SPROULE. That will be perfectly satisfactory, so far as I am concerned.

Mr. QUINN. Will the Minister give us some details as to where the dredges will work during the coming year ? We do not ask that the Minster shall be bound down by the letter of his statement and be held responsible next season for the dredges not working as he would indicate, but we should know where it is contemplated that the dredges shall work.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I could not locate where we would work all the dredges now.

Mr. QUINN. We know there has not been anything like the quantity of dredging done in Quebec province that has been asked for, and I suppose it is the same in other provinces. If the department is properly conducted, the Minister must have some information from his officers as to what points it is contemplated to work the dredges next year. That is what we want to get.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Did I understand the Minister to say that while the dredges were not dredging the crews were doing the repairs ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Everything that can be done by the captain or crew is done, but not the whole thing ?

Mr. MONTAGUE. Are not the crews on these dredges at the present time.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I understand that only a portion of the crews are engaged now. My instructions were that the crew should not be employed until the work is begun.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Would the Minister say what repairs have been done by the men ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am told by the Deputy Minister that small repairs are done by the men. My hon. friends opposite are doing me a great service in criticising all these details so closely. I will go deeply into the matter now and if the chief engineer of my department has not kept things as he should, I will know why it is.

Mr. MONTAGUE. According to the Auditor General's Report there is $600 charged for carpenters and caulkers, and evidently the crews did not do those repairs.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I suppose they did not. I promise my hon. friends that I will have the closest inquiry made into the working expenses of these dredges. It is not very long since I took office and I have to rely on the advice of the officers I found there. My hon friends opposite seem to think there have been some abuses because they would not criticise all these items so severely if they did not think there were abuses.

Mr. MONTAGUE. As far as I am concerned I am not criticising the officers of the department.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman cannot be criticising me, because I do not do it.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. Minister is not immaculate.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I suppose I am just as immaculate as my hon. friend.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I am offering no criticism of the hon. gentleman's officers, but still we should have all necessary information.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. These Estimates have been prepared by the officers I found in the department, and I frankly admit that I did not go into these details myself. My instruction to Mr. Coste were: Do not allow one cent of expenditure which is not required, and if Mr. Coste has not fulfilled his duty, I would be very sorry for him. Now that my attention has been called to all these details, I will go very closely into them, and I promise that next year there will not be one dollar that I will not know where it has gone.

Mr. BERGERON. Where were these dredges kept during the winter?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Some were taken to Sorel, and some wintered elsewhere.

Mr. BERGERON. If they were the whole winter in Sorel, it would be natural to think that the repairs should be done during the winter at the workshops there.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. They were not all taken to Sorel.

Mr. BERGERON. Would it not be good policy to bring them into Sorel and have the repairs made during the winter?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Some are taken down to Sorel, when the chief engineer advises it. I leave him perfectly free to follow his own course, because I am not an expert.

Mr. BERGERON. It is very unfortunate that the chief engineer is not here to give us information.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think my hon. friends are getting more information than ever was given in the House.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It has been shown by the discussion and the Auditor General's report that the chief engineer would be able to protect himself pretty well. The Minister has explained that these dredges in Ontario that are idle are under commission, and for the time being their crews are employed doing small repairs. He has not yet mapped out the work for these dredges, although it is now the 25th of May, and that is the reason they are lying idle.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I never interfere with the chief engineer's work. He gives me an account of what he is doing. He submits to me the work that he intends doing, and I approve of it or do not. But he has full control of his work. As to the delays, there have been no delays this year. The repairs may not have gone as quickly as they should, but that is not my fault. They were under the control of the chief engineer.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. Minister misunderstands some of us, because we were not criticising adversely what had been done by the chief engineer or himself, but were endeavouring to get information. He has kindly promised to give us, in concurrence, the cost of these dredges. I would ask him to add the number of days which each of them have worked during the season.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I shall have a statement prepared of all the days the dredges have worked and the money paid on every one of them.

Mr. HENDERSON. The hon. Minister was good enough to say that he was not going to forget his friends, and I desire to remind him that about a month ago a number of his very special friends from Oakville waited upon him with reference to the refuge harbour at Oakville, and the repairing of the pier. Supplementaries have come down, and I have seen nothing of any estimate for that work.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The Supplementaries are not yet down.

Mr. HENDERSON. May I ask the hon. Minister whether they will contain an item for the purpose of making repairs at Oakville and for the dredging of that harbour. If not, I would urge the Minister strongly to take something out of this large appropriation to make the improvements asked for.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman understands that I am not free to tell him what the Supplementary Estimates will contain. I may say that representations were made to me, and that I received a deputation which urged on me the importance of doing the work, and I am confident that when the Supplementaries come down, I will have the good-will of my friends.

Mr. MARCOTTE. (Translation.) I was very glad to hear the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) stating that there was a Government dredge working at St. Jean Deschaillons. I draw the attention of the Minister to the fact that this is one of the most dangerous points on the River St. Lawrence; and I would like to know whether it is his intention to keep a dredge working there permanently the whole season in order to dredge and widen that part of the channel. Does the Minister propose to devote a large sum to that work?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Translation.) The dredge "Nithsdale" is working at St. Jean Deschaillons and will be kept at work there the whole season, just as was done last year.

Dredging—Manitoba..... $8,000

Mr. LaRIVIERE. I hope the hon. Minister will give some explanation as to the work to be done this year on the Red River. Is there any dredging to be done elsewhere than at the mouth of the Red River ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have the dredge "Winnipeg" and the tug "Sir Hector" there. It is estimated that the sum of $8,000 is necessary for the working expenses of that dredge.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. Where will the dredge be employed ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. At the mouth of the Red River, dredging from the sand-bar that is there. The same kind of work that was done last year.

Dredging—British Columbia..... $15,000

Mr. MONTAGUE. Is there any work to be done at the entrance of the works at Vancouver ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, my attention was called to it by the report of the chief engineer lately, and if my memory serves me right, I have given instructions that some work should be done immediately there. Mr. Coste wired me two weeks ago.

Dredging—General service..... $5,000

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. A good deal of this is used to pay part of the salaries of the officers in Ottawa, who were at work on the dredging. We have in Ottawa a general superintendent, Mr. Goodwin, and he has a staff around him.

Mr. BERGERON. He has a salary ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. He has been employed fifteen years. He has a salary of $1,200 a year, and he has a staff of officers. That $5,000 is just in the same line as the item we have discussed for harbours and rivers.

Mr. FOSTER. There is not a dollar of it spent on dredges ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is in connection with dredging operations, and is the same vote we have had for the last twenty-five years.

Slides and Booms..... $5,000

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have no details of that amount. If the House will pass it, I pledge myself to bring down the details before concurrence is taken.

Mr. HUGHES. I would like to ask the Minister what was the revenue last year from the St. Maurice River boom.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. On the St. Maurice River last year the collections amounted to $28,893, against $22,090 for the previous year.

Mr. MARCOTTE. (Translation.) How many men are in the employ of the Government there ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. (Translation.) We have ten permanent employees.

Mr. MARCOTTE. (Translation.) I will avail myself of the opportunity to protest against the unfair treatment meted out to one of the oldest and most faithful employees at the St. Maurice River Boom. I do not think any investigation has taken place in his case, and I believe he never interfered in politics. He discharged his duties faithfully and he was dismissed in order to make room for a partisan. I deem it my duty not to allow this item to pass without registering my protest.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. (Translation.) All I have to say in this connection is that I have made several changes at the St. Maurice River Boom, and when the hon. gentleman knows what has come to my knowledge within these few last days, he will agree that I was perfectly right in making those changes.

Roads and Bridges—
Dominion traffic bridges throughout Canada, including approaches..... $5,000

Mr. BERGERON. What is that for ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have several bridges in the North-west and on the Ottawa River, and this is for maintenance.

Bridge across the Saskatchewan at Edmonton, N.W.T..... $25,000

Mr. FOSTER. I will ask my hon. friend (Mr. Tarte) to allow this to stand. It has stood for some time.

Maria Street Bridge, over the Rideau Canal—Re-construction $10,000

Mr. FOSTER. What is the reason that this has not been expended ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Because I did not ask enough. I am going to ask more in my Supplementary Estimates. I am sure the hon. gentleman will help me as he knows the matter will have to be attended to.

Mr. HUGHES. Is the Government going to ask for tenders for this work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, the work will be let by contract.

Mr. BERGERON. Is the Government obliged to build this bridge ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Sappers' Bridge, Ottawa, extraordinary repairs.. ..... $2,000

Mr. SPROULE. What is meant by this expression "extraordinary repairs" ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is the cost of making a new floor. That is not an ordinary repair.

Telegraph Lines.....	$20,600
Land line on north shore of St. Lawrence—To improve roadway, repair line and increase operating facilities generally, between Godbout and Pointe aux Esquimaux	$1,000

Mr. BERGERON. How is that work being done ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. By contract. The contractor is Mr. De Courval.

Mr. BERGERON. Is that an old contract ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The contract has been going on for the last two years and has been held by the same man.

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON. I would like to know whether these lines are used exclusively by the Government or whether they are used by the public telegraph companies ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. They are used by us and by every one who wishes to use them. All our lines are open to the public.

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON. For instance, there is an item here for $15,000 for one line. Does the Government pay for this line without getting a revenue from the telegraph companies that use it ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is not used by the telegraph companies but by the public in a general way.

Mr. HUGHES. Has the Minister any returns of what the receipts are ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, we have these returns, carefully prepared by the superintendent.

Mr. BERGERON. On this land line on the north shore of the St. Lawrence—extension from Point aux Esquimaux eastward, for which $15,000 is asked—how far does the Government intend to build eastward ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We are on the route to Belle Isle. We have 290 miles more to build.

Mr. FOSTER. How much a mile does it cost ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It costs $105 a mile and we supply the wire.

Mr. BERGERON. Who pays the operators ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We do.

Mr. BERGERON. What is the revenue generally ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The revenue is very small. The line is specially built in the interests of navigation and trade. Still we are getting more revenue every year.

Mr. FOSTER. Does it pay the expenses of operation ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, that is one of the questions into which I will inquire during the recess.

Telegraph Lines, British Columbia—To provide for an alternative line connecting Cape Beale and Carmenah with Victoria by extending the French Creek-Alberni line southwardly to the southwest coast of Vancouver Island.....	$4,600

Mr. HUGHES. Is the Government taking any steps about a telegraph line into the Yukon country ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not think we have made much progress in that matter yet.

Mr. HUGHES. I am aware of that. I was asking what was proposed ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am really not ready to give the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hughes) an answer yet. So far, we have not done anything.

Mr. GANONG. I want to call the attention of the Minister to some matters down in the county of Charlotte in connection with telegraph and telephone lines. I made some suggestions a short time since in regard to carrying out some improvements. One of them was the advisability of making a connection between Head Harbour light on one end of the island of Campobello and Welsh Pool, which has already connection with the mainland. Down among these islands, as hon. gentlemen are perfectly aware who know anything of the fishing industries, there are very few teams, in fact the roads are not always in the best condition, and the fishermen have to depend for communication principally upon their boats. In that county it is difficult to obtain fast communication, at least, on account of the very rapid tides around the coast, as well as the difficulty they occasionally have with fogs. It would seem that if it is essential to have a light at Head Harbour, it is quite as essential to have some communication between the Head Harbour light and some point where they might receive assistance. There is a great amount of tonnage going through this passage, the steamers between St. John and the ports of Portland and Boston all pass this point, some of the steamers two or three times a day. The total expenditure, as I understand it, is estimated only at $880, or an equivalent to $22 a year for interest. This connection would also give a very desirable communication between the large fishing village of Wilson's Beach and Welsh Pool. At the same time, no less important, I can assure the Minister, is the

connection between Deer Island and the mainland. On Deer Island we have a population of 1,700 people who have no communication whatever of this kind with the outside. I think the estimated cost of this work was about $3,500, equal to an interest account of $85.50 a year. This line would probably prove self-sustaining, as among those islands they do a business of some $300,000 or $400,000 a year. Their business is principally with the town of Eastport. It certainly is desirable so far as possible to facilitate the business of this community by giving the people direct communication, so that they may be kept in touch with the markets where their fish are principally sold. It is certainly an idea that should be taken up by the Minister very soon. I hoped he had put some amount in his Estimates for this purpose, and I trust he may yet see his way clear to do so in the Supplementaries.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I cannot give any promise. We are extending our lines as quickly as possible. It is a question of money.

Mr. FOSTER. It is a question, too, of distribution. The plea that has been made by the hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. Ganong) is a good plea. There are some points there that ought to be attended to.

National Art Gallery.. ..... $2,000

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON. Is this amount of $2,000 spent every year on this National Art Gallery.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, not every year. We are not very far advanced in the way of art.

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON. Who makes the selection for the National Art Gallery ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have an artist in our department, Mr. Taylor, who, with the assistance of some of the officers in the department, has made the selections in the past. Since I took office, I have not bought anything.

Mr. SPROULE. Is this amount for the purpose of buying pictures ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, and to pay the caretaker. I understand that my predecessor bought a picture, the Death of Nelson, for which he paid $1,000. I have not bought any yet, but I am negotiating for the purchase of a picture by an artist of London.

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON. It seems to me that the Minister, in selecting specimens of Canadian art for the National Art Gallery—and I may say that I approve of having a gallery of that kind—should be assisted by experts in selecting these pictures. They should not be bought upon the mere word of any single gentleman in the department, or through the friends of artists who are only too anxious to sell their pictures. We ought to have in the National Art Gallery the very best work Canadian artists can produce. I think the Government would do a commendable thing in spending more money in patronizing Canadian artists. We should have the very best work by the very best artists, and we should also have the best experts and judges of art to select those pictures.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend is perfectly right, but it might be a little difficult to find those experts. I would be glad to have a private conversation on the subject with my hon. friend.

Mr. HUGHES. I would suggest to the Minister that a very fine expert is the hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Ross Robertson).

Temporary clerical and other assistance, inclusive of services of all persons required who were first employed after the 1st of July, 1882, notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Civil Service Act..... $25,000

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. When I took office I reduced the expenditure too much, and I find myself short.

Mr. HUGHES. How many clerks were dismissed ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not think there has been one dismissal.

Mr. SPROULE. Have they been continued on year after year in contravention of the Act, and are some of the employees still on the list ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is another case where I took things as they were left. This is to make regular the employment of persons who have been employed since 1882. But then there was a law allowing the employment of a certain class of men, and the money has always been voted that way.

Mr. SPROULE. This $5,000 additional, is that to increase their salaries or to employ others ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If the hon. gentleman will look at past estimates he will find that in 1895-96, for the same purpose, Parliament voted $30,700 ; in 1896-97, $24,500. I thought I could get on with $20,000, but I find I cannot. The hon. gentleman will find, if he examines my estimates, that the expenditure so far as the civil service is concerned, has been reduced by more than $125,000.

Mr. SPROULE. In one year the hon. gentleman asked for $25,000, in the following year he asked for $23,000, or $2,000 less, and then for the succeeding year $20,000 was voted.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is an additional vote in the Supplementary Estimates for 1895-96 of $4,000.

Mr. HUGHES. The total sum should appear.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I admit that I asked for $5,000 more than last year.

Towards a monument to the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie..... $7,000

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Models have been sent in according to the tenders advertised for. We have found some difficulty in taking upon ourselves the responsibility of deciding between the competitors.

Mr. FOSTER. How long have the models been in ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. They were sent here in January.

Mr. FOSTER. How does the hon. Minister propose to make a selection ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We propose to make a selection through experts. I have not quite made up my mind as to whom we will engage as experts, and I will be very glad to receive names from hon. members on both sides of the House, for, of course, it is not a party question.

Mr. SPROULE. What is likely to be the total cost when completed ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I estimate that the statues of Her Majesty the Queen and the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie will cost about $15,000 each.

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON. There is no item for which I will vote more willingly than that to perpetuate the memory of Alexander Mackenzie in bronze and to erect a statue of Her Majesty the Queen. But I should like to know from the Minister whether the intention is to select from the clay models now in the National Gallery the bronze statues that are proposed to be placed in front of the Parliamentary Buildings ; or whether those models, executed by Canadian artists, are adjudged by the Government to be the best examples of Canadian art ? If the Government are not satisfied, would it not be well to extend the competition to British artists, so that when we perpetuate Her Majesty the Queen and the late Mr. Mackenzie, we may have the best examples of bronze work that it is possible to produce. I do not suppose the hon. Minister, who has seen the examples in clay in the National Gallery, will say they in any way, either in pose, proportion or in likeness, portray either Her Majesty or the late Mr. Mackenzie ; and therefore I think the Minister and the Government should take seriously into consideration whether it would not be well to extend the competition to British artists. We have very few men in this country who can give us good pieces in this particular class of art. The only good pieces of bronze that I know of in Canada are at Montreal and Quebec, and are the work of a French Canadian. I regret our sculptors have not accomplished more in the models in the National Gallery, and suggest that before the Minister makes a selection, the hon. gentleman and the Government should seriously consider whether we should not obtain examples from the best British artists, so as to secure life-like representations of Mr. Mackenzie and Her Majesty the Queen as she appeared on the Jubilee day.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. When tenders were asked I was not in Ottawa, being away on a trip, and my colleagues thought, as the time was progressing, they should invite tenders immediately. Tenders were asked only from Canadian artists. I do not want to reflect in any way on the models sent in, but my hon. friend can understand the hesitation I and my colleagues feel in regard to the delay that has taken place. I cannot say more today. I shall be very glad to receive suggestions privately from both sides of the House in regard to this matter.

Mr. LEMIEUX. (Translation.) I have listened with very great pleasure to the remarks fallen from the hon. gentlemen in connection with the models now exhibited in the National Gallery. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Ross Robertson) thinks that it would be well to extend the competition to British artists, concurrently with our Canadian sculptors. I do not think, Sir, that is necessary at all. We have had, within the last few years, monuments executed by foreign artists which are far from being good pieces of art. The city of Montreal, for instance, has had a statute of Sir John Macdonald erected on the Dominion Square, which was executed by a London sculptor, and everybody knows that it is art in its very infancy. This statue, if I am correctly informed, has cost $50,000. We have another monument in Montreal, on the Place d'Armes, representing Maisonneuve taking possession of Ville-Marie, surrounded by his friends and fellow-countrymen, his fellow-labourers in his work of colonization. That monument has cost but the modest sum of from $20,000 to $25,000, but it is generally considered to be vastly superior, as a piece of art, to the costly monument I have just mentioned. I avail myself of the opportunity to say, in this connection, that it is not necessary for us to go abroad in order to find what we need. We have in this country all the artistic talent that is needed for producing master-pieces of art. We have in our midst, I am proud to say, a French Canadian artist, Mr. Philippe Hébert, whose work is a credit to this country and bears witness to the artistic genius of the French race in Canada. Reference has been made here to the clay models now exhibited in the National Gallery in this city. I have examined, with some friends of mine, during the session, those models, and I entirely agree with the

statement of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ross Robertson) that they do not all deserve to be allowed to compete, and that some should even be ruled out; but, when the hon. gentleman says that we should extend the competition to foreign artists, I think he is mistaken. When tenders were asked for Sir George E. Cartier's statue, from twenty to twenty-five models were received from France, Italy, England and the United States, and were exhibited in the Parliament Library. Now, when the competition took place, it was found that not a single one of those examples coming from the most renowned studios in the world could hold comparison either as to sculptural beauty or as to likeness with that which had been modelled by Philippe Hébert, who was then taking his steps in that career, and who is now a justly renowned artist. I have heard the matter discussed by competent men and I have no hesitation in saying that I do not see the necessity of re-opening the competition, as suggested. In my opinion, there is no reason why we should invite the competition of European artists, in order to obtain what we wish. The models exhibited by Hébert in the National Gallery, portraying Her Majesty the Queen and the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie give indisputable evidence of talent of the highest order and should be accepted without opposition. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Ross Robertson) seems to think that those models are not life-like representations. It cannot be denied that the pedestal of Mackenzie's statute is a splendid piece of art. As to the matter of likeness, that can easily be remedied. The pedestal represents an admirable conception, and expressed in a truly striking manner industry, energy, and love of duty.

As to the model of the Queen, while it is not a life-like representation of Her Majesty as she appeared on Jubilee day last year, it is a good likeness of the Queen, as she was ten years ago. I have but scanty notions of sculpture, but I understand that when a sculptor wishes to perpetuate a personage by a statue it is not absolutely necessary for him to represent that personage as he appears at the very moment when the artist is doing his work. Leaving aside the question of actual likeness, which, after all, is of secondary importance, I say that these models denote genius and art carried to their highest pitch. They have been closely examined by competent artists, who are all agreed that nothing better could be produced. The delays having now expired, I hope the Government will give this order to Mr. Hébert, our Canadian artist, whose reputation is daily growing and who, even in Europe, has reaped well-earned laurels. In the city of Quebec some of his statues now embellish the facade of the parliamentary buildings. At Chambly, he has made a bronze statue of de Salaberry. Here, in Ottawa, we have his statues of Cartier and Macdonald. Under the circumstances, I do not think the hon. Minister should hesitate a single moment to entrust the execution of these two monuments to a Canadian artist who may, besides, get information from a competent jury.

Mr. MARCOTTE. (Translation.) I have but a word or two to add to the eloquent words just fallen from the hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Lemieux). I fully concur in what he said about the small encouragement given in this country to artists and literary men of talent. This is a favourable opportunity to encourage our Canadian artist and to show that we appreciate to its just value the master-piece he has produced and which is a credit to our country. I think the hon. member for Gaspé has sounded the right note. I have examined those models and some of the best pieces of art executed by Mr. Hébert and I think the House will agree that he should be selected to execute these pieces of art, so as to enable him to still further develop the talent of which he has given us so many evidences so far.

Mr. HUGHES. Has the Minister selected the sites for those statutes?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Not yet.

Mr. HUGHES. I would draw the attention of the Minister to the disgraceful condition in which the vestibule at the entrance to the Parliament Building is kept. The condition is such that many persons would not tolerate it in their stables. I do not blame the Minister, but I would suggest that he give some of his friends in Ottawa a job to scrape the old paint off the pillars there. I give notice to the Minister that on concurrence, I shall ask for details about the building of that new Kaministiqua dredge, and I will also be pleased if the Minister would be good enough to bring down the estimate, harbour by harbour, as to the share of the province of Ontario in that $60,000 for dredging?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will do the best I can to comply with that request.

Resolutions to be reported.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. FOSTER. What business will be taken up to-morrow?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The resolution respecting the death of Mr. Gladstone; the resolution respecting the judges, and then Supply.

Mr. FOSTER. What supply?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We have not decided yet, but I think the Minister of Militia expected to go on with his Estimates to-night.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 1.10 a.m. (Thursday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 26th May, 1898.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FOREIGN IMMIGRANTS.

Mr. MACLEAN asked,

1. How many Galicians, Ruthinians, or other foreigners from the continent of Europe settled in Canada last year?
2. How many of this class of immigrants settled in the Dominion from January 1st to May 15th, this year?
3. How many immigrants from the British Isles settled in Canada last year?
4. How many immigrants from the British Isles settled in the Dominion from January 1st to May 15th, this year?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). 1. 8,563 Galicians, Ruthinians and other foreigners from the continent of Europe arrived in Canada and declared their intention of settling in this country last year. 2. 2,267 of this class of immigrants arrived and declared their intention of settling in the Dominion between the 1st January and 30th April this year, the latter being the latest date up to which the department has complete returns. 3. 10,741 immigrants from the British Isles arrived and declared their intention of settling in Canada last year. 4. 2,949 immigrants from the British Isles arrived and declared their intention of settling in the Dominion between the 1st January and the 30th April this year, the latter being the latest date up to which the department has complete returns.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright) moved:

That for the remainder of the session the House shall hold two sittings on each day, one from 11 a.m. until 1 p.m., and the second from 3 p.m. until the hour of adjournment, and at each such sitting Government Orders shall have precedence.

Mr. FOSTER. I want to call my hon. friend's attention to the fact that one or two important sittings of the Public Accounts Committee will yet be necessary in order to finish investigations that have actually been commenced. I suggest whether or not it should go into effect at the time proposed, or whether it should not be postponed a couple of days, and I think my hon. friend will make just as much progress in that way. I suggest that in view of the important committees now finishing investigations entered into, and which it is very important should be finished, the motion should not go into effect as proposed. Leaving those investigations as they are, in an unfinished state, would be unjust to parties who have been summoned, and the time mentioned in the motion should be delayed two or three days.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). We have thought that perhaps it might be possible that committees should meet at 10 a.m. and sit for one hour, and the business of the House commence at 11 o'clock. In this matter I am only desirous of consulting the wishes of my hon. friends opposite, and if my hon. friend thinks it would be better to postpone the date when the motion should go into effect, we will consent, but I hope he will consider the proposition I have made.

Mr. FOSTER. The committees are sitting now at 10 o'clock, and to sit one hour is absolutely no gain. It is my wish, and I know it is the wish of the hon. members who are prosecuting these inquiries to take up no more time than is absolutely necessary.

The PRIME MINISTER. Will the hon. gentleman consent to an amendment that the morning sittings commence next Monday?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. CASEY. I should like to ask the Government if it is not possible, by permission of the House, that some of these committees should sit during the forenoon session of the House? I think permission has been given in other sessions. There is important work before the Railway Committee, for example, in addition to the work before the Public Accounts Committee, to which the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) has adverted. Bills are before the Railway Committee which have gone through several stages, and it is hardly fair to the promoters that they should be deprived of the opportunity of getting them passed.

Mr. BERGERON. It is only a postponement of one day.

Mr. CASEY. I may refer to a Bill in my hands that has already passed the Senate, but which may be shut out if it does not get through the Railway Committee before Monday next. I beg leave to call the attention of the Government in regard to this proposal to the fact that unless important business before these Private Bills Committees is finished before next Monday, some arrangement should be made that routine business of that kind can be gone on with in the forenoon, although the House is sitting.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I would suggest to the right hon. the Premier and to the members of the House, that if after the committee sits, it is found there are opposed Bills that may go through this session, a motion might be made giving leave to the

committee to sit during the session of the House At present, however, that is not necessary. It may be possible that there are some Bills on the Order paper that the committee are unanimous or almost unanimous with regard to putting through, and in that case we can ask leave to sit during the session of the House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Is it the intention to sit on Saturday ?

The PRIME MINISTER. The Government have no objection at all to have a morning sitting next Saturday if it be convenient for the members of the House. It might be possible to sit from 11 o'clock until 6 o'clock, but as to that it would be better to have an understanding with our friends on the other side and we may perhaps think it over between this and tomorrow afternoon.

Motion agreed to.

ST. JOHN BRIDGE AND RAILWAY EXTENSION COMPANY.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved that the House at its next sitting resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following proposed resolution :—

That it is expedient to provide that the time for the repayment of the moneys advanced by the Dominion Government to the "Saint John Bridge and Railway Extension Company," under and by virtue of chapter 26 of the statutes of 1883, be extended for a period of fifteen years from the expiration of the present term of fifteen years mentioned and provided for in the said statute and the schedule thereto, the moneys so advanced to bear interest during such extended term at the rate of four per centum per annum, payable annually on or before the 30th day of June in each year ; such extension of time for the repayment of the moneys so advanced to be on condition that the said advances and the interest thereon shall remain during such extended period as now, a first charge and lien upon the real and personal property, rights, franchises, easements and privileges of the company aforesaid, and that all the provisions of the indenture or mortgage deed, dated the 10th day of December, in the year of Our Lord one thousand eight hundred and eighty-three, and executed by the said company under the provisions of and in accordance with the said statute, shall continue and remain in full force and effect during the said extended period, and on the further condition that the Government may, if it should be found advisable, take possession of the bridge, railway and appurtenances, at any time within five years from the date of the beginning of such extended period, on payment of the difference of the amounts then due to the Government for advances and interest and the sum of the total amount expended by the company as the cost of the said bridge, railway and works and ten per centum on such amount ; the Minister of Justice, any deeds, mortgages or instruments necessary for the proper carrying into effect of the foregoing.

Motion agreed to.

THE QUEEN VS. SKELTON ET AL.

Mr. DAVIN. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I want to appeal to the Prime Minister again, as to the case of the Queen vs. Skelton. I doubt if I made myself understood to the right hon. gentleman when I said that on Friday week, nearly a fortnight ago, I had an interview with the Minister of Justice and he assured me then that he would let me have a copy of certain affidavits. I have asked for them but I have never received them. It is not a request that they be placed on the Table, but what the Minister of Justice told me was that he would give myself personally a copy of those affidavits.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The question which was asked from me by my hon. friend (Mr. Davin) was whether a new trial had been granted in the case of Skelton. I was not then in a position to answer, but I am able to inform him to-day that no new trial has been granted. As to whether or not the Minister of Justice has promised to give my hon. friend a copy of the affidavits, that is a matter between the Minister of Justice and my hon. friend (Mr. Davin).

Mr. DAVIN. The right hon. gentleman will see that it is more than a matter between myself and the Minister of Justice, because the Minister of Justice is a member of this Government, and if he promises an hon. member of this House to give him certain documents and does not do so, I rather think it reflects on the efficiency of the Department of Justice and on the honour of the Government.

BELLEVILLE POST OFFICE.

Mr. CORBY. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I have a matter which I would like to bring before this House in reference to the dismissal of the whole post office staff of the city of Belleville, by the Postmaster General.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. CORBY. I will conclude with a motion.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I would suggest to my hon. friend (Mr. Corby) that he can bring this matter up equally well when we go into Supply.

Mr. CORBY. I am leaving for home on Saturday.

The PRIME MINISTER. We will be going into Supply in a few minutes.

Mr. CORBY. I understand the leader of the Opposition has something to bring up on going into Supply.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. McMILLAN. Before the Orders of the Day are called, Mr. Speaker, I want to draw attention to a statement that appears in "Hansard." When I came to the House yesterday, the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) sent me across a note of the speech he made, and to my utter astonishment I found that he made an unfounded charge against me in that speech. He said that I was going to make a charge against the Minister of Agriculture. I never made such a statement and the allegation is altogether unwarranted. I have always sympathized very strongly with the Minister in the position in which he is placed, and let me say that I am glad to see that he has adopted one suggestion I made years ago, and is going to appoint a man to take charge of the stock.

Mr. TAYLOR. I wish to say a word in reply to the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMillan) who says I made a misstatement. In speaking with the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMillan) a few evenings before, he said that when the Experimental Farm Estimates were up he proposed making the statement that the accounts were not kept properly and as they should be. If that did not constitute a charge against the Minister of Agriculture, I do not know what did. He (Mr. McMillan) made the same charge against the late Government, and he told me he was going to bring it up this year.

Mr. McMILLAN. I want to explain.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order; sit down.

Mr. McMILLAN. I won't sit down.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. McMILLAN. I want to make a personal explanation.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. Personal explanations, such as the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMillan) made, are in order, but they must not be converted into a discussion.

Mr. McMILLAN. I am not going to discuss it, Mr. Speaker.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order; Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER. We will hear what the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMillan) is about to say.

Mr. McMILLIAN. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) came across the floor and asked me if I was going to discuss the Experimental Farm. It was at his instance he came over to me, and if he would mind his own business in future it would be better.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Some days ago I inquired whether the Government would have any objection to lay on the Table a copy of instructions sent to the officers appointed for the purpose of enforcing the Alien Labour Law.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). My hon. friend (Mr. Fitzpatrick) will attend to that.

Mr. FOSTER. I call the attention of the Postmaster General to the return asked for about the post office route between Golden and Fort Steele. I asked a question from the Postmaster General and he informed me that he could give the information, but he could not give it so fully in answer to a question as on notice of motion. Notice of motion was then passed and I have not got the papers yet. Neither have I yet received the copies of instructions that were given to the postmasters with refernce to carrying out or modifying the order for reduced postage to Great Britain.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). I am not aware that there was any order of the House on that subject.

Mr. FOSTER. I am not saying there was an order of the House for the papers; but I asked the hon. gentleman, upon the occasion of a discussion upon one of his Bills, if he would bring them down. I understood him to say that he would. I now ask him whether he will bring them down and give them to the House or not?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). I would say to my hon. friend, with regard to the copies of the instructions sent to postmasters which he desires to have, that I am not aware of any order of the House, or of my having stated, impliedly or expressly, that they would be brought down, simply because I was not aware that my hon. friend had made that request.

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, yes.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Very well, I shall have very much pleasure in meeting his wishes.

Mr. FOSTER. And a copy of the Berne Convention.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I shall be very happy to give him a copy of the Berne Convention; but the library, I presume, contains one.

Mr. FOSTER. I would rather have one authentically from the Postmaster General.

Mr. DAVIN. I would ask the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) when we

are to have the return with regard to dismissals in the North-west Territories, which was ordered by the House.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). I was under the impression that I had brought it down. However, I will look it up and see.

THE LATE RIGHT HON. W. E. GLADSTONE—RESOLUTION OF CONDOLENCE.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Mr. Speaker, with the permission of the House, I beg leave now to lay upon the Table the report of the committee which was appointed a few days ago to prepare a resolution of condolence on the death of the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone. The report is in these terms :

The Committee appointed to prepare a resolutin of condolence on the death of the Right Honourable W. E. Gladstone, beg leave to submit the following resolution to the House :—

"Resolved,—That the House of Commons of Canada desire to record their profound sense of the loss the Empire has sustained in the death of the Right Honourable William Ewart Gladstone.

"For a period of more than half a century Mr. Gladstone has been one of the most conspicuous figures in the Parliament of Great Britain.

"Four times Premier of the United Kingdom, his tenure of office was distinguished by the inauguration of sound fiscal and political reforms of the greatest and most far-reaching character, and he passes away, full of years and honours, among a nation's tears, the most illustrious man of his generation.

"The people of the entire Empire are his mourners, and the House of Commons of Canada lays reverently on his bier this tribute of testimony of the respect and affection with which they regard the great statesman who has departed."

(Sgd.) WILFRID LAURIER,
Chairman.

I beg to move, seconded by Sir Charles Tupper, that the report be now adopted. Mr. Speaker, everybody in this House will, I think, agree that it is eminently fitting and proper that in the universal expression of regret which ascends towards heaven from all parts of the civilized world we also should join our voice and testify to the very high sense of respect, admiration, and veneration which the entire people of Canada, irrespective of creed or race or party, entertain for the memory of the great man who has just closed his earthly career.

England has lost the most illustrious of her sons; but the loss is not England's alone, nor is it confined to the great Empire which acknowledges England's suzerainty, nor even to the proud race which can claim kinship with the people of England. The loss is the loss of mankind. Mr. Gladstone gave his whole life to his country; but the work which he did for his country was conceived and carried out on principles of such high elevation, for purposes so noble and aims so lofty, that not his country alone, but the whole of mankind, benefited by his work. It is no exaggeration to say that he has raised the standard of civilization, and the world to-day is undoubtedly better for both the precept and the example of his life. His death is mourned not only by England, the land of his birth, not only by Scotland, the land of his ancestors, not only by Ireland, for whom he did so much, and attempted to do so much more; but also by the people of the two Sicilies, for whose outraged rights he once aroused the conscience of Europe, by the people of the Ionian Islands, whose independence he secured, by the people of Bulgaria and the Danubian provinces, in whose cause he enlisted the sympathy of his own native country. Indeed, since the days of Napoleon, no man has lived whose name has travelled so far and so wide over the surface of the earth; no man has lived whose name alone so deeply moved the hearts of so many millions of men. Whereas Napoleon impressed his tremendous personality upon peoples far and near by the strange fascination which the genius of war has always exercised over the imagination of men in all lands and in all ages, the name of Gladstone had come to be, in the minds of all civilized nations, the living incarnation of right against might—the champion, the dauntless, tireless champion, of the oppressed against the oppressor. It is, I believe, equally true to say that he was the most marvellous mental organization which the world has seen since Napoleon—certainly the most compact, the most active and the most universal.

This last half century in which we live has produced many able and strong men who, in different walks of life, have attracted the attention of the world at large; but of the men who have illustrated this age, it seems to me that in the eyes of posterity four will outlive and outshine all others—Cavour, Lincoln, Bismark and Gladstone. If we look simply at the magnitude of the results obtained, compared with the exiguity of the resources at command—if we remember that out of the small kingdom of Sardinia grew United Italy, we must come to the conclusion that Count Cavour was undoubtedly a statesman of marvellous skill and prescience. Abraham Lincoln, unknown to fame when he was elected to the Presidency, exhibited a power for the government of men which has scarcely been surpassed in any age. He saved the American Union, he enfranchised the black race, and for the task he had to perform he was edowed in some respects almost miraculously. No man ever displayed a greater insight into the motives, the complex motives, which shape the public opinion of a free country, and he possessed almost to the degree of an instinct, the supreme quality in a statesman of taking the right decision, taking it at the right

moment, and expressing it in language of incomparable felicity. Prince Bismarck was the embodiment of resolute common sense, unflinching determination, relentless strength, moving onward to his end, and crushing everything in his way as unconcerned as fate itself. Mr. Gladstone undoubtedly excelled every one of these men. He had in his person a combination of varied powers of the human intellect, rarely to be found in one single individual. He had the imaginative fancy, the poetic conception of things, in which Count Cavour was deficient. He had the aptitude for business, the financial ability which Lincoln never exhibited. He had the lofty impulses, the generous inspirations which Prince Bismarck always discarded, even if he did not treat them with scorn. He was at once an orator, a statesman, a poet, and a man of business. As an orator he stands certainly in the very front rank of orators of his country or any country, of his age or any age. I remember, when Louis Blanc was in England, in the days of the Second Empire, he used to write to the press of Paris, and in one of his letters to "Le Temps," he stated that Mr. Gladstone would undoubtedly have been the foremost orator of England if it were not for the existence of Mr. Bright. It may be admitted, and I think it is admitted generally, that on some occasions Mr. Bright reached heights of grandeur and pathos which even Mr. Gladstone did not attain. But Mr. Gladstone had an ability, a vigour, a fluency which no man in his age or any age ever rivalled or even approached. That is not all. To his marvellous mental powers he added no less marvellous physical gifts. He had the eye of a god, the voice of a silver bell; and the very fire of his eye, the very music of his voice swept the hearts of men even before they had been dazzled by the torrents of his eloquence.

As a statesman, it was the good fortune of Mr. Gladstone that his career was not associated with war. The reforms which he effected, the triumphs which he achieved, were not won by the supreme arbitrament of the sword. The reforms which he effected and the triumphs which he achieved were the result of his power of persuasion over his fellow men. The reforms which he achieved in many ways amounted to a revolution. They changed, in many particulars, the face of the realm. After Sir Robert Peel had adopted the great principle which eventually carried England from protection to free trade, it was Mr. Gladstone who created the financial system which has been admitted ever since by all students of finance as the secret of Great Britain's commercial success. He enforced the extension of the suffrage to the masses of the nation and practically thereby made the Government of monarchial England as democratic as that of any republic. He disestablished the Irish Church; he introduced reform into the land tenure, and brought hope into the breasts of those tillers of the soil in Ireland who had for so many generations laboured in despair. And all this he did, not by force or violence, but simply by the power of his eloquence and the strength of his personality.

Great, however, as were the acts of the man, after all he was of the human flesh, and for him, as for everybody else, there were trivial and low duties to be performed. It is no exaggeration to say that even in those low and trivial duties he was great. He ennobled the common realities of life. His was above all things a religious mind—essentially religious in the highest sense of the term. And the religious sentiment which dominated his public life and his speeches, that same sentiment, according to the testimoney of those who knew him best, also permeated all his actions from the highest to the humblest. He was a man of strong and pure affections, of long and lasting friendship, and to describe the beauty of his domestic life no words of praise can be adequate. It was simply ideally beautiful, and in the later years of his life as touching as it was beautiful. May I be permitted, without any impropriety, to recall that it was my privilege to experience and to appreciate that courtesy, made up of dignity and grace, which was famous all over the world, but of which no one could have an appropriate opinion unless he had been the recipient of it. In a character so complex and diversified, one may be asked what was the dominant feature, what was the supreme quality, the one characteristic which marked the nature of the man. Was it his incomparable genius for finance? Was it his splendid oratorical powers? Was it his marvellous fecundity of mind? In my estimation, it was not any one of those qualities. Great as they were, there was one still more marked, and if I have to give my own impression, I woud say that the one trait which was dominant in his nature, which marked the man more distinctly than any other, was his intense humanity, his paramount sense of right, his abhorrence of injustice, wrong and oppression wherever to be found or in whatever shape they might show themselves. Injustice, wrong, oppression, acted upon him, as it were, mechanically, and aroused every fibre of his being, and from that moment, to the repairing of the injustice, the undoing of the wrong, and the destruction of the oppression, he gave his mind, his heart, his soul, his whole life with an energy, with an intensity, with a vigour paralleled in no man unless it be the First Napoleon. There are many evidences of this in his life. When he was travelling in southern Italy, as a tourist, for pleasure and for the benefit of the health of his family, he became aware of the abominable system which was there prevailing under the name of constitutional government. He left everything aside, even the object which had brought him to Italy, and applied himself to

investigate and to collect evidence, and then denounced the abominable system in a trumpet blast of such power that it shook to its very foundation the throne of King Ferdinand and sent it tottering to its fall. Again, when he was sent as High Commissioner to the Ionian Islands, the injustice of keeping this Hellenic population separated from the rest of Greece, separated from the kingdom to which they were adjacent and towards which all their aspirations were raised, struck his generous soul with such force that he became practically their advocate and secured their independence. Again, when he had withdrawn from public life, and when, in the language of Thiers, under somewhat similar circumstances, he had returned to "ses chères études," the atrocities perpetrated by the Turks on the people of Roumania brought him back to public life with a vehemence an impetuosity, and a torrent of fierce indignation that swept everything before it. If this be, as I think it is, the one distinctive feature of his character, it seems to explain away what are called the inconsistencies of his life. Inconsistencies, there were none in his life. He had been brought up in the most unbending school of Toryism. He became the most active Reformer of our own times. But whilst he became the leader of the Liberal party and an active Reformer, it is only due to him to say that in his complex mind there was a vast space for what is known as Conservatism. His mind was not only liberal but conservative as well, and he clung to the affections of his youth until, in questions of practical moment, he found them clashing with that sense of right and abhorrence of injustice of which I have spoken. But the moment he found his conservative affections clash with what he thought right and just, he did not hesitate to abandon his former convictions and go the whole length of the reforms demanded. Thus he was always devotedly, filially lovingly attached to the Church of England. He loved it, as he often declared. He adhered to it as an establishment in England, but the very reasons and arguments which, in his mind, justified the establishment of the Church in England, compelled him to a different course as far as that church was concerned in Ireland. In England the church was the church of the majority, of almost the unanimity of the nation. In Ireland it was the church of the minority, and therefore he did not hesitate. His course was clear; he removed the one church and maintained the other. So it was with Home Rule. but coming to the subject of Home Rule. though there may be much to say, perhaps this is neither the occasion nor the place to say it. The Irish problem is dormant but not solved. but the policy proposed by Mr. Gladstone for the solution of this question has provoked too much bitterness, too deep division, even on the floor of this House, to make it advisable to say anything about it on this occasion.

I notice it, however, simply because it is the last and everlasting monument of that high sense of justice which, above all things, characterized him. When he became convinced that Home Rule was the only method whereby the insoluble problem could be solved, whereby the long open wound could be healed, he did not hesitate one moment, even though he were to sacrifice friends, power, popularity. And he sacrificed friends, power, popularity, in order to give that supreme measure of justice to a long-suffering people. Whatever may be the views which men entertain upon the policy of Home Rule, whether they favour that policy or whether they oppose it, whether they believe in it or whether they do not believe in it, every man, whether friend or foe of that measure, must say that it was not only a bold, but it was a noble thought, that of attempting to cure discontent in Ireland by trusting to Irish honour and Irish generosity.

Now, Sir, he is no more. England is today in tears, but fortunate is the nation which has produced such a man. His years are over, but his work is not closed; his work is still going on. The example which he gave to the world shall live for ever, and the seed which he has sown with such a copious hand shall still germinate and bear fruit under the full light of heaven.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, I do not rise for the purpose of speaking upon the resolution which has just been submitted in terms so admirable and so eloquent by the leader of the House, as on a recent occasion I had an opportunity of making reference to the sad event which has plunged the civilized world in mourning. I only rise for the purpose of formally seconding the resolution and making way for an hon. gentleman, the representative of Victoria (Mr. Costigan), who, I am sure, will only be too glad to avail himself of this opportunity of expressing the gratitude of the race to which he belongs for the eminent services that the departed statesman rendered them.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Mr. Speaker, it is particularly because of a reference made to myself by the hon. leader of the Opposition that I venture to say a word on this occasion. The death of the Right Hon. William Ewart Gladstone, one of the greatest statesmen that England ever produced, and, in most respects the most commanding and wonderful personality of the 19th century, is evoking expressions of genuine grief and mourning from all over the world; and one of the greatest tributes that could be paid to the memory of the illustrious dead is the universal recognition of the inadequacy of these many-tongued expressions to fitly voice

the sorrow of mankind, or the worth of him for whom earth mourns.

But I feel it to be especially my duty to say that in no part of the Empire will sorrow more thrill men's hearts than in Ireland; nor is it only the hearts of Irishmen within that ancient and glorious kingdom that swell with grief for this mighty tribune of the people, but the hearts of Irishmen and their descendants in all lands and on every sea.

Mr. Gladstone's efforts in the sacred cause of Home Rule for Ireland endeared him to the Irish people. His sympathy and his efforts gave to the Home Rule cause the dignity and the strength and the safety of a great constitutional movement, and this not only in the United Kingdom, but wherever Irishmen and their descendants work for the motherland.

That grand measure of reform has been delayed, it is true, but only delayed, and in the struggle that Ireland will continue unto a glorious victory no moral force will help more potently than the memory that Ireland's cause has had the sincere approval and generous advocacy of a man so great and so good.

Motion agreed to.

The PRIME MINISTER moved, seconded by Sir Charles Tupper:

That the resolution of condolence on the death of the Right Honourable William Ewart Gladstone be communicated to Mrs. Gladstone, on behalf of this House, by Mr. Speaker.

Motion agreed to.

POST OFFICE ACT AMENDMENT.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock) moved the third reading of Bill (No. 110) further to amend the Post Office Act. He said: When this Bill was in Committee of the Whole a discussion of the proposition to decentralize the dead letter branch evoked some little criticism. In order to meet this criticism I was willing to consent to a limitation of the outside dead letter offices; and, accordingly, the number was stated in the Bill at three, at remote points from Ottawa —Victoria, Winnipeg and Halifax. Subsequently, I ascertained from the officers of my department that it would be greatly to the interests of the public and of the service if Toronto could be included in the list: and accordingly, when the Bill came up for third reading, I moved the House into Committee of the Whole with a view to adding, if possible, Toronto and Montreal. The committee made the addition, but it was suggested by the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) that possibly that would be regarded by some members of the House who were not then present as a departure from a supposed understanding arrived at when we were in committee. Accordingly, I deferred the third reading until these gentlemen should be present, to see if they would assent to that view. I am not desirous of departing in the least from any supposed understanding reached, but I would ask them to consider if it would not be in the public interest to add Toronto and Montreal to the points in which dead matter may be examined. I think I would be correct in saying that, so far as all dead matter originating in the vicinity of Toronto or west of that point is concerned, the necessity of that matter being brought to Ottawa and treated here would involve something like a week's delay. There is a routine in connection with the communication with Ottawa involving sometimes two and sometimes three letters between Ottawa and the place of origin or destination, so that considerable delay results. From the city of Toronto there are sent to the dead letter office in Ottawa, now monthly, nearly 5,000 letters; and from Montreal nearly 6,000. In the public interest, therefore, I ask my hon. friends who hesitated before to extend the number of points beyond three, whether they cannot consent to these two points being added. They are now in the Bill as amended, and as it stands for the third reading.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am much obliged to the hon. the Postmaster General for having left this matter over in order that it might receive further consideration. I would like to ask him whether he has had any means of knowing what the public sentiment is in these two important cities of Toronto and Montreal in relation to this question. I should hesitate very much to oppose the extension to these two cities if the hon. gentleman has reason to believe that the public sentiment in those cities is largely in favour of the change he proposes.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think the question is a very proper one, and in reply I would say that certain members representing those cities have spoken to me strongly in favour of this measure. Some of them are in the House, and I would prefer if they gave their views to the House themselves.

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON. The proposal to decentralize the dead letter office has given unqualified satisfaction to the business men and the mercantile community in Toronto. We feel that Toronto is a large postal centre, and this effort on the part of the Postmaster General to help the business men, is recognized as being in the line of progress. The proposition meets with the universal approval, not only of the mercantile community, but of the public in Toronto. In fact, the whole Bill has given general satisfaction. In my conversation with business men in Toronto during the past ten days with regard to the different features of the Bill, I find a unanimous approval, not only of the clause of the Bill now under discussion, but also of those

clauses of the Bill referring to newspaper postage and to the reduction of the rates in the postage on American and Canadian letters.

Mr. BERTRAM. The suggestion made by the Postmaster General that Montreal and Toronto should be included as points for dealing with the dead letter matter that is now sent to Ottawa, is, I think, one of those internal reforms that might very well be adopted. I was much surprised indeed to hear that the quantity of such matter sent from Toronto to Ottawa was so large, amounting to nearly 5,000 letters monthly, or 60,000 a year. It seems to me that it is a waste of time to send those letters to Ottawa for the purpose of being opened and dealt with, it would be a great convenience to the writers if they were dealt with in the Toronto post office, where, I think, the officials are just as well qualified to deal with those letters that are improperly addressed and have to be opened as are the officials in the city of Ottawa. Therefore, I hope that this reform, which will be of so much benefit to the general public, will be carried out.

Mr. SPROULE. It appeared to me there were two objects in view in making this change. One was to expedite the business and get it off the hands of the department as early as possible, and to make the delay between the posting of the letter and its return as short as possible. The other object was to lessen the expense of carrying such matter from all over the country to one centre, both of which are no doubt very proper objects. But if the latter object is one of the problems, I would suggest to the Postmaster General that he could reduce that by refusing to allow the members of Parliament to send their little trunks or stationery boxes home through the post office, as these must weigh fifteen or twenty pounds. I am informed they are being sent even as far as Manitoba and the North-west Territories through the post office. It seems to me to be an abuse of the system to send such heavy packages as that by mail, they ought to be sent either by express or by freight.

Amendments concurred in, and Bill read the third time and passed.

NORTH-WEST IRRIGATION ACTS.

Bill (No. 146) to amend and consolidate the North-west Irrigation Acts of 1894 and 1895, was read the second time, and the House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 51,

Mr. DAVIN. Is it not the intention at an early period to place this whole question of irrigation under the local government? I presume the Minister does not contemplate using other than existing officers to carry out the provisions, for instance, of this section?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The intention is, as far as possible, that the local work and scientific work shall be carried out by the Public Works Department of the local administration. The only officer in the service of the Government who has had extensive experience and made a thorough study of irrigation is Mr. Dennis. He is the Deputy Commissioner of Public Works of the North-west Territories, and the intention is, as far as possible, in the early stages of the operation of the Act, to allow it to be carried out under his charge.

Committee rose and reported progress.

ACT RESPECTING THE JUDGES OF THE PROVINCIAL COURTS.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick) moved that the House resolve itself into committee on a certain proposed resolution declaring it expedient to amend the Act respecting the judges of provincial courts, and to provide as follows:—

That the salary of an additional judge of the Court of Appeal for Ontario shall be $5,000 per annum.

That the salaries of fourteen puisne judges of the Superior Court of the province of Quebec, whose residences are fixed at Montreal and Quebec (including the judge to whom the district of Terrebonne is assigned), shall be each $5,000 per annum.

That the salary of an additional judge of the Superior Court of Quebec shall be $4,000 per annum.

That the salary of an additional judge of the Circuit Court of the district of Montreal shall be $3,000 per annum.

That the salary of the judge of the Supreme Court of the Yukon Territory shall be $4,000 per annum.

That on and after 1st July, 1898, the salaries of the judges and junior judges of the county courts of Ontario, other than the judge of the County Court of the county of York, shall be each $2,000 per annum during the first three years of service, and after three years of service each $2,400 per annum.

That on and after the said date the salary of the judge of the County Court of the county of Halifax shall be $3,000 per annum.

That on and after the said date, in Prince Edward Island, the salary of the judge of the County Court of Queen's County shall be $3,000 per annum, and the salaries of two other county court judges each $2,000 per annum during the first three years of service, and after three years of service each $2,400 per annum.

That to each of the judges of the Court of Queen's Bench in the province of Quebec, for attending the said court for a part only of a term, or for the purpose of disposing of cases already heard, or for attending for the performance of any other judicial duty, or attending at Montreal or Quebec at the written request of the chief justice or judge performing the duties

of chief justice for the purpose of conference and délibéré as to appeals heard, there shall be paid, for travelling allowances, $6 for each day's absence from his place of residence, provided that three days' absence at least shall always be allowed.

That to each of the judges of the Superior or Circuit Courts attending as such, at the request in writing of the chief justice or judge discharging the duties of chief justice in the district, any court held at any other place than that at which he is directed to reside, for each day he is absent from the said place of residence, there shall be paid for travelling allowances, six dollars; but no travelling allowances shall be granted to any judge requested to sit in review under the first section of the Act of the Legislature of Quebec, 61 Victoria, chapter 20, unless it is certified by the chief justice or judge discharging the duties of chief justice in the district that the attendance of such judge was necessary by reason of illness, incapacity or absence of one of the judges resident at Montreal or Quebec, as the case may be.

That to the judges of the Supreme Court of the Yukon Territory there shall be paid such travelling allowances as the Governor in Council determines.

That to each judge of a District Court in the province of Ontario there shall be paid, for travelling allowances, an annual sum of $500.

Motion agreed to, and the House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The object of this resolution is to enable us to provide for the appointment of an additional judge to the Court of Appeal for the province of Ontario, and one additional judge to the Superior Court in the province of Quebec, and also to provide for the salary of the judge of the Yukon district. In addition to what I have said, the resolution is to provide for the increase in the salaries of the junior county court judges in the province of Ontario, and also for the increase of the salaries of two county court judges, one at Halifax, N.S., and the other at Charlottetown, P.E.I. The increase so far as the Ontario county court judges are concerned will be to the extent of $400 per year.

Mr. FOSTER. Making what?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. $2,400 in the case of the Ontario junior county court judges, and $2,800 for the judges at Halifax and Prince Edward Island, and then in the latter case there is $200 additional for travelling expenses which will make it $3,000.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The resolution says $3,000 salary, not $2,800 salary and $200 travelling expenses?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes, the intention is to make the salary $3,000. I thought that would include travelling expenses, but I find in the details of the Bill that it is $3,000 salary. I might add that the Bill will also provide for the appointment of an additional judge of the Circuit Court of Montreal, making the number there three judges instead of two.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I would like to ask the Solicitor General as to the principle upon which he is proceeding on this resolution as a whole. Some time ago we had a discussion in this House on the anomalous condition of things whereby the local Parliaments created judges and we provided the salaries. In connection with this proposition to increase the number of judges, has the Solicitor General proceeded upon the theory that the local legislatures have created these additional judgeships, it is a perfunctory duty, so to speak, on the part of the Federal Parliament to provide the salaries; or, has the Solicitor General investigated the condition of litigation and the state of the dockets in existing courts so as to reach an opinion that these additional judges are necessary for the proper discharge of judicial business?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The administration of justice being a matter for the provinces it is absolutely necessary that due regard should be had to the wishes expressed by the local authorities. At the same time I would not agree to a proposition that this duty is merely perfunctory on our part; that is to say, that the local authorities have the right to create a vacancy, and that it is our duty to fill it. That, in my opinion, would not be a proper manner in which to interpret the conditions as they exist. After the local legislatures have made it known that it would be necessary to appoint an additional judge, I take it that our duty is to make an investigation and to ascertain whether in reality there is such a necessity as would justify us in putting this additional burden upon the shoulders of the federal taxpayers. At the same time I do not think it would be right for us to lightly set aside the expressed wishes of the local legislatures in that respect. Dealing with the appointment of an additional judge to the Court of Appeal in the province of Ontario, I think it will be admitted—and my hon. friends from Ontario will be able to bear me out in this—that it is necessary for the due carrying on of public business in that province we should have an additional judge in the Court of Appeal.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That would give five judges to the Court of Appeal of Ontario instead of four?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes. In so far as the circuit court of Montreal is concerned, it is absolutely necessary that we should have an additional judge there. Now, there are two judges and the roll has become so congested that at the present rate of progress it would take a year to catch up with the current business. It is

absolutely necessary. I say, that something should be done to provide against that condition of things. I am quite prepared to say this: That the judges ought really to understand that greater diligence is expected of them and that they should pay closer attention to the performance of their duties, and give—I am speaking now for my own province with the necessities of which I am more familiar than in the case of the other provinces—and give closer attention and more time and more diligence to the performance of their duties. I quite see the necessity of my making that statement in the House. At the same time I do not see how it would be possible for the circuit court of Montreal to perform the duty expected of it if additional assistance is not given to that court.

As to the appointment of an additional judge to the Superior Court of Quebec, that additional judge will be in the district of St. Francis. In that district, which is the centre of the eastern townships, there is but one judge now, and I know from personal experience that the quantity of business done there is such that it is practically impossible for one judge to do the work. Sherbrooke is the chief town of that district. It is the centre of a very prosperous country and there are interests of very great magnitude constantly coming before the court. So far as the judicial district is concerned it is absolutely necessary that there should be assistance given to the one judge there now.

Dealing wth the county court judges in Ontario, there can be, in my judgment, no justification for the distinction that is at present made between the county court judge and the junior county court judge. The county court judge under the law as it now stands is appointed at a salary of $2,000 per annum, and after a number of years' service the salary is increased by $400, making the maximum $2,400. The qualifications necessary to be a junior judge are absolutely the same as for a county court judge, and I cannot see why there should be any distinction in the way of salary between men possessed of the same qualifications and called upon to perform, not only the same duties but much more arduous duties, because the junior county court judge in Ontario has also to take the division courts, which places upon him the performance of duties of a more complicated and onerous character than those which the county court judge himself performs.

Mr. HUGHES. This will apply forthwith to judges who have already been three years in office?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes.

Mr. WALLACE. Would the Solicitor General be able to tell us how much the proposed increases will cost the country per year in addition to the present salaries?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. There are eighteen junior county judges receiving an increase of $400 a year each, an additional judge of the Court of Appeal of Ontario at $5,000, and an additional judge of the Superior Court of Quebec at $4,000.

Mr. WALLACE. And travelling expenses?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. No. Then, there is $3,000 for the salary of a Circuit Court judge in Montreal. For the Supreme Court judge of the Yukon territory there is $4,000 and expenses. There is an increase at Halifax of $600, and an increase at Charlottetown of $600. There are four district judges and one junior district judge in Ontario. The four will require $500 a year each for travelling expenses. We also provide in the second paragraph of the resolution an addition of $1,000 for a judge who now lives in Montreal and performs the duty of a judge in the district of Terrebonne. He now receives $4,000, and the intention is to increase his salary to $5,000 to put him on the same basis as the other judges.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think my hon. friend has made his explanation of the financial part of his resolution as clear and definite as he should. The only reason for his coming here with this resolution is to inform the committee what will be the financial burden; and, after listening to him, I do not know what it will be. I think he should be a little more definite.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not rise to oppose the Minister's proposal, but to call attention to a discrepancy between the first resolution introduced and the second one, so far as the province of Quebec is concerned. The first resolution provided for an additional judge of the Court of Appeal of Ontario at $5,000, an additional judge of the Superior Court in the province of Quebec at $5,000, an additional judge of the Circuit Court of the district of Montreal at $3,000, a judge of the Supreme Court of the Yukon territory, and so forth. The second resolution provides that the salaries of fourteen puisne judges of the Superior Court of Quebec, whose residences are fixed at Montreal and Quebec, including a judge to whom the district of Terrebonne is assigned, shall be each $5,000 per annum. In this there is evidence of an afterthought for the purpose of putting on the same basis the judge of the district of Terrebonne, who, I am told, resides in Montreal, and hitherto has been working under another law. A gentleman who has evidently taken some interest in this matter, sends me the following memorandum, which I will read for the information of the Solicitor General:—

I beg to call your attention to the resolution now before the House concerning the fourteen puisne judges of the province of Quebec. It is

provided by this resolution that fourteen judges, including the judge to whom is assigned the district of Terrebonne, and who resides in Montreal, will get $5,000 of salary. There is nothing to be said concerning the salary of the judges who have exclusive jurisdiction in Montreal. But I beg to call your special attention to the salary of the judge for the district of Terrebonne, for whose sole interest that change in the law is proposed.

By the Act of 1889, 52 Vic., chap. 39, sec. 4, it is provided that thirteen judges residing in Montreal, but not including the judge of the district of Terrebonne, will receive $5,000 a year.

Judge Taschereau is the judge to whom is assigned the district of Terrebonne, and according to the law of the province of Quebec he should reside in his district, that is to say, Terrebonne. But in 1889 he got the law of Quebec amended so as to permit him to reside in Montreal, and, at the same time, the law was amended at Ottawa so as to meet his case, that is to say, so as to permit him to reside in Montreal. Still, he was not to receive more than $4,000 of salary, being the salary of a rural judge. He, however, found his way clear to increase his salary under the form of travelling allowance. By looking at the Auditor General's Report, I find that he has received the following amounts for travelling allowance :—

1894 (Page H—12).....	$1,226
1895 (Page I—11).....	1,058
1896 (Page I—11).....	1,352
1897 (Page I—12).....	1,686

Forming an average for those four last years of $1,331 over and above his statutory salary of $4,000 a year. He has consequently received, since four years, $5,331 yearly. He has consequently received more salary than any other judge of Montreal.

Now, how did he come to charge so exorbitant an amount for travelling allowance ? He resides in Montreal, and I suppose that when he sits in Montreal he charges $6 a day, as judges are permitted to charge when sitting outside of their district.

I am told that there is an agreement which can be found in the Department of Justice, that provided he could reside in Montreal he would sit in Montreal without extra charge.

If that resolution is adopted, and if the charges which he has made till to-day are correct, that judge will receive then very much more than any judge in Montreal, which is absolutely unfair and unjust.

I merely draw attention to the fact that if there is any unfairness, and it seems to me that there is, this change in the law is specially made in the interests of this one judge alone, because it does not change the salary of any of the other thirteen judges.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The hon. gentleman is quite right, the sole intention of that portion of the resolution is to meet Judge Taschereau's case—to remedy a gross injustice which has been done him in the past ; and I am quite certain my hon. friend will agree with me when I explain the position to him. Judge Taschereau is assigned to the district of Montreal ; his residence is in Montreal, and he acts in Montreal. I ask those hon. gentlemen who practice in Montreal to say whether or not there is a judge in the whole district who does more work and takes a larger share of the performance of judicial duties than Judge Taschereau. Not only does he perform his duties as judge in the district of Montreal, and do more than his share—I use the words advisedly—of the judicial work there, but he also does the whole of the judicial work in the important district of Terrebonne. That being the case, am I not warranted in saying that a gross injustice has been done him in the past and the time has come to remedy it.

Mr. SPROULE. Does the hon. Minister mean to say that Judge Taschereau was not assigned to Terrebonne but appointed to the district of Montreal ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. He was appointed judge for the district of Terrebonne and his residence was fixed in Montreal, and residing in Montreal he performed the duties of judge in that district, and saved us the necessity of appointing an additional judge there.

Mr. SPROULE. Does he charge $6 a day when discharging his duties in Montreal ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. No, he charges $6 a day when he performs his duties in the district of Terrebonne. Let me call attention to the law, chapter 27 of 52 Victoria of the Quebec statutes :

> Eleven judges of the Superior Court shall reside in Montreal, and one of those judges who reside in Montreal is to be charged with the duties of the district of Terrebonne.

So that he is a judge residing in Montreal under the statute, and in addition has to discharge the duties of the district of Terrebonne.

Mr. SPROULE. Though he takes his salary as judge at Terrebonne, he charges $6 a day when he works there.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. He takes the salary to which he is entitled as a judge residing in the district of Montreal, and then travels to Terrebonne for the purpose of performing his duties there.

Mr. MONK. I can corroborate what the Solicitor General says with regard to Judge Taschereau. He sits in the district of Montreal, and certainly those who practice in that district have no reason to complain with regard to his industry or his attainments either as a judge. What we have always understood is what the Solicitor General has stated, that he gets this allowance for travelling expenses when he goes into the district of Terrebonne, and I presume that allowance will continue even when he gets the $5,000.

Mr. DAVIN. I would like to know whether what is stated in the memo. which my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) read is correct, namely, that Judge Taschereau not only

charged travelling expenses when he is in Terrebonne but also in Montreal ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. With the knowledge I have of Judge Taschereau, I say that it is utterly impossible to imagine that he would do anything of the sort. I have not got the name of the hon. gentleman's informant, but I cannot conceive it possible that Judge Taschereau could do such a thing.

Mr. SPROULE. How do you account for the items in the Auditor General's Report ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. His residence being in Montreal, he gets his expenses when he goes to Terrebonne.

Mr. BERGERON. As far as Judge Taschereau is concerned the resolution is a very good one, and I think it will put matters in a better position. There can be no doubt that Judge Taschereau does a great deal of work in Montreal. He is one of the most laborious judges there, and his position was abnormal. He was first appointed to the district of Kamouraska and then transferred to Montreal for the district of Joliette, and resided in Montreal. What we are doing to-day should have been done long ago. He was residing in Montreal and doing the work in Montreal, and was transferred to Terrebonne when Judge Delormier was appointed to Joliette. To-day he will be purely and simply one more judge for the district of Montreal, and will have besides to attend to the district of Terrebonne, when, I suppose, he will be entitled to the $6 a day granted judges who are travelling outside of their place of residence.

I wish to put a few questions to my hon. friend. Who has asked for a judge at Sherbrooke ? I admit that there should be two judges at Sherbrooke, but I wish to know if it is the Quebec Government that has asked for it. It is in the province of the Quebec Government to locate the different judges in the different districts, and, therefore, of course, we cannot do that here, but since we are called upon to pay for an additional judge, let me point out that in the distribution of judicial districts in Quebec there is a great deal of inequality. There are certainly four or five districts where there is hardly anything to do, and the judge required in Sherbrooke might easily have been taken from one of these districts. Take the district of St. John and St. Hyacinthe, surely one judge could perfectly well administer those two districts. I should say that one judge could administer St. Hyacinthe, St. John and Richelieu, because in those three districts the judges have a great deal of time at their disposal, and come and sit in Montreal where they do good service, if you like, but at the same time their districts could be amended. I understand that that would have to be done by the Quebec Government, but I do not see why this Government should not confer with the Quebec authorities and avoid the payment of an extra judge, if not needed.

Another thing I would call the hon. gentleman's attention to is this. There seems to be in the resolution brought down a discrepancy between the judges of the Court of Appeal and the judges of the Superior Court. There seems to be an idea of making the judges of the Superior Court of the province of Quebec district judges, while as a matter of fact, as my hon. friend will find in the Act which appoints them, they are appointed for the whole province of Quebec. Therefore, this Bill would have the effect of minimizing their position.

Now there is also a point in this resolution about the payment of judges who are sent out from their own districts. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in his resolution allows the judges of the Court of Appeal $6 a day for every day they are called out of their own district either to sit in term or to render judgment, and so on. "Provided that three days' absence at least shall always be allowed." That is the old law which, I understand, is restricted to the judges of the Court of Appeal and does not apply to the judges of the Superior Court. Of course, this is a matter of policy, but I do not think that this change would be in the interest of justice. A judge is allowed to receive $6 a day during his absence from his own district. The tendency will be for the judge to spend more time away from home, instead of spending many evenings, as he does now, in preparing judgments and working up cases. In the case of a judge residing outside of Montreal, say in Beauharnois, when he sits at Beauharnois he is not entitled to any travelling allowance, but if he goes to St. Martine he will be allowed $6 a day.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. That is a difficulty I have to meet. It arises from an oversight and I shall have to change my resolution to meet it.

Mr. BERGERON. It says here "Any court held at any other place than that at which he is directed to reside." That is one of the points I wanted to raise.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes, that is right.

Mr. BERGERON. Now, so far as the judge for the court of circuit in Montreal is concerned, the Solicitor General will understand how hard it is for any lawyer to say anything about the judges ; but I think that it becomes our duty here, and we are bound to do it. There is no doubt that two judges for the Circuit Court of Montreal would have been amply sufficient, if these two judges had been old judges—I do not mean old in years but old practitioners.

The PRIME MINISTER. Does my hon. friend mean to say that the appointments were not judicious ?

Mr. BERGERON. I am not quite saying that. The appointment was made under the old Government, and I will not say it was not judicious. But I will come to it this way: The judges of the Circuit Court of Montreal were first appointed by Mr. Mercier in Quebec as district magistrates. These were political appointments—to call things by their names. These gentlemen were very respectable men, very good men, as far as their qualifications as gentlemen and honest men and everything of that kind was concerned. But they were political nominees. The jurisdiction of the magistrates was up to $50. Afterwards the law under which they were appointed was disallowed, because Mr. Mercier had given them a salary which he had no authority to give under the local statute. But this court had proven a great help in dealing with small cases, and when the law was disallowed, there was a demand in Montreal for the creation of a court with somewhat similar jurisdiction. Under the old system the Circuit Court was held by judges of the Superior Court sitting in term and dividing the term amongst themselves. They were old judges and men of a great deal of experience and they did their work very rapidly. There is no appeal from the decision of the Circuit Court, and the cases before it range between $50 and $80 and upwards to $100. During the interregnum, when the court appointed by the local government was suspended or disallowed, the Circuit Court cases went before the judges of the Superior Court, as in former times. At that time, if I am not mistaken, there were from one hundred to one hundred and fifty cases behind, the two district magistrates having been unable to keep up with the business. The judges of the Superior Court being appointed to this work, in a week's time they had cleared off all the cases that were behind and finished up such business as was brought before them to the satisfaction of the bar. When the district magistrates court was no longer allowed to exist, there was a demand to continue the Circuit Court, with the nomination of judges, whoever they might be. But pressure was brought to bear on the Minister of Justice of that day, Sir John Thompson, to appoint the same men who had been doing this work as district magistrates. And although there was opposition to such an appointment, still, the Minister of Justice concluded that it would be a hardship to set them aside and that it would be a reflection upon their reputation. Consequently, they were appointed. The gentlemen I refer to were Messrs. Barry and Champagne. When Mr. Barry died, he was replaced by Mr. Purcell, a very promising young lawyer in Montreal. Now we find that the Government have before the House a proposal for the nomination of another judge for the Circuit Court, and for this judge we are called upon to provide $3,000 a year. But if the nomination is made in the same way as the others were, in a year or two there will be a demand for another judge for the Circuit Court. What I wish to bring before the House and to call the attention of the Government to is that two judges of the Superior Court of the province of Quebec, as under the old system, could keep up with the cases daily. As it is to-day the work is not kept up every day, and even if there is a third appointment, my impression is that it will be no better. There will not be so many cases behind, but the business will not be fully kept up, and in a year or two we shall be called upon to add another judge to the Circuit Court. I call the attention of the hon. Solicitor General to this, and I ask the Government, when they make a nomination to appoint a very good lawyer. And I would say this, so as not to make any reflection upon these gentlemen, that a salary of $3,000 a year is a very small salary for a judge of the Circuit Court of Montreal called upon to do the duties that are expected of him. I contend that there is no judge of the Superior Court in the province of Quebec who really works as hard as these judges of the Circuit Court in Montreal. They work every day. One sits from 10 o'clock to 4 or 5 and sometimes 6 o'clock, while the other prepares judgments at home or sits in chambers. The right hon. the Premier understands very well our system and knows that the Circuit Court judges are called upon to decide cases as important as those which come before the Superior Court. They may not involve the same amount of money, but they involve the same principles. Moreover, there is no appeal from the judgments rendered in the Circuit Court, and, therefore, it is most important that the judges of the Circuit Court should be men well versed in law and of great experience. The qualifications necessary for these men to possess deserve a higher salary than $3,000. As a matter of fact, I contend that these judges should be paid the same salaries as are paid to judges of the Superior Court. I call attention to these points in the hope that, in making the nomination, the Government will consider them.

The PRIME MINISTER. I am ready to admit that the judicial system as it exists to-day, in so far as it implies that there should be a division of power and a division of jurisdiction between the Federal Parliament and the local legislatures, is most inconvenient and unsatisfactory.

But we have to administer the system as we find it at the present time. Referring to an observation made a moment ago by the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) with reference to the necessity of an additional judge in the province of Quebec, I have always held the view that this Government has but a limited

power in the matter of appointment of judges. The constitution is so framed that the organization of the courts does not rest with this Parliament, but rests with the local legislature; and while it is open to the local legislature to say that there shall be so many courts and those courts shall have so many judges, the constitution also has this singular feature, that it is the Federal Parliament which shall provide for the appointment and the payment of those judges. Though I have always considered this a strange system, we cannot administer it properly except by taking it for granted that the legislatures know better the needs of the province in that respect, and we are bound in every case to accept their decision, unless we are satisfied that there is fraud or some grave reason why such a law should not be carried out. But in this case the only additional judge, in so far as the Superior Court is concerned, whose salary is here provided for, is a second judge for the district of St. Francis. There is one judge now in the district of St. Francis, and a law recently passed by the legislature of Quebec has provided that there should be a second judge in that district. Now, upon this point I am happy to be able to quote the opinion of Sir Melbourne Tate, Chief Justice of the Superior Court for the district of Montreal, residing in the city of Montreal. In the month of September last, at the opening of the courts after a long vacation, an address was presented to Sir Melbourne Tate, the Chief Justice for the district, and in answer to this address he spoke as follows:—

> While it is right and proper that justice, civil and criminal, should be administered in each district, I do not know any paramount reason why a judge should be required to reside in any of these districts, with the exception of St. Francis, and perhaps Ottawa. In the former, the work is too heavy for one judge, who has several circuits to attend besides the one at the chef lieu.

This is an eminent authority upon the point that an additional judge for the district of St. Francis, whose salary is provided for by this resolution, is absolutely required for the administration of justice in that important district.

Mr. BERGERON. He does not say it should be a new nomination. If a judge was taken from some other district and brought to Sherbrooke, it would satisfy the opinion of the chief justice.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I do not so understand him. What the chief justice means, I think, is that at the present time the judges might very properly be required to reside in one city, in the city of Montreal, as the judges reside in Toronto under the Ontario system. In the latter province, all the judges reside in one city, and travel to different parts of the province to administer justice. For my part, I would not be averse to that system in the province of Quebec. I think it is preferable in many respects to the present system in Quebec. But, as the Solicitor General says, we have no power to do that. The law at present provides that the judges shall reside in the district where they administer justice, so many in Montreal, so many in Quebec, two to reside in St. Francis, and so on throughout the province. My hon. friend knows that one of the grievances complained of in the days before the union of 1841, was what we called then the centralization of justice. There were only four districts, Montreal, Quebec, St. Francis and Gaspé. Perhaps that system was wise and perhaps it was not; it was not wise, out of those four districts, to create twenty. I think twenty are too many.

Mr. BERGERON. We have railways now.

The PRIME MINISTER. While it is true that every part of the province is connected by railway, I see no reason why the law should not be amended by the legislature of Quebec in the direction of adopting the Ontario system under which the judges reside in one city, and then go about on their circuits. But we cannot do that at the present time.

Mr. BERGERON. Confer with the Quebec Government.

The PRIME MINISTER. We can confer with the Quebec Government, but this is not the time to do so. My hon. friend knows that governments are slow to move in these matters, and though we might confer with Quebec, I venture to say it would not be possible for the present Government of Quebec, strong as it is, to make so radical a change at once, or even within a few months, in a system which has been existing for more than thirty years. With regard to the Circuit Court of Montreal, I think it is admitted on all hands that a third judge is necessary. I do not agree with my hon. friend that the appointments which were made by Mr. Mercier at the time he created the magistrate's court, were political appointments. He appointed Mr. Justice Champagne and Mr. Justice Barry, both of whom were known to be perfectly well qualified for the position which was assigned to them. That is evident from the fact that after the legislation creating the court of district magistrates had been disallowed, and the present Circuit Court substituted for it, the same appointments were made by the late Federal Government. Now, I do not know the standing of the judges. I have not the honour of knowing Mr. Justice Purcell, but as for Mr. Justice Champagne, I think my hon. friend will agree with me that he is a most competent and admirable judge for the work he has to do. The Government will take due warning from the admonition which has been given by my hon. friend to select as good a man

as possible to be the third judge of that district. Now, with regard to Mr. Justice Taschereau, his case is one which deserves, I will not say the sympathy only, but the consideration of this House, because Mr. Justice Taschereau has been most unfairly dealt with. This is the way the case stands at the present time. The judicial business in the district of Montreal has always been congested, and there have been demands made from time to time to increase the number of judges in the district of Montreal. They have been increased from time to time, but still that increase has not kept pace with the increasing business. In 1889 or thereabouts, the government of the province, while not willing to agree to the suggestion of this Government for the appointment of an additional judge for the district of Montreal alone, did ask that there should be an additional judge who should administer justice in both the district of Montreal and the district of Terrebonne; so that Mr. Justice Taschereau, who has no more work assigned to him by the law than any other judge, is nevertheless appointed to administer justice in both the district of Montreal and the district of Terrebonne. If he were appointed for Montreal alone, he would be entitled to a salary of $5,000, but because he has to perform the duties of a judge in the district of Terrebonne also, he only gets $4,000 a year, the salary attached to this latter district. Now, nothing can be fairer, in fact, only full justice can be done to him by not only increasing his salary by $1,000, but by increasing it by $2,000. He should have the salary which is attached to the functions of a judge who administers justice in Montreal, which is $5,000, and also an additional $1,000 for discharging the duties of a judge in the district of Terrebonne. But we ask only that he should receive the same salary as is paid to other judges who reside with him in Montreal, who do the same work as he does, but do not perform the work that he is called upon to do in the district of Terrebonne.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. When Parliament is being asked to make such a grant as $792,775 for the payment of judges in Canada, and certain increases of which the Solicitor General has not given the exact figures, but before all the increases are met under the resolution, the original estimate will be increased this year by $14,900——

Mr. LISTER. Does the hon. gentleman say that the judges require $792,775?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Yes. These amounts are set out on pages 22, 23 and 25 of the Estimates. I refer to the administration of justice, including the salaries of judges.

Mr. LISTER. The salaries of judges will not amount to $100,000.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Yes. Take, for example, the province of Quebec, now under consideration. The hon. gentleman does not realize that there are no less than 30 Superior Court judges already in that province, drawing from $4,000 to $5,000 each.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The hon. gentleman is aware of the number in Ontario—74.

Mr. FOSTER. 79.

Mr. COCHRANE. The judges in Ontario only get half the salaries of the judges in Quebec.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman will see, according to the Estimates, under "administration of justice," that outside of salaries for judges, there appears to be only the sum of $98,375 to be deducted from the total of $792,775. I am the last man to say that we want cheap judges or cheap justice; but when the amount is growing year by year and is assuming huge proportions, it seems to be the very serious duty of Parliament to investigate very closely the reason for further increase in the charges. I have always advocated, and been an outspoken advocate of bringing about such a condition of things that the judges actually required for the proper administration of justice will be paid much higher salaries than those any judges now receive. Public opinion is not ripe or educated up to the point to see the great importance and benefit to be derived by this country from having fewer judges, but judges better paid than any now in the land. But if we proceed on this assumption, to which the Prime Minister has given much support, to my great regret, we drift gradually into a most dangerous position. I am referring to the view presented by the Prime Minister that it should take a case of fraud or gross wrong on the part of a judge before this Parliament would be clearly warranted in refusing to grant an addition. The danger of giving strength or support to that proposition in the face of the admittedly large grant to be voted, whether we vote for this increase or not, is that there will never be any inducement on the part of a local legislature to grapple with this condition of things, which the hon. gentleman knows to exist in the province of Quebec to-day. I take Quebec, because it has been mentioned first—I am not singling out that province. But I happen to know something about the unfortunate condition in regard to the number of judges there, Superior Court judges in particular, and the absence of anything like a fair distribution of work among them. The Prime Minister pointed out that some of the judges are heavily worked. The hon. gentleman referred to certain portions of the province, but he did not refer to the many judges who have practically nothing to do but draw their salaries.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Who appointed them ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Such things being so, I was led to believe when I held the position of Minister of Justice that the time had come for a redistribution of the work and the reorganization of the districts, and such a reform should end in the cutting down of the number of judges, the fact being that many of the judges under the system organized a long time ago have now practically nothing to do and that we have too many judges of a certain kind—surely if that information was reliable, I was justified in resisting at the time the pressure brought to bear to add to the already long list involving heavy expense. The view the right hon. gentleman has propounded to-day will never bring about what we all desire, and that is a reform and re-arrangement of districts and the necessity of doing it by the only authority that can do it, and that is the local legislatures. If they find out that they have simply to create those offices and call upon the Dominion Government to fill them, and this Parliament stands prepared to pay the salaries without demur, the task, which is never a welcome one, will not be taken up by the Attorney General of undertaking to grapple with this question, as otherwise he would be prepared to do. There would not be half the difficulty experienced in grappling with the question if the Government now took the position that the record shows Sir John Thompson assumed as regards the several provinces, and that is, that although the local legislatures might create judicial positions, he would not appoint judges until it was satisfactorily shown, first, that those judges were required, and, second, that the judges now in office could not be rearranged, and the local legislature carry out a system of reorganization of the districts so that the docket be kept clear in a proper fashion. I think the Solicitor General, before proceeding with such a large order as these resolutions involve, should hesitate, and I must tell him, what he perhaps knows, that a leading member of the bar, a gentleman whose position in the province of Quebec the hon. gentleman would respect, has assured me, in connection with the 30 judges of the Superior Court of Quebec already in office, that one-third of those judges are not occupied for more than three months in the year. That is the statement made to me in order that it may be made here ; and be it right or wrong, it is entitled, coming as it does from counsel of standing at the bar, to the consideration of the Solicitor General so that he may meet it and meet it successfully before proceeding further with the request for another judge. Almost all the argument of the Solicitor General with regard to the position outside of Montreal, had special reference to the district of St. Francis, where the position may have been sound enough under the old system, but it has not been readjusted to suit modern conditions, and it is a most likely condition that one place requires more judges while others do not require the existing number ; but this condition will not be changed until the local legislature sees that this Parliament will not pay additional judges salaries without careful inquiry as to the needs of the additional appointments. At present the legislatures only have to ask for a judge and we appoint one and pay him. In regard to Sherbrooke, the counsel to whom I referred admits there is trouble there. Still, even in that case, although the present judge is overworked and the place is called an important judicial centre, the system now in force provides that in case of urgency a judge from another district can from time to time be assigned to a district where his presence is found necessary. That is provided for by the Revised Statutes of Quebec, article 2,221. And so, as is stated by this gentleman, if the despatch of judicial business requires it, the chief justice is empowered to send another judge to the district requiring such judicial help. He goes on to say :

> In the case of Sherbrooke it will be most easy for the chief justice to assign from time to time to the district of Sherbrooke the judge of the district of Bedford, or the judge of the district of St. John, or the judge of the district of Sorel, or the judge of the district of Beauharnois, all of whom certainly have not enough work to occupy their time.

These are very serious statements and the source from which they come, knowing it as I do, gives them a great deal of weight. The present system, which I have said is not up to date, is not likely to be improved if money is generously handed over whenever, instead of reforming the system there is a proposal to perpetuate it in this way. The present system was, I am told, adopted as far back as 1854. I am sure there are many members of the bar on both sides of the House who are anxious to see the judiciary strengthened and the position made more attractive both to actual members of the bar, and to those who are likely to choose one profession rather than another. Those hon. gentlemen who wish to make the administration of justice more beneficial to the country by increasing the salaries of judges will see that all these suggestions are putting that result further and further away from the realm of possibility, because it will readily be seen that if money is lavishly scattered on the mere demand of the local legislature, to judges already too numerous and to judges not of the highest court of the province, it will become more difficult if not impossible to ever add to the salaries of judges who are actually required. The latter proposition I believe meets with approval from many on both sides of this

House and is backed up by the majority of public opinion in the country.

What necessity has the Solicitor General shown for the appointment of an additional judge to the Court of Appeal of the province of Ontario? Is it because the number of judges now in that court is four, and that the difficulty of an equal division of opinion may arise? The members of the bar of Ontario will not object to my repeating what I have been told, and not by Conservatives either, that there is no strong demand for this appointment on the part of the members of the Ontario bar.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Then they say one thing and write another.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. They may, but I make this statement for what it is worth in the presence of leading members of the Ontario bar, and subject to their opinion. The Solicitor General knows that the Act constituting this extra judge was passed over a year ago; does the hon. gentleman know the exact date? The hon. gentleman does not seem to know the exact date. Well, no action has been taken since that office was created, although from the position taken by the Prime Minister it would have appeared that the moment that Act was passed this Government should have immediately proceeded to obtain the necessary money. It cannot have been a matter which was very pressing, because the Act was passed quite a long time ago, and even the Solicitor General does not remember the exact date any more than I do.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. It was immediately previous to our last session.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The session of Parliament and a year were allowed to pass by without action, and the inference is that the necessity for the appointment was not very pressing. The Court of Appeal of Ontario has given great satisfaction with its four judges. It is regarded all over Canada as one of the strongest courts in the Dominion, and it has won that high position under its present constitution. Certainly there has been no very apparent reason for the appointment of an additional judge and the increase of $5,000 a year taxation on the people. Can the Solicitor General tell me when authority was taken for the additional circuit court judge in Montreal?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. 60 Vic.—about a year ago.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. There are now in the Superior Court of the province of Quebec, the chief justice, salary $6,000; senior puisne judge, Montreal, salary $6,000; twelve judges at $5,000 each, $60,000; fifteen judges at $4,000 each, $60,000, including the new appointment; two judges at $3,500 each of the Superior Court, as I understand it. In view of the statements which have been made, the Solicitor General should give us some detailed reasons for those changes in the judiciary. When the late Sir John Thompson proposed to deal with the readjustment of the salaries of all the judges in Canada, a very elaborate statement was prepared in that connection showing approximately the work of the courts. This document was ordered to be prepared by Sir John Thompson, as it was his duty to do when he was asking Parliament to increase the salaries of the judges, and I submit we should have a similar statement now. When as Minister of Justice, I myself asked that this Parliament should not allow an old law to operate so as to cause a decrease in the salary of a judge in British Columbia, on the death of Sir Mathew Begbie, hon. gentlemen who were present will remember that it was made necessary for me—and I expected it should be so as it was my duty—to obtain all information as to the condition of business in that court before I was entitled to ask Parliament to prevent what, as I claimed, would have been a decrease in the salary of a judge. All those particulars were given then, and if there ever was an urgent case for showing that no re-arrangement is possible with the large number of judges paid such salaries, and if no such evidence is forthcoming to the committee, then in my opinion the committee should not adopt this resolution.

Mr. MONK. I desire to say a word in regard to that part of the resolution which concerns the province of Quebec, and more particularly the district of Montreal. There is one point which I think the committee may feel perfectly satisfied about, and that is as to the necessity of an additional circuit court judge in the district of Montreal. The amount of litigations in that court is so great and litigants are obliged to wait so long for the adjudication of their cases that it is really surprising to think we have endured the present state of things so long.

When the committee are told that litigants before the Circuit Courts in the district of Montreal have, as a rule, to wait for more than a year for a decision of their cases, the committee must be convinced that it is time some remedy should be applied. The difficulty in these matters is, I think, the one pointed out by the right hon. leader of the House. It is one of the most anomalous features of our constitution that the provincial legislatures alone have the regulation of the tribunals of justice, and that the only part assigned to the federal power is the appointment and payment of judges. It was only a year ago that the legislature of Quebec saw fit to give the federal authorities the necessary power to appoint one additional Circuit Court judge for the district of Montreal. It is regrettable that that statute did not provide for two addi-

tional judges. It is also regrettable that these judges are not paid higher salaries than they will receive under this resolution. The duties of these judges are enormous, and very fatiguing, and it is very unfair to expect them to perform these duties at a salary of only $3,000 a year. As regards the additional judge of the Superior Court, the same anomaly applies as in the other case, namely, that the federal authority can only name the judge, whereas the local authority makes the demand for such a nomination. In this case, the appointment has been demanded for the district of Sherbrooke, and I will not deny that in that district judicial affairs are in a congested state. But what I think the federal authorities ought to do is to bring what pressure they can to bear upon the local legislature to bring about a change in the composition of our tribunals in the province of Quebec. The present organization is known to be obsolete. It dates back to 1854, or thereabouts, when different conditions prevailed, and when it was considered popular to decentralize the administration of justice. But I do not think that scheme is one which commends itself to our people at the present day. We have certainly not too many judges in the Superior Court of the province of Quebec for the business that has to be done, even with the additional judge provided for in this resolution; but the distribution of the work is pre-eminently unjust and unequal. I am now mentioning facts which are well known to all who practice at the bar of the province of Quebec. There are some districts where the judges are comparatively unoccupied, or at least, have a great deal of free time, whereas in other districts, such, for instance, as the district of St. Francis, and even more so in the district of Montreal, the judges are overworked. The business of the courts has increased in a far greater ratio than the number of judges. In 1873, I think we had six judges in the district of Montreal; we have ten now, but the increase in the business has been far greater than this increase in the number of judges. The business has increased three-fold since that time. Therefore, the resolution which we are about to pass presents this anomaly, that we are remedying a grievance which exists to a certain extent in one district, whereas in the district of Montreal, where the congestion is far greater, we are powerless to apply a remedy unless the means I mentioned a moment ago are adopted by the Department of Justice. The result of the congested state of affairs in the district of Montreal is that the judges are unable to perform the duties assigned to that district alone, and they are obliged to seek the assistance of judges residing in outside districts who have considerable leisure time, and the cost of this is considerable. The Solicitor General is aware that last year, if I am not mistaken, we had to pay nearly $16,000 for the travelling expenses of these outside judges. With this amount we could have provided for three more judges for the district of Montreal, who would have resided there, and who would have found ample work to attend to. These deficiencies existing in our province are well known to the lawyers practicing there; and the only thing we can urge here is that the strongest possible pressure should be brought to bear by the Department of Justice on the local authorities to bring about a change in our system. From what I have heard, I have no hesitation in saying that the system that prevails in the province of Ontario is far preferable. Before resuming my seat, I wish to call the attention of the Department of Justice and of the committee to the inadequate salary which is provided for the judges assigned to the district of Montreal. Those judges are paid to-day the same salary that they were paid twenty-five years ago, although it is a well-known fact that the cost of living in the city of Montreal is nearly 40 per cent higher than it was in 1873, when the salaries of the judges were readjusted. Since that time the salaries of all public employees have been increased, whereas those of the judges of our courts are left as they were then. Not only has the cost of living increased, but the amount of work which these men are called upon to perform to-day is far greater than it was twenty-five years ago. Under these circumstances, it seems to me that the Department of Justice should take into serious consideration the propriety of increasing the salaries of these overworked men. It is a well-known fact that, in the city of Montreal, many of our judges are obliged to have recourse to outside work to provide for the absolute necessities of their families. Of course many of them succeed in obtaining work. Some of them labour in our universities, where we are very glad to see them assisting in the instruction of our youth. Some also have other means of increasing their income, but there is no doubt it is a depressing fact that men of this kind should be obliged to have recourse to outside work in order to obtain the amount absolutely required to meet the expense of living in Montreal. There is no set of men through the British Empire paid as meanly as are the judges in Montreal, considering the expense of living there. Look to England, or any of the British dependencies, and you will find that men occupying positions equivalent to that of the judges in Montreal, are paid twice their salaries. I have here the statistics bearing out what I have said, but I do not wish to weary the committee by reading them, and I am sure they are in the possession of the Department of Justice, and the Solicitor General is well aware of the truth of what I am saying now. The remedy for that state of things lies in a reorganization of the courts, which has to be done by the local authorities, but it

seems to me that when the relations between the local and federal Governments are of such a friendly character, it would be possible to bring about that change, and the Solicitor General would confer a great favour on the province of Quebec if he brought all his efforts to bear in the direction of such a desirable modification of the organization of our tribunals.

Mr. QUINN. The difficulty at the moment is to decide whether, on the demand of a local legislature, the number of judges is to be increased indefinitely by this Parliament. It has been abundantly shown that the work of the district of Sherbrooke has been performed by calling into that district judges from outlying districts and asking them to attend to the duties on the payment of the regular allowance. If this Parliament is going to appoint a judge every time a provincial legislature declares that one is necessary in some portion of the province, it will be impossible for us to control the number of judges existing in the Dominion. The hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) expressed the opinion of many hon. members of this House, who are members of the bar of the province of Quebec, when he suggested what I have reiterated, namely, the calling in of a judge from an outlying district to the city of Sherbrooke to do the work required.

There is another question to which I might refer, that of the Circuit Court judges in Montreal. I cannot agree that the work of the Circuit Court in Montreal is being performed as efficiently as it was under the old system. It has not only the disadvantage of keeping two or three judges in the one court for the trial of unimportant cases during the whole year, but it keeps the judges of the Superior Court altogether in the Superior Court, and does not give them the experience in our procedure and the hearing of cases that they had under the old system, when they sat alternately in the Circuit Court of Montreal. There was another advantage in the old system as compared with the present one. A judge of the Superior Court having sat for a certain number of terms in that court, and then presiding in the Circuit Court in the trials of small cases, would be better able to decide when a sufficient amount of evidence was adduced than a judge who was confined altogether to the Circuit Court. There is another point. A judge of the Circuit Court, in a very short time, realizes the fact that there is no appeal from his decision, while a judge of the Superior Court, always knowing that there is an appeal from his decisions in that court, is more careful in trying cases in the Circuit Court, being under the impression that there might be possibly an appeal. I believe that the impression now existing in Montreal is that the old system of trial by judges of the Superior Court instead of by the judges of the Circuit Court, as at present, would be preferable. At the same time I am perfectly willing that a trial should be given to the present system, and that we should appoint another judge for the Circuit Court. I think I am safe in saying that there are 20,000 cases instituted before the Circuit Court in Montreal every year. Anybody who will pause and think for a moment and who will estimate the number of cases which each one of these judges have to try in a day, will at once see that it would be impossible for any two judges to keep up the work of the Circuit Court, so that another judge is absolutely necessary even if we are going to give the system a trial for a little while longer. I think the time will come when the Government will find it necessary to return to the old system of having the Superior Court judges sit in turn in the Circuit Court.

There is another question to which I would like to draw the attention of the Solicitor General, and that is the representation made by the Montreal Board of Trade concerning the establishment of an admiralty court in the city of Montreal. I think the earliest opportunity ought to be taken by the Government to have a consultation with the Quebec Government on these different points, including the one I am now referring to, in order that the affairs of the province may be better administered in the Department of Justice. I have here a communication which I have received from the secretary of the Board of Trade in Montreal, enclosing copies of letters addressed to the Deputy Minister of Justice, Ottawa, dated 31st of January, 1896, and replied thereto, and then the answer of the secretary of the Board of Trade, which I shall read to the House:

Office, Board of Trade,
Montreal, 31st January, 1898.

Deputy Minister of Justice, Ottawa.

Sir,—Having reference to the former correspondence by the Council of the Montreal Board of Trade, pressing that steps might be taken to establish a Maritime Court in the city of Montreal, I am desired now, on behalf of the Council, to earnestly press upon the Minister of Justice the necessity for favourable action at the coming session of Parliament. It is a standing injustice to the city of Montreal that we should have no Maritime Court here. We have no facilities for dealing with maritime matters other than the ordinary courts of law, involving almost prohibitory delay and expense. The only option we have is to proceed to Quebec with our lawyers and witnesses, again making it a most expensive matter.

We venture to suggest, as a practicable mode of dealing with the subject, that the present judge of the Vice Admiralty Court in Quebec might hold occasional sittings in Montreal from time to time as necessity arises.

I am, sir,
Yours obediently,
GEO. HADRILL,
Secretary.

The answer is as follows :—

Department of Justice,
Ottawa, 19th February, 1898.

Sir,—Referring to your letter of the 31st ult., and to previous correspondence, with respect to the establishment of an Admiralty Court at Montreal, I have the honour to inform you that I have communicated with Mr. Justice Routhier on the subject with a view of ascertaining whether it would not be possible to meet the requirements of the case by holding occasional sittings at Montreal when there are cases to be tried there.

I have just received a reply from the judge, in which he states that he is very busy in Quebec as a judge of the Superior Court, and that probably he could but seldom absent himself. He considers, however, that it would be practicable for him to attend occasionally in Montreal for trying Admiralty cases, where there were many witnesses to be heard, the proceedings, of course, to be taken at Quebec as at present, and the registrar of the court to go with him to Montreal for the purposes of the trial. He suggests that this means of transacting the business might be adopted if the lawyers would previously agree with him upon a time for trial which would be convenient to all.

I would like to know if this proposal of the judge would meet the views of the Board of Trade. It appears to me that it might be tried, at all events, as an experiment for the present.

I await your reply before taking any further steps in the matter.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
E. L. NEWCOMBE,
Deputy Minister of Justice.

George Hadrill, Esq.,
Secretary Board of Trade,
Montreal.

To that the secretary of the Board of Trade was intrusted to reply as follows :—

Office, Board of Trade,
Montreal, May 12th, 1898.

E. L. Newcombe, Esq.,
Deputy Minister of Justice,
Ottawa, Ont.

Sir,—I must apologize for the delay in answering your letter of the 19th February, re Admiralty Court at Montreal, but owing to the absence from town of the member of our council who was chiefly interested in the question, the council deferred replying until his return ; in the meantime the subject matter of your letter was discussed with solicitors here and with the marine interests, both underwriting and shipping.

I am now desired to express appreciation of your endeavour to meet the wishes of the council, but would point out that the proposition as submitted makes it optional with the judge to come to Montreal—practically it is to be agreement between the solicitors.

The council would state frankly that the feeling in Montreal is that we are entitled to have an Admiralty Court here as a matter of right, and it is held that litigants should not be in doubt as to whether the court could be held in Montreal or not.

The expense of taking witnesses and lawyers from Montreal to Quebec has been something enormous, and establishes an unjust discrimination against this city, the fear of such expense preventing parties from taking proceedings in protection of their rights.

The council therefore respectfully urges that steps be taken at the present session of Parliament to establish a branch Admiralty Court in Montreal, either under the present Admiralty judge at Quebec, which would be entirely satisfactory to this board, or in such other manner as may be deemed advisable, always provided that the principle the council seeks to have recognized is duly conserved.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
GEO. HADRILL,
Secretary.

Now, this is only one of the cases in which, as I contend, the interests of Montreal have not been propery regarded in connection with the administration of justice. So far as the distribution of the work among the judges is concerned, personally, I would strongly favour the system in vogue in the province of Ontario. I understand that system to require residence in the principal city of the province of nearly all the judges and their going from that city to the different districts, following what is called the circuits of the province. If this were done, we should have a sufficient number of judges in the city of Montreal, in which by far the greater part of the business of the province is done, to meet all requirements. If this were not deemed sufficient, the judges might be distributed, a certain number in Montreal and a certain number in Quebec. And in that way, no jealousy would exist between the two cities, and the province might be divided into two districts over which the judges of Montreal in one case and the judges of Quebec in the other case should preside. But, of course, we cannot legislate to that end in this Parliament. It is, therefore, necessary, I say, that the Government should communicate with the Government of the province of Quebec and try in some way to arrange the judicial districts of the province, so that all the judges shall have sufficient to do to occupy them during the year, and the public business shall be properly attended to.

Now, I listened to the right hon. leader of the House (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) with the greatest attention. He realizes the position, but the only error that he makes, as I think, is in saying that it would be useless to undertake a conference at this time. I do not think it would be at all useless. We must begin some time. Every practising barrister in the province of Quebec recognizes how necessary it is that something should be done in order to relieve the congestion that exists in the city of Montreal and in the district of Sherbrooke. We realize, too, that this will not be relieved by the mere appointment of a judge for the district of Sherbrooke ; but it can be relieved by distributing the work as evenly as possible among the judges in the province. Now, if this is to be done by a rearrangement of the districts, if it is to be done by the subdivision of the province into two districts, or however it is to be done, it is a subject that must engage the attention of

the provincial legislature. I think it is absolutely necessary that the Government here should take the initiative steps and ask for a conference with the authorities of the province in order to meet these difficulties. It can only be done in that way. It certainly cannot be done by merely appointing a judge in a district in which it may please the province of Quebec to ask to have one appointed.

As regards the remuneration of the judges in the city of Montreal and in the province of Quebec generally, that is a subject, of course, that has engaged the attention not only of this Government but of several preceding Governments. I think all barristers of Montreal who will have the courage to speak freely and openly on the subject will say that the judges of the city of Montreal are not sufficiently recompensed by the salaries they receive to-day. As my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) has so well pointed out, the increasd cost of living in Montreal is such that it is impossible for a judge to maintain the dignity of his position on the salary paid him to-day. I do not think that in any part of the province of Quebec the judges are too highy paid, but I feel that the judges of the country districts are very much better paid than the judges in the city of Montreal. I do not reflect at all on the judges in the city of Quebec when I say, as I do without fear of contradiction, that the difference in the cost of living in Montreal and Quebec is so great that, while the judges in Quebec may be properly paid with the salaries they receive, it is impossible to say that the judges in Montreal are properly paid. I know that many hon. members, after looking through the Auditor General's Report, as I see some members on the other side of the House doing, will have some criticism to offer about the travelling expenses of judges. Now, I would like to hear these criticisms made by hon. gentlemen who come from the provinces in which the judges reside who are to be criticised. I think a member of Parliament who wishes to criticise any subject should have the courage to criticise it himself, instead of furnishing documents to somebody else to enable him to make a criticism. While in some cases the travelling expenses paid to some judges in the province of Quebec may appear large, yet I think anybody who will consider the work that is being done by these judges in going from one district to another as they have been obliged to do in numberless cases, will realize at once that these travelling expenses are not too large. We know that judges have been brought from the country districts, at any rate surrounding Montreal, into Montreal for the purpose of relieving the congestion which has existed there for years. This was not done in order to enable the judges to earn $6 a day and travelling expenses.

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

After Recess

Mr. QUINN. When six o'clock was called I was referring to the travelling expenses of the judges who at different times had been called from their districts into the city of Montreal to relieve the congestion which existed there, and I said this had not been done to enable the judges to earn the daily allowance or the travelling expenses which are accorded to them by statute. They came because they were absolutely required to do so for the administration of justice. It is a well-known fact that there is an insufficiency of judges in Montreal, and has been for a number of years. Some criticism has been made of the judges because of the amount of expenses which they charged up as travelling expenses and daily allowance which they were entitled to under the statute. But if these expenses appear too large in certain cases, it is not due to the misconduct of the judges at all, as some might wish to infer, but to the liberal allowance which has been made by statute in cases of this kind. However, I do not think this is a matter that need be dwelt upon, I think it would be unfortunate if the conduct of the judges in this respect were made the subject of criticism in this House, and I do not propose to pursue the subject any further. I will now say a word or two of the proposition in the motion before the House to increase the salary of Mr. Justice Taschereau. I quite agree with everything that has been said by the Solicitor General concerning Mr. Justice Taschereau; I quite agree that he is probably one of the best judges that we have in Montreal. Where all are good it is very difficult to make a distinction, but I think I am not going too far when I say that there is no judge in Montreal better entitled to consideration than Mr. Justice Taschereau. I realize, too, the anomaly which existed in his case, and I am glad to see that a change is being made. But I would like to see this change made in such a way that it would not militate against the other judges who reside in some of the country districts outside of Montreal. I see a disposition to distinguish, for example, between the judges of the Court of Queen's Bench and the judges of the Superior Court. Now, why this should be, I cannot understand. Under the old system of allowing at least three days' expenses to a judge coming into the city, possibly the expense might have run up to a much larger sum than was anticipated, but I do not see that this is any reason why a change should be made and the judges compelled to count every day of service as an ordinary workman would count. Judges cannot work as ordinary workmen, I do not think it is intended that they should work as ordinary workmen. I think it would be a mistaken policy of economy for us to begin by curtailing in any way either the salaries of the judges or their travelling expenses; I think it would be a mistake for

us to do that, or to criticise our judges in this respect, unless their conduct should be really open to criticism, or be such as to amount to a public scandal. I am happy to feel that no such thing exists in any part of this country; I am glad to know that the impression does not exist in this House that the conduct of our judges in any case could be considered a matter of public scandal. Therefore, I do not see the necessity of making the distinction which is made by the resolution introduced by the Solicitor General, between the judges of the Superior Court and the judges of the Court of Queen's Bench.

Speaking of the judges of the Circuit Court, I have no hesitation in saying that the two gentlemen who occupy the positions in Montreal are eminently fitted for that post. They are men both possessing wide experience. While I do not altogether approve of the system which removes the trial of Circuit Court cases from the judges of the Superior Court, I do not think that a better selection could have been made than that of those two gentlemen who occupy the position of judges of the Circuit Court in Montreal. As I have said, I do not believe in the system existing at the present time. I think it is not beneficial to our judges of the Superior Court, and is not conducive to the speedy administration of justice in the Circuit Court to have special judges appointed to that court. The cases tried in the Circuit Court may be what are considered small cases, but they are entitled to the same consideration as cases tried in the Superior Court are entitled to. There is no better field for studying practice under the code of procedure and the practice of the courts than that furnished by the Circuit Court in Montreal. I do not say our judges require to receive instruction in procedure; but every professional man within the sound of my voice knows exactly what I mean when I say that the Circuit Court has been the training school for the judges of the Superior Court in matters of procedure for a number of years. Besides, it deprives our judges of the opportunity for coming together frequently in order to consider the judgments that are to be rendered; and I think lastly, and probably it is the most important reason of all, it destroys uniformity, or rather it does not conduce to uniformity, in the judgment of the court that we should like to see, and which exists in the Superior Court. I again draw the attention of the Solicitor General to the question of the Admiralty Court in Montreal. I should like to see a conference had between the Government and the Government of the province of Quebec with the object of devising some means of giving our judges all the work they can do, and with the object eventually of making their salaries such as they would be entitled to as judges of the Superior Court. My own idea is that our province should be divided into two principal districts, Montreal and Quebec; that all the judges of the province should reside in one or other of those cities and follow circuit through their districts; that from Montreal and Quebec they should travel through the outlying country, but they should reside in the city of Quebec or the city of Montreal, and receive proper salaries that would enable them to live in comfort in those cities.

Mr. McMULLEN. I desire to say a few words on this question. In looking over the travelling expenses of the judges of the province of Quebec for the last three years, I must express my amazement that hon. gentlemen opposite, when in power, permitted this condition of things to go on from year to year. Money has evidently been improperly withdrawn, to use mild language, from the Dominion treasury from year to year, and the ex-Minister of Justice and those who discharged the duties before have permitted it to go on for years, and the sum has increased, till last year no less than $21,000 were drawn, and in many cases improperly drawn, dishonestly drawn, from the Dominion treasury. I congratulate my hon. friend the Solicitor General on the introduction of this Bill. If there is one thing relating to the judiciary of the Dominion that requires immediate and prompt action it is the course that has been adopted by the judges in the province of Quebec with respect to drawing mileage. I notice that Judge DeLorimier, who is supposed to reside in the district of Joliette, has drawn $1,494. For what? For allowance for travelling as judge from Joliette to Montreal to discharge his duties as judge. He does not live in Joliette, but in Montreal, and he has lived there continuously, notwithstanding the fact that he is supposed by the law to reside in his district. He, however, violates the law and resides in Montreal, but when he comes to charge an allowance for travelling expenses, he actually charges it from Joliette to Montreal every time, and by that means pockets $1,494. I am amazed to think that any man undertaking the onerous duties of a judge should dare to risk the disgrace of being placed in this position, and in an indirect way, by fraud, he having no right to the money, but under a technical interpretation of the law, takes advantage of it, puts $1,494 in his own pocket. I am glad to see the ex-Minister of Justice (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) in his place. He must have known that this thing was practised during late years.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What is that?

Mr. McMULLEN. Judges in Quebec who live in Montreal, in violation of the law, who should live in the districts to which they were appointed, when they serve as judges, actually charge for coming from the

district where they are supposed to live to Montreal, as Judge DeLorimier did, who drew $1,494 for travelling allowance during the very year the hon. gentleman was Minister of Justice. I find there are many who have done that. Mr. Ouimet——

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I rise to a point of order. If the hon. gentleman desires to make a charge deliberately against a judge that he made a dishonest claim, I think he is out of order. There is only one way in which a matter of this kind can be dealt with by Parliament. I think the Solicitor General is bound in his official position to protect the judges. I may say that I never had the slightest intimation before me or brought to my notice that any judge was doing what is dishonourable, or an act which would render it necessary to ask Parliament to interfere in his case. But the hon. gentleman is entirely out of order if he attempts in this way and in committee to charge any Superior Court judge with rendering false accounts.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I am not specially called on to defend the judges who have been attacked, who are altogether judges in the province of Quebec. I intend to defend them all.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. If the hon. gentleman makes an insinuation of this kind, and I take it that he makes a direct charge, that the judges were making dishonourable charges, and when he states that I must have known it, he is taking an unwarrantable liberty and making a reckless statement. That is, however, a trifling matter. The hon. gentleman has a right to asperse me, but my point is, that the hon. gentleman has no right to make a charge of dishonourable conduct against a judge in this manner.

Mr. McMULLEN. I will recite my charge, and leave the Deputy Speaker, after I have given the full facts, to say whether I am not justified in making the statement.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I insist on a ruling on my point of order. It is that the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) has already made a serious charge against a judge, and he is now proceeding to make another serious charge against a judge. I ask your ruling, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I am very much afraid that the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) has perhaps gone too far in charging the judges with being dishonest. It is permitted to a member of this House to criticise the judges to a certain extent, but I do not consider it would be parliamentary to charge them with being dishonest.

Mr. McMULLEN. I accept your ruling, Mr. Chairman. I will state a plain bald fact, and I do not think I can be prevented from doing that.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I do not mean that the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) has not the right to make a charge, but there is a certain procedure which must be adopted when a charge is made against a judge, and the hon. gentleman is not following that procedure.

Mr. McMULLEN. A certain number of judges live in the city of Montreal, and some of them are supposed by law to live within their judicial districts. Judge De Lorimier is supposed to live in the district of Joliette but he does not. If he did and if he were called to Montreal to discharge duties there he would be entitled to an allowance of $6 per day, counting the day before he started for Montreal, the number of days he was engaged in Montreal, and the day he returned home: so that if he sat in Montreal only one day he would under the old rule be entitled to get $18. Well, now, Judge DeLorimier lives in Montreal, but he is judge for the district of Joliette, and when he has been called upon to discharge duties in Montreal he has drawn $6 a day for living allowance the same as if he came from Joliette into Montreal. By doing that he has put into his own pocket $1,494 during the year 1895, $2,040 in the year 1896, and $1,644 in the year 1897. Take another judge who lives in Montreal. Take Judge Ouimet, who was once a member of this House.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No.

Mr. McMULLEN. Perhaps not. This Mr. Ouimet is judge for Richelieu district, and supposed to live there, and he has no right to live in Montreal. It is a violation of the law for him to live in Montreal, but he does so.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I again rise to a point of order. It is quite clear that the object of the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) is to bring into contempt the judges of the land, and I have under my hand an authority which would, I think, warrant the members of the Government in protecting the judges from these aspersions and insinuations which I submit are not manly. The authority is this:

> Bearing in mind the general responsibility of Ministers of the Crown for the due administration of justice throughout the Kingdom, and the obligations which they owe to the dispensers of justice to preserve them from injurious attacks or calumnious accusations, it is necessary that before consenting to any motion——

The hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) does not dare to make any motion——

> ——before consenting to any motion for a parliamentary inquiry into the conduct of a judge, or even for the reception of a petition complaining of the conduct of a judge, and not asking for his removal from office in accordance with the statute, or not alleging reasonable ground for such proceeding, Ministers should themselves have in-

vestigated the matter of complaint and be prepared either to oppose or facilitate the interference of Parliament on the particular occasion.

Now (Mr. Chairman, I submit that this is abundant authority to show that this discussion is entirely irregular, and that even if the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) proposed to proceed formally, openly and aboveboard and in a manly direct fashion, even then the Ministers of the Crown would be bound to interfere until these parliamentary proceedings were taken when they could either assist the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) or resist them. I ask for your ruling, Mr. Chairman.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not know whether my hon. friend (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) has any other authority, but that which he has recited only refers to a motion or application to present a petition, and not to the remarks of an hon. member.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The authority I cited was from Todd. I supposed the Postmaster General would have seen that the spirit of the quotation would have prevented anything like this discussion. But Todd continues:

> The House of Commons should not initiate, and Ministers of the Crown ought not to sanction any attempt to institute criminative charges against any one unless upon some distinct and definite basis.

The committee is aware that the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) does not take the responsibility of making a formal charge. If any one dared to assume that responsibility of course a different state of things would be presented and then the way would be clear. It seems to me unnecessary to argue that this indirect manner of aspersing and bringing into contempt the judges of the land is entirely against parliamentary procedure, and that the Ministers who are charged with the duty should protect the judges from such an attack.

Mr. McMULLEN. Well, Mr. Chairman, I claim the right in this House——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order; Chair.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) has a right to discuss the point or order.

Mr. QUINN. He is not discussing it.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. He has not so far spoken as to indicate what he is going to say.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am simply making a statement of what I find on the public records of this House. I am not making any statement that is not backed up by the records that are placed before the eye of Parliament. I am taking that as my guide and the ex-Minister of Justice (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) is not going to prevent me making any statement here which I am within my right in making as a representative of the people. If it reflects upon any person outside of this House, I cannot help it. I merely state what the records of the House prove.

Mr. QUINN. I rise to speak on the point of order. The hon. member (Mr. McMullen) says he is speaking from the public records, and he has made a statement that certain judges reside in Montreal when they should reside in their judicial districts. The hon. member (Mr. McMullen) cannot pretend that he has in the records before him any such statement of fact. The statement of the hon. gentleman is a charge against a judge that he has violated the law under which he is appointed. The hon. Postmaster General says that the authority of my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Justice (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) does not go as far as he pretends it does, because it refers only to petitions and motions. But if a formal petition or motion is not to be presented to this House without an investigation by the Ministry, how much less should irresponsible statements of members of this House criticising the conduct of judges be tolerated when those judges have not the opportunity of defending themselves before this House. I think it a most disgraceful thing and a reflection on the administration of justice of our country.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. When a point of order is to be discussed, it should be discussed very calmly and without the use of such expressions as that which the hon. gentleman has just used.

Mr. QUINN. I am discussing it very calmly. I say it would be a disgraceful thing if it could be tolerated that the characters of the judges of the Dominion of Canada could be aspersed here by any hon. member of this House—not staking his reputation, not having the courage to make a direct charge against them, but standing up here without any responsibility and charging them with stealing the public money, with violating the laws under which they were appointed. I say that if such a thing were possible, it would certainly be a most disgraceful thing, and would not secure that proper administration of justice and that respect for the judiciary which it is entitled to under our constitution.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The question which has been raised is a very important one. I think a discussion concerning judges should be held with very great caution. I find in the authorities that generally no charge should be made against the judge without adopting the usual proceeding. I understand that a statement which would

not reflect upon the honour of the bench could be made, and I hope that nothing will be said that will impugn the honesty or honour of the bench or of any judicial proceeding.

Mr. McMULLEN. Mr. Chairman, I shall respect your ruling. My hon. friend from Montreal Centre (Mr. Quinn) grew very wrathy because he thought I had made some discourteous references to the judges. I dare say that my hon. friend, like all other lawyers, is very anxious to stand in well with the bench. Now, I am going to confine myself——

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I must rise to a point of order. I believe it is not permitted, under the rules of this House, to impute motives. The hon. gentleman who has just spoken has imputed to the hon. member who has spoken against an attack on the judiciary, the motive of having done so for the purpose of standing in with the judges. That is not only imputing a motive, but it is one of the grossest charges of a motive that it is possible to conceive

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. It is a well-known rule of the House that no improper motive should be imputed to an hon. member. Unfortunately, I was reading when my attention was called to the question, and I did not catch the expression the hon. gentleman has used.

Mr. McMULLEN. Mr. Chairman, if I said anything that very seriously wounds the feelings of my esteemed friend and that is unparliamentary, I am quite willing to withdraw it. Expressions which wound so very much are very apt to be pretty near the truth.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. McMULLEN. However, Mr. Chairman, I shall comply with your ruling. I will tell my hon. friend what I am quoting from. I am quoting from a production which I have very much admired in this House for many years, that is, the Auditor General's Report; and if hon. gentlemen opposite, including my hon. friend from Montreal Centre, would give a little more attention to that valuable production, they would render considerably more service to their constituents than they do now. My hon. friend said I was charging the judges with drawing money for day's allowance in attending court in Montreal, when they ought to be living in their own district. I am not going to say whether they lived there or not; but I am going to give the facts as I find them in the Auditor General's Report, and leave hon. gentlemen who know the facts to draw their own conclusions. I have given the facts for 1895, and I will now give the facts for 1896. I find that Mr. Tellier—I am not going to say where he lives—has drawn $1,506 as daily allowance at the rate of $6 a day.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER Did the hon. gentleman hear the Prime Minister's explanation of an item of about $1,600 for Judge Taschereau, to show that there was nothing wrong in it?

Mr. McMULLEN. I will allow my hon. friend to present his side of the case when I am through, if he can offset this by any statement he can make.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I was referring to your leader's statement.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am only complimenting my hon. friend the Solicitor General on the manly act he is doing introducing his Bill to put a stop to this condition of things, so that in the future the country will not be subjected to the payment of money which might well have been saved. Now, we will take the next: Mr. C. J. Gill drew $1,140 in the same way.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I do not wish to stop my hon. friend, but I would like to call his attention to the fact that in England, when members speak of the judges, they always refer to them as Mr. Justice So-and-So, and I think we should adopt the same rule here.

Mr. McMULLEN. I will do that. I hope they are all justly entitled to be referred to in that way.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. McMULLEN. Hon. gentlemen are exceedingly sensitive. I should hardly think there is anything wrong in that. If the hon member for Montreal has any point of order with regard to that statement, I will sit down.

Mr. MONK. I think a point of order may fairly be raised with regard to that. I do not think it is in conformity with your ruling, Mr. Chairman, for an hon. member of this House, when called to order by you, and instructed to refer to the judges as they should be referred to, to say he hopes they are entitled to the title they should have.

Mr. QUINN. The reason I did not raise the point of order, in which I agree with my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), is because I think it is the duty of the Government of this country to protect the judges. If they do not see that to be their duty, I think it will reflect more upon them than upon any private member of this House.

Mr. McMULLEN. I shall proceed to quote from the Auditor General's Report for the year ending 30th June, 1897. I notice by it that Mr. Justice Gill drew $1,830 for allowances. I find that other judges drew moneys in the same way. I find that Judge de Lorimier drew $1,644 for travelling allowances and Judge Taschereau $1,686. My hon. friend from Montreal prevents my pointing out where Judge Tasche-

reau lives, because I have not got it in any authenticated report in this House.

Mr. QUINN. I asked the hon. gentleman not to point it out but to leave it to those who gave him the information, and who ought to have the courage, if they want to make these statements, to make them before the House, and not have the hon. gentleman do their dirty work for them.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The expression is not parliamentary.

Mr. QUINN. Of course I did not intend to apply that term to the conduct of the hon. gentleman, and therefore cheerfully withdraw it, but I thought that the hon. gentleman should leave it to these people to do their own work in that direction, and have the courage to face this House and the country, if they think they are doing something meritorious.

Mr. McMULLEN. I had no intention of referring to the hon. gentleman's discourteous remark with regard to myself, because I always treat such remarks according to the quarter from which they come. The hon. gentleman has complied with the rules of the House and taken back the expression, but I had no intention of pressing him to withdraw it at all. Mr. Justice Ouimet has drawn $798 for travelling expenses. I do not know whether he lives in Montreal or not, but he is supposed to live in his own district, and when coming to Montreal to be entitled to a certain per diem allowance. I see that he has drawn $786, and presume he lives in his district. Payments of this kind have been increasing. In 1895, the judges drew $17,442; in 1896, they drew $20,058; and in 1897, $21,012. These amounts they drew in addition to their substantial salaries. I compliment my hon. friend upon the introduction of this Bill. I do not think it has come a moment too soon, and I believe that in the interests of this country it is a prudent measure that should be passed in order that the law may distinctly define what allowances the judges are entitled to under those circumstances. I hope the Bill will have the effect of putting a stop to what I consider an injustice which the country ought not any longer to submit to.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not agree with the hon. member for Montreal that this is not a subject which should be discussed in this House. If I understand my duty here, it is to deal with any subject that requires expenditure of public money and see that more money is not expended than necessary. The system which has obtained for some time past in the provinces of Quebec and Ontario is such that more money is being spent than ought to be, and when we have a Bill under consideration which has for its object the remedying of that grievance, that is the proper time for us to criticise the system now existing, for it is the system we are attacking and not the judges. I do not understand that we are attacking either the personnel or the character of the judges, but discussing evils which have grown up under the law and which an effort is now being made to remove. I referred to one of the cases before recess, but I find, like the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), in looking over the Auditor General's Report, that I might refer to a great many. Here are ten judges in the province of Quebec, who have drawn for travelling allowances over $1,000 apiece.

Mr. QUINN. In the province of Quebec—not in the district of Montreal.

Mr. SPROULE. In the province of Quebec, I mean. So far as my information goes, it is to the effect that the expenditure should not be so large for travelling allowances. I drew attention to one case, concerning which information was given me, and the hon. Solicitor General seemed to question the correctness of my information. I refer to the case of Judge Taschereau, which was the only case the information I got referred to.

I find there are several others who are—properly or improperly, I do not know which—doing the same thing. But the Solicitor General said that Judge Taschereau had a right to live in the city of Montreal, and he quoted the provincial statute, which he was kind enough to send to me. This law was passed in 1889 and it provides that article 2319 of the Revised Statutes of the province of Quebec is amended by striking out the words "ten of the judges shall reside" at the beginning thereof and replacing them by the following: "Eleven of the judges of the Superior Court, one of whom to be specially charged with the district of Terrebonne, shall reside." The authority I was quoting from and which I think thoroughly justifies what I said, was the Dominion statute of the same year, the language of which I have given to the House, quoting from chap. 39:

> Thirteen puisne judges of the said court, whose residence are fixed at Montreal and Quebec, not including the district of Terrebonne, $5,000 apiece.

Therefore, Terrebonne was left out. Now I wish to call attention to the fact that the provincial Act which the Solicitor General quoted came into effect on the day it was sanctioned, which was the 21st March, 1889. The Dominion statute that I have quoted was assented to on the 2nd of May, 1889, and was, therefore, of later date than the provincial statute. The question is, which one is the authority? I merely cited this to show that I was justified in making the quotation I did. According to that statute, if I am correct, Judge Taschereau had not the right to live in Montreal, and if he had not, I think it would have been improper for him to charge the travelling allowance appearing opposite his name here.

Mr. McMULLEN. I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) is charging a judge with improperly drawing travelling allowances. I am amazed at hon. gentlemen sitting on the right and on the left of the Speaker should remain silent at that, considering that when another member of this House was trespassing very nearly on that mistake, they raised a protest and found fault.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) is mistaken. I do not think he can have any intention of misrepresenting what I said. I said I gave this statute in justification of the opinion I gave to the House. I do not say whether it was correct or incorrect, but I cited it to allow the Solicitor General to give such an explanation as would enable us to understand the matter, and if the information was incorrect that it might be set right before this House and the country. With regard to the resolutions before the House, I do not understand that even if carried out, they will do away with this trouble. I may not understand them, and I would ask the Solicitor General if he would show where it is proposed in these resolutions to make such a change as will meet the difficulty that has been pointed out.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I would refer the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) to the paragraph which says:

> That to each of the judges of the Superior or Circuit Courts attending as such, at the request in writing of the chief justice or judge discharging the duties of chief justice in the district, any court held at any other place than that at which he is directed to reside, for each day he is absent from the said place of residence, there shall be paid, for travelling allowances, six dollars.

And so on. This is instead of $18 heretofore paid in consequence of what I consider an improper construction of the statute. Now, the judge cannot receive more than $6 a day.

Mr. SPROULE. How much did he receive before?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Eighteen dollars a day. That was the construction put upon the statute. The further provision I make for the purpose of preventing this exorbitant—if I may use the word—charge is that no judge shall be allowed to leave his district to go to an adjoining district unless he is specially requested to do so by the chief justice of the province. No judge will have the right to go from one district to another and make the charges heretofore made for travelling allowances, unless he can produce, when he files his account, a certificate in writing from the chief justice stating that he has gone there at the request of the chief justice. I think that this would reduce these travelling expenses by fifty per cent.

Mr. SPROULE. It does appear probable that this law when passed will accomplish that. But the judge is allowed $1,000 a year more of salary, and that will reduce the saving, though, apparently it will still leave something.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I shall have occasion to refer to the matter when I reply, but in the meantime, I do not wish to mislead my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule). This will not affect Judge Taschereau because he will get his $1,000 the same as the other judges; and if he goes to Terrebonne to administer justice he will get $6 a day additional.

Mr. SPROULE. I am obliged to the hon. gentleman for giving me this information. I have only to say in addition to what I have said, that, so far as my opinion goes, the system that obtains in the province of Quebec at the present time is a bad one. It is most regrettable that a change cannot be brought about by a conference between the provincial legislature and Dominion Parliament or by some authority that might deal with this matter. It seems to be the fact, as stated by the ex-Minister of Justice (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper), that there are a sufficient number of judges in the province of Quebec to do the work. Perhaps it could be done by fewer judges, if the work were better distributed. I do not care whether this applies to the province of Quebec or any other province. I think it is the duty of the province and the Dominion to work in a friendly way to remedy things of this kind. It is unfortunate that there is not, in my judgment, a sufficient disposition on the part of provincial legislatures to correspond and cooperate with the Dominion Government in bringing about these desirable changes. For they are desirable, and in the interest of the country, they should be brought about. As I understand it, we have not the authority in this House to deal with the matter, but the provincial legislatures have the authority. Still, we at least control the travelling expenses of the judges, and these should be cut down in some way so that influence would be brought to bear on the provincial governments to remedy the evil for the benefit of the people.

Now, I am not opposing this Bill; on the contrary, I believe it is in the right direction. But these irregularities or evils seem to have existed for a length of time, and the sooner they are remedied the better. My principal object in rising was to protest against the disposition that seemed to be apparent in this House to prevent a criticism of the expenditure of money in this House by any hon. member. I protest against any interference with the rights of the members of Parliament to criticise any proposition to expend public money when it comes before this House, whether

relating to the expenditures of judges or of any other parties in this country.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. I am not going to discuss the merits of the proposition now before the House from a Quebec or an Ontario standpoint, though the resolution seems to affect only those two provinces. But my object in rising is to express regret that while dealing with this question of the salaries of judges, the Government has not thought the time opportune to re-arrange the salaries of judges in the other provinces, especially those of the higher courts. In the province of Manitoba, where we have only four judges who are attending three large judicial districts, as the province is now divided, those four judges have to attend to all the criminal and civil cases belonging to the Court of Queen's Bench; they have to attend to chancery cases, to cases in equity, and they have also to sit in chambers after attending to the districts where they have quarterly sittings I say that our judges are overworked, and are not receiving an adequate salary for their services. In the provinces of Ontario and Quebec the judges are receiving, some $7,000, others $6,000, others $5.000 a year, while in the province of Manitoba the chief justice only gets $5,000 a year, and the three puisne judges are only getting $4,000 each. I hope that the Government will see their way to making a just distribution of the salaries so that our judges, who are, as I say, overworked in having to attend to all those courts, may be more adequately remunerated. They not only have to sit in cases in the first instance, but they have also to sit in review of those very cases; they have to sit as a court of appeal, while in the other provinces those duties are assigned to certain judges appointed for the purpose, whose duties are confined to those courts of appeal. In Manitoba the same judges have to attend to all those cases, and they get a mere pittance. In our province the living expenses are much higher than they are in the eastern provinces, therefore, I say, it is time that the salaries of the judges in Manitoba should be looked into, and that the Government should put them on the same footing as the judges of the other provinces. There should be no discrimination as to the salaries of our judges. In 1892 there was a proposition laid before this House whereby the salaries of the judges of Manitoba were to be increased by $1,000 each, but I am sorry to say that the Government at that time did not see proper to carry out that proposition. There was a general redistribution of salaries proposed by the late Sir John Thompson at that time, but it appears that on account of some opposition coming from some of the provinces, the idea was dropped, and the intention to fix the salaries on a proper scale has been abandoned. I therefore hope that the present Government will take up this question and deal with it anew, in so far as Manitoba is concerned.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I understood the Solicitor General to say there was a radical change here in connection with the statute upon which there had been placed such a construction that $18 for a day's attendance by a judge had been allowed, whereas under his resolution the amount should be limited to $6. Now, I hold in my hand the old statute, and I fail to see a difference in that respect, and I will point out my difficulties to the hon. gentleman. I would like him to explain how he considers this change is brought about. The clause to which I have reference relates to the Superior Court judges, because the resolutions include Circuit Court judges with the Superior Court judges. Now, the resolution reads thus:

That to each of the judges of the Superior or Circuit Courts attending as such, at the request in writing of the chief justice or judge discharging the duties of chief justice in the district, any court held at any other place than that at which he is directed to reside,——

And I call attention to this:

——for each day he is absent from the said place of residence, there shall be paid for travelling allowances $6; but no travelling allowance shall be granted to any judge requested to sit in review under the first section of the Act of the Legislature of Quebec, 61 Vic., cap. 20, unless it is certified by the chief justice or judge discharging the duties of chief justice in the district, that the attendance of such judge was necessary by reason of illness, incapacity or absence of one of the judges resident at Montreal or Quebec, as the case may be.

That is the clause the hon. gentleman refers to. Then, in regard to the judge of the Court of Queen's Bench, just preceding that, there is a provision of $6 for each day's absence from his place of residence, provided that three days' absence at least shall always be allowed. That is, if it is one day he gets $18. Now, the old statute has these two phrases:

To each of the judges of the said Court of Queen's Bench, attending any other court, for each day he is absent from his place of residence, $6.

The same per diem allowance exactly. Then, there is a proviso:

Provided that any judge of the Superior Court required to attend, as such, the Court of Queen's Bench, appeal side or criminal side, elsewhere than at his said place of residence,——

I need not read the whole of it, but it says:

——the allowance shall be $6 for each day's absence from his place of residence, except that three days' absence at least shall always be allowed for.

It seems to me that this refers to practically the same provision, with the excep-

tion of the certificate, that is as regards the Queen's Bench work, three days' allowance always, at least $6 per diem allowance, Superior Court judges, $6 per day—the same in the old statute as in this, except that the hon. gentleman introduces a provision making the production of a certificate necessary to secure the indemnity. In the other case, the necessity was shown by the attendance at court, it being necessary before $6 a day was allowed that the judge drawing it should have attended court.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I may say to my hon. friend that the construction he now puts upon that statute is the construction that I propose to put upon it, and that I did put upon it when I came to the department. The trouble is that a different construction was put upon it up to that time, and that heretofore the judges have invariably claimed for each day's absence three days' allowance, when the absence did not exceed one day, and they were paid it.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman proposes to repeat this clause "except that three days' absence at least shall always be allowed."

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Under my amendment a judge of the Court of Queen's Bench who absents himself for the performance of any judicial duty shall be entitled to the payment of $6 a day for each day's absence. If he is only absent one day, he shall be, under any circumstances, entitled to $18. If a judge of the Superior Court absents himself, he must first have obtained authority from the Chief Justice of the province, and then he is entitled merely to $6 per diem allowance: but under the construction put on the statute previous to the change of Government, a judge of the Superior Court who absented himself was under any circumstances entitled to $18 a day. It all turned on the fact that the concluding words of the proviso in the 13th section were made to apply to judges of the Superior Court as well as judges of the Court of Queen's Bench, which was an entire misconstruction of the statute, but that construction prevailed, and I thought it necessary to make this change proposed.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I think it is a very interesting question as to whether that proviso did not touch the preceding section. I see the point is the construction put on clause 13 regarding the judges of provincial courts and as to the distinction between judges of Queen's Bench and judges of the Superior Court. It is now proposed to draw a line and say that the judges of the Court of Queen's Bench shall be allowed three days' travelling allowance if they are absent one day, but a judge of the Superior Court shall be allowed only one day's allowance, and his absence must be certified by the Chief Justice. Why is this distinction drawn in regard to allowances?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I will give the reasons. It is in the old statute.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That is assuming the hon. gentleman's interpretation of the old statute. The hon. gentleman will admit that there seems to be considerable room for argument, owing to the construction that has obtained for so many years, in drawing a distinction between these two courts. The hon. gentleman has now come to a definite conclusion, and asks for a declaratory Bill. But the practice having existed so long, does it not operate as against the view put forward by the hon. gentleman, and I think he should give some reason for drawing a distinction between the judges, as to why a judge of the Court of Queen's Bench should be allowed three days' travelling allowance and it should be reduced as regards any other judge.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. It is necessary to understand our judicial system to follow the statement I am about to make. Our court of appeal is an ambulatory court; it sits alternately in Montreal and Quebec. Four of the judges reside in Montreal and two in Quebec, and they sit at stated periods in one city or the other. When a judge of Queen's Bench is called to Quebec to sit when judgments are given or for conference, it is impossible that his expenses can be covered by $6, for the necessary expenses will reach $12 or $13. Under the old rule a judge would be absolutely out of pocket as a result of going to the court, and we thought it proper that $18 should in any event be allowed for one day's absence when for only one day. In addition, it is impossible to go from Montreal to Quebec in a day; it must occupy a day and a night or a day and two nights. So that practically under most advantageous circumstances it is necessary for a judge to be absent a day and two nights. This condition does not apply to the judges of the Superior Court. Such a judge may go from one district to another, and may not travel more than ten miles. He can go to Montreal in an hour, and under the old system he might charge $18.

Mr. BERGERON. The hon gentleman stated before six o'clock that he would change some parts of the resolution to meet the cases of judges in my own district.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes; it was on oversight.

Mr. BERGERON. There was a good deal of discussion in the old Parliament on this subject. Take a judge going to Sorel, in the old days, to sit on circuit. It would take one day to go down, and he would sit one or two days, and he would take one day to

return. So that the judge would charge three days. The Department of Justice maintained that ruling, although of recent years a judge could leave his home in the morning and go to Montreal, hold court all day, and return at night. I want to call attention to the fact that they can still charge three days, and I know they are doing it now. I do not believe, however, it is in the interest of their own work or in the interest of justice. The judge takes a train to Montreal in the evening and charges one day. What does he do during the evening? Nothing. If he were at home he would work. Next day he holds court, and returns on the following day, and charges three days. It cannot be contended that the interests of justice are advanced in this way.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. A judge will not be guilty of such an act as that.

Mr. BERGERON. That is what is being done.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I call your attention, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to the fact that this is a reflection on the judges.

Mr. BERGERON. The hon. gentleman is not serious. I am putting the case as it is, and am pointing out that under the old law judges could claim three days. I might remind the hon. gentleman of a case which came before the Department of Justice when the accounts of Hon. T. J. J. Loranger were discussed. He gave those reasons, and they were accepted at the time. It was understood that the judges were allowed three days' allowance for holding court in one day, one day being occupied in going, one day in holding court and one in returning home. Although a judge can go to Montreal by train in the morning and return at night, he will not do it. Of course in some cases a judge would have to start early in the morning, travel twenty or thirty miles, sit in court all day, and return the same distance in the evening; and judges will not do this. The old law was more in the interest of justice than the present law.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I want to avoid discussing the question of travelling expenses.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Well, it is in the resolution.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. All I can say is, that when you learn we spend $20,000 a year to pay our judges for travelling expenses in the province of Quebec in addition to their salaries, I think every one will admit it is time for us to look about it and to see if we cannot change it.

Mr. BERGERON. That shows the system is bad.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Can the Solicitor General give me any precedent for this check which we are now putting upon the judges of the province of Quebec, upon the assumption that there has been a gross abuse for many years in the construction put upon the law by the Justice Department. Let me ask, are we going to strengthen the position of the judges of the Superior Court of the province of Quebec, some thirty of them in all, by placing them in this extraordinary position. I say this resolution places the judges in a most unenviable position before the public, because it says that hereafter their accounts will have to be certified to by another judge of another court, and that in future these judges are not to be trusted. If any judges are guilty of wrong-doing and the department cannot trust them to render proper accounts under the law for their travelling expenses, how under the sun can they expect to be free from such wrong-doing as makes this sort of resolution necessary. Under the language of the resolution, these judges are to be put under such a cloud that hereafter none of them can obtain their per diem allowance unless the chief justice, or the judge discharging the duties of chief justice in the district, certifies that the attendance of such judge was necessary. The Solicitor General may be able to give me a case which shows that this is not an invidious distinction made in the case of these judges, who are already charged with taking undue advantage of the law. Does the hon. gentleman know of any other judges who, before they draw their travelling allowances, have to submit their accounts to another judge. I know of none in my experience.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I do not think my hon. friend (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) fairly states the case.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I put it interrogatively?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. What is intended by the law if it passes is, that the judge shall be under the control of the chief justice of the province in so far as the administration of justice is concerned; that he shall not go from the district to which he is assigned to an adjoining district or to any other district of the province without being requested to do so by the chief justice. I differ from my hon. friend (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) in this respect: that I do not know of any country in the world under our system where the judges are not under the control of the chief justice. Here the judges are assigned by law to a particular district. They leave that district to go to another district, and surely we are entitled to know why they go there, and surely we are entitled to see they do not go there without having the sanction of the chief justice who presides over the court.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The reply of the Solicitor General makes it

all the more necessary for me to press my point. The hon. gentleman says that there is nothing invidious in judges being subject to the control of a superior judge. The chief justice of the court in a sense controls his puisnes, and I find no fault with the statement of the Solicitor General. It is the tradition of the position that they are subject to a head whom they loyally serve and with whom they loyally co-operate. But my point is, that I can call to mind no case either in England or in the other provinces of Canada, where one judge submits his account of expenses to the chief justice or to any other judge. If you provide that they shall do so, are you not destroying their influence and weakening their position as administrators of justice. The resolution says that not only are they under control in regard to the administration of their duties, but their accounts must be approved.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I do not think my hon. friend has read the resolution.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I have and I will read it again:

> But no travelling allowance shall be granted to any judge requested to sit in review * * * unless it is certified by the chief justice or judge discharging the duties of chief justice in the district, &c.

In my official experience I know of no case where one judge must have his accounts checked by another judge, but perhaps my hon. friend can give a precedent.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. There is no question of having his account checked by another judge. There is no such intention, and it is not so expressed in the resolution. I am sure that my hon. friend (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) is desirous to see the thing done fairly.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I am asking a question merely.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I think we are at one on that. A judge is assigned to a judicial district by law and his duty is to administer justice in that district. If he leaves that district and goes to an adjoining district, he is entitled to receive a travelling allowance, but, I ask, should he be allowed to leave his district and go to an adjoining district without some control being exercised over him by the chief justice. The intention is that the chief justice should exercise control over his going and coming from one district to another; not as to travelling allowance, for once he is authorized to leave his district, his account for expenses will be made by himself. There is no intention whatever of doing that, and I repeat that the intention is that the chief justice shall supervise or control the movement of the other judges solely and their accounts.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. And he cannot get a dollar without having that certificate?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I beg your pardon; he cannot move without the certificate, but once he has moved he can get the money.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. No.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Let me put this case to my hon. friend. Judges—I speak in the abstract now—have been known to come from their district and to go into an adjoining district, and the judge of the adjoining district leave his district and go into his confrere's district, both of them to administer justice on the same day and at the same time, simply changing districts, and be paid travelling allowances for such as that. That is going to be stopped and this resolution is intended to stop it.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. And that very statement supports my position. The Solicitor General has now spoken about a gross irregularity and a kind of conduct that would warrant a specific charge in this House and the removal of the judge guilty of it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That sort of conduct is of the grossest possible character, and the Solicitor General brings it forward as a reason for this legislation which he proposes to pass.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I say there is no checking of accounts in the resolution.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Very well. Is there any checking of accounts of the County Court judges in Ontario, in Nova Scotia, in New Brunswick, in British Columbia?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. There are no accounts to check in Ontario; they are allowed a certain fixed sum.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I have had to give authority for the payment——

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Then if my hon. friend paid them anything there was no authority for it under the statute, for the statute says they are given $200 allowance.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. My hon. friend will find in the supervising of the accounts of the judges of British Columbia that they have no fixed allowance.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. You referred to Ontario.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I referred to Ontario it is true, but the case in my mind was that of British Columbia, and as the Estimates will show I am right

in that. The allowances are not fixed absolutely. For instance, take the judges of the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia: you do not see in the Auditor General's Report a fixed amount for each judge. Do not the judges interchange their circuits? What voucher has the hon. gentleman before him in auditing these accounts? It is considered, as it ought to be considered, that in these matters the judges can be absolutely relied upon; if they cannot, they are utterly unfit for the position they occupy. The hon. Solicitor General mentions a fearful scandal which he says exists among the Superior Court judges in the province of Quebec, by which they jockey to increase their allowances, and instead of proceeding against them in the regular way, he proposes to stop it by having this sort of check on the other judges, and placing these thirty men in a position which will absolutely mar their usefulness in public opinion—placing them in such a position that I can hardly understand a man, with proper pride and self-respect, and bred up under professional traditions, remaining in that anomalous position for a moment.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I do not admit the construction which my hon. friend puts upon the resolution. I do not think it is a fair construction. There is no attempt to exercise control over the judges in their own districts. A judge may go freely about his district without any control; but if he leaves his district we say that he should not leave it without some control being exercised, and that control we think can be best exercised by the chief justice of the court to which he belongs. We say that a system has grown up which we think ought to be stopped, and that the way to stop it is by passing this resolution; and I say again that no fair-minded man can read that resolution without coming to the conclusion that our desire is to control the movements of the judges, to see that they live within the districts to which they are assigned, and to prevent them going beyond the bounds of their districts unless called upon to do so by him who has the responsibility, that is, the chief justice. But we must stop the system that has grown up in connection with travelling expenses, and we think we shall accomplish that by the resolution as now drafted.

Mr. MONK. So far as the district of Montreal is concerned, I think this part of the resolution is very wise. In that district we are exceptionally situated. We have not a sufficient number of judges there to attend to the business of the courts, and, therefore, it has become customary for judges in the outlying districts to come into Montreal. They knew that the want existed for them, they knew that they would always be welcomed there, and that there was work for them to do. But there is no doubt that this provision for the written request of the chief justice will have the effect of bringing more order into this practice. We require these judges; the business of the Montreal district could not be done without their attendance; but there must be some control. I fail to see in this resolution anything for the checking of the judge's accounts; but there should be some control of their movements, and that control is properly placed in the hands of the chief justice. I think that an analogous control exists in the judicial conditions of other countries. There must be a request from the chief justice when a judge is required from an outlying district, but I do not understand that he must go to the chief justice to have his account audited or checked.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. There is no intention to do that at all.

Mr. MONK. We have a Court of Review sitting in the district of Montreal and another in the district of Quebec. There ought to be a sufficient number of judges to hear appeals in review; but where a judge is necessarily absent through illness or other cause and is unable to take his seat on the bench in the Court of Review, composed of three judges, there must be some means for procuring the assistance of judges from some of the outlying districts. In that case a justification is required, and that justification is the fiat of the chief justice. I myself fail to see in that resolution anything debasing to the dignity of the bench, and I think it will have this effect: as we cannot have under our judicial organization a sufficient number of judges, it will bring some order into the system by which we are to be assisted by outside judges. But I would call the Solicitor General's attention to this. If this resolution is to be interpreted as he reads it, we may be debarred from the assistance of some of the judges, who may hesitate to come to Montreal if they are only to receive one day's allowance. If, for instance, on the requisition of the chief justice a judge is called in from Sherbrooke, he will require three days.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. He will be paid for each day he is absent from home.

Mr. MONK. As regards the strictures that have been made with regard to the claims for travelling allowances of some of our judges, I do not think the matter should pass without somebody who knows whereof he speaks saying anything upon it. I think some of those strictures have been made by gentlemen who do not know whereof they speak. It is well known to those who have paid any attention to the administration of justice in the province of Quebec that in the district of Montreal we have a congested state of business in the courts, and that we require the assistance of outside judges, who have hitherto been repeatedly called upon

in an informal way. The judges of the districts of St. Hyacinthe, Sorel, Richelieu and Joliette, although supposed to reside in their respective districts, have been requested to assist in the district of Montreal, and they have continued to remain in Montreal, where their presence has been tolerated, because it has been found that they could render valuable assistance. When these gentlemen remain for weeks in the city of Montreal, attending to the judicial business of a district for which they were not named, they claim a travelling allowance, and I think they have a right to claim it. They have been performing the duties of city judges, as a matter of fact, although named for outlying districts. Mr. Justice Gill's name has been mentioned.

It is a well known fact that for a long time he sat in Aylmer, when the resident judge there was ill and unable to attend court, and was therefore entitled most regularly to the travelling allowance. I do not think that the case which the hon. Solicitor General has mentioned, although it comes from him, has ever occurred in the province of Quebec. The information was brought to the Solicitor General, but I do not think that in the province of Quebec there could possibly ever have been any exchange of districts in the manner reported to my hon. friend without a good reason. Of course, the seat of the whole evil lies in our judicial system in the province of Quebec, and the sooner the Quebec legislature deals with that subject and remedies the existing grievance, the sooner we will cease to hear criticisms of the kind we have heard to-night, and which are not calculated to advance the proper administration of justice.

Mr. McNEILL. I do not think that the members of the Government, at all events, will consider that during this session I have shown any disposition to regard their measures with too great favour—the very good measures which, no doubt, they thought they were introducing. I have not at all hesitated to criticise them as I thought they deserved; but so far as this measure is concerned, I am quite satisfied that in introducing these resolutions, the Government could not have been influenced by a desire to gain political capital. I do not think that they could have considered that what they were doing would be exceedingly popular in the country, and I am credulous enough to believe that these resolutions were devised by the Minister of Justice and his department in the belief that they were right and just and in the interests of the country. Starting from those premises, I am inclined therefore to regard the resolutions with some degree of favour. As far as the province of Quebec is concerned, I know nothing about the condition of things there except what I have gathered from the discussion which has taken place. With regard to Ontario, of course one acquires a little knowledge from living there. I was very glad indeed to hear the remarks of the hon. gentleman who last sat down (Mr. Monk), and to find that he agreed with the Solicitor General in his view that it was not intended to subject the judges to that indignity, as it would really be, which some of our friends on this side seem to think the resolution necessarily implied. I think it would be very unfortunate if we were to forget for a moment that however good the laws may be which we pass, they are of very little value if we have not judges properly to administer them. The duties of a judge are about the most onerous and thankless that any member of the community has to perform. He cannot deliver judgment in any case, or seldom can do so, without offending one or other of the parties to the suit. He is subject to all kinds of misrepresentation; and unless he is supported by the good-will, the good opinion and the sympathy of his fellow-subjects, unless he has popular sentiment behind him, he cannot successfully discharge his duties, and therefore it is, I think, very important, in discussing these matters to bear in mind that the judges should be treated with a degree of delicacy and consideration which we would not perhaps extend to any other class in the community.

I think we may say with regard to the judges of the Dominion of Canada generally, that the people of Canada have a right to be thankful for and proud of our judiciary. So far as the junior judges of Ontario are concerned, it seems to me that they are at present very inadequately paid. They are, from every point of view, entitled to as much remuneration as the senior judges. The one is called the senior judge and the other the junior judge, but the difference is only in name. The junior judges have a great deal more work to do than the senior judges. I find that last year while the cases disposed of by the senior judges involved only $24,000, the cases dealt with by the junior judges aggregated a money value of $582,000, showing how very much more work the latter are doing. They have to travel, and the senior judges have not, and the amount allowed them for travelling expenses is not sufficient to cover the disbursements, in most cases, in the larger counties. Their salaries have not been adjusted for a quarter of a century, so that the salary which a junior judge has to-day is the same as he had a quarter of a century ago, although in that time the jurisdiction of the court has been very much extended, and of course the work is heavier and of greater importance. From my point of view, the case for the very moderate increase proposed in the salaries of the junior judges in Ontario is an exceedingly strong case indeed. I quite realize that any increase at the cost of the taxpayers of this

country is not popular, and for that very reason, I feel that the Government in taking up this matter and in dealing with it justly are deserving of the support of the members of this House.

Mr. ANGERS. (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, one of the objects of this resolution is to remove certain grievances which some members of the judiciary have had to complain of in the past, and this is, no doubt, a most laudable object. In the case of Mr. Justice Taschereau, I think everybody will agree that he is perfectly entitled to the additional salary which is provided by this resolution. Now, I deem it right to avail myself of this opportunity to call the attention of the Solicitor General to another injustice and to ask him to remedy it.

At the time when the salaries of the rural judges were fixed by the law, it was provided that a salary of $4,000 should be paid to all the judges with the exception of the two judges assigned to the districts of Saguenay and Gaspé, who receive only $3,500. This is an abnormal position, and for my part I am at a loss to understand on what ground such a discrimination was made and why those two magistrates were not put on the same basis as the other judges were.

I further say that if, at the time when those salaries were fixed there was some reason for thinking such a discrimination, that reason no longer exists. Why, Mr. Chairman? Because those very same districts which had but a sparse population at the time when those salaries were fixed, are far more densely settled now; they have acquired a far greater importance, and as a consequence, the judge who is assigned to the districts of Chicoutimi and Saguenay has now an increasing business to attend to, having more work than some of his colleagues who are drawing a salary of $4,000.

I take the case of Mr. Justice Gagné, who is administering justice in the judicial districts of Saguenay and Chicoutimi, because I am more familiar with the condition of things prevailing there. This is an immense territory, extending from the eastern limit of the county of Montmorency down to Blanco-Sablon.

Mr. Justice Gagné administers justice not only in that district but also in that of Chicoutimi. As a judge of the Superior Court, he has to hold court at Chicoutimi and Malbaie, and also to sit in the Circuit Court at the same places and at Baie St. Paul and Hérbertville. I might further say that he has to travel over long distances, having, as a matter of fact, hundreds of miles of territory to cover, undergoing considerable hardship. To give an instance of the hardships he has to undergo, I may mention as a fact that which is within my knowledge, that upon one occasion, he had to spend eight days on the road in covering a distance of 90 miles, from Malbaie to Quebec.

As I said a moment ago, those two districts are far more densely populated now than they were at the time when the salaries of the judges were fixed by law. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, Chicoutimi, where the court sits now, has grown into a city of considerable size and is still developing and progressing in a most wonderful way. A more industrious, and a more progressive population than that of Chicoutimi is not to be found anywhere. The Lake St. John district is also much more densely settled than it was at that time, and as a consequence, there are more cases instituted before the court and the amount of work which the judge is called upon to perform is far greater than it was in former years. And yet the salary of that judge as well as that of the judge for the district of Gaspé—and if I did not mention the latter's name before, it is because I am less conversant with his case—is only $3,500.

We have been told here with much reason, and the hon. members on both sides of the House seem to agree that it is desirable that the gross injustice which has been done Mr. Justice Taschereau in the past should be remedied. What are the facts of the case? Although he is a judge of the Superior Court, called upon to administer justice in Montreal, still he gets a thousand dollars less than his colleagues in the same court receive. And there seems to be a general consensus of opinion in the House that this anomaly should be corrected.

Now, if Mr. Justice Taschereau is entitled to be put on the same footing as the other judges, why, I ask, should the judges of Chicoutimi, Saguenay and Gaspé be dealt with differently from the other rural judges? We have been told that Mr. Justice Taschereau discharges his judicial duties with zeal and discipline. I may make the same argument on behalf of Mr. Justice Gagné, with whom I am personally acquainted, and who displays the same zeal in the discharge of his duties. If Mr. Justice Taschereau, as we were told here, does as much work as his colleagues of Montreal, I may say that Mr. Justice Gagné, who has to administer justice in those two districts, does a greater amount of work than several of the other rural judges. Such are the reasons why I feel I am justified in asking that the injustice which I have pointed out should be remedied.

Therefore, I think I am only asking what is fair, when pressing upon the Government the desirability of amending this resolution so as to give the judges of the districts of Chicoutimi, Saguenay and Gaspé the ordinary allowance of $4,000.

This amendment seems to me so much the more opportune as it is admitted that the intention of a portion of the resolution is to remedy the injustice which has been

done Judge Taschereau in the past. I do not think anybody could object to the Government removing both grievances at the same time.

Mr. WALLACE. I am sorry that I cannot agree with some of the former speakers. I think that there is very little in the proposed resolutions to recommend them to this House. Take, for instance, this one providing that the salary for an additional judge of the Court of Appeal for Ontario shall be $5,000 per annum. We have got along in the province of Ontario with four judges in the Court of Appeal; and, in the opinion of many who are capable of judging the business might very well be done by three. With four judges no difficulty has arisen. The appointment of this fifth judge is simply an added expense to the Dominion, and justice will not be better administered than before. I think that this appropriation is entirely unjustifiable and that this clause of the resolution should be struck out. In these resolutions we are confronted with an additional expenditure in the Department of Justice of $26,400. That would pay the interest, according to the way the Finance Minister is borrowing money now-a-days, on very nearly $1,000,000. We know that there is less litigation throughout the country than there was, at any rate in all the eastern provinces, Ontario, Quebec, the maritime provinces. According to the statement of the ex-Minsiter of Justice (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) there are a number of judges in Quebec who are not employed three months in the year.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. That is absolutely without foundation.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It has this foundation—the statement of a member of the Quebec bar.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I should like to know who he is.

Sir CHRALES HIBBERT TUPPER. You know him very well.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Probably it is somebody outside of Montreal.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. He is practising both in Montreal and in Quebec.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I do not believe it.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I give you my word; you can believe it or not as you please.

Mr. WALLACE. I was about to remark Mr. Chairman, that the business of the county courts in the province of Ontario has almost entirely disappeared. The senior county court judges, I am told, conduct the business of the county court, and the junior judges the business of the division court and business of that kind. The senior county court judges have very little to do, except in the case of the county of York in which is situated the city of Toronto, and there, of course, the senior judge is kept very busy. But in the counties, of the province of Ontario generally these places are almost sinecures to-day; and yet we are proposing to increase the staff of judges. The present county court judges are not fully employed in many cases. I can state that with positive knowledge of what I am saying. With regard to the province of Quebec we have the evidence of the men who know. Yet in the face of this we are asked to increase the expenditure of that department, and that in the face of the fact that for the last two years the cost of living has decreased and all classes of the community have had to curtail the expenditure and live on less money. That being the case, I do not see why the judges should not be called upon to exercise a little economy as well. But, instead of that, we have the salaries increased and new judgeships created, making additions to the expenditure which are thoroughly unjustifiable and which, I believe, will not be regarded with favour by the people. Consider the expenditure under this head, I have here the Auditor General's Report, and I quote some figures respecting judges in the province of Quebec. One judge received for travelling expenses, $1,830; another, $1,182; another, $1,644; another, $1,198; another, $1,050; another, $1,750; another, $1,428; another, $1,686; another over $1,000. So that most of the judges I have here indicated have been paid $6 a day for almost every working day in the year. We know that, in the province of Ontario, at any rate, there is what the lawyers call the long vacation, extending, I do not know how long, but through the summer and part of the fall. Yet these men are drawing their $6 a day apparently for every working day in the year. For instance, $1,830, at $6 a day would represent 305 days, out of a 312 working days in the year. Can aybody pretend that this is a fair charge or one that should be made or paid? Yet the Auditor General's Report shows that during the last fiscal year that amount was paid to one of the judges. Another judge, alluded to by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), Judge Taschereau, drew $1,686, as the hon. member for East Grey said. This judge was to live in the county of Terrebonne, but he got permission to live in Montreal. If he resided in Terrebonne, I presume he would not be entitled to mileage while administering justice in his own county. He goes to Montreal, however, and draws $1,686 for travelling expenses, or at the rate of $6 a day for 281 days. There were not that many days when court was held to justify such a charge. The Solicitor General said that that was a grievance in the past, but he was proposing to remedy it. But these resolutions do not remedy it; they do not meet

the case, as was pointed out by the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper). The so-called remedies are only offensive to the judges without being such as to correct the abuses which have prevailed. For instance, in the case in which reference has been made, these judges who go to their places to hold their courts have to get the certificate of a chief justice as to the days they are away, and the chief justice has to take their word for it. That is an invidious position in which to place a judge, and it does not secure what the Solicitor General contemplates. The Chief Justice cannot give a certificate on his own personal knowledge but can only do so on information given him by the judges themselves. It is provided that the district judges in the province of Ontario are to get $500 for travelling expenses. These district judges, as I understand it, are the judges for Algoma and the large territories where they have many hundreds of miles to cover, a larger territory than nearly all the rest of the province. Their travelling expenses in such a territory most be very considerably more, I am quite sure, than those men who are receiving more than three times as much as they do for travelling expenses. In looking over the Auditor General's Report, I do not see any statement that the judges in the province of British Columbia receive travelling allowances.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It appears in another page of the report.

Mr. WALLACE. I am glad to hear that, because any one who knows British Columbia and the enormous distances that have to be travelled by judges going from one place to another to hold court must realize that it is very expensive travelling. The charge on the railways is considerably higher than in any other part of the Dominion and the cost of travelling and living there is greater, so the judges of that province should be given liberal travelling allowances.

While they are not holding court, they are spending a large portion of their time travelling over these long distances, and in many places off the lines of railway, and undergoing considerable hardship. I think it is recognized that the judges there are also of a high class, and should receive their travelling allowance. However, I have been told they do receive it, and I think that is only right. I repeat that I think the Solicitor General has made a great mistake in bringing down these resolutions and committing this Parliament to such an enormously increased expenditure for the administration of justice, at a time when other people are curtailing their expenditure, and at a time, too, when we know that litigation in almost every province of the Dominion, except perhaps the North-west provinces and British Columbia, has enormously shrunken, and at a time when there is no necessity whatever for increasing the expenditure of this branch of government.

Mr. QUINN. In the remarks which I had the honour to address to the committee some time ago, I purposely abstained from referring in any way to the travelling expenses of the judges in the province of Quebec. I did so because I did not consider it was a matter which could be discussed here without reflecting upon the judges, and I would not wish in any way to reflect upon the character of the judges either in the province of Quebec or in any other province of the Dominion. The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) has taken the trouble to go into details concerning some of the judges of the province of Quebec. He asked me to consult the Auditor General's Report. I have taken his advice, and I would like to draw his attention to page I-10 of that report for 1896-97, where he will find that ten judges in the province of Ontario drew $13,700 last year for travelling expenses.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. In addition to that, they are allowed $1,000 a year each by the province.

Mr. QUINN. In addition to which, as I am informed, they are allowed $1,000 a year by the province of Ontario, and receive salaries of from $5,000 to $6,000 from this Government. I find that in the province of Quebec 31 or 32 judges drew in travelling expenses the sum of $21,012. In other words, there is an average of $677 paid each judge in the province of Quebec for travelling expenses last year, and in the province of Ontario, the sum of $1,370 each. If my hon. friend would devote his attention to the judges of his own province, of whose conduct he should know something, he will be able to give some enlightenment to this House; and if he will leave the discussion of the conduct of the judges in the province of Quebec to the members from that province who are familiar with their conduct, he might perhaps receive a little enlightenment. Now, I would recommend my hon. friend once more to look at the salaries of the judges of the province of Ontario. I wonder why he should undertake to criticise the judges of the province of Quebec any more than the judges of any other province. However, I would commend him to look at the salaries of the judges of Quebec, and compare them with the salaries of the judges of Ontario. For example, I find that for salaries to the judges in the province of Ontario, there are paid out by this Parliament $247,000 per annum, whereas, to the judges of the province of Quebec, there are paid $186,000 per annum in salaries. There are paid out in travelling expenses in the province of Ontario $25,800; that is to say, there are two items asked for this year, one of $13,000

and the other of $12,800, making a total of $25,800 for travelling expenses for the judges of the province of Ontario; while my hon. friend the Solicitor General asks for $16,000 in all for the allowance of Circuit Court judges in the province of Quebec. In other words, in the province of Quebec, for some 38 judges, $16,000 are asked for as travelling allowances, while for 40 odd judges in the province of Ontario, we are asked for $25,800. Now, I do not think these travelling allowances are excessive. My hon. friend the Solicitor General referred to a case which I do not think he could have taken from the province of Quebec, a case where two judges exchanged districts, so to speak, that each judge might get his travelling allowance. I would be very sorry to believe such a thing could occur in Canada at all, until I received the word of the Solicitor General that it actually did occur. I would prefer to believe it occurred in some outlying districts or territories of the United States. But my hon. friend has referred to the case of a judge travelling from one district to another, for instance, going to the city of Montreal. Now, take the case of the judge of the district of Richelieu, how would it be possible for him to go to the district of Montreal and attend to his duties as a judge in the city of Montreal, if so required to do by the chief justice, without exhausting three days' time? He would be obliged to go on a steamer, leaving Sorel, we will say, at twelve or one o'clock at night.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. He would be paid for three days as usual.

Mr. QUINN. Then what I object to in the resolution of my hon. friend is that particular portion which obliges a judge to make out, so to speak, an account for a certain number of days attendance, instead of doing as is done in the province of Quebec, voting a sum en bloc for the travelling expenses of judges, allowing them to divide it up, as has been done by the judges in Ontario. Here I find the amounts divided up in Ontario as follows:—$1,400 to one judge, $1,400 to another, $1,300 to another, $1,600 to another, $1,500 to another, $1,400 to another, $1,300 to another, $1,000 to another, $1,400 to another, $1,400 to still another. I think that would be a proper and dignified way of apportioning the travelling expenses. Let the chief justice who resides in Quebec and the acting chief justice in the city of Montreal, apportion the $16,000 that are paid for travelling expenses according to the requirements of the judges who are to be drafted from the different districts into the districts of Montreal or Quebec, as the case may be, and then we will not have this kind of criticism, which tends to anything but the elevation of the judges of the country, or to increase the respect to which they are entitled from the citizens of the country.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I want to say a word in reference to a statement I made. I understood from what the Solicitor General said that he did not accept my statement that a leading member of the profession in Quebec who practiced in Montreal and Quebec——

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I accept your statement.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I want to fix that upon the attention of the committee, because its importance is undoubted. Here is a proposal to increase the number of Superior Court judges in the province of Quebec, and my statement was that I had information from a leading member of the profession that one-third of those very judges have not more than three months work in the year. Now, instead of mentioning the name of my correspondent, I take up the reports of the House of Assembly at Quebec when the Solicitor General was a member of that assembly, I refer to the debates of 1893-94. I want the hon. gentleman to listen to the statement of the Atorney General in that assembly, on the introduction of a Bill dealing with this whole question of the judiciary and the practice of the courts. Now, on that occasion the Attorney General made this observation:

> The judges of the Superior Court in rural districts tell us to-day: "We have not much work in our districts, while there is much work in Montreal, and besides we usually come from the great cities, from Montreal or from Quebec."

Take this specific statement, supported as it is by statistics, and let us see where the congestion centred in the province. The Attorney General of the province, speaking on his responsibility on that occasion, further said:

> During the last ten years there were issued from the Superior Court for the whole province of Quebec 52,331 writs. Thus, in all the province of Quebec there were issued from the Superior Court 52,331 writs. Now, how many do you think out of this number were issued from the Superior Court of Montreal. I was surprised and astonished at the number of writs issued from the Superior Court of Montreal, and this inclines me more than ever to say that I should come to the aid of the city which suffers the most from the existing state of affairs. The number of writs issued from the Superior Court of Montreal was 29,260. That is to say that more than half of the writs of all the province of Quebec were issued from the Superior Court of Montreal. Now let us take the judgments in contested cases. The Superior Court judgments in contested cases for the province of Quebec amount to 16,220. Now for the city of Montreal alone, in the district of Montreal, out of this total number of 16,220 judgments there are 7,708, that is to say, again the half of the judgments rendered in the province of Quebec in contested cases. Now it is easily seen that if in certain districts the judges have hardly one, two or three months' work to do a year, the judges of Montreal district are so overcrowded with work that

they cannot do it at all, and are obliged to call to their assistance the judges of the surrounding country districts, and even to call the judges of country districts lower down in the river than Quebec, and the obstruction is such in the Court of Appeals at Montreal that, as I said a moment ago, that if you to-day inscribe a case at the Court of Appeals at Montreal you would be obliged to wait two years before being able to plead it.

Later he said:

I repeat that at least in a dozen districts there are judges who have not more than three months' work a year, while in the district of Montreal, Quebec and Sherbrooke the judges have more to do than they can accomplish.

That is a specific statement.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I have a very vivid recollection of this statement. It was made by Hon. Mr. Casgrain, as Attorney General, at the time he introduced his Bill, and although he was bolstered up by one of the strongest governments that ever held power in the province, he was compelled to withdraw the Bill. That indicates the force of his statement.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Does the hon. gentleman impugn the statement made?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. When any gentleman makes the statement that a judge in the province of Quebec has only one month's work in the year, I impugn it.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Three months in the year.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The statement, is one, two or three months.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Is the hon. gentleman prepared to impugn the statistics?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I impugn any such statement made.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. One statement bears out the other.

Mr. BERGERON. I want to call the attention of the Solicitor General, before he brings in his Bill, founded on this part of the resolution, which speaks about the Court of Review, to the following portion of the resolution:—

But no travelling allowance shall be granted to any judge requested to sit in review under the first section of the Act of the Legislature of Quebec, 61 Victoria, chap. 20, unless it is certified by the chief justice or the judge discharging the duties of chief justice in the district that the attendance of such judge was necessary by reason of illness, incapacity or absence of one of the judges resident at Montreal or Quebec, as the case may be.

I call attention to a statute passed by the legislature of Quebec during its last session, in which I find the following:—

1. Article 2321 of the Revised Statutes is amended by adding thereto the following:—

"The three judges of the Court of Review are, however, taken from all the judges of the Superior Court of the province, at the discretion of the chief justice or acting chief justice, as the case may be."

I believe under this Quebec statute we would be doing an act which would be unconstitutional by providing that country judges should be allowed to sit in review only when city judges could not act as judges in review.

Mr. McMULLEN. I want to say a word in reply to the hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Quinn). The hon. gentleman stated in the calculation he gave from the Auditor General's Report that the salaries of the judges of the province of Quebec amounted to $186,000. That may be quite correct, but the hon. gentleman did not add the travelling expenses, which brought up the amount to $207,000. Then the hon. gentleman calculated the salaries of judges in Ontario, but he gave the salaries and the travelling expenses together.

Mr. QUINN. I did not.

Mr. McMULLEN. I challenge the hon. gentleman's statement. He said the salaries were $247,000, and he added the travelling expenses as well as the salaries.

Mr. QUINN. I did in the other case.

Mr. McMULLEN. If the hon. gentleman will go over the figures, he will find I am right. I am not challenging the expenses paid in Ontario, nor am I challenging those paid in Quebec, if honestly and properly drawn; but I wish to point out that when a judge in Toronto is called to discharge his duties, and he draws a per diem allowance of $6 for coming in from an outside section where he was supposed to be located as a judge, while at the same time he was living in Toronto—if a judge drew money in that way, I would find fault with him. The hon. gentleman is trying to draw a herring across the track, in order to show that the judges of Ontario and the judges of Quebec were in the same category with respect to the expenses, which I contend they are not. The judges in Ontario are allowed by the Act of the provincial legislature and by a provision of the Act of this Parliament to the amount they draw; there is an understanding and clearly defined arrangement, while in the case of the Quebec judges they draw this allowance by means of a side wind. The hon. gentleman said it would be better for hon. members from Ontario to criticise matters relating to Ontario, and allow members from Quebec to discharge the same duties with regard to matters relating to Quebec. Will the hon. gentleman pretend to say that we are simply here to attend to matters for the several provinces we represent?

Mr. QUINN. No.

Mr. McMULLEN. Then, why did the hon. gentleman suggest such action in regard to the province from which he comes? We are here to legislate for the entire Dominion. I am surprised to hear an hon. member, with the learning and ability the hon. gentleman claims to possess, suggest that hon. members should confine themselves to affairs of their own province.

Mr. QUINN. I never suggested it.

Mr. McMULLEN. You will find it so recorded in "Hansard."

Mr. QUINN. What I said was that if the hon. gentleman would leave the members of the bar of the province of Quebec, who understood the matter, to discuss it, he would probably learn something. And I repeat that statement. It is true that I made a mistake. The figures should have been $182,000 salaries and travelling expenses for the judges of Quebec, and $247,000 salaries and travelling expense for the judges of Ontario. I adhere to the statement that $247,100 is asked for by the Estimates this year for travelling expenses and salaries for judges in Ontario, and $182,000 for salaries and travelling expense for judges in the province of Quebec. I reiterate that statement, and if the hon. gentleman will look at the Estimates, he will find I was correct.

Mr. McMULLEN. My hon. friend (Mr. Quinn) may possibly find that in the Estimates, but if he looks over the Auditor General's Report he will find that my statement is correct. He first quoted from the Auditor General's Report, but when he got cornered he deserted the Auditor General and went to the Estimates.

Mr. QUINN. My hon. friend (Mr. McMullen), with his usual wriggling policy, tried to put me in the hole in which he is himself. I have shown he is wrong by the Estimates, and now I will prove it by the Auditor General's Report, from which I quoted that there were actually expended last year, $13,700 for the travelling of ten judges in the province of Ontario, while 32 judges in the province of Quebec only spent $21,000. I showed from the Auditor General's Report that 32 judges in Quebec, actually spent in travelling, an average of $667 each per annum, while the ten judges in the province of Ontario spent an average of $1,300 per annum each.

Resolution agreed to, reported, read the second time and concurred in.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 150) to amend the Act respecting judges of the provincial courts.

SUPPLY—PACIFIC CABLE FROM VANCOUVER TO AUSTRALIA.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved that the House do again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. CASEY. Before that motion is carried, Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring a matter before the House which I consider is of sufficient importance to justify our devoting a little time to it, even at this late period of the session. I need not say that what I shall bring up is not a motion of want of confidence in the Government, nor even any attempt to find fault with the Government. It is a matter on which I hope to elicit the opinion of the House to some extent, and possibly the opinion of the Government; a matter which I consider to be of Imperial importance. I refer to the question of the laying of a Pacific cable to connect Vancouver with Australasia. It will be within the memory of all of us that this subject has occupied the consideration of colonial conferences, of colonial Governments, and of this House at different times. Not to go further back than the first intercolonial conference of 1887, held in London, we know that resolutions were passed there favourable to the laying of such a cable. Subsequently, when the then Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Mackenzie Bowell) visited Australia, negotiations took place which led to the summoning of the intercolonial conference in Ottawa in the early summer of 1894, where that question was again considered and the laying of the cable approved by resolution.

I shall not detain the House by reading these resolutions in detail, but I may say they were to the effect that the Imperial Government should be asked to consider as to what aid they would give, and that the Canadian Government should be asked to ascertain what such a cable would probably cost. As a result of that conference, in the year following the Government of this country called for tenders, and the lowest tender for the construction of that cable, and its maintenance for three years by the contractors, including all possible risks during the making and laying of the cable, amounted in round numbers to about one and a half million pounds sterling. None of these tenders were accepted as they were invited merely for the purpose of ascertaining about what such a cable would cost. The matter was not concluded after these investigations, but early in 1896, an Imperial committee was called together in London to consider the subject, at which Sir Donald A. Smith, now Lord Strathcona and Mount Royal, and Sir Sandford Fleming were appointed to represent the Canadian Government; there being representatives present from the Imperial Government and from the Australasian colonies. That committee held

its sittings through the summer and autumn of 1896, and at great length investigated all questions connected with the cable, and established not only the practicability of a cable being laid in the waters in question, but also that the cost would be moderate and the traffic large. The report of that committee has never been published, for some reasons which are known only to the official mind of the Colonial Office in England. For reasons of policy they have objected to the publication of the report of that committee. However, the Canadian representative, and Sir Sandford Fleming—who did not sit as a member of the committee, having stepped out and acted as consulting expert only, because the other colonies only sent one representative each—the Canadian representatives reported to the Canadian Government their own proceedings in connection with that committee. Some considerable time ago I obtained an address from the House asking for the report of that committee, and the reports of the Canadian representatives thereon. The Secretary of State reports in the return which was brought down yesterday: that "the report itself asked for, is held as confidential under instructions from the Imperial authorities not to publish until permission is given to do so." The reports of the Canadian representative and of Sir Sandford Fleming have been brought down in this return, which I shall certainly not read to the House at this time, although I hope that it will be printed for the information of the public on this very important matter. I will, however, occupy a few moments in reading a letter received from Sir Sandford Fleming by myself, in response to a request of mine for a concise and brief statement of the whole question. The letter is as follows:—

Ottawa, May 26th, 1898.

Geo. E. Casey, Esq., M.P.

Dear Mr. Casey,—I am very glad to reply to your inquiries.

I have recently received many communications from Australia, all pointing to the great interest taken in the Pacific Cable, and the desire on the part of these rich and growing communities, seated in that favoured region of the globe, to cultivate close relations with Canada.

The communications received embrace official and private letters. Among the former the following extracts from letters received from the Premiers of Queensland and New Zealand may be taken as illustrations.

The Premier of Queensland states in a letter of February 19th, 1898, that his Government "have in no sense altered their views as to the advantages to be derived by the Australian colonies and the Empire generally from the construction of the proposed Pacific Cable, connecting Australia with Great Britain by way of Canada." He is pleased to be able to give his "hearty assurance of entire sympathy with the movement in favour of this important national undertaking, and trusts that before long it may be possible to take some definite steps in the direction of executing what is by Queensland regarded as not only a very desirable, but a very practicable scheme."

The Premier of New Zealand, in a letter of March 16th, 1898, expresses the hope "that no efforts will be spared on the part of Canada to ensure the accomplishment of the scheme for a cable from Australia to the United Kingdom by way of the Pacific." He adds: "The New Zealand Government strongly favours the Pacific Cable."

In the same month (March) the Premiers of New South Wales, Queensland, Victoria and Tasmania met in Melbourne, and agreed on behalf of those colonies to supply one-third of the cost of the Pacific Cable if Canada and Great Britain will co-operate with them.

New Zealand was not represented at this conference, but the letter of Mr. Seddon, the Premier above quoted, indicates that the undertaking is strongly supported by his Government. This fact he communicated to the conference of Premiers by telegraph.

The cost of the cable has been ascertained to be under £1,500,000, and the most careful experts have calculated that an annual gross income of £150,000 would more than meet interest, sinking fund, working expenses and maintenance. In the year 1896 the cable traffic between Australasia and Europe, according to Government returns, reached 2,326,984 words. If we reckon the traffic at three shillings a word (the rate between Australia and Europe is four and nine pence per word), we have a gross revenue of £349,047, showing very clearly that, even assuming the cable business will never exceed that of 1896, there would be amply remunerative business for the Pacific Cable.

But the cable business is progressive. The following is a statement taken from the Government returns of the number of words transmitted in each year from 1891 to 1896. The traffic for last year (1897) has not yet been received.

	Total Words Transmitted.
In 1891	1,110,869
1892	1,321,412
1893	1,401,293
1894	1,323,243
1895	1,948,630
1896	2,326,984

This establishes that from 1891 to 1896 the cable business has more than doubled, and in view of the stimulating effect of a new line of communication, it is reasonable to estimate that the gross cable business in 1901 will not be less than 4,000,000 words. As 1,000,000 words at three shillings a word will produce £150,000, the revenue required to cover every charge against the Pacific Cable, it is evident that if the Pacific Cable obtains one-quarter of the Australian-European traffic it will be a paying concern from the first year it can be put in operation.

To my mind there is no reason to apprehend that the Pacific Cable will not obtain far more than one-quarter of the entire cable business. The Australian land lines are public property, managed by the Post Office Departments, and each Government will have the power to direct traffic over the Pacific Cable, so as to make it remunerative. The cable business takes its origin chiefly in New South Wales, Queensland, Victoria and New Zealand, and it is obvious that if these colonies have a proprietory interest in the undertaking its complete financial success will be assured.

New South Wales, Queensland and Victoria have agreed through their Premiers to become

responsible for one-third of the whole cost. It is understood that the Imperial Government will be willing to bear one-third. There remains one-third to be borne by New Zealand and Canada, in proportions to be agreed upon.

These facts and explanations clearly establish that whatever share of the co-partnership may be assumed by Canada the liability will be merely nominal. As the existing traffic alone, without taking into account the new business certain to be created, would be more than sufficient to cover working expenses, maintenance, interest and sinking fund to pay off the original loan, all increase of business and all new business to be developed between Canada, the United States and Australia would swell out receipts in a few years so as to admit of a reduction in charges on messages much below present rates, by which great advantage to the public would result.

It has been proposed to establish this national work through the instrumentality of a Pacific Cable trust, to be created by the several Parliaments. This trust to be empowered to raise by loan the required capital, providing for its replacement by sinking fund. The loan to be guaranteed by the associated Governments in agreed proportions.

The Pacific Cable trust would be a small board on which the associated Governments would be represented. As empowered by statute it would do everything necessary to establish and operate the line, collect the revenue and properly account for it.

By this means a great national undertaking designed to promote trade and bring the outer Empire into electric contact would be easily established without any actual addition to the public debt or any annual charge on the taxpayer.

Yours very truly,

SANDFORD FLEMING.

It may be asked, Sir, why, if this enterprise is so sure to pay, it should not be undertaken by a private corporation. The answer is, that if it were undertaken by a private corporation, the provincial governments in Australasia which have been referred to would not be bound by their own interest to send over it the business necessary to make it a paying concern. That is a very sufficient answer in itself. It would have to compete for its business with the Eastern Extension Cable Company, a tremendously wealthy and influential corporation in trying to get into the good graces of the provincial governments which control that business and it is easy to understand that a new company could not compete successfully with an old, influential and wealthy one. In the second place, the capital could not be obtained at nearly as reasonable rates by a company as by a cable trust, with the guarantee of the different governments. The ordinary rate of profit expected by investers would certainly range from 5 to 8 per cent, or probably more, whereas the rate of interest at which money could be borrowed on a government guarantee would be between 2½ and 3 per cent. That difference is enough to make the distinction between a paying and a non-paying investment. As to the responsibility incurred by the governments which guarantee this loan, I think Sir Sandford's statement, which he assures me is taken from the Government blue-books of these colonies, is sufficient to make it appear that the responsibility would be purely nominal. I might instance the case of the Intercolonial Railway. When Canada proposed to build that road the Imperial Government, whose credit was so much better than ours, guaranteed a very considerable amount of the bonds, and we got the money at a lower rate of interest than we otherwise could have done. Yet the Imperial Government has never had to pay a cent of the interest on those bonds. When we have a case like this, in which it is clear that the other parties who would go into the enterprise of laying the cable, have it in their power to direct over it a paying stream of traffic, and would be interested in doing so as guarantors of the scheme, it seems to me very clear that neither this country nor any of the other colonies would ever have to pay a cent towards liquidating the cost of that cable.

Why should Canada take the initiative in this matter? In the first place, because she is the most important colony and most interested in this cable of any except Australia. In the second place, because Canada has acquired already what it is now fashionable to call the hegemony of Greater Britain. She is the most important in the councils of the greater Empire which lies outside the British islands. Since the day of the Jubilee celebration, I think that cannot be doubted. Ever since then it is admitted by Englishmen that Canada is not only the leader of the colonies, but the leader of the Empire, in many questions of policy, both internal and external. Canada has already gone a long way on certain paths which are intended to promote, not only her own prosperity, but the unity of the Empire and the mutual co-operation of its different members. It is eminently proper, therefore, that Canada should take the initiative in this matter. I do not speak now as if the initiative remained to be taken. Canada has taken the initiative in discussing this matter and obtaining the necessary information with regard to it. What is required is that she should now take the initiative by being the first to lay down a definite scheme to carry out the plans that have already been fully discussed, and take up her share of Imperial responsibility in this connection.

The commercial advantages to Canada of this scheme will be great. We have had for some years a line of steamers plying between Vancouver and Australia, but only within this year that line has ceased to pay and has had to be taken over by another company. Why? Simply because there has not been direct telegraphic communication between Canada and Australia. Where there is no direct telegraphic communication, and no ports of call, having

telegraphic connections, between points so far distant as Vancouver and Australia, where ships can call for orders, commerce is sure to languish as it has in this case.

Still more from the point of view of the safety of the Empire, and thereby indirectly our own, this cable would be an agency whose importance cannot be exaggerated. In these days of wars and rumours of wars, and of cutting of cables by one of the combatants to embarrass the other, the necessity of a cable with its terminals on British territory is very clearly apparent. This proposed cable line, according to the most feasible route, will start from Vancouver, and then by way of Fanning Island and Fiji to Norfolk Island, from which it will fork to New Zealand and Australia. The total length will be something over 7,000 miles. The committee in England have fully established the feasibility of laying a cable in these waters at a reasonable cost. Under all these circumstances I am sure that we are in a position to ask the Imperial Government to drop the veil of secrecy which has been laid over the matter at present, and to come out fully and frankly and meet ourselves and the other colonies half way, not only in promising support to this scheme, but in maturing and carrying out the project. There is urgency in the matter at present for two reasons. In the first place, this Eastern Extension Company has been trying to obtain the assistance of the Australian colonies to another route, by way of the Cape of Good Hope, from Australia to England. In the second place, the French Government has a cable from New Caledonia to New Zealand, and steps have been taken to construct another link in a route which would connect New Caledonia with Hawaia, and thence by the American cable with San Francisco. If either of these schemes took practical form, the proposal for the Canadian cable would be at an end, because either of the others would serve the purpose of Australia, if not ours.

A profitable and growing trade between Australia and Canada cannot be accomplished by any other means than by this electric communication. We should then be the warehouse for European goods going to Australia and Australian goods coming to England over our great national highway, the Canadian Pacific Railway. I do not bring up this question with any idea of forcing the hand of the Government or urging it to say anything definite in the matter to-night, but in the hope that it will promote such a discussion as will give the Government some idea of the feeling in the House and country, and that there will be such discussion in the country, even in these days of interesting war news, as will call public attention to the matter, and enable the people to see that it is a national Canadian, as well as Imperial, work of great importance and deserving of more activity on our part.

I do not know that I have anything further to add to what I have already said and to the remarks I have quoted from the greatest living authority on submarine cables, Sir Sandford Fleming. I could give interesting details from the various papers brought down, but although they would add to the interest of the subject, they would not add to the pleasure of the House to-night. I hope to hear from both sides on the question. I am sorry that some hon. gentlemen are not present whom I would desire to see here to-night. I refer to members from British Columbia on this side of the House—I see one on the other side—who are, to my knowledge, in sympathy with this scheme, but I am forced to bring it on in their absence on account of the nearness of prorogation.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I waited, Mr. Speaker, before rising, in the belief that some member of the Government would, in response to the very strong appeal just made by the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey), favour the House with the position which the Government propose to take on this very important question. I have not had an opportunity of reading the papers that have been placed on the Table, and from what my hon. friend says, I am afraid I would not derive a great deal of information if I had.

Mr. CASEY. Yes, the report of the Canadian commissioner is pretty full.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I speak of the matter so far as the views of the Government are concerned which is an important point; and, from what fell from my hon. friend who has just gone over this subject with so much care and ability, I am afraid I should not have learned a great deal as to the attitude of the Government. But I may say, that I am afraid that the Government have scarcely realized our just expectations in regard to this very important matter. The question was taken up with great zeal and great ability long ago by Sir Sandford Fleming, who gave the subject attention, not from the promoter's point of view, because he never dealt with the subject from that standpoint at all, but entirely from the higher point of view of what he could do—and it was a great deal—to bring such facts and evidence to bear upon the question as would commend it to the consideration of the Government and lead to its being taken up by the Government of Canada and other countries interested with a view to its accomplishment. I do not intend to say a single word with regard to its importance. The hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) has pointed out, that probably the failure of those who undertook the establishment of a line of communication between the great Island Continent of

Australia resulted to a large extent from the want of that direct telegraphic communication which so greatly facilitates commercial transactions. I will now give the House a little idea of the position in which that question was when I resigned the position of High Commissioner in London. The great conference that was held of the Australasian representatives and the representatives of the British Government meeting here with the representatives of Canada gave a great impetus to this project. After consideration of the subject that conference arrived at a practically unanimous resolution in favour of the question being taken up and pressed upon the consideration of Her Majesty's Government. Lord Jersey, who represented the Imperial Government at that conference attached very great importance to this project and dealt very ably with it in his report to Her Majesty's Government upon the conference itself. When the present Government came into power I made a very strong appeal under direction of the Government of Canada to the Right Hon. Mr. Chamberlain, the Colonial Minister, to take up this question of the Pacific Cable connecting Canada with Australasia, and that right hon. gentleman having given a great deal of attention and careful consideration to the subject was good enough to receive a deputation. On that occasion, I was accompanied to the Colonial Office by the representatives in London of all the Australasian colonies, including New Zealand, with the exception of the representatives of South Australia and West Australia. We never expected to have the active support of these provinces, for the reason that they had built a very long and expensive line of telegraphic communication across the country connecting with the Eastern Extension Company, and the carrying out of the project of cable communication on the Pacific from Vancouver to Australia would tend very much to take away the business upon which this line constructed by South Australia and West Australia depended for its maintenance. I may say that when on the occasion on which, under instructions of the Government of Canada and of all the Australian Governments, except the two I have mentioned, we waited upon the Right Hon. Mr. Chamberlain with a joint request that a commission should be appointed by Her Majesty's Government for the purpose of taking up the question as to whether it was desirable that this Pacific Cable should be established and in what form it was most likely to be successfully carried out, the Colonial Minister at once warmly entered into the subject, and, in response to our application agreed promptly to issue a Royal Commission to invite representatives from Canada and from Australia to meet in England for the purpose of conferring with Her Majesty's Government on that subject. And I may say—and it is a very important statement that I am about to make—that Mr. Chamberlain, who is noted not only for his great ability, but for his thorough knowledge of financial questions, stated to the delegation or representatives from Canada and Australia that, having given to the subject the fullest and most careful consideration in his power, and, in the light of all the information that could be brought to bear upon it, he had arrived at the conclusion that the accomplishment of the Pacific Cable from Vancouver to Australia would not involve, practically, any financial responsibility. He reached this conclusion not only from the evidence that had been submitted by Sir Sandford Fleming, to which he had given careful attention, but from the stronger and more complete evidence afforded by the invitation for tenders by the Government of Canada at the request of the Ottawa conference. This invitation resulted in obtaining from one of the strongest firms of Great Britain, the India Rubber and Gutta Percha Cable Company and Works a tender for the construction and maintenance for three years of the cable. This not only established that the calculations that Sir Sandford Fleming had made—and very elaborate calculations they were—were sound but that the terms on which one of the strongest cable companies in Great Britain was prepared to carry out the work, was nearly a million less than Sir Sandford Fleming had estimated.

So that instead of having been too sanguine, instead of having overestimated the results of his labours, it was found by practical test that his figures were outside figures, and that he could undoubtedly have constructed it at a much lower rate than he had estimated. Not only that, but as I have said, the Colonial Minister himself declared that having gone into the subject with great care, he had arrived at the conclusion that this great work in which Her Majesty's Government were most deeply interested, could be carried out by the joint operation of Canada, Great Britain and Australasia, without practically involving any other material financial responsibility whatever. Now, Sir, that was an enormous point gained. A commission was appointed, and, as the House knows from the papers that have been laid upon the Table, no definite conclusion was arrived at. A change of Government occurred about that time, and an alteration was made in the commission, although I am glad to know that the present Government availed themselves of the invaluable services of Sir Sandford Fleming in this matter, as the previous Government had done, but with the result that while we all looked forward to this great Jubilee occasion as one on which we had every reason to believe this important work would be finally arranged, on the contrary, for some cause, to me unaccountable, the work was not proceeded with, but suffered a decided set-back. The hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey)

has invited the Government to seek Her Majesty's Government to remove the veil of secrecy and let us see behind the scenes, let us learn why it is that in view of this great work, so vitally important to us and to Australia, equally important to Her Majesty's Government and to the Empire itself, as recent events have strikingly evidenced—why it is that this matter should be apparently in abeyance. Now, Sir, I hold in my hand a paper to which I would like very well to have drawn the attention of the First Minister, who, I am sorry to see, is not in his seat to-night; it contains a statement made apparently with a good deal of authority, and which throws a good deal of responsibility in regard to the present position of this important question, upon that right hon. gentleman. I hold in my hand a copy of the London "Standard," of the 26th of July, 1897. I may say for the information of some members of the House who may not be aware of the fact, that the London "Standard" is practically the organ of Her Majesty's Government. I do not know a paper published in London that is looked to with the same confidence as the London "Standard" to ascertain the views and sentiments of Her Majesty's Government. This paper professes to give, on what purports to be the best authority, the report of an interview between Mr. Chamberlain and the Colonial Premiers. We have had since that a portion of the details laid by that right hon. gentleman himself upon the Table of the House, but this inside view of the interview gives us some information above and beyond anything that is to be found in the statements laid upon the Table of the House of Commons. I may say that from the very moment that this question of a Pacific Cable was mooted, it met with the most untiring hostility of the Eastern Extension Cable Company of which Sir John Pender, a very able man, was the founder, a man of consummate ability, and whose arms were long and far reaching. I say from the outset this Pacific Cable project met with the determined hostility of the Eastern Extension Cable Company for the obvious reasons that they had practically a monopoly of communication with the great islands of Australasia, and disliked any competition from another and superior line of communication, and one more free from interruption than the line that now exists. Well, it appears that in their untiring efforts to defeat this scheme, they brought forward and placed before the cable commission in London, an alternative scheme. I will now read a report of what professes to be a result of the conference between Mr. Chamberlain and the Colonial Premiers:

> The conference left the Pacific Cable scheme in mid-air, and it is very unlikely that anything more will be heard of it for a considerable time. The position was entirely changed by a proposal by the Eastern Extension Telegraph Company to lay an all-British line from Western Australia, across the Indian Ocean to Mauritius, thence connecting with the Cape and St. Helena and Ascension. Under any circumstances, Western Australia and South Australia were opposed to the Pacific Cable,——

For the reasons I have mentioned.

> ——which would divert traffic from their land lines, and Victoria was indifferent. New South Wales, Queensland and New Zealand were, by reason of their geographical position, prepared to subsidize the Pacific line, and if the Home and Canadian Governments had been willing to pay their share, no doubt the scheme would have been carried out. But the conference soon discovered that the Imperial Treasury was very unwilling indeed to subsidize the line, while Sir Wilfrid Laurier indicated that he mistrusted the estimates of cost, revenue and maintenance which had been submitted by the projector, and was not prepared to pledge Canada to bear a share of the burden.

Now, Sir, I regret that the right hon. gentleman is not here to give to this House some explanation of the grounds upon which he should have questioned the conclusion of the projector, for that could be no other than Sir Sandford Fleming, as he was the party who had put forward all the data upon which this question was dealt with. I would like to know why he should throw doubt and discredit upon Sir Sandford Fleming's calculations of the cost, when they had been subjected to so severe and important a test as that of being submitted to competition between the great cable companies, and it had been found that instead of those calculations being unworthy of confidence, he had erred upon the safe side of largely over-estimating the cost beyond what it was found an important cable firm in London were prepared to construct the work. If that be a correct statement, I regret very much that such doubts should have been expressed, or that any hesitation should have been expressed by Canada in regard to a matter that I look upon as very important, not only to Canada and Australia, but perhaps still more important to the Empire itself.

If Her Majesty's Government show a disposition, as here stated, to recede from the position of being prepared to bear a large and substantial portion of the risk, regarded as a very light one by the representative of the Imperial Government, Mr. Chamberlain, a very great change must have taken place in that right hon. gentleman's opinion from the time I had the pleasure of discussing that subject with him in connection with the delegates from all the colonies. I do not intend at this hour to occupy further time than to say that this is a question deserving the hearty support of the Government and Parliament of Canada. I believe it is all but demonstrated that it is of great importance to us, that it would make Canada the great highway and thoroughfare for a very large amount of the cable communication between the great island conti-

nent of Australasia and Europe; that it would have ensured us a position that would have been one of great value commercially, that it would have been attended with a very moderate charge, if any, on the revenues of the country, and at the same time have resulted in giving our geographical position that importance to which I think it is justly entitled. I hope the further consideration of this question will lead to its being promptly taken up by the Imperial Government, the Government of Australasia and the Government of Canada at no distant day, and that at no distant day we may see that which has been regarded with general favour and as a matter of great importance by all parties, except by those interested and who have a direct interest, such as the Eastern Extension Cable Company has, in preventing its being carried out.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). I do not think it would be safe to accept the "Standard" or any other newspaper as accurately representing what may be the true position of this question. One thing I may assure the hon. gentleman and that is that up to a very recent date the Imperial authorities objected to bringing down any further information, and I am justified in saying, in obedience to that intimation, nothing further has been brought down. As to the question itself, no doubt the hon. leader of the Opposition and my hon. friend who has brought this matter under the consideration of the House, are quite justified in saying that this is a very important enterprise, and under certain possible conditions it would probably be extremely desirable that the several parties concerned should take steps to bring it about. But as regards the people of Canada at large, with whom we are most concerned, while I am not disposed to say it is of no great consequence to them, I am disposed to say this, that of the three principal parties concerned, they are, in my judgment, the least directly concerned. I think the great Australasian group beyond question are the most interested, and next to them, having regard to their enormous interests in the Pacific Ocean at large and in Australasia in particular, I think the Imperial authorities are most interested; and while not disposed to deny that Canada has a distinct and material interest in promoting trade and commerce with the Australian colonies, I think I am justified in saying that of the three parties we are the least interested, from a commercial point of view, at all events. Under these circumstances, and bearing in mind that Canada, in my judgment, has been called upon to contribute enormously in proportion to her resources to the building of a trans-continental railway across this continent, in regard to which I have always held the British Government ought to have contributed, and I think the hon. gentleman opposite, if I am not mistaken, was very much of the same opinion——

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. It is no particular secret now that if we had been a little less precipitate in making an agreement for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway some thirty years ago, the British Government would have been compelled to have assisted largely in its construction. However, the whole burden fell on Canada. Canada, in carrying that out, in my judgment, rendered great service to the Empire, which has not been adequately acknowledged up to the present time, at all events, by the British Government. Under these circumstances, while I would not be disposed to refuse to take a reasonable share in this cable enterprise, I consider Canada should not to be called upon to bear too large a proportion; and that without entering into any very minute discussion to-night on the subject of the proposed cost and of the proposed revenue which may be obtained from various sources, we in this Dominion are justified in saying both to the Australasian group and to Great Britain that after all we should not be called on to contribute to it more than in accordance with our interest. Up to the present time the Government have not found it possible to come to an exact understanding with the other parties to the enterprise, although they have not abandoned the hope that negotiations may yet be carried out to a successful issue. I am not at the present time going to enter into any details about these negotiations, which would rather injure than promote the cause; but of two things the hon. gentlemen opposite may rest assured: first, that we shall not lose sight of it; and second, that we shall feel it our duty to see that Canada is not called upon to bear more than her proper proportion of the cost. It may prove, and I hope it will prove, when this matter is thoroughly brought before the Australian colonies, and the proposal is placed before the people at home, that the expectations formed by the gentlemen promoting this scheme are correct, there is reasonable hope that advances will speedily be made which will bring about the realization of the hon. gentleman's desire. Up to the present moment, although these things are in the air, they are not fully crystallized, I am not in a position to come down to the House with any definite proposition on the subject. Moreover, though Canada is a country of great potential resources; the Dominion and this Government have undertaken a great many expensive operations up to the present moment, and our resources at this time, as we shall be reminded by speeches from hon. gentlemen opposite later on, are very fully engaged. I must say that we should be very careful in regard

to entering into any immediate liability, although we may believe there is a reasonable good chance of being recouped within a moderate space of time. I do not want to deter any hon. gentleman who has taken an interest in the subject from giving the House and the Government the benefit of his views. Anything the hon. leader of the Opposition or his friends or our friends may choose to say will be carefully considered by the Government and receive due attention at their hands We are not, however, in a position to bring down at this moment any suggestion as to the proportion of the enterprise we should undertake, and I hardly think it would be profitable to those who desire to promote this enterprise to enter into any discussion of that phase of the question. As to the general benefit that may follow, I do not dispute it. The only point I make is, that while it may be of interest to Canada, it is of very much more interest to the Australian group, whose inhabitants are wealthy people, quite as wealthy, and perhaps more so, than are Canadians as yet; and to the people of Great Britain, whose interest would be very largely served by having a second line of cable through British territory which would be practically inaccessible to any attempts that may be made by any foe at any time to interrupt communication.

Mr. McNEILL. I do not purpose to detain the House in reference to this matter, but I would like to call the attention of the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) to one fact in connection with the subject which he admits is one of very great importance, and that is, that the emissaries of the Eastern Extension Telegraph Company are at present hard at work in Australia doing all they can to induce the Australian colonies to give up their intention of supporting this project, so that delay now will be exceedingly dangerous. I would also call the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that the present time seems to be singularly appropriate for urging this question upon the attention of the Imperial authorities. When every one must be alive to the enormous importance of telegraphic communication from one point of the Empire to the other, I should imagine that this was a time, if ever, when an effort should be made to bring this question home with the greatest possible force to the Imperial Government. I find that in a memorandum which was recently presented to the Imperial House of Commons by the Colonial Secretary, the Colonial Secretary said, that the Imperial authorities were ready to co-operate; willing to co-operate, but that they would not take the initiative, as the initiative should come from the colonies interested. If that initiative is not taken and if this matter is allowed to drift, the result might be that this hostile cable company may succeed in blocking this very important Imperial scheme altogether. I very much regret that there should have been the delay which has taken place in regard to it. I think it is only too true what was said by the "Standard" in reference to the action taken by our own Prime Minister in England, because I find that in a letter, a copy of which was placed on the Table of the House last night, addressed by the Prime Minister of Queensland to Sir Sandford Fleming, this sentence occurs:

> The matter was, as you are aware, discussed at the conference between the Right Hon. the Secretary of State for the Colonies and the Premiers of the self-governing colonies held in London last year, and it was with some surprise that I heard Sir Wilfrid Laurier announce during the course that the proceedings that his Government was not yet prepared to give practical effect, so far as the Dominion of Canada was concerned, to the proposal that the colonies interested should guarantee their shares of the cost of the construction of the cable.

It would seem, therefore, that the information possessed by the "Standard" is correct, and that really Sir Wilfrid Laurier's course in London last year had very much to do with the blocking of this most important Imperial work. It is very unfortunate that that should have been the case. From the best information that we can obtain, from the opinion of the Right Hon. Mr. Chamberlain himself, and from the opinion of many other experts, it would seem that this great Imperial work will not cost the people of Canada one cent; that it will not in any way increase the burdens of the people of Canada; that it will be a self-sustaining concern from the very beginning and that all the Government of Canada will be asked to do will be to give a guarantee. No one has at all ventured to dispute that fact. Under those circumstances I do think that it is unfortunate that there should be any appearance of stickling for the exact proportion which may be guaranteed by Canada, by Australasia, and by the mother country. I believe that the benefit to Canada of the Pacific Cable would be enormous, both commercially and as a matter of safety for the whole community. No portion of this cable will be laid upon foreign soil, and it will have this other great element of safety connected with it, that it will be a deep sea cable, a cable that it will be exceedingly difficult for any hostile power to reach and interfere with. In that respect it would be very different from the cables proposed to be laid by the Eastern Extension Company, which will be cables laid in shallow waters, and which might be readily intereferd with. If through any untoward circumstances the people of this country should be deprived of the advantage which the construction of this cable would bring to them, it would be a very great pity indeed. I would venture to urge upon the Government in the strongest way possible that they should do all that they can do to expedite the negotiations, whatever they

may be, that are being carried on at the present time.

Mr. WALLACE. I regret very much that the Government have not a more satisfactory statement to make with regard to this cable. Recent events have made it most imperative that some action should be taken in this regard. I have here a letter written by Mr. Parkin, Principal of Upper Canada College, than whom I think no one is more capabe of giving an intelligent opinion upon the importance of this cable, both from a Canadian point of view and from the standpoint of a great national British work. Mr. Parkin's letter, which I will take the liberty of reading to the House, is as follows :—

NOW FOR THE PACIFIC CABLE.

An Object Lesson which Establishes its Utility and its Political Urgency.

Editor World :—The events of the last few days have brought out with startling vividness some truths which a few thinkers have with pain and difficulty been trying to impress upon our British world of late years. These lessons are now being written in letters of flame on men's minds. The importance of coaling stations, the need of instant communication with every part of the world, the overwhelming weight of naval defence energy, the amazing significance of sea power, are things which are now in every man's thoughts. Are we British people going to learn, and learn effectively, one great lesson which they teach ? Will the events of the past week at last make us realize the immediate necessity for constructing the Pacific Cable ?

It seems to me that Canada is the country which should move in the matter, and move at once. I believe that the whole thing can be done, so to speak, with the turn of a finger. A joint resolution by both Houses of the Canadian Parliament, addressed to the Queen or to the Colonial Secretary, asking that a Royal Commission should at once be appointed, with full powers to arrange for the construction and operation of a cable from Canada to Australia, and to assign the fair proportion of cost to be borne by the different parts of the Empire, would almost compel action in the matter. Canada's guarantees for the initial cost tacked to the resolution would make it immediately effective. Such a guarantee can be given without any risk. Sir Sandford Fleming has proved over and over again that the cable must necessarily pay from the start. We do not contribute to the Imperial army or navy, which protects us, but we can at least show our national pluck and patriotism in a peaceful enterprise like this.

The proposal is made in no jingo spirit To quote the words used by the American admiral to Mr. Goschen, as they together viewed, last summer, the 30-mile line of British battleships drawn up at Spithead : " This makes for peace." The mere idea of the whole might of the British navy, its North Pacific squadron, its China squadron, its Australian squadron, its West African and East African squadrons, to say nothing of the Channel and Mediterranean fleets, or of the flying squadrons, which we now know can be sent to sea inside of forty-eight hours, launched from every quarter of the globe under the impulse of one will and one national purpose against an enemy, presents, in the light of recent events, a picture of prodigious and irrestible power, which, more than anything else, will make nations disposed to trouble us shrink from war. The comparative paralysis which would fall upon this gigantic machinery if the power of concerted action were removed, as it is likely to be without a Pacific Cable, cannot be contemplated with equanimity by a nation which has such vast industrial and commericial interests at stake as have our British people. A single battleship let loose on one of our great cities in any corner of the world would in one hour do more damage than would cover the cost of three such cables. If we have men at Ottawa who know how " to take occasion by the hand," now is the opportunity. Not a moment should be lost, for we know how easily the destructive forces of the world may be let loose. British people hold a position in the world where they must do something more than hope for peace ; they must, if possible, command it. This is a time when every link of the Empire should be firmly welded, and Canada has the opportunity of welding one of the most important. I am satisfied that the Government at Ottawa would be heartily supported by men of all parties if they boldly and immediately dealt with the question.

GEO. R. PARKIN.

I think that is a pretty good argument in favour of immediate action without requiring any further remarks from myself.

THE AUDITOR GENERAL.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, before you leave the Chair, I want, late as the hour is——

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has already spoken.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I propose to move a resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER. As the hon. gentleman has spoken on the motion before the Chair, to enable him again to speak, an amendment would have to be moved by another hon. member.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the motion is put, I desire to move the motion which my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition proposed to move, in this sense :

That all the words after the word " That " be left out and the following added instead thereof :—" in the opinion of this House the Auditor General as a functionary of the House of Commons charged with the duties of control over the application of the public moneys by the executive Government is entitled to great latitude in reporting his opinions to Parliament, and that he should be encouraged, in the public interest, to explain, in detail, every particular connected with the appropriation of the public grants upon which he may think it desirable that Parliament should have further information."

I do not imagine that there will be any opposition to the passage of this resolution ; but it does seem necessary, in the light of certain events that have taken place, to have the affirmation put upon the records of the House. It is not within our right to take notice of what has transpired in a

committee; but we have seen from the public press that certain strictures were passed upon the Auditor General during the proceedings of a committee of this House which rather led to the idea that possibly the Auditor General's freedom, which he has hitherto exercised, in the criticism of public accounts and expenditures, it was in contemplation to narrow and restrict to a certain extent. I have had, as Finance Minister and a member of the late Government, a great deal of intercourse with the Auditor General; and although at times some friction, such as will always take place between a parliamentary officer and the spending departments, took place in regard to various accounts from time to time, I can bear cheerful testimony, as I have always done, to the fairness and honest endeavour of the Auditor General to perform his duties as a parliamentary officer without fear or favour or partiality. It would be a great mistake, I think, and one which Parliament could not overlook, if any attempt were made to restrict the freedom of the Auditor General in these respects. For my own part, rather than see that done, I would rather see greater facilities placed at his disposal for the most efficient investigation of every expenditure which is made—facilities which, I think, should be cheerfully placed at the hands of the Auditor General by every department; for every department is in the end most vitally interested in having the closest and deepest scrutiny of its expenditures detailed to this House and to the country. I do not propose to make a long speech upon what is a self-evident proposition. I place this motion before the House in order that my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition may have an opportunity of expressing his views more at length.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, I took an opportunity of placing this motion in the hands of the right hon. leader of the Government a short time ago. At that time it was not exactly convenient that it should be moved; and I therefore consented not to move it on that day, but to take a subsequent opportunity, on the motion to go into Supply, to move it. It is in virtue of that arrangement that I desire, before temporarily leaving the House, to say a few words on the subject; at this hour of the night they will be very few. I do not move this motion from a hostile point of view at all. A motion made on going into Supply is usually regarded to a certain extent as a vote of want of confidence, and is resisted by the Government; but that, as my hon. friends on the Treasury benches know, is by no means a necessary result. It is perfectly competent for the Government—and they very frequently do it—to accept a motion which is made on going into Supply, and when there is no other means, as at this period of the session there is no other means, of reaching the question. I hope and believe that this resolution will receive the unanimous support of the House—that hon. gentlemen opposite, who are more interested at this moment than we are, will avail themselves of the opportunity to have the increased protection which such a resolution as this will give to them. The House will remember that some time ago, after the leader of the Liberal Government, the Hon. Mr. Mackenzie, had some experience of the cares and responsibilities and difficulties of his position on the Treasury benches, he gave expresson to a very plaintive appeal in a letter to one of his friends over his own signature, as to the position in which he found himself, and in case any hon. gentleman opposite has forgotten that appeal, I will read an extract from the letter written by the late Hon. Alexander Mackenzie on the 27th April, 1875:

> I would like much to be relieved of the Public Works Department, but I cannot see my way to do that at present. It is a great spending department, and a possible great jobbing department, and a department that can make or ruin the Government at such a time as this. Nearly twenty-five millions are in the power of its head to spend in public works. Friends expect to be benefited by offices which they are unfit for, by contracts they are not entitled to, by advances not earned. I feel like the besieged, lying on my arms night and day. I have offended at least twenty parliamentary friends by my defence of the citadel. A weak Minister here would ruin the party in a month, and the country very soon.

Every hon. gentleman will know that, true to the principle which the Hon. Alexender Mackenzie announced in that letter, he brought forward a measure which he considered of great importance in the protection of the public revenues of this country. That was the establishment of the office of Auditor General. The Auditor General was not to be a Government officer but a parliamentary officer, placed by statute beyond and above the power of the Government, and only to be reached through Parliament itself. The hon. gentleman selected a gentleman to fill that position of great ability and high character, and, as I believe, of independence and integrity, to discharge the important functions of Auditor General of this country. Well, we were startled not long ago by reading in the press that a prominent gentleman connected with the Administration had stated that he intended to have a very sharp issue with that important parliamentary official, and that in fact the Government did not intend to submit to his exercise of the right of free criticism of their acts to the extent he had shown a disposition to do. That is a very alarming statement, taken in the light of the note I have just read from a gentleman who was charged with the duty of carrying on the Liberal Government of this country and with the serious responsibility of resisting their onslaughts of his supporters upon the public revenues and treasury of the country. It, therefore, becomes a matter, not only of importance to

Parliament and the country but of the first significance to the Government themselves, that that official, thus clothed by Parliament with the power to protect the revenue of the country, should have his hands strengthened instead of weakened, and instead of being terrorized by the determination of the Government to resist his efforts to discharge his duty in a thoroughly independent manner, he should be made feel that he has the confidence of Parliament, and that, independent of party, we are determined to strengthen his hands in the discharge of his duties.

A rumour still more startling than that to which I have just referred has been passing about the lobbies of this House and received a good deal of prominence in the last few days. It is that a prominent member of the Administration had absolutely declared that he did not intend, as the head of a great spending department in this country, to be restrained by the Department of Justice; that although he might ask the opinion of the Department of Justice on questions of law bearing upon the expenditure of public money and questions of that kind, he practically declared that he only intended to use the Department of Justice as a buffer to protect the Government rather than direct and control them in the expenditure of public money. In that state of things, we can only say that it becomes doubly necessary that gentlemen on both sides should combine to strengthen the hands of the officer who was created for the express purpose of preventing even the Government from taking any undue liberty with the control and administration of public funds. I do not see why this resolution should not receive the unanimous support of both sides, because it is simply a declaration of facts that will have the result of effectively strengthening the hands of an important public officer, who has been clothed with power for the express purpose of protecting the public interests of Canada.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I am sure it is a great pleasure to me, and I am certain that it would have been a great pleasure to my lamented friend, Mr. Mackenzie, could he have witnessed it, to have so ample and satisfactory a testimony to the wisdom of our determination to appoint an Auditor General as is now given by hon. gentlemen opposite. I may take some little credit, too, for I believe it fell to my lot to introduce the Audit Act and appoint the Auditor General in the first instance, I would just caution my hon. friend opposite not to put too great credence on the rumours he hears about the corridors, especially when, as in this case, they have no doubt been started by friends of his own who are not all anxious to promote harmony among the members of the Government. I have not heard any hon. gentleman presiding over a great spending department express any determination to ignore the Department of Justice—very much the contrary. Nor do I think he is correct in stating, as far as I know, that any member of this Government has announced his intention of making things unpleasant for the Auditor General. Of course the Auditor General may on occasion come into collision with members of the Government, or rather perhaps I should say, more correctly, with officers of their departments, with respect to the extent or amount of information which he thinks it is necessary for him to obtain. My own relations with Mr. McDougall have always been of a most pleasant character. Besides a long and intimate friendship with him, I believe him to have always been a very excellent officer. I think he has discharged his duties with perfect impartiality. He has been perhaps a little unpleasant to hon. gentlemen opposite when on this side, by checking a good many of their extravagances, and it may be that occasionally he has come into collision with some officers of our various departments by reason of their not giving him all the information he required. But when the hon. gentleman asks us, particularly after indulging in the allusions he has made, to accept a motion of this kind, I think he is asking a little too much. My recollection of parliamentary affairs in the Dominion of Canada is quite as long as the hon. gentleman's, and I do not think he has exhibited his usual accuracy of statement when he declared to the House that he has found motions of this kind very frequently accepted. I remember pressing one or two motions from that side, which, under peculiar circumstances, were accepted, but it was not very frequently that such a thing occurred. It was, I think, to the best of my recollection, about twice in eighteen years; and perhaps if the hon. gentleman—as I hope he will—will continue in the enjoyment of health and vigour and remain in his present position for a similar term of years, we may hope to accept a couple of motions from him in good time. There is, in my judgment, a right and a wrong way of dealing with this matter.

I do not think, Sir, that we shall help the Auditor General materially; I do not think we shall in any way strengthen his hands, by passing a vague motion such as the hon. gentleman has proposed. So far as I am aware, the Audit Act, as it stands upon the Statute-book, gives to the Auditor General all the power that he can require. But if it be demonstrated that in any respect that Act is lacking and that the Auditor General does not, under it, obtain or have the right to obtain all the information that is necessary to discharge his duties, then I can assure hon. gentlemen opposite that if they will suggest an amendment to that Audit Act in a proper way and at a proper time, we will be very happy to consider it. I am of the same opinion that was entertained, I believe, by the hon. gentle-

man's colleagues and former Premiers of this Dominion, that the Auditor General is a very valuable functionary to the Government of the day, in this respect, that he may prevent and very often does prevent them from committing irregularities that might prove to the detriment of the public service; and though his extra punctiliousness, as some may regard it may cause delay, and may cause inconvenience to some, I am quite at one with the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) in thinking that it is better that there should be some delay and some inconvenience, from time to time, than that there should be any risk of the public money being improperly expended. So far, I am at one with the hon. gentleman. I am also at one with him in the tribute he has paid to the Auditor General himself. I am further at one with him in saying that if it can be established that the present Audit Act does not give him sufficient power to investigate matters properly and obtain proper vouchers, we will be ready to consider that and to accept proper amendments from whatever side of the House they may come. But that at least ought to be shown, and I cannot, for my part, say that I think the hon. gentleman ought to press us to adopt this amendment now, nor can I offer him any hope that it will be accepted as it stands.

House divided.

YEAS:

Messieurs

Bell (Addington),	McDougall,
Bell (Pictou),	McLennan (Glengarry),
Bergeron,	McNeill,
Clancy,	Martin,
Davin,	Mills,
Ferguson,	Monk,
Foster,	Morin,
Ganong,	Quinn,
Gillies,	Sproule,
Hale,	Taylor,
Henderson,	Tupper (Sir Charles),
Hughes,	Tupper (Sir Charles Hibbert),
Ingram,	Wallace,
Kloepfer,	Wilson, and
LaRivière,	Wood (Brockville).—32.
MacLaren,	
McAlister,	

NAYS:

Messieurs

Bazinet,	Logan,
Beith,	Mackie,
Blair,	McClure,
Bourassa,	McGugan,
Bourbonnais,	McHugh,
Brodeur,	McIsaac,
Bruneau,	McLellan,
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd),	McMillan,
Casey,	McMullen,
Copp,	Meigs,
Desmarais,	Migneault,
Fielding,	Mulock,
Fisher,	Paterson,
Fitzpatrick,	Préfontaine,
Flint,	Ratz,
Frost,	Rinfret,
Graham,	Rutherford,
Hurley,	Savard,
Jameson,	Sifton,
Joly de Lotbinière (Sir Henri),	Snetsinger,
Landerkin,	Stenson,
Lavergne,	Sutherland,
Legris,	Tarte,
Lemieux,	Tucker, and
	Turcot.—49.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. members for Victoria (Mr. Earle), East Bruce (Mr. Cargill), West Hastings (Mr. Corby), and East Middlesex (Mr. Gilmour) have not voted.

Mr. CORBY. I am paired with the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson).

Mr. CARGILL. I am paired with the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Britton).

Mr. EARLE. I am paired with the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. McInnes). Had I voted I should have voted for the amendment.

Mr. GILMOUR. I am paired with the hon. member for Hamilton. Had I voted I should have voted for the amendment.

Mr. DUGAS. I voted for the motion. But I am paired with the hon. member for Lévis (Mr. Guay) and should not have voted. Had I voted, I should have voted for the amendment.

Mr. ANGERS. I am paired with the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain). I should have voted against the amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am paired with the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Borden). Had I voted, I should have voted against the amendment.

DISMISSALS IN BELLEVILLE POST OFFICE.

Mr. CORBY. I must apologize to hon. members for rising at this late hour of the evening to bring before the House the subject of the dismissal of officials of the Belleville post office, but I consider that I should not be doing my duty as the representative of West Hastings did I not strongly protest against the high-handed measures taken by the Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) in relation to these officers. I assure the House that in the criticism I shall pass on the Postmaster General, I will speak as a business man and not as a politician. I think I can say to this House that before I get through I shall show that not only have these officials been badly treated, but a slur has been cast on the beautiful city of Belleville by reducing the status of the office from that of a city to that of a town office. The plea of the Postmaster General is economy; but had he wished to economize he should have begun in the city of Ottawa and in his own department. Let me refer to just two or three cases of superannuation he has made in a very short time, in which

he could have saved more than the extra wages formerly paid to the officials in the city of Belleville. First, I wish to refer to the superannuation of one of the very best men that ever held a position in the Post Office Department, Colonel White. Why, Mr. Speaker, it is ridiculous to superannuate one of the very best men in the department, giving him a superannuation allowance of $2,240. The Postmaster General also superannuated Mr. Griffin, a gentleman well qualified in every way to fill the position he held and to perform the duties expected of him. This gentleman's superannuation allowance is $2,239. The Postmaster General also superannuated Mr. Shannon at $680. Then he writes up to the city of Belleville and tells us he is going to save $4,500. And how does he do it He discharges the full staff of officials, and reinstates only one man at an increase of salary—the deputy postmaster general, a gentleman well qualified for the position, and a credit to the office. He dismisses the postmaster, who was appointed about three years ago, or about a year before this Government took office, a gentleman well qualified for a position and one against whom they had no cause of complaint—and the right hon. leader of the Government told this House that no man should be dismissed without cause. Now, Mr. Speaker, I claim that this postmaster and these other officials were dismissed without cause. I know that the Postmaster General, in replying, will state that he has cut down the expense, but he has done so by hiring these men back at a paltry sum of $400 each. I will go over the officials in the Belleville post office. First, take Mr. Duncan, assistant postmaster, 37 years of age and with fifteen and a half years' of service to his credit; his salary being $1,350.

They superannuated him and gave him $400 a year, then they turn round and make him acting postmaster at a salary of $1,600. The next man on the list is Mr. Alfred Gillen, a young man that passed a second-class clerk's examination, age 39, served 15 years and 3 months, worked up to a salary of $1,200. The Postmaster General superannuated him at $360 a year, then turns round and engages him at a paltry salary of $400. Now, Mr. Speaker, it will lower the efficiency of the staff of any office to make such reductions. I claim that a man holding an honourable position in a post office is entitled to more wages than a labouring man. A labouring man to-day can earn his $390 a year, and here the hon. gentleman is putting back those officials to the paltry salary of $400. I am willing to back up the Postmaster General in trying to reduce the expenses, but I say he should do it in a legitimate way. I had a conversation with the Postmaster General two years ago about the time he took charge of his department. He told me then he intended to run his department on purely business principles, and I assure you I was surprised and disappointed when I found that the first move he made was a political one. I claim it was a political move, and I claim that the hungry Reform politicians in the city of Belleville forced his hand to dismiss these men and put them back at a smaller salary, thinking they would throw up their positions, and that they would get their places, and that one of their friends would get the postmastership at $1,800 a year. I can assure the Postmaster General that as long as I have the pleasure of sitting in this House, whenever he does that, he may expect to hear from me. Now, I will go on with these officials. Here is a young man, Mr. Embury, a third-class clerk, 41 years of age, 13 years in the Belleville post office, under the Civil Service Act. He had worked up to $800, and the Postmaster General superannuates him at $204.52. Mr. Embury, I may say, put in seven years in the post office previous to the thirteen years, so that after having been there twenty years, they dismissed him and threw him on the world with a family to take care of. The Postmaster General may say that he wanted to economize. If he wanted to economize, why did he not give this man a chance to get back under the salary of $400 offered? He allowed some of them to go back, and why did he dismiss this young man and put in his place the daughter of the ex-president of the Reform Association? I have nothing to say against the young lady in any way. He also engaged Mr. Taylor, son of an English Radical, a man who has a daughter who holds a position now in the Brockville asylum. The next on the list is W. B. Walker, a third-class clerk, 34 years of age, served 13 years and 9 months, worked up to $800, was superannuated at $208 and dismissed. He is the support of an aged father and mother, who have no other support outside of a married son. Next case is Miss J. M. Newbury, third-class clerk, aged 43, served 13 years, worked up to $800, and superannuated at $207. She is the only support of a widowed mother. Now, take Mr. Lynch, third-class clerk, 30 years of age, served 12 years, worked up to $800, he is superannuated at $186. Mr. Reeves, third-class clerk, 28 years of age, served 8 years, worked up to $600. He gets a gratuity of $304. Now, I want to say with reference to Mr. J. H. Reeves that to prove that the Government are not paying these officials what they are entitled to, I got that gentleman a position through the hon. member for South Grenville (Mr. Reid) in the Edwardsburg Starch Works, three weeks ago, at a salary of $720. The Government were paying him $400. He gets $800 the second year, and $1,000 the third year. I claim that the Government have a right to pay men what they are worth, and I claim that if that young man is worth $720 to the Edwardsburg Starch Company, he is worth that money to the Belleville post office. I say that the Government have

no right to dismiss a man because they have him in a tight place, hire him over, and pay him only $400, after serving the number of years they have served. Take Miss Kennedy, 34 years of age, served 4 years and a half, worked up to $520, gets a gratuity of $187, and she is put back at $400. B. L. Hargrave, third-class clerk, served 4 years and a half, at a salary of $520, and is dismissed. He has gone to the States to earn a living. The last is Mr. John Taylor, postmaster, who served two years. Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to read the letter sent dismissing the postmaster. It is dated October 1st, at the Post Office Department:

Sir,—With reference to the departmental letter of the 25th ultimo, informing you that by Order in Council of the 22nd ultimo, the system obtaining in connection with the staff of the Belleville post office, which was on a city basis, yourself and your clerks being under the provisions of the Civil Service Superannuation Acts, was to be discontinued from the 1st October, 1897, I am directed to inform you that you have been retired from the service on and from that date.

I am to express the Postmaster General's regret that although he recommended to Council the granting of a gratuity in your case, it was not allowed under the provisions of the Civil Service Superannuation Act, as you were upwards of forty-five years of age at the time of your appointment and did not contribute to the Superannuation Fund.

(Sgd.) Secretary.

I claim that is pretty short notice for a man against whom the Government have not the scratch of a pen. It is hard treatment all through, and I would not be doing my duty as the representative of that city if I did not stand up here and protest against the manner in which the city of Belleville has been treated. The Postmaster General received letters from the mayor and corporation, and also from the president of the board of trade, protesting against the high-handed action taken by the hon. gentleman. If it was done from motives of economy, why single out the Belleville post office? Why not take other offices which have less claim to consideration. The Minister has no right to single out Belleville because Belleville happens to be represented by a Conservative, and put it back to where it was a great many years ago. I wish to give some figures from various post offices, to show that the expenses of a large number of them are double those of the city of Belleville in proportion of population and receipts. Take, first, the town of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Charlottetown, the expenses of that office amount to $16,278, or 114 per cent of the receipts. The expenses of running the Belleville post office are 54 per cent of the receipts. Why did not the Postmaster General put back the office of Charlottetown the same as he did the Belleville office? Take, for instance, Kingston, costing 80 per cent of the receipts, Hamilton, 67 per cent; Ottawa, 101 per cent—though I do not suppose that Ottawa is a fair criterion—Windsor, 70 per cent; Quebec, 96 per cent; Sherbrooke, 38 per cent; St. John, 75 per cent; Victoria, 59 per cent. I claim the Postmaster General has no right to select one post office like Belleville and make changes there alone. The other places are represented by Liberals. If economy has to be practiced, salaries should be cut down at different points. I claim the Postmaster did not make a fair comparison as regards Belleville. The action of the hon. gentleman is condemned by the best thinking Reformers in West Hastings; it is condemned by Mr. Ritchie, my opponent at the last general elections. I am not saying that the parties who urged this change on the Postmaster General were office-seekers, but they were not the best-thinking Reformers in the riding. I will now read a few extracts from the city papers in order to show the stand they have taken in regard to this action by the Postmaster General

The changes made in the post office status and staff, and particularly the dismissal of Miss Newbery and Mr. Walker, two of the most efficient members of the staff, who were willing to continue at the reduced salaries, have aroused an almost universal outburst of condemnation in Belleville.

To the credit of the Liberals be it said, the great majority of those who have spoken on the subject are just as emphatic in condemnation of the affair as are the Conservatives.

One well-known Liberal said that it was an outrage. No new and untrained clerks ought to have been put in. The party would be seriously injured not only in Dominion, but in provincial politics in this district. Henceforward he would pay but little attention to politics and devote himself to his business.

Another Liberal, who for forty years has voted for and enthusiastically supported his party, said that he would never cast another Grit vote.

Such are fair samples of the expressions heard on all hands.

The question which chiefly agitates the public mind is as to where rests the responsibility for the dismissals.

Certain Liberals state that the executive of their association were authorized from headquarters to choose two persons for appointment as clerks, but that they did not agree as to the new appointees; also that all the other appointments rested with Mr. Duncan.

The daughter of a widow, who is her mother's sole support, and was one of the most efficient clerks, dismissed; another highly capable clerk, the chief support of a family, retired; a young woman, without training in post office work and of slight physique, daughter of one of the bosses of the Grit machine, and the son of another of the bosses, appointed. These are, in brief, the facts in connection with the dismissals from the post office made on the first of October that stand out most conspicuously as an outrage. Partisanship and greed are so manifestly exhibited in the transaction that the feelings of the people of the city have been stirred as they never were before. The Government that permits such wantonness and the political machine by whose behest so heartless a proceeding is carried out, are regarded with something akin to contempt. Other features of the action of Postmaster General Mulock will be referred to in a subsequent issue.

I claim that it is not right to place the responsibility on Mr. Duncan, who is acting postmaster to-day, for the discharge of officials. I am satisfied that he was authorized by the Reform association or others to send names to Ottawa. He dare not open his mouth in regard to this transaction and give information in regard to it. I have not asked him for any information, but I do not think it is on his responsibility that these officers were dismissed. I feel I am justified in criticising the Postmaster General for his action against Belleville in removing certain officers and allowing members of the civil service elsewhere to remain in their positions. If he had taken all the officers in the service and made reductions, I would not have found fault with his action. I hold that the Government have no right to hire officials and pay them less than they are really worth, and less than they can afford to work for. There is great responsibility devolving on post office clerks who have charge of the registered letter department and savings bank department, and they should obtain higher salaries than labouring men. At least the Government should pay a fair salary for a reasonable day's work. I secured a position for Mr. Reeves, who instead of receiving $400, will be paid $720 and $800, and has a promise of $1,000 during the next two years. I felt it my duty to bring this matter before the House, for this post office has not been treated in a proper manner, the position of the office has been lowered, and in doing so the Government have passed a reflection on our beautiful city. I can tell the Postmaster General that the people will resent this treatment. Whether I am a candidate or not at the next elections, and I hope I will not be, the constituency will return a Conservative owing to the way it has been treated in this matter. I do not blame the First Minister, who evidently wants to do what is fair and just, and I am satisfied he would never have given his sanction to the wholesale dismissal of officers. At each election I worked for my party, and have always fought the Reform party, and expect to do so in future; I do not propose to surrender any principles to the present Government. If these public officials do not receive better salaries they cannot live. The late Mr. Mitchem was postmaster for about fifty years, and during his occupancy of the office there was never a registered letter or an ordinary letter lost. I never interfered with that gentleman, who was 85 years old when he was superannuated. He came to me two or three times and asked to be superannuated, and at length I agreed to have it done, and nominated John Taylor, who is well qualified and held in high esteem and remained the officer for two years, and then hon. gentlemen came into power and dismissed him. This is a bad system, and I do not advocate it and never did. I do not believe in the system to the victors belong the spoils.

The Postmaster General and his friends can make up their mind about one thing. It is a long lane that has no turn, and you can make up your mind that if there are any dismissals in my constituency, and if I am a member of this House and the Conservative Government gets back to power, then every man who is put in the position of a dismissed man without cause, will have to go, or I will not support the Government of the day. I intended, Sir, to give more facts and figures to the House, but I do not suppose it would make my case any better, and in view of the early hour of the morning I shall rest content with what I have said.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). The hon. gentleman (Mr. Corby) suggests that perhaps the action of the Government for which I am responsible, though it was governmental action, was directed by other than considerations for the public interest. The hon. gentleman seemed to suggest that it was perhaps attributable to the fact that West Hastings sent a Conservative to this House. Whether my statement be accepted as correct or otherwise, I may say that the change in the Belleville post office was made purely for the reasons set forth in the Order in Council and not because of any outside considerations. The bare facts will perhaps best explain the situation, and these facts I will give the House. In 1882 the Belleville post office was on a commission basis the same as the majority of post offices throughout the country. The Postmaster was paid a regulation allowance on the same scale as is in force for thousands of offices throughout Canada, and at that time the revenue of the Belleville office was $15,580, and the allowance for expenses of running the office $3,770. That system had been in force from the establishment of the office up to 1882, and it worked well. I do not know whether it was the present member for West Hastings or his predecessor, or what influences were brought to work; but in 1882, the then Government made the mistake of placing the Belleville post office upon a city basis. When the change in that post office was made by me the revenue had increased from $15,580 in 1882 to $16,586, and if it had been continued under the old system it would have cost the country $3,907 to administer. There was no complaint against the old system, and I am not aware of any petition having been presented, asking for the change in the public interest, but it is probable that a number of persons anxious to obtain more lucrative positions succeeded in getting the change made and the country put to the useless expense which I tried to remedy by the Order in Council last year.

Mr. HUGHES. What was the expense of the post office then?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. If the system previous to 1882 had been continued the cost of the post office, when I made the change, would have been $3,907, but in consequence of the extravagant system brought into force in 1882 the expense of the office had become $9,079 at the time I made the change. That was an unjustifiable expense.

Mr. HUGHES. What is the present cost of the office ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. My hon. friend (Mr. Corby) correctly states that in order to bring into force the new system it was necessary to deal with the staff according to the Act. Some of them had been recent appointees and they were retired from the service by the payment of gratuities which amounted to $553.59. Those who had been more than ten years in the service were entitled to pensions, and these pensions, omitting that of Mr. Duncan who does not draw his pension whilst retained in the office, amounts to $1,166.79. The reduction in expenses during the first year the change was in force amounted to $3,421; that is charging against the office the gratuities and the pensions and all the expenses of the office.

Mr. WILSON. What is the expense of the office now ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. We save by the change at the present time $4,005 a year. At present it costs us about $3,907 or rather that is when the change was made, and I do not know if there has been any variation since. The cost is based upon a scale which depends upon the revenue of the office, and at the time the change was made the cost of administering the office, if we had no pensions to pay would have been $3,907, as against the former cost of over $9,000. The saving, even including the pensions, is $4,005 and the cost to-day is not one-half what it was under the old system. If we had not the pensions to pay the cost would have been $5,000 less. In other words, it is the difference between $3,900 the present cost and $9,000 the previous cost. These are the reasons for the change, Mr. Speaker. I do not know that at this late hour, anything can be gained by referring to the superannuation of Colonel White and of Mr. Shannon. I will be quite prepared to discuss those and other post office matters at the proper time, but I suppose the hon. gentleman (Mr. Corby) would prefer at this late hour that the discussion should be confined to the Belleville office.

Mr. HUGHES. Who is now the postmaster in Belleville ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Mr. Duncan is the postmaster or acting postmaster. Mr. Duncan was formerly the assistant postmaster. The postmaster was Mr. Taylor who was appointed in 1895, and I do not know that it was any hardship to Mr. Taylor to be retired from the office. I think Mr. Taylor was engaged in very large farming operations in the North-west. At all events, this change was not brought about for political reasons. It was not asked for by what the hon. gentleman describes as the hungry politicians of Belleville. If there was any feeling on the part of the people there, it was for the old system, partly out of consideration for the staff, and partly from pride in the town itself.

Mr. HUGHES. When the new postmaster is appointed, will that not bring the cost up nearly to the old figures ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No. Mr. Duncan was the assistant postmaster, and became entitled to a pension. My recollection is that his pension amounted to $400 or $500 a year; but I gave him the option of continuing as an under postmaster at Belleville, and so long as he continued in the office he would not draw the pension. I think the allowance paid to him as postmaster is something like $1,500 a year; my hon. friend says $1,600, and I suppose he has informed himself correctly as to the amount. However that may be, instead of proceeding politically, or, as the hon. gentleman suggests, in a malicious way towards those in office because of their politics, I think if he had informed himself of the facts, he would have given me credit for having at least had consideration for those in the office. He complains that a number of them were continued in office, although at reduced salaries. The greatest consideration which the conditions admitted was shown in the reduction of the staff. Mr. Duncan, like all others, was given a free hand as to whom he would retain or not retain; but it was in his instructions that he should appoint to the office no persons who were not agreeable to the representatives of the Liberal party in the city of Belleville. That and that only was the extent to which we interfered; but I think the Liberal party must have had a great deal of consideration for the staff, when my hon. friend tells me that nearly the whole of that staff has been continued in office, although at a reduced rate. If we had desired to proceed with political animus against the staff, I presume that instead of all but two being retained in the service, there would have been none retained. My hon. friend says that I should have proceeded to have applied this principle to Charlottetown and other places, and would have done so but that they were represented by Liberals. I would say that that circumstance had no force whatever with me in not proceeding to change the status of the offices of those cities. The city of Victoria, B.C., which he cites as one which ought to have been put on the same basis, is not represented here by Liberals, but by two Conservatives. My hon. friend says that the cost of maintaining the Charlottetown post office is very greatly in excess of the cost of

maintaining the Belleville one. The expenses of the Charlottetown post office are not correctly set forth in the Public Accounts or in the Civil Service List which the hon. gentleman quotes from. Charlottetown is the capital of the Island of Prince Edward, and the postmaster, Mr. Brecken, is also inspector; the staff of the office also do the inspector's work for the whole Island, and the two services are charged in one account against the Charlottetown post office. Thus it appears that the expenses of the Charlottetown post office are greater in proportion than those in other cities. However, I do intend, if it will gratify my hon. friend, to make some changes in the Charlottetown post office with a view to economy. But I will say that it was easier to deal with the case of Belleville, because the staff have been a less time in office. If you analyse the terms of the officers in Windsor and Charlottetown, you will find that it would cost a great deal more to retire them than it would the Belleville staff. Nevertheless, a very considerable reduction was effected at Windsor; and perhaps, if the staff had been appointed as recently as the staff at Belleville, I might have dealt with it in the same way. Windsor stands in a different position from Belleville. It is on the international frontier, and it has a large amount of exchange work which in no way appears to affect the revenue. It is quite true, a protest was sent against this change by the Belleville Board of Trade and by others in Belleville. But the view I took of it was this, speaking now from the standpoint of the Board of Trade and the natural pride which my hon. friend and the Belleville people generally naturally take in the welfare of their city. I found a system in force in Belleville that was almost without precedent. With all respect to Belleville, I do not think any one would say that a great office like Hamilton stands on the same footing. The revenue of the Hamilton post office, speaking from memory, is $70,000 or $80,000 a year. It would be a very different matter to put an office of that kind on the same basis as that of Belleville which does perhaps not more than one-fifth the amount of business. So I might say with reference to the other cases which the hon. gentleman has cited. But taking the parallel cases to which he has referred, I will briefly refer to those figures. Here was Belleville, on a city basis, doing a business of less than $17,000 a year and costing $9,000 a year. At the same time, we have Woodstock post office, with a business of $15,000 odd and only costing the country $4,100. We have the city of St. Thomas post office, doing a business of $19,300, with the expenses $4,900.

Mr. INGRAM. I would like to state to the hon. gentleman that since the removal of one of the prominent insurance companies from there the revenue of the post office has not been quite so much. The revenue has been higher than $20,000.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Still, it was under the same system. These are the figures up to the 1st of July, 1897, shortly before the coming into effect of this change. St. Catharines, revenue, $16,000; expenses, $3,500; Peterborough, revenue, $18,800; expenses, $4,500; Guelph, $20,600 revenue; expenses, $5,000; Chatham, revenue over $15,000; expenses, $3,600; Brockville, revenue, $24,500, and expenses, $4,400; Brantford, revenue, $25,600, and expenses, $4,900. Compare that with Belleville, whose revenue was $16,000 and expenditure $9,000, and it will be seen at once that we had to bring Belleville to the same basis as the others. I do not see that there is any indignity to Belleville in putting it in the same category with Brantford and Woodstock, St. Thomas and Guelph and other thriving and promising cities in Ontario. We must remember that it is not Belleville which pays this expense. If it were, then we might leave that matter in the hands of the people of Belleville, but my hon. friends know very well that if this expenditure were charged to the people of Belleville, if they themselves had to pay it, and he were running for the mayoralty, he would stand very little chance of being elected on a policy continuing a system that costs $9,000, instead of replacing it by one which would only cost $4,000.

Mr. CORBY. Why single out Belleville, and not take Kingston alongside of it?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman complains that the change was a slur on Belleville in the first place, and then that Belleville was discriminated against in not being given the same treatment as was meted out to other places. I am dealing with the first charge, and I say that this cannot be considered a slur on Belleville, but that, on the contrary, it is a thing which the people would have voted for themselves. My hon. friend asks why we did not follow the same course in Kingston. Well, Kingston has been on the present basis a great many years, and there is a large staff there that have been in office many years, and to superannuate them would have cost a very much larger sum in proportion to the number employed, than did the superannuation of the Belleville people. Moreover, my hon. friend will admit that Kingston is very considerably larger than Belleville, and the business done there is very much larger. My hon. friend complained of the cost of running the Kingston post office.

Mr. CORBY. I was showing the comparison between Belleville and Kingston offices—that is the percentage cost of running the offices.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman cannot have a low percentage and high salaries. He complains that the

Belleville salaries are too light, but if he wants high salaries, he must have higher receipts.

Mr. CORBY. You are paying officers in Kingston more than in Belleville. You reduced the officers in Belleville to $400 a year.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I know nothing whatever as to the remuneration of the staff at Belleville.

Mr. CORBY. Do I understand the Postmaster General to say that he did not fix the salaries, but left it to the postmaster to give these men just $400 a year?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. My recollection is that a certain sum was set apart for the maintenance of the Belleville postoffice, based upon the business of the office, and I think that that was left to be apportioned amongst the staff as the Postmaster might in his own judgment determine. That is the practice, although a sort of middle course has grown up in the country lately. For example, in St. Thomas the remuneration of the staff is fixed, but at Belleville it is limited by the appropriation for the maintenance of the office. The same system, I think, applies in Peterborough and in Brockville. It may be that that system was the one applied to Belleville, but on that point I speak with hesitation. All I do say is that a certain appropriation of revenue was assigned for the maintenance of the Belleville post office, and I think that the apportioning of it amongst the staff was referred to the postmaster himself. As to the retention of the acting postmaster, Mr. Duncan, he is a Conservative, and if I were anxious to get rid of all Conservatives, I had an excellent opportunity of relieving the service of him as well, and my hon. friend's complaint has opened that question again. I did what the interest of the country demanded, and what in no way injured the efficiency of the post office in Belleville.

Mr. HUGHES. I would like to ask what the hon. gentleman meant by his last remark, that this opened up the question again. I do not think it is decent for the hon. gentleman to make any reference to Mr. Duncan, as though he were a school boy who happened to have a friend in the House and whom the hon. gentleman consequently intended to punish. If he is going to throw down the gauntlet, members on this side will take it up and make the proceedings very warm for the hon. gentleman. If I were to follow his example and descend to the sort of thing that he resorts to, I might point out that all this interference of his in the post offices did not take place until after the protests in North Simcoe and North Ontario had been dropped.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not know what the hon. gentleman means. I do not care about indulging in insinuations, and if the hon. gentleman has anything to say against me let him make the statement here on the floor of Parliament. He asked me to say what I meant by my reference to Mr. Duncan. I mean just what I said. The hon. member for West Hastings suggests that the changes I made in Belleville were made on political considerations. I think I have shown that that is not the case. And in proof of it, I mention the fact that a very large portion of the staff is still on duty there, although in different positions and under different circumstances.

Mr. CORBY. Some of them at about 70 per cent reduction.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Still, I suppose there are plenty of Liberals who would like to have these positions even at these rates. When, at all events, I have not interfered to deprive these people of employment, and, in one case have actually retained in the lucrative office of acting postmaster, the former officer, the assistant postmaster, and when we find that nearly the whole staff, as I understand the hon. gentleman is still in office——

Mr. CORBY. I say you should have taken all the staff back that wanted to come.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am dealing with the charge that the hon. gentleman made. If the hon. gentleman or any one else is not prepared to see fair dealing when it is done, he simply wants a different kind of treatment. If he objects to our retaining in office these employees, and if he desires that what he says shall have weight——

Mr. CORBY. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) is making threats, he will not punish me, but innocent people.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am making no reference whatever and have no reference to the hon. gentleman. I tried to have fair treatment dealt out to that staff, and if the hon. gentleman, voicing public opinion, says that the retention of the staff in office was not fair, then I have only one course open.

Mr. CORBY. I did not say so.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman must give me credit for fair dealing, or I must have a free hand. I will not stand here and hear the hon. gentleman declare that I acted from political considerations in making these changes, and, at the same time, tell me that these people are in office to-day. He must not blow hot and cold at the same time.

Mr. CORBY. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) is making threats. He will not punish me but innocent people. He occupies a high position, and I think he ought to be above anything of that sort. I think he is belittling himself by making any such statement as he has made.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I find it is impossible by any method to satisfy the hon. gentleman. I have allowed these men to be retained in office. Not only that, but I did what I could, in a friendly way, with the acting postmaster, to see that the best consideration was given them. If I had not been so moved, probably none of them would have been in office, not even the acting postmaster himself; and I regret to say that after I had tried to do this, instead of receiving some recognition, I only meet with criticism.

Mr. FOSTER. I should not be doing my duty, I think, did I not protest against the spirit shown by the Postmaster General and the words he has used. His case would have been very much better, I can inform him, not only in the opinion of this House, but in the opinion of those outside this House who will read this discussion, if he had sat down a little while before he finished. The hon. gentleman is Postmaster General—that is true. But he did not buy the office; it does not belong to him, he is there to act for the people. My hon. friend from West Hastings (Mr. Corby) is here in his capacity as a member of this House. He has a perfect right to ventilate any grievance that he feels.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I do not wish to interfere in the discussion, but the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) has already spoken on the question.

Mr. FOSTER. Not on the main motion.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. On the motion before the Chair.

Mr. FOSTER. I will move the adjournment of the House.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman cannot speak to such a motion made by himself.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, I will take another opportunity.

Mr. INGRAM. I should like to draw the attention of the Postmaster General to the fact that one of the clerks in the St. Thomas office resigned some time ago, and, as they are short-handed in that office—in fact they always have been—and as the holiday season is coming on for the hard working employees I would like to know from the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) when he will have a man appointed to take the place of the officer who has resigned?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I will take a note of the matter.

Mr. McMULLEN. I desire to say a word in connection with the changes that have taken place in the Belleville post office. I think these changes are in line with what the Postmaster General has done in other ways in endeavouring to reduce the expense of his department. I think that the hon. gentleman deserves great credit for the effort he is making. He is evidently determined to handle his department in the interest of the country, and I hope that every hon. Minister will follow him in the efficient and economical management of his department. The people will be slow to condemn a change by which $5,000 a year is saved to the taxpayers of this country. We know that the Post Office Department has been a tax on the people to a very considerable amount year after year. We believed, at the time that this system was inaugurated in Belleville, that it was imprudent from a financial point of view. The city of Belleville is, no doubt, a very nice little town. We wish it every success, and when it reaches the status that entitles it to have its post office run as a city post office, with all the expense that is incurred in populous places, and with a good revenue, no doubt it will get every consideration. The very figures produced by my hon. friend from West Hastings (Mr. Corby) himself prove that it was improvident from a financial standpoint, to place Belleville post office on the basis of a city system. The hon. gentleman himself did not deny that the revenue does not come up to the amount that would warrant the system then inaugurated. No doubt, when it was inaugurated there were anticipations that Belleville would make more rapid progress than it has done. I have gone over the Auditor General's report of receipts and expenditure of various post offices. I find that in Brantford the receipts were $25,632, while the sum paid out was $4,916, or 19 per cent.

Mr. CORBY. That is a commission office and has nothing to do with the case before us. Belleville was taken out of the commission offices and a city service established.

Mr. McMULLEN. But I would ask my hon. friend (Mr. Corby) if it is right when, in the city of Brantford, where the gross contribution is about $25,000, the office is on a commission basis, and the expenditure only 19 per cent of the receipts, that Belleville, with a revenue of only $16,235, should have a city delivery at an expense of about 50 per cent? Will any person dare to say that it is not in the interests of economy and with a desire to reduce general expense that these changes were made? But the hon. gentleman (Mr. Corby) says: Why has the Postmaster General not dealt in the same way with other places: there are other places in which the expenditure is a large percentage of the revenue. But it is impossible to deal with all at once. I think the Postmaser General has made a very creditable progress in the direction of cutting down the expenses of his department, and I earnestly hope that he will handle other offices as he has handled Belleville, and will make further reductions. He will be obliged to do so, because he has intimated to this House, and I think he in-

tends to carry out what he has intimated, that it will be possible, by reductions in this and other branches, to bring the expenditure down to within $100,000 of the revenue. It now costs the country about half a million dollars from the general revenue to make up the deficit in the revenue of the Post Office Department. To endeavour to make the revenue and expenditure balance is a very commendable thing.

I believe he is actuated solely by the desire to carry out that intimation he has given to this House, and I am sure the people will be glad of it. The move that he has made in the case of the Belleville post office bears on its face the proof that it was done purely in the interest of the administration of the department, and in the taxpayers of this country. The object is to cut down expenses, and to make the department self-sustaining at the earliest possible moment. I have no feeling against Belleville, and I hope that in every other town where similar conditions exist, the same reductions will be made, and that the country may be relieved to that extent from unnecessary taxation. Possibly there was a powerful influence exercised at the time this system was established in Belleville. No doubt my hon. friend had powerful influence at court, and he was backed up no doubt by another hon. gentleman who is now in the Senate. We cannot tell what influences were brought to bear in order to raise Belleville from the position of a town office to that of a city office, and with the expense attaching to a city office. I hope the Postmaster General will make similar reductions in all other offices where extravagance exists. He has made a magnificent start, and the people of this country will give him credit for what he has done.

Mr. QUINN. When the Postmaster General takes credit to himself for effecting economy in the case of Belleville, and as the city of Kingston was mentioned by the hon. member for West Hastings (Mr. Corby), I am reminded of a little circumstance connected with the appointment of a postmaster in Kingston a couple of years ago. It is unfortunate that the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) did not also remember that circumstance when he spoke of the great good that the Postmaster General had done in the inauguration of this economical system. It is only withint two years that the Postmaster General appointed as postmaster in the city of Kingston a man over 60 years of age, after having superannuated a man barely 60 years of age. That was a good chance to begin a system of economy, and I do not see why it was not grasped at by the Postmaster General. Now in the case referred to by the hon. member for West Hastings, it seems to me extraordinary that such a wholesale wiping out of officials should have taken place in that particular office. While I can accept with the greatest freedom the statement made by the Postmaster General, that he was not actuated by political motives, at the same time I think that an outside observer will perhaps connect that sweeping reform with the fact that this constituency was represented by my hon. friend from West Hastings, and that this fact had something to do with the dismissal of these men. The Postmaster General takes credit to himself for making reductions there, but if I understood the figures he gave, if these people who have been superannuated had not been re-employed, and if their superannuation had not been paid to them, and other persons employed in their place, the reduction would have been very small indeed. I understand that four or five of them were superannuated at from $300 to $400 a year.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The only member of the staff whose superannuation has been suspended by his reappointment, or continuance in office, is Mr. Duncan the postmaster. His superannuation was $400 or $500 a year. All the others are drawing their superannuation allowance and the salaries they are getting under the new arrangement.

Mr. QUINN. So that besides the salary they receive from the Postmaster General, they receive a superannuation from the department, and that must be added to the cost of working the office. I do not know that it will show anything like a clear saving of $5,000.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It shows a saving of $4,005 so long as the superannuations have to be paid.

Mr. QUINN. We have cases cited here by the hon. member for West Hastings that are exactly similar, if not a little more grave than the case of Belleville, and I hope the Postmaster General will follow out the economical strain in which he has started, that he will devote his attention to the case of Charlottetown and other places which are represented by members supporting the Government, and then perhaps the public generally will have reason to accept with the perfect confidence that we do, the statement of the Minister that there was nothing political in this operation.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I am glad the hon. member for West Hastings (Mr. Corby) brought this matter up. One might have supposed, after hearing him speak, that some injustice had been done to these officials; but when we get at the facts, we feel satisfied with the action taken by the Postmaster General. He gives as efficient service as they had before, and he saves one-half the cost of maintaining the office. Now can anybody tell us why Belleville was exalted above all the other cities and towns of similar size in the Dominion? What had Belleville done that she should have a pre-

ference above all others and be given a set of officials costing twice as much as those in other towns where the revenue was larger than in the city of Belleville? I am rather surprised that the hon. member for West Hastings should bring this matter before the House and cause all the facts to be exposed. I give the Postmaster General credit for what he has done. I do not care for the threats that are made by the hon. member for West Hastings. I tell the Postmaster General, and I tell the hon. member for West Hastings, that if the Government conduct matters in such a way as they have done in this instance, they have no fear to face the people. I think if the hon. member for West Hastings backs up a system such as this, a system so extravagant and so burdensome to the taxpayers, he is taking the wrong course to secure the confidence of the people of this country. The Postmaster General has acted very considerately in this case. He has left in office those whom he found there, and has saved a considerable amount of money to the people, but he gets no credit for it from the member for West Hastings. The Postmaster General has no cause to fear an appeal to the high court of the people, and as long as he continues to discharge the duties of his department in the same efficient manner that he has done so far, the people of this country will owe him a debt of gratitude.

Mr. McMILLAN. Since this session began, how often has the Government been blamed whenever they have reduced the expnditure in any department, but whenever there was an increase in the expenditure, the hon. gentlemen opposite have always been willing that it should be done. Wherever, in the interest of economy, the Government have made reductions, they are found fault with by hon. gentlemen opposite. In this case of the Belleville post office, we are not told that the people of that town are not as well served as they were before, or that the office is not conducted as efficiently as it was before. The Postmaster General has given a satisfactory reason why Belleville was singled out, namely, that it was the last office placed on the city regulations, and that a very small amount was required for the civil servants to fiulfil the conditions and place them on salary. When this discussion goes abroad there will not be an honest thinking Conservative who will assert that the Postmaster General has not done his duty, especially when it is remembered that post offices with receipts exceeding those of Belleville by $3,000 or $4,000, are only costing $3,000 a year. The Postmaster General has taken the very best step possible. I do not believe he discriminated against Belleville because the member for East Hastings was a Conservative, but he simply took one of the towns that could be dealt with and effected an economy by reducing the expenditure. The Postmaster General is doing everything possible to give the country very efficient service. In my own riding a storm was raised when the Postmaster General cancelled a contract which had run for fifteen years without tender. The result, however, was that instead of having a mail three times a week, the hon. gentleman was able to secure a daily mail at $12 less than the old system. It is impossible for the Postmaster General and the Government to reduce expenses without some people feeling it, but the interests of the general taxpayers must be consulted, and they will support the Government when they see that no general injury has been done. The hon. gentleman said these officers were paid $400 a year, which is only a labouring man's wages. Farm labourers in Ontario average only $250 a year. I commend the Postmaster General for the action he has taken in this case, not because it is Belleville, but because it is the last place brought under civil service regulations, and he could do justice to the civil service and at the same time reduce the cost. If there are other localities where he can make a saving, I trust he will take them up, so as ultimately to place all the officials in the post offices as nearly as possible on an equal footing.

Motion agreed to, and the House again resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

Steam communication between St. John and Digby, from 1st July, 1898, to 30th June, 1899.....	$12,500

Item agreed to.

Resolutions to be reported.

The FINANCE MINISTER (Mr. Fielding) moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. FOSTER. What business will be taken up to-morrow?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We will probably proceed with the Estimates, taking Public Works and Railways and Canals.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 1.40 a.m. (Friday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 27th May, 1898.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

PACIFIC CABLE.

Mr. CASEY moved:

That Rule 92 be suspended and that the Return of Papers with regard to the Pacific Cable be printed forthwith.

Motion agreed to.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 151)—from the Senate—to incorporate the Pacific and Yukon Railway, Navigation, Trading and Mining Company.—(Mr. Rosamond.)

BILL WITHDRAWN.

Mr. SUTHERLAND moved :

That Bill (No. 95) respecting the Great Commonwealth Development and Mining Company, Limited Liability, and to change its name to the Alberta and Yukon Company, be withdrawn.

Motion agreed to.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. In accordance with request of some members of the Railway Committee I beg to move :

That leave be granted to the Select Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines to sit during the time the House is in session.

Mr. FOSTER. The Railway Committee finds it necessary to ask leave to sit while the House is in session, and the Committee on Public Accounts was unable to finish its investigation into the Manitoba matter to-day, but has arranged to finish it on Monday. The question arose there whether it would not be wiser to defer the morning sittings of the House until Tuesday morning when the Committee on Public Accounts would be through with its business. I submit to my right hon. friend that perhaps we would get along just as well by doing that.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I am very anxious to meet the views of my hon. friends opposite. I think they are reasonably disposed not to retard the day of prorogation.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The PRIME MINISTER. If my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) thinks it would be more convenient that we should not sit on Monday morning I will agree to have the motion changed so that we will not sit until Tuesday morning.

Mr. FOSTER. I think that would be better, and I can assure my right hon. friend that we are as anxious to get away as he is.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. With the permission of the House I ask leave to withdraw my motion.

Mr. CASEY. I would ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sutherland) not to withdraw, for the reason that although the Public Accounts Committee may be certain of getting through on Monday the Railway Committee is almost certain not to finish its business on Monday.

Mr. FOSTER. Perhaps that motion might go.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood the Railway Committee was to meet to-morrow.

The PRIME MINISTER. Perhaps it might.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. All this illustrates the necessity of carrying out the rules of the House. Most of these Bills now before the committee are Bills which came in after the time fixed for presenting the Private Bills had expired. In most of these cases the notices were not given, and now we are called upon to retard the proper business of the House in order to attend to these late private Bills. I trust that next session the committee having charge of the petitions will see that the rules of the House are carried out and that these irregularities do not occur in future.

The PRIME MINISTER. The remarks made by my hon. friend from Provencher (Mr. LaRivière) are quite proper. Of course, we have been in the habit of late years, as everybody knows, of being very indulgent with regard to the observance of the rules of the House, especially with reference to private Bills. But if it were to be understood at the end of this session that next year the rules would be rigidly adhered to, and that every man who wants private legislation would not get it unless he observed the rules and gave notice in time, then nobody would have any reason to complain ; and before the end of the session, I will take occasion to call attention to that subject.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to ask if it is understood that the Railway Committee will meet to-morrow ; because if it does not, there are a number of members who would like to go home.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. A request was made by some parties that the committee should meet to-morrow ; but some considered that it would be difficult to have a meeting, and therefore it was agreed that we should not meet to-morrow.

Mr. CASEY. A number of these delayed Bills are not delayed for the reason the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. LaRivière) seems to think, but because of the length of the discussion on some other Bills which have stood on the Order paper, like one Bill that came down from the Senate. The notices were given early, and it was no fault of the promoters of the Bills that they could not be brought into this House earlier.

Mr. FOSTER. We might as well settle now a matter that was spoken of yesterday, whether the House will sit from eleven to six o'clock to-morrow.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). No.

Motion agreed to

The PRIME MINISTER moved:

That for the remainder of the session, after Monday next, the 30th of May, the House shall hold two sittings on each sitting day, one from 11 a.m. until 1 p.m., and the second from 3 p.m. until the hour for adjournment, and at each such sitting Government Orders shall have precedence.

Motion agreed to.

THE QUEBEC HARBOUR.

Mr. DOBELL moved second reading of Bill (No. 142) to authorize the Quebec Harbour Commissioners to borrow money.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the hon. gentleman explained the Bill to the House? If not, would he kindly do so?

Mr. DOBELL. Mr. Speaker, the object of this Bill is to make provision for the additional service which is now required in the public interest. In old times Quebec had every accommodation necessary for a large number of ships of small tonnage; but it has now become necessary to make provision for large steamers of 10,000 tons, and to do that, it is necessary to lengthen all our wharfs or such portions of wharfs as we expect the steamers will lie alongside. To do that we estimate that $200,000 will be required. We may have to make an additional wharf at Point Lévis for the same purpose; and if so, we propose to use a portion of the money for that purpose.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend is not explaining what would be the ultimate effect of this, and it might be well for the House to understand the question. I believe the Quebec Harbour Commissioners owe an amount of money already to the Dominion, do they not?

Mr. DOBELL. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. And this is allowing them to borrow from outside parties, I suppose?

Mr. DOBELL. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. What security do they give for that money, and in what way does it change the prospects, not very bright, probably, for the payment of the interest, and ultimately of the principal, to the Government?

Mr. DOBELL. It will not prejudice the Government interest in the least by lessening the value of the present property. It only allows us to borrow $350,000 more to complete the property that has already been constructed, and the bonds we now propose to issue will take precedence of the Government debt.

Mr. FOSTER. That is the security of the proposed lenders of this amount—that for $350,000 of bonds they shall have the first lien on the revenue?

Mr. DOBELL. Exactly.

Mr. FOSTER. That affects the position of the Government by putting very far off, I am afraid, the possibility of the Government receiving any portion of the interest due upon the very large sum already borrowed from it; or, does my hon. friend think the improvements that will be made out of this $350,000 will improve the revenues to such an extent that the interest on this sum can be paid without prejudice to what may accrue on account of interest upon the debt already owed? I quite understand that the revenues of the harbour of Quebec are small, and I suppose will not grow larger unless there is extraordinary accommodation, and that this is meant to provide that extraordinary accommodation. If the hon. gentleman could give any fair business assertion that the expenditure of this money, involving even the putting back of the Government security to a second lien, may, in a business pont of view, probably not result to the disadvantage, but may be to the advantage of the Government debt, it would be well for the House to hear that.

Mr. DOBELL. The hon. gentleman has put it exactly as I would like to put it—that this outlay actually brings into use certain properties which we have not been able to use on account of the increased size of the steamers that come into the harbour. We intend to increase the width of the Harbour Commissioners' wharf from 300 to 800 feet, in order to provide for the accommodation of the large steamers I have spoken of. Quebec has suffered of late years from the entire withdrawal of what used to be its staple trade, by the abandonment of sailing ships, and now we must make provision for large steamers of 10,000 tons. I may inform the House that one firm alone had under contract last winter for the St. Lawrence trade twenty-six steamers, ten of which were over 10,000 tons, which will be launched within the next twelve months. All these steamers require special facilities for loading and unloading. This work, which we intend to carry out, will give us three lines of railway down to the end of the Harbour Commissioners' wharf, and a sufficient width to build a grain elevator; we have already a cold storage shed, and we intend to build other sheds, so as to be in a position to discharge cargoes quickly, and tranship them to the west. I feel myself perfectly satisfied that Quebec harbour will yet pay interests on the amount loaned—I shall not say the full amount, because hon. gentlemen know that a great deal of money has been wasted in Quebec—but to-day our revenue is improving and we have every reason to believe that this will enable us to earn a revenue on property which has been dead for some years.

Mr. FOSTER. What are the revenues of the past two years, and the expenditures?

Mr. DOBELL. The net revenue last year was $35,000, the gross revenue was about $70,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Was the $35,000, the difference between the net and the gross revenue, all taken up with expenses of management, or with interest as well?

Mr. DOBELL. We had permission to use the revenue for completing the outer basin in order to have 27 feet of water, as we were then providing for the fast line. We refaced the long wharf.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the actual cost of management?

Mr. DOBELL. There is really very little expenditure. There is only the expenses of the harbour commissioners, which is merely a trifle, $5 a sitting, and they sit once a week.

Mr. FOSTER. There must be some expenses for management besides.

Mr. DOBELL. There is a wharfinger and an engineer and a secretary and the chairman of the commission, who gets a special amount.

Mr. FOSTER. Are the charges of management more than $2,000?

Mr. DOBELL. Yes; perhaps $7,000.

Mr. FOSTER. It seems to me that $7,000. in the financial condition of the harbour, is rather a large percentage—10 per cent of the gross revenue.

Mr. DOBELL. I am including the wharfinger, engineer, chairman of the commission, and other incidental charges. I do not think it is possible to reduce the expenses without changing the constitution of the harbour commission.

Mr. FOSTER. Perhaps my hon. friend will give me those details before the third reading.

Mr. DOBELL. Certainly.

Motion agreed to.

Bill read the second time, and the House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. FOSTER. I see that one of the purposes of this is to enable the corporation of the Quebec Harbour Commissioners to acquire additional lands on the river front. What is it proposed to acquire?

Mr. DOBELL. There is a small piece of frontage at the extreme end of the inner basin, which is owned by a private estate, and we propose to take it and give a portion of our present property to the Lake St. John Railway.

Mr. FOSTER. By way of transfer?

Mr. DOBELL. Yes, it is a very small transfer. I am quite sure that the property we propose to purchase will not cost more than $10,000 or $15,000 altogether.

Bill reported.

THE WINNIPEG GREAT NORTHERN RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. BLAIR moved second reading of Bill (No. 148) respecting the transport contract between Her Majesty and the Winnipeg Great Northern Railway Company. He said: This Bill is for the purpose of enabling the Government to make a new arrangement to a certain extent with the Winnipeg Great Northern Railway Company, in the event of that company consenting to do so, in respect of the route of the railway which is to be constructed. The House is no doubt aware that a contract of some years' standing has been in existence between the Government on the one hand and this railway company on the other, providing for the construction of a line which is to tap the Saskatchewan River. That line has not all been completed, and the company have not earned the subsidy to which they will be entitled, but a balance of something like 120 or 125 miles still remains to be constructed in order to complete their line to the point mentioned in their charter and the contract with the Government. The Government are moving in the direction of having this change made, because, in our judgment, it would be very much in the public interest if the line of the railway instead of being completed to run to the Saskatchewan River were to be deflected to run to the Swan River country. We are led to believe that it would be very much better in the interest of settlement and in the public interest generally if such alteration were made. We, therefore, ask Parliament to give us the power, in the event of our being able to secure the consent of the company to such change, to make the change and to substitute the new line as pointed out in this Bill.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and the House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). Would the hon. Minister of Railways inform us what is the difference in mileage between the line it is proposed to substitute and that under the original contract?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). It is not proposed to make any difference in the mileage. The company will be obliged to construct 125 miles toward and into the Swan River district, in order to earn the subsidy they would be entitled to under their contract if they build to the Saskatchewan River. We do not contemplate either increasing or decreasing the mileage.

Mr. DAVIN. What parties represented to the Government that it would be advantageous to make this change? Did any representations come from the North-west?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I must ask my hon. friend to inquire of the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton), from whom, chiefly, I have received information as to the desire of the people of that section of country and as to the advantage of the change of routes. The hon. Minister of the Interior is not here at the moment.

Mr. FOSTER. The third reading can be allowed to stand over, then.

Bill reported.

ST. JOHN BRIDGE AND RAILWAY EXTENSION COMPANY LOAN.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved that the House resolve itself into committee to consider the following resolution:—

That it is expedient to provide that the time for the repayment of the moneys advanced by the Dominion Government to the "Saint John Bridge and Railway Extension Company," under and by virtue of chapter 26 of the Statutes of 1883, be extended for a period of fifteen years from the expiration of the present term of fifteen years mentioned and provided for in the said statute and the schedule thereto, the moneys so advanced to bear interest during such extended term at the rate of four per centum per annum, payable annually on or before the 30th day of June in each year; such extension of time for the repayment of the moneys so advanced to be on condition that the said advances and the interest thereon shall remain during such extended period as now, a first charge and lien upon the real and personal property, rights, franchises, easements and privileges of the company aforesaid, and that all the provisions of the indenture or mortgage deed, dated the 10th day of December, in the year of Our Lord one thousand eight hundred and eighty-three, and executed by the said company under the provisions of and in accordance with the said statute, shall continue and remain in full force and effect during the said extended period, and on the further condition that the Government may, if it should be found advisable, take possession of the bridge, railway and appurtenances, at any time within five years from the date of the beginning of such extended period, on payment of the difference of the amount then due to the Government for advances and interest and the sum of the total amount expended by the company as the cost of the said bridge, railway and works, and ten per centum on such amount; the company to execute, to the satisfaction of the Minister of Justice, any deeds, mortgages or instruments necessary for the proper carrying into effect of the foregoing.

Motion agreed to, and the House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. FOSTER. What is the amount of the loan?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Mr. Chairman, the St. John Bridge and Railway Extension Company, as, perhaps, many of the hon. gentlemen may be aware, was chartered to build the well known cantilever bridge across the St. John River, together with a small section of railway, forming the connection between the Intercolonial Railway and the railway on the western side of the harbour which has since become part of the Canadian Pacific. The bridge and works connected with it cost about $600,000. Of this sum the Government loaned to the company $433,000 at 4 per cent for 15 years. The company carried out its undertaking successfully, and has kept the bridge in good condition and paid its interest promptly, having paid into the Dominion treasury something over $200,000 by way of interest. The company has sought an extension of the loan for another period of 15 years, and under all the circumstances, and regarding it as a safe investment, and the transactions hitherto having been quite satisfactory, the Government advises that the loan should be continued.

Mr. FOSTER. At the same rate of interest?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The same rate. In the original Act there was a proviso that within five years after the date of the first advance the Government might take possession of the bridge upon paying 10 per cent advance on the cost. That provision has expired by lapse of time, but we propose to renew it—not that we have any special policy with regard to the matter, but because we thought it well to renew the loan on substantially the same terms as before.

Mr. FOSTER. I wish all our investments were as good.

Resolution agreed to.

CANADA EVIDENCE ACT AMENDMENT.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick) moved second reading of Bill (No. 143)—from the Senate—an Act to amend the Canada Evidence Act, 1893.

Mr. FOSTER. Is my hon. friend (Mr. Fitzpatrick) anxious to take that up to-day? The hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) is not present.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I would like to take it up to-day some time, either this afternoon or during the evening sitting.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. member for Pictou cannot be here to-day. Are there any important questions involved in the Bill?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. No; it is simply to make clear some points which I think are sufficiently clear, but which the judges have found difficult.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, then, the third reading might stand.

Mr. BRITTON. There would seem almost to be a case unprovided for in this Bill. It does not excuse any one from answering and it prevents the evidence being used in a criminal trial. However, as I understand the Bill—I have just read it this moment—there seems no provision to prevent the evidence being used in a civil case. I understand that a constitutional difficulty might arise here, this Parliament not having the power to legislate to prevent such evidence being used in civil proceedings. But if the Bill is right in principle, then, surely there ought to be concurrent legislation on the part of the provinces so that, as evidence is given under compulsion, and as the party is protected against the use of that evidence against him in a criminal case, he should be protected as against the same evidence on a question of civil liability.

Now, I suppose the reason why it is not covered by this Bill is just what I mentioned, that the Solicitor General will say that this House has no power to amend the Evidence Act as applicable to a mere question of civil rights, and that that power belongs to the province. But if by an Act of this Parliament a person is excused from answering, surely this Act ought not to go into operation as regards the civil rights of individuals that are interfered with by this Act until there is concurrent legislation on the part of the province ; therefore, I would submit that the Act should not go into operation until a proclamation to that effect is issued, giving an opportunity of protecting persons in reference to their civil rights. I may say that this is an attempt to cure, and I suppose that to that extent it does cure, or remove a difficulty that arises by reason of a conflict between two divisions of the courts of Ontario. Hon. gentlemen who took any interest in the amendment I introduced in the early part of the session to the Criminal Code, will remember that one of the objects of that amendment was to remove a difficulty of this kind, to prevent a conflict between two divisions of the high court in Toronto, such a conflict as arises in reference to depositions taken before a coroner. One division decided that depositions taken before a coroner were admissible against the person on trial, and the other division held that they were not. The amendment that I introduced proposed to make a reserve case, not to any one of the divisions, but to the Court of Appeal so that there could be no conflict in cases of that kind. In one case, the case of Mr. Hammond, they allowed a new trial, and that trial is now going on ; the new trial was allowed by reason of the improper admission of those depositions. In the other case, a person suffered the extreme penalty of the law because the other view was taken.

Mr. FITZPATRICK.

The Solicitor General, or the Minister of Justice, has thought proper to go to the root of the matter in this one particular case, and amend the Evidence Act by making that evidence admissible, or, in other words, compelling the person to answer, but protecting him as to the result of his answer, saying that it shall not be used against him in any criminal proceedings. So far, they have removed a difficulty in regard to this question of evidence, but a similar difficulty may arise on any other question that may be reserved hereafter in any criminal case. That will have to be cured later on, or there may be a similar conflict to the one that now exists between these two divisions of the court. The point with reference to this Bill is provided for as follows :—

No witness shall be excused from answering any question upon the ground that the answer to such question may tend to criminate him, or may tend to establish his liability to a civil proceeding at the instance of the Crown or of any person ; provided, however, that if with respect to any question the witness objects to answer upon the ground that his answer may tend to criminate him or may tend to establish his liability to a civil proceeding at the instance of the Crown or any person, and if but for this section the witness would therefore have been excused from answering such question, then, although the witness shall be compelled to answer yet the answer so given shall not be used or receivable in evidence against him in any criminal trial or other criminal proceeding against him thereafter taking place other than a prosecution for perjury in giving such evidence.

To sum up, while he is not excused from answering on the ground that it may tend to make him liable in a civil proceeding, there is no provision in this Act for protecting him when an action is brought against him in a civil matter. As I understand it, it cannot be because the question of jurisdiction arises as to this Parliament having a right to say that a person shall not be compelled to answer in a civil proceeding, or that this evidence shall not be used against him in a civil proceeding. I think when a person gives evidence under compulsion, we ought to provide in some way that this Act ought not to go into operation until there is provincial legislation protecting him in some way in his civil rights, as this Act now protects him in a criminal matter.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. This Act has been in force since 1893, and this is the first time that I have heard of the difficulty that my hon. friend now points out. The Canada Evidence Act applies only to criminal proceedings, and with respect to these the Parliament of Canada has jurisdiction. Now, this particular section 5 abolished the privilege of silence which existed under the old law, and which exists in England at the present time. Under that law the witness has got in his own hands the right to protect himself against

his incriminating testimony, that is the general principle of the law. This section of the Act abolished the privilege. At the same time, the intention of the legislature was evidently to protect him against the consequences of his testimony that he is obliged to give. I think it was contended that the evidence so given by him, practically under compulsion, should not be made available against him in a criminal proceeding, and that was clearly the intention. However, when the matter came to be discussed before the courts, the judges divided. There were two cases in which the judges held that the privilege did not apply, and there were two other cases in which they held that the privilege did apply. That is to say, in two cases they held that this provision of section 5 did not apply, and that evidence so given under compulsion could be used against him except in a prosecution for forgery. It was held that that did not apply when a man came before a coroner, for instance, and gave evidence that then he had no protection. Now, the intention of the amendment is to make it absolutely clear, and to provide that, whereas the privilege of silence is abolished, the protection that formerly existed, that is to say, in a case where a man is compelled to give evidence improperly, that privilege or protection is still extended to him, and he is now protected against the consequences of the evidence that he gives under compulsion. That is the intention of the law, simply to make it clear.

Mr. DAVIN. But still there is clearly a cogency in what the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Britton) suggests, that if the Department of Justice could get the provincial authorities to co-operate with him, it would be very desirable to have provincial legislation to protect the witnesses from the consequences pointed out by him.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. That is to say, to protect the witness against the consequences of a civil proceeding that might be brought in consequence of evidence given under these circumstances. I think that protection is already given under the law. However, I think a witness compelled to give testimony, as he is compelled under this Act here, would be protected against the consequences of that testimony absolutely as well as he would have been under the old law, if he was obliged by an improper ruling of the court to give evidence in a case in which he should not be compelled to give evidence against himself. But here is the point: The judges in the Ontario Court of Appeal decide in one way, and the divisional courts decide in another, and we have had cases disposed of arising under those rulings. In one case, a man is found guilty upon evidence given under that section, the case came before a divisional court, and the judgment was confirmed, and the man was hung. Another man was tried on evidence given under the same section and under the same conditions, and he gets a new trial. Now, we must amend such a condition of things as that, and that is the object of this Bill.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, considered in committee and reported.

SUPPLY—DEBTS DUE THE DOMINION.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. McMULLEN. In connection with the Bill just passed, granting additional power to the Quebec Harbour Commissioners to borrow money, I notice in looking over the accounts that there is now a very considerable amount of interest in arrear. The amount is $1,155,575. The very large amount of debt standing against the harbour is evidently more than the intrinsic value of the improvements made there, and that debt is an unsatisfactory condition. I also observe that the Fredericton and St. Mary's Railway Bridge Company is in arrears of interest to the extent of $96,000. It would be very much better if the Government, in the case of the debt on Quebec harbour, were to place a proper value upon improvements made there, and in some way vitalize that debt by reducing the amount to a sum which the harbour may fairly be expected to pay and place the interest at something like a reasonable amount, in order that the debt and interest may not be allowed to accumulate in this very unsatisfactory way from year to year. I dare say we all recollect the manner in which money was spent on the harbour of Quebec. We remember years ago hearing unpleasant statements as to the way in which the money was squandered. I think in the case of that debt, it would be very much better to make a revaluation, and recast the whole debt and reduce it to a sum the Harbour Commissioners may reasonably be expected to pay, and then ask that the interest be paid annually. Why allow this interest to roll up in this unsatisfactory condition? I think the Harbour Commissioners have not the means to pay the interest on this enormous debt, and it would be very much better that an investigation should be made so as to have the debt adjusted in some way and reduce the sums on which the Harbour Commissioners will be asked to pay reasonable interest, and after paying the interest on the amount they have now asked powers to borrow, so that we may fairly expect to receive the interest every year. With respect to the Fredericton bridge, the interest on that work has been allowed to accumulate. I drew the attention of the House

several years ago to the fact that this company had never paid one cent of interest, except a small instalment when they obtained an additional grant from the Dominion. Since that time the revenue has been consumed in expenses for keeping the bridge in running order, and whenever there has been a small surplus it has been expended in painting and improving the work, the shareholders having evidently made up their mind that they will expend any returns on the bridge itself. If that policy is to be followed, the country should take possession of the bridge and any revenues obtained. I see there are several debts mentioned in the Auditor General's Report as being in arrears; they are set out on page 45, and the amount due on 30th June, 1897, was $1,297,-295. Why should these debts be allowed to accumulate? It would be better if the Government would consider them, and place them on a basis so that the companies would be able to pay interest. I do not believe any reduction should be made in the case of the Fredericton bridge, for if it were efficiently operated and proper tolls charged on the cars passing over it, the country would reap a reasonable rate of interest from the investment. Unfortunately it is virtually controlled by two lines of railway, one on each side of the river, and the result is that between these two companies the tolls are kept down, and while the companies have the advantage of the use of the bridge, the Government is not able to collect the interest due. If the Dominion is going to make a present of the bridge to Fredericton, let the announcement be made; if not, the Government should do something to vitalize the debt and put it in shape to pay interest. I hope the Government will do this in regard to the Fredericton bridge and also with respect to the harbour of Quebec. I believe in the latter case a very considerable reduction should be made, for we all remember the extravagant expenditures that occurred, which resulted in the harbour board being encumbered with such a heavy debt that it has been unable to meet the interest.

Mr. DOBELL. The Government sympathize a good deal with what has fallen from the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen). There is some reason for reconsidering the arrangements entered into with the Harbour Commissioners of Quebec. I am sorry my hon. friend was not present in the House when I gave reasons for borrowing a further sum of $350,000 to bring into life property that was constructed more than twenty-five years ago, and is now quite unsuitable for the present style of steamers coming up the St. Lawrence. If my hon. friend will allow this matter to stand over, we will probably have some scheme to present here to carry out the views he has expressed.

Mr. McMULLEN.

THE QUEEN vs. SKELTON.

Mr. DAVIN. I would make an appeal to the Solicitor General about the copies of affidavits in the case of the Queen vs. Skelton that I have been promised. I have the word of a Minister of the Crown that I would get them, and it is very strange that I do not. Is there any chance that I shall?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). I will draw the attention of the Minister of Justice again to the matter.

ALIEN LABOUR LAW.

Mr. BENNETT. I ask the right hon. the First Minister, is it his intention under the Alien Labour Law to appoint some official on the north shore of the Georgian Bay to see as to the enforcement of the Act? I believe that a large number of Americans are at present being employed there, and I may suggest that the appointment of an official at Parry Sound would meet the requirement of the case.

The PRIME MINISTER. I will be very glad to adopt the suggestion of my hon. friend (Mr. Bennett). I see no reason why it should not be done.

CROW'S NEST PASS RAILWAY.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I desire to call the attention of the Government to a matter which was reported to me yesterday in connection with the construction of the Crow's Nest Pass Railway. I have received information on what I believe to be very good authority, that the railway company is thinking of abandoning the construction of the last fifty miles of the 330 for which a bonus of $11,000 per mile was granted by this Parliament last year. I am informed that instead of constructing these fifty miles the cost of which is estimated to be from $25,000 to $30,000 a mile, it is the intention of the company to put heavy train boats on the lake, and to carry passengers and freight by boat instead of building the line around the shores of the lake. That, of course, would relieve the company of a very heavy expenditure. I have not positive information on the matter, but I call the attention of the Government to it in order that they may have inquiries made, and inasmuch as one of the terms of the contract is that the bonus shall be paid on every ten miles of the road completed, it might be well for the Government to inquire, and if it is a fact that the company does not propose to build these fifty miles, then the Government should withhold the bonus and keep the company to its bargain.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). The hon. gentleman

(Mr. Richardson) intimated to me that he intended to bring this matter up, and I can only say in answer to his remarks that this is the very first I have heard of such a rumour being abroad with regard to the intention of the Canadian Pacific Railway. It will be remembered by members of the House that when the Crow's Nest Railway contract was under consideration, it was pointed out to the House that that portion of the road between the south of Kootenay Lake and Nelson was very expensive and difficult to construct, and could not be completed at as early a date as some other portions of the line, even though the work might be entered upon at the Nelson end and the Kootenay Lake end at the same time. The Government, understanding there would be some delay in this, and that the 31st December, 1900, would be the earliest date at which we could hope for the completion of the line from Macleod to Nelson, caused a clause to be inserted in the contract providing that from the southerly point of Kootenay Lake to Nelson, there should be, pending the completion, a service by car ferry. I presume that some persons may have seen evidences of the company making arrangements for such a mode of transport and have drawn the inference that the company intended to abandon that part of their work. I feel very well assured that there cannot be any such purpose in the mind of the company, and I may state to my hon. friend (Mr. Richardson) that I will make close inquiry in regard to it. I would most unquestionably avail myself of the power which is conferred on us under the contract in case we should see any evidence of intention on the part of the company to abandon that portion of the road.

Mr. FOSTER. Can the Minister say as to what time it is supposed the road will be finished through to the Kootenay River in East Kootenay below Fort Steele ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The company have contracted to complete the line to the southerly point of Kootenay Lake by the end of the present year.

Mr. FOSTER. That is, beyond East Kootenay River ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, within fifty or fifty-five miles of Nelson.

Mr. FOSTER. The question I asked was, if my hon. friend (Mr. Blair) knew the probable time of the road reaching the East Kootenay River below Fort Steele, because then it comes into line with a fairly serviceable water communication both ways.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am not informed as to when that part of the line will be completed so that the trains can be run, but I think a very large portion of it is now finished. There are one or two breaks that have to be filled up. Of course the contract makes it obligatory on the company to complete it all to the southerly point of Kootenay Lake at the end of the current year.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. BELCOURT. I desire, Mr. Speaker, to refer to a personal matter. In the columns of the Montreal "Gazette" to-day I notice the following item :

> Hon. A. G. Blair stated to-day in the Railway Committee that the Government had decided to oppose all Yukon railway Bills for roads to cross the international boundary. This does not affect existing characters, such as that of the British Yukon Company, but it means that Mr. Belcourt's Bill to incorporate the Alaska and Northwestern Railway Company, which is reported to be one of Hamilton Smith's Bills, and which is now before the Railway Committee, will not be allowed to pass. The same result will happen to Hamilton Smith's other Bill, which passed the Senate yesterday.

I desire to state and to have it clearly understood, that so far as I know Mr. Hamilton Smith has no connection or interest, direct or indirect, with the Bill which stands in my name and which is still before the Railway Committee. I desire to add further, that I have the very best of reasons for believing and knowing that Mr. Hamilton Smith has no connection with this Bill.

Mr. COCHRANE. It would not hurt it if he had.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY TRAIN SERVICE.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. I desire to ask the Minister of Railways when it is the intention to issue a new time table on the Intercolonial Railway for the summer business ?

Mr. FOSTER. Is it a new time table my hon. friend (Mr. Choquette) asks for ?

Mr. CHOQUETTE. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. I thought it was a new tariff.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). The summer arrangement will be entered upon about the 15th or 20th of June.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. Then I will ask the Minister of Railways if it is his intention to see that a proper train service is given on the Intercolonial Railway to the Quebec district. Some of my colleagues from that district, as well as myself, have very often had occasion to remind him that the present train service on the Intercolonial Railway is simply intolerable. The people of the Quebec district are now obliged to travel on way freights and accommodation freights which for the last four or five months have been many hours late every day. We have always been promised that some remedy would be given, but so far nothing has

been done. I myself saw Mr. Pottinger yesterday and he promised to improve the service at once so as to have a through freight train instead of having the cars taking on and putting off freight at every station. I should like to know if that is going to be done now, because in the past we have only had promises.

Mr. McALISTER. It is well to accommodate all people living along the Intercolonial Railway as far as possible, but the hon. gentleman (Mr. Choquette) must remember that the district of Quebec is not the only place to be considered in this matter. I find that the present arrangement is giving universal satisfaction between Montreal and the maritime provinces. If it does not suit Quebec, I think a change should not be made to accommodate Quebec alone unless it accommodates other parts of the country as well.

Mr. TALBOT. I would ask the Minister of Railways if the delay of the Intercolonial in the Quebec section is due to the railway being short of engines? That is the reason given, that the engines which ought to be kept for hauling passenger trains are used for hauling freight trains. I would ask the Minister of Railways whether that is true or not?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I think it can hardly be said that the regular trains are delayed in consequence of any shortage in our traction power. It is quite true, we are not very well supplied; but rather than have the passenger traffic delayed, we believe it to be our duty to go further than we have yet gone, and we have gone some distance, in hiring locomotives. But the difficulty which my hon. friends are complaining of is one which I presume it is not possible for us to avoid without putting on a more expensive class of train than we are running between the points mentioned. Our express trains are running on time, and I have heard no complaint at all with regard to them; and in the desire to afford additional accommodation, we have added passenger cars to our train service. This I expected would have been appreciated to a somewhat greater extent than my hon. friend seems to appreciate it. It has rather furnished a ground of complaint against us, because we have not been able, providing the accommodation in that way, to make quite as regular and speedy time as we could wish. Our intention is, as soon as we are in a position to make the arrangements, to give what I think will be found to be a fairly satisfactory service to the Quebec district, and I hope my hon. friends will have patience until these arrangements can be got into better shape than they are in at this moment.

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

Mr. CHOQUETTE.

(In the Committee.)

To cover balances of expenditures for works for which the appropriations may be insufficient (the amounts expended under this appropriation to be shown under the heading of the several works affected)..... $3,000

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). I beg to say that this item has been placed in my estimates by the Department of Finance. Perhaps it would satisfy my hon. friends if I were to add these words: "Provided that the sum in each case shall not exceed $100 for each work." We are carrying on works for which at times we are short by $50 or $25, and it is in order to provide for such cases that the Department of Finance has suggested this item. With the proviso I have just indicated, I think the ex-Minister of Finance will be perfectly satisfied.

Mr. FOSTER. The objection I had to the item was this. My hon. friend will see that he has a most elastic estimate, much more so than any other department of the Government. In the first place, he takes an estimate for every special work, and it is of the essence of estimating that the estimate shall come as near as possible to the cost of the work. After my hon. friend has estimated for every special work in a province he takes a general vote to cover work in any part of the province. After dealing with all the provinces in that way, he takes a further vote for the Dominion generally; and now he is capping that by putting in an item to cover any balances that may be required. If all the departments are going to estimate in that way, where will this thing end. In the first place, it induces carelessness in the department. I have heard no strong reason given so far why we should not get on without this vote.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think if my hon. friend will carefully consider the question, he will agree with me. He knows that when my department or any other department has a special amount voted for a special work, the Auditor General will not allow me to take from any general vote any amount in which I might be short for the special work. So that these general votes are not available for this purpose, and that is the reason why I am asking this vote. Not long ago, I was $63 short in one case, and I was obliged to over-expend. It is to cover these small shortages that I ask this small amount.

Mr. FOSTER. I will make a suggestion. Make the vote read "To cover balances of expenditures for works already authorized," and then add at the end "And in no case to exceed $100 for each work."

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I agree to that.

Bridge across the Saskatchewan at Edmonton, N.W.T..... $25,000

Mr. DAVIN. I want to ask a few questions with regard to this, and think it would be desirable that we should go over rapidly the history of the contract. The hon. gentleman is aware that an advertisement was published, dated the 16th July, 1897, calling for tenders for the construction of three piers and two abutments for a bridge, according to plans and specifications to be seen at certain points, on and after 22nd July, and that tenders were to be in not later than Friday, August 6th. An accepted cheque, payable to the order of the Minister of Public Works, for $2,000 was to accompany each tender and to be forfeited if the party declined the contract or failed to complete the work. In looking at the specifications, I find that they call for a lump sum for the whole work shown on a certain plan and described in the specifications and also a price per lineal foot for piles driven, and per thousand feet, board measure, for timber laid and spiked in the foundations of the piers and the abutments. The hon. gentleman assents to this ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am following my hon. friend closely.

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. gentleman will interrupt me, if I misstate the case.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, but I shall simply reply when the hon. gentleman is through.

Mr. DAVIN. The amount paid for the finished work would, therefore, consist, first, of the lump sum, second, the amount paid for piles, and third, the amount paid for the timber work, which was to be sawn pine timber. According to sections 14 and 15 of the specifications, the timber was to be of the very best description, and according to section 17 the piles were to be white oak or rock elm for the piers and cedar for the abutments. As may be seen on looking at the plan, there are no piles in the pier but only in the abutments. Again, there is no cedar in the North-west, but for piles sunk in the ground, tamarack, of which there is an abundance in the Nprth-west, is as good as cedar. I will now ask what timber is being used ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The chief engineer is not here at present, but the acting engineer tells me that oak has been used, but I shall let my hon. friend know to-morrow.

Mr. DAVIN. Oak is being used for piles ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will find out and let the hon. gentleman know.

Mr. DAVIN. The piles were to be built of rock-faced ashlar masonry, first-class in every respect. The stone was to be limestone granite, and from a quarry accepted by the engineer, and the abutments were also to be of ashlar masonry. I am quoting from the specifications. No estimates were to be paid during construction. Have estimates been paid ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Not one cent.

Mr. DAVIN. The work was to be commenced as soon as possible after the signature of the contract, and to be completed on or before 15th November, 1897, and there was a fine of $50 every day after that date that the work remained uncompleted. The date of the contract was the 17th August. Therefore for this large work, there was less than three months allowed in which to do it. Why was it that the time for putting in tenders was so short?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Let the hon. gentleman make his statement. I would rather answer all his questions at once.

Mr. DAVIN. I have a perfect right to put this question.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is simply an argument, and I will give the details in reply.

Mr. DAVIN. How can the hon. gentleman know, when I am stating the history of the case, whether or not there is a point in it that I consider calls for comment, because he cannot build an argument on a mere statement of the case. He would have to make an argument in reply to one made by me on my statement of facts.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have a statement to make to the House and I see that the hon. gentleman has a statement also. I will hear his statement and then give my reply.

Mr. DAVIN. The date of the advertisement is the 16th July and the tenders had to be in on the 6th August. Why was so short a time given for the construction of the work—less than three months ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am taking a note of that and will certainly answer my hon. friend's question.

Mr. DAVIN. Why was it that a penalty of $50 a day was attached to each day that should elapse after the 15th of November, while the work remained incomplete ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am just taking a note of my hon. friend's statement, and will certainly answer it.

Mr. DAVIN. I would ask the hon. gentleman whether the work was completed in that time ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I I will answer my hon. friend as soon as he gets through.

Mr. DAVIN. Surely, Mr. Chairman, I am entitled to know whether the contract was completed or not.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It was not completed in the time specified.

Mr. DAVIN. Was the fine of $50 a day imposed ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No fine was imposed.

Mr. DAVIN. Was there any forfeiture ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, there was no forfeiture.

Mr. DAVIN. As the contract is signed on the 17th August, there would be less than three months to complete a work thus hedged around with forfeitures and penalties. And it is perfectly clear, from the way it has turned out, that for the tenderer who got the contract, there was no terror in these forfeitures and no danger in the penalties. Now, anybody who has had any experience of the execution of public works knows that when you limit the time, when you confine a contractor to a very brief period for doing the work, he will have to spend more money than he would have to spend if the work is extended over a longer period.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIN. Very well. Now, in this case, I believe some stone was shown at the office to the contractors tendering, which they were told was to be had about fifty miles from Edmonton in a quarry belonging to one Alexis Degagné. And I believe that this Mr. Degagné is a supporter of the Liberal party.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I never knew him. I do not know whether he is dead or alive.

Mr. DAVIN. He is a strong supporter of my hon. friend from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver). I believe the contractors were told at the office that this stone could be had dressed at the quarries at $14 per cubic yard.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not know that there was any price fixed, but I remember that in the report of the chief engineer, which my hon. friend (Mr. Davin) has in his hand, it was stated that the stone was shown in the office as coming from Degagné's quarry.

Mr. DAVIN. Now, Mr. Chairman, it will be seen that all the conditions were harsh and calculated to frighten contractors. First, the time allowed to put in tenders was short. Second, no estimates were to be paid. Third, there was a penalty of $50 a day. And lastly, there was a forfeit of $2,000. Now, Sir, it is obvious—I just put this hypothetically—that if any one contractor knew that there was no terror in that penalty, no terror in that forfeit, he would be able to tender at a lower rate than one who believed that there was business in these conditions—I do not mean in the sense of "business is business"——

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That old chestnut once more. My hon. friend (Mr. Davin) makes himself cheaper every day.

Mr. DAVIN. I am afraid that the chestnut was so hard that the cracking of it has destroyed the political teeth of my hon. friend (Mr. Tarte). Now, if one contractor knew that he need not use stone at all, that everything would be easy for him, he would be in a position to tender much lower than his competitors. There were four tenders put in. The first was from Frs. Lemoine, living in Montreal. The lump sum of his contract for all the work other than piles and sawn timber work, was $36,500. For piles driven, his charge was $1 per lineal foot, and for timber laid and spiked $30 per thousand feet, board measure. The second tender was from Joseph Bourque, living, I think, in Hull. The lump sum of his tender was $42,750, with $2 per lineal foot for piles and $65 per thousand feet for timber laid and spiked. Then, we have a third tender from John Burns, of Ottawa. The lump sum of his tender was $44,900. The price he proposed to charge for piles was 30 cents per lineal foot, and for timber laid and spiked $50 per thousand feet. The fourth tender was from Rourke & Allison. The lump sum was $59,500 ; piles, oak, 75 cents per lineal foot ; cedar, 60 cents per lineal foot ; and timber, $36 per thousand feet, board measure. The first tenderer was from Montreal, the second from Hull, the third from Ottawa, and the fourth from Winnipeg. Lemoine was the lowest for masonry ; Burns the lowest for piles driven ; Lemoine the lowest for foundation timber. The dates of the tenders were respectively : Lemoine, 6th ; Bourque, 6th ; Burns, 6th ; and Rourke & Allison, 4th August. You will observe, Sir, that the sixth day was the last day the tenders could come in. Now, I wish to ask the hon. Minister, when did these tenders, dated the 6th August, arrive at the office of the Minister of Public Works?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I cannot say. These tenders were not opened by me, but by the Deputy Minister and the chief engineer. I have not opened a tender since I took charge of the department—yes, I opened one, just to see how things were done. The tenders were received in the ordinary way by the secretary of the chief engineer.

Mr. DAVIN. Is that Mr. Roy ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. DAVIN. When were they brought to the attention of the Minister ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not remember the date, but they were brought to my attention in the ordinary way by the Deputy Minister.

Mr. DAVIN. Of course, at any time, but specially at the present time, it would be impossible for a contract to be made with the Department of Public Works without the Minister's sanction.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Quite so.

Mr. DAVIN. What date was the contract awarded ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. As the hon. gentleman himself says, it was the 17th August, if I remember well.

Mr. DAVIN. That is not what I mean. When was it determined to award the contract ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not remember the exact date.

Mr. DAVIN. Does the hon. Minister remember whether he was in Ottawa when he determined to award the contract ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think so. I cannot pretend to remember these things.

Mr. DAVIN. Now, it is quite clear that there are some gaps in the papers that have been brought down. In the papers that have been brought down, there is what is apparently a telegram dated the 7th, at Montreal, and signed by Louis Coste, engineer, saying :

Am instructed by the Minister to ask you to immediately notify the lowest tenderer for Edmonton bridge masonry that his tender is accepted. Minister goes to Quebec to-morrow night ; I return to Ottawa by late train to-night.

Therefore, on the 7th the Minister must have been in Montreal.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Perhaps I was in Montreal.

Mr. DAVIN. Evidently it was in Montreal that the Minister decided to give the contract. The tender from Montreal was dated the 6th of August. Now, I want to know whether that tender of Lemoine was sent by mail.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, it was sent to the Deputy Minister by mail.

Mr. DAVIN. Then, if the tender was dated the 6th of August and sent by mail, it could not have arrived in the department until the day after the time for receiving tenders. If sent by mail, as we are now told it was, it could not have reached Ottawa before the 7th, which is the date on which Mr. Louis Coste's telegram is apparently addressed to Mr. Roy, the secretary. Now, the same remark is true of the tender of Bourque & Burns, and of that of O'Rourke & Allison. It is doubtful if they could have arrived on the 6th. Now, on the 7th, the Minister and his engineer are at Montreal, and from Montreal Mr. Coste sends a telegram that the contract was to be given to the lowest tenderer ; therefore, the Minister must have decided—and I ask his attention to this—to give the contract to the lowest tenderer without going into the merits of the respective tenderers. My hon. friend laughs at it. Is not that so ? Did the hon. gentleman enter into the merits of the respective tenders ? No answer.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Not at the present time.

Mr. DAVIN. But surely the House is entitled to know whether the hon. gentleman considered the merits of these tenders.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The question is ridiculous.

Mr. DAVIN. It is not at all ridiculous. It is clear the hon. Minister of Public Works is not desirous of shedding any light on that point.

Mr. McGREGOR. Or the speaker, either.

Mr. DAVIN. Just wait awhile, and we shall see. It is quite evident that some of the backers of the Minister of Public Works who have stood by him under all circumstances in this House, are rather afraid that he is being a little squeezed, and are trying to come to his rescue. Now, Sir, I want an answer to the question : Did the hon. gentleman at Montreal consider the merits of these tenders ? Now, at Montreal, on the 7th, which is presumably the date that the tender of Lemoine arrived at the Department of Public Works, the Minister authorized Mr. Louis Coste to give directions to have the contract given to the lowest tenderer. Will the Minister answer this : How came he and the engineer to be at Montreal on the day the decision was arrived at ?

An hon. MEMBER. They went by train.

Mr. DAVIN. Hon. members are pleased to laugh and jeer at any amount of curious work that may be perpetrated by any department, but remember there is a day of reckoning coming. How came the Minister and the engineer to be at Montreal on the day the decision was arrived at ? How is it that he sends his decision by telegram ? How came it to be the date on which the tenders arrived in Ottawa that he decides in Montreal ? The Minister is silent, but of course we will insist upon having a reply to that. Now, Mr. E. F. E. Roy appears to have notified Mr. Lemoine by letter, which letter is not here, because on the 9th of August Lemoine telegraphs : "I will be in Ottawa this evening." On the following day Lemoine writes the secretary a letter dated Ottawa, saying that he is ready to enter

into a contract with the Government for building the piers and abutments of the Edmonton bridge according to his tender, and asks that he may be addressed at Montreal. On the 11th of August, R. C. Derochiers, assistant secretary, informs Lemoine by letter that the contract had been sent to Montreal for execution. The contract is dated the 17th of August. Now, the Minister will have to give me some enlightenment, because I will surely be entitled to some help to piece out this history. What occurred afterwards? After the contract was thus let, Mr. Lemoine goes up to Edmonton, he examines the quarry, and then comes back and informs the Department of Public Works that the stone is unfit for building piers and abutments. Is that correct?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will take a note of it.

Mr. DAVIN. Is it correct or not?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I shall not discuss political matters in connection with that department.

Mr. DAVIN. There is nothing political.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I mean public matters.

Mr. DAVIN. Then Mr. St. Laurent is instructed to test the report that he made about the quarry at Edmonton, and he also tests the report made about the stone at Calgary. It was then decided to allow Mr. Lemoine to build the pier and abutments of the Edmonton bridge of concrete, and the conclusion was arrived at that it would cost about as much to build it of concrete as of masonry. The result was that Mr. Lemoine, without any new tenders being called for was allowed to build the piers and abutments of concrete. Does the hon. Minister assert that the cost of concrete is anything like the cost of masonry? What I complain of is this: I assert that the cost of concrete is not much more than half the cost of masonry, and under these circumstances, we want an explanation from the Minister of this item.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I should be very glad indeed to give to my hon. friend all the information he may be anxious to obtain. Tenders were asked for the bridge, tenders were received, and when they were put before me I instructed my officers to give the contract to the lowest tenderer, who happened to be Mr. Lemoine, of Montreal. Whether the result of the opening of the tenders was put before me in Montreal or in Ottawa does not much matter.

Mr. HAGGART. Did you give the contract yourself or make a report to Council, which was afterwards approved by His Excellency?

Mr. DAVIN.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I always report to Council. When I speak of myself I do so as head of the department. Tenders were opened by my officers in the usual way. The lowest tenderer happened to be Mr. Lemoine. I knew him to be a contractor of good reputation, and without any hesitation I awarded him the contract. The contract was given on 17th August and was to be completed on 15th November. The hon. gentleman has asked why the period was so short. The chief engineer reported that the bridge could be completed during that time, and that the period should be made short on account of the rising of the water in the river, and the short season in the west. I concurred in that recommendation. My engineer prepared the specifications, and I relied on him, as I do in every such case. My hon. friend is correct in stating that it was announced that the piers would be built in masonry, and that a sample of the stone to be used was in the Department of Public Works.

Mr. DAVIN. When were the tenders laid before the Minister?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. They were laid before me immediately, as it was considered a very urgent matter indeed. The stone was to be obtained from a quarry owned by Mr. Degagné, and a sample of which had been in the department since 1894. Tenders were put in no doubt on the face supposition that stone, according to the sample in the department, would be used. Mr. St. Laurent went west.

Mr. DAVIN. Had the tenders been before the Minister before he directed the engineer to tell the secretary that the contract would be given to the lowest tenderer?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not know whether the tenders themselves were placed before me or not, but the result of the examination of the tenders was placed before me. The business is always done in that way. Every hon. member who has been a Minister knows that the result of the examination of tenders is laid before the Minister and he writes his name or initials on the schedule accepted. Mr. St. Laurent went west to carry on the work. I may say that Mr. St. Laurent is an old officer of the Department of Public Works, who has been employed in Ottawa and Manitoba, and I appointed him as superintendent of the work because of that experience. The first intimation the department had that something was wrong is contained in this report:

Department of Public Works, Canada,
Resident Engineer's Office,
Ottawa, 30th August, 1897.

Sir,—I have just returned, after a hard trip, from a visit to Mr. Degagné's quarry, about fifty miles up the River Saskatchewan, and I find that the stone, of which he sent a sample to the

department, is positively not suitable for bridge piers.

The stratification of the stone is bad, the different beds are cut up by thin vertical seams in all directions, these seams being composed of weak cementing material.

The action of water and frost in splitting open this stone is plainly visible through the seams, and it is quite impossible to get a single block of sandstone of the dimensions required for the piers.

I have notified the contractor to take immediate steps to procure suitable stones at once, and to proceed vigorously with the work, which, in fact, is not practically commenced yet. As I intend to leave for Lake Manitoba about the 10th of September, and will be away from Edmonton a few weeks, it might be advisable that a competent inspector be appointed during my absence. Please advise me at Winnipeg. In any case, if not detained unavoidably at Lake Manitoba, I shall try to be back to Edmonton at the end of September.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,
(Sgd.) ARTHUR ST. LAURENT,
Engineer in Charge.

Louis Coste, Esq.,
Chief Engineer,
Dept. of Public Works, Ottawa.

This is dated Ottawa, but that is evidently a mistake, as Mr. St. Laurent was apparently writing from Edmonton. This was the first report that came to us. The second report that came from the same engineer is dated Calgary, 15th September, and is as follows :

Department of Public Works, Canada,
Chief Engineer's Office,
Calgary, 15th September, 1897.

Sir,—In accordance with your instructions, I visited all the quarries in Calgary, with the view of finding suitable stone for the Edmonton bridge piers, and I have the honour to report herein the result of my visit, supplementing my telegram of the 14th inst., stating that no suitable stone had been found in this connection.

All the quarries examined around Calgary prove to be sandstone, and although finding many kinds different in their properties, I conclude, after mature consideration, that it would not be safe to risk the use of them in the large and exposed piers of the Edmonton bridge. Two varieties were mainly examined, the others being considered not worth mentioning—one of a dark cream colour, the other of a bluish gray. The first variety is soft, and hardens on exposure, but owing to its porosity, and consequently high absorptive power, the action of frost is great on that stone, and this action is plainly visible in some of the Calgary buildings where it has been used. However, I would not hesitate to recommend the use of that stone in piers above ordinary water, though very soft, if the stone could be dried in the sun for a few weeks before using.

The blue variety shows great compactness, and it is the hardest sandstone found at Calgary. It occurs in pockets in the ordinary sandstone formation, in depths of one to six feet.

At first sight the stone was all that could be desired for piers, some of the residents stating positively that the frost had no action upon it, though they could not point out to me its use in exposed situations.

In stripping off this quarry, large pieces of that blue stone were rolled down the steep cut bank to the Elbow River below. In every instance where these blocks were in a position to be soaked by the river water and exposed to frost, they showed frost splits.

Moreover, the quantity in sight is much under the quantity required. It would take many weeks of earth and stone stripping to get at it, with the prospect of the pocket running out.

Under these circumstances I felt it my duty to report against the use of any of the Calgary stone in connection with the Edmonton bridge.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
(Sgd.) ARTHUR ST. LAURENT,
Engineer in Charge.

Louis Coste, Esq.,
Chief Engineer,
Dept. of Public Works, Ottawa.

I may say at once that the specifications required that the stone would be at least 15 inches thick. We found, as Mr. St. Laurent says, that the quarry of Mr. Degagné could not supply the necessary stone and that the stone at Calgary was not considered suitable.

Mr. DAVIN. Is that the original report of St. Laurent ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am reading from a copy.

Mr. DAVIN. I suppose there would be no objection to giving us the original report ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There would be no objection. I suppose the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) does not pretend that we would falsify a document ?

Mr. DAVIN. Oh, dear me, no ; I would be incapable of suspecting it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This copy was prepared by the officers in the department.

Mr. DAVIN. May I ask the Minister this question, because it is quite clear that all the papers did not come down. When Mr. Lemoine came to the office to say he could not do the work, was Mr. St. Laurent instructed here or was he telegraphed to, or what was done ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. When Mr. Lemoine went west to carry out the work Mr. St. Laurent proceeded at the same time with him. I do not remember the dates, but Mr. St. Laurent was sent out by the chief engineer.

Mr. DAVIN. Might I ask the Minister further——

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I want to make the statement complete and I cannot do that and discuss these questions with the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin).

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) has not the right to speak unless with the consent of the member who has the floor.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will be very glad to answer the question

of the hon. gentleman when I have finished my statement. The two reports that I have read give the reasons why delays took place. My hon. friend (Mr. Davin) has asked me why we did not impose the fine of $50 a day. The reason is very obvious. Mr. Lemoine tendered on the faith of the Public Works Department saying that there was stone available, and there was a sample of the stone in Mr. Coste's office. Mr. Coste no doubt thought at the time that Mr. Degagné's quarry could supply suitable stone and Mr. Lemoine tendered on the faith that he would find the stone required there. He went up there, but, as the chief engineer's report shows, the stone was not suitable and the work could not be carried out. I had better now read the report of the chief engineer, because it affords the best possible argument and gives an answer to every question that has been put by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin). Mr. Coste's report is dated the 22nd September and reads as follows :

On the 17th of August, 1897, a contract was entered with Mr. Lemoine for the construction of the piers and abutments of the Edmonton bridge for an amount of $36,500, the specification calling for masonry of rock-faced ashlar from a limestone or granite quarry accepted by the engineer.

Tenders were invited for this work on the 22nd July, and were received on the 6th of August, the lowest being that of Mr. Lemoine.

I may say that I was personally under the impression that unsuitable stone could be found in the neighbourhood of Edmonton. As far back as September, 1894, I had caused an examination of the banks of the river to be made by C. J. Duggan, formerly in the employ of the Canadian Pacific Railway, who reported that he found a quarry fifty miles up the river from Edmonton with a hard flinty stone, the ledge showing along the bank for about 600 feet, and from 8 to 10 feet thick, from which large pieces could be obtained.

This opinion of Mr. Duggan was further corroborated by Mr. Alexis Degagné, who, on the 16th June, 1897, forwarded a sample of stone taken from his quarry, situated about fifty miles up the River Saskatchewan, stating that he could contract for any quantity that might be required, and that the stone existed in mass-like granite, and not in layers, and that blocks of any thickness could be obtained. He offered that stone for $14 per cubic yard, dressed.

The sample was examined in my office, and found to be of excellent quality for bridge-building, and was shown to all contractors who inquired whether or not stone could be procured in the neighbourhood of Edmonton—nothing, however, being guaranteed.

As soon as the contract had been awarded, Mr. Lemoine proceeded to Edmonton, but came back at once and reported that he could not find stone of the dimensions or of the quality required by the specification. He was told to procure it elsewhere, but replied that he had also examined the stone found at Calgary, and was of the opinion that it would not be accepted.

Then Mr. Arthur St. Laurent, engineer of this department, was sent to examine the quarries, and he reported as follows, under date of August 30th, 1897.

As I have just read the report of Mr. St. Laurent, I need not read it again. After quoting from that report, Mr. Coste continues :

From these reports you will see that it would be unsafe to use any of the stone found at or near Edmonton, or at or near Calgary, and the nearest place where stone could be found would be Winnipeg, but I submit that freight rates make the use of that stone prohibitory.

Under the above circumstances, having ascertained that good clean gravel can be found on the banks of the Saskatchewan for concrete work, I have the honour to strongly recommend that the substitution of concrete for masonry be permitted.

With regard to the price, I find that if the contractor had been able to procure dressed stone from the Degagné quarry, even at the very high price quoted to me in June last, viz., $14 per cubic yard, delivered at the site of the bridge, the cost of his masonry per cubic yard would have been as follows :—

Stone, dressed, delivered.....	$14 00
Cement mortar.....	2 60
Laying, scaffolding, &c.....	2 50
	$19 10

And for backing the price would have been :

Stone, delivered at the site of bridge	$ 5 00
Cement mortar.....	6 00
Laying	2 00
	$13 00

And as the proportion of ashlar and backing are two to one, the average price of the masonry would have been $17.00.

The price of a cubic yard of concrete I estimate as follows :—

Broken stone, delivered on site of work	$ 3 50
Sand	0 20
Cement mortar.....	10 80
Laying and scaffolding.....	2 50
	$17 00

which price would be augmented by about 80 cents per cubic yard if the 80 cubic yards of pure mortar forming the 3-inch coating is taken into consideration, thus bringing the estimated cost of concrete work at a value of $17.80 per cubic yard.

It appears to me, therefore, owing to the high value of cement in Edmonton, which is $6 per barrel, the prices of concrete and of masonry at that place are about the same, and I therefore recommend that the price of the contract be allowed to remain the same, viz., $36,500.

I desire to add to the above that concrete work for bridge piers and abutments, is, in my opinion, much preferable to indifferent masonry work, and that this kind of work is now in general use where first-class stone cannot be found.

On the Canada Atlantic Railway, nearly all permanent bridge piers and abutments are built of concrete, and in Europe dock walls and foundations are also frequently built of concrete masonry, and one of the chief reasons that has to a certain extent militated against concrete work is the difficulty to obtain first-class cement.

In the present instance the contractor has furnished good cement, and under the superintend-

ence of Mr. Arthur St. Laurent, engineer of this department, I have no doubt that the work will be done in a satisfactory manner.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
(Sgd.) LOUIS COSTE,
Chief Engineer.

Acting on the report of my chief engineer, I left the contract in Mr. Lemoine's hands; but I may say that before I did so, Mr. Coste and myself tried to find out whether we could not procure stone in Manitoba. We made inquiries, but we found that the railway rates rendered it simply impossible.

Mr. DAVIN. What were the railway rates?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. From Calgary to Edmonton, ten cents per hundred pounds, and from Stony Mountain and other points in Manitoba, forty cents per hundred pounds for dressed stone.

Mr. DAVIN. Why would forty cents per hundred pounds for dressed stone make it impracticable to take stone from Manitoba?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The rates would amount to $15 per cubic yard, which was out of the question. Whether I was right or wrong in awarding the contract to Mr. Lemoine, events will prove. I know that the work is being carried out in a first-class manner. Only two days ago I received a resolution from the Edmonton Board of Trade thanking me for the way in which the work is being carried out. The masonry work will be completed by the end of June. It is to the personal knowledge of a great many members of this House that many works of this importance are now being built of concrete masonry. The work that the Montreal Electric Company are putting up on the Chambly River is being built of concrete, which is considered better even than stone work when the concrete is well done. Mr. St. Laurent is an engineer of vast experience who is testing cement every day.

Mr. DAVIN. Will the hon. gentleman send me the report of Mr. St. Laurent?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. With pleasure. I may be permitted to read the resolution of the Edmonton Board of Trade:

Edmonton, N.W.T., May, 1898.

The council of the Board of Trade have unanimously passed the following resolution:—

"That this council has viewed with pleasure the rapid progress made on the Edmonton bridge, and believe that the work reflects great credit on the contractor, Mr. Lemoine, and also the engineer in charge, Mr. St. Laurent."

The height of the piers was not considered quite sufficient. We decided that they should be raised two feet, at an additional cost of $1,500.

Mr. DAVIN. Why was it, when Mr. Lemoine came back to Ottawa and told the Department of Public Works that he could not build the piers and abutments of masonry, new tenders were not called for?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Because we were anxious that the work should be carried out immediately, and as the chief engineer, Mr. St. Laurent, reported to me—and I do not think his report can be disputed—that concrete work is even better than the stone which could be supplied there, I did not see any reason for losing any more time.

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. gentleman's object was that the work should be done immediately, but he learned in the autumn, just entering into winter, that the work could not be proceeded with. Could he proceed during the winter?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No.

Mr. DAVIN. Where then did the immediate necessity come in?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I expected the work would be carried out quickly, and it has in fact been done more quickly than if we had called for new tenders. Mr. Lemoine was there with his plant and was ready to go on and he had been the lowest tenderer. And as my engineer reported to me that concrete work was just as good as masonry, I acted on his advice.

Mr. DAVIN. My hon. friend gave one reason why he entered into a new arrangement, and that was that he wanted to have the work done immediately. But the whole winter had to elapse, and it was only commenced the other day. Finding this reason insufficient, he now says that Mr. Lemoine had plant up there. What plant had Mr. Lemoine out there on the 17th August for the construction of concrete?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am sorry that I cannot give any other reasons than those I have given, which I think are quite sufficient. I am sorry if I cannot convince my hon. friend, but that is a pretty hard task at times. My conduct has been perfectly above-board, and I have acted on the advice of my officers. If they advised me wrongly, I would be very sorry for them, but they did not.

Mr. DAVIN. My hon. friend has not seized the point. He gives two reasons—first, that he wanted the contract carried out immediately, and next, that Mr. Lemoine had plant up there. If there is no foundation in fact for these two reasons then, he must find other ones. He could not have the bridge constructed immediately because the winter was coming on, and it is morally certain that Mr. Lemoine had no plant up

there, because we are told that he made a hurried trip to Edmonton and came immediately back to the department and reported that he could not build the work of stone.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am sorry to have to repeat that I cannot offer any other reasons than those contained in the report of my officers, and which I considered sufficient. If the hon. gentleman will not acquiesce in the report. I will have to dispense with his acquiescence.

Mr. DAVIN. There is nothing in the report about immediate or about Mr. Lemoine having the plant up there to construct a concrete bridge. The hon. gentleman has given me two reasons, and I want to know whether there are any facts behind these reasons ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If the hon. gentleman has some charge to make or facts to show, let him bring them out. There is no use proceeding by insinuation. I am generally prepared to meet any accusations, and if the hon. gentleman has any to make let him make them. The contract was for masonry, but proper stone could not be found. The contractor went west and came back, and reported that the quarry pointed out by the engineer could not supply the stone required.

Mr. DAVIN. The question I put was why fresh tenders were not called for as this was new work. The hon. gentleman replied that he wanted the work done immediately, and he has admitted that it was then coming on winter and the work could not be proceeded with until the spring.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It was September.

Mr. DAVIN. Was it done immediately ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It was proceeded with immediately, but not as quickly as I expected. The ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) laughs, but he has seen many works that were not built as quickly as he expected.

Mr. FOSTER. I want a definition of the word "immediately."

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. What I mean is that I was anxious the work should be proceeded with immediately, and so it was, but it was not completed immediately.

Mr. DAVIN. When did the cement get out and the work begin ?

Mr. OLIVER. I can perhaps throw some light on the subject. The work was commenced some time in the latter end of August or the beginning of September, and proceeded with until the ice took in the river in the fall. The foundations of two of the piers were completed last fall, and the abutments were partially completed. Preparations were made for the foundation of the third pier, but were not completed, owing to the early setting in of winter. Had that work been done last fall, it is very possible it could not have been completed this summer, as there would not have been sufficient time between the going out of the ice in the spring and the high rise of water in June to allow of the work being completed. So that the work that was done last fall was practical and substantial, and necessary to the completion of the bridge at a sufficiently early date this season to allow the superstructure to be put on during the summer.

Mr. DAVIN. As my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) evidently knows a great deal more about the Department of Public Works than the Minister does, I will ask him a question——

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. He lives at Edmonton, where this work is.

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. gentleman says the laying of the concrete foundation was commenced in August.

Mr. OLIVER. I could not say—the latter part of August or the first of September ; but the work had made good progress during September and was continued during October and did not cease, I believe, until some time in November.

Mr. HAGGART. The principal point in this change, as I see it, is the change from masonry to cement. The Minister justifies the change by saying that the report of his officers was to the effect that one was as good as the other and that it would cost as much to put in cement as to put in rock.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Out there.

Mr. HAGGART. The Minister says that the stone cost about $14 per cubic yard at the quarry.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That is the price given to me.

Mr. HAGGART. And in the work it cost about $17 per cubic yard. He says that the concrete would cost $17 per cubic yard. He bases this estimate upon a cost for concrete of $6 a barrel there. If he will look at the report of the Auditor General he will find that the hon. Minister of Railways gets his cement at Soulanges for $1.60 a barrel. He can get the very best Portland cement for $2 a barrel. I would like to know from the hon. gentleman, does it cost $4 per barrel to take it to Edmonton ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The acting chief engineer, whom I have just consulted, tells me that I have made a mistake and that, instead of cement being $6 a barrel there, it was $6.50. Of course, I have to take my officers as authority on

these matters. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) has been a Minister and understands that point. The price was laid before me by the chief engineer himself. I remember perfectly well asking him at the time whether that was not too high. His answer was that he had received information on the subject.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. Minister must know, and his department must know, the cost of cement, because they use thousands of barrels a year, buying it delivered in Montreal. If they do not know the price, they can find it by consulting the Auditor General's Report. Does the hon. Minister mean to tell me that it would cost $1,000 a carload to take it to Edmonton? That is what it would mean if the cost is $6 or $6.50 a barrel there.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have the answer here in the form of a telegram from Mr. St. Laurent, dated the 5th May. This gentleman is in charge of the works. He wires:

Cost of cement, per barrel, delivered, $6.50.

What more can I say?

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. Minister says that it was on the report of his chief engineer, Mr. Louis Coste, dated 22nd September, that he gave the contract to build these works of concrete. My hon. friend from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) tells us that it had commenced early in September. I have a question to ask my hon. friend. I have here what purports to be a copy of the report of Richard St. Laurent, engineer in charge, and it is dated "Department of Public Works, Canada. Resident Engineer's Office, Ottawa, 13th August."

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I explained that that was a mistake.

Mr. DAVIN. How does my hon. friend know?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My officers tell me so.

Mr. DAVIN. When will the hon. gentleman place the original of this on the Table?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Whenever the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) wishes. I have already given instructions to have it brought.

Mr. DAVIN. I shall be glad to see it. Now, as to this report of the chief engineer, is not $14 per cubic yard for stone at the quarry an exorbitant rate?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I cannot judge these things. Let the hon. gentleman discuss them with the chief engineer.

Mr. DAVIN. Now, here is a paragraph which my hon. friend read:

As soon as the contract had been awarded, Mr. Lemoine proceeded to Edmonton, but he came back at once, and reported that he could not find stone of the dimensions or quality required by the specification. He was told to procure it elsewhere, but replied that he had also examined the stone at Calgary, and was of opinion that it would not be accepted.

Did Mr. Lemoine on that occasion see the Minister of Public Works?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think he did, but I do not remember.

Mr. OLIVER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin), as I understand, was asking something with regard to myself.

Mr. DAVIN. No, that is of no consequence. I am now speaking in reference to Mr. Lemoine. He came back from Edmonton and reported about the stone, and the Minister says he probably saw him. Was the decision immediately come to then to build the bridge of concrete?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I cannot remember. I know the whole thing was discussed.

Mr. DAVIN. If this decision was immediately come to, that will bear out what the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) says. He says that the concrete work was commenced, he thought, in the latter part of August, but certainly early in September.

Mr. OLIVER. I did not say that the concrete work was begun in August or early in September——

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. But the foundations.

Mr. OLIVER. I said that Lemoine had commenced his work at that time. I did not say the concrete had been commenced then. There was a great deal of preliminary work before the concrete could be laid. The bed of the river had to be dug out to make a place for the foundation. The piles had to be driven, abutments had to be dug out, soundings had to be taken, weeks of work had to be put in, expensive work, employing a large number of men, before the concrete work could be commenced. Now, in regard to this bridge, I may be allowed to take up a few minutes of the time of the committee, and my apology for doing so is that this bridge is in the constituency I represent, and that the town in which I live has put up $25,000 of its good money to help the construction of the work.

Mr. DAVIN. I want to ask the hon. gentleman a question.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. OLIVER. The hon. gentleman has taken up all this afternoon in regard to matters which do not concern him and in regard to which he is not informed; I think it is only fair that I should have a few

minutes to give the committee some information on the subject. I do not know what object the hon. gentleman has in view, and those who are backing him in this matter; but if they are trying to make political capital against the Minister of Public Works in the matter of this bridge, I will tell them something of its history. The question of this bridge has been before the late Government and before the public for a number of years, and the people of Edmonton and those who are interested in building the bridge, were jollied along by the members of the late Government year after year; they were to be given this, they were to be given that, and they were to be given the other thing, but they got nothing except a great big game of talk, such as the hon. member has been giving us to-day. When the new Government came in the people of Edmonton approached them with the view of getting this bridge constructed, and they were successful in getting the new Minister of Public Works to take up the matter. The late Government understood the necessity of this bridge, and offered to construct it from time to time; but the last we heard from them was when the former Minister of the Interior made a visit to Edmonton and told us a very funny story. It was a great joke, and the end of the story was that if the brick staid up we would get the bridge. Well, the joke turned against the hon. gentlemen when election day came round; and I think that probably the effort of the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) will not tend to the security of his present position when the next election day comes round. When the new Government came in and the same representations were made to them that had been made to the old Government, this Government took the matter up and instead of giving us great big promises, they came down to business and they said: If you want a railway bridge at Edmonton and will pay the difference in cost between a traffic bridge and a railway bridge, we will pay the cost of a traffic bridge there. We closed with the offer at once, and put up $25,000, and the Minister of Public Works at once went on with arrangements to build the bridge. I may perhaps be allowed to go so far as to say that I had something to do in what may now be considered mistakes in regard to this bridge; that is to say, I pushed the Government with any strength I had for an early construction of the bridge. There had been so much dilly-dallying by the late Government that the people had lost confidence in the good faith of any Government in regard to this important public work, and they said: If we are putting up our money we want the work commenced, and we want it pushed. I pressed that view upon the Minister of Public Works, and he acceded to it. I suppose it was because he saw fit to accede to that view that he made the limit of time so short for the completion of the piers. I do not know any better reason can be given than that every pressure possible was brought to bear by those who are putting up one-third of the cost of the bridge, to get him to make the time limit as short as possible. That having been decided on, I must also take some responsibility for the matter of the stone. I was anxious that for that bridge local stone should be used if possible, and I asked Mr. Degagné to put in a sample of stone to see if it would be approved by the officers of the department. I have never seen the quarry, I did not know that the stone did not exist in blocks as large as was desirable. It was certainly of a desirable quality, it was accessible, and it would have been a good thing for the people and for the Government as well, if it had been available. But when the contractor came up and saw the quarry, he reported that it was not desirable. The engineer who came at the same time as the contractor, with the evident intention of pushing the work, then went up and examined the quarry as well, and he reported that the stone was not suitable. Now, I can assure the hon. gentleman that every effort was made by those of us who were interested in that locality to get that stone accepted by the Government, by the engineer and by the contractor, but we failed in doing so, and I believe now that it was in our own interest that the stone should not be accepted, because it was not suitable for the work. When the contract had been let on the understanding that the stone could be procured in the locality, and when it was found that stone could not be procured in the locality, it was then for the Government to decide whether they should make a new arrangement with the contractor or throw the matter over for another year. I can assure the hon. gentlemen who are interested that we, who, I think, were more deeply interested than they are, still continued to press the Minister for the early commencement and completion of the bridge.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It will be completed in a short time now.

Mr. OLIVER. I do not say that the department were swayed by the pressure we sought to exert upon them, but at least they considered our views in the matter by making a new arrangement with the present contractor in order to get the bridge commenced last season so that it could be built this season. As I said a few minutes ago, owing to rise of water in the river in June, it becomes impracticable for a couple of months in the middle of the summer to do any work at all, and it is even now a question whether the piers will be built before that rise takes place, so that had a new arrangement not been made with the contractor last season, the construction of the bridge would certainly have been thrown over for another year, to the great dissatis-

faction of the people in that part of the country, particularly as it is now known that there is railroad construction in prospect there which is dependent upon the construction of this bridge as a railway and traffic bridge. If it is a crime on the part of the Department of Public Works to go into a business arrangement with the people of a town who desire the construction of an important public work, and are willing to put up their money to aid the work—if that is a crime, then these gentlemen are justified in attacking the Minister of Public Works. If it is a crime for the Government to do all that can be done to procure the material required for any public work in the locality in which the work is to be constructed, then the Minister is open to their attacks; and if it is a crime for the Minister to desire the earliest possible completion of important public works that are desired specially by the people interested, then again he is open to their attacks. But I say that unless these are crimes, and they have not been crimes before in the history of this country, and they are not crimes in the eyes of the people who are interested, then it seems to me that the Minister is not open to their attacks, and I say that the time of this committee has been wasted during the whole of this afternoon, because there has been no allegation, there has been absolutely no proof, that there is any waste of public money, nor that there has been any waste of time on the part of the Government in the matter of this bridge.

As to the difference in the cost of material, between stone and concrete, I am not an expert in these matters, and some hon. gentlemen opposite seem to throw doubt on the estimated cost of the material as laid down at Edmonton. The engineer gives the cost of cement at $6.50 per barrel. The hon. member for Hamilton, who knows what the freight rates on railways to that country are perhaps better than any other hon. member, has informed me that the rate of freight on cement is $1.80 per 100 pounds, and there are 360 pounds in a barrel. So that the cement is being laid down at Edmonton for less than the ordinary rate of freight on the same, and if there is a steal as regards the charge for the cement, it is a steal on the part of the Government against the contractor and not on the part of the contractor against the Government. I am very sorry that the time of the House should have been occupied with a profitless criticism of what is an important public work, and which has been carried out in a business-like way, and certainly to the expressed satisfaction of the people who are interested not merely as spectators, not merely as overseers of the work, but who are putting up at least one-third of the actual cash required for the construction. I submit they are the parties who are entitled to full consideration in the matter. If they express satisfaction, I do not see there is any room for the dissatisfaction expressed at such great length by the hon. member for Western Assiniboia.

Mr. DAVIN. I wanted to get the Canadian Pacific Railway rate, and I have them here for May 18th, 1898.

The PRIME MINISTER. What was it a year ago?

Mr. DAVIN. It was just the same a year ago, 99 cents per 100 pounds.

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

After Recess.

SONS OF ENGLAND BENEFIT SOCIETY.

Bill (No. 122) to incorporate the Supreme Grand Lodge of the Sons of England Benefit Society (Mr. Bertram) was considered in committee and reported.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 147)—from the Senate— for the relief of James Pearson.—(Mr. Sutherland.)

Bill (No. 129)—from the Senate—to incorporate the Tobique Manufacturing Company.—(Mr. Taylor.)

LAKE BENNETT AND KLONDIKE RAILWAY AND TRAMWAY COMPANY.

The House proceeded to the consideration of the amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 31) to incorporate the Lake Bennett and Klondike Railway and Tramway Company.

Mr. HAGGART moved that the said amendments be read the second time and concurred in.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). This Bill has been standing over for some few days in order to ascertain whether, if possible, some arrangement could be arrived at whereby the objection to leaving the Bill in its present form might be overcome. The hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper), who I regret is not present, has been interested in the Bill, and I have had several interviews with him, and have stated my views with regard to the amendment made in the Senate to the 4th section. That amendment provided that in addition to the power given to the company to lay out, construct and operate a railway and tramway within the points indicated, it also conferred upon the company the right to build a wagon road to run on either side of the Miles Cañon and White Horse Rapids and from Marsh Lake to the Hootalinqua River. It appears to me, in view of the legislation which has passed this House during the pre-

sent session incorporating two companies—one to build a tramway on the east side of the Miles Cañon and build a tramway on the west side—that it was objectionable to allow any interference with the rights which we were conferring upon these companies until at least it would appear that no reasonable effort was being made to exercise the powers which were being or had been conferred upon those companies. I have been informed, and those who are interested in promoting this Bill assert with confidence, that on either side of these cañons or rapids there would be no sufficient opportunity for laying down a wagon road and a tramway both, side by side, and that one would necessarily interfere with the construction of the other. Under those circumstances I pointed out to the hon. member for Pictou that it would not seem to be fair that we should confer this power, which might be exercised at once before the other companies could get into operation. At the same time I conceded that it would be unreasonable to prevent this company from building a wagon road if they reached these points, and the necessities of their enterprise required that a wagon road should be constructed. So I drafted a section, which met with the approval of the hon. gentleman, and, with some little alterations which he has suggested, I have it in my hand; and, if it would be in order to make a motion in amendment to the Senate amendment, I would now move what I propose, and what was agreeable to the hon. member for Pictou as an amendment to the Bill. I would propose to add the following at the end of subsection 2 of section 4, to become subsection 3 of section 4:

The building of a wagon road under the authority of this Act shall not prevent any company authorized during the present or any previous session of Parliament from constructing and operating a tramway along and over the route of such wagon road, and any such company may, subject to the provisions hereinafter, enter upon and take possession of the whole or any part of such wagon road if the same is deemed more favourable by such company for laying down their tramway than the adjoining lands along the route of the wagon road, and may build their tramway thereon and use and occupy the same for tramway purposes.

In addition to that clause, it was agreed between the hon. member and myself, that words should be added which would enable this company, if it should build the wagon road, to claim compensation for the outlay on its construction, should it be appropriated by the company that has been chartered during the present year. The hon. gentleman stated, and I have no doubt he is correct, that this provision follows the usual language which is employed in Acts of Parliament for this purpose:

Whenever such tramway company, or person acting for it in that behalf, fails to agree with the company building or having built the wagon road as to the value of any lands or property so entered upon, taken or promised as aforesaid, the company or person acting for it may tender the reasonable value in the estimation of the company or person so acting with a notice that if the same is not accepted the question will be submitted to the Governor in Council.

The compensation money agreed upon or awarded by the Governor in Council for any land or property acquired or taken by the company shall stand in the stead of such land or property; and any claim or encumbrance upon such land or property shall, as respects the company so taking the land or property, be converted into a claim to such compensation money or to a proportionate amount thereof, and shall be void as respects the land or property, which shall by the fact of the taking possession thereof become and be absolutely vested in the said company, subject always to the determination of the compensation to be paid and to the payment thereof when such conveyance, agreement or award has been made.

Mr. HAGGART. I do not know whether I understood the hon. Minister of Railways aright or not, that he had a conversation with the hon. member for Pictou, and that he was agreeable to the amendment.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, he drafted the latter portion of the amendment, and I drafted the first portion.

Mr. HAGGART. Then it is all right.

Mr. SPROULE. I may say that the hon. member for Pictou spoke to me before he left the House, and stated that it was satisfactory so far as he was concerned.

Amendment agreed to, and amendments made by the Senate read the second time, and concurred in.

TORONTO AND HUDSON BAY RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. CLARKE moved that the amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 77) to incorporate the Toronto and Hudson Bay Railway Company be read the second time and concurred in.

Mr. SPROULE. I have looked over those amendments since last meeting, and I do not think they make any material change in the Bill, but accomplish what was intended to be accomplished, only in another way.

Motion agreed to; and amendments read the second time and concurred in.

SUPPLY.

The House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. DAVIN. My hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Oliver) rose to give us some instruction concerning the building of the bridge at Edmonton. His first remarks left the impression that the concrete work had begun last year, whereas his further ex-

planation showed that what he meant was not that the concrete work began last year, but that certain excavations, which had to be made in any case, were made last year, and that we knew. He then devoted some time to arraigning me for having attacked the construction of the bridge. But that I have not done at all. On the contrary, I am very glad the bridge is being built, and I am finding fault because it was not built more rapidly, so that the precious time, the loss of which the hon. gentleman mourned, was really wasted by himself and not by me.

I want to call the attention of the Minister of Public Works and the committee to a paragraph in Mr. Coste's report:

As soon as the contract was awarded, Mr. Lemoine proceeded to Edmonton, but came back at once and reported that he could not find stone of the dimensions or quality required. He was told to procure it elsewhere, but replied that he had also examined stone found in Calgary, and was of the opinion that it could not be accepted. Then Mr. Arthur St. Laurent, engineer of this department, was sent to examine the quarry, and he reported as follows, under date of August 30th, 1897.

I call the attention of the hon. Minister to this fact. The contract was signed on the 17th August, in Montreal, and Mr. Lemoine, according to this report, went from Montreal to Calgary, from Calgary to Edmonton, from Edmonton to the quarry, inspected the quarry, came back to Edmonton, thence to Calgary, and thence to Ottawa, and the department instructed Mr. Arthur St. Laurent to examine the quarry at Edmonton, and Mr. St. Laurent had time to examine it and make his report dated August 30th at Ottawa, for the report was apparently dated at Ottawa, but even if it were not, that would not matter, for the purpose of my argument. Here we have an achievement that outstrips the wildest imagination of Jules Verne in his "Tour of the World in Eighty Days." His speed was far surpassed by the rapidity with which those gentleman can telegraph themselves bodily around. I take the liberty of sending the hon. Minister the Canadian Almanac, so that he can follow the dates himself. If he will turn to August 17th, he will find that it was a Tuesday. Let us suppose that Mr. Lemoine left the very day the contract was signed—a very unlikely thing. Let us suppose that he left Montreal on Tuesday, the 17th of August, for Edmonton. He would first reach Calgary, and then the first connection he could possibly make would be on Monday the 23rd, for the trains leave Calgary for Edmonton on Wednesdays and Mondays. Let us suppose that he left Calgary on the morning of Monday the 23rd, he would arrive at Edmonton between seven and eight o'clock in the evening of the same day. On the 24th, if he took a good team, which no doubt he did, to the quarry, he could make the fifty miles in half a day, and reach there about mid-day on the 24th. Could he inspect the quarry, so as to know that the stone was good or not, in half a day or even a day and a half? Would he be in a position to judge by merely looking at the surface stone? Everybody knows that the surface stone of quarries is always bad. Then, to return, the trains leave Edmonton on Tuesdays and Thursdays and therefore he could not have left for Calgary before the morning of the 26th, and if he did he would have only had time to make a very perfunctory examination of a few hours of the quarry. He would arrive in Calgary about eight o'clock in the evening, and could not do anything on that evening. Supposing he devoted Friday the 27th to examining the quarries in Calgary, which would take him a whole day anyway, he could only leave Calgary on the night of the 27th or on the 28th, and therefore could not possibly arrive in Ottawa before the 1st of September. Yet we are asked to believe that he did all this travelling and inspection and went into the office of the department in Ottawa long before that date, because the moment he went into that office, instructions were given to Mr. St. Laurent to test the report of Mr. Lemoine. I do not care whether Mr. St. Laurent happened to be west in Calgary and was telegraphed to go and test the report or was sent from here, he could not possibly have examined the quarry at Edmonton and come back to Ottawa and written a report there on the 30th of August, the day before Mr. Lemoine arrived, and the day before Mr. St. Laurent could have got any instructions. I am afraid that this report, on which my hon. friend relies, is not one that will acquit him in the eyes of the people of Canada of having been reckless with their money in the price he admits he gave for the concrete. Mr. St. Laurent, according to this report, went and examined the quarry at Edmonton some time before the 30th of August. Now, how could he have done that? He writes:

I find that the stone from the Degagné quarry is positively not suitable for bridge purposes. The stratification of the stone is too defective, cut up in thin vertical seams, and so on.

If he made such an examination, that must have taken him a day or two. If he started from Ottawa, it would take him four or five days to get to Edmonton and a day to get to the quarry and another to get back, and if, as appears from the document laid on the Table, he wrote his report in Ottawa, some fourteen or sixteen days would have had to elapse, and that would have to count from the date Mr. Lemoine returned from the journey he had commenced on the 17th of August. Such a story has never before been placed before Parliament in the history of our public works. Mr. Coste's report further says:

From these reports you will see that it would be unsafe to use any of the stone found at or near Edmonton, or at or near Calgary, and the nearest place where stone could be found would

be Winnipeg, but I submit that freight rates make the use of that stone prohibitory.

Under the above circumstances, having ascertained that good clean gravel can be found on the banks of the Saskatchewan——

Now, I ask especial attention to this——

——for concrete work, I have the honour to strongly recommend that the substitution of concrete for masonry be permitted.

Therefore, up to the date of this report, the permission had not been given—or else that paragraph is as inexplicable as the other paragraph of which I have spoken. But I call your attention, Sir, to this expression "good clean graved," because I am going to comment upon it in a moment.

With regard to the price, I find that if the contractor had been able to procure dressed stone from the Degagné quarry, even at the very high price quoted to me in June last, viz., $14 per cubic yard, delivered——

Mind, he admits that $14 per yard for dressed stone was an exorbitant price. I ask attention to this, because the relationship between stone and concrete is one that I intend to deal with—the relationship between concrete and stone not an exorbitant price but at an ordinary price. That relationship is about as 8 to 4. And, if cut stone at an ordinary price is to concrete as 8 to 4, how much higher must the first figure be that would express the relationship between stone at $14 per cubic yard, which Mr. Coste himself admits is a high price, and concrete——

——delivered at the site of the bridge, the cost of his masonry per cubic yard would have been as follows :—

Stone dressed, delivered.....	$14 00
Cement mortar.....	2 60
Laying, scaffolding, &c.....	2 50
	$19 10

And for backing the price would have been :

Stone delivered at the site of bridge	$ 5 00
Cement mortar.....	6 00
Laying	2 00
	$13 00

And as the proportion of ashlar and backing are two to one, the average price of the masonry would have been $17.06.

He goes on :

The price of a cubic yard of concrete I estimate as follows :—

Broken stone, delivered on site of work, $3.50.

This is at page 4 of his report. But on page 3 he tells us that there is any quantity of good clean gravel to be had on the banks of the Saskatchewan. If so, what does he want with broken stone, for the gravel is better than broken stone? But, even if he wants the broken stone, everybody knows that $3.50 is an extravagant price for it, and that you could get enough good clean gravel—which is better—for a cubic yard of concrete for 30 cents. But suppose you take what I am told by contractors is an extravagant price—suppose you say 50 cents. The amount of sand, he puts down at 20 cents—he could get it for 10 cents. In this report he quotes the price of cement per barrel at Edmonton at $6. To-day we are told it is $6.50. I will not quarrel with that. The Minister of Public Works knows that last year cement was sold at Montreal at $1.50 for the four hundred-pound barrel. This year it is higher, I know. But take the price given in the report, and, if any one wishes to dispute this price, I am ready to demonstrate from other sources, what should be the cost of a barrel of cement in Edmonton. Well, how much cement is required to make a cubic yard of concrete?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. A barrel and a third.

Mr. HUGHES. What weight?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There would be 375 pounds of cement in a barrel.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). The standard weight of cement in a standard barrel is 360 pounds.

Mr. DAVIN. I wish to take the hon. Minister's own figures. With a barrel and a third for a yard of concrete, and $6 a barrel for the cement, that would mean $8 worth of cement for a yard of concrete. Then, add 50 cents for gravel, and 20 cents for sand. The laying, I am told, could be done for $1.25. This would make the cost of the concrete and laying it at Edmonton less than $10 per cubic yard. And I am in a position to show that there are contractors who would have been very glad to lay it for less than $10 at Edmonton. Here, then, we have more than $7 a yard paid in excess of what should have been paid. I want to ask the Minister of Public Works, in passing, what brand of cement is being used?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. A Belgium cement of the first class.

Mr. DAVIN. I have here quotations as to what cement can be laid down in Edmonton for, to-day: Belgian brand, 350 pound casks, "Camel" brand, "Parrot" brand and White Star brand, $5.21, $5.28 and $5.41 respectively.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. What year?

Mr. DAVIN. This year; it was cheaper last year.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, it was $2 a barrel higher, at least. The hon. gentleman does not know anything at all about it.

Mr. DAVIN. There is the "Stork" brand, Belgian brand, $5.57; "White's" English brand, $5.99. How can any man take a pencil in his hand and find the amounts on

which the Minister of Public Works should give this enormous price for concrete so greatly in excess of what the justice of the case would demand? Now I want to call attention to the closing lines of this report:

In the present instance the contractor has furnished good cement, and under the superintendence of Mr. Arthur St. Laurent, the engineer of this department, I have no doubt that the work will be done in a satisfactory manner.

Why, Sir, he talks there of a contract in the past tense. The contract had been given, although this is the report on which the Minister of Public Works bases his giving the contract. But I have to call the attention of the Minister to a thing he did not read in his defence. Here is an extract from the report of the Committee of the Privy Council for the giving of this contract, approved on the 20th October, 1897, and this is based on a memorandum of the Minister's of the 14th of October. He could not legally make a contract without its bearing date, at the very nearest, on the 20th of October, without that Order in Council he could make no contract: yet he has read to us a report of the 22nd of September to justify his giving the contract, and that report implies that the actual contract that he says was given in consequence of a report, had already gone into effect:

On a memorandum dated 14th October, 1897, from the Minister of Public Works, submitting that in July, 1897, tenders were called for by public advertisement for the construction of the piers and abutments of the proposed bridge across the Saskatchewan at Edmonton, N.W.T., and that on the 17th of August, 1879, a contract was entered into with Mr. François Lemoine, of Montreal, the lowest tenderer for the work mentioned, the amount of the contract being $36,500.

That the specifications forming part of the said contract stipulate that the masonry was to be built of rock-faced ashlar from a limestone or granite quarry accepted by the engineer.

That as soon as the contract had been awarded, Mr. Lemoine proceeded to Edmonton, but he returned with the report that he could not find at Edmonton stone of the dimensions or the quality required by the specifications, and that he had also examined the stone which could be obtained from Calgary, and was of opinion that it could not be accepted for the same reason.

The Minister states that Mr. Arthur St. Laurent, an assistant engineer of public works, who was then sent by the chief engineer to examine and report whether at or near Edmonton or Calgary any quarry could be found out of which stone suitable for the intended purpose could be procured, reported against the use of various kinds of stone which were available at those places, they not being at all suitable for the work in question, for the reasons given in his report, which is embodied in the chief engineer's report, hereto attached.

That in this latter report the chief engineer of the Department of Public Works states that it would be unsafe to use any of the stone reported upon by Mr. St. Laurent, and that he has ascertained that good clean gravel can be found on the banks of the Saskatchewan for concrete work, and he recommends that the substitution of concrete, which is now in general use whenever first-class stone cannot be had for masonry, be permitted in the construction of the piers and abutments of the proposed bridge at Edmonton, and further, that as the price of concrete per cubic yard is about the same as that for masonry at Edmonton (for instance, the price per cubic yard for masonry being, he thinks, $17.06, and the price per cubic yard for concrete $17.80 at that place), the amount of the contract remains the same, viz., $36,500.

The Minister, in view of the foregoing, recommends that authority be given to amend the contract.

Now, let this be noticed: Nearly a month after the report of Mr. Coste, which report speaks of the contract as going into operation, the Order in Council that was to authorize the contract, asks that permission be given——

To amend the contract entered into with François Lemoine, of the 17th of August, 1897, for the construction of piers and abutments of the proposed bridge across the Saskatchewan River at Edmonton, N.W.T., in so far as the material to be supplied in the construction of the same is concerned, and to permit the contractor to build them of concrete instead of masonry, as stipulated in said contract, the amount of the contract to remain the same.

I asked for the new contract, and I was told by the officers of the department that the Order in Council was practically it—in fact there does not seem to have been any formal new contract entered into. It will be seen that the documents are self-contradictory, and the theory of those documents is one that cannot be for a moment sustained. I quoted from an offer to take brands of cement to Edmonton; I am now going to show what is the relationship between the ordinary price of cut stone, and the ordinary price of cement. I have here tenders for contract No. 37 of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and also tenders for contract No. 41 of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Here is the proportion that exists between these two classes of work:

CONTRACT No. 37, CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY.

Name of Contractor.	Bridge Masonry in Hydraulic Cement Mortar, per C. Yd.	Concrete made with Hydraulic Cement, per C. Yd.
McGreevy & Heney	$13 00	$ 7 00
C. Scripture	8 30	5 70
J. M. Rousseaux	11 00	5 00
Smith, Repley & Co	11 00	5 00
E. H. Lemay	12 00	6 00
Curran & Malette	10 00	6 00
F. B. McNamee & Co	12 00	6 00
Starrs & O'Hanly	10 00	6 00
Murphy & Upper	9 25	6 00
John Ryan	11 00	6 00
D. B McDonald	10 00	4 00
Maguire & Kimmet	.....	5 50
Charlebois, Shanly & Montly.	10 00	6 00
Law & Conmee	11 00	4 50
Lobb, Dawson & Murray	.....	5 00
James Goodwin	10 00	6 50

CONTRACT No. 37—Continued.

Name of Contractor.	Bridge Masonry in Hydraulic Cement Mortar, per C. Yd.	Concrete made with Hydraulic Cement, per C. Yd.
J. D. Irwin	$ 14 00	$ 7 00
Worthington, McIntyre, McDonald & Isbester	15 00	5 00
P. Larkin	10 00	5 00
D. O'Brien	18 00	7 00
Nagle, McDougall & McQuarrie	14 00	5 00
Loss & McRae	8 00	7 00
Falardeau & McDonald	11 00	6 00
Alex. Manning	.....	8 00
Davis & Stewart	15 00	7 50
Sullivan & Beemer	11 00	8 00
CONTRACT No. 41.		
Marks & Conmee	8 00	1 00
Charlebois & Shanly	14 00	2 50
Denis O'Brien	12 00	7 00
Wardrop & Ross	10 00	7 00
J. R. Macdonell	12 00	8 00
Jas. Goodwin & Co	13 00	7 00
A. Laberge & Co	18 00	6 00
R. H. McGreevy	14 00	8 00
Hunter, Murray & Booth	8 00	6 00
Manning, Macdonnell & Co	12 00	8 00
Purcell, Ginty & Ryan	9 00	4 00
Macdonald & Falardeau	12 00	6 00
F. B. McNamee & Co	11 00	6 00
R. Nagle & Co	8 00	5 00
Walsh & McCarron	14 40	6 00
Pitblado, Fraser & Grant	12 00	7 00
Stevens, Turner, Burns & Co	12 00	8 00
H. C. O'Reilly	11 00	6 00
Hurlburt, Grennell & Campbell	10 00	6 00
Wm. Hendrie	15 00	5 00
Baird & McLean	11 00	4 00
Ferguson, Symmes, Mitchell & Co	12 00	8 00
Appendix No. 42—		
Morse, Nicholson & Marpole	14 00	4 00
A. Laberge & Co	16 00	6 00
Andrews, Jones & Co	12 50	8 00
A. P. Macdonald & Falardeau	12 00	6 00
Fraser, Grant & Pitblado	11 00	6 00
Jas. Goodwin & Co	18 00	8 00
Wardrop & Ross	12 00	7 00
F. B. McNamee & Co	11 00	6 00
Joseph Whitehead	16 00	6 00
Ferguson, Symmes, Mitchell & Co	12 00	8 00
Loss & McRae	20 00	10 00
Denis O'Brien	15 00	8 00
Robert H. McGreevy	16 00	10 00
Hunter, Murray & Booth	20 00	12 00
Hurlbert, Grennell & Campbell	10 00	6 00

Out of forty-eight tenders there is not a single tender that places concrete as of the same value as masonry, and in nearly every case there is a relationship running from more than double to something like two-thirds to one-third.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). What is the date of the tenders read, and where were the works? Was it for a similar kind of work?

Mr. DAVIN. The works were on the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). Were they under water or on piers, or of what kind?

Mr. DAVIN. The bridge work was under water.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Where were they?

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. Minister would not allow me to ask him questions, and I am now going to make my argument. Taking the figures of the hon. Minister himself, it cannot be shown that concrete placed at Edmonton was worth more than $10 per cubic yard. If we take the figures I have quoted, the very highest sum that should have been paid was $9 per cubic yard. Here are the plans, and it will be seen from what I have pointed out that there are 1,450 cubic yards. My own calculation is that $9.21 would have been ample for that concrete laid.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My engineer is gone.

Mr. DAVIN. I do not know how to account for what took place. There is more than one Napoleon, I fear, in this Government. We know what one Napoleon can do, and the Heavenly Twins are equal to anything either separate or together—the apostate Castor of Quebec and the hon gentleman who has charge of the Interior Department. There are, I say, some 1,450 cubic yards. That quantity at $9.21 per yard would amount to $13,354. I will put $1,500 for riprap, and that would give a total of $14,854. How does that compare with $36,500? There is a difference of $21,646, or a profit on one item alone of about 150 per cent. Take the piles. There are forty-six piles in each abutment and that would give ninety-two piles as the total quantity. I have here a letter from D. R. Fraser, of Edmonton, as follows:—

Edomnton, Alberta, 25th April, 1898.

Dear Sir,—In reply to your inquiry for prices of material that would be required in the construction of the bridge here, I have pleasure to give you the following quotations:—

12 x 12 spruce, 12 to 30 feet long, $16 per M.
8 x 8 spruce, 12 to 30 feet long, $16 per M.
10 x 10 spruce, 12 to 30 feet long, $16 per M.
Plank, spruce, 2 and 3 in., 30 feet long, $16 per M.
Piles, 12-inch diameter, spruce or tamarac, 12 to 30 feet long, $12.50 per M.
Ready for delivery in May, June and July; 2½ per cent off for spot cash.
Hoping that these figures may be satisfactory, and to be favoured with your orders,

I remain,
Yours truly,
(Sgd.) D. R. FRASER.

Now, Sir, as I say, there were 92 piles, and if we take these piles at from 15 to 20 feet long at $1 a foot; if they were 15 feet long you have $1,380, and if 20 feet long, $1,840. Now, piles at $12.50 per thousand, board measure, is a fraction less than five board

feet to one lineal foot of the pile, or 1,250 multiplied by 5 and you get $6,250 per thousand, or 6·250 cents per foot. This contractor, therefore, gets for driving piles 93·750 cents per foot, whereas 12 cents is enough. One contractor offered to do the work for 30 cents a foot for piles, and that would have left him 12 cents a foot clear profit. Now, if the piles are 15 feet long he gets $966 in excess of what would have given him a large profit, and if 20 feet this contractor gets $1,248 more than would have left him a large profit. Add the profit on piles to $21,646.50, and you have, according as the piles are 15 or 20 feet long, $22,787.10 or $23,115.30, on this contract of $36,500 for a lump sum and so much for the other details; or, you have 153 per cent profit in one case and 155 per cent in another. Now, Mr. Chairman, I say in regard to this contract, we have suspicious circumstances connected with the letting of this contract, and in the next place we have an incredible story. We have suspicious circumstances connected with the changing of the contract, we have calculations which will not bear analysis, and the conclusion to my mind is irresistible that it was determined to give the contract to Lemoine, that conditions were attached to the specifications to make other contractors tender high, that Lemoine must have been told that no fines or forfeitures would have been enforced, and it is to be feared the transaction is typical of what is now the system in the Public Works Department. I say, Sir, that it is a most serious thing; I say that the whole story leading up to the change from masonry to concrete reads like a fable on analysis, and that when it was determined to change it from masonry to concrete no attempt was made to make a better bargain. No attempt was made to get, as could have been got in a few minutes, tenders from others for the concrete, and no consideration was taken of the fact that one of the contractors had tendered 70 per cent lower for piles driven, than François Lemoine. Therefore, I come to the conclusion that Lemoine was a favoured individual, and now that I have completed my statement of the circumstances I would be glad to know how the Minister is going to explain them.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Shall this item be carried?

Mr. DAVIN. No, Sir, it will not be carried without some explanation.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not think I should repeat what I have said. I have no more to say.

Mr. DAVIN. Well, Sir, then I understand that he is incapable of explaining the incredible story told in this report. He is incapable of explaining the extraordinary story, which I will emphasize to his heart's content:

As soon as the contract had been awarded, Mr. Lemoine had proceeded to Edmonton, to come back at once and report that he could not find stone of the dimensions or quality of the specifications. He was told to procure it elsewhere, but replied he had also examined the stone found at Calgary, and was of opinion that it would not be accepted. Then Mr. Arthur St. Laurent, engineer of this department, was sent to examine the quarries, and he reported having examined the quarries, under date August 30th, 1897.

The copy of the report placed before us here is dated Ottawa, August 30th, 1897. On the 17th August the contract was signed in Montreal, from the 17th to the 30th of August Lemoine could go to Calgary. He could not leave Calgary before the morning of the 23rd; he could not leave Edmonton before the following Thursday; he says that he examined that quarry at Edmonton and the quarries at Calgary, and that he came back here, and saying he could not carry out his contract, Mr. St. Laurent is sent to make a report, and he could make a report dated the 30th of August. Sir, if the Minister sits silent there it is because he cannot say a word.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Shall this item be adopted?

Mr. DAVIN. No, not before we get an explanation. I will extort the courtesy of an attempt of an explanation from the hon. Minister anyway.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am very sorry the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) takes things in that way. I have not been unwilling to give to the House any reasonable explanation, but I do not feel bound to say anything more, because I think I have satisfied all reasonable members of the House that I have done the best in this case. Four tenders were received, as follows: F. Lemoine, $36,500; Joseph Bourque, Hull, $42,759; Mr. Burns, $44,900; Bourque & Harrison, Winnipeg, $59,500. I awarded the contract to the lowest tenderer. I do not think I have much more to say. The changes made have been fully explained, and I have read to the House the reports of the engineers on which I based my action. I cannot undertake to convince my hon. friend (Mr. Davin) and now that I have said this much, if he feels bound to make any more speeches, he is perfectly welcome to it. He has the full right to talk just as long as he wishes, but I cannot give him any more explanation. If I had any more I would give them to him. When he alluded to these contracts of the Canadian Pacific Railway he should know that in all these contracts the comparisons that he made about concrete in the Edmonton bridge have no bearing at all. I say again, I have no doubt that the reasonable members of the House are perfectly satisfied that this contract was a fair one, and that everything was done above-board.

Mr. DAVIN. I doubt if in the whole time I have sat in this House, and observed this House from that gallery, anything has occurred so calculated to give pain as what has just occurred here. Here is a contract for something like $40,000, and when circumstances of a character to create suspicion in Parliament and in the public mind are brought before the Minister, all he can do is to say, "I cannot say anything, I cannot explain anything"; and he has something like the effrontery to say that he has given explanations. He has not given explanations; he has not attempted to explain the impossible story that is told. Take that comparison which I made between the tenders of these various contractors for stone, masonry and concrete. The point of that is that in forty-eight tenders there is a large disproportion between the cost of masonry and the cost of concrete. In the present case the ground of calculation of price for stone masonry is admitted to be high. Everybody knows that $14 per cubic yard for dressed stone is an exorbitant price; all it costs in Ottawa is something like $7; and, in these forty-eight tenders there is not a single instance of a contractor estimating the cost of concrete as anything like the cost of dressed stone. Yet we have here the cost of concrete measured by the cost of dressed stone at a fancy price—an exorbitant price as compared with the usual prices; and I say it is a humiliating and painful thing. We have had no explanation, and I see the acting leader of the House turn to the Minister of Public Works and bid him be silent and not attempt to explain, because he knows he cannot explain without probably putting his foot in it, and letting us see exactly how things are. My object is not, of course, to attack the building of that bridge. My object is to do what we have a right to do here—criticise the expenditure of public money and guard the treasury which the former leader of hon. gentlemen opposite said he had to lie on his arms to guard from the plunderers of his own party. Our duty is not only to do that, but if we have a Government that either in whole or in part is corrupt; if any member of that Government, especially any man who is at the head of a great spending department is corrupt, it is a sacred duty to the credit and the honour of Canada to try and drag into light any iniquities that may have been perpetrated. That is a duty which I will never shrink from so long as I have the honour of a seat in this House; and I only regret that the duty has been thrust upon me to drag into light in this instance an act which the Minister responsible for it has to stand dumb before, and impotent to explain or to cover over. I must say, from the way the hon. gentleman deals with his estimates, that he is pretty skilful to weave a web; but this time the hook is in the gills of the fish, and the more he wriggles the deeper the hook will go.

Mr. TARTE.

Mr. FOSTER. We will get through as quickly as possible, but I scarcely think the Minister of Public Works will allow the statements that have been made to go without at least some explanation.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am very sorry I cannot say anything more to the hon. gentleman. If he has followed me, he will admit that the explanations I have given are complete, and could not be more complete. I think the report I have read to the House fully justifies every circumstance of this case. As my hon. friend will admit, I am always happy to give any explanation that is asked of me; but I do not feel bound to answer two rambling speeches that have no bearing at all on the case. If there is any point on which my hon. friend desires information, I will be very glad to give it; but I think I have answered every point that has been made.

Mr. FOSTER. It is a little difficult for me, just listening to the statements on either side, and not being an expert—being much in the same position as my hon. friend in that respect—to make a technical criticism; but there are some points that struck me as being necessary to be explained of which a full explanation has not been given by my hon. friend. The points are these. Here is a large public work. Granted that it had been in the air for a considerable length of time, and that the Minister was very anxious to bring it to a conclusion, as he thought time was the essence of the contract. These considerations are all very well as modulating the hon. gentleman's action, but they ought not to be allowed to go too far. There are certain things to be guarded against even in the face of such a laudable desire. The total work will probably come to about $75,000, of which $25,000 are to be paid by the people of Edmonton. Here is one item of expenditure, involving some $36,000. It is peculiar that my hon. friend should advertise in eastern papers for tenders from eastern contractors for a distant work of such magnitude, and give only nineteen days' time for the tenders to come in and be opened. That is the first thing that strikes a man who is not technical, but who has a little common sense. No man can make a reasonable tender for a public work of that size, thousands of miles away, satisfactorily in the time that elapsed between his receipt of the call for tenders and the time that the tenders were to be opened, if that total time is only 19 days. How is it possible for a man to get on the ground in that time? How can any man, who has not been on the ground, adequately make an estimate for a public work at Edmonton, where the circumstances, the geography of the country, and the lay of the land and other circumstances are different and present their own difficulties? That is the first point, and the hon. gentleman ought, in calling for the construction of

large public works of that kind at such a distance, when he depends on eastern contractors to make the tenders, to give them reasonable time to visit the place and make their investigations, so as to base their tenders upon practical knowledge.

What is the other point in the way of criticism? The hon. Minister, in calling for tenders, gave but little over two weeks for men to make up their tenders, and coupled with that limited time the condition that the whole work was to be finished in three months. Doing his best, it would take an eastern contractor nearly a fortnight before he could get his men out there and he would then have to look for his stone material and the hundred and one things incident to a contract of that kind, and yet that whole work, of a magnitude measure by the expenditure of some $36,000, was to be done inside of three months. I am not putting it too strongly when I say that these two conditions are, under the circumstances, unusual. My hon. friend will not deny that. And to that extent they are suspicious. In a department, which is not noted for the lightening speed with which it takes hold of large public works and finishes them, such conditions are certainly unusual. My hon. friend has business right under his nose, which it was essential should be done at once, and yet with which he has dilly dallied, as one hon. gentleman has explained it, for more than a year without having yet commenced it, and there are other public works close by which have been lacking completion for a long time. But here is a distant work, and lightening speed is made in calling for tenders, and the whole thing must be finished inside of three months. Those two things are unusual, and to that extent are fit subjects for criticism, and my hon. friend must not find fault because he is criticised. From the calculations given to-night, it appears that more than lightening speed must have been used by the gentlemen who was sent to make what were supposed to be the necessary inquiries for the guidance of the hon. Minister. No man could go to a quarry 50 miles from Edmonton and return to Calgary and get back here to Ottawa and make his report in the short space of the time in which he appears to have done all this, from the reports submitted to this House. I would like to have a photograph of the man who did this, because I would like to have embalmed in my memory the officer of the Department of Public Works who nearly ran himself to death in order to find where there was a stone quarry and make his report to the Minister. What happened afterwards? The conditions upon which those tenders were called for were that the abutments were to be made of ashlar masonry, whatever that means, but it certainly does not mean cement. They were to be of stone, and every man who tendered understood so. Nobody had the least suspicion that they were to be of anything else than masonry. More than that, there was attached to the contract the condition of quick fulfilment within three months, and a penalty of $2,000 for not doing the work, and of $50 for every day delayed in doing it over the three months. All those things were difficulties in the way of an ordinary tender, but were not difficulties in the way of a man who happened to have the ear of the Minister or a pull on the party. There was no difficulty in his way, because he could go upon the assumption that he would in any case escape the penalty and the fine.

What happened after the lightening investigator had done his work and come back and made his report to the Minister that stone of the proper kind could not be found at Calgary or Edmonton? The Minister's engineer made a report in which he recommended that concrete be substituted for stone. Now, that varied the condition entirely. The call for tenders was on the basis of stone being used. Then the information was elicited that stone of a proper quality could not be found out there, and that consequently the department was going to build with concrete made from cement. Why was it not considered a matter of prudence and of right dealing with the public that this altered condition should be allowed to inure to the prospective benefit of the public? The conditions were altogether changed. There was no longer any penalty, no longer a fine for delay, the three months time was indefinitely extended, and the material was entirely changed from stone to something else. Would it not then have been prudent for the Minister of Public Works to have advertised for new tenders? That would not have taken much time. It certainly would not, according to the lightening speed which the Minister displayed before. He only allowed 19 days for the first tendering, and it would only have taken 19 days more to call in the second tenders, and it is impossible for the hon. Minister to argue that a delay of 19 days would have been in any way fatal to the speedy building of that work at Edmonton. But the hon. gentleman took care not to do that. To those three criticisms, which are founded in a fair basis, we have not had a fair reply.

The hon. Minister said he did not call for tenders the second time, for two reasons. One was that he wanted the work immediately proceeded with, and the other was that Mr. Lemoine had plant there and consequently would be able to do the work more speedily. Now, the statement that Mr. Lemoine had any plant there was challenged in this House. A member of this House, on his own responsibility, questioned the misstatement, and give it as his opinion that there was no plant there. Has there been any proof that there was? No one is going to say that he would distrust the word of the Minister. That is not the point in criticism at all, but every member has a perfect right, when a Minister gives

a reason, to question whether it is well founded, and the Minister has no right to refuse to reply. Has he any proof to give? If there was a plant there, he or his officers must know it, and he could easily demonstrate that in this House. As to the immediate building of the bridge, judging by the Minister's previous action, the only delay that could have taken place by the calling of new tenders would have been 19 days. If I had been Minister, I would have considered that insufficient in each case. But taking his own rule of 19 days, that would have been sufficient delay in which to ask for tenders on the altered conditions, and the hon. gentleman would then have had the benefit of public competition on the new conditions, which are absolutely different from the old ones. He did not get the work immediately done. It is not yet done, and a delay of 19 days would not have made any essential difference. The statement is made, and it is borne out by figures, that cement can be taken to Edmonton this year and concrete can be made of it there and laid, at a figure not exceeding $10 per cubic yard. And the hon. Minister is paying $17 per cubic yard.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). There is cement and cement.

Mr. FOSTER. Not in this case, because the Minister of Public Works says he is using Belgian cement and the figures quoted here are for Belgian cement.

Mr. HUGHES. Is it $17 per cubic yard of cement?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Not for the cement alone, but for the——

Mr. FOSTER. For the concrete.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Quite so.

Mr. FOSTER. An hon. gentleman rises here and gives quotations from dealers showing the figures from which they are prepared to lay down this material. A calculation is made and admitted by the House as to the quantity of cement it takes to make a cubic yard of concrete—a barrel and a third, or about 500 pounds—and, adding what is necessary for gravel and sand, with a good price for laying it, and you do not exceed $10 per cubic yard. The Minister of Public Works, under this privately-given contract, is paying $17 per cubic yard. I have never seen it before, and I would not like to see it now that a Minister should sit in this place and say: I have said all I have to say. If he does not answer he must expect to be condemned. There will be a suspicion that he had no answer to give, and that he has thrown up the sponge. I would not like to see my hon. friend (Mr. Tarte) in that light. He occupies a difficult position; many eyes are upon him; many thoughts are thought about him; and I am anxious that he shall acquit himself like a man, and shall make himself a grand success in this Cabinet, of which he was the founder and builder, and of which he is to-day the directing genius. The big policeman from Ontario no longer counts. When the wiry little man from Quebec issues his ultimatum—it goes. Now, I say to that hon. gentleman: Rise to your responsibility; do not sit silent under an accusation of this kind; do not let the world say that you have no answer to give. These are the points of my criticism. Are they fair or not? I leave it to my hon. friend (Mr. Tarte) to give his opinion.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I must again thank my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) for the great interest he takes in me. I hope that he and I shall live for some time more together in this House.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). In your respective places.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In our respective places. I quite admit that if I had not already explained the point just made by the hon. gentleman I should be bound to make an explanation. But when he says that I sit here and make no answer, he is quite unfair. If I remember aright, I spoke for over an hour on this very question. I do not like to speak too much on any question; I am not in favour of long-winded speeches. On this occasion, I think I have made the point very clear, reading not from my own speeches, but from the reports of competent men. Well, now, my hon. friend insinuates, in so many words, that these two officers, Mr. Coste and Mr. St. Laurent, are corrupt men.

Mr. HUGHES. Or blunderers.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That they are corrupt men. The insinuation is clear, for I did not make these reports. Mr. Coste made the reports on information furnished by Mr. St. Laurent.

Mr. FOSTER. If my hon. friend (Mr. Tarte) would allow me, there are two points to which I would like to call attention. In the first place, he should not put words in my mouth as to insinuation of corruption on the part of his officers. I do not think that is fair. The other point is that as a Minister he is responsible, and I do not care if he has 500 officers, and they make 500 reports. It is his duty to make up his mind as to the action to be taken, and, when the action is taken, he is responsible.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I understand that. But the hon. gentleman has admitted, as we knew before, that he is not an expert. I am not an expert either. When Mr. Coste presented to me the report I have read to the House, stating on his reputation and his knowldege as an engineer that concrete, in his opinion,

would cost $17 per cubic foot at Edmonton, I had nothing to do but to accept that report.

Mr. FOSTER. I say quite differently——

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not object to be interrupted, but I wish to finish my statement if my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) will allow me. When Mr. Coste made this report as chief engineer, I questioned him very closely. I quite understood that there was a change and it would be challenged in the House. He submitted to me the two reports of Mr. St. Laurent. These reports proved in a conclusive manner that the quarry at Edmonton would not supply suitable stone——

Mr. FOSTER. I do not question that.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Then, we all agree upon that. That is a very important point. I admit now that sufficient information had not been obtained by my engineers, and it is through this that this trouble has arisen. I told Mr. Coste, when he came with this report, just what I am saying now. I asked him how it was that he had in his office a sample of the stone out of which that masonry was to be built. He said: I made an investigation and had every reason to believe that the stone was good. But the stone was found not to be good, and changes had to be made. Mr. Coste reported to me that the prices he laid before were the real actual prices that the contractor, Mr. Lemoine, had to pay for the broken stone, for the sand, for the cement, and for laying a scaffolding. Hon. gentlemen opposite challenged these prices. If they will make a careful calculation, a fair and honest calculation, they will find out that the cement alone necessary to build a yard of concrete will cost $8.70. Besides the cement, you have to have the broken stone or the gravel and the sand, then you have to pay for the labour of mixing and for laying and scaffolding. I suppose it cannot be disputed that it will cost $8.70 to build up a yard of concrete. There remains, then, over $1.30 for the work of preparing the mortar, and so on. Well, it will be readily assumed that those prices are fair.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman has given us the cost of the cement, now will he give us the cost for a cubic yard of each of the other materials?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. These are the prices my chief engineer has given me: Broken stone, delivered on the site of the work, $3.50 per cubic yard. This is Mr. Coste's report. I am not an expert, and do not profess to be. I say once more that a Minister should not be accused when he comes before Parliament with the report of his chief engineer. If Mr. Coste is an ignorant man, if he has deceived me in this case, the sooner I know it the better. I have a right as a Minister, having taken office, having retained the officers which were appointed by my predecessor, to expect from the other side of the House better treatment than is being given me. I have kept in my employ the officers who were appointed by my predecessor, and when I come before Parliament with calculations made by those officers, my own honour is assailed. I say it is not fair, and I shall not stand it very much longer.

Mr. FOSTER. If the hon. gentleman does not wish to stand it, he can sit it; but as long as he is a member of this House, and we have seats here, we will criticise these things, no matter what officers make them.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have the floor. I will say immediately that the words I have just spoken were not addressed to the hon. gentleman. This is what I say, that if Mr. Coste has deceived me, I shall not stand that very much longer—that is just what I mean. I quite admit, no one will admit more readily than myself, the right of members of Parliament to criticise me; but I say that if officials appointed under the late regime deceive Liberal Ministers, we are not bound to stand it. Let the hon. gentleman understand me well, I am not addressing myself to them at all. They have no doubt a right to criticise everything that I bring before the House. I am sorry that my officers, in whom I have confidence, are placed in that difficult position, I am sorry for them; I think they are advising me to the best of their ability. I have been reproached over and over again by Liberal members of this House for retaining officers that had been appointed under the late Administration; and since my estimates have been discussed before the House in the manner that is well known, I have been reproached more severely than ever. I have been told this: There are some of your officers who are trying to put you in a hole. But I do not believe it, yet I am speaking in the presence of the men who have cast that reproach at me. As I have said, I am not an expert. I come before this committee with calculations made, I say it again, by officers who were trusted by the late Administration. If it were only the exactitude of those calculations that was assailed, I should not speak as I do; but when my own honesty is assailed on account of those calculations, I resent those accusations, because they place me in a position in which I should not be placed. Now, Sir, I listened with respect to every word that my hon. friend uttered.

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). May I ask the hon. gentleman a question? When you speak of $3.50 a yard, do you mean a yard of broken rock, or is it the portion of the broken rock that makes up a yard of concrete?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Here are the words of the report of Mr. Coste, which I hold in my hand:

> Price of a cubic yard of concrete, I estimate as follows:—Broken stone delivered on the site of the work, $3.50, sand 20 cents, cement mortar, $10.80, laying and scaffolding, $2.50.

Those were the figures put into my hand, and on those figures I acted. I may have been wrong, but I hope not. My hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Oliver), who lives in Edmonton where the work is being carried on, says that I am right. The town of Edmonton is contributing $25,000 to this work, and I say that if anything had been going wrong, if an excessive price had been paid, I would have been informed of it. I read to the House a resolution of the board of trade congratulating me on the success of that very work. Now, Sir, I was reproached by the hon. gentlemen on account of the short time that was given to the tenderer. I may say that the officers of my department inform me that the usual time given is 30 days. My hon. friend from Alberta explained in a very clear way this afternoon the reason why we proceeded a little quicker. The season was advancing, Parliament had just been prorogued, and I could not deal with that question during the session, of course. As soon as the session was over, I took it up, and asked for tenders in the month of July. The first contract was given in the month of August. As the hon. member for Alberta explained, the season is short, and my chief engineer, who knew the place well, and Mr. St. Laurent, who had gone on the spot and made a plan, both informed me that the work could be carried out in three months. I had to take their word for it, as I am not an expert. The reason why we shortened the time for the tenders was because both these gentlemen told me that the work could be done in three months.

There was competition, for we had four tenders. The lowest tender was accepted. I have given all the information in my possession, and there is no other to be furnished on this question. The reason why the time after the receipt of the tenders was short was because the season was brief, and my engineers thought the work could be carried out during that season. My friends at Edmonton were very anxious to have the work carried out immediately, and we were endeavouring to comply with their wishes on that point. The hon. gentleman has expressed his desire to have a photograph of Mr. St. Laurent. He is an old appointee of the department, and was appointed to his present position by Sir Hector Langevin ten or twelve years ago. I think he is one of the ablest young engineers in the public service. I believe he is thoroughly honest and honourable, and I will keep him in his present position because I have full confidence in his ability and honesty.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. I fully endorse the character given to Mr. St. Laurent. I know him personally, and he is one of the best men that could be employed by the department.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Although appointed by my predecessor, I retained him in the service because he is a capable engineer, and I would trust him with any work. I have treated the hon. member for Assiniboia fairly when he has exploited the date of this or that report. Engineers do not always make their reports at the time they inspect the works. An engineer may inspect a work to-day and may make a report a few days afterwards.

Mr. DAVIN. That makes it worse.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The sneers of the hon. gentleman do not amount to anything. He has simply insinuated that the officers were dishonest. I have confidence in Mr. Coste; I have full confidence in Mr. St. Laurent, and the insinuations thrown out is that they simply played into my hands, and that I asked from them false reports and false dates. I have said on my word that I have nothing to do with those reports. Mr. Coste had charge of this matter. If any man was guilty, he was the man, for he advised that there was a quarry there. He thought there was no doubt in regard to the quarry, but he should have taken better notice regarding it. I do not charge him with anything improper, but if tenders are based on a certain quantity of stone to be taken out of a certain quarry, the engineer should be perfectly certain that the stone is available. Mr. Coste has explained that he received a report from Mr. Duggan and another engineer on the subject. Mr. Coste undoubtedly acted to the best of his ability. An accident has occurred. My hon. friend said what he should not have said, that the contractor had the ear of the Minister, and, therefore, a change could be made from cement to stone or from stone to concrete, and he was therefore in a better position to tender than his competitors. This is a very plain insinuation, and I do not think an hon. member occupying the position of the hon. member for York should resort to such insinuation. He has no evidence to adduce; he cannot bring a particle of evidence in this case. Why should we in this Parliament resort to such actions—there is no reason, there is no ground for the position taken by the hon. gentleman in this case. We are called here to discuss together political questions and in fact all sorts of subjects, and I do not see why we should not discuss the cases as they come before us without these insinuations. Has the hon. gentleman any evidence to adduce that there was dishonesty practiced in this case? If so, let him rise and produce it. He has applied to me, and asked me to rise in my place. If he has any ground to attack let

him show it; if not, let him not make any insinuations. I have always met hon. gentlemen opposite on that ground. They have tried to put a great many little jobs on me, but they have not succeeded yet. The hon. gentleman takes great interest in my future.

Mr. FOSTER. And your past, too.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My past career was spent in the same boat with the hon. gentleman. If there was any mistake made, I was of course responsible and he was also responsible. I supported him for many years. The day came, however, when we parted. He did not ask me to leave the boat, I was not asked to do so by hon. gentlemen opposite. They were very glad to have me in the boat then—there is no possible doubt about it. Of course the boat has been a great deal more successfully managed since I left. The boat may have been sailed with better chances of success; but I know the boat has been wrecked. I did not wreck it, but hon. gentlemen opposite have not shown enough ability to sail it in a successful manner. If there are any other points which I have not touched I shall be glad to answer any question regarding them. There is a point to which I wish to call the attention of the hon. gentleman, and on which I challenge him once more. He has no right to make insinuations; his right is to make assertions. He has insisted that this contractor got my ear, and that because he got my ear the change was made. If that accusation were true, it would prove that Mr. Coste has been bribed or has been compelled by me to make this report; in either case he would be unworthy of the position he now occupies. It would also prove that Mr. St. Laurent, who made the report, was a dishonest man. That is not the case. This is a straight contract, one above board; and I am surprised that the hon. gentleman opposite (Mr. Foster), who is an able man and a man of long experience in public affairs, has fallen into the manner of the hon. gentleman when he makes windy speeches. A man who is responsible to the House and to his party should not do that kind of business. He referred to the comparison the member for West Assiniboia made as to the tenders asked by the Canadian Pacific Railway. Those comparisons are ridiculous and unworthy of attention. In those contracts, what were the facts? A large quantity of masonry was tendered for and a small quantity of concrete. They were mixed contracts. We all know that contractors tender low on some items and high on other items.

In this case we have to deal with particular circumstances. Edmonton is far away from here and it costs $4.50 to carry a barrel of cement there. Mr. Coste's calculations were based on the bills of lading that Mr. Lemoine had to show, and on the actual price of the cement and the freight rates, and the cement actually costs $2 a barrel here. There is no use saying that cement sold in Montreal for $1.50. That is not the case, but even if it were, this particular brand of cement cost $2 a barrel. That cannot be disputed. I think, Sir, I have given all the information that can fairly be asked from me, but if my hon. friends opposite think they can make a big case out of this contract, they are very welcome to it.

Mr. McLENNAN. (Glengarry). The Minister of Public Works appears to become a little excited, and probably he has reason to be. Perhaps he would rather not hear the exposures that have taken place this afternoon. The hon. gentleman spoke of the cost of concrete compared with bridge masonry. I have here forty-eight tenders for contracts on the Canadian Pacific Railway for bridge masonry and concrete. Some gentlemen opposite said it was cheaper to put in foundations, but I say from experience it is more expensive. We find here the best contractors in the Dominion tendering for work in Manitoba and Ontario, between Lake Superior and Winnipeg, and find that their prices for bridge masonry are nearly double what they are for concrete. Neither the Minister nor any hon. gentleman in this House will undertake to say that contractors who tendered for this work do not understand their business and the value of work when they tendered, and what is more, they got the contracts and carried them out successfully. The bridge masonry on the Canadian Pacific Railway cost on an average $14 a yard, and the concrete from $5 to $6 a yard, so that bridge masonry costs double what the concrete did.

Mr. FLINT. I would like the privilege of asking a question bearing on this point.

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). When I get through you can ask questions. I was in Montreal the other day, and I inquired as to what price they would deliver cement at certain points in British Columbia and the North-west, among other places, Edmonton. I think Mr. Gibson, a member of this House, is using the White Star brand Belgium cement on the Victoria Bridge in Montreal, and it must be a good quality of cement. The price delivered at Edmonton is $5.41 per barrel. A yard of concrete does not take one and one-third barrels of cement. A barrel of cement is sufficient to make a yard of concrete.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is concrete and concrete.

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). Yes, there is concrete and concrete, and this is first-class concrete and first-class cement. I say a barrel of cement is quite sufficient for a yard of concrete.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is not as good though.

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). Yes, a barrel of good cement will make a yard of first-class concrete. I am told that the concrete used all through the Welland Canal did not cost quite $4 a yard. I am told by practical men who would like to get the contract for the work at Edmonton that a good average paying price for concrete in Ontario is $4 a yard, and I am told also by as practical a man as is in Canada to-day that he would be glad to get the Edmonton contract at $10 a yard, and he would furnish ample security to this Government. There is $3.50 allowed for broken stone, and how they could put that value of broken stone into a yard of concrete I cannot see. The engineer reports that there is good gravel on the spot suitable for the work, and if that gravel, as he says, can be found on the banks of the Saskatchewan, they would certainly take it out for 50 cents a yard. Even if they had to go fifty miles up the Saskatchewan for broken stone and bring it down on flat bottom boats and tugs, they could do it for $1 per yard, which would be a liberal estimate. All the sand that goes into the concrete would not amount to more than 10 or 15 cents a yard. They have $2.50 for laying and scaffolding; I think $2 would be sufficient, but take $2.50 and $5.50 for cement and $1 a yard for mixing, which is a good average price, and put them all together and it would amount to only about $10 a yard; even allowing this high price for taking the cement up to that country. Some gentlemen opposite said that the freight rates were higher a year ago than they are now, but I do not think they can substantiate that statement. As a matter of fact, a year ago cement was about 30 cents a barrel cheaper than it is at the present time.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It was $2 a barrel for that brand.

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). It was 30 cents cheaper a year ago than it is now. There is no question about it, but that the Minister is paying $7 a yard too much for that concrete at Edmonton. I am sorry to see that the Minister of Public Works on every occasion when he is questioned on matters affecting his department atempts to place the responsibility on his officers.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not.

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). If the Minister of Public Works is really a Minister of the Crown the most honourable way for him to do is to take the responsibility, and he should not drag his employees before this Parliament by insinuating that it is possible they should do wrong and give him wrong statements.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is not I who did it.

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). The Minister's officials are not responsible for the fact that there were only 19 clear days allowed for tendering. Any man who knows anything about tendering knows that it is impossible to send in an intelligent tender for a work at that distance in so short a time. If a tender is sent in, it must be sent in at random, and any man who sends in a tender in that way takes good care to put in a price large enough to cover any contingencies that may arise. In this case the contract was let at an average of $17 a yard. Sometimes men who tender find out all about the work sooner than others. It struck me as very peculiar that this contractor had only twelve clear days from the time the contract was signed to go to Edmonton, the North-west and come back again; and from the report of the engineer we find that after the contractor came back the engineer went to the North-west and examined all the quarries in the country and made a most elaborate report upon them. That report was sent in on the 30th of August. The contract was signed on the 17th of August. The contractor went to the North-west and examined the quarries, came back here, then the engineer was sent up, and he examined the quarries and reported upon them—all within twelve days. How will the Minister explain that? Now, as I explained, the price of the concrete is at least $7 per cubic yard more than it should be. The men in the hon. gentleman's department are perhaps not to blame in this matter, because they perhaps found that they could not get proper stone in the locality, and reported in favour of doing the work with concrete, which would be cheaper than using stone. That may be all right enough, but the Minister should never have given this man a new contract without having called for tenders. That is where he is to blame, and the men under him are not to be blamed for that at all. He has no right to make a contract without giving the public an opportunity to tender. I am positive it does not take a barrel and a third of cement to make a yard of concrete.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have a despatch of my own engineer in my hands in which he says there is a barrel and a half in every yard of concrete.

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). They do not use so much on the Cornwall Canal or the Welland Canal.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am not speaking of the canals, but of the work as it is, and the more cement that is used the better is the concrete. If you make concrete with stone alone, it will not cost much.

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). Granting that it will take a barrel and a half of cement, cement can be got at $5.40 a barrel, which is something like $8 a yard. How can you justify paying $17 a yard for this concrete? Practical men who are

known to nearly every public man in the Dominion and who give their whole life to this kind of work, say that they have to pay nearly double for bridge masonry to what they have to pay for concrete.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That depends on the work and on the place, as the hon. gentleman knows.

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). Taking the hon. gentleman's own figures for cement, the concrete could not possible have cost more than $10 a yard. No wonder the hon. Minister got angry, because he was cornered. I think the country will understand this matter. This method of letting contracts without proper notice and changing a contract after it has been let, ought to be exposed, and there should be an end to it.

Mr. FLINT. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat posed before the committee, and no doubt addressed the committee as a practical man, who is better qualified than the large majority of the members of the committee to speak on a matter of this kind. It was calculated, and properly calculated, that his position and presumed knowledge would lend weight to anything he said on a practical matter of this character. He declined to allow me to call his attention to the figures which had been laid before the Minister of Public Works by Mr. Coste, the chief engineer of his department, another practical man of great experience, on whose opinion the Minister is bound to rely. The point I wished to call the attention of my hon. friend to was that another practical man, whose ability, knowledge and good faith are unquestioned, at any rate on this side of the House, had laid a series of figures on this very subject before the Minister; and acting on the figures placed in detail before him by his chief engineer, the Minister, who does not pretend to be an expert, and who is like the majority of us, a layman in matters of this kind, accepted those figures as correct. Then my hon. friend while pretending to attack the Minister for accepting a calculation, which he thought was extravagant, joined in the insinuations against the Minister's integrity, and impliedly threw out insinuations against the integrity of the engineer, and then added to these faults the additional one of denouncing the Minister for placing the calculation of his own chief engineer between himself and these criticisms. When a layman who is called upon to assume the responsibility of a Minister accepts a contract which we will assume for the sake of argument might be criticised as unduly high, it is perfectly legitimate and fair for him to say: My excuse for accepting that was that it was recommended by one in whom I had every reason to have confidence, and in whom I still have confidence as an expert. That being the case I think that the hon. gentleman should have addressed himself to the calculations of Mr. Coste, the chief engineer, and shown from his own experience, that those were absurd. I do not see how the hon. Minister can be charged with any impropriety for basing his defence of certain changes in the contract upon the report and estimates of so highly esteemed a professional authority as his chief engineer. If there is any impropriety in the matter, it must revert to the persons who recommended the scale of prices which my hon. friend, as a practical man, says are perfectly ridiculous.

There are other points brought up with regard to these changes of contract, which no doubt every lay member of the committee has listened to with a great deal of interest. One is the short interval allowed for sending in tenders, and the other is the change from stone to concrete and the failure to call for second tenders when that change was made. These are legitimate subjects for discussion, but I think the presumption must be that the hon. Minister was actuated by proper motives, in view of the fact that he was pressed by the municipality of Edmonton to expedite the work and that the season was a very short one in which it could be done. It seems to me that the explanation which the Minister has given ought to satisfy any reasonable man that he could have been guided by no improper motive in making the change and hastening the completion of the contract.

The point I rose to make against my hon. friend who spoke last (Mr. McLennan) is this, that, as a practical man and a man of considerable authority on these matters in the House, he should have directly challenged the figures of the chief engineer, and not given the committee a comparison between the figures of this contract and tenders made for other work, under other circumstances, concerning the particulars of which, such as the quantity and the kind of cement and so on, we know nothing. No doubt I am disposed to be partial to the hon. Minister, being one of his supporters, but it does appear to me that the explanation he has made of all the circumstances ought to be considered most satisfactory; and I for one strongly deprecate the style of insinuation indulged in by the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) throughout the whole course of his remarks. It seems to me that if the hon. gentleman has any serious charge to make against the Minister, if he believes the Minister acted corruptly or was in collusion with the contractor, and consequently consented to more favourable terms than were comprised in the original contract, aided and abetted by his chief engineer and the other engineers who have been spoken of, the hon. gentleman ought to have brought the matter before a special committee and have all the parties concerned examined by a committee which would have been better adapted to investigate this matter than can the Committee of the Whole House. If,

however, he has no charge of corrupt practices to bring, but simply makes a charge of carelessness and neglect, I think he ought to have assumed a different tone and line of argument, and I consider that the hon. Minister was justified in his indignant repudiation of any improper motives.

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). I have here a report of contracts let and a list of men who tendered for contracts on the Canadian Pacific Railway, no doubt, the last speaker knows very well. Here are such men as Marks & Conmee, Charlebois & Shanly, Denis O'Brien, Wardrop & Ross, J. R. McDonald, James Goodwin & Co., R. McGreevy and others, all prominent contractors, men who understand all about this business, men whose knowledge of this kind of work nobody can dispute—we have these men submitting prices nearly double for bridge masonry as compared with concrete. How then can you justify the course followed in this case? You speak of the engineer being a practical man, and no doubt he is, but these men who have been doing this work their whole life, we must admit are more practical as to the value of that kind of work than any engineer in Canada. They are putting their money into it, and it is their business, and engineering is a separate business altogether from contracting. Why do they ask twice the figures for bridge masonry than they do for concrete? How are you going to justify paying the same price for concrete, without calling for tenders and making the change in the short time you did? And your engineer reported, as far back as 1894, that he had examined the quarries out there, and was always under the impression that they were first-class. There was some stone taken out and sent down here to be examined, and was accepted as good stone, and that stone was shown to the men who were tendering and who did not get the contract. But this gentleman got the contract, and he went up to Edmonton and inquired all about this stone and came back and said it would not do, and then there was an engineer asked to go up and report, and that engineer went out to Edmonton and examined several quarries and reported, and the whole thing was done by both these men inside of twelve days. I have here the engineer's report. He speaks about the different quarries, tells us what stone can stand the weather, and the thickness and the quality of the stone. He evidently must have travelled a great deal. I say that no man could have gone over the country and made the report he did in the time he did it. All this, according to the report we have from the department, was done by the contractor and him in twelve days. The contractor went up and came back and reported, and then the engineer went up and came back and reported, and then the whole thing was changed from masonry to concrete, and the same price paid. Yet I have read you the names of some of the prominent contractors, and there must be in this list 150 of the most prominent contractors in Canada, whose ability no one can doubt, and who, according to the tenders which are here, say that bridge masonry in western Ontario and Manitoba is worth double as much as concrete.

Mr. FLINT. The observations which the hon. gentleman has made, as a practical man, tell, not against the Minister, but against his advisers. With regard to the speed with which the engineer who reported upon the quarry made his journey and examination, and on which a great deal of stress had been laid, I do not think the majority of the committee are prepared to enter into a discussion of that question without a careful examination of all the dates alluded to. But, assuming that the examination, from a superficial examination of these papers, was a farce or that it was not made in the time referred to in this report, every practical man knows that that proves nothing whatever, because it might very often occur that an examination may have actually been made at another time than it appears by the document itself to have been made. I do not know that that is the case in this instance, but I recollect a case in my own experience in which, if the matter had been of importance, a tremendous outcry might have been made against the report, as is made in this case, based on the date of that report.

The examination was made by a professional man in his private and individual capacity. Subsequently, he was asked for a report upon the matter, and he said he did not care about reporting unless he was asked officially to do so. He was then, probably a year after the examination, asked officially to make an examination and report, and he did so, making his report within a day or two. That report was simply to comply with official form and appearances. The examination had actually been made a year before, it was not until then that the official report was called for and made. This transaction was perfectly open and above board, and open to no objections. But I can fancy that a gentleman who had before him some collateral evidence and having a case on which suspicion might be thrown, could make an enormous amount of insinuation on the basis of a matter which was thoroughly square and honourable. So, there might be a dozen explanations of this matter which would be thoroughly consonant with the highest honour and integrity and efficiency on the part of the gentleman who has just been so eulogistically referred to. I simply take the ground that the insinuations are not against the Minister but against professional men of high honour and standing—not against their integrity necessarily, but against their professional standing. For, certainly, if Mr. Coste made a report which

is utterly ridiculous and absurd as is alleged by my hon. friend (Mr. McLennan, Glengarry), a practical man of eminence, certainly, his professional standing as one upon whom the Minister can rely in deciding matters of this kind must suffer. I think that, on that account, the matter should have had a more careful investigation elsewhere before being brought to this committee, because we are not in a position to investigate the subject fully and fairly as we could with these gentlemen and other experts to give their evidence.

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). I am not charging anything against the officials, and I took great care to make myself clear on that point. I said that if the officials found that there was no stone suitable for the bridge they were justified in reporting that it would be better to build with concrete. The proper course for the Minister then was to ask for tenders and give those who had tendered before as well as others an opportunity to tender. Not only should this have been done as a matter of justice to would-be contractors, but in the interest of the country, so that no more money should be spent upon the work than was actually necessary. Now, as the question of time has been mentioned, there is a paragraph here that I do not understand, but perhaps the hon. gentleman can explain it:

As soon as the contract had been awarded-----

Mr. FOSTER. Namely, on the 17th August.

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). The extract I am about to read is taken from the report prepared in the Public Works Department and placed upon the Table of this House.

Mr. Lemoine proceeded to Edmonton but came back at once and reported that he could not find stone of the dimension or of the quality required by the specifications, and he was told to procure it elsewhere, but replied that he had also examined the stone found at Calgary and was of the opinion that it would not be accepted. Then Mr. Arthur St. Laurent, engineer, of this department, was sent to examine the qarries and he reported as follows under date of August 30th, 1897.

In twelve clear days, the contractor went up, after signing the contract on the 17th August examined the quarries in that country and came back and this is the report copied from the report which has been laid on the Table. If he got back before the 30th he made a very quick trip. This goes to show that he got back and that the engineer started up there and was able to make a report dated 30th August.

Mr. OLIVER. I would like to answer the remark of the hon. gentleman (Mr. McLennan), who has just sat down, when he questions the possibility of Mr. Lemoine having visited the quarries in the time shown in the report. I can only assure the hon. gentleman—and he will have to take my word for it—that Mr. Lemoine did visit the quarry between the time he signed the contract and the time he returned to Ottawa. He came in from Ottawa on the train on a certain night. Before daylight next morning he started for the quarry, and came back to Edmonton during the following night and went out on the next train. Mr. St. Laurent came on the same train as Mr. Lemoine, but did not go to the quarry at the same time as Mr. Lemoine. But he did visit it and made a report that he could not find suitable stone. I understand that Mr. St. Laurent, on the way to Ottawa visited the quarry at Calgary, which, as every one knows who has visited that locality, is within a few hundreds yards of the railway station. So, there was no great loss of time in any of these transactions. Allow me to assure the hon. gentleman that Mr. Lemoine did, at the time referred to, examine the quarry above Edmonton, and that Mr. St. Laurent did at the time referred to examine that quarry and did also, I understand, examine the quarry at Calgary. There was nothing impossible about it. In regard to another point raised by hon. members that there was no plant on the ground at the time when the contract was changed, I beg to assure them that a heavy piece of machinery necessary for some part of the construction of the bridge did arrive in the train either with Mr. Lemoine or within a train or two afterwards; and operations went on from that time until the present time, as a matter of fact. Of course, until a re-arrangement was made, matters went much more slowly than they did afterwards, but still the work went on, and money was expended.

Now, if hon. gentlemen are satisfied on these points, I will just say a word on the general question. I think it is hardly fair to the private members of this House at this late day of the session, that a whole day should be taken up on this question. I am the last member of this House to deprecate criticism, fair or unfair, against the Government or any member of the Government; but I say that criticism which takes up so much time of the House, should have some point in it, should have some likely consequence. Hon. members have attacked the Minister of Public Works. Have they attacked him for the purpose of showing that this bridge contract was a corrupt transaction? If they have, they have not brought one tittle of evidence in support of their contention. If they have brought on this discussion for the purpose of proving that the Minister of Public Works had a corrupt interest in connection with this contract, they have utterly failed to show anything looking towards that end. If they desired to prove that the contract was improvident, or was mismanaged, all the evidence with regard to that point was placed before them by the Minister in the very beginning of his explanations, and they have brought forward nothing additional since. The facts will

go before the country, and the people will be able to judge for themselves whether the contract was provident or improvident, whether it was well or ill managed. The hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. McLennan) has brought forward certain figures which, coming from him as a practical man, must be accepted with a certain amount of credence, and they go to show that the contract might possibly have been let for less money. That is the only point that has been indicated, and it seems to me a waste of time to have taken up so much time to elaborate that point, something which might occur in the case of any possible contract that was ever let in any part of the world, by any person or by any Government. I will go so far as to say that the whole attack is very peculiar coming from the hon. gentleman that it does come from, and from a party having the associations that attach to that party. However, let that go for what it is worth. I would be sorry to have the measurement of this Government taken by that of the late one. Let every contract stand on its own merits. Now, the hon. gentleman must have had some purpose in view in bringing on this discussion and prolonging it to such an extent. If their purpose was to condemn the Minister as a corrupt politician, they have failed; if their purpose was to show mismanagement, I do not think that they have succeeded. If I understand them aright, their purpose must have been to cover up the discredit which attached to the late Government for their conduct in connection with this bridge, by attempting to fasten discredit upon the present Government, so that the credit which was due to this Government for having prosecuted a necessary public work which had been neglected and mismanaged by the late Government, might thereby be diminished as much as possible by the simple process of throwing mud at the Minister of Public Works.

Mr. McMULLEN. I have gathered together the facts connected with this contract, and having listened to the discussion on both sides, it appears to me that, in the first place, the people of Edmonton were very anxious to get this bridge built at once. The evidence of the necessity of the structure being proceeded with as speedily as possible, is shown by the fact that the people of Edmonton have granted the sum of $25,000 for that purpose. The Minister of Public Works was urged to secure the erection of that bridge at the earliest possible moment, he asked for tenders, and received four. He accepted the lowest tender. So far, I think, hon. gentlemen will admit that everything was all right. Now, the only question that has arisen is the wisdom of accepting concrete in place of stone, when the engineer reported that they could not get stone of proper quality to put into that bridge. Hon. gentlemen opposite maintain that he should have asked for new tenders. The Minister takes the recommendation of his engineer. This is what his engineer reports: "I have the honour to strongly recommend that the substitution of concrete for masonry be permitted." I think it will be generally admitted by engineers and by practical men, that concrete is as good as masonry. We find that concrete is being used in many costly and valuable structures, which proves that it is considered to be as good as masonry. Now, did he pay an extra price for concrete? No, the contractor agreed to put in concrete at the same price for which he had contracted to put in masonry. The contractor agreed that he would carry out the contract for the same tender, and that he would substitute concrete for masonry, and the chief engineer of the department urges that concrete should be accepted in place of masonry, on the ground that the work would be worth more. And that is what all this fuss is made about, there is nothing in it whatever. The hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) tried to make a point that there was not time for the engineer to have gone up there and examined this stone to be able to pronounce upon it. He has got his answer from the member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver), who lives at Edmonton, and who declares that the engineer did make an inspection, and reported that the stone was not of proper quality. Why did the Minister act so hastily? Because the people of Edmonton were anxious that the construction of this bridge should be rapidly carried on. The work is now going on, and it will be finished this year. Now, where is the injustice, where is the boodle, where is the steal? The hon. member for Assiniboia thought he had found a mare's nest, but after all his labour, the mountain has not even brought forth a mouse, it has brought forth nothing at all. The ex-Minister of Finance grew quite eloquent when he reproved the Minister of Public Works for not asking for new tenders. What was there to be asked for? The only change made was the substitution of concrete for masonry, and the Minister has the certificate of his own engineer that concrete was as good as masonry, and even better, and concrete was to be put in at the same price. They talk about $17 being an excessive price. Do they remember what the estimated cost of the masonry was in the case of the Wellington bridge at Montreal? I have the evidence under my hand. The estimated cost on the Wellington bridge is $18 per cubic yard, and on the Grand Trunk Railway bridge the same. The hon. gentlemen opposite went on and built those bridges, and a pretty mess they made of it; it cost the country three times $18. Now, if the Minister of Public Works had taken this work off the hands of the contractor, had sent his own men up there and had built this bridge at a cost three times the amount of the original estimate,

there would have been some grounds of complaint. Hon. gentlemen opposite would have then no doubt a basis on which to found a very serious charge. But nothing of the kind has been shown, and the indisputable evidence is that the Minister proceeded properly, as is shown by the fact that the Edmonton Board of Trade has endorsed the course he adopted and have complimented him on the energy displayed in connection with letting and carrying out the construction of this bridge. I consider all the statements made by the hon. member with respect to any recklessness or any impropriety on the part of the Minister as entirely unfounded. I do not believe there is a tittle of truth in the statement put forward by hon. gentlemen opposite, that charges of wrong doing can be sustained against the Minister in relation to this work. The hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. McLennan) sought to make the point that cement had been laid down at Edmonton at $5.41. That is taking the rates for this year, and we know that the rates on the Canadian Pacific Railway have been less this year than previously.

Mr. FOSTER. How much on this particular item?

Mr. McMULLEN. We do not know. With respect to the use of gravel or broken stone, I am not prepared to say that gravel will make as good concrete as broken stone, though perhaps the engineer may hold a different opinion.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We used broken stone.

Mr. McMULLEN. I dare say it would be better. The engineer of course knew the gravel was there, but he decided on broken stone, and the Minister accepted that recommendation and acted on it. There is not a single charge that hon. gentlemen opposite have attempted to substantiate out of which the bottom has not completely fallen, and they should confess honestly that their efforts to fish out wrong doing has explicitly failed.

Mr. FOSTER. The committee will see that at least something has been done. Whereas a little while ago the hon. Minister thought everything necessary had been said, and his friends behind him agreed in that opinion, and they evidently entered into a compact that nothing more was to be said, things have changed. The hon. Minister has come out with an impassioned speech.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Not impassioned.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, impassioned in the true sense of the term; the hon. gentleman's whole object being to endeavour to turn the discussion into a different channel. And more than that, the sturdiest of the supporters of the Minister back of the Treasury benches have been spurred forward to make elaborate defences, and one supporter made a most elaborate apology for the action of the Minister. The hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint) cannot be said to have made any defence, but he made a most abject apology for the Minister's action. The hon. gentleman who last spoke I expected to defend the Minister. But all the time he was defending his action and whittling the case down till at last he came to the conclusion that there was not the slightest ground for criticism. I could not help looking back two or three years ago and considering what a strong and virile attack the hon. gentleman would have made, and how he would have denounced the then Government if such a case as this had been brought forward.

Mr. McMULLEN. No.

Mr. FOSTER. There is an importance to be attached to this case from two points. I deprecate one especially. We had a sample of it last night. When an hon. gentleman made an appeal for those dismissed from the post office in Belleville, and brought what he considered a proper statement before the House, how was he met? In the end he was met in this way by the Postmaster General, referring to the man acting as postmaster as a Conservative: I tried to be fair; the member who represents Belleville does not give me any credit. That opens up the question anew. What does it mean, translated into the English language? Simply this, that the Postmaster General used the poorest kind of threat, that if the hon. gentleman attempted to criticise the action of an administrator he did it at the peril of any friend he had left in office. Now, I ask hon. gentlemen, who when they are not heated by partisan bitterness are fair and who generally are fair when they are talking among themselves, is this a proper position for a Minister to take? Must the life of every employee of Conservative tendencies be imperilled because an hon. member on this side of the House ventilates a grievance against the Government in regard to a Government employee in his county? Is it a manly way of meeting it? There was a business answer to make to the hon. member for Belleville, and it should have been given and remained at such; but the Minister was not content with that, and there was this threat thrown out, that if a member on this side of the House ventured to ventilate a grievance he does it at the peril of any friend remaining in office. Is there any doubt that this was intended as a threat against that member, and an attempt to influence that member by saying: we are keeping some few of your friends in office, and if you say a word about any of these cases, you will only make those officers suffer. I say that is not manly. I say the very same thing has been repeated to-night by the Minister of Public Works. The Minister cannot shift his

responsibility as a Minister on to his officers. Neither is it fair, and he knows it, when a gentleman on this side of the House criticises, as he has a right to do, the action, and the report to Council on which the action is based, for the Minister to fly into a passion and to say: Mr. Coste is a man who was one of your appointees; I have trusted him, and if he has deceived me all the worse for him; thus making the open threat that it would go hard with the official friends of the Opposition if they ventured to make such criticism.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I did not say that.

Mr. FOSTER. I will take my hon. friend's language when "Hansard" is printed and we will go over it if he pleases, and I venture to say that any honest man will give that meaning to it, and cannot give any other. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Tarte) was a little bit heated at the time and he may have gone further than in calmer moments he would, but he did go that far. Now, Sir, for any friends of the Liberal-Conservatives that remain in office I have the greatest solicitude. I would not wish to injure their prospects in the least, but if it comes for me as a member of this House to choose between being silent on points where I think I ought to criticise; and even injuring—if the Minister wishes to take that ground—those Conservatives that still remain in office, I will have to perform my public duty and let the Minister take the responsibility of performing that other duty if he wishes to do it. It will not abate one bit of the criticism that I as a public man think proper to make here. There is this other point. This action is one of many on the part of the Minister of Public Works. Already I can tell him there is an uneasy feeling in the country because of remarks which he has made which tend to the breaking down of the system of giving out public works by contract based upon tender. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Tarte) has taken the ground here that it will be at his own will and his own judgment as to whether he will carry on large public works by tender or by day's labour. He is doing dredging in Toronto harbour which will amount to $20,000, and he made the statement here that he was actually doing that work, not by contract on tender, but doing it simply by agreement with a friend of his own, and he justified it on the ground that his friends must be looked after. Look after your friends if they choose to put themselves in a position where you can look after them consistent with the public interest, but call for tenders and let your contracts to the lowest tenderer. If two persons have the same tender which is the lowest, one a Conservative and the other a Liberal, give it if you wish to the Liberal as a choice between the two. That is your right, but it is not the right of the Minister to use the public works of this country and to farm them out for the sake of looking after friends of his own.

Mr. McMULLEN. Speak about the bridge, please.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, I will leave it in the judgment of the House if my criticism is not fair, and it is not on the lowest ground of criticism I am proceeding. The stone fence around the park was to cost $14,000, we were told by the Minister. He said afterwards that was a mistake, but at all events it cost over $5,000, and although that was one of the easiest pieces of work to give by contract based upon tender, he claimed he was right in doing that by day's work; doing it by his own friends and looking after his friends. It cannot be denied that in the case of the Edmonton bridge contract, after the Minister came to the conclusion to take away penalties and to take away fines, and to extend the time for the completion of the work from three months to an indefinite period, and to change it from concrete to masonry; it cannot be denied that under such circumstances the Minister would have consulted the best interests of the country if he then put up this $36,000 contract to public contract on tender.

Mr. McMULLEN. He was getting the same price and one was as good as the other.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. And better work.

Mr. FOSTER. I will come to that in a minute. Will any one deny that there was a total change in the conditions of the contract?

Mr. McMULLEN. In what?

Mr. FOSTER. I will tell you.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will answer him.

Mr. FOSTER. The Minister feels that he is not altogether done with it yet, and he still has another answer to make. I am glad of that because we will get the subject elucidated. Here are the changes made in the contract for the information of the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen). Nineteen days was given to tenderers to make their examination of work 2,000 miles distant; they had three months in which to build a $36,000 job; they were to be fined $50 a day for every day over that, and $2,000 penalty if the work was not done under certain conditions. All these conditions were changed in the second contract. There was no time limit to complete the work, no fine, no penalty and the material was to be concrete instead of stone. Are not these absolute changes? I say that after these changes were made the Minister would have consulted his own best interests and the best interests of the country if he had taken even only nineteen days more to get new tenders, and he could easily have done that. On the

17th of August the contract was signed; on the 30th of August the reports were in, and the Minister had come to the conclusion to substitute concrete for rock. I find that athough urgency was claimed to be in the case, the Minister's report to Council was not sent on the 30th August but only on the 22nd September, and the authority to go on with the work by Order in Council was not passed until the 20th October. That is a month and a half after these reports were before the Minister. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) contend that the Minister had the right to make this substitution without the authority of an Order in Council? Not one stroke of work had he a right to do under these changed conditions until he had the authority of an Order in Council to do it, and he did not have that authority on the 20th October. Was the urgency so great that it exonerated the Minister from taking nineteen days after the 30th August to ask for tenders under the changed conditions. As to that my hon. friend (Mr. McMullen) will have his opinion and I will have mine and the people of the country will have their opinion, and the opinion of the public will be that the Minister under the changed conditions should have called for new tenders. Two or three members have taken me and my hon. friends here to task for consuming some time. Here is a statement made, and it is backed up by good evidence. If practical builders of large public works put in tenders on the basis of rock or concrete, and if the unvarying difference is between 40 and 60 per cent, in favour of concrete for cheapness, I say that is a tremendously strong argument on which to rest an allegation that concrete is cheaper than rock. We cannot gainsay the statement made by a practical man who is not an extreme man, who has never shown himself to be so in this House.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. An offensive partisan.

Mr. FOSTER. He is not an offensive criticiser of hon. gentlemen opposite. A party man he is, but he is a practical builder and contractor; and he takes the actual quantities that the Minister himself declares as necessary to make a cubic yard, and his statement is that concrete can be laid there for $10 per yard. Add that to the evidence of these other contractors, and you have cumulated evidence. What is more, my hon. friend has stated as a member of this Parliament, that contractors have told him that they would be glad to get the laying down of that concrete in Edmonton for $10 a yard.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. When the girl is married, there are plenty of men who want her.

Mr. FOSTER. I will leave the Minister of Agriculture to express his opinion on that point. There is the evidence; what is to rebut it? I have heard nothing except that the hon. member for North Wellington and one or two other members have said that there might be a great difference between the railway charges of last year and those of this year. Have they adduced a fact to prove that? Not one. It is simply a supposition; and a supposition not supported by a single word of proof. Suppose that evidence is true. There were 1,450 cubic yards of concrete. On the basis of $10, which the evidence gives as sufficient to lay the concrete there, the $17 that is paid means a loss of $10,000 to the people of this country. That is a pretty respectable sum of money. I have heard my hon. friend criticise by the hour over a difference of a cent a yard for carpet; or over items the whole value of which would not be $50; and here is an amount of $10,000, if the evidence is to be trusted, which has been lost to the country simply because the Minister of Public Works hastened to change a contract without tender for a friend who had got the contract first.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. How do you get over the deputy's valuation?

Mr. FOSTER. I am coming to that.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. You ought to go over that first.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend the Postmaster General is of a very dictatorial caste of mind. I am trying to make my case in my own way, but the hon. gentleman sprawls out before me in approved ministerial style, and says I ought to do so-and-so first. I must take leave to conduct my case in my own way, and leave other men to conduct their cases in their own way. That item of $10,000 is worth something to this country, although my hon. friend laughs over the matter.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, I laugh at it; it is a ridiculous calculation.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend, then, was not laughing at the loss of $10,000 to the country through a mistake of his own?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I did not make any mistake.

Mr. FOSTER. Will my hon. friend rise in the House and declare that as a principle in letting public works he is going to go on the plan of changing the conditions of a contract without again calling for tenders?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will not say anything of the kind.

Mr. FOSTER. He said it practically in this case, and as a result we are face to face with a possible loss of $10,000 to this country. Now, I am coming to the point of the hon. gentleman's statement with reference to his engineers. The hon. gentle-

man says, I am not an expert, and I must take my engineers' report; if that is wrong, I am exonerated from wrong and the guilt is on their heads. That is not true, as a matter of ministerial responsibility or executive administration in this country. Will my hon. friend say that that is the doctrine of the present Government?—no ministerial responsibility, but shift the responsibility on your officers? Will the hon. member for North Wellington, no matter how enormous or how frequent these losses are, do in each case as he has done to-night—get up and say, "I cannot see that the Minister is to blame, because he simply went on the calculations of his engineer." Where does ministerial responsibility come in? Now, my hon. friend might as well face it; he is responsible. If he is not a technical man, and is entirely at the mercy of his officers, the question is whether he ought to occupy the position of the head of a department which is spending millions a year, having no better qualifications than that. My hon. friend would have saved himself if he had simply asked for tenders and given the work out by contract. Then the figures of his engineer would have been tested by practical business men contracting for the work. They would have been his vindication if he had got it done at no less than the estimate of himself and his officers: if he had got it for less, then so much gain for the country.

So my hon. friend must be responsible. How easy would it not have been for the hon. gentleman to have made the simple mathematical calculation. His engineer could have told him how much of this cement it would have taken to make a cubic yard of concrete, he himself could have inquired as to the prices of cement and the railway rates there, and a very little investigation would have informed him what would be a fair rate for the laying of it.

But this is the point that I make, that the hon. gentleman, without appealing to the contracting public, changed all the provisions of the contract and made what was really a private contract for a work which cost $36,000. He tries to vary the subject by saying that the people of Edmonton approved of his course. Well, the people of Edmonton did not care particularly how much the bridge cost. That was a matter for the Minister to consider. What they wanted was to have the work done and done quickly, and what they commended the Minister for was not his manner of letting the contract, but simply the fact that the work was going on and there was every prospect of its being soon completed. An hon. gentleman said that he knew my motives and those of my hon. friend, and that the only thing we had in view was to cover up the dilatory action of the previous Government.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I did not say that.

Mr. FOSTER. No, I acquit the hon. gentleman of saying it. I do not admit that we were more dilatory than we should have been. There were certain preliminaries which had to be arranged; and if my recollection serves me right, it was some time before we got the people of Edmonton to the point of agreeing to raise one-third of the cost, $25,000, if we would pay the balance, and no doubt they would rather have had the whole structure built by the Government and not have been called upon to contribute anything. But that has nothing to do with the present case. You may chide us if you like, but that does not condone the course of the present Government. My hon. friend is more prescient than I gave him credit for being when he attempts to read the motives of hon. gentlemen on this side. I am sorry he has so slight an idea of the ability and standing of his colleagues in this House who happen to sit on this side. Hereafter I shall bow with very great humility before his opinion, and shall think less of myself than I ever did before after this crushing estimate which the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) has made of the mental and moral stature of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. I have not an unkind word to say of my hon. friend. His motives are good. He is an excellent member in his way. He does the best he can, and I am bound to say that he does it very well; but if I were to venture on a criticism of a brother member, I would say that he lays himself open to a slight suspicion of a little inconsistency now and then between his professions and his support of the Administration.

It was said that I made insinuations. The hon. Minister of Public Works charged me with having insinuated corrupt dealing on his part and that of his officers. I did not mean to, and I do not charge or insinuate corruption either against himself or his officers. What I said was this, and it is generally true. A contractor who is of the same political persuasion as the Government from which he hopes to get a contract, always has more or less the opinion—and he may by virtue of that opinion and the remarks made by friends of his, not in the Government or in the departments, very well get the idea: Oh, well they will not be hard on one of their friends; these penalties and the like of that, I think I can manage all right. That was the distance I went, and the only distance I intend to go. But what becomes of the miserable argument that because we attempted to criticise the course of the Government in this matter, we are hunting for actual corruption on the part of the Minister or his officers? Surely we can criticise an administrative act, surely we can say it is improvident and wrong in principle, without being bound to this, that unless we show actual corruption we have not proved our case. I did not

start in to charge actual corruption and never insinuated it, but I did start in, after listening to the discussion, and my hon. friend (Mr. McLennan) had the same idea, to show that the Government was improvident and that a different course would have been far better in the interests of the country. I have said my say, and hope I have not lectured anybody, and that I have not offended the sensibilities of my hon. friend from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver), because I have taken a little more time after he has said that I had already taken too much. And I hope that the criticism I have made will be taken in the spirit in which I have made it, as a fair and reasonable criticism of the administration of the Minister of Public Works, whose conduct I condemn in this matter on the grounds I have stated.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I cannot complain of the tone adopted by my hon. friend in criticising the item before us. But my hon. friend has lost sight of one important fact in this case. The Department of Public Works, under the advice of the engineer, called for tenders. In the notice, we specified that the work was to be built of masonry, and we stated that there was a quarry available. A sample of the stone was deposited.

Mr. FOSTER. If the hon. gentleman will allow me to interrupt him. I wish to mention a point that I had forgotten. I do not hold Mr. Coste as culpable or the department as culpable for the mistake made about the quarry. The quarry had never been opened, nobody had seen it, and the department here had sufficient prima facie evidence to believe that the stone was very good.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We called for tenders and said that a stone quarry was available for the work. The lowest tenderer believed that there was a quarry available, but when it was proved that there was not, what was our position. Would not my hon. friend admit that when Mr. Coste stated to the contractor and to myself that concrete work was just as good as masonry work, the contractor would have an action for damages against us if we had not let him the contract at the same price? He had tendered on the condition and understanding that there was a quarry available. He had made expenses. He had gone up there.

Mr. DAVIN. Was there any mention of that stone in the specification?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Certainly.

Mr. DAVIN. There was not.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman has only to look at the specifications.

Mr. DAVIN. I have them here.

Mr. McGREGOR. Have you the stone there, too?

Mr. DAVIN. No.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is no use of splitting hairs and playing upon words.

Mr. DAVIN. Will you show it in the specifications?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If I am to be interrupted at every step, I shall simply have to take my seat. I was saying that the tenderers were led to believe that there was a quarry of stone available. Mr. Lemoine tendered on that basis. The fault was ours, if fault there was. We were justified in the belief, as my hon. friend says, that there was a stone quarry there, but we had made a mistake. The contractor then would have a claim for damages against us. There can be no doubt about that. All that is taken into consideration. Further, the country is having at least as good work in concrete as it would have had in masonry. And so, it seems to me, there is no ground for all this fuss.

I wish to assure my hon. friend that he is altogether mistaken if he thinks that it has come to my mind to threaten any employee because that employee belongs to the same political persuasion as hon. gentlemen opposite. I may have all sorts of failings, but it is not in my character, I think, to act in an unmanly way. I know that the chief officers of my department do not belong to the same political persuasion as the party now in power. When I took office I called the chief officers of the department together and told them: Gentlemen, I know that you have served my predecessors to the best of your ability, and I will give you my full and entire confidence; and I have done so. I have resented, perhaps with some heat, the insinuations that were thrown at me, and I have said that the insinuations placed me in a very difficult position. That is perfectly true. I have been reproached over and over again with retaining Conservative employees. And, when it is insinuated that—not by my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) but by some of his friends—I have acted in a dishonourable and dishonest way in a matter in which I was led by the advice of those employees, I say again I am placed in a very difficult position. My hon. friend will understand that I do not feel that it is necessary to say more, except this: The calculation made in this Chamber to-night as to the cost of the work are—I say it with all deference—ridiculous. The cement which goes into a yard of concrete in the bridge costs $8.75. We put in a barrel and a half of cement. It is said that we could build with less than that. No doubt we could. We could use a good deal more stone than we are using. But this is a pretty difficult work in a somewhat inclement climate, and we are obliged to do first-class work.

For that reason we are using a little more cement than is used in works of less importance.

It is no argument to say that in this work or that on the Canadian Pacific Railway contractors have tendered for cement work at certain figures. We know how contractors tender—low on one item and high on another. We have to deal with a special kind of work, concrete work for building piers. I will only say that the country is undoubtedly getting better work than if it had masonry built with local stone, and is getting it for the same price, and that price was the price of the lowest tender.

Mr. DAVIN. Before the item is adopted, I have a word or two to say. I have here the specification and there is not one word about the Edmonton quarry. The fact that the contractor examined the quarry at Calgary, nearly 200 miles away, shows that he was not confined to the Edmonton quarry, and shows that the statement made by my hon. friend (Mr. Tarte), that the Government would be liable to an action for damages, is simply the act of a drowning man catching at a straw, so anxious is he to excuse the position he finds himself in. What the specifications call for is simply stone, without saying that it was to be had. How, then could the failure of the Edmonton quarry to yield the stone required make the department liable for an action for damages?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The specifications called for stone and we could not find any stone.

Mr. DAVIN. Well, how would the action for damages arise ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Because we had a sample of the stone in our office and the contractor was led to believe that he could get stone of that quality.

Mr. DAVIN. Is that in the specifications or contract ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I did not say it was. But stone was the article to be used, and there was a sample of stone in Mr. Coste's office, and Mr. Coste in his report says that Mr. Lemoine was shown that stone.

Mr. DAVIN. The position taken by the Minister is a very peculiar one. He makes a contract based upon certain specifications, providing that the piers and abutments are to be of ashlar masonry. And, because it is said that the contractor—without even the least evidence as to that—could not find stone at or near Edmonton, the Minister tells us that, if he did not accept the alternative of concrete, he would be open to an action. That could not be, unless, in some way, the Government was responsible for providing the stone. There is not a section of the contract or the specifications to bear out the position taken by the Minister. In order that we may understand what cement is being used, I would ask the hon. Minister what firm in Montreal is supplying the cement ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not know.

Mr. DAVIN. Now, this debate has pained the soul of the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver), by reason of its length. I was sorry when I heard the hon. member for Alberta speak. He was suffering deeply; his soul was wrung with anguish at the thought of the time that had been taken up. And, with great zeal, he came to the defence of the Minister of Public Works. I could not help thinking that my hon. friend from Alberta was taking this opportunity to bring himself shoulder to shoulder with the Liberal party, if he possibly could, after his brief and solitary step towards independence that characterized his action on Yukon matters. The hon. gentleman is a professed economist, and he cannot quarrel with hon. gentlemen in this House, who, while not at all condemning the building of a bridge in the North-west and the building of it as quickly as possible, but approving of this, yet, whether a bridge is in the North-west or in any other part of Canada, assert their right to insist that economical methods shall be used and their right to this—that documents placed before this House to account for any course taken by the Government shall be documents that shall be consistent, and shall not make demands upon the credulity of gentlemen on this side of the House that would simply stultify us if for one moment we accepted the propositions thereby implied.

It was a curious spectacle to see the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) steal like a spectre into the chair of the plenipotentiary at Washington (Sir Louis Davies). Surely the hon. member stood like the sheeted ghost of the member for Wellington that used to rise up on this side and declaim in favour of economy and against extravagance. There he stood, and in a mincing way, in a voice that was ashamed of itself, asked: What have you to complain of? Have you not got concrete, and is not concrete, according to some engineers, as good as masonry ? Was that the question ? Was not this rather the question: Does concrete cost as much ? Although I do not think the hon. gentleman either a Gladstone or an Aristotle or a Grotius——

Mr. McMULLEN. I thank God, he is not a Davin.

Mr. DAVIN. Well, Sir, I suppose that is the only doxology the hon. gentleman can put up to which I can heartily say, Amen. Not only do I say amen to his thankfulness that he is not a Davin, but I will say here, from what I know of the respective races, that to any remote posterity the hon. mem-

ber for Wellington will never have any representative that will have the least in common with myself or with any past or future kindred of mine. But there was another question besides the question of substituting concrete for masonry. One of the contractors had tendered at 30 cents a foot for the piles, and this contractor, Lemoine, was charging $1 a foot. Here was a price that made a difference in the contract, according to whether the poles were fifteen or twenty feet long, of a sum varying from $1,200 to $1,400. That sum may seem small to men who have got into positions of apparent wealth, but if $1,400 has, by the misconduct of any department, been thrown wrongfully into the pockets of a contractor, I think the people who pay the piper will consider that something very wrong has been done. If the hon. gentleman had said: I find I will have to change this from masonry to concrete, I will see if I cannot get a lump sum lower than $36,500—as a fact, he could have got it done for $14,000, and he could have saved $21,000 to the people of Canada. The hon. gentleman laughs.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I must laugh; it is so ridiculous.

Mr. DAVIN. That laugh is more like a grin than a laugh. I will say this, that if every ministerial magnate in this Government were to laugh or grin like a Cheshire cat, it will not divert the attention of the people of Canada for such transactions as we have sought to drag into light. Mr. Burns, one of the contractors, proposed to drive those ninety-two piles at 30 cents a foot, and you are paying $1. When the hon. gentleman had the option of changing the tender and getting this done for 30 cents a foot, why was there no attempt to change the price for piling? The hon. gentleman replied to me, and he replied to the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster), and he replied to the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. McLennan), and what is the character of his reply? The character of his reply invariably is to avoid the issue that has been raised, although he said in his somewhat theatrical manner, and I rather fear inspired by the Minister of Trade and Commerce, that he would not speak any more. But it became so warm that he could not sit silent, he had to speak, because the point of the case had gone so completely beneath his fifth rib that he found it was necessary to do something, and so he squealed. He got galvanized, he gesticulated. Now, he says that the difference between ashler masonry and concrete is shown in the Canadian Pacific Railway contracts. I have here the official volume published by the Minister of Public Works. He says it is well known that contractors sometimes tender low for some things of which there is a very small quantity, and tender very high for others. But in the case of forty-eight tenders, it is not possible that they should all bear a certain proportion as between masonry and concrete unless that proportion was founded on the nature of things and on value. Let me point out to the hon. gentleman what we have in these contracts. Marks & Connolly, tendering for the piling on contract 41, the quantity being 18,500 lineal feet, gave a rate in the first column of 24 cents and in the second 25 cents. In the present case under consideration the prices are 30 cents and one dollar.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. And the contractor was the lowest tenderer for both contracts.

Mr. DAVIN. The lowest as regards the lump sum. When the hon. gentleman had an opportunity of reconsidering this work he should have been influenced by the fact that one tender was for 30 cents per foot while another tender was for $1. In the Canadian Pacific Railway contracts Charlebois & Shanly offered pilling at 30 cents per foot, Andrew Jones & Co., 30 cents, Denis O'Brien 40 cents, J. R. Macdonell, 30 cents, J. Goodwin & Co., 30 cents. These prices were for this large quantity I have mentioned, and so the parties had not the temptation to tender at a low rate. Under these circumstances it is palpable that 30 cents is a very fair amount to pay for piling. Probably owing to the magnitude of the other portions of the case, the Minister has not explained anything about the piling. In regard to that report made by Mr. Coste, I sympathize entirely with the remarks made by the hon. member for York as to the extraordinary manner in which the Minister refers to his officers. He said he questioned Mr. Coste when he made this report. This report indicates that the Minister had already consented to have the work done. "In the present instance the contractors have furnished good cement." This had been furnished before the report of the 22nd September was made; yet the Minister said he questioned him about his report. The fact that the report is made on the 22nd and that the language refered to is used is evidence that the change of contract had taken place before then, although the Order in Council permitting the change to be made is dated 20th October.

Mr. DOBELL. That cement was for the foundation and had nothing to do with the other part of the work.

Mr. DAVIN. I have great faith in the hon. member for Quebec (Mr. Dobell), and I love to see him when laughter ripples in his countenance so fair.

Mr. DOBELL. Allow me to say a word.

Mr. DAVIN. After I have concluded. I cannot do so now as I cannot persuade myself at the moment that the hon. gentleman would shed any light on the subject. If I could do so I would willingly give way to

him. Here are a set of documents that raise questions on their face, and they have never been explained. I want to say a word with respect to the statement made by my hon. friend, who I know would not make a statement without good ground for making it, the hon. member for Alberta, to the effect that he knew that within the time the feat extraordinary as described in this report was accomplished. It may be quite true that he saw Mr. Lemoine in Edmonton. It may be true that he saw Mr. St. Laurent there—I do not doubt it for a moment—but the feat described could not be accomplished, because there are only two trains a week going and coming between Calgary and Edmonton, and when Mr. Lemoine arrived in Edmonton, he could not have left it—because the first time he could have left Montreal was when this contract was signed on 17th August—before the morning of 26th August. He goes to Calgary and he inspects the stone there, because when he arrived at the department here and when told to go and get stone elsewhere (which is by the way a complete answer to what was said by the Minister of Public Works as to liability to an action. he replied that he examined the stone at Calgary and was of opinion that it should not be accepted. I grant that by lightning speed, but certainly not making any profound examination of either the quarry at Calgary or Edmonton, he might have gone up and reached the Department of Public Works breathless on 30th. But where then was the time for Mr. St. Laurent to go and examine the quarry at Edmonton and make a report to the Department of Public Works, dated Ottawa, 30th August, twelve clear days, as was emphasized by the hon. member for Glengarry? It is a most remarkable fact that this feature of these documents has been carefully avoided by the Minister, and one of the reasons is that it is impossible to explain it. These documents will not fit in with the theory that the Department of Public Works, when Mr. Lemoine secured the contract, was anxious that stone should be secured. If you formulate the theory that there was a desire to facilitate it being built of concrete and to give Lemoine the building of it in concrete at the same rate as he was to build it of masonry, these documents will fit in with a theory like that. The Minister throws out the suggestion in a very defiant manner, and says: Do you dare to suggest that I directed my officers to do certain things. Well, Sir, I am not going to suggest that, but I say that we are in the face of the inexplicable, and I will remind the Minister of this, that the God of worship of so many hon. gentlemen, Napoleon, when he used to have a court martial to try some person obnoxious to him would give directions to the court martial what its finding should be. And the darkest blot upon his great career, was the murder of the Duke D'Anghien. When the court martial sat upon that unfortunate man it heard no evidence, but it brought in a verdict that he was to be shot, and shot he was. And when one of the colonels of the court martial was remonstrated with, he replied: What could we do? If we had not shot the Duke D'Anghein we would have been shot ourselves. I tell the story and any application of it that has to be made can be made. But, Sir, I repeat that when we have documents that are inexplicable it need not be wondered at if our criticism of these documents sounds in what the Minister calls the language of insinuation.

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

(In the Committee.)

Telegraph Lines—North-west Territories. $8,000

Mr. DAVIN. Is the Minister of Public Works responsible for the dismissal of Mr. Gisborne from the inspectorship of telegraphs in the North-west Territories?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is in my department.

Mr. DAVIN. Why was Mr. Gisborne dismissed?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I considered that it was in the public interest to have a competent telegraph operator as superintendent of the telegraphs, and as Mr. Gisborne was not a competent operator, I thought it was better to change him.

Mr. DAVIN. There could be no idea of partisanship touching Mr. Gisborne. I never heard of him taking the least interest in politics. Was the Minister influenced at all by politics?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No.

Mr. FOSTER. Who was appointed in his place?

Mr. DAVIN. A man named Macdonald. It is the first time I heard that Mr. Gisborne was not a capable man. I have always understood he was a thoroughly scientific man, and I know that long before he was dismissed, the gentleman who was appointed in his place and who distinguished himself as a very hard worker against me in my election, said he would get the position.

Mr. HUGHES. Did he get it?

Mr. DAVIN. He did.

Mr. HUGHES. Is he a practical man?

Mr. DAVIN. He can send a message. I must say that I think the Minister got rid of a very good man in Mr. Gisborne.

Resolutions to be reported.

PRINTING COMMITTEE REPORT.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to ask permission of the House to move that the report of the Committee on Printing which sends down the testimony taken in the case of the examination before the Public Accounts Committee, with a recommendation that it be printed, shall be adopted and that the document be printed.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I wish my hon. friend would allow that to stand till Monday.

Mr. FOSTER. It is usual to print it, and it was recommended by the Printing Committee.

Motion agreed to.

QUEEN VS. SKELTON.

Mr. DAVIN. I am going to make a very humble appeal to the Prime Minister. I was promised by the Minister of Justice this day fortnight that he would give me the affidavits in the case of the Queen against Skelton. The Solicitor General always talks as if I would get them, but I think I am treated rather badly. I know my right hon. friend, and I do not think he would like to have a member of this House treated in this way, and I hope he will give me some help.

The PRIME MINISTER. It is difficult to resist such a personal appeal as the hon. gentleman has made to me. The hon. gentleman knows that this is a matter between him and the Minister of Justice. The only thing I can do is to speak to the Minister of Justice about it.

DISMISSALS IN THE NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES.

Mr. DAVIN. I would again ask my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior if he will bring down the return in regard to the dismissals in the North-west?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). That return is one which has to be prepared by all the departments. The necessary information from the Indian Department and the Department of the Interior has been sent to the Secretary of State. The Secretary of State informs me that there are one or two departments yet to be heard from to complete the return, but that he will call their attention to the matter and endeavour to have it completed at once.

The PRIME MINISTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 12.20 a.m., (Saturday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 30th May, 1898.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

SITTINGS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. SUTHERLAND moved:

That leave be granted to the Select Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines to sit during the time the House is in session.

Mr. FOSTER. With the consent of my hon. friend, I will move to amend that by adding "and the Public Accounts Committee."

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I have no objection. There is considerable business before the Railway Committee which will be disposed of to-morrow. As to the business of the other committee, I do not know anything about it; but there is no reason, I suppose, why it should not be included in the motion.

Mr. McMULLEN. I have a resolution in my hand, in the same sense, which I intended to move with regard to the Public Accounts Committee.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. McMULLEN moved:

That the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts have leave to sit during the time the House is in session.

Motion agreed to.

CUSTOMS ACT AMENDMENT.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 152) further to amend the Customs Act.

Mr. FOSTER. Explain.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. This is a Bill to amend the Customs Act in some particulars. First, a slight change is made with reference to ship's stores. Provision is made for an allowance for the leakage of liquors while in bond. It is also provided that standards for tea may be adopted, and that the system of testing tea may be changed. Another clause has reference to the removal of doubts from or making more clear the law with regard to the transport of goods in bond. These are the four points touched in the Bill.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I would like to ask the Minister of Customs whether he has had time to consider the subject of the Bill I introduced touching the coasting trade. It was discussed at

some length by myself and the Minister of Customs, and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) promised to look into the subject. I introduced it for the purpose of having it considered at a date when it was impossible for it to be dealt with in the hands of a private member.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I think the Minister of Marine and Fisheries promised the hon. gentleman that he would look into that Bill, and it was a subject of some conversation between himself and myself; but he is not here at present, though he will be back, I think, before long. That subject is not dealt with, however, in this Bill.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I quite understand that, but I thought this was a favourable opportunity to ask whether the Government had reached any conclusion with regard to introducing legislation of that character—that is, to meet the United States laws to the same extent that we have hitherto done. Their laws have gone somewhat further than ours.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I cannot say that the Government have as yet reached a conclusion with reference to the subject of the hon. gentleman's Bill.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

PROTECTION OF CUSTOMS AND FISHERIES.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 153) further to protect the customs and fisheries. He said: The object of this Bill is to make somewhat clearer the law with reference to the examination of a vessel that may be suspected of being engaged in the contraband trade, by providing that upon proper steps being taken, she may be brought to, and that the officers in charge may be indemnified for any damage that may be claimed while acting legally under the authority proposed to be conferred.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

L. P. O. NOEL.

Mr. DAVIN. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to ask the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) a question. Why is it that he dismissed Mr. L. P. O. Noel from his place as telegraph and signal service operator in the Saskatchewan? I want to call his attention to an article in the paper. I do not think it will be necessary for me to move the adjournment of the House, but, if necessary, I will move the adjournment in order to call the attention of the Minister of Public Works to this matter. Here is an article in the Saskatchewan "Herald" of May 13th:—

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

For more than a year the Liberal Central Committee, to whom Mr. Laurier and Mr. Davis assigned control of the political patronage of this portion of Saskatchewan, have been labouring to secure the dismissal of Mr. L. P. O. Noel,——

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member (Mr. Davin), of course, is not at liberty, in asking a question, to introduce any controversial matter.

Mr. FOSTER. He is reading a paragraph to explain.

Mr. DAVIN. I will conclude by moving the adjournment.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). I, perhaps, may satisfy my hon. friend (Mr. Davin) by saying that Mr. Noel has not been dismissed.

Mr. DAVIN. I am very glad to learn it.

THE MAJOR GENERAL COMMANDING.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would claim the privilege of reading a letter I received a few days ago from Major General Gascoigne:—

Ottawa, May 24th, 1898.

Dear Sir Wilfrid Laurier,—On May 5th, Sir Charles Tupper made some very severe reflections on myself in Parliament. These were reported in the press on the following day, but the reports which I saw appeared to me to be only the expressions of Sir Charles's own opinion, and though these were terribly severe, yet undoubtedly he was perfectly within his right to make them, if he saw fit, in the House. I was very grateful to see that neither you nor my own immediate Minister endorsed these opinions, but, on the contrary, protested against them, and, therefore, I saw no reason to complain, as I recognize that a public official is open to any criticism.

But a copy of "Hansard" has now reached me, and in it I see certain statements of facts reported, which, if not contradicted, will stand against me for all time, and which are not only untrue, but are exceedingly damaging to my personal character.

The statements I refer to are on page 5064. Sir Charles is reported to have said that he had it "on the authority of the most eminent counsel in Canada that if the civil action threatened against me had been brought, an adverse verdict would have been obtained, with the result that I would have been driven out of the Imperial service altogether." How far any counsel, however eminent, is justified in deciding an untried action is open to question, but what I altogether emphatically deny is that any verdict, even an adverse one, would have caused my expulsion from the Imperial service.

Sir Charles is reported further to have said that "I was able to avoid this disgrace by getting my resignation accepted."

This is altogether untrue, as you yourself are aware. My resignation was sent in after the threatened civil action was unconditionally and unreservedly withdrawn; it had no bearing or reference to that action whatever; indeed, I had spoken to the Horse Guards, in England, fully twelve months ago as to the possibility of my applying to resign, and I emphatically repeat

that my resignation had no bearing or reference whatever to that civil action. I sent in that resignation on purely personal grounds ; I am on the best of terms with my Minister ; and both he and you, sir, yourself, were kind enough to express regret at my resigning. If uncontradicted, and viewed in the light of the exceedingly severe criticisms which precede and follow these misstatements, it would appear on the official records of the House that to escape the consequences of a civil action, which would have expelled me from the Imperial service, I was allowed to resign my appointment in this country. The very vagueness of the (unmentioned) charge to be brought against me by this civil process, would only, in after years, intensify the unknown nature of the crime which it would appear I had committed, and to escape the consequences of which I had been mercifully allowed to resign.

I am ignorant as to the procedure of Parliament, but I feel confident that when you read this letter and compare my statements with those recorded in "Hansard," and see for yourself the conclusion which, in after years, could be arrived at, if these misstatements are uncontradicted, that you yourself. sir, and the whole House, including, I believe, Sir Charles Tupper himself, would desire to remove the damaging and erroneous impression.. At any rate, I leave the matter with the utmost confidence, in your hands.

Believe me,
Yours faithfully,
W. J. GASCOIGNE,
Major General,
Commanding Canadian Militia.

This letter, which is dated the 24th instant, I received on the 25th. Being enaged otherwise, I did not answer it on that day, but I told Major General Gascoigne that I would bring it to the attention of the House on Friday last. On Friday last Sir Charles Tupper was not in his place, and I refrained for that reason from calling attention to the matter. It did not occur to me, though I should have known, it having been mentioned in the public prints, that Sir Charles Tupper intended to sail on Saturday last. I have to express my regret that this matter was not brought to the attention of the House while Sir Charles Tupper, the leader of the Opposition, was in the House, but I deem it my duty to lay this letter of explanation from the General before the House and the public. I move that this letter be laid on the Table of the House.

Motion agreed to.

INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I would like to ask the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) if he has the statement I have asked for several times during the session showing the names of parties dismissed from the service of Customs in my constituency ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). I asked the officers in my department to prepare that statement for the hon. gentleman. I have no doubt they are doing it. However, I will take a note of the matter and call their attention to it again.

Mr. DAVIN. I wish to tell the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) that I have not yet received a copy of the affidavit or affidavits of the Queen vs. Skelton that I was promised.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I can only say that I shall again call the attention of the Minister of Justice to the fact that the promise made to my hon. friend (Mr. Davin) was not carried out.

Mr. FOSTER. I add my plaint to the others. I have not yet received the instructions the Postmaster General sent to his postmasters, nor a copy of the Berne Convention, anent the proposed reduction of postage between this country and Great Britain. I begin to find myself under quite a grievance on account of this not being brought down.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). On Friday night, at a late hour, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) reminded me of his desire to see these instructions, and at the earliest hour on Saturday morning I gave written instructions to have them prepared. I also made inquiries as to the Berne Convention, as I stated to the hon. gentleman before, and I directed the department to present to the library, for the hon. gentleman's special use and for the use of the public in general, a copy of the volume up to the latest moment. I have no doubt he will find it in the library at this moment, or at all events during the day.

Mr. FOSTER. I am so sorry the hon. gentleman would not give me one for myself.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. If it will at all improve the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) I shall have much pleasure in doing so.

THE RIFLE RANGES AT COTE DE LEISSE.

Mr. MONK. I would like again to call the attention of the Minister of Militia to the firing at Cote de Leisse, which is continuous and causes considerable inconvenience to the farmers, because they are absolutely unable to work a considerable portion of their land near the road from Ste. Laurent to Dorval. I had a report yesterday from the Mayor of St. Laurent. who informed me that the firing continued on Saturday and that a number of farmers had been obliged to leave their work. To be thus prevented from working their land at this time of the year is a serious injury to them. I venture to suggest to the Minister of Militia the desirability of having this firing stopped and the practice discontinued and having this complaint investigated by some disinterested person. I am perfectly

convinced that if the matter is fully investigated, the Minister will find that this grievance is well founded.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). I may say to the hon. gentleman that on Saturday last Lieut.-Col. Cotton and another officer at headquarters visited the range with a view to ascertaining the facts with regard to the complaint contained in the letter which the hon. gentleman read a few days ago in the House. I have not received their official report, but I am told that there is not a word of truth in the statement contained in that letter, that any instructions were issued to the farmers in that locality that they were not to work on their farms on certain days of the week. I am further informed that these officials consider that under the careful instructions that have now been given with reference to firing and the careful supervision, there is no danger. However, I will have their official report, and will lay it before the House to-morrow, perhaps.

MAIL COMMUNICATION BETWEEN PORT MULGRAVE AND ST. PETER'S.

Mr. GILLIES. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to inquire of the Postmaster General if he has issued the necessary instructions to have the mails carried by water from Port Mulgrave to St. Peter's instead of having them carried by the overland route. It has been the custom for years past, on the opening of navigation, to send the mails by the steamer plying upon that route, and in this way the mails are delivered the same evening they leave Halifax, instead of on the following morning.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). I will make inquiries, and if the mails are not being so carried, will give the necessary instructions. I would remind the hon. gentleman that last year was the first time they ever went by water.

Mr. GILLIES. The hon. gentleman is entirely mistaken. The hon. gentleman should not make those statements in the House, because they are not correct. The fact is that they have been going by the steamer, when navigation is open, for years past.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I may be wrong.

Mr. GILLIES. The hon. gentleman will find my statement corroborated by the records in his department.

Mr. FRASER. Last year was the first year they ever went on the boat between Canso and Mulgrave.

Mr. McDOUGALL. That is an entirely different route.

Mr. MONK.

CLAIM OF E. J. WALSH.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. This may be a convenient opportunity to call the attention of the Government to some papers that were brought down in answer to an Address of this House during the present session, relating to the claim of Mr. E. J. Walsh against the Government of the Leeward Islands. Considerable correspondence has taken place on the subject, it seems, in connection with this claim of Mr. Walsh, who was engaged on the request of the British Government, or the Colonial Office, made to this Government some years ago, for a competent engineer to do service in that colony. A dispute arose in terminating his servce there, and this correspondence covers the claim which he presented through the Secretary of State of this Government, to the notice of the Government of the Leeward Islands, and to the Right Hon. Mr. Chamberlain. So far as this correspondence goes, it shows that the claim was recognized, and the amount of the salary was recognized, up to the date when his services terminated. The claim was paid and the Right Hon. Mr. Chamberlaine gives it as his opinion that the further claim of Mr. Walsh cannot very well be pressed. On an examination of these papers, however, it will be seen that there is ample material on which the Colonial Secretary might again be urged to press this claim upon the attention of the Government of the Leeward Islands.

Mr. SPEAKER. I suppose——

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Only a moment. I think it is more convenient to mention this matter now than to go into all the papers on going into Supply, in which case I do not think I would serve the purpose of Mr. Walsh or satisfy the House. I only wish to call the attention of the Government to the fact that having admitted part of the claim to be due, that is, the amount of the salary, there is the very best ground for the rest of this claim, which is for the expenses that he was put to for about two months in waiting for the Government of the Leeward Islands to deal with his claim, in view of the position in which he was placed. I think also that the Colonial Office is under some obligation to press this claim, or at any rate to recognize it, because it was really through the Colonial Office that Mr. Walsh's services were obtained, and that being a Crown colony, the responsibility, perhaps, attaches in a measure to the Colonial Office itself, independently of the manner in which this engagement took place. I did intend to go fully into this matter, but I think the present reference will suffice to direct attention to it of the Secretary of State, who has been looking after the matter. He will see, at least, from the correspondence, that there is material on which to press a fur-

ther claim on the Right Hon. Mr. Chamberlain for the expenses that were incurred by Mr. Walsh in remaining in the colony to obtain what is admitted to be due for meritorious services.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I can only say to my hon. friend that personally I know nothing of the matter to which he has referred, and I suppose my colleagues about me are in the same ignorance. However, I will have much pleasure in drawing the attention of the Secretary of State to the remarks of my hon. friend.

Mr. WALLACE. I think that the Prime Minister might do more than that, because I may say to him that the matter has engaged the attention, to some extent, of the Government through the Secretary of State. The Secretary of State for the Colonies, the Hon. Mr. Chamberlain, declined to interfere very much, not because he had not the power—because the Leeward Islands being a Crown colony, he has a large amount of jurisdiction over the affairs of that colony—but the claim is founded upon the fact——

The PRIME MINISTER. Will my hon. friend pardon me? I see that my hon. friend has information which may be of value upon this subject. If he will allow me, I would ask him to defer his remarks, out of regard for the rules of the House, until we go into Committee of Supply. The House will be moved into Committee of Supply to-day, and that will be the proper time. This discussion is irregular.

CASE OF W. J. SPENCER, NORTH-WEST MOUNTED POLICE.

Mr. DAVIN. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to mention——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. DAVIN. I was going to mention the case merely to the Prime Minister, but I shall now move the adjournment of the House. I was going to mention to the Prime Minister the case of a man named Spencer——

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I would suggest to my hon. friend as an old parliamentarian, that it is better to follow as closely as he can the rules of the House. There is no objection to moving the adjournment of the House for the purpose of calling attention to an urgent matter. But I see this question is of such a nature that it can be properly dealt with when the House is moved into Committee of Supply, and I would suggest to my hon. friend that he wait until that is done. As he knows, that is the proper time to ventilate any grievance that a man may have. But I think both sides of the House will agree with me that the adjournment should not be moved except when there is no other possible method of bringing a subject before the House.

Mr. FOSTER. That seems to be the case just now. What my hon. friend rose for was simply to bring a matter to the attention of the Government in very few words, but lately I have noticed, as no doubt my hon. friend has, that when he rises to speak he is met with a chorus of "boo hoos" on the other side, and I do not think the hon. gentleman would be otherwise than within his right if he entered into the subject most fully.

Mr. DAVIN. I should be very glad to accept the suggestion of the right hon. First Minister, but he, as an old parliamentarian, knows very well that every member of this House has certain rights, and he knows well that the freedom of debate and the freedom of question in this House is its most sacred, its most vital right and function. If you have a majority of the House so disciplined and at the same time so apparently ashamed of the gagged condition——

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman will understand that if he moves the adjournment of the House on the question of parliamentary gagging, or whatever it may be, he will have to confine himself to that subject.

Mr. DAVIN. I had to deal with the point that was raised by the right hon. First Minister. It seems that there is a determination to gag us, but I do not think that would facilitate business, and certainly I do not think that the Opposition are in any mood to be brought into that condition. I intend to move the adjournment, and I wish to bring before the House the case of one Spencer, who served his country gallantly in 1885. He was wounded, and a board of police officers sat upon his case and made a finding. The board of medical officers, assembled by order of Commissioner Herchmer, inquired into the nature of the disability of Regimental No. 983, ex-Constable W. J. Spencer, of the North-west Mounted Police, on the 21st day of November, 1887, at Regina, N.W.T., and they found as follows:—

We declare upon our honour that we have duly and impartially inquired into the case of Reg. No. 983, Constable W. J. Spencer, of the North-west Mounted Police, who appeared before this board this day, and we find that the above-named W. J. Spencer is suffering from the effects of a gunshot wound in the right lumbar region, the ball entering just above the crest of the right ilium posteriorly, and passing out 3½ inches anterior to its point of entry, having apparently traversed the cellular tissue between the abdominal muscles and the skin.

We do further declare upon our honour that we consider the above mentioned wound was received in action, and that it was simply a flesh wound, and that the injury is not one which will disable him permanently, and that he will probably be fit for service or his usual occupation in six months, being now at "light duty," and

we recommend that he receive pension under the 4th degree until fit for full service.

A lot of correspondence took place, and the upshot was that an Order in Council was passed, giving this man 23 cents a day for only a year, under the belief—and to this I call the attention of the right hon. gentleman who is at the head of the Mounted Police service—that he then would be as well as ever. The Government evidently believed that at the end of twelve months he would be as well as ever, but as a matter of fact he is still suffering to-day in consequence of that wound received in action, and the very least that should be done for our police, when wounded in action, is to place them in the same position as soldiers in the British service, and give them a pension, however small, for life. Now, this is the last letter of Mr. Fred. White, the comptroller:

Ottawa, 20th May, 1889.

Sir,—Referring to your letter No. 319 of the 17th ult., transmitting proceedings of a board of inquiry upon ex-Reg. No. 983, Constable W. J. Spencer, I have now the honour to inform you that an Order in Council has been passed granting a pension to Spencer at the rate of 23 cents per day for one year from the 21st December, 1888.

Will you be good enough to notify Spencer, and forward to him the inclosed cheque for $30.13, which represents the amount due to him under the Order in Council above quoted, to the 30th ultimo.

The report of the board of inquiry in Spencer's case recommended that in the event of his residing in the vicinity of a police post during the period for which he was recommended for a pension, he might receive medical treatment and medicine free of charge in connection with the injury received by him during the rebellion of 1885.

There is no objection to this recommendation being carried into effect.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
(Sgd.) FRED. WHITE,
Comptroller.

The Commissioner,
N. W. M. Police,
Regina, N.W.T.

MEMO.

Cheques for the balance of the pension granted to ex-Constable Spencer were forwarded as follows:—

On the 29th October, 1889, from 1st May to 30th September, 1889, $35.19.

On 11th June, 1890, from 1st October to 20th December, 1889, $18.63

The papers are on the Table, and if the right hon. gentleman will look into them and have an inquiry made into the condition of Mr. Spencer, he will find that he is lame and no longer the same man; and I say it was discreditable to the past Government that this man should have been so treated, and will be equally discreditable to this Government if they follow the same course. What I intended was only to refer the papers to the right hon. gentleman, but as I have made some comments, I move the adjournment of the House.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I am really sorry that my hon. friend did not adhere to the intention he had in his mind when he first rose. His intention was merely to call my attention to the case of this man Spencer, but he has chosen instead to move the adjournment of the House and to bring the question more fully before us. He must understand that it is impossible for me at this moment to give him any answer at all. My hon. friend is not only an old parliamentarian but he was an old soldier.

Mr. DAVIN. I fought in the rebellion.

The PRIME MINISTER. And I would suppose that the roar of battle on the floor of this House or anywhere else would not make him withdraw from any intention he had in his mind, and that no matter what obstacles were in his way, whether in the shape of bullets or otherwise, he would adhere to his intention. I am sorry to say that I cannot any longer hold that good opinion of him, because he changed his mind simply on account of some gentle criticism from this side. I will look into the matter and reply when we come to discuss the Estimates.

Motion to adjourn negatived.

THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 122) to incorporate the Supreme Grand Lodge of the Sons of England Benefit Society.—(Mr. Bertram.)

LAKE CHAMPLAIN AND RIVER ST. LAWRENCE SHIP CANAL COMPANY.

House resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 99) to incorporate the Lake Champlain and River St. Lawrence Ship Canal Company.—(Mr. Préfontaine.)

(In the Committee.)

On section 19,

Mr. FOSTER. This Bill appears to have been all cut up since it was originally printed.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Clause 19 has been materially changed.

Mr. FOSTER. It is one of the strangest Bills ever brought down and passed by a committee of the House. I have been trying to ascertain whether the Government were running it or a private corporation, as it asks for all the powers and procedure belonging to a Government. I have been trying to follow it, but I find it has been excised and added to. It is very objectionable that Bills should be changed so much from the form in which they came before the House and be passed through it when

they re-appear before the House in committee. The Government have a printing office, and it would not take long to reprint the Bill, and it would only be fair to members of the House who are not on the committee, that this should be done. If the hon. First Minister has read the Bill, he will have found it is a most extraordinary one.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The rule I have invariably followed in matters of private legislation is to accept the report of the committee to which the Bill has been referred. If the attention of the House is subsequently called to the fact that it contains provisions which are objectionable, we are then only too glad to consider the matter; but up to the present time the practice of the present Government has been to follow the practice of the late Government, to accept the reports of the committees to which private Bills were referred, unless the attention of the Government was specially called to a particular case. If the hon. gentleman has an objection to offer, the only course to pursue is to discharge the order or to take time to consider the point.

Mr. FOSTER. The interest of the promoters would not be prejudiced if the Bill were reprinted, and I urge that that course be adopted. It is true the Bill has been considered by a large and important committee, but at the same time this House is the body that passes the Bill, and it is simply making a machine of the House to pass it through in this way when the original Bill has been so seriously amended. The Minister of Railways is not present.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Perhaps I was wrong in stating that there have been some material changes. No doubt the wording of the clauses has been changed to a considerable extent. The powers asked by the promoters have been considerably restricted by the committee. I may add that the consideration of the Bill occupied two whole sittings of the Railway Committee.

Mr. FOSTER. There must have been some disputed points to consider.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Some members took objection altogether to the granting of legislation of this kind. The point now is whether the Bill should be reprinted. As regards the charter being one to build a canal from Lake Champlain to the St. Lawrence River, there is no material change; the changes made by the committee have been confined to the wording of the clauses in order to further protect the public interest.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend (Mr. Sutherland) will see if he looks at that Bill that fully one-half of it has been changed or excised.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The main purpose of the Bill was to grant a charter to build a canal from the Lake Champlain to the River St. Lawrence and that still remains the chief object of the Bill, and so far as that is concerned there has been no material change. As I have already explained, the only changes made were changes in the wording of the clauses and restricting the powers of the company asked for.

Mr. HAGGART. I draw the attention of the Government to what is the principal objection of this Bill, and that is, that if ever it is built it will be on the proposed line of the International Canal. The commission appointed to inquire into the waterways of Canada, recommended the adoption of the St. Lawrence route or an alternate route from Oswego or Buffalo to New York, for transport from the upper lakes to the seaboard. The principal link that remains unbuilt is that from Lake St. Francis to Lake Champlain. It is true that this does not cover the particular link intended to connect from the St. Lawrence or Lake St. Francis, but the proposal in the Bill is just as important as if it were from Lake St. Francis to Lake Champlain, because if ever the Georgian Bay route be followed, then the American connection would be in line with this proposal. My attention has been drawn to this by one of the Deep Waterway Commissioners. He said to me: We expended a large sum of money for building the St. Lawrence canals; the connecting link is through our own territory, and if ever we went to make arrangements with the American Government for the purpose of obtaining a connection to New York or to the Hudson River, we can say to them: We have already contributed the money for the purpose of building these canals and the greater part of the expenditure required for building this link should come out of your pockets because it concerns you more than anybody else. Then, Sir, why should we part with that power which is at present in our hands and which we now control and give it to any private individuals. That argument I adduced before the Railway Committee and I am glad to say that the Minister of Railways took the same view of the case. I thought that the hon. Minister had brought the matter before the Government and got their policy in reference to this matter. It is a most important thing that the control of that link between the St. Lawrence River and Lake Champlain, whether it starts opposite Montreal or whether it starts from Lake St. Francis, should never be parted with by the Government and given to private individuals. If private individuals have control of this, the Government may contribute a sum of money towards it and these individuals may part with it to a foreign Government. Foreigners may get control of the stock just the same as the English Government got con-

trol of the Suez Canal, or the French Government may get control of the Panama Canal by granting certain rights to private individuals. I believe it was afterwards provided in the Bill as amended that the incorporators should be British subjects, but there is even still great danger that a portion of the stock, or the majority of it may be possessed in a foreign country. This is a Bill which the Government should inquire into carefully to see whether it is in the interests of the country or not that the right to that particular link should be parted with to a private corporation. I submit that the Government should have a policy with regard to this Bill.

Mr. CHARLTON. The question as to the policy of granting the power asked for in this Bill is one that should carefully be considered by this House. I was intending to wait until the question reached the stage when a motion would be made that the committee should rise, but as the discussion seems to be open now perhaps time will be saved by my marking what remarks I desire to make with regard to this Bill. I agree with the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) that the franchises and powers sought under this Bill are of a very important character, and before Parliament proceeds to act definitely, it should be fully aware of all the consequences that may attend its action. The control of the waterways of this Dominion of the great line of communication which does now exist, and which it is proposed to perfect between the great west and the seaboard, is a matter of the utmost importance. When the Brown draft Reciprocity Treaty was negotiated in 1874, one of the features of that treaty was an agreement between the two Governments, that a canal should be constructed from the St. Lawrence River to Lake Champlain, and an extension of that canal from Whitehall at the southern end of Lake Champlain to tide water on the Hudson River. That action taken in 1874 illustrates very clearly the importance that was attached to this matter by both Governments at that time. Since then we have had various proposals with regard to the deep waterway communication from the great lakes to the ocean. We have had commissions appointed and reports made, and the commercial bodies of both the United States and of Canada have taken a deep interest in this matter. This, Sir, is a question of national consequence. It is a question the control of which should remain in the hands of the federal legislature and the Parliament of Canada should not abdicate its powers in this matter and pass them over to a private company. We should consider very carefully what we are doing in regard to this question to-day. We have before us various propositions in this connection. We have already decided to deepen the St. Lawrence Canals to 14 feet, and we have under consideration or will have under consideration, a project for a canal or waterway from Montreal to Lake Huron by the Ottawa Valley; a project which probably in the end will become a matter of necessity. That great work must have its connection with Lake Champlain. Circumstances will arise that will render this course necessary. Now we are proposing under this Bill to pass this matter of national importance, over to a private company, and that private company will be placed in a position in which they can extort from this Government in the future very large sums of money for this franchise that to-day we are giving away. This Bill is brought in at a very late date in the session, and it cannot receive that mature consideration which its importance demands. I do not believe that under the circumstances this House is warranted in proceeding with the consideration of this measure. I feel very strongly that the Government should retain this franchise in its own hands, I feel that this matter of a canal from Lake Champlain to the River St. Lawrence is one of national consequence, and whatever may be done with regard to it should be done by the Canadian Government in connection with negotiations with the United States. The time will come when the United States will be called upon, in connection with Canada to pay whatever it may be decided shall be their proportion of the expenses of improving the deep waterway communication between tide water and the great lakes, and we are simply complicating the question, we are making its satisfactory solution more difficult, by the course we are proposing to take under this Bill. I am decidedly opposed to the granting of this charter—opposed to it on grounds of general policy, opposed to it because it has been brought in at a stage of this session when we cannot be placed in possession of the information that it is necessary to have in our hands, to arrive at a just and proper decision as to the course that we, the custodians of the people's interests, should pursue in this matter; and I wish to record here my protest against this Bill, and to move that the committee do now rise.

Mr. MONK. I am sorry the promoter of this Bill is not here. The Bill was very carefully examined in the Committee on Railways and Canals, and I think it would be a great pity if it did not pass. The main objection to the measure, according to the ex-Minister of Railways and the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, is that it keeps out of the hands of the Government a work of national importance. That was considered by the Committee on Railways and Canals. That objection, it seems to me, loses a great deal of force when we consider that there is a clause in the Bill which permits the Government at any time to take possession of this work.

Mr. CHARLTON. The Government may just as well retain possession now.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I wish to call attention to the last clause which was passed by the committee, providing that this Act should only come into effect on the proclamation of the Governor in Council.

Mr. MONK. I thank my hon. friend for reminding me of that provision; but there is also a provision in the Bill which makes the measure entirely different, I presume, from the legislation under which the Suez Canal was constructed. There was no provision in that legislation for any such exercise of power as is granted to the Government in this case. The Government are not ready at the present moment, I assume, to undertake this work, nor will they be ready for some time to come. This Bill is one of great importance to us in the province of Quebec, especially to the city of Montreal, where there is a very large commercial interest involved. To give an instance, there is no doubt that if this canal were constructed we should get our coal from the United States at a much cheaper rate than we are now doing. It seems to me that the objection that the confiding of the building of this canal to private enterprise is depriving the Government of its power to take possession of this work whenever it may seem fit to do so, is a futile objection, in presence of this clause of the Bill, which allows the Government to take possession of the work at any time on paying to the constructors of the canal what they have expended upon its construction.

The PRIME MINISTER. The points which have been raised in this discussion are certainly of very great importance. The Committee on Railways and Canals have dealt with the question; therefore, the question is not new; and they have come to certain conclusions. Recognizing the danger which lies in this Bill, they have inserted certain clauses with the view of protecting the public interests. The Government will have to consider whether or not the safeguards provided by these clauses are sufficient to protect the public interests; and with this view, I will ask, in amendment to the amendment of my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), that the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. FOSTER. With the understanding that the Bill be reprinted.

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. There is a great deal of force in the objection urged by the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) that it is utterly impossible to understand this Bill without its being reprinted. It was considered at two sessions of the committee, and there was a great deal of argument over it. I supported the Bill on the distinct understanding that a clause should be inserted providing that it should not go into force except by proclamation of the Governor in Council. While that was done, the many amendments which were made in the Bill make it utterly impossible for any one going through the Bill to understand its nature without its being reprinted.

Committee rose and reported progress.

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 151) to incorporate the Pacific and Yukon Railway, Navigation, Trading and Mining Company.—(Mr. Rosamond.)

BOUNTIES ON IRON AND STEEL.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson) moved that the House, at its next sitting, resolve itself into committee to consider the following resolution:

That it is expedient to amend the Act to provide for bounties on iron and steel made in Canada, and to provide as follows:—"The provisions of chapter six of the Statutes of 1897, intituled 'An Act to provide for Bounties on Iron and Steel made in Canada,' shall be held to have come into force on the twenty-third day of April, in the year one thousand eight hundred and ninety-seven."

Motion agreed to.

ABOLITION OF CIVIL SERVICE SUPERANNUATION.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock) moved second reading of Bill (No. 76) to provide for the abolition of the Civil Service Superannuation Act, and for the retirement of members of the civil service.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to ask the hon. Postmaster General to give us an idea of the scope of the Bill, as briefly as possible, of course. I have noticed reports in the papers of certain interviews had with members of the civil service with reference to this measure, and I think I saw an intimation in one of the papers, as a result of those interviews, that changes were expected to be made in an important particular. As far as I am concerned, I think the Bill itself is essentially bad, but even a bad Bill may be made a little better by taking the most objectionable features from it.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is a reprint of the Bill that was submitted last session, but the Government propose to suggest some amendment. Even if the Bill be regarded by some as essentially bad, it is one the country has called for, and the Government, therefore, is simply in this, as in other respects, living up to its engagements by presenting this Bill to the consideration of Parliament. It provides for two things. It provides, in the first place, for the cessation of the Superannuation Act as regards certain classes and the adoption

in lieu thereof of another measure for the retirement of civil servants. Some members may think that no retiring fund is necessary, or no provision whatever for the relief of civil servants who have ceased to be able to discharge their duties efficiently, but our experience has shown that it is necessary for Governments to have some fund whereby, either by way of gratuity or pension or otherwise, the service may be relieved of persons who have survived their usefulness, without being compelled to throw them adrift upon an unkind world with no means of support. Experience shows that men of fixed salaries, with rare exceptions, live up to their salaries. A special sort of improvidence seems to attend them through life, and if the Government does not in some way provide for them, they will have nothing, as they will not provide for themselves. Therefore, in order that the public service may not be hampered by useless employees, and that the embarrassment of discharging such persons may not be postponed by unnecessary though natural regard for the circumstances of worn-out officers, it is necessary that some provision of this kind be made. The old Act made no provision whatever for those who died in harness, and in their case their whole contributions were lost to them or their families. The present Bill introduces an entirely different principle, and it will be a mistake to suppose that the change is suggested by any feeling of hostility to the civil service. On the contrary, it is offered to the service as a just measure, removing the element of chance from their accumulations, and providing that the amounts deducted from their salaries shall be available on their retirement or, in case of death, to their families, without any contingency of loss by reason of their death in harness. This measure is introduced in no other spirit than that of regard for the interests of the staff. It is customary, on many occasions, when appeals are made to the electorate, for persons to speak in other than complimentary terms of the civil service of Canada, but so far as my experience goes, in my department at least, I can say without qualification, or with a very slight qualification, that a more efficient and worthy staff no member of a Government could desire. I believe that the same may be said, to a very large extent, of the whole staff of Canada, and it will be, therefore, most unfair if a measure such as this were to be introduced with any desire of injuring or causing detriment to the service. It may be that its provisions may not commend themsleves to everybody. There may be a few hardships encountered; but still, I venture the opinion that when the measure has been worked for a reasonable term of years, it will be found satisfactory, not only to the staff and their families, but to the taxpayers as a whole, who certainly have to be considered in a measure of this kind. The time has passed for discussing the merits or demerits of the present Superannuation Act. The present Government is committed to the abolition of that Act. True, we did not undertake to abolish it as regards every one in the service, but to abolish it, at all events, as regards new appointees, and leave the question of the treatment of those already in office for future decision. The Bill, in the first place, proposes to transfer certain classes now in office from the operation of the present Superannuation Act to the operation of the Bill now before the House, and it proposes that new appointees or men who have not yet contributed anything to the service shall come in under the entirely new scheme of contributing to the fund out of their own salaries and having their contributions funded and capitalized at the rate of 5 per cent per annum, which fund will be available for the civil servant whenever he retires, or be payable to his family or representatives in case of death. My hon. friend asks me in what respect I now propose to amend the Bill. Representations were made from time to time that it might work harshly. For that reason, when it was brought up last session the Government consented to postpone the second reading, so that every possible case of hardship might be brought to its notice before the following session, feeling confident that all possible cases of hardship would be brought to their attention within that time. I may say, as regards such cases, that they are limited to those of the staff who have been contributing to the civil service superannuation fund for a shorter period than ten years. Various arguments have been advanced and carefully considered. The Bill, as it now stands in the hands of hon. members, provides that all those now in the service, but who have been contributing for less than ten years to the superannuation fund, shall come under the provisions of this Bill, and cease to fall under the provisions of the present Act. It was pointed out that such a provision would work hardship in various ways, and I am going to illustrate one case, which will explain the amendment I now propose. It happened that one officer in particular has been appointed to an office in the Militia Department under the Government of the old province of Canada. He was transferred to the civil service of Canada under the British North America Act, acquiring the same status as he held under the former Government; but by some series of accidents, legislation after legislation has affected him, so that although over thirty years have elapsed since he was appointed, he does not happen yet to have contributed to ten annual instalments required under the present Act in order to entitle him to an annuity. Other instances might perhaps be cited, and therefore, in order to prevent

any hardship. I propose to submit an amendment to subsection "b" of section 2, in the following words :—

To strike out the words "who has been subject to such deductions for a period of less than ten years" and substitute therefor words which will make the clause read as follows :—"Every person now in the civil service, but who has not been in the civil service for ten years."

Mr. FOSTER. What is the meaning of that ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It means that this Bill shall not apply to any person who has been in the service for more than ten years. If he has been making less than ten years' deductions, but has been in the service for a longer period than ten years, this Bill will not apply, but he will continue under the provisions of the Superannuation Act. We need not discuss the phraseology at this moment—that is the object to be attained.

Mr. McNEILL. Suppose a man has been contributing for nine years, would this not apply to him ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. If he has been in the service only nine years this Bill will apply to him ; but if he has been in the service for a longer period, it is not proposed that this Bill shall affect him. Another amendment it is proposed to offer is this : It is claimed that under the present Superannuation Act, officers who have served less than ten years and contributed less than ten years, if they have not acquired vested rights at least, they have formed very great expectations that their positions would mature into vested rights at the expiration of the ten years of the service ; and that, in the meantime, they have certain rights in the event of the Government choosing to retire them. Under the present Act, if the Government retires a civil servant who has served less than ten years, by reason of the abolition of his office or of infirmity of body or mind, the Government is permitted to pay to him, on retirement, a gratuity not exceeding one month's pay for each year of his service. But hon. gentlemen will see that this is a condition entirely dependent upon the will of the Government, there being no option in a civil servant to acquire and demand the gratuity under the clause referred to. It is proposed not to make it compulsory upon any officer who shall have served less than ten years and contributed less than ten years to come in under this Act. But in order to give him the benefit of what that class conceive to be the spirit of the Act, the option will be given to any in the service who have not paid ten years but have paid something, to withdraw from the service if they desire and be entitled, as a matter of right, to what is at present a gratuity, viz. : a month's pay for each year of service. These are the only changes in the Bill that are to be offered, except, perhaps, some of a formal character.

Now, I would submit to the House for a moment the working of the new method. My hon. friend from York (Mr. Foster) says the Bill is essentially bad, but that a bad Bill may be improved. I am glad to get that much encouragement. This scheme, now being inaugurated, providing for a savings account out of the salary of the officer, is, in the first place, I think, eminently just to the people themselves who contribute the money. After this becomes law, no person hereafter appointed will become a charge upon the country, but will simply earn and be paid his earnings, with the exception of a certain amount reserved and funded for his own benefit. The public, therefore, will not be liable, as they have been in the past, to be burdened by the abuse of the system that has been so long in force. Under his proposed measure, the amount funded and carried to the credit of the officer is his from the moment it is withdrawn from his salary and put to his credit with the Government. It carries good interest. Some complain that we give too high a rate of interest.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The reservation is compulsory ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes. That five per cent of his salary will be carried to the officer's credit and will bear five per cent per annum, compounded half-yearly. This money is his or his family's or his representatives and cannot be lost to him by those accidents that forfeit the benefits of the present Act to so many of the service. The working out of that scheme, will illustrate to some extent what I say, and will, perhaps, to some extent, commend it to the favour of my hon. friend from York. I have here a list showing the number of civil servants who have left the Post Office Department, inside and outside, in the 20 years preceding the 30th June, 1896. These figures cover the period when no such legislation as this was in contemplation and might be said to represent the workings of the present system. I have not the returns for other departments, but the Post Office Department, I think, represents about one-third of the service, and, if so, these figures will probably be accepted as fairly representing the working of the Act throughout the whole service. Well, Mr. Speaker, during the whole 20 years mentioned there have left the Post Office Department 842 officers. I mean that they have left the service from all possible causes, resignation, death, dismissal or any other possible cause.

Mr. FOSTER. Transfers ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No, this does not include transfers. There are 842 who left the service of Canada in the 20 years I have mentioned, speaking of the

inside and outside service of the Post Office Department. These 842 were entitled in greater or less degree to benefits under the Superannuation Act whilst they were alive or in office. Some of them being under the ten years provision, only took gratuities; those who had been in the service longer than ten years, were entitled to pensions.

Mr. FOSTER. Not those who died?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Of course not, a pension for the life of a dead man would not be a very valuable asset. Now I propose to point out wherein this present Act must have disappointed a large number of officers, or families of officers, who had contributd towards this fund. No matter whether the provision was adequate or inadequate, they contributed, and that contribution awakened expectations that they might be fortunate in sharing the benefits of the Act. Of the whole number of 842 that in one way or another severed their connection with the service, only 197 derived any benefits whatever under the Act. Of those 197, 162 were superannuated, and 35 retired. The rest, 481, retired, having served less than ten years. When I use the word "retired," I mean severed their connection from any possible cause. Of those who had served longer than ten years, and who, if they had survived, would have been entitled to the pension under ordinary circumstances, 164 failed to have any superannuation allowance. So that means, so far as these 842 civil servants are concerned, that 23 per cent alone got any benefit under the Act, and 77 per cent lost all benefit, either to themselves or to their families.

Mr. CLARKE. How much did those 77 per cent contribute?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I cannot give the figures of their contributions. I suppose some of those 164 had contributed for more than ten years, so the hon. gentleman will see they had contributed substantially, and had passed the line which entitled them to superannuation under certain conditions, and yet they lost all benefits under the Act. Now it is believed that such a statute, that disappoints the fair expectations of three-fourths of the contributaries, is not fair to them, and ought not to be allowed to continue. The Bill which it is proposed to substitute for that, provides for the establishment of a fund, and the working of this fund I now ask leave to illustrate. It will work in various ways. You can take an officer who has entered the service at $400 a year, and whose salary has gone up by annual increments of $50, until we will say, the 30th June, 1896, when the statutory increases ceased. I am taking now the worst case of hardship which can arise under the Act, men who, should this Act become law in a few days, have been in the service nine and a half years. We will say they entered at $400 a year, and have contributed under the provisions of the Act, first of all, one and a quarter per cent, and subsequently, two per cent, until their nine and a half years are completed, until their salary had become $800. Then we will suppose they pass out from that class and come in under the provisions of this Bill, and from this time forward they will be contributing their five per cent, and the Government will be contributing five per cent interest half-yearly. I give this illustration, which will perhaps cover a good many cases, and enable the House to decide, with the facts before them, how far this fairly takes the place of a pension. This schedule which I have in my hand, hon. gentlemen will observe, deals now with those actually in the service, the cases that may be prejudicially affected by the legislation, cases of officers who entered at $400. Suppose that they remain in the service 35 years, suppose we select as an age limit for men leaving the service, 65 years; how long, on the average, will those officers have served the public? That will depend, of course, upon when they entered. I am told, though this is not based upon actual examination, that clerks are now entering the service at a somewhat earlier age, as a rule, than formerly. Suppose they enter at an average of 30 years, then they will have served 35 years when they attain their 65th year. If, therefore, there are those in our service at the present time who are aged 30 when they entered the service——

Mr. FOSTER. I presume my hon. friend knows that it is now a provision of the Act that civil servants are not appointed if they are above 40.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Forty-five.

Mr. FOSTER. Forty-five—then I think that would make 30 an altogether too high an average.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It may. If so that will help my argument, but I shall give the House the benefit of both figures. My remarks have to do with those who are now in the service, who have spent from one to nine and a half years in the service. We will say that they all entered the service at an average of 30 years; the working of this Bill will put to their credit, when they attain their 65th year, $2,507.92; that is, beginning at $400 and going up by annual increments to $800. An officer of that class will have to his credit, should he be alive then, or to the credit of his family should he be dead, the sum of $2,507.92. Now if, in lieu of drawing that money in cash, which he or his representatives may draw, suppose that in lieu of taking a bulk sum, it suited his convelnence better to purchase an annuity with it, the question is: What investment could he make in the way of an annuity? On data furnished to me, the last rates issued by the New

York Life up to the 1st of January, 1897, and according to those rates calculated at a four per cent basis, the sum of $2,507.92 would purchase for a life at the age of 65 years—the expectation of life then is about 11 years—would purchase for that life an annuity of $291.06, and every officer that retires would get the $291.06 annuity, or have a fund wherewith to buy that annuity, based on the present rates of annuities, or he could have the money itself. If, instead of that, the present law were to continue in force, on a salary of $800 a year, the law would give him 35-50ths of his then salary, $800; while the present Act would give him $560 of a pension, or the fund he will draw would buy him a pension of only $291.06. In this case every person receives his money, there is no lottery about it. The Government offers that alternative as a better system than the one of chance, which is the fundamental principle of the present one. Not only so, but the present scheme provides for a man's family as well as provides for himself, should he survive.

Mr. DAVIN. How much, under the system the hon. gentleman wants to introduce, would a public servant receive at 65, who commenced at $400 and went up to $800?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Suppose he served twenty-five years, he would have to his credit $2,570.92.

Mr. DAVIN. What I ask is, what income would he have when he left the service, or would he only have a lump sum?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. He can draw the principal. If he buys an income at 4 per cent, the rate at which annuities were sold, according to the scale adopted by the New York Life Company in January last, it would amount to $291.06. Thirty years is a rather high average as the time when men enter the service, and I propose to give the results on entering at 25 years. In that case the officer would serve forty years before he attained 65 years of age. On reaching 65 years of age he would have to his credit $3,439.99, which would buy him an annuity of $387.80, or $172.72 less than $560.52, which would be his allowance under the present Act. But under the present scheme an officer would get $387.87 per annum, whereas under the present Act only about one-fourth of them or less get any benefit.

Mr. CLARKE. What percentage of, say, one thousand men who enter the service would be in the service at the end of thirty-five years?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Under the proposed measure it is not necessary to remain thirty-five years to get any benefit. Suppose a man remained in the service only six months, there would be so much standing to his credit. Every year there would be his savings and 5 per cent added, and at any time he could, as a matter of right, demand the principal with the accretions. The deduction from salary is 5 per cent per annum. On each $100 the amount would be $2.50 at the end of each half year, and there would be added interest at the rate of 5 per cent per annum.

Mr. FOSTER. Five per cent interest is the Government contribution, not, however, 5 per cent of the salary added.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. My hon. friend asked me sometime ago why I selected an officer receiving $800 yearly. I did so because I was endeavouring to take a class now in the service which would be most affected by the proposed scheme. Most of the officers entered at $400, until the law was changed. The cases of the greatest hardship would occur to men who are just attaining their tenth year. If a man entered the service on the 30th June, 1896, at a salary of $400, he would in ten years almost have reached $800.

Mr. FOSTER. Suppose a man goes in at 25 years and dies at 50, or is superannuated, what would stand to his credit?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. At the end of his twenty-fifth year there would be $1,210.96 standing to his credit.

Mr. FOSTER. What amount of annuity could he obtain?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have not got the annuity table applicable.

Mr. FOSTER. It would be small enough.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Of course it would be small.

Mr. FOSTER. About $120. What would he obtain now as a superannuation allowance?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. $400.

Mr. FOSTER. So the disparity is very marked.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes; but we cannot defend the scheme of the Superannuation Act.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman has spoken of commencing at $400 and increasing to $800 by annual increments. I was not aware that annual increments were admitted.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am not dealing with future appointees at present.

Mr. FOSTER. The Postmaster General is not giving the House the working out of his system. Suppose a man enters at a salary of $400 and remains twenty years and has still $400 a year?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I will give my hon. friend a table that will deal with that. I was first dealing with those in the service, because the Government has felt it their duty to consider that question.

Mr. McNEILL. Are there any who enter the service at a higher salary than $400 ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The same rate will apply to them.

Mr. McNEILL. I am speaking of those who are deprived of it because they have not been ten years in the service. The hon. gentleman is referring to the fact that they entered at $400 and rose by annual increment up to a certain sum at the end of ten years. But they may enter at a very much larger sum than $400 and the hon. gentleman would see that that rule would be much more oppressive on those.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. If a man entered at $800 the same table would apply.

Mr. McNEILL. The difficulty to my mind was that there are members of the service who have entered at a higher rate than $400, and if they have been in the service for nine years and are made subject to this provision it will affect them much more injuriously than it would those who entered at a lower rate.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That, of course, is a matter of argument, but the table I have given will apply to any salary.

Mr. McNEILL. Would the Postmaster General be willing to allow to those who have not been in the service the full ten years, to take the option either of remaining under the old system or coming under the new system ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am afraid I could hardly go that far. The Bill does give an option of the kind mentioned.

Mr. McNEILL. Not to those who have been less than ten years in the service.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It gives them the opportunity of the benefit of the gratuity if they desire to sever their connection with the service.

Mr. McNEILL. If the hon. Postmaster General would go as far as I have mentioned, I think it would remove difficulties from the minds of a great many.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That is a question which may fairly be argued, and I have no doubt these arguments will be presented, and will receive, I am sure, every consideration, but I am not able to say anything further on that subject. I will now proceed to deal with the case of the new appointees, and I shall give a table of accumulations on a salary, say of $100. The table that I shall now quote from shows the state of a fund derived from a salary of $100, this fund being made up of half-yearly contributions, by deductions from the salary at the rate of 5 per cent per annum with interest of 5 per cent per annum compounded half-yearly. Now, $5 a year deducted from a salary of $100 and treated in the way I have mentioned, will at the expiry of 35 years amount to $474.52. Suppose the officer has $1,000 a year instead of $100. there will be to his credit when he is 65 years of age $4,745.20, and if instead of accepting that bulk sum he prefers to invest it in an annuity on the terms I have mentioned, he will be able to purchase an annuity for himself of $534.32. The officer drawing $1,000 a year under the present law would be entitled to retirement after 35 years on a pension of $700 a year, so that the difference between the working of this Bill if it becomes law, and the present Act, is. that under the present Act he would get $700 a year if he lives and his family nothing if he dies ; under this Act he would get a bulk sum of $4,745.20, which would buy him an annuity of $534.32.

Mr. FOSTER. That is coming in at the age of thirty years ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes. That is about $163 less than the pension under the present Act. Supposing the officer comes in at the age of 25 and serves forty years, when he attains the age of 65 there will be to this credit $6,361. and if he chooses to buy an annuity that amount will purchase him an annuity of $716.32 which is a shade over what the law gives him to-day. Every officer in that class will under that scheme get a capital sum which will be his own or that of his family, or an annuity if he chooses to buy one on these terms which will be greater than the pension under the present Act. I mention these features of the working of the Bill so that hon. members will see that the provision, taking the average of life, is a fairly good one for the benefit of the members of the service. There is little more for me to add except to say that the Bill contains a clause making it optional for those who have served more than ten years to come under the new Bill, provided they signify that choice within three months. The amendment which it is proposed to offer to subsection "b" is as follows :—

> Every person now in the civil service who has been subject to such deductions for a lesser period than ten years may, at his option (to be declared in writing, signed by him or his duly authorized agent, and deposited in the office of the Secretary of State within three months from the passage of this Act) retire from said service, and thereupon shall be entitled to be paid a gratuity amounting to one month's pay for each year of his service.

Mr. CLARKE. What advantage would it be to those who have been over them years in the service to take advantage of this option ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That will be for them to determine. I know of one gentleman who asked me if he could come in under it. He is a relative of a former colleague of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. FOSTER. May be, he is a little afraid of his position.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is not that.

Mr. FOSTER. I wish my hon. friend would anticipate an objection, and give us his justification; that is, why those who have been so unfortunate as to have been less than ten years in the service should be discriminated against—why, for instance, the arbitrary limit of ten years' service should be taken as the division between the old and the new.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think my hon. friend has scarcely used an apt expression when he asks why those who have served less than ten years should be discriminated against. We are not discriminating. We are leaving each class in the enjoyment of their rights. Those who have served over ten years have certain rights, and those who have served and contributed for less than ten years have different rights. Those who have contributed for less than ten years have not derived a vested interest, they have not a legal right to a pension. The only thing that can be argued is that if the Government desire to retire them from the service within the ten years for certain named reasons, they may be so retired, and in that event, they shall receive a gratuity.

Mr. FOSTER. There is more than that, is there not?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Not according to the opinion of the late Minister of Justice.

Mr. FOSTER. Because they are travelling continually to the time when the right arises.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. They are travelling towards it, but they have not crossed the line. Until they cross the line, they have acquired no legal right, and therefore I think we can hardly use the term discriminate. We are leaving each class in the full enjoyment of their rights; and more than that, as regards the class to whom my hon. friend refers, we are giving them benefits and options which they at present do not enjoy. Further, we are making the Bill retroactive, so far as they are concerned, and giving them the benefit of this 5 per cent, ante-dating it, and going back to the nine years and a half or less that they have been in the service. So that the Bill gives them benefits in that respect, instead of discriminating against them.

Mr. FOSTER. Suppose a clerk, after having been ten or fifteen or twenty years in the service, is guilty of gross misconduct, and is dismissed, he has the absolute right to all the benefit of his fund and the Government's accretion to it of 5 per cent interest.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is not proposed to deprive him of his legal rights, whatever his misconduct may be. It must be dealt with in some other way, if there is another way of dealing with it.

Mr. FOSTER. There would not be, unless it were a criminal proceeding.

Mr. SPROULE. It seems to me that this Bill will have two results. The Postmaster General is dealing more generously with those civil servants from whose salaries a certain amount is deducted every year and invested for them, than he is with the poor labouring man who puts his money in the post office savings bank, for he is allowing 5 per cent in the one case and only 2½ per cent in the other case.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Which way does the hon. gentleman wish us to move?

Mr. SPROULE. I think the hon. gentleman ought at least to give the labouring man as much consideration as the man in the civil service who receives a larger salary and has much shorter hours to work. The other feature of this Bill that attracts my attention is that it destroys the stability of the service. There will be no stimulus to the ambition of men who come into the service who may be superannuated at any time at the whim of a Minister.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There is nothing in the Bill changing the status.

Mr. SPROULE. There is a good deal in the Bill that changes. The Government can say to a man, "At any time you leave the service we will give you what money has been retained out of your salary, with 5 per cent interest upon it, and when we have given you that, no more and no less, we have done you no injustice."

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think that is not the correct view to take of the matter. Whatever the position is to-day between the Government and the civil service continues just the same—I mean as respects the tenure of office.

Mr. SPROULE. Will it not be possible at any time, without any such cause as would be considered a justifiable cause to-day, to drop a man from the service without it being regarded as an injustice to him, so long as the Government paid him back the money he has contributed to the fund, with interest at 5 per cent?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There are perhaps a few members of the civil service to-day whom it would be both to their own interest and to the public interest to retire; yet it may not be fair to the public to retire them, because it would mean paying them a large annuity; and if this measure does enable the Government to weed out men who have survived their usefulness, then it is in the public interest that it should be passed.

Mr. SPROULE. I admit that; but the fraction of such men that would be weeded out would be comparatively small if it were done in the interest of the country and not at the whim of the Government for the time being. But the same thing applies equally to a large number of men who have not survived their usefulness, and whose stability in the service and ambition to do their best in it are destroyed. There is one feature of the Bill that I do not quite understand. Do I understand that the Government keep back 5 per cent of the salary from year to year, and allow 5 per cent interest on that, or do they add 5 per cent of the amount of the salary in addition?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No, it is interest only.

Mr. SPROULE. A man only gets interest on the amount retained out of his salary?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes, and on the interest already to his credit.

Mr. SPROULE. That is, compound interest? That is as I understood it.

Mr. McNEILL. I would urge the Postmaster General to regard this measure from the point of view from which it must be regarded by those who have been in the service less than ten years. It seems to me that we are introducing a very bad and a very dangerous precedent when we make an Act of this kind retroactive. I do not think we have any right to alter the status of those who entered the service under a different condition of things and a perfectly different understanding. I have already expressed the view more than once in this House, but I cannot help repeating that it does seem to me that if there be one thing more than another which the Government of Canada, whatever Government it may be, ought to determine, it is this, that they will maintain good faith with those who entered their service, trusting to their good faith; and I do not think we have any right to deal as we are dealing with these men who have been less than ten years in the service. If my hon. friend would give such persons the option of coming in under this new Act or remaining in the position in which they are, it seems to me he would be doing what is just and right. Anything less than that seems to me unjust and unworthy of this country. I do not suppose that after all it would make a very great difference in the cost, but the question of cost ought not to have weight in a matter of his kind. If it be true that we induced these people to come into our service on a certain understanding, we have no right whatever to violate that understanding, no matter what the cost may be of adhering to it. That is my view, and I think it would be very desirable that my hon. friend should allow these civil servants the same option that he allows those who have been in the service ten years.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am very glad indeed that the Government have undertaken to abolish the superannuation system which has existed in this country for some 26 or 27 years. I was rather surprised at some questions that were put from the other side of the House, particularly one by the ex-Finance Minister (Mr. Foster), and also by my hon. friend who has just taken his seat (Mr. McNeill). They appear to think that those who have not served a period of ten years are discriminated against by this Bill in a manner in which they are not discriminated against by the present law. The present law does not provide at all for the superannuation of any man until he has been more than ten years in the service. If he is retired before he has served ten years, he is only entitled to a gratuity. The law was grossly abused in past years, because there are on the list no less than 53 who were superannuated in violation of the law. In some cases where they had only served three to four years, hon. gentlemen opposite added years to their time so as to bring them under the application of the Act.

Mr. FOSTER. Were hon. gentlemen on this side the only sinners in that respect?

Mr. McMULLEN. If the hon. gentleman will cite a case in which the Mackenzie Government violated the law, I shall be very willing to admit it. I have here a list of forty names of persons who were superannuated in violation of the Act by hon. gentlemen opposite—men who had not served ten years, but to whose time of service years were added in order to bring them under the application of the Act. There are men on the superannuation list to-day who did not serve over three years and are still drawing pensions. The fact is that from the very inception of the Act down to the time hon. gentlemen opposite left office, it was grossly abused for party ends. It drew upon the resources of this country to an enormous extent. Had it been continued in force as at first outlined, when introduced in 1871 by Sir Francis Hincks, the deduction from the salaries of civil servants would have been four per cent, when the salaries were $600 and over, and 2½ per cent when less than that figure. During the first three years there was a very considerable sum to the credit of the fund; but just previous to the election of 1874, the then Finance Minister, Sir Leonard Tilley, brought in an amendment. I presume that the service had complained of the heavy deductions of four and two and a half per cent, and no doubt he and his colleagues thought it would be very popular in the service to lower the deductions. I believe there were representations made that the deductions were excessive, and Sir Leonard Tilley introduced a Bill cutting them down one-half. The result was that so many were added to the

list that the very first year after the passing of this Bill, it showed a considerable loss. The amount paid in the first year after these deductions took place was $34,620.18, and the amount paid out $64,642.94. In this way, the Act at once became a drain upon the country's resources. Then every year parties were removed from the civil service in order to make room for others, to such an extent, that that practice became one of the greatest abuses to which the Act was subjected. Year after year very large additions were made to the list of superannuated officers, so that many of these men are on the list to-day and drawing pensions who never should have been put on there at all. If the Government had, in the inception of the scheme, adopted the practice followed by England of having the superannuation system managed by a committee of the civil service, the country would never have been called on to suffer the enormous loss it has had to pay. The then Government, however, thought it better to keep the application of the Act under their own control, with the result that large additions were made to the superannuation list, and we have had to face an enormous loss. The entire sum contributed by all the civil servants—whether those that participated in the advantages of the fund or those who were dismissed from the service, or those who died in the service—up to the present, including this year, amounts to $1,422,977.95, and the gross sum paid out altogether amounts to $4,655,133.39, showing a net loss in twenty-six years of $3,232,055. It is time that an Act which has drawn to such an extent upon the resources of the people should be repealed. It is not necessary that I should detain the House at a great length in exposing the abuses of the Act. Hon. gentlemen opposite would hardly like to listen to such a statement. But unquestionably the Act was very badly abused. Years were added to men's time as hush money to cause them to be satisfied to accept superannuation. Take for instance, the case of the postmaster of Montreal. He had served sixteen and a half years and had drawn a salary of $4,000 a year during that time. Another man was very anxious to get the office, and, in order to induce Mr. Lamothe to retire, the Government added eight and one-half years to his time of service. This they did under a clause providing that if, when a man entered the civil service he was possessed of technical knowledge, the Government might add years not exceeding ten to the term of service on his retirement. What technical information had Mr. Lamothe as to the duties of postmaster before he entered upon that office? None at all. But they made his term of service for superannuation twenty-five years instead of sixteen and a half years, thus entitling him to draw twenty-five-fiftieths of his salary of $4,000, or $2,000; and Mr. Dansereau was appointed, and he now draws $4,000 a year. I could give many other cases of men who have been thus retired with years added to their term of service, the result being an enormous amount of public money squandered. The average amount contributed annually by the civil servants to the superannuation fund was $14.10, not sufficient to buy a life policy for more than $500. As I have often said before, the civil service are a well paid class and they should be an intelligent class, and I believe they are. I am ready to accept the statement of the Postmaster General—but I must say that it is not at all complimentary to them—that it is absolutely necessary on the part of this Dominion that we should in this way provide a retiring fund by taking 5 per cent from the salaries of civil servants and allowing it to accumulate until the beneficiaries are sixty or sixty-five years of age. One would suppose that the civil servants were called upon to live almost up to their salaries. I do not think that is the case. They have no right to put on style in excess of other people throughout the country. Take, for instance, the bankers, take the commercial men, in all lines, take the teachers—these men do not get as high salaries as do the civil servants; and yet many of them manage to have a comfortable sum to their credit before it is necessary for them to retire. I contend that the civil servants, who are so well paid, should be required to take care of their funds in their own interest.

The one redeeming feature of this Bill is that it completely cuts off a drain upon the resources of the Dominion. After the passing of this Act, the country will not be asked to contribute a dollar, except in the way of a high rate of interest. My hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) objects to this rate of 5 per cent in view of the fact that depositors in the post office savings bank are paid only two and one-half per cent. I believe there is some force in that observation. I would like to see the rate of interest under this Bill cut down, as I do not see why we should give so high a rate. When we get into committee, we can discuss that point. I would like to see a provision in the Bill that the money is to be held by the Government as a guarantee of good faith and efficient service on the part of these officers. Unless they faithfully and honestly discharge the duties devolving upon them, they should not have the right to demand this money. In many cases security is taken for good conduct; but in the majority of cases security is not taken. If a civil servant acts dishonestly, we should have the right to say that he shall not be entitled to draw this money that is deducted from his salary.

Now, there is another provision to which I wish to draw the attention of the House, and that is the amount of money we have lost by this system of adding years to the time of service. There are only twenty

names upon the present retired list of men who were retired by the Governments previous to the time that hon. gentlemen opposite last came into power. It is true that the present Government have superannuated some since they obtained office. I do not find fault with that, for they found the Superannuation Act upon the Statute-book, and they must administer it as long as it is the law of the country. But I would ask my hon. friend the ex-Finance Minister (Mr. Foster) to point out, if he can, a single case in which a man has been retired and another appointed in his place, the retired man having years added to his term of service. There is, I believe, one such case, the Chairman of the Land Board at Winnipeg. I understand that there was some condition made by hon. gentlemen opposite when this gentleman's salary was reduced from $5,000 to $4,000 that, in the case of his retirement, some years would be added to his term of service. Under the Superannuation Act, a civil servant had a right, on being retired, to receive a certain amount. He could claim that, and the Exchequer Court would give it to him. The country did not wish to violate the terms of a contract upon which it had entered. A civil servant, after serving ten years, was entitled to an allowance. But, though the country was obliged to give them a retiring allowance, it was not obliged to add years to their term of service in order to increase the allowance. By this system of adding years to their terms of service, hon. gentlemen opposite actually lost to the country $97,428.

Within a few dollars of $100,000 has been paid out virtually as hush money in order to induce men quietly to accept their retiring allowance, and to allow others to take their places. Now in the face of all these abuses, in face of the manner in which this Act has been administered, I am rejoiced to know that the Government have brought in the Bill that is now before the House, and that it will put an end to a system that has so far drawn from the resources of the people of this country about $3,250,000, for which they have had no return. This is one of the promises the Government made to the people of this country, and I am glad to find they are implementing that promise. The hon. the Postmaster General says that a retiring fund is necessary. As I said before, I believe if we had an intelligent class of civil servants, and I hope we have, it would be better if those servants were to realize that when approaching the evening of their days, they should make provision themselves for it. When superannuations were introduced in England years ago, there was no such cheap system of life insurance as we have to-day, there was nothing of that kind in force when superannuations were inaugurated in Canada in 1871, and the advantages of life insurance at low rates were not then obtainable. I think that civil servants should take advantage of these insurance companies, and contribute annual sums the same as others do, and they ought to have intelligence enough to keep up their payments, and thus provide for their old age, and if they had done that, they would not have to come here and ask the country to provide for them. I quite agree with the Postmaster General that a great many men in the service who have served faithfully for many years, were in a certain sense deprived of the moneys that justly belonged to them. Of course every servant in the civil service was entitled to his salary, but though there were many thoroughly efficient servants that died in the service and got nothing at all, I believe that in a great many cases, in the majority of cases, it was those who were inefficient, the drones I may say, that were superannuated. There were other cases where good and efficient servants were superannuated in order to make room for others. That abuse of the Act, I earnestly hope, will cease; at least I am glad to know that from the moment this Act becomes law, the country will not be called upon to pay one cent for the superannuation of civil servants, but will only have to pay back to them the money they have contributed with five per cent interest. Now, Sir, I think if there is any member in this House that deserves credit for the abolition of this Act, I claim to be that man. I assailed the superannuation system from the time I came into this House, I never allowed a single session to pass without exposing the manner in which it was abused, and by which the people's money was drained away, year after year. I spent more time in exposing the abuses of that Act than any other person in this House, and I feel proud of what I have done. If I never accomplished anything else in my parliamentary life than to contribute to the abolition of that system, I should feel satisfied in the knowledge that I had done something to free this country from the burden to which it has been subjected by the unjust operation of the Civil Service Act.

Mr. DAVIN. Could the Postmaster General tell me how many officers have entered the civil service between the years 1888 and 1896?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The Act will date from the 1st of July, 1898.

Mr. DAVIN. I want to know how many entered during the last ten years up to 1896?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I could not say exactly. When a calculation was made some months ago, it was about 1,000. But every day there are some passing over into the other class.

Mr. DAVIN. Whether the policy that will be inaugurated by this Act is a good one or not, time will show. As for those who

entered the service subsequent to the passing of this Act, they can have nothing whatever to complain of, they enter the service with their eyes open. But it may turn out to be the case that in order to get men to come into the service under the conditions of this Bill, you will have to pay larger salaries than are paid at the present time. There is a fallacy running through a good deal of argumentation against the old Civil Service Act, although some of that argumentation is sound. I was opposed myself to the old Civil Service Act, and to its adminstration. I am opposed to the facile superannuation of men who are in the prime of life, and able to serve the country. But I am sorry to say that neither party can throw a stone at the other in regard to offences on that score. But let nobody suppose that all the argumentation, such for instance, as we have heard lately from the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), is sound. He talks as if this superannuation was not part of the inducement held out to men to enter the service and, when in the service, to serve the country well. The remuneration he receives is not altogether the nominal sum he is paid as a salary; an important part of his remuneration is that which he receives under the Superannuation Act. But as I say, I am not going to antagonize the principle of this Bill.

As regards officers who entered the service with their eyes open, they have nothing to complain of. But take the persons affected by subsection "b" of section 2, I hold that in their case the Government are clearly breaking faith with a certain number of members of the civil service, apparently a small number, as the Postmaster General said they would not exceed 1,000. In order to save the amount of money that would be saved in regard to those thousand officers, is it desirable that there should be an Act placed on the Statute-book which a considerable number of persons outside or inside the service will feel was a formal breach of faith with certain persons on the part of the Government of Canada. The reason I asked the Postmaster General how many evil servants have come in during the eight years from 1888 to 1896 was that from the moment hon. gentlemen opposite came into power it was known they intended to bring in such a Bill, and therefore I would not feel that any such breach of faith had taken place between parties entering the service after June, 1896. When we go into committee I intend to make a suggestion to the Postmaster General in regard to that subsection, because I hold that in a young country like this we cannot be too chary about the honour of Government and Parliament. In Canada the only road to distinction is the political road, and it is most important that that road should be paved with honour and that we should feel jealous of our honour. With regard to the remarks made by the hon. member for North Wellington, I desre to show him that all the faults in regard to superannuation do not lie at the door of the Conservative party. I give him the following data:—

1878.

	Years added.
R. H. Russell, May, 1878.....	10
John Langton, July, 1878.....	10
Thomas Crose, 28th Sept., 1878..	2
T. C. Bradley, 28th Sept., 1878....	5
E. A. Meredith, 7th Oct., 1878....	3

1877—July to December.

Thomas B. French.....	10
Henry Livingstone.....	10
J. N. Ross.....	6
Rev. H. McMillan.....	10
Rev. John Cameron.....	10
C. M. Nutting.....	10
W. A. Ryan.....	10
Joshua Stansfield.....	5
J. G. Shippell.....	10

Mr. McMULLEN. If the hon. gentleman will take those officers he has pointed out as having been retired and to whose terms ten years were added as hush money, and will then give the list of those put in their places, I shall be satisfied.

Mr. DAVIN. I thought the hon. gentleman was going to ask a question.

Mr. McMULLEN. My complaint was that the Superannuation Act was used for the purpose of securing the retirement of men from the service, and years were added to their terms of service in order to secure their consent. The Act provides that this may be done, but it does not say that they shall be entitled to additional years. The point I made was that men without possessing technical knowledge had years added to their term of service which had the effect of hush money. The hon. gentleman should give a list of those put in their places and were possessed of technical knowledge.

Mr. DAVIN. It is quite clear these few facts I submitted have gone home. The hon. member for North Wellington is quite excited. He assumes that every time years were added by the Conservatives there were some sinister motives actuating them, but when the godly Grits added ten years it was a just and righteous act to do so. In committee I shall appeal to the Postmaster General to amend the second clause. As regards the general principle of the Act, what it amounted to was this, that for men of the same talent a less remuneration practically will be given under this Bill. Whether the Government will always be able, in the case of skilled men, to get their services for the same nominal salary, is exceedingly doubtful, and it may be found, under this system, that we will pay as much as under the old Superannuation Act.

Mr. FOSTER. I have a few remarks to offer on this Bill, and I find it really impossible to close before six o'clock.

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

After Recess.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, the Postmaster General has explained the modifications which he proposes to make in his Bill as introduced and I must confess to some disappointment at the small measure of betterment which he has announced by way of amendment. The interview in the newspaper may have been somewhat aside from the actualities of the case, but certainly the tenor of the report of the interview between the leader of the Government and the members of the civil service who waited upon him, was to the effect that the distinction between under ten-year men, and those who had been in the service and paid the abatement for more than ten years was to be done away with. It seems, however, that that was an untrue representation of the results of the interview, or else that the Postmaster General has not acceded to the suggestions made and which I understood had been accepted by the right hon. the Prime Minister. The report of the interview probably was wrong. Now, in the first place, I want to say that if the Postmaster General takes this measure as a reform measure, and if his fidus achates takes it also as a measure of great reform and distributes the merits impartially, though largely to himself and in a lesser degree to the Postmaster General; I think it just as well that they should inform the House as to the whole extent of the reform. Now, they are not reforming the old Superannuation Act by any means, they are not reforming the Act as it was passed in 1870. They are reforming an altogether different Act, they are reforming an Act which has been already reformed and reformed in most essential particulars. This Bill introduced by the Postmaster General does not repeal the Civil Service Insurance Act, nor does it repeal the betterments that were made in the Civil Service Act in 1893, when the Acts were passed amending the Superannuation Acts and providing for a system of civil service insurance. The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) seems to think that he has proved his case against the Superannuation Act when he has pointed out what he calls the abuses of that Act. I do not think that logically or practically he will get very far on that ground. He will have to prove something else than that abuses exist in a measure in order to justify the entire abolition of the measure, because abuses may be reformed whilst the principle of the measure may be sound. The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), too, has confined his efforts in past years not so much to an attack upon the Superannuation Act, as to attack upon his opponents because of alleged abuses in the administration of that Act. Now, Sir, I take it that if you go back before 1879, you will find signal instances of what my friend (Mr. McMullen) is pleased to call gross abuses. My hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) read a number of them, and I might also quote numerous instances of very gross abuses of the Superannuation Act from 1873 to 1878, both years inclusive. Abuses have also taken place from 1878 up to the present time. I suppose there is scarcely any administration of an Act upon the Statute-book in which you cannot point out abuses, but I beg leave to say that for the last ten years the Superannuation Act has been, so far as the late Government and present Opposition is concerned, very carefully and very conservatively administered, and I am quite willing that these ten years' history of the administration of that Act should be thoroughly gone into, and if you like that it may be compared with the administration of the same Act during the two years just passed. But, that is aside from the question. Now, Sir, what was the great burden of the civil service and the great burden of the superannuation system? It was due to two things. The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) has pointed out one. When the Superannuation Act first became law a certain percentage of abatement was fixed as what was necessary in order to make the Act, under fair administration, self-sustaining or nearly so. Who was it changed that? After a few years a sentiment arose in some way or other; Parliament was responsible for the change and Parliament authorized the change. The Superannuation abatement was reduced below the self-sustaining basis, and I do not care how conservatively you had administered the Superannuation Act from that time, on that basis of abatement it could not be self-sustaining. Parliament reduced the percentage of abatement below what was actually necessary for the cost. The great reason for the cost of the civil service was not in what you may call its higher grades. I do not think any sensible man in this House, looking over the history of executive administrations, will come to the conclusion that the higher officials in the civil service have been paid too high salaries. Take our Deputy Ministers, our controllers, those men who have had to work up to their high positions, and who hold responsible and important positions; no man on either side of this House will contend that, either comparatively or absolutely, these men are paid too highly for the work they do. The burden of the civil service was due to the fact that for that class of work, which was simply writers' or clerks' work, which could have been done, just as effectively, for from $300 to $600 per year, has been paid for at the rate of from

$400 to $1,000 per year. When a man entered the service as a third-class clerk at $400 a year, he did not rest, if he remained in the service, until he reached the maximum, which was $1,000, while doing the very same work. The result was that this country was paying men $1,000 each for doing simply writers' or clerks' work, which could have been just as well or better done by young men and young women for from $300 to $600 a year. During the time of the last Government, while I was in the Government, though I take no extra credit for it, these two burdens were entirely removed from the service, as far as legislation could remove them. In what way? In the first place, the Superannuation Act was amended by placing the future service on a strictly self-sustaining basis. The percentage of abatement was raised from 1¼ to 3 per cent on salaries below $600, and from 2 per cent to 3½ per cent on $600 or over; and the limit of age beyond which no person could be admitted to the civil service and the superannuation list as well, was fixed at forty-five years. This system, calculated on an actuarial basis by Mr. Fitzgerald, the superintendent of insurance, was brought down to this Parliament with the assertion, which has been proved and which will remain proved so long as that system is carried out, that under these conditions the civil service would be self-supporting, and not in any way a burden upon the people of this country. So that, after that amendment was passed, the civil service that came into operation from that time, and so long as no change was made, would not have cost the country one cent. You would have had all the advantages derivable from a superannuation system, and the country would not have paid anything for its maintenance. Can we not on either side of the House fairly agree to that? When hon. gentlemen talk about reforming a tremendous abuse, it is just as well to let the House know what they are reforming. They are not reforming that part of the service, because that is no longer an abuse. To-day half the civil service on the hill, if I mistake not—I mean all under ten years of service—have come under that system: and in the course of a very few years the civil service would have been almost entirely renovated, and would have ceased to be a burden on the country. What else was done? Recognizing the fact that this system of third-class clerkships, with salaries going up to $1,000 a year, constituted the real burden of the civil service, I introduced an amendment doing away with third-class clerks; and this class was not to be admitted to the present, no third-class clerk has been appointed. An arrangement was made for a class of writers, to take the place of third-class clerks, and to be paid from $300 to $600, with increases of from $30 per year: and this class were not to be admitted to superannuation at all, and were consequently no burden upon the superannuation fund of this country. I thought it necessary that we should see exactly what the civil service system and the superannuation system are to-day, when you come to consider this new legislation. With regard to the superannuation scheme, it was felt that there was a hardship in respect to the official dying in harness and leaving nothing for his family. How was that met? It was met in this way. We introduced an insurance system, which was to be carried out by the Insurance and Finance Department at Ottawa without any cost to the country at all. We simply said that the Government would invest the money on the basis of 6 per cent interest, and would allow the civil service to insure themselves for not less than $1,000 and not more than $2,000.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. What do you mean by a 6 per cent basis?

Mr. FOSTER. The tables were calculated on a basis of 6 per cent investment for the insurance funds. So that under the new plan the civil servant, if he lived, would have superannuation, and he would also have the cheapest form of insurance; and to both of these the whole contribution of the country was simply the payment of 6 per cent on the moneys paid in under the insurance part of the system.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Compounded?

Mr. FOSTER. No, it is not a compounding. Take an insurance society, it fixes its rates on the basis of a certain amount of interest which its investments will carry. In this case the interest was put upon a 6 per cent basis, the Government being responsible for that rate on whatever was in hand.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). It would be compounded practically.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, it would. The Government added the interest at the end of each half-year. Now, Sir, let time do its work, and in the course of a very few years the civil service would have been on an entirely self-supporting basis, so far as superannuation was concerned, because the abatement was founded actually on what was necessary to carry the system. To this superannuation system would have been added a cheap insurance system, to which the Government gave that small contribution of the difference between 6 per cent on the money invested and whatever rate the Government considered the current rate for its loans. With that we got the advantages of a superannuation system and a stable civil service system. Now, what are hon. gentlemen opposite doing?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) say what the deductions amounted to?

Mr. FOSTER. Under the terms of my Bill, which became law, instead of being 1¼ on $600 and under, as under the previous law, they were 3; and instead of 2 on all over $600, they were 3½.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Would that have bought an annuity equal to the former provision under the Act?

Mr. FOSTER. It was not intended to buy an annuity. It was a superannuation system pure and simple. The only difference between it and the one that preceded it was that under the old superannuation, the Government had to carry it largely, while, under this, it was self-sustaining.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It took 6 per cent to do it.

Mr. FOSTER. I am afraid I cannot get my hon. friend (Mr. Mulock) to separate the two—the superannuation system and the insurance system. The hon. gentleman has dilated on the fact that under the superannuation system many got nothing, while under his annuity system, every man gets his own money at 5 per cent compounded half-yearly instead of an annuity. There was a certain force in that. But the superannuation system was not meant for an insurance system—it was meant for just what it said, and just the same as the English system upon which it was based. To meet the difficulty that has been pointed out, the Government added to the superannuation system an insurance system, and this insurance system was available to those who entered under increased rates. The investment was made at 6 per cent, and that carried the insurance at very low rates. The civil servant got his insurance at the cheapest possible rate, because all costs of management were eliminated, and the investment received a clean, straight and steady 6 per cent interest.

Now, there are some things I do not like in the hon. gentleman's Bill, some things which strike at what I consider the root of the whole matter. What I have said has simply been to clear away from the minds of hon. members and of the people generally misunderstandings as to what it is that hon. gentlemen are reforming and what it is that was not left for them to reform but had already been treated, as I have explained. The hon. gentleman proposes to sweep away the superannuation system entirely. No—not at once, for even he acknowledges vested rights. He says, with reference to civil servants who have paid the superannuation fees for more than ten years, they cannot be interfered with. Except with their own volition, this Act has nothing to do with. So that, for that part of the civil service, no change is brought about by this Bill. Where does the hon. gentleman commence his change? He commences it at the magic number of 10 years. The man who has paid his superannuation fees for 10 years and has been in the service that long keeps his privileges; but the man who happens to have paid his superannuation fee for nine and a half years loses the privilege which he was supposed to have under the Act. The Postmaster General says: No, we do not take from him anything that he had before; we are quite willing to give him his gratuity if he wants it. But, in order to get his gratuity, he must leave the service, he must leave the place he has fitted himself for and where he has passed 7, 8 or 9 years, and where he has become almost unfit for anything else. He could retire and take his gratuity of one month's pay for each year's service, and find out how to make a living for himself, if he pleases. But when a young man entered the civil service of Canada under this law and under the practice of 25 years, what did he have? He had not only before him the fact that if, at any time during the ten years of service, he retired, he would get a gratuity, but, if he remained for more than 10 years, he became eligible for superannuation. That the Postmaster General does away with entirely. Now, what reason or justice is there in making this dividing line at 10 years, so that if a man has been in the service for only a month more than 10 years, his privileges will be maintained, but if he has been there for only half a year less than 10 years, he is to be deprived of his vested interests in this respect. I do not think there is any ground of reason or justice which can be given for making that arbitrary distinction, and I think it is an arbitrary distinction.

Mr. McMULLEN. Was there not the same arbitrary distinction in the old Act? You could not superannuate a man unless he had served 10 years?

Mr. FOSTER. Quite true. But a man who was working up to his 10 years had this within his power of achievement, simply by doing his duty honourably and remaining in the service for 10 years. That was something to be worked for. A man has what he eats every day, but he is also laying by something which he may eat when he cannot earn; and it would be arbitrary to step in and by merely making a division line at the magic number of 10 years, take away his right to provision for old age. That is the difference between the two, and it was not a difference that was made in the old Act. There was not a dividing line which prevented a man getting that for which he was working if he stayed 10 years in the service and pleased his employers.

I think that one mistake made by the hon. gentleman and also by the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) is in assuming that the Superannuation Act is meant simply for the benefit of the civil service employee. That was not the reason for which the Superannuation Act was passed, but it was in the interest of the country. This is well shown in the report

of the Civil Service Commission of 1892, under section 6, which says :

> At the time the Act was placed on the Statute-book, in 1870, it was evidently the idea of Parliament that superannuation was entirely in the interest of the state, as will be witnessed from the preamble :
>
> "Whereas, for better ensuring the efficiency and economy of the civil service of Canada, it is expedient to provide for the retirement therefrom on equitable terms of persons who from age or infirmity cannot properly perform the duties assigned to them."

I make bold to say that in Great Britain, in the United States and in this country the Civil Service Acts are based upon that primary idea that it is done for the benefit of the state, and not solely or primarily for the benefit of the individual —though I believe it is for the benefit of both. I am not going to prolong the discussion upon that. The law being accepted, and being the practice for 25 or 26 years, the young man who looked to the civil service of Canada looked to it in the light of the legal enactment and practice ; and, having chosen that for his career, went into it with the idea that Parliament would not break faith with him. And I think that Parliament should not break faith with any, as my hon. friend is preserving the vested interests of those who paid for 10 years. I have here a statement of the clerks under 10 years' service now paying into the superannuation fund. I find that the total number is 1,173, and that about 540 of these are in fund No. 2 and self-supporting. That is, of all the clerks under ten years of superannuation payment in the civil service, one-half at present are self-supporting, as being under No. 2 Superannuation Act, and consequently the discrimination has to be made only against about 630. Now, when you save the vested interest of all these who have paid more than ten years, when you do not interfere with any of the 540 that are on plan No. 2 and self-supporting, because they are not a detriment to the public funds, it is but a small thing in comparison with the breaking faith by this Government with the people of this country, that you should make an exception of the other 600 or so who have not paid up to ten years' superannuation and yet who are upon the old or No. 1 system. So that when you come to get down to the facts of the case, the number that are the exception is small indeed, and that makes the injustice all the greater. What you ought to do is simply, if you are going to make this rule, make it for the whole service more than ten years as well as less ; or if you are going to keep vested rights in one instance, keep them in the other and the cost will be very small to this country and be amply repaid by the very fact of keeping faith and acting according to the legal and certainly the moral spirit of the past legislation of twenty-five or thirty years.

I have made notes of several points which I am not going to amplify, but there are one or two which I wish to speak about in particular. What is this going to do ? In the first place, you take a civil servant and you look only to his own welfare, because you are not looking for any benefit to the state at all, but are making legislation which compels that civil servant to invest his surplus as you say and not as he thinks best. I do not believe that that is right unless we are doing it in some form of a civil service superannuation, which bears its attendant great benefit. You are giving no great benefit to this young man. You simply pay him 5 per cent on the money you order him to invest in a certain way. That is, he has $40 or $50 more than he requires to live upon, and which he might want to invest in insurance or in some other way, which appears to him to be the better way, but he is estopped from doing so because the Government steps in and says : You must put this in our hands, and we will pay you 5 per cent on it. Unless there is some collateral benefit for the country, it does seem to me that you have no right to interfere with the manner in which a young man in the service shall invest the little surplus he has.

More than that, what are you doing ? To-day the Minister, beset as he is and as he will be in every Government—and especially in this, on account of the party having been out of power for eighteen years, and consequently having a great many followers hungry for what they call the rights which belong to the victorious party—the Minister surely has all he can do to withstand the pressure at present, but what a tower of defence he has now. An insistent supporter comes to him and says : Mr. Postmaster General, I want to get a man into the post office here. The Postmaster General says, the office is full and I have no place for him. The insistent supporter replies : Dismiss that rampant Tory and put in my man, who is a good supporter of the party.

Mr. McMILLAN. That was your past experience.

Mr. FOSTER. I may frankly say that I have had just that experience, not often, but I have had it, and I do not think I am a rara avis in that respect. The insistent supporter says : Dismiss this man and put mine in his place ; the one you dismiss will be a Tory and the one you will put in will be a good Liberal, who will do the work just as well as the other. What reply has the Minister ? I cannot do that without facing, first, the Council, and then Parliament and putting a burden on the finances of the country, and having to make good my action before Parliament. That is a strong tower of defence, and the insistent supporter backs down and out, and says : Very well, give me a lien on the first va-

cancy, and the first poor fellow who dies or gets so sick that he cannot do the work and has to go, let me put my man in—and he is satisfied with that But look at it now. The moment this Bill is passed, for every civil servant who comes under it there is no longer any safety or feeling of security, and for every insistent supporter there is this royal road to preferment of his friends. He will simply go to the Minister and say: Put this man out and mine in, and that will be no charge on the country at all, because you will be simply giving the man you dismissed his own money, with the interest, and you take the new man under the percentage of abatement on which you will pay interest, a little less than before, because there will be a little less money in the fund. You do not need to face Parliament, because Parliament has practically nothing to say in the matter. The road is clear, and the Minister will be put into all sorts of difficulties, and the insistent supporter into a heaven of supreme contentment until he has more to get in than can be placed in the department. But how is it to-day? To-day the civil servants feel—at least, they did before this Government came in, and before this measure was foreshadowed—that if they do their duty well, they have security and stability in office, and that is the very essence of good service, I do not care where you find it. This Bill, then, is doing what? It is taking away the essence of stability from the civil service, and that once taken away you have an insecure service, a partisan service, one which shifts with every caprice of a Minister and every change of Government. That is a thing I am very sorry to see brought into the civil service of this country, and that is the chief difficulty I find with the hon. gentleman's Bill.

Now, my hon. friend has made one amendment. He says that if there is a civil servant who has not paid the abatement for quite the ten years, but who has been in the service in some other capacity for one or two years so as to make up the ten years, he shall be exempted and kept upon the old superannuation list. That removes an injustice in that respect, but what greater injustice is there in that case than in the case of a man who came in, supposing he was dealing with a Government which would stand by its legislation and the practice of thirty years, and has loyally done his work and paid his superannuation abatement for eight or ten years.

I cannot see the distinction. You try to remedy an injustice in the one case, and you fail to remedy it in the other. What is the reason why it should not be remedied in both cases? I am not going to go over the calculations that the Postmaster General made, those calculations are plain and clear as far as they go, and every member sees just how far they go. When you take a civil servant and suppose he is going to live up to 65 years, and make your calculations upon it, you get a very good showing for the new system. But what is the percentage of those who will stay in the service up to 65 years of age? The percentage is very small indeed, when you take the average. The stay in the civil service will be somewhere, probably, more like twenty years than thirty-five, may be less than twenty—I have not made any calculations. You will find that on the average, and in the individual instance, the second system, as an annuity builder compared with superannuation after he has been retired from the service, does not give the recipient at all what he would get under the old system. We had an able civil service commission appointed in 1892. The members of that commission were Mr. Hague, a bank manager in Montreal, well known as a most practical and business-like man; you had Judge Burbidge, who is an old and skilled business man and financier; and you had Mr. Courtney, the able Deputy Minister of Finance. These gentlemen applied themselves thoroughly to this work of a commission, they made their investigation into the actual facts and conditions of things as they were here, and as they were in other countries: and what were their recommendations? Their recommendations were straight in favour of a civil service system pure and simple. They might have had some modifications of it, and they did recommend some, but they did hold to the keeping of the superannuation system, and it is well to have their opinion, in conclusion, put on record:

> In conclusion, your commissioners are of opinion that the Superannuation Act now on the Statute-book for over twenty-two years, and under which moneys have been retained from the salaries of public servants, constitutes an agreement that the Government and the country are in all equity bound to execute, and whatever action be taken towards amending the Act, they would recommend that the vested right of every public servant now contributing from his salary superannuation abatement, should be respected to the highest degree.

That, I think, is a weighty deliverance from men of that class and character, and in the direct line of the civil service systems the best and most advanced in the world. To make a long story short: In the first place, I am sorry that the Postmaster General proposes by this Bill to emasculate and destroy the civil service system of Canada. Hereafter, and in proportion as this system works, the service is no longer permanent, the service is temporary and changing, temporary and changing at the will of the Minister while he is in office, belonging to his party, and changing as every party changes. It is going back to the old spoils and changing system of the United States out of which they are coming by leaps and bounds. It is a mistake to say that the spoils system is now the system of the United States of America. It was the system, but within the last six years that system has been al-

most remodelled, and to-day a very large proportion of the civil service of the United States are permanent and not temporary, and the spoils system does not apply. This will simply be going back to the spoils system, it will take away and destroy the amour proper of the service, the ambition of the service, the spirit of the service. Every man in the service will be looking to political friends outside, to the favour of this one and that one who is strong with the Minister inside. I think the hon. gentleman will find that it will be realized, if this unfortunately goes upon the Statute-book, that the deterioration will be marked and certain, and that the result of experience will be that this country sooner or later will go back to a wise, well devised and sensible civil service system. That there are evils in the present one, any one can well admit, but that the system is a sound one, I think most of us know and feel, and I believe that the country is of that way of thinking also. Why not cut off the excrescences? Why not take away abuses if they exist? But keep the system, instead of making this bold, bad plunge into what will inevitably end in an insecure and unsatisfactory service, and open the way to the spoils system in its most unadulterated form.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I presume the hon. gentleman refers to the statute of 1893, the Civil Service Insurance Act. If that is the only Act, will the hon. gentleman say wherein the legislation that he refers to affects or modifies the Superannuation Act?

Mr. FOSTER. As I said before, my hon. friend found fault with the superannuation system because, as he said, nine-tenths, or three-fourths, or seven-eighths, whatever the proportion is, never got any good from it. For instance, a man would pay in his abatement year after year in the service, and he would get no good from it, and there was that feeling that some provision ought to be made for the family. The Insurance Act of 1893 was based upon that sentiment, and met that sentiment. It was to be applied to the civil servants who paid the abatements under the superannuation system, and who consequently got the cheapest form of insurance that could be got, without any cost of administration, and with a steady investment of the funds that came in at 6 per cent, the Government interest. A civil servant then could do two things: Paying his abatement, he felt that if any disability came and he had to retire from the service after a certain length of service, and lived on for years after that, he had his superannuation to rest upon. He felt also that by this cheap system of insurance under Government control, it did not take a large amount of his salary each year to pay the rate upon that insurance, and that consequently he provided a cheap insurance for his family in case anything should happen while he was yet a public servant, and before he had been retired, and consequently got the benefit of the superannuation system. That is what I maintain, and I think that is borne out by the facts.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The only provision I find in the Act varying the conditions so far as the superannuation side of the question is concerned, is changing the old rate to 3 per cent, and on top of that, a life insurance system, which, of course, is only applicable by payment of the entire premium. So that all the Insurance Act does as regards the Superannuation Act, is to change the former contribution to the contribution mentioned in this Act.

Mr. FOSTER. No, it does not even do that. The abatements were changed in the amendment to the Superannuation Act itself, and then the Insurance Act was made applicable to those who paid the heightened abatement.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Reading the amended Act of 1893, the Insurance Act, and this Insurance Act, the only change in the Superannuation Act, to make it self-sustaining, is to change the old rate from 3 per cent to 3½ per cent. That is all the change. Whether it is self-sustaining or not, depends upon whether those rates make it self-sustaining.

Mr. FOSTER. They were calculated by an actuary, and based on that system.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. An arbitrary sum applicable to all classes and irrespective of each, would scarcely be regarded as an actuarial calculation.

Mr. FOSTER. You may call it actuarial, or modify it as you will, it was an actuarial calculation. The whole matter was submitted to Mr. Fitzgerald, with instructions that he should go very carefully into the history of the civil service, the ages civil servants were taken in and the maximum age—that he should take all these elements into consideration; he did so and prepared a statement in very elaborate form.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The insurance benefits were dependent upon further contributions. I asked the hon. gentleman whether the Government contribution of interest, perhaps more than the current rate, was based on a calculation in which the interest had been compounded. He seemed to imply that it was not. If not, how were those contracts made good? The only fund which the Government could have would be the principal money contributed year by year, like premiums in ordinary insurance. Was it simple interest for the lifetime of the officer, or what was the arrangement?

Mr. FOSTER. I explained that when the Minister of Trade and Commerce interrupted me. I said that instead of looking for interest upon investments in real estate or otherwise, these funds were invested with

the Government, and the Government paid 6 per cent. So that it was really compounded interest.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That is what I wanted to know.

Motion agreed to. Bill read the second time, and the House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. FOSTER. I would suggest the changing of the title of the Bill. Instead of "retirement" of members of the civil service, we should insert the word "abolishment." The hon. gentleman might take this as a suggestion without a formal motion.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Give notice of it—put the question on the paper.

Mr. McMULLEN. I desire to draw the attention of the ex-Finance Minister to this point. He has drawn attention to the report of the commission, which was appointed and reported in 1892, and he made some remarks to the effect that it was composed of experienced officers. The hon. gentleman was then in power. I remind him that the commission reported by Bill. No Bill prepared by the commission was ever introduced by the Government. The commission also made recommendations with respect to the Superannuation Act. Those recommendations the commission recommended should not be applied to the second division of the inside service. The Government never carried out that recommendation. They did not carry out what the commission recommended, but they did many other things. It was no doubt a very intelligent commission and reported an extended Bill. They recommended alterations in the Act, but they were not carried out by the Government. What has the hon. gentleman to say in regard to these matters?

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman thinks he has accomplished some mighty feat.

Mr. McMULLEN. No, I draw the hon. gentleman's attention to these matters.

Mr. FOSTER. It is sometimes a greater exercise of power not to do something than to do something, and hon. gentlemen opposite would show greater power and better sense if they did nothing in this matter than to do what they are going to do. We did not propose to abolish the civil service system, and we were at one with the commission in that respect. We believed the civil service system as it has remained on the Statute-book and been in practice for thirty years gave certain rights to employees and we did not propose to violate them. The hon. gentleman is in favour of action, and he is going to act against the representations of the members of the commission in that respect. But the hon. gentleman must not suppose that the whole case is gained when he says that the late Government did not do anything that the commission recommended. As the result of the commission's work the Government made changes in the Act, and those changes I have detailed to-night, and the most important change they made was in the direction of taking away burdens from the civil service, especially the third-class clerks.

Mr. McMULLEN. When that commission sat, the individuals who appeared and gave evidence were the Deputy Ministers and whatever clerks they named. Most of those witnesses therefore were the accountants of the departments and clerks who drew large salaries, men of extended service. No doubt they may have been honest men, but they thought superannuation should be continued, which it was natural for them to do, for they were looking forward to the time when they might reach some advantage from the system.

Mr. FOSTER. As the hon. gentleman has appealed to Cæsar, I will put on record what Cæsar said in some important respects. The commission reported among other things:

> Your commissioners, on due inquiry into the whole subject, are of opinion that it is eminently desirable and in the interest of the public that a superannuation system should form part of the scheme of carrying on the public service, and that such a system, if properly administered, directly leads to both efficiency and economy in administration.

The Postmaster General thinks differently.

> That it is a growing practice with railway companies, banks and other large corporations to undertake the establishment of superannuation schemes.

The Postmaster General is against it on the ground of growing expense.

> That the British Parliament decided forty years ago that superannuation was in the interest of the state, and that abatements should not any further be deducted from the salaries of public servants.

This proposed legislation proceeds on the ground that all civil service legislation has been necessarily in the interest of the employee and against the interest of the state. The report goes on to give the preamble of the Act of 1870, which places that matter without doubt so far as Canadian legislation is concerned. Then it goes on to say:

> Much misapprehension exists in regard to the Superannuation Act, as no account is taken of the saving to the public expenditure of the salaries of those superannuated

That is a wise remark. The present Finance Minister makes use of that wise remark when it suits him, but he goes against it in the legislation which the Postmaster General proposes, for when the Finance

Minister brought down a list of those superannuated and to whom gratuities were granted by this model anti-superannuation Government which the hon. member for North Wellington had been drilling in the ranks of the Opposition for seven, eight or nine years—an immense list, he said at the end :

> The superannuation of those officers makes their allowances a charge on the Superannuation Fund, but there is a large saving to the treasury.
>
> In some cases the officials had to be superannuated on account of age or infirmity, and their places have been filled, but in the majority of cases the office has been abolished.

Without doubt any person who will make a fair estimate of the civil service superannuation system must take into account the savings as well as the burden of superannuation upon the fund.

> 6. That the present rates, according to the evidence of Mr. Fitzgerald, are sufficient, if the Act were properly administered, to pay in round numbers one-half the charge for the service.

Now, these rates were just about double, and under the new superannuation system No. 2 they are self-supporting.

The last recommendation I have already quoted with reference to the conclusion of the commissioners that the statute and the practice of the country for so long had made a vested right for every public servant that had been contributing of his salary to the superannuation fund.

Mr. McMULLEN. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) knows that at the time of the introduction of the superannuation system in England there was no such system of general life insurance as at the present time ; in fact, life insurance was hardly known at all, and besides the civil servant in England years ago was given a mere pittance, and the state felt that some provision should be made. That condition never existed in Canada. In England the civil servant did not get a salary equal to what was paid in other lines of life, and they looked to a retiring allowance, but the Canadian civil servant is getting a salary equal and more than any other class, and why should we continue superannuating. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) has drawn attention to the superannuations the present Government have made since they came into power. I have carefully gone over the list, and I find that about 154 have been superannuated in all the departments, and out of that number there are 110 or 111 whose places have not been filled, or have been filled by promoting the next official in rank, so that consequently there was no extra cost to the country.

Mr. FOSTER. That is generally the way.

Mr. McMULLEN. That is a proper application of the Superannuation Act, and besides no years have been added to their time of service. You cannot possibly refuse to pay, under the present Act, a superannuation allowance to men who have been retired, and who have been over ten years in the service. When the present Government found there were unnecessary men in the service they could not dismiss them, but were compelled under the law to superannuate them. No man will dare to challenge the honesty of doing that.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend (Mr. McMullen) missed one point in his argument. He said that in England they established a superannuation system fifty years ago because there was no such life insurance system as now.

Mr. McMULLEN. The Civil Service Act was introduced over a hundred years ago in England.

Mr. FOSTER. I will not cavil about the time ; but at all events, now they have a cheap insurance system in England, and yet, strange to say, England still keeps that superannuation system in existence.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Shall this clause be adopted ?

Mr. FOSTER. The Postmaster General will not accept my amendment ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. We will consider.

Mr. FOSTER. You might as well accept it and be honest.

Mr. ELLIS. Whatever may be the difference as between parties on either side of the House with regard to this matter, it appears to me that there is a contract, or at any rate an implied contract, between the country and the civil servants, and I would rather that the Postmaster General would provide that all those persons in the service for under ten years should have the right to select for themselves what class they would go into. It seems to me that while there may be very grave public reasons why the superannuation question should be dealt with as provided in this Bill, yet the rights of the individuals in the public service exist, and they are rights that should be regarded by the Parliament of Canada. I listened attentively to the speech of the Postmaster General, but he did not appear to me to state a reason why the limit should be drawn at ten years. If I were the Postmaster General—he will excuse me for making the suggestion—I would at least allow it to be elective with these men under ten years in the service to accept these new proposals, or to continue on as they have been from the beginning under the Superannuation Act.

Section agreed to.

On section 2, subsection "b,"

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. As there appears to be a difference of opinion with

regard to this subsection, I will ask that it be allowed to stand.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I desire to know whether there is any, and what, amendment to section 7 of the Civil Service Superannuation Act? It would be very convenient if the Postmaster General would give the reference to any amendment to that Act so that we might know the changes made in the present law. That was found very convenient in the case of the Franchise Act, and it would be a good practice in the case of all important Bills introduced. I may tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) that what I desire to know is this: Whether or not a person who has been in the service ten years, but has not paid into the superannuation fund for ten years, is at present entitled to be superannuated upon a deduction being made, as provided by section 7 of the Superannuation Act?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The late Minister of Justice (Sir Oliver Mowat), I think, gave it as his opinion that those who have not paid for ten years were not entitled to the superannuation allowance.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Perhaps the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock), when he brings this subsection up again would be good enough to give us information as to the view of the Government with regard to the law on that point.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The view of the Government is as I have stated.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). We may accept that as the view of the Government.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think so.

On subsection "c,"

Mr. DAVIN. If the hon. gentleman is going to postpone subsection "b," would it not be well also to postpone subsection "c," because if the hon. gentleman amends subsection "b," he will have to amend subsection "c." Suppose the hon. gentleman had moved his amendment to subsection "b," and some hon. gentleman near him were to move that instead of "less than ten years," there be substituted "less than two years." I apprehend that the word "ten" in subsection "c" presupposes that subsection "b" has been carried?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Oh, no, it is quite independent of subsection "b." Subsection "b" applies to those who have been less than ten years in the service, or who shall have contributed for less than ten years. Subsection "c" deals with an entirely different class.

Mr. CLARKE. It seems to me that the time given in subsection to those who have been more than ten years in the service, to elect whether they will come under this Act or not, is altogether too short. I suppose that many men who have been in the service for over ten years will know very little about this Act during the next three months. I notice also that they can only come under this Act with the consent of the Governor in Council. On what principle are men to be allowed to come under the operation of this Act?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. As to the first objection, that three months is too limited a period, I would be glad to have a suggestion from my hon. friend.

Mr. CLARKE. I think twelve months should be allowed.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. With regard to the inquiry as to the consent of the Governor in Council being required, the matter is in the nature of an insurance company changing a contract. Suppose that the state of a man's health is such that a pension would be of no value to him, he has taken his chances on that point. If we were to allow the contract to be altered without the consent of the Governor in Council, every one of the 5,000 in the civil service might elect to change their contract and come under this arrangement. One reason why the consent of the Governor in Council is required, in my opinion, is that the Governor in Council may cause inquiry such as an insurance company would make in the case of any one applying for an insurance benefit. If a man is about to die, he would naturally elect to come under this Act, whereas if his probabilities of life were great, he would perhaps remain as he is. We want a fair medium.

Mr. CLARKE. Is it intended to require a medical examination or evidence of health before transferring a man from one branch to another?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. As the consent of the Governor in Council is required, before they give that consent, they will no doubt consider what precautions should be taken.

Mr. DAVIN. Suppose subsection "b" were made to apply to persons who have been in the service for less than two years, would not subsection "c" be required to apply to persons who have been in the service for more than two years?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Perhaps it would meet the hon. gentleman's objection to give the option to all.

Mr. DAVIN. Yes, that would do. If the hon. gentleman intends to amend subsection "b," I apprehend that the question would come up whether he would not amend subsection "c."

Mr. McMULLEN. I think we should adhere to the principle of the old law, which provided that no man became entitled to superannuation unless he had served ten years. The ex-Finance Minister said that a

man, all the time he was serving, was growing in the direction of becoming entitled to superannuation; but after all he did not become entitled until after he had passed the mark.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend misunderstood the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin). He and the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Ellis) stood on the same basis, and I stand with them in that respect. They do not ask that a man who has been less than ten years in the service and has been paying the abatement should have the right to superannuation, but they ask that he should have the option to say whether he will come under the new system or remain under the old.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I will meet the views of the hon. member for Western Assiniboia by striking out subsection "c" and making the clause read, "to every person now in the civil service who has been subject to any such deductions, and who, within six months," elects to come under this Act.

Mr. CLARKE. I would like to urge upon the Postmaster General the reasonableness of giving these officials at least twelve months to exercise the option.

Mr. FOSTER. Make it twelve months.

Mr. MONK. I wish to call attention to a numerous class of employees in Montreal, particularly in the Customs Department, who have served considerable time, without receiving permanent appointment. As the hon. Postmaster General is aware, a great number of these were employed a number of years as temporary clerks before being put on the permanent list. From 1870 to 1884, these employees, when placed upon the permanent list, were allowed, when being superannuated, to add the period of their temporary employment to their years of service for superannuation. In 1884, the Government considered that unjust, and an Order in Council was passed making it incumbent on those employees, if they wished to claim the benefit of their temporary employment, to pay the abatements during that period. In 1893, an Order in Council was passed revoking the Order in Council of 1884, so that since 1893 it has been found impossible for civil servants to claim the benefit of their years of temporary employment, even by paying the abatements as they used to do. The radical change we are making now in the conditions of superannuation or retirement has caused many of these employees to make inquiries, and I would submit to the hon. Postmaster General the propriety of providing some safeguard of their rights such as they existed from 1870 to 1893. From 1870 to 1884, according to custom, and from 1884 to 1893 under the Order in Council, they had the same privileges as employees who had been made permanent civil servants from the first, simply on paying the abatements during the period of their temporary employment, and I have drafted an amendment to this subsection "c," as follows:—

To add to paragraph "c" of section 2 the following words:—"Provided, however, that all civil servants who desire to remain subject to the Civil Service Superannuation Act, may, for the purpose of such superannuation, add or cause to be added their time of service as temporary officers by paying all the abatements due on their past temporary salaries from the commencement of such temporary service, within such time as may be fixed by the Governor General in Council.

In other words, the object of this amendment is to restore to civil servants who have had a period of temporary employment, the plenitude of their rights such as they existed from 1870 to 1893, and I think that this moment, when we are making such a change, is the proper time to provide for their rights in a clear and unmistakable way, and it seems to me that those rights should in justice commend themselves to the attention of the committee.

Mr. McMULLEN. If you are to include all the temporary clerks in this Dominion—and they all would have just as good a right to be included as those in the city of Montreal—you would have to include over 2,000, which would add enormously to the list. Why should my hon. friend ask that the temporary clerks in the city of Montreal should be included?

Mr. MONK. I am not asking for any special favour for the city of Montreal, but simply that the provisions of this Bill should apply to all civil servants without any distinction, and that will be simply a recognition of their rights, as they existed from 1870 to 1893. These temporary clerks have not the same tenure of office, but did the same duties as the regular employees.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Does the hon. gentleman contend that temporary clerks had the right to superannuation?

Mr. MONK. They had from 1870 to 1893.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I speak from recollection, and I do not think that any temporary clerk was ever on the superannuation list at any time.

Mr. MONK. I am speaking of the permanent employee, who was once a temporary clerk.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Does the hon. gentleman mean that the men who had been temporary clerks, were allowed to count the period of their temporary service?

Mr. MONK. I think there is no doubt about it.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I think not. I think it is only

from the date they paid superannuation allowance.

Mr. MONK. I speak subject to correction, but my information is that according to custom, from 1870 to 1884, permanent employees were allowed, for the purposes of superannuation, to add to their years of service the time they were employed as temporary clerks. In 1884, on the 7th January, an Order in Council was passed providing that on and after the 1st January, 1884, it should be optional with temporary officers, on receiving permanent appointment, to place themselves, as far as regards their temporary service, under the Superannuation Act.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Does the hon. gentleman say that that came in force on and after January, 1884?

Mr. MONK. Yes.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I was referring to the practice which prevailed from 1870 to 1874, and at which time permanent employees were not allowed to count their temporary service.

Mr. MONK. As to the period previous to 1884, I am informed that permanent officers were brought under the operation of the Superannuation Act and their temporary services counted, when retired or superannuated, provided they paid the necesary abatements.

Mr. McMULLEN. In connection with that matter, in my opinion the Order in Council was unquestionably wrong. A temporary clerk, as a rule, gets a larger salary than a permanent one. A person entering the civil service as permanent clerk gets the lowest rate and works up, but a temporary clerk may get, on entering, a salary considerably in excess of a permanent one. I know of men who have been in temporary employment, who have got more salary than they would have received if on the permanent staff. If you allow them to serve a certain number of years receiving a larger salary than they would on the permanent staff, and then come under the benefit of the superannuation and have that date back to the time of their temporary employment, you are placing a premium upon men remaining in temporary service.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I think cases may be found where permanent officers, on being retired, have had counted for them years of service passed in some other permanent capacity not carrying superannuation; but I do not recall any practice of a permanent officer being retired and having added to his time of service the time in temporary employment.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. My recollection is, having seen the Order in Council, that it did not apply to men being retired but to those who had been in the temporary service and it went back, I think, six years, and I think provided that each person who desired to avail himself of the option might add years of his temporary service on paying the equivalent of a month's pay for each year of temporary service. I would ask the member for York (Mr. Foster) the reason why the Government rescinded the Order in Council of 1884 by the Order in Council of 1893?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not recollect that they were allowed to go back to temporary appointment. I cannot recollect the Order in Council referred to.

Mr. MONK. It is the order of the 9th February, 1893, respecting the Order in Council of the 4th January, 1884.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Whatever may have been the reason for the Orders in Council of 1894 and 1893, it is not necessary to have this legislation in order to deal with the matter proposed. If the Superannuation Act made it lawful for the Government to pass such an Order in Council or revoke such an Order in Council, that power is still left with the Governor in Council, and legislation is not necessary, and the amendment, therefore, is not necessary.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. CLARKE. Might I ask the hon. Postmaster General that the time in which these officers may exercise this option, instead of being merely extended from three to six months, should be fixed at the 1st of January.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Can the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clarke) suggest a reason for that?

Mr. CLARKE. It will be a definite date, whereas under the amendment proposed many of them will not be able to know exactly when this Act comes into force and, therefore, when their option expires.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Make it the 1st December. That will be six months from the 1st June.

Mr. FOSTER. That will make your calculations wrong.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. All right, make it the 1st January.

Amendment agreed to.

On section 3,

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Instead of enumerating the officers, as here proposed, I propose to strike out section 3 and substitute the following:—

The Civil Service, for the purposes of this Act, shall include all officers, clerks and employees mentioned or referred to in section 2 of the Civil Service Superannuation Act.

Amendment agreed to.

On sections 5 and 6,

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I would ask that sections 5 and 6 be allowed to stand.

On subsection 8,

Mr. McMULLEN. I think there should be some provision that the person who retires or who is dismissed should receive this money upon condition that his conduct has been satisfactory. Supposing he violates some of the rules, supposing that he steals, I do not think that he should have a right to claim this money in that case.

Mr. FOSTER. If he steals, there is a penalty for it.

Mr. McMULLEN. He might be guilty of some grave offence, he might leave the service and run away. So I think that payment should depend upon good faith and efficient service. I do not think we should allow such men the privilege of drawing money if they have done anything for which the department felt it necessary to dismiss them. The money should then be kept as a security for faithful and efficient service. If they do their duty faithfully, then let them have the money, but not otherwise. I think that where the civil servant gives no security at all, it is right that this money lying to his credit, should be a guarantee to the Government, and that he should feel that if he violated his duty, he ran the risk of losing that money.

Mr. FOSTER. The loss of office is quite penalty enough for any offence other than that against the criminal or civil law, and the penalties, in the law itself are sufficient for that. We must not be too draconian.

On section 9,

Mr. FOSTER. Now, if the Postmaster General will only be good natured for a moment, and take out that clause in section "c," which lets the Governor in Council meddle with the business, I think he would do what is right. The contract, as my hon. friend is pleased to call it now, is a contract for service. This man's money is his own money, and the Government pays interest upon it. Now if he has the choice at all, let him have a free choice. It is not a matter as to whether you lose his service or not. It is a matter of choice, and is simply as to whether he shall elect to remain under one system or go into another. If it was on account of illness or something like that, the Government is strong enough to let the family have the benefit.

Mr. CLARKE. It seems to me that the defects in the old law mentioned by the Postmaster General this afternoon will not be remedied or improved if he persists in keeping these words in this subsection "c." I understood the Postmaster General to say this afternoon that under the law which he is amending by this Act, a person might be in the service ten, or fifteen or twenty years, and if he became ill and died, his representatives practically got nothing out of his contributions to the fund. Now I understand from his explanations made to-night, that though an officer may have been more than ten years in the service and desires to take advantage of this new Act, if it is found that such an officer is in poor health, he is not to be transferred, and cannot get the benefits of this new Act. If that is the case, the Government are perpetuating what the Postmaster General felt to be an injustice that obtained under the old Act.

Mr. DAVIN. I would appeal to the Postmaster General on the grounds of justice as well as on the grounds of humanity, to accede to the suggestion made by the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) and supported by the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Clarke).

Mr. ROGERS. Of all the Acts which this Government has dealt with, I think this and the Franchise Act are the most important. The superannuation system played a considerable part in the last election contest. The people have felt its burdens very keenly, and they hoped the Government would take some vigorous action in this matter. It is one of the most indefensible Acts, I think, that the late Government supporters had to defend before the rural constituencies. We never could see any reason why the Government should take such paternal care over the civil servants of this country. We feel that these men are exceptionally well paid, much better paid than any other class in the community, regularly paid, and their pay is sure, something which cannot be said of the salaries of men in some other callings in life. I have spoken to many civil servants this year, and I understood that they would much rather the Government did not take such paternal care of them, but would allow them to look out for themselves in their old age. This they can do, especially in recent years, when there are so many mutual benefit associations and straight life insurance companies giving such good terms. These men have told me that they could do better with their money than they are doing now by paying it into an endowment fund. I do not think it would be any hardship to these men if the Government would abolish the system entirely and pay the civil servants a certain amount of interest on their contributions. I do hope the Postmaster General will not cut and destroy this Bill in such a manner that we cannot defend it before the electorate of this country. They are looking for some radical change in the direction of doing away with the superannuation of civil servants. Speaking about civil servants not accepting this, that or the other thing, you might leave

the ten year limit to their choice. They have been in for a certain length of time, they are not obliged to stay there, they can leave any time they like. We all know that there will be hundreds of applications to take their places; every member of Parliament knows what a worry it is to receive applications for appointments in the civil service. Therefore I do not think there can be any hardship if this ten year limit is left in, and I hope it will not be removed. Then with regard to this 5 per cent interest clause. The great mass of the people throughout this country feel that 5 per cent is too much to pay on the money retained from the civil servants. It is more than they can get in any other investment, it is more than the people can get for any money they may have invested. I speak particularly of the rural classes, because they are the great majority of the taxpayers, and they have to be considered and counted with on election day. There is nothing you can put before an agricultural audience that will prove such a bug-bear as the superannuation of civil servants at enormous rates. They are indignant when you tell them of men in the service drawing $2,000 or $3,000 salary while they remain in, and afterwards drawing as high as $37,000 superannuation money after they have left the service. Some of these men go into foreign countries to spend their money. The people feel this is a great hardship, and they decline to submit to it. You cannot argue it away with them. The small arguments put forth in this House, will not take with the agricultural classes. The Liberal party made strong promises along that line of what they would do, and the people are looking to the Government now to fulfil their promises. I say again, I hope the Postmaster General will not cut and carve this Bill in such a way as to make it indefensible before the people. All the arguments I have heard put forward to-night are from the city standpoint and does not count with the agricultural classes. They get no direct benefit from the money spent by the civil servants. They justly say: Who will superannuate me, who will look after my family when I die? These men toil day after day for years, and when they finally drop in their steps from over labour and exertion, and die prematurely, who will pay their families any superannuation allowance? They feel it as an injustice for they never had half the luxuries and comforts of life possessed by civil servants. These people have to live very closely, and you need not discuss at public meetings this question of superannuation for you cannot get them to accept it. I hope the Postmaster General will exercise a firm hand and do justice to all classes, those who receive these allowances and those who pay the taxes.

Mr. CLANCY. I think the Postmaster General should be disposed to carry out this proposition, that those who have been in the service for a lesser period than ten years may have a choice. I hope there will be no limit, as has been suggested.

Mr. McMULLEN. It would be unfair to the Government if they were not allowed the right to judge as to whether a man should be permitted to take advantage of the Act or not. Supposing a man was dissipated, and it was inadvisable to retain him in the service, and he was about to be dismissed as unsuitable. We know cases of that kind are likely sometimes to occur. Unless this power were given to the Government, these civil servants might take every dollar and leave the service. I should object to the Government parting with their right of deciding whether the civil servants, as regards the manner in which they have discharged their duty and as regards their character, should be allowed to take advantage of the Act.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I cannot quite understand the object of retaining this provision. There are many reasons why it should not be retained. One is that so long as it is there, it creates uncertainty for the civil servants, and it is not desirable there should be uncertainty on one side or the other. The objection raised by the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) does not seem to have any weight. He suggests that the Government might desire that a particular person should not come within the provisions of the Act. If any person is fit to remain in the civil service, he is fit to come within the provisions of the Act. The Act amounts to this: the Government take from each man every year 5 per cent of his salary, and give him interest thereon at a rate somewhat higher than the Government usually pay, but probably somewhat lower than he could get elsewhere. That is not very much encouragement to the civil servants. Perhaps the Postmaster General will explain why he desires to retain this power.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. When the clause was framed it had to do with civil servants who had contributed more than ten years, and are not within the provisions of this Act, and it was simply an option given to them by the Government. It is impossible to anticipate whether it would or would not be proper on all occasions to consent to the request of the civil servants. They have their rights under the Civil Service Act, and those rights are not being curtailed. If they desire to alter their rights and the Government as a party to the contract chooses to allow them, well and good; but as it is a contract and they have their rights and the Government has its rights, the matter must be considered from the standpoint of the public interest. The hon. member for North Wellington takes an imaginary case, that of an officer who might properly be dismissed. Very few such cases

occur, but we can suppose such a case. Such officer, knowing that he was about to lose his position, might elect to take the money and interest, and thus get what he would not otherwise obtain. The consent of the Governor in Council is necessary in order that a man shall obtain a pension.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The hon. member for North Wellington suggested that an officer fearing dismissal might desire to come into the arrangement. But the hon. Minister will remember that the period is limited as between now and the 1st January, and threfore that reason will not have effect beyond 1st January next, and the hon. gentleman is dealing with a very small number of cases of officers who may be dismissed between now and that date for misconduct.

Section agreed to.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I mentioned, on moving the second reading, that it was proposed to add a clause allowing officers who have served less than ten years to retire, and upon retiring to exercise the option of retiring with their gratuity. But inasmuch as subsection "b" which deals with that class of officers, has been reserved, I shall also reserve the amendment under consideration.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will read the amendment that he will submit.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The amendment will be as follows:

Every person now in the Civil Service who has been subject to such deductions for a lesser period than ten years may, at his option (to be declared in writing, signed by him or his duly authorized agent, and deposited in the office of the Secretary of State) within three months from the passage of this Act), retire from said service, and thereupon shall be entitled to be paid a gratuity amounting to one month's pay for each year of his service.

Committee rose and reported progress.

SUPPLY.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

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

(In the Committee.)

Canadian Pacific Railway—To pay balance for work under award..... $2,600

Mr. FOSTER. Is this pretty nearly finished up?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). The balance remaining to be paid is between $8,000 and $9,000 altogether.

Mr. FOSTER. So that this nearly finishes the work.

Canadian Pacific Railway—To pay for land damages, &c..... $2,000

Mr. MONTAGUE. Where were these land damages?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Nearly all in British Columbia, at Port Moody.

Mr. MONTAGUE. How were the damages assessed?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They have been settled by understanding between the parties where it was possible to reach an understanding. There have been valuations made, but the parties have not been willing down to the present moment to accept the valuation.

Intercolonial Railway—Increased accommodation at Halifax..... $135,000

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) in what position the proposed increased accommodation at Halifax now is; whether anything has been done with respect to that accommodation; if nothing has been done for what reason the delay has taken place, and if the work is not already commenced at what probable date will it be commenced. As the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) knows, the matter has been brought to the attention of the Government in various ways during the present session, and in the recess since last session. I am not aware that up to the present time any considerable progress has been made. It is a work of great urgency; it is a matter in which the entire city of Halifax and a very considerable portion of the province of Nova Scotia is very deeply interested. I would like as full an explanation from the hon. gentleman as possible with regard to the intention of the Government respecting this.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The intention is to push the balance of the work which remains uncompleted as vigorously as possible. There has been quite a little work done during the past year, and there has been an expenditure from the 30th June, 1897, to the 1st of March, 1898, of between $14,000 and $15,000. I can assure my hon. friend (Mr. Borden) that it is not at all our purpose to delay. The department is contemplating arrangements which will during the ensuing year practically complete the terminal facilities at Halifax.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The hon. gentleman will, of course, recognize that the expenditure of $14,000 or $15,000, out of a vote of $135,000, does not indicate a very vigorous rate of progress; and if he does not proceed any faster in the future than he has done in the past, it will take something like ten years to complete the expenditure. I trust that the hon. gentleman will be able to complete it in something less than

that time, and I venture to hope that the terminal facilities, according to the views pressed upon the Government by delegations during the past year, may be constructed at Halifax before the close of the present summer. I should think that would not be an impossible feat. As I said before, not only the city, but the business of the Intercolonial Railway, is suffering for the want of these terminal facilities.

Mr. McMULLEN. My hon. friend must remember that there are other people in this Dominion who have a little interest in the expenditure on the Intercolonial Railway besides the people of Halifax. I do not want to say anything against providing necessary accommodation; but I would like to know from the Minister, before this item passes, how much money has been spent on terminal accommodation up to the present time, and whether this amount is considered sufficient to provide ample accommodation without any further money being required in the future. Year after year very large amounts of money have been expended for increased accommodation at different stations along that line of railway, and I would like to know whether the sum now proposed will complete the necessary accommodation at Halifax?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). So far as I am concerned, I shall have to refer the hon. gentleman to the Minister, and I would also refer him to his own vote of last year, when this item of $135,000 passed. I would also like to remind him that the fact that there are other places in Canada besides Halifax does not seem to be any particular reason why the Government should occupy ten years in carrying out a measure which they themselves considered worthy the expenditure of $135,000. This expenditure is proposed, not in the interest of the city of Halifax alone, but in the interest of the whole country, which owns the Intercolonial Railway. As much if not more detriment is being done to the business of the Intercolonial Railway than to the city of Halifax by the failure to provide these terminal facilities. It also affects the trade of Ontario so far as that trade is carried through the port of Halifax; and I, for one, hope that some considerable portion of the trade of Ontario to the old country will be carried through the port of Halifax. The constituents of my hon. friend from North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) as citizens of this Dominion, are interested in this work to some degree, if not to as great a degree as my constituents. I am simply pointing out that if this vote is a proper vote, and we must assume that it is, it ought to be dealt with vigorously and in a business-like manner, and that these terminal facilities, the necessity of which is recognized by this vote, should be proceeded with at once, as they would be by any railway or business corporation, and not be allowed to stand from year to year, or played with at the rate of $14,000 or $15,000 a year, to the detriment of the business of the country.

Mr. McMULLEN. My hon. friend must not attempt to construe anything I have said into opposition to improvements at Halifax. What I said was that I wanted to know the entire sum that had been expended at Halifax, and whether this vote would complete the expenditure at that point. That does not indicate any antagonism on my part to votes for Halifax. I remember when my hon. friend opposite was Minister of Railways we had votes of this kind. We want to know, when the money is spent, if it is going to accomplish what is intended?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I was quite sure that my hon. friend had that broad spirit which would enable him to appreciate a vote of this kind, and would do the simple justice of admitting that it should be expended promptly and in a business-like manner. So far as further improvements are concerned, I am not proposing to give my hon. friend any assurance. If I were the person to give any assurance, I think I would content myself with saying that as soon as this amount is expended, we will take into consideration whether or not there will be necessity for any further improvements. I do not know at present of anything beyond this; but I imagine my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals would not undertake to pledge himself that he would not at any time in the future find it necessary to expend some further money for terminal facilities at Halifax.

Mr. McMULLEN. My hon. friend is evidently labouring under a mistake. The question I put was put to the Minister of Railways, not to my hon. friend from Halifax.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am quite sure the hon. member from North Wellington does not take any narrow view of this subject, but that the question of the expenditure of a sum of money towards completing the necessary terminal facilities at Halifax will be regarded by him as a measure, not for Halifax, not for Nova Scotia, not for the maritime provinces, but for Canada. My hon. friend will, I am sure, see that it is the duty of the Government to ask Parliament to make all necessary and proper provision for the purpose of putting the Intercolonial Railway upon such a footing that it will be able to do the business for which it is designed, and which we hope will offer to it. As to the amount in the gross which has been expended in connection with the Intercolonial Railway at and in the neighbourhood of Halifax, it has unquestionably been large, amounting in the neighbourhood of between $1,700,000 and $1,800,000 in the whole. A good deal of the property which

we had constructed there, including the most important and valuable of our wharfs, with the sheds and elevators, was unhappily destroyed by fire, and as the Government had not, according to its wont, insured that property, it was necessary that it should be restored.

What we are asking for now is to restore in part the property that was destroyed, and I think we can make a very strong case in favour of that request because there are very strong indications that business which has not hitherto come to the Intercolonial—particularly ocean business, outgoing as well as ingoing—is likely to come at an early day, and we must necessarily, if the Intercolonial is to realize our reasonable expectation, be ready to do that business when it does offer. The Government will see that the money is expended carefully and prudently, we will go no further than we find the needs of the situation appear to require, according to our very best judgment. My hon. friend seems to think that we have been very dilatory in laying out this money. I can assure him that though there appears to have been some delay, it has not been intentional. I have been most anxious to inform myself fully as to what form this expenditure should take before making it, and I have pretty well settled that. We shall construct suitable and sufficient pier accommodation to replace that which was destroyed, and I am in hopes that it will be done during the incoming year.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. May I ask what was spent out of the vote of last year ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Between $14,000 and $15,000. A portion was spent in dredging, a portion in timber ; we have built a shed and retaining walls, and laid down sub-tracks and grading, which constitute the greater part of the expenditure, and between $8,000 and $9,000 has been spent in putting down new tracks and preparing the ground for the laying of the tracks.

Mr. HAGGART. What is the estimated cost of the whole work ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If my hon. friend would defer putting that question until a little later, I shall better satisfy him, because it is not improbable that there may be some item in the later Estimates which will have to be included in the statment I shall make.

Land Damages—Oxford and New Glasgow and Cape Breton divisions..... $2,000

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This is the usual sum which we take every year to meet claims made upon us.

Original construction $2,000

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There are still some claims coming in, from year to year, for damages in connection with the original construction of the Intercolonial.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it not time these were superannuated ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There was expended out of the current year not a very large sum, but this is a thing which we necessarily have to make provision for.

Mr. FOSTER. You only spent $724 last year.

Mr. McMULLEN. How are these things adjusted—by commission ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They have been adjusted lately by suit more than any other way.

Mr. FOSTER. To whom was the $724 paid ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I cannot give the name. It included the legal expenses, and was the result of a judgment.

Mr. FOSTER. Is the original claimant on account of the original construction still living ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. He bobs up serenely every year.

Extension to deep water, North Sydney.. $20,100

Mr. HAGGART. How much did the hon. gentleman expend last year ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I expect to spend by the 1st of July $20,000.

Mr. HAGGART. You spent $30,000 last year in the town of Sydney carrying out its arrangement with the Government. Have you the right of way in the wharf as promised ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The town has arranged to furnish the right of way.

Mr. HAGGART. Are all the conditions that they promised when we agreed to take this new road to the water's edge being carried out by the town of Sydney ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am so advised. The only obstacle for building the pier was that the town did not furnish the right of way as agreed on, but they have now done that. We have nothing to pay for the right of way, but the actual cost of the construction of the pier and shed and the laying of the track will amount to some $50,000.

Mr. GILLIES. Do I understand that the town of Sydney has furnished the right of way from the present station down to the water.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. An arrangement has been con-

cluded with the town, and they have obtained the title. I have no doubt that our agents have already had it properly seen to. We have let the contract for the work upon the basis that the title will be placed in our hands before the work will be commenced. The contract has been let for the work.

Mr. GILLIES. I am personally aware that the contract has been let by the department, and that the construction of terminal facilities for North Sydney are now in progress. But I was given to understand, whether it is the fact or not I do not know, that none of the land titles from the present terminus to the water's edge have yet been furnished to the department. If that is the case the department is running a great risk.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Does the hon. gentleman suggest that the right of way from the present station to the water has not been conveyed to the Crown ?

Mr. GILLIES. I do not say all the way, but that the title to a large portion of the land, I have been informd, has not been furnished to the department.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Gillies) is misinformed.

Mr. GILLIES. Do I understand the hon. Minister to say that titles has been furnished, and that the right of way has been paid for by the town of North Sydney ?

Mr. HAGGART. Does not the Minister exercise the power of expropriation with the understanding that the town shall afterwards recoup the department for the expenditure ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is the understanding.

Mr. HAGGART. This seems an enormous amount of money for the work that is to be done there.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. According to the estimate of the engineer it will cost $31,000 for wharf and freight sheds. It is quite an extensive wharf and shed, and we deem it advisable that they should be sufficient, inasmuch as this is to be used by the Newfoundland line, which is becoming an important line and doing a large business. In addition to this sum there will be for grading, $6,000 ; track laying and ballasting, $1,500 ; rails and fastenings, $1,900 ; dredging, $5,280 ; making, with other small sums, $50,000.

Mr. FOSTER. How much for the land ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is not included. It is to be paid for by the town.

Mr. HUGHES. Were tenders advertised for ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, and the lowest tender was accepted. It was something less than our estimate. It was, according to my recollection, between $22,000 and $23,000, our estimate being $31,000. So we hope that the total will be something less than the sum here asked for. These estimates were prepared before we received the tender and they were made out on the basis of the estimate of the officers of the department.

Increased accommodation at Moncton... $20,000

Mr. FOSTER. What is the whole cost of this work ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The total cost of the new station, yard, shed, &c., I think, will not fall short of $140,000.

To increase the strength of iron bridges. $50,000

Mr. HAGGART. Will the Minister please give details of that item, and also give the reason for charging it to capital account ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We included this amount in capital account because we are making the bridges very much stronger than they have been hitherto, so they may be safe and secure for the very much heavier trains that we shall now run. We are charging against capital the amount which the increased strengthening would cost. The intention of the department is to increase the strength of nearly all the bridges along the line. That portion which is fairly represented by renewal on the same basis as these structures will be paid out of revenue ; but, of course, we consider it fair to charge to capital the amount required to increase the strength of these works.

Mr. POWELL. Where are these bridges ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We propose to take off two spans from the bridge over the North River near Truro, two spans over the De Bert River, eight miles from Truro, and two from the Ishgonish. These are to be removed and are to be doubled up to six spans for the new bridge and the one on Folleigh River. Then we take off one span of 60 feet, and this is to be replaced by a stronger and heavier span. The difference of putting in new bridges of additional weight and repairing them up to their present standard will be charged to capital.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I understand the hon. gentleman says that his explanation for charging this to capital is that these bridges are to be strengthened. If I remember right when the wooden bridges were replaced by iron, that distinction was not made, and that argument did not apply. For instance, the iron bridge

that the hon. gentleman proposes to replace by a stronger one, was itself substituted for a wooden bridge, or at any rate that system was adopted. Those iron bridges were not charged to capital account, but I think they were charged to income.

Mr. McMULLEN. I can give the hon. gentleman a case. I know that when the wooden snow sheds were burned down and iron snow sheds replaced them, these latter were charged to capital account. Sir Charles Tupper was then Minister of Railways and Canals, and we had a long discussion as to whether iron snow sheds should be charged to capital account. We challenged the propriety of making such a charge, and the then Minister of Railways and Canals claimed that as they were permanent structures and not temporary, they should be charged to capital account.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman has explained the difference between the two cases. But in this case there is no question of permanent structures as distinguished from temporary structures. Certainly the Opposition of a former time strenuously insisted upon that style of book-keeping, and I would like to know how the hon. gentleman now justifies this change.

Mr. McMULLEN. They merely permitted it in the matter of the snow sheds on the ground that they were iron structures.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. As I did not make that argument, I cannot be called upon to justify it. I have nothing to explain so far as my own past actions on the question are concerned, and the hon. gentleman will not expect me to answer for anybody else. I may say, however, that these bridges are not to replace wooden structures, they are to replace iron structures which are absolutely good in every particular, but they are not heavy enough for the present needs of the road. No doubt they would be perfectly safe for a long time if we continued to run light engines over them; but we have to make provision for the altered conditions, we are going to run very much heavier engines.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. No one disputes the necessity for strengthening the bridges for heavy rolling stock. Does the hon. gentleman know what is the system adopted by the Grand Trunk Railway and Canadian Pacific Railway in keeping their accounts for strengthening bridges?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The officers belonging to both those roads inform me that the invariable rule is to charge all betterments to capital, in every department of the service.

Mr. HAGGART. The Minister has started a new line here. I remember that again and again when I was bringing down estimates, not for betterments upon the road but for increased accommodation at Halifax or St. John, the Minister of Trade and Commerce said it was time that all expenditure on capital account on the Intercolonial Railway should cease. There is no justification at all in this particular. Suppose you do want heavier bridges for heavier engines, it is not proper to charge the expense to capital account at all, it should be charged to income. There is the next item: To provide a passenger and freight shed at Richmond, $1,500, to be charged to capital account. To build snow fences on the Oxford, New Glasgow and Cape Breton division, $6,000. I have not the slightest doubt that they are required, and that the bridges need to be strengthened for the heavier engines; but what I object to is that these items and similar ones should be charged to income and not to capital account.

Mr. POWELL. What the Minister of Railways and Canals says is absolutely correct, in fact, on any fair principle of book-keeping, I do not see why betterments should not be charged to capital account. I may say that the Minister of Railways and Canals must feel very proud that he has behind him a luminosity that sheds so much light on every possible question that comes up in this House, and where the Minister's information fails him, the omniscience of the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) can come to his rescue. Now, in the past a great deal of complaint has been made with the management of the Intercolonial Railway on the ground that improper charges were made to capital account. Of late years, at any rate, a great change has been made in this respect, or I should speak more correctly if I said that the custom for a long time past has been to charge these betterments to revenue account instead of to capital account. I can give a number of instances where this was done. When very heavy bridges across the north-west branch of the Miramichi River and across the south-west branch of the Miramichi River, were strengthened a number of years ago, the expenditure was charged, not to capital account, but to revenue account. If I am not misinformed at the time the road was taken over from the Grand Trunk Railway from Lévis to Rivière du Loup, all the improvements on its bridges were not charged to capital account but were charged to revenue account. In addition to that I am informed that every new rail that was placed upon the Intercolonial Railway had the charges incidental to it entirely placed to the revenue account, and not one dollar in connection with the vast expenditure of changing rails on the Intercolonial Railway from 56 to 67-pound rails was charged to capital account. In addition to that, the supply of the immense number of engines on the whole Intercolonial Railway system was charged under the administration of the

late Government, not to capital account, but to revenue account.

Mr. McMULLEN. Oh, you are wrong.

Mr. POWELL. The hon. member for North Wellington, with his assumption of intelligence, says I am wrong. The hon. member may be an authority to himself, but I can assure him that he is not much authority to gentlemen on this side of the House. The hon. gentleman, no doubt, knows more about jack knives and lead pencils than I do. I will concede that. But there are some people who, if they do not know the facts of their own knowledge or from their own investigations, have been sufficiently fortunate to be informed by persons who do know, and, who if they do not possess the originality of the hon. gentlemen opposite, succeed in obtaining stores of information. The very large expenditures for iron bridges on the whole system of the Intercolonial, the raising of the overhead beams, thereby affording ample protection and doing away with what has been a nuisance and a great danger to trainmen, were charged, not to capital account, but to revenue account. The general policy of late years has been to endeavour to charge everything to revenue account which formerly was charged to capital.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. gentleman is quite mistaken, and if he had been in the House a few more years he would not have made the statement he has made and would not have been quite so "fresh." When Sir Charles Tupper was Minister of Railways he made a clear statement as to what rules were to guide in making charges against working expenses and those against capital. In the case of an engine getting worn out, and it became necessary to get a new engine, that was charged to working expenses. Where a car got worn out and it was necessary to get a new one it was charged to working expenses. But where additional cars or engines were put on the road they were charged against capital account. If five new and additional engines were put on they were charged to capital account and the same with respect to one hundred new cars. The hon. member for Westmoreland has evidently been in the dark.

Mr. FOSTER. I think the item is a more important one than the Minister or the Government seem to think. In fact it implies a complete change in the manner of keeping the Intercolonial Railway accounts, and it is an attempt at cooking the accounts with respect of the Intercolonial. The Minister of Finance and the Minister of Trade and Commerce, the latter of whom understands the value which must be attached to uniformity in keeping the accounts of the Dominion as capital and income, should give a little attention to this matter. Two years ago the Minister of Public Works commenced by charging to capital what had hitherto been charged to income, and we had an afternoon's discussion with respect to the principle involved, and the Minister had the good sense to see that uniformity must be carried out in order to have a fair basis for comparison. With respect to the Intercolonial, every one is aware that considerable discussion has occurred as to the deficits in operating the road. Charges and counter charges have been made with respect to the use of the capital account. If the Minister of Railways is to come down here with the doctrine that everything which strengthens and improves the road is to be charged to capital and not to revenue, then there is no chance for comparison between the old and the new accounts with respect to the working expenses of the road. Will the Minister of Railways give an answer to this question: When the wooden bridges were changed to iron bridges, was the cost charged to capital or to income?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am not familiar with the past history of the methods and manner of operating the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman ought to be familiar; that is what a Minister is for.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman has stated that this method is evidently a new departure and a cooking of the accounts. I assure him it is nothing of the kind. It would be utterly unreasonable and absurd to say that when by reason of the development of business there was necessarily an entire and total departure from the old plan of running light engines and light bridges over the road, when the necessity arose for doubling the engines and strengthening the capacity of the bridges, the cost should be paid out of income and the Parliament should not be asked for this sum on capital account, although it was expended to bring up the road to the general condition which the altered needs require. You might just as well say that the original cost of construction should be taken out of income. The bridges require to be doubled in strength. I propose in effect to take two bridges and make one out of them. I am not charging that bridge to capital, but I am charging to capital the bridge to replace the one taken away. A century would be occupied in bringing the Intercolonial Railway up to the necessary standard and enable it to compete for and carry the business offered, if the necessary outlay were to be taken from revenue. Parliament would be tieing the hands of the Minister and making the Intercolonial Railway useless until, after a long lapse of years, there had been accumulated sufficient income to pay for these necessary betterments in the direction I have mentioned.

The hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Powell) seems to be of the opinion that it was the rule in some years past that those

betterments should be paid out of income. Hon. gentlemen need only turn up the Estimates submitted by the ex-Minister of Finance during the last Parliament to see item after item of the very kind and description I submit here. It is true we do not happen to find any item for the building of heavier bridges.

Mr. HAGGART. To what Estimates is the hon. gentleman referring ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am referring to the Estimates for the fiscal year ending 30th June, 1897. I find the following headings : "Coal trestle and shed at Mulgrave," "Increased accommodation at Pictou," "Extend freight at Truro," "Increased accommodation at St. Flavien," "To provide a water supply at Grand Narrows," "To provide station sidings at No Man's Brook," "To do cribwork protection at Cape Breton," "To make improvements at Little Metis," "Improvements at Sussex," "Improvements at Trenton," "Improvements at Orangedale." I could go through previous years and show that it is by no means the rule which the hon. gentleman has stated in recent years, and I think I am entitled to follow the example which has been set me, and particularly am I entitled to claim that the construction of what are practically new bridges of a heavier character would be a proper charge to make upon the capital of the country, and especially so when I repeat that that is the invariable rule, as I am informed, on the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Might I ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) whether the rule is to charge the entire cost of the new bridge in such a case, or the cost a new bridge less the value of the bridge which is replaced ? I do not know about the usage on the Canadian Pacific Railway or the Grand Trunk Railway, but I do know that in a great many companies the cost of a new work of that kind is charged to capital, less the value of the work which it replaced at the time it was replaced.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is correct, and that is what we are doing here.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I did not quite understand that before.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is the case.

Mr. HAGGART. I would like to know from the Minister what is the total cost of this work and how much of it he thinks is betterment ? He states that the amount charged to capital account is only the cost of the betterment or improvement required for the increased strength of the bridge.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I said that there were three points, from two of which the spans were removed. There are two spans taken from one place and two spans taken from another, and the two are brought to a common centre and added to two spans which are already located, making six spans, and these six give the necessary weight for the bridge, and we have therefore two bridges to build in place of the two spans in each case which have been removed.

Mr. HAGGART. I understand you are taking some of the old bridges and utilizing them as part of the new ones, and I want to know what the total cost of that is, and whether the Minister includes the price of putting them up and what the amount of the betterment is ? The hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) instanced a lot of works which he said were of a similar character to this, but not one of which was of a similar character. The expenditure at Mulgrave and these other places was entirely for new work. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) might as well charge to capital account if he changed the 56-pound rail to a 75-pound rail, which would be required for the purpose of improved traffic on the road and accommodating these heavier engines.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. And I think that would be an entirely defensible position.

Mr. HAGGART. We do not. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) says that in order to make a comparison of the cost of the Intercolonial Railway we should continue on a similarity of accounts, but I state that in no estimate I ever brought down was anything such as the improvement of a bridge or snow sheds charged to capital. Even in the case of large expenditures such as for terminal facilities at Halifax and St. John, which is entirely new work, I had a great deal of doubt about asking Parliament to make that expenditure on capital account. I was of opinion, and I enforced it as much as possible on my department, that it was time the capital account of the Intercolonial Railway was closed altogether, and that unless there was new mileage added or an addition of that kind made, it was not justifiable to ask this House to vote the expenditure on capital account. What is the cost of the betterments on this particular bridge ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The betterments are estimated not to exceed $50,000, and the principle upon which the calculation has been made is that no portion of the amount of the original value of the bridge and cost of the bridge is to be charged against capital. The only cost to be charged against capital is the sum which it will take to bring the bridges up to the necessary standard. The hon. gentleman has had no cases of this kind to deal with in the past, because the necessity did not arise.

Mr. HAGGART. What is the total cost of the improvements ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We intend this year to expend to the amount of $50,000 and next year probably we will ask a further sum. The estimate of the engineer's department is that in order to go over the whole road it would take something like $200,000, and our expectation was that we might be able to spread that expenditure over a period of four years.

Mr. HAGGART. With reference to this particular bridge which the Minister is asking $50,000 for, what amount does he intend to charge to capital and what amount to income ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I can only give the hon. gentleman the amount we are actually going to expend for the new spans we will put in. There are six new spans altogether, every two of which we estimate will cost $14,000, and that will amount to $42,000. We have calculated up to that and these are the only direct figures that have been furnished to me. The $50,000 will be expressly applied to the new and not to any repair of the old.

Mr. HAGGART. All I can learn from the Minister is that the total expenditure is to be in the neighbourhood of $42,000 on income and capital, and he is asking $50,000 which he states is only to be employed in betterment, or $8,000 in excess of what ought to be the cost on income and capital combined.

Mr. FOSTER. I have not yet had any answer to my question as to whether when the wooden bridges were replaced by iron bridges, the cost was charged to capital or to income, and when the heavy rail was substituted for the light rail, whether the cost was charged to capital or to income.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am aware of the fact that when the rail was increased from 56 pounds to 67 pounds, the difference in cost was not charged to capital, but was paid out of income. As to the bridges, the Deputy Minister tells me that when any of the old bridges were replaced with new ones, the cost was charged to income.

Mr. FOSTER. These are cases exactly in point. I venture to state, so far as my knowledge is concerned, that that has been invariably the rule with the past Government. If when you replace an old wooden bridge with a new iron bridge, I would like to know if the argument, from the Minister's present position, is not strong, that that should be charged to capital ? And when you take a light rail, and replace it with a rail nearly twice as heavy, you thereby improve the working capacity of the road.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Is a 67-pound rail nearly twice as heavy as a 56-pound rail ?

Mr. FOSTER. If my hon. friend wishes to take a small point, he is welcome to do it. There is certainly a great difference between the two. When you substitute the heavy rail for the light rail, you make the carrying capacity and the endurance and permanence of the road very much greater ; you can put on heavier locomotives and heavier cars. Every argument which the hon. gentleman has used for charging the cost of these bridges to capital account can be used in these two instances, and used with greater effect than the hon. gentleman is trying to use it here. My hon. friend says that unless he is allowed to do this, it is impossible to get the betterments. He is taking this year $50,000. Can he not take that out of income ? He can, but if he does, his deficit will be more by $50,000 than if he takes it out of capital. There have been deficits on the Intercolonial Railway for years. These deficits have been created largely by charging these betterments to income and not to capital ; and so my hon. friend this year proposes to abstract $50,000 from capital account, and save the income by that much, and by that much lessen the deficit of the railways ; and then he will go through the length and breadth of the country saying how much better his administration has been than that of the late Minister of Railways. I say that is simply cooking the accounts ; there is no other word for it. When the public compare the expenditures on the Intercolonial Railway against its receipts from year to year, they suppose that the accounts are kept from year to year in about the same way. I grant you, there will be little shades of difference where it will be difficult to make the distinction between capital and income. That will occur under all governments and all ministers ; but the main distinctions can be kept. The Minister knows what these are. The cases which he has given to-night, when the facts have been got from his deputy, are cases stronger than those he has cited of expenditures charged against income account. In previous years these have been charged to income, but when the Minister proposes to charge them to capital, I want to know how anybody can make a fair comparison as to how the Intercolonial has been managed from year to year. What the hon. gentleman should do is to follow the precedents of previous years as far as possible, if he wants to show a fair comparison and to give us in Parliament and the public a chance to know whether the railway is being run as economically as before. I put that in a fair spirit of criticism as to account keeping. I put it to the Minister of Public Works, when we were discussing the question before, and in the end he acceded to that view—not because he thought the ex-

penditure should not go to capital, but in order to carry out the custom of previous years, for the sake of comparison of the accounts. Therefore I would suggest to the hon. Minister of Railways that he had better charge this to income rather than to capital. The money has to be expended and the country has to foot the Bill; but by all means, whatever Government is in power, let us keep about the same uniform method of accounts. In that way we will not be doing any harm to each other as parties; but the greater end will be gained of letting the public know exactly how matters are going as regards these great works of ours.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The Minister of Railways will surely yield to the appeal which has been made to him to keep the continuity of the comparison, which he knows is a most important thing. I am sure that he does not wish to gain any advantage from a comparison before the public of facts which cannot fairly be compared. The hon. gentleman knows perfectly well that if he compares the expenditure on the Intercolonial under his system of charging to capital account that which was charged to income by the late Government, the comparison cannot posibly be fair; and I am sure the hon. gentleman does not want an unfair comparison before the public. The hon. gentleman will perhaps tell me whether he would to-day regard the construction of entirely new cars as being properly charged to capital account or to revenue account?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That would depend altogether upon the circumstances.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Would the hon. gentleman tell me under what circumstances he would charge them to capital account?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I should think we ought to charge them to capital account if we were furnishing additional cars beyond the number that have been maintained from time to time. Suppose the business demands are such that we require a thousand additional cars, I should feel that we would be entitled to ask Parliament to put us in possession of funds from capital account to supply those additional cars. We are adding to our equipment, not simply replacing the former equipment. Therefore, they must properly be charged to capital account, and that has always been the practice.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I am afraid that my hon. friend the Minister of Railways will have difficulty with that proposition before Council. That is, providing his colleagues have not absolutely abandoned every vestige of the policy they advocated in Opposition. The very proposition the hon. gentleman put was discussed before this House by his colleague, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and the hon. gentleman will find in the "Hansard" of 1891, page 3,802, what the Minister of Marine and Fisheries said. Discussing the question of new freight cars, he went on to condemn the Government for doing just what the hon. gentleman is now doing. He said:

> An enormous amount of money was expended some years ago in the building of freight cars for the carriage of coal, and I think I am within bounds when I say $2,000,000. I may be wrong, for I speak without reference to the book, but every dollar of that should have been carried to revenue instead of capital account.

The hon. gentleman now contends that that should all go to capital account; but if I remember correctly, the Minister of Trade and Commerce stormed, time and time again, against the late Government, and demanded that the capital account of the Intercolonial should be closed for ever.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You would need to close the road.

Mr. MONTAGUE. That he must argue with his colleague, the Minister of Trade and Commerce, and not with me; but I tell the truth when I say that not only the Minister of Trade and Commerce, but the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, as well as the Hon. Edward Blake, all contended that even the small amounts which were being charged to capital by the late Minister of Railways and Canals for absolutely new constructions, such as the extension of the line and the erection of new accommodation in various points should have gone against revenue account. I appeal to the Minister of Public Works to say now whether the Minister of Trade and Commerce did not persistently demand that the capital account of the Intercolonial should be closed and that these things should be applied to revenue account entirely. I am sure that the Minister of Railways and Canals wishes us to go before the country with an argument and a comparison upon a fair basis, and now I ask him whether he will contend for a moment that we can go before the country and have a fair comparison, if he persists in charging to capital account large sums for constructions which, under the old Administration, were charged to revenue account entirely?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not think that the hon. gentleman can be serious in putting the proposition in the form in which he has put it. It is not a business suggestion, because he takes no note whatever of the altered conditions which undeniably exist, and which all those operating railways in the country recognize as existing. I cannot see why the hon. gentleman should think it is fair argument to say that the reason of this vote is that a comparison may be more favourably made between the late and the present Gov-

ernment. We do not need to ask the vote I am now proposing for the purpose of renewing or repairing the bridges here mentioned. Those bridges, with such ordinary repairs as would be made from time to time, would probably last half a century, but we cannot do the business with them, and we must have our bridges increased in strength. My hon. friend is not willing that a comparison should be made fairly as between myself and the previous Minister of Railways and Canals. The facts show that the bridges are not in need of repair and that we need not spend a dollar on them for ordinary purposes, but we have to double them up and make them into a totally different bridge to do the business. Why should I be asked to pay the large sum that will necessarily be imposed upon me out of income or revenue, if I am to do the business at all as it now requires to be done. I have always found my hon. friend reasonable and fair, and do not know why he should insist that a course should be taken which would, beyond doubt, and necessarily make the comparison unfavourable to my administration? But I do not think it is a question of comparison between my hon. friend's administration and myself at all. It is always open to my hon. friend to make the argument he has made.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. gentleman is quite aware that it is the custom in this House and before the electors to make comparisons between the two administrations, and it is a matter of great importance that the electors should receive proper information when instituting comparisons. I want to ask my hon. friend has he not admitted that he has charged to capital what under the previous administration was charged to revenue.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have not.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Has he not admitted that he has charged to capital account the same class of work that, under a former administration, was charged to revenue account?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I think I heard it stated by the hon. Minister that under the previous administration, this strengthening and renewal of bridges was charged to revenue account.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I was asked, when the wooden bridges decayed and they were replaced by iron bridges, whether the iron bridges were charged to capital or revenue account, and my deputy informs me that they were charged to revenue account. The new bridges were built to replace the old ones, and are no doubt more durable.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. Minister states that under the old administration, when a wooden bridge was done away with and an iron one was constructed in its place that was charged to revenue account, and now he says that if you remove one iron bridge and put in another somewhat stronger in its place, you should charge that to capital account and not to revenue account?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I say that if you take the spans upon the bridge and make them part of another bridge you are practically putting in a new bridge in the place of the one that, though it is taken away is still in use. You are not losing the old bridge, for the old bridge still exists, not in the same place but as part of another bridge.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Then you are not buying a single span——

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, you are buying what is, in fact, a new bridge.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. Minister says that if you take down a wooden bridge, which, if I am correctly informed costs two or three times as much——

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Not necessarily.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Usually so.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, not usually so.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Well, sometimes so, and in this case so—I want to be fair with the hon. gentleman as he has said I am; but for the life of me, I cannot understand on what principle he will charge the change from a cheap wooden bridge to an expensive iron or steel bridge to revenue account, in the next moment ask us to charge the expense of improving an iron bridge which already exists to capital account—for that is the proposition he makes.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Montague) thinks that is the proposition I make, I can only say he is mistaken.

Mr. MONTAGUE. What is the proposition?

Mr. CAMPBELL. He has stated it two or three times already.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Well, will the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Campbell) explain it. I challenge any hon. gentleman to explain it otherwise than as I have done.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have not said that when these wooden structures are replaced with steel which, the hon. gentleman says, costs two or three times as much, the additional cost should not be charged to capital.

Mr. MONTAGUE. But it was charged to revenue under the other Government.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. But I do not say that it is a sound principle.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Oh, now we are getting at it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. member (Mr. Montague) must not assume that I am responsible for everything done by my predecessors.

Mr. HAGGART. Will the hon. Minister state what are the extraordinary conditions that call for heavier bridges ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You have now engines that are many tons heavier than those that have been in use——

Mr. MONTAGUE. How many are there ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We have not as many as we hope to have. We are going to ask Parliament, I apprehend, to give us the means to get some of those heavy engines ; and we wish to have our bridges in shape so that we can carry these heavy engines. Unless we can carry out this policy we can not do the business.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) and I understand each other. He says he charged the change from wooden to steel or iron bridges to revenue account, but he does not advocate that system.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not think that it is necessarily sound.

Mr. BERGERON. It may be unfortuate for the House, but it is certainly very fortunate for the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) that he was not here under the old administration to hear the criticisms of his friends. Since we are to have these big engines to carry the great traffic on the Intercolonial Railway, brought down, I suppose, by the Drummond County Road, perhaps the hon. gentleman will tell us what is the deficit in the earnings of the road this year.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am very desirous of giving the hon. gentleman all the information he seeks, because he asks his questions in a very friendly spirit. But he will see that I can not give him the returns for the present year, because those returns will not be made out until after the close of the year, and the year ends on the 30th June. When the general item of the Intercolonial Railway is up, I intend to give to the House some idea of the expectations I have on the subject, and, if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergeron) will pardon me, I will not give that statement just now.

Mr. POWELL. The Miramichi bridges, which were strengthened for the same reason which the hon. gentleman gives for strengthening these—the heavy rolling stock on the Intercolonial Railway. I would ask whether the betterments in these cases were charged to capital or to income. I would ask also the same question with regard to the bridge across the Tantramar, a very long bridge, which was strengthened two years ago. The contract in that case was awarded, I believe, to Mr. Forbes, of Halifax, and some thousands of dollars expended.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I will be glad to procure the information desired by the hon. gentleman, but I cannot give it offhand, and I apprehend that my deputy will hardly be able to do so either. The hon. gentleman wants the amount expended on the Miramichi bridges——

Mr. POWELL. No, not the amount expended, but whether the expenditure was charged to capital or to income ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have already answered that question. I said that I was informed with respect to the bridges that were changed from wood to iron, all were charged to income.

Mr. POWELL. But the Miramichi bridges never were wooden.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am told that the amount was charged to income.

Mr. POWELL. And what about the Tantramar ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It was charged in the same way.

Mr. POWELL. I would ask the Minister if the reason for the strengthening of these three bridges, at a very large cost, was not the heavier rolling stock being put on the Intercolonial Railway ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The Deputy Minister says it is due to that cause.

Mr. MONTAGUE. So the cases are on all fours.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, I do not think so. With respect to the expenditure on the line from Rivière du Loup to Lévis, I do not know with regard to the expenditure upon bridges, but I do know that the work that was done upon that road in reforming the embankment, in laying sleepers, in putting downs rails, and in ballasting, amounting altogether to something over one million dollars, every dollar of it was charged to capital account. After the roadbed had been bought, which cost about $12,000 a mile, over one million dollars was spent on this 125 miles, and all was charged to capital account.

Mr. HAGGART. That was taken over from the Grand Trunk Railway. It had fallen into a bad state of repair, and they had to put it up to the standard of the Intercolonial Railway, and there had to be a large expenditure.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. gentleman admits that under the old administration wooden bridges replaced by iron bridges and the construction of new ones, were charged to revenue.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. MONTAGUE. And that of weaker iron bridges strengthened or replaced by stronger ones, the cost was also charged to revenue.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. In so far as an outlay was made.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Now, I want the hon. gentleman to admit that for purposes of comparison between periods, since he is charging the strengthening of iron bridges to capital, he cannot compare the periods in future at all, the comparison is destroyed.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not think you can make a fair comparison in that way between these cases. No doubt, many bridges required from time to time to be strengthened and repaired: no doubt these Miramichi bridges required to be strengthened from time to time. But this present proposal is something totally different from any thing that has been done heretofore, in that we are requiring practically to double up, over the whole extent of this line, the carrying capacity of many of our bridges. The Deputy Minister tells me that there were no new additional spans, some few additional cords were put in, but they were trifling. The amount is inconsiderable compared with the additional cost which these structures require.

Mr. COCHRANE. Would not the principle be the same?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, it would make all the difference in the world. The business of the road now requires engines weighing twenty, twenty-five or thirty tons heavier than those heretofore used. The cases are not parallel You have to go over these roads and double the weight of the iron, and double the carrying capacity of many of these bridges. There has been, I think, in times past on that road no similar experience to this. If we had to pay this out of income, the effect would probably be that we would have to postpone to an indefinite period the putting of our bridges in a safe condition, because we could not undertake it. It would be unreasonable in addition to put upon income the cost of repairing and strengthening the bridges from point to point, if we had to spend $50,000 and upwards a year in order to get those bridges in shape for business. We would probably have to defer the strengthening of these bridges, and consequently we would have to defer the work of getting our line into shape.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Here is what a very solemn authority in this House said upon this very point:

> An attempt to eke out a deficiency at the expense of capital account would be a very dishonest procedure.

That is the opinion of the Hon. Edward Blake, who is now a member of the Imperial Parliament, who was leader of the Opposition at that time, and who was criticising this very practice.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. How did he impress you at the time?

Mr. MONTAGUE. I must say that he was a little vague later on. But I have no doubt if the hon. gentleman had been here, he would have impressed him wonderfully, as he did the hon. gentlemen on that side of the House who are now silent, but who at that time cheered most lustily the sentiments he expressed.

Mr. HUGHES. It appears to me that members on this side of the House are a little persistent with the Minister of Railways and Canals. I cannot see what more they want. He has repudiated his colleagues, he has said that he does not hold himself bound by any arguments they have placed on the "Hansard" in past years. It is a little peculiar that as soon as this discussion came up, the hon. member for North Wellington got up and sloped out of the House; we see the Minister of Trade and Commerce get up and quietly meander out; we see the Postmaster General get up and slip out another door; and the only one of the old guards that is left is the Minister of Commerce.

Mr. COCHRANE. The Minister of Railways and Canals says that the old Administration made a mistake in charging the renewal of the bridges to revenue when it should be charged to capital account. Now, he says, if I understand him aright, that because he is compelled to pay larger sums than they did, therefore they ought to be charged to capital account. If I understand him, if a bridge requires $10,000 to strengthen it, that should be charged to revenue, but if it requires $20,000, it should be charged to capital account. Is that the doctrine? Under the old Administration they renewed wooden bridges by replacing them by iron bridges.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, because the old ones decayed.

Mr. COCHRANE. Hon. gentlemen opposite wish to avoid a deficit, and are therefore

charging this work to capital instead of revenue. I want to be fair with the country in discussing the matter, and hon. gentlemen opposite should be fair with the country and not withdraw from all their pledges and statements made when in Opposition. Hon. gentlemen opposite now admit that the Liberal party made a mistake when they declared that the changing of wooden bridges to iron bridges should be charged to revenue and not capital account. The trouble is that the present Administration does not want to be responsible for anything. No doubt the hon. member for North Wellington will back up the Government again and will come to the rescue of the Minister, and give reasons why the Government should go back on all the principles they advocated when in Opposition. I cannot understand why if the late administration replaced wooden bridges with iron bridges and charged the cost to revenue, the expense of strengthning these iron bridges should not be charged to revenue.

Mr. INGRAM. When were the iron bridges, which now require strengthening, constructed ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. In 1872 or thereabouts. This expenditure, however, is not so much to strengthen the existing bridges, as to utilise the iron in them, closing them together, putting them into one or two, and practically providing new bridges for the balance. That is the effect of the proposition.

Mr. INGRAM. What was the weight of the engines used on the Intercolonial when these bridges were built ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My deputy says he cannot state what the weight was, but the cylinders were 16 x 22, and the new engines will be 19 x 28.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Is it the intention of the Government to spend any of this money on the Georges River bridge on the Cape Breton division ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I had not such an expenditure in contemplation, for we are not likely to run any of our heavy engines over that part of the road.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Is it the intention to improve the condition of the bridge ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is under consideration.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I understand that the condition is unsatisfactory, that it is not safe.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is safe.

Mr. McDOUGALL. It may be safe, but there is some question about it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There is no question about it.

Mr. McDOUGALL. It would not be wise to delay a proper examination of that bridge, because it is built on a very sharp curve, and is a dangerous place if any accident should happen.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We have had an examination made and report on it.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Latterly.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Within the last six months.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I have heard nothing about it within that time.

Mr. HAGGART. Does the hon. gentleman intend to have all the bridges finished and strengthened before any of the new engines are allowed to pass over the road ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I hope so.

Mr. INGRAM. I cannot believe that the hon. gentleman cannot tell us the weight of the engines.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Does the hon. gentleman suggest that I stated what was not correct ?

Mr. INGRAM. I cannot believe the Deputy Minister is not in a position to tell the hon. gentleman the weight of the engines on the road.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is a very common form of indicating the capacity of an engine to mention the size of the cylinder and the length of the stroke. An officer may not be able to tell the weight, but the size of the cylinder indicates it to an intelligent man.

Mr. FOSTER. It does not convey anything to me. I too cannot believe that the Deputy Minister or the railway engineer who has been in charge of the Intercolonial for fourteen or fifteen years is not able to give approximately the weight of the engines now in use. I think we should have that information.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The deputy will be glad to procure the information, which he has not at hand at the moment. The question, however, was as to the weight of the engines in 1872, when the bridges were built. That is the question I asked of the deputy, and he stated that he did not like to commit himself definitely about it, but he would obtain the information.

Mr. INGRAM. There is not a manager of a railway who cannot tell the weight or tonnage of the engines on his road. Some years ago 30-ton engines were used, with light rails and light bridges, but increased competition led to increased weight of rails and

iron bridges owing to the fact that 90-ton engines were used. We know that the cylinders vary in size, but every railway manager knows also the weight of the engines.

Mr. CAMPBELL. That is what the Minister told you an hour ago.

Mr. INGRAM. The Minister did not tell me anything about the tonnage of these engines.

Mr. CAMPBELL. He told the reason for strengthening the bridges.

Mr. INGRAM. I know the reason for strengthening the bridges as well as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Campbell), and as well as the Minister for that matter. I do not understand how it is that they do not know the tonnage of the engines. Every railway company in this country knows that.

Mr. POWELL. What is the weight of the large engine.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Seventy-two tons.

Mr. POWELL. What was the weight of the Moguls ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The Deputy Minister says about 50 tons. The nearest he can come to the weight of the old engines in use in 1872 is 40 tons.

Mr. FOSTER. From whom does the Minister of Railways propose to buy the new spans he is putting in the bridge ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I really have not given any consideration to that yet. We propose to ask for tenders.

Mr. FOSTER. I want now to make a final appeal, not to the Minister of Railways, but to the Minister of Finance. This matter is now about as plain as it can be made if we discussed it for two hours more. The Minister of Railways proposes a new plan with reference to the apportionment of the expenditure. He has himself admitted and been informed by his deputy that in the past, when the wooden bridges, as traffic became heavier, were replaced by the stronger and more costly iron bridges, it was charged to the revenue account; that when iron bridges of great strength were made still stronger, owing to the increased traffic and weight of rolling stock, that was charged against revenue; that when the 56-pound rail was replaced by the 67-pound rail for the same reason, that was also charged to revenue. The present Minister (Mr. Blair) says he does not agree with that system at all that he did not originate it, did not practice it, and is not responsible for it. To-day he has iron bridges which are to be strengthened; and he says that this strengthening must be placed to capital account and not to revenue account; and his chief reason is that if it were not that way he could not strengthen them at all. Evidently he can get the $50,000 required for this just as easily out of revenue as out of capital. But there is a deficit at the end of the year and the consolidated fund has to make up that deficit. In plain English, the meaning of the Minister is that there is to be a change in the method of book-keeping which will result in this way: that whereas formerly an item like this would cause $50,000 more of a deficit on the Intercolonial Railway, now there will be $50,000 less of a deficit, but the $50,000 will be expended all the same and charged to capital. If the Minister of Railways does not see any obligation on his part to maintain a continuity and uniformity of accounts—not for party purposes, because the Minister of Railways is above that we will say—I appeal to the Minister of Finance, whose duty it is to guard the accounts of the country and place them properly before the people; I appeal to him as a man of responsibility in that respect, whether he proposes to give his weight and the weight of the Government towards that change. If he does, what we must do is to examine these matters before a committee and take care every year that the country knows just exactly the sum total of these differences. The country pays the bill in the end, and what matter should it make to the Minister of Railways. There is no man so warped as to ask that just for a matter of this kind, the whole face of these accounts shall be changed, and that hereafter the country will always be at the mercy of the man who speaks last, one saying that there was such a deficit and the other saying that the real deficit is more, because what was formerly paid out of revenue is now paid out of capital. In the interest of straight book-keeping and of presenting the public accounts in the uniform manner to the people, I make an appeal to the Minister of Finance. That responsibility is on the Minister of Finance, and I do hope that in this case he will take exactly the same position he took with reference to the items in public works, and that he will counsel that this work be charged to income.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). I had not the good fortune to be present during the entire discussion, as I was obliged to leave the House on a pressing engagement, so perhaps I speak at a disadvantage. I think it is even better to be right than consistent, and without entering into the question of what has been the practise I must say that from the discussion I did hear the Minister of Railways created the impression in my mind that in charging these sums to capital account he was doing that which was done by all the leading railways of Canada to-day. If that is the fact it is a fair argument for charging it to capital. Whether we have been right in the

past in our dealings with these matters is also a fair subject for consideration. If my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) is right, that precisely similar works have been charged to revenue account, undoubtedly that would need to be taken into consideration in any comparison which might be made with reference to the Intercolonial Railway. From that part of the discussion which I heard, I was impressed with the fact that the item now proposed to be charged to capital is precisely the same as is charged to capital on the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway. If that be the fact, it would be difficult to prove that the course pursued is a wrong one, yet if it is inconsistent with the practice it is a fair question for discussion. I admit that if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) is correct in his statement that similar charges have been in the past placed against revenue, that fact would have to be taken into consideration in any comparison of the workings of the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose there is no moral principle of right or wrong in mere technical book-keeping. The only question that men have to look at when charged with the responsibility of exposing these accounts to the country is to keep a uniform method, and I do hope that this item will be allowed to stand so that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) may have a chance to talk it over with his colleagues. I do not overrate the importance of it. If it is done in this case it may be done in other cases, and it is quite certain, such are partisan methods in this country, that if it is done once it may be carried on. It is a bad principle to import into our finances. Wherever else we may carry politics, do not let us carry politics into the finances of the country. Now, I am quite willing to take the history of the Railway Department and bring it to the test, and say whether or not the course of that history has not been to charge these things in the main to revenue rather than to capital. If so, we are on no fair ground of comparison hereafter. Anyway, the hon. gentleman should allow this to stand for the time being. It makes no difference to him or to the vote. We want to have these bridges strengthened, and if he gets the bridge from income it will be just as strong a bridge as it would be if he got it from capital.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Speaking from a manufacturing point of view, the distinction would be between replacing an old piece of machinery that is worn out and utterly useless, and putting in new machinery. In this case, you will continue to have the asset which you have now, with all its value; it is not to be destroyed. It is not like the renewal of a wooden bridge that has become absolutely useless, and has to be replaced by a new wooden bridge or any other structure. You will have all the asset you have now, and in addition to that you have a new asset.

Mr. FOSTER. I will take my hon. friend on his own ground as a business man. Suppose he runs a business as manager for a company; for ten years he runs it in a certain way, and is accustomed to charge such and such things to current expenses, and such and such things to capital account. After he has run the business in that way and made yearly reports to his stockholders, another man comes in to manage the business, and he has a different idea. He says: "I think I can make the yearly accounts show a little better to the stockholders if I charge certain things to capital account which hitherto have been charged to income." He charges say, $10,000 in this way to capital, and his report to the stockholders at the end of the year appears $10,000 better than his predecessor's. Would my hon. friend, as a business man, think the stockholders were being properly used in such a case?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Is that a parallel case?

Mr. FOSTER. I think so.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. No, because the Minister is putting in $10,000 of new machinery. That is just the distinction. He keeps the present asset; he keeps the three spans, and he puts in three entirely new spans. The country has only got a bridge, it is true, but it is a bridge worth double the money.

Mr. COCHRANE. The Minister of Customs will see the absurdity of his argument when it is put in the proper light. He takes the ground that the Minister of Railways and Canals, in taking some spans and putting them with other spans to strengthen the bridge is giving the country an asset. The old administration took out a wooden bridge that was useless, and put in a new iron bridge, and it was charged to revenue; and yet, according to the hon. gentleman, the country did not get an asset. I think the absurdity of the argument will be apparent to the Minister of Customs himself.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The hon. gentleman ought to see the absurdity of it, because he says that the wooden bridge which was replaced by the iron bridge was useless, was of no value, was not an asset, whereas in this case, we still have a valuable asset of the same value that it was before, and we add to it another asset—and the asset which we propose to charge to capital account is an entirely new structure.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The Minister of Customs has demonstrated that he slept a good while, because he says the old wooden bridge was absolutely useless. The reason given by the Minister of Railways why the old wooden bridge was changed to iron was that the weight of the rolling stock was in-

creased, and the reason given for strengthening the iron bridge is that the weight of the rolling stock has been increased. I appeal to the hon. gentleman to say whether these cases are not entirely parallel. The Minister of Finance has hardly grasped the whole question properly in view of its past history in this House. The position of the two Governments, if I may believe "Hansard," has always been that the renewal of works which have once been constructed should be charged to revenue, and that only absolutely new works should be charged to capital.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not think that general statement can be accurate, because in the case of the wharfs and sheds which were destroyed by fire at Halifax, the proposal was, when they were burned down, that they should be rebuilt out of capital.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I can understand that every rule has its exception, and that is an exceptional case, where a work is destroyed by fire and has not been worn out by use.

Mr. HAGGART. Is the Minister correct when he says I proposed to rebuild out of capital the buildings which had been burned ?

Mr. MONTAGUE. Let me go on and state my position. At any rate, as a general rule the contention of the late Government was that in the case of works which had been built in the early history of the Intercolonial and had to be renewed for ordinary causes, the renewals should be charged to revenue. But that when an absolutely new work had to be constructed, it should be constructed out of capital. The Opposition of those days contended that the Government did not go far enough and that not only should the renewals for strengthening of old work be charged to revenue but the construction of new works also. I have here the statement of Mr. Ross, the present Minister of Education for Ontario, who was discussing this very subject in 1883, and who declared what the principle of his own leader, Mr. McKenzie, was.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Probably if the hon. gentleman is in Opposition some little time, he will be making some contentions too.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I am not making any contention that we did not carry out when in power. The Hon. Mr. Ross said :

> I remember the discussion that arose between the hon. gentleman and the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) as to the propriety of charging new works to capital account, and the hon. member for East York maintained that after the road was completed all additional works should be charged to revenue.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The Minter of Railways has intimated that he has no special desire to press this item unduly, but will let it stand for to-night. I think we may possibly err in attempting to follow precedent too closely in this matter. We have had some very strange ideas in our estimates as to what should be charged to capital and what to revenue. We charged to capital a large sum of money which was applied to the excellent purpose of buying cartridges which go up in smoke. Then we spent a lot of money in buying a piece of land and putting up a $200,000 building on it and charged that to revenue.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Is that in Liverpool ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, that will be exceedingly modest, and the kindly interest which the hon. gentleman took in it will be remembered in due course. The hundreds of thousands of dollars which are spent in acquiring land and putting up expensive buildings, such as the new drill hall at Halifax, which will cost upwards of $200,000, are charged to income, while the money that is spent on ammunition is charged to capital. That is one of the anomalies, in which we may not be right in adhering too closely to the past. I do not think the Hon. Mr. Ross, who is now Minister of Education in Ontario, would claim that he had attained perfection when a member of this House. He doubtless improved in his views after he became a Minister in Ontario. The Minister of Railways has agreed to let this item stand for further consideration and perhaps we will make progress with some of the other items.

Mr. FOSTER. The very fact which the hon. gentleman has adduced is a very good reason for the argument I have been trying to make. We commenced these public works out of income and have kept that up, and I think that so long as we have a Parliament we will keep it up, if for no other reason than that of keeping a parity of accounts.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That means that in order to prevent possible advantages for one party or the other, we are not to make changes.

Mr. FOSTER. I threw that out of consideration owing to the fact that I thought the Minister of Railways would hardly like to come down to so low a ground, and therefore I took the other ground, which is still higher, and that is the information to the public.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If we agree as to what is right, I would say we should do that, irrespective of what was done in by-gone years, and not follow a bad precedent. I quite agree that we should not make a change from one practice to another, in such a manner as to create erroneous impressions in the comparison between the two political parties.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman was wrong in saying that the Dominion Cartridge Factory was charged to revenue.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We have the ammunition charged to capital.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend is not quite fair. Two years ago we were face to face with this fact. We decided on a large appropriation of $1,500,000 for the militia, and that included our schools and the Cartridge Factory as well. We came to the conclusion that the time had arrived when we should expend an extraordinary amount in order to get a stronger and fuller equipment, and we spent nearly $2,000,000. That vote was agreed to as a special case, but it is not right to say that the cartridges we have for our common use are charged to capital account. We purchased batteries and ammunition, it was for an extraordinary purpose, and it was absolutely necessary to charge it to capital account because we had not the income for it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is one of the arguments my hon. friend condemned a moment ago.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I would like to ask the Minister of Railways whether the railway to water terminus at North Sydney is under construction ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We have just entered into a contract with Ross & McManus.

Mr. McDOUGALL. What are the terms of the contract ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Between $22,000 and $23,000, if my memory serves me right.

Mr. McDOUGALL. There was some discussion with regard to the route over which the road was to be extended to the water from the present railway station.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We run down the valley of Oxford Creek or Belly Creek to the water—down to the Emory wharf.

Mr. McDOUGALL. What depth of water is there at the end of the pier ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am advised there will be 18 feet at the end of the pier at low water.

Mr. McDOUGALL. What is to be the length of the dock ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. A steamer will lie in front, alongside, and the wharf will be a narrow one.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Then it is not the intention to build the breastwork to the old works, except to build a pier into the harbour ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No.

Mr. McDOUGALL. What is the length of the pier ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I can give the hon. gentleman details to-morrow. The chief engineer says the wharf will be about 600 feet long. That is a sufficient pier, I think.

Mr. McDOUGALL. If it is 600 feet, I think it will do for present purposes. I would like if the hon. Minister would be kind enough to give some information I asked for in the early part of the session in regard to dismissals on the Cape Breton division of the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. This item will stand.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I want to know whether I am to get the information.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Did the hon. gentleman (Mr. McDougall) ask for some information, and has it not been brought down ?

Mr. McDOUGALL. No. I asked my question on the 17th February in the following words :—

What changes have been made in the employees in the Cape Breton division of the Intercolonial Railway since June, 1896 ?

That information was refused. I put it in the form of a notice of motion for papers, and that was called on two occasions, and on each occasion the request came from the Government side of the House to have it stand. Finding I could not bring my motion on and discuss it, I asked to have it dropped in order to have the opportunity of getting the information by other means. I am still without the information I desire, and I ask the Minister what time he will be prepared, if not now, to give it to me. I am prepared now to go into the facts of these dismissals ; but if it will be more convenient for the hon. Minister, let him name any other time that will be convenient, and I am willing to agree to a postponement of the matter until that time, unless it is too late in the session.

An hon. MEMBER. Next winter.

Mr. McDOUGALL. It will not do next winter. I want to see that these items do not pass before I get some satisfaction with regard to these dismissals. I would not have taken that stand if I had been fairly treated when I asked for the information.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I scarcely imagine for a moment that the hon. gentleman would say that I had not treated him fairly. I do not recollect that he asked me for any information which I declined to give. If he withdrew any notice of motion designed to bring out information, it was not at my instance

or suggestion. If he had intimated to me the information he desired, I would have done what I could to secure it for him. The information that he asks for is not the kind that he can get at a moment's notice. I shall have to send to Moncton for it, and it cannot be here in a day or a week, as it will take some little time to prepare it and send it forward. The hon. gentleman will surely not say that I treated him with want of courtesy or declined to give him the information asked for.

Mr. McDOUGALL. That seems to me a most extraordinary way to meet a matter that was put on the public records early in the session. I have here a clipping from the official record of the 17th of February last. I read——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The discussion that the hon. gentleman (Mr. McDougall) proposes to bring on will come up more properly under item No. 252.

Mr. McDOUGALL. If you are going to take that plan of shutting me out from getting information, Mr. Chairman——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. If I may be permitted——

Mr. McDOUGALL. I shall see to it that the Minister shall not gain anything by attempting to shut me out that way.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I only called the hon. gentleman's attention to an item under which this discussion could more properly take place.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not want the hon. gentleman (Mr. McDougall) to imagine that there is any information that I can give him that he is not going to get. But he cannot expect me to carry all these details in my head. I do not recollect that he ever asked me for information that I declined to give. He must have misunderstood the circumstances or have forgotten what actually happened. There is a general item for the Intercolonial Railway which I do not expect to reach to-night. If the hon. gentleman will give me a memo. in a friendly way across the floor, showing the information he wants, I will try to have it for him when the Intercolonial Railway item comes up.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I wish to give an illustration of how I have been treated in this matter, and how I expect to be treated hereafter if this matter is left to a day when it will be impossible to get the information. The notice was put on the official record, and the question was put by me.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. What was it?

Mr. McDOUGALL. It was a question as to what dismissals of employees had taken place on the Cape Breton division of the Intercolonial Railway. I was refused that information.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. What was the answer?

Mr. McDOUGALL. I could not get any answer.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Why not?

Mr. McDOUGALL. I was refused, but why I have some difficulty in understanding. I was refused in general terms by several members of the Government of that day. They protested against answering my question as to the changes that have taken place in the Department of Railways and Public Works. The question came up chiefly when asking for information with regard to dismissals under the Fisheries Department.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Was the hon. gentleman (Mr. McDougall) asked to move for a return?

Mr. McDOUGALL. I was, and I put a notice of motion on the paper. But when it came up and I was about to move it, a request came from the Government side that the motion should stand, in order to shut me out from going into the question and getting the information, I asked with regard to the dismissals in the fisheries service, the customs service, railway service and public works. This question I put on the Notice Paper on the 17th of February. I followed that up by putting a notice on the paper, and when my notice of motion came on, I was met with a request from the Government to let it stand, and I dropped it. Three or four weeks ago I saw there was a plan of the Government side to prevent me getting information. I put the following questions, and received the following answers:—

Mr. McDOUGALL asked,

1. Why was Mr. Rory McNeil, section foreman at West Bay Road, dismissed from the service of the Cape Breton division of the Intercolonial Railway?

2. Was his dismissal asked for by anybody; if so, by whom?

3. Was there any charge against him; if so, by whom, and was there any investigation?

4. Who was put in his place, and was he in the railway service before?

5. By whom was he recommended?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). 1. Mr. Rory McNeil, section foreman, West Bay Road, was dismissed from the service of the railway on the ground of offensive partisanship. 2. His dismissal was asked for by Dr. McLennan, M.P. 3. A charge of offensive political partisanship was made against McNeil by Dr. A. McLennan, M.P. No investigation was made. 4. D. C. McDonald, trackman at McIntyre's Lake, who has been in the service of the railway since 1891, was put in McNeil's place. 5. D. C. McDonald was recommended for employment by Dr. Cameron in 1891.

That question was asked on the 16th of February, the general question was asked on the next day.

Mr. McDOUGALL asked,

What changes have been made in the officials and employees of the Department of Marine, in the county of Cape Breton, since June, 1896 ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). In this and succeeding questions the hon. gentleman asks for long lists of names in all the different departments of the Government in the county or in the district of Cape Breton. Another gentleman will probably ask similar questions with regard to the province of Ontario, another with regard to Nova Scotia, and so on. It is practically impossible that this information can be given in the form of answers to questions. But, if the hon. gentleman will put it in the form of a motion, I promise him that the information shall be brought down promptly.

That is the answer I received, and I then put all the questions in the form of a notice for papers. Now in reference to the answers which I received from the Minister of Railways and Canals with regard to the dismissal of Rory McNeil, I wish to show that the information which I received from the Minister is not in accordance with the facts, and that is the reason why I want to get information in regard to others in time to enable me fully to investigate them, and to give to this House what I know is different from the information that the Minister has to give, but yet is correct.

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). If the hon. gentleman says that the charge against McNeil is unfounded, I beg to tell him that he is stating what is really not consistent with the facts. Of course I take full responsibility for having made the recommendation for the dismissal of McNeil, who was a most offensive partisan. It is quite true that he was from the hon. gentleman's county, but that does not signify when his conduct is called in question. He has been at the head of a gang employed on the railway who made it their business to insult and attack everybody that was in opposition to them in politics.

Mr. McDOUGALL. The hon. gentleman having volunteered to give information on behalf of the Minister, I would like to ask him whether he made a request for the dismissal of Rory McNeil on that ground ?

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). I certainly made a recommendation to have McNeil dismissed on the ground that he was a most offensive political partisan, and I take full responsibility for having done so.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I have some documents here which throw a little more light on the subject. I have here a letter dated 25th August, 1897, written from Point Tupper to Rory McNeil, section foreman on the Intercolonial Railway, West Bay Road :

Dear Sir,—I am instructed by the department to say that after 14 days from date your services will no longer be required.

Yours truly,
C. W. ARCHIBALD,
Track Master.

Here is a letter written by Rory McNeil in reply to C. W. Archibald, dated at West Bay Road, August 26, 1897 :

C. W. Archibald, Track Master, I.C.R., Sydney, Cape Breton.

Dear Sir,—I am in receipt of your letter of yesterday's date, inclosing notice of my dismissal. In reply I would like to be permitted to ask on what grounds my services are to be dispensed with on the Intercolonial Railway. Will you please inquire, and furnish me with this, in order that I may be able to ask for an investigation and defend my position.

I am, yours truly,
RORY McNEIL,
Section Foreman.

The letter is returned to Mr. McNeil, and the following notice on it :—

R. McNeil.

Dear Sir,—No grounds are mentioned.

C. W. A.

I have here a letter which was written in reply to a letter of McNeil, addressed to the hon. member for Inverness. The letter is dated Margaree, 6th October, 1897 :

Dear Sir,—By the inclosed you will observe that I have made application for you in Cape Breton County. So great is the local jealousy against my permitting people from other counties to be employed here, in this county, I am going to press for your employment, and will communicate with Dr. Kendall and others with that end in view.

Yours truly,
A. McLENNAN.

But he was born in another county, eighteen miles distant from where he worked. Here is the inclosure :

New Glasgow, Sept. 30, 1897.

Dear Sir,—I am pleased to inform you that I have succeeded in getting John Morrison, of West Bay Road, reinstated as per your request. I had a letter from Mr. W. B. McKenzie yesterday, stating that John Morrison has been reinstated, and in regard to Mr. McNeil, the man you wished to get employment for in Cape Breton County, he regretted to say there was no vacancy in that county at present.

Yours truly,
T. C. CAMPBELL.

This is the McNeil who was dismissed for offensive partisanship, and the hon. member for Inverness wanted to appoint him to Cape Breton County.

He regretted to say there was no vacancy in that county at present.

Yours truly,
T. C. CAMPBELL.

Such is the condition of matters on that division of the Intercolonial Railway, where the hon. member for Inverness wrote to an official of the hon. Minister asking for the employment of a man whom he dismissed, not for offensive partisanship, but for the reason he was not born in the county where he was working. That goes to show to the House the importance which the country should attach to a statement coming from the Gov-

ernment, and to which we are accustomed to listen from day to day, that certain parties were dismissed on information received and that new appointments were given on the recommendations made by people in whom the Government had confidence. That answer of the Government is by this time about patented; we have had it so often with respect to dismissals that I believe we can obtain no other answer except this, that the Government dismissed a man on the recommendation of a gentleman or party in whom they had confidence. Will the Minister tell me now if he has confidence in the hon. member for Inverness, who has misled him, and who, after securing the dismissal of the man for offensive partisanship, forsooth, wrote to the railway officials, behind the Minister's back, recommending the man for a position occupied on some other division of the Intercolonial Railway. That is the position occuped to-day by the Minister and the hon. member in whom he has confidence, and the same position is occupied by them in regard to a great many other dismissals from the service. In order to prepare the Minister for giving the information which I ask in respect to others, I want to call his attention to the dismissal of the blacksmith of the forge at Grand Narrows, Rory B. McNeil. He was dismissed—I do not know for what reason. I am aware of many reports that have been in the air about the dismissal of this man, and of every other employee on that section of the railway. I asked the question of the Minister of Railways some months ago with respect to that man—it was on the 18th April, and was as follows:

1. What was the reason for dismissing the blacksmith employed in the Government forge and railway bridge at Grand Narrows, Cape Breton?
2. Who asked the dismissal?
3. Was there an investigation; if so, before whom?
4. Who gave evidence against the dismissed man?
5. Who was appointed in place of the dismissed man?
6. By whom recommended?
7. Is he doing the same work as the man who was dismissed was, and is he capable of so doing?

I added: I find that one of my questions is omitted: Is he a blacksmith? The Minister of Railways and Canals replied as follows:—

I may say that I have not information on that point; but I presume he is. My answer to the other parts of the question is: R. McNeil, bridge-tender and blacksmith at Grand Narrows, C.B., was dismissed for political interference. There was an investigation held by Mr. John T. Ross. J. J. McKinnon was appointed in his place. He was recommended by persons in whom the department has entire confidence. He is doing satisfactorily the same work as McNeil was doing.

Will the Minister be surprised to find that he did not give correct information with respect to that dismissal, and that the man appointed is not a blacksmith, but he is so strong a Grit that he has his newspapers addressed to him, "J. J. McKinnon, Grit." No one can say that this man has any other recommendation of any kind. He is utterly unfit for the work, as he is not a blacksmith. I ought to know for he lives in my neighbourhood. There is something further connected with this man to be stated. He was employed by the Government to go around with blank subpœnas for collecting evidence against officials of the Government in the various departments. He was searching for information against employees of the Government, and after he succeeded in getting some kind of evidence against this man and against others, he was given the place of a man employed on the forge built by the Government for the purpose of doing blacksmithing work for that division of the road. The work consisted of all kinds of work required for repairs to cars, snowplows and so on. The Minister told me in answer to my question, that this man was satisfactorily doing his work. He might as well have said that I could competently do the work of a blacksmith. This man who was appointed is no blacksmith. He might be able to sharpen a piece of iron and heat and bend it, and yet not a blacksmith but he is appointed to do the work of a first-class blacksmith, who had served for five or six years in learning his trade doing carriage mountings and similar work. The class of work that was done by the man who was dismissed is now sent to Moncton or elsewhere. I was informed on what I considered to be good authority, that such work as the making of frogs had to be sent a distance of over 250 miles from Grand Narrows to Moncton, because the blacksmith who was put in the place of the man who was dismissed was not fit to do the work. The country is under the expense of paying him and his helper to do the work in the forge and to open and close the draw, and the time they are required on the draw is only a few hours at most out of the whole day. The rest of the time they are supposed to be at work in the forge during the ordinary repairs to iron work that are required on the line between Sydney and Point Tupper. The man was put there in charge over the man who had been helper with the man who had been dismissed since the road was open in 1890. If any man at all was fit to do blacksmith work it was the man who was assistant to the blacksmith, but let me tell the Minister in advance that that man does not pretend to be able to do blacksmith work, because he was only helper to the man who was dismissed, and besides he is getting to be an old man and would not likely take the trouble to learn a trade. It was on my recommendation that both these men were appointed. I had the old man appointed because he was one of the best boatmen known about the shores and the work at

the opening and closing of the draw required such a man. He had an exceptional knowledge of handling boats and with the strong current there during a heavy storm, it is very difficult to manage to get on and off the draw with safety. I have known that old man to remain on the draw all night during a storm because he could not with safety land. The blacksmith was a fair boatman, but I knew he had not the experience that would make him as safe a man in a boat as the old man. If the Minister (Mr. Blair) can give me any information with regard to these dismissals, which is not in keeping with my statements, and that he can prove is correct, I am willing to hear it.

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). With regard to Rory McNeil in reference to whom the hon. gentleman (Mr. McDougall) has so much to say, I might explain why I wrote him such a letter as has been read. My reason was this. McNeil belonged to the hon. gentleman (Mr. McDougall's) county. He is one of the chickens whom he sent abroad to forage on other constituents when his Government was in power. McNeil began to feel his way around in Inverness and thought that the same regime that held sway in Cape Breton would do in Inverness, and he took considerable delight in organizing political warfare around the Intercolonial stations in the county of Inverness. When the Minister of Railways very justly answered my demand by dismissing McNeil, I felt no objection whatsoever to have him employed in Cape Breton County to carry out his Toryism at his own sweet will. Hence it is that I wrote a letter to my friend, Dr. Kendall, in Cape Breton County, saying that if he had any use for Mr. McNeil and his political proclivities, he might avail himself of them both. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. McDougall) objects to that kindly letter I wrote to McNeil, I promise him never to write such a letter again.

Mr. BERGERON. Politics is getting down pretty low.

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). In the meantime I say that it is not coming down low, to shake excrescences like McNeil who comes into another person's constituency to foment trouble in the county where he is earning his bread. The least he should have done was to have kept his politics to himself. He did not do so, and as proof of the fact that it is to his politics and character I objected in the answer of the Minister will be found a reply to any charge of that description, because the nominee of my predecessor, Dr. Cameron, took McNeil's place. He was another Tory, but he kept quiet and minded his business.

Mr. McDOUGALL. And why is it that the nomiuee of Dr. Cameron got the place? It was because the hon. member (Mr. McLennan) could not get his nominees to take the place of Rory McNeil for the taskmaster, in obedience to his duty, had to select a man who had some knowledge of the business and had to pick out the best man he could get on the track as had been the custom. He put on Mr. McDonald and that is where the ingenuity of the Minister (Mr. Blair), assisted by the hon. member for Inverness (Mr. McLennan) came in, when he said that the man put in the place of McNeil was a man recommended by Dr. Cameron, as if that was going to knock me down. I would like to know who took the place of the man who was put in the place of McNeil? Did not the hon. member secure the place for one of his own nominees?

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). Well, now.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Well, now. Why did not the member for Inverness when he was writing to Rory McNeil have the manliness to tell him he was dismissed for offensive partisanship. It is surprising that a man of his (Mr. McLennan's) height should not have the manliness to tell the truth about that. Why, Sir, his manliness went down to his boots, and nowhere else.

Mr. BERGERON. He might meet that man again, if he goes down there.

Mr. McDOUGALL. And if he does that man will behave well, as he always has done. I never knew of Mr. McNeil being anything else but a sober, civil, industrious servant of the public or of anybody else whom he had undertaken to serve. I never yet heard he was an offensive partisan.

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). Why did you not employ him in your own county?

Mr. McDOUGALL. Because I had more applications for employment in my own county than I had places for, and because I secured positions for men from the county of Inverness in my county and the Government whom the hon. gentleman (Mr. McLennan) is supporting dismissed them. I might as well here remind the Minister of Railways that he dismissed the station master in the town of Sydney, who formerly came from the county of Inverness, and that man's place is not yet filled. It is likely the hon. Minister has not got the right explanation in regard to that, and I will give it to him. The Minister's friends in Sydney recommended a man who was unfit to discharge the duties of the position, and who therefore could not take it; and the leading supporters of the Minister to-day in and around that station are urging him, perhaps not directly, but through those who have his ear, to reinstate the man who was dismissed, because he was as fit a man as could be got to fill the position. Besides that, he was not deserving of being dismissed. He was not an offensive partisan. He gave no offence; but a job was put up, by which evidence was got against him, and this resulted in his dismissal. The man I

refer to is D. R. McLellan. I make the statement here in the presence of the Minister and of the House, and in the hearing of the Minister's deputy, who knows this man, who has had reports from him from time to time. I challenge the Minister to get a statement from his deputy, who sits near him now, that he was not one of the best station masters he had on the Intercolonial. To-day the business of that station is demoralized, and it has been so since the beginning of last winter or last fall, because no man was put in the place of the man who was dismissed. Before leaving this subject, I would like to ask the hon. member for Inverness if he has written any other letters in regard to this man Rory McNeil to give the impression that he was dismissed for political partisanship.

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness.) I think it is scarcely the hon. gentleman's business how many letters I write or to whom I write them.

Mr. McDOUGALL. It is my business to show the hon. member for Inverness in the right light. He is one of the gentlemen on that side of the House who asked to have my notices of motion stand when I asked for this information. I know the reason, and I knew it then. The hon. member has written several letters, but I will give an extract from one, with regard to Rory McNeil, who has been dismissed. A clergyman wrote to the hon. member, pointing out the mistake he had made in recommending the dismissal of this man, and in answer he wrote a letter dated Margaree, September 18, in which he says:

* * * Re McNeil's case, I will fix that all right. I had to make a move of this kind in the meantime.

Yours very truly,
A. McLENNAN.

Perhaps with a little more search we will find more letters of the hon. member. In order to settle this question, will the hon. member tell me why it was he lost his pluck and did not tell this man McNeil why he dismissed him?

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). When I got him sent to his political father, I thought he was safe.

Mr. McDOUGALL. If the hon. member means to refer to me as his political father, he did not go to his political father; but he is employed on a railway, well employed, I am glad to say, and I have no doubt the young man would get employment wherever he went, because he would be perfectly fit to fill any position he would apply for; and I think, from the evidence I have given to the House, that is more than I can say of the hon. member for Inverness.

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). I desire to say that I am not ashamed of anything I have written in this connection. I would not wish to be understood as having written anything that would follow McNeil into his native county. I did not care how soon McNeil was employed anywhere else; but I repeat that I did not want his politics to be exercised around the station at West Bay Road in the county of Inverness. Once he was out of that, I did not wish him to be prevented from earning his living anyway he might see fit. With regard to McLellan, I can only say this, that I am acquainted with him and his conduct, and if political partisanship should prevent an official of this Government from receiving employment under it, I say McLellan richly deserved dismissal. He is originally from the county of Inverness, which I have the honour to represent in this House, and there is scarcely a friend of his in that county to whom he did not write, earnestly pressing him to vote against myself. Therefore, although I did not move a finger to bring about his dismissel, for the simple reason that he was not in my county, I did not at the moment regret that he was dismissed, because I felt, as I feel now, that he richly deserved it.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I attach the same importance to the statement of the hon. member for Inverness that I did to the one the hon. Minister of Railways made on his authority with reference to the dismissal of Rory McNeil. The one is on a par with the other. I feel perfectly confident that the station agent at Sydney did not write to a soul in Inverness any more than he did in the county where he was residing. He may have done so before he was appointed to the position. I can well understand that he would, because he was a strong supporter of the Conservative party. Of course, his appointment on my recommendation was largely due to the fact that he had rendered service to the party. I am not ashamed to say that, and I am not ashamed to say that he more than filled the position admirably and to the satisfaction of the leading Liberals of the county, as well as Conservatives. Not a Liberal worthy of the name who had dealings with him would recommend his dismissal. Scallawags would recommend his dismissal, but not the respectable business men of Sydney.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I think that is not a proper expression to use in this House.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Do you forbid me calling people in my constituency scallawags?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I understand that the hon. member for Inverness has recommended the dismissal of this man McLennan, and I do not think that is a proper expression to apply in this House to a member who recommends a dismissal.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I did not apply it to any member of this House, but I apply it

to men in my constituency who make those recommendations for dismissals.

Mr. INGRAM. I think this country would save money if a different method were adopted for managing our Government railways. What I have to say on that subject is not intended to reflect in any way on the Minister. Of all the discussions that have taken place in this House with reference to the dismissal of employees on the Intercolonial Railway, what we have heard in this House to-night is one of the most disgraceful. I would like to know, in the first place, what knowledge the hon. member for Inverness has with respect to the ability of any employee on the Intercolonial Railway to perform his duty to the general satisfaction of the manager, the superintendent or the master mechanic of that railway. He has not apparently the slightest knowledge of the qualifications of a man to fill the position on the railway. That being the case, surely so long as the manager and superintendents certify that an employee performs his duty faithfully and well, he should hold his position until his services are no longer required. If he does his services to the satisfaction of the general manager and superintendents, and there should be a chance for promotion, he ought to be promoted. If such instructions were given to the general manager and superintendents and track masters, the road would be conducted in a better way than it is, and be put in a position to earn and save more money than at present. I would suggest, as a practical railway man, that if the Railway Department were to place in the hands of their general manager and superintendents the entire control of those employed on the railway, they would be acting in the best interests of the country. They would place the officers of the road in an independent position and relieve the members of Parliament, representing constituencies through which the road passes, from the position in which they are now. Year after year members supporting the Government are pestered to death by applications for employment on the Intercolonial. These members have written recommendations to the department to employ their friends, and the department has been forced to refuse the applications. How much better would it not be for the representatives to be able to say: We have no control, because the department has issued orders that representations coming from members of Parliament will not be paid any attention to, and the only way you can get employment is to apply to the superintendent or general manager. That is the system on which other railways are conducted. The officers decide who shall be employed and dismissed, and until that system is adopted by this country, you will never have a surplus. We have had deficits from year to year on the Intercolonial, which, I think, are wholly due to the over-employment of men not required by the road. A few years ago the member for Kent and others found fault with the Government for employing more men than were necessary, and the Government found it very difficult to get rid of those superfluous men without creating dissatisfaction and prejudice on the part of their own political supporters. To avoid that annoyance, let the department issue instructions taking the so-called patronage out of the hands of hon. gentlemen supporting the Government and representing constituencies through which this road passes.

There is another point I wish to make. Surely in the employment of men on the road, they should be given some grounds for the belief that if they perform their duties faithfully and well they will be retained, and that if dismissed the reasons for their dismissal will be given them. Here is a man who is shown to have been a first-class trackman, and who was dismissed without cause, so far as the officials are concerned. The road master himself states "No grounds mentioned for his dismissal." On any other railway in this country, if an employee asks why he was dismissed, the company will give him the reasons unless he has been dismissed for cause. If he is dismissed because not required on account of the company having too many hands or some other reason of that kind, the reason is given to him, but if dismissed for cause it is not, because practical railway men know what cause means, and therefore do not investigate that at all. I trust the hon. Minister will promise us that he will adopt a new principle of conduct in the future.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I wish to add another word to what I have said in reference to the dismissal of the blacksmith, so that the hon. gentleman may understand the injury he has done this man by dismissing him. Only a few months before dismissal this man finished a House which cost him $1,000. He had bought a piece of land and built a house on it, but now, on account of his having been dismissed from the position he expected to occupy during good behaviour, he is deprived of his home and has to seek employment somewhere else. He is forced to abandon that property, on which he expended his savings, and which is situated in a place where it is not likely to get any rent or consideration for it whatever. That is what the hon. gentleman has done to that man in order to give the position to one who, neither by his character or reputation or other qualification, is fitted for it in any respect. His only qualification is that he is a Grit.

Mr. INGRAM. That is not the only way in which the Government have injured this man. According to the present system of conducting railways in this country, he will not be able to get employment on any rail-

way in Canada or the United States without presenting a letter of recommendation or a letter to the effect that he has been employed on such a railway. Unless he has such a letter he cannot get employment.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The item stands.

To provide a passenger and freight shed at Richmond	$1,500
To build snow fences on Oxford and New Glasgow and Cape Breton divisions	$6,000
To dredge at Pictou Landing wharf	$1,500
To dredge at Pictou wharf	$1,000

Mr. HAGGART. I must object to nearly all these items being charged to capital account. I suppose this building at Richmond is to replace one already there. And these snow fences on the Oxford and New Glasgow and Cape Breton division—that is a work that should not be charged to capital account.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I must say that I am surprised that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) should have selected from among these votes as objectionable, one that is practically only a revote of his own item.

Mr. HAGGART. I will not allow the Minister to make a statement of that kind, because it is not correct. When the Oxford and New Glasgow road was built we had to have it furnished with snow fences. But it has been built for six or seven years. I never put in any of my estimates an amount for doing anything of that kind on such a road to be charged to capital.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I must assure the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) that he did.

Mr. HAGGART. It may have been immediately after the road was built. But here is a road that has been running for four or five years. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) show me the item?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman asked an appropriation for the year ending 30th June, 1897, for $12,000, for these snow fences. I only spent $6,000, and am only asking for a revote of the balance.

Mr. HAGGART. New Glasgow branch was built only two or three years, and the snow fences had to be constructed. Here is a road that has been running six or seven years. I do not recollect any such item as the hon. gentleman speaks of. If he will show me the item, thus making it clear that I am in error, I will readily acknowledge it. The hon. gentleman says he got a vote of $12,000 and spent only $6,000, but, according to these estimates, there was no vote last year, and no part of this is marked as a revote. There is no such information before the House as the hon. gentleman states.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am giving the information now.

Mr. INGRAM.

Mr. HAGGART. It should appear in the Estimates, and there is nothing to show that there was anything voted for it in 1897-98.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I spoke of the year ending 30th June, 1897.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) stated that he got a vote last year of $12,000 and only expended $6,000, and he wanted to complete the work.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). He was referring to the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Haggart) own estimates, and that could not have been last year.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. What I said was that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) declared an item to be unwarranted which he introduced in his own estimates ending 30th June, 1897, the amount being $12,000. Only $6,000 was spent, and I want to expend the balance.

Mr. HAGGART. Then I misunderstood the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair). I understood him to say that I had a vote in my estimates of $12,000 for this purpose, and he last year had $12,000 in the Estimates and only expended $6,000.

To improve accommodation at Mulgrave	$1,000

Mr. McDOUGALL. Is the hon. Minister doing any more for accommodation on the Cape Breton division east of Point Tupper?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, I think we shall have quite a little. I cannot furnish details at present.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Can the hon. Minister tell me what building is being put up at Grand Narrows?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We have many requests for sidings and additional buildings.

Mr. McDOUGALL. This is not a siding; it is a building that is being erected.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We are going to have a restaurant there.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Is the Government building it?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, we gave the lease of a small portion of land there, and we allow the parties to whom we leased it to put up a building with the right to remove it at any time. We are not building or bearing the cost.

Mr. McDOUGALL. How much land does the hon. gentleman give for this purpose?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I cannot say just now. We insisted upon it being 15 or 20 feet from our station house.

Mr. McDOUGALL. What are the terms of the lease, except with regard to removal?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. One of the terms is that the restaurant must be conducted in a manner satisfactory to the department.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Is there any money consideration ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think there is some merely nominal sum—a dollar a year or something like that.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Is there any agreement ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, in writing.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Does the agreement give the privilege to the lessees to do anything else than conduct the business of a restaurant ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Does the hon. gentleman mean to conduct a hotel. If the lessee pleases to put up a building to accommodate a few guests, I do not know that there is anything in the lease to preclude him from doing so.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Is not this departing from the usual practices of the Intercolonial Railway—giving people the privilege of building hotels beside the railway track ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not know that it is contrary to the usual practice.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Is it ever done ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I should be very sorry to say that it has ever been done, because I have no evidence to bear out such an assertion.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I am not aware that it has been done on the Intercolonial Railway or that there is anything like it on any railway. I must make known to the House the object the hon. Minister has in departing from the usual practice, or, at least, the object his advisers had. I myself am interested in a hotel near that place.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I am quite willing the hon. gentlemen should cheer that statement. But there was no public place there where a man could go and get his dinner at the time that hotel was built, and I did what I think was quite proper and legitimate, built a hotel. I have an interest with others in that hotel, and I challenge the Minister of Railways and Canals to deny this statement, that there was no other undertaking east of Halifax, of that kind, that did as much for the Intercolonial Railway as that investment of my friends and myself. He goes to work to-day, because I did not wheel round and support himself and his Government, and tries to shut down that house if he can ; he gets a party of outsiders that undertake to put a hotel adjoining the Government track, and as close to that track as the railway station is. If the Minister will give this House any reason for putting up that hotel, I will submit without complaint. But I think the Minister should give a reason for giving the privilege to private parties to go and put up a hotel on Government property to compete with another hotel.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I know something of the locality myself, I have been there, and I have heard a great many complaints, and I have received many complaints with regard to the inconvenient location of the only place where people can go and get a meal in that locality.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Will the Minister give me one name ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I shall not give the hon. gentleman half a name.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Because you cannot do it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. He can draw any inferences he pleases, but the fact remains all the same. The hon. gentleman's hotel is quite a distance away from the station, and there are times of the year when it would be exceedingly inconvenient for people to find their way to his hotel to get a meal. The complaints which were made to me, and which my examination of the locality justified, led me to agree to the arrangements which have been concluded under which a restaurant is being built on Government grounds, and will be very conveniently located for public use.

Mr. McDOUGALL. So far as I am personally concerned, I have not a word to say against building a restaurant ; but I challenge the Minister to give me the name of a single man who made a complaint that that house did not afford proper facilities for the accommodation of people who wanted to get their meals during the time the train stops. The train stops there 20 minutes. There was always a large bus in waiting on the pasengers that took them free to the hotel, and brought them back free. If a traveller prefers a restaurant to a hotel, I have no objection to that. But I do object to the hon. Minister interfering with the business of a private individual by building hotels on the railway track in competition with capital that was invested in a hotel within a reasonable distance of that station. That is my complaint.

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). I think a restaurant would not come into competition with the hotel the hon. gentleman has built there. I think the restaurant would fill a public want. The hon. gentleman has put up a

first-class hotel suited to meet the wants of summer tourists, of whom a great many frequent that house in the summer season. But poor people travelling by the Intercolonial Railway cannot all afford to go and buy a 50 cent meal. Therefore do I consider that the Minister of Railways and Canals is perfectly justified in meeting a public need of this character. According to the hon. gentleman, because there is a hotel in Truro, the restaurant in Truro should be swept away.

Mr. McDOUGALL. The hon. gentleman is making a wrong statement; I never said so.

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). I feel that I am stating the facts as they appear to stand at this moment. I submit whether the Minister is not perfectly justified in the course he has pursued. I cited the case of Truro as a case parallel with that of the gentleman. I know further that if the records be correct, I do not see what interest the hon. member for Cape Breton has in that hotel now, because he made an assignment of it if I mistake not. I cannot see what interest he can have in this matter, and in raking the Minister of Railways and Canals for alleged interference with a hotel that he has no connection with.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Let me say to the hon. gentleman that in arranging for the building of this restaurant and in giving accommodation there, no person, so far as I know, was influenced by any prejudice, feeling or desire to injure the hon. gentleman. It was felt that owing to the location of his house it was unreasonable to insist upon every person who wanted a meal being compelled to go there or else go without a meal. I do not apprehend that this party is going to interfere with him seriously, as he will only furnish meals for persons who might prefer to take a meal in a restaurant instead of a hotel. The hon. gentleman is attaching a great deal more importance to the matter than is quite fair, and I think he will probably find when the result comes to be fully known that he was in error in his impression as regards the restaurant being injurious to his particular business.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I am surprised that the hon. gentleman should attach so much importaace to the remarks of the hon. member for Inverness after the disclosures tonight. He has gathered from that hon. gentleman information that only a restaurant is being put up, and he accepts the information. It is more than a restaurant. I want the Minister, if he has any better evidence than that of the hon. member for Inverness, to produce it. I am informed that the building has the dimensions of an hotel. The hon. member for Inverness made only one true statement. He tried to impress the committee with the idea that I was objecting to this item because it was to build a restaurant. I repeated several times that such was not the case; but it was a building for an hotel and it would enter into competition with another hotel. The hon. member for Inverness was not satisfied, and he repeated the statement in order to be able to tell the House that I had made an assignment. That is the character of the hon. gentleman. I did make an assignment, and I am not ashamed of it, and it is in order to do my duty that I take some interest in the hotel. It is my duty to pay my debts and obligations. If I gave up my interest in the hotel, I would be doing my creditors injury. I do not want any such statements made by hon. members, and it is below the dignity of an hon. member to refer to a matter of that kind.

Mr. McLELLAN. Do you deny it?

Mr. McDOUGALL. I say I made an assignment. But in what spirit did the hon. member throw it against me in this House? Every one can take his measure on the basis of that line of argument. If the hon. gentleman has anything worse than that to communicate to the House and the country, let him trot it out. I am willing to listen to him.

Mr. HAGGART. The Minister of Railways stated that I had placed an item in the Estimates for $12,000 for fencing on the Intercolonial, and charged it to capital account. Is that so?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. On the Oxford and New Glasgow road. In the Estimates ending 30th June, 1897.

Mr. HAGGART. Such an item does not appear in the Estimates.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is for the year 1897. I find it stated in a memorandum handed to me by my deputy: charged to capital account, new fencing, Oxford and New Glasgow Railway. In 1897 there was voted $12,000. Only half was done at a cost of $6,000, leaving a balance of $5,994. During the year ending 30th June, 1897, this amount was expended; no expenditure was made in 1898, and application is made for a revote of $6,000.

Mr. HAGGART. Then the hon. gentleman is misinformed.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My deputy says it is absolutely correct. I shall, however, be very glad to correct the statement if it appears there was an error.

Mr. HAGGART. It must have been an error.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Might it not have been brought down in the Supplementary Estimates?

Mr. HAGGART. The charge made against me was that I found fault with an item when I had myself introduced a similar one in the Estimates.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Such an amount could not have appeared in the Supplementary Estimates. The Supplementary Estimates for 1896-97 were not the Estimates of the late Government but of the present Government. The main Estimates of the previous Government were adopted in their entirety, but the Supplementary Estimates were the creation of the present Government.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We will ascertain the facts.

To provide increased station and other accommodation at various points $6,000

Mr. HAGGART. This item should be changed, as at present it might include even painting.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is not proposed to do any painting. The item was intended to furnish additional accommodation such as stations and buildings wherever required. That it would not cover painting is self-evident.

Mr. HAGGART. It is not self-evident at all. The vote is to improve station accommodation at various points, and if that does not cover almost everything I do not know what the meaning of the English language is.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Can the Minister name any of these points where the buildings are to be improved or added to.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There are quite a few points at which I think I could with advantage, and no doubt very much to the interest of the railway service, lay out the sum, but I have not yet selected which of them are the most urgent and in respect to which I would direct the expenditure to be made. I could not give the hon. gentleman a definite statement on the subject to-night.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Is not this amount based on any estimate for the particular work ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am reading now from page 7 of the Statutes of Canada for the year 1896-97, under the heading of Intercolonial Railway, chargeable to capital "To provide for snow fences at Oxford, New Glasgow, Cape Breton, St. Charles Branch Railway, $12,000."

Mr. MONTAGUE. Quite so, that is in your own Supplementary Estimates.

Mr. HAGGART. Will the Minister tell me whether that is in the Suppelementary Estimates or not ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. "Sums granted to Her Majesty by this Act for the financial year ending 30th June, 1897, and the purposes for which they are granted."

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is not in the main Estimates, that is very clear.

Mr. MONTAGUE. They are in the Supplementary Estimates prepared by the Minister himself.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The Supplementary Estimates which are introduced by us are to be found in the same volume later.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Yes, in the Supplementary Estimates for 1896.

Mr. HAGGART. And the Supplementary Estimates read by the Minister is an estimate with which I had nothing whatever to do.

Mr. MONTAGUE. It is another case of the Minister comparing himself with himself, and making us bad fellows.

Mr. McDOUGALL. To whom was that lease of the hotel property made ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not remember the man's name just now.

Prince Edward Island Railway—
To shorten the main line by the removal of certain curves therein.... $15,000
To provide additional rolling stock.. 3,500

Mr. HAGGART. You do not require heavier engines and the traffic of the road is not increasing, and why charge this $3,500 to capital account ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is where the hon. gentleman is in error. The traffic of the road is increasing, and it is for the purpose of furnishing cars in addition to equipment which is now on the road that this vote is taken. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) may not be aware that there has been a very considerable development of business in the island recently, and I fancy the hon. member (Mr. Martin) will verify my statement that the business demands are calling for additional railway appliances. This vote is for additional live stock cars which are needed to carry hogs to the pork-packing establishment at Charlottetown, which promises to do a very considerable business.

Mr. MARTIN. With reference to the removal of these curves, what has been done and what is proposed to be done ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The intention is to shorten the line. We are taking the curve out of the line between Charlottetown and Summerside. It will make the line about three-quarters of a mile straighter.

Mr. MARTIN. What is the total cost to be ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My officers estimate that the whole cost will not exceed $25,000.

Mr. MARTIN. Is that all that is proposed to be done ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is all I am asking money to do just now. I should be sorry that that is all that should be done in the future. There are other curves which are perhaps not so bad as this one ; I think perhaps this is the worst curve on any railway that is being operated.

Mr. MARTIN. Is that the worst curve on the road ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am told it is nearly as bad as can be.

Mr. MARTIN. I know, as a fact, that it is not the worst curve. How is it that this particular curve was straightened when worse curves were not.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am not aware there are any worse curves, but I know that this is a pretty bad one. This curve is between two important towns, and it is desirable that the straightening should be done first where the heaviest traffic occurs.

Mr. MARTIN. I know, as a matter of fact, that is not the worst curve.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Is not that the place where the passengers on the end car can shake hands with the engineer ?

Mr. MARTIN. I do not know about that. I do not think there has been any desire expressed or any petition from the people of the province for the straightening of these curves ; but I am sure that the hon. Minister's department received many petitions for the expenditure of money in other directions. I do not know what reason he had for expending money on this part of the railway. I do not know that the line has been shortened very much, although there has been an expenditure of money on a part of the line which is in the constituency of one of the members of the Government ; and that may be a reason why the expenditure was made. The work was made by day's labour, and I understand that the heelers of the party came in for the greatest part of the spoil ; and that may be one of the chief reasons for straightening the curve. I do not think the main line is shortened to an appreciable extent ; but if the intention is to straighten the curve, I hope the Minister will go a little further. There are parts of that road where there have been accidents, but at those parts no attempt has been made to do anything. Where the sharpest curve is nothing has been done. So we have reason to suspect that this work is being carried on, not so much to straighten the curves as to provide work for the heelers and workers in the constituency of one of the Ministers.

Mr. YEO. I may say that in my opinion this is one of the sharpest curves on the road ; but there are several other bad curves, and I hope that after this one is straightened the Minister will give his attention to the others. With respect to the work being done by day's labour, I consider the Railway department is showing good judgment in having it done in that way. I have consulted many who are competent to judge, and their opinion is that it is being done in th e best way. With respect to its being undertaken to supply work for the heelers of the party, that is a mistake. I have recommended men for employment on the work without any reference to their politics. I have never inquired as to their politics, and I think the hon. gentleman from East Queen's has been misinformed on that point.

Mr. HAGGART. As this vote is for $15,000, is it not intended to let the work by contract ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. From the best information I could gather, from the opinions and reports of the superintendent on the island, the general manager at Moncton, the chief engineer and other officers of the road, I concluded it would scarcely be in the public interest to have this work done by contract. It is not a very large work, and I am advised that so far as it has gone, it is being done in a very economical way, and as little expense as we could reasonably hope for if it were done by contract. You can easily see how, in carrying on a work of this kind, which crosses the line of railway, there would be difficulties between the contractor and the Government, which would not arise when the work was being done by day's work. I think there are no contractors on the island to take up work of this description ; and seeing that the people who are employed on the work are employed at a time of the year when they are not engaged on their farms, and for the other reasons I have stated, I was led to conclude that it would be in the public interest to have it done by day's work.

Mr. HAGGART. The statute is directory, where there is an expenditure of over $5,000, that it shall be done by contract. In certain cases that is modified by Order in Council. Where the Minister wishes to do a work like this, he must report to Council, and get an Order in Council giving him power to do it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not think that is necessary,

unless it is proposed to give a contract without tender. Then the Minister must necessarily submit to Council the reasons why he thinks the department should be permitted to make such a contract. But that does not apply to a case like this at all.

Mr. HAGGART. But the statute makes it compulsory to obtain a special order where there is an expenditure involving upwards of $5,000. I cannot understand how the hon. gentleman can get the account paid by the Auditor General without it.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood the Minister to say that when this work was completed, it would cost $25,000. Does that apply to only one curve, or will it extend over several curves ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The road is very crooked at this point unquestionably. The hon. member who has spoken has stated that he thinks it is about as crooked a part of the road as there is, and those who have been over the island know that it is a pretty crooked road.

Mr. SPROULE. Surely the hon. gentleman has an estimate of his engineer to do work in certain places and for certain sums, and must know to what part of the road it applies.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The work is being done at one place and along one continuous stretch. What we are doing is to avoid as far as we can, what is called the North Wiltshire grade. We are reducing the distance and taking the kinks out. It is not work done partly at one part of the line and partly at another.

Mr. McLELLAN. The part of the road proposed to be straightened by the Minister of Railways is the most crooked between Charlottetown and Summerside, and the statement of the hon. member for East Queen's (Mr. Martin) is altogether made on his own responsibility. I know that road better than he because I have travelled over it a good deal oftener, and I believe that the curve being taken out by the department is the worst curve of the whole line. It is what the Minister calls the shaking hands curve. Few men in this House probably know the crookedness of the road between Charlottetown and Summerside. It was built by contractors who were allowed to make their own survey, and it was run around, I might say, every pine stump between Charlottetown and Summerside, and I am glad to see the present Government undertaking the work of straightening out the road and putting it in some sort of decent shape. I know it will take some years before this can be accomplished, for it will have to be done piecemeal. The way the work has to be done renders it almost impracticable to let it by contract, and I am sorry that the hon. member for East Queen's (Mr. Martin) is throwing cold water on the undertaking and taking away from the Government the credit justly due them for straightening it out.

Mr. MARTIN. With regard to the statement of the hon. gentleman that this is the sharpest curve of the whole line——

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Between Charlottetown and Summerside.

Mr. MARTIN. The whole line is not between Charlottetown and Summerside.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I did not say it was.

Mr. MARTIN. I say it now. The road extends east from Mount Stewart, what is known as the Souris branch, and every person who knows anything about Prince Edward Island knows that on the Souris branch is the sharpest curve of the road. The hon. gentleman will not dispute that, and if we are to avoid danger, the people of that section are entitled to safety just as well as the people between Charlottetown and Summerside. When I made the statement that there was a sharper curve——

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Is there any between these two points ?

Mr. MARTIN. I am not talking about two points on the line, but the whole line and one part of the line is as important as the other.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Most of the business done is between Charlottetown and Summerside.

Mr. MARTIN. There is quite a business between the Souris branch and Charlottetown. Instead of throwing cold water on the undertaking, I told the Minister of Railways that he should not stop and leave one of the sharpest curves on the road without spending a dollar to straighten it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I did not say we were going to stop at this.

Mr. MARTIN. The objection I have is to the work being done by day labour. I do not want to throw cold water on it, but I do not believe there was any general cry in the province for straightening that particular curve, and I think the Minister of Railways will find his department loaded down with petitions for expenditures in other directions. I say that it looks a little suspicious that this money should be spent on that part of the road which is represented by one of the members of the Government, and the sharpest curve on the road is left untouched and that this money is spent without tenders being called for.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Will the hon. Minister give me the information with regard to the lessors of that property ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My impression is that the man's name is McNeill.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Is the hon. Minister quite sure it is not the Hon. Geo. Murray, Premier of Nova Scotia. Was it not he who communicated with the hon. gentleman with regard to it ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The lease was executed by me and it was not to the Hon. Geo. Murray.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Then it was only a few days ago since Mr. Murray was on the ground and found fault with the building not being put up properly.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That will be the right of any good citizen.

The committee rose and reported progress.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES 1898-99.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) presented a message from His Excellency the Governor General.

The SPEAKER read the Message, as follows : —

ABERDEEN.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons, Supplementary Estimates of sums required for the service of the Dominion for the year ended 30th June, 1899, and in accordance with the provisions of "The British North America Act, 1867," the Governor General recommends these Estimates to the House of Commons.

Government House,
Ottawa, 30th May, 1898.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. HAGGART. What does the Government intend to take up to-morrow ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We meet at 11 o'clock. I fancy we shall take up some small Bills, and then endeavour to proceed with the Estimates.

Mr. HAGGART. The Main Estimates ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 2.35 a.m. (Tuesday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 31st May, 1898.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 11 a.m.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 154)—from the Senate—to provide for the government of the Yukon district.—(Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière.)

Mr. McDOUGALL.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

Mr. FOSTER. I move, with the consent of the House, that the 5th and 6th reports of the Committee on Public Accounts, which were reported to the House and the printing thereof recommended, be printed forthwith.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). What are the subjects ?

Mr. FOSTER. The Baie des Chaleurs Railway is one and the other is the case popularly known as Killam's cow.

Motion agreed to.

ADVANCE TO MONTREAL HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). I beg to move that the House, at its next sitting, resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following resolution :—

That it is expedient that the Governor in Council may advance to the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal, in addition to the amount authorized by chapter 10 of the Statutes of 1896 (first session), to be advanced to the said commissioners, a further sum not exceeding two million dollars for the completion and construction of certain works in the harbour of Montreal, the said commissioners thereupon depositing with the Minister of Finance their debentures to an equal amount in par value to the advance so made by the Governor in Council, repayable within twenty-five years from the date of their issue and bearing interest at the rate of three per cent per annum, payable half-yearly.

Motion agreed to.

THE MAJOR GENERAL COMMANDING.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to bring up a matter affecting the conduct of the House some, to which I suppose there will be no objection, and I will be very brief. Yesterday or the day before, the right hon. leader of the Government read a letter from General Gascoigne in rebuttal or meant to be in rebuttal of certain remarks made in this House and which appear in "Hansard." At the time my hon. friend was reading it I had some doubts as to whether he was in order or not, but, relying on the support which Mr. Speaker gave to the reading, supplemented by his suggesting a motion to have the letter laid on the Table, I thought I must be wrong. I find, however, in looking the matter up, that I was not wrong, and in order that the matter may be before the House I think it well to read a paragraph taken from Parliamentary Procedure by Bourinot, at page 408 :

It is not in order for a member to make extracts from books, newspapers or other printed publications as part of his speech, provided in doing so he does not infringe on any point of

order. But there are certain limitations to this right; for it is not allowable to read any petition referring to debates in the House. In making extracts a member must be careful to confine himself to those which are pertinent to the question; it is not regular to quote a whole essay or pamphlet of a general character. Neither is it regular for a member to read a paper which he is asking the House to order to be produced.

Now begins the portion which bears directly on the subject:

Nor is it in order to read articles in newspapers, letters or communications, whether printed or written, emanating from persons outside of the House, and referring to, or commenting on, or denying anything said by a member, or expressing any opinion reflecting on proceedings within the House. During the debate on the tariff in the session of 1877, Mr. Mills referred to the opinions of Sir Alexander Galt, formerly a member and Minister of Finance. Subsequently one of the Canadian papers published a letter from Sir Alexander, in answer to some of Mr. Mills's remarks; and proposed reading from the paper in question; but the Speaker interrupted him and questioned the propriety of this course—a decision entirely in accordance with the English rules of debate.

I think from that, my right hon. friend was not within the rules of order in reading the letter from General Gascoigne. I have no objection to General Gascoigne making his statement, which was not an intemperate statement at all, in a constitutional way, but evidently my right hon. friend was not aware of the rule in that respect, and I was a little surprised that the Speaker, who is so well informed on the rules, allowed the matter to proceed, and it was because he did so that I did not carry out my first intention of questioning the point, relying on his watch over the proceedings.

Mr. SPEAKER. The reason I allowed the matter to proceed was because it was based on a motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, which he moved and which was carried, and which appears in the Votes and Proceedings:

On motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, an Order of the House was issued to the proper officer for a copy of a letter from Major General Gascoigne, relating to certain statements made in Parliament reflecting upon him as Commanding Officer of the Canadian militia.

But the House will remember that when the leader of the House read that letter, I said to him: I suppose you will propose a motion that that be laid on the Table? And, of course, that was assented to unanimously as I understood, and the motion was put by me and was carried. That was the proceeding. The question of the propriety of the letter has not arisen until now that an hon. member refers to it. And I quite agree that if the paper had simply been read by any member of the House without a motion connected with it, it would not have been properly in order. That was the only way I could see to bring the proceeding in order at the time.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, Mr. Speaker, you will perhaps allow me to say that you, being in the Chair at the time know quite well that the letter was read without any attempt on the part of the hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to make a motion. The hon. gentleman did not make a motion, and it seemed to me that he had no intention of making a motion; nor do I believe he had at that time, though I do not know his motives. But he was helped by the kindly suggestion of the Speaker, and he made a motion, but after the letter was read. If that could be done, this rule of the House would become entirely inoperative, because all that a gentleman will have to do, in order to get a letter before the House from a person outside, is simply to make a motion and then proceed to read the letter. Now, is it the Speaker's opinion that a gentleman can make a motion at any time in order to have a letter from an outsider read? This is not a public document. I have no feeling in the matter, but I wish the matter to be understood.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I desire to deal quite candidly with the House. I stated yesterday that I had received a letter from General Gascoigne; and I thought it was due to him that his version of a matter which had been the subject of a debate here should be given to the public, and that his denial of certain statements that have been made should be laid before the House.

I regretted at the time that, perhaps through my own negligence, the letter had not been brought out while Sir Charles Tupper was present. I should have known that he was to sail on Saturday. But in the multiplicity of matters that I have to attend to—it may not seem unnatural to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster)—I did not have it clearly before my mind that his sailing on Saturday would imply his leaving the city on Friday. It was my intention to bring the matter up while he was here. I thought, as he was not present on Friday, that I would take the next opportunity to bring it up. I believe it was due to General Gascoigne that his version of the facts should be laid before the House. I am free to confess that I did not look at the precedents as to how the matter should have been done; and I am free to confess that if I had looked at the precedents and read the authority quoted by my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) I might have taken a different way to bring the matter to the attention of the House. I can see the force of the hon. gentleman's observations. I think Mr. Speaker saw it. But no objection was taken at the time. If my proceeding was wrong, I suppose that we can say that if I was trespassing my hon. friend did not observe it at the time. At all events I have no fault to find with my hon. friend for bringing the matter to the attention of the House. It is a question that is well worth looking

into. And I can say to my hon. friend that, I may have erred and trespassed on this occasion, I shall look over the matter again. I shall always only be too glad, whenever occasion may arise, if, as leader of the House I am astray in carrying out the rules of the House, to have my attention called to the matter.

Mr. SPROULE. Does not the hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) think it rather unfortunate——

Mr. SPEAKER. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) allow me. I think it is the duty of the Speaker when a point of order is not raised, to try and assist those who address the House to remain in order, whether on one side or the other. If the Speaker is fortunately, right, I think that his assistance in this way is of advantage to the House. I think the House will remember that, only a few days ago I made a suggestion to the leader of the Opposition, who rose to move a motion distinctly out of order because he had spoken. I made a suggestion pointing out how he could place himself in order—by having the motion moved by somebody else—and the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) adopted the suggestion. So, I am not at all inclined to defend myself against the charge that I assist members in keeping order in the House. Of course, if a point of order is taken and the matter comes before me in that form, that ends the matter. But no point of order was taken, and I assumed that the leader of the House desired the letter to be brought properly before the House. I made a suggestion, and, no objection being taken, the motion was put and carried.

Mr. SPROULE. I was going to say, Mr. Speaker, that it was unfortunate that, as the matter stands, it will be quoted as a precedent. I think it would be well, if the Speaker feels that the rule followed was not absolutely correct, to avoid it being cited as a precedent in the future, it should be so stated. Coming from the high authority, it did, from the leader of the House, and assented to by the Speaker, though it was, in my opinion, at the time, entirely wrong, private members did not like to dissent from it, and therefore, it was allowed to pass.

The PRIME MINISTER. If I may be permitted, I would say that I should be glad if Mr. Speaker would take an opportunity to look over the matter and give us his opinion upon it. On the authority which has been quoted, I am not quite sure that I was in order. Of course, I think it is the duty of the leader of the Government to try, as far as possible, to maintain the traditions of the House, and if it so happens, that he himself errs, he should be the first to give an example of submission to the rules.

Mr. SPEAKER. I may say that I do not feel any doubt at all on the subject. As I mentioned before, if objection had been taken, it would have been a different matter, But the reading of the letter was out of order, and though the only way to bring it properly before the House was to move the motion that I suggested, and, as no objection was made to that, the motion was moved. It is no precedent for the reading of a letter without a motion. If the point of order is raised it should always prevail in a case of that kind.

Mr. FOSTER. The only good that will come out of this will be a little more care, and, if possible the elucidation of one point, which I confess, is not quite clear to me. If the rule is laid down that a letter from an outsider cannot be read in the House, is that rule to be made null and void by the simple moving of a motion by the member who wishes to read the letter? Surely, that cannot be. That is the point I would like to see elucidated. A notice of motion would be taken up, moved and adopted, but a motion at the moment, I should think, would be in order if any person objected to it. In the case that Mr. Speaker cited of his suggestion to the Opposition side, the point of order was taken as against Sir Charles Tupper that he had spoken, and it was suggested that I should make a motion. The point arises whether the Speaker is not the guardian of the rules of the House and whether, in all cases, as in some cases he certainly does, it is not the duty of the Speaker to keep the members in order, even though no one raises a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER. I agree with that too.

QUEBEC HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS.

Mr. DOBELL moved third reading of Bill (No. 142) to authorize the Quebec Harbour Commissioners to borrow money.

Mr. FOSTER. I think my hon. friend (Mr. Dobell) was expected to give a statement, on the third reading of the Bill, of the expenditures, salaries, &c., of the Commission.

Mr. DOBELL. I am quite prepared to lay before the House the details of the salaries paid by the Quebec Harbour Commissioners. I stated when the second reading was taken, that the total salaries amounted to about $7,000; I find that the actual salaries paid amounted to $8,000. But I have received a telegram from Quebec stating that the salary of the engineer should not have been included in that amount, and that the salary of the engineer taken out makes the figures I gave absolutely correct. The total net revenue for the five years averages $34,000 a year, and the actual gross revenue averages about $66,000 a year. For the last three years the gross revenue has been increasing, and this last year the increase amounts to $5,000, and the year before showed an increase of $4,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Will my hon. friend just give the amounts of the five years separately, gross and net ?

Mr. DOBELL. For 1893, gross $67,000, net $36,000 ; for 1894, gross $65,000, net $31,000 ; 1895, gross $66,000, net $35,000 ; for 1896, gross $70,000, net $36,000 ; for 1897, gross $75,000, net $32,000. The net, you will observe, for the last year is smaller in comparison than for the other years. That is accounted for by the large expenditure which was made for dredging the outer basin of the St. Louis Dock for which some $10,000 was spent and taken out of the revenue of the Harbour Commissioners.

Mr. FOSTER. Now, could the hon. gentleman give the details of the salaries for last year ?

Mr. DOBELL. The chief engineer gets $2,500. I think the secretary is paid $1,600 ; the harbour master, $1,600 ; one wharfinger, $800 ; and the other $600.

Mr. FOSTER. That does not make up the amount. I suppose there are the fees of the Harbour Commissioners.

Mr. DOBELL. There is a retaining fee of $500 for our legal adviser. Those are all the details they have sent me. I may explain to the House that there are charges now paid by the Harbour Commissioners that used to be paid by Trinity House, which relieves this Government of a considerable expense. These involve an expenditure annually of about $10,000 a year, which this Government is now relieved of.

Mr. FOSTER. Has any reduction been made in the charges on vessels in the last five years ?

Mr. DOBELL. No, they are exactly the same. But I may explain why we are asking this sum of money. Some years ago about 1,100 or 1,200 sailing vessels came to the harbour of Quebec ; in 1895 we only had 300 or 400 ; and last year I think we did not have more than 350. The trade of Quebec is being now done by large steamers. I may admit that personally I agree with the hon. member for York thus far, that I think we might reduce the expenses of the Harbour Commissioners, and I may promise that I will look into this matter next year. But the expenses to-day are not as heavy as they were some years ago, although they are still too heavy for the revenue. Any corporation only getting $30,000 revenue, ought not to have one-third of it taken up by expenses. But our trade is increasing, and I think we should show a better result this year, and we will try to cut down expenses.

Mr. MONTAGUE. What is the total at the present date ?

Mr. DOBELL. Nearly five million dollars.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the third time and passed.

THE BERNE CONVENTION.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). I desire to lay upon the Table of the House a copy of the Berne Convention. Perhaps the officers will present it to the Library. I also have great pleasure in meeting the application of the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster), who I am sure will be a most industrious student of the contents of this volume, if I present it to him personally, as I have much pleasure in doing, in the name of the Government.

Mr. FOSTER. The only remark I have to make is that I am sorry to say that it is only printed in the dominant language, that being French. I should like it much better if it were printed in the dual language.

THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 148) respecting the Transport Contract between Her Majesty and the Winnipeg, Great Northern Railway Company.—(Mr. Blair.)

Bill (No. 143) to amend the Canada Evidence Act, 1893.—(Mr. Fitzpatrick.)

SUPPLY.

The House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

Canals, construction and enlargement—
Soulanges Canal—Construction..... $1,610,000

Mr. BERGERON. I see a large increase for 1898-99. Does that amount contain the damages which have been incurred by the land slide which took place a few months ago ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No ; there is nothing in this item to cover the cost of the landslide ; this is all construction.

Mr. HAGGART. Would the hon. gentleman tell the House when this work will be completed, if there was any change in the contracts, and if so, the reason of the change ; also, the estimated cost ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The estimated cost of the whole Soulanges Canal is $5,000,000, in round figures. The department entertains the strongest possible hope, and unless the unforeseen occurs that hope I think will prove well grounded, that the work at the canal will be sufficiently forwarded to enable us to open it for the purpose of business next spring. That is the present expectation. We never can tell what will happen ; there may be difficulty arise which we do not know at this stage, but the engineers of the department express great confidence that, while the canal will not be absolutely completed in every particular, it will be sufficiently so to open it for navigation. In regard to changing the contractors, there were necessarily during the past year two changes

made in the personel. One was with reference to Mr. Stewart. He was not making such progress with the work as satisfied the department that he would be able to complete it, certainly he would be wholly unable to complete it within the time required. Another was with respect to Mr. Goodwin, which resulted in Mr. Goodwin practically stopping work. We had to take the contract off his hands. The contracts were relet, after due notice had been given, and the works so taken up by the new contractors are progressing vigorously.

Mr. BERGERON. No doubt the hon. Minister is sincere when he expects the canal will be opened for navigation by the date of navigation next year; but he will be seriously disappointed. It will take more than one year, probably two or three years to finish the canal. The land is very bad for a canal to pass through it, as the hon. gentleman may have noticed when the papers came up before him in connection with the last accident which took place there, the landslide. The hon. Minister says the canal will cost $5,000,000. It will cost much more. We had a long discussion in the House when it was decided to construct the canal on the north shore of the St. Lawrence, and predictions then made by some hon. members are being realized. It was a very unfortunate move on the part of the late Government; I am not blaming the present Minister, because he is not responsible. The land on that side of the river is very much of the same nature as that at the Cornwall Canal, where an immense sum has been expended for repairs, and we are going through the same experience in regard to the Soulanges Canal. It is being constructed across rivers, and the culverts have not been able to stop the natural course of the streams. When it was decided to build the new canal, the cost was estimated at $4,200,000. Already it has gone up to $5,000,000, and is not yet finished. The cause of the whole trouble—it may be ancient history to some hon. members, but I want to repeat it—was the decision to place the canal on that side of the river, and at the same time not widen and deepen the Beauharnois Canal, which is a good work and has cost practically nothing for repairs for twenty or thirty years, it being built through rock and solid earth. The estimates for building the new canal on the north shore were placed exceedingly low for the purpose of enabling the Government to make out a case in Parliament. The contractors, proceeding on those estimates, tendered too low, with the result of almost ruining Mr. Goodwin and Mr. Stewart, and increasing the cost to the country. I should like to inquire what is the extent of the damage done by the last landslide, and who will have to pay, the contractors or the Government.

Mr. BLAIR.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My impression is that the whole of the material displaced by the slide has not yet been removed, and so far as the Government are concerned we have not paid anything. There is a question pending between the contractor and the Government as to whether or not the loss will have to be borne by them or by the Government. I am free to confess that I am inclined to the opinion that the contractors should not be expected to bear that loss. We have an estimate as to the probable cost of clearing out the prism of the canal and restoring the canal as far as possible to its former condition at that particular point on Raynor's section, and this, we judge, may be about $30,000.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Who took Stewart's contract?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Ryan & Macdonald, the lowest tenderers.

Mr. HAGGART. Do the engineers anticipate any difficulty from any of the slides in the canal?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The engineer appears to be very sanguine that nothing in that direction will again occur, but after all that is only an impression; he may possibly not be right.

Mr. BERGERON. That is a very bad opinion too.

Mr. HAGGART. I agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) that the anticipation of the Minister as to the opening of the canal is entirely illusory. I know something about that work and the probabilities are that the canal will not be opened until the spring of 1900.

Mr. BERGERON. Put it back again unless the Government spend double the amount of money.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is not a question of the expenditure of money, because we have asked for a sum that is sufficient if no mishap occurs. I can be only expected to speak the views of my engineering staff and they tell me with confidence that unless some casualty occurs the work will be sufficiently forwarded to enable us to do business on the canal next spring.

Mr. SPROULE. At what stage of advancement is the work now?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It has so far progressed that the chief engineer is of opinion that it will be ready next year, in the absence of anything abnormal.

Mr. HAGGART. Can the Minister give us any information as to how much the water was backed on the north side of the canal

compared with the south, and whether these viaducts are sufficient to carry it off ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is the opinion of the engineers that they are, and that they have no doubt on that point. The viaducts are very well built.

Mr. HAGGART. I have noticed a statement made again and again by members of this House with regard to the amount of damages which Mr. Goodwin obtained from the Government in connection with this canal. What is the amount of the certificate given Mr. Goodwin by the department for the work, which certificate, I believe was approved by the Minister of Justice, and what was the amount of the verdict Mr. Goodwin obtained in the Exchequer Court ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The amount of the judgment was $73,000 or thereabouts, and of course the whole certificate ran between $300,000 and $400,000.

Mr. HAGGART. I beg pardon. The certificate was not in excess of the amount of the judgment. If my memory is correct Mr. Goodwin got his judgment just for the amount of the certificate given by the department.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The amount of the verdict corresponds with the amount of the certificate which applied to that particular part of the work. I thought the hon. gentleman had asked me what was the gross sum.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Has that been paid yet ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It has not yet been paid. The Department of Justice I believe is considering as to whether there ought or ought not to be an appeal. My impression is that it will not be appealed.

Mr. BERGERON. The Minister of Railways is hopeful that this canal will be opened next spring, and my hon. friend (Mr. Haggart, who I think knows more about it because it was under the late Government it was commenced, does not believe that statement ; I do not believe it will be ready for navigation before three or four years.

Mr. MONTAGUE. You are an unbeliever.

Mr. BERGERON. I have always been an unbeliever in that scheme. Not only has the canal to be finished but the locks on both sides have to be dredged to 14 feet before vessels of large tonnage can pass through. At the foot of the canal they will have to dig for a mile or two, and I am told that this spring the ice was there a fortnight after it had left the river. Unless the Government increase the amount of money they are taking for that work and put dredges on, the canal will not be ready for navigation before three or four years hence. Let the Minister take a note of what I am saying now and he will find that I am correct.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I must be guided by the advice of the officers.

Mr. BERGERON. I have very little confidence in them from what I have seen.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. So far as my experience has gone, I did not find that their calculations have been very much astray.

Mr. BERGERON. You will find that what I say is true.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Almost anything is possible in connection with a canal located such as this.

Mr. BERGERON. No doubt.

Mr. McDOUGALL. We had quite a lengthy discussion on the Goodwin claim in this House, and taking the advice of the then Liberal Opposition the Minister of Justice referred this case to the courts. What has been the cost up to the present time of that reference to the courts ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I can give no idea. I presume the Solicitor General, if he were here, would know that.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Is it $10,000 ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not think it could be that.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I think you will find it was more than $10,000.

Mr. SPROULE. The Minister is asking here for a large vote of $1,610,000, and it seems to me that he should give some information with regard to the present condition of the work. That information would enable us to exercise our own judgment with regard to the possibility of the canal being completed within the time expcted. The Minister should give us some information as to what state of progress the work is now in when he is asking for this money.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I may tell the hon. gentleman that there was expended up to the 30th of June, 1897, $2,639,000, and from the 30th of June, 1897, to the 1st of April, 1898, $561,000. The expectation is that before the close of the present fiscal year there will be expended another sum, in round numbers, of $200,000. That will leave, according to the estimate, $1,600,000 to complete the work ; $3,400,000 will be the amount in full expended up to the end of the present fiscal year.

Mr. SPROULE. That statement shows the money expended, but it does not show the condition of the work. There must have been given to the Minister some outline of the

work done, and he should give us some information as to how much of the work is done, and how much there is to do.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If the hon. gentleman will turn to the report of the department for the year, I think he will see there set forth very much of the information which he desires. I can give him a statement of the amount which we estimate will be required to complete the different sections. On sections 1 and 2, which were taken out of Mr. Stewart's hands, there has been paid $517,000, and we estimate that it will take $300,000 to complete the work required to be done upon those sections. Upon section number 3, that is O'Leary Brothers' section, we have paid $193,000 and upwards, and there still remains to be paid, $36,000; but the work on that section has practically been completed, and we are waiting for the settlement of the final estimates to pay the balance. Sections 4, 5, 6 and 7, which were the Goodwin sections, are now under contract to Mr. Onderdonk; $386,000 has been paid to the contractors, and we estimate that $500,000 odd will finish the work. On section 8, which is the Raynor section, where the landslide occurred, there has been paid $236,000, and the balance to be paid, if the landslide had not occurred, would have been $23,420 to complete the work. On section 9, the Manning and Macdonald section, the amount paid is $100,000, and there remains still to be paid about $30,000. On section 10, which is under contract to Rogers and Taylor, $240,000 has been paid, and there is still to be paid, $30,000. On section 11, another of the Goodwin sections, there has been paid to Goodwin and the other contractors, $250,650, and there remains something over $50,000 still to be paid. On section 12, which was also one of Mr. Goodwin's contracts, and which is now let to Mr. M. J. Hogan, there has been paid $73,000, and there remains to be paid, $216,000. On section 13, which is Manning and Macdonald's, there has been paid $420,000, and there remains to be paid, $120,000 odd. That is the last section. Then, we have different items made up of lock-gates, swing bridges, steel bridges, and so forth.

Mr. SPROULE. Can the hon. gentleman tell us how many locks are on the canal?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Four lift locks, one guard lock, and a guard gate.

Mr. HAGGART. Has the hon. gentleman decided to put a guard lock on that canal?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. HAGGART. Then you have changed the plans of the department?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, they were changed.

Mr. HAGGART. What do you want a guard lock and a guard gate for?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They are not located on the same spot.

Mr. HAGGART. They are for entirely the same object. I am aware that the engineer in charge of the canal was in favour of a guard lock, but the necessity for it I could never understand. I suppose it was his urgent representation to the Minister that decided him to adopt it, though the department had decided to build the canal without it. I see that Mr. Onderdonk has a contract for building a portion of the canal Was he the lowest tenderer?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. He was the lowest tenderer who was willing to accept the contract. There was an offer below that, but in the notices we issued calling for tenders, the time was stated at a more remote date than we finally concluded upon. He was unwilling to take the contract and engage to have the work done within the time last specified.

Mr. MONTAGUE. What tenderer was that?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. M. J. Hogan. He made offers for two works. He was willing to undertake one of them and complete it in time, but not both. The guard gate is on No. 4 section and the guard lock on No. 13. I am quite aware that my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Railways had rather a strong opinion against the wisdom of putting up the guard lock, and it is a question which gave me a good deal of concern: but I did not, I confess, myself have any expert or special knowledge to enable me to form a judgment on that question. The engineers of my department were strongly in its favour. I knew the hon. gentleman had disapproved of the guard lock, and I had a very careful examination made and took outside expert opinion, which was very strongly in favour of a guard lock.

Mr. HAGGART. If the hon. gentleman will refer to two of the finest works built in America, namely, the American Soo Canal or locks at the Soo, and those on our own side, he will find that neither of them had guard locks. The engineers adopted the plan I intended to adopt of stopping the water coming in. These guard locks are condemned entirely by the American engineers as not being necessary and costing large expenditure. However, I suppose the hon. Minister was guided entirely by the pressure brought on him by the engineer in charge of the works, and who is strongly in favour of the guard locks. The hon. Minister states that the contract was let to a party lower than Mr. Onderdonk for one of the sections, but he objected to completing the work within the time required. Was

that time the time mentioned in the advertisement for tenders ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It was somewhat shorter.

Mr. HAGGART. How much shorter ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think about a year shorter. After the advertisements were published, we concluded that it would be possible to have the work done in a shorter time, and Mr. Hogan, while willing to do one of the works within the time, was not willing to undertake the other.

Mr. HAGGART. Was it not the duty of the department, under the circumstances, to ask for new tenders. Look at the disadvantage the other tenderers were under. You ask for the construction of a particular kind of work in two years, and after the tenders are in and you have found out the prices, you decide to have it done a year shorter, and you call for no further tenders. That opens the door for jobbery, for making arrangements between the contractors themselves, and the duty of the Minister, in fairness not only to himself but the contractors throughout the country, was to have asked for new tenders.

Mr. MONTAGUE. It seems extraordinary that after the department had considered the question and fixed the time necessary for the completion of the work and received tenders on the basis of that time limit, they should then change their mind. I think the committee ought to be given the reason, and that reason should be a very grave and important one, why the decision was thus suddenly changed. Too much cannot be said on the line my hon. friend from Lanark (Mr. Haggart) has taken as regards the opportunity this opens up for irregularities.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have no hesitation whatever in giving my hon. friend the information he asks. About the time the tenders were received, the Government came to the conclusion that it would address itself to the completion of the St. Lawrence Canal system at the earliest possible date. I had myself been led to the opinion that it would be in the public interest to have the work pushed so vigorously as to enable us to have a continuous waterway 14 feet deep, at the earliest possible moment. We decided if possible to get the work done by the spring of 1899, and I cannot see that the shortening of the time affords any ground for criticism. If we had invited the general public to tender for this work to be completed at a certain day, and then had privately agreed to extend the date to one of the contractors, the contracting public might very well have complained that additional time was going to be allowed, they would have tendered for a less sum for a longer time, because the more time you allow for the completion of a work the lower the contractor can afford to tender at. But this was entirely the reverse. We concluded to get this work done, if possible, in a year less than we had proposed. We said to Mr. Hogan, who was the lowest tenderer : We have decided to get this work done in a year less time, are you willing to complete it in that time ? He said : No. I will undertake the other contract, but could not undertake both. I have tendered on a longer date and will require more if I am to complete the work in less time. We went to the next tenderer, Mr. Onderdonk, and asked him if he was prepared to do the work in less time for the same price. He said he was. I laid the facts before the Governor in Council, and the Council approved of the contract being entered into with Mr. Onderdonk at the same price as he had tendered to do the work for at the longer term.

Mr. FOSTER. What was the difference in price betwen Mr. Onderdonk's tender and Mr. Hogan's ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My deputy says he thinks it was between $30,000 and $40,000.

Mr. FOSTER. That is the point.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. Minister is perfectly right in saying that the contractor would not do the work in a shorter period for the same sum as he would in a longer period, but the question then comes, how much more did the Minister pay above the lowest tenderer ? The hon. Minister is not certain, and he says that Mr. Onderdonk got between $30,000 and $40,000 more than Mr. Hogan. Under those circumstances it surely would have been the correct thing for the department to advertise again and get new tenders for the work. The parties who had tendered to do the work in three years were required to do it in two years. Any one knows that it costs more to do in two years than in three, but if a contractor gets the work at a far higher price than what the lowest tenderer offered to do it for, he may be fully compensated for the reduction in time. Tenders like that ought to be open to the public. Mr. Hogan finds that he is the lowest tenderer, while Mr. Onderdonk finds that he is within $40,000 of the lowest tender. The Minister changed his mind as to the time for the construction of the work. Now, I do not say that this occurred, but I am showing the possibility —Mr. Onderdonk says, I can do the work within two years. And he goes to Mr. Hogan, who says he will not do the work in the time, and, perhaps, he may take the $10,000 for dropping it, and the other gentleman will make $30,000 out of the job.

Mr. MONTAGUE. May I ask if an estimate was made by the engineer of the department as to the cost of building the work in the shortened time, and may I ask further what that estimate was, and how it

compares with the price paid to Mr. Onderdonk ? If the time was changed, as it certainly was, the Minister should have had a new estimate as to the cost of completing the work. Otherwise he could not have reliable data for letting the contract for a much increased sum.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I can say that the estimate which was made of the cost of completing the work was higher than the price we have to pay under the contract for building it in the shorter time.

Mr. MONTAGUE. What was the estimate ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I cannot give the figures at the moment, nor can my deputy. We were short of time, as hon. members must realize, being behind, then. You cannot get tenders out and contract arrangements made inside of a month. Therefore, every moment seemed of importance. One thing hon. gentlemen may rely upon, and that is that the work having been thrown open and everybody having an opportunity to tender at the longer date, the Government got the work done certainly as cheaply as it could possibly hope to have it done, seeing that we were shortening the period by one whole year.

Mr. SPROULE. I remember very distinctly the strong exceptions that were taken to the conduct of the late Government when they shortened the time for building the Sault Ste. Marie Canal. And, at the time, it was held that one of the first necessities on the part of the Government was to ascertain by estimates of their engineer what additional cost would be incurred on account of shortening up the time. Now the hon. Minister says they had estimates as to the cost of the work for the longer time, and, because the contract made for the shorter time was no higher, the Government was justified in entering into the contract. But would it not suggest itself to his mind that if, having a longer time enabled the contractor to do it at a certain figure and he agreed to do it for the same figure for the shorter time, there must have been something wrong, for the reason that it must cost a contractor more to complete the work within a short time than within a long time ? I remember that the increase in the various items of expense necessitated by the reduction in the time for completing the contract was given in the case of the Sault Ste. Marie Canal. The Government should have ascertained how much the work would cost and, not doing so, they did not know that they were not paying more than they were warranted in paying. I thought it was a sound rule then and I think it is now. I do not think that the Minister's conduct or his explanations will be satisfactory to the country.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Under the present appearance of the work is the hon. Minister convinced that the contractors will complete it within the shortened time ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, I am so advised.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Will the penalties be enforced ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Unquestionably, the work will be taken off the hands of a contractor who does not go on with proper despatch.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. Minister was kind enough to give us information as to the money spent under these various contracts. But, the work being paid for on progress estimates, it may be found that the work cannot be completed for the sum that the Minister thinks. I should like to know whether the money still unpaid bears such a proportion to the work still undone that it will pay for that work when completed.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The chief contractors upon the work, remaining to be done are Ryan & Macdonald, Onderdonk & Hogan. The officers of my department tell me that these firms have on the ground sufficient plant and that they have sufficient organization, so that, proceeding as they have been proceeding, they will complete the work in the time—that is, as I have always said, sufficiently to enable the canal to be opened for business at the beginning of the next season of navigation. I do not see how it is possible for me to give my hon. friend further information. I have no photographs here that I can exhibit to show the hon. gentleman the state of the work.

Mr. SPROULE. Perhaps I did not make myself understood. There are a certain number of cubic yards of stone work to be done, so many gates to be built, so many locks, so many thousand yards of excavation. Surely, the progress estimates would show whether the work still to be done is proportionate to the money still to be paid, so as to show whether the money voted will be sufficient to complete the work.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I would gladly tell the hon. gentleman, though I think it would not be possible even with a very careful examination made by the officers of the department to make my hon. friend one whit better able to form a judgment as to the probable time for the completion of the work than he is now. He could not have the data upon which to judge of the value. The men who have been familiar with the work since it started, the character of the plant, the size of the organization, the amount of progress that has been made since they have been fully equipped, all afford information which has led the offi-

cers of the department to give me these assurances which I am now conveying to the House. I think these officers must be in a better position to form a judgement than anybody else.

Mr. HAGGART. I suppose the Minister is aware that there is no object in having this completed before the opening of navigation, because it could not be utilized unless all the stretches along the river were opened at the same time. When he states that it will be open to navigation the first of next spring. I suppose that all the other works which he has under contract on the St. Lawrence will be open at the same time, too; because there could be no object in shortening the contract from two to one years unless he was sure of the deepening of the St. Francis, the completion of the works at Cornwall, at Farran's Point, and the Rapids, and the Cornwall Canal. There is another thing I would like to ask the Minister. From evidence which was adduced in another place, it seems there has been an expenditure of over $20,000 for cement upon this canal. The officer in charge of the work says that it is entirely useless, that he does not intend to lay it upon the work. I would like to know from the Minister from what authority in his department he advertised for and took that cement for the construction of the canal? When I was Minister, the engineer in charge of the work protested strongly against the use of any such material for the construction of the works. I went over the works myself on the Cornwall Canal, and saw where they had been using cement of a similar character, and I thought it was a pity that the magnificent stone used in the construction of that work should be entirely useless on account of the fact that the cement which had been used was good for nothing. I took the opportunity of asking the engineer as to that matter, and his answer was that the cement was entirely useless. He said they employed about 100 barrels, but the rest did not come up to the standard and could not be used.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I presume my hon. friend is referring to the cement known as hydraulic cement, or Thorold cement. I can tell him at once how the department came to award a contract for this cement for use upon the canals. Tenders were invited for cement in the usual way, stating the character of the cement to be furnished, and that it would have to stand a test of 60 pounds after 24 hours setting. When the tenders came to be awarded, we found that an offer had been made by the Thorold people to furnish us cement, undertaking that it should satisfy the required test. In support of their claim that the cement was of good quality and could be properly used in the works on the canals, they furnished certificates from Mr. Monro, engineer of the Soulanges, and from Mr. Thompson, engineer of the Welland, and from Mr. Page, whom I suppose hon. members very well recollect. Mr. Thompson certified to us in the most explicit manner that he had used this cement in great quantities on the Welland works, that it was there still to show for itself, that it was of good quality, as good as could be desired, and he recommended that we might very properly use it on the Soulanges. A contract was awarded to the Thorold people for a portion of the cement required for the whole work, and in their contract they expressly undertook that the cement should stand the required test, and any cement that has been used on the canal has only been used, I apprehend, after it has been tested. I have seen the tests myself. I heard some complaints with regard to the cement, and before the cement which had been taken from the contractors was paid for, I went down to the Soulanges and the official there charged with the duty of making the tests, showed me the record of the tests, and I brought back with me, for the information of the engineer and for my own information, abstracts from the test book and from the records made by the officer, Mr. Green, of the tests made by him from time to time. Mr. Schreiber advised me that the tests were very satisfactory, some of them showing 58 and some 60 pounds, and it was considered that it complied with the requirements of the contract. I also brought some briquets up with me, and had them tested here by Mr. Perley, who was the officer charged with that duty in the Public Works Department, and the result was exceedingly satisfactory. I think that some of the briquets stood the test of 120 pounds after 24 hours setting; so I think it would be unfair and unjust to the Thorold people to say that their cement ought to be condemned. Possibly some of that which they furnished was not up to the test, perhaps from having been air slacked, as I infer from what I have recently heard. They delivered us more than we were able to use, it came in bags, and as a result I think it air slacked. At all events, there will be some loss upon that cement. But the contract required it should be of the standard, that it should stand this test, and if it stood the test, I do not see any reason why the cement should be condemned.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. Minister must understand that cement is generally paid for upon the certificate of the engineer in charge of the works. It is his duty to test, not only a large consignment, but to make a test of every five barrels that he puts into the work. The engineer in charge of the work reports that it is unfit. What astonishes me is how the man has got paid. There is no certificate from the engineer on the Soulanges Canal showing that the cement is good, or that he received it at all. The amount is paid on the certificate of Mr.

Schreiber, who has not got the certificate of the engineer in charge of the work, but of an engineer, as he states, connected with the Public Works, an entirely different department. This shows that he must have had some information from the engineer in charge of the works that it is unsuitable. The engineer states before the Public Accounts Committee that he would not allow such cement into the work, that it is unfit for the work, and it still lies there. It could not have been tested, though I see from the Public Accounts Committee that over $20,000 has been paid for it.

Mr. BERGERON. Paid to whom ?

Mr. HAGGART. A person by the name of Battle.

Mr. SPROULE. The Minister has told us that three engineers certified to the quality of the cement.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I stated that the contract was not awarded for any Thorold cement until I had been furnished with certificates from the officers.

Mr. SPROULE. Were those engineers officers of the department ? I understand Mr. Thompson was superintending engineer of the Welland Canal. How did it happen that the Minister had Mr. Page's certificate, when he has been dead so long ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The certificate was probably given before he died.

Mr. SPROULE. There seems to be a nigger in the fence somewhere. Another feature is that while the cement was no use, it has been paid for, and the engineer in charge had reported against it. The committee must come to the conclusion that the cement was good or was not good. If it is good, proper care was not taken of it by the department. If not good, the certificates were not reliable. The country has, however, to bear the loss. These facts suggest either incompetence in the faithful discharge of duty by the Minister or laxity on the part of the officers. Whichever it is, the country will decide. The country will hold the Minister responsible for the loss, and will come to the conclusion that either the hon. gentleman or his officers failed to do their duty, or otherwise this loss would not have been incurred.

Mr. McCLEARY. I know something as to the quality of Thorold cement. If there is anything wrong about it, it is news to me, because this cement has a record extending over fifty years as being a splendid material, and really the best make of cement in this country. If there is anything wrong about the cement it has occurred accidentally, because the Welland Canal stands to-day as a monument of the quality of this cement. In the Welland aqueduct not a barrel of other cement has been used ; it has been used largely on all the locks, and hundreds of thousands of bushels have been used. I do not know why this cement did not stand the test applied to any other Canadian cement. Of course, it cannot be put in competition with imported cement, Portland or German, but for ordinary work, it is all right. I thought the late Government acted somewhat strangely in not using our native cement, they always taking the ground that it did not come up to the standard required by the engineers. I had interviews with the ex-Minister of Railways and his deputy, and the answer always given was that if the cement came up to the standard the department would use it. I think it is right that I should make this defence of the industry in the town where I live, which has a record for furnishing a good article and only what it is represented. The company make tests of their cement every day, as they seek to put a good article on the market. It is due to the men interested in this enterprise in my town that this statement should be made.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. When tenders were invited and offers were made of Thorold cement, I would scarcely have been justified, without possessing ample evidence, in deciding that the cement was utterly unfit for use on public works. How could I come to that conclusion ? I had evidence put before me that Mr. Page regarded the cement as being satisfactory. I will not say that any officer in the department contended that the cement ought to be used in all classes of work, but there was a considerable portion of the work, such as dry work and backing, for which it could properly be used. I had a statement from W. G. Thompson, superintending engineer. He represented to me in a most explicit way that it had been used by him for years, that it had been used on the Welland Canal, and he pointed to that work as showing that it had turned out well. I had a statement from Mr. Munro to the same effect. Mr. Gibson, M.P., who has had large experience in works of this kind, wrote me and saw me personally, and stated that he had used thousands of barrels and had found it a good article, and he would advise the department to give a contract for a portion of the cement required.

Under these circumstances, seeing that the cement had been used and was being used in various works connected with the department down to the moment the contract was let, I would not be justified in condemning that cement and saying that the department would not use any of it for any purpose, and that I would not afford a home industry in the country any recognition. That is the view I took. I venture to say there is not any of the hon. gentlemen opposite who have been criticising my course in that respect—and legitimately so, I suppose, if they can make a point out of it politically—I ven-

ture to say there is not one of them who would not have taken the course I did, seeing that the cement that was to be furnished must come up to the specification. I do not think it is customary to examine every five barrels of any kind of cement which is furnished, and my engineer informs me it would be impossible to make so continued and close an examination, but there is no question that from time to time sufficient tests were made in the judgment of those who had to do with the matter. I think that even now hon. gentlemen opposite ought not be too hasty in saying that the cement was unfit for use and ought not to be taken by the department. These gentlemen who make the cement have carried on their business with success for many years and have lived by the industry, and members of Parliament cannot express these hasty opinions without doing a very great deal of injury to the manufacturers. I confess that I am not sufficiently informed to express an opinion adversely to that cement, and I do not believe that hon. gentlemen opposite are so informed at this moment. I think that hon. gentlemen opposite ought to consider that those whose living depends upon the successful prosecution of their industry are entitled to expect that these gentlemen shall withhold such an unqualified condemnation of the product of their industry until the evidence justifies it. To say that Mr. Monro has condemned the cement does not by any means settle the question.

Mr. BERGERON. Oh, no.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Although I have a very favourable opinion of Mr. Monro's capabilities, yet we have to differ with our engineers from time to time. I had a question before me very shortly after I came into the department which I had to determine adversely to Mr. Monro's strong view. He said that a certain stone was not fit to go into construction, and he was fortified in that by the opinion of some other people, but there was a body of valuable opinion the other way, and I had to do the best I could in determining as between the differing opinions, and I came to the conclusion that there was good stone in that quarry and that it should be used. That stone has been used and the more I see of it the more convinced I am that I was right and that Mr. Monro was wrong. If I have been guilty of remissness in regard to this cement no one is more ready than I am to submit to the judgment of the House, and to take the full responsibility of any error that I have committed, but it should be borne in mind that the cement might have been good if it was used at the time, and that there may be no fault attached to the cement itself, but that the fault is due to other causes. For instance, a very large portion of the cement that was put in last fall was not used. It was, I think, carefully housed, but hundreds of bags of it got air-slacked and it became as hard as rock. That was not the fault of the cement, and I do not think it was anybody's fault in particular. The work was not, unfortunately, as far forward as we expected. There was a very large quantity of masonry which we expected Mr. Stewart would have completed last fall, as he was required to do under his contract, but, unhappily, Mr. Stewart failed to do it, and we did not have occasion to use the cement which we thought would have been required. It might be possible to complain that we ought not to have supplied ourselves with such a large quantity of cement, that we ought to know that Mr. Stewart might fail in carrying out his contract, but even if we are at fault in that respect, do not let us condemn the cement unless we know that there is reason for our doing so.

Mr. BERGERON. Oh, no.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) is, I am sure, fair-minded enough to withhold censure until he is better informed than he is at present. The Deputy Minister tells me that he has just received a statement from Mr. W. G. Thompson, of the Welland Canal, that during last and recent seasons he has used no less than 5,600 barrels of this very cement on the Welland Canal, and that it turned out to be excellent. That evidence ought to be sufficient reason why hon. gentlemen opposite should not be too hasty in condemning the cement. When you find it proven clearly that this cement was not fit for the purpose, then it will be ample time to express that opinion.

Mr. HAGGART. There is no one finding fault with the product of Mr. Battle or of anybody else, but what we contend is that the whole engineering department of the country protested against the use of this cement, and there is evidence in the department that the engineer in charge of the Soulanges Canal protested against it. I myself, in going over the work with the chief engineer, have seen, in the case of similar material furnished by Mr. Rathbun, that the engineer could put his stick the whole length into the cement, and that it was utterly unfit for beautiful work like that. I had to resist pressure brought by the Owen Sound people, by Mr. Rathbun, by Mr. Battle and by a dozen others, for the purpose of getting me to use that cement, because I thought it would be better to make these parties who manufacture the cement a present of the money and get good cement, rather than ruin the work. What we protest against is using material entirely against the advice of the engineering department. I will give you an instance of the use of such cement. In some of our works we did use it. We allowed it to be used on the Sault Ste. Marie Canal; but the contractors on that canal, Ryan & Co., had

occasion to use Battle cement on part of their work. They were men who took a pride in their work, and they said to me, "The cement we are required to use is Thorold cement, but rather than use it we will use proper cement and pay the difference out of our own pockets." What I protest against is the Minister taking the decision as to these materials into his own hands, and not being guided by his engineering department. Why does he force on the engineering department materials which are unfit for the work? And why is it that the Finance Department and the Auditor General's Department paid $20,000 for material for which they had no certificate of the engineer in charge of the work? The certificate they were forced to get in order to pay this man for his cement was obtained by the engineer or the deputy head of the Department of Railways from an officer of the Public Works Department. My advice to the Minister is this. This is a loss to the country, and let it remain a loss to the country. Rather than put that material into the work of the Soulanges Canal, pitch it into the river—the country will forgive you—and see that proper material is put in and a good job done.

The PRIME MINISTER. I see it is five minutes to one o'clock, and I move that the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to, and committee rose and reported progress.

THE MAJOR-GENERAL COMMANDING—QUESTION OF ORDER.

Mr. SPEAKER. In reference to the discussion which took place this morning upon the question of order, it occurs to me that possibly it might not be clear what my opinion was on one point, which I think was suggested by the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster). In the first place, I hope I made it clear that I did not think it would be in order to read the letter in question without a motion to lay it on the Table of the House. In the next place, I think the hon. member for York suggested a query as to whether any hon. member could at any time put himself in order in reference to such a paper by making a motion to lay it on the Table of the House. I think it is quite clear that an hon. member could put himself in order in that way, provided he gave proper notice of the motion, or the House unanimously agree to the motion at any time, as was the case on this occasion. The House did not object to the motion being put, but there was a unanimous assent to it, as occurs continually in reference to similar motions. It is only in that way that such a motion could be made either by a Minister or by any other member of the House. So that, I think the point is very clear and simple. I would also mention that hon. members will have observed, this session, at any rate, that when a Minister has desired, or has been requested, to lay on the Table any paper which is not in answer to an Order of this House for a return, the hon. member has, at my suggestion, generally, to put his action in order, made a motion that he do lay on the Table such a return. That has been done a number of times this session, exactly as was done in the case of General Gascoigne's letter. I would also like to say that when that letter was being read by the leader of the House, I mentioned to the Clerk that I proposed to make it regular by putting a motion—of course, with the assent of the House. I also mentioned to the Clerk that I thought that would be more fair, because it would give an opportunity for the discussion of the letter, which could not be had if it were simply read and laid on the Table. So that I think there can be no doubt at all on the part of any hon. member as to what the rules of the House are in matters of this kind.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, am I to understand that the ruling of the Speaker is this, that although it is laid down by the authorities on parliamentary procedure that an extra-parliamentary letter should not be read in Parliament, it may be read in Parliament on a motion of a member before the motion has been affirmed?

The PRIME MINISTER. I do not understand it in that way, but what is constantly done here is this. Members constantly ask, as a matter of privilege to be allowed to read a newspaper article, for the purpose of giving it a denial; and what applies to a newspaper article would apply to a letter. That is done over and over again, as my hon. friend knows.

Mr. FOSTER. What I want is to be clear on the question. I find in Bourinot's book that a letter from an outside official rebutting something which a member of Parliament has said is not to be read in the House. Am I to understand that if I want to put such a letter before the House, I can do so by simply making a motion, and before that motion is passed, and without previous assent of the House I can read that letter? If so, the rule would have no force.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, is the rule this, that if I want to get an extra-parliamentary letter read, I must first state what I want, and ask the assent of the House, and if I get the assent of the House, I can then read the letter?

Mr. SPEAKER. The decisions which have been quoted to-day all refer to what has gone on in the course of debate. No motion could be made in those cases, and the reading of irregular matter cannot be put in order by any motion in the course

of a debate. My impression would be, if the point arose, and if a motion were made after proper notice given, or made with the assent of the House, for leave to lay a paper on the Table of the House, it could be read after the motion was adopted.

The PRIME MINISTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 1 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Second Sitting.

TUESDAY, 31st May, 1898.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the 7th report of the Public Accounts Committee be ordered to be printed, and that rule 94 be suspended.

Motion agreed to.

POST OFFICE SAVINGS BANK.

Mr. DAVIN. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to ask the hon. Finance Minister whether he could let me know to-morrow what are the withdrawals during the month of May from the Post Office Savings Bank, and what are the deposits, either exactly or approximately? I rather think it will not be as easy to give me the latter as the former, but I suppose there will be no difficulty about the withdrawals. It would be instructive if we could have this week the withdrawals and the deposits so that we could see whether there is a deficit or a surplus.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). It would be difficult to give the information as this is the last day of the month, but so far as possible, before the session closes, I shall be glad to give it.

FRENCH LINE OF STEAMERS.

Mr. BERGERON. I would like to ask the right hon. Prime Minister how the negotiations stand with the Government concerning the French line of steamers which we heard of at the commencement of the session, and if we can expect anything to be done before the session is over?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I am sorry I cannot give any information, as the negotiations are pending.

THE LIEUTENANT-GOVERNOR OF THE NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES.

Mr. FOSTER. May I ask my right hon. friend whether he can confirm the report that a former member of this House has been appointed to the position of Lieutenant-Governor of the North-west Territories? I refer to the member for Huron (Mr. Cameron).

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Mr. Cameron has been appointed Lieutenant-Governor of the North-west Territories.

THE CROW'S NEST PASS RAILWAY COMMISSION.

Mr. BELL (Addington). Has the report of the commission appointed to inquire into the grievances of the labourers on the Crow's Nest Pass Railway been ordered to be printed, and when may we expect to have it?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I am sorry that I cannot give any information to-day, but shall endeavour to do so at a later stage.

THE MONTREAL, OTTAWA AND GEORGIAN BAY CANAL.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. POUPORE. Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw the attention of the House to a very important matter which is now agitating a very large proportion of the public mind of Canada. I refer to the Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal project. Last year I formed part of a deputation which waited upon the right hon. First Minister and his Cabinet with regard to that gigantic enterprise. We had on that deputation representatives from a large number of the boards of trade of Canada which had previously petitioned the Government to adopt some plan whereby the Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal should be placed under construction at once.

At that convention some very prominent gentlemen from the various towns and cities of Canada pointed out the vast advantages that would accrue to Canada if the project were carried to completion. The proposition was that the Government should contribute aid towards the construction of this great enterprise, and the right hon. First Minister replied that whilst he did not at all undervalue the importance of the scheme, but on the contrary looked

upon it as one of paramount importance to Canada, still the other obligations devolving upon the Government, such as the construction of works under contract and other projects seeking Government aid, made it impossible for them to take up the project of the Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal. He did not, however, throw cold water upon the project on that occasion. He said he considered it an important project for Canada. When the deputation received that answer from the Prime Minister and his colleagues, the promoter of the recent agitation in connection with this scheme, Mr. McLeod Stewart, felt that if it were to be pushed forward it would be necessary for him to place himself in communication with the capitalists of England so as to devise means to raise the funds for carrying out the work. With a view of getting into immediate contact with the people, Mr. Stewart went to London and spent several months there. He not only interested the general public of England in this great enterprise, but he interested capitalists and prominent engineers in that country. So successful was he that, when a committee was appointed by the Senate, during this very session, to inquire into the benefits that would accrue to Canada from this canal, one of the witnesses there who came before that committee was Mr. Meldrum, the representative of S. Pearson & Son, Ltd., of London, known to be the largest contractors for public works in the world. With your permission, Mr. Speaker, and that of the House, I will read the report of Mr. Meldrum's evidence before that committee. But, before proceeding to do so, let me give a few words of explanation. This project is not a new one to the people of Canada. It was taken up in 1860, before confederation, by the Canadian Government of that day. That Government saw the importance to Canada of the construction of this canal. They had a survey made of the Ottawa River, in fact, the survey covered the ground from Montreal to the mouth of the French River, with a view to building a ship canal, so that sea-going vessels, instead of stopping at Montreal, might go through to Georgian Bay. At that early day, this was considered a gigantic enterprise. But, notwithstanding that, the far-seeing men of that period, realizing that the Ottawa River was one of the arteries of this country, one of the great inheritances with which Providence had endowed the people of Canada, offering a route to Liverpool a thousand miles shorter than any other, felt that it was necessary to carry this work to completion to cheapen the transportation to the sea of freight of all kinds. A considerable sum of money was expended on the project at that time. For instance, at the Chats Canal a large expenditure took place. Had it not been for the lamented death of the then representative of the county I have the honour to represent, the late John Egan, this project, I do believe, would have been pushed to completion at that time. Mr. Egan was a man of commanding ability, whose knowledge of these matters and skill in handling gigantic enterprises was recognized, not only on this continent, but in Europe. No greater mind lived in Canada at that time. He saw the necessity of constructing this canal and thus bringing the great lakes into direct communication with the Atlantic Ocean.

What has been done since 1860? What events have taken place in the history of our country since then? The greatest of all was the confederation of the provinces into one great Dominion. That absorbed the attention of the public men of our country until its accomplishment. Following this came the obligations incident to confederation and the carrying out of the great schemes devolving upon the central authority, the Dominion Government, by reason of it—the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, the enlargement of the St. Lawrence canals, and other great enterprises. The attention of our best minds was devoted to these questions, and the canalization of the Ottawa River to Georgian Bay did not receive the same attention as before. But, quite recently, the question has been brought to public attention again. I say from my seat in this Parliament that Canada is indebted to especially one man for this. The future historian of this country will write a page in golden letters chronicling the work of McLeod Stewart. Mr. Stewart has been laughed at. But by whom? By men of our own country who have not taken the trouble even to learn by reading of the importance of this transportation question to Canada; by men who have not the brains, perhaps, nor the diligence to read up this vast subject and learn the magnificent endowment we have in that great water stretch, the Ottawa River. In discussing this subject, one is at once confronted with an argument which, to my mind, is senseless. I have been told: Why, Poupore, what is the use of talking about the Georgian Bay Canal? We have all the railways we need, we have the St. Lawrence canal system, we have all the conveniences for trade and traffic necessary for our country. Why talk about a thing that is just about as difficult of fulfilment as the building of a railway to the moon. Mr. Speaker, do you consider that a gentleman who would thus express himself knows anything of the history of this country? It is a well-established fact, and, if it be not known to all the members of this House, let me tell those who do not know it, that Canada receives only one-seventh of the vast volume of the western trade at its seaports. Where does the other six-sevenths of that trade go? Does it not go to build up the cities of the United States? Then, will not a thinking man

say that we should seek to devise some means whereby we can get more of that volume of trade ?

Already we know that our railways and canals are able to handle more of that trade than they are getting. The moment we stop to inquire into that phase of the question, we are confronted with the irrefutable fact that we are now carrying all we are able to carry because of our limited facilities. Hence I say that the necessities of the moment demand of us to-day the solution of this problem, and that solution is to allow the men who are willing to come and spend their own money in developing one of the natural arteries of Canada, to touch the Georgian Bay district, thus shortening the distance beween Duluth and Liverpool exactly 1,000 miles. What does that mean when you speak of a route for the transportation of all our natural resources ? It simply means a saving in expense. There is a principle admitted by all men who know anything about the subject, that trade will find the shortest and cheapest route to its destination. I do not think there is a man to-day in this House, nor is there a man in Canada, who will contradict that statement. The trade of a country will seek the shortest and cheapest route to its destination. Now, I can prove that by no less an authority than Mr. Walter Shanley, whose opinions as a civil engineer, I think, stand unquestioned to-day, not only in Canada but in the United States of America. Consider the achievement of that great engineer in constructing the Hoosac tunnel in the United States, he immortalized himself in that country, his name to-day stands in the United States as it does in Canada, a household word. The name of Walter Shanly, in point of scientific skill and knowledge, and in point of honesty and integrity, stands to-day unrivalled. I offer his opinion to this House. I do not want it understood that I am imposing upon my colleagues my own opinions on this question ; I simply ask my colleagues to give me ear for a moment till I show them what some of our great men say, both as to the possibility and as to the necessity of carrying out this gigantic enterprise, the necessity of making Canada what she ought to be, one of the greatest nations of the earth. Last year in England, where was there a Canadian who was not proud of himself as much when, at that great event, the Queen's Jubilee, he saw his country represented in so distinguished a manner by the right hon. gentleman the Prime Minister of Canada ? Sir, I say I felt proud on that occasion, and I would be failing in my duty as a Canadian if I were to say or think otherwise. I am one of those who, while not in direct political accord with the hon. the Prime Minister of Canada, am yet a Canadian who is willing to give credit where credit is due. I think Canada to-day is rated among the nations of the earth as one of the first ; in fact, to use a well-known poetical phrase, Canada is the brightest jewel in the British Crown. When we saw this country of ours represented in such a distinguished manner on that occasion by the right hon. the Prime Minister, we were filled with a greater desire than ever to make our country still more illustrious. Divine Providence has given us the wherewith to do it. Divine Providence has given us one of the main arteries of this continent. Now we, the representatives of the people of Canada, are simply expected to do—what ? Simply to do our duty and that duty is to make Canada one of the finest countries on the face of the earth. It is said we have a lot of railways, we have a magnificent canal system on the St. Lawrence route, and we have there all the means we need for the transportation of the produce of the west. But those who make that statement appear to forget that year after year the products of the west are simply doubling, as you may say ; year after year the resources of our great western country, both in Canada and the United States, are simply doubling. Therefore, if we do not double our facilities for handling those products, we are simply blocking up the development of our country, nor can the seaports of Canada ever become otherwise what they should be. I could show this by statistics, but it would be at the risk of tiring my colleagues. I do not wish to tire them, but this question is one of such importance that I think that even if the Parliament of Canada were to devote one afternoon to the consideration of this question, posterity will feel indebted to those hon. gentlemen who stood up in the House of Commons and considered this business proposition. We are not asked as a Government to put our hands into our pockets and to give to somebody else the money with which to construct this route. We find that Mr. McLeod Stewart has created a great interest in this question among the English public, and even in the English press we have seen some of the finest articles treating this question that have ever appeared in their columns. Again, Lord Dufferin, a former Governor General of Canada and one of the warmest friends this country has to-day, met Mr. Stewart on the occasion of his visit to London last year. Why, Sir, Lord Dufferin is in raptures over this scheme, as are all men of profound minds who have given it consideration, they think it is the making of this country. According to Mr. Shanly's statement before the committee, we find that we are now getting one-seventh of the whole western trade at our Canadian seaports ; and that gentleman shows that by shortening the route between Duluth and Liverpool 1,000 miles, we shall then get at least seven-tenths of the whole trade. Mr. Speaker, has any gentleman taken the trouble to inquire into what that means for

Canada? If I were to quote the figures they would appear simply fabulous. But assume that we did not take seven-tenths of the whole trade, assume that we could only get another seventh, which is in fact too modest an estimate, let us consider what that means for Canada. As I have said, it is an established principle that trade will always seek and find the shortest and cheapest route to its destination. Now, it is clearly established, and I have never heard it denied, that the distance between Duluth and Liverpool via the Ottawa River is exactly 1,000 miles less than the distance via Buffalo, the Erie Canal and New York. Now, there is no reason in the world why a steamer leaving Duluth and passing via the Ottawa River should not travel, under the same conditions, just as fast as one that goes via Buffalo, the Erie Canal and New York. Then if that be admitted, it follows that a steamer via Ottawa will have exactly 1,000 miles less to travel to reach Liverpool. Now, what is the logical sequence of that fact? We are driven to the conclusion that a steamer which has 1,000 miles less to travel will reach its destination four or five days sooner than a steamer which has to go round via New York. Now it is evident to every member of this House that if we can save the enormous expense involved in running a steamer four or five days between Duluth and Liverpool, we are cheapening the cost of transportation by all that sum; and it being admitted that trade follows the shortest and cheapest route, the only logical conclusion we can arrive at is that trade will follow the route via the Ottawa River. What will that mean?

It means we shall have the activity, expansion and every advantage incident to the growing trade of a seaport. That is not all. Let us look at the development which must occur the very moment this work is constructed. You will leave Montreal and come to Ottawa, where we see only a small proportion of the electrical power capable of development utilized to-day. You go on further to the Deschenes, and on to the Chats, where we have the whole Ottawa River divided into immense water-powers, as is well known to some hon. members of the House. You go on some miles further to Portage du Fort, and next come to the grand Calumet Falls of historic importance. There you have a second Niagara. Those who may doubt my statement have only to take up the history of our country and see that I state a historical fact which cannot be controverted. I want to impress on my colleagues the vast resources which lie dormant, dormant because the representatives of Canada are dormant, because we have been dormant in the past, and if any words of mine, any efforts of mine will have the effect—I will not claim the credit of arousing our people to the obligations under which we are to the nation—I shall utter the words, and feel I shall have done my duty to Canada in bringing my colleagues to realize the great inheritance we have received from the hands of Divine Providence by having the grand Otawa River in our midst.

In my opening remarks I made allusion to the fact that the representatives of an English firm had been heard before the Senate committee. With your permission, Mr. Speaker, and the forbearance of my colleagues, I shall read some of the statements made on that occasion. Mr. James Meldrum was examined before the special committee of the Senate appointed to investigate and report on the feasibility of and advantages that would accrue to the Dominion of Canada from the construction of a canal uniting the waters of Lake Huron with those of the Ottawa River. Mr. Meldrum made the following statement:

I am a member of the Institution of Civil Engineers of Great Britain, and head of the foreign department of S. Pearson & Son, Limited, who, I think, are the largest contractors of public works in the world.

We have been approached by Mr. McLeod Stewart as to whether we will undertake the construction of the Georgian Bay Canal, and my answer has been that provided the financial position is satisfactorily settled we are willing to undertake the construction of the works on a basis to be arranged with the company, and to give these works the skill and attention which have proved satisfactory to other governments. To establish our position as to our ability to carry out these works, I propose to give you briefly a list of some important works which we have recently constructed or are now constructing. We have recently completed the Blackwall Tunnel for the London County Council at a cost of about one million sterling, for which service the president of our company has been created a baronet. We have just completed the drainage of the valley of the city of Mexico by canal 25 miles long, and in places 90 feet deep, which has changed the whole area from a swamp into dry land, at a cost of about $10,000,000. At present we are constructing for the Admiralty of Great Britain, Dover Harbour, at a cost of about three millions sterling, which will convey to you that we are on the Admiralty list, which is the highest honour that a contractor can get. We are constructing Vera Cruz harbour for the Mexican Government. We have railway and dock contracts in England amounting, exclusive of the Dover harbour contract, to three or four millions sterling. We have just completed an arrangement with the Mexican Government by which we take over from them the Tehuantepec Railway from the Pacific to the Atlantic. We propose to build large harbours at each end and divert the whole trade of the Pacific to the Atlantic, to a new route. More within your own knowledge, we built and are part owners of the Halifax graving dock.

The Chairman.—What did that cost?

Mr. Meldrum.—I could not at this moment say.

Hon. Mr. Power.—It is a good work.

Mr. Meldrum.—I believe it is the only satisfactory graving dock on the east coast of America. Besides what I have mentioned, we are at present in negotiation with the Egyptian, Chilian, Argentine and Uruguayan Governments for other large works, amounting in all to about fifteen millions sterling. We have works in hand

to over ten millions sterling, and are negotiating for fifteen millions more. As to the scheme before us, I can only say that I have read over the various descriptions of the works which have been prepared by the distinguished engineers engaged on the survey, and from these I see no engineering difficulty to prevent their execution. As to the commercial aspect, I think it would be presumptuous of me to offer any ideas at all to your committee. You are in a far better position than I to form any idea as to the commercial aspect. Our idea is this : that if the Canadian Government, the provinces and, probably, also the Home Government gave a certain guarantee on the proposed capital that we could undertake to assist in raising the capital in London, and in forming a company there, and ourselves execute the whole work. It seems to me undoubted that you are the best people to appreciate the advantage of such a canal : and that, therefore, if you are prepared to back your opinion in cash in the nature of a subsidy or guarantee, we are prepared to execute the works. I have attempted to give you an outline to show you that we have backbone enough to carry through such a scheme. As to the advantages of canals, some years ago I had occasion to report to one of the London banks on a railway in Holland, and there I found, what is generally known, that for low grade traffic which does not require any great speed, railways have no possible chance with a canal. Only a few of the through lines in Holland pay, where they compete against canals. I think I said I had not been over this route, I had been delayed in arriving here, and therefore am not in a position to criticise or give any opinion on the route or on the engineering details. Mr. McLeod Stewart has asked me whether for such a scheme, if the Government propose to guarantee the interest on the capital, it would be possible to arrange that interest should commence not on the beginning of the works, but on the opening of the canal.

A particular point to which I wish to draw the attention of the House is this :

On that point I have only to say that it is often done in Great Britain ; it could be arranged that the interest on the bonds could be paid by the contractors during construction, and, of course, added to the cost of the contract, so that the guarantee of the Government would only become effective when the canal was open.

Now, that to my mind, in plain English means, that if the Government of Canada simply agreed to guarantee the bonds of the company at the very low rate of 2 per cent interest, then this canal company will undertake to carry out the construction of the project before the Government is asked to pay one single solitary cent. But, Sir, that is not all the business proposition which I have to propose to this House ; for, in addition to that, the canal company will oblige itself to repay to the Government of Canada whatever moneys the Government shall have paid on account of interest for the canal company. The canal company will hypothecate to the Government of Canada the total result of the expenditure of that $17,000,000 as security for the repayment of whatever advances the Government shall make on account of interest. In other words, Mr. Speaker, the Government is asked to guarantee the interest on the bonds of a company who come to Canada with $17,000,000 of their own money to open up one of the greatest avenues of trade we have in this country, but the Government is not called upon to pay one single cent until that project is completed. Is that a fair and sound business proposition ? Or may I put it the other way : Is not that a sound business proposition ; so sound that you can go to private individuals with it and expect it to meet with fair consideration. Now, Sir, an appeal is made to the Government of Canada, to the representatives of the people of Canada who are sent here in the interests of the people to look after the development of the latent resources of the country ; an appeal is made to them to contribute whatever in their judgment may seem best to develop the resources of Canada, and to make this country that which Providence destined it to be, one of the greatest countries on the face of the earth. I have quoted a portion of the evidence of Mr. Meldrum, the representative of this great contracting firm, and I have shown that all that the Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Company ask is that the Government of Canada will pass a Bill at this session, guaranteeing interest on the $17,000,000 of the bonds of the company. And, Sir, when I say that is "all" we ask, it is because, in my opinion, it is hardly anything when you consider the amount of money that is going to be spent in Canada, and when you contemplate the vast result of that expenditure. With all our combined railway system to-day, and with all our great canal system, all that we can claim is one-seventh of the trade of that western country of Canada and the United States, but this canal once completed the story would be very different. We are now asked simply to sanction a scheme whereby that money, which is now ready, may be induced to come here to build a canal system which will tap that great western trade, and the Government of Canada is not asked to pay one single dollar, further than the conditional guarantee of 2 per cent on the bonds of the canal company for such time as the company is unable to earn sufficient revenue to pay its own interest. This work is to be undertaken by a practical combination of men known to be to-day the strongest contracting firm in the world, the firm of S. Pearson & Co., Limited. These gentlemen have undertaken gigantic enterprises and carried them to completion in all countries of the world ; they are men who must know what the value of money is and what the value of a scheme is, and do you think they would take the chance of investing in Canada $17,000,000 of their own money unless they had good reason to hope and to believe that their project would be a success. These gentlemen grant a mortgage to the Government of Canada on the result of their $17,000,000 investment, guaranteeing the Government to

refund every single dollar that is paid in interest, and they say further, the moment our canal is earning sufficient to meet our own obligations, we will not ask you to pay one cent, but we will pay you back the full amount of the interest you paid for us, with interest at 4 per cent. That exactly is the substance of the Bill which I propose to ask the right hon. the Premier to introduce before the termination of this session of Parliament. My reason for pressing that point is not an idle reason. I believe we should at once take the power to permit these men to come to Canada and spend $17,000,000, and my reason that such a Bill should be passed this session is because we find in that great country to the south that the people are not only spending $10,000,000 to make the navigation on the Erie Canal nine feet for the immediate wants of their trade, but they are considering now whether they shall make the whole canal navigation fourteen feet at an additional cost of $50,000,000, and there is still another proposition before them, one which I think will meet with the favour of the people of the United States, namely, that they should make their waterways twenty feet deep at an additional cost of $200,000,000. The progress of the people of the United States has been the marvel of the civilized world, and when we find these people willing to expend such untold sums of money in developing their waterways, are we Canadians, with as much pluck and vigour, with as much patriotism and as many resources as they have (though all our resources may be more dormant), are we going to refuse to open the door to the admission of $17,000,000 of private capital? Are we going to refuse to guarantee the low rate of 2 per cent interest on the bonds of that company, a request which is asked of us, not because the company wants interest, but because they want to be able to float their scheme, and to show the people of England that Canadians have confidence in their own country. That is why the Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Company ask the Government to guarantee the interest on their bonds. Even though I may be accused of repeating myself, I must repeat: are we going to refuse to do so little when by doing it we can accomplish so much for our country? These people are willing to spend $17,000,000 to develop our natural resources in Canada, and in view of the fact that the people of the United States are not only spending $10,000,000 to make nine feet navigation on the Erie Canal, but are considering whether they should spend $50,000,000 more to procure fourteen feet; in view of that, are we going to refuse this request of the canal company, when by granting it we can secure for Canada the trade of the great west? But the question which is agitating the public mind there, even more than the other two questions, is whether the people of the United States shall spend $200,000,000 in making a twenty-foot waterway. When that people are putting forth such energy and making such sacrifices to develop their waterways, are we to refuse to guarantee the petty sum of $340,000 a year for a great national highway, with all the possibilities we in Canada possess? Are we to refuse to do that which the Almighty has intended we should do to develop the latent resources with which we are endowed? Mr. Speaker, I speak somewhat warmly on this subject, because it has been in my mind since my infancy. In 1860, when the first survey of the Ottawa River was being made, and when I was a mere boy, I looked forward with the hope that the day was coming very shortly when the people of Canada would realize the inheritance they possessed. I thought I could see that some day in the future the grand highway of the Ottawa River would be the main avenue of traffic to Liverpool. From the little knowledge I then had, gleaned from the engineers who were making the survey, I realized that it was a thousand miles shorter than any other known route. I felt that the people of Canada, through their Government, would some day realize not only the national character but the imperial character of this gigantic enterprise. I do trust, Mr. Speaker, that I have not been hoping all these years in vain. I do trust that we have reached the opportune moment. This country is noted to-day all over the world for the era of prosperity and progress through which it is passing. I do not know that that is entirely due to the change of Government that took place in 1896; but even if it should be due to that, ought we not to be thankful that a change of Government under these circumstances did take place? Though I am a Conservative, and though I adhere with a great deal of tenacity to my political principles, yet even at the sacrifice of my political principles I am glad to know that the gentlemen on the other side of the House have come to power if by their coming to power we have got these better times. I am glad to be able to make that admission. If they can make the wheat grow, I will hold up both hands and applaud them for it. Now, I am simply telling what is true, and I am willing to challenge any gentleman on either side of this House to controvert, or seek to controvert in the smallest degree, any statement that I have made. These statements are simply historically true. Now, in speaking of the development that must necessarily follow the construction of the Ottawa ship canal, I have not mentioned one of the greatest dormant resources that Canada possesses to-day. I even hesitate to speak of it, because it seems almost fabulous, and as if we were in dreamland. But the business facts are there, and I will bring them to the notice of yourself, Mr. Speaker, and my colleagues. It is computed upon a fairly easy and conservative basis—and when I say

conservative I mean good—because every thing that is conservative must be good—by very eminent authorities that the electric power that will be developed between the city of Montreal and the mouth of the French River will amount to at least 2,000,000 horse power. If I wished to take the time to go into details, I am perfectly satisfied that I could convince any hon. member of this House who might doubt that statement, that it is absolutely true. It is predicted by scientists, men whose opinions we must not refuse to listen to—for we must remember that the discoverers of electricity and steam were laughed at and thought to be crazy—it is predicted by scientists that before ten years every passenger train on our trunk lines in Canada will be run by electricity wherever water power is available. This statement may seem very strange; but is it strange if you look upon it with the business eye, and consider that you have lying dormant in the Ottawa River a motive power which with the expenditure of a few dollars will enable you to generate such electric energy as will run railways between given points forty or fifty miles apart? If it shall be possible to save at least half the cost of running these railways, the men who own them are not going to neglect to avail themselves of such an opportunity. The Baltimore and Ohio Railroad and other railroads running out of New York are now being run by electricity, and wherever water power is available, you find that the process of operating railroads by electricity is gradually being adopted simply because it costs one-half less. Where a man can buy goods at half price, you may be sure that there he is going to do business, and it is exactly the same rule of business, applied to the operation of our railroads that is going to bring about the adoption of electricity as a railroad motive power. Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to show you what this asset of 2,000,000 horse power of electric energy will amount to. The market price per horse power of electric energy to-day is from $20 to $25 per year; it is $20 in Montreal. Let us put this power at one-half that cost, at $10 per year per horse power, and what does this electric horse power amount to in dollars? We find that we shall have a revenue of $20,000,000, from 2,000,000 horse power of electric energy which you are going to develop by the construction of this canal. Is that all, Mr. Speaker? Why, I could take you to twenty or thirty different points in my own county and show you where we are going to develop some of the untold wealth that has been lying undeveloped there because it has been unknown. I could show you in my own county abounding wealth in various lines of coarse timber and minerals. I had the pleasure a week or ten days ago of taking some of my colleagues to a mine we are operating in my own county—and I am glad to say that I had friends from both sides of the House on that occasion; and they were simply amazed to see the deposits of mineral which we had lying near the surface. Go up to the Chats Rapids, where we have an immense water power, and you will find what is known as the Bristol iron mines. A company have expended a large sum of money in the development of those mines. They have for the present suspended operations, for the very good and sufficient reason that the cost of transportation prevents them from handling the low-grade product of those mines by rail. But were this canal constructed, those deposits of iron could be developed at a profit. Go thirty or forty miles further west to Portage du Fort and you will see some of the best serpentine marble you can find anywhere. So good is it that the people of Montreal haul it seven miles by wagon to Haley station and ship it to Montreal, and the only difficulty is that they cannot get half enough of it carried by rail from that point.

Now, what will be the consequence if we can get this canal put through so as to go right alongside that marble deposit. We have a resource right at Portage du Fort that will amaze people when they have the least idea of its vastness. These are only a few of the very many advantages that must accrue to the people of Canada, if that canal be constructed. It has been so often stated: Why, the people of western Canada are not in favour of your canal, and there is no use talking about it, for they will oppose it. I wish to dwell on that point, because it is one of the vital points. Why should the people of western Canada oppose the construction of the Georgian Bay Canal? Is it because they have not already traffic enough to handle with the facilities which they already have? Is it not a well established fact that the St. Lawrence Canal system, and the Grand Trunk Railway and every other railway we have in Canada, can only handle one-seventh of the whole trade? Is that a reason why the people of western Canada should oppose the making of another channel, which would prevent the six-sevenths of our traffic going to the United States, as it does to-day? Is it not rather the duty of the people of Canada as a whole to say: We can now handle only one-seventh of the western trade of Canada which goes to our seaports, and the other six-sevenths goes to the United States, and therefore we will take means to control the other six-sevenths also. Would not that be the patriotic thing to do? I say that the St. Lawrence Canals and every mile of railway in Canada, whether owned by one company or another, will have more than they will ever be able to handle, no matter how many hundred of thousands of tons may pass through the Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal, for the good reason that the increase in trade by the development of our western country is more rapid than the increased

facilities we have to accommodate that increased trade.

If I have not made myself understood so far upon the various advantages that must accrue to Canada from the carrying out of this project, then my failure must be due to one of two things. It must be due to my inability to make myself understood or to the fact that my hon. friends will not believe what I am saying. But I do not ask a single colleague of mine in this House to accept my statement for anything. I want to be able to convince him that what I am stating here is the result of research and profound study by eminent men, qualified to make that study. Let us take the evidence of Sir William Van Horne before the Senate Committee. This, I think will convince you, Mr. Speaker, and all my hon. friends in this House, because Sir William Van Horne is a gentleman who is admittedly, not only not surpassed by any but not equalled by but few men in Canada in point of business and far-seeing qualities. What did Sir William Van Horne say in his evidence before the Senate Committee? He said:

I am of the opinion that the construction of the Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal will benefit the commerce of the Dominion generally. Anything done to lessen the cost of transportation between Manitoba and the North-west and the seaboard must have unquestionably a beneficial effect. The trade of this canal would chiefly be in grains, food products, and mineral and other products; and the water power it would afford would result in the establishment of important industries all along its course in the provinces of Ontario and Quebec. This canal would greatly increase the trade of Montreal and Quebec, and other Canadian seaports. It would also develop local resources by the utilization of the water power it would afford; and by cheapening transportation, this canal would have a good effect on the Canadian Pacific Railway, as it would create more traffic than it could take.

That is the evidence of Sir William Van Horne, whose opinions of railway matters will be generally accepted as equal, if not superior, to that of any other living man. He says that the building of the canal will not injure the Canadian Pacific Railway, but on the contrary would benefit that great institution. He says further, and I want to draw your special attention to this feature of his evidence, that the pulp and wood industries would be beneficially affected, as it would result in the utilization of all kinds of forest products, some of which are not now available because of the cost of carriage. Let me just on this point make this statement of what has come under my own personal observation within the last two weeks. I put myself in communication with an American pulp firm, with the view of finding a market for a large quantity of pulp wood on certain lands belonging to me in my county. I received a letter from that company making me this offer:

We will give you a contract for 125,000 cords per year of pulpwood, four feet long, for a period of ten years, and the price we will pay you for that wood, delivered at our factory, will be $6.75 per cord.

I immediately went into the question, and found that the cost of transportation from the point of cutting the wood would leave a net profit to me at the railway station of $3 per cord. In other words, I would receive for my pulp wood at the Waltham station $3 per cord. The cost of producing that wood and placing it at that station would be $1 to $1.25 per cord, so that I would have, even under those conditions, $1.75 per cord profit on that pulp wood, after paying all the expenses of transportation charges to the United States. Now, I asked myself this question. If by the construction of this Georgian Bay Canal, you pass a road within a mile and a half of that very point, is it not sure to follow that pulp factories will be established along this Ottawa valley, to which the cost of transportation, instead of being $3.75 to these factories in the United States, will be from 50 cents to $1. So that instead of being worth only $1.75 per cord profit to me, that same wood, with the construction of that canal, will be worth for myself and others similarly situated a margin of about $4 per cord profit. I mention this simply to illustrate one of the many other resources that the construction of this canal must surely develop.

Then consider our mineral deposits. Why, we have got at every step, from this very city, iron, galena, lead mines, serpentine marble, and up near Sudbury we have gold mines. Is it not reasonable to suppose that by the construction of this canal we are sure to develop every one of these mines, and to place within the limits of our own country smelters and concentrators that are to-day making fortunes in every country in the world.

I wish to mention one case that has come before my personal attention. I am a director of the Grand Calumet Mining Company. We are taking out galena ores and preparing to ship them to European smelters. We have to pay the smelters the same for treating it that we should pay if it were reduced into matte. If we reduced the ores into matte, the cost of transportation would be reduced as four to one. But we must ship the ore because we have not the smelters with which to treat it. The production of the ore is not sufficient to warrant the large expenditure necessary for the construction of smelters. But if we build this canal, we touch ore not only at the one point of the Grand Calumet. Stake out the line from this city to the Georgian Bay in ten-mile spaces and you will strike a mine in every space. You are going to develop the great electrical energy that I have spoken of, and putting it at half the market value of to-day you get an aggregate revenue from that one source alone, of $20,000,000 per annum. This may sound fabulous, but I am prepared to give the

figures, and I defy successful contradiction of my statement. So you have the development of electrical energy, you have the mining industry, you have the pulp industry.

I now beg to quote a letter received by Mr. McLeod Stewart from Mr. T. Curtis Clarke, ex-president of the American Society of Civil Engineers. He says:

New York, Dec. 10th, 1897.

McLeod Stewart, Esq.,
Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Company.

Dear Sir,—At your request, I visited Ottawa about a fortnight since to examine the condition of the plans, profiles and estimates which you have of the proposed Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal.

I found that with the addition of some surveys of no great amount or cost, the data you have is such that contractors can make intelligent tenders for the construction of the whole work. Were it necessary for engineers to come from England to get this information the cost would not be less than from £10,000 to £15,000 sterling, and one season would be occupied.

The time required to complete the navigation ready for use would, in my judgment, be less than the five years you have estimated, owing to the great improvements made in the last few years in the use of power drills and high explosives.

I learn from you that I shall be associated as consulting engineer with Sir Benjamin Baker, who probably stands at the head of the engineering profession in the British Empire. No engineer could be found whose opinions carry more weight, both with the Government and with investors.

I am also advised that you have made a provisional contract with the firm of Sir S. Pearson, M.P., in which he agrees to furnish all the capital required for the construction and interest until completion, if you get the moderate guarantee you ask for, and that he will also agree to postpone any returns from the capital invested until the Government shall be refunded interest paid.

The firm of Sir S. Pearson & Co. are financially able to do this, and that they should be willing to do it is the strongest proof possible of the financial merit of the undertaking.

That a canal with tolls should be able to compete with free canals would seem incredible, were it not for the vast prospective revenue to be derived from electric power along the Ottawa and French rivers. I say, as an engineer, that there is no place in any other civilized country, even Niagara Falls not excepted, where there is such an amount of water power available for electric purposes as here, as it can be used over and over again. This, it seems to me, is one reason why you are entitled to ask for Government aid, as there is nothing that will settle up and develop the country and cause the investment of foreign capital so quickly and extensively as this.

The managers of the Canadian Pacific Railway see this clearly and hence are, I believe, favourable to your scheme. Certainly their business between Montreal and Lake Huron would be vastly increased by it.

Hoping that I have made myself clear,

I am, fathfully yours,
(Sgd) THOMAS CURTIS CLARKE,
Past President American Society of Civil Engineers,
Member Institute of Civil Engineers.

Mr. Curtis Clarke estimates the cost of the work as follows:—

OTTAWA NAVIGATION.

New Estimate of 1898.

Estimate of 1860		$12,057,680
Deduct cost of work done below Ottawa	$2,255,687	
Deduct engineering	574,175	
		2,829,862
		$9,227,818
Add or increased excavation at Summit Cut, on account of Lake Nipissingue not being raised and larger size of section—		
Earth, 2,148,000, at 35 cents	$751,800	
Rock, 4,477,000, at $1	4,477,000	
	$5,228,800	
Estimate of 1860	2,028,000	
		3,200,800
		$12,428,618
This includes cut of new locks and excavation below Ottawa. — Add to enlarged size of locks.		
Old estimate—483,000 yard at $9	$4,180,000	
New estimate—700,000 yards, concrete, at $6	4,200,000	
		20,000
Add for increase of excavation along line.		
Old estimate—1,443,000 yards at $1.15	$1,647,000	
New estimate, 1,800,000 yards at 90 cents	1,620,000	
		.....
Lengthening five locks of Lachine Canal from 250x45x14 to 300x45x14		500,000
Light houses, buoys, telegraph, &c.		250,000
3,000,000 bushel elevator at Montreal		1,500,000
Engineering and superintendence		735,000
		$15,433,618
Add 10 per cent for contingencies		1,543,361
		$16,976,979

Say $17,000,000 without interest.

N.B.—Mr. Forward, of Ottawa, estimates that if Lake Nepisssingue can be raised five feet above L. W., there would be a saving of about two million yards of rock excavation.

Rock excavation on the Chicago drainage canal, including pumping, cost as per latest contracts, 59 cents per yard; so that $1 seems a liberal estimate, if the water can be excluded by cofferdams and the excavation laid dry.

The important points to be examined are:

1st. The summit cut.

2nd. The avoidance of the Rocher Fondu Channel.

3rd. The relocation of locks at Ottawa city.

4th. The enlargement of the locks below Ottawa.

(Sgd) THOMAS C. CLARKE,
Consulting Engineer.
Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Co.
New York, May 4th, 1898.

But what about the other feature of our canal, the transportation of troops and munitions of war to the western frontier for the protection of our country? One of the gentlemen who gave evidence before the Senate committee was Major General Gascoigne, and here is what the General said as to his opinion of the construction of this great waterway:

Major General Gascoigne.—I may state broadly, from a strategic point of view, I look upon this scheme as the most desirable possible. Of course, I should qualify my statements in this respect, that a great deal depends upon the depth of the water that you propose to make.

The Chairman.—The depth will be fourteen feet.

Major General Gascoigne.—I was going to ask for fourteen feet. If you make it fourteen feet deep, I can only say it will be of the utmost value, from a strategic point of view, to the country. I know the Imperial authorities look at it in that light also.

The Chairman.—Have you ever been over that route?

Major General Gascoigne.—No.

The Chairman.—But you know the general lie of the country?

Major General Gascoigne.—It is, of course, a thing we have looked at very closely, both at home and here, from a strategic point of view. Parts of the country I have been over myself, but it is quite sufficient to look at the map to judge of the enormous value of this route, from a military point of view.

The Chairman.—What depth of water would it require for the purpose of transporting your armaments through?

Major General Gascoigne.—Fourteen feet is what I should ask for. Fourteen feet would do me. I could do with less, but I should be very sorry to have less. Of course a torpedo boat does not require the same depth of water, but, at the same time, to get the full value of the work, from a strategic point of view, fourteen feet is the least I should ask for.

The Chairman.—What is the length of your vessels?

Major General Gascoigne.—I cannot tell you the full length, but the locks would have to be of considerable length. I am speaking from memory, but I think they should be not less than 120 feet.

The Chairman.—Three hundred feet is the length proposed, and they are to be forty-five feet wide.

Major General Gascoigne.—That is excellent: nothing could be better. I feel perfectly sure that you would never regret the construction of such a canal. It would be of vast importance.

The Chairman.—You recollect that this Rideau Canal was built a great many years ago, with that object in view, by the Imperial authorities?

Major General Gascoigne.—Yes.

The Chairman.—And if it was necessary then, do you consider it is equally necessary now?

Major General Gascoigne.—Much more necessary now, from many points of view, which I think it would not be prudent for me to state here publicly, if you will just take what I have said from a strategic point of view. I cannot speak too highly of the value of this projected canal. I think it would be wise for me not to go into details, because I do not know how far my statements might be repeated abroad.

Hon. Mr. Power.—You may take it for granted that they would be stated as widely as possible.

Hon. Sir Mackenzie Bowell.—And exaggerated.

Major General Gascoigne.—I should like to confine my statements to the vast importance of the project, as I look at it.

Mr. Stewart.—Sir John Michel, who commanded Her Majesty's forces here in 1866, and Admiral Hope, commander of the squadron, went over this route the whole way by canoe and other ways, and when they came back they reported at a meeting held in Montreal that this canal was not only a commercial but a great military necessity for Canada. Are you of the same opinion?

Major General Gascoigne.—I am.

The Chairman.—Do you know the opinion of the military authorities in England?

Major General Gascoigne.—I do. It would be looked upon with the utmost pleasure at home if this scheme were carried out.

Hon. Mr. Power.—I take it that it is chiefly from the naval point of view. Since that time of which Mr. Stewart speaks, 1866, two railways have been built connecting the Ottawa with Lake Huron, and of course for the purpose of transporting troops, for instance, the canal would not be nearly as useful or valuable. It is valuable now chiefly as a means of getting ships through.

The Chairman.—And munitions of war.

Hon. Mr. Power.—They could be carried through by train. You would not think it is very necessary to have this canal for the purpose of moving troops east or west?

Major General Gascoigne.—Of course it would be a most admirable thing even from that point of view.

Hon. Mr. Power.—But considering the fact that there are two railways running from Ottawa to Lake Huron, do you think the canal would be largely used for transporting troops in case there was any difficulty and it became necessary to move troops?

Major General Gascoigne.—It was not the movement of troops that I had in my mind chiefly.

The Chairman.—But it would serve a purpose in that respect?

Major General Gascoigne.—Most unquestionably it would serve the purpose, but there are greater purposes than that which I have in mind.

The Chairman.—I suppose you could not have a route more remote from the frontier for transportation than this Ottawa route?

Major General Gascoigne.—Certainly not, and it is just for that purpose that I consider it important.

Looking at it from this military point of view, is it possible to find a system by which

you could transport both troops and munitions of war so protected and guarded? It is very well to say that you can transport troops by rail, but we are exposed at different points to attack by the enemy. Going by the canal, you are travelling through the heart of our country entirely inland and protected absolutely from the attack of any foreign power. This is a feature that I think the representatives of this great Dominion should recognize. We should do our duty in dealing with this matter before this Parliament prorogues.

I would be very sorry indeed if I were considered as attempting to build castles in the air. Many people, in conversation with me from time to time, have said: Oh, this is too big a thing for the Ottawa valley. But, Sir, are we speaking alone for the Ottawa valley, when we advocate this great canal? Are we not speaking for the whole of this vast Dominion? Are we not speaking for the seaports of Canada? Are we not speaking for the growing trade of the great west, both Canadian and American? Look at the enormous figures of that trade on the great lakes, look at the tonnage that passed through the Sault Ste. Marie Canal alone last year, and compare it with what passed through the little canal that was built forty or fifty years ago. It is simply marvellous, it makes one feel proud of being a Canadian. We are not entitled to call ourselves Canadians unless we rise equal to the emergency and put forth the energy and brains with which the Almighty has endowed us in order to raise this country to the height and greatness which I believe Providence has designed it should attain. Sir, my sole desire on this occasion is simply to fulfil a duty that rested upon me as the representative of my county; but I feel that the same duty rests upon every member of this House, whether he lives in western Canada or eastern Canada. There is no sense in any objection raised from any particular section of this country. The question appeals as strongly to a gentleman living in western Ontario as it does to a gentleman living in the city of Ottawa, because, as I have said, we are only taking one-seventh of the trade that is growing up in the west. I find that while that trade is doubling every year, our facilities for handling that trade are not augmenting in the same proportion. We are neglecting our opportunities, because we possess one of the main arteries of this country, an advantage with which Providence has favoured us in this Ottawa River, and no greater river exists on this continent except the St. Lawrence itself. Sir, I was rather astonished the other day by a question a gentleman asked me while we were standing on a platform near here overlooking the Ottawa River. He said: Is this the Ottawa River? I said, Yes. Why, says he, it is as big as the Coulonge? The Coulonge, I answered, is only a tributary of the Ottawa River, one of the many tributaries of the Ottawa River, while the Ottawa itself is a river some 800 miles in length, running from James Bay to the seaboard. We have a continuous line of river and water stretches, all being navigable, and the question of this gentleman shows you how little he knew of the importance of the Ottawa River. The Coulonge is but a feeder of the Ottawa River; we have probably thirty-five or forty rivers equal to the Coulonge which empty into the Ottawa between this city and the height of land. Now, the advantage of the Ottawa River over the St. Lawrence, in so far as we are concerned as Canadians, is this: The St. Lawrence River is common to both the United States and Canada, while the Ottawa is entirely within the territory of the Dominion of Canada. Every improvement we make on the Ottawa will benefit Canada alone, but every improvement made on the St. Lawrence, whether it is made by the Americans or by the Canadians, benefits the traffic of both countries. In time of disturbance or war—a day which I hope will never come—the St. Lawrence River, being common property, the enemy would have as much access to it as we would ourselves. But take this grand Ottawa of ours, and who dare show their nose on it in case of trouble? Who, with any hostile motive, would dare put his foot on the Ottawa River? Mr. Speaker, I have tired myself out, and I know I have tired the House. But if there is any question, if there is any feature connected with this subject upon which hon. gentlemen would like any more light or any more explanation, I should be only too happy to reply to any such questions. I do not wish it understood that I am acting from any other motive than the promotion of the interest of this country. I have no interest whatever in the canal company, I have no interest, good or bad, with the gentlemen who are proposing to take up this project. I am simply addressing this House as a representative of the people of Canada, particularly of my own county. But in speaking on behalf of the people of my county in relation to this matter, I feel that I am also speaking on behalf of the interests of this whole Dominion, from the east to the west, and from the north to the south. I thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I thank the House for the patient hearing they have given me.

Mr. BELCOURT. Mr. Speaker, during the early part of this session, I caused a notice of motion to be placed on the Order paper providing for the appointment of a committee of this House to act conjointly with the committee of the Senate, to investigate the project which has just been brought to our attention by my hon. friend from Pontiac (Mr. Poupore), which committee of the Senate has been engaged during the present

session in hearing evidence concerning this scheme. The rules of the House prevented me from reaching my motion, and I seriously regretted that the session was apparently coming to a close without the attention of the House and of the Government being turned to this matter, until my hon. friend from Pontiac informed me yesterday that he intended to bring the matter up in the House to-day; so that what I considered at first a source of regret, has turned out to be a source of good fortune, because it has afforded the House the opportunity of hearing the very able and exhaustive argument of the hon. member for Pontiac. I have felt, and I feel now, that that hon. gentleman, on account of the avocation which he follows, on account of the personal experience which he has had, and on account of the knowledge he has of the country through which this canal is to pass, is in a position to discuss this matter with much more authority than I am. For half a century the construction of the Georgian Bay Canal has been constantly discussed. From the time the Duke of Wellington, in 1837—impressed with the great military advantages of this route—advocated its construction, down to the present day, the construction of the Georgian Bay Canal has been a live question. It has engaged the attention of the public, and it has engaged the attention of this House, I may say, almost constantly for many years past. It has engaged the attention of business men and of capitalists, both in this country and in the mother country. It has more particularly engaged the attention of engineers, and amongst them some of the foremost in the world. It is true that for a time this question has lain dormant, as my hon. friend has said, but that was owing to the fact that almost constantly for the last half century it has been overshadowed by other enterprises which have engaged the attention of the several Governments of this country. But, Sir, I assert with the greatest confidence that outside of the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, there has been no enterprise advocated for half a century so closely bound up with the interests of Canada as the construction of the Georgian Bay Canal.

In our day and within very recent years this subject has been revived by Mr. McLeod Stewart, who with that tenacity, splendid courage and persistency which are so characteristic of the Highland race to which he belongs, has devoted almost every hour and day of his life for years in bringing this subject to the attention of the public and Parliament, and who has amassed such an amount of data and information and has brought in support of his scheme such convincing arguments that I am satisfied any hon. member or any intelligent Canadian, if he will give the matter his unprejudiced and unbiassed attention, cannot but be convinced that the construction of the Georgian Bay Canal is deserving the support of every Canadian. The information which Mr. Stewart has gathered, and which is at the command of everybody, is in many respects technical, and I feel I have not the authority to discuss it intelligently.

Then, again, the hon. member for Pontiac (Mr. Poupore) has covered the ground so thoroughly that I do not desire at this stage of the session, when every hon. member is desirous of returning to his home and affairs, to occupy the attention of the House at greater length than is absolutely necessary. I propose in a few words to endeavour to show that the construction of this canal is not only feasible and practicable, but that we have to-day the strongest evidence of its ultimate success. I feel that in a matter of this kind one is apt sometimes to speak with warmth and with a little more enthusiasm than is proper in discusing a matter of business such as this is, and I feel I am at this moment running the danger of speaking too warmly and enthusiastically about this project, perhaps all the more so because, like some other hon. members to whom reference has been made, I at one time was not a believer in the Georgian Bay Canal scheme. I confess that at one time I was very much inclined to look upon the promoters of the Bill as visionaries and dreamers; but when I looked into the question, desirous of satisfying myself as to its merits or demerits, in a very short time I came to the conclusion that the project was a very deserving one, and perhaps owing to my conversion to the scheme, because I am now a thorough and enthusiastic believer in it, I may possibly fall into the error of speaking too enthusiastically about it. But I shall endeavour to do so in sober and brief language, and to point out in a few words the advantages which this scheme offers to Canada.

The first point I desire to make is, that this Georgian Bay Canal scheme is one of Imperial importance. As was shown by the evidence quoted as having been given by the General commanding the forces in Canada, it has immense strategic importance. It is not a new project. The Duke of Wellington in 1837 was strongly impressed with the great advantages of this route. I am not a strong believer in war, I hold that, though the millenium is not at hand, the work of arbitration is bound within a very few years to supplant the work of the sword; but though not a believer in war, and though I wish and hope no war will ever fall to our lot, yet it seems to me that since Canada has taken its place among the nations of the earth, since our country has, within the last few years come into such prominence, and as all the eyes of the British world at all events are on this Dominion, since we desire to be considered a nation, that fact imposes on us new duties and increased responsibilities and certainly

the obligation of taking such measures as are necessary to conserve our national territory, and it seems to me that no measure we could adopt at this moment to enable us safely to preserve our national heritage, would prove more effective than the construction of this canal, affording thereby an Imperial and military route to the interior, to the very heart of our country.

The second point I desire to make is, that this canal would ensure to the St. Lawrence and Ottawa rivers a great portion of the traffic to and from the interior of the continent and establish one of the greatest channels of commerce. It is well known that a very large portion of the immense trade of the west and north-west would be brought through the Georgian Bay Canal if it were constructed. My hon. friend has dwelt particularly on this point, and it is unnecessary for me to refer to it at greater length. It woud also tend to the creation and development of numerous enterprises and manufactures in this vast territory. By the utilization of the immense water power on the Ottawa River, by the development of our mineral resources, which we are told are unlimited, by the development of pulp and other industries, a great channel of commerce would be created by the construction of this route. We all know what the lumber industry has done not only for Ottawa but for the whole Ottawa valley. We know the immense value of the timber limits north and west of the valley, which remain yet undeveloped, and which by the construction of this waterway would be immediately developed. It would open up to colonization an immense territory equal to the whole of New England, a territory which possesses as rich lands as are to be found anywhere in Canada, and it would undoubtedly establish the greatest stretch of open navigation on the whole continent. It would, to use what I think is a very apt expression, give a new front to northern Ontario and north-western Quebec. While I speak on this point I may refer to one of the objections put forward to the scheme. It has been urged that the construction of the Georgian Bay Canal would be in competition with the St. Lawrence route. I submit that if the matter is looked into carefully, the evidence given shows that this is not the case. I desire to read an extract from a statement written by a prominent gentleman interested in the subject, on this point. He said :

> The Ottawa River navigation has met with some slight opposition arising from the mistaken idea that it was being urged as a competitor of the St. Lawrence canals, intended to supplant them, or to do away with the necessity for their enlargement. Nothing could be further from the attitude of its promoters, who do not ask that the St. Lawrence canals be deprived of one cent of public money which should rightfully go to them.
>
> In our opinion, work on the Ottawa as well as on the St. Lawrence ought to be pushed vigorously and at once. The Americans are keenly alive to the value of handling the enormous traffic, and are making every effort to retain the whole of it for United States carriers to United States ports. While to this end they contemplate a deep waterway in the future, they are not neglecting to deepen the Erie barge canal to nine feet. And, following their example, we ought to neglect no advantage we possess. If they are beforehand with us it will be a difficult matter for Canada to retain that supremacy in the carrying trade of the northern part of this continent that nature has fitted her to achieve. The traffic to which we are fairly entitled by our position is sufficient already to fully employ both the Ottawa and St. Lawrence routes. These latter are really complementary, instead of competitive, both having Montreal for their terminus. The true rivalry is with American routes carrying trade to New York.
>
> The shortness of the Ottawa route, and the very low rates at which freight can be carried by it, ensure that as soon as opened it will gain and bring to Montreal and Quebec a share of the through traffic that now goes to New York. Its local traffic also will be important and far in excess of that of the St. Lawrence canals. And every ton of through freight moved on the Ottawa River, as well as every ton of increased production of the Ottawa valley seeking export, will necessarily go to Montreal or Quebec for an outlet, not being liable to be diverted at numerous points, like the traffic on the St. Lawrence canals, which experiences exhaustive drains at Buffalo, Oswego and Ogdensburg.

On the same point, Mr. Speaker, I would like to read to you the opinion of Mr. Walter Shanly, that eminent engineer, to whom my hon. friend (Mr. Poupore) has made reference. Mr. Shanly, in the evidence which he gave before the Senate, expressed himself in these words :

> I believe the construction of this Ottawa Canal would greatly increase and benefit the commerce of the whole Dominion. It could not but assist the North-west beneficially in cheapening transportation.

I call the attention of my hon. friends from Manitoba and the North-west Territories to this part of Mr. Shanly's evidence :

> It could not but assist the North-west beneficially in cheapening transportation, especially in affording same to the water powers along the route. The Ottawa valley might become the greatest flour-milling country in the world.
>
> The trade would, of course, chiefly be in cereals. The effect both in Ontario and Quebec would be beneficial as stimulating trade generally.
>
> Grain from Lakes Michigan and Superior could be laid down in Montreal at a lower rate and in Quebec at no higher rate than the lowest rate yet ever reached between the lakes and New York. Whatever benefits the country generally will not harm the railways. So this canal would have a good effect on the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Ottawa, Arnprior and Parry Sound Railway.

I may here say that I am informed on very good authority that as far as the Ottawa, Arnprior and Parry Sound Railway are con-

cerned, the owners of that road have not the slightest objection to this canal, but on the contrary are entirely in favour of it.

The New York Central Railway alongside the free Erie Canal increases its traffic and its earnings year by year, and it will do so when the canal has been improved (a work now in progress) to nine feet draught.

This canal will certainly be most beneficial to the lumber and wood-pulp industries.

The successful development of mining and smelting industries in the Ottawa valley, and especially of iron mining, is mainly dependent on cheap transportation that the projected Ottawa navigation will provide.

As between the lakes generally and Montreal, the season of navigation would be probably ten days shorter by way of the Ottawa than by way of the Welland Canal.

Mr. Thomas C. Clarke, the eminent engineer, who held the high and important office of President of the American Society of Civil Engineers has also furnished us with most valuable and interesting information on this matter. As late as the 10th December, 1897, Mr. Clarke wrote as follows :—

New York, 10th December, 1897.

McLeod Stewart, Esq.,
Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Co.,
Ottawa, Canada.

Dear Sir,—At your request I visited Ottawa about a fortnight since, to examine the condition of the plans, profiles and estimates which you have of the proposed Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal.

I found that with the addition of some surveys of no great amount or cost, the data you have is such that contractors can make intelligent tenders for the construction of the whole work. Were it necessary for engineers to come from England to get this information, the cost would not be less than from £10,000 to £15,000 sterling, and one season would be occupied.

The time required to complete the navigation ready for use would in my judgment be less than the five years you have estimated, owing to the great improvements made in the last few years in the use of power-drills and high explosives.

I learn from you that I shall be associated as consulting engineer with Sir Benjamin Baker, who probably stands at the head of the engineering profession in the British Empire. No engineer could be found whose opinions carry more weight, both with the Government and with investors.

I am also advised that you have made a provisional contract with the firm of Sir S. Pearson, M.P., in which he agrees to furnish all the capital required for construction and interest until completion, if you get the moderate guarantee you ask for, and that he will also agree to postpone any returns from the capital invested until the Government shall be refunded, interest paid.

The firm of Sir S. Pearson & Company, are financially able to do this, and that they should be willing to do it is the strongest proof possible of the financial merit of the undertaking.

That a canal with tolls should be able to compete with free canals would seem incredible, were it not for the vast prospective revenue to be derived from electric power along the Ottawa and French Rivers. I say, as an engineer, that there is no place in any other civilized country, even Niagara Falls not excepted, where there is such an amount of water-power available for electric purposes, as here, as it can be used over and over again. This it seems to me is one reason why you are entitled to ask for Government aid, as there is nothing that will settle up and develop the country and cause the investment of foreign capital, so quickly and extensively, as this.

The managers of the Canadian Pacific Railway see this clearly, and hence are, I believe, favourable to your scheme. Certainly their business between Montreal and Lake Huron would be vastly increased by it.

Hoping that I have made myself clear,

I am, faithfully yours,
(Sgd.) THOMAS CURTIS CLARKE,
Past President American Society of Civil Engineers.
Member Institute of Civil Engineers.

Mr. T. C. Clarke also stated in one of his reports to the Government that the great value of the Ottawa navigation is this :

Out of the 975 miles between Chicago and Montreal, 591 miles is an inland or perfectly protected navigation, leaving but 384 miles of open lake. In open lake a speed of 4½ miles an hour can be made by tows of barges. In the protected portion an average speed of ten miles an hour can be made. The cost of insurance by this route would be much less than by any other.

By the Welland and St. Lawrence route, there are 991 miles of open lake navigation, and but 297 of inland or protected navigation. The depth of the Welland and St. Lawrence Canals would limit the draft of barges to 13½ feet, which is too shallow for navigation in lakes such as Erie, subject to sudden violent storms. The rates of insurance would be greater, and the longer time required, owing to greater length, and slower movement through the unprotected parts, would more than make up for the 22 days of longer open navigation by the Welland route.

Now, Sir, it seems to me that with the improvement and equipment of the Montreal harbour, such as this Government propose to accomplish, the construction of this route would unquestionably create the safest, the cheapest, the best land-locked interior system of navigation to be fonnd on this continent, or for that matter, on any continent in the world. In order to show that the Americans have not been slow in recognizing the great importance of this route, and that they even look upon it with envy and jealousy, I would like to cite here from the report of Major Symons, that eminent engineer, who was requested by the United States Government to prepare a report upon the waterways of America, and who carried out his work in a very exhaustive and able manner in the year 1897. I direct your attention particularly, Mr. Speaker, to what Major Symons has to say with reference to the Georgian Bay Canal. He says in his report to Congress in 1897 :

It would open almost a direct route from Lakes Superior and Huron to the St. Lawrence, and shorten the distance between Chicago and Liverpool nearly 400 miles, thereby diverting a vast deal of grain, lumber and other carrying trade now enjoyed by American railroads and waterways. It would also open the settlement of great tracts of Canadian territory, rich in timber and mineral resources, and well adapted to the cultivation of wheat and other cereals, and would

act as a magnet in drawing pioneers to north-western provinces like Manitoba, which Canada has so sedulously sought to fill with an industrious population. All this would mean increased competition for American producers, with odds it would not be easy to overcome. Moreover, the proposed Georgian Canal is not to be a canal merely suited to 1,500-ton barges. It is to be of a size and depth to admit of British gunboats being readily taken through to the great lakes for patrol service.

You will see that this eminent engineer, than whom there is none more eminent in the United States, not only looks upon the construction of the Georgian Bay Canal as feasible and practical, but he is strongly impressed with the immense advantages which are to be derived ultimately from its construction. He fears not only that it is going to create possibly the greatest commercial route on this continent, but if we read between the lines he also apparently fears that it is going to be of immense value as a military route. I should like now, Mr. Speaker, to give the House the opinions of two of the greatest Canadian statesmen, and in order to show that both political parties in Canada have looked favourably on this scheme and that it has not been advocated by one party more than another, I shall quote what was said by the Hon. Alex. Mackenzie and by Sir John A. Macdonald. This is what Mr. Mackenzie said

I am convinced that the true route for a canal to Georgian Bay is up the Ottawa, because that would give a great backbone to the country. If we had a fine canal capable of carrying vessels of war in that direction, it would be a splendid means of defence, as well as a great highway for the commercial products of the west.

And, again :

I am perfectly satisfied that the Ottawa valley presents the greatest facilities of any route on the continent for the transportation of the products of the North-west to the Atlantic Ocean.

Sir John Macdonald said :

The Ottawa Ship Canal and the Pacific Railway must be constructed,——

Mark the words, Mr. Speaker : The Ottawa Ship Canal and the Pacific Railway must be constructed, and Sir John Macdonald did not hesitate to place the Ottawa Ship Canal before the Canadian Pacific Railway.

The Ottawa Ship Canal and the Canadian Pacific Railway must be constructed, and no word would be raised against the great national work that would open up the western states and colonies to the seaboard.

It seems to me that if nothing else were said in this House than the mere citations of the opinions of these eminent men, that alone would impose on every member of this House the necessity of making himself acquainted with this scheme and would impose upon every Canadian the necessity of satisfying himself whether it is a reasonable, a feasible and a practical scheme. I have given the matter some consideration and it appears to me that the construction of the Georgian Bay Canal has now become an absolute necessity. It seems to me that it behooves Canadians to co-operate with nature and make this the great waterway of this continent. Why, Sir, what has the Otawa River been from all time ? Was it not at one time the only means of communication from the seaboard to the interior ? Was not the Ottawa River the route through which the great discoverers of this continent, the heroic missionaries, made their way ? Was it not the route through which civilization and Christianity were brought to the interior of this continent ? We are simply co-operating with nature and availing ourselves of the great advantages which nature has placed at our hands, in improving this waterway, and making it the great waterway of this continent. It is the route which the voyageurs for centuries followed, and still follow. It is the route which reaches the great lumber fields of the north and the west.

Now, Sir, coming to things, perhaps, more material, I would like to cite a few figures to show the great advantages which are to be derived from the construction of this canal. First of all, it will be the shortest and most direct route from the Sault to the city of Montreal. Let me give you the figures. The distance between those two points by the St. Lawrence route is 1,348 miles, by the Georgian Bay route 980 miles, an advantage of 368 miles in favour of the Georgian Bay route. From Chicago to New York, via the waterways, the distance is 1,415 miles ; from the Sault to Montreal, via the Ottawa Ship Canal, the distance is 980 miles, an advantage of 435 miles in favour of this route. It would offer the least canalling, because on it there would be only 29 miles of canal, whereas on the St. Lawrence route there are 71 miles and on the Erie route 351 miles of canal. It would be the quickest route. The Erie route takes 192 hours, and the St. Lawrence route 138 hours, whereas the Ottawa route would take only 103 hours. It is the safest route. It is landlocked all the way. It is in the interior of Canada ; and in these days when we are speaking so much of Canadianism, when we want Canada for the Canadians, when it has been urged in this House, and very properly urged, that our railways and canals should as much as possible remain under our control, it is no small merit in this canal that it is an absolutely all-Canadian route. There is not half a mile of it that is not in our own territory. It is absolutely and altogether under our command and control. When the Intercolonial Railway was constructed, its rapid completion was considered necessary to form a link between old Canada and the lower provinces. I submit that the construction of the Georgian Bay Canal is necessary for the same reason : it is the natural link between the old provinces of Canada, Ontario and Quebec. There is nothing which to my

mind will bring more closely together the commercial, financial and national interests of the two provinces than the construction of a canal of this sort; there is nothing that will bring the people of the two provinces more closely together or better promote interprovincial trade than the construction of the Georgian Bay Canal. It has been urged on the street and in the lobbies of this House that this is a local scheme, an Ottawa scheme. Well, Sir, it is not an Ottawa scheme; it is a national scheme; nay, more, it is an Imperial scheme. There is nothing local about it. It is truly and broadly national. Like my hon. friend from Pontiac (Mr. Poupore), I have not the slightest personal interest in this matter. My constituency is interested, and largely interested, in the construction of this canal, but Canada is as much interested in it as the counties which are contiguous to it. Now, Sir, while the scheme did not assume the definite shape which it has at last assumed, and in which it is presented to us to-day, I could understand that the Governments which preceded the present Government might have been very much in doubt whether they should go on with the construction of this work. But I say that there has been no enterprise submitted to the intelligence of the Parliament of Canada upon which so much data has been gathered as has been gathered in regard to this scheme. There has been no scheme ever proposed in Canada about which we know so much, or upon which we can with such certainty base our calculations. Why, Sir, everything has been taken into consideration. Not one or two or three engineers only have gone over this route; not simply common every day engineers, but the foremost engineers of this continent and Europe, have gone over this route by the dozen, and every one of them has pronounced in favour of it. The Imperial authorities have been immensely impressed with the importance of the construction of this route. Any one who, without prejudice or bias, looks at the details of this scheme and at the guarantees which are offered in connection with it, must be convinced of the absolute necessity of constructing this canal. Now, Sir, what is it that the Government are asked to do? It is asked to assume a very slight obligation. The largest and most substantial firm of English contractors are to-day prepared to come and spend $17,000,000 on this enterprise. They are prepared to bring their own money and spend it in Canada, because it is a part of this scheme that everything that goes into this work shall be Canadian—Canadian labour and Canadian goods. And what do these people ask? No bonus, no subsidy, in land or money. They ask for merely nothing, because, I say the mere guarantee of the interest at two per cent on the bonds of $17,000,000, which amounts to $340,000 a year, is a mere nothing; but that interest is to be paid only if the returns from the operations of the canal are not sufficient to pay four per cent interest on the bonds, and only so far as those returns are insufficient to pay that interest. What is more, this guarantee is to last for only twenty years; and at all times the first returns shall go to reimburse the Government for every cent of money which the Government are called upon to pay. Before these contractors, who are prepared to spend $17,000,000, and the shareholders of this company will have one single cent of profit from the canal, they are willing that the Government shall be paid every cent it has advanced. Now, I submit that if we can insure the expenditure of $17,000,000 in this country by merely guaranteeing the interest at 2 per cent, we are doing something for the good of Canada. But these people are prepared to do a great deal more. They are prepared to return every dollar that the Government may have to pay in guaranteeing these bonds.

Mr. POUPORE. With interest at 4 per cent.

Mr. BELCOURT. With interest at 4 per cent, as my hon. friend says. That is their proposition. It is no dream, no castle in the air, it is there in black and white. As Mr. Meldrum, the representative of the London firm of contractors told us in the Senate, they are prepared to begin now and complete the canal in five years, and in the meantime they do not ask for a cent. The Government is not called upon to pay the guarantee or any part of it until the canal is fully completed and ready to be operated. It seems to me that no proposition was ever submitted to this House, which presented itself with such clear and advantageous terms.

Mr. TAYLOR. It is away ahead of the Yukon.

Mr. BELCOURT. Yes, indeed it is. Central Canada will live long after the Yukon is gone and forgotten. I do not desire to make any reproach whatever to the Government, because I think they were bound to do what they did, but in this session alone we have expended nearly half a million dollars on the Yukon; and at our doors there is a scheme to develop a country which is bound to last long after the Yukon is forgotten. Why, therefore, should the Government not give this guarantee, particularly when it will be the means of bringing an expenditure into Canada of $17,000,000?

As to the ultimate success of this canal, the figures upon which this anticipated success is based are open to the inspection and examination of everybody. Anybody can satisfy himself that the canal is bound to be a success; and in any case what better guarantee could be asked than that this firm should be willing to spend $17,000,000 on this scheme? It seems to me that in that

alone you have ample guarantee for its ultimate success.

I do not desire to prolong the debate, I feel that my good friend from Pontiac (Mr. Poupore) has stated the case with far greater ability than I could hope to bring to it. I wish to conclude in saying simply this, that I regret that owing to the lateness of the session and to the fact that my colleagues are naturally so anxious to return to their homes and business, it was impossible for me to move the resolution standing in my name on the Order paper for nearly three months I regret exceedingly that my colleagues were not afforded the opportunity of joining with the Senate committee and hearing the evidence given there during this session. I regret exceedingly that they were not, at an earlier stage, called upon to look into the information to which my hon. friend and myself have referred, because I fully believe that any hon. gentleman who has had the opportunity of doing so could speak just as enthusiastically of this project as did my hon. friend and as I am endeavouring to do. I beseech on behalf of this scheme the unprejudiced, unbiassed, close and earnest consideration of every member of this House, and I ask particularly the attention of the Government, being satisfied that when the matter is looked into, when it is sifted down and examined closely, there is no one in this House or outside of it who will not be absolutely convinced of the great advantages it offers. I know that this gigantic enterprise has its opponents and its enemies, and it would be a mighty poor one if it had none. I know that there are those who are sceptical and incredulous, and do not believe in the feasibility, importance and necessity of this work. I know more. I know that some persons, perhaps quite a number, do not hesitate to believe that Mr. McLeod Stewart, my good friend from Pontiac (Mr. Poupore), myself and others, in our enthusiastic support of this scheme, visionaries and dreamers. I have heard that said, but I am glad to know that those who say it are rapidly becoming few in number. I know that my good friend, Mr. Stewart, has been talked of by quite a number of people as a dreamer, but I am satisfied that the future will vindicate him and every one who has had the courage to stand up and urge the construction of this canal; and in the meantime Mr. Stewart, the hon. member for Pontiac (Mr. Poupore) and myself may well console ourselves with the recollection that in all days and in all climes men whose achievements have revolutionized the world—and I say this without the slightest desire of including myself in that category—have been looked upon as dreamers, as visionaries. The very men who came up this Grand Ottawa River three hundred years ago, carrying to this continent the light of civilization and christianity, the heroic missionaries, the undaunted pioneers and the brave discoverers of this continent were no doubt, in the estimation of their contemporaries, visionaries and dreamers, and yet they gave America to the world. I invite the brilliant statesman who to-day is conducting the affairs of this country in so able a manner, whilst making such a record for his party, to give to this matter his immediate and earnest attention, and I invite him to add another to the many laurels he has already won by lending the influence of his words and of his support to this truly and broadly Canadian and Imperial scheme.

Mr. CHARLTON. The question which has been brought to the attention of the House by the hon. member for Pontiac (Mr. Poupore) and discussed by the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt) I desire to allude to briefly, and to present a few business considerations that it will be necessary to bear in mind while we are considering this most praiseworthy scheme. I avow myself, at the outset, a believer in the Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal. I believe in that work very thoroughly; and in my estimation we should concentrate our energies, so far as we make appropriations for public works, to the prosecution and completion of this great work. I, perhaps, do not approach the consideration of this question with the degree of enthusiasm that characterizes my hon. friend from Pontiac (Mr. Poupore) who lives upon the immediate line of the work and has perhaps a personal interest in its completion as well as a patriotic one, or my hon. friend from Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt) who resides in the city that will be largely benefited by the completion of this work and to which the work is of local importance. I am endeavouring to look at the question purely frm a national standpoint; and looking at it from that standpoint, I believe that the construction of this canal is essential to the commercial prosperity of this Dominion.

My hon. friend from Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt) has pointed out that it would be an Imperial route, in the first place, for military purposes in case of war which, Heaven grant we may never have. He pointed out, in his closely reasoned argument, that it would develop the resources of the country through which it passes and serve as a colonization factor and be an all-Canadian route exclusively within our control. All these are statements which I fully endorse. He also says it would secure to us a large proportion of the trade of the west. This is the most important consideration in connection with the construction of the canal, and the realization of that prophecy would depend very largely upon the character of the work. We must not flatter ourselves, when contemplating the possibility of constructing this public work and counting upon the advantages that it will bestow upon us, that we are undertaking a work of slight magnitude. We shall find that, if the Ottawa

and Georgian Bay Canal is to serve the purposes for which it is intended, it must be a very costly work, much more costly than is contemplated by the scheme now under consideration. It is to present business considerations in connection with this question that I ask the indulgence of the House for a few moments. My desire to see this work a satisfactory one, one that will accomplish the purpose designed, leads me to present some points to the House that have not been presented, and, possibly, have not been considered by the gentlemen who presented this scheme.

My hon. friend from Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt) has referred to the report made by Major Symons, who was appointed by the United States Government to report on the waterways system. I have read that report with great care. I was much struck by conclusions arrived at by that high engineering authority. One statement made by him struck me with some surprise. He makes the statement that a canal from Buffalo to New York City of ten feet draft, admitting the passage of fifteen-hundred-ton barges, will furnish the cheapest possible route of transportation from the upper lake ports to the sea-board. He says that if a ten-foot canal with fifteen-hundred-ton barges were placed side by side with a ship canal of 21 feet draft, the ship canal could not compete with the other. That assertion seemed at first an incredible one. But if it be true, then the city of New York is preparing the best possible conditions for a cheap transit way for grain and other freight from the west to that city. A fact with regard to the marine of the upper lakes which is well known to those familiar with the facts is that vessels of 14-feet draft have become a back number. They are unprofitable. That class of vessel property which a few years ago formed the largest class of carriers is now not worth over 20 cents on the dollar. They have been crowded out by the vessels carrying 250,000 bushels of grain, five or six thousand tons of freight, and drawing from 18 to 20 feet of water. This class of vessel loading at Fort William or Chicago and transporting their cargoes at Buffalo, where they are transferred to elevators and thence to barges on the Erie Canal, are furnishing transportation at a rate with which it would be very difficult to compete. You can bill grain through from Chicago, Milwaukee and Duluth to New York City for 4¼ cents per bushel. Added to this will be the elevator charges, the total cost of the transference of wheat from one of the upper lake ports to New York being almost 6 cents per bushel. We have gone on and made appropriations for the enlargement of the St. Lawrence canals to a depth of 14 feet. Every dollar of the millions put into this work has been uselessly expended so far as securing the trade of the far west is concerned. The canals will not serve the purpose of securing that trade. In order to enable Montreal to compete with the Buffalo route, you must have a line of communication that will enable you to bring the largest lake carriers to the wharfs of Montreal as they are now brought to Buffalo. If that is not done you have adopted an ineffective scheme for developing the trade. If the Ottawa Valley Canal is constructed upon these specifications now presented to the House, with a depth of 14 feet, it will not serve the purpose, it will not secure the trade; it will not compete with the Buffalo route; it will not lay down grain at the seaport at the price at which grain can be laid down from the west in New York.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. CHARLTON. Certainly.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). Will the hon. gentleman tell the House what is the difference between the cost per bushel of wheat laid down in New York, and wheat laid in Montreal, both being seaports?

Mr. CHARLTON. I am not in a position to tell what the difference is.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). It seems to me that that would be the best comparison. The hon. gentleman takes a seaport in one case, but not in the other.

Mr. CHARLTON. I can tell the hon. gentleman that, in consequence of the rates by Buffalo and New York being less than they are by Montreal, that line has secured about three-quarters of the Manitoba wheat trade. Whatever the rates may be, they are such as to draw the trade in that direction.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). Let me point out that that might be accounted for by the fact that they have superior elevator accommodation in New York to that which is afforded Montreal.

Mr. CHARLTON. No, it is accounted for by the fact that the rate of freight from the point of shipment in the west to New York is less than the rate to Montreal, and by the additional fact that when the grain reaches New York City, in nine cases out of ten, the rates of freight to Europe are more favourable than from Montreal. Unless we provide means to overcome disadvantages that Montreal labours under—the disadvantage of being closed during a portion of the year, the disadvantage of having less ample vessel accommodation for the shipment of wheat to Europe; and the disadvantage of having slightly higher, if not considerable higher freight rates to Europe than from New York—it is useless to talk about making the Montreal route a competitor with the other route. You must make the freight to Montreal cheaper, or, at least, as cheap as it is to New York city—and you cannot do that with a 14-foot channel

from Lake Huron to Montreal. You must enable the class of vessels that take a cargo of 200,000 bushels of grain into Buffalo, carrying it at a rate that the 14-foot vessel cannot carry it for, to reach the docks at Montreal, in order to compete with that rate. I point out these facts to illustrate the position I wish to take. As a friend of the Ottawa route, as a representative who desires to see trade diverted from American channels to our own channels, especially to secure and hold our own trade, I ask the House to consider this from a business standpoint, and to realize that we are not dealing with a question involving an expenditure of $17,000,000, but with a great highway of communication from the interior to the seaboard that will compete with the other lines and which, unless we make it compete, will be of no value to us except so far as it enables us to develop local resources along the line of the canal. The difference in the distance, of course, is a matter of some consequence. But the difference should not be measured by the actual difference in distance, because the passage through the Ottawa Canal would be much slower than the rate of speed down the lakes to Buffalo. The difference in distance, will not greatly add to the advantages of the route, so far as time is concerned, until you reach Buffalo, then there will be a saving in the time in getting through the Erie Canal.

What I rose to point out, and what I reiterate is that it is useless to spend money in a canal that will not compete with the other routes. If grain is laid down in New York at 5 cents by the Buffalo route, we must have a route that will compete with that rate, or it is useless to invest our money in it. I do not wish to go into the matter in details by quoting tables; but I will say, that if we examine this carefully, we shall be obliged to arrive at the conclusion that this enterprise is one that is meritorious and desirable, one that we should seek to embark upon as soon as our resources will permit. But it will involve an expenditure of probably more than $100,000 and we ought to look at it carefully before embarking upon it. Probably the time will come when the co-operation of the United States Government will be secured in the construction of this very line, which is the best commercial line and which would serve their purpose if it were continued from Montreal by Lake Champlain to tide-water upon the Hudson. The time has not come, I imagine, for undertaking this enterprise. We have got to think over it a little more carefully, and realize that the difficulties are of greater magnitude than we suppose, and that it will require more money than we thought. There is no use going into it until we understand all the circumstances thoroughly, and are prepared to make our scheme effective and successful.

Mr. MACKIE. I would like to say a few words in regard to this ship canal. This canal has been engaging the attention of the Government for something over thirty years, and I think the Government have spent $100,000 or $200,000 on the Chats Rapids, through the efforts of the late Mr. John Egan. But for some reason, the thing burst up and nothing has been done about it since. There is an opinion that there is not sufficient water on this route to the Georgian Bay to float vessels through. I may tell the House that I have floated lumber down all those streams between the Georgian Bay and Montreal, and there is any amount of water, no difficulty about that. Of course, at some points the water may be shallow, but there is a great deal of deep water on the whole route. If the Government had to furnish the money to construct this canal, I do not know that I would feel like asking them to undertake it; but when private individuals are willing to invest their money in this scheme, and only ask a guarantee of 4 per cent interest on that money, I would insist on the Government, at least, looking into the matter carefully. I hope they will give it their best consideration, and do what they can to promote it, as the cost, under the scheme proposed, would be so slight to the Government that it would be no extra burden on the country.

Mr. HAGGART. At this late period of the session, I will not make my remarks as lengthy as I would otherwise on the important subject which is before the House. I compliment the hon. member for Pontiac (Mr. Poupore) on the clear and incisive manner in which he has introduced this subject, and for the earnestness which he displayed; and also the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt) for the clear, lucid and earnest manner in which he supported the motion. Years ago, when I was younger like those two gentlemen, I was a great believer, and am yet, in the Ottawa Ship Canal. I took advantage of an opportunity to go up the Mattawa into Lake Nipissing and down into the Georgian Bay, and I am fully convinced that of all the practical routes from the lakes to the ocean, the best route is the one proposed in the scheme outlined by the hon. member for Pontiac. Of course, there is the Trent Valley Canal, there is the Toronto Canal, and several other rival schemes, but none of them, I think, are equal in importance to this one. I was always in favour of that route, it was a scheme advocated by the Conservative party over twenty years ago. A canal was commenced there as an experiment, as the hon. member has shown, upon the Chats Canal, and it was the intention to build that route ultimately. As for the argument of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) that it will require for building that canal a sum run-

ning up into the hundreds of millions, that is all—I will not use the phrase that is applicable to it. The hon. gentleman has only to read the report of the United States engineers appointed for the purpose of inquiring into that subject, and he will find that instead of a 20 or an 18-foot navigation for inland canals to carry freight from the great lakes to the coast, either at New York or Montreal, they recommend canals of a less depth than we have adopted upon the St. Lawrence, a depth of twelve feet, which they think is quite sufficient for all practical purposes. It would be almost impossible to build a canal of twenty feet navigation down the St. Lawrence. You would not only have to canalize the rapids, but you would have to canalize the river itself, deepening the channel in many places. The depth which has been adopted by the Government for the St. Lawrence Canal is, I believe, the greatest depth that is economically of any value. The engineers appointed by the United States Government have entered fully into that subject, as well as our own engineers. The hon. member for Norfolk argues that vessels drawing eighteen or nineteen feet have driven other vessels drawing twelve or fourteen feet off the great lakes. That is perfectly true, but that is on the great lakes alone, and that is in regard to communication from one port on the lakes to another where there is no canal to pass through except the Sault Ste. Marie Canal. But where you have to utilize long stretches of land, or the banks of rivers, and it is necessary to expend large sums of money for canals, those who have thoroughly gone into the subject are of the opinion that the most economical depth for the purpose is that which has been adopted by the present Government. The hon. gentleman says: Look at Manitoba's wheat, look at the products of our great west going by Buffalo and by New York to Europe, instead of down our system of canals. The reason of that is simple. As long as you can send wheat from Buffalo as cheaply to Liverpool as you can from Montreal, the wheat will always travel by the cheapest and best route. If you can send grain from Buffalo to Liverpool as cheaply as from Montreal, what is the use of carrying it from Buffalo down to Montreal? Those are the economical facts in reference to this question. It is easy to understand why the present condition exists. The St. Lawrence is more difficult of navigation, there is a greater amount of insurance upon the St. Lawrence, and it is open only for about six months in the year, whereas the port of New York is open the whole year round. Then, vessels going by the St. Lawrence have only freight one way, going out; they cannot get return freight. In the case of vessels plying from New York, one of the principal returns to the vessel-owner is freight coming from Europe to New York; they can always get return freight; and vessels will go where they can get freight both ways. A bushel of wheat, when it arrives at Buffalo, can be sent to Liverpool as cheaply as from Montreal. The New York route is also an old-established route, and there are more commercial advantages for sending grain by that route. We all know how grain is carried from the western states to Europe. You can sell a load of grain, with the shipping receipt attached to it, anywhere between Chicago and New York just as well as if it was in an elevator in Albany, New York or Chicago. It is a merchantable article that can be sold in any markets, in any corn exchange, in the cities of the United States. However, we hope in time, by building this canal which will give a much shorter route, to overcome all these difficulties. I am of the opinion that the day will come when that canal will be built, not only for the purpose of carrying freight between the great lakes and Montreal, but for local purposes. As the hon. member for Pontiac said, the time will come when, although we have not the coal here for the purpose of smelting the large mass of mineral ores in this district, electricity will be used and the immense stretches of water from Montreal to Lake Huron will be thus utilized, and the day is not far distant when every road in this section will be run by electricity. I hope to see the day, and I am satisfied it is not far away, when instead of one or two trains running from this city to Montreal daily, we shall be able to jump on an electric carriage in front of the Parliament buildings every half hour or hour and start for Montreal or Toronto. This will be a more cheap means of conveyance than our present system of railways. There is a grand future for this country on account of its water powers, there being, as stated by the hon. member for Ottawa, not less than one million horse power along this particular canal route.

Mr. BELCOURT. Two million horse power.

Mr. HAGGART. I do not know what the power is, but it is an immense power. We possess the finest power in any part of North America. It is the cheapest means of obtaining electricity for heat and power purposes. And there is an immense future for this section of the country, which was thought to be useless, whereas these primitive Laurentian rocks will at one time prove the most valuable part of the country. As to the feasibility of the Georgian Bay Canal, I had doubts in regard to its feasibility, because it must depend entirely on the water from the summit level of the canal. I thought at first, I did not look very carefully into it, that it would lie somewhere between Lake Nipissing and Mattawa River, where there is at present a canal four and a half miles long, and it is now stated that Lake

Nipissing will be the summit level of the canal. If that can be accomplished by ordinary expenditure, the success of the undertaking is assured. Although the undertaking might not return one cent of dividend to the investors, I entertain the firm belief that on account of the cheapness of freight, if it were utilized for no other purpose than regulating the charges on the railways, it would be a benefit to the country, if it could be built, as I believe it could be built, for the sum of money stated. As to the financial part of the question, I did not follow up the explanations closely. I do not know about this work bringing in $17,000,000 of capital. The investment in the canal would be made on the security of the people here, and if money were invested it would be because the work was expected to be able to make a return. For my part, I do not think it will be, perhaps, the right thing to entrust this work into the hands of any private enterprise. If it should be built at all, it should be carried out by the Government, and the people of the country would fully support any Administration which by an ordinary expenditure each year would accomplish the desired object, an object very much desired in this section, and one which would do more to promote the development of the resources of the Ottawa valley than any other enterprise. Some hon. members, no doubt, will ask why I did not do something in that direction when head of the Department of Railways and Canals. I was anxious to build a lock or two each year, and in ten or twelve years thus accomplish the object in view. We had however, a Finance Minister who was very jealous as regards the expenditure of public money and kept a very tight line upon the spending departments, both Railways and Canals and Public Works; but I hope in this year of plethora, when everything is flourishing and money is abundant in every portion of the country, a fair portion of it, instead of being directed to the Yukon and distant points of the Dominion, should be applied to the Ottawa valley for the purpose of constructing this proposed canal, which is in the interest not only of the people of the Ottawa valley but of the inhabitants of the whole Dominion.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). I am sure the House is under great obligation to the hon. member for Pontiac (Mr. Poupore), and also the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt) for having brought before the House the very important question now under consideration. I have not gone deeply into the question brought to our notice; still, I have given some attention to it, and I do not hesitate to say that at some time this scheme will have to be taken up. But for the time being we are engaged in other works. I was very sorry that my hon. friend the hon, member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) made the statement he did, in so many words, that he had no confidence in the St. Lawrence route unless we go deepening our canals to 20 feet in order to secure the freight between the west and the east. The hon. ex-Minister of Railways has answered that argument, which had already been answered by the experience of the past. What has been the experience in regard to the Erie Canal, and that is not a 20-foot channel? The hon. member is losing sight of this fact, that the railways are becoming every day more and more important factors in the carrying trade, in the grain especially. There has been an evolution from the railway standpoint. In past days, when a car could carry 500 bushels, it was considered a remarkable feat; now that quantity is doubled. We have a living experience in the Parry Sound Railway. A few months ago, when I asserted before the business men of Montreal that the railway would carry 15,000,000 bushels of grain, I was nearly laughed out of the room; and yet that is an accomplished fact. Through the great industry and enterprise of Mr. Booth, we are going to have another railway bringing to the St. Lawrence route an immense volume of trade. I say the St. Lawrence route, and I use the term purposely. This route will be a great benefit to us if we will but take advantage of its possibilities, which we have not done in the past. We have built railways from the east to the west and deepened our canals, but we have not given accommodation necessary to receive and handle freight that is going into Montreal. I am sorry to say that Montreal has the worst harbour facilities of any great city in the world, and I have travelled a good deal. How can we compete against Buffalo, Boston and New York with Montreal equipped as it is? The hon. member for North Norfolk expressed surprise that so much grain trade was done at Buffalo.

Well, Sir, last year there were fifty-two elevators in full operation in Buffalo and there was not one in Montreal, and in addition to the fifty-two elevators in Buffalo there was an additional steam elevator which was being built by Mr. Hill. I say again, how can we expect that the trade will come to us if we do not provide facilities for it. I say that we have neglected our waterways in an incredible manner; I do not blame any one for that for we have been building railways which are a good thing in their way, but there is no doubt that we have been neglecting our harbour facilities and our waterways. Our harbours on the great lakes, at Collingwood, at Midland, Owen Sound, Goderich, and at other places should be deepened and properly equipped for trade. The port of Montreal, the port of Quebec, the port of St. John, the port of Halifax, all these national harbours should be prepared to handle as cheaply as our rivals do. But, after all, we have made wonderful progress. In

spite of the inadequate facilities at our disposal, last year there were 27,000,000 bushels of grain exported from the port of Montreal, while the port of Boston only exported about 40,000,000, so that we have not done so badly after all. Our St. Lawrence route is about 500 miles shorter than the American route and we have the great lakes at our disposal. When you remember that the trade of these great lakes amounts to about 40,000,000 tons annually, and that we receive only a few thousand tons, you can see the great possibilities before us, because the Canadian route is the shortest and it will be the best when we have it equipped. I do not want to say much more on that question to-day, but I cannot help protesting against the assertion which my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) has made. I say again, the St. Lawrence route is the shortest and we can make it the best.

Mr. POUPORE. You mean the Ottawa route is the shortest.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend the Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair) has touched the point when he said that we must provide for cheap rates from east to west, and the port of Montreal on the St. Lawrence route is making a great deal of progress in that direction. A few years ago, we had to a large extent only tramp boats in the freight trade, but now we have steamers of 10,000 and 12,000 tons capacity coming from English ports to Montreal, and it is a well-known fact that the bigger the ship the cheaper the freight. The St. Lawrence channel is being improved from year to year, and that is one of the reasons why I have asked from Parliament this year a pretty large amount to go on with the dredging. Let us bring the largest possible ships from Europe to Montreal—and when I speak of Montreal I speak of Quebec at the same time—let us equip our ports and then we will assure for the St. Lawrence route a fair proportion of the immense traffic of the west.

Mr. POUPORE. Say something about the Ottawa River Canal.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have not given much attention to that question as yet, and I generally speak of questions to which I have given consideration.

Mr. POUPORE. I would like to have some opinion on the Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I have listened with a great deal of attention and interest to the discussion which has taken place, and especially to the remarks of my hon. friend from Pontiac (Mr. Poupore) and of my hon. friend from Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt). My hon. friend from Pontiac has introduced this subject with a great deal of zeal and fervour. He believes in the scheme; he has given it, as he said, his attention from his early boyhood, and it is not extraordinary, therefore, that he should have reached the conclusion which he has expressed with so much positiveness. I might say the same with regard to my hon. friend from Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt) who has spoken in a similar strain. But it seems to me that my hon. friend (Mr. Poupore) has jumped rather quickly at his conclusions. He has asked us, that on this the very first time the matter is brought to the attention of the House, the Government should immediately bring forward a measure to guarantee interest at 2 per cent on $17,000,000 of bonds. As I understood him, he said that the canal company was ready to undertake the building of the canal provided the Government were prepared to endorse their bonds to the extent of 2 per cent per year for twenty years, and would not be called upon to disburse any money until the canal was in operation and in a condition to earn the subsidies.

Mr. POUPORE. No subsidies.

The PRIME MINISTER. In a position to carry freight and derive earnings, I meant to say. This, I must say, is a proposition which independently of all the accompanying circumstances seems to be a very moderate proposal. If there was nothing more than that, and if the conditions of success were assured, I could see no reason why the Government should not be ready to accept the offer of my hon. friend (Mr Poupore). The question of transportation is the most important question perhaps which Canada has to deal with at this moment. The future of this country very largely lies upon this problem of transportation, and as has been stated by my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton)—although I do not agree in his conclusions nor in many of his arguments—the problem for us is to carry freight at cheap rates so as to compete with New York. The moment we have done that we have solved the problem. But how are we to do it? I have no doubt whatever that if the canal which is suggested by my hon. friend (Mr. Poupore) were built and in operation, it would undoubtedly be a potent factor towards the reducing of the freight rates. There can be no doubt as to that, but the question is: Have we before us the evidence that this canal can be built for the sum of $17,000,000, and have we the evidence further that it would be a commercial success? From the point of view of the engineer there can be no doubt that the scheme is feasible, because the authorities which have been quoted by my hon. friend (Mr. Poupore) make that point beyond question. I have no doubt at all either, that from the point of view of reducing the tolls this canal would also be a success. But I ask my hon friend (Mr. Poupore): Have we the evidence before us that this scheme can

be completed for the sum of $17,000,000, and have we the evidence before us that as a commercial venture it would prove a success ? I submit to my hon. friend (Mr. Poupore) that we have not the evidence. But he may answer me this : What matters it whether or not you have the evidence that the canal can be built for $17,000,000 ; what matters it whether you have evidence that it will be a commercial success or not, for the Government is simply asked to guarantee the bonds and not to disburse any money until the canal has been put in operation. My answer is this, and I submit that in this the Government will have the support of both sides of the House : The Government should not give even its sanction or approval to any scheme unless it is satisfied in advance that the scheme shall be a commercial success. The Government should not give even its moral sanction or authority to a sheme, and thereby invite British capitalists to invest their money in it, unless there is a reasonable certainty that the money thus invested will yield a fair return.

Mr. POUPORE. Has the hon. gentleman any doubt as to that himself ?

The PRIME MINISTER. I must say that I have no more knowledge on this subject than the knowledge which I have derived from the speech of my hon. friend, which is valuable, and from the articles of Mr. McLeod Stewart, who has devoted to this project the most commendable energy ; but having read all that, I am sure my hon. friend will not find fault with me if I say that I am not yet convinced that the scheme would be a commercial success. Moreover, I must say to my hon. friend that on a question of this kind I would not act on my own judgment—I do not pretend to be an expert in such matters—but I would follow the judgment of experts who are more qualified than I am to form a judgment upon the question. I think it is at present premature to say that the scheme has reached the point at which the Government should step in, as the hon. gentleman wants us to do. I do not wish to refer to what has happened in the past for the purpose of recriminating in any way ; but in the past we have been too forward in giving the countenance and authority of the Government to schemes which experience afterwards has proved were not feasible, from a commercial point of view. At the present time, unfortunately the bond-holders of the Chignecto Ship Railway Company are in a very unfortunate position, because they have been induced to invest their money by the moral sanction and authority of the Canadian Government. That is unfortunate in many ways, and my hon. friend will, I am sure, agree with me that it is the duty of this Government to take every means to see that no scheme is put upon the English market with its sanction, unless it has before it a fairly reasonable assurance of the commercial success of the scheme. When that is the position of this project, the Government will be prepared to look into it. Certainly the scheme is one that has merit in it. Assuredly, it is one that is not to be dismised contemptuously. On the contrary, my hon. friend has made a case, and a case which the Government is bound to take into consideration ; but he will agree with me, I am sure, that he can not fairly expect the Government at this time to take up the scheme, although he can expect the Government will give to it its very best consideration.

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

After Recess.

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

(In the Committee.)

Railways and Canals, chargeable to capital—
Soulanges Canal—Construction..... $1,610,000

Mr. FOSTER. On the section that was the subject of discussion this morning, Hogan and Onderdonk's, what was the time allowed for completion at the time of the first call for tenders ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I do not want to be held to the day or the month, but I think it was to the last of December, 1899.

Mr. FOSTER. When the rearrangement was made as between Mr. Onderdonk and Mr. Hogan, the time was shortened until what period ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Until the spring of 1899.

Mr. FOSTER. Was any penalty exacted in the contract made with Onderdonk, in the event of his not having the contract finished in the spring of 1899 ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The same conditions were imposed as are usual and customary in the letting of canal contracts. The tenderer deposited the amount required, and he would of course incur the risk of forfeiting his deposit. He would also incur the risk of forfeiting the drawback upon the progress estimates, and he would be liable under his contract to action in the event of his not performing it, and in the event of damages accruing to the Crown as the result of his non-performance.

Mr. FOSTER. These are the penalties which attach to any contract. There were no special penalties in this case ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, I want to know if it is usual in the department, before tenders

are called for, for any work, to have an estimate of the engineer of the department as to the cost of the work ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is usual and customary.

Mr. FOSTER. I want to ask whether, when the change was made and a private contract was entered into with Onderdonk on the altered terms, there was any estimate asked from the engineer as to the cost of the completion of that contract by the hastening of the season ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We did not ask for any further estimate on the subject. The necessary inference would be that the more you shortened the time, the more you would be likely to increase the cost of the work.

Mr. FOSTER. But the difference between Hogan and Onderdonk, as I understand, was some $40,000.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. So my deputy tells me. I do not remember myself.

Mr. FOSTER. And the hon. gentleman did not think it was necessary to have an estimate again of that work to ascertain what increase there would be in its cost, owing to the shortening of the time and taking into account the fact that there was a tender on the longer time for $40,000 less. He did not try to ascertain whether or not the added cost of doing the work with greater rapidity would be equivalent to $40,000 or not. I have been following, as an interested listener, the criticisms on this contract and also with reference to the cement, and I cannot help but think that the business in both cases is rather serious. I am very sorry that the right hon. First Minister is not here and more members of the Government. It is very much like a farce that the millions of money which the Government and the service of the country call for are left to within three or four days of the end of the session, and then heaped upon us by $3,000,000 at a time of new estimates, when all spirit has fled the House, when everybody is wearied with the length of the session, when the benches are depleted, and the absence of those who have gone only serves to add greater restlessness to those that remain and a greater desire for rushing through the business that remains. I know that hon. gentlemen opposite were very earnest in their denunciations of that practice when in Opposition. For five or six years of the time of the preceding Government that was remedied very largely by the Estimates being gone into the first or second week of the session ; but that system has been changed by the present Government, and the Estimates are kept back until the dying days of the session. Why, when we were discussing the matter of the Soulanges Canal this morning, I took a survey, from time to time, of the opposite side, and found there was positively not a member on that side who seemed to take the least interest at all in the discussion.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). They were all in the committee rooms.

Mr. FOSTER. No, they were not, and those that were present were a goodly number, just as many as are here to-night, but not one took the least interest in the money discussions going on. The criticisms came from a few on this side, but there was no setting down to the main work of Parliament, the disposing of the $48,000,000, which the people have to raise by way of taxation. Now, it is hoped to have this House prorogued somewhere about the latter part of this week or the first of the next, and within four days of that hoped-for time the hon. Minister brings down $3,000,000 of new Estimates and throws them upon the House. Everybody knows that there can be no fair discussion of these, and it is not intended that there should be. They are kept back in order that they may be run through in a half-hearted way, with scarcely any members on the benches, and the Opposition has to do its duty and has been trying to do its duty, with reference to the Minister of Railways in criticising the estimate now under consideration. The two things which are developed are not creditable either to the Minister or the Government or the party which supports it. Here you have a very large sum to be expended in what is recognized, without a show of objection, as the great public work of the country, the canal system. From the earliest period, it has been the rule that the greatest publicity should be given to intended work, and that tenders should be a show of objection, as the great public works. We have the Minister and his department sitting down and taking council with each other and determining to call for tenders upon such section of the work to be completed within such time, and publishing the advertisement for the space of a month. The time comes when the tenders are opened, and the lowest tenderer is a gentleman by the name of Hogan. Everything is regular. The second lowest tender is $40,000 for the same work. Then, for no particular reason given, the Minister, of his own motion, comes to the conclusion that he will alter entirely the condition of that contract by shortening the time of its completion one season. He comes to the conclusion suddenly that a reason for haste has been developed, and that it is his duty to try and have this finished in the spring of 1899 instead of the autumn of 1899. Everybody knows that in a large work, where you have to do it within a certain time, the estimates are made upon that as a basis of cost. Everybody knows that if that has to be done in a shorter time the condi-

tions are varied. It may be that they are varied to the extent of a large increase in the cost, and it may be that the time of completion makes but a very slight difference in the cost. Anyway, the only fair method by which the Minister can well perform his duty to the public is to leave it with the business sense of the contracting public. But the Minister did not choose to do that. After the tenders were opened and known and the gentlemen who tendered knew each other's figures, the Minister says: I am going to vary the conditions of the contract.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The figures were not known.

Mr. FOSTER. Were the tenders opened and the lowest tender announced?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, I venture to say that my hon. friend is not so simple as not to know, what everybody else in this House does, that when the tenders are opened and the lowest tenderer is notified, there is no object in keeping the figures concealed. The contractors talk to each other, and tell their figures to each other, so that they may be easily known, and as a matter of fact are known. Now, with the difference of $40,000 between Mr. Hogan and Mr. Onderdonk, and with this change in the conditions of things, the Minister decides that he will not go to the contracting public again, and ask them to tender on the new conditions, but he says to Mr. Hogan: I want this done in six months shorter time, can you do it? Mr. Hogan replies that he cannot. The Minister then goes to Mr. Onderdonk, who tenders at $40,000 higher, and asks him if he will do it six months earlier, and Mr. Onderdonk says he will.

Now, there is a way in which you could violate the spirit as well as the letter of tender and contract based upon tender. Why, if that is to be the policy that is carried out, everybody knows that collusion and combinations will be made. It is easily done, and the incentive is great. What could be more easily done, and where could there be a greater incentive in that it offers a man a chance to make a neat little pile. Mr. Onderdonk, whose tender is $40,000 above that of Mr. Hogan, may go to Mr. Hogan and say: You are $40,000 below me. The Minister has changed the conditions and wants the whole work done six months earlier. You say that you cannot do it. I will get $40,000 more for the work, and I will see that you do not suffer in the transaction. Now, my hon. friend (Mr. Blair) who is so innocent—and who has proved it so during his whole career—may say that this is showing too great suspicion of human nature, and that it is not in the heart of man to conceive any such guile as that. But I think the majority of business men who know what the world is will say that the Minister opened a door and issued an invitation—and backed that invitation up with the temptation of a very large amount of money—to just such an operation as that. When the Minister changed the conditions and found that there was a difference of $40,000 between the lowest tender and the next lowest, he should have taken another month and asked for tenders on these changed conditions, and let the public market value the change in cost under the new restriction of time. My hon. friend is very frank with the House. He gets up to say that, amongst all the Ministers, he is the one who will not try to shield himself; he will take the full responsibility, and, if he has made a mistake and involved the country in the loss of a great amount of money, he is willing to acknowledge it. That is very good for the peace of his own soul, but it does not help the treasury of the country, nor does it prevent the country from suffering loss.

Take the item of cement. I will venture to say that the hon. gentleman—who does not care for precedents and boasts in this House that he is not going to read up the history of his department—may take the history of the canal department under Mr. Page and from him up, and he will find that cement has been bought upon certain conditions; and these conditions are necessary in order that the department itself shall be guarded, but, more than all, in order that the public works in which the public money is spent, works of the greatest utility and importance, shall be properly built. It is a small matter if a man, in building his own house puts defective material in it, because he himself suffers the inconvenience and no one else. But, take an immense canal and put in bad material, and let there be a defect in the work which results in having to un-water the canal and in the stoppage of the business of the country on the great St. Lawrence route for one or two or three weeks, and the whole country has something to say to that. I venture to say that the hon. gentleman will go through the history of his whole department and he will find that there is one unvarying rule with reference to the material used, cement, for instance. That rule is this—as to the kind of cement we use, it must be the best and the best for that particular purpose; and the judge of whether it is the best for that purpose is not the man who has it to sell, but the engineer on the work. And what took place? Why, a transaction in which the Minister overrode the engineering department, in which pressure was brought to bear upon him to buy a large quantity of cement and pay for it before it was used, and not as it was being used.

The rule as to cement is that it is taken upon the test of the engineer in charge of the work. But $20,000 worth of it is bought in a lump, and that without such test, without

the every day working test of the engineer. If I understood rightly the facts that were elicited in this case, the engineer of the works himself is opposed to the use of this cement. He does not certify that the cement is fit to be used here and does not certify that it is used. In fact, in his evidence before the Committee on Public Accounts he declared that it was not fit to be used for that work. But what happens? The Minister steps in ahead of his engineering department, a bold and risky thing for a Minister to do. The Minister has right to use his judgment upon the report that is given him by his technical officers, but, unless he can overweigh that by better technical authority than that of his own officers, he has no right to make a bargain for himself in such matters as this. But, in violation of that wholesome rule he bought and paid—at the solicitation of political friends, probably—for $20,000 worth or more of cement, and a large proportion of that cement lies to-day somewhere useless by the testimony of the engineer who has charge of the work, and the country is in a fair way to be done out of $20,000. Now, why did the Minister take that course? Why did he constitute himself the judge of the kind of cement that was to be used? And why did he pay for it in bulk, months and months before it was to be used, and so violate the wholesome rule which has been observed in that department heretofore? With a countenance so naive and innocent that it will work on almost any one's feelings, the hon. Minister says: It may be that a mistake has been made, if so I will own up and take the responsibility. But who takes the responsibility for the large sum of money lost to the country?

I say that the Minister of Railways and Canals has in both these cases gone aside from sound business methods, probaby to the great loss of the country in each instance. It is these things which are cropping up in the hon. gentleman's administration which give point to the criticisms upon that administration; and these, together with the assertions made by the hon. gentleman, make it necessary for the Opposition at least—whether the Government benches are going to take any interest in this or not, I do not know—to call the attention of the Government of Parliament and the country to the condition of things as it seems to be established. It seems to me that it is a fair thing to say that the Minister would have consulted his own interest, and the interest of the country most certainly, if he had called for tenders when he altered the conditions, and, if, in the case of buying the cement, he had followed the old, sure method he would not then have landed himself in the predicament in which he is to-day, when the chief argument he has to give us is that the Opposition is trying to destroy the manufacture of native cement. That is not in question. If native cement for the purposes of building canals is as good as any other, by all means, put it to the same test, and use it. But, if it is not, we are not obliged, and it is not right, to hazard the public money in the first place, and the permanence and durability of the work in the next place, for the purpose of trying to give patronage to an industry, even though a Canadian industry. I do not know enough of the matter technically to express an opinion as to this question of cement. We are told that the Battle cement is good in its place; but, in this case, it has evidently not secured the certificate of the engineer, as the Minister himself has to acknowledge.

These are things that we ought seriously to think of. It makes no difference whether we are opposing or supporting the Government, we ought all to be interested in seeing that the wholesome rule of contract by tender and of buying cement upon technical engineering authority is carried out; and it does not seem that the Minister has carried this out in any particular.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not question for a moment the right of the hon. gentleman as a critic of the Government to call me to task in respect of my administration of the department, in any respect which commends itself to his judgment; but I do question very much the good taste, the discretion and the propriety of the hon. gentleman in undertaking to lecture independent members on this side of the House as to what their attitude should be during the discussion of these questions. It will probably be found anmply sufficient for the hon. gentleman to direct his attention to his own course of procedure and conduct, and leave to the sense of right of the gentlemen who are sitting in front of him, as to whether they will listen or not to what may be said upon the subjects which are under debate. These gentlemen have to answer to their own constituents, and to their own consciences, as to how they will comport themselves in this House, and not to the judgment of hon. gentlemen opposite. Now, I take leave to say that the statement which the hon. gentleman has presented to this committee to-night in criticism of my conduct in respect, either of the matter of cement or the matter of letting the contract, is founded upon presumptions which are not supported by evidence, which are the creatures of his own imagination, or which are the product of the suspicions with which he regards the conduct of his political opponents. The hon. gentleman starts out by assuming that there has been a deliberate purpose upon the part of the Government to delay discussion of these estimates until this late moment in the session, so that criticism of hon. gentlemen may be avoided. There is no evidence to justify that statement, not one particle. The Estimates were introduced

and the discussion was commenced over a month ago, and if they have not been all discussed and dealt with before, it does not at all rest with the Government or any of the Ministers. There has been no disposition at all to avoid discussion. I think that when the time comes that the actions and conduct of this Government cannot be discussed in open day and in this House, the time will then have arrived when it is better that we should withdraw from the Treasury benches and let other men take our places. The hon. gentleman depicts me as very naive, and with a great appearance of frankness, trying to show in a plausible manner, as he says, which I expected would carry conviction, that I was perfectly willing to stand any condemnation that might result from any mistakes I might have committed in this matter. I made no such admission in this House or anywhere else. When the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) held out to me the terrible threat that the country would hold me responsible, why, I admitted in a spirit of concession to the hon. gentleman, that I was willing to take the consequences of my action. But it appears that to make an acknowledgment of that kind when invited by hon. gentlemen opposite who are disposed to crush me in this matter, is to act improperly in the judgment of hon. gentlemen. Well, I have to submit myself to the judgment of the House in that particular. Now, I want to ask the members of this committee who have heard the hon. gentleman criticise what took place with respect to the letting of this contract to Mr. Onderdonk in place of Mr. Hogan. I want to ask them whether the hon. gentleman could have based a more serious condemnation upon my course if, instead of reducing the time within which the work was to be done and getting it done for the price for which it would have been done in the longer period, if the work for the longer period had been tendered for, I had pursued the reverse course, and had extended the time, and given Mr. Onderdonk the benefit of the contract for the increased period without offering it to tenders. How much more severely could the hon. gentleman, in that case, have undertaken to condemn my course. Yet anybody can see that there is all the difference in the world between awarding a contract to a person who is willing to do it within a less period of time upon prices which he had offered to do it in the further and extended period, and allowing a contractor further time at the same price. Is it not self-evident that if a man is willing to do an important work involving a large amount of money for the same price within the specified time, that the public interest is being amply safeguarded if you give him the contract for the sum mentioned in the tender at the longer period? That is the view I took of the matter, that is the view my colleagues in Council took of the matter when the whole facts were presented to them. When the hon. gentleman says there was no reason for reducing the time, has he not actually ignored the statement which I made of the determination of the Government after due consideration, meeting as we thought the desire of the country to secure the construction of that great work as part of the whole series of the St. Lawrence canals, to secure their construction a year earlier than had been originally designed? We felt we were meeting the public expectation in that regard. When, therefore, we determined upon that, and that was not determined upon until after notices had been issued calling for tenders for the longer period, and when we found that we could get this work done within the shorter period without its costing us any more money, I want to know whether we were not justified in taking the matter up promptly and vigorously and losing no further time, and awarding the contract in the way we did. That is my judgment, I may be taking a one-sided view of the question, I may not be able to see it in anything like a judicial spirit, but it does seem to me that when the arrangement that was entered into was one which insured the earlier completion of the work, and we got it done for the same figure, I think that the hon. gentleman is going far afield in looking for an opportunity to criticise. Now we come to the question of the cement. What occurred with regard to the cement? The hon. gentleman assumes that the department intended that this cement should be used for all the purposes of canal work. Was there any statement made this afternoon by me, or any other statement brought out, which justified the hon. gentleman in making that observation. On the contrary, I know that is not the fact. The hon. gentleman assumes that I have over-ridden the judgment and opinion of the engineers of the department. I have done nothing of the kind. I have not stated, and I cannot truthfully state, that the action which was taken by the department was not taken with the concurrence of the chief engineer. I am free to confess that the chief engineer was of the opinion that the Thorold cement ought not to be used for a very important class of work, he would not allow it to be used in the locks, he would not allow it to be used in the weirs. We did not intend to use it in the locks or in the weirs, nor was it bought for that purpose. It was bought and intended to be used in certain classes of work where it could properly be used according to the judgment of the officials of the department, except, I may concede the opinion of Mr. Monro.

Mr. Monro has come to have latterly a very strong opinion against Thorold cement: he has also come to have a very strong opinion against the stone used for the locks on

the Stewart section. But Mr. Monro is not the only officer of the department. His opinion was not concurred in by the chief engineer, and when we had the opinion of the engineer of the Welland Canal, Mr. Thompson, and when we had Mr. Page's opinion and the opinion of the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson), who has used many thousand barrels of this cement—when all these facts came to my knowledge I did not over-ride the judgment of the officers, but I agreed with their opinion, and I considered that I could very properly award a contract to the Thorold people for cement for portions of the works other than the locks and piers. The hon. gentleman stated that I had over-ridden the judgment and opinion of my officers. I did nothing of the kind. The decision to allow the Thorold people a contract for a portion of the cement required, directly stipulating that the cement should stand the test, otherwise it should not go into the work and be paid for, was done with the concurrence of the officers of the department, whose opinion I did not venture to over-ride. Then the hon. gentleman suggested that the cement was paid by my order, again over-riding the judgment of the engineers, and that nobody had ever heard of such a case previously. The hon. gentleman does not know of the matter to which he has referred. The department has to pay very frequently for cement before it is used. The quantity ordered was not in excess, but within the quantity which the department considered would be required before the close of the season. Why did the department not require it? It was because Mr. Stewart, one of the contractors, failed to carry out his work where the bulk of the cement would have been used. The cement could not, therefore, be used on the work and was thrown on the hands of the department. The Thorold people were not responsible for that fact, but it resulted in the department being bound to keep the cement through the winter. Unfortunately it became air slacked, as I am informed the best cement will do. When we examined it in the spring we found that the air and dampness had hardened it into stone. This is proof that the cement was of good quality, for hon. members can now go and see hundreds and perhaps thousands of bags of that cement as hard as rock.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that all air slacked?

Mr. POUPORE. The hon. Minister means that the cement became hardened, which shows that it is good cement.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is what I intended to say. I have no technical knowledge on the subject, and I am not giving my opinion, but that of men who have knowledge and experience. I only know the Thorold people in a business way. I am not actuated by any personal or other considerations of friendship for them, but as a matter of fair-play to those gentlemen, it is not proper or becoming in members of the House, whose only object is to make a political point against their opponents, to condemn in this public way the products of well known people who for a large number of years have furnished an article which has been used on public works without a word of criticism and complaint. I have done none of these things charged against me. I did not over-ride the department. I would not be disposed to express my own opinion adverse to that of the trained officers; but the trained officers do not always agree, and sometimes it is necessary, as when doctors differ, that some one should come in and adjudge. Nor did I over-ride the officers in the matter of making payments. I do not know how the certificates came in. It is not part of my duty, in fact I have not time to follow up these details. I take it that the certificates came in proper shape and were satisfactory to the officers, and the money was paid after the proper evidence had been furnished. After hearing the complaints of Mr. Monro I visited the Soulanges Canal works and made inquiry, the chief engineer accompanying me part of the way. I went to the place where the tests were carried on and asked them to show me their records, and I brought away with me a memorandum of the result of my inquiries, and some briquets made from the cement in order that we might not only have the result of tests made there, but also the results of tests made here by our engineers, where we have perfect machinery for the purpose. I do not know how far these tests satisfied anybody else, but they satisfied the chief engineer that the cement was what the contract called for, and in due course he paid for it. He could not withhold payment through the whole winter and spring as a matter of justice and fair-play to the parties who supplied the cement. We received it from him under his contract, and it was not his fault that the cement was not used. And when a reasonable time elapsed and the cement was found to be what the contract called for a very considerable portion of the money was paid.

Mr. POUPORE. I would call to the mind of the Minister (Mr. Blair) that I myself was present at the time that test was made, and I bear testimony to the accuracy of the statement made by the Minister. The test was made in our presence and the whole question arose whether the department should use Thorold cement or Portland cement. I was not interested in the matter, and I can say that the test which was made at the time was quite as good as that of the other cement, and the Thorold cement being a Canadian product and being just as good as the imported article, I could not for the life of me see then, nor can I now, why that cement should not be used in preference to the imported cement.

Mr. SPROULE. That is not the question.

Mr. POUPORE. I rose to verify the statement made by the Minister.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I met the hon. gentleman (Mr. Poupore) when I was going to Soulanges, and I mentioned to him that there was some question as to the cement, and I would like him to come along. He came with me to the office, and I dare say made an inspection of the registers showing what these tests were. The contract provided that the cement should stand a certain test and it did. Now, we have to treat people who deal with the Government on some principle of fair-play, and I believe the country will justify us in doing so, and so long as I am at the head of the department I do not propose to do anything else. I had no interest in paying the parties if their cement was not of good quality, but I had every interest and every duty the other way. I was not satisfied that the testing apparatus at Soulanges was a perfect one, and knowing that Mr. Perley was a most excellent and skilful officer and had in the department the latest appliances with which to test the cement, I brought some of these briquets away with me which were made from this cement, and they were tested by Mr. Perley and after twenty-four hours' exposure in the water they tested 120 instead of 60, as guaranteed. Neither I nor the engineer could refuse to pay these people their bill nor any part of their bill, under the circumstances, after we had resorted to every possible expedient to satisfy us that the cement was of the quality contracted for. I have now the letter of Mr. Thompson, superintending engineer of the Welland Canal, addressed to Mr. Schreiber, in which he says:

St. Catharines, Ont., May 28th, 1898.

Dear Sir,—Referring to your verbal inquiry yesterday, when I was in your office, as to whether any of the "Battle Cement" had been used on the Welland Canal works in the last two or three years, and if so with what results, I beg to say that in the years 1895, 1896 and 1897 a total of 5,572 cubic yards of concrete formed with "Battle Cement" has been put in place in the east pier at Port Dalhousie, with good results where it was used as hearting. I will send you a sample of the cement on Monday, which I will take myself direct from the mill.

Yours truly,
(Sgd.) W. G. THOMPSON.

The observations of the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) seemed to make it necessary that I should read this letter, and I believe it to be good evidence that this cement was proper cement to use.

Mr. GIBSON. I regret very much that I was absent in the forenoon when this discussion took place. I was rather astonished to hear of the statements made by the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster), although I should not be astonished at any statement made by him, because he spoke recently about this Government extending the time of a contract and allowing the contractors large sums of money, when he surely could not have forgotten that the Government of which he was an honoured member gave the contractors of the Sault Ste. Marie Canal a present of $100,000 to complete the canal within twelve months, but afterwards gave them an extension of time. Now, I may tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) that on this very Sault Canal contract the cement he is complaining of now was used to a large extent, and that, notwithstanding the fact that the specifications declared that no native cement should be used. The ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) also said: Go back to the good days when the Government established this matter of buying the cement themselves. I would like to ask the House who established the principle of buying cement by the Government? It was the present hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Haggart), but the most of the public works of the Dominion, including the Welland Canal, were built of Thorold cement, bought by the contractors, and very properly so, because the moment the Government undertakes to supply the contractors with cement they must keep a stock of it on hand, for if the contractors are delayed for want of it they will very justly make a claim against the Government. What are the facts in connection with this cement that we hear so much about? Battle's people asked to be allowed to put in a tender for some of the work that was to be let on the canal. The Minister of Railways asked my opinion about the quality of the Thorold cement, and I am in the judgment of the House and the judgment of the country when I say that I have used 100,000 barrels of it during my life at one time or another, and I have yet for the first time to receive condemnation at the hands of any company that I have ever done work for. It may be true, as the Minister pointed out, that the cement was sent in bags, and before the close of navigation in order that a sufficient quantity of it might be on hand. I am not prepared to say that was a proper mode of taking care of the cement. My experience is that all cement should be put in barrels, and the best Portland cement is not only put up in barrels, but in wrapping paper within the barrels, and the barrels are tarred so that the cement may not become air-slacked. If my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) knows anything about air-slack, he would know that it would not become a hard lump, as no cement that is affected by air ever becomes a hard substance, but remains in loose condition.

No cement that would set would ever become a hard substance, because its hydraulic principle would be gone: but the fact is, that the cement had got damp and had be-

come as hard as rock. In 1885, the Welland Canal was enlarged to fourteen feet depth of water, and two feet eight inches of masonry had to be put on the Welland Canal from one end to the other. I had some experience of that work, because I had the contract for section "J," and after an experience of seven years, during which the Thorold cement had been in use on the old work, I found that while we could remove the stone without much trouble, the moment we came to the interior wall where the cement had hardened, we could only take it out with ball drills, proving that the Thorold cement met the test imposed by the very authority the hon. gentleman quoted to-night, Mr. Page. Mr. Page's letters are on file, and I think that you will find that he as well as Mr. Monro and Mr. Thompson, at present the superintending engineer of the Welland Canal, all recommended this cement. I consider that the Minister was justified in buying the Thorold cement at the time he did. He paid no more for it than the contractors, and he was justified on the advice of his officers in procuring a sufficient quantity to do the work during the winter. If the contractor failed in his obligations to the Government, and the work was not carried on, was it the fault of the department or the Minister, that $20,000 worth of cement was lying in stock in the Government sheds, and that the work was not going on? Of necessity a large portion of the cement would be of little use; but if it had been used right along during the winter months, and if it had been kept under proper cover, I am bound to say, from the experience I have had of the Thorold cement, that it would have stood the test as well as Portland cement. One advantage of the Thorold cement is that it is fresh ground and fresh burned, whereas the Portland cement may be kept in storehouses for years, and may perhaps arrive in Montreal late in the fall of the year, though it may not be needed till the spring. No man can tell anything about cement until it is laid in layers, and the masonry is laid upon it. Then comes the test whether it will harden or not. I wish to say, in reply to the charges which have been made, that the last time the Minister of Railways was in Thorold, we had a test of the cement made in his presence, and it met a much higher test than the requirements of the specifications. This cement is not a new article in Canada. Thorold cement, to my knowledge, has been used on the canals of this country for over forty years, and this is the first time that it has ever been condemned, either in private or in public, to say nothing of its being brought up in a parliamentary discussion. It is quite proper to condemn the Government for buying too much cement or keeping it improperly stored; but I think it is hardly fair for an hon. gentleman occupying the position of the hon. member for York to stand up and condemn an article which he knows nothing about, and to condemn an honourable manufacturing concern which has been doing business with the people of Canada for forty years. So far as I can bear testimony to the worth and value of the Thorold cement, as manufactured by Mr. Brown for many years, and afterwards by Mr. John Battle, and now by his sons, I wish, as one having had something to do with it, both on public and on private works, to bear my testimony to the good article that they have furnished.

Mr. DAVIN. I would like to ask the Minister of Railways how soon after the tenders arrived in the office he determined to shorten the time?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am not able to state how long before the tenders were received, authority was obtained for shortening the time for completing all these works. The hon. gentleman must bear in mind that a decision so arrived at is a decision of Council. It was a conclusion arrived at generally in respect of all the works then pending, some of which were let and some of them were not let. Those which were let were dragging their slow length along, the time for their completion in almost all cases having passed. I am not able to say whethere it was just before or at the time these tenders were received that that conclusion was arrived at.

Mr. DAVIN. The reason I asked the hon. Minister the question was this. Obviously, the object of calling for tenders is to exclude the element of the ministerial will from the conditions of the contract, and after tenders are called for and are in, the very moment the Minister changes the conditions of the contract, that very moment he introduces an element that gives an opportunity for the very thing that the calling for tenders is intended to obviate. It opens up a possibility of that kind of bargaining which the people of Canada have desired to get rid of, for they have passed a law that tenders shall be called for. This Mr. Onderdonk is a man who has had some experience in the past in absorbing three or four or five big contracts and contractors; and seeing what took place, according to the account of the Minister himself, it is possible—I do not say that it occurred—that the moment Onderdonk found that he was the second lowest tenderer, being higher than the lowest by some $40,000, he would put himself in communication with somebody who would be able to introduce a new condition into the conditions of the contract, and would give an opportunity, to use a vulgar but expressive phrase, for a new deal.

I say that the criticism made by the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) has not been met by the Minister of Railways. The member for York dwelt on the undesirability of the course taken with reference to

introducing this new condition into the contract. He pointed out that it was capable of abuse, that it got rid of one of the safeguards of public morality which the system of tendering is intended to erect against corruption, and the Minister failed to overturn the position taken by my hon. friend. With regard to the first remark made by the hon. member for York, and which was commented on by the Minister of Railways, the member for York (Mr. Foster) very properly pointed out that surely it is a thing to make the people of this country pause to find that at the close of the session millions will be voted away with a light heart and the members of the great majority taking no interest whatever in the matter. I think if we could crowd those galleries with the people of Canada and could show them how, in the closing week of the session, millions are voted away rapidly, without any opportunity being given for fair discussion, they would come to the conclusion that a rule should be made to have the Estimates brought down early in the session and that the great work of the session should not be done perfunctorily but gone into with that degree of business scrutiny which the public interest demands. I do not propose to discuss this cement question becaue I do not profess to be capable of discussing it, but what is clear to the intelligence of every one is what was done with regard to changing the conditions of this contract.

My hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Gibson) made a curious defence of the Minister. He said that the late Government lengthened the time of the contract on the "Soo" Canal. But that was obviously a very innocent operation. If a contractor takes a contract and it is found that he cannot complete it in the time fixed to remit his forfeit and extend the time is clearly a thing that does not throw open the door to what is undesirable. I do not say that anything undesirable has occurred, I do not make any charge of corruption, but I say that one of the objects of passing a law requiring that tenders shall be had and that the lowest tenderer shall get the contract, is to prevent corruption in ministerial places, and if the law is not adhered to, Ministers need not be surprised if they are sharply criticised by the Opposition or if the people throughout the country should be dissatisfied.

Mr. GIBSON. I was quite sure the hon. gentleman did not understand what I said, because the remark I made was this, that the late Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Haggart) gave the contractors on the Soo Canal $100,000 in order to get the canal completed a year within the contract time, and then paid the $100,000 but allowed the time just the same.

Mr. DAVIN. I understood the hon. gentleman perfectly.

Mr. GIBSON. With regard to the cement, there has not been a gentleman who has spoken on that matter who has charged any collusion or that any price was paid above the regular market price. In order to give some idea of the extent to which Thorold cement is used on public works throughout the country, let me give the following figures:—On the new Welland Canal, there were used 250,000 barrels of the Thorold cement. On the Soo Canal, 17,540 barrels, and I believe some 5,000 barrels have been added since this statement was made. On the Soulanges Canal, 22,000 barrels. The Grand Trunk Railway has used 50,000 barrels. The St. Clair Tunnel, 10,000. My name is mentioned here as having used more than 50,000. Sarnia, 2,000 barrels. Petrolea, over 2,000. The Edison Electric Light Company of Peterborough, 2,000 barrels. The Soo Pulp and Paper Company, 200 barrels. The Dominion Government have used in the concrete pier at Port Dalhousie 4,000 barrels, and the Victoria Power Company of Dunnville, some 600 barrels. This shows that the Thorold cement has certainly given satisfaction throughout the country.

Mr. HAGGART. The matter of the contract has been thoroughly threshed out, and I have already given my views upon it. There has been no new light thrown upon the cement question by the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson). The Minister admits that his chief engineer recommended him not to use that kind of cement for lock or weir work. The gentleman who has charge of the Soulanges Canal and who was for 25 years, or nearly that, on the Welland Canal, and who knows the quality of Thorold or Battle cement as well as any other man in Canada, refused to use it on the Soulanges Canal or to certify that it was fit for the work. The Minister says he went to the office of Mr. Monro, for it was there tests were made, and he found that the tests were up to the standard. Why then did he not get the engineer to certify to that effect? He states that he brought a briquet of the cement up and had it tested in the Public Works Department. How could he get a test of it there? He is naturally not aware of the technical manner in which tests are made. One of the principal tests with reference to cement is a test for expansion. So delicate is the test in reference to that, that they put the cement in a small, thin glass phial, and if the cement expands in the slightest, although it may have all the textile and pressure qualities of the best English cement, it is rejected as entirely unfit for use. That test could not have been made on the briquet which the hon. gentleman brought up for the Public Works Department. I have never heard a word but that Mr. Battle's cement—what is known as native cement or water lime—is the equal of any-

thing of its kind in Canada. There is no objection to it on the ground. The objection to it is that water lime or native cement is not the equal of Portland cement, and could not be used in works requiring first-class quality of construction. Every one throughout the country knows that cement is being used for sidewalks and for roads in every part of Canada. Has any hon. gentleman ever known water lime or native cement to be used for that purpose? Experiment was made in the use of this material on the Sault Ste. Marie Canal. What was the result? It had all the textile qualities, it stood the breaking and crushing tests, but it was a failure. Why, look at the testimony of facts with regard to the manufacturers of that article throughout Canada. We have as good water lime or native cement as is produced in Canada made right here in Hull. But the manufacturers found they could not sell it any longer, and they have gone into the manufacture of Portland cement. Mr. Rathbun was engaged in the manufacture of native cement, and we used a good deal of it on the St. Lawrence Canals. But it was condemned, and he has gone into the manufacture of Portland cement. And the same is true of the manufacturers in Owen Sound.

But the greatest fact is that the Minister could not get the certificate of the engineer to pay the money for the cement. He should either have rejected the cement or, if he thought the engineer in charge was wrong, he should have sent a person who was capable of judging or superintending the work and got a certificate from him. He was obliged to get the chief engineer to send in a certificate on the report of an officer of the Public Works Department, and then the money was paid. This kind of cement was rejected by the engineer in charge, though the engineer at the head of the department said that it was fit for other work than locks or weirs. I ask the hon, Minister if any was used in construction of the locks?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My deputy informs me that there was not.

Mr. HAGGART. I may be mistaken, but the information I had with reference to the matter is that it was used for concrete for the bottom of the locks. This material was rejected by the engineer on the works, Mr. Monro, who, if any man in Canada does, should know the value of native cement, having used it for twenty-five years. He was superintendent of construction of the Welland Canal, where it was used again and again. He said it is entirely useless, as he told me himself, for first-class work in building canals. Against his advice it was sent to the works, and without the report of an engineer upon which works as to whether it was found to be up to the quality, even as native cement, the payment was made. And we have the statement of the Minister of Railways and Canals that, through a contractor who was not prepared to go on with his work as quickly and as efficiently as he ought, the cement is a direct loss to the country.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood in the early part of this discussion, that certain tests were made of the cement, and I would like to ask how frequently these tests were made?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My information, as received from the Deputy Minister, is that the usual custom in the past is that the engineer on the works does not certify to the tests having been made of the cement, but he certifies to the delivery of the cement, and, I take it that the presumption is that the cement is of proper quality or it would be certified otherwise. Now, my deputy tells me, notwithstanding all that the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Haggart) has said, that there was not a test of one pound of cement used on the Sault Ste. Marie Canal, that, in fact, they had not the apparatus for making the test.

Mr. GIBSON. They removed the engineer so that they could do as they liked.

Mr. SPROULE. My distinct recollection of the evidence brought out before the Public Accounts Committee is that tests were made several times, and the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson) objected, according to my recollection, that the tests were not made every second or third day. He contended that while you might use a barrel or two that would be all right, you might then strike a barrel that contained bad cement. For this reason, frequent tests were necessary. I think I am right in saying that.

Mr. GIBSON. I am sure the hon. member (Mr. Sproule) does not wish to misrepresent me before the House. The position I took in regard to the matter was that they had allowed Thorold cement to be used while they were paying for Portland cement, which the specifications called for.

Mr. SPROULE. I think that the hon. gentleman objected on the ground that 60,000 barrels, if I remember well, of Thorold cement was put in. It was claimed that for certain work it was as good as the other, but they paid for Portland cement. His other contention was that the cement must be tested periodically at short intervals or it could not be known if it was up to the standard. If this were so on the Sault Canal, it must be so in this case. If any test was made and the cement found satisfactory, why was it that Mr. Munro condemned it afterwards? And if he condemned it, was it because it had hardened or because he had tested it and found that it was not up to the strength?

I understood the Minister to say that it stood the test of 60 pounds to the inch. I think that used on the Sault Ste. Marie Canal stood a test of 60 or 72 pounds, and that was considered to be a low average. In the case of the Sault Ste. Marie Canal, while it was shown that the Thorold cement might be suitable for backing up and concrete work, the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson) contended it was not suitable for face work for which Portland cement was required. This cement may have been good enough when it was laid down, but on account of its being laid down in sacks instead of barrels, it was exposed to the action of the air, and suffered deterioration, and therefore this $20,000 is lost to the country for want of proper care on the part of the Government. That might happen, and still the Government might be excusable because the work was not done in the time they anticipated. But they should have instructed their officers, in the event of the work being delayed, and in view of the risk of the cement deteriorating, to take precautions to preserve the cement in such a state as that it should be fit for use. The engineer must have known that the cement does not keep as well in sacks as in barrels. Now, was it understood by the Government that the cement was intended to be used shortly after its delivery ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, we expected to use it before the close of the season's work. The statement that there was $20,000 worth gone to waste, is away beyond the mark, because a large quantity of it was used in the work, some 4,000 or 5,000 barrels were used. We have got 8,000 barrels on hand now, which we have reason to believe is in good condition, and we are having it tested. If we lost the whole amount that was in bags, the loss would not exceed $8,000. It would probably be $6,000 or $7,000.

Mr. SPROULE. I did not wish to do the Minister an injustice. I was basing my remarks upon the fact that the engineer had declared the cement to be unsuitable, and that $20,000 was the amount paid for it.

Mr. McMULLEN. I presume the Government fully expected that the contractor would proceed with the work, and if he had done so, probably the cement would not have been lost. But, after accepting the cement in bags with the hope that it would be used if kept over winter in that condition, certainly it would be lost, the engineer in charge was to blame for not reporting at once to the department the condition of that cement. I do not know whether the engineer reported that fact to the department or not, but if he did not report that the cement was in danger of deterioration by being left in bags instead of in barrels, so that precautionary steps could be taken, I think the engineer is decidedly in fault, and that he deserves to be dismissed.

Mr. BERGERON. It is unfortunate that when the Government are found in fault, hon. gentlemen should attempt to cast the blame upon their officials. I heard the testimony of the chief engineer in the Public Accounts Committee, and I heard him say there were 20,000 barrels of cement deposited upon the Soulanges Canal, which was not good. His certificate was never asked for ; on the contrary, the money was paid without his certificate being obtained. The cement that was deposited there was not good and it is there still. There were $20,000 worth of cement paid for which should not have been paid for without his certificate.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I will state to my hon. friend that such a course of procedure as he indicates has never been taken.

Mr. BERGERON. That is the statement, under oath, the other day, of Mr. Monro, the chief engineer. Now, I want to ask my hon. friend, starting from the point that 20,000 barrels of cement had been left there that could not be used, was that cement replaced by some other cement that could be used, and was any more money paid for this new cement ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There was no replacing of the cement.

Mr. BERGERON. But the chief engineer says this cement was not used.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think the hon. gentleman must have misunderstood the evidence which Mr. Monro gave, because he could not say accurately that there were $20,000 worth of that cement received which was not used.

Mr. BERGERON. I want the hon. Minister to understand that I am not blaming him in what I say. I gathered the other day from the testimony of the chief engineer that $20,000 worth of cement had been deposited on the Soulanges Canal for the works of that canal, which he had not accepted, for which he had never given his certificate, which he did not look upon as good cement, but which was paid for, because we find the expenditure in the Auditor General's Report. Now, if that cement was not used, has it been replaced ?

Mr. McMULLEN. I rise to a point of order. My hon. friend, who is an old member of this House, knows perfectly well that it is unfair to quote evidence taken before the Public Accounts Committee before it is published and in the hands of the members.

Mr. BERGERON. It is here.

Mr. McMULLEN. I challenge the accuracy of the statement of my hon. friend, I do

not think he makes a wrong statement intentionally. Now, how are we to decide as to whether he is accurate ? We can only do it by the evidence taken before the Public Accounts Committee, and that is not yet printed nor in the hands of the members. It is unfair to quote evidence unless hon. members have the same evidence in their hands. I am not saying that the hon. gentleman did this intentionally, for I am sure he conscientiously believes the statement he made, but I have no recollection personally that such a statement was made.

Mr. BERGERON. The hon. gentleman is perfectly right that it is out of order to refer in the House to the proceedings of a committee until the report of the committee is before the House. But we are now in Committee of the Whole, and we are endeavouring to find out the truth, which is in the public interest. I recollect that Mr. Munro stated the other day before the committee that cement to the value of $20,000 was deposited on the banks of the Soulanges and was useless. I do not need the evidence to quote from, I remember the statement made. Mr. Munro may have been mistaken. I should like now to know if any other cement has been bought, and from whom ?

Mr. SPROULE. As the point of order has been raised by the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), I may say that the report was laid on the Table. And so the hon. member for Beauharnois had a right to refer to it and quote from it.

Mr. McMULLEN. If the report was on the Table, the hon. member could use it and quote from it ; but it has passed from the Clerk's hands and is now in the hands of the printer. If the hon. gentleman had quoted from it when it was on the Table, other members would have had an opportunity of quoting from it.

Mr. SPROULE. It is in the possession of the House, and an hon. member can quote from it. I ask the ruling of the Chair on the point.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have no fault to find with the hon. member's quotation ; he is giving his recollection of what occurred and is no doubt honestly doing so. If it should turn out that his memory is at fault, it can be easily corrected, and we can get at the facts. I take it that the hon. gentleman has the impression that Mr. Munro stated at that inquiry that there were $20,000 worth of cement delivered on the work which was not used and is no good. My information is that if Mr. Munro made that statement it was not accurate, and when his attention is called to it no doubt he will make it right, because I am sure he would not wish to make any misstatement. I believe from what the chief engineer now tells me that 4,000 barrels and upwards of the cement were used on the work, that there are 8,000 barrels of cement in barrels which has not been used and which has not undergone any change and is no doubt good. So the difference is between the quantity delivered and those 4,000 and 8,000 barrels. There is no question of replacing the cement.

Mr. BERGERON. Has other cement been bought since ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We are buying cement all the time. The quantity of the Thorold cement was only a small portion of the whole cement used in the work. Portland, German and Rathbun cement were also used.

Mr. BERGERON. I desire now to ask the Minister if there are any arbitrators at work on the canal. There was a commission of arbitrators appointed under the previous Government, and when hon. gentlemen opposite came to power they were dismissed and others appointed. Are the new arbitrators at work, or have they been dismissed lately ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We retired them or terminated their engagement. There are now no valuators employed on the Soulanges Canal.

Mr. BERGERON. Has their work been finished, or will new arbitrators be appointed.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There may possibly be some instances in which we shall require valuation of work done, but I think it has been practically closed.

Mr. BERGERON. Would the Minister state why the last commission was cancelled ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Because we felt their work was subtantially terminated, so that we could dispense with their services.

Mr. BERGERON. That was the only reason ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Cornwall Canal—Enlargement..... $150,000

Mr. HAGGART. How much will be required to finish this work?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. After the present vote, the expectation is that about $25,000 will be required to complete.

Farran's Point—Enlargement..... $325,000

Mr. HAGGART. What is the fall in the river which the canal is intended to overcome ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. About 3 feet 6 inches.

Mr. HAGGART. I believe there is not any necessity for constructing this work. The canal will be no use after 14 feet navigation has been secured, for there will be plenty of water in the river, which will be utilized by the vessels then going up and down. The present canal is large enough to meet the needs of transportation at the present time.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There may be a difference of opinion on the point. The decision of the department was made, and it has been necessary to proceed.

Mr. MONTAGUE. When does the hon. gentleman expect the work on the Onderdonk contract on the Soulanges to be completed ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. In the spring of 1899.

Mr. MONTAGUE. When does the Minister expect to complete the work on the whole canal ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. By the opening of navigation in 1899. I have always introduced this qualification, that while the canal might not be wholly completed, it will be sufficiently advanced for purposes of navigation.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Then the hon. gentleman states that he is perfectly confident that we may expect to have a uniform depth of 14 feet by the spring of 1899.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, I am so advised.

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). What is the length of those large locks in the Cornwall and Soulanges canals ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. All the locks, except two, are of the uniform length of 270 feet between the gates.

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). They have to lock in the other places going east and west and they only lock here going one way. Why is it necessary to go to this extra expense of $200,000 for each lock, when they only lock there going one way ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I was advised that they could get up there with a whole tow, whereas as to the others they could only get up with half a tow.

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). This would cause an additional expenditure of $400,000, which at 3 per cent would amount to $12,000 a year. It would appear to most anybody that it is absolutely unnecessary to go to the expense of putting in there two large locks.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I felt extremely reluctant myself to authorize the construction of these additional locks, but Mr. Rubidge urged very strong reasons in their favour. The chief engineer concurred in Mr. Rubidge's opinion, but I still felt reluctant, and I took the responsibility of asking Mr. Shanly to give me his best judgment upon it before I authorized the construction of this lock. Mr. Shanly's opinion was entirely in harmony with that of Mr. Rubidge and the chief engineer.

Mr. HAGGART. I enter my protest against the building of any such lock as that. If our canals are ever to be utilized for practical purposes we must adopt the American system of each barge having its own propelling power, and doing away with tows of barges altogether. The locks at present in use on the St. Lawrence are plenty large enough for the barge traffic. The canals were enlarged not for barges but for utilizing these steamboats which have become quite common on the upper lakes. The idea of a boat with consorts is being done away with altogether. If you are going to divert the trade to the St. Lawrence you must do away with the system of barges, and I tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) that in my opinion there was no necessity at all for the building of these two large locks. They are not utilized by barges going down, and if you want to use your canals in the most economical manner you must have a propelling power of at least ten knots an hour, for if I remember rightly the strength of the current at these two particular points is in the neighbourhood of four or five knots.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am bound to say that the weight of opinion is against the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) on that question. We took occasion to have Captain McDougall come down here before we decided with regard to the vigorous prosecution of this work. Captain McDougall is admittedly a man of very large experience, engaged in transportation on the lakes all his life, and he expressed an opinion decidedly the reverse of that of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart). From what I have learned with regard to Captain McDougall it would be difficult to find any person who has had a larger experience and who is able to form a more competent judgment on this question.

Mr. HAGGART. I have no doubt that the Minister will get every barge owner from Kingston to Montreal of the same opinion. They have the barges at present and it is in their interests to have that opinion, but these barges are going out of use. You are not deepening your canals to 14 feet and lengthening your locks to accommodate barges, but to accommodate a larger class of vessels which will be entirely used on these canals in a few years.

North Channel—Straightening and deepening..... $250,000

Mr. HAGGART. This is another work which I must enter my protest against. Immediately above the Galops Canal in the American channel there is a width of nearly two miles and an ample depth; and for the purpose of getting a channel through our own territory it is proposed to expend about $400,000. Under the Treaty of Washington we have as much right to navigate that water as the Americans have, and there is no need of the expenditure of one dollar for the deepening of the north channel. I know that this is one of the pet ideas of Mr. Rubidge; but there is no difficulty in going to the head of the Galops Canal through the American channel, and this expenditure is a pure waste.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The channel which the hon. gentleman speaks of is a very circuitous channel, involving a bend of considerable length. The information I have received is that it would cost more to clean out that channel and make it fit for navigation than it would to change the north channel as we propose. That is the information furnished to me by men who are supposed to be competent to form a judgment on the question.

Mr. HAGGART. The American channel is now used by every boat that goes down. The north channel is used by only one boat of very light draft. My information is that all that is necessary is to blast off a little point on an island to go direct to the Galops Canal. If the charts of the channel are correct, there is more than fourteen feet of navigation from the head of the Galops Canal through the American channel.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The transportation men are unanimously crying out in favour of the deepening of the north channel, and the information of the department is that in the channel the hon. gentleman speaks of there is not more than eight or nine feet of navigation.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman can easily verify it. An accurate survey of the channel has been made by the coast surveyors of the United States. I venture to say that he will find that there is over ten feet of water from the head of the Galops Canal.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Has the Minister examined the survey of which my hon. friend speaks?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I went over the surveys with my deputy before this work was authorized, and I was satisfied, from the information furnished to me, that we had to do either one thing or the other.

Mr. HAGGART.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Does the hon. gentleman remember the depth of water mentioned in the survey?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not, but I am informed that eight or nine feet was the general depth; and, as I am reminded by my deputy, the superintending engineer, Mr. Rubidge, who went into the question, submitted an estimate of the probable cost of deepening the channel sufficiently around the bend to afford navigation.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Is the hon. gentleman positive as to the eight or nine feet of depth?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am speaking, not from memory, but from statements now made to me by my deputy.

Mr. HAGGART. There were two plans submitted to me. One was for the deepening of the north channel, and the other was to blast a point off a small island. But at present all the vessels go down that way, and it is not necessary to deepen the channel at all. This surely must be a mistake. The Galops channel was deepened to the depth which the canal has at present. That was intended to be used by vessels going down the river without going into the canal at all. Surely you would not have deepened the Galops channel if the entrance to it was not deep enough.

Mr. McLENNAN (Glengarry). I would like to call the Minister's attention to the fact that he has made no attempt to justify the expenditure of $400,000 on the 800 feet lock I spoke of, other than that the engineer reported in favour of it, and he accepted the report of the engineer. Here is another expenditure of some $300,000 or $400,000 for deepening this channel, and he has the same justification for it. That official appears to be a very expensive official. I think the Minister should have a better explanation for the expenditure of so much money when he comes and asks this House to vote the money. The late Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Haggart) is well acquainted with that section of the country, and when he says that it is not necessary to incur that expenditure, I feel satisfied that he knows what he is talking about. I got up to say that if the Minister has no other justification for this work than to say that his official recommended it, he may be a very expensive official, and I think it is time the matter should be looked into.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am very sorry the hon. gentleman does not think my explanations are very satisfactory. I am sorry he says that I offered no explanation why this work was proposed. Not only was it the advice and opinion of Mr. Rubidge, whom I found in

the department and who was the engineer under the ex-Minister of Railways, and has had a very lengthened experience—probably a larger experience with reference to the St. Lawrence waters than almost any other man in the country—but it was the advice of the chief engineer as well, and I went outside these and got the opinion of a gentleman whose name has been mentioned here today in the highest terms, Mr. Shanly, and he concurred in the opinion of these two officers of the department. That, I think, ought to be a fairly satisfactory explanation why this work was taken up, and I am sorry it does not satisfy my hon. friend.

Mr. HAGGART. As to the engineer in charge I have nothing to say. He is a very efficient and trustworthy officer. He may be extravagant, as my hon. friend from Glengarry (Mr. McLennan) says, but I have every reliance in his judgment and he has been a long time on the work. I am sure that he believes thoroughly that this is the best course, but he is a thorough Briton and looks upon the question from a national point of view. He believes in having the channel in our own waters. It is useless to point out to him that we have the right of navigation of the St. Lawrence as well as the Americans; he has set his heart upon that deepening. I have been over the ground several times and examined the charts and came to the conclusion that no such expenditure at all was required to make the canal efficient. I would like to have the report of Mr. Shanly approving of this particular work.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I did not say that we had any report from Mr. Shanly with respect to the north channel.

Mr. HAGGART. I understood that Mr. Shanly concurred in the opinion of the engineer as regards this particular work.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, on that question I did not have any opinion from Mr. Shanly at all.

Mr. MONTAGUE. There seems to be a direct point of dispute between the late and the present Minister as to the depth of the channel. Will the hon. gentleman look up the figures?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I shall do so, but do not wish to be understood as putting my recollection in opposition to what has been said by the ex-Minister. I did not say that I recollected that 8 or 9 feet was the depth, but I am reminded by the Deputy Minister that that was the general depth at the end of the channel.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. gentleman will admit that it will make a material difference if he finds there is fourteen feet of a natural channel.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am quite sure that there is not, but not quite clear as to the 8 or 9 feet.

Mr. HAGGART. Was not the Galops channel, that is the one outside the canal, down the rapids, intended for a navigation of 14 feet?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. HAGGART. It runs parallel to the canal going down there. There is not 50 yards divergence going down the Galops rapids and into the locks. If there is 14 feet depth to the channel, there cannot be but a very short distance to go from it into the canal?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. How does that effect this question?

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman says there is only 8 or 9 feet navigation.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I say that the channel in the bend which we shortened, by what we agree is the north channel, contains water to about that depth. I am not speaking of the Galops channel.

Mr. HAGGART. The Minister must understand that in order to get into the Galops rapids, you come down the American channel, and have 14 feet navigation all the way to the Galops rapids. The divergence is not 50 yards at the most from there into the entrance of the Galops Canal, and the Minister says that in order to get from the entrance of the Galops Canal into the American channel, there is only a depth of 8 or 9 feet. If there is any low water of that kind, it would be only over a distance of 50 feet, provided the channel is deep enough to take the boat into the entrance of the rapids, which undoubtedly it is.

Galops Channel—Straightening and deepening $50,000

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This is for removing rocks.

River reaches..... $50,000

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This is the St. Regis section, and it is for clearing out the boulders and dredging.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Is it done by contract?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Lake St. Francis—Removal of boulders. $50,000

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This has been let by tender.

Trent Canal—Construction..... $600,000

Mr. OSLER. Apparently this Government has money to burn. I know that I am speak

ing against the idea of many of our friends, but the spending of the country's money on building a six-foot ditch connecting these lakes is perfectly inexcusable. I have a steam launch on Lake Simcoe, and I believe I am almost the only one who will use this canal connecting with Lake Simcoe. It is absolutely throwing away the money of the country, and because money has been spent in the past on this work is no reason we should spend more on it now. I protest against the expending of money on such an absolutely useless piece of public work. This canal will never be of any use. It will never pay the wages of a lock keeper. I am very sorry indeed to see that a better policy has not been adopted in connection with this canal by the present Government.

Mr. BENNETT. As the hon. gentleman who last spoke (Mr. Osler) comes from the city of Toronto, I almost expected a wail to go up from him, because, at present it must be admitted if credence is given to statements in the public press that the city of Toronto is finding itself cut off, on all sides, by other towns and cities which are securing the trade which once the city of Toronto thought was its own for all time to come. If the proposal were made to make a canal from the city of Toronto to Lake Simcoe, my hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Osler)——

Mr. OSLER. Would vote against it straight.

Mr. BENNETT. But, in deference to the wishes of his electors he would rather have to appland it, though his own conscience was against it. How he would compromise with his conscience I would not like to say.

Mr. OSLER. I would not compromise ; I would vote against the proposal.

Mr. BENNETT. However, I do not propose to speak at any length on the merits of the Trent Valley Canal. The proposal has been so long before the public, and so much work has been done on the canal, that it has become a matter of necessity for the interior navigation of the province that the work should be completed. And, while it is quite true, that the depth will be only 6 feet it must be borne in mind that the Erie Canal, with no greater depth, carried millions and millions of bushels of grain to New York. I hope that when this canal is constructed my hon. friend from West Toronto will go over the route. He will see that, instead of being a series of locks and canals it is a series of locks connecting lakes and rivers. I need not say much, because the Minister of Railways and Canals himself most commendably, went over the route a couple of years ago. The result of his observations was to convince him that the enterprise was a commendable one. I would like to ask for some details of how this $600,000 is to be expended ?

Mr. OSLER.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. About half of it will be required for works that are already under contract, in the Peterborough and Lakefield districts. The other $300,000 we propose to expend in constructing a hydraulic lift instead of building a number of locks, thus following the Belgian pattern. We think it would be more economical in construction and we are sure it will be more economical in its working.

Mr. BENNETT. Has the contract been given for the construction of the lift lock.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No ; the time for receiving tenders expired to-day, and I have not seen the tenders.

Mr. HUGHES. I was surprised when the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler) got up and made an exhibition of himself in regard to the Trent Canal. This is not the first time that in this House and out of it that gentleman has made an exhibition of himself in regard to matters that do not centre in the city of Toronto. It is within the memory of the whole of us that that hon. gentleman occupied a prominent position in the city of Toronto, when not only the Board of Trade but the City Council quarrelled with the Canadian Pacific Railway. Thirty thousand people who would otherwise have been added to the population of the city of Toronto were driven to the city of Montreal, by the blundering stupidity and incapacity of the public bodies of the city of Toronto. I will give you another instance. When the Ottawa, Arnprior and Parry Sound Railway Company were seeking a bonus from the Dominion Government, these gentlemen from Toronto put on their silk hats and frock coats, and came here to assist in getting the bonus for that road. What for ? To take away trade from the city of Toronto ? Every move they have made in that connection for years has been in the wrong direction. If they pursue this policy for many years longer, if the sensible people of the city do not step in and interfere, I am very much afraid that the grand old city of Toronto, the Queen City of the west, under the management we have seen exhibited in the Board of Trade and in the City Council, will degenerate into a country town, if not into a country village. The hon. gentleman says the canal will be of no use. How does he know ? Has he ever read the report of the commission upon it ? Has he ever investigated anything in relation to the canals in this country and other canals ? Has he ever been down the Erie Canal, or ever considered that that waterway which, though only four feet and a half in depth, as compared with the Trent at 6 feet, and not half the width of this, has greatly helped to make the city of New York, has built up the city of Albany, and the city of Buffalo, and has helped to re-

duce the city of Toronto to where it stands at this moment? That canal would not be parted with for millions every year by the farmers of New York. But we do not pay much attention to what such gentlemen say. The work is going on; and, I am satisfied when completed this canal will be one of the grandest institutions, not only for the Dominion of Canada, but even for the very city that this hon. gentlemen (so far as this matter is concerned at all events) misrepresents. I am delighted to see him solicitous about the money of the people of this country. But the hon. gentleman did not speak of the cost to the people, nor did the member for Toronto rise in his place in the House to protest when $3,200,000 was given in bonuses to roads in the North-west in which the hon. gentleman is interested. Upon that subsidy at the present time, the taxpayers of this country are paying no less than $160,000 a year, for roads owned by him or by organizations with which he is connected. And all what for? For the benefit of the country? We did not oppose it. But these roads are not doing one-tenth part of the good to the Dominion as this canal will do when it is completed. However, I did not rise here to defend the Trent Valley Canal. There was a commission appointed years ago to investigate that matter. I would like the hon. member for West Toronto to read that report. Much as we may respect and admire him in some things, he must excuse us if we do not get down upon our knees and bow at his dictum, when he says that this canal will not pay the salary of a lock-keeper. We do not want it to pay the salary of a lock-keeper. What we want it to do is to bring trade Why, there was not a man attempted to gainsay what was stated by the hon. member for Pontiac (Mr. Poupore) this afternoon that the city of Toronto as well as other districts should speak favourably of the Mattawa Canal.

I stand here now to say that my vote and my voice shall go heartily in support of a Mattawa canal, not because I am willing to forego the construction of the Trent Canal, but because I believe that it will cause a city to arise at the entrance to the French River which will benefit my county, the same as if you promote the city of Montreal to have two or three million inhabitants, it is going to benefit the county from which I come. If the Ottawa valley is prosperous, it will have a tendency to make the Trent valley prosperous. We see new towns springing up on the shores of the Georgian Bay, and we see the city of Ottawa prospering. Why? Because Mr. Booth has had the pluck and the energy to extend his road down to Parry Sound, thus opening up that country, and we heard to-day that 50 million bushels of grain are going to come by that route to the city of Montreal. We who live along the line of the Midland Railway between the town of Midland and the Bay of Quinte, see every siding up and down that railway filled with Grand Trunk Railway freight cars laden with grain from Chicago, because there are not enough elevators, and they cannot get vessels in Montreal to take it across the ocean; so the cars are side-tracked up and down the country. At present American shippers are beginning to realize the great benefit of that route. I am satisfied that when the Mattawa canal is constructed, and when the Trent Canal is constructed, as it will be in a few years, the shippers of the United States will send their freight over that very same route, and it will prove for all time to come a great service as a through route as well as a local route. Let me give you one example. In the town of Peterborough there are large bridge works that made a tender for the Sault Ste. Marie bridge some years ago. They were cut out of that tender simply on account of the freight. The freight from the town of Peterborough to Sault Ste. Marie was several thousand dollars higher, for the same quantity of iron, than it was from Belgium to Sault Ste. Marie. The through rate from Belgium to Sault Ste. Marie was lower than the local rate from the town of Peterborough Had we had our waterway at that time, the people of our district would have had an opportunity of filling that tender. There are thousands of people living along the line of that canal, just as many as there are in the city of Toronto, and people who contribute as much to the welfare of this country. But let me say that I am not charging the people of Toronto with being actuated by the narrow views that appear to actuate certain gentlemen who claim to represent the city of Toronto. The people of Toronto themselves are broad-minded and patriotic, they are willing to see other parts of the country get their fair share of public advantages, people who see that the upbuilding of Midland, Lindsay, Orillia and Peterborough means the upbuilding of the city of Toronto. I know that the merchants of Toronto desire to see the prosperity of those towns, and they are not actuated by any of those narrow cheese-paring policies which we unfortunately see in various persons. Now, the freight rates on grain from the district are greater than they are from the west. The Iowa farmer gets his grain landed in New York and in Liverpool cheaper than the farmer of Simcoe or Victoria counties. Why? Because he has the waterway to the city of New York by way of Buffalo and the Erie Canal. So that the farmers of Simcoe and Victoria counties, and those other Midland counties to-day, are labouring under disabilities as compared with the farmers of Illinois and Iowa, simply owing to the fact that they have no water communication with the front. However, that is coming, we are not at all afraid of that. But there is one thing that I regret to see. The Minister, having spent $300,000 last

year, is only asking for an additional $300,000 this year. When the Minister of Railways and Canals took office he found, I think, tenders calling for the construction of a section between Kirkfield and Lake Simcoe. It is not a difficult section to construct, and as soon as it is open for navigation, there will be uninterrupted communication through Victoria and Peterborough counties down to Campbellford, within a few miles of the Bay of Quinte. In other words, these broad central water stretches will all be connected, and there will remain only the two ends to open down into the main waterways. I would respectfully impress upon the Minister the necessity of taking this into consideration, and calling for tenders for that section as early as possible. My hon. friend the Postmaster General knows the great advantages that will be conferred upon the community by the completion of that section. No doubt the Minister has been over the route and knows it well, and I hope he will not allow the persistent calls for money from other parties, to cause him to neglect this work and allow it to hang fire as it was unfortunately neglected by my own friends when they were in office until the late Minister (Hon. Mr. Haggart) took it up with much vigour. I hope the Minister of Railways and Canals will push this work to a speedy completion, and if he does, he will never have cause to regret it, for a large portion of the country will be benefited. I do not see any allowance in the estimate for the drowned lands along the Cameron Lake and other lakes in Victoria County.

Mr. BENNETT. How much will it cost to finish the Lakefield section? Will that be built this fall?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The expectation is that it will be completed during the coming fiscal year. We estimate it will take about $300,000.

Mr. HAGGART. In speaking of that work, I understood the hon. gentleman to say that tenders were being asked for the construction of a lift lock in this particular section, on plans of the character of something he saw in Belgium.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There are three or four of those lift locks in actual opration in Belgium, one a short distance out of Brussels, which I saw myself.

Mr. HAGGART. Has the Minister got plans, specifications and details of these locks, so that parties tendering will know exactly what they are going to build?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. BRITTON. Will the Onderdonk contract absorb the whole amount asked for?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No.

Mr. HUGHES.

Mr. BRITTON. Assuming the whole amount, $600.000, to have been expended, how much more will be required to complete the canal in accordance with the views of the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Hughes).

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If he means the cut we are now making through to the lake, the canal could be finished for about $1,000,000 in addition to what we are now asking.

Mr. BRITTON. So $1,600,000 will yet be required to be spent. I do not value this canal so highly as do some hon. gentlemen who have spoken. It would pay a great deal better to buy out all the wheat that the county of Victoria, through which the canal passes, produces than proceed with the canal to help them to get it to market at a cheaper rate than at present. I do not under-value work of this kind. Any work of this kind must to some extent benefit the country, but a work commenced so long ago as this was, and with the spasmodic efforts made to finish it at a large expense of public money is very disappointing to the people. It was commenced before confederation, and there has now been expended on it no less than $2,301,539, according to the last report of the Minister of Railways and Canals. We have now as the product of that expenditure only 21,145 tons of tonnage passing through the canal during last year, while the total amount collected was only $823,62. I am free to admit that the amount of toll collected on an unfinished work is not a fair estimate of the value the work will possess when fully completed, and yet it affords some indication of the probable traffic of the canal when completed. The cost during the year for repairs was $22,343, a very great many times the amount of the tolls collected. Perhaps we cannot stop when a large amount has been expended without having more expended in order to get the benefit of the expenditure already made; yet I cannot let the item pass without at any rate saying that this work is not a work so much in the interest of the country that we need expend on it so large an amount when the money is so much more required in other places.

Mr. HUGHES. I am very much pleased to see the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Britton) on his feet. I have a distinct recollection of visiting that town some four years ago and speaking to some forwarders and suggesting they should have elevators. Nothing of the kind, they said, Kingston did not need them and would not have them. To-day Kingston has gone crazy over elevators and has no less than three. This merely indicates that the views of these gentlemen may change. Of course, there is a little bit of selfishness in Kingston. We know that the Montreal

Transportation Company makes Kingston one of its termini, and there transhipps its grain into barges to go down the river. This brings grist to the Kingston mill. If the hon. gentleman will look beyond the end of his face, he can very readily see that the Trent Canal would benefit Kingston, and the Toronto people might see that they would be benefited by carrying a branch to Lake Simcoe. Kingston need have no fear that this canal will injure that city. They have their graving docks, and every vessel sailing the lakes has to be repaired there.

Mr. BENNETT. What was their income from the graving dock last year?

Mr. HUGHES. The Government are trying to sell it. Not a barge can pass Kingston without benefiting that city. Let the hon. gentleman remember that only three years have elapsed since he and all Kingston were condemning elevators, saying that a floating elevator would do, and yet they are all elevator crazy to-day and have now three in that city, and therefore I hope Kingston and its worthy member will in another year or two ardently support the Trent Canal.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I could ask the hon. member for Kingston to apply the same calculation he made in regard to the Trent Canal to the Rideau Canal.

Mr. ROGERS. I am very glad some other hon. members agree with my views as regards this canal, especially as the member for West Toronto and lawyers and professional men do not as a rule take my view. There is a feeling through the country against this work, and that feeling is expressed by many members privately. It is not a feasible scheme and cannot be consummated so as to produce any benefit compared with the outlay. We all know its history, and that we were led to believe that expenditure on it would cease after the contracts let by the late Government had been finished. Its total cost would be over four million dollars to complete. When the delegation was here last year, I asked one of the delegates what were the natural waterways and the depth of the entrances. He replied that the depth was about three feet and it was proposed to increase the depth to seven feet; whereupon I asked him what was intended to be done with the drowned lands. The hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Hughes) has said that already claims are coming in for damaged land and he expected that these claims would be pretty heavy. There is a great deal of that country in flats and valleys composed of the best of land, and that would be drowned by this water being raised seven feet. We know the history of the Rideau and the Tay Canals as regards damages for drowned lands. We know that the Rideau Canal has been built about 60 years and we are not done paying for damaged lands yet. Last year this Government had to pay a sum awarded by the late Government seven years ago, to different parties who had their lands injured. In my own constituency to-day they are getting up petitions asking for compensation for drowned lands, and it is their right that they should get this compensation. I was in hopes that some of the damages on this canal were paid, but it appears that it is only now commencing. If in this canal that is now to be constructed we have to pay for damaged lands for sixty years hence, the original cost of building the canal will only be a small matter as compared with the immense sums spent for damages. The day is past for these little side show canals of six feet of water, and I am sure that many of the members who are advocating the Trent Canal know very well that it is a foolish scheme. We do not expect a canal to pay a surplus revenue into the treasury of the country, but we think it ought to pay for its working expenses. We know that the Rideau Canal is a regular sink hole for public money, and that its maintenance and operation cost us more than $50,000 a year above its earnings. Surely we do not want to perpetuate that state of things. One of the hon. members of this House who represents a constituency along that Trent Canal said to me recently: I have to support it, but I know it is a farce.

An hon. MEMBER. Name.

Mr. ROGERS. The hon. gentleman is, I believe, within hearing of my voice now. The great majority of members in private conversation express themselves that this expenditure is useless, but they are anxious to get a few votes in their counties and so they will vote for it. It is said that some people do not look beyond the tip of their nose, and many members of this House who are supporting this scheme do not look beyond the tip of their noses when they are voting this large sum of money. I do feel that the Government will not be supported when they go before the country if they continue voting large sums of money for this Trent Valley Canal. I am very glad that the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler) is opposing this scheme. This Government has been influenced in the past by what the Toronto Board of Trade has said, and I think they should be influenced now. Here is the resolution with reference to the Trent Valley Canal, passed by the Toronto Board of Trade on the 5th of April last:

(Special to The Journal.)

Toronto, April 5.—At the meeting of the council of the Board of Trade yesterday the report of the Transportation Committee on the Trent Valley Canal was that the expenditure thus far on this system of waterways, with a view of creating a thorough and efficient route between the Georgian Bay and Lake Ontario has been unwarranted and unnecessary.

They recommend that the council should strongly urge the Government not to grant any further sums of money for the carrying on of this work, the expenditure on which in the end can result in no practical benefit to the country. The council acted on the report and appointed the president to make representations to the Minister of Railways and Canals in accordance with the resolution.

In view of this expression of opinion from the great city of Toronto, and in view of the fact that the majority of the rural constituencies will vote against this canal when their representatives go before them, I do not see what ground the Government has for continuing to spend money on it. I believe the Government will feel it at the next election if they do, and I know in my county they will feel it. There is an enormous expenditure every year, and we know that the Estimates brought down this year are very heavy and we talk tariff for revenue, but if they go on spending money like this it will be protection with a vengeance, and I say the sooner they call a halt the better for themselves.

Mr. OSLER. I do not think that any of the four members from Toronto will suffer very much by the threats of the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Hughes), because I do not think there will ever be water enough in the Trent Valley Canal to drown the shortest member coming from that city.

Mr. SPROULE. This is a very large expenditure and we ought to have some explanation from the Minister with regard to the progress of the work, and what he proposes to do if this large amount is voted for the coming season.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have already stated that $300,000 of this amount would be required to pay the balance that would be earned by the contractor under the existing contract between Lake Wood and Peterborough, and the remaining $300,000 is the sum which we estimate will be required to cover the cost of the hydraulic lift.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood the Minister to say that it would require about $1,000,000 in addition to this, before the canal is available. What depth of water will he have in the canal then?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Six feet. The exact estimate of the amount that will be required to complete the canal to the lake is $900,000. We will have six feet of water after that is carried through. We have let no contract since I came into the department; we have simply been paying for the work done under the contract then existing.

Mr. HUGHES. I think it is six feet on the sills, but you have provision for eight feet.

Mr. ROGERS.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There is a clear foot, I take it, but we have six feet on the mitre.

Mr. SPROULE. This is to pay for the work under contract when the Minister came into power?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, with the exception of $300,000 to cover the hydraulic lift.

Mr. SPROULE. When will that hydraulic lift be put in?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. A year from the present spring is the earliest date, but it might be along in the fall.

Mr. SPROULE. Notwithstanding the probability of incurring the displeasure of the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Hughes), I may say there is a well-grounded impression in the west that this canal will not be as valuable as some people seem to expect after all this expenditure, and that the country will not get an ample return for the money. There is no doubt that all these highways of commerce are valuable, but the question arises whether the benefits will be commensurate with the cost. I have heard a great many comments about this canal in the west for several years past. I do not like to oppose it, because it might prove to be valuable, even with no more than six feet of water. Some hon. member suggested that after this expenditure of a million dollars was made, there would be enough water to take up that trunk which the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Rogers) would not take, if he could convert it into a boat. If the canal had only six feet of water, it would be of very little use, especially when we are having our canals deepened, and vessels of a greater draft of water are being constructed every year, because this would involve transhipment from one kind of vessel to another. If we are finding it necessary to deepen all our canals to fourteen feet, we are not likely to get much trade for a canal with only six feet of water.

Mr. COCHRANE. I am a little surprised at the range which the discussion has taken with regard to this canal. As for me, I am not looking for votes for it at all. To show the limited view of the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Rogers), with regard to the expenditure of money, I would like to ask him how much revenue the Kingston drydock has paid? It seems strange, too, that the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler) should object to any money being expended on this canal. I would like to ask him how much revenue has been received in return for the money spent on the harbour of Toronto? It seems to me hon. gentlemen ought to have broader views on a question of this kind. I dare say that fault is found with this expenditure in that

part of the country which the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) represents, because some people are so small that they cannot see the advantage of an expenditure of money unless it is right at their own doors. We know that this canal would serve a large section of country the produce of which cannot be got out because it costs so much to ship it by rail that it does not pay to export it. I do not agree with the hon. member for East Grey that a six-foot canal is of no use. We know that the great bulk of the grain from the western states is sent through the Erie Canal. I think this canal is going to be a great benefit to this country, and it does not follow that six feet of water is not sufficient. I would like to ask the hon. member for Frontenac how he expects to have a revenue from a canal of which only the centre is completed. The hon. member is very much alarmed at the expenditure of the Government. Of course, he is talking to the great party of patriots he represents in this House; but every time the expenditure of the Government comes up, he votes for it like a man. I suppose he will point to the eloquent speech he has made to-night as an evidence of how economical he is, though he has voted for every dollar the Government has proposed this session. This canal is not going to be of special benefit to my constituency, which borders on Lake Ontario; but if we are not going to benefit from it directly, we know that from every expenditure to develop the resources of this country, every constituency in the Dominion of Canada is benefited indirectly.

Mr. SPROULE. I want to say something in reply to the hon. member for East Northumberland (Mr. Cochrane), whose strictures are uncalled for. If the member for East Grey were in the habit of objecting to expenditures in different parts of the country when they are not made lavishly, he might have some reason for his contention to-night. The question I raised was whether the return would be commensurate with the expenditure. From the information we have, when that canal is completed, giving a depth of five or six feet of water, there will have been an outlay of about $3,250,000; and the great question for any member of this House to ask is, will the country receive a fair return for that large outlay? We are voting over half a million dollars for this work to-night. It has been going on, as one hon. member said, since confederation, that is over thirty years, and the expenditure must continue for several years longer before it can give us uninterrupted navigation. I say that is a fair question to ask, and it is not asked from any narrow-mindedness because the canal does not benefit my section of the country. That is a matter which does not affect my view of the question. If there were a proposal to cut a canal from the Georgian Bay to a point near Toronto I would support it very strongly, because if we could get such a canal, with a depth of fourteen or sixteen feet of water, it would be very valuable as a means of carrying the grain of Manitoba and the west at a much less rate than is possible at present. It may be that I am not as well informed as some hon. members with regard to what has been done on this work, but from the meagre information at my command, I have been very strongly inclined to the opinion of late years that the expenditure we have been making on it has not really been a very wise expenditure. I think we could expend the money in many other ways that would yield a much larger return and be of more benefit to the country at large.

Sault Ste. Marie Canal—Construction.. $45,000

Mr. SPROULE. What work is going on in the Sault Ste. Marie Canal now?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There is a large and unsightly pier at the entrance which I think the House is unanimously of the opinion ought to be removed at the earliest possible date. Then it was necesary to make some arrangement with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company looking to the construction of a new bridge across the canal. That, of course, can only be undertaken after we have made a satisfactory arrangement. The expectation is to replace the Canadian Pacific Railway bridge with a bridge of a larger span, which would cost $65,000.

Mr. SPROULE. Does the hon. Minister propose that the Government shall pay all the expense of removing that and building a larger span?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. It would seem only fair that the railway should bear a portion of the expense from it as well as the country.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This is the younger construction, and the principle which governs in these cases is if you are running a canal over or under or across a railway track and a bridge becomes necessary, you have to furnish the bridge If, on the other hand, you have a canal, and the railway company desires to lay a track across your canal, they have to pay for the bridge.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood, when the incorporation of that company was had that the land had been practically taken possession of for the canal, that was before the railway company built their bridge, and therefore the Government would be practically the first owners of the ground necessary for the canal, and when the right to build a bridge there was given, it was given subject to the approval of the Governor in Council, so that that bridge might not in

any way interfere with the navigation of the canal.

Mr. HUGHES. Has the hon. Minister taken any steps about removing the pier in that canal ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, we are taking that pier out of the canal. That is what we have been making desperate efforts to accomplish. I propose to have it out before the close of the fiscal year, if possible.

Lachine Canal—Enlargement..... $125,000

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This is for deepening it between Côte St. Paul and Lachine. We are getting a full depth of 16 feet there. This week will finish it.

Lachine Canal—Deepening River St. Pierre $15,000

Mr. HAGGART. This is the old vote for the deepening of the River St. Pierre, which I have contended, again and again, the Government have nothing whatever to do with. It has not interfered with the building of the Lachine Canal in the slightest. It is for deepening that portion of the St. Pierre River from the Lachine Canal to the St. Lawrence River. It was again and again urged upon the late Government, but whatever their iniquities were, they never committed such an iniquity as this. They refused it again and again.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This is a revote, and the balance required for this purpose. The hon. gentleman will recollect that sums were paid in times past for damages which resulted from the need of just such a work as this. Nobody can deny, who has seen what has been done and can form a judgment as to what will be accomplished, the fact that the completion of the work will prove very beneficial. The leakage from the canal has led to large claims for damages in the past, and these have been paid. Since, however, this work has been undertaken, sufficient is already established to show the existence of a grievance and the cause of these damages will be entirely removed.

Mr. HAGGART. This does not interfere at all with the leakage of the canal. That has been paid for over and over again. The canal has been ditched on each side to carry the water into this River St. Pierre. This is a river that runs under the Lachine Canal. We improved it and built a ditch at the enormous expense of $300.000 or $400,000 from the village of Lachine down to the tunnel that goes under the canal. This money we are voting now is for the purpose of deepening the river from the Lachine Canal to the River St. Lawrence. I cannot understand how it is possible at all that the building of the Lachine Canal should interfere or affect that river in the slightest between the Lachine Canal and the St. Lawrence. It may be a work of use to the municipality, but what the Government have to do with an expenditure of that kind I cannot understand.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. How would it be possible to carry away the water or leakage to the canal by other means than we now use ? Would not the deepening and straightening of the route of this river be the most natural and reasonable way for carrying off that leakage.

Mr. HAGGART. The leakage from the canal is but a trifle in comparison with the water that goes down the River St. Pierre. When the proposition came up before me, I brought down the late Sir John Abbott, who was Premier at the time, and showed it to him and he would not allow a cent to be expended for that purpose. There is not a single justification for it. It is a purely local work, and if needed, should be made by the municipality alone.

Grenville Canal—Enlargement..... .... $45,000

Mr. SPROULE. What kind of work is done here ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I understand from the engineer that the effect of the falling in of the sides has been to fill up the canal and the effect of clearing that out would be to deepen the water.

Mr. SPROULE. What depth of water will there be when this is cleaned out ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Nine feet.

Mr. SPROULE. Will this sum cover the whole work ? What is the estimated cost of completing the work ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The estimated cost of the work is $90,000. There has already been spent about $23,000, from the beginning of the fiscal year up to the first of last month.

Mr. HAGGART. Is this part of the old contract that Mr. Goodwin had, and is he the contractor for finishing the work ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. He was the contractor, but the work was taken off his hands and is now in the hands of other contractors.

Mr. MONTAGUE. When was the contract let ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. A little over a year ago.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The contractors were the lowest tenderers, I suppose ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, I have already furnished to the House information as to the tenders.

Intercolonial Railway Extension to Montreal—To pay rental to Grand Trunk Railway Company and Drummond County Railway Company, for railway from Chaudière to Montreal, to be operated as part of the Intercolonial Railway..... $210,000

Mr. FOSTER. I would suggest to the hon. gentleman that he should allow this matter to stand.

Chambly Canal—To build a swing bridge at Ste. Thérèse Island..... $2,000

Mr. HAGGART. Was there a bridge there before?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, a ferry. We propose to put in a steel swing.

Mr. HAGGART. And will $2,000 do it?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is estimated that it will do it.

Trent Canal—
To remove blasted rock above Hastings. $2,500
To construct one dump scow..... 700

Mr. HUGHES. I would ask the hon. Minister if there is to be a vote for clearing out the Lindsay River. I do not find anything there or in the Supplementary Estimates. In case the hon. Minister may not remember, I may remind him that there is a great deal of log towing on these waters in the Victoria district, a considerable portion of the logs being hardwood. If they are not well fastened, they drop out and sink, and there are a number of them in the bottom of the river. The steamers passing up and down, some of them large vessels carrying as high as 400 passengers, frequently strike these sunken logs. I worried the late Minister of Railways and Canals on this subject, until his hair turned gray partly on account of it——

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. With what success?

Mr. HUGHES. No success, though I think I did better than my hon. friend on the Trent Valley Canal. There are twenty or thirty steamers on these waters and they are constantly passing up and down.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There are a great many excursion parties.

Mr. HUGHES. Yes, every day.

Mr. COCHRANE. I would like to ask the hon. Minister how he proposes to do the work of removing the blasted rocks above Hastings? Will it be done by contract?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have not thought of that yet.

Mr. HUGHES. I would like to press for an answer with regard to the Lindsay River. This is not in North Victoria.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am afraid I must say to the hon. gentleman that no provision is made this year. It is late to take the matter up now. What does the hon. gentleman suppose would be the probable cost?

Mr. HUGHES. There is an estimate in the department, made two or three years ago, I believe, and, according to that estimate, as I understand, the work will cost about $5,000.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think that subject will have to be deferred, but I shall be glad to give it consideration during the year.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I take it, from the statement of the hon. Minister that these are the only Estimates for the year.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. These and the Estimates brought down last night.

Mr. MONTAGUE. And these Supplementary Estimates—are they finally final?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. So far as we know at present.

Cornwall Canal—To repair recess platforms and tail bays, locks Nos. 15 and 17 ..... $10,000

Mr. HAGGART. Is this work to be done by contract?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This is for repairs. No contract is let. I know of no reason at the moment why a contract should not be let; but I would not like to be held to that definitely.

Mr. HAGGART. We must have a promise that the Order in Council providing that works costing over $5,000 shall be done by contract shall be strictly adhered to.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I would not like to make a definite promise of that kind. This is for repair work, and it may turn out, though I do not say it will, that it would be very unwise to issue specifications and call for tenders. I should be disposed to ask for a contract if I can do so safely and properly.

Williamsburg Canals—
To provide a combined gate and stone lifter to be used on river reaches.... $5,000
To build one pair of lock gates for lock. 4,000

Mr. HAGGART. Is this done by the workmen on the canal?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My first expectation is that we will ask for tenders for both of these works.

Murray Canal—To provide a floating landing stage at collector's office..... $1,000

Mr. COCHRANE. I would like to ask the Minister if he is aware that the bridge tenderers on this canal who have built houses

for themselves on the canal, have been turned off and their houses are useless to them. All the officials on the Murray Canal, with one exception, have been dismissed, and I would like to know from the Minister why they have been dismissed. The Minister of Railways and Canals will recollect my speaking to him last session about the hardships in connection with dismissal of bridge tenders on that canal, and I think he told me then there would be no officials removed from that canal without his sanction. The hardship put upon these men is such that I do not think anything like it has taken place before in the history of Canada. When the late Government asked for recommendations and I recommended men for the position, I was given to understand that if these men built houses, the Government would allow them rent for the houses, the same as they did to men that had to rent houses. When these men were appointed, I never dreamed that any official would be removed. I recollect that county for the last 30 years. When the Mackenzie Government was in power that riding was represented alternately by Mr. Keeler and Mr. James L. Biggar. There has never been an officer dismissed in that riding, by either a Liberal or a Conservative Government. I supposed when these men were appointed and two of them built houses on the canal, that they would live there as long as they performed their duties; but to my utter surprise and disgust they were turned off without a moment's warning. I would draw the Minister's attention to the case of one man named Wesley Goderich. He built a house that cost $600 or $700, he improved two or three acres of the canal reserve, and fenced it in with wire fencing, and this man was taken out of his house, removed to the western bridge, and a new appointee was put on the bridge and put into his house. I can say to the Minister that no one who knows this man can say that he was an offensive partisan. I do not believe any body knows how he voted. He was a man in weak health, and I may say that all my recommendations on that canal were men for whom it was a charity to give them the appointments, because it put them in the way of earning their living when they were physically unable to earn it in the ordinary walks of life. This man has been turned out of his house; I never supposed that a Government calling itself a Reform Government would perpetrate such an iniquitous job. I do not blame the Minister, because I think he told me he was not cognizant of the fact. This man was allowed to remain on the canal until this spring, and now he has been turned off, as well as turned out of his house. I think a deputation waited upon the Minister in reference to a man named Johnson. He also built a house on the canal, and he has been dismissed from the canal, and his house is no benefit to him whatever. I would ask the Minister if that is the way he is treating officials that were appointed in good faith, and who have discharged their duty faithfully and well? There has never been any complaint against these men. I have never said a word about it before, because I was fearful that the only man left on the canal would be turned off. The last man turned off was John Clouston, as fine a man as there is in my riding. He got that position as an act of charity, and I am fearful that he will become a charge on public charity. He was an old and faithful servant who did his duty well, but to my utter surprise, I got a letter the other day stating that John Clouston was dismissed, and a young man who is able to earn his living in other spheres, was put in his place. I would ask the Minister if he was consulted in reference to the removal of John Clouston from that canal?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not recollect the name, but I will try to ascertain.

Mr. COCHRANE. Can the Minister also tell me what he proposes to do in reference to these men that have been turned off the canal, and who have put their money into houses. It appears to me a great hardship that these men who built houses under the late Government should be turned off the canal, and their property left there, no good to them whatever. Let me tell the Minister that there never was a man, either Grit or Tory, ever removed from office in my riding. I have represented that riding for 16 years, and the only man that ever got an increase of salary was a Liberal by the name of Fowler, a custom-house officer in the village of Colborne, appointed by the late Mackenzie Government. That man is in office to-day, and we never dreamed of such a thing as his removal. I hope the Minister will take John Clouston back again. Johnson, I may say, put every dollar of money he made on the canal into his house, it is a nice little house, worth about $800 or $1,000.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. What is Clouston's age?

Mr. COCHRANE. He is about my age.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I will look into this.

Mr. COCHRANE. I will promise the Minister that if he restores this man, and if the Liberals are turned out of office, I will remember some of the hon. gentleman's friends in mercy when we get into power.

Mr. FOSTER. I really think the hon. gentleman has no need of pleading before the Minister. His mere statement of a case like that, a case that must have been done without the knowledge of the Minister should bear its own rectification. Surely

when bridge tenders are appointed and build small houses and are supposed to be permanent and put their earnings in those houses, there should be some very good reason why they should be turned out. It seem most inequitable and unjust, and it is coming pretty low down in the spoils system business. The officers who do that should be expostulated with, and the mere statement of the case should, as I have said, bring its rectification.

Mr. HUGHES. Some time ago I observed that some two-penny half-penny business was going on in my riding. Every man with an office worth $100 a year was being turned out, and yet I found in other ridings they were not being turned out. The system was that the local member, or the Grit candidate, if he was a man of that class, kept poking away to secure the man's removal, by saying that the man was absent from his post and so on. I know one case in which the Minister of Railways was actually deceived in regard to a man in my own constituency, and did not know the circumstances. I am satisfied that if the Minister knew the facts of the cases, he would not interfere with them.

Mr. HAGGART. The remarks are rather too kind to the Minister. In my riding, without the slightest complaint being made, he turned out two bridge tenders and put in two new ones. He did more. He sent a circular to the representative of the neighbouring constituency saying that he could have all the offices at his disposal.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Who did that?

Mr. HAGGART. You did.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman is entirely in error.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman may turn up the Debates, and he will find that the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Frost) made the statement regarding the Minister, but the hon. member did not recommend the change of a single man. That is bringing politics down to a pretty low level. Many of these men were appointed thirty or forty years ago, and some of them were old Imperial officers on the canal. I notice the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Frost) is now in his seat. I state that the hon. gentleman received a circular from the Minister of Railways asking him to nominate parties for different positions on the canal even when not a single complaint had been made against any of them. The hon. gentleman had knowledge enough and charity and good sense enough not to change any of them. But in my little place two very efficient persons, without any charge having been made against them, were removed and two others were put in their places.

Mr. BRITTON. There is a great deal of misunderstanding in regard to persons dismissed or said to have been dismissed on the Rideau Canal. At the end of the season, after this Government came into power, it was given out that all persons on the Rideau Canal had been removed from office, and a great deal of talk was occasioned all over the country. But as a matter of fact, those men have not been accustomed to be employed during the winter, because there is nothing for them to do, and although expectations were raised on the part of many Liberals that those places would be filled by them, the old officers were in nearly all cases re-employed. So, although the accusation went out against the Minister of Railways and Canals in regard to dismissals on the Rideau Canal, it was not a fact, for in nearly every case—I do not know about the cases mentioned by the hon. member for Lanark—but, speaking generally in regard to employees on the canal, they were re-employed during the following summer.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. member for Leeds and Grenville (Mr. Frost) I think will not say he received a circular from me to the effect that he had a free hand and was to set aside the employees of his section of the canal. I think if the hon. member so understood the matter he was in error. The hon. gentleman and I unquestionably had some conversation on the subject, and he was aware that the intimation had gone out to the superintendents of the different canals stating that they should advise the employees when they left the service in the fall, that it would not necessarily follow that they would be employed in the spring. I think a circular went out from the different officers, or some of them, that was in many ways very objectionable, but I had not seen it before it went out, otherwise I would have had it corrected. Before the following season opened, the spring of 1897, I put myself in communication with nearly all the members representing portions of counties on this and other canals, and among the rest with the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Frost) There was not one of the members, I think, to whom I did not say that I hoped he would exercise a careful judgment in the matter, and so far as the employees who had been in the service was concerned, I think the hon. gentleman will say that I relied on his discretion and judgment in not asking me or insisting on any more interference with the re-employment of the men previously employed than was absolutely necessary. I was very well satisfied with the way in which the hon. gentleman advised me in the matter, and I think he will say that I did not go beyond expressing these views to him, that I did not issue any circular and made no statement and did not treat the matter in the sense in which the hon. member for Lanark has stated.

Mr. FROST. I might just say in respect to the matter that I had several conversations in regard to employees on the Rideau Canal, so far as regards my constituency, with the Minister of Railways and Canals, and in all those conversations I gathered from him he desired that no employee should be removed. That was my impression, and I stated that I did not care to remove any employees in my constituency, that they were men of worth and good character and had been on the canal for a number of years The Minister very kindly concurred in everything I had done and approved of it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Did the hon. gentleman receive any circular from me ?

Mr. FROST. I never received a circular. I received a list of employees from the department. It went out to all the members along the Rideau Canal. I took it for granted at the time that it was simply for my information, and also that as a certain number of the employees were only temporary and their services were always dispensed with at the end of the year or the 15th of December, it was understood that these men were not necessarily appointed again in the spring, but as they were all good men I did not move for having any of them at all displaced. I just left the list as I got it from the department. There was no pressure brought to bear on me for the dismissal of any of them, and I am happy to say that with the exception of one man who was not able to attend to a certain bridge on the canal by virtue of his infirmity —a new bridge being built there at the time which he could not handle—I think there have been no employees dismissed in North Leeds and Grenville, not one.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. And that most of the temporaries were re-employed.

Mr. FROST. All the temporary employees were allowed to remain just as they were when the present Government came into power. I may say that so far as the Minister of Railways is concerned, this has been done with his full concurrence and I might say his desire in the matter. There has been no pressure brought to bear upon me by any Minister in any of the departments, post offices or anywhere else. I have never interfered with any postmaster, with any canal employee, with any Inland Revenue officer, with any one of the officials in the constituency of North Leeds and Grenville. Everything is there to-day as it was, except in one or two cases where deaths occurred, and where we appointed our own friends as anyone would naturally expect.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. And I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Frost) is just as strong in his constituency as if he dismissed them all and put others in their places.

Mr. FROST. I have always understood that we were under British Parliamentary Government, and where it was not necessary to dismiss a man for cause, such as incompetency, I have allowed him to remain just where he was.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. FROST. For my part I have always opposed making any dismissals of any kind except for incapacity or something of that sort, and I must say that all the officials in North Leeds and Grenville, so far as I know are performing their duties as well as anyone could perform them. I was not willing to interfere with any of them, and in whatever I have done the Minister of Railways always concurred.

Mr. HAGGART. I did not say the Minister brought pressure upon the hon. gentleman (Mr. Frost) to dismiss any of them, that would be going too far, but the hon. gentleman (Mr. Frost) knows that every employee on the Rideau Canal is temporary.

Mr. FROST. Not all the lockmasters. Mostly all the lockmasters are on the superannuation list.

Mr. HAGGART. These would be lockmasters appointed to ten or twelve years ago when the Order in Council was passed making them temporary employees. They are temporary now and every man on the list the Minister sent the hon. gentleman, who was appointed during the last ten or twelve years was a temporary employee. No Conservative member who ever represented any constituency on the Rideau Canal ever had influence enough to get any of these temporary employees removed. They were continued permanently and unless the department officials recommended their dismissal for neglect of duty or other just cause, they were never dismissed under a Conservative Government. My statement was that all the employees in the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Frost's) constituency on that list were temporary, and he had the right to choose their successors. Although the hon. gentleman (Mr. Frost) did not exercise the option given to him, that option was exercised in my riding. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Frost) disavowed having anything to do with it, but two bridge tenders were dismissed, against whom no charge was made as political partisans. I do not consider that would have been a sufficient charge to dismiss them on, unless they were offensive, because a poor bridge tender has the right to exercise his vote, and express his opinion if he thinks fit. He need not be offensive nor need he go to a meeting to interrupt a political opponent, for perhaps if he did that he would be dismissed by a Conservative Government. But he always had the right in this country before the era of the

present Government to exercise the franchise and express his opinion if he wished to. The sending out of these circulars by the Minister of Railways, undoubtedly suggested the inference that the hon. member for the constituency might select the successors of these employees if he so wished, and that is a new doctrine introduced by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair).

Mr. FROST. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) is misrepresenting the case to a certain extent. The document that was sent out by the Minister of Railways was more for the purpose of discovering if there were more officials than necessary upon the canals. It was not for the purpose of turning out any officials to replace them by Liberals, but with the idea of economy. There was one appointment made by the late Government in my constituency that was entirely unnecessary, and that appointment, I think, was cancelled but no new appointment was made. In reference to the two bridge tenders in the town of Perth, of course the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) knows I had nothing to do with either of those cases. I know nothing about them at all. In North Leeds and Grenville there was a third man appointed to swing a bridge, a year and a half before the bridge was built. He was doing absolutely nothing there. There was only one lock upon which there were two men, and those two men had plenty of time to attend to one lock and the bridge, but still the late Government appointed a third man when there were not two hours work per day for the two men already there. The services of that man were dispensed with in the interests of economy, and as I understand it, that circular was sent just to see that such waste of public money did not occur. Of course I know what I said on this particular question at the first session, but I think I was taken up wrongly on the statement I made. I know how it reads in the "Hansard" as I have read it over. My hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) took me up at the time, and commented on it to the disadvantage of the Minister of Railways and Canals. I did not think it worth while at the time to reply to his comments. At the same time, I understood the circular to mean that where there were any unnecessary employees on the canals, their appointments could be cancelled. There was only one in my constituency cancelled, and that appointment has not been filled, and is not likely to be filled. I have not recommended any because I believe that the two men we had at Jones' lock can carry on the work without any difficulty, having very little work to do.

Mr. HAGGART. I listened to the hon. gentleman when he made the statement some time ago, and it was on that statement that I made the statement in reference to the Minister. Here is what the hon. gentleman said:

> And to-day, what is the result? In my own constituency, where there is scarcely a Liberal office-holder, not one single man has been discharged. I know that on the Rideau Canal, where there were over twenty-two officials suspended last fall, when the Minister himself gave me a list, and I could put any official in that I liked——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. FROST. Certainly I could. I had that privilege; but what did I do?

Mr. HAGGART. I am not accusing the hon. gentleman of doing anything wrong. What I said was that the Minister gave him a list, and he had the right to exercise the privilege of discharging every man he chose in his constituency; but I paid him the compliment of having the good sense not to dismiss any man, though power was given to him by the Minister to do it.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. I think it is very unfair to speak of the Minister of Railways in that way. If there is a reproach to be made against the Minister it is that he has not dismissed more men than he has done. We on the Intercolonial Railway have asked him time and again to put out very partisan Tories, and he has refused to do it. To see how lenient he has been to his opponents, it is only necessary to look into his office. He has even gone so far as to keep as his private secretary the same man who was the private secretary of his predecessor, and as his other secretary the man who was the private secretary of Sir Mackenzie Bowell. Hon. gentlemen opposite should be the last to reproach the Minister with having dismissed some Tories. We have reproached him for not having put out enough, and I hope he will put out some more before long.

To defray expense of an exploratory survey to ascertain the most practicable route for an all-Canadian railway from some point on the existing railway into the Klondike district..... $40,000

Mr. FOSTER. We would like to have an explanation of this?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This sum is an estimate of the probable cost of an exploratory survey from Edmonton through the passes and towards the Pacific coast. It is quite impossible for one to indicate with any degree of definiteness along the beds or courses of what rivers it will be desirable that the surveying party should pass; but in a general way the parties will likely seek the Peace River, and perhaps they may follow up the Nelson to the Liard, and then proceed west; or they may perhaps run along in a more southerly direction. The first survey will probably be divided into three parties, and they will probably be

able to give us during the present season a report which will be of value and answer our purpose.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman does not propose to go to the Pacific coast, does he ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Pretty close to it, if we can. A second item, it will be observed, provides for an exploratory survey from the Stikine River to some port on the coast. It is our expectation that the surveying parties will likely strike a common point somewhere between the Stikine River and the seaboard upon the Pacific coast of British Columbia. If one can form anything like an accurate judgment at all from the map and from the information that is available as respects that country, it is not unlikely that somewhere to the south of the Stikine River the parties surveying from the east and seeking a line from Edmonton as a starting point would intercept a line which would be found practicable from the Stikine River to an ocean port.

Mr. HAGGART. I suppose this is to carry out the view of a railway as propounded a few days ago by the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton). In replying to some hon. gentleman, he said that the Stikine road would be a portion of a line of railway which it was proposed to build from Edmonton, so that the Edmonton people would have the advantage not only of a road to Dawson City, but also of one to the coast. I suppose this is for the purpose of carrying out that scheme.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, it was indicated, I think, at a very early period in the session that the all-Canadian route, when extended south of the Stikine, would form part of the line of railway from Edmonton running through the Rockies to the west.

Mr. MONTAGUE. What is the Yukon costing us in the current year for all services ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think it is in the Estimates for the coming year. It amounts to between $600,000 and $700,000.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Outside of what Mackenzie & Mann have to get ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Up to the present time our receipts from the Yukon have exceeded the expenditure.

Mr. FOSTER. Is the report true that a fiat has been granted to Mackenzie & Mann for any damages ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is no foundation for the statement.

Intercolonial Railway—
To increase strength of iron bridge.... $50,000

Mr. FOSTER. What conclusion have the the Government come to ? I hope they have come to the conclusion to follow the practice of the preceding years and charge that to income rather than to capital account.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is hardly worth while to reopen the discussion, but I would not wish to be taken as assenting to the proposition that this it at all contrary, or if it is, only in a very limited sense, to past experience. It will be impossible to withdraw this item, and I must ask the committee to pass it.

Mr. FOSTER. Then let it stand. There will be certainly a long discussion on it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Why not reserve the discussion for concurrence.

Mr. FOSTER. I have no objection.

Intercolonial Railway, including Montreal Extension..... $3,650,000

Mr. HAGGART. This item shows an expenditure of $550,000 in excess of what it was. That pre-supposed that there is to be a large amount to be expended on the Montreal extension

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is operating expenses.

Mr. HAGGART. If you will give us the latitude of discussing this item on the other No. 138, we have no objection to passing it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We will discuss the Intercolonial in the widest possible way on No. 138.

The Department of Militia and Defence, including $2,400 to J. W. Borden, $2,800 to Lieut.-Col. D. A. Macdonald, and $1,400 to Lieut.-Col. Guy, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act to the contrary..... $41,250

Mr. FOSTER. What is the explanation of this ? Why is $1,400 given to Lieutenant-Colonel Guy ? Is that a new appointment, and why the exception to the Act ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The reason is that Lieut.-Col. Guy has been a second class clerk at the maximum of his class and he has been promoted to the position of first class clerk without any increase of pay, and, as he had never passed the civil service examination, it was necessary to do it in this way. He was brought into the service some years ago, I think originally from the Imperial service at Halifax. He also served under the Provincial Government of Nova Scotia, then, after confederation, under the Dominion Government at Halifax. Then he was transferred to Ottawa as a second class clerk. He has been a long time in the service and has been a faithful officer. As he had reached the maximum of his class, I thought it only

proper to make him a first class clerk, though, for the present, he gets no increase in his pay. With regard to Lieut.-Col. D. A. Macdonald, he has been a first class clerk for many years and has been at the maximum of his class, receiving only $1,800 a year. Lieut.-Col. Macpherson had been the director of stores at $3,000 for many years. I have combined the positions formerly held by Lieut.-Col. Macpherson and Lieut.-Col. Macdonald into one position, giving $2 800 for services for which formerly $4,800 were paid, thus effecting a saving of $2,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden) superannuated Col. Macpherson ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes, at $1,500. But it seems to me that, to some extent, at least, superannuation should be charged as against the sums which the officer himself has paid in, he having been a contributor to the superannuation fund for many years. He was an old officer, and some time ago had passed the period when he might have been superannuated. At any rate, whether it is to be admitted to be a saving of $2,000 or less, a considerable saving has been effected by this change.

Mr. FOSTER. Lieut.-Col. Macpherson is still competent for active duties, is he not ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The services are being as efficiently performed now as they were before by one officer, and we are saving a certain amount of money.

Mr. FOSTER. I understand that Lieut.-Col. Macpherson is aireday superannuated ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes, since last September.

Mr. FOSTER. There was a question about the appointment of Mr. Borden, as the hon. Minister will remember.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I remember. I stated to the House that I had the opinion of the Deputy Minister of Justice, approved and endorsed by the Minister of Justice, that this appointment was a proper one to be made as a technical appointment under section 37 of the Civil Service Act. I promised the hon. gentleman I would bring that opinion. I have brought it for the benefit of the hon. gentleman and the House. Perhaps I had better read the correspondence that took place.

An hon. MEMBER. Read the Minister of Justice's decision.

Mr. FOSTER. Perhaps it would be better for the hon. gentleman to read the letter sent to the Minister of Justice. That will give us the grounds on which the Minister acted.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. It is suggested that I should read the whole correspondence. It is as follows :—

Ottawa, 8th July, 1897.

E. L. Newcombe, Esq.,
Deputy Minister of Justice,
Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—I desire to appoint in charge of the accountant branch of the Militia Department an expert accountant possessing special technical knowledge. I find that such a step is absolutely necessary in the public interest.

Will you kindly give me your opinion as to whether I have power under section 37 of the Civil Service Act.

Yours very truly,
(Sgd.) F. W. BORDEN.

Ottawa, 10th July, 1897.

Dear Mr. Borden,—I have considered the question submitted by your letter of 8th instant, and am of opinion that the proposed appointment may be made under section 37 of the Civil Service Act, upon the certificate of your Deputy Minister, in compliance with that section.

I have submitted the matter to the Minister of Justice, who concurs in my view.

Yours sincerely,
(Sgd.) E. L. NEWCOMBE.

The Honourable
F. W. Borden, M.D.,
Minister of Militia and Defence,
Ottawa.

(Confidential.)

Memo. for Minister of Justice.

Dr. Borden spoke to me privately about a change which he contemplates in his department. He proposes to superannuate his accountant and replace him by an expert accountant from a bank, the latter being possibly over age, at all events not having passed the civil service examination, and, therefore, not being qualified for appointment in the usual way. He also, I think, proposes to pay him the same salary which the present accountant is receiving, which would be in excess of the minimum salary of a chief clerk, which the present accountant is. The latter, I believe, receives $2,400, which is a chief clerk's maximum. I asked Dr. Borden to write me a letter so that I might submit the matter to you, as, if the Auditor General should object, the case would have to go to the Treasury Board, and then your opinion would be required. I attach his letter hereto.

Such an appointment can, I think, be made under section 37 of the Civil Service Act, if the Deputy Minister will give the certificate there required. There can, I should think, be no doubt that the qualifications of an expert accountant are technical within the meaning of this section. If that be so, the examination may be dispensed with, and the age of the candidate would be no disqualification. Further, as to technical officers, the Act places no limit as to salary.

If you concur in this view, I will advise Dr. Borden accordingly.

The matter is, I believe, somewhat urgent.

(Sgd.) E. L. N.

9th July, 1897.
(Sgd.) O. M.

Ottawa, 3rd August, 1897.

The Honourable

The Minister of Militia and Defence.

The undersigned has the honour to recommend the appointment of Mr. J. W. Borden, aged 40 years, to the position of chief clerk and accountant of the Department of Militia and Defence, at a salary of $2,400 per annum, vice Mr. Cornewall Herbert O'Meara, superannuated. The qualifications requisite for such office are wholly technical, and are not possessed by any person now in the service of this department, and that it is in the public interest that the civil service examination be wholly dispensed with in this case.

Respectfully submitted.

(Sgd.) C. EUG. PANET,
Colonel,
Deputy Minister of Militia and Defence.

Mr. HUGHES. I wish to say a word with reference to the permanent corps in the way of suggestion, not criticism. I wish to call attention, first, to the horses for the batteries of artillery and for the squadrons of cavalry. The number of horses is quite inadequate. The Quebec battery have only enough horses for two guns. The Kingston battery only two span for each of six guns and for one wagon. The full complement is three teams to each outfit. It would have been a splendid opportunity to advertise Canada if this battery were sent to England and—on this subject I will have something to say later on—the horses were to find their way into the Imperial service.

Another suggestion about horses in annual camp is this: Horses now get $1 a day and men get 50 cents. A horse is worth $25 to $50, so that a man in a few years pays for his horse. I will suggest that the horse be paid the first year at the rate of 50 cents, the second year 75 cents, and the third year let him be paid $1, and stand at that. There is really as much training required for a horse as for a man. In reference to the pay of officers of the permanent corps, that is now fairly good for subalterns, but very low for officers of senior rank. Take a third class clerk in some of the departments here, he is paid more than the officers commanding some of the batteries. In some of the permanent corps in the service, officers who risked their lives in the North-west rebellion, who have given technical study to the art of the profession, are all paid salaries in commanding these squadrons, or batteries, or infantry corps, that do not compare with the salaries of third class clerks. A chief clerk gets $2,400, a first class clerk gets $1,800. It would be fair to have the officers commanding troops or squadrons or companies hold the rank of chief clerks. They certainly require much more skill than clerks. Take the officer commanding the battery in the city of Quebec, or in Kingston, he has need to study up his profession, and yet to-day that officer commanding the battery in Quebec, and the officer commanding the battery in Kingston, or the squadron in Toronto, each is actually paid less than third or second class clerks, in the departments at Ottawa. These clerks in Ottawa receive pensions, but those men who are soldiers in every sense of the term, receive no pension whatever. These are some of the points that I would submit to the Minister for his consideration.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I am much obliged to the hon. gentleman for the suggestion that he has made. I must confess that I was not aware that in the matter of horses the pay was so far below what it ought to be. With regard to the pay of officers, the hon. gentleman is quite right, although he knows perfectly well that our officers in this country are paid rather more than the officers of the same rank in the Imperial service.

Mr. HUGHES. For senior officers?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I am told so.

Mr. HUGHES. I think the hon. gentleman will find that an officer who serves as lieutenant for a certain number of years, and reaches the salary of $3, if he becomes promoted to be a captain, is degraded in pay. He gets the honour, but he falls back to $2.82 a day.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. But the hon. gentleman must remember that a provision was made some time ago, by which, after an officer had served, I think, his four years, he should receive an extra 50 cents, and after eight years, 50 cents more. Then if he is given the second 50 cents, I believe it does happen that after promotion he gets slightly less pay than he did before. But the difficulty in our service is the slowness of promotion. Our service is very small, our officers are all in good health, we have no wars to kill them off, and so they remain, and promotion is very slow indeed. But there is a great deal in what the hon. gentleman says. Employment, particularly in the artillery branch of the service, is technical, and requires men of first-rate ability, and no doubt some of those men are grievously underpaid. Particularly is this so in the case of officers commanding districts. Take a district like that of Montreal. When I came in I found that the district officer in the important district of Montreal, required to live in that city and keep up a certain amount of style becoming a lieutenant-colonel, and compelled to do so, or try to do so, on a paltry $1,800 a year. We have changed that, and improved it by giving him a house, light, &c., equivalent to an increase of $500 a year in respect of allowances. But even now I think his pay is altogether too low. I am giving attention to the matter, and perhaps another session I will be able to bring down a scheme which will remove some of those defects.

Mr. HUGHES. I am not finding fault with the Minister. I am merely making

suggestions. I believe the Minister is doing everything he can to bring the force up to a proper standard, and I compliment him for it. While I am on this question of the permanent corps I wish to make another suggestion. The question of colonial troops in the Imperial service has engaged the attention of the House before to-day. I notice that in another place the matter has also been put before the people of Canada in reference to the 100th regiment. I will take the liberty of telling the Minister what I think would be a proper plan to pursue in connection with this. We Canadians should be willing to do our part in contributing corps to the Imperial service; whether we pay for them directly or indirectly is a matter of detail. Take for instance the infantry corps. Let the permanent infantry corps of the Dominion constitute the 1st Battalion, and let this be sent off on active or foreign service, or on garrison duty for the Imperial Government. Also let the battery of artillery now in Kingston be sent on similar service and a new one be constituted into a 2nd battalion, the same as the English territorial districts now are. The 1st battalions or batteries are usually sent outside the district, the 2nd battalions are recruited at the headquarters of the various districts. In this way Canada would still have a permanent corps at home, and still have her active service corps abroad doing duty for the Empire. In this way our officers and men would get experience abroad. I recognize that it would take some time to bring this about, possibly a year or two more, but we will, I hope, see that done. Then I would suggest that in case the other proposal be not adopted that an exchange be made. For instance, why should not some of our corps be transferred with some of the British corps, the same as the Minister has already done between Quebec and Halifax? British artillerymen are now garrisoning the city of Quebec, and the Canadian artillery are garrisoning Halifax. Take the battery in Kingston, which is an excellent corps, with the exception of lacking its full complement of horses. Taking the horses in the two batteries, they would easily make a squadron. Fully horse the battery and let it be sent in exchange with an Imperial battery. Our men would compare favourably with any in the Empire. The difference in the pay here and elsewhere is very little, and it would no doubt be met by the men. The experience abroad and the novelty would do much to improve our men. I trust this matter of the formation of a colonial brigade or a colonial force in the Imperial service will receive the early consideration of the Government.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I think the observations made by my hon. friend are sufficiently important to require some attention from me. In regard to the question of repatriation, as it might be called, of the 100th Batallion, that is a very important and interesting question, and is now being considered by the Government. It was brought to the notice of the late Government just before they went out of power, and it has been under our attention from time to time, the difficulty being to decide what portion of the expense should be borne either by the Government of this country or by some locality, Toronto, Ottawa or another point which might desire to have the battalion headquarters fixed there. With respect to the question of exchanges, that is a very important one indeed, and it has been carried out to some extent already. An exchange has taken place between a company of the Royal Infantry of the permanent corps at Fredericton and a company of the Imperial forces at Halifax for a period of three or six months, and it was very advantageous to our permanent corps and perhaps equally to the Imperial troops. When I was in England not long ago, I had the pleasure of meeting some of the military authorities there, and I found they are very keen about this matter of exchanges. We are now making an exchange between our artillery at Quebec and the artillery at Halifax. If the matter is to be carried further as suggested by my hon. friend, and that is very earnestly hoped for in the old country, at the Horse Guards and the War Office, it will be necessary to make arrangements that it shall not be for a shorter term than one year. We could prepare a company and send it over to England for one year, and this is something to be looked forward to and might be attained in the near future.

Rifle Association grant $37,000

Mr. HUGHES. I suppose there is no decrease in the Association grant?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. No.

Mr. HUGHES. What arrangements have been made with the Association?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Cartridges cost to manufacture, from $25 to $30 per thousand. We have decided to issue them at $15 per thousand for rifle practice.

Miscellaneous and unforeseen..... $15,000

Mr. HUGHES. I presume the vacancies among officers and men caused by the troops sent to the Yukon will be filled after the 1st July?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes, as regards the officers, not as regards the men at present.

Dominion Cartridge Factory..... $65,000

Mr. MONTAGUE. What is the reason of the increase of $6,000 in this vote?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. It is due to the change in rifles in use. The materials for the present cartridges cost more than formerly.

Mr. HUGHES. I do not wish to be understood as objecting for a moment to the participation in any ceremonial for a prominent personage by the militia, provided they choose to attend. Recently the militia were given permission to attend the funeral of Cardinal Taschereau. I am not finding fault for permission having been granted. I understand, however, that considerable fault was found that officers and men of a different faith to that of Cardinal Taschereau should have been required to present arms, not only to the body, but to some form or ceremonial of the church. I also understand that two or three years ago a Protestant ecclesiastic of the highest standing in the city of Quebec, Bishop Williams, died, and like permission was sought by the officers and men of the regiment, of which he had been chaplain, to attend the funeral. Does the hon. Minister know that that permission was refused to the militia? If so, what is the reconciliation of the conduct of the Militia Department in refusing to allow the men to turn out and honour their old chaplain, Bishop Williams, a Protestant bishop, and permitting the men to turn out and attend the funeral of Cardinal Taschereau? I do not find fault with allowing them to turn out with their arms at that or any other similar ceremonial, but I should like to obtain an explanation of the matter.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I received an intimation this afternoon that that question might be asked and I endeavoured to get the information. I think I am able to give full information with regard to what took place on the occasion of the funeral of the Cardinal, but I have not been able to ascertain that any application was made to the department with reference to the funeral of Bishop Williams. I am now having the matter looked into in the department and I will get the information, if there is any, at a later date. As to what took place at the funeral of the Cardinal, I have here the correspondence and the orders issued. I was not aware that arms were presented or that anything out of the ordinary course was done, but I think it is better that I should read the correspondence to the committee so that every one may know exactly what occurred:

13th April, 1898.

District Officer Commanding, Quebec.

I am mailing permission for Militia, including permanent corps, to attend the funeral of the late Cardinal Taschereau.

ADJUTANT GENERAL.

From Adjutant General of Militia
To District Officer Commanding
Military District No. 7, Quebec.

Headquarters, 13th April, 1898.

Officers, non-commissioned officers and men of the Royal Canadian Artillery at Quebec and of the Active Militia, who can be spared from duty, desiring to attend the funeral of the late Cardinal Taschereau, in uniform and with side-arms, will be permitted to do so, without expense to the public.

(Sgd.) M. AYLMER, Col.,
Adjutant General,
General Officer Commanding.

Adjutant General of Militia
To District Officer Commanding
Military District No. 7, Quebec.

Headquarters, 15th April, 1898.

Sir,—Adverting to my instructions of the 13th instant, permitting the Militia to attend the funeral of the late Cardinal Taschereau in uniform and with side-arms, I have the honour to inform you that the officers, non-commissioned officers and men will be permitted to attend with arms. It must be understood that the attendance at this parade is entirely voluntary.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
(Sgd.) M. AYLMER, Col.,
Adjutant General of Militia.

A. G.,

I understand that instructions have been issued. I understand that the wish expressed by me will be carried out, viz., that as I find there is a general desire on the part of many of the troops to pay honour to the deceased, I am willing to allow it on the distinct understanding that the attendance at this parade is to be purely voluntary.

(Sgd.) W. J. GASCOIGNE,
Major General.

15-4-98.

18th April, 1898.

Captain F. Pennée, Chief of Police, Quebec.

General Officer Commanding regrets that he has no power to authorize the firing of minute guns at funeral to-morrow.

ADJUTANT GENERAL.

Mr. HUGHES. In reference to the Bishop Williams case, the matter was spoken about to me at the time of the funeral of Cardinal Taschereau, but I did not then bring it up.

Mr. LANDERKIN. How long is it since Bishop Williams death.

Mr. HUGHES. A few years ago, but I heard nothing of it then.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. It was prior to 1896; I could have had nothing to do with it.

Mr. HUGHES. I am not finding fault in that respect with the Minister. It was under the Administration of the Conservative party.

Mr. GIBSON. Your own friends.

Mr. HUGHES. I know that. At the time of the funeral of Bishop Williams an application was made to the Militia Department and the answer wired back by the General Officer commanding was "certainly not." I know that to be the case so far as one can know without being cognizant of it personally. When the application was made

for the Cardinal's funeral there was as one might naturally expect considerable feeling over it. The fact that the volunteers, both permanent corps and militia were merely granted permission to attend, it was not an order, raised no feeling whatever, but the objectionable feature of it was their being ordered to carry arms and ordered to present arms at some especially religious part of the ceremony peculiar to the Cardinal's own church. Some people thought that was utilizing the militia in a religious service, especially as the Militia had been refused permission to even walk in uniform at the funeral of the Protestant bishop a few years before. That certainly created some feeling amongst the militia. I draw the attention of the Minister to this fact; if the militia are to be turned out to the funeral of a bishop of the Roman Catholic Church, then as an outside pillar of the Methodist church I certainly insist that the same honour, and it is an honour, shall be conferred on the president of any Methodist conference, should he unfortunately be called to depart this life; or, in the case of the death of the moderator of the Presbyterian General Assembly.

Mr. GIBSON. Never mind that; the Presbyterians will take care of themselves.

Mr. HUGHES. I suppose the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson) will look after his own interests. It is my opinion that this whole business should be kept out of any connection with the militia. This one little incident in Quebec has done a great deal of harm. I know that many broad minded men, men who have nothing to do with anything bigoted, men who would have been delighted to attend the Cardinal's funeral even if they had not been ordered, and delighted to pay homage to the remains of such an eminent citizen as he, they did not like this in view of the refusal some years ago to allow the militia to attend the funeral of the Protestant bishop.

Gratuities to officers..... $15,000

Mr. HUGHES. I would like to have an explanation of these gratuities.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The gratuities are to three officers, namely, Lt.-Col. Maunsell, Lt.-Col. Smith and Major Rivers. Col. Maunsell is going out on account of the age limit. He is one of the district officers commanding District No. 8, New Brunswick, and the school at Fredericton. He gets $7,000, Lt.-Col. Smith, of London, gets $4,000, and Major Rivers $1,800. Major Rivers is, however, employed at present at headquarters, and I do not know whether the idea will be carried out in his case or not. At any rate if the money is not required it will not be used.

Mr. HUGHES. If Major Rivers should be retained permanently in the Militia Department, and I hope he will because he is a very efficient officer, would he not still get that $1,800?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I think he would. If he served in the military branch of the department I think he would not, but if he enters the civil service he would simply retain his present rank, being transferred from the permanent force at Quebec to serve here. I think that is his present position.

Mr. HUGHES. Has the Minister the details of Col. Smith's $4,000?

Mr. MONTAGUE. He is a good officer, is he not? Why are you retiring him?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Age limit. I have not the details here, but I may tell the hon. gentleman the principle on which these retiring gratuities are made up. An officer receives 10 per cent of the salary he is enjoying at the time he retires for every year he has served. I see that Colonel Smith's allowance is fixed at $4,300.

Mr. HUGHES. How many years would he have served?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I am unable to give the number.

Mr. HUGHES. Colonel Smith entered the service a number of years ago. He is a very efficient officer, and he acted as Brigade Major in the third military district, his home being in Cobourg. Was his period of service while he was Brigade Major counted in his years of service?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Oh, yes.

Mr. HUGHES. Then, on the coming into power of the Liberal party in 1874 he was retired for a time. I would like to know whether his services prior to that time has been counted?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Colonel Smith seems to have served as a district officer from the 12th of January, 1872, to the 1st of May, 1876, then as commandant Royal School Infantry to the 19th of July, 1887 and district officer commanding No. 1 to the 1st of May, 1898. I presume the calculation was made up from these dates.

Mr. HUGHES. The reason I am asking is this, that on the principle laid down by the Minister I have figured that Colonel Smith's allowance should be over $5,000. I hope the Minister will allow this item to stand instead of the other one.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I would like to put in a plea for the locality in which I live. We have a splendid battalion in the county of Haldimand, as my hon. friend knows. It

has been under the command of one of the best officers in province, Colonel Davis. In the district from which I more particularly come we have a first-rate company, I think, No. 5. The number of the battalion is 37. This company was taken hold of a number of years ago by a young man named Captain Rastwick, who has brought it up to a high state of efficiency, but he is handicapped by having no drill shed. A short time ago they had premises rented, but a fire came along and wiped out the whole thing. I hope the Minister will see that the conditions are such that he can give us a drill shed.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The general orders provide that the district shall contribute a site and bear a portion of the cost. I had the pleasure of seeing the battalion to which the hon. gentleman refers two years ago at the camp of Niagara, and it is really a first-class battalion. I think there are at least two Indian companies in it, as fine men as I ever saw. In view of the splendid efficiency of that battalion, I shall be very happy to do what the regulations will permit towards assisting in the construction of a drill shed.

Mr. GIBSON. That reminds me of a telegram I received this afternoon from the secretary-treasurer of the Collegiate Institute of St. Catharines asking if the Government intended to provide anything for a new drill shed for that city. In 1866 the drill shed was put on what is known as city property, which is now occupied partly by the collegiate institute and partly by the drill hall. The city is prepared to contribute $1,000 towards the removal of the drill hall, as the space is needed for the collegiate institute and for other schools in the neighbourhood. I understand that an inspection has been made of the drill hall and it is not in such a condition that it is possible to remove it. I hope that if the Minister cannot see his way this year to provide a drill hall for St. Catharines, he will do something next.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The matter to which the hon. gentleman refers has been under my consideration. I would have been very glad if it had been possible to put a sum in the Estimates this year to construct a building in St. Catharines. My hon. friend the Minister of Public Works, who has charge of that particular matter, will, I am sure, bear me out in saying that I have used my best influence with him. In the present year it has been unavailing, but I hope that in the near future we shall be able to do something towards a drill shed for St. Catharines.

Mr. HUGHES. The matter of armories, not drill sheds, for a certain corps that wishes to be armed with the Lee-Enfield rifle has, I believe, received the attention of the Minister. As it is not possible for him to build armories in very many localities, may I ask what arrangement might be made to have the Government pay the rent of a suitable building for battalion headquarters or store of arms? In the case of the 8th Hussars, I think the rent was honestly due by the Government; but there are a number of companies in exactly the same position, and if one officer is to be paid rent for a building for the store of arms, every other officer ought to be paid, or the Government should build the armories. I do not know whether the Minister can this year build an armory in the county of Victoria. The battalion in that county, according to the report of the inspecting officer, stands ahead of every other rural or city corps but one regiment that was inspected by Colonel Otter. I am sure that if the hon. member for South Victoria (Mr. McHugh) were here he would endorse what I say.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. My hon. friend will understand that the Dominion would have a pretty heavy bill to pay if we undertook to pay rent for armouries for all the battalions in Canada—something like 100 of them. The hon. gentleman knows that there is now an allowance to the rural battalions of $40 for each company for the care of arms, and I always understood that the captain takes care of the arms and provides a place for that purpose, which is included in the $40. The idea now of the headquarters staff is that this should be changed and that a central armory should be fixed upon where all the arms belonging to a given battalion could be taken care of. If that is done, the $40 will be withdrawn probably from the captains, and be used, as far as possible, to pay for taking care of the arms.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) has made a strong appeal for a very good battalion, and both the hon. gentleman and his county and battalion have received a great deal of consideration in the past. I hope that when the hon. Minister undertakes to make provision for efficient battalions, he will consider the most efficient battalion probably in the province of Ontario, the 22nd of Oxford, which never received any consideration from my hon. friends opposite when in office but have always had to pay their own way.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Have they no drill shed?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. No, and there was no use inquiring for one. I hope that the Government will look into the matter more fully and do some slight justice to those who have been neglected for years.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I am very much obliged to my hon. friend for having called my attention to this matter, and I assure him that it will

receive my most favourable consideration. I can sympathize with him, having stood shoulder by shoulder with him for many years in any wants he has experienced. I can quite sympathise in the view that to a very large extent charity should begin at home; and when we are providing drill sheds for our battalions, I shall not lose sight of his important battalion and his important county.

Mr. HUGHES. Our hon. friends opposite have only themselves to thank for anything that transpired in relation to militia matters during the eighteen years they were in Opposition. It was their party that began the breaking up of the militia, and I regret exceedingly that the Liberal-Conservative party never had the backbone to re-establish the proper policy, and I commend the present Minister for having returned to the old policy of the Liberal-Conservative party prior to 1873. I would make a suggestion to the hon. Minister. Rural battalions, such as the Oxford battalion, do not require drill sheds, but what they require are armories at battalion headquarters. I see that my hon. friend (Mr. Sutherland) has a public building in the estimates, and I am pleased to see it. In the town of Lindsay, we propose to utilize the part of the public ground, and when putting up public buildings in Woodstock or Liverpool or elsewhere, the Government could very properly provide an armory under the same roof, where the arms could be conveniently placed at little cost. One thousand dollars would build a very efficient place where the arms could be brought and kept, and you would have an armory for each company in every district of the Dominion.

Pensions payable to Mounted Police, Prince Albert Volunteers, and Police scouts, on account of the rebellion of 1885	$2,920 66

Mr. HUGHES. Might I ask whether the widow and family of the late Captain French get a pension?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I will call the attention of the right hon. First Minister to the matter.

Resolutions to be reported.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 155)—from the Senate—to amend chapter 11 of the Statutes of 1897 and to restrict the importation and employment of aliens.—(Mr. Fielding.)

Bill (No. 156)—from the Senate—respecting the identification of criminals.—(Mr. Fielding.)

ADJOURNMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. MONTAGUE. What business will be taken up to-morrow?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We shall proceed with the Estimates.

THE DISMISSAL OF MR. DUNDAS.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Before the House adjourns, there is a matter I would like to bring before the attention of the Government and especially of the Postmaster General. It is in reference to the dismissal of a mail clerk by the name of Dundas who was employed on the railway between Palmerston and Southampton. Some time in the election of 1896, I believe, Mr. Dundas, though not taking an active part in the election, yet, owing to some influences became connected with it, and in an election trial he was found guilty of corrupt practices, and, of course, was disqualified from holding his position. I have had applications made——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I will remind the hon. member that on a motion to adjourn of this kind a general debate cannot be brought on. If the hon. gentleman only desires to put a question——

Mr. LANDERKIN. I am only going to ask a question. I understand there are extenuating circumstances, and if the matter were reported to the judges I think some solution of the difficulty might be found and Mr. Dundas, who was long in the service, and against whom no complaints were made, might be restored to his position. I would like the Postmaster General to give his attention, as it seems to be the desire of the people generally that the case should be dealt with leniently by the Government. Mr. Dundas has already suffered almost two years, and I think his case is worthy of consideration. I thought the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) would have brought this up and I have waited until near the end of the session before calling the attention of the Postmaster General to the matter.

Mr. GIBSON. I have received a great many communications from friends of Mr. Dundas at different points from Southampton to Hamilton. Mr. Dundas was in the mail service for 24 years, and during that time he was not 24 days absent from his duty. I know him intimately, and I feel perfectly safe in saying to the Postmaster General and to members on both sides of the House that if he had been asked for assistance in the general election, Mr. Dundas would have just as readily given $20 toward my election or that of any friend of mine as he did to that of the hon. member for North Bruce. I understand that the money he contributed was not used for corrupt purposes. If I am correctly informed, the money was given to a man by the name of Scott, who, if report is correct kept the

money. However, an injustice has been done Mr. Dundas, and I trust that the Postmaster General will take the matter into his consideration. If it is not possible to reinstate Mr. Dundas—as I believe, in fact I have a certificate from a doctor that Mr. Dundas, through lifting heavy mail matter for so many years is suffering from hernia—and if he is unable to resume his duties as a mail clerk, I think that, after all the years of good service he rendered to the country, he should be entitled to receive superannuation, having contributed to the fund for such a long time. This is an act of justice that will meet with the approval of his own political friends and of all who know him.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I heartily concur in what has been said. A number of people on both sides of politics, strong partisans on both sides, have spoken to me about this case. I did not bring it up, because it has nothing to do with the district from which I come, and I thought it would be brought up by other hon. members. All the parties from whom I have heard express regret that, owing to unfortunate circumstances, Mr. Dundas lost his position. At the time the trial took place, I think, parties on both sides of politics who read the proceedings felt that it was a considerable hardship. I join with the hon. members who have spoken in hoping that the Postmaster General will extend to this gentleman all the consideration he possibly can.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). I am not aware of the particulars that led to the report of the judges, but after what has fallen from the lips of the hon. gentlemen I will have an inquiry made and see if the facts behind the report will warrant a reconsideration of this case. All that appears of record which is also on the journals of the House is that the judges on the trial reported Mr. Dundas guilty of corrupt practices.

Mr. LANDERKIN. He contributed some money.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That does not appear on the report presented to the House. There are, of course, corrupt practices and corrupt practices. It may well be that the moral guilt might be very different although the technical consequences so far as the trial is concerned are the same. Therefore, I am quite willing to have every inquiry made to see whether there are extenuating circumstances. If there are, I shall be only too glad to recommend them for consideration of His Excellency.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 1.30 a.m. (Wednesday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 1st June, 1898.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

PRAYERS.

DRUMMOND COUNTY RAILWAY.

Mr. LISTER. I beg to present the second and final report of the Special Committee appointed to inquire into the expenditure of subsidies granted to the Drummond County Railway, and into all negotiations and transactions between the Government of Canada or any member thereof or any person on its behalf, and the Drummond County Railway, or any director or officer or person on the company's behalf, relating to the acquiring of the said railway by the Government, together with the evidence.

Mr. FOSTER. I wish my hon. friend (Mr. Lister) would move that the report be printed forthwith.

Mr. LISTER. I move that the second and final report of the Drummond County Railway Committee, together with the evidence, be printed forthwith, and that rule 94 be suspended.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think that should include the proceedings before the committee as well as the evidence.

Mr. LISTER. I agree with that, and I would move that the proceedings also be printed with the report and the evidence.

Motion agreed to.

TRANSPORTATION OF SUPPLIES FOR THE YUKON CONTINGENT.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to say that the Minister of Militia (Mr. Borden) did not keep faith with me—I do not say it offensively, no doubt he has forgotten it—in regard to his promise that, before the Estimates of his department were reached, he would lay on the Table the papers relating to the contract for the transport of militia supplies over the Northern Pacific by the port of Seattle and the Boston and Alaska line. I am anxious that, before the remaining item of the Militia Estimates is reached, that promise should be implemented. I desire, also, to say that Colonel Prior, one of the members for Victoria, has sent me a telegram, evidently to bring to the attention of the Government the same point. The telegram says:

Am credibly informed Boston and Alaska Company have no ocean steamer ready to take Sel-

kirk supplies. Does not contract call for sailing 20th May ? Also no river steamers. Can you ask for contract, as informed it allows goods to be delivered Dawson instead of Selkirk, at same rates, namely, $300 per ton. Canadian Development Company here ready and willing to take goods June 9th, $250 per ton, also to convey Evans and his contingent Lake Teslin to Selkirk.

I desire to call the attention of the Prime Minister, in the absence of the Minister of Militia, to this matter, I think it would be convenient, if when the papers are brought down, such additional information is brought down as may be necessary to inform the House with regard to the subject of this telegram.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). Without dealing fully with the subject mentioned by the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper), I may say, in the absence of my colleague, the Minister of Militia, that the officer of the Government at Vancouver, Major Perry, is now making an investigation into the question of the ability of the company to carry out the contract.

IMMIGRATION LITERATURE—CORRECTION.

Mr. DAVIN. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would call the attention of the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) to the fact that in one of his immigration pamphlets there occurs the same misrepresentation of Western Assiniboia that occurs in the larger book and that I called attention to the other day.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). It is a reprint of the same. I will have it corrected, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) having called my attention to it.

ALIEN LABOUR LAW.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I beg to remind the Prime Minister that some days ago he agreed to lay upon the Table the instructions issued to the officers appointed for the purpose of carrying out the Alien Labour Law.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Yes, I think I shall be able to give them to my hon. friend (Mr. Montague) this afternoon or to-morrow.

INQUIRY FOR RETURN.

Mr. MARTIN. I would remind the hon. Minister of Public Works of the Order of the House agreed to on the 18th April last for a return showing the amount spent by the Government in the years 1896-97 and 1897-98 on private piers and wharfs.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). I will see that the papers are brought down to-day.

ST. JOHN BRIDGE AND RAILWAY EXTENSION COMPANY.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved second reading of resolution adopted in Committee of the Whole on Friday 27th May last respecting the payment of the money advanced by the Dominion Government to the Saint John Bridge and Railway Extension Company, under and by virtue of Chapter 26 of the Statutes of 1893.

Motion agreed to, resolution read the second time and concurred in.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 157) respecting the repayments of the moneys advanced to the St. John Bridge and Railway Extension Company.—(Mr. Fielding.)

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES.

The House again resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 71) further to amend the Weights and Measures Act.

(In the Committee.)

On section 2,

Mr. FORTIN moved in amendment :

That in the province of Quebec, when potatoes are sold or offered for sale by the bag, such bag shall contain at least 80 pounds.

Amendment agreed to.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I would like to explain to the committee——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Carried, carried.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. There are several other amendments which I had prepared, but since I find that the members are unwilling to let me introduce them now, I will let them drop.

Mr. CLANCY. We cannot afford to pass over such a matter lightly. I desire to ask the Minister of Inland Revenue if he proposes to drop the other proposed amendments during the present session.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. It was my hon. friend amongst others who compelled me to drop them by calling "carried." We will now have to wait until another session.

Bill as amended reported and read the third time and passed.

SUPPLY—SHIRT AND COLLAR INDUSTRY.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. MONK. Before that motion is carried I desire briefly to call the attention of the

Government and of the Minister of Finance to the state of an industry which requires, I think, the serious consideration of the Government. I refer to the shirt and collar industry. As the House is aware, that is an industry which has been built up under the tariff which existed previous to 1897, and which has been qualified as the National Policy. The industry had no existence and held no position whatever in this country before the National Policy was introduced; and its products, shirts, collars, blouses and cuffs, were imported from Europe and from the United States. The moment the industry was given sufficient protection, a considerable number of manufacturers came in from the United States, and a number of skilled employees as well. I might give, as an instance, the case of Williams, Green & Co., an American firm who, as soon as the new tariff was introduced in 1879, established themselves at Berlin, Ontario. That firm, finding that the tariff gave them sufficient protection, started an industry employing 300 operatives, most of them coming from the United States. That industry, as the Minister of Finance is well aware—because I know he has given the subject considerable study, and that representations have during the last two years been made to him—that industry progressed considerably, and as it stands to-day, it employs within the Dominion of Canada over 8,000 operatives, who receive, on the average, wages of $4 a week for sixty hours. Ninety per cent of these operatives are females, a very large proportion of them are the sisters, wives and daughters of our farmers in the provinces of Ontario and Quebec. In the immediate vicinity of Montreal, there are a very large number of farmers' wives and daughters employed by the shirt and collar manufacturers in the the city of Montreal, and to whom this industry is a very great boon indeed. I said the wages were $4 a week for sixty hours; the House is perhaps not aware that these wages are greatly in excess of those paid in Europe for similar work. In Europe the wages are only $2.20 per week of seventy-six hours, and it is a well-known fact that there are no operatives so poorly paid as the seamstresses in England. As to skilled labour, the operatives in this industry command wages of about $1.50 per day, and there are a very large number employed in the factories in the city of Montreal, as well as in the adjoining district.

As to the capital engaged in this industry, statistics will bear me out when I say that over $1,500,000 is invested in the shirt and collar factories of this Dominion. The wages paid annally exceed $1,500,000, and the annual sales amount to $2,500,000. The material purchased in Canada by the manufacturers is of the value of $500,000, and the raw material brought in from elsewhere and employed by the manufacturers in the Dominion exceeds in value $250,000. As the Minister of Finance is well aware, there is no combination in this industry. There are a number of rival factories, and it is well known that the consumer gets fair value as regards the goods which are the products of those factories. The American and foreign manufacturers get their raw material at from 25 to 30 per cent lower than the raw material can be obtained by ourselves. They have cheaper money, machinery at first hand and their general charges are lower. It seems to me these circumstances invite the particular attention of the Minister of Finance, because, as the House will remember, when the new tariff was brought down the hon. Minister stated that whatever might be his own views in regard to the opposing theories of free trade and protection the Government were anxious not to sacrifice in any way existing industries, and that was the governing principle under which the present tariff was framed. Let us look for one moment at the condition of the tariff as it was previous to the introduction of the present arrangements. Under the tariff as it existed under the previous Government, shirts, collars, cuffs and blouses received a protection of 25 per cent. Shirts had, in addition, a specific duty of $1.00 per dozen; collars, 24 cents per dozen; cuffs, 24 cents per dozen; and blouses, $1.00 per dozen. The change introduced by the new tariff is very considerable. Upon all the articles I have just named the duty is a uniform one of 35 per cent, less, of course, the preferential duty in favour of the countries which have the benefit of that preference. As regards the raw material under the previous tariff, printed shirting was 30 per cent. The changes increased the protection up to about 35 per cent. Dyed shirting was 30 per cent; it has been increased to 35 per cent. Linen shirting was 20 per cent, it has been increased to 25 per cent. Woven shirting was 30 per cent; it has been increased to 35 per cent. Bleached cotton was 22½ per cent; increased to 25 per cent. Soap, under the previous tariff, bore a specific duty of one cent per pound, and that has been maintained. Starch under the previous tariff, was one and a half cent per pound; this also has not been disturbed. As to the protection afforded the industry on whose behalf I am speaking, it has been reduced under the present tariff, whereas the protection afforded to the raw material has been considerably increased. It seems to me that this discrimination is unfair. I do not intend to weary the House, particularly at this stage of the session, by showing in what ratio the business of the cotton factories has increased since the present tariff has been in force; but it is a fact which can easily be borne out that the cotton industries at the present moment are most prosperous, that their earnings have been considerably raised, and not only have they been able to pay large dividends, but they have been also able to greatly improve their plant; they have been running continuously, and have been able to lay

aside for their shareholders, in practically all cases, large rests. On the other hand, the shirt and collar manufacturers have, I think, satisfied the Minister of Finance that since the existence of this tariff they have, in reality, when purchasing their product in Canada, paid the cotton producers the full amount of the increased duty, and have very often been obliged to purchase outside of Canada their raw material. I believe that the situation of this industry at the time the tariff was being framed engaged seriously the attention of the Minister of Finance and I base my hopes for some change in the present tariff on the declaration he made at the time, that the tariff he introduced was a tentative tariff, to a certain extent, and if the evidences manifested themselves he and his Government would be only too anxious to afford relief where relief was justifiable and necessary. As a matter of fact, the Minister of Finance is well aware that last year he himself brought down a modification of article 355a of the tariff relating to cottons, by which under an article, which was subsequently abandoned by the Minister of Finance, some relief would be afforded to the shirt and collar manufacturers. The remarks made by the Minister of Finance at the time that article was by him abandoned are reported in "Hansard" of 1897, at page 4182, and they go to show that the Minister, as well as the Government very reluctantly abandoned that article, and declared there was really, under the tariff as then framed, a substantial grievance existing as regards the shirt and collar manufacturers, but that conflicting interests at the time—and I believe the conflicting interests were the cotton industries—obliged the Minister to abandon that amendment, the effect of which was to give some relief to the shirt and collar manufacturers. Since then the industry has been steadily declining. I only state the fact, which is borne out by the daily publications of our leading newspapers, when I say that the products of foreign manufacturers are actually flooding our markets and rendering all competition by our manufacturers almost impossible. It is sufficient to open the journals of our principal cities to see that very large quantities of collars and shirts received from foreign countries are advertised for sale at prices that defy competition by our own manufacturers. I may state the case of Eaton & Co., of Toronto, to whose advertisement my attention has been called, who advertise men's collars at 60 cents per dozen, to the number of 2,000 dozens, they being Barker's brand, made in Troy, United States, and which collars are sold there at 25 cents each.

It is evident that under such a tariff as that which brings into our markets goods for slaughter from the markets of the United States, of England and of Austria, it is impossible for our own manufacturers to maintain themselves. The shirt and collar manufacturers of the Dominion have recently held a meeting in Montreal and they have resolved: that the Government should be appealed to once more praying for some measure of relief during the present session of Parliament in favour of their industry, upon the ground I stated a moment ago, that foreign goods are now coming into Canada to an alarming extent, and even before the full measure of the preferential clause has been in force. They consider that after the 1st of August the loss in both capital and labour will undoubtedly be serious if legislation is not passed which will enable them to compete successfully with goods from abroad.

Now, Sir, what do these manufacturers propose as a relief in the present damaged state of their trade. They have made alternate proposals. In the first place they submit as a remedy an increase in the present ad valorem duty to the extent of 20 per cent, which would afford them sufficient protection; and another remedy is to restore the former specific duties which were their protection, and which is not an insufficient one. There is also submitted by them—and their deliberations I think have been brought to the consideration of the Government—the reduction of the duty on all cottons and linens, to shirt and collar manufacturers; also specific duties on soap and starch in order that the difference in duty of 20 per cent a very fair difference I think, should exist between their raw material and the finished article. Failing some of these remedies which they have submitted to the consideration of the Government, they find themselves unquestionably obliged to have recourse to a general reduction of wages in all their factories throughout the provinces of Ontario, and Quebec; a reduction which would be very detrimental to the interests of the 8,000 people engaged in this industry. What I think the Minister of Finance might do would be to have recourse once more to the article which he himself brought down to the House last year, and which was afterwards laid aside. I refer to article 355a the text of which I have not been able to procure, but which reads in this sense:

> Printed and dyed cotton to be admitted at 15 per cent to be cut into shirts, collars, cuffs and blouses, in bond under Government supervision.

It is not asking too much from the Government to ask some protection for this industry, especially when we see in what a flourishing condition the cotton factories are. It seems only just that an industry such as this of shirts and collar making, should not be left to perish unprotected by the Government. If we refer to the United States tariff we find that this industry receives a very considerable amount of protection. If the Minister of Finance and the members of this House will take the trouble to refer to article 258 of the United States tariff of 1894 they will find that the protection under

that law was 40 per cent, and that under the Dingley Bill it has been increased to 50 per cent upon collars and cuffs. Under the present American tariff the following duty is placed upon shirts :—

Shirts valued at not more than $1.50 per dozen have a protection of 60 cents per dozen and 15 per cent ad valorem. Shirts valued at more than $1.50 per dozen and not more than $3 per dozen have a protection of $1.10 per dozen and 15 per cent. Shirts valued at more than $3 per dozen and not more than $5 per dozen have a duty of $1.50 per dozen and 15 per cent ad valorem. Shirts valued at more than $5 per dozen and not more than $7 have a duty of $1.75 per dozen and 35 per cent ad valorem.

It will be seen that the ad valorem duty under the present tariff in the United States upon shirts is 63·32 per cent. I believe, Sir, that the representatives of this industry have in a far more clear manner, because they are more conversant with the subject than I am, made representations of their grievances to the Minister of Finance. I believe they have made these representations to the right hon. the Prime Minister himself, and have received from him the promise that their grievances would be attended to, and although I know that the session is about to close and that the members of the Government are extremely busy, yet I think the restoration of article 355a framed last year by the Minister of Finance would commend itself to Parliament, and I sincerely hope that in the interests of the city of Montreal and of the large number of people interested in this industry, farmers' wives and daughters who are residents in the surrounding counties of Jacques Cartier, Laval, Hochelaga, Terrebonne and Laprairie, the Minister of Finance will see his way clear to introduce in the Ways and Means resolutions the modifications of which I have just prepared.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). I am very much afraid, Mr. Speaker, that at this late stage of the session it will be difficult, if not indeed impossible, to re-open the consideration of the question in the manner indicated by my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk). Though I referred to the late period of the session, I confess that even though the matter were brought to my attention at an earlier date, I think the difficulties in the way would have been so very considerable as to possibly prevent the accomplishment of what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) desires. There is really nothing much that can be said to-day that is new on this question of the shirt and collar industry. All the information which my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) has referred to has certainly been laid before the Government very fully last session, and to some extent during this session. The situation is simply this: The shirt manufacturers find that in purchasing what they call their raw material, it bears a duty of 25 per cent on white cottons and 35 per cent on coloured cottons, while the duty on the finished article is 35 per cent, being the same rate as on the coloured cottons which they call their raw material. My hon. friend (Mr. Monk) has several times in his argument spoken of cottons as the raw material. Of course in a discussion of the tariff question we are apt to constantly get into the difficulty that what is one man's raw material is another man's finished product. There is no such thing as raw material for the shirt manufacturer. That which my hon. friend calls raw material is the finished product of the cotton manufacturer. Therefore, if we are to reduce the duty on that so-called raw material, we are reducing it on a finished product of another manufacturer; and which of these two manufacturers can best bear the change is of course a fair question for consideration. Last year, we did propose an amendment at one stage, such as that quoted by my hon. friend as 355a in the tariff resolutions, whereby we proposed to fix a special duty on cotton goods for the use of shirt manufacturers. The idea of having a special rate on goods to be used by manufacturers was found to a considerable extent in the tariff before, and to some extent it still remains. There are, however, difficulties in the way of working that out. In the first place, it would have been, I think, an advantage to the large manufacturer of shirts rather than to the small one. The proposal was to allow materials to be imported and cut in bond under the supervision of a customs officer at the reduced rate of 15 per cent. The Customs Department found that it was very difficult from their point of view, in fact, the Minister of Customs said it would not be worked out; but even if there were no difficulties from the customs point of view, this plan would have imposed disadvantages on the smaller manufacturer of shirts, while the larger manufacturer would be able to profit by it. For these two reasons, we found that we could not proceed on that line. One of the difficulties in the discussion of all those tariff questions is that we differ as to what is the effect of a high tariff. Men who oppose a high tariff generally consider that when a high duty is imposed on an article, the home producer of an article of like character will take the full benefit of it. Therefore, the free trader or the revenue tariff man generally adds the duty to the price. The advocates of a high tariff usually dispute that, claiming that the duty is not added to the price, but that its effect is simply to secure a home market without the price being affected; though I notice that whenever a protectionist comes to use an article manufactured in Canada, he insists that the duty is added to the price; and so, the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) says that the cotton manufacturers take the full advantage of the tariff on their cotton, and in that case the

duty is to be added to the price. I call my hon. friend's attention to the fact that in using that argument he is rather cutting the ground from under the feet of the gentlemen who usually associate with him in the advocacy of protection. We were told last year by the cotton manufacturers that that was not done—that the additional duty did not increase the price of cottons. We were told that they would not take full advantage of that duty, but would produce their cottons at a fair price and would give such terms to the shirt makers as would remove all cause of trouble. Of course, that was a mere understanding between the cotton manufacturers and the shirt industry. I remember at one interview, when we were fortunate enough to get both industries together, which is always an advantage in dealing with the tariff question, the cotton manufacturers intimated that their facilities were such that they would be able to produce cottons at a reasonable rate, and that the shirt manufacturers would have no trouble in buying from them. I am told that the shirt manufacturers claim that that understanding has not been carried out, but that the cotton manufacturers have charged the full amount of the duty. However that may be, the remedies suggested are three. One is that to which I have already alluded—making a specially low rate for the importation of cottons for manufacturing purposes, and cutting them in bond. The disadvantages and difficulties in the way of that I have already mentioned. The second is that we shall add 20 per cent to the duty; that is to say, where we have a duty of 35 per cent on shirts and collars, we shall call it 55 per cent. I doubt if many hon. members on either side of the House would advise us to adopt a change of that kind. The third suggestion is that we should adopt the system of specific duties. The representatives of the shirt and collar industry have generally put forward the specific duty as the one they prefer. The chief advantage of a specific duty is that you are able to charge a very high duty without letting the public know what it amounts to. There are at present specific duties in the tariff, and I am not prepared to say that they are the best features of the tariff; but if we were to adopt the suggestion of the shirt and collar industry and impose specific duties which would amount to 55 or 60 per cent, and in some instances more, I am inclined to think the public would say that we were going far beyond the limits of legitimate protection. That the shirt and collar industry is placed at a disadvantage as compared with some industries, I am prepared to admit; but while the duty on cotton goods is 25 per cent—I am speaking of white goods—the duty on shirts and collars is 35 per cent, so that there is a difference of 10 per cent in their favour. I am aware that the duty on coloured goods is 35 per cent, and the duty on shirts and collars is the same. But the labour must be considered, because, although the duty is the same the difference in value may give a reasonable protection to the industry, and that is exactly what has happened in the case of the shirt and collar industry. The manufacturers buy a certain raw material bearing 35 per cent duty, but they are protected on the article they manufacture to the extent of the labour that passes into it. That, of course, will be admitted. It is only a question whether that is sufficient, and in some branches of the industry, under the tariff, undoubtedly, the protection afforded them is more than that. I do not see that we are in a position to offer any relief. If the situation is not, in all respects, as favourable as some would like, I am afraid that the divergence of opinion as to what are the remedies will lead to difficulties. Any one of the three proposals would be open to grave objections. While I sympathise with the position of my hon. friend representing the interests referred to, I do not think the position of the shirt and collar industry is quite as bad as he pictures it. If he means to say that it is not in as good a position as some industries, still it is in a fair position, and it will be found that this industry will have a fair chance to do business. Though it may not make as much money as in past years, still it will have as fair a share of the business as it could reasonably expect. Even if it is not in as good a position as some industries, I am not in a position to adopt any of the three remedies proposed.

Mr. FOSTER. I am sorry that the hon. Minister of Finance has had to meet this demand with a blank refusal, especially in view of what the right hon. leader of the Government repeatedly promised to the shirt manufacturers. I imagine that the starting sentence of my hon. friend was just by way of padding, namely, that he would not be able to do it because of the late period of the session.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I added that it would not have made any difference in any case.

Mr. FOSTER. These demands were put fully and fairly before my hon. friend very early in the session, and the real reason of the hon. gentleman is what he last gave, namely, that the Government did look into the matter and came to the conclusion that they were powerless to help the industry. I am not going to take a long time at this end of the session in arguing the question. It has been argued out here on previous occasions. The Government has had the whole measure of this matter stated to them. They put themselves in a certain position on the very first announcement they made to this House. A tariff commission was appointed consisting of the ablest men which the Government had in their ranks. That commission spent three or four months tra-

velling through the country, interviewing all these various industries, and then sat down and made up their minds with reference to this and other things. They came to the conclusion that they would give the cotton manufacturers protection and did so. Then they took up this most important industry, and came to the conclusion that it ought to have a fair measure of protection, and gave it that by putting a certain duty on the manufactured product, and allowing what the Minister cavils at as their raw material to come in at 15 per cent instead of 25 or 35 per cent duty. That was what the Minister and his colleagues thought reasonable justice to be meted out to the shirt and collar industry. Why was that not persisted in? Why was that entirely taken away as the basis of protection and the full protection kept upon cotton manufacturers? Why was the shirt and collar industry discriminated against? We have the raw cotton brought in—which is undoubtedly a raw material—free, and we have 35 and 25 per cent protection for the manufactures of this raw material which is brought in free. Whether you call this manufactured product a raw material absolutely or not, it is the raw material out of which shirt-makers make their goods. They find in some instances no difference in duty between what they get as protection and what they pay as a duty on their raw material, and in other cases the difference is only 10 per cent; but the hon. gentleman must take cognizance of the competition and the difference in the prices of labour at the sources of competition, and when he takes into account the fact that our operators are paid here at the rate of $4 per sixty hours, whilst European operators are paid just about half that rate, and also takes into account the cheaper raw material that the makers in European countries get, you will find that the competition is based upon conditions which make peculiarly hard against this industry. My hon. friend, I suppose, fully and fairly estimates the importance of this industry. It is a popular industry, more than perhaps almost any other he could name. Out of it many families of our country and city people make their living, the work being largely done in their homes. Eight thousand operators are a large number to depend on an industry; and under all these conditions I think the Government have not fairly dealt by the industry when they place it in a position in which it is clearly discriminated against.

What have we to-day? We have to-day advertised in this country American collars and cuffs and shirts at prices which are away down may be below the cost of production. I find here, for instance, in an immense store in the city of Toronto, advertisements from time to time of first-class American collars, which are sold at the rate of 5 cents apiece and which are 25 cent collars under the current regular prices. But these are bought from the American producers, and are placed upon the market in hundreds of thousands to compete with our own products. What competition can be fairly kept up by our own shirt and collar makers under the conditions which have been named? A tariff of 35 per cent on the valuation I have given is simply no protection at all. I would like to ask the Minister of Customs what is the valuation he puts upon these articles for customs tariff? Does he put 35 per cent upon what is presumably the wholesale cost, when these can be sold at 60 cents per dozen? If so 35 per cent on 5 cents per collar is a very small protection against such abnormally low prices. For this branch of industry, a specific duty is the only fair duty and is not burdensome for the consumer, and the hon. gentleman ought not to be afraid of specific duties. His tariff bristles with them. He says he does not think they are model duties, but he has no business to keep them in his tariff if they are not. No superstitious fear exists in his mind or that of the Minister of Trade and Commerce against specific duties, for they are found on every page of their tariff. I have not made the calculation, but I dare say that over one-third of the items bear specific duties, taking them altogether.

I think it is particularly unfortunate that this industry should be put in the position in which it is. I have a statement put before me, for which I believe I am able to vouch, that the hon. First Minister, before the election, specifically promised his friends among the shirt manufacturers that the shirt duty would not be unreasonable or unfair, and since this tariff has been brought down it is stated to me that he specifically promised his friends among the shirt manufacturers that these duties would be made right. Now, he is leader of the Government, it is his Finance Minister who alone can bring down a measure to right the wrong. Does the promise of the right hon. First Minister count for nothing after the election is once over, or are these gentlemen stating what is untrue when they state specifically that they have letters in their possession conveying this promise of the right hon. Premier? Surely if the right of the case is with the manufacturers, as affirmed by the Government when they brought down their tariff, and the Government gives away that right only under pressure, and if the head of the Government makes a promise and reiterates it, and fails to carry it out, I think the Government is in a pretty hard position. I think they are in a position which they cannot justify on grounds of tariff right and reasonableness, because they have cut that ground from under their own feet. Nor, on the ground of political faith being kept, can they refuse to right this which I consider to be a wrong, and which, I am afraid, is

going to sacrifice one of the best and most popular of our industries. This industry employs a capital of one and a half millions, pays wages of one and a half millions, has annual sales to the extent of two and a half millions. It is an industry distributed among the families of the country. For all these reasons, it is an important factor in the life and business of the country, and I think more regard should be paid to it than the Finance Minister and the Government appear to have paid. Why did they not stick to what they declared to be right as a matter of tariff? Why did they recede from it? For political reasons? Then, the reasons were not worthy reasons. Why has not the Prime Minister implemented the promise he gave? Because of superior pressure? A Prime Minister ought to be ready to implement his promise against all pressure; or he ought to leave his position as Prime Minister.

TREATMENT OF WORKMEN ON THE CROW'S NEST PASS RAILWAY.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). Before the motion is carried, I wish to introduce notice to the House of a matter which, I think, is of the greatest importance; and which, as I understand, can only be remedied by bringing it up in this way. It is, of course, well known to the country and to the House that a great deal of complaint has been made of the manner in which the men that were employed on the Crow's Nest Pass Railway have been treated by the contractors or by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. So numerous and important were the complaints made, that a commission was appointed, and I believe, has recently reported to the Government as to the nature and extent of the maltreatment that the men had suffered at the hands of these parties. These matters that were investigated by the commission are largely matters of wages and exactions——

Mr. FOSTER. If my hon. friend (Mr. Bell) will allow me a moment. At this time of the session when the grievances that members have to present must be presented tersely and in large numbers, I think it is of the utmost importance that the Minister representing the departments affected should be represented here.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). I may observe that when my hon. friend, the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) left the Chamber, the hon. member for Pictou was not on his feet, and a totally different subject was being discussed. However, I have sent for the Minister of the Interior, to whose department I infer this refers. Or is it in the department of the Minister of Railways and Canals?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Both Railways and Justice—the Solicitor General should also be here.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Unhappily, as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) can well understand, members of Parliament and other parties are continually sending for Ministers, and it is sometimes difficult to refuse them, although the practice is a bad one, I know.

Mr. FOSTER. I wish to supplement what I said, with this: The leader of the Government, at such a time as this, ought to be in the House. I know that the calls upon him from outside are many and pestering, but it is the duty of the Prime Minister, at this particular time, to be in the House, where the people's representatives are. We lose the force of a protest when the leader of the Government is away. Because there is no responsibility amongst the subalterns.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). The complaints investigated by the commission largely referred to matters of a material character—wages, exactions, impositions and so on. But the matter I have now to bring to the attention of the House is more serious, being a case in which, apparently, something almost equivalent to murder has been done through neglect or wrong doing on the part of some persons in connection with the company, and it refers further to the fact, that, apparently attempts made by interested parties to secure justice in this matter have been defeated.

I think I cannot do better than to recite the facts in connection with this case. Two young men belonging to the county which I have the honour to represent were employed on the Crow's Nest Pass Railway. They were taken with diphtheria, a very deadly disease. As far as we can learn, they were left about two weeks without treatment and without medicine. They were then sent away, in the month of January, in the coldest part of the winter, a distance of 110 miles, although they had almost reached their dying moments, in an open conveyance, without food, without medicine, without attendance, without stimulants—without care of any kind except, simply, that they were transported. Something like three days was occupied, through various misunderstandings, in making this journey. At the end of three days, these young men were placed in a box car on a railway siding, or at the end of the track laid by the Crow's Nest Pass Railway, and were left there to die, apparently unattended, and without any one being responsible for them. An hour or two after they were left there, a passer-by heard men moaning and complaining. He entered the car and found the men apparently dying. He succeeded in persuading one of the officials representing the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to send to the neighbouring town of Pincher Creek for medical assistance. The doctor was induced to leave

Pincher Creek, and did so almost at the risk of his life, because, I am informed by the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver), who was on the ground, that there was then prevailing one of the most severe storms of the season. The doctor found them in a box car lying on the floor, without light, and the only heat they had was from a box stove in which they were trying to burn hay and coal. The doctor states that the smoke in the car was so dense that he was unable to enter, and had to leave the door open for a time before going in. On entering, he found one man dying. He did die in a few moments. The other was not so far reduced, and, in the absence of anything else, and, as the man was asking for something to relieve the pain, he administered an injection of morphine, which gave him some temporary relief. I think I cannot do better than give the words of the doctor himself——

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). Did the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bell) state the name of the medical gentleman ?

Mr. BELL (Pictou). It was Dr. Mead.

Mr. DAVIN. I have had some correspondence with the Minister of Railways and Canals in this matter, and I think the hon. gentleman should be here.

Mr. FOSTER. If this had happened in Bulgaria, the whole country would have been aroused over it; but these men are only Canadians, so it does not matter.

Mr. BELL (Pictou)—reading—

I found the young men in a common box car with some hay to lie on. They had a box stove, and were trying to burn coal and hay in it. The smoke was so bad I had to leave door of car open some time before I could breathe or see. One man, MacDonald, was almost pulseless and speechless, just dying, at the far end of bunk. The other, Fraser, was lying on floor close to stove to try and keep warm and be out of way of smoke. He could hardly speak, and gasped out something—"Ease—pain!" I asked for stimulants, but was told there was none. I then asked for milk, but same answer. I then asked what they had got, and I was told water. I asked for a lamp to examine men by (they had only a dirty stable lantern), and got same answer as before. As I had nothing else, I gave Fraser an injection of ½ grain of morphine as a stimulant. He revived a short time, and asked me if he could not sue the company for their brutal treatment of himself and chum. I went back to agent's car to see what could be done, and told him that if they died before getting to MacLeod I should hold an inquest. I was not in car five minutes before a man ran in and said MacDonald was dead and Fraser much worse. I went back to box car and found what he said was true. I stayed with Fraser till the end, and ordered agent to sidetrack car that I might hold inquest on the bodies. I sent Dr. Harwood out to make a post mortem examination, which showed that they had died of diphtheria and pneumonia.

Now here we have the facts that immediately preceded the death of these men. I have already mentioned that they suffered from a depressing and deadly disease for nearly a fortnight. They had been in camp without treatment during that fortnight and had finally been sent a distance of 110 miles in the month of January in the winter, in an open conveyance without medicine or medical attendance, without care of any kind. They were compelled to occupy something like three days in making that journey in the depth of winter; so I am sure it is not going too far to say that these men were really murdered, and if any individuals could be held clearly responsible for their death, there is no doubt that an action for manslaughter would certainly lie against them. But the more serious part of the matter is to follow. These men are dead and I am sorry to have to say that I believe that the father of one of them was brought to the grave by the shocking circumstances of his son's death, for he died a very few weeks after learning this awful news. It would be thought that such an occurrence having taken place in a civilized and Christian country, it would be impossible that such facts could have been kept from public knowledge, and that justice would have been done; but on the other hand, I regret to have to state that, apparently, whatever power has been brought to bear at all, has been brought to bear to suppress the facts, and to prevent any knowledge being obtained by which the guilty party could be brought to justice. I will briefly recite the facts. Dr. Mead, in pursuance of the statement made by him, began an inquest on the following day after the death. He had the bodies examined, the report of the medical man who examined the bodies showed they had died of diphtheria and pneumonia, the pneumonia, probably, resulting from the exposure they had suffered. The doctor then, as these men had died at a point long distant from where their sickness had begun, adjourned his inquest. The death of these men occurred in the night between the 23rd and the 24th of January, he held his inquest on the 24th, and adjourned it until the 1st of February, as the witnesses had to come a long way. The day before the inquest he states that a lawyed named Wood, from Macleod, called on him and tried to get him to drop it on legal grounds, and later, the doctor states, this man Wood offered some very improper inducements to him to abandon this inquest. These statements I shall not make now, because I hope that the result of bringing this matter to the public notice will be the appointment of a commission who will bring out the facts as they should be. Wood attended the inquest and, according to the coroner, was exceedingly obstructive, and threw all the difficulties he could in the way of making an inquiry. As some of the witnesses had not attended, the coroner further adjourned this inquest until the 7th of February. On that day, as he says:

I was served with notice of prohibition, and so adjourned till February 21st. Not having heard

from the judge on that day, I had to adjourn sine die. I was served a few days ago with a notice forbidding me to go on with the inquest.

That is to say, the injunction was confirmed by Judge Rouleau, of Calgary, I understand. Then he says:

That means stopping the inquiry altogether, as no other coroner could take over my jury.

Of course, I cannot say as to whether that is legally correct. Then he says:

No one would care to dig up bodies that had died of such a disease as this kind. If any one else did go on with inquiry, I think it would now be difficult to find the witnesses. A great part of this you will find given before the C.M.P. Commissioner.

Mr. BRITTON. Does he state the grounds on which the prohibition was granted?

Mr. BELL (Pictou). Dr. Mead, who began the inquest was the only man who practically was in attendance during the last moments of their lives, and Judge Rouleau says, at least I understand that the ground he gives for his decision is that Dr. Mead should have been a witness at the inquest. Now the decision finally given by the judge, was not given until the 28th day of March. The first day upon which the inquest was held was the 24th day of January, so that two months were allowed to elapse before this judge confirmed his ruling in the matter. The effect of that was precisely, I presume, that it became utterly impossible to secure those witnesses that were material. In two months these witnesses had gone to their homes, they could be removed by interested parties from one part of the country to another, and scattered everywhere, and the result of this long delay is that now it has become almost impossible to secure evidence necessary to bring home the guilt in connection with these men's deaths, to the proper parties. Now, I am sure no more important matter has been brought before this House during this session. Here we have two young men, brought up in my own county, whom I knew personally; as good citizens as you could find in the Dominion of Canada, brought up in Christian homes, in comfortable, happy homes, and condemned to die like dogs, or worse than dogs, through the cruelty and neglect of some parties or other. When, in addition to that, we find the processes of law are used, not to secure justice, but to perpetuate injustice, I think it is time that the Parliament of Canada should interfere and say that the citizens of this country shall not be treated so brutally. I was going to suggest that the Government should take this matter up. I presume some of these questions have been raised by the coroner as to whether a subsequent coroner could take his jury and go on with the inquiry. But there must be some process by which the Government of Canada can issue a commission that will at least make it impossible—I hope that will be the result—that any such an occurrence can happen in the future. It is impossible to help these poor fellows now, they are gone beyond mortal aid; but it should surely be the care of the Government that no matter in what remote locality of Canada such an occurrence may happen criminal conduct of this kind should not go unpunished. I do not wish to reflect upon any person. I know this matter was brought to the notice of the Justice Department some two months ago, because I find that a telegram from Dr. Mead addressed to the Department of Justice on the 9th of February, informs the department that his action as coroner had been interrupted, and that he had been summoned to appear at Calgary to argue, by counsel, I presume, before Judge Rouleau, and he asked the Government to employ counsel to represent him. I find that the request of his was refused. Subsequently I believe argument was made before Judge Rouleau, but it was by a lawyer of Calgary, acting entirely upon his own responsibility, not instructed, I believe, nor having his remuneration guaranteed by the Government or any other person whatever. I understand that Mr. Bennett argued the case before the judge. He came into the case at the request of Dr. Mead. The great wrong done was the delay which occurred, and which, under the circumstances, rendered it almost impossible ever to gather together the witnesses upon whom would rest the responsibility of proving the circumstances attending the death. I hope the Government will take this matter under their consideration. It is important to our future as a civilized country that it shall not be possible that such cases can occur again in the western country. I shall be glad if hon. members who are acquainted with the facts will express their views to the House, and I may say that the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver), who was on the spot, did all he could at the time to see that justice was done. I shall be glad, as I said, if hon. members acquainted with the facts will supplement my statements, in order that the Government and the House may be impressed with the importance of adopting all possible means to remedy what is certainly a most cruel wrong.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). I should like to add a few facts that have come within my own knowledge. I was glad that at an early period of the session the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Bell) took this matter up. From communications I have had with parties on the spot and with friends of the deceased I can corroborate all the hon. member has said. This was not an ordinary case. All that the hon. member has said about the character of the young men is true. They had gone to Manitoba, they had worked there and then they tried their fortunes on the Crow's Nest Pass Railway. They were not only young men of excellent character and had funds with them, but

the father of Fraser and the father of McDonald were men possessing substantial means, being among the best farmers in the county of Pictou, and any notice sent to them would have enabled not only the company but the authorities to have advanced any sums of money required to look after the boys, even if they had not had a dollar. The fathers together are worth $10,000. The young men were not tramps, but they had been brought up in good surroundings, possessed good education, and besides their fathers were able to provide for them. They did not need to leave home; they were not young adventurers, but they had pluck and energy, they were such young men as the county of Pictou sends out by the hundreds to the west seeking their fortunes. Fraser was engaged in the Steel Works and received a substantial salary, while the other was helping his father. There was no attempt made to hold any communication with the fathers in New Glasgow; in fact the very first notice was a notice to the civic authorities to find out the fathers of these young men, after the young men had been sick two weeks at least. There are two features of this case, that are not only deserving of the Government's notice, but are sufficient to lead the Government to take some action. First, there was the conduct of those in whose employ the young men were. I need scarcely say that when a man employs a young man he is bound to look after him, if he has means; or if not, then he is bound to see that the young man gets means from his people. But outside that plea, the common dictates of humanity would tell a man to look after such a youth. These young men were temperate, they were excellent workmen, and no men could have given better satisfaction. The Government could not look after those responsible for the dreadful state of things that occurred, when those sick young men were locked in a car that was not fit for an animal. I would like to know—and on this point I speak with reservation—whether the judge who granted the order granted it with all the facts before him. No doubt he did what in his opinion was right. But it was very unfortunate indeed, if the facts now presented to the House were known, that there was not some person attending the court to see that the case should be fully argued. It might be difficult in that part of the country to get another coroner except the medical man, and I fail to see that because the coroner only knew the facts as to how these men died, he should be unable to hold an inquiry. I understand there was no coroner except this medical man. The ground of the injunction was that the coroner held an investigation and he was the doctor who alone saw the young men in their last moments, and that he could not act as coroner because he had evidence to give. Are we to suppose that we have arrived at this point that when in a locality there is no other coroner except the doctor, who happens to attend the case and happens to be able to give evidence of the last moments of the dying man, he is not to be permitted to hold an inquest simply because of his knowledge of the case? Among our neighbours to the south it appears to be the rule that no man can be a juryman unless he shows to the court that he is ignorant. I urge there should be strong and immediate action by the Government. I care not whether the Canadian Pacific Railway Company are responsible, or the judge or anybody else. I want every young man in this country to know as a result of the decision which will grow out of these two particular cases that he can go to any part of the Dominion and feel safe. What opinion would prevail in the eastern part of Canada, in Quebec and Ontario, if it became generally known that if young men of good character became sick out west, they might be put in a box car sent east, occupy it for three days without proper wraps or medical attendance, and allowed to die? Is that going to promote immigration to the west? Will our young men go there, unless they obtain security and protection. I strongly urge on the Government that no time should be lost and no efforts spared to find out the guilty parties in order that such a case may not occur again. I speak with some feeling. One of the men who died is a relation, and the other is well known to me; but irrespective of that fact, no two better young men ever left the county of Pictou, and I also know that the aged father of one of them so soon as he heard the facts died of the effects of receiving the news. While this may not be a reason why the Government should take action, I simply mention it incidentally as showing another side of this sad story. I hope no effort will be spared by the Government in dealing with the matter.

Mr. OLIVER. I regret very much having to say anything on this matter, but I think the House will admit that under all the circumstances I would be lacking in justice to myself if I did not state the facts as I know them in this particular case, and also the action which I took in the matter. As has already been stated, the case occurred in the district which I represent, and it is of importance not so much on account of this particular case in itself, as from the fact that this was but a sample case of what was occurring on the works on the Crow's Nest Pass Railway all last summer, according to the best information I have received. I supposed that this matter would have come before the House in a regular way by the presentation of the report of the Crow's Nest Pass Commission. The commissioners were almost on the ground at the time this occurred; they covered the whole route of the Crow's Nest Pass Railway, and the facts as to the

treatment of the sick men must be within their knowledge, so that if the report were before the House I should think hon. gentlemen would be thoroughly informed in regard to the condition of affairs that existed. But as that report is not before the House, and as this question has come up, and as I have certain personal knowledge of this particular case I will take the liberty of stating the facts as I know them. The men on the Crow's Nest Pass Railway were taxed 50 cents per month out of their pay for medical attendance, and the medical attendance provided was that the manager of the construction of the line contracted or hired certain physicians to give medical attendance to the men, these doctors being placed in charge of the men on certain sections.

Mr. FOSTER. Was that rule made by the sub-contractor or by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

Mr. OLIVER. It was made by Mr. Haney, the man who managed the whole business for the Canadian Pacific Railway. Mr. Haney hired the doctors and gave each doctor a section and paid the doctor such salary as he could arrange with him, and I may say the general impression is that Mr. Haney, or the company for whom he was working, had quite a margin of profit between the amount the labourers paid and the amount paid the doctors for medical attendance.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). I understand from information obtained by the Government solicitors at Lethbridge, that one doctor named Mewburn had control of the medical attendance and I think he employs subordinates. I think the contract was directly between the Canadian Pacific Railway and Dr. Mewburn.

Mr. OLIVER. I regret to say that I am compelled to differ from the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bell). While Dr. Mewburn had charge of several sections, he did not have charge of the whole of the work as I understand it, or if he had he certainly was not the contract doctor. He was hired just as the other doctors were, and the company were the contractors with the workmen for medical attendance and benefited to the extent of the difference between the price paid to them by the workmen, and the price paid by the company to the doctors. But the company in providing medical attendance such as it was, did not provide hospital accommodation, and as everybody understands, medical attendance under such circumstances without hospital accommodation is of comparatively little value. As a matter of fact all last summer men had to be transported from any point upon the work where they were found sick, to hospital at Macleod, and if the hospital at Macleod was too full they were taken on 35 miles further to Lethbridge. That is to say, men suffering from typhoid fever were brought from the Crow's Nest Pass 50 miles to Macleod, and if the Macleod hospital was not ready to receive them they were carted on 35 miles further to Lethbridge. I do not know how many of these men died when they got to hospital, but it was considered to be a most remarkable thing by the people who lived along the road and were acquainted with the circumstances of the case, that so few, if any, of them died under that process of transport. It was fully expected by those who saw the process going on that the lives of men would be sacrificed from day to day. However, as a matter of fact, I believe the deaths of these two men were the first which occurred in transport. I happened to be at Pincher Creek the night the men died. I drove to Pincher Creek from Macleod on the day they drove the sick men from Crow's Nest Lake to Pincher Creek, and the character of the weather was such that during the last hour of our drive to Pincher Creek, although it was broad daylight, we could not see twenty-five yards ahead of us, because of the severity of the storm. These men did not reach Pincher Creek until after darkness had set in and the House can gather from what I have said what the weather was like for the transport of sick men in their condition. Though the town was only four miles away and all necessary treatment could have been got in the town, they were dumped into the box car to be transported next morning to Macleod hospital. The doctor was called out in the storm which I have described and the men died as has been already related. That part of the story is told and I do not wish to dilate on it more than to say again, that this was not an isolated case, but a sample case. It was a specimen of the treatment which was systematically accorded to sick men along that road, and was in the estimation of all men whom I met living along that road, a disgrace to civilization.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. OLIVER. I make that statement irrespective of anything in regard to the general treatment of the labourers, because many of the men who spoke to me had little sympathy with the labourers as regards their ordinary treatment, but they said the hospital accommodation was a scandal and should be looked after.

Now, Mr. Speaker, while this is a sufficiently painful part of the subject, there is still something more painful, and it is to that I am compelled to allude in my own justification. This case occurred in the constituency I represent and came under my own personal knowledge. It was, I suppose, part of the duty of a member of Parliament to see that justice was done to people in his constituency, and I am compelled to go so far as to state some of the steps I took in order that I may justify myself before the people concerned. I can assure the House that the matter was laid before the Depart-

ment of Justice by Coroner Mead at the earliest possible date.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. When was that ?

Mr. OLIVER. The date stated by the member for Pictou (Mr. Bell). Some weeks afterwards a merchant from Pincher Creek who happened to be on business in Ottawa brought the matter to my attention again. I supposed that, of course, in the ordinary process of the law the matter was being attended to, and that there was no question but that the Department of Justice having such a case brought to its notice, would attend to it. When this gentleman from Pincher Creek called here he asked me about the case, and we both went to the Department of Justice to see what progress had been made. We were referred by the Minister of Justice to the Deputy Minister, and the Deputy Minister informed us that he had no jurisdiction in the matter, that he had no control over the coroner, that he could not provide any funds to argue against the injunction being granted, that, in fact, he could do nothing whatever. It seemed to me that he considered the matter of no interest to him or to the public generally. I pressed the matter upon his attention from time to time until the injunction was confirmed ; and by that time, as the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Bell) has said, the possibility of securing evidence that would be satisfactory in carrying on the case had passed. The railway manager had of course taken means to disperse, as far as possible, the men in his employ who would have been able to give evidence in the case. There is no doubt that the injunction had been secured for that very purpose, and that the object of it was attained ; for, if the question were re-opened, it would probably be impossible, owing to lack of evidence, to secure a conviction, which I believe could have been secured, and would have been secured, if the case had been proceeded with at the proper time. I wish to say further, in my own justification, that when the Deputy Minister of Justice informed me that the injunction had been issued against Coroner Mead because he had been in medical attendance on these men, I at once suggested to him that if there was any danger of that injunction being confirmed, Coroner Mead might be withdrawn and another coroner put in his place. The Deputy Minister told me he had no authority to do so. I pressed the matter further, and finally it was suggested to Dr. Mead that he might withdraw and let another coroner take his place. The coroner offered to withdraw if asked by the department to do so ; that is, he left it to the department to decide. But he was not asked to withdraw, he did not withdraw, another coroner did not take his place, and the matter remains as it is. This is a very painful statement for me to make. I do not wish to drag in any officials of the Government ; but if it comes to a question whether or not I have done my duty in this matter, I am not going to lie under an imputation for the sake of any official of the Government.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). The matter that has been brought to the attention of the House divides itself into two phases. The first relates to what took place after the death of these two men, and brings into question the action of the Department of Justice, the judge, and all who had anything to do with it. Manifestly, it is impossible to discuss the action of the Department of Justice in the absence of the representative of that department in this House, the Solicitor General, and in the absence of the papers referring to it, which would give us an accurate knowledge of what has been done. If my hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) is correct in saying that the ground given for the injunction which appears to have been issued to prevent the coroner from proceeding with his investigation, was the only ground given, I have no hesitation, as a lawyer and a lawyer having had some experience in the administration of justice, in saying that it strikes me as somewhat remarkable that the injunction was issued, and the House will be entitled to a full explanation of that circumstance. That part of the matter, I assume, will be taken up and explained to the House at a later date by the Solicitor General. I do not think anybody could listen to the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Bell), and the corroborative statement by the hon. member for Guysborough, without feeling that a very serious occurrence had taken place—an occurrence which, while it affected only two men in the first place, is yet of such importance that it fully deserves the most careful attention of every member of this House. The whole question of the treatment of the labourers upon the Crow's Nest Pass Railway came before me in my capacity as a Minister having charge of the work of immigration—in this way. I had arranged for the employment of a certain number of Welsh immigrants upon the Crow's Nest Pass Railway under a special arrangement. They were brought out and employment was procured for them on that railway. Some of them wrote letters to the Welsh papers complaining of the treatment they had received. Information came from various sources that the men were not being properly treated, and the statements made in the papers seemed to be so well grounded that the Government deemed it its duty to authorize a proper inquiry. We issued a commission for that purpose. I received the report of the commission a couple of weeks ago. In the press of business I was not able to get time to read it until last night, when I completed a careful examination of the report,

and I expect to lay it on the Table of the House to-day.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That commission does not cover this case, does it?

The MINISTER OF [illegible]OR. I will refer to that in a moment. I will, of course, only deal with the question so far as it affects the treatment of the labourers on the line of railway. I may say that although the report of the commission only refers somewhat briefly to the death of these two men, yet it corroborates pretty fully the statement which the hon. member for Pictou has made. In advance of the presentation of the report, I desire to say that I rose from a very careful perusal of it, having read it through two or three times to make sure that I had got the purport of it, fully and accurately, with a very strong feeling that there had been gross and inexcusable negligence on the part of the persons who had been responsible for the death of these men, and gross and inexcusable treatment of other men on this line of railway. I have not so far been able to form a definite conclusion as to where the responsibility should be placed; but I have no hesitation in saying that the railway company and the manager of construction, whatever may have been the arrangements between them and the contractors, cannot possibly escape responsibility in connection with this matter. My judgment is that when the railway company appoint a manager of construction and engage in the construction of a great public work, having had great experience in such matters, and knowing all the difficulties that are likely to arise in connection with the employment of large numbers of men, particularly in a practically uninhabited section of country, they are responsible for making such arrangements that the men will be treated at least with common humanity; and I state most distinctly for myself that when the House comes to examine that report, I think it will feel that there has been gross negligence. The report of the commission and the evidence which was taken will advise the House of the facts of the case.

I am pleased to say that the report of the commission seems to have been excellently prepared. It brings the facts to a head in a very concise form. The action of the Government was this. They appointed a commission with Judge Dugas as chairman. The reputation of Judge Dugas is, no doubt, well known to members of this House. We selected him as a suitable man to conduct the investigation, from his legal knowledge and experience and general reputation, and the thoroughness and care with which the investigation was conducted amply justify the judgment of the Government. We added to the commission Mr. John Appleton, the president of the labour union of the city of Winnipeg, as being a man who would represent the labour element, not perhaps in a direct sense, but in whom the labouring men of the country would feel that they had a representative who would be interested in seeing that there was no attempt made to slur over or suppress any grievance on the part of the labouring men. In addition to these two gentlemen, we placed on the commission Mr. Frank Pedley, the superintendent of immigration, who would have special knowledge of the interests of the immigration department and its work in connection with these men. We thought, therefore, that the commission was well and fully constituted for the work it had to do, and I think it made a very thorough investigation of the whole matter.

I have reason to believe that in every way it was just as full, impartial and complete as possible, and the House will, therefore, be placed in the position of having not only the conclusion of the commission, but a very full statement of the evidence taken carefully, not only at different points on the line, but in Winnipeg, Ottawa and Montreal, where men were to be found who had been working on the line, and thus have a complete statement of the facts available to every member. So far as any action on the part of the Government is concerned, I am not prepared to express any opinion as to what legal power the Government possesses to deal with the matter. Within my recollection no similar case has arisen. and before coming to a decision the Government would have to give the matter its most careful consideration.

So far as regards the particular matter to which my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Bell) has referred, respecting the action of the Department of Justice, that will be closely and carefully looked into at once, and every endeavour made to see that justice is done .

I want, before I sit down, to say that I fully agree with what the hon. gentleman has said, and also the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser), in relation to the distressing nature of the circumstances, and that if anything the House can do to place the legislation of this country in such a position that no such occurrence can possibly occur again, the Government will see that it shall be done without any regard to parties or politics.

Mr. DAVIN moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to and debate adjourned.

The PRIME MINISTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to and the House adjourned at 1 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Second Sitting.

WEDNESDAY, 1st June, 1898.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

THE LONDON AND LAKE HURON RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. LISTER. I move that the rule respecting Private Bills be suspended for the purpose of enabling me to introduce a Bill respecting the London and Lake Huron Railway Company. He said: Some three or four weeks ago a Bill incorporating this company was passed through this House and the Senate. A section of the Bill had been struck out in the Railway Committee, under a misapprehension of the Minister of Railways and Canals, but when the Bill was referred to the Committee of the Whole that section was reintroduced in the shape of an amendment which was adopted. Through some inadvertence, however, the amendment was not initialed by the chairman, and when the Bill went to the printer, he left it out altogether, and the Bill passed this House and also the Senate, without the amendment. I now ask the House to allow me to introduce a distinct Bill providing for the amendment that was agreed to by the Committee of the Whole, omitted by clerical error.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). As this amendment was left out through a clerical error, there can be no difficulty in our consenting to the motion, but I would like my hon. friend to state the nature of the amendment.

Mr. LISTER. It is the usual statement inserted in the case of the incorporation of electric railway companies. It asks for power to enter upon a highway with the consent of the municipalities and put up poles and pay damages for any injury to trees.

Motion agreed to, and rule suspended.

FIRST AND THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 158) respecting the London and Lake Huron Railway Company.—(Mr. Lister.)

ST. VINCENT DE PAUL PENITENTIARY—PRINTING OF REPORT.

Mr. FORTIN moved:

That the report of the investigation held into the administration of the St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, now before this House, be ordered to be printed, and that rule 94 be suspended.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. Mr. Speaker, this is a departmental affair, the investigation having been ordered by a department of the Government; and I do not think that this House should be saddled with printing of the report—for it will be charged against our contingencies account. It should properly be borne by the department that ordered the investigation. There are other investigations of a similar character, and, if we establish this precedent, we shall be expected to follow it with regard to other investigations that are held.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I would observe to my hon. friend (Mr. LaRivière) that though this report is purely departmental, the House has taken possession of it, having asked for its production; and it is now before the House. If the report were not now part of the archives of the House, there would be force in the contention of my hon. friend. But as the House has made it part of its own archives, we are simply following the precedent in the case of the Kingston Penitentiary, in which case, if I remember aright, the same thing was done.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. No, that was made part of the sessional papers.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. I think my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) is, perhaps, in error when he says that this report is before the House. We are supposed to have a copy. But I do not think that the House ever ordered the original report to be brought down. The original is supposed to remain in the department to which the report was made.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It is as broad as it is long. If the report is brought down, it will be printed by the House as part of the sessional papers. So there would be no saving.

Mr. GIBSON. This matter was before the Printing Committee. We have established the rule that the clerk of the committee shall go to the various departments and find out what papers laid upon the Table of the House are to be embraced in the reports of the departments. We were informed by the clerk of the committee that this report was to appar in the report of the Department of Justice. I understand, however, that as before this report of the Department of Justice appears, another year will have passed, a number of hon. gentlemen are anxious that this should be printed as a special report and copies placed in the hands of members of both Houses of Parliament. The committee, so far as it was concerned, was influenced by the consideration indicated by the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. LaRivière). We simply lay the facts before the House, and it will be for the House to say whether this is to be printed or not.

Mr. SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of Mr. Fortin.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. I object to the suspension of the rule, Mr. Speaker. The matter has come before the Printing Committee,

and it has been dealt with there. The request of the hon. member was discussed in committee, and we ascertained that the Department of Justice was going to print that report.

Mr. SPEAKER. As the hon. gentleman makes objection to the motion, it cannot be moved at present.

PETERSEN FAST LINE SERVICE.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the leader of the Government, or the Minister who has the matter in charge, if there is any late word as to the success of the Petersen fast line company. Is there any late information with reference to the progress that that company is making towards a contract?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). No later information has been received up to date.

PROPOSED JOINT COMMISSION WITH THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. FOSTER. I see that our hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) is back again from his short and I hope successful visit to Washington, and I think that the House and the country as well would be very glad to hear any statement he may be prepared to make with reference to what eventuated in Washington as a result of his final visit.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). The suggestion made by the hon. gentleman is a perfectly natural one. Of course the House being in session, it is proper that it should be put in possession of all the facts so far as I am able to give them in this matter. It is within the knowledge of the House that at the request of the Premier and of my colleagues, I went to Washington to have some preliminary negotiations with the authorities there looking to the establishment of a joint commission between the two countries for the purpose of settling existing differences which have been unsettled for years back. I went with that determination and with those instructions, and had interviews with the President and with the officers that were specially appointed to meet the British ambassador and myself to consider these different questions. We sat in consultation every day while I was there, and went over these troublesome questions one after the other, discussing them generally, and I am glad to say, in a very cordial spirit of good-will and amity. I can frankly say that the best of disposition was shown on the part of Mr. Kasson and General Foster, who represented the President on the occasion, to discuss with great fairness all those several questions. After lengthy and prolonged discussions we came to an agreement, which was put in proper form and duly signed by the several gentlemen on the commission, and which has been forwarded to each of the Governments of Great Britain and of the United States for their final approval. I have no reason to doubt that that approval will be given in both cases, and if it is, there will be a joint commission appointed by the Governments of the United States and of Great Britain which will meet at an early day for the purpose of discussing and settling and putting in the form of a treaty if possible, all the several questions which were discussed at our preliminary meeting. The city of Quebec has been chosen as the place of meeting, and I think the Canadian people will be satisfied with the choice of the place. From expressions which dropped from the President and others with whom I was brought into consultation, I have no doubt that that commission will be composed, on the part of the United States, of gentlemen of very distinguished standing in that country. I am pleased to say that so far as I was able to gauge the public opinion with which I came in contact, there never was a time, as it seemed to me, more favourable for a fair meeting of minds and a discussion of these difficult and unsettled questions, and I am not without hopes that if a commission is formally constituted, they will be able to arrive at a solution of all, or, at any rate, of nearly all, these questions, which will be generally satisfactory to the people of both countries, and will promote largely the good feeling and harmony which should exist between these two great English-speaking peoples.

Mr. FOSTER. Of course Canada will be represented on that proposed commission?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Oh, yes. I may say to my hon. friend that the number of commissioners was not finally settled upon, but it is distinctly understood that Canada will be adequately represented on the commission.

Mr. FOSTER. If I may be allowed a single word, without entering into a discussion, I will take the opportunity of congratulating my hon. friend on the success of his mission in its preliminary stage, and while doing that, I think I may justly congratulate the Parliament of Canada and the electors whom we represent, on what I think may be claimed as a more satisfactory condition of feeling between the two countries. I do not think Canada ever had anything but the most friendly feeling towards the United States in all these matters which have been in a certain sense in dispute between us. I am not so sure, however, that the public men of the United States have always sufficiently well understood us Canadians and our interests in these questions, and have sympathized with us as they should have done. But I am happy to know that at

present, from different causes there is a fair prospect of prominent people in the United States so far entering into sympathetic relations with us as to bring about the settlement of these questions. Nobody, I am sure, will withhold what congratulations are due to my hon. friend ; everybody will be very happy indeed if his visit results in initiating a settlement of all the questions which have disturbed the good relations which should exist between the two peoples.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I must express to my hon. friend my entire satisfaction, and more than that, my gratitude, for the words he has just spoken as to the success of my hon. friend and colleague the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. It is quite true that in the past our relations with our neighbours have not always been as cordial as they should have been, but perhaps it is just as well at this moment not to inquire who was in the wrong or who was in the right. I think we can say that from this moment the past had better be forgotten, and the present indications are such that we may hope that in future amity and peace will prevail between the two nations, and that the cordial relations which now exist between the United States of America and Great Britain will extend wherever there are nations which have acknowledged, or still acknowledge the sovereignty of England.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I want to ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries whether he can say more definitely whether this commission is to cover, as he expressed it, all existing differences between Canada and the United States, or whether only special subjects are to be referred under the agreement ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I may say to my hon. friend that the commissioners on both sides brought forward those questions which they deemed to be unsettled, and they were formulated in a protocol.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Can the hon. gentleman give the heads ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I have not yet made a report to my colleagues, I must officially make that first ; but there will be no secret about it. It is to be submitted to the Imperial Government and to the United States Government. Of course I would not feel justified, without special permission, in laying it before the House. But I may say to my hon. friend that the mode of proceeding was to take up each subject separately, and then we put in an omnibus clause which I hope will be satisfactory.

ALIEN LABOUR LAW.

Mr. MacPHERSON. I desire to ask the Government whether it is their intention to appoint some officer in Hamilton to keep an eye on the Alien Labour Law. We are all aware of the recent mission of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and I desire very much to know from him whether efforts have been made to abolish this abomination on both sides of the line.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The Government have taken no steps to appoint an agent to carry out the Alien Labour Law at Hamilton, and their attention has not been called to the matter. But I have good reason to hope and believe that after a few months there will be no cause for such appointment.

RECIPROCITY IN WRECKING.

Mr. BRITTON. I want to call the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to a motion I have on the paper in regard to some minor matters of difference between the United States and Canada, in regard to the operation of the law in respect to reciprocity in wrecking, and also as to the rule of the road in respect to passenger steamboats, as equipment. Did those minor matters come up for discussion, and are they within the scope of the commission to be appointed by the two countries ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). I will just say to my hon. friend that I should hardly like to be questioned as to whether this or the other subject came up for consideration, but I will go this far and tell the hon. gentleman that I do not think any good will arise from the discussion of the question, as the matter has been under advisement.

OTTAWA RIFLE RANGE.

Mr. MONK. I desire to ask the Minister of Militia if he can possibly give an answer in regard to firing at the rifle range, to which I called attention.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). I have much pleasure in being able to inform my hon. friend that orders were given yesterday to stop all firing over that range for the present.

ALIEN LABOUR LAW.

Mr. CLANCY. I desire to call the attention of the First Minister to a subject in regard to which I have received considerable correspondence, namely, the appointment of an officer with respect to the enforcement of the Alien Labour Law. The hon. gentleman a day or two ago gave a list of persons appointed, six of whom were appointed in the Niagara Peninsula, one at Toronto, one at Windsor, one at Parry Sound. I have had many requests for the appointment of an officer at Wallaceburg, which is very near the frontier. There is no officer at Chatham or Sarnia. I hope the Minister will take the matter into

his consideration, and have an officer appointed at Wallaceburg, or some point near there where he would be easily available.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I must say to the hon. gentleman that my attention has not been called to Wallaceburg. I will note the hon. gentleman's suggestion.

Mr. McCORMICK. I should like to ask the name of the officer appointed at Parry Sound.

The PRIME MINISTER. I gave some information to the House on the subject a few days ago, information I had received from the Department of Justice. I cannot remember whether or not Parry Sound is in the list. I shall be glad to make inquiries.

VOLUNTEERS OF 1866.

Mr. HEYD. I have received a dozen letters with respect to the position of the volunteers of 1866. I went over to the Militia Department and obtained the necessary answers in different cases. I presume other members are receiving letters asking for certain information. The men want to know when the medals will be granted, who will be entitled to them, and how they will be able to prove their identity, and so on. If the hon. Minister will make a statement, which may get into the public press, he will satisfy the public and save members of the House much trouble.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). The hon. gentleman will observe in the Supplementary Estimates an item to provide for payment for medals which are intended to be given to the militiamen who served in 1866 and 1870. I had intended when the item came before the committee to give explanations, and it would perhaps be well to wait until the Estimates are considered.

REPATRIATION OF THE 100TH REGIMENT.

Mr. HUGHES. As the question of the repatriation of the 100th Regiment is engaging attention at Toronto, Hamilton and other cities, I desire to take up the subject at some time that will meet the convenience of the hon. Minister. I propose to do so either on going into Supply or when the Supplementary Estimates are considered.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). I think it would be more convenient to discuss the matter on the Supplementary Estimates.

SUPPLY—LABOURERS ON CROW'S NEST PASS RAILWAY.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. DAVIN. A few days ago we had from the right hon. Prime Minister an eloquent appreciation of Mr. Gladstone, and the feature in Mr. Gladstone's character that the Prime Minister dwelt on as formative, as salient was his abhorrence of wrong. His heart swelled and burned at the thought of injustice, and the Prime Minister gave several instances. However impatient we may all be to get back to our homes, as we are, I do not think when we are ready to give our sympathies to the sufferers by oppression in Bulgaria, this House will consider a few moments wasted in bringing before the House what may prove to be the first real step against oppression in the future, and, if possible, securing redress for the wrong which has been done. Unfortunately some wrong has been done that cannot be redressed, such wrong as the hon. member for Pictou called attention to, where life was lost. My hon. friend called attention to the loss of two valuable lives. But even a more cruel case occurred in regard to one who was a resident of the constituency whence I come, and who leaves behind him a wife and family. He was killed undoubtedly in a way that gives him, in my opinion, legal redress. But you can imagine nothing more helpless than a poor man going to the Crow's Nest Pass, making a contract with a powerful contractor like Mr. Haney, and there having one of his friends fall by his side. When you tell him to go to law, probably he has not the money to do so, he is afraid of litigation. I hope the result of the discussion brought up by the hon. member for Pictou will be that some policy will be introduced by the Minister of Railways, because I still hold that this question belongs to the Department of Railways, and that a Bill will be submitted and become law which will enable the Minister to guard in future against such occurrences as have taken place in connection with the building of a portion of the Crow's Nest Pass road. I wish to call the attention of the House for a few moments to the peculiar position of the men who were taken to work on that railway.

An arrangement seems to have been made between Mr. Haney, the head contractor and the sub-contractors, under which Mr. Haney was to get the men to work, although ultimately they would work for the sub-contractors and be paid by them. I, for one, will frankly say that nobody could complain of the way in which the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) spoke of this matter to-day. Evidently he has glanced over the report, and the report has made on his mind an impression that will be on the mind of every man who knows the facts, that great wrongs that have taken place in Canada, taken place in this free country, taken place at a time like this in a colony of Great Britain, and we ought in this Parliament to guard against such things ever happening again. I wish to call the attention of the

House to a few sentences of this report of the Crow's Nest Pass Railway Commissioners :

A general system has been established by Mr. Haney, applying to contractors and sub-contractors alike, and which may be summed up as follows :—

"Scale of wages to 1st February, for ordinary labourers, fixed at $1.50 a day, they paying $4 a week for board. Since the 1st of February wages have been raised to $1.75 a day, and board to $5 a week.

One authoritative witness was examined as to the scale of wages, and he gave evidence that it was $1 and $1.50 a day, and from $4 to $5 a week was charged for board, so that this scale of wages made by Mr. Haney would not seem to be just.

Transportation to Macleod fixed at 1 cent a mile, to be charged in all cases, and to be deducted from wages, though at the latter part of September, being in need of men, instructions were given to agents at Winnipeg to send 500 men free of transportation. This order remained in force during two weeks, the rule being to charge 1 cent a mile, the contrary being the exception.

One of my friends to my right, Mr. Speaker, asks me to call your attention to the way some members on the Government side are going on while a question affecting the lives, aye, and the liberties, of citizens of Canada is being brought before the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. members will be good enough to keep order. I do not think it will tend to shorten the debate at all if order is not kept.

Mr. DAVIN. The report goes on to say :

Reception agents were appointed at Macleod to receive, board and lodge the men as they arrived. When intended for the company's service, men were charged transportation only from Macleod to the work, being boarded free in the meantime, whilst those allotted for service under contractors, if sent to the works by the company, cost of transportation either by rail to Macleod or from there to the work, and board, would be charged to contractors, who afterwards deducted such cost proportionately from wages.

There were certain agreements made, and the report on page 10 says :

The board for the company's men is supplied by contract by Mr. Smith, the board due by the men being deducted from their wages and paid to Mr. Smith.

I want to call the attention of the House and especially of the Government, to this statement, that the men could be discharged at any time without notice by the company.

Mr. SPEAKER. I am afraid the hon. member is not confining himself to a discussion of the question which was raised by the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Bell). I do not think it is quite regular to discuss the report on the question before the House.

Mr. DAVIN. If you, Mr. Speaker, will recall what the Minister of the Interior said you will be aware that he widened the scope of the discussion, and in any case it is as broad as it is long, because I have had correspondence with one of the departments about the death of a man of great respectability, who lived near Maple Creek, and who went to work on this Crow's Nest Pass, and if I cannot refer to the fact now, I will have to take another opportunity. The report says :

Men can be discharged at any time without notice by company and contractors, whilst the men are to give 15 days' notice when intending to leave work.

Now, Sir, I hold that there should be no jug-handled arrangement like that. I hold that if the men have to give fifteen days notice, justice should demand that they should get fifteen days notice if discharged, especially when they were taken thousands of miles away from their homes.

Fifteen days of back pay is kept until final settlement.

Public hospitals used at Lethbridge, Macleod and Nelson. Company's hospital at St. Eugène.

At various points on the line there are stations for accommodation of men with mild forms of disease, and those on their way to the hospitals.

Where you had four thousand men the head medical officer got some $2,000 for attending to their sanitary condition, and therefore there is no excuse whatever if the medical attendance was not all that was desirable. It is laid down in the report, and it is in Mr. Haney's evidence, that two pairs of blankets are necessary for comfort in that country, and anybody who knows anything of the North-west, knows that in August in that district, or in fact in any part of the North-west, two pairs of blankets are required for comfort. Now, Sir, it seems that it having been found that men could not be hired under the conditions first fixed by Mr. Haney, the report says :

It having been found that men could not be hired under conditions first fixed by Mr. Haney, subsequent telegrams were exchanged between Mr. Haney and Mr. J. B. Charleson, when finally on the 20th July Mr. Haney gave orders to the latter to hire 100 good axemen at $20 to $26 per month and board, with 6 cooks at prices fixed in the previous telegram, to wit : from $40 to $50.

One Herménégilde Magloire Roy was then charged by Mr. Charleson to hire these first 100 men, and the result was that on the 24th July, Roy started with 115 men, which, by his deposition, he acknowledged having hired at $20 to $26 per month and board, and food to be furnished them on the journey. With the exception of a few, all the contracts which Roy had signed were blank as to wages, and the reason given for this was that the rate being from $20 to $26, it was left to Mr. Haney to fix the amount according to the ability of the man. Still, there were some contracts specifically fixing the wages at $26, as Roy considered the men hired thereunder as particularly good axemen, who, besides, refused to sign unless the amount of their wages which they were to receive would be specially settled. The length of service and character of work generally also were not specified, but they were

all told verbally that they were to work as axemen and be paid as such. Roy states that having specially asked Mr. J. B. Charleson as to the fare, he answered that it would be all right, understanding this to mean that it would be free, and that this is what he represented to the 115 men he engaged.

Mr. FOSTER. Who engaged these men ?

Mr. DAVIN. A man named Charleson.

Mr. FOSTER. What had he to do with it ?

Mr. DAVIN. He was told to do it by Mr. Haney. The report goes on :

He also understood and represented to the men that they would be fed on the road, that their time would commence from the day they arrived at Macleod, and that there they would be furnished with blankets. On leaving, Mr. Charleson gave him tickets for the men, and also handed him $40 to buy them food for the trip. Having reached Macleod on the 28th July, at 8 p.m., Roy reported to Mr. Harwood, the accountant of the company, and there tried to obtain blankets for the men, but failed. At Macleod those men were kept nine days idle, and on the 6th of August they were ordered to leave for Crow's Nest Lake, at a distance of 70 miles. During the nine days kept idle at Macleod, the men were under tents and without blankets, the company stating they had none in stock, and the men complained of suffering from cold during the nights. On or about the 23rd of August these men, hearing that the company intended to deduct their fare from Ottawa to Macleod, and transportation from Macleod to the works, took advantage of the presence of Mr. Haney at Crow's Nest Lake to send a deputation of two (one Frenchman and one Englishman) in order to inquire about the same, and as to whether they would be paid for the nine days passed at Macleod. But, according to the report of these two men, no satisfaction could be had, and one of them, Laferriere, with one Dupont, was the day after discharged. In his testimony, Mr. Haney said they had been reported to him by P. Nash, under whose charge the men were, as being ringleaders, and that this was the reason for his discharging them.

So that the moment those two men went to complain that they had been deceived and that the contract as they had made it was not being carried out, instead of getting any satisfaction, when they went back to camp, they were discharged, with a view, no doubt, of putting an end to anything like that. Now, I should like to know who this Mr. Charleson is—whether he is connected with the Canadian Pacific Railway, or with any of the departments of the Government.

An hon. MEMBER. The Public Works Department.

Mr. DAVIN. I do not see the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) here, and I will postpone that question until he is here. The commissioners report :

This charging of fare under the circumstances, and after the representations made by Roy to these 115 men, the non-payment of wages from the time they reached Macleod to the time they began work at Crow's Nest Lake, and the charges for transportation, were the first principal causes of discontent.

Other reasons were that having been hired as axemen, they had to work with pick and shovel for weeks, and having been engaged for the month at $20 to $26 and board, they were deducted for Sundays and for days they could not work owing to bad weather.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Carried.

Mr. DAVIN. No, it is not carried. It is far too important a matter to treat with levity like that. These men, although they were hired by the month, were kept there in enforced idleness for a space of nine or ten days, and they were not allowed for that time. It was deducted from their pay.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Carried.

Mr. DAVIN. Oh, no, it is not carried. Mr. Speaker, let me say one word in passing about the demeanour of this House. I think the right hon. gentleman will bear me out in saying that the demeanour of this Opposition is very different from the demeanour of the Opposition which the right hon. gentleman used to lead with such distinction in this House. I think he will bear me out that this Opposition does not manifest towards the Government or any member of the Government, or in fact towards the humblest member on that side anything like the demeanour—I will not use the word that would properly characterize it—that used to be manifested by that Opposition. When you scratch a Russian you find a Tartar, and apparently even the sweets of office and the sunny side of victory cannot change the qualities that made that Opposition so rowdy in other days.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Mr. Speaker, of course, it is desirable and we all expect that there should be order in this House, but we also expect that distinguished members of this House should be the first to give the example ; and I think my hon. friend is not giving an example of good order when he is reading from a report that has not yet been laid on the Table of the House.

Mr. DAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I was not aware that I was doing anything contrary to order.

Mr. SPEAKER. I certainly think the hon. gentleman is extending the debate beyond its proper scope when he is reading from and commenting upon a public report which the other members of the House are not in possession of. I admit that the Minister of the Interior, who in connection with the question that was under discussion, referred to the contents of that report, was bound at once, upon the request of any hon. member, to lay it upon the Table of the House ; and no doubt he will do so. I think he said he would do so. But until that is done, I think it would be at least

exceedingly inconvenient, and would not conduce to the regularity or the shortening of debate, to engage in a discussion of the report.

Mr. DAVIN. Well, Mr. Speaker, if it is not in order, and if the Government side of the House are restive under the bringing out of these facts, I certainly shall not transgress against order to bring them out. I have read the report cerefully, and what I find is this: There is evidence that the lodging of the men who went there, their protection against the weather, the precautions taken to preserve their health, were simply disgracefully insufficient, and above all that the remuneration was so arranged and the truck system was so carried out, that after the men had worked 12 months, they would not have $5, although they had gone out there in order to be able to send money back to their families. All these things were of such a nature as to constitute a most glaring outrage on common justice and humanity. Some things have taken place at the Crow's Nest Pass which are not mentioned in this report, and the Government will have to go beyond that report. They will have not merely to take steps to guard against things of this kind in the future, but if possible to see that when valuable lives are lost in consequence of wrong-doing on the part of persons employed by this company, enfranchised and subsidized by this House, compensation must be given to the families of those persons who were injured.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. If the hon. Minister of the Interior, when speaking for the Government had taken the course I expected, it would not have been necessary for me to say a word concerning those saddest of all facts that have ever been mentioned in my time on the floor of the House of Commons in connection with the good government of Canada. The harrowing circumstances related by members behind the Government benches and by my colleague from the county of Pictou (Mr. Bell) are fully corroborated by Coroner Mead and the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver), who took such a very active and energetic part in endeavouring to move the authorities of this country to take immediate steps for the bringing to justice of the parties responsible for the atrocities that were committed. With these statements before him, with a full knowledge of the facts that were pressed upon the Department of Justice privately as well as by members in this House, with the knowledge that a notice of motion covering this subject was given as early as the 18th March, with the action taken subsequently by my colleague from Pictou (Mr. Bell), who on no less than two occasions drew the attention of the Government to this culpable or criminal negligence on the part of those connected with the death of these two men, Macdonald and Fraser, employed on a public work subsidized by this Parliament, I did expect the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton), confessing as he did that his own attention has been drawn to this subject, and his sympathy moved by documents that he had read, to announce that the Government would take prompt action and use all the resources and power at their command to probe this matter to the very bottom. Instead of that, he gave expression to doubts regarding the power of the Government. Although he has sat here ever since the subject was brought up, although those deaths occurred as far back as January last, although the facts were before the Government, although the Government knew that some one was trying to suppress information that would bring the guilty parties to justice, forsooth, the Minister of the Interior, on this 1st of June, raises doubts as to the power of the Government to interfere. The hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) told us that all the comfort he got from the Department of Justice, when he pressed the matter on them in his well-known energetic manner, was the reply that it did not seem to be a matter pertaining to that department. I shall not go over the sad history of these cases. The facts have been mentioned by my colleague (Mr. Bell), and the hon. members for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) and Alberta (Mr. Oliver) have corroborated his statement. I shall, therefore, not deal with these facts, but there are others, which are not mentioned for the first time now, but which I deem it necessary to bring to the attention of the House in order that they may see why all these quirks and quibbles were brought to the front in connection with the administration of justice in the territory, and how it was that an injunction made abortive the coroner's inquest, attempted to be held at the outset, and at a time when it was possible to obtain all the facts, and certainly possible to obtain much more information than can now possibly be got in any shape or form. The coroner was prevented by an injunction from the court of the North-west Territories from holding an inquest simply because he had acted as a humanitarian, in his capacity of doctor of medicine, by attending the dying hours of this poor man. The fact that he had acted in this way was taken advantage of by some parties, and as we have been informed by the Minister of the Interior, the result was that the investigation he attempted to hold was frustrated by an injunction. At the same time, while these technical objections were being raised and the object of Dr. Mead was being frustrated, he was approached by parties connected with the employment of those two young men, who suggested to him that it would be more in his interest if he abstained altogether from following the matter up. When these parties were told by Dr. Mead

that if he did not then act, the result might be that the matter would have to be dropped, because the exhumation of the bodies of these diphtheria cases would be almost impossible or useless later on, and because the witnesses would have disappeared, they said: "So much the better." With the facts detailed in that connection by Dr. Mead, and in a letter I have before me, he stated that a full report was sent by him to the Department of Justice, with this attempt to buy or threaten the coroner in the first place, then the successful resort to the courts, we stand face to face with the fact that, through the fault of some one, it seems to me through the fault of the Government, this extraordinary and unfortunate delay has taken place. When I say the fault of the Government, I have some reason for saying so. The Government had no doubts as to their powers to appoint a commission, to spend public money without a special vote of Parliament. When the case of some poor underpaid officer in the service of the Government was charged with being a political partisan, the Government was quite clear as to its powers to send commissions to every part of the land. When the Attorney General of Manitoba, then expecting to get into this Government, thought he could fasten upon his political opponents charges of corruption in the general election of Manitoba, such as stuffing ballot boxes, $19,000 could be snatched—partly out of the public treasury and partly from other sources, but, in the end, out of the public treasury, every dollar of it—to hire Pinkerton detectives in the United States and send them all over the province of Manitoba, to engage counsel by the score to go upon what they termed a fishing expedition and seek to fasten upon somebody offences to be punished by imprisonment up to two years; but in the case of the death of these two men under the circumstances mentioned by my hon. colleague from Pictou (Mr. Bell), there were doubts as to the powers of the Government to ferret out and expose fully the circumstances under which these deaths occurred. I do not know of a case that could be set before the department that should command more prompt and careful attention than this very case. Unless this sort of thing can be exposed, unless it can be shown that the efforts of parties interested, or whoever they were, to cover up the facts will be unsuccessful what a black name that part of the country, and in fact, all Canada will obtain wherever the facts are known. I trust that before this subject is allowed to pass from the consideration of the House, the Prime Minister himself will give us that which not only are we entitled to from him under the circumstances but which his own judgment should prompt him to give—an assurance that an immediate examination and inquiry will be entered upon, whether by special commission—which it is undoubtedly within the power of the Government to issue—or by exercise of the authority they have exercised in cases not as much in need of it in the interest of the country to employ detectives or officers or special men to probe this matter to the very bottom. I am suggesting, of course, nothing new in dwelling upon the serious circumstances connected with the horrible fate of these men. After the statement made by the right hon. gentleman's own colleague, even with the partial information on this subject contained in the report of a commission not charged specially with inquiry into this subject but into the general question of the treatment of the men on the Crow's Nest Pass Railway, I trust that the hon. Prime Minister will not allow the subject to be disposed of or to pass from the attention of the House without giving a frank and explicit assurance that the case will not merely engage the attention of the Government, but that the Government will use every means at its command to expose all the facts and to make sure that the guilty parties, if any are guilty, shall be brought to justice, and such an example made as will prevent such cruelty—amounting to murder—being again perpetrated in our land. Every one knows how cruelties not half so great as those these men were subjected to, when inflicted upon British seamen in times happily gone by, being made known to the British Parliament, brought about legislation and such prosecutions as wiped out this disgrace from the history of the Empire. Even with regard to dumb beasts, this Parliament has shown the spirit of the people by legislation to prevent brutes being treated with cruelty when sent by ship or by railway. Here you have the case of men, Canadians, young men in the prime of life assisting in the construction of this public work, subsidized by this Parliament, having gone far from home in the hope of bettering their condition, subjected to treatment not merely sufficient to kill them, but so cruel and so horrible that the like of it will hardly be found in any place outside of Siberia.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I do not intend to offer more than a very few remarks upon this question. I may say that in my capacity as the editor of a newspaper in Winnipeg, I have received a great many reports with regard to cruelties practised upon the men employed in the construction of the Crow's Nest Pass Railway. Now, I have not read the report of the commissioners, not having had the opportunity of doing so; therefore, I cannot speak with regard to the scope of that report. But it seems to me that it is the bounden duty of the Government to inquire into the cost of the road. I have been informed by different parties who, I think, are in a position to judge, that the Canadian Pacific Railway has built the road, at least, up to Kootenay

Lake for the subsidy that this Parliament has granted to the company. Now, if that is the case, it shows that the company has been enabled to grind the face of the poor workingmen in that country. There is no doubt as to the evidence on this point. Men, almost by the score, who have been obliged, because they could not secure enough money to pay their way, to walk the entire distance from the scene of their work back to civilization, have complained most bitterly of the treatment received—in some cases of the food, in some cases of the places they have been obliged to sleep, and so on. It is only fair, if the country has paid for this work that the men should receive proper treatment, and it should be the duty of the Government to inquire into this question fully and carefully. I may say also that I have it on the best authority that the contractors have been treated most shabbily by the company.

I know as a matter of fact that a number of contractors who went out there hoping to make a fair living, have been obliged to leave the work, claiming that not only did they not make any money but they lost the little they had when they went there. In one or two cases contractors failed and were unable to pay their liabilities, and left the men who worked for them without sufficient money to return to civilization. I am also informed that some other contractors still remain in the mountains with the promise, it is said, of a reclassification of the work which they have done, in the hope that they would be able to secure sufficient to pay their honest debts and return to civilization. Now, with regard to the death of these two men, a young man who was employed on that work came down on the train, I think, which followed these two men. I met him in Winnipeg, and he informed me that these men were placed in a box car and left there to die, without anybody to attend to their wants, and without the attendance of a medical man. It is well known that every employee of the Crow's Nest Pass Railway has been obliged to contribute 50 cents a month of his wages to pay for medical attendance; and it seems an outrage and one that the Government should carefully investigate, that these men, after paying this fee monthly, were left to die in that manner. I hope, speaking on behalf of the people that I represent, that there will be the most searching investigation, and that whoever is responsible for the brutal treatment accorded these men, will be properly punished.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). I had not the advantage of being present this morning when this matter was first discussed. I think, however, it is proper, from the standpoint of the Department of Justice, that I should state the facts that were brought out, and that I should state to the House what is the responsibility that attaches to us. On the 8th of February last, Mr. Mead, the coroner who was appointed by the Government of the North-west Territories, not by the Government of the Dominion of Canada, held an investigation into the cause of the death of these two young men. During the course of this investigation, a notice was served upon him to restrain him from proceeding further, by way of an injunction. So soon as he received notice of the application for the injunction, he communicated with the Department of Justice, and then for the first time the attention of the department was drawn to the matter. On the very same day, the 8th of February, he was asked whether he was willing, of his own accord, to retire from the investigation, so that some one else could be substituted against whom the charges could not be made that were made against him. The injunction was taken against him on the ground that he was a person interested; that is to say, that he would be a competent witness himself, as he was the party who attended the deceased at the time of their death in the box car at Pincher Creek. The ground upon which the injunction was applied for was that he, having attended the deceased himself, should have been a witness at the investigation instead of acting as a coroner. Immediately upon receipt of that information, and upon the statement by the coroner that he did not wish to withdraw—and, of course, there was no way open to us by which we could force him to withdraw—we then communicated with the agent of the Department of Justice, Mr. Coneybeare, for a full statement of all that had taken place. He reported on the 24th of February, and then for the first time I appeared myself on the scene. I asked Mr. Coneybeare to instruct the Department of Justice on all the facts, so that we might be able to form an opinion ourselves as to whether criminal proceedings might be adopted against the parties connected with this transaction. Mr. Coneybeare reported fully all the facts connected with the matter, and the conclusion of his report is in these words:

> I could not recommend instituting criminal proceedings until the responsibility was more definitely located.

We made inquiry then for the purpose of locating more definitely the responsibility, as our agent suggested. It appears from the facts reported to us that these men were in the employ of the Crow's Nest Pass Railway Company, or rather of the contractors in the mountains. They took diphtheria in the mountains, and they were immediately put into a van and removed from that section upon which they were then working, so that they might be taken to the hospital at Lethbridge. They came down from that section and passed through the two adjoining sections before they reached the place called Pincher Creek, on the way to Leth-

bridge where this hospital was. Our information is to the effect that after they left the place where they were working, they were taken from the van and put into a car.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. They were placed in a box car.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. They started out in a van and came part of the way in a van, and then they were removed into an open wagon, and were brought in that open wagon down to Pincher Creek, where they were taken from the open wagon and put in a box car. These are the facts as they really occurred. Now, it is impossible to conceive, on the face of it, more cruel treatment than this. At the same time you have to realize that from the time they left the mountains until they reached Pincher Creek, where they were placed in a box car, they were amongst labourers who were afraid that these men would communicate the disease to them. The fact is that from the time the men first started they were left without any care or attendance whatever until they reached this box car at Pincher Creek, and this was in the month of December or January. When they came into the box car they were there for about two hours before they died, Dr. Mead being in attendance. Now, on these facts, which I do not mitigate, for which I offer no excuse, I ask hon. gentlemen opposite to indicate the course they would follow. What are we going to do about it? Where is the criminal proceeding to be adopted? Where is the criminal remedy which they can indicate to us? We sought for it at the time, not only sought for it, but instructed our agent in the locality to make full inquiries into the matter.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Did not Mr. Coneybeare indicate a course?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. No. I have here the report of Mr. Coneybeare, dated the 24th of February, which I am willing to give to my hon. friend.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The point I refer to is the last paragraph, in which he says:

> Under these circumstances the only course open would be to appoint a special commission to investigate the matter, if it is to be proceeded with, and in view of the circumstances attendant on the case, which certainly go to show that these men were shamefully neglected, I believe it to be advisable that some effort should be made to ascertain who is to blame.
>
> CONEYBEARE.

That is dated the 15th of April.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I have not seen that letter, it has never been brought under my notice, and I do not believe the Minister of Justice has ever seen it either.

The PRIME MINISTER. There can certainly be no complaint made of the manner in which my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Bell) has introduced this matter to the House. He has done it in very temperate language, simply calling the attention of the House to the facts, and has invited the Government to take action upon the matter. I cannot say that I can give the same commendation to the remarks of the senior member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper), because he gave me the impression that he had in his mind not so much securing a proper remedy as impugning the conduct of the Government in this matter.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I certainly consider the Government blameworthy—I do not deny that.

The PRIME MINISTER. In what manner was the Government blameworthy? Where did their responsibility commence? At a certain time in February their attention was called by the coroner who was holding an investigation on the deaths to the fact that his jurisdiction had been interfered with by judicial proceedings. I have no opinion to offer at this moment as to the merits of the action taken by Judge Rouleau. But it is a well known rule of this House that judicial proceedings have to be considered with respect, and we must assume that Judge Rouleau acted in a proper manner in the performance of his duty. The Solicitor General has stated that it was impossible to do anything more. The action suggested by the senior member for Pictou, which might have been done and should have been done, was the appointment of a commission to investigate into the facts. The Government, he said, was not chary about issuing commissions, that they had appointed commissions to investigate offences of partisans, officers, and so on. But my hon. friend forgets, and he should not forget, that at the very moment of which he speaks the Government had appointed a special commission to investigate these matters; the Government at that moment had a commission specially authorized and empowered to investigate into the grievances of the men who had been engaged to work on the Crow's Nest Pass road. It had been sitting for some time, and had been appointed months before, not, however, on these complaints, because they had not been called to the attention of the Government. But complaint had been made to the Government and published in the press that men engaged to work on the railway were not treated in a humane manner, and acting on the complaints then made, the Government appointed a commission to investigate them. It was a commission well organized and it discharged its duty properly. The hon. gentleman should have remembered also that the commission had no power to investigate this case, because

the commission was issued before this case occurred, still it was proceeding when this lamentable occurrence took place, and the commissioners investigated it as far as they could. There is a report on the subject by the commissioners. They have taken the subject into consideration, they have investigated the facts and given their opinion. I have only this to say, that the report of the commission is satisfactory or not satisfactory. It will be laid on the Table to-morrow, and I invite the attention of my hon. friend to it.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It hardly deals with this subject.

The PRIME MINISTER. If it is not satisfactory, we shall have to deal with the matter in some other way, but my hon. friend will have an opportunity, after reading it, to answer the challenge given by the Solicitor General to indicate what action should be taken by the Government. If the report shows sufficiently where the guilt is, because it is beyond doubt that a most lamentable occurrence has taken place and those two young men were brought to premature death by ill-treatment, it is quite possible a charge of murder, or if not murder of manslaughter will lie. We know that wrong has been done, we know that parties have suffered, we do not know who are responsible. If the report is not satisfactory, we shall be ready to investigate the facts, and if possible to bring the guilty parties to that justice they deserve. We can do nothing more at this moment. An hon. member opposite stated a few moments ago that the law of this country was adequate to protect the lives and property of the inhabitants, whether a citizen or an alien, but though we may be in that position, we may have to implement the law in order to bring the administration of justice to bear where the law is not sufficient to mete out adequate justice to everyone. The laws are sufficient in the old parts of the country, such as Ontario and Quebec, but in the mountainous regions of British Columbia it may be quite possible that the general law, which will be sufficient in the older provinces, is inadequate in that portion of the Dominion. Certainly the administration of the law has been inadequate in this instance. The Government have no intention but to give the matter their best consideration, and I have again to say to the junior member for Pictou (Mr. Bell) that the Government have no fault to find with the manner in which he brought the case to the attention of the House, which he did in a calm and judicial manner and in a manner which will engage the attention of the Government.

INTERNATIONAL COPYRIGHT.

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON. Before the House resolves itself into Committee of Supply there is a matter to which I would like to refer for a few moments. I desire to call the attention of the Government, and more particularly the attention of the First Minister, to the fact that a very important Bill has been introduced in the British House of Lords concerning copyright by Lord Herschell, and this Bill has received its second reading. The passage of this Bill may most materially affect the copyright interests of Canada. If the Parliament of Canada has the power, as I think it has, to enact and enforce such copyright legislation as may be necessary for the Dominion, this Bill needs no further consideration; but if the right of Canada to legislate on the question of copyright is to be restricted in the future as in the past, then I think we are bound to consider the effect of the Herschell Bill on the publishing interests of this country. Let me point out to the House a few facts in connection with this question of copyright and emphasize these views in connection with the Herschell Bill. There has always been doubt as to the legality of copyright by simultaneous production in Great Britain and the United States. The Herschell Bill dispels this doubt. The noble lord proposes that simultaneous publication in any part of Great Britain and the United States shall secure copyright throughout the entire British Empire. This provision, as the House will see, gives a direct and important advantage to the American publisher. Under this clause the American publisher need no longer send his stock of books across the sea to London and issue them on the same day as he issues his stock in New York and Boston in order to secure British copyright throughout the British Empire. Oh, no, the American pubisher has under this new regulation merely to send his books to any Canadian point across the international boundary line between Canada and the United States in order to secure copyright throughout the British Empire. At the present time I am advised there is considerable doubt whether an American author can obtain copyright in Great Britain without manufacturing in Great Britain. On this point I am also informed that the British law is not very clear. A British subject may secure copyright in Great Britain by the British law, but it is not clear that an alien may secure copyright in Great Britain. At the present time Great Britain is most liberal in its terms for copyright with foreign countries. Great Britain, with France and Germany and other foreign countries is a member of the Berne Convention; an international copyright convention which this country unwittingly joined through the profound—I might almost say criminal ignorance of the Canadian politicians of that period. The United States was asked to enter this Berne Convention, but the American Government is more mind-

ful of the interests of its workingmen than was the Canadian Government, refused to enter. Despite this refusal on the part of the United States, Lord Herschell in his Bill proposes to be still more liberal. He actually proposes to grant copyright throughout Her Majesty's dominions to any person whether he is or is not a British subject, and without any condition as to manufacture. Another, or rather a second part of Lord Herschell's Bill requires special attention. Her Majesty in Council may modify this new Act as applied to Canadian legislation, provided that British authors are protected in their works first published in other parts of the British dominions. Should this clause allow Her Majesty to assent to our coyright legislation no fault is to be found with it, but should this not be the case—and I do not think that from past experience we can afford to take any chances—I would impress upon this Government the necessity of immediate action, by a protest against that part of this section of the Act that prohibits the importation of foreign reprints of British copyright books, unless the Canadian Government undertakes to collect a royalty and to stamp every copy so imported with the words "foreign reprint."

Royalty duty has not been collected in this country since 1895, thanks to the action of the late Sir John S. D. Thompson, but it looks to me very much as if we should have to recede from the position we have taken and once more act the part of toll-gate keeper for the British publisher. The third part of Lord Herschell's Bill is also very important. By the present Imperial Act Her Majesty in Council is permitted by Order in Council to grant copyright to foreign countries in any case where the foreign country grants copyright to authors whose works are first produced in the United Kingdom. Lord Herschell in his new Bill substitutes the word "published" for the word "produced." This substitution of a word in ordinary conversation is as a general rule a trivial matter, but it may make a most material difference in the reading of an Act of Parliament. The word "produced" in the present Act means that the book must be manufactured, if not written, in the United Kingdom, but if Lord Herschell substitutes the word "published" for the word "produced," he lays wide open the gate to the American publisher, and wipes out a very definite term to replace it by a very indefinite term.

If in the future Her Majesty's advisers should include the United States of America in any order in regard to copyright, this House can see that it would give a decided advantage to the American publisher. In fact the Dominion publisher would not be in the race at all. I am anxious to hear the opinion of the Government upon this important question. I am the last man to weary this House, but on so grave a question as copyright at this particular juncture, I cannot sit here without entering my protest. The publishers, the printers, and all concerned with copyright in Canada, have struggled for ten years to have a just, a fair, and an equitable copyright Act passed. When the Liberals were in Opposition they were our bosom friends in this struggle, and now that they are on the sunny side of the House I hope they will not turn around and be our enemies. The hon. gentleman (Sir James Edgar) who presides over the deliberations of this House was our champion, but owing to his position as Speaker, his voice is sealed as far as debate is concerned, although I am sure, in fact I know, we still have his good wishes. The only man who fought for us on the Conservative side was the late Sir John S. D. Thompson. Had he been spared we would have had copyright, but he is gone, and we are again in the field of battle fighting for our lives with no friend save the Solicitor General, on the side of the Copyright Association. We are as far off the goal as we were in 1888, when we commenced the agitation in the time of Sir John Macdonald. I may say that that gentleman always regretted his action in leading this country into the toils of the Berne Convention. Sir John Thompson in due and proper form gave the required notice and demanded we should be free from the terms of that convention. The Colonial Office was notified, but the Colonial Office laughed and said: What we have we hold; and the death of our champion ended the struggle. Surely this state of affairs cannot be allowed to continue. It cannot be that this Government, this Liberal Government, that when in Opposition took so much interest in copyright will refuse our just claims to a Canadian copyright law, or decline to protest against this British Bill which may knock out what little life we have left in our endeavour to do what we can for our Canadian book-making industry. An Act acceptable to Great Britain has been for the past three years in the office of the Minister of Justice. This Act which embodies all the points of the Hall-Caine agreement was prepared and revised by Mr. Newcombe, the Deputy Minister of Justice, who is thoroughly versed in the question of copyright. It is too late, I am aware, to expect legislation upon this subject this session, but in connection with this Herschell Bill I hope that the Government will make a prompt and energetic protest against the clauses in it concerning colonial importations and copyright. I can only hope that the next Address we hear from the Throne at the opening of Parliament will contain the welcome announcement that the long-neglected question of copyright will be dealt with at the next session, so that the wrongs and the injustice that the printers, the pub-

lishers, and the allied trades concerned in copyright have suffered for over half a century in Canada, will be righted.

The MINISTER OF ARICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). I feel that the House and the Government perhaps, owe a debt of gratitude to the hon. member (Mr. Ross Robertson) for having brought this very important question up at as early a stage as was consistent with his opportunities. The Bill of Lord Herschell, to which he has referred, is one which certainly will very considerably modify the present Imperial Copyright Law, and will to a certain extent at all events affect the Canadian position in regard to this matter. I confess, Sir, that it was only when I received notice that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ross Robertson) was going to bring this matter up, that I took occasion to look into that Bill. It is an unfortuate fact that some years ago the papers and all documents connected with copyright while copyright administration is still in the Department of Agriculture, were transferred to the Department of Justice.

The copy of the Bill which was sent to our Governmeat was sent to the Department of Justice, and did not come under my immediate notice until I discovered it there. The hon. gentleman has spoken of our right to enact copyright in Canada. I do not think any Canadian is prepared to forego that right, or to allow it to be lessened in any way. At the same time, we cannot shut our eyes to the facts of the case, and we find that the Imperial authorities are not prepared to allow of any amendment to our present Copyright Act. We have contended, and I fully concur in the hon. gentleman's opinion, that they are not justified in taking that position; but I believe that the present condition of affairs is such that were we to enact a copyright law, the courts of the land, and certainly the Privy Council, if the question were carried there, would decide against us. The result would be that contentions of all sorts would arise in the courts upon the copyright question. The hon. gentleman, a few moments ago, alluded to the present Deputy Minister of Justice as one who is thoroughly conversant with the copyright question. I have under my hand a memorandum written by that gentleman, in which he says:

> The validity of that contention, however, although upheld on our part, has been denied by the law officers of the Crown and also by some of the Canadian courts, and I do not doubt that the Judicial Committee would decide it against us should occasion arise. If, therefore, the Bill which I drafted some time ago were enacted and allowed to go into operation, as I am convinced it would be by the Colonial Office, the question would soon arise in the courts as to its validity; and while from tactical and other reasons we should not in the first instance ask for Imperial confirmatory legislation, yet we should be driven to do so should our Act be pronounced ultra vires by the Judicial Committee.

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON.

Now, Sir, if we require not only the consent of the Imperial Government of the day to our legislation, but confirmatory Imperial legislation, it is very doubtful indeed if we could obtain that, even if the Government of the day were favourably disposed towards us; because we know that at present the public opinion of England is very jealous indeed in regard to copyright legislation in a colony which might interfere with the Imperial copyright law. Under these circumstances, it seems to me that we shall have to go easy, and try to attain our ends by careful negotiations and conciliatory methods. The hon. gentleman has characterized Canada's adhesion to the Berne Convention in no measured terms, which I do not wish at all to add to. It is, I believe, unfortunate that Canada is within the Berne Convention. Apparently, it is impossible for us, without the concurrence of the Imperial authorities, to escape from that position which a former Government here placed us in, without the endorsation or consent of the Parliament or the people of Canada. The hon. gentleman alluded to section 38 of this Bill, which provides:

> Her Majesty the Queen may, by Order in Council, direct that this Act shall apply to literary and artistic works, or any class of literary or artistic works, first published in the foreign country or countries named in the Order, in like manner as if the works had been first published in the United Kingdom, and thereupon subject to the provisions of this Act and of the Order, this Act shall apply accordingly.

The hon. gentleman appears to fear that under that section the United States might be given privileges in the British Empire which they have not now. I hardly think that is likely, because there is no doubt that the intention of the section is that the privilege thus accorded shall be reciprocal; and judging from the position which the American authorities have always maintained with reference to copyright, there is no probability, at all events for some time to come, that they will give reciprocal privileges to the British Empire. Reciprocal privileges would mean that subjects of the British Empire would be able to obtain copyright in the United States, without manufacturing or producing the copyrighted work in that country; and up to the present time there is no indication that the United States would listen to any such proposal. The hon. gentleman seems to fear this Imperial Bill very much; and I confess that, on reading it very hastily, as I have only been able to do this afternoon, it appears to me to be one which we shall have to take into our serious consideration, with the view of taking such steps as we may find necessary to protect Canadian interests before the Bill becomes law. But I would again refer to the memorandum of the Deputy Minister of Justice, which will perhaps to a certain extent relieve the

anxiety of the hon. member. Mr. Newcombe says:

From my standpoint I do not consider that our position will be less favourable if Lord Herschell's Bill be enacted than it is at present. On the other hand, I consider that the Bill would facilitate matters, inasmuch as it provides for the bringing into force of the Canadian statute by the Imperial Order in Council.

There is a clause in this Bill which provides for an Order in Council endorsing and bringing into force a colonial statute, a provision which at present does not exist in the Imperial Copyright Act.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Will the hon. gentleman read that?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It is section 35, and reads as follows:—

Where an Act or Ordinance shall be passed in any British possession respecting copyright in any literary or artistic works first published in any other part of the British dominions, Her Majesty the Queen in Council may make an order modifying this Act, so far as it applies to that British possession, and to any literary or artistic works so published, in such manner as to Her Majesty in Council seems expedient.

Provided as follows:—

Before making any such order in respect of any British possession, Her Majesty in Council shall be satisfied that the British possession has made such provisions as it appears to Her Majesty expedient to require for the protection of authors of works first published in other parts of the British dominions.

If this Act is interpreted and carried out in a spirit of concession or of justice to Canada or other colonial British possessions, this provision would be greatly in favour of colonial British possessions. Should this Act be carried out in a hostile spirit, then, of course, we would be in no better position than we now are, perhaps not even in so good a position.

The hon. gentleman asks what the Government will do in view of the introduction of this Bill. I may say that while I am not prepared at present, the Government not having discussed this question, to say positively on what line we will act, I can assure the hon. gentleman that we will try and see that the interests of Canada are thoroughly safeguarded, and if any protest or action on our part will have that effect, we shall be sure to take it.

I may further say that this question of copyright has been to some extent considered by the Minister of Justice and myself and other members of the Council during this session. Unfortunately, in the pressure of business, we have not been able to come to any definite conclusion, sufficient to justify us in introducing legislation this session. This question is one of the most intricate that can be taken up. It is one I confess not to have in any sense or way mastered. I have only just touched on the threshold of it, but I trust in the future to get a better grasp of it. The Government intends considering the question and may also enter into communication with the Imperial authorities so that we hope to be in a position, in the earliest period of next session, to introduce a Bill which will meet with the approval of the Imperial authorities and remove the difficulties which seem to surround the subject at present. The Deputy Minister of Justice has at present a draft Bill which he considers will be acceptable to the Imperial authorities, and, I understand, is acceptable, in a general way, to the Canadian Publishers' Union, and I can assure the hon. gentleman that in any negotiations which the Government may undertake, the interests of those gentlemen, as well as the public at large, will be thoroughly considered and every effort taken to safeguard them as much as possible.

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON. Why should not the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) advise that the action of the late Sir John Thompson be continued with regard to the Berne Convention? We gave notice, in due and proper form, to the Colonial Office, but they refused to entertain our notice. This Government has the power to withdraw from the convention. The previous Government was assured that they could, on a year's notice, step out of that convention, and yet we have never been able to free ourselves from it. I think that the first step the Government should take would be to point out to the Colonial Office that we have the right to withdraw from the Berne Convention, that we have given a proper notice of withdrawal, and should be able to withdraw more especially as we are not actually in that convention, owing to the fact that we have not yet provided the necessary legislation to bring us within its circle.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman is quite correct. The Parliament of Canada has not implemented its adhesion to the Berne Convention which was given some years ago, I think when Sir John Macdonald was Premier. The hon. gentleman says that Sir John Thompson gave notice to the Imperial authorities that we desired to withdraw, but the Imperial authorities would not accept that notice, because certain Imperial interests stood in the way. I confess that that part of the question has not come under my study, and consequently I am not able to say anything positively with regard to it. I, however, promise the hon. gentleman that we will look into the matter, and if we can accomplish something in the interests of our country, we will not fail to do it.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I would like to add a word to urge upon the Government, not merely the policy of looking into this subject generally, but of grappling with the issue that is really presented to us, broader and larger than any particular

Bill. What we attempted to do, in the time to which the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Robertson) has referred, which was the time when Mr. Newcombe's draft Bill was prepared and when he made his special visit to the Colonial Office, was, without taking issue on the general question of right, to try whether it was possible to obtain the assent of the Imperial authorities, not to the measure adopted here, subject to the Governor General's proclamation in 1889, but passing that by, not asking the full powers which we claimed through Sir John Thompson, that we possessed, but to such a measure as would be satisfactory to the publishers and authors in Canada, short of a full measure of what we asked. It was no doubt impossible to obtain that legislation. The draft Bill that my hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Robertson) and the Minister of Agriculture referred to is a draft Bill of Mr. Newcombe's, which he thinks ought to be satisfactory to the Canadian interest, and which he has reason to believe will be satisfactory to the Colonial Office, but I was satisfied, after hearing Canadian interest, that that draft would not satisfy them at all. We talk of ourselves as a nation, and yet there is this extraordinary feature in connection with the British North America Act, according to the interpretation of the law officers of England and contrary to Sir John Thompson's opinion, that while we are admitted to have full powers with regard to legislation on patents, on an almost similar subject we are told that our wings are clipped and that we cannot legislate as the Canadian people desire. The reasons are notorious. I venture to say that they are not Imperial but are founded upon a very influential and selfish interest, the authors and publishers of London, who have been conspicuous in their opposition to any movement this country has ever made to obtain the powers we ought to have, as an independent self-governing country, in regard to all matters of this character. In everything else we are given authority, but the powerful influence, represented by some of the greatest names in literature, opposes us when we come to discuss this subject with the Colonial Minister. I venture to say that if that influence were out of the way, many a British Government that has resisted us, Conservative and Liberal, would willingly have acceded to the strong representations made. I would suggest to the Government to leave questions of detail and claim at the hands of the Imperial Government, declaratory legislation, if necessary, giving us the full powers, which we claim to hold, under the British North America Act, with regard to copyright just as we have with regard to patents.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). If I may be permitted just one word, I would say that my hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Ross Robertson) suggested a moment ago that we had given notice of withdrawal from the Berne Convention and that, therefore, we have the remedy in our hands, so far as Canada is concerned—that we have only to insist to the Imperial authorities that we want effect given to the notice of withdrawal. But that notice was given seven years ago. If it was not acted upon there must have been some cogent reason for it. My hon. friend from Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) has just given the reason. The reason is that there are powerful interests, and interests which none can afford to disregard altogether, pressing upon the British Government to insist that the Berne Convention should not be altered. My hon. friend from Pictou has stated that some of the most illustrious names in literature take a deep interest in this matter, and up to the present time their representations have been strong enough to make the British very reluctant to have the Berne Convention interfered with. The Berne Convention was made principally for the protection of authors. It was the strong literary sentiment of Europe that brought that convention into existence. It is very unfortunate, I think, and very much to be deplored, that the United States have not been willing to join the Berne Convention. Had they done so all this trouble to us would have been avoided. But the United States have refrained from joining the Berne Convention, and so we find ourselves placed in a somewhat false position. But I understood that this matter was satisfactorily compromised, some few years ago, by what has been called the Hall Caine Convention. And, if I understood aright—and I wish to be corrected, if I am wrong—my hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Ross Robertson) was satisfied with the Hall Caine Convention if brought into legislation.

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON. We were satisfied with the arrangements made with Mr. Hall Caine at the interview held in the Department of Agriculture, at which my hon. friend from Pictou was present.

The PRIME MINISTER. I am satisfied with that. It is a satisfactory compromise, and I think we can give effect to it. My hon. friend from Toronto, if I understood him, thinks that the recent legislation introduced in England by Lord Herschell would make it impossible to carry into effect the Hall Caine Convention. That is the burden of the impression he has attempted to make upon the Government. So far as his question is concerned, the Department of Justice do not agree with my hon. friend; they take issue with him directly. The Department of Justice and Mr. Newcombe, who has given great attention to this subject, I can speak with authority when I say, are clearly of opinion that the Act introduced by Lord Herschell will not interfere with the arrangement known as the Hall Caine arrangement, but that that arrangement can be given effect to by legislation. That is the

view which we intend to press upon the British Government. The question, as my hon. friend from Toronto knows, is not one of a very wide import. It is important as it affects an important class, but it is more important to that class than to the people generally. But the questions involved are of a character to have given this Government and preceding Governments the greatest amount of anxiety; and so far it has not been possible to find any satisfactory arrangement. The first arrangement we have been able to find which will give satisfaction is this Hall Caine arrangement; and I repeat that the Department of Justice is of opinion that the legislation introduced by Lord Herschell will not prevent the carrying into effect of that arrangement and we intend to press it upon the British authorities.

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON. I would like to ask to be permitted to say a word in answer to the Prime Minister when he says that this is not an important matter.

The PRIME MINISTER. No, I did not say that. I said it was important to one class of the community, the publishers. But my hon. friend (Mr. Ross Robertson) will agree with me that the general public do not take the same interest in it as the publishers do. This is a question upon which we have not been able to enlist very strongly the sympathy of public opinion.

THE DUTY ON RUBBER GOODS.

Mr. OSLER. Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring before the Government a matter which has caused grave injustice to a large industrial enterprise in this country, an injustice which the Government could at once remedy, and which, I think, they are bound, in common honesty, to remedy without hesitation and without delay. When the tariff was brought down, item 214, the duty on rubber boots and shoes, rubber belting, rubber cement, was reduced to 25 per cent. That was agreed to by the House. But when the tariff came to be printed, by an error, the duty was placed at 20 per cent and not at 25 per cent. The attention of the Minister was drawn to this, but, so far, nothing has been done to correct this clerical error, which has resulted in very serious inconvenience and loss to a large manufacturing industry in this country. I think the Government need only have their attention called to this matter to remedy it at once. I do not think that it is a state of things that should be allowed to stand for one day after the Government's attention has been called to it. I am sorry to say that the Minister of Customs' attention was called to the matter last year and also this year as early as April; but, so far, he has neglected or refused to take any action. In common honesty and fairness, I think, the Government should at once correct that clerical error.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). I will take a note of what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Osler) has said. The matter, he said, was mentioned to the Minister of Customs. I am not in a position to make a further statement than to say that what the hon. gentleman has said will receive the best consideration.

MILITARY CAMP IN BEAUHARNOIS.

Mr. BERGERON. I desire to put a question to my hon. friend, the Minister of Militia and Defence. Some of his friends are circulating in my county the statement that the camp was to be held at Beauharnois this summer, and with this everybody seems to be well satisfied. They say they have an intimation from the Minister of Militia and Defence that the camp would be held there if it were not on account of me. I desire to ask the hon. gentleman if it was his intention to hold camp there, and tell him that I should be very glad if he would do so.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I can assure my hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) that no representation of the kind attributed to me has been made by me. I am not able to say positively where the camp is to be held. But I am under the impression that some arrangement was made some time ago with St. Johns by which the Government is under some obligation to hold the annual camp there, where it has been held for the last two or three years. There is not the slightest truth in the statement that my hon. friend had in any way interfered with the camp being held at Beauharnois.

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

(In the Committee.)

Supreme Court of Canada—For the purchase of law books and works of reference for the Supreme Court Library.... $4,000

Mr. FOSTER. Why this increase of $1,000?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. This sum is placed at the disposal of the judges of the Supreme Court for the purchase of law books, and it has been found necessary to increase the vote for that purpose. I do not think any of those who are familiar with the Supreme Court library will find that $1.000 additional would be wasted. It is simply to improve the library.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I may say to the hon. the Solicitor General that in the Supreme Court library I think there are some uncompleted sets of American reports, they have been completed up to a certain date, and then have been discontinued for

some reason. It is evident that the uncompleted series is practically valueless, because you never can rely upon them. I would suggest to my hon. friend that he might inquire whether it would not be in the interest of economy to complete those books.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. It does seem to me almost unaccountable that we should have in the Supreme Court any uncompleted sets, because it is evident they would be valueless. They should either be disposed of or else completed.

Mr. FOSTER. Who expends this money?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. It is expended practically by the judges. There is a little of go-as-you-please about it. I think it is as well that the judges should understand, now that Parliament has discussed the expenditure of this sum of money, that they should see that they get full value for the money expended. I have made some inquiry, and I find that each judge practically gives an order, without conference with other judges, for such books as he thinks should be brought into the library. It occurred to me that this matter now having been brought to the attention of Parliament, the judges should be asked to take more care, and that some control should be exercised by the chief justice of the court over the expenditure. It would probably be proper that no books should be bought except after full conference by all the judges, and with the sanction of the acting chief justice. A report is made to the Justice Department of the purchases each year, and this goes to the Auditor General.

The Exchequer Court of Canada—Contingencies, judge's and registrar's travelling expenses, salaries of sheriffs, printing, stationery, etc., and $50 for judge's books $4,000

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. With the consent of the committee, on some other item, though not as germane as this, I would like to make some observations in regard to the case of Judge Spinks. I want to save my right on the Supplementaries.

To Charles Morse, for furnishing reports of Exchequer Court decisions to leading periodicals, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act..... $50

Mr. FOSTER. Is Mr. Morse an employee?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. He is reporter of the court.

Penitentiaries—St. Vincent de Paul.... $96,200

Mr. FOSTER. I would ask my hon. friend if the atmosphere is quiet at St. Vincent de Paul?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes, I think that we can safely say that the difficulties are over now.

Mr. BERGERON. When will we get the printed report of the investigation?

Mr. RICHARDSON. The committee decided not to print that.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. A motion was made this afternoon to have the report printed, but it was not disposed of.

Mr. BERGERON. I think the Department of Justice should print that report. I do not see why the House should be called upon to order its printing. The Department of Justice should pay for it.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I think we have paid quite enough.

Mr. BERGERON. Can the hon. gentleman state the total cost of the investigation?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. $17,000. I expect to provide for it in the Supplementary Estimates.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the hon. gentleman remember how much he estimated the cost would be when he first brought down the proposition?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. About $10,000. I find I made an error in regard to $2,000 salary being given to a local judge in Quebec; the amount should have been $1,000.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. What was the reason of the decrease?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The former judge received $2,000, but when a new judge was appointed his salary was placed at $1,000, the same amount as was received by the judges of this class.

Mr. GILLIES. Has the hon. Solicitor General given any attention to the question I brought to his attention during a former session, the necessity of affording greater facilities for carrying on Admiralty suits in the Exchequer Court? On the Atlantic coast collisions frequently occur and the cases are carried to the Exchequer Court, but parties living at a considerable distance from Halifax are subjected to a great deal of inconvenience. Before a ship can be libelled and a case put into the Exchequer Court, the party engaged has to go to Halifax, take an affidavit before the registrar, have a writ issued and sent to the place in question, but in the meantime the ship may have sailed away and be out of the jurisdiction of the court, and the claim therefore lost. This inconvenience is apparent and the expense is a grievance that this Parliament should remedy. What I suggest is that jurisdiction should be created in the county court judges ad hoc. I would suggest that these judges be empowered to take affidavits of any applicants and issue warrants for the arrest of ships, which thereafter would be obliged to furnish security. Sub-

sequently the litigation would proceed before the Admiralty Court judge, he being the Chief Justice in the province of Nova Scotia. When the new Admiralty Act was carried in 1891 I brought to the notice of Sir John Thompson the facts I have stated, and he stated that the power to create further courts was vested in the Governor in Council and that the matter would receive attention a little later. Shortly after that Sir John Thompson died, and the matter has been left in abeyance. The Solicitor General, being well acquainted with the Admiralty practice, will undoubtedly be able to realize the great inconvenience to which petitioners are subjected in the manner I brought to his notice. Sometime ago the hon. gentleman said he would give the subject his attention and consideration. I now desire to inquire, does the department contemplate placing in the county court judges authority to act in the manner I have indicated, and give them power to take affidavits for the arrest of ships.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I quite see the difficulty pointed out by the hon. gentleman, and it seems to me it would be very easy to remedy it. I think the best plan to adopt would be to have registrars appointed to issue warrants in the different localities. All the request in reality is to secure the issue of warrants for the arrest of ships, and subsequently the matter would be dealt with by the judge of the Exchequer Court. I desire to have any amendment proposed submitted to the judge of the Exchequer Court, and I will give an undertaking that before next session there will be an amendment in that direction.

LYMAN DARTT—REMISSION OF SENTENCE.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It will perhaps be as convenient at this time as at any other time to bring to the attention of the hon. Solicitor General and of the House the remission of the sentence on Lyman Dartt. This young man who, I believe, is of the age of seventeen years, was tried before Mr. Justice Ritchie with a jury for the murder of an Armenian pedlar, and he was defended by counsel of great ability and experience, and after a trial which occupied some days, and upon evidence which was nearly altogether circumstantial, he was found guilty of murder and sentenced to death by the judge. The defence that was put forward at the trial was a denial that the prisoner had any connection at all with the murder. The pedlar in question, an Armenian who had not been in the province for any great length of time, was walking along the highway about a mile and a half from Green Oak, in the county of Colchester. He was shot and fell dead instantly, and he was found lying at the side of the highway by the driver of a mail coach. An inquest was held, and upon information which then came to light, and upon information which was subsequently acquired by means of a detective, this young man was placed under arrest. The grand jury found a true bill against him, and the case came on to trial in the ordinary way. It will be necessary in order to make myself intelligible to the House, that I should give some statement of the facts, and I cannot do this better nor in a fairer way than by reading the report which the trial judge made of the facts as they appeared before him in evidence at the trial. This is what the judge reported to the Minister of Justice upon an application by the prisoner for a commutation of the sentence or, in the alternative, for a new trial. He says:

> The important facts that were proved on the trial are briefly as follows:—
>
> In the afternoon of Saturday the 25th day of September last the body of Ashard Deron, a travelling pedlar, was found dead on the highway about a mile and a half from the Green Oak post office, in the county of Colchester. There were no inhabited houses within half a mile; on one side of the road, the right hand side, going towards Green Oak from Princeport, the bushes came down to within a few feet of the road, on the other side was a cleared field. The body was found lying on its face with the head turned towards Green Oak, and a box and a pack such as pedlars carry were lying on the road, one on each side of and close to the body.

It must be apparent, therefore, and indeed it is conceded by every one who knows anything about the case, and this is a concession, no doubt, in favour of the prisoner, that the motive for the murder, if it were a murder, was apparently not robbery.

> There were no tracks visible near the body, but those of the deceased, nor any indications of a struggle, and none of the pedlar's effects had been touched. On examination of the body, it was found that he had been shot from a point behind, and a little to his right, with a gun loaded both with shot and ball. The ball had passed through the body, severing the spinal cord on the right side of the centre, and shots of two sizes had struck the body and both packs. Pellets of shot, battered and out of shape, were found in the clothes and hat of deceased and in both packs. The body when found was still warm. On the next day (Sunday) about noon, a man picked up on the side of the road, about thirty-five yards behind where the body was found, and about six yards to the right, and on the edge of the wood, three pieces of newspapers, which had the appearance of having recently formed part of the wadding of the gun.

Then the learned judge goes on to point out in detail what I think it is not necessary for me to read in full to the House, the circumstantial evidence upon which the jury found the prisoner guilty. That circumstantial evidence may be briefly stated as follows: This prisoner was proved to have been out that afternoon, shooting near the spot and at the time this pedlar was shot; there was in the house in which he

lived the Boston "Globe" of a particular date, and the pieces of paper wadding found by the side of the road where the gun which killed this man had evidently been discharged, fitted in to the remainder of the newspaper found in the House; the shot with which the man was struck corresponded with the size of the shot which the boy had in his possession, and the bullet with which the man was killed was such a bullet as might have been formed by a bullet-mould which was also in the boy's possession. The boy was seen proceeding from near the spot in a very hurried manner a few minutes after the firing, on his way to his foster father's house. All these circumstances are more or less outside of the case now, for the reason that after the boy was convicted he made a confession that the pedlar came to his death by the discharge of the gun which was in his hands, and he set up the theory that the shooting was accidental. Now, throughout the case, from first to last, and during the inquest, and after this shooting was bruited abroad, this boy contended from the very inception of the case until after his conviction, that he had nothing to do with this man's death and knew nothing at all about it, and his counsel, a gentleman of great experience, during the trial of the case cross-examined on that theory, and that theory alone, and cross-examined for the purpose. as will be apparent to any one who examines the evidence, of showing that the man came to his death, not at the hands of this boy, but at the hands of some other pedlar with whom it was suggested deceased may have had some quarrel.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). Was not the suggestion made that the man came to his death from a gun fired by this boy, but not intentionally or fired at him?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That suggestion was made after the boy had been convicted and when his confession was taken down by a clergyman in writing. But from first to last during the trial no such suggestion was made, and counsel did not go on the theory that this boy shot the man accidentally. Counsel went on the theory, under the instruction of this boy, and on that theory alone, that the gun which was discharged and killed this man was not discharged by this boy. That is most important to be borne in mind. Now, I may say in passing, that I am not able to understand the report of the Minister of Justice in this case, for more reasons than one, and I would like here to bring to the attention of the learned Solicitor General, or to the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if he proposes to deal with the case——

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not propose to deal with it, but I was interested and was following the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden).

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would be very glad if the hon. gentleman (Sir Louis Davies) would take an interest in it, because it seems to me that the way in which this case has been disposed of does not add any lustre to the administration of criminal justice in Canada.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). Do you mean by the courts or by the Government?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). By the remission of this man's sentence; I pass no reflection at all upon the trial judge. The Minister of Justice, in dealing with this case, has apparently misunderstood what was reported or suggested by Mr. Justice Ritchie, who tried the case, and if the papers have been brought down in full, then the Minister of Justice has misunderstood or misquoted the confession of this boy, because the greater part of the report of the Minister of Justice is made up with extracts from that confession, which I cannot find among the papers at all. I do not understand that the boy made more than one confession. The Minister of Justice quotes from a confession which is not in the papers, and he gives incidents which are not in the confession that was brought down. In fact, the extracts embraced in the report of the Minister of Justice and purporting to be quotations from the confession of this boy are about twice as long as the entire confession of the boy which is brought down here, and verified by the affidavit of the clergyman. It may be that it is owing to the mistake of some official that there has not been brought down another confession, but it will be apparent to any one that what I state with regard to the quotations is literally the fact. Either there is another confession, or the Minister of Justice has drawn upon his imagination, as he certainly has drawn upon his imagination when he undertakes to quote from the reports of Mr. Justice Ritchie. As I have said, this boy made a confession after conviction, and the confession is probably not in the boy's words, but is a confession which was taken down by the clergyman of whose congregation he was a member. I will read what the boy's confession is, and I will say, in passing, that so far as the papers brought down show, it has not even the verification of an affidavit in support of its truth from the boy himself. That such a verification would be sufficient to enable the Minister of Justice to deal with this as a jury would deal with it, surely no practical lawyer in the House would for a moment pretend—no right of cross-examination, the evidence not given viva voce, not given before the tribunal who had to deal with it—and yet it lacks even that poor verification; and that confession alone, so far

as I can understand the report of the Minister, forms the ground on which he has ventured to open the prison doors and to tell this man to go forth and have his liberty, without any proper trial before the tribunals of this country, of the sole question which should have been tried by the jury, if the theory which the boy puts forward now is really a correct theory.

In passing, I would venture to suggest to my learned friend the Solicitor General and to other members of the Government that when returns such as this are brought down, it would be very useful, and would save a great deal of the time of members, if they were accompanied by an index. A confused mass of papers are brought down, not arranged on any system, very often not arranged in the order of their dates or in the order of their connection with each other, and without any index, with the result that every member who has to consult them occupies about three times as much time to get at their purport as he would do if they were accompanied by a proper index made by some official before being brought down. I have myself taken the trouble to page this return, and make an index to it.

The boy's confession, which was made in the presence of the clergyman and the jailer, and was dictated to the clergyman, is found at page 33. It is dated the 10th of December, 1897, and is the only confession I can find among the papers. It is as follows :—

I, Lyman Dartt, on the 25th day of September, 1897, left my home at Green Oak for the purpose of shooting, and during the afternoon I passed the mouth of Beaver Brook road, continuing down towards Princeport to the top of Fisher's Creek Hill, so called. While there I heard a noise in the bush, caused, as I afterwards learned, by cattle. Supposing it to be caused by a fox, bear or other large game, I took from my pocket a bullet, which I had carried for some weeks, and put it into my gun on top of the shot load. While going through the woods a twig caught the hammer of my gun, causing it to discharge. I was carrying the gun at the time in my right hand, in a nearly horizontal position. I was just coming out of the bush on to the highway. I heard a cry or groan, and on coming out to the road I saw a man lying on the road a little distance in front of me. I did not stop to see who he was. I did not know until I saw him on the road that there was a man so near to me. I had not seen him, but I knew by the groan and by the direction of my gun when it discharged that I had shot him. I became frightened, and went rapidly and directly home, keeping as much as possible in the cover of the bush. I reloaded my gun after I reached home. I saw some boys that day near the top of Creek Hill, but do not know whether they knew me or not.

These are the boys who identified him at the trial as having come shortly after they heard the report of the gun, from the direction in which it was fired. It goes on :

An investigation was carried on, and during the sitting of the court at which I was tried and found guilty, my fear grew stronger.

His story about fear is absolutely inconsistent, as I shall show from the report of the trial judge, with his demeanour at the trial. There, as Mr. Justice Ritchie said, he appeared perfectly calm and self-possessed, the most unconcerned person in the room, and when he was arrested he gave the same indication of being thoroughly self-possessed. He said he expected to be arrested, because he had heard some talk about it. The confession goes on :

This, coupled with hope of acquittal, sealed my lips, so that I made no confession until this time, except verbally to the keeper of the jail last night before I could sleep. This I now make to my pastor, Rev. Lewis W. Parker, to be taken in writing.

When I was dealing with the report of the trial judge, I should have mentioned what he said at the end of that report. This is what he does say :

Viewing the case from the standpoint of a juryman, I would have been unable to concur in the verdict given.

The learned judge explains afterwards, in his report on the confession, a copy of which was sent to him, that what he meant by that was that on the evidence the boy should have been found guilty of manslaughter, and not murder. The trial judge never for a moment, either on the evidence given at the trial, or from the boy's confession, thought that the prison doors should be opened, and the boy sent out into the world again, without the slightest inquiry into the truth of his confession, which admits that in some way or other the man came to his death from a gun which this boy discharged.

Mr. McCLURE. Will the hon. gentleman read the sentence just preceding the one he has read ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax)——

No motive whatever was shown for the crime. It did not appear that Deron had been in the settlement before this, or that the prisoner had ever seen him. Even if the pedlar came to his death from a gun in the hands of the prisoner, the circumstances proved are, in my opinion, quite as consistent with the view that the killing was not intentional, as that it was premeditated.

That was entirely a question for the jury on the evidence. It is not necessary to prove a motive to find a man guilty of murder. If there is a motive, that makes the case stronger ; but if a man shoots another without any motive at all, if it is not shown to have been accidental, he may be found guilty of murder, because he is supposed to know the consequence of his act. Once you prove the killing, if there is no explanation of it, or if the accused puts forward no theory to show that the discharge of the gun was accidental, the jury are justified in finding the man guilty of murder. The judge proceeds :

Perhaps the prisoner's silence militates somewhat against this view, but that may, I think, be accounted for by his fear of the consequences if his story were not believed. He was only seventeen years old.

As I said before, the boy's confession was sent to Mr. Justice Ritchie, and he has reported upon it, and that report I will read, because I think it is important.

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

After Recess.

THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 126) respecting the Saskatchewan Railway and Mining Company, and to change its name to the Saskatchewan Pacific Railway and Mining Company.—(Mr. Landerkin.)

Bill (No. 125) to incorporate the Ottawa Interprovincial Bridge Company.—(Mr. Belcourt.)

Bill (No. 137) to revive and amend the Acts respecting the International Radial Railway Company.—(Mr. MacPherson.)

PRIVATE BILLS.

Mr. MONK. I desire to ask the Prime Minister if he has decided anything in relation to the Bill referring to the Champlain and Chambly Canal ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I have not. I propose to deal with that the next time we take up the consideration of private Bills, as well as with two other Bills that I have asked to be allowed to stand, those relating to the Dawson City Electric Lighting and Tramway Company and the Dawson City Electric Company.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

LYMAN DARTT—REMISSION OF SENTENCE.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Mr. Chairman, I was about to bring to the attention of the House the report of Mr. Justice Ritchie on the prisoner's confession. That report is to be found on page 41 of the documents that have been brought down, and it is as follows :—

Sir,—I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of a communication from the Deputy Minister of Justice, inclosing a confession of Lyman Dartt and other papers. These papers did not reach me until late this afternoon, probably in consequence of the detention of the trains by the snow.

I have fully read over Dartt's confession, with the annexed affidavits, and would submit the following observations :—

The story is somewhat improbable, but no doubt the homicide might have happened as stated by Dartt. There are also some inconsistencies between his story and the evidence given in the case, but a more careful inquiry might fully remove them.

The hon. Minister of Justice states in his report to Council that the confession is quite in accordance with the evidence given in the case. But Mr. Justice Ritchie says there are some inconsistencies between Dartt's story and the facts brought out in evidence. And now he proceeds to point out what they are :

For instance, Fisher Creek Hill is where the boys were standing. Their evidence is that the man (now presumably the prisoner) came out of the bushes near the Casey house, and passed along the road towards Green Oak, followed by Deron, who was only a short distance behind him, until they both passed out of sight of the boys. If the prisoner went into the woods again, and he must have done so if his story is correct, it was some distance from Fisher Creek Hill. He could only have remained in the woods a very short time, not long enough to hunt for any game, or Deron, who was close behind him, would have passed along the road and got beyond all danger.

After the men got out of sight, two of the boys followed them, and when they got to the Casey house they heard the gun and saw the smoke.

So, in that very remarkable and important particular, the confession of the prisoner which the Minister of Justice says is in accordance with the evidence, the trial judge says is not in accordance with the evidence at all.

The reason given for loading with ball does not commend itself to me. I don't know what view a jury would take of it, and it may be the true reason.

Indicating most conclusively that he did not think the Minister of Justice would assume the function of a jury, and on the strength of an unsworn statement deal with a matter that should be dealt with on sworn evidence in the presence of the prosecutor for the Crown and subject to cross-examination.

The country is open, with no extensive woods near it, and the probability of there being a bear there at all, or even a fox so close to the highway at that time of day, is extremely slight.

As regards the direction of the shot, &c., it is impossible to premise anything without having the spot where the gun was discharged carefully examined, and the difference in level between that spot and the place where the body was found definitely ascertained.

Well, as I understand the report to Council of the Minister of Justice, he imagines that all these matters are so definitely set forth in the statement of the boy given by way of confession that he is in a position to deal with them. The trial judge has the correct view, that you cannot deal with matters of that kind until you have accurate measurements made and further evidence given. Then the learned judge continues as follows, with a great deal of force :—

The most extraordinary thing to my mind is, that, assuming this story to be true, the prisoner allowed the inquest and other investigations to go on without giving any information, when his evidence and a carefully conducted examination of the locality made within a day or two of the death would in all probability have satisfied the public of the correctness of his statement. He does not give one the idea of his being a nervous boy, or one that would be unduly alarmed at a matter of this kind. During the whole trial he seemed very cool and collected, and was apparently the most unconcerned person in the court-room, but I should judge not in the slightest degree wanting in intelligence.

Therefore, you have a boy, who, according to the learned judge was of remarkable self-possession for one of his age, and not in the slightest degree wanting in intelligence, a boy who throughout the case, from beginning to end, puts forward the theory that he had nothing to do with the killing of this man, and who, when he is convicted puts forward this unsworn statement and finds it cogent enough to enable the Minister of Justice to send him out of prison without further investigation.

If the jury were satisfied that Deron came to his death by the discharge of a gun in the prisoner's hands, I thought the verdict should have been one of manslaughter only, as I supposed the death was caused by the careless use of the gun in firing at something near the public highway.

That explains, as I said it would explain, the remarks of the learned judge at the trial that he did not agree with the verdict of the jury. He did not agree with that verdict for the simple reason that the killing was probably a case of manslaughter—that it was mere recklessness on the part of the boy, who possibly had no intention of killing the man, but aimed at him in mere recklessness or had been guilty of such carelessness as to constitute the crime of manslaughter. But the learned judge did not indicate in any way that the boy should be discharged as an innocent person—for the effect of the remission of the sentence is to give a verdict of innocence after the jury had given a verdict finding him guilty, and properly finding him guilty upon the only line of defence that he put forward at the trial.

But if the confession of the prisoner is to be believed, the alleged offence is not a culpable homicide and he should be discharged.

But does any one suggest that the Minister of Justice should assume the function of a jury and try the case upon the unsworn statement of this boy, upon a confession which, if it could be used, if it could be brought forward in favour of the boy could only be brought forward, it seems to me, as a reason for giving him a further trial in respect of a defence which he might and should have put forward at the trial of the action.

Now, it seems to me that this case, after all, lies within a very narrow compass. It is now admitted as a matter of fact that this boy shot the Armenian, though he persistently denied it until after the trial. According to his counsel he did not even indicate this line of defence to his counsel, either at the inquest or during the trial. He did not ask the jury to pass upon this question of accidental shooting. The only question in the case upon the evidence and the admitted facts is whether or not the shooting by this boy was accidental, and that is a plea which the boy, though defended by able counsel, did not put forward at the trial at all.

Now, the jury upon the abundant evidence—of a circumstantial character, it is true—because Mr. Power, in his report, admits that the circumstantial evidence was sufficient to justify the verdict of the jury that it was by the discharge of a gun in that boy's hands this man came to his death, then the jury, upon abundant evidence of a circumstantial character, found him guilty. He now puts forward in defence his confession which, according to the view of the learned judge at the trial, is not consistent with the evidence which was given at the trial in many important respects. Then, what is the position of the Minister of Justice? Let us turn to his report, which is to be found at page 29 of the documents which have been brought down. In the first place, he quotes that concluding portion of the report of Mr. Justice Ritchie, which I have already read to the House, and then he says:

Upon a careful perusal of the evidence taken at the trial, the undersigned concurs in the view expressed by the learned trial judge in the conclusion of his report, that the facts proved are entirely consistent with the view that the killing of Deron was unintentional and unpremeditated.

It appears that the learned and hon. Minister of Justice has fallen into an error as to what the judge's view really was. He seems to think that the view of the judge was that the prisoner should be discharged and sentence should be remitted. On the contrary, the judge explains in his statement that his view was that the prisoner should have been convicted of manslaughter. I must say in explanation of the remarks I have already made, the report of the Minister of Justice that I now for the first time observe that he apparently did not receive the report of Mr. Justice Ritchie until after he had ordered this prisoner's discharge; in fact, he got this prisoner discharged. I believe, almost before counsel had time to earn his fee by coming up from Truro to be heard. The prisoner was discharged without waiting for a report from the trial judge with respect to his view of the confession—because I observe that the report of Mr. Justice Ritchie upon the confession is dated the 26th of February, and it is on the 24th or 26th that the telegram is sent down to discharge the prisoner. Indeed, this was not a case which could wait the

ordinary course of the mails—a telegram was sent down to open the door of the prison and discharge this man. No one out of the many persons who signed the petition with respect to the sentence imposed upon this boy, except the Minister of Justice, seemed to think it was a case in which sentence should be remitted; one and all of them asked, either that the sentence should be commuted to one of imprisonment, or that there should be a new trial. His counsel puts forward the contention, so far as I can understand the affidavit, that there should be a new trial in the case upon the newly-discovered evidence, if you like to call it that, though it is not newly discovered so far as the prisoner is concerned—upon this statement which has been kept back by the boy during all this time, and is now brought to the attention of every one, including his counsel, for the first time. Then the Minister of Justice, in his report, proceeds to state that the boy was a stranger to Deron, and that therefore as is quite true the meeting must have been accidental. It may or may not have been true, because the evidence shows that the boy, about fifteen minutes before this shooting, was told that a pedlar was going up the road, and he was asked whether he would not like to have certain articles which were in the pedlar's possession, some musical instrument, a mouth organ, or something of that kind, and he made some profane remark about it. Then he proceeds to deal with what I have mentioned before, that none of the goods of Deron were taken, that they remained intact. Then he goes on and quotes the confession. I again point out that there must be something omitted in these papers, because he quotes two type-written pages of confession, and the papers brought down indicate that the entire confession is something less than one type-written page. I imagine, therefore, that there must be some other papers, because it is hardly conceivable that the Minister of Justice can have invented all this which he quotes. I cannot find it among the papers, it is not in the confession brought down, yet it is here in the report of the Minister of Justice. Perhaps my hon. friend will be able to explain that. Then he proceeds again:

> The statement of the prisoner exactly coincides with the evidence given at the trial.

I have read the report of the trial judge, who says that it does not, who says he regards it as an improbable story, and points out in what respects it does not coincide with the evidence given at the trial. Then he concludes by saying

> That he concurs in thinking——

I do not know with whom he concurs, with some person unknown——

> ——that the prisoner, upon the evidence submitted, was entitled to a verdict of acquittal, and that his confession since made rationally accounts for the shooting of Deron, for which no motive at the trial was disclosed.

The whole question of motive is entirely foreign to the point with which the Minister was dealing. The question of motive has nothing at all to do with the case except as an element of probability on one side or the other for the jury. The Minister of Justice seems to indicate that in his opinion it was not murder unless there was a motive. I do not so understand the law nor the definition of murder in the Criminal Code. Now, what would be the position of this matter if it went before a court having power, as courts have in many cases, not civil cases, either to order a new trial or to order judgment for the defendant? Take a civil case. Suppose a party had put his case forward in court on one line, and on one line alone, and a jury, upon sufficient evidence, as this was sufficient evidence, had found against him, and then he went before a court upon affidavit, in such a way as would lead the court to believe in the probability at least of his statement, that another line of defence would have resulted in a judgment in his favour, would it be imagined for a moment by any person having the least knowledge of the principles upon which courts of appeal deal with matters of that kind, that a court would order judgment under those circumstances for the defendant? The very utmost that man could get—he would not get it in the civil case—but the utmost he could get under circumstances of that kind, even in a criminal case, would be a further investigation. It would be going very far, under circumstances of this kind, to say that he should be allowed even the privilege of a further investigation after he had taken his chances in the way in which, as I have indicated he did take his chances. But in view of the value of human life and the bare possibility that his story might be correct, it might be competent, and no one would complain if the Minister of Justice had availed himself of the provision found in the Criminal Code, in section 748, to direct a new trial and place this man in such a position that those things with which the Minister was not in a position to deal, could be dealt with by a jury—no one, I am sure, would have had the slightest criticism to make upon the Minister of Justice if he had adopted that course. I do not suppose there are many in the House who would have criticised him very much if he had commuted the sentence to one of imprisonment, although I do not think that would be a logical course to pursue under the circumstances. The circumstances, if they entitled this prisoner to any consideration, entitled him to a new trial; that would be a logical and proper course to pursue. But to say that under the circumstances of this case, this man is to be tried by the Minister

of Justice upon his new, unsupported, uncorroborated and unsworn statement, I think indicates that the Minister of Justice takes a view of this controversy which will not be participated in by any lawyer in this House who has any practical acquaintance with criminal justice in Canada. Suppose this boy had made a confession and stated that this shooting was done in self-defence, would any one for a moment take the view of the Minister of Justice that it would be within his competence, or a proper function for him to exercise, to try that question himself, and to say that that boy should go forth as innocent out of prison? Would not any one say, under the circumstances, that the proper course would be, if anything could be said in favour of the boy, to grant him the right to have tried by a jury the question which he should have put forward in the first instance, and that in extending to him that favour and that clemency, you were going to the very utmost possible limits that you could properly go. I regret that I have been compelled to speak as I have of the action of the Minister of Justice in this case, for whose abilities and character I have the utmost possible respect; but I feel I would not be discharging my duty as a representative in this House if I had not occupied to the extent to which I have the time of the House in bringing this matter to its attention, and I trust the action of the Minister of Justice in this case will not at any time in the future be invoked in favour of any proceeding of this character.

Mr. POWELL. Was the boy sworn, and did he give evidence in his own behalf?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The boy did not go on the witness stand at the trial.

The PRIME MINISTER. I am sorry I did not hear the whole of the discussion which has arisen on this question. I would not pretend to speak with authority upon it, but as a member of the Government and one of the advisers of His Excellency, and having had to advise in this matter I think I owe it to the Administration to put before the House the view which guided us in arriving at the decision we reached. I may say to the hon. gentleman who has just criticised the action of the Government that there is no duty perhaps which it is more painful to exercise and which brings such a sense of responsibility upon those whose duty it is for the moment to advise the chief of the executive, than that of reviewing capital sentences. When a case of capital punishment is brought before us, where the fate of the life of man practically lies in the hands of those who for the moment are the advisers of the Crown, I need not say that we always approach it with a good deal of nervousness and trepidation; and if there is a principle of British law which should apply to the administration of the criminal law it is that it would be far better that ninety-nine guilty should escape than one innocent man should suffer the dire penalty of death. Leaving aside altogether the confession made by the prisoner after the trial, when he was under sentence, if the case had come before us simply as it was submitted to the jury, it would have been very difficult, so far as I am personally concerned, for me to have confirmed that sentence, in fact I would not have confirmed it under the circumstances as revealed to the jury; but with the confession of the prisoner, I certainly would not have consented to have the sentence of death carried out on this boy. The hon. gentleman has stated the boy is intelligent and cool. I admit all that. I think the boy is not remarkably intelligent, but still is possessed of a good deal of intelligence and coolness, but we must remember that he was a lad only 17 years old. Therefore, the verdict of the jury, as the case was presented to them, was quite proper; they could not come to any other conclusion than that which they reached, because the only question submitted to them was whether the boy had killed the Armenian. That was the bare question submitted to them. The question of motive, of other incidents which might have thrown light on the facts which ultimately came to be weighed when sentence had to be reviewed, did not appear at the trial. There is no doubt the case happened in this way. This boy went out shooting, leaving the house to shoot partridges. He heard some noise in the distance. There was a rush and a noise and he thought there was big game. The hon. member for Halifax said that country was open, and that the idea that the boy would look for his game under such circumstances was absolutely preposterous. It may have been preposterous to a man advanced in life, having knowledge of life, but certainly for a mere lad to have entertained such an opinion was not extraordinary. He thought there was big game. He put a bullet in his gun in addition to the charge already in it. Finding it was not big game but simply cattle, he wanted to take from the gun the bullet, but he could not do it and went away. Then accidentally, as I believe, the trigger was caught in a branch, the gun was discharged accidentally and the pedlar was shot in the road. Then the boy was scared. He ran away, never said a word to anybody, never opened his lips. Everybody inquired, who killed the man? The circumstances pointed forcibly to the boy and it appeared clear that nobody else could have done it. He was arrested, put upon trial, but never gave his confidence to his counsel. The circumstances were such that the jury could come to no other conclusion than that he committed the deed. The question might have arisen, what was the motive? It could not have been revenge, because he did not know the pedlar. Neither could it have been covetousness

nor a desire for plunder, because all the goods of the pedlar were found on his person. It was ascertained that whoever killed the man, he never approached the dead body, for there were no traces of footsteps near the body. The man who killed him evidently had run away. The jury did not inquire whether there was any motive for committing the act, because the simple question submitted to them was, who was the author of the killing, who did it? And the jury simply came to the conclusion that the guilty party was the boy and could be nobody else. Under these circumstances the jury brought in a verdict of guilty. When the poor boy found himself face to face with the consequences of his act and his indiscretion, he did what he should have done long before. He should, when arrested, or at all events at the trial, have stated the circumstances. He would have shown greater wisdom and intelligence if he had surrendered himself and stated the facts such as they were presented afterwards. But his intelligence was of that character which supposes that if there was no witness to the commission of an act of killing there could be no verdict of guilty rendered. He was under the impression that no one having seen him, the circumstances being such that he could not be pointed out as the author of the act, if he did not speak he would escape conviction. But he was convicted. If he had been a brighter boy, more educated and possessed of a larger mind he would have come to the conclusion that under the circumstances the best thing to do was to make an open confession of everything that had taken place. But, being brought face to face with the consequence of his act, then the boy made a confession, and I ask my hon. friend (Mr. Borden) does he not think it impossible to explain the killing of that man by any other circumstances than an accident. There cannot be any motive given for that killing. My hon. friend (Mr. Borden) has submitted for consideration as to whether there was manslaughter or murder, but under the circumstances this question does not arise, because admitting that the boy committed the killing with the gun which was in his hand, you cannot find any reasonable motive for the act, and the advisers of His Excellency had to advise as to what should be done with a lad of seventeen years old, who undoubtedly by an act of his had killed a man, but for which killing there was no possible motive, no motive of revenge, no motive of plunder, no motive of gain to the boy. I ask any hon. member in this House, what would he do if he had to deal wih a human life under such circumstances? My hon. friend (Mr. Borden) argued that suppose this boy had been tried in a civil action, and that he had acted foolishly in not disclosing the whole of his case and in not giving his defence, and the jury passed upon it, the hon. gentleman asked would anybody think of reopening the case. Certainly not. If it had been a civil case nobody would have tried to step in between that man and the courts, but on the contrary it was a criminal case which involved the life of that boy and the question arose: Were we to send him to abide by the consequences of an act which was an accident, and as to which he was foolish enough not to give his defence to his counsel. Whatever may be the technicalities of the law in this respect, for my part I would not hesitate to take the course which was taken. It may be that my hon. friend (Mr. Borden) may happen to be Minister of Justice in the remote future, and when he himself has to assume the responsibility of passing upon life and death, he will I believe always take the merciful side rather than the technical side of the case.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). As the right hon. gentleman has made an appeal to me with regard to one or two matters I would like to add a few words. It is apparent that I have not made myself clear to the right hon. gentleman, because he has followed exactly the line of the Minister of Justice. He says, in the first place, that there was only one question submitted to the jury, namely, as to who actually occasioned the killing. If I could for a moment believe that, I would be the first to say that there at least should be a new trial and probably a remission of the sentence. But I think I know Mr. Justice Ritchie too well to suppose that in instructing the jury he did not give to them explicit direction as to what constituted the crime of murder, and what they must believe before they could find a verdict of guilty. The right hon. gentleman presumes something which could not possibly have taken place. Mr. Justice Ritchie in directing the jury would tell them what constituted the crime of murder, and he would tell them distinctly what they must believe before they could find the man guilty. My right hon. friend cannot take refuge in any such idea as he has suggested, for it is absolutely inconceivable. The right hon. gentleman recites all these things that the Minister of Justice has recited in his report, and he says, having regard to all these things: We could not confirm this sentence. But the right hon. gentleman does not have to confirm anything. The sentence does not require any confirmation by the Government. The question is as to whether the clemency of the Crown shall be exercised either in remitting or commuting the sentence, or giving a new trial. Let me point out to the right hon. gentleman that if the question which he says was the real question in the case, was not submitted to the jury, whose fault was it? The Crown proved their case when they proved the killing. It was for the prisoner to submit this question to the jury. Suppose that I granted to the right hon. gentleman his argument so far, what would follow from it? He seems to think that

the Government ought to try this question which he says was the real question. The Governor in Council is not to try such questions; the Governor in Council has no such functions; the Governor in Council simply considers whether it is a proper case for clemency to be extended to the prisoner, and in a case of this kind, where it all depended upon the statement of the prisoner which had not been put before the jury at all, which had not been sworn to before the jury, where the prisoner making that statement had not been sworn and had not been cross-examined; the Governor in Council should not have undertaken to decide the issue of fact. I say that the criticisms which I have made have not been met by the right hon. gentleman. My point is that if there was a case for clemency, it was a case for a new trial and that is what section 748 of the Criminal Code is for. I do not find fault with anything the right hon. gentleman has said. All I say is: That these grounds on which the Minister of Justice has relied were considerations for the jury; these were not considerations which would in any way justify the Governor in Council in taking the steps they did take. My right hon. friend also says that it is impossible to state that there was any motive. I repeat again that it is not necessary there should have been any motive. The people who live near this boy and who know him very well have not much doubt about the manner in which this shooting took place. The jury of the county are the best judges of that. And suppose the boy were reckless or careless, does the right hon. gentleman say that he should go out free as an innocent person, as he has gone out without any further investigation. The right hon. gentleman takes up my illustration with respect to a civil case, but he must remember that if you are dealing with greater interests on one side you are also dealing with greater interests on the other side. You are dealing with the question of this boy's life, but you are also dealing with the question of the Armenian's life, and therefore while you may, because the boy's life is in question, grant a new trial which you would not do in a civil case; nevertheless you shall not say that where a human life has been sacrificed, that the case shall be taken away from the jury of the country who are the proper persons under the law and the constitution to deal with it. I venture to suggest these conclusions to the right hon. gentleman, because it seems to me, with every possible deference to his remarks and giving them all the force which his great experience as a lawyer would entitle them to, he has not met the case which I ventured to put before the House in regard to this matter.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Mr. Chairman, some members of the committee perhaps may not understand, from the observations made by the right hon. leader of the Government, that the question raised in this case by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Borden) is not as to whether it was a case for the exercise of the clemency of the Crown—whether the youth of the boy and the evidence as a whole should have been considered by the Government when dealing with the sentence of death; but the question raised by the hon. member for Halifax is one of the most important in connection with the administration of the criminal law that has ever come up in this Parliament or in the English Parliament. I can recollect when the Criminal Code was before the House of Commons, and this novel principle, involving the right of the Minister of Justice to order a new trial, was under consideration, there was in the minds of some a great fear lest the new departure might be so radical as really to endanger the safety of the public, and make crime more common in the country. The Minister of Justice at that time, Sir John Thompson, as hon. gentlemen will recollect, recognized the delicacy of introducing that novel feature into our criminal laws. I recollect very well his expression, either in or out of this House, that it would be hard to conceive of the circumstances under which that power would be exercised; it would have to be exercised in the most careful manner. Yet, this and other cases are now being discussed; and not only are leading men at the bar in Canada hearing of them with surprise, but the public interest is largely aroused in regard to what is becoming somewhat a frequent, some think too frequent, exercise of this extraordinary power, which was given to the Minister of Justice to be exercised in extreme and extraordinary cases. In order to show what was felt on the subject, let me refer to one or two things which were stated when this very machinery for granting a new trial was under consideration; and the committee will see how foreign it was to the framers of the Act, or to any member of the House who took part in discussing the changes being made in the law, to suppose that a Minister of Justice, in dealing with fresh testimony, or in reviewing the circumstances of a case, would have thought for a moment of ordering the prisoner to go scot free. The circumstances under which it was suggested that a Minister of Justice might be warranted in ordering a new trial were of an extreme character. For instance, I remember that the present Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) asked in committee whether it ought to be open to a prisoner to show that there had been an improper interference with the jury, even after the verdict. He was informed that that would be dealt with later on. Mark you, this was not a power to re-try cases in the Privy Council, sitting as a court of appeal. A provision was made for that. The courts of the land are to deal with questions of law, and the Privy Council sitting as a court of appeal could review such ques-

tions; but the provision in question had reference to the powers of the Crown to pardon or remit sentences or to order a new trial. The section was founded upon the examination made by the eminent commission in England which reported on the subject of a Criminal Code for Great Britain; and this was the paragraph on which we framed the provision giving this extraordinary power to the Minister of Justice:

> The result of the inquiries of the Secretary of State may be to show, not that the convict is clearly innocent, but that the propriety of the conviction is doubtful; that matters were left out of account which ought to have been considered; or that too little importance was attached to a view of the case, the debating of which was not sufficiently apprehended at the trial. In short, the inquiry may show that the case is one on which the opinion of a second jury ought to be given. If this is the view of the Secretary of State, he ought, we think, to have the right of asking a new trial on his own undivided responsibility.

Not under the circumstances detailed to-night by the Prime Minister—not the right to let the man go scot free; but the right of asking a new trial. Then, such members as the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister) spoke in the discussion on the clause in question. That hon. gentleman said:

> If the court should refuse to grant a new trial, on the ground that the verdict was contrary to the weight of evidence, then application could be made to the Minister of Justice, and if there was any doubt he would direct a new trial.

Sir John Thompson said in regard to this:

> If the Minister of Justice saw that the case was cognizable by the court of appeal, he would decline to exercise his power;——

That is, in other words, he should decline.

> ——but after the decision something may arise to throw doubts upon the conviction.

That was the case, as it seemed to the members of the Government, when this prisoner made his confession so contrary to the former line of his defence. It was sufficient to make a case of doubt, and it would have been arguable whether with that document and nothing else, the Crown would have been warranted in exercising the power under this clause in the code. Later on Mr. Lister said:

> It is much better for the Minister of Justice, in case he thinks justice has not been done, to be in a position to direct that a new trial shall take place, than to decide that the verdict of the court was wrong.

Hon. members will, therefore, see that that was the idea that prevailed when this statute was passed—that if it was supposed that the jury was wrong, the advisers of the Crown should not review the decision of the jury, or sit as another jury and decide finally and for ever that the jury was wrong; but if they thought the jury was wrong, they could exercise the right of directing a new trial; and that is all that was intended. I feel confident, therefore, that this action on the part of the Government has startled a great many people in the country. The hon. gentleman who has brought this subject to the notice of the committee has not suggested that this was a case for the exercise of clemency. No one has suggestd that. But the point which seems to be extraordinary, and which has not to my mind been satisfactorily explained by any one as yet, is how, under the circumstances, that man, who was regularly found guilty of a crime, the judge who tried him declining to suggest in his report that it was a case where justice had so miscarried that the sentence should be remitted—how in such a case this man could have been thrown back into the community as a free man.

The danger is, in all those cases, that if an impression prevails among the criminal classes that there are such chances as occurred in that case of producing further evidence without cross-examination, that will increase instead of repress criminal tendencies in the community. It is notorious that all those acting on behalf of the prisoner never expected a pardon. What they hoped was that, taking into consideration the facts which are not in dispute and were commented on by the judge in his report, and the youth of the prisoner, there would be a sentence of something like 10 or 12 years imposed instead of the extreme penalty of the law being carried out. It was no surprise to me to be told that after this pedlar under the circumstances detailed, had been killed, and the man who shot him pardoned, all the remaining Armenian pedlars doing business in Colchester County, N.S., immediately took the train and left the country.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). I am sure it must be a matter of very deep regret that these pedlars should have departed from the province of Nova Scotia, but I may say that I regret very much the tone of the remarks made by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Borden) and the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper). This was not a question of extending clemency. It was a question of application to this man's case of certain well known principles of criminal law. He was either guilty of murder or innocent. There was no middle course to take. To talk about sentencing a man, who is innocent, to imprisonment for ten years, is worse than insult. He was either guilty and should have suffered the penalty of the law or he was innocent. There was no suggestion of manslaughter in the evidence. There was no room for a verdict of manslaughter. There had been no trouble between the parties, no ill-feeling, no motive ascribed to the prisoner. The victim lay there, with all his money upon him and his chattels untouched. The absence of motive was clear. There was not a shred of evidence on which a motive could have been founded. That boy was guilty of murder or he was innocent. Let me tell my hon. friend that this case engaged the grave

and serious attention of His Excellency's advisers a very long time. Among them there were a good many men who have had a great deal of experience in criminal cases, some who have been attorneys general in their provinces for ten, twelve or fourteen years, and there was not a shadow of a doubt in the minds of any one of them, when the evidence was read, of the innocence of that boy. There was no proof of guilt, there was not a suspicion of evidence to show that the boy shot him intentionally. There was entire absence of proof to show that he shot with intent to kill. Now, we come to the point of law. Were the facts as proved at the trial, and which are not disputed, consistent with his innocence? I need not ask my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Borden) what the answer would be if the conclusion was that the innocence of the boy was consistent with the facts proved. What is the duty of a judge? What is the duty of a jury? It is not a question of mercy with them, not a question as to whether they would like to do this or that. The duty of a judge is to tell the jury that if the facts as proved are consistent with his innocence, they must discharge him. There is not a possibility of doubt about that. What were the facts? My right hon. leader has stated them. The boy, a stripling of 17, was out shooting in the woods, and a man going along the road was shot by the gun he held in his hand. The boy had never seen him before, there was no feeling between them, and the boy never touched his chattels or valuables. There was no motive shown for the shooting, and the judge reported the matter to the Government in the following words, and that is what led me to make up my mind on the question absolutely:

> No motive whatever was shown for the crime. It did not appear that Deron had been in the settlement before this, or that the prisoner had ever seen him. Even if the pedlar had come to his death from the gun in the hands of the prisoner, the circumstances are, in my opinion, quite as consistent with the view that the killing was not intentional as that it was premeditated.

If that is the law, then there is an end to the matter. I assume that the judge did charge the jury in these words. The jury had a duty to discharge and that was to acquit the prisoner. There was no room for doubt. When the facts proved at the trial are just as consistent with the man's innocence as with his guilt, it is the duty of the judge to charge the jury to acquit him.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Is the position of the hon. gentleman that if the facts are consistent with guilt or innocence, and the jury finds the accused guilty, then the prisoner has the right to expect that he will be pardoned by the Crown?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. My position is perfectly plain as a matter of law, and the hon. gentleman will find it laid down in every elementary book on criminal law. I am in accord with the best writers on the subject and the best decisions. My opinion is this, that if the facts as proved are consistent with the man's innocence, it is the duty of the judge to tell the jury to discharge the prisoner. That is my opinion of the law, and I have never seen it questioned before, and I have seen many a man discharged on that view of the law. A great deal has been said about the statement or confession, so-called, of the young lad afterwards:

> The young lad's silence (the judge said), perhaps somewhat militated against this view, but I think that may be accounted for by his fear of the consequences, if the story were not believed. He was only 17 years old, and viewing his case from the standpoint of a juryman, I would have been unable to concur in the verdict given.

Here is the report of the judge:

> I cannot concur in the verdict. I think the evidence was consistent with his innocence. I think his silence should not be held against him.

And when these three reports were made by the judge, there was not a shadow of doubt left in the minds of His Excellency's advisers as to what course they should take. It is not a case where doubts might be raised as to its being a case of manslaughter, for which a man might get ten years. It could not be manslaughter. I have read the evidence carefully and listened to the report read by the Minister of Justice, and under the evidence given, the verdicts could only have been murder or innocence. The judge said the evidence was consistent with either, and the boy's silence should not be taken against him, and that he did not concur in the verdict of guilty. All these facts taken together, there was but one course for the Government to take. There was no new trial necessary, because there were no new facts disclosed. The boy made a statement of his whereabouts, and that statement happened to coincide with the facts as proved at the trial.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). My hon. friend has hardly given one fact straight so far.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The facts which I have given and which my hon. friend has the courtesy to say are not straight, are facts I have read from the report. I do not think I misread this statement, and I say there was no new trial required, because there was no new evidence.

The statement made by the boy was a statement consistent with the evidence given at the trial. He made an explanation of how it came that the gun went off; and the evidence given by the doctor is that the wound found in the man's body shows that the gun, when it was fired, must have been fired with the butt on the ground, because the bullet went upwards, instead of downward or inward, as would have been

the case if fired from the shoulder, because the man was going down hill. All these facts did not leave any doubt in our mind. We did not see the necessity of a new trial, and the judge having reported as he did, we thought the case conclusive.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I will have to say a few words in reply to the hon. gentleman (Sir Louis Davies), as he has been good enough to speak of the spirit in which I dealt with this matter. If I made any remark about the hon. gentleman not giving the facts correctly, I hope he will pardon me. I think I approached this matter in a perfectly fair spirit. I endeavoured to do so, and not to be extravagant in the statements I made. The hon. gentleman has stated, as the last of the reasons on which he depends, that the story of the boy as given in this statement is consistent with the evidence at the trial. I do not suppose that the hon. gentleman understands the evidence better than Mr. Justice Ritchie, who presided. I do not know whether he claims that he does or not. I have pointed out, as he would have understood if he had done me the honour to listen to me, that the trial judge says the story is not consistent with the evidence given at the trial. Therefore, that part of the hon. gentleman's reasons go. Then the hon. gentleman says that it could not be a case of manslaughter. The hon. gentleman speaks of the great experience of the gentlemen who are members of the Government. I do not deny their experience. But I do not know that any of them has had more experience than Mr. Justice Ritchie, or that any of them knows more of the case than he. In the report which I read in the hon. gentleman's hearing, and which he has apparently forgotten, the judge said that the verdict should have been a verdict of manslaughter.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I did not see it. That report was not before us.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If the hon. gentleman had not been in such a hurry——

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We had the judge's formal report which he sent in answer to the request that he should give an opinion.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I should think that in dealing with a matter of such importance as this, after sending the confession to the trial judge, they would await his answer before letting the man out of jail. If they had had the patience to wait two days longer, they would have had the report of the trial judge, in which he said that the verdict should have been manslaughter, a verdict which the hon. gentleman says is preposterous. Does the hon. gentleman say that he understands the criminal law better than Mr. Justice Ritchie?

Sir LOUIS DAVIES.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Who is he?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). He is judge of the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Would the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden) have given a verdict of manslaughter?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would have agreed with Mr. Justice Ritchie that the verdict should have been nothing less than manslaughter, and only by distorting the facts would it be possible to make anything less out of it. Mr. Justice Ritchie is entitled to the respect of the Government and the country of which he is the judge. And, when I quote the statement of the trial judge that the verdict should have been one of manslaughter, I make the best possible answer to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that a verdict of manslaughter would be preposterous.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. To whom did he make that report?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). To the Minister of Justice. And, if the Government had waited two days, they would have had that report before them. And the hon. gentleman stands up and tells Mr. Justice Ritchie that his opinion of this case is preposterous. That is the effect of it. To say that his opinion of this case, after trying it, and with his experience on the bench for fifteen years, with a very much longer experience, I venture to say, than the hon. Minister in both civil and criminal practice, is preposterous, is really an extraordinary justification——

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I took his own report.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am taking his own report, too.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. You can reconcile them, perhaps.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). His own report, made in answer to the Minister of Justice, says that in his opinion the jury should have found a verdict of manslaughter. The hon. gentleman talks about courtesy, but I do not think there is very much courtesy in standing up and saying that the opinion of a learned judge——

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I hope my hon. friend will not say that I said that about Mr. Justice Ritchie. I never heard of this report that the hon. gentleman speaks of. I read Mr. Justice Ritchie's report that the evidence was consistent with the man's innocence, and if so, he could not be convicted of manslaughter.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). And I read in the hon. gentleman's hearing the statement of Mr. Justice Ritchie——

Mr. McGREGOR. Did the judge give two written opinions?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am endeavouring to deal just now with the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and I will deal with my learned friend (Mr. McGregor) later on. I am pointing out that in the report sent to this Government in response to the Minister of Justice, Mr. Justice Ritchie says that there might have been or should have been a verdict of manslaughter I will get his exact words, I read them before.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I did not hear it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Then, the hon. gentleman should not have undertaken to deal with it.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I tell the hon. gentleman that it never came before the Government. A report of Mr. Justice Ritchie which came before the Government, and on which we acted, stated that the evidence was consistent with the man's innocence.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The hon. gentleman, perhaps, does not understand me. I read here in the presence of the hon. gentleman what Mr. Justice Ritchie said about the verdict of manslaughter, and I said that, after I had read that report and brought it to his attention, the hon. gentleman rose in his place in the House and said that any such view as that would be preposterous. And I have said that, when the hon. gentleman undertakes to speak of courtesy, he might bear in mind that it is not a very courteous way to speak of one of the judges of the country, of whose Government he is a member. Now, the hon. gentleman went further and said that the facts stated in this confession were consistent with the evidence given at the trial. I suppose he did not hear me when I read from the report of Mr. Justice Ritchie that the statements were not consistent with several of the facts brought out in evidence at the trial. My hon. friend seems to think that there is no question in this case except whether the man was guilty of murder or wholly innocent, that no question of manslaughter can arise. Let me point out to my hon. friend the position of this boy. He must remember, in dealing with the question of motive, that the boy had denied his guilt and only makes his confession after he had been convicted. This is a most important circumstance to be taken into consideration in connection with the motive or in connection with the facts that might lead to manslaughter. Suppose he was using his gun in a reckless and negligent manner. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that he would not be guilty of manslaughter unless——

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Unless you prove, and there was not a scintilla of evidence to show that, he had handled his gun in that way that would make him guilty of manslaughter.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am glad the hon. gentleman says that, because it leads up to what I was coming to. When you have the facts proved by the jury and found by the jury that this boy, with the gun in his hand, shot his man, and the only defence put forward was that he did not have the gun in his hand, and did not shoot this man, the burden of proof was on the boy to show that the shooting was accidental.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That is new law to me.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If one man brings another to his death by means of shooting, and there is no explanation given of the shooting, or the reason for it, the jury are perfectly justified in bringing in a verdict of murder or of manslaughter. In a case of that kind where the death is proved of one man at the hands of another, that is an end of the question. The burden of proof after that, so far as motive is concerned, is upon the prisoner himself, if he wants to get rid of a verdict of manslaughter, at least. In this case my hon. friend seems to put out of sight altogether the fact that the very ground on which this man was discharged from prison by the Government, was not put forward by the prisoner at the trial, and the jury were not asked by him to pass upon it. That is a point which my hon. and learned friend has not met, and it is for that reason chiefly that I say that any extension of the clemency of the Crown should have been by granting a new trial.

Mr. McCLURE. I would not venture to say a word on this subject except that I have some personal knowledge of the circumstances which it is evident some hon. gentlemen who have addressed the House, are not familiar with. I am bound to say at the outset that the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Borden) is perfectly correct when he says that the decision of the Department of Justice was received with considerable surprise. I entirely concur with the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) in saying that nobody ever expected such a decision, and nobody ever asked for it. But I am bound to say also that I do not think that the hon. gentleman has presented any clear or conclusive argument to show that the decision is wrong. He undertakes to say that the decision of the Department of Justice is in some respects inconsistent with the report of the

trial judge upon this case. I am unable to gather that from my reading of the report, or from my knowledge of the facts of the case. Before any confession had been presented, before the judge knew the contents of that confession, he writes to the Minister of Justice a report in which he makes this statement:

> No motive whatever was shown for the crime. Even if the person came to his death from a gun in the hands of the prisoner, the circumstances proved are, in my opinion, quite as consistent with the view that the killing was not intentional as that it was premeditated.

Then I want the House to notice this statement, because it appears to be somewhat inconsistent with the later report of Mr. Justice Ritchie:

> Perhaps the prisoner's silence militates somewhat against this view, but that I think may be accounted for by his fear of the consequences if his story was not believed. He was only seventeen years old. Viewing the case from the standpoint of a juryman, I would have been unable to concur in the verdict given.

That was the report, given before he knew anything about the confession. Yet I want you to notice particularly that after the report of the confession has been given, Mr. Justice Ritchie thinks it was very remarkable, if this statement is true, that the boy did not say something at the inquest or at some of the proceedings of the trial. Yet before he knew anything about the confession, he had himself given a very substantial reason why the boy did not give that confession before. Now, after the confession is given, it is sent to Mr. Justice Ritchie, and he sends back a second report upon which the hon. gentleman comments at considerable length. In that report for the first time in his reports of the trial Mr. Justice Ritchie puts forward the view that the verdict should have been manslaughter. But I wish him to pay particular attention to this part of the report where he says: The story is somewhat improbable, but no doubt the homicide might have happened as stated by Dartt. Then he goes on to point out one or two inconsistencies between the confession and the facts as proved at the trial, and I want you to notice what those inconsistencies are. In one respect, perhaps, a little local knowledge of the circumstances will enable you to see how little there is of inconsistency. He places great stress upon this fact: He says it was very improbable that this boy would expect to find large game in that vicinity. Now, I undertake to say from my knowledge of the circumstances, that it not only would not have been very improbable for a boy of 17 to expect to find bears in any place where there is woods, but as a matter of fact, it would not have been very surprising if he had found a bear in that very spot, for they have been seen in that locality.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That merely proves that my hon. friend would have been a very good witness for the defence at a new trial.

Mr. McCLURE. I am not talking about the evidence given at the trial; I am talking about what the judge undertakes to say is an inconsistency. The statement which I make is not inconsistent with any statement made at the trial. This question of large game did not arise in the trial at all. This theory was not put forward at the trial, and I want to impress upon the attention of this committee this important fact, who is to blame for it I am not going to say, but it is a fact that in the report made to the Department of Justice, the judge who tried this case puts forward the view which I have read to you here, to the effect that the facts as proved were as consistent with the view that the killing was not intentional, as that it was premeditated. But I listened to that trial very carefully and read the reports carefully, and I find it strange that view was never presented to the jury. I can understand why the defence did not, because they relied upon the plea of denial. The prosecution had nothing to do with it. I do not wish to criticise the action of the judge, but I do say it is somewhat peculiar that that view, which was strongly presented to the Department of Justice, never was presented to the jury upon the trial.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I suppose the reason of it was that the defence rested entirely on the line which he had suggested, and would not feel it competent for him to put that forward to the jury.

Mr. McCLURE. That may be a satisfactory explanation; I am not going into the legal aspect of the case. But I say that up to the present moment, while there has been presented in the papers here most conclusive evidence that that man was shot by a shot from a gun held by that boy, there has been to this hour not one tittle of evidence presented that the boy fired that shot intentionally. We have had a lot of talk about motive. The judge says that there is no motive; that is very true. The hon. gentleman answers that it is not necessary to prove motive. I agree with him it may not be necessary to prove motive, but it is necessary to prove more than who actually did the shooting, it is necessary to prove that he did it intentionally. Where is the evidence that he did it intentionally? I grant you that he did it, but the circumstances are perfectly consistent with the theory of accident. If they be perfectly consistent with the theory of accident, what right has the jury to assume that if the boy shot the man, he did it intentionally?

As the judge said, it was open to them to assume that, although there is no proof he did not do it intentionally. True, the argu-

ment was not taken advantage of, but it was open to the parties to use it. Another view of the case is this. The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Borden) thinks there should be a new trial. That would be a very dangerous course to see followed in a case of this kind. What is the argument? Here is a man tried and found guilty, he presented a certain theory to the court in his defence and a certain line of evidence; the court convicted him and he was condemned. Afterwards it is stated on behalf of the prisoner that he did not state the truth to the court, and that if another chance is afforded him he will present the truth and prove his innocence. That would be a somewhat dangerous precedent to establish—to say, give a man a new trial because at the time he was convicted he did not tell the truth, and if he now gets a new trial he will tell the truth and be acquitted. There is difficulty in pursuing that line; yet the hon. gentleman undertakes to argue in that way and declares that the young man should have had a new trial and not a commutation of sentence. I am not pleading the question, but I am bound to say, that the action taken struck me with some surprise, and yet the hon. member for Halifax has not made that successful attack which I expected he would do when he rose to present the case, because I say that to-day there is but one theory and one set of facts put forward which will explain satisfactorily why and how the boy did the shooting, and that is the theory of accident. Is there a jury, a counsel or a Governor General, who would assume that a boy sixteen years of age, without the slightest provocation and without any inducement known would go out in broad daylight and shoot a man on the road, leave him there and not return?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is that a question for a jury or for the Governor General in Council?

Mr. McCLURE. I submit it was a question for the jury. I say further that under the Criminal Code as it stands to-day, the hon. gentleman cannot deny that it is also a question for the Minister of Justice. The section is a somewhat peculiar one, and the code is to blame more than the Department of Justice. It reads as follows:

> If upon any application for mercy of the Crown on behalf of any person convicted of any indictable offence, the Minister of Justice entertains a doubt whether such person ought to have been convicted, he may instead of advising Her Majesty to remit or commute the sentence after such inquiry as he thinks proper by an order in writing direct a new trial at such time and before such court as he may think proper.

If the Minister of Justice entertains any doubt as to whether the boy was proved guilty or not, leaving out the confession and everything but the bald evidence, what has he the option of doing? He may, instead of remitting the sentence, order a new trial. If he does not entertain any doubt he may remit the sentence. If the Minister and the Government are of the opinion that without doubt the boy is innocent, and viewing all the circumstances, if it is plain and clear that the only explanation is that the boy did the shooting accidentally, is it not a duty incumbent upon them to remit the sentence and discharge the boy, which, while it may have surprised the public and the hon. gentleman, as it certainly did surprise me, is yet a course consistent with the theory of the law and the duty imposed on the Government under the law.

Mr. BRITTON. On hearing this case so ably presented by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Borden), it seems to me it would have been a judicial murder if this sentence had been carried out. I cannot think for one moment that on the facts presented to the House any other than the exercise of the Executive clemency should have been carried out in a case of this kind. The hon. gentleman must know, as all of us do who have had to do with the administration of the criminal law that if there are two theories as regards the killing, one consistent with innocence and the other with guilt, there must then be doubt in the mind of the jury or the court which tried the case. It is not a question of mercy or privilege, it is not correct to say that the prisoner was entitled to the privilege, for it is a right that must be exercised in his favour. If there are two theories there cannot be a conviction. So, is not the whole case ended when the judge reports—I do not care whether he made one report or two reports to the Government—and in that report says, first, he is not satisfied with the verdict, and, second, that the facts established on the trial were consistent with accident. If they are consistent with accident, they are consistent with the innocence of the defendant, and if so, then it was not a mercy extended, it was a right that had to be extended, and the statement had to be admitted that if those were the facts this man was not guilty and should not have been found guilty. I submit further that in dealing with this question we are not dealing with that much-discussed section No. 748 of the Criminal Code, which gives the Minister of Justice power to order a new trial. There is great difference of opinion in regard to that section, and whether we have the right in Canada to have that privilege or duty placed on the Minister of Justice. This is not a case of the kind, but such a case as came before the Government long before the Criminal Code was passed, a case in which the Government were called on to decide on the application of a prisoner for executive clemency, whether the sentence should or not be carried out. It was dealt with on the facts that came before the Government, and they were, first, that the shooting was consistent with accident, and then

a conviction for murder or for manslaughter —because it is just as inconsistent for manslaughter as for murder if the shooting was accidental—was wrong, and a conviction made under such circumstances should be set aside and the man set at liberty. The only other question was as to this man's subsequent confession after the trial. How often does it happen, especially with young men, when they are brought face to face with the killing of a fellow-being that they think no one saw them, they will deny everything, accidental or otherwise, in connection with the shooting; and having made the first mistake, this young man persistently followed it down to the trial and it was not until after the trial that the prisoner told the truth. But in making that confession it was not done with the intention of basing upon it an application for a new trial, and it was consistent with the theory that the shooting was accidental. Under these circumstances and the report of the judge made, and the only report the Government could act on, showing these two points, first, that the judge was not satisfied with the verdict, and second, that this view was not inconsistent with accidental killing, I submit that no other course could have been fairly followed by the Government then to have left the young man go perfectly free. It is well known as a principle in the administration of criminal justice, that where there are two theories equally consistent with all the facts of the case, one consistent with a man's innocence and the other consistent with a man's guilt, we are obliged to give the benefit of the doubt to the prisoner. Nothing more than that was done in this case, and it would have been a monstrous wrong on the part of the Government to have dealt with this case in any other way than they did deal with it.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). The importance of the point raised by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden) justifies me in saying just one word. I stated to him the ground on which His Excellency's advisers, advised that the clemency of the Crown should be extended towards this young lad. I challenged my hon. friend (Mr. Borden) to question the law, apart altogether from the question of mercy. Those who watched the hon. gentleman in his reply to me must have noticed that he entirely evaded touching that point. My learned friend from Kingston (Mr. Britton) has put the point so clearly that not only every lawyer but every layman must thoroughly understand it. My hon. friend from Colchester (Mr. McClure) has quoted the words of the judge: that the evidence was consistent with this shooting having been purely accidental, and I put it to my learned friend (Mr. Borden) and he did not grapple with that point as I humbly believe he was bound to, that if that was the evidence as the judge reported it, the judge was bound to submit it to the jury and the jury were bound to acquit. One word more. When I scouted the idea that this boy on the evidence could be found guilty of manslaughter, and challenged the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden) to put his reputation to the statement in this House that he thought that evidence justified manslaughter, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden) was silent and did not dare to commit himself to such a statement. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden) said there was a statement made by the judge, and behind that he sheltered himself, but the hon. gentleman who took the responsibility of bringing the Government to the Bar of this House for having been guilty of the miscarriage of justice; the hon. gentleman did not dare to take the responsibility of saying that he believed the evidence justified a verdict of manslaughter. Let me present the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden) the Criminal Code. No one knows better than he does, for he is a lawyer of great experience and I recognize his ability and experience; no one knows better than he the definition of murder in the Criminal Code, and he knows what reduces that crime of murder to manslaughter. I ask the attention of the House for a moment while I read the section which defines the reduction of murder to manslaughter, and then I will ask, is there a man in this House who will say that the ingredients which reduce the crime of murder to manslaughter were present in this case or could possibly be found in the evidence.

> Culpable homicide, which would otherwise be murder, may be reduced to manslaughter if the person who causes death does so in the heat of passion caused by sudden provocation.

Is there a suspicion of that here? Could it be sustained if such a verdict was found; I trow not.

> Any wrongful act or insult, of such a nature as to be sufficient to deprive an ordinary person of the power of self-control, may be provocation if the offender acts upon it on the sudden, and before there has been time for his passion to cool.

Was there a suspicion that any of these facts were present in this case. Let my hon. friend (Mr. Borden) now take the responsibility of raising in his place.

Mr. POWELL. I will ask the hon. gentleman (Sir Louis Davies) if he has ever heard of the indictment of a person, or of a corporation, or negligence resulting in death.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am not talking about negligence resulting in death.

Mr. POWELL. But that constitutes manslaughter.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am talking about the code which defines what murder is, and defines the circumstances which reduce murder to manslaughter.

Mr. POWELL. Will the hon. gentleman pardon me. In the latter clause of the report of Mr. Ritchie, he says:

> I thought the verdict should have been one of manslaughter only, as I suppose the death was caused by the careless use of a gun fired near the public highway.

I thought under criminal law that constituted manslaughter.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. My hon. friend (Mr. Powell) is perfectly entitled to his opinion, but if he will point out one scintilla in the evidence which would justify a verdict of manslaughter, I will surrender the case. There was not before the jury the suspicion of a hint of negligence.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Does the hon. gentleman (Sir Louis Davies) understand that the Criminal Code in giving that definition of manslaughter, altered the law from what it was before?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not know whether the intention of the codifier was to alter the law as it was before, but the code in my opinion lays down the correct definition of what was murder and what will reduce it to manslaughter, and if I recollect aright this code is copied word for word from the English code in that respect. I have never found any lawyer nor any one else find fault with the definitions I have read. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Britton) has stated that the carrying out of that verdict would have been judicial murder; nobody has any doubt about that. But they suggest that manslaughter might have been found, and I say with very great deference to my hon. friend (Mr. Borden) that there is just as much cause to find a verdict of murder on the evidence as there is to find a verdict of manslaughter on the evidence. I lay it down as a cardinal law which nobody dare challenge: That where the facts as proved are as consistent with the innocence of a man as with his guilt, that man is entitled to be discharged. I never heard that principle questioned in a court of law, and if it is questioned here I will produce the highest authorities from the text books of the writers of Great Britain and of America to justify my statement. It is on that crucial point the judge says that the facts were as consistent with the accidental firing of the gun as with it having been fired premeditatedly. That being so, the judge was bound to charge the jury in the words he reported to the Minister of Justice, and the jury were bound to find in accordance with that charge "not guilty."

Mr. POWELL. At the risk of delaying the passing of the Estimates, although I recognize the great desire on the part of all the members of the House to get home as quickly as possible, I shall direct the attention of the House to this question for a very few moments. No one will question the fundamental principle of the criminal law as announced by the Minister of Marine. He has stated it very well, and were I called upon to state it I would simply say that the rule of criminal law is this: That where there is a parity of reasonable probability between the prisoner's guilt and innocence, there should be no conviction. We all, I think, agree on that, and I accede to the statement of the Minister of Marine, as I presume that is about the statement of the principle he meant to make to the House.

Where the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is wrong is in the application of the rule that where there is a parity of reasonable probability there should be no conviction. What the hon. gentleman adduces are matters in respect of which there is a presumption of evidence—not an irrefutable presumption, but a prima facie presumption of evidence—that they exist. These are matters such as the connection between cause and effect, which is presumed. There is a prima facie presumption of fact that an act is an intelligent act, that a man means what he does. It is necessarily so, otherwise you could not try any cases at all. How could you possibly enter into a man's motive? As was said by Chief Justice O'Brien long ago, in homely but rather vigorous language, "the devil himself cannot tell what the motive of a man was." We will take this case: A man is found dead in a field who has been killed through violence without doubt; an individual is last seen with him; there is proof that cannot be gainsaid that no other individual was near him. It is nonsense to assert that the law of this country is so lame that the individual last seen with the man cannot be convicted of either murder or manslaughter, unless there is positive evidence that the killing was intentional. The jury can draw the inference of intention as well as of commission of the act. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries will have to revolutionize the whole theory and administration of English criminal law if he wishes to set up such a contention. There is no doubt that as a matter of law the individual under such circumstances could be convicted. Whether or not his conviction is just, whether or not there were grave doubts as to the prisoners guilt under the evidence, whether or not it would be indiscreet to inflict the death penalty—these are questions not of law, but considerations which may or may not call for executive clemency. The hon. gentleman says there is nothing to establish a motive. I am not going to argue that point at length; but I will merely mention two or three facts which clearly show intention or are evidence of intention. In the first place, before this deed is committed, this boy is heard using harsh language concerning the victim of the crime; after the crime is committed, he does what? He

tries to conceal his act, he lies about it; and the fact that a man who is charged with a crime does not tell the truth about it, but falsifies facts concerning it, is an evidence of a motive. The party threw himself on the court on a certain line of defence, that he did not do the act. That line of defence was false and unsuccessful. After he fails in that, he wishes to go before the court on another line of defence that he did do the act, but not intentionally. Give his confession and claim all the force we can, and what does it mean? It means that this matter has not been submitted to a jury, and should be submitted to a jury to decide whether the act was intentional or accidental. That is a matter, not for a judge, but for a jury alone. Now for the principles of law that should guide the Minister of Justice in such a case as this. The provision that is incorporated in our code is from the report that was made by the commission for the revision of the English criminal law. The British Parliament never adopted it, but it has been adopted in this country. Look for one moment at the opinion of those very eminent men who drafted the English code. It can be best gathered from the parts of commissioner's report, which I shall read:

It must also be remembered that a court of justice in deciding upon such applications would, in order to avoid great abuses, be obliged to bind itself by strict rules, similar to those which are enforced in applications for civil cases on the ground of newly-discovered evidence. Such applications cannot be made at all after the lapse of a very short interval of time, and are not granted if the applicant has been guilty of any negligence; and this stringency is essential to the due administration of justice and to the termination of controversies. It would be unsatisfactory to apply such rules to applications for new trials in criminal cases.

The law is there discussed by the commissioners very ably. On an application to quash a conviction, no matter what the ground is, if that ground was not taken, but could have been taken at the trial, and the fact that it was not taken was due to the negligence of the party, then it is not a ground for quashing the conviction. The greatest effect that could be given to it would be a ground for a new trial through clemency. With regard to the power proposed to be given to the Secretary of State in England, which has been given here to the Minister of Justice, the commissioners say:

Experience has shown that the Secretary of State is a better judge of the existence of such circumstances than a court of justice can be. He has every facility for inquiring into special circumstances; he can and does, if necessary, avail himself of the assistance of the judge who tried the case and of the law officers. The position which he occupies is a guarantee of his own fitness to form an opinion.

The report winds up by saying:

The result of the inquiries of the Secretary of State may be to show not that the convict is clearly innocent, but that the propriety of the conviction is doubtful; that matters were left out of account which ought to have been considered, or that too little importance was attached to a view of the case, the bearing of which was not sufficiently apprehended at the trial; in short, the inquiry may show that the case is one on which the opinion of a second jury ought to be taken.

After mentioning a series of cases, they say: "In short, it may be a case which the opinion of a second jury should be taken." That is what this case is, and there can be no reason at all why the Minister of Justice acted in this case as he did. While I agree to the proposition of law stated by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, it has no application whatever to this case. It it preposterous to say that because it was possible that the act might have been done innocently, therefore the man should be discharged. If that principle were applied in such cases as this, you would not have a man convicted once in a thousand years, because, as Chief Justice O'Brien says, it is impossible to know a man's motive. But back of that there is this fact, as stated by Mr. Justice Ritchie, that there was or may have been negligence in the handling of the gun. The fact that a man does a thing and damage results is evidence of negligence without anything further. Again, pointing a loaded gun at another being prohibited, if a man simply points a gun at another without intending to shoot at all, and the gun goes off, he is guilty of manslaughter. The whole matter resolves itself into this—that the case should have been left to a second jury, and if the administration of justice in this country is going to be so poorly guarded that a man who meets another in a byway, where no one sees him, and murders him, and is pardoned because there is no evidence of any motive, beyond the commission of the offence, I can assure this House that the crime of murder will be much more frequent in this country in the future than it has been in the past.

Dorchester Penitentiary..... $48,700

Mr. CALVERT. In connection with the Estimates for the Department of Justice, I desire, even at this late date, to call the attention of the committee for a few moments to an expenditure in connection with that department. I refer particularly to the expenditure in connection with the late London election trial, and I may say that I regret very much that my hon. friend for London (Mr. Beattie) is not present, because I am sure he would agree with me in what I have to say in reference to this question. I asked the House for an order, which was granted some time ago, for copies of the account of Mr. H. H. Robertson, registrar of the election court trial held in London in the fall of 1897, determining the right of Thomas

Beattie, Esq., to sit as member for the city of London, in connection with the said trial, vouchers and certificates and all correspondence relating thereto. I may say in connection with this that under section 41 of the Dominion Controverted Election Act, the judges are empowerd to employ stenographers, and the expense thereof shall be considered as costs of the case and chargeable to the unsuccessful party. Section 43 of the same Act provides that the judges shall forward to the Speaker of the House of Commons a copy of the evidence or notes of evidence taken at the trial, and by an Order in Council dated 22nd December, 1875, the fees to be paid the registrar of the election court for a copy of the notes sent to the Speaker of the House of Commons shall be 10 cents per folio of 100 words.

Now, you would expect that with the liberal allowance of 10 cents per folio and with the system of type-writers now in use, whereby several copies can be made at one and the same time, no further charge would be made to the original cost. The stenographer engaged in connection with the London election trial was Mr. Nelson R. Butcher, and he was ordered by the judges to make a copy of the evidence. He did so, and presented an account for 7,962 folios at 10 cents per folio, or $796.20. He also presented an account for $180.60, being for twenty-one days employed as stenographer and travelling expenses in connection therewith, or a total amount of $976.80, and the trial judges issued an order ex parte, without the knowledge of the petitioner, that this large sum of $976.80 should be paid out of the $1,000 deposited by the petitioner, and it was so paid. Then Mr. H. H. Robertson, registrar of the election court, and the son of one of the presiding judges, received a copy of the evidence from the stenographer, which he got for nothing, mailed the same to the Speaker of the House of Commons, and presented his account to the Department of Justice for a similar amount to that already paid. The Auditor General, when he received this account, refused to pass it for the full amount, but reduced it by 451 folios, or from 7,962 to 7,511, and the Government paid Mr. Robertson $751.10 for a copy of the evidence that he had received for nothing, and which he had simply mailed to the Speaker of the House of Commons.

As I understand it, the expenses that shall be paid by the unsuccessful party, so far as the stenographer is concerned, are $5 per day and travelling expenses, and that the charge for copying the evidence shall be paid by the Government, and when Mr. Robertson received from the Government this $751.10, the petitioner certainly expected that the money taken from his deposit would be returned to him, less the expenditure of $5 per day and travelling expenses due to the stenographer. But Mr. Robertson refused to return the money, and the counsel for the petitioner applied to the trial judge on the 8th November, 1897 to hear evidence why this money should be returned, and the judges refused to hear evidence.

In order that the House may be placed in full possession of the facts, I must ask your attention, Mr. Speaker for a few moments while I read part of the correspondence, which will make it perfectly plain that an injustice was done in this case. The first communication was from the solicitors for the petitioner.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Will the hon. gentleman tell me what interference he suggests, either on the part of this House or the Government?

Mr. CALVERT. I ask that if it is at all possible this money should be returned and the Government should take some steps to have it returned. If not, we have an Order in Council of over twenty years' standing that I do not think is of any importance at present, and if nothing more can be done, we could have that amended or wiped out entirely, and in the future would not have expenses of this kind imposed on the petitioner or the Government.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Nothing, however, can be done in this case.

Mr. CALVERT. I am not sure of that. I will read part of the evidence, and the hon. gentleman can see whether the Justice Department can do anything or not.

London, Canada, November 10th, 1897.

The Right Honourable Sir Oliver Mowat,
Minister of Justice,
Ottawa.

London Election Petition.—Fewings vs. Beattie.

Sir,—We beg to say that we are instructed to write you as to the payment of the stenographer's charges in this case, under the following circumstances :—

The court stenographer at the trial of this petition was Mr. Nelson R. Butcher. Upon the fiats of the trial judge he received out of the petitioner's deposit $976.80, of which sum $180.60 were for 21 days' attendance and travelling expenses, and $796.20 were for making copies of evidence. For this payment Mr. Butcher made and delivered to the registrar of the court, Mr. H. H. Robertson, three complete copies of the evidence taken at the trial of the petition, of which one copy is now at Osgoode Hall, a second copy is in the hands of the trial judges, and the third copy was sent to the Speaker of the House of Commons under section 43 of the Dominion Controverted Elections Act.

Mr. H. H. Robertson thereupon made out his bill against the Government for his services as registrar, in which he charged (under the tariff as fixed by the Order in Council of 22nd December, 1875) 10 cents per folio for a copy of the evidence, and it was allowed, and actually received from the Government, in addition to his charges—$751.10 for a copy of the evidence (Auditor General apparently not finding as many folios of evidence as Mr. Butcher had charged).

The firm of Kerr, McDonald & Davidson, as well as ourselves, had some correspondence

with your department during the present year, and we were advised, as we understood, that the unsuccessful party should pay the stenographer's per diem allowance and expenses, and that the charge for copying evidence would be defrayed by the Government out of the grant for legislation, and that the registrar of the court, on receiving the tariff allowance of 10 cents per folio should settle with the stenographer for copying the evidence, or if payment for this had been previously made out of the petitioner's deposit that the registrar should refund the amount received by him therefor.

Acting on this advice we caused an application to be made to Mr. H. H. Robertson to refund the sum of $751.10 received by him as above, and when he paid no attention to this request, counsel for the petitioner and respondent made an application to Justices Ferguson and Robertson, the trial judges, for a direction that Mr. H. H. Robertson should bring the above mentioned sum into court. Then application was made on Monday, November 8th, but their Lordships positively refused to hear it, or even to allow it to be discussed.

We ought to mention that on the 19th of December, 1891, a number of the judges of the High Court of Justice for Ontario assumed to make a rule for payment of the stenographer's charges out of the petitioner's deposit. This rule appears to be contrary to the statute, but if it means that the judges pay the stenographer out of the deposit for copying the evidence, it must mean that they pay him for as many copies as they need, and especially for the copy which the judges have to forward to the Speaker of the House, and that the amount so drawn from the deposit should be subsequently made good by the amount paid by the Government for such copy. Considering the manner in which copies of evidence are prepared, and that in practice four or five copies cost no more than one copy, it is little short of an outrage that the judges should pay the stenographer $796.10 form moneys in court for two copies of evidence for their own use, and expect the department to pay as much more for the third copy required by the statute.

We submit that the respondent and the petitioner have been treated unjustly and illegally by the judges and the registrar, and as the latter are accountable only to Parliament, we beg to lay the facts of the case before you, and we venture to ask that the moneys improperly taken should be made good by the Government from the parliamentary grant for legislation, or from such other moneys as may be voted by Parliament for the purpose.

We have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servants,
(Sgd.) MACBETH & MACPHERSON.

When the Department of Justice received this communication they immediately wrote to Mr. Robertson setting forth the facts of the case as presented in the communication from Macbeth & Macpherson, and Mr. Robertson answered Mr. Newcombe in this way:

Hamilton, November 24th, 1897.

To the Deputy Minister of Justice,
Ottawa.

Re London Election Petition.

Sir,—I had the honour on the 20th instant to acknowledge the receipt of your favour of the 18th instant.

Mr. CALVERT.

You are correctly informed as to the payments to me, as registrar, at the above trial, of $751.10 for one copy of the notes of evidence annexed by me to the report of the court to the Speaker, being at the rate of 10 cents per 100 words, payable under the Order in Council of the 22nd of December, 1875, but you have been misinformed in the representation that the court stenographer was paid for the same copy out of the petitioner's deposit, or for the copy in respect of which I, as registrar, received payment. The court stenographer has, in addition to his expenses and daily attendance, been paid for one copy only out of the deposit, at the rate of 10 cents per 100 words, which was required to file of record under rule 51 of the general rules made by the judges under the Controverted Elections Act (for which the Order in Council does not provide), and not for making three copies as has been represented to you.

I do not think it is necessary for me to read all the letter sent me by Mr. Robertson.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. You had better read it all, in justice to him, as you are making a charge against him.

Mr. CALVERT—

Section 41 of the Controverted Elections Act provides that:

"The judge may, in his discretion, employ a shorthand writer to take down the oral evidence given by witnesses, at the trial of the petition, and the expense of employing such shorthand writers shall pay costs in the case."—27 Vic., chap. 10, sec. 51.

In furtherance of this provision, on the 19th of December, 1891, the judges of the Supreme Court then on the rota for the trial of election petitions passed the resolution, of which the following is a copy:—

"December 19th, 1891.

"Present:

"Osler, Ferguson, Rose, Robertson, Falconbridge, Maclennan, MacMahon and Street, J.J.

"As to the reporters' charges in the Dominion election cases:

"The judges who tried the petition will certify to the accuracy of the account of the reporter. The reporter will then apply to a judge of the court in which the petition was filed and the deposit made, who will, by his fiat, or order, direct payment of the account out of the deposit.

"The reporter's charges, in the opinion of the judges present, should be taxed to the successful party as part of his costs of the cause, and should be treated as actual disbursements in respect of evidence, taxable in ordinary action between party and party, within the meaning of subsection 4 of section 52 of the Controverted Elections Act, as amended by the Act of 1891."

And although I am in no way responsible or answerable for what the judges may order, yet as I know what the practise has been since that time, I may, for your information, point out that acting on this, all the judges assigned to try election petitions have since then given fiats authorizing payment of "the expense of employing a shorthand writer" out of the deposit, and "such employment being adjudged to include actual travelling expenses, board, and the usual rate per folio allowed by the tariff, for extending the notes, never in any case, however, exceeding the rate of 10 cents per 100 words, for one complete copy of the notes."

It is admitted that in no case under this rule are the parties prejudiced, for the reason, first, that such expenses are by the statute declared to be "costs in the case," so that the successful party is entitled to tax such as disbursements against the unsuccessful party, and recover them with his other costs for which he obtains judgment. In case petitioner is successful, he would be entitled to tax such payment as disbursements against the respondent, and, on the other hand, if the petition is dismissed and the petitioner ordered to pay the costs, the respondent may tax such expenses against the petitioner, and the amount with such other taxable costs to which he may be entitled, would first be deducted out of the deposit, and any balance over would go to the petitioner. In case the deposit is not sufficient to meet the whole amount for which respondent has judgment, he would be entitled to execution against the petitioner for the balance. That is clearly the law as determined by the judges.

Owing to the extreme length of the London cases, and to the fact that the court, under the amended law, is composed of two judges, instead of one, each of the judges required a copy of the notes of evidence, when judgment was reserved for the purpose of determining the case. but the stenographer charged, and was paid out of the deposit, for but one copy in all, at the rate of 10 cents per 100 words.

Upon the decision come to by the judges in December, 1891, as above set out, every judge assigned to try an election petition has since acted, and granted fiats for "the expense of employing the shorthand writer," as indicated, to be paid out of the petitioner's deposit, the registrar, at the outset, making an arrangement on his own account, for the furnishing or providing the copy of the evidence to be annexed to the report to the Speaker, and which I, as registrar, forwarded by direction of the judges, to the Speaker, and for which, as registrar, I was entitled to 10 cents per 100 words under the Order in Council before referred to.

The registrar is not paid out of the deposit or by any fiat or order of the court.

Speaking generally, it may happen that the unsuccessful party is not a man of substance, and the successful party being unable to recover the amount of his judgments, if he should be the respondent (by reason of the thousand dollar deposit not being sufficient to pay the whole of this taxable cost), might just as well call upon the Government to make good the difference as to require the amount paid to the registrar, under the Order in Council, for the copy of the evidence which he has to furnish for the Speaker, to be paid into court to supplement the deposit, which it is submitted cannot be done so long as the law is as it is.

I submit, therefore, with great respect, that, so far as the registrar is concerned, there is no force in the claim made by either the petitioner or the respondent in regard to the amount which has been paid to him for the copy of the evidence forwarded to the Speaker.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
(Sgd.) H. H. ROBERTSON,
Registrar.

Immediately on receipt of this, the Deputy Minister, Mr. Newcombe again wrote to the stenographer, as follows:

November 27th, 1897.

Re London Election Trial.

Sir,—A question has arisen with regard to the payment of $751.10 to Mr. Robertson, registrar of the court, for copy of the evidence furnished to the Speaker of the House of Commons. It has been represented to me that you were the court stenographer at the trial and that you were paid out of the petitioner's deposit the sum of $976.80, of which $180.60 were for 21 days' attendance and travelling expenses, and $796.20 were for making copies of the evidence. It is stated that for the consideration of $796.20 you furnished to the registrar three complete copies of the evidence, of which one copy is filed of record, another copy is in the hands of the trial judges, and the third copy was sent to the Speaker. I have communicated with Mr. Robertson, stating the facts as above, and he replies that I am misinformed. He says that you were not paid out of the petitioner's deposit for the copy which he sent to the Speaker, and says that you have been paid for one copy only out of the deposit at the rate of 10 cents for 100 words, which was the copy required to be filed of record; and I understand him to say that he had an arrangement with you on his own account for the furnishing of the copy which was forwarded to the Speaker. In these circumstances I would like to have a statement from you as to whether you furnished three copies of the evidence to Mr. Robertson, and if so, whether you were paid or expect to be paid anything for those copies in addition to the amount which you received from the petitioner's deposit. Was there any and what arragement between you and Mr. Robertson by which he was to pay you an additional amount for the copy sent to the Speaker? This matter is important for two reasons: (1) If the facts are as represented to me by the solicitors, it would seem that Mr. Robertson had received an amount of $751.10 to which he is not entirely fairly entitled, and (2) because it seems to show the necessity for an amendment of the present Order in Council, to prevent similar occurrences in the future.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
(Sgd.) E. L. NEWCOMBE,
D. M. J.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. To whom was that addressed?

Mr. CALVERT. That was addressed to Mr. Butcher, the stenographer. Then Mr. Butcher replied to the Deputy Minister of Justice on the 10th of December, 1897, as follows:—

E. L. Newcombe, Esq., Q.C.,
Deputy Minister of Justice,
Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—I have the honour to acknowledge receipt of your letter re the London Election trial, and in reply beg to say that I shall be glad indeed to give the facts concerning the reporting. I have been away on circuit at the Hammond murder case, and other courts, hence the delay in replying.

The court engaged me to report the case in the usual way; by that I mean in the same way as all reporters have been engaged for this purpose as far back as I can remember.

Nothing was said as to terms, because I understood I would receive the same rate we have always received for this work, viz., $5 per day and expenses, and 10 cents per folio for my transcript. Nothing was said as to the number of copies, but I intended to give the best service that I could to the judges for the 10 cents. If the case had been an ordinary one as to length and judgment given at the close, I would have expected to have supplied each judge with a copy and have received 10 cents. This case turned out to be an

extraordinary one as to length, and there were adjournments from time to time, which necessitated that each judge should have a copy before him of as much as I could have ready. I took the precaution to make a number of copies in case anything should happen to the judges' copies, or in case I had an opportunity to sell extra ones.

I knew, of course, that the registrar would forward, as he always does, a copy, and receive his 10 cents, as has always been the custom, and I do remember saying to Mr. Robertson he had better forward a copy, or deposit it in some place of security, because it would take three months to make another, and that my disbursements had been $500 or over.

The judges required their copies for use in preparing judgments, and of course would mark passages and make their own private notes in the margins, and in order that they should be able to do this, I bound up our own office copy, which I gave to the registrar, without charge, and I presume this is the one he sent to Ottawa.

Mr. Robertson was not to pay me, nor has he paid me, nor will I receive payment for anything supplied to him in this connection. You ask if Mr. Robertson had an arrangement with me to supply him with the copy he forwarded. To this all I can say is that I knew he would forward a copy and be paid under the Order in Council, and that I would receive nothing for it.

Strictly speaking, I suppose for the 10 cents the courts would only have asked from me one copy, but I knew 10 cents would be all I would receive, and for it I wanted to give the best service that I could. The case turned out so extraordinary as to length and circumstances, I really had to give more than value for the ten cents, or put the judges to inconvenience. When Mr. Robertson says there was an arrangement between us as to his having a copy, he is no doubt correct, because it was an understood thing, though I do not remember any words passing. I intended to do this as in all other cases as far back as I can remember; the registrar gets his copy for nothing, so far as he is concerned.

Some reporters have dickered with the registrar for the sale of a copy, and in order that the registrar should not be able to get a copy from which to have another one made to forward, I understand, have delayed filing the records until it was too late to have one made. This friction causes inconvenience to the judge. I adopted the other course, of giving good service to the courts. The registrar gets his payment as registrar, and I have not considered I was entitled to anything as registrar; but I have always thought the Order in Council should be amended so that the stenographer would be paid by the Speaker, and that the judges would not have to pay the stenographer out of the deposit.

You say this matter is important, and on behalf of the reporters I fully concur. It is not my place to criticise any payment to the registrar, but by reason of this double system of paying for transcripts the reporter has had to work for less than a fair remuneration, and has had to rely upon his chance of selling copies to the parties, and in the London case, by reason of the fact that I was paid out of the fund, I supplied counsel with copies at a nominal sum, so that in that way they had the benefit, to a certain extent, of the payment from that source. In the London case my disbursements must have been about $500, while the work would have equalled a month's session of the House of Commons, and it took us several months to get it out, with the aid of our whole office staff.

Mr. CALVERT.

It is fair that I should state that before the application was made, the petitioner's lawyers in London wrote me saying they wished me to understand they considered me entitled to all I had been paid.

I supposed the fact is that the provision for paying the registrar for a copy has reference to a time when there was no shorthand writer, and when he had to make a copy from the judge's notes and forward. If the reporter receives the 10 cents instead of the registrar, though he cannot work for 10 cents with profit, yet I think it will be a fair payment by the Government, and he must look for his profits in supplying copies to the parties, unless the Government should see fit to make it 15 cents for four copies, and let the parties have their copies gratis.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
NELSON R. BUTCHER.

Now, after receiving that communication, the Deputy Minister of Justice sums up the whole case in this letter to the solicitors at London:

15th December, 1897.

London Election Petition.

Gentlemen,—Referring to your letter of the 10th instant, I have the honour to inform you that I have corresponded with Mr. Robertson and Mr. Butcher, the stenographer, and find that the facts as set out by you appear to be substantially admitted. In these circumstances it appears to me the retention by Mr. Robertson of the $751.10 which he received is quite improper, and payment to him would, I have no doubt, not have been made had the attention of the Auditor General been called to the matter before payment. As the matter stands, however, Mr. Robertson holds the money, and I presume (although I have not made a formal demand upon him) that he will decline to repay it. There is, as you are aware, an Order in Council of 22nd December, 1875, which provides that the registrars shall receive among other payments "for a copy of the notes of evidence under section 29 and of any other documents required by the judge to be copied for the Speaker of the House of Commons at the rate of 10 cents per 100 words." That provision was made, I assume, at a time when stenographers were not employed to take down evidence, and when the practise was for the judge to take the evidence himself and file it after the trial, in which case the registrar would be the proper person to make the copy and receive payment. The reason for the rule that the registrar should be paid for a copy has, however, practically disappeared with the introduction of the shorthand writer into the trial, the real intention of Council doubtless being that the officer who did the work should be paid for the copy, and I have no doubt that justice would be done in the present case by the registrar depositing the money to the credit of the petitioner's deposit, inasmuch as the stenographer has been paid out of that fund all that he claims and expects to receive in respect of transcribing the evidence and furnishing copies.

I am very much surprised to hear that the judges would not consider an application o compel the registrar to so deposit the money. Since they have refused to do so, however, I have been unable to devise any means by which you can compel the registrar to make the deposit or to refund the money. I think if any reasonably hopeful course could be suggested that the

department would be willing to adopt it, but under the letter of the Order in Council which, I believe, has been heretofore consistently acted upon, the registrar was entitled to the payment, and legally, I suppose, was not less entitled because he got the copy which he furnished for nothing. If that be so, we would fail in proceedings to make him refund, and of course the department has no locus standi to take proceedings to compel him to account to the petitioner.

I will be glad to consider any further observations or suggestions which you may have to make upon the subject, but I must add that I do not see any reason arising out of the circumstances of this case on account of which the Government should recoup the deposit. The money has been paid in the only way in which the Government ever undertook or became liable to pay it, and if the registrar declines to make the proper application of it, that would seem to be a matter between him and the parties beneficially entitled, and although we would be willing to do what we reasonably can to ensure the proper disposition of the money, yet we cannot, I think, assume any further liability. I may say, further, that the difficulty, so far as the parties to the proceedings are concerned, seems to arise principally from the rule made by the judges that the stenographer's charges should be paid out of the petitioner's deposit. I am considering the authority of the judges to make such a rule, but as at present advised, I am of opinion that it is inconsistent with the statute and therefore ultra vires.

I have the honour to be, sirs,

Your obedient servant,

(Sgd.) E. L. NEWCOMBE,
Deputy Minister of Justice.

Macbeth & McPherson, London.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the expenses in connection with this trial were enormous. Of course the trial lasted a long time, and the expenses for which the Government are responsible were also very great in comparison with other election trials, the London election trial exceed them all. Take, for instance, the South Brant trial where two judges were employed in each trial the same as London, and each judge received $100. The expenses in connection with South Brant, all told, were $248.75; in connection with North Brant, $365.52—this is the amount of money paid by the Government. East Durham, $236.45; North Grey, $227.15; East Northumberland, $240.63. In connection with the London election trial we paid for the judges, $200; sheriff, 21 days, $105; sheriff, four notices, $6; advertising, "Free Press," London, $3.60; advertising, "Advertiser," London, $3.60; 7 constables, 21 days, $1.50 each per day, $220.50; crier calling cause, 60 cents; administering 131 oaths, $19.65. Then we paid Mr. Robertson for 24 days $144; paid Mr. Robertson as registrar, $23.65; paid Mr. Robertson, hotel expenses, $55; paid laundry for Mr. Robertson, 40 cents, making a total of $223.05 paid to Mr. Robertson for twenty-four days during which he was engaged in connection with the trial. Then he also received $751.10 for simply mailing a copy of the evidence he received from the stenographer to the Speaker of the House of Commons. Then the petitioner was called on to pay out of this fund to Mr. Butcher, the stenographer, $976.80. So we have these two young men employed twenty-four days, and giving other twenty-four days for copying the evidence we have these men receiving a total of $1,950.95, a sum equal to that paid to two "Hansard" reporters who spend four months in this House, or equal to the indemnity of two members who spend a similar portion of the year here. I think the judges acted wrongly in this case. Whether these claims were justified or not, and the deputy Minister of Justice has his doubts on the point, I would ask the Government if it is possible that they can take such proceedings as will result in the money being returned to the treasury and from the treasury to the petitioner, who, I think, is entitled to it; and if not, I think the Department of Justice should at all events wipe out the Order in Council, which cannot be of any use in the present state of affairs.

Kingston Penitentiary..... $167,000

Mr. BRITTON. In regard to Kingston penitentiary, what is intended by addition to prison equipment, $5,400?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. A new wing has been built, and it must be equipped and rendered fit for use by providing beds and furniture.

For a line or lines of steamers to run between St. John or Halifax or either and the West Indies and South America.... $78,000

Mr. ELLIS. I would like to ask the Minister of Trade and Commerce if any representations have been made to him with respect to the character of the steamers on this route? There is a feeling that the steamers which are employed for this work are not up to the requirements of the service. A very severe competition comes from New York, and certainly the influence of the departmnt ought to be exerted to give us better steamers. There is a very good subsidy paid for this service, but nevertheless the steamers are not at all up to the requirements of modern travel. They are not only slow but they are not fitted up as they should be. It is quite apparent to every person that the West India trade has not developed as it should, in view of the assistance given to the West Indian steamers. There is complaint also that the Ontario people are not making use of the facilities which are afforded to them by this service to develop the trade between Canada and the West Indies. However, I am not so much concerned with that as I am concerned with the desire of the people of the maritime provinces that better steamers should be employed.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). I may say to my hon. friend (Mr. Ellis) that some

complaints have been made. This service, however, is under a contract which lasts for a period of five years, and the service appears not to have been worse during the last year than it was heretofore. I have made a note of what my hon. friend (Mr. Ellis) said, and I will certainly call upon these gentlemen to show cause why they cannot improve their service so far as the terms of the contract fairly permit us to require it of them.

Steam service between Victoria and San Francisco $5,000

Mr. FOSTER. What is done with that money now ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. That is a kind of treaty obligation. It was part of our original obligation to British Columbia that we should retain this communication between San Francisco and Victoria.

Mr. FOSTER. Formerly the vote was much larger.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. My hon. friends from British Columbia have not made any complaint of the service. Has the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) any experience of these steamers in his peregrinations ?

Mr. MONTAGUE. I may say they are very good boats and give a very good service.

Mr. FOSTER. The question is the benefit of spending $5,000 on a steamboat service at this date when you have trains running daily to carry the mails.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I grant you, but this is a treaty obligation.

Mr. FOSTER. There is an obligation and the amount of money formerly was much larger, but as a result of the expression of opinion that took place, this vote was reduced on the idea that the money would be more beneficial for other services in British Columbia than this one, such as a service running north rather than running south.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I apprehend we should have the consent of the British Columbia legislature to change the vote.

Mr. FOSTER. I understand, but I do not think it would be difficult to get that.

Steam communication during the season of 1898, i.e., from the opening to the closing of navigation between Gaspé Basin and Dalhousie $12,000

Mr. FOSTER. Is the "Admiral" running there now ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. No, I advertised for tenders and the steamer "Monticello" got the contract as being the lowest tenderer.

Mr. FOSTER. Are they performing a similar service ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Yes, at a lower rate.

Mr. FOSTER. I must say my hon. friend has got a very excellent boat.

Steam communication during the season of 1898, i.e., for not less than 32 full round trips, between St. John and Halifax, via Yarmouth and other way ports. $7,000

Mr. FOSTER. Is the trip continuous from St. John to Halifax by the same steamer, or is there transhipment to another steamer at Yarmouth ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). The line is a continuous one in the sense that it is conducted by the company, but there is transhipment at Yarmouth.

Steam communication from 1st July, 1898, to 30th June, 1899, between Quebec and Gaspé Basin, touching at intermediate ports $5,000

Mr. MONTAGUE. May I ask the Minister of Trade and Commerce whether he has under consideration the subject of granting any subventions to steamship lines to South American ports ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. No. As the hon. gentleman will see in the Supplementary Estimates, we have one or two propositions to submit to the House, but we do not propose any subsidies for steamship lines to South America.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I did not ask whether the Government intended to propose them, but whether they proposed to consider the subject.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I cannot say that it is under consideration. It may possibly be taken up, but at present the reports made to us would hardly warrant us in coming down to the House and asking for additional subsidies.

Mr. FOSTER. What, in brief, were the arduous labours of Mr. Sheppard ?—I do not mean to Mr. Sheppard ; I mean to the country.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The hon. gentleman will have an opportunity of perusing Mr. Sheppard's report, which is published in the last report of the Department of Trade and Commerce. It does not occupy more than 150 pages according to my recollection.

Mr. FOSTER. Would the hon. gentleman save me that labour by stating in brief the substance of Mr. Sheppard's report ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. To say the candid truth, Mr.

Sheppard's report was not very encouraging to our hope of doing much trade in South America, except possibly in the Argentine Republic. There, he thinks, there is some opening, and the Government will have an agent who will endeavour to do some work there. Certain lines of our manufactures might be introduced into the Argentine Republic, such as agricultural implements. On the whole, I think it was well to reconnoitre the region. There does not appear at the present moment to be any great apparent opening for extending the sale of our manufactures in South America—not as much, in fact, as we had hoped. That is, no doubt, partly due to the fact that political complications have very much disorganized the Brazilian market, in which at one time we carried on some trade. On the western coast we are very much handicapped in the matter of cheap rates. German ships that sail from Hamburg lay down goods there at rates which are almost ridiculously low. We might do something in Mexico; there is possibly a chance there; but, as the hon. gentleman is aware, on the east coast, the Americans have a great advantage over us by reason of the much greater nearness of their ports and their superior facilities in the matter of railway communication. Two or three great lines of railroad coming from various parts of the United States centre in Mexico. There might be something done in Mexico on the ground that the Mexicans would be glad to trade with Great Britain or with Canada, rather than from our inherent natural advantages. We are making inquiry to see what can be done. Still, I am bound to say that the results of Mr. Sheppard's investigations, except in the Argentine Republic, are not very encouraging.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Will the hon. Minister tell us what the reconnoitering cost in the way of salaries and expenses?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. It cost a good deal. Mr. Sheppard was paid—I am speaking from recollection—something like $2,800 and his expenses for the time he spent. Travelling in that region is, of course, pretty expensive, and his expenses amounted to from $300 to $500 a month, according to circumstances.

Mr. FOSTER. How many months was he away?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Seven or eight months, I should think, and a month to compile the report.

Mr. FOSTER. What was the total cost?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The total cost, I suppose, would amount to $7,000.

Mr. MONTAGUE. That is a good deal more than the trade will be in the next quarter of a century.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Not altogether; but I am bound to say that it would make a reasonable percentage of the profits of the trade we are now carrying on in those countries. But it was probably worth while incurring the expenditure for the purpose of ascertaining what was possible to be done, and I am bound to say that Mr. Sheppard took great pains to satisfy himself and the commercial public on that point. In course of time some results may flow from his labours: but the immediate results were not very encouraging.

Mr. FOSTER. While I can congratulate Mr. Sheppard on a pleasant and agreeable voyage, with certain financial results to himself, I am certain I cannot congratulate my hon. friend on the expenditure of $7,000 or $8,000 on that wild-goose chase.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I think there were some trips of my hon. friend to the West Indies and elsewhere that had no more apparent results.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend might have got from records in current histories, and from the trade returns of other countries, just about as much information as Mr. Sheppard brought, and that $7,000 might have been used in a much more advantageous way. How much per day, might I ask, did Mr. Sheppard get?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. $10 or $12 per day, I think, and expenses.

Mr. FOSTER. A very nice trip. I suppose in the meantime the Government got rid of any little trouble they might have had if the trip had not been taken.

To provide for the Administration of the Chinese Immigration Act, including remuneration to Trade and Commerce and Customs officers.....	$ 3,500
To meet Canada's proportion of expenditure in connection with the International Customs Bureau.....	600
Commercial Agencies, including expenses in connection with negotiations of treaties or in extension of commercial relations	20,000

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend evidently contemplates excursions in some other far-distant region. What is the increase of $5,000 in the last item for?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Various expenses have been charged to this vote at various times—for instance, expenses connected with trade negotiations with the United States or elsewhere; and at present I have a considerable number of new applications. For example, there appears to be some reason-

able chance of developing a considerable trade with South Africa in a number of articles which we produce; and we shall probably have to send somebody, but at more moderate rates, that I can answer for, to investigate the prospects in that region. Then, strong applications have been made to me with respect to sending some person to the West Indies to see if my hon. friend's recent generosities there will be productive of any good results. These two, and possibly one or two matters which may come up, will be likely to absorb at least $5,000, I am afraid.

Mr. FOSTER. I am very glad to hear my hon. friend make the admission that the trips that may be inaugurated during the coming year may not be so expensive as, for instance, the South American trip. But why should we send some one to South Africa? Has not the member of the Cabinet from Quebec done South Africa already? Has the face of the country changed so completely since his trip that some one else must be sent to reconnoitre the land? Or is not sufficient reliance put upon his report? It does seem like a want of confidence in him by his colleagues, and a want of confidence all the more remarkable since he has a large business experience not to be expected from the generality of persons sent scouting down South America. I do not see why any money should be spent with reference to that country. As to the West Indies, after the extreme generosity of the Minister of Finance and the extremely friendly way in which his generosity was met by the Island of Jamaica, which proceeded to put up the duties on bacon and other agricultural products, it might be well to spend some money in sending some one to see the Governments there. I am not sure, however, that it would not be better, if the hon. gentleman himself would perform mission work upon the gentleman by his side.

Mr. MONTAGUE. May I ask if the member of the Cabinet without portfolio made any official report on his mission to South Africa?

Mr. DOBELL. My visit to South Africa was entirely for my own pleasure and experience.

Mr. FOSTER. And the profit of the country?

Mr. DOBELL. That is always my first aim in everything I do, and I may say that I brought back from South Africa an offer from the Government of the Cape of Good Hope to join Canada in subsidizing a line of steamers to Cape Town. At that time there was no line of steamers leaving this continent at all for Cape Town, but a line was being arranged from New York, and the gentlemen who were carrying out that scheme offered to go to Canada if Canada offered them the subsidy which they suggested and of which Cape Town would pay its share. At that time the Opposition were my friends.

Mr. FOSTER. And are yet. We do not cherish any bad feeling.

Mr. DOBELL. And I reported to them the scheme, which, I believe, was well worthy of their attention, but just at that time they were greatly in love with Australia, and did not think there was room for a second opening. A line of steamers was established between New York and Cape Town, to make monthly trips. That service has since been increased to a fortnightly one, and this spring a gentleman came to New York to establish a weekly service from that city to South Africa. Yet we have no service from Canada to that country. I do believe that South Africa would afford a field for a large portion of our surplus manufactures and agricultural implements. It would take also large quantities of flour and other products of the field, and I think it is a place worthy of our serious attention during the next two or three years.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Has the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce any report from Ecuador recently?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. There are possibilities, no doubt, but on the western coast of South America we find ourselves considerably handicapped by the operations of German merchants who succeeded in inducing their vessel owners to give them extremely cheap freights, much cheaper than we can obtain either from British Columbia or Canada.

Mr. INGRAM. What is the item to provide for the administration of Chinese immigration?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. There is a tax per head on Chinese coming to this country, and that is collected under the supervision of the officers of the Trade and Commerce Department.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The last sub-item in this item, for commercial agencies, including the expenses connected with the negotiation of treaties, &c., shows an increase.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COM- I was just explaining to the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) how that was likely to be expended. It will be expended chiefly in promoting trade with South Africa, and probably also in sending some gentleman to the various West India Islands.

Mr. MONTAGUE. There was a discussion as to whether Canada should have a commercial agent at Washington. This is not intended for that purpose?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. No. That was a larger question which was raised. It is one which has been discussed here before, and that is the ex-

treme desirability—an opinion I still entertain—of having some one attached to the British Embassy, who would directly represent Canada—having a diplomatic agent in Washington in connection with the British Embassy.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Has that been decided on by the Government ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. No.

Mr. FOSTER. I am not opposed to a grant for commercial agencies, providing that the money is spent really in fields which show some prospect of being remunerative in the way of increased trade. But if this vote is merely to give jaunts to these who have rendered party service to distant fields, that will not be the intention with which it was initiated. There is one remark made by my hon. friend which I would ask him to think over and that is as to the use of this money for travelling expenses to and from Washington. It was not the intention, when this vote was inaugurated, to ask it for that purpose, but for commercial agencies, pure and simple. These trips are in the way of treaty making, and I think the expense should come under a separate item and not be taken out of this vote.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The Auditor General is extremely careful in his construction of any votes of the kind and very apt to bring us up short.

Mr. FOSTER. The trouble has been that heretofore—I do not know how it is now—the Government were successful in having a very tolerant Minister of Justice.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. We may have to use some portion possibly, in the absence of a distinct appropriation.

Mr. FOSTER. On the face of it, this is not meant to be used for Minister's travelling expenses.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. In anything connected with the promotion of a trade treaty, it seems to me it would be appropriate.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. If a Minister goes to Washington on a trade matter, it is pretty hard to charge that to his travelling expenses.

Mr. FOSTER. It is not charged to his travelling expenses in connection with his department, but is charged against him for the specific purpose for which it was used. It is shown as the expenses of the Minister, but for such and such a purpose. It is very easily arranged. I know my hon. friend (Sir Louis Davies) is somewhat sensitive on this subject, since his European trip.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I think I am quite right in being sensitive. If I am travelling in the Dominion on the business of the department, I charge my expenses to travelling expenses of the Minister. But suppose, as was the case the other day, I am sent outside of Canada to represent my colleagues in a matter not having to do with my department more than any other, I do not see that I should charge my travelling expenses in the same way. It would not be fair to the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. FOSTER. Does not the hon. gentleman know that it has been done before ? It would appear as the Minister's travelling expenses on his trip to Washington.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I would draw a distinction as between a matter relating to a matter of trade, a settlement of a boundary or something of that kind, which could not be charged fairly to commercial agencies.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. Minister (Sir Louis Davies) has given us a statement we are all delighted to hear, that we are to have a commission, probably sitting in Quebec, to deal with these international questions. The hon. gentleman will have to have a vote for that, I suppose ?

Mr. FOSTER. I see that the vote here has been increased, and reads : "commercial agencies, including expenses in connection with negotiations with treaties or in extension or commercial relation." I see that what I said was not strictly germane.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Is this increased vote intended to cover the expenses of that commission ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Some portion of it might be applied to that purpose. Of course the expenses incurred in a matter of that kind would depend entirely on the length of time the commission happened to sit. But hon. gentlemen, I think, will agree with me in one thing and that is that any commissioners who come here as guests of the nation should be properly and handsomely entertained.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I am sure we would all agree to that. It was in no spirit of criticism that I asked the question.

Mr. GILLIES. I happened to be absent from the Chamber, but before we pass from the Department of Trade and Commerce, I would ask the hon. Minister a question. I may not be here when the Supplementary Estimates are being discussed, and I desire some information on the subject. I would like to tell the Minister—perhaps he may not be aware of it as he is necessarily not so familiar with the matter as I am, that this service was performed for some years by the Bras d'Or Steam Navigation Company. That company have gone out of business, and the route of this service has been taken up by some other people. I

desire to know from the Minister what company or association or person has entered into a contract with the department for the purposes of this service ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. As this item has been dropped and the subject might come up under items 42 and 43 of the Supplementary Estimates, and as I did not expect to take this matter up to-night, I have not the information at hand, but if the hon. gentleman will come to the department to-morrow, I will give him any information I can.

Mr. GILLIES. I would dislike very much calling at the department when the hon. Minister is not there, as I have done on several occasions.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I must have been attending the committees. But if my hon. friend will come at 10.30 to-morrow, I will endeavour to meet him.

Mr. GILLIES. I will keep the appointment.

Inspection of Staples—For the purchase and distribution of standards of grain and flour and other expenses under the Act $4,500

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend the ex-Controller of Inland Revenue (Mr. Wood, Brockville), wishes to be present when this item was taken up. If the Government have other items with which they could occupy the time, I should be glad to have this postponed.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière). I have been speaking to my hon. friend (Mr. Wood, Brockville), the remarks he wishes to make he can make on the Supplementary Estimates.

Mr. MONTAGUE. A special time might be set for this discussion.

Mr. DAVIN. In the early part of the session, I asked the hon. Minister whether he intended to take any steps to settle the question of the standards of grain and inspection and he told me it was under consideration. Will he tell me what has been done ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I do not know that I understand to what my hon. friend (Mr. Davin) alludes. We have a committee appointed to settle the standards. They met last fall and they will meet again this fall. I have not heard any complaints as to the way they settled the standards. The only complaints in connection with the inspection of grain can hardly be laid to the charge of the inspector. It is easy to mix the different qualities of grain after the wheat has been inspected and sent away from Port William or Port Arthur, and I do not think that any system of inspection could prevent that.

Mr. GILLIES.

Mr. DAVIN. What I referred to is this : There is a feeling that the standard question has not been solved and there is a very strong feeling against the mixing of scoured grain with the grain coming from the west and from Manitoba. This mixture makes a good wheat, no doubt, but a far lower class than the grain that could be furnished from the west and Manitoba. There is a strong feeling amongst a large class of farmers that the buyers, the traders in Liverpoool, should have a standard of our North-west and Manitoba grain entirely undiluted by this discounting and admixture that takes place at Port William. At an early part of the session I asked the hon. gentleman if he would consider the question generally with a view of coming to a more satisfactory solution of this matter. I can assure the hon. gentleman that there are still some people in the west who think that a better arrangement can be made than even that which has been made. I know very well that the board is representative of the classes who are interested in this question ; nevertheless there is a feeling on the part of the farming community that though they are represented on that board, somehow or other they are not so represented but that interests antagonistic to them can pretty well have their own way.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I want to know exactly what my hon. friend wants. Does he object to the way in which the standard gauge is fixed by the board that meets at Winnipeg every fall ?

Mr. DAVIN. I say that board should be thoroughly representative. I do not think there is a single representative from so large and important a wheat-growing district as Western Assiniboia on that board. I know that some men taking a great interest in this question, feel that the efficiency of the board is lowered in consequence of the name of Mr. T. B. Baker having been omitted from it. He is one of the best wheat men in any part of Canada, a thoroughly practical man, a man who handles a large amount of grain, who has built elevators of his own, and who has the entire confidence of the farmers in the community where he lives. His name used to be on it, and I am afraid he has been omitted from the board for no other than unworthy reasons. When, in 1896, I spoke to my hon. friend about the constitution of that board and mentioned Mr. Baker's name he invariably said to me : Go and see so and so—mentioning the name of an hon. member in this House from a contiguous constituency. But the Minister must know that it was impossible for me to go to another member of this House when I wanted to deal with the Minister himself about the management of his department. I would appeal to the Minister to consult with Mr. Miall, who knows what an efficient man Mr. Baker is, and see if he cannot put Mr. Baker on the board. But there is the larger

question of a grain standard. When I raised the question in the early part of the session, the hon. gentleman assured me that he intended to consider it, and that he would have a scheme forthcoming that would present a better solution of what I admit is a complex and difficult question. I am surprised to hear him say now that he considers the arrangement made for the grain standard last year as final.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I have not the remotest idea who Mr. Baker is. The hon. gentleman does not appear to have any reason to complain of the way in which the standard was made up at Winnipeg, only he complains that Mr. Baker is not on the board. Well, I did the best I could to make a representative board by making it one-half of farmers, and the other half representatives of the millers and dealers. I thought it was only fair to give a large representation to the farming community who are really the producers of the wheat. I am wholly at a loss to understand at this moment why my hon. friend complains of the composition of that part of the board which represents the farming interests, that is to say, one-half of the board. Since this session began, I have received a large deputation of gentlemen interested in this very same question, but I do not remember that my hon. friend accompanied that deputation, though I know that nearly all the western members were there. We had a thorough consultation of the whole question, and I may say that the only cause of complaint I could learn was, not in settling the standard of the grain, but in the way grades of grain are mixed after it had been inspected. We all found there was a great difficulty in preventing that, when once the grain leaves the elevators, or when it is put on board ship after being inspected, or when not inspected at all. There is certainly a very difficult question to deal with in order to keep up the reputation of the grain by preventing that mixture. But even that meeting of representative men was not able to suggest any remedy.

Mr. DAVIN. Of course that is part of the question. But my hon. friend will recollect what he used to say to me in 1896 when I went to him and asked him in regard to the constitution of that board, he would say to me : Go and speak to so and so—as if an irresponsible member of this House was the master of his department.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I hope my hon. friend will not think I am wanting in courtesy. What I told my hon. friend probably was to this effect, that he was equally interested with the other western members representing the farming community, and they should be able to agree about the composition of the board to the satisfaction of themselves and the public.

Mr. DAVIN. I am afraid my hon. friend has forgotten what took place. I went to him three times in regard to one matter, which was a subject of public importance. In each case he mentioned that I had better go and speak to some other member, naming him, which I of course would not do. We are not fresh from an election and there is no prospect of a by-election, so the hon. gentleman will probably feel more free than he was in 1896, and I urge on him to consider whether a representative cannot be placed on the board from Western Assiniboia, and I cannot name a better representative or one who will commend himself more to the support of men on all sides than T. B. Baker.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I desire to point out an anomaly that occurs with respect to the Inland Revenue Act. In 1891 section 31 was substituted for section 130 of the Act. That was repealed and another section was substituted by the Act of 1895. Then in 1897 the same thing was done. The Act of 1891 was repealed and another was substituted, but no notice was taken of the Act of 1895. So you have the Act of 1891 twice repealed, and the Act of 1897 repealed, but no notice is taken of the Act of 1895. Confusion might arise and it is desirable to remove this anomaly.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. The Bill was carefully prepared, and perhaps the hon. gentleman will point out the section in question.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I will send a memorandum to the Minister.

Post Office—Outside Service—Increase of salaries of 105 letter carriers at $30 each and 24 clerks at $40 each..... $4,110

Mr. FOSTER. I desire an explanation of these increases.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). These increases apply to all these servants who have salaries less than $450 a year.

Mr. FOSTER. What was their former status ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The increase is $30 a year, and this will bring them up to $480.

Mr. FOSTER. Is not this practically giving the statutory increases to these clerks ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not know whether it could be called statutory, but we are giving each of these servants $30. This increase is given to those having a salary of $450.

Mr. FOSTER. Is the hon. gentleman adopting the principle that this increase may be given, but for the time being it will be limited to a certain range of salary ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The Government has not recommended to have this increase of $30 apply generally beyond those enjoying salaries of $450, but it does not say that this increase must stop at $480, and it will be quite competent to go to higher salaries on a future occasion. I do not think that $480 is adequate in some parts of the country, for example in British Columbia. It would not be fair to have an arbitrary standard throughout the Dominion as the cost of living varies.

Mr. FOSTER. The Government started out by boldly declaring that the statutory increases were to be a thing of the past. They were given by the late Government and would not be given by this Government. While during the first year the Estimates showed increases in departments presided over by particularly strong or persistent Ministers, these second year Estimates show in almost all the departments that the Minister picked out certain clerks and gave them statutory increases. Now comes the Postmaster General and by wholesale methods gives these statutory increases to 150 or 160 men in his department, while in other departments young men who are not receiving $480 a year, but whose work is more beneficial than that of these men, do not receive any increase. It just illustrates what we declared would be the result, namely, that it would come to be a matter of favour on the part of different Ministers, and not a uniform practice, because it would vary with the temper, persistency or power of the individual Minister. I am afraid my hon. friend will find he is doing the very thing to disorganize the service, which is a very bad thing to do, and is entirely depriving it of anything like uniformity. I do not want it to be said in reply that I am opposed to the letter carriers receiving this money. My theory is that they should have received this amount in the course of their regular increase. I am pointing out what the effect will be ultimately in the service. We shall find young men just as worthy, and whose work is more onerous, refused this increase of $30 or $50, while in other departments it will be given, and this does not advance the morale of the service, but destroys it.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I appreciate the tenor of the remarks of my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) but I would point out to him the difference between a liberal increase of salary to men who have very small salaries, and increases to men whose salaries are perhaps in excess of the value of the services rendered. When you come to the class of men who are paid $450 or less, the value of the services must be very small if they are not worth $480. But, if a man is doing the same work and is paid $1,000 for it, some discretion ought to be exercised before you would allow an automatic increase to take effect, and the statutory increase practically was an automatic increase.

Mr. FOSTER. It always had to be voted, and so has this?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes, but it became a matter of form. It seems to me that if a letter carrier or messenger is worth keeping at all he is worth $480 after a couple of years in the service. Speaking for myself, I would say that the great difficulty in the past has been in not having the salaries commensurate with the services. It would have been better if there had been appointments of men to do particular duty carrying with the office certain titles, such as if we had a class of men kown as shorthand writers appointed as such. It does seem to me that the system is not good, of calling them all clerks, and of allowing a man by the automatic principle to rise to the position of first class clerk, when he is still doing the same work as he did when he entered the service at $400 a year.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I want to call the attention of the Postmaster General to a matter which I am sure he will see to once his attention is called to it. The hours at which most post offices are compelled to be open varies at different places chiefly dependent on the time at which the mail arrives. I have a post office in my mind where a short time ago the mail in the morning was despatched for the cities at nine o'clock, and the office was opened at eight o'clock so that business men might register their letters and secure post office orders if they required to do so. The mail from the cities with which the town does business arrives, the night before at between seven and eight o'clock, and the post office closes at eight o'clock, so that business men cannot transact business in regard to registered letters or post office orders that night. Now the train service has been changed and the mail departs in the morning at half past eight. The postmaster instead of opening the office at an earlier hour has posted a notice requiring the people who require to register letters or secure post office orders to do it the night before. That is a very serious inconvenience and practically delays the transmission of registered letters for one day between that point and the city of Toronto, all for the convenience of the postmaster who receives a good deal larger salary than the postmasters at many points in the neighbourhood where the post offices are open at five and six in the morning. I refer to the village of Dunnville. I have had complaints with regard to this matter from business men, and all I ask is that the Postmaster General, as I am sure he will feel in duty bound to do, will require that so long as the present train arrangements exist, that the post office shall be open at the hour of, say seven o'clock in the morning, instead of at eight as at present.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think that is a most reasonable request.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) will have it done.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I will have it done.

Post Office—Miscellaneous expenses.... $212,120

Mr. TAYLOR. Before this item is adopted I wish to draw to the attention of the Postmaster General to a matter which has arisen in connection with the dismissal of a postmaster. I refer to Mr. Williams, of Seeley's Bay. The question of his dismissal has been thoroughly threshed out in the House but since the discussion I have received a letter from one of the most prominent Liberals in my county, namely, Mr. McCutcheon, from Seeley's Bay, which I propose to read. When this matter was up before I submitted the following question to the Postmaster General :—

Was a petition, signed by nearly all the residents of the surrounding district, presented to the Postmaster General protesting against any change being made ?

I do not know whether a petition was signed by nearly all of the residents or not.

Mr. TAYLOR. It is immaterial.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. On that point, I would say that, though a petition was presented, it was never brought to my knowledge until to-day.

Mr. McCutcheon, of Seeley's Bay, writes as follows :—

Seeley's Bay, April 28th, 1898.

Mr. Geo. Taylor, M.P., Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—I was very much pained on reading Mr. Mulock's answer to your question, "Was a petition, signed by nearly all the residents of the surrounding district presented to the Postmaster General protesting against any change being made ?" And his answer was that although a petition was received it was never brought to his knowledge until that day, April 14th, 1898. Now, sir, I hold an acknowledgment from the Postmaster General of said petition by him, dated December 17th, 1897, which I inclose you. That there has been underhand work in this matter is very evident, and that Mr. Williams was wrongfully dismissed from the office. I trust this thing will be thoroughly investigated and justice done all concerned. It is not true that Mr. Williams removed himself to Smith's Falls, that his daughter carried on the business of the post office in his absence in a very satisfactory manner to all concerned is a fact. It is also true that Mr. Williams has an interest in a branch store at Smith's Falls, that he spends his time between the two places. But that he did supervise the post office at Seeley's Bay as well, as when his time was given to Seeley's Bay alone, it is also true that the public in general was well satisfied with Mr. Williams as postmaster, when there was over 100 genuine signatures on the petition sent by me to the Postmaster General, praying that there be no change made, given by Reformers and Conservatives alike, all getting their mail at said office, and none outside. I would address the Postmaster General on this matter, but fearing he might never see my missive I refrain for the present, seeing you have taken the matter in hand, I will leave it with you. Hoping Mr. Williams may be reinstated postmaster at Seeley's Bay.

I am, yours,
(Sgd.) F. McCUTCHEON.

I may say that Mr. McCutcheon has been the standard bearer of the Reform party in that section. He is one of the most respectable and prosperous farmers of the neighbourhood, living within a mile of Seeley's Bay. He incloses to me a letter which I will now read. Having been the first signer of the petition to the Post Office Department, the answer was directed to him. It is as follows :

Post Office Dept., Can.,
Ottawa, 17th Dec., 1897.

Messrs. Jas. McCutcheon, Geo. Collis on and others,
Seeley's, Bay, Ont.

Gentlemen,—I am directed by the Postmaster General to acknowledge the receipt of your communication praying that the present postmaster of Seeley's Bay may be retained in office, and representing that the situation to which it is proposed to remove the post office would be an extremely inconvenient one, and, in reply, to inform you that the subject to which you refer will receive due inquiry and consideration.

I have the honour to be, gentlemen,
Your obedient servant,
W. D. LeSUEUR,
Secretary.

This proves conclusively that the petition came to the department on the 17th of December, although when the Postmaster General answered the question in the House as to whether a petition had been presented to him, he said it had never been brought to his attention until that day. I may say that Mr. Williams, the postmaster who was dismissed without cause, is one of the most respectable men in this or any other section of the country—a gentleman occupying a high position, a member of the Methodist Church, a class leader in the church, an advocate of temperance, and in every way one of the best living men in the country. Yet this gentleman is thrown out, though his family are living there and attending to the telegraph office and the telephone office, and carrying on a store—his wife and daughter being there, and he devoting his time between Seeley's Bay and Smith's Falls. Every Conservative and every Reformer in the neighbourhood signed the petition. The office has been removed to an inconvenient place at the west side of the village, and a gentleman who has had no experience in handling letters or dealing with post office orders has been appointed postmaster. I believe that when the next election comes round, if for no other reason than the injustice that has been meted out by the Postmaster General to Mr. Williams, every Reformer in that section of the country will resent it, whether the candidate be myself or somebody else. Notwithstanding that, I would like to see Mr. Williams reinstated, and the people left to vote as they

see fit. But I can tell the Postmaster General that if this state of affairs continues, the hon. gentleman and his friends will hear from the people there the next time they have an opportunity to cast their ballots.

Mr. BERGERON. Will the hon. Postmaster General tell me who is the mail carrier at Valleyfield at present ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I cannot tell the hon. gentleman that just now.

Mr. BERGERON. The contractor who used to carry the mails between the post office and the stations—the St. Lawrence and Adirondack station on the south side and the Canada Atlantic on the north side—was a man named Leduc, and he did the work to the satisfaction of the public and the department. When my hon. friend came into office, he cancelled that contract, and I want to know from him the names of the contractors who are carrying the mails now. There are two, and they do not do their work properly. If my hon. friend does not know their names, I will tell him. The man who carries the mails between the post office and the Canada Atlantic station on the north side is named Rapin. He does the work for a very small price, and does it very badly. The other contractor for carrying the mails between the post office and the St. Lawrence and Adirondack station on the south side, is a man named Laniel. He took the contract at such a small price that he completely abandoned it a year ago, and the mail is now carried by a carter, who goes to the station every day for his own purpose, and who carries the bags just when it suits him. He throws them into his carriage, and after driving his passengers around the town, and after finishing his own work, he condescends to bring the mail bags to the post office. I want to tell my hon. friend, as he will be interested in knowing it, that the service, though done very cheaply, is done very badly. In fact, it is looked upon there as a perfect scandal —the way the mails of Her Majesty are dragged about, and only brought to the post office when the carrier has finished his own work. I am surprised that my hon. friend has not these names. He should have them.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have no doubt the facts are as my hon. friend says; but the people apparently have not found fault with the service, for I have not heard of any complaint from them yet. I suppose they have left my hon. friend to take this opportunity to call my attention to it; and as he has done so, I will look into the matter. As to the remarks of my hon. friend from South Leeds (Mr. Taylor), on the Seeley's Bay transaction, which does not come up as altogether a novel circumstance, I would say, with regard to this letter of acknowledgment of the petition, that I am sure that no one who is familair with the departmental routine would assume that because of the phraseology of this communication, I had any knowledge of the receipt of the petition. This document is a receipt filled up in a printed form, commencing with the words in print, "I am directed by the Postmaster General to acknowledge the receipt of your communication of the." That is an ordinary printed form, and one of the staff has filled it up as a matter of course. There are thousands of communications coming to the department, directed to the Postmaster General, which he personally never sees; and that was the case with the petition in question. I can only repeat what I said before, that the change of postmaster at Seeley's Bay was made because the postmaster had ceased to reside in the town.

Mr. TAYLOR. No, he resides there yet.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The evidence before the department showed that he was living at Smith's Falls, forty miles away.

Mr. TAYLOR. Does not a man live where his family is ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The postmaster is supposed to personally perform the duties of the office or to personally supervise them, and he could not supervise the duties of the office at Seeley's Bay while living at Smith's Falls. The evidence shows that occasionally on Saturday night he returned to Seeley's Bay; but he was certainly not carrying on the work himself or supervising it. That is a rule that I did not originate. It was a rule I found in the department, made by my predecessors; I recognized it as a wholesome rule, and applied it in this instance. I regret that a good Liberal should have taken offence, but our loss is my hon. friend's gain, and therefore personally and politically he can only rejoice at my having made what he conceived to be a mistake.

Mr. DAVIN. I should like to ask the hon. Postmaster General what is his course of procedure when instituting inquiries into the conduct of postmasters in the west. I understand that when complaints were sent in to him, he would write back to the complainants stating either that he would send on somebody to investigate or else ask them to send in statutory declarations, and decided the cases on these declarations.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There was no regular course, but every effort was made to get at the truth. In some cases where charges were made, copies of statutory declarations were sent to the postmasters, accompanied by copies of charges, and they were required to return answers under statutory declaration: in other cases, I sent out Mr. McLeod, of Winnipeg, to investigate.

Mr. DAVIN. Did he conduct the investigation at Battleford? Mr. Mercer was the postmaster there.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That was last year. My recollection is that the postmaster's wife had been postmistress during the absence of her husband. Was she a niece of the late Sir John Schultz?

Mr. DAVIN. My hon. friend is confusing Prince Albert with Battleford. What took place at Battleford was this. Complaints were sent down to my hon. friend against Mr. Mercer, and my hon. friend instituted an inquiry. He sent copies of affidavits to the postmaster at Battleford, and I would like to know if Mr. McLeod was also sent out.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not remember.

Mr. DAVIN. With regard to the Prince Albert case, I have in my hand a comment on that from the Prince Albert "Advocate," the organ of the present Government in Prince Albert. I know that when the hon. gentleman removed Mr. Way from the postmastership, the feeling among Liberals and Conservatives was that it was a very high-handed proceeding, and the Prince Albert "Advocate" thus comments on it:

THE POST OFFICE AFFAIR.

A general sensation was caused in Prince Albert last week when the rumour went abroad that R. B. Way had been dismissed from the position of postmaster, and Mrs. Charles Mair appointed to the office. Mr. Way says he has not, up to the present, received any official notification of the change, but the rumour may be taken as correct as Mr. Way, in a curt note from Chas. Mair, sr., was told to hold himself in readiness to relinquish his office on September 1st. There appears to be no charge against Mr. Way, the only grounds apparently for his removal being that as Mrs. Mair had held the office some four or five years ago, she should be reinstated. This is all the information that can be obtained regarding the matter at the present time.

Almost all citizens in the place are a unit in denouncing this high-handed proceeding, and whoever may be responsible for it. The position is one of importance and trust, and must not be interfered with unless on the grounds of grave irregularities, and under no consideration will the public suffer it to be bandied about at the will of politicians who may feel inclined to meddle with it for any reason. This smacks much too strongly of American jingo politics to suit our fair-minded, justice-loving Canadians

If Mr. Way had been removed for cause, no one could reasonably have criticised the action, as it would have been the correct proceeding, but no cause is given. Let us look into the matter, go back into history a few years, and judge by matters of record whether his removal and this appointment is fair or just. Some fifteen or sixteen years ago, when Mr. Way became identified with the post office, Chas. Mair, sr., was postmaster, Mr. Way acting as assistant, which position he held creditably for a number of years, doing all the work in connection with the office, even when Mr. Mair had left the country and engaged in business in the United States. Citizens after a season became clamorous for a resident postmaster, and Mr. Mair, being unable to hold the position longer, resigned, when influence was brought to bear with the result that his wife, who was yet a resident here, was appointed to the position. Mr. Way meanwhile discharged the whole duties of the office, the postmistress only appearing to sign the weekly report necessary to be forwarded to the department. After a time Mrs. Mair, finding she could not attend to the duties herself, and the office at that time being hardly self-sustaining, resigned, and Mr. Way was appointed to the vacancy.

Now the Mairs, after an absence of several years, turn up and usurp the office which they grossly neglected when it was placed under their charge. Will they do better by it now than they did previously? Why the change had been made, or what was the motive which prompted such action is a mystery to every one, and we voice the sentiment of the entire Liberal party in this district in entering a vigorous protest against turning out a faithful servant without cause, and placing a responsible trust in the hands of parties who utterly neglected it when they previously held it. Should the appointment be insisted on, the citizens are talking of drafting a memorial to Postmaster General Mulock, to be forwarded through our representative, Mr. T. O. Davis, M.P., against an appointment which is most obnoxious to them.

And the opinions and desires of a community must be respected. We belong to free Canada, but if this sort of work goes on, our vaunted superiority of public office over our neighbour to the south must disappear, and our institutions will sink to the lowest depths of degradation to which a power, wrongfully exerted, can drive them.

Of course, I am not endorsing the personal criticism in this article, but merely citing it as an instance of public opinion. I should like to ask the hon. gentleman whether the memorial was presented to him by Mr. T. O. Davis, and whether Mr. Davis urged the prayer of the memorial on him, and what decision he came to?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is a year since this matter was brought to my notice, and therefore my hon. friend will excuse me if I should perhaps not remember all the details, but I think I remember with accuracy the case that was laid before me. Mr. Mair, the postmaster at Prince Albert, was obliged from ill-health or some misfortune, to move to California, and his wife was appointed in his place. She continued to hold the office for some time, but efforts were made to take it from her. I am not aware that there is anything of record showing that she did not give perfect satisfaction. But she alleged that she was induced to sign a resignation under coercion, that she was informed by a person whom she regarded as reliable that he had undoubted information that she would be dismissed, and that she had to choose between dismissal and resignation. She yielded to the coercion and resigned from office. She said she had been badly treated, and I thought she had been. As to what evidence I obtained in support of the case, I cannot say from memory, but I remember

quite well consulting the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) and having his confirmation of the facts as narrated by the postmistress. I have never heard of any memorial protesting against the change. If any has reached the department, it has never come to my notice. I will make inquiries and tell the hon. gentleman to-morrow if such a memorial has reached the department.

Mr. GILLIES. As the matter of dismissals is up, and as I have an extraordinary case in my county relating to the Post Office Department, and as I failed at the proper time to get the information that I sought, I feel compelled to try if possible to get from the Postmaster General the information that at that time he failed to furnish me. I refer to the dismissal of Roderick Ferguson, late postmater of Lower L'Ardoise. I will be obliged if the Postmaster General will give me information with respect to that case. I certainly fail to understand it. It would be an injustice to the hon. gentleman (Mr Mulock) for me to fail to bring the case to his notice, because there is a deep seated conviction throughout my constituency that the hon. gentleman must have acted on information the truth of which he had not sifted to the bottom; because, if he had, I am disposed to do him the justice to say, he would not have dismissed this man. This is a large section in my county. Now, on the 21st February last, I put the following question on the Order paper :—

1. Who is the postmaster at Lower L'Ardoise, county of Richmond, at the present time ?
2. When was the present incumbent appointed ?
3. Who was his predecessor in office ?
4. Why and when was he removed ?
5. At whose request ?
6. Were any complaints in writing against the late postmaster filed with the Government or the Post Office Department ?
7. What was the nature of these complaints, and by whom were they furnished ?
8. Was an investigation afforded the late postmaster before removing him from office ? If so, by whom was the inquiry held ?

These are perfectly legitimate questions, and they were properly put. They were called on several occasions, but they were not answered until the 7th March, being asked to stand for one reason or another. On the 7th March the Postmaster General gave me the following reply :—

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr Mulock.) The present postmaster, Daniel C. Mathieson, was appointed on the 30th September, 1897. His predecessor in office was Roderick Ferguson. Certain complaints having been made against him, they were communicated to him in order to afford him an opportunity of replying thereto, which he did, pleading guilty to all of said complaints excepting one—an immaterial one—it was not thought necessary to hold an inquiry.

But the Postmaster General had not any reply to my question if the complaints were furnished or forwarded to his department, and if so, by whom, and what was their nature. He assumes at once they were all admitted, except an immaterial one—he does not say what is was or what any of the complaints were. Then I gave notice at once in the regular way, of the following motion :—

Order of the House for copies of all correspondence, inspectors' reports and all documents respecting the dismissal of Roderick Ferguson, late postmaster at Lower L'Ardoise, Richmond County, and the removal of the post office to the store of Joseph Mathieson, late M.P.P., for the said county of Richmond ; also, copies of all letters recommending Daniel K. Matheson as successor to Mr. Ferguson ; also, copy of the writ of summons issued out of the Supreme Court of the province of Nova Scotia against the said Daniel K. Matheson for corrupt practices in the general local election of the year 1894 ; also, copy of the judgment of Mr. Justice Henry, dated 3rd July, 1895, condemning the said Daniel K. Matheson, the present postmaster at Lower L'Ardoise, in a penalty of $400 and costs for corrupt acts committed by him in said election, and of which he was found guilty by the judgment of the said Mr. Justice Henry, one of the Supreme Court judges for the province of Nova Scotia.

That notice of motion was given on the 17th March, and was called, from time to time, but the Postmaster General asked that it should be allowed to stand.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No.

Mr. GILLIES. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. He will find that in "Hansard."

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I never saw it before.

Mr. GILLIES. It was called from time to time until the 9th of May, when I dropped it, because I found it was not the intention to pass it ; and if it remained on the Order paper I would not be allowed to discuss it.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I never asked that it be allowed to stand.

Mr. GILLIES. The Postmaster General is mistaken. It stood at his request. What I say is absolutely correct.

Now, Mr. Chairman, what are the facts ? Mr. Ferguson, the late postmaster, was one of the most respectable men in my county. He held the position of postmaster from the time it became vacant in 1886 until he was dismissed last September. He conducts a large mercantile business in the county where he resides, and he is municipal councillor for that district, one of the most intelligent men in that county. He was dismissed on the 30th of September last, for what reason I do not know. The Postmaster General did not answer my inquiry, therefore I am at a loss to know why he was dismissed. On the 20th of September, Mr. Daniel K. Matheson was put in his place. This young man, in 1894, was proceeded against in the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia for corrupt practices in the election that was held in March of that year. The cases of corruption that

took place in that election were so glaring that the party to which I belong could not tolerate them without an endeavour to have the law vindicated. Among those that were proceeded against was this very man Matheson, whom the Postmaster General appointed to succeed Mr. Ferguson. I will read the writ that was issued in the Supreme Court and served upon Matheson, and out of which grew the suit that was tried before Mr. Justice Henry, the judgment of which case I asked for in this return :

1894—A No. 113.

In the Supreme Court.

Between John Morrison, plaintiff, and Daniel K. Matheson, defendant.

Victoria, by the Grace of God, &c.

We command you that within ten days after the service of this writ on you, inclusive of the day of such service, you do come and appear and be entered for you in an action at the suit of John Morrison, and take notice that in default of your so doing the plaintiff may proceed therein and judgment may be given in your absence.

Issued at Arichat the 6th day of August, 1894.

N.B.—This writ is to be served within twelve calendar months from the date thereof, or if renewed, within six calendar months from the date of the last renewal, including the days of such date and not afterwards. The defendant may appear hereto by entering an appearance either personally or by solicitor at the prothonotary's office at Arichat, in the county of Richmond.

The plaintiff's claim is :

(1) That the defendant is indebted to him in the sum of $400, being the forfeiture provided in and by section 68 of chapter 5 of the Revised Statutes of Nova Scotia, 5th Series, for the offence of bribery, which offence the said defendant was guilty of between the 15th day of February, 1894, and the 15th day of March, 1894, within the said county of Richmond, wherein the said defendant hath acted contrary to the provisions of said chapter 5 of the Revised Statutes of Nova Scotia, 5th Series, in connection with the election of a member for the House of Assembly for the said county of Richmond, holden on the 15th day of March, 1894.

(2) That the defendant is indebted to him in the sum of $100, being the forfeiture provided in and by section 66 of chapter 5 of the Revised Statutes of Nova Scotia, 5th Series, for hiring and paying for horses, teams and carriages, cabs, and other vehicles for Joseph Matheson and one Simon Joyce, candidates at the said election, for the purpose of carrying a voter or voters to or from the polling places—which offence the said defendant was guilty of between the 15th day of February, 1894, and the 15th day of March, 1894, within the said county of Richmond, wherein the said defendant hath acted contrary to the provisions of said chapter 5 in connection with the said election.

That writ was served by the sheriff of the county of Richmond and was endorsed thereon as follows :—

This writ was served at L'Ardoise on the defendant, Daniel K. Matheson, on the 10th day of August, 1894.

Endorsed, 11th day of August, 1894.

Fees : Record, 10 cents ; travel, $3.40 ; service, $1 ; total, $4.50.

This case, as I said, was tried out before Mr. Justice Henry at Arichat, and Matheson was found guilty of corrupt practices as alleged in this writ of summons, and was subjected to a penalty of $400 and $100 costs, and was also disfranchised for five years. I will read to the House a copy of the judgment that is now entered in the Supreme Court at Arichat, as follows :—

In the Supreme Court, 1894, A No. 113.

Between John Morrison, plaintiff, and Daniel K. Matheson, defendant.

This action coming on for trial on the 6th day of June, 1895, and this day in the presence of counsel for the plaintiff and defendant, upon hearing the evidence of Urgel Burkey and Charles Burkey, Martin Campbell, Wallace Preyent, John Campbell, D. K. Matheson, the defendant, and James Potty, taken on the oral examination and what was alleged by counsel on both sides, the said cause having been tried before the Hon. Mr. Justice Henry, at Arichat, in the county of Richmond, and the said judge having ordered that judgment be entered for the plaintiff for the sum of $400 and costs. It is this day ordered and adjudged that the plaintiff recover from the defendant the sum of $400 and costs to be taxed.

The costs, as I said, were over $100. Now, Mr. Chairman, that is a full record of the proceedings against this man D. K. Matheson, whom the Postmaster General appointed on the recommendation of some one, I presume, residing at Lower L'Ardoise. Now, I refer the Postmaster General to our Act upon controverted elections, under which this man was prosecuted, 51st section, chapter 5 :

Any person other than a candidate found guilty of any corrupt practice in any proceeding in which after notice of the charge has had an opportunity of being heard, shall during the five years next after the time at which he is so found guilty, be incapable of being elected to and of sitting in the House of Assembly, and of voting at any election and of holding any office at the nomination of a lieutenant-governor or any municipal office, or of being appointed or acting as a justice of the peace.

I do not bring this matter up in any factious spirit. I only want to know from the Postmaster General now how he came to dismiss Mr. Roderick Ferguson from the post office at Lower L'Ardoise, and appoint in his place a man who was fined $400 for corrupt acts in a recent election in the county, a man who is incapable of being elected to or sitting in the House of Assembly, a man that cannot vote at any election for any candidate, and a man that cannot hold any office at the nomination of the Lieutenant-Governor, a man that cannot hold any municipal office, and cannot be appointed justice of the peace. I think it is only fair to the district in which that young man is who was appointed postmaster and who labours under all these disqualifications, that the Postmaster General should state the reasons for the change. I repeat,

that I do not bring it up in a partisan spirit, but it is only fair to the Postmaster General himself that he should tell the committee on what principle he acted, how he came to appoint the partisan who labours under so many disqualifications and is on record for having been guilty of courrupt practices.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have not seen the notice of motion to which the hon. gentleman refers, and I did not ask it to stand, but probably it stood as many motions are asked to stand, if they are debatable, or in my absence one of my colleagues may have asked that it be allowed to stand. I shall consider it my duty to examine the records and lay on the Table of the House all papers that bear on the question, and then the hon. gentleman will be furnished with all the information. I have not the faintest recollection of the details. I never heard of this action to which the hon. gentleman refers or the disqualification of Mr. Mathieson from holding any office in the gift of the local legislature. That circumstance in itself does not, however, technically disqualify one from holding a Dominion office, although some people might think it affects his personal fitness. I have made note of the matter, and I will endeavour to bring down the papers to-morrow.

Mr. GILLIES. I am not sure that I will be here when the Supplementary Estimates are discussed, but in case I am not, I will state now the position I would take then. I have given the committee the facts and have spoken from the original records as to this man's disability. In view of these facts I ask the Postmaster General if he will cause an inquiry to be instituted, and if the facts I have stated are borne out by the result, he will cause a change to be made in the person who holds the office.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am not able to answer the question now. As regards the question of removal, it is unnecessary to have an inquiry on that point as it is not necessary to prove an admitted fact. The hon. member will have the opportunity of considering the charges and admissions and deciding on the action to be taken. As to whether a man should be removed from a Dominion office because he is disqualified under a local Act involves the opening up of another question. There are no doubt persons holding office who have been disqualified and are not entitled to vote for members of Parliament in another province or in the Dominion. I submit that the disqualification for a political offence does not per se disqualify a man from being a fit and proper person to act as postmaster.

Mr. GILLIES. I understand the position taken. The Postmaster General will admit that he did not know he was appointing a man resting under all these disabilities. The hon. gentleman removed one partisan and he has appointed another. He will acknowledge that he was seriously misled and badly advised. I take it that the Postmaster General would refuse to remove a man and appoint a partisan in his place. The responsibility now rests with the Postmaster General. I have brought the facts to his notice and I hope he will never commit a similar error again.

Mr. McALISTER. I wish to refer to the closing of the Oak Bay Mills post office in the county of Bonaventure, near the town where I live. In April I placed a question on the Order paper referring to the closing of the office. One of the questions was: "When was the office closed?" The answer I received from the Postmaster General was that it was closed on April 1st, 1897. But I found on further information being received from the postmaster at Oak Bay Mills and the receipts of the post office inspector, who closed the post office, that it was closed on March 13th, 1897.

Mr. BERGERON. Was it after the elections?

Mr. McALISTER. Four days before the elections. The 1st of April was a few days after the elections, and 13th March a few days before. I do not accuse the Postmaster General or the officials of having wilfully given a wrong date, but they have given a wrong date notwithstanding, whether in error or not, it is not for me to say. If the date given by the Postmaster was correct and the record shows the office to have been closed on 1st April, then the office was illegally closed by some subordinates without the authority of the Postmaster General.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Does the hon. gentleman remember why the office was closed?

Mr. McALISTER. I think a political reason is the only reason that can be assigned for it. Last year I asked for all the correspondence in regard to the closing of the office, and the only correspondence I got was covered by two letters signed by the Minister of Pubic Works, which I will read. One is dated Ottawa, March 5th, 1897, and reads as follows:—

> Dear Mulock,—I spoke to you yesterday of the postmaster of Oak Bay, Bay des Chaleurs. The present postmaster has attended the Conservative convention and the Liberal candidate has made a complaint against him. I showed it to you. Now, Mr. Guite wires to me that there is no need of a post office at Oak Bay, and that it should be closed at once.
>
> I inclose Mr. Guite's telegram. I think it should be acted upon, if your officers agree.
>
> Yours truly,
>
> (Sgd.) J. ISRAEL TARTE.

The second letter is dated Ottawa, March 10th, and reads as follows:—

Ottawa, March, 10th, 1898.

Dear Mulock,—Our friends from Bonaventure strongly insist that the Oak Bay post office be abolished. They state that it is only maintained for the benefit of one offensive partisan. I think you had better comply with the request made by our friends and, in the interest of economy, abolish that post office.

Yours truly,

(Sgd.) J. ISRAEL TARTE.

Hon. William Mulock,
Postmaster General,
Ottawa.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BERGERON. Who signed that letter?

Mr. McALISTER. It is signed, J. I. Tarte, who I presume is the Minister of Public Works. I asked for all the correspondence, telegrams, and so forth, referring to the closing of this post office, and that is all I have received. I asked later for the telegram, and the Postmaster General told me he could not find it, and of course I accept his word for that. It is very singular that there is no report of the inspector or of any officer in that district, stating that this post office was kept for the benefit of an offensive partisan, as the Minister of Public Works calls him, or recommending that the post office be closed. Further than that, one of the questions I asked in April was: What was the revenue from the Oak Bay Mills post office, and the revenue from the Oak Point post office? And the answer I received was:

The revenue for the year ending 30th June, 1895, from Oak Bay Mills post office was $75; for the year ending 30th June, 1896, it was $71; and for the half year ending 31st December, 1896, it was $41.

The revenue from the Oak Point post office for the same dates was for the first year, $39.69, for the second year $39.27, and for the half year $22.25.

Mr. BERGERON. And yet it has not been abolished.

Mr. McALISTER. The revenue from the Oak Point post office was little more than half the revenue derived from the Oak Bay Mills post office which the Minister of Public Works says was only kept open for the convenience of one offensive partisan. That of itself is sufficient evidence to show that the Oak Bay Mills office should not be closed. Now, the fact is that the postmaster at Oak Point was a partisan. He was not what the Minister of Public Works would call an offensive partisan, because he was a supporter of the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Guite), whom I am glad to see in his seat now. The hon. member (Mr. Guite) who says that the Oak Bay Mills office was kept open for an offensive partisan and that it was in the public interest it should be closed, would be nearer the truth if he had said, that it was in the interest of party and in the interest of party heelers who supported the hon. gentleman (Mr. Guite) that it should be closed. I do not wish to say anything harsh against the hon. member for Bonaventure, but when he recommends that this post office at Oak Bay Mills should be closed, I think he is ignorant of the wants of the people in that locality, or otherwise he is guilty of wilfully doing an unjust act to that portion of his constituents. I do not think the hon. member (Mr. Guite) ever was at Oak Bay Mills before the election when he went seeking votes, and I do not think he has ever been there since, and further, I question very much if he knew that that district was in his county at all. The distance between the Cross Point office and the Oak Point office is seven miles which distance is without an office at all, and around Oak Bay Mills, there were 22 families served by that office all the year round, and in addition there were 40 transient men working there who received their mails at that office. When that is taken into consideration I do not think it can be said that that office was kept open for the benefit of one offensive partisan. It was kept open for the benefit of a large community there, the largest community between Cross Point and Carleton, a distance of forty miles. If the postmaster at Oak Bay Mills had been a supporter of the hon. gentleman from Bonaventure (Mr. Guite) that office would never have been closed. The mails at the present time are carried by the Baie de Chaleur Railway and Oak Bay Mills is only about 100 feet away from the station so that no expense would be incurred in conveying the mails to the post office, whereas at the present time the mails have to be carried a distance of a mile and a half to the Oak Point post office. That is of itself a strong reason why the Oak Bay Mills post office should be opened, and if it were in the public interest or in the interest of economy to have any office closed it would be the one at Oak Point. I do not say that the Oak Point office should be closed, for I know nothing about it, but I do know that the office at Oak Bay Mills should be kept open. If it is necessary for the people in any community to support the Government in order to receive what is due to them from the postal service, then the sooner the people of this Dominion know it the better. I do not think the Postmaster General wishes to be unfair, but I do say that the manner in which that post office was closed was arbitrary and unprecedented. I do not think that in the history of the Dominion you can find another instance where a post office was closed on the strength of a telegram or recommendation from "our friends" as the Minister of Public Works called them. A report should have been had from the inspector before any action was taken. If the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Guite) persists in refusing to recommend that this office be open and that justice be done to an important part of his constituency, I think the Postmaster General should have

an investigation made and get a report from unprejudiced officers, who will desire to see justice done. Another office that has been closed in my county is at Jacket River. I do not think that office was closed from any partisan spirit. It was closed, I think, after some consideration ; but it is situated in an important section of the country, and it served a great many people along the coast. The closing of that office has been a great inconvenience to a thickly populated district, as well as to a large settlement in the rear. I think a memorial was sent to the Postmaster General, largely signed by the inhabitants, asking that it should be reopened. I would ask the Postmaster General if he did not receive such a memorial ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I cannot say from memory.

Mr. McALISTER. I am informed that such a memorial was sent, and I hope the Postmaster General will give the matter his favourable consideration.

Mr. GUITE. (Translation.) As I have just heard my hon. friend from Restigouche (Mr. McAlister) complaining about the Oak Bay Mill post office having been closed at my request, I deem it my duty to give the reasons why I have taken such a step. This post office was of small importance, being kept open only in the interest of a few individuals who could without any trouble mail their letters at the nearest post office, at Oak Point.

Mr. BERGERON. (Translation.) What is the distance between the two places ?

Mr. GUITE. (Translation.) About two miles. In that portion of my constituency, over a distance of 22 miles, between Oak Point and Metapedia, there are six post offices for the accommodation of a population of 1,383 inhabitants, while throughout the whole county of Bonaventure there are forty-five post offices for the accommodation of a population of 20,835 people, which gives for the whole county a ratio of one post office for every 463 people ; while for the western portion of the county of Bonaventure, in which my hon. friend for Restigouche seems to take such an interest, there are but 1,383 inhabitants, which gives an average of 230 people for every one of the six post offices now in operation. It was at my request that the Oak Bay Mills post office was closed, as in the public interest it was not considered as needed. I am not aware of anybody having complained about its being closed, and I do not know of any petition being sent to the department to the effect of having it reopened. I am at a loss to understand why the hon. member for Restigouche takes such an interest in the post offices of the county of Bonaventure. He has just stated that, if I asked for the closing of that post office, it was because I was ignorant of the real state of affairs. The hon. gentleman is quite mistaken. I may tell him that I am well posted as to the number of post offices in operation in my constituency and about the localities where they are most needed. I did not take that step without knowledge, and I venture to tell him that the public are perfectly satisfied as well as the Government. I have also pressed upon the Government the desirability of opening other post offices in more convenient localities and I hope I will succeed in having some opened at several points in my constituency. For instance, in the parish of Maria, where I live, we have but three post offices for a population of 2,433 souls, and I think we should have at least the double of that number.

Mr. BERGERON. (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, I would ask the hon. member for Bonaventure for what reason he did not ask for the closing of the Oak Point post office, the revenue from which is little more than half the revenue derived from the post office which has been closed at his request ?

Mr. GUITE. (Translation.) I will tell the hon. gentleman why I did not ask for the closing of that post office : it is because Cross Point is thirteen miles distant from Escuminac, and the Oak Point post office is midway between those two post offices. I thought it preferable to close the Oak Bay Mill post office so as to give everybody an equal chance.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. With regard to the inquiry why Jacket River post office was closed, I will make full inquiry, and give the hon. gentleman the information at a later stage. As to the Oak Bay transaction, I presume he has had a full explanation from the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Guité. It is within two miles of Oak Point post office, and not necessary. However, I will make inquiry of the proper officers, and see whether they consider that that office is necessary in the public interest.

Mr. BENNETT. I would like to ask the Postmaster General for an explanation, if he can give it, in reference to the appointment of a postmaster at the town of Gravenhurst. A short time ago I put an inquiry on the Order Paper in reference to the matter, and the facts of the case, partly to my own knowledge and partly from information given to me by responsible people, are about as follows. A Mr. J. P. Cockburn, formerly postmaster at Gravenhurst, a gentleman of about fifty-five years of age, according to the statement of the Postmaster General, resigned the position and his son, a young man, I am informed, of twenty-three or twenty-four years of age, was appointed in his place. The Postmaster General, on coming into office, took very high ground, making the statement publicly that if it could be shown that any wrong-doing or collusion was practised under his department, he

would cause inquiry to be made in every case, and in the event of such inquiry proving anything of the kind, just retribution would follow. In pursuance of that policy, he found a grievous complaint against the appointment of the postmaster at Cobourg, a Mr. Guillet, and a commissioner was appointed to inquire into that appointment. If my recollection serves me, it was proved that the predecessor of Mr. Guillet, for a consideration, had entered into an arrangement by which he resigned his office, and Mr. Guillet was appointed. On the finding of the commission, Mr. Guillet was dismissed from the office. Now, here is a case of which the Postmaster General had full notice. He could have found from the reports what was the age of Mr. J. P. Cockburn. The town of Gravenhurst is a considerable town. The office is not an unimportant one; the salary, I assume, reaches about $1,000 a year; and the Postmaster General, before making a change, involving the retirement of a man in the prime of life and the appointment of his son, must have had fair notice; and he should be in a position to state, for the information of the House, and more particularly for the information of the people of Gravenhurst, whether this was done under any arrangement between Mr Cockburn and his son. I know that the protests on the part of the people of Gravenhurst against the change, are very deep—not from Conservatives, because it is not a matter in which they are interested, for no Conservative would have obtained the position; but I have had remonstrances made to me by prominent Liberals in the riding, who believed that the Postmaster General would conduct matters in his department fairly and above-board. They complain bitterly that an arrangement of this kind should have been made between the two Cockburns without any reference to the Liberals of the riding. Although the appointment was made on the recommendation of Mr. H. H. Cook, who has the patronage of the county, I think it is only fair to the Liberals of the town that the Postmaster General should state to the House what the circumstances of the arrangement were; and if the facts are not known to him, then I say, that following the precedent laid down by him in the Cobourg case, he is in honour bound to institute an inquiry by a commission and ascertain what reasons existed between the two Cockburns for the change. I may say that surmises are on foot in the town of Gravenhurst. It is said that Mr. J. P. Cockburn claimed the appointment for his son as a recompense for his resigning in his favour. Whether that is true or not I do not know; it can only be ascertained by a full and searching inquiry. But I say that the Postmaster General, having had notice of the facts, was put upon his guard that there was something, to put it in the mildest terms, at least, in the nature of a colourable transaction between the two Cockburns. What explanation has the Postmaster General to make of the changes made.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am not aware of having made any such declaration as my hon. friend mentions. With regard to the Cobourg case, it was stated by reliable persons that a consideration had been given in order to procure the resignation of Mr. Robertson, the then postmaster. A very positive statement was made, accompanied by detailed particulars as to the transaction. It was not mere suspicion, but the evidence of those who declared that they knew all the facts. Upon that statement a commission was issued and an inquiry was made, and the result my hon. friend knows. My only duty is, in all cases, to carry out the law; and though I do not profess to be always equal to the task, I always endeavoured to do so. With regard to the Gravenhurst case, I know nothing whatever of the transaction, except what appears in the department. I never saw the former or the present postmaster, and have no recollection of having ever had a word of communication with them, directly or indirectly, and I know nothing about the reason that led to the resignation of the father and the appointment of the son.

Mr. BENNETT. About a year ago certain charges were preferred against Mr. Goffett, who was then postmaster at Orillia. The result was that it became regarded a very well authenticated fact that Mr. Goffett had been dismissed. Mr. Melville Miller was openly spoken of as his probable successor, and it was admitted by Miller that he had as good as received the appointment. It was stated in the local papers that Mr. Miller would be installed in office in a few days. I am now referring to the year 1897. At that time a special remonstrance was made to the Postmaster General by a gentleman very prominent in Liberal circles in Orillia, who came to Ottawa and protested against the appointmen of Mr. Miller. This I know to be the fact from having been told so by that gentleman himself. Owing to that remonstrance, the Postmaster General, fearing that the dismissal of Mr. Goffett and the appointment of Mr. Miller would have a very detrimental effect on the approaching elections, which were anticipated at an earlier day than they were held, the appointment of Mr. Miller did not go into effect. The old postmaster was continued in office until 1898, when, owing to some happenings which I need not detail, his services were dispensed with. Then Mr. Miller was appointed, and I wish to ask if in 1897 he had been recommended for this position, in or about the month of April, by Mr. Cook. I would also ask if the appointment was not made then owing to the remonstrance that it would affect the election, then anticipated. The appointment was therefore postponed

until 1898. It is a matter of comment in Orillia that Mr. Miller carried round this appointment in his pocket for a year, and it was only made public after the local elections were disposed of. In the light of future events, it would have been probably more in the interests of the service if Mr. Goffett's services had been dispensed with in 1897. It is a fact that Mr. Miller, in March or April, 1897, had been promised a position by the Postmaster General and recommended by Mr. Cook, and was the appointment delayed until after the approaching local elections ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have no objection to give my hon. friend every information. Mr. Melliville Miller never received any promise or communication authorizing him to suppose he was going to be appointed postmaster until he was appointed a very short time ago. My hon. friend is aware that the former postmaster was not conducting the office in the interests of the public for a considerable length of time, and well founded complaints were made against him, and I presume that the community recognized the fact that this office was at least in danger, and many thought I should have removed him long before I did. About that time I received a communication, I think, from Mr. Cook representing Mr. Miller.

Mr. BENNETT. That would be in 1897.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. This recommendation was in the event of a vacancy. I suppose that when I received that letter people were aware that a vacancy was probable, owing to the conduct of the officer, and in that event Mr. Cook recommended the appointment of Mr. Miller, but I did not create the vacancy at the time, because the postmaster had a good staff in his office, and I hoped that they would take care of it, and it would not be necessary to make a change. I therefore made no change until the circumstances happened to which my hon. friend referred ; and until I directed a telegram to be sent to Mr. Miller announcing his appointment, I had arrived at no conclusion whatever. In fact, when the charges were made against the postmaster many thought I should have acted more promptly and dismissed him at the preliminary investigation. But I felt that it would not be fair to prejudice his case before another tribunal or to prejudice him in the eyes of the community by appearing to assume his guilt. Hence I resisted the, perhaps, not unreasonable pressure on the part of those who were more cognizant of the local circumstances than I was. I felt it my duty to resist the pressure and to retain him in office. If the charges which were under investigation this spring had turned out favourably to him I should not have felt warranted in disturbing him in his office.

Mr. BENNETT. As I understand the Postmaster General, in the year 1897—I am not referring to the troubles which happened to the postmaster this year—charges were preferred against the postmaster of alleged wrong-doing in the conduct of his office.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not say that charges were made in a formal way. I think I had communications of various kinds referring to him. In fact, I think the community had come to the conclusion the year before that he was not a fit and proper person to remain in the office. My recollection is that I sent the inspector to Orillia with instructions to inquire whether the general conduct of the postmaster was regarded as so notoriously bad as to make it amount to a public scandal to leave him in office. I think it was about that time, probably, that the public may have thought that he was going to be dismissed. The inspector did give me a report, and I threw the veil of charity over the man and left him in office a while longer.

Mr. BENNETT. I wish to show that the action of the Postmaster General has been rather remarkable. In the year 1897—as I understand it—and I wish to be fair—complaints were made as to the conduct of this officer.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No, the conduct of the man himself outside of office.

Mr. BENNETT. You can hardly dissociate a man and his office in that way. His deportment, it would seem, was such that the confidence of the public was lost to him in his office. The postmaster was complained of and these complaints found their way to the ears of the Postmaster General and were regarded so seriously by him that he thought it his duty—and, of course, he was quite within his rights in what he did—to send the inspector for the division to inquire into these charges. And the report, if I understand him correctly, was that the charges were only too true. Now, in view of these facts it seems strange that the Postmaster General did not see fit to dispense with the services of the official at the time. He has made the statement that he was aware of alleged lapses in the conduct of the postmaster as far back as nearly a year before his final dismissal. The public there can judge of the facts as stated here whether or not it was to meet, as alleged, certain party exigencies, that the office was kept in that condition for nearly a year, against the protest and remonstrances of a large part of the community.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I can tell my hon. friend (Mr. Bennett) with absolute frankness and without qualification or reservation that political considerations had nothing whatever to do with the retention of the man in office. I will submit it to himself as a member of the legal profession what I ought to have done under the cir-

cumstances. It was stated that the postmaster had committed a certain offence, not in connection with the post office at all.

Mr. BENNETT. If the Postmaster General will pardon me, I am referring to the complaints of 1897.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. So am I. It was stated he had committed certain offences not connected with his duties as an official, but what are regarded as offences against society and good morals. I had to consider what my duty was not only to that officer but to all officers under similar circumstances. Speaking in the abstract now, I would submit to the committee: What is the duty of a member of the Government under such circumstances? You cannot issue a commission to try a man on a charge that is capable of being tried in a court—that is not the duty of the Government. If it is a case that is cognizable in a court, let the court take notice of it; and, after the decision of the court, it will be the duty of the Government to act or not as the result demands. But if a public officer's character was so questionable that the public regarded it as a scandal that he should be retained in office, then I should be warranted, in fact my duty would be to remove him from office. But I could not try a private issue in that way. So I sent the inspector with instructions to visit the most respectable people in the town, not men in politics at all, but the clergy and others specially interested in looking after the moral condition of the people, and to bring a statement whether or not they regarded the postmaster's conduct as sufficient to disqualify him from being postmaster. The officer made that inquiry, and the result did not warrant me in dismissing him. The report did not satisfy me, that to allow the postmaster to continue in office would be a scandal. It is my recollection that it was shown also or that I was informed that he had a wife and children, and this circumstance had also to be considered. But I do not know what his politics are and no politician ever spoke to me on the subject of his being removed or retained on that score.

Mr. FOSTER. Does not the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) think that we have been in this atmosphere long enough?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do think we have done a square day's work. I move the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Resolutions to be reported.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 1.25 a.m. (Thursday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 2nd June, 1898.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

PRAYERS.

AWARD TO THE DOMINION ATLANTIC RAILWAY.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick) moved that the House, at its next sitting, resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following proposed resolution:—

Resolved, That it is expedient to ratify the award of the Honourable G. W. Burbidge in favour of the Dominion Atlantic Railway Company, and to authorize the payment to that company of the sum of one hundred thousand dollars for the commutation of its privileges with respect to the drawback of customs or import duties.

Motion agreed to.

GRANT TO THE PROVINCE OF MANITOBA.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved that the House, at its next sitting, resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following proposed resolutions:—

1. That it is expedient to provide that the sum of two hundred and eighty-four thousand four hundred and fifty-six dollars and forty-seven cents, being the cost of the erection and furnishing of the Legislative Buildings and Government House at Winnipeg, which sum was charged against the "Province of Manitoba debt account," may, on the first day of July, one thousand eight hundred and ninety-eight, be credited to the said account, and that the interest payable to the said province on the said first day of July, one thousand eight hundred and ninety-eight, on the balance at the credit of the said debt account shall be calculated on the balance at the credit of the said account after the said sum of two hundred and eighty-four thousand four hundred and fifty-six dollars and forty-seven cents has been credited thereto as above provided.

2. That it is expedient to provide that the Government of Canada may, on the said first day of July, one thousand eight hundred and ninety-eight, pay to the Government of the province of Manitoba the sum of two hundred and forty-one thousand eight hundred and thirty-six dollars and twenty-nine cents, being the sum of the amounts which would have been payable to the province of Manitoba by the Dominion, in excess of the amounts actually paid as interest from time to time payable on the balances at the credit of the said debt account, had the cost of the erection and furnishing of the said Legislative Buildings and Government House at Winnipeg not been charged against the said debt account, together with interest at the rate of five per centum per

annum on each of the amounts so payable, in excess of the amounts actually paid, from the date when the same would have been payable to the said first day of July, one thousand eight hundred and ninety-eight.

Motion agreed to.

BOUNTIES ON IRON AND STEEL.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson) moved that the House resolve itself into committee to consider the following resolution :

That the provisions of chapter six of the statutes of 1897, intituled "An Act to provide for bounties on iron and steel made in Canada, shall be held to have come into force on the twenty-third day of April, in the year one thousand eight hundred and ninety-seven."

Mr. FOSTER. I would like the hon. Minister of Customs to give us an explanation of this resolution.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. When the tariff resolutions were introduced on the 23rd of April last year, as a matter of course, they went into operation at once. At that time the duties on iron were reduced, and the tariff resolutions provided that the bounties that were given upon iron should be increased. It was intended that the increased bounty should take effect at the same time that the tariff resolutions took effect ; but through an oversight, that was not provided for, the new scale of bounties became payable only after the Act had become law by the assent of His Excellency. That made a period from the 23rd of April to the 29th of June during which the old rate of bounty on iron would have to govern under the law as it stood. But as hon. gentlemen can understand, the import duties having been reduced, the price at once fell to that extent ; and this is simply to declare that what was intended at the time that the Bounty Act was introduced, should have effect given to it.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend thinks it is right, if it was the intention of the Government that the bounty payments should date from that time and if, by an error, legislation was carried through which did not provide for it, he should come down to the House and remedy that error. I think the hon. gentleman is quite correct in coming to that conclusion. The good faith of the Government, though often it does not get into the legislation, ought to get into the legislation, and my hon. friend is, of course, doing right in remedying the defect, even at a late date. But I want to call the attention of the Minister of Customs to another point which is, if anything, somewhat stronger than this, although the matter is not so important a one. When the tariff was brought down, as my hon. friend will see, it placed upon rubber belting a duty of 25 per cent. That was done after deliberation by the Government, they set rubber belting at 25 per cent, they passed that into legislation, and that legislation went through the House to the Senate. But in its passage to the Senate, or on its passage to the ultimate signature of the Governor General the figure 25 was changed to 20 and rubber belting has been under the disability of a 20 per cent duty from that time up to the present. I believe there is no doubt at all that 25 per cent was intended to be placed upon rubber belting, and was placed upon it by the resolution, and was placed upon it by the Act which ensued on those resolutions, and was passed through this House. Now correspondence has taken place. These gentlemen certainly have a right to ask the Government to put them in the position that they were given by the legislation as it passed this House. But, more, they made sales and carried on their business transactions for a certain length of time on that basis, and they were involved in great trouble with their customers, their customers saying to them : You represented to us that rubber belting was 25 per cent ; we have bought, and now we find that it is only 20 per cent. All these things taken into account would show, I think, that if my hon. friend wishes in this case to correct an error, which he is perfectly right in doing, he ought to do it in the other case, too. Aside from the merits of the question which were settled when the hon. gentleman brought down and carried that tariff through the House, there is the good faith with the manufacturers themselves. I would strongly recommend my hon. friend to carry out what was the intention of the department, and to make the rectification in the case of rubber belting as well as in this case. The correspondence shows, and the legislation shows, just how the error crept in, or at what stage it crept in. I suppose it was merely a clerical error.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think my hon. friend was not in the House yesterday when this matter was up.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think the error hardly occurred in the way the hon. gentleman mentioned. However, the substantial result was as he states, and as I stated yesterday. I would be very glad to consider the matter, though I am not able to give a definite answer at this moment. It may be still treated before the final stage is made. I will look very closely into it, and as the Minister of Customs has had it before him, with the information he has received and that which has been given to us in the House, I think we shall be able to give an answer within a day or two.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I would ask the Minister of Customs whether the resolution be-

fore the House has anything to do with regard to the application made by the Nova Scotia Steel Company for some changes in the bounty provisions for the industry of that company.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I am not sure what the hon. gentleman has in his mind. I do not know exactly to what he alludes.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I understand the Nova Scotia Steel Company put in an application for an extension of the time of the bunty with a view to going on with further works in the province. They are arranging for the building of extensive works in my constituency, but their construction will depend largely on the concessions granted. Does this Bill provide for the concessions asked? I understand several deputations from the company have been here during the present session. What does the Government propose to do?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I am aware that representations have been made to the Government on the subject. This Bill, however, simply deals with the amount of bounties due to certain companies. There has been some difference in this regard, and there are due to the Ferona Company, and one or two iron companies, a sum amounting altogether to $6,000. This Bill deals with that matter alone, and does not involve any extension of the principle of bounty.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I do not think the Ferona works got the full benefit of the term of five years.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This resolution covers the point. It was intended that the bounty and the change of duty should take effect at the same time. The tariff, however, took effect immediately it was adopted by the House, whereas the Bill respecting bounties took effect at the end of the session. There was therefore a period between the two dates and thus the company was placed at a disadvantage, and that is dealt with in this resolution.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Was there not a distinction in regard to bounties payable in respect of new industries and those which had already received bounties? For instance, the period was running in such a case as that of the Ferona Iron Works. The Hamilton Works would, of course, come in, and they were entitled to the bounty for a longer period than the Ferona Works.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Under the Act the bounty was applicable only to steel ingots made in Canada prior to April 23rd, 1902. The Act only extends to 1902 for any industry.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Under the original Act the bounty was for five years from the date of the starting of the furnace.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I regret to find the Government have not seen fit to grant to the people engaged in that great steel industry the concessions they ask, which I do not think are too great. They want the bounty to extend for a longer period of years, but at the same time they would be subject to reductions after a certain period, or after the period set out in the present Act. If the bounty regulations were not changed after a certain period, they would get no bounty and new works will not get much advantage. These people entered into negotiations for the starting of a large branch of their industry in the county of Cape Breton. The people of Sydney offered a bonus, I am informed, of $50,000. They also offered exemption from taxation for a long period of years, for twenty-five years or more, and were willing to make reasonable concessions in respect to land. These facts go to show the importance of the industry in the eyes of the people of that constituency. The advantages to be gained by establishing that industry in the county of Cape Breton are great, as the company will be able to get ore and coal cheaper, and thus make their business more profitable. Different ores are, however, required, and these can be obtained from Newfoundland, which the company are unable with equal convenience to do for their head works at Ferona. The coal industry, moreover, is not so prosperous as it should be. Not more than half the number of coal mines are open in Cape Breton to-day that were seven or eight years ago.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. How as to the output?

Mr. McDOUGALL. I quite agree that the output is increasing, but it does not come up to the rate of the former increase of the mines, owing to the manner in which the mines are operated at present, with the exception of the old Sydney mines which is not in the new organization. We have coal development carried on under very different circumstances now as compared with formerly. Where ten men were employed years ago, one man does the work and produces as large a quantity as the greater number; but the mines are not worked to their capacity, and therefore we call on the Government to encourage industries in the neighbourhood of the mines which will furnish a market for larger quantities of coal. The two best-producing mines in the county have closed down during the last twelve months, and all the people engaged are scattered throughout the province and many have left the country altogether.

Mr. SPEAKER. This is a motion simply to effect a change in the law making certain bounties retroactive. It is not a motion that opens up the general question of

bounties and dealing with coal lands, and I do not think a debate can be permitted on those subjects. The discussion has gone too far already, and it must be limited to the question dealt with in the motion.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I am ready to submit to your ruling, Mr. Speaker. In my opinion the resolution should be extended. If it provided that the bounty should be extended for a longer period than is provided in the original Act, it would cover the matter of which I complain. That is why it is that I took advantage of the opportunity to refer to this question and if, Mr. Speaker, you will not permit me, under the rules of the House, I shall have to submit.

Resolution considered in committee, reported, and read the second time, and concurred in.

BOUNTIES ON IRON AND STEEL.

Bill (No. 159) to amend the Act to provide for bounties on iron and steel made in Canada (Mr. Paterson) was read the first and second times, and reported.

COLD STORAGE—CONTRACTS WITH STEAMSHIP COMPANIES.

Bill (No. 149) to authorize certain contracts with steamship companies for cold storage accommodation, was read the second time, and the House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). I move to strike out the word "steamship" in the third line between the words "Manchester" and "liners." The company with which I am making this contract have changed their title by striking out the word "steamship."

Section amended.

Bill, as amended, reported.

GOVERNMENT OF THE YUKON DISTRICT.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton) moved second reading of Bill (No. 145)—from the Senate—to provide for the government of the Yukon district.

Mr. DAVIN. What is the explanation of this Bill?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The explanation can, perhaps, best be given by simply referring to the clauses. The Yukon District, comprising the territory north of the 60th parallel of latitude in the North-west Territories, and west of the watershed, was erected into a judicial district by a proclamation bearing date the 16th August, 1897. Section 2 of the Bill provides that this judicial district shall be separated from the North-west Territories, and constituted a separate territory under the name of the Yukon Territory. Section 3 provides for the appointment by the Governor in Council of a chief executive officer, to be called the Commissioner. The fourth section provides that the Commissioner shall administer the government of the territory under instructions from time to time given him by the Governor in Council or the Minister of the Interior. That follows the old North-west Territories Act. Section 5 provides that the Governor in Council may, by warrant, appoint a number of persons, not exceeding in the whole six, to act as a council with the Commissioner. Section 6 defines the legislative powers of the Commissioner in Council, following also the principle of the old North-west Territories Act, and gives the Commissioner in Council power to make ordinances for the government of the territory, the power being limited to the power that is exercised by the legislative assembly and the Lieutenant-Governor in Council of the North-west Territories. Section 7 provides for the forwarding of the ordinances to the Governor in Council, and for the power of disallowance.

Mr. FOSTER. Do the ordinances have the force of the law before they are reviewed by the Governor in Council?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. What was the objection to having all such ordinances reserved?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The delay. It was considered impossible in the old days in the North-west Territories to follow the other practice, and it would be still more so in this case. Section 8 is a copy of the provisions of the old North-west Territories Act, giving the Governor in Council the power to make ordinances for the peace, order, and good government of the territory. In the exercise of the power conferred upon the Governor in Council by that section, the Governor in Council would be exercising residuary jurisdiction over and above the jurisdiction possessed by the Commissioner in Council. The clause of the old North-west Territories Act is followed word for word in section 8. Section 9 provides that the laws relating to civil and criminal matters in the North-west Territories shall be the laws relating to civil and criminal matters in the Yukon district, except as they may be altered by competent authority hereafter. Section 10 provides for the constitution of the territorial court which will be established for the administration of justice. Sections 11, 12, 13, 14 and 15 also refer to the court. Section 16 provides that the Commissioner of the territory, each member of

the council, each judge, and each commissioned officer of the North-west Mounted Police, shall, ex-officio, possess the powers of one or two justices of the peace. Section 17 provides that no person shall be summoned or sworn as a juryman on any trial in the territorial court unless he is a British subject. Section 18 provides that every lock-up, guard-room, guard-house or place of confinement provided by or under the direction of the North-west Mounted Police force, or the regular military force, or municipal body, or by the commissioner or commissioner in council, shall be a penitentiary, jail, or place of confinement. Section 19 provides that all persons possessing the powers of two justices of the peace shall also possess the powers of coroners. Section 29 is an administrative provision, providing for the power of appointing officers for the administration of justice, and providing how they shall be paid. Section 21 provides that in case of the death of the commissioner the senior member of the council shall act as commissioner until his successor is appointed. The general scheme of the Bill is to adopt as far as possible the principles of the old North-west Territories Act. The only radical departure from that is, I think, that we have not provided for any elective members of the council. I think the House will agree with me that in bringing in a tentative measure for the Government of the district, until matters become more settled. and we know more about what kind of a community we shall have to govern, it would be extremely foolish to undertake to provide for a system of popular representation, especially as all the information we possess goes to show that perhaps nine out of every ten persons in the district are aliens, totally unacquainted with our method of representation, and the population will in all probability be a very nomadic character, at least for the present. It is intended to be a tentative measure, to clothe the Government with power to maintain order and administer the country for a year or two until we shall have a better opportunity of knowing what kind of a community we shall have to provide laws for. As a matter of course, if a permanent population establishes itself in the district, some representative system similar in principle to what was given to the North-west Territories will have to be provided later on.

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. gentleman makes a deviation from the old North-west Territories Act that he has not mentioned. The clause in the old North-west Territories Act corresponding to section 5 here, not merely provided for the number of councillors, but provided that certain persons should be ex-officio members. I do not know that it is a very important detail; but this clause gives the appointment to the Governor in Council, which means practically the Minister of the Interior, whereas the corresponding clause in the North-west Territories Act of 1875 provided for five councillors, including ex-officio three stipendiary magistrates. I have carefully read the Bill, and I consider that it meets the needs of the Yukon district pretty well. But I would ask the hon. gentleman to consider whether it would not be well, for instance, to make the judge and one or more magistrates ex-officio members of this council. In instituting a Government for the Yukon district, the hon. gentleman has a great advantage that was not possessed by the Government of Canada in framing the original Act for the government of the North-west Territories; because he is able to apply to the Yukon district the body of carefully considered law which now exists in the Territories. Nevertheless, I think it would be well for the hon. gentleman to consider whether it is desirable for him to keep in his hands the power to appoint every member of the council. I saw that it was suggested in another place that the Government ought to give some guarantee that the miners would be represented. I am strongly inclined to leave this question entirely to the Government. I do not think, from what we know of the workings of the old council, that it would be very advantageous to put in a clause that would enable miners to elect a man to the council. When the time comes to introduce those elective element into the council governing the Yukon, I hope there will be a possibility of making arrangements that will work better although I think that the transitional method of government in the North-west Territories worked pretty well. Still, there were inconveniences connected with it, and I believe that with the experience of the past, the hon. gentleman, if he wanted to legislate on that particular phase of the government of the new territory, would be able to make a marked improvement. So far as I have been able to study the Bill, it seems to me, with this qualification, to meet the needs of the situation, but I think it would be an advantage if the hon. gentleman would, in committee, change this 5th section so as to have two or three persons who would be ex-officio members of the council because of their position. Even that will minimize the autocratic position of the Commissioner, which is very desirable. Suppose we were to pass the Bill as it is, what will happen? The power of appointing these six persons will be entirely in the hands of the Government, which means absolutely in the hands of the Commissioner, because the Government will appoint those he recommends, or if they do not, will be declaring a want of confidence in their representative, in whom they must have entire confidence, if he is efficiently to govern that country. In the past those men who were ex-officio members of the council were independent of the Lieutenant-Governor, and they were thus

in a position to give him better advice than if they were absolutely his creatures.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I quite admit the desirability of providing that permanent officers of the Government might be ex-officio members of the council, but the difficulty is that these officers are likely to be very busily engaged, and possibly might not be able to give any time, for the first little while at any rate, to the discharge of the duties of members of the council. There is also the difficulty of the extreme slowness of communication, which makes it necessary to have the members of the council stationed in the one place for a considerable length of time, so that they will be able to transact expeditiously the enormous amount of work they will have to do. There are about 40,000 people in the district now, and it is possible that there will be 50,000 or 60,000 there before the winter, and the amount of work which the council will have to do in preparing municipal and other regulations will be very great, and I thought it would be hardly fair to impose the necessity of attending the sessions of the council on officers engaged in very important judicial or administrative duties. I will go this far, however, in the way of meeting the hon. gentleman's suggestion. I will provide that judges of the court may be designated as ex-officio members of the council, but would not be prepared to include any other officers of the Government.

Mr. DAVIN. Does my hon. friend mean that there will be an enormous amount of work for the judicial and other officers of the Government or for the council?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I think there will be an enormous amount of work for both just at the beginning. I have no doubt that the judge who is there now will be for the first year very much overworked. My information is that there was a very large number of cases waiting for trial when he got these, because there was some difficulty in having them proceeded with through there being no means of putting them in shape for trial. As to the duties of the council, practically everything has to be done. Municipal and sanitary regulations and all the other little things that will turn up in a totally new community, where everything has to be done in a hurry, will take up all their time, and members of the council will have their ability and energy taxed to the utmost.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time and the House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 5,

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I move that the following be inserted as subsection 2:—

Each judge of the court shall be ex-officio a member of the council; but the total number of council, including the judge or judges, shall not exceed six.

Amendment agreed to.

On section 18,

Mr. FOSTER. What does the Minister mean by "policy" of the penitentiary in subsection 2?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I followed exactly the provision of the old Act. I do not think it extends the meaning at all.

Bill, as amended, reported.

JUDGES OF PROVINCIAL COURTS.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick) moved second reading of Bill (No. 150) further to amend the Act respecting the Judges of Provincial Courts.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. If it would suit the convenience of the Government, I should be glad if they would take up some other order in the meantime. I have said all I wish to say on the subject myself, but the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) desires to speak on this subject. He happens to be out of the Chamber at this moment. Could this order be postponed until this afternoon? Or could this stage be taken now and the committee stage left until the afternoon?

Mr. DAVIN. Before the Bill is read the second time, I desire to say that there is no provision in it for ameliorating the condition of the judiciary in Manitoba and the North-west Territories.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. There is a provision respecting the judge in Manitoba. I would refer the hon. member (Mr. Davin) to section 7.

Mr. DAVIN. I confess that I only judge by the resolutions, not having had an opportunity to read the Bill. We have five judges in the Territories. But, though the expense of living in that country is far higher than in any other part of Canada, these judges are paid only $4,000 a year apiece. Long ago it was understood by the members coming from the Territories that provision would be made for a chief. It is very desirable, when you have five judges, that you should have a chief. We have a senior judge who has all the work of a chief thrown upon him, and yet he has neither the salary nor the dignity of a chief. I think it is not treating the Territories well, when a change like this is made to leave this bench without the dignity that belongs to the bench in other parts of Canada, and

without emoluments suitable to their position.

We ought to take into account the cost of living and the large amount of work they have to do, and the very least they should have is $5,000 a year. Under any circumstances, we should have the senior judge elevated to the position of chief justice. It is due to the Territories, it is due to his long service, and an additional thousand a year is well earned by him. I must say that in my opinion we ought to record a protest against the great addition to the cost of judicial administration in this country provided for by this Bill. Especially did it strike me in hearing the opinions of hon. gentlemen from Quebec, on both sides of politics, and gentlemen whose fitness to express an opinion on such a subject is undoubted. They state that in that province there is a large portion of it where there are a great many more judges than are necessary, though in other portions of the province we are told that judges have quite enough to do, and that in Montreal they are overworked. I think the Government should withdraw this Bill, and next year bring in one dealing justly with the judiciary all over the country, if necessary, to raise the incomes of those judges in Quebec, and most certainly in parts of the country where living is much more expensive. But what can we think of a measure brought in by a Government pledged to economy, which adds enormously to the cost of judicial administration in the province of Quebec, when we have it in evidence that that province is over-manned with judges, and that those judges are over-weighted with the amount of leisure on their hands? Sir, it is a monstrous thing for any Government to do, but it is especially monstrous for a Government of economy. I will not move the six months' hoist to this Bill; there is too strong a majority of economists opposing it.

Mr. COCHRANE. Mr. Cameron is not there.

Mr. DAVIN. Of course, the hon. member for North Huron (Mr. Cameron), who was my friend, is now also my king, and I must not speak evil of dignities, but bow to the ruler of those vast Territories. I see before me still many economists; I see that the "Sun" newspaper of Toronto especially goes in for economy, and pats the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) on the back, calls him its white-headed, economical boy for the remarks he made on the resolution on which this Bill is founded. I will throw out a challenge to that hon. gentleman. If he will move the six months' hoist, I will support him, or if he will second the motion, I will move a six months' hoist, and I think, with aid from both sides of the House, we may be able to make a break, and stay a little the extravagant down-hill course of this Government. Anyway, I protest against this Bill. I say if you are going to have this legislation, behave justly, and remunerate the judges of the North-west Territories properly, because, according to the schedule of remuneration given here, they are not remunerated properly. Deal with this question in a comprehensive way, take back your Bill, and reorganize the judicial districts in Quebec. Don't let this country have the spectacle of such a scandal, for it is nothing else, as we see in this House, members rising up in their places and telling us that half the judiciary of Quebec have not enough to do, and yet we are adding to the expenditure, raising the salaries, increasing the number of judges with the highest salaries. I must say it is done with a very light heart. I must compliment the Government in that they are able to face anything like this, any extravagance, any tergiversation, with a smiling countenance, and with apparent confidence that the people will bear with it. If the people bear with it, the hon. gentlemen will have a certain amount of justification; but it seems to me that I see the handwriting on the wall, and that the day of reckoning may be much nearer than hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches imagine.

Mr. FOSTER. I am opposed to this Bill from start to finish, and I propose briefly to give the reasons why. I will qualify that statement by saying that I do not mean that in many cases we are paying our judges too much, but on the other hand, we are paying many of them too little. Whilst it is true that the salaries of many of our judges are not sufficient, I believe that it is incontrovertibly true that the amount of money that goes out of the public chest for the administration of justice, is quite enough, if not too much—that is the position I take. I will appeal to the inner sense of my hon. friend the Solicitor General, if he will not, if he makes an honest statement in this House—and I am sure he would make no other, if he felt it were politic to do it, if he were not restrained from doing it—if he would not say that in the provinces of this Dominion too much is paid for the justice that is administered, and that the crying want is reorganization and a redistribution instead of further squandering the public funds in the administration of justice. What are we paying for the administration of justice? We are payng out of Consolidated Revenue, $98,375, and we are making payments authorized by statute of $694,400, a total of $792,775. We are crawling closely up to a million dollars for salaries of judges and allowances of judges in this country. I take it upon myself to state in this House that in province after province judges are falling over each other in their numbers, and they are not all doing an honest year's work for the wage they are get-

ting, not because the judges are not good men, but because they are too numerous, they are badly distributed. I am not going to except my own province when I make that statement. Any business or legal man will tell you that in many of the provinces a redistribution would give a better apportionment of the work and more money to do it, and it would leave this Parliament and the country in a position to pay judges what they ought to receive for the high services they render. What sums are we paying at the present time? In the Supreme Court there are six judges receiving salaries amounting to $43,000 and a registrar at $2,600, giving a total of $45,600. There is the Exchequer Court with one judge at $6,000, six local admiralty judges, now attached to the Exchequer Court, at total salaries of $6,400, a registrar at $2,000, making a total of $14,200. In Ontario high courts there are fifteen judges with salaries of $79,000, and 64 county judges with salaries of $142,300; there are allowances to the high court judges of $13,000, and allowances for the county court judges of $12,800, or together in salaries $221,300, and in allowances $25,800 for the judges in Ontario. Next we come to the province of Quebec, and in that province they are all high court judges. There are 37 high court judges, getting salaries of $170,000. In Ontario the total salaries of the high court judges and the county court judges amount to $221,300. In Quebec the country has to pay 37 high court judges $170,000 in salary and $16,000 for allowances. In Nova Scotia there are seven high court judges with salaries of $29,000 and six county court judges receiving $16,400, and travelling allowances $1,400, making $45,400, with allowances of $4,000 for the high court judges. In New Brunswick there are six high court judges, with salaries of $25,000, and six county court judges with salaries of $15,000, making for salaries $40,000 and allowances $4,000 for high court judges, and $1,200 for the other judges. With great modesty, but yet holding an opinion on the subject, and knowing that we have good judges in New Brunswick, I may express my honest belief that half of the judges could do the work of the province. If that proposition holds with regard to New Brunswick, I believe it also holds with respect to Quebec and many of the other provinces. In Manitoba there are four high court judges and five county court judges, the former receiving in salaries $17,000 and the latter $14,000, or a total of $31,000. In British Columbia there are five high court judges, receiving in the aggregate $31,000 for salaries, and five county court judges receiving $12,000 for salaries, or a total payment for salaries of $33,000. In Prince Edward Island there are three high court judges, receiving in salaries $10,400, there are three county court judges, receiving in salaries $7,200, making a total of $17,600, and allowances amounting to $600. In the North-west Territories there are five high court judges with salaries aggregating $20,000, five sheriffs with salaries of $2,500, making a total of $22,500. So in Canada we have 178 judges, two registrars and five sheriffs to whom a total amount is paid in salaries of $640,800, and allowances paid under statute $53,000. In the amount to be voted this year there are also some allowances and I had not taken into consideration this statement.

I want to emphasize my opinion as a layman in contradistinction to the doctrine set forth by the hon. Prime Minister, that this Parliament is reduced to the position that the opinion of a province must prevail with respect to the judges and judiciary of that province. I hold it true that the legislative authority which does not have to provide the money is never the safest kind of power to be absolute in the arrangements it may make whilst another legislative power provides the funds and assumes the responsibility. I must stand in opposition to that position and as being in accord with the hon. Solicitor General when I say it is the bounden duty of this Parliament to check the extravagance of provincial legislatures, pushed by party followers seeking high office, for with this temptation before them they can provide positions at the expense of the public funds of the Dominion and reward party men. The legislature of Quebec, and I take that province as an example, knowing as well as it knows the necessity that the judicial system of the province is crying out for reorganization, yet in the face of that cry, and every business man in the province is conversant with it. The provincial authorities are creating new judgeships. And yet the right hon. First Minister comes here and announces the doctrine: Make all the judgeships you like, reward all your party friends; we are the superior power, but we will humbly bow to your decision and ask the taxpayers of the Dominion to pay the salaries. Stated in plain English, that is the position which the Prime Minister takes, and he is the first Prime Minister who has taken it, and I doubt whether any Prime Minister after his time will assume his position. The Prime Minister himself, if he knows anything about judicial matters in the province, as he unquestionably does, knows there is a crying need for reorganization. How is the right hon. gentleman helping the movement along? By building buttresses and bulwarks straight across the path of any one who wants to reform the judiciary. He is placing vested interests in the province of Quebec or any other province as a bulwark against the effort of any man who wishes to reform it; he is adding to the public expenditure and is adding an unnecessary number of judges and is placing most effective obstacles in the way of reforming the judicial system in the different provinces. I have stated that there was good ground for saying that

in order to get the best judges it is found difficult with the salaries at the command of the Government to take able lawyers from active practice and put them on the bench. I grant that. I think, however, it may prove true that sometimes the best lawyer does not make the best judge on the bench, and we have a very good class of judges in this country for the salaries we are paying, and I doubt whether if we paid $1,000, $2,000 or even $3,000 more it would be sufficient to take the first-class men and the most prosperous and popular lawyers from the firms with which they are connected and place them on the bench. At the same time I am willing to state that my conviction is that we might pay more in salaries to the judges. But, so long as I have a seat in Parliament I will oppose the paying of more salaries to the judges of this country, until we first reorganize the judicial system and put it upon a basis which is reasonable. We cannot do it, says my right hon. friend; no, we cannot in a way, but we can in another way, and at least what we can do is to strengthen the hands of those in the provincial legislatures who recognize the evil and wish to cure it. But I say to my right hon. friend that he will never accomplish it by making the doctrine current throughout the country, that we are just here for the purpose, in this respect, of registering the decrees of the provincial legislatures, and by additional judges and additional salaries blocking the efforts for reform and reorganization. I do not want to say anything harsh with reference to the judges. They are men like the rest of us. The judiciary of this country, on the whole, I believe, stands high. We ought to pay them well for the work they do, and we can do that by the money that we now pay if we only had a proper system of distribution. I think when we come to the conclusion written on our estimates that $800,000 of the people's money goes for salaries of judges and allowances, we are paying quite sufficient. If we have not a proper distribution, let us use influence to get it. My right hon. friend can use his influence with the provincial legislatures when he wants to. He can do it in Quebec when he likes, he can do it in Manitoba; he says he will do it in certain important respects. My right hon. friend is now all-powerful in the province of Quebec. How great the impetus he could give to the reorganization of the judicial system in that province were he to use his personal and public influence in that direction. I am certain that my hon. friend, the Solicitor General, would hold up both hands for the reorganization of the judicial system in the province of Quebec, and while I am speaking of that province. I speak of it because it has been brought up, and not because I am singling out the province of Quebec in any respect. I do not want to take up the time of the House further, but there are my views and that is why I am opposed to the Bill.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) expressed considerable doubt as to the opinion entertained by the Prime Minister, and he said it was not to his knowledge that any other Prime Minister had ever asserted in this House such an opinion.

Mr. FOSTER. Not so extreme an opinion.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I will read for my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) the opinion expressed by Sir John Macdonald in 1880 in connection with the appointment of Supreme Court judges in British Columbia, and it will be found at page 119 of the Commons Debates for that year:

> The burden of administration of justice is thrown on the provincial legislatures; and when such powers are given them exclusively, we having no right to interfere with their powers, it is assuming a very great responsibility for us to say: Although you declare certain judges are wanted, and have passed an Act constituting a particular court, we refuse you the means required to carry that policy into effect. I quite understand we are not obliged to grant salaries, and, if it was proved to the consciousness of the House that beyond a doubt the legislature of any province had made appointments solely for the purpose of creating new offices, and getting the advantage of them in the expenditure of the salaries, we shall be justified, on reasonable evidence that that was the design of the legislature, in refusing to gratify that wish and motive. But it is not suggested here that that is the case.

That is exactly what the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) said.

The PRIME MINISTER. Hear, hear.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Let me deal with this Bill in detail. In the first place, so far as the number of judges in the province of Quebec is concerned, I venture to make the statement that to some extent the number might be reduced, but in order to enable us to do that it would be absolutely necessary to reorganize our entire judicial system. That reorganization, as we know, can only be carried out by the local legislatures. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) said that the present Prime Minister has great influence in the province of Quebec, and that by a judicious exercise of that influence, he might bring about a better condition of things there. Let me point out what has occurred. In the province of Quebec a few years ago we had one of the strongest Governments in point of majority we have had for many years, namely the deBoucherville Government, afterward succeeded by the Taillon Government. In that Government the present hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) was the Attorney General. He introduced a Bill for the purpose of reorganizing and redistributing the judicial districts in our province, and notwithstanding that the Government introduced the Bill through their Attorney General, and had a majority of from 25 to 28 supporters, the Bill never got beyond the second reading, and the Bill had to be withdrawn. The

reason was that in our province the people are wedded to their judicial system. We have got what is known as a decentralization system; the judges have districts assigned to them and they are supposed to reside in their districts. I am prepared to admit that in some cases two of these districts might be merged into one, and if the judges resided in their districts as the law requires them to do we would then have an ideal system in the province of Quebec. The judge of the high court in our province is called upon to administer justice in a case in which the sum of $1 is involved, just as in a case where there is a million dollars involved. He may be called upon to try petty larceny where the amount involved would be 5 cents, and also at the same assizes try a case of murder. The range of their duties are greater than is the range of the duties of the judges in the other provinces. They are called upon to perform more important duties, and I think upon the whole we may safely say, if I eliminate the question of the travelling expenses, that we have in the province of Quebec a number of judges of whom any province might well be proud.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The whole trouble in our province arises from the fact that a system has grown up; a system for which this Government is not responsible—and I think it proper to draw the attention of the House to the fact that when we are called upon to account for this enormous expenditure that is going on in the administration of justice, up to the present time there has not been any increase for which this Government is responsible. We had to take the condition of things which we found in existence, and dealing with that condition of things; how are we going to remedy it? The only remedy that is within our power as a Federal Parliament to apply and can apply is with regard to the travelling expenses. That is the only thing we can remedy, and we intend to remedy that. My hon. friend from West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) made his whole attack on this Bill from the standpoint of the province of Quebec, and he spoke of the increased expenditure that would be involved so far as that province is concerned, if we pass this Bill. I draw the attention of hon. gentlemen to the fact, that the whole expenditure, so far as Quebec is concerned, resulting from the adoption of this Bill will be about $7,000, and if the Bill is applied, as I think it should be applied, the result will be a saving instead of an increase, because of the change that this law will bring about in connection with the travelling expenses. The only two judges we are called upon to appoint in Quebec is a judge for the district of St. Francis and an additional judge for the Superior Court in Montreal. Now, the appointment of a judge in the St. Francis district is not the result of legislation for which we are responsible. It is the result of legislation introduced into the local legislature by my hon. friend from Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain), by a former Conservative Government in the province. It is not legislation that I blame, I say it was necessary, and I am prepared to justify that legislation. But when the friends of my hon. friends opposite introduced that legislation they made it necessary for us to do this, and hon. gentlemen have got to remember that not only was the legislation introduced into the local Parliament by the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain), but that in the session of this Parliament in 1896 the then Minister of Justice (Mr. Dickey) introduced a resolution to provide for the salary of this judge.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). Was that concurred in by my hon. friend (Mr. Foster)?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes, it was necessarily concurred in by hon. gentlemen opposite. Now, Sir, under these circumstances it seems to me we cannot be held to too strict account for our action in connection with this. I can point my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) to the correspondence that took place at that time between the then hon. member for Sherbrooke, then Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Ives) and the Department of Justice. Mr. Ives asked that this judge should be appointed and Mr. Dickey moved that provision should be made for his salary, and provision was made so far as it was possible to provide in that session, by the introduction of the resolution.

Under these circumstances it seems to me hardly fair that we should be so closely criticised by the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster). While I agree with him in much of what he has said, I cannot agree with him in holding this Government exclusively responsible for that appointment. The appointment was a necessity. There are three important districts in our province—the district of Quebec, the district of Montreal and the district of Sherbrooke. The district of Sherbrooke is one of the most important districts in our province, and the judge of that district is overworked. The late Judge Brooks, a gentleman well known in this House, for he was for many years the member for Sherbrooke, was on the bench for several years, and I venture to say it was by reason of the arduous nature of the duties he had to perform as a judge that his health gave way and he came to a premature end. He first resigned, and a short time afterwards he died. To my personal knowledge he was overworked. We now have Mr. Justice White, a man who is eminently qualified for the position he fills; and I have received letters from him asking me to have an additional judge appointed for that district, because it is impossible for

him adequately to perform the duties assigned to him. Then, take the district of Montreal. I venture to make this statement, that there is more business done in Montreal than there is in the whole province of Ontario. If my hon. friends will look at the list of cases before the Supreme Court, they will find that in the last three terms of that court there have been more cases from the province of Quebec than from all the other provinces put together.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think that is only latterly, not usually.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I say for the last three terms, notwithstanding the fact that from the province of New Brunswick any case may be brought involving $200 and from the province of Ontario any case involving $1,000, while from the province of Quebec only cases involving over $2,000 may be brought. The whole difficulty in the province of Quebec arises out of the unfortunate habit contracted by our judges of charging travelling expenses to which they were not fairly entitled.

Mr. FOSTER. How does that affect the distribution?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. In this way, that if our judicial system were carried out in the spirit as well as in the letter, each judge would reside in his own district, and he would not have any travelling expenses.

Mr. BERGERON. Suppose he has nothing to do?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Then the district should be abolished. The hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) knows that one of the strongest governments we ever had in Quebec—I mean strong in its majority—tried to change the system, and they could not get their Bill beyond the second reading. They dare not submit it to the test of the House.

Mr. BERGERON. My hon. friend knows why.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Because our people are so thoroughly imbued with the idea that they must have the paraphernalia of justice under their eyes.

Mr. FOSTER. But you take away from them the paraphernalia of justice by not keeping the judge in his district.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. That is what we want to provide against by this Bill. We say that the judge shall not leave his district at his own sweet will or without the consent of the chief justice.

Mr. FOSTER. It is awfully hard on the judges.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. It may be, but it is absolutely necessary.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It is destroying their usefulness.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. It is not, because the chief justice of the court should have control over his puisne judges, and should know what they are doing. The chief justice is responsible for the proper administration of justice by his court in the province; and we say that he shall determine when a judge shall leave one district and go to another, and the judges will not be free to do so at their own sweet will. We have expended in the province annually about $21,000 for circuit allowances; this year we ask for only $16,000, and we hope to keep well within that mark; and as an additional expenditure there will be $4,000 for the district judge in Sherbrooke and $3,000 for the circuit court judge in Montreal. The additional judge for the Sherbrooke district is a necessity to which my hon. friends are committed, for they went as far as they could to make the appointment. We say that we shall so control the expenditure for circuit allowances that the public exchequer will not suffer from the appointment of these two additional judges for the province of Quebec. We have also to deal with certain judges of the province of Ontario, and it is very strange that with the exception of the remarks of the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster), we have not heard a word against the increase in that province, although it amounts to $7,200 as against $7,000 for the province of Quebec. I do not make any complaint that we are not blamed for that increase, but I want to explain the reason of it. In the province of Ontario, the county court judges and the junior judges must have the same qualifications; yet the county court judge, after I think three years service, is entitled to $2,400, in addition to which he has all the surrogate fees and the other emoluments attaching to his office. The junior judge, on the other hand, though required to have the same qualifications and to perform the same duties, is required, in addition to the duties assigned to the county court judge, to attend the division court. What is the result? In the province of Ontario last year only 357 cases were tried in the county courts, whereas in the division courts, presided over by the junior judges, 52,204 cases were tried. The junior judge has to do all the travelling, and to incur an expenditure far in excess of the amount allowed him, and gets $2,000 a year, whereas the county court judge gets $2,400, and the fees I have mentioned. It seems to me that there is no justification for continuing that state of things. The hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) seemed to take rather a curious stand when he referred to the increased expenditure involved by this Bill in the province of Quebec, and at the same time asked that there should be an increased expenditure for Manitoba and the

North-west Territories. It does not seem to me that his position is quite logical.

Mr. FOSTER. That is like your protection position.

Mr. DAVIN. No, I repudiate that. My position is perfectly logical.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I have no doubt it is quite logical, but it does not appear so to the ordinary mind.

Mr. FOSTER. That is the fault of the ordinary mind.

Mr. DAVIN. The ordinary judicial mind.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I am very much pleased indeed that there has been some discussion in this House on this question of judges, because I have to go before the judges every day of my life when away from here, and therefore have to be a little careful in what I say about them. Still, I feel that it is proper—speaking now entirely of my own province, for I know little about administration of justice in other provinces—that the judges should understand that those who pay them expect to receive a fair return for their money, and it is proper they should know that the eyes of Parliament are upon them, and that they who are called upon to administer justice do not stand aloof from this Dominion and are not above criticism and may expect in the future to be criticised as they have been this session. Honest, just and fair criticism is as necessary to the proper administration of justice as to anything else.

The total expenditure resulting from this legislation will amount to $26,900.

Additional judges in Court of Appeal.	$5,000
Increase to one judge in the province of Quebec (Judge Taschereau).....	1,000
Additional puisné judge for the St. Francis district, province of Quebec.	4,000
Additional judge, Circuit Court, Montreal	3,000
Judge of the Yukon district.....	4,000
Junior judges, Ontario, 18 at $400....	7,200
County Court judge for Halifax.....	600
County Court judge, Queen's, P.E.I...	600

Mr. FOSTER. What is the salary of the Halifax and Charlottetown judges?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. It was $2,400, and will now be $3,000, and that will make their salary the same as that of the county court judge of St. John, N.B.

District judges, Ontario, additional amount for travelling expenses....	$500

They used to be allowed but $100.

Five additional judges at $300 each..	$1,500

Mr. FOSTER. Is the jurisdiction of that county court in Prince Edward Island over the island?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). Over the county and city.

Mr. FITZPATRICK.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Has the Solicitor General had recently any correspondence with the Attorney General of Ontario as regards the question of junior judges? He is perhaps aware that some time ago an Act was passed by the Ontario legislature asking that the appointments of these judges should be restricted very much, and the hon. gentleman knows that afterwards, when his right hon. leader formed his Government, that Act was repealed, just adding to the convenience of hon. gentlemen in power.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I do not quite appreciate the force of my hon. friend's remark, but I would draw attention to this fact, that there are only twenty county civil judges in Ontario, and that two vacancies were not filled there—in Ontario and Waterloo—because the requirements of the statute as to population are not met in those counties. This shows that we are endeavouring to stick as close to the law as we can. So far as the judge of the Court of Appeals of Ontario is concerned, the Act 60 Victoria, chapter 13, passed the session before last, provides that the Court of Appeal of Ontario shall consist of the chief justice and four other justices; and that appeals from the decisions of the divisional courts on matters affecting controverted elections shall be brought before five judges, so that the court was absolutely blocked by the additional judge not being appointed.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The same legislature which made the block has the appointment of the judge.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I do not mean to say that that is the case, but to a perverted mind it would appear so.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It is not a charitable suspicion.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I might point out to the hon. gentleman, now that he has come back to the fold, and become again one of us, that a court of appeal consisting of four judges is very unsatisfactory.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That court has worked well, and I understand is a very satisfactory court.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. No doubt; but a case recently came before them, in which there were two judges against two, and that is not satisfactory. As a rule, the judges of the Court of Appeal of Ontario are men of the highest standing, and it is one of the courts which is held in the highest respect, but I do not know of any other country in which a court of appeal consisting of four judges is satisfactory.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. One or two subjects have excited considerable interest. For instance, the hon. Soli-

citor General suggested that it was curious that so much had been said about the Superior Court judges of the province of Quebec and so little about the county court judges of the other provinces. The reason, I take it, is this. This Bill does not propose to increase the number of county court judges in Ontario, and there is no statement with regard to those like the one I read to the committee, when considering the resolution on which this Bill is founded, and that was the opinion of the Attorney General of the province of Quebec, who said that they already had more than sufficient judges in that province now, but the trouble was the reorganization or the question of the redistribution of work. Take, for instance, that sentence to which I attach tremendous importance, and which will be sufficient until met by a specific statement:

> At least in a dozen districts there are judges who have not more than three months' work a year, while in the district of Montreal, and so on.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. This Bill, which makes it necessary to appoint a judge for the district of St. Francis, was passed when my hon. friend opposite, the member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) was Attorney General of the province of Quebec, and it is at his request that the resolution was introduced.

Mr. BERGERON. Does my hon. friend mean to say that Mr. Casgrain asked for the appointment of a new judge or simply for the appointment of another judge at Sherbrooke, to be taken from one of the other judges?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. A new man entirely.

Mr. BERGERON. I do not believe that.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Read the statute, and then perhaps you will believe it.

Mr. BERGERON. When the hon. member for Montmorency is here he may explain it himself.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I do not care whether Mr. Casgrain represented a Conservative or a Liberal Government in the province of Quebec, the fact is that the Attorney General of Quebec endeavoured to meet the abuse which has grown up there, and which is due to the fact that there it has been allowed to exist, and that around it the affections of the people have grown and all that kind of thing. If you go on adding to that system, of course no Attorney General of Quebec will find it an easy thing to reduce the expenditure of federal money in that province. Then, the right hon. Prime Minister particularly—for he has not the support of the Solicitor General in that view—attempted to come to the rescue and said that unless there was a case of fraud proved on the part of the local legislature of Quebec, it was the duty of this Government to shut its eyes to extravagance in the number of justices. We have nothing to do with whether they are required or not. The local legislature creates the judgeship and our duty is clear—it is simply to supply the money. And the Solicitor General's main argument is that Sir John Macdonald on one occasion said so in this House. But that speech of Sir John Macdonald was made, curiously enough, when the leader of the present Government and Mr. Blake were strongly opposing the Bill introduced by Sir John's Government to provide salaries for additional judges. These gentlemen then opposed in a most vigorous manner the proposition of the Government. Proof was given as to the necessity for the provision of these salaries. The Senate on that occasion, I think, threw out the Bill altogether.

Mr. SPEAKER. As we have to adjourn at one o'clock, perhaps the hon. member (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) will move the adjournment of the debate.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 1 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Second Sitting.

THURSDAY, 2nd June, 1898.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

BOUNDARIES OF THE PROVINCE OF QUEBEC.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 160) respecting the boundaries of the province of Quebec. He said: The Bill is for the purpose of ratifying a conventional boundary on the north and north-east of the province of Quebec, which was agreed upon between the Government of the province of Quebec and the Government of the Dominion, and ratified by an Order in

Council of this Government, under date of the 8th of July, 1896. The Bill is not yet drafted, and I ask the indulgence of the House to introduce it in blank.

Mr. SPROULE. Is not that somewhat unusual, to allow a Bill to be introduced without presenting any Bill?

Mr. SPEAKER. It can only be done with the consent of the House.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The Bill is merely formal, the subject is well known. Of course, if the hon. gentleman takes objection, it cannot be introduced.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not wish to object.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 159) to amend the Act to provide for bounties on iron and steel made in Canada.—(Mr. Fielding.)

Bill (No. 149) to authorize certain contracts with steamship companies for cold storage accommodation.—(Sir Louis Davies.)

Bill (No. 154) to provide for the government of the Yukon district.—(Mr. Sifton.)

JUDGES OF PROVINCIAL COURTS.

The House resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Fitzpatrick for second reading of Bill (No. 150) further to amend the Act respecting the judges of the provincial courts.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It is a very bold thing, perhaps, to enter at this moment upon an argument at any length touching this measure, but there are one or two references I have to make to fortify the position I took in connection with this subject. The argument is much relied on by hon. gentlemen opposite that there is absence, so to speak, of responsibility on the part of the Government in connection with the proposition for the increase of the judiciary in the different provinces, and I think neither the right hon. leader of the Government nor the Solicitor General in their references to the argument used by Sir John Macdonald presented the case as fairly as the facts required. For instance, the position taken by him on that occasion was really taken by several, and he did not content himself with stating that the duty here was perfunctory when an increase of the judiciary took place requiring us to provide a salary; but he used that argument among others to this extent only—and I quote only a short portion of his speech on that occasion:

> As a general rule, I think we may safely trust to the discretion of the provincial legislatures in this regard.

Mr. SIFTON.

1880 is a long time ago. Between 1867 and 1880 these increases in the number of judges had not reached anything like the increases that we are now face to face with in 1897. But the present Minister of Justice did not so construe the language of Sir John Macdonald in 1880, to which reference has been so often made, because, speaking of that debate on another occasion, the present Minister of Justice said:

> Certainly, when county courts were wanted in Nova Scotia he (Sir John A. Macdonald) did not take exactly the same view as to the functions and duty of the House in the appointment of judges, and in providing for their salaries, as on the present occasion. I remember that, then, the friends of the hon. gentleman in the other House rejected the proposal to provide for the payment of the judges in a court which the people of Nova Scotia though necessary for the due administration of justice.

Constantly from 1867 down to the time the present Liberal Administration came into power, their leading men, including their Minister of Justice, and their Minister of Justice in the preceding Liberal Administration, Mr. Blake, and their leader, Mr. Mackenzie, supported always, and notably by the Prime Minister of the present day, by the Minister of Trade and Commerce himself, all took the line that it was the bounden duty of this Parliament to check any approach at extravagance in regard to the appointment of judges by the local legislatures. When they rely upon that one argument used by Sir John A. Macdonald when he laid it down as a general rule that we should trust to the discretion of the local legislatures, they have the satisfaction of knowing that from 1880 down to the day of his death, Sir John A. Macdonald never used that argument, never proceeded upon that theory, but he and every Minister of Justice who succeeded him, and notably in the case of Sir John Thompson, not only pursued the other line of investigating and examining all the cases which were brought up, but he explained to Parliament, without demur, with opposition on the part of the right hon. leader of the present Government, with the consent of this House, with the approval of this House, he explained why they had not appointed judges created by the provincial legislatures, notably, for instance, in the case of British Columbia, where years were allowed to elapse, and the excuse for delay given by Sir John Thompson, without any expression of disapproval from a single member of Parliament, was that there had not been, in his opinion, any reason for the appointment until he came down and asked for a resolution to authorize the introduction of a Bill to provide for the salary. So that with the exception of that little discussion in 1880, there is not an argument to support the present view thrown out from the Treasury benches as to the perfunctory duty on the part of the federal legislature in

providing salaries. No appointments were made, but on the contrary the practice has been consistent until the accession of the present Administration to power, of carefully examining the why and the wherefore, the reason and the necessity, and the conditions existing, before coming to this House and asking for an additional appropriation.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Did not Mr. Dickey make that investigation ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I am coming to that argument, the last weak prop on which the hon. gentleman landed. He found that Mr. Dickey had introduced a resolution, and I will deal with that point before I sit down. I have shown how strongly the view I have expressed has been entertained and has been regarded as the consistent view of Parliament, how it has been supported by the Liberal party before the present day ; but at the present time or in the present era of their history hon. gentlemen opposite seem not merely to abandon their promises, but the traditions of their party are treated with the utmost contempt. For instance, Mr. Blake, in 1887, is reported as saying :

He did not think it in the public interest at that time, without further complaint of the inefficiency of the administration of the law, to appoint another judge.

Mr. Blake made that statement in reply to Sir John Macdonald, and it was made on 19th February, 1877. When Mr. Mackenzie was leading the Liberal party, he on another occasion said he desired to know if the Government considered the demand from the legislature of British Columbia a proper and reasonable one. There had been a Bill reorganizing the judiciary in the very early days of confederation in the province of British Columbia, and Sir John Macdonald came down to this House to ask for the necessary provision to make the reorganization effective. Mr. Mackenzie said he did not think that because the local government had power to create courts, we had nothing to do but fill those vacancies as soon as they were created. Speaking on the subject at some length, he said later on :

This House should not agree to a proposition of this sort merely because the local government of British Columbia thought it necessary to have two more judges appointed to act in that province. Some grounds should be given on which this House should exercise its wise discretion, and he looked to the Minister of Justice for further information.

Sir John Macdonald's speech in 1880 has been referred to already. The Minister of Justice at that time thought it was necessary to go further than merely say the local legislature had acted, and the hon. gentleman said :

Irrespective of the increase of expense, the local legislature gave very strong grounds on the point of necessity, showing that parties charged with crime had to undergo, often, twelve months' imprisonment before they could be tried, and, in many cases, then proven innocent of the charges.

The hon. gentleman proceeded to give reasons, which appeared to have weight, in favour of the proposition put forward by the province. The present Secretary of State, Mr. Scott, is on record in this matter. He said :

It does seem to me that the Government has yielded probably to local prejudice in this particular case, to the fact that the British Columbia legislature passed the Act and sought to change the system. The Government have yielded rather too lightly in face of the large expenditure entailed on the country by the administration of justice in that province.

Again, referring to Mr. Blake, these are the views he expressed as an interpreter of the British North America Act. He said :

I have always maintained, while I have had the honour of sitting here, that we are not bound, simply because the provincial legislature proposes the appointment of a judge, to provide a salary.

In a few words the hon. gentleman expressed what I have attempted to say in many words, that so long as this Parliament provides the salaries, contrary to the view Mr. Blake then entertained, there will be ex-extravagance, and increasing extravagance, instead of the extravagance being stopped. The present Minister of Justice spoke on the subject. Mr. Mills said :

I think the House is exercising an independent power in undertaking to vote this money, and when the hon. gentleman asks the House to provide for the payment of additional judges on him devolves the responsibility of showing it is necessary.

So I say that though the argument referred to was used on one occasion by Sir John Macdonald, contrary to these views I have indicated, and which brought out the strongly expressed views of the Liberal party, the practice has been consistent with these views, and even in the 1880 case reasons were given for the appointment and they were not met, as the action of the provincial government is met now by the official statement of the Attorney General of the province, made only four years ago and shortly before those additional judges were created, that a large proportion of the judges of the court already had only three months' work in the year. The member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain), who held the office of Attorney General in the province of Quebec, now states that some of the judges have only one month's work to do in the year. Let me come now to the authority for the statement I made and consider the view held by Sir John Thompson. The other view referred to had been abandoned in his lifetime by Sir John Macdonald, and Sir John Thompson, speaking of a Quebec appointment on 23rd April, 1894, said :

The Act was left to its operation, although the Government did not concur in the statements made in the preamble thereof, as to the insufficiency of the Court of Queen's Bench, as now constituted, to perform its functions, and it was expressly stated that such action was not to be taken as an expression of opinion on the part of the Dominion Government that the appointment provided for by an Act should be made. The French Canadian senior member of the Montreal bar presented a petition in that sense, and also asked that the claims of their nationality be considered in any appointments to be made.

There can be no doubt that these quotations from "Hansard" show there had been a meeting of minds as to the independence of this legislature regarding the voting of salaries for judges created by a certain province. We had the admission, that the Government in asking Parliament for supplies of this character were bound to show good cause as in every other case. For a long time there had been a statute providing for the appointment of additional judges in British Columbia, and it was not until 1894 that Sir John Thompson asked this House to vote the salaries. The right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) then leading the Opposition asked in the debate simply: "what is the increase," and no demur was made to the principle involved in the following observations of Sir John Thompson :—

Mr. LAURIER. What is the increase ?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The object of this resolution is to provide for another county judge for British Columbia, in the Kootenay district. That district was created a county court district by the provincial legislature several years ago. It has not been thought necessary to make the appointment, but it is deemed expedient to take the powers now, owing to the increased population of the district, and the population going there is of a class that requirs the attendance of a court of justice.

I can abundantly show from the records that that was the position when the present Government took office, when they suddenly and in a most extraordinary case where there had not been action of the executive in Manitoba in order to create a judicial district and which in that province required the passing of an Order in Council only; such was the hurry to appoint Mr. Prendergast a judge that the Government came down pell mell and discovered before the supplies were granted that they had preceded the action of the local authorities, and simply at the request of the Attorney General had asked for money to pay an additional judge. It was after that, there was an additional district carved out under the general Act by the local government of Manitoba. It was then necessary for the right hon. gentleman to shelter himself behind this argument that his party had successfully contended against from 1867 down to that date. The Solicitor General now suggests that in connection with the provisions for an additional judge in the province of Quebec, Mr. Dickey, when Minister of Justice, put a resolution on the paper proposing to ask the House to make provision for that judgeship. The answer to that is complete. No action was taken upon it, because Mr. Dickey did not state that that resolution had either the approval of the Government or the assent of the Crown. As is not unusual, a Minister may in advance of the decision of the executive put the necessary notice upon the paper, and it is not until he moves a formal stage in the House that it is required of him to state that the executive has taken steps to obtain the assent of the Crown.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). My hon. friend (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) has either imagined or magnified the differences which he supposes to exist between hon. gentlemen on this side of the House and himself as to the construction of the British North America Act. I have never understood from any of my colleagues, either in Opposition or in Government, that they considered the duties of this Parliament in the voting of judges' salaries to be either perfunctory or automatic. I have always understood from my leader and from my colleagues, that they had a clear and definite understanding on the subject, and that, as the Parliament of Canada, we have responsibilities in voting these salaries which we cannot ignore. The principle which we endeavoured to lay down a year or two ago, and which I understand my right hon. friend insists on now, is this: That the duty of the central Government is to take care that there is no improvidence on the part of the provinces in the exercise of their power to create judicial districts.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I do not think that is the Prime Minister's position.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I have a very clear recollection of the right hon. gentleman laying down that position, and almost in the words I used. We cannot ignore the fact that the British North America Act has created mutual powers and duties with respect to the administration of justice. The provincial legislatures are charged with the administration of justice in the provinces, including the constitution, maintenance and organization of the provincial courts, both civil and criminal. We are charged with the appointment of the judges and the payment of the judges' salaries, and it goes without saying that if there was an improper or improvident exercise of this power by a provincial legislature, this Parliament would stay its hand and pause before voting the necessary money. It would be a great misfortune if the idea became prevalent that there was any difference between the leaders on either side of the House as to this important matter, and I do not

think any such difference exists. I do not understand either, that there was any intention to force the perhaps hasty view expressed by Sir John Macdonald in 1880 beyond the particular case he had before him, or to lift his language into that of the enunciation of a general principle. I think he was merely applying his remarks to the particular case he had before him, and I am glad to know that on both sides of the House there is an almost unanimous feeling that our duties are not perfunctory or automatic, that we have the responsibility of examining into each case when the legislatures of the provinces act, and that if after examination we find that the exercise of their power has been improvident we will not vote the money. I challenge the correctness of one remark made by the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper). He said that so imbued was this Government with the novel idea which they had introduced in 1896, that they proposed to provide for the salary of Judge Prendergast before a judicial district was created for him. The hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) is wrong in that. Under the law of the province of Manitoba power was vested in the Lieutenant-Governor in Council to create a judicial district.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That is what I said.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The Lieutenant-Governor in Council did exercise that power.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. No.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I speak on the authority of my right hon. friend (Mr. Fitzpatrick), and it bears out my recollection of the facts, and in addition to that the Attorney General of Manitoba made a full report advising this Government of the necessity of the appointment. We had every antecedent condition fulfilled. The legislature gave the power to the Executive Council to create judicial districts, the Executive Council exercised their power; the Attorney General of the province in an elaborate report explained satisfactorily to the central Government the necessity of the appointment of a judge, and then, and not till then, this Parliament was asked to vote money for the payment of the salary. I am glad to know that after all our discussion is largely academic. I am glad to know that no argument has been advanced that we should not vote the salary for an additional judge in the Court of Appeal in Ontario. It is acknowledged, I believe, that this is a court of very high standing, and that the legislature thought the number of judges of that court being four, that it was inconvenient.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Would the hon. gentleman allow me to refer to this question of fact, and perhaps it will refresh the mind of the Solicitor General. In 1896 the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Russell) argued on the assumption that the Manitoba executive had acted, and I said:

> But after the subject had been more fully considered, and the Solicitor General had made his last statement, it appears that this proposition has not even been considered by the executive of the government of the province of Manitoba, but that there happens to be a general Act in that province whereby the Governor in Council may carve out and add to the judicial districts for county court purposes. Apparently, from the Attorney General's telegram and the papers laid before the committee last night, the Executive Council may, in the future, so decide.

I go on to show that according to these papers the executive action had not been taken, and that there was merely a request from the Attorney General.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. My recollection is that the Order in Council had passed, and I am strengthened in that belief by the Solicitor General, who knows the facts. I was proceeding to call the attention of the House to the fact that our discussion on both sides has been largely academic. Practically no opposition is offered to the provision for the payment of a new judge for the Court of Appeal of Ontario. Nobody challenges the action of the Ontario Government in creating that additional judge, and nobody challenges the duty which lies on us, under the circumstances, of providing for his salary. So far as that is concerned, the House is at one. Then, we have the judge for the Yukon district, the necessity for whom, and for making provision for the salary of whom, is not challenged. And so with the judges in the province of Quebec; I will leave that matter to my hon. friend to discuss. Now, I am coming for one moment to a matter which is not in the Bill, and which I regret is not in the Bill; that is, that it does not make provision for an increase in the salaries of any of the Superior Court judges throughout the Dominion of Canada except, I believe, in a very special case in the province of Quebec, where an anomaly existed. There has been a very serious anomaly existing as between the salaries of the Superior Court judges of the province of Prince Edward Island, and the salaries of the judges in the adjoining provinces. The matter arose in this way. When the province came into confederation, the judges had been accustomed for years to collect fees for chamber work done by them, and in a very improper way, in my opinion, and I think that opinion will be concurred in by all lawyers. They eked out the salaries which were paid to them by the Dominion Government, by the collection of fees; and when that fact was brought to the attention of a former Minister of Justice he wrote a letter to the judges of Prince Edward Island, express-

ing his opinion that that practice should cease. Of course, it should not cease without provision being made for commuting the fees which they had been accustomed to receive, and increasing their salaries by the amount of the commutation. That letter was written, and the judges were glad that it was written ; for it is not a pleasant thing for judges to sit in chambers and have their clerks collect fees from them. Lately the provincial government of Prince Edward Island brought to the attention of this Government the fact that those fees belonged to the province, and that the provincial exchequer had been improperly deprived of them, and when the matter was argued before Council, it was acknowledged that their claim was absolutely good. I have no doubt that a claim will be made for the fees which had been collected by those judges ever since the province came into confederation. These gentlemen said, "It is your duty to provide proper salaries for these judges, and not attempt in a surreptitious way to make the province pay a part of their salaries." I was in hopes, when my hon. friend the Minister of Justice introduced this Bill, that he would have in it a clause to remove this anomaly. My absence from the capital prevented that being done, which I believe would otherwise have been done. The Minister of Justice told me that he intended to take that matter up. I rose for the purpose of making this explanation why this anomaly is continued, which Government after Government have acknowledged to be indefensible ; and I hope that the first moment any legislative action is taken with respect to the salaries of any of the Superior Court judges of the Dominion, that anomaly will be removed, and the salaries of the judges of Prince Edward Island placed on the same footing as those of the judges of the adjoining provinces.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I wish to set the matter right as between the hon. gentleman and myself. The hon. gentleman did not accept the quotation from my own speech in 1896 ; but I find in "Hansard" his own speech when he read the papers and showed that the Executive had decided to act. There being then no dispute between us, he said :

> We have the intention of the Government expressed clearly as to the judicial district they propose to create, and the reason why.

The hon. gentleman will now perhaps accept the statement I made that no judicial district had been created for Judge Prendergast ; but the Solicitor General said that it was intended to create one.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I desire to make a few remarks only on this subject, especially so far as the Bill concerns the province of Quebec. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) said the discussion was almost academic. This is not quite correct, for I am sincerely of the opinion that there is no call whatever for the increase in the number of the judges of the Superior Court of the province of Quebec. There are some provisions of the Bill with which I am in accord. For instance, I think the Solicitor General is quite right in giving an additional $1,000 to Mr. Justice Taschereau, who exercises his functions in the city of Montreal, like the other Montreal judges, and also in the district of Terrebonne. I think he is also quite right in providing a salary for another judge of the Circuit Court of Montreal. We who practice in Montreal know that the arrears of the Circuit Court are enormous. When a case comes on in that court, it is almost impossible to find the witnesses, and in some cases the parties are dead, so long a time has elapsed since the case was instituted. With regard to the other provisions of the Bill referring to the province of Quebec, I take the stand which I have always taken, that the system in that province is wrong ; and this Government should do something, either by conference with their friends in the provincial government or otherwise, to bring about a complete reform in the system. Something has been said—I am sorry I was not here at the time—about the reforms I endeavoured to introduce while I had the honour of being Attorney General of the province of Quebec. I brought the measure to which allusion has been made, twice before the local legislature—first, in 1893, and again in 1894. My hon. friend the Solicitor General was mistaken when he stated that it was because the reforms were unpopular that I had to withdraw the Bill without its being read the second time. In all the endeavours I made to bring about those changes, I had the very valuable assistance of my hon. friend the Solicitor General. He was with me from the start, and encouraged me, and if he could at that time have led more of his supporters in the House, the Bill would have been carried.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I would say to my hon. friend that I am still of the same opinion.

Mr. CASGRAIN. In 1893 the Bill was read the second time and referred to the Committee of the Whole. The reason why the Bill did not then pass was because I was asked by a great number of the members of the bar of the province of Quebec to allow the measure to stand over for a year so that it might be studied by the bench and bar and others most interested. To that request, I acceded, and therefore the Bill was not passed that session ; but when I introduced it, I knew very well that I would not have the support of lawyers from the rural districts, and that was the reason why I approached my hon. friend, the Solicitor General, and some leading lawyers in the House, and asked them if they would make

up the deficiency in my party by coming to the rescue in order to carry the measure through the House. I was promised that support, and I must say that my hon. friend the Solicitor General was true to his promise, but unfortunately, when the Bill came up in 1894, the other hon. gentlemen who had promised me their support thought it was not in the interest of their party to vote for it, and therefore, with the number of hon. gentlemen from my own side whom I lost, because they were always averse to any measure which they thought would centralize the judges in Quebec, Montreal and Sherbrooke, and which would make it very difficult for them to be ever appointed judges, I was obliged, if not to withdraw the Bill, to leave it before the public for another year, and it was referred to the committee on legislation. This measure now before the House, in so far as the province of Quebec is concerned, is not needed. There are already thirty judges of the Superior Court in that province disseminated all over the province. Ten were assigned to the city and district of Montreal and four to the city and district of Quebec, and the others are supposed to reside in their special districts. When I brought my Bill before the local House, I had very carefully prepared statistics on which I based my opinion, and on which I claimed that the House should make this radical reform in our system. These statistics are true to-day as they were then, and they go to show that there should be certainly no judge added to the number already appointed. Here are the figures of the average number of writs issued yearly in each district, in the years 1877, 1878, and 1879, and I have also similar statistics for the years 1889, 1890 and 1891. I may say that the system which prevails in the province of Quebec was introduced in 1854 by the late Sir George Cartier, and this has continued to exist without any amendment except the increase in the number of judges. It is a system which is completely out of date, and should certainly not be allowed to exist any longer. Here are the statistics for the years 1877, 1878 and 1879, of the average number of writs issued yearly in the Superior Courts in the various districts, in cases of $400 and over:

Arthabaska	38
Beauce	22

That is, 22 suits taken out in the district in a year.

Beauharnois	18
Bedford	55
Chicoutimi	5
Gaspé	2
Iberville	26
Joliette	10
Kamouraska	33
Montmagny	23
Montreal	900
Ottawa	25
Quebec	398
Richelieu	58
Rimouski	21
Saguenay	3
St. Francis	126
St. Hyacinthe	25
Terrebonne	30
Three Rivers	42

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. One judge had two suits a year.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Yes, and in some of the districts which are enumerated here, the number of writs now issued is still less than it was in those years. Take, for instance, the district of Montmagny, it is a well known fact that judicial business has decreased there enormously, owing especially to the law which was passed not very long ago, by which the county of Bellechasse was detached from the district of Montmagny and concurrent jurisdiction given to the court of Quebec over it.

Let me give some statistics for the years 1889, 1890 and 1891, and I am sorry I have not statistics for the later years. During these years, the average yearly number of writs, in cases of $400 and over, issued by the Superior Court, was as follows:—

Montreal	470
Quebec	104
Ottawa	20
Joliette and Terrebonne	39
Three Rivers and Richelieu	56
Chicoutimi and Saguenay	4
Gaspé and Rimouski	19
Kamouraska and Montmagny	59
Beauce and Arthabaska	39
St. Francis	104
Bedford and Beauharnois	64
St. Hyacinthe and Iberville	53

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I have an official return which shows that in 1890 there were 3,965 cases in Montreal; in 1891, 4,443 cases; and in 1892, 4,540 cases.

Mr. CASGRAIN. The figures I am giving now are those of cases of $400 and over.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. We do not try small cases under $400.

Mr. CASGRAIN. For the same year, the average number of cases under $400 was as follows:—

Montreal	282
Ottawa	13
Terrebonne	7
Joliette	16
Richelieu	16
St. Francis	63
Beauharnois	18
Bedford	20
Iberville	15
St. Hyacinthe	17
Quebec	63
Three Rivers	17
Saguenay	1
Chicoutimi	2
Gaspé	3
Rimouski	3
Kamouraska	7
Montmagny	28
Beauce	9
Arthabaska	14

I am sorry I have not any statistics for the later years, but the judicial business in the province of Quebec has decreased. There are not as many cases now in the rural districts as there used to be. It seems to me that when a proposition is made to this House to vote a salary for another judge, thus increasing the number of judges in that province, the Government are asking this House to do something which is absolutely useless and imposing upon the country a useless expenditure of $4,000 per annum. Of course, I know the argument can be made in this House, which I believe my learned friend made this morning. It is true that in 1894 or 1895—I forget which—I, as Attorney General, was constitutionally responsible for the law which was passed in the province of Quebec giving one additional judge to the district of St. Francis. I am sorry to say—and I say it without any hesitation—that that law was a mistake, and that I was wrong, and at the time I knew I was wrong, but, unfortunately, there are some things which have to be done, and a crisis cannot be brought on every time a Minister does not agree with his colleagues. Hon. gentlemen on the other side are in the same position in which I was when I introduced this law in 1894. There was no use for it, because if it be true, as it is, that in the district of Sherbrooke there is too much work for the resident judge, it is not necessary to propose this law, because article 2321 of the revised statutes of the province of Quebec provides:

> Whenever the despatch of judicial business in any district requires the services of more judges than there are in such district, or whenever the sole judge in any district is unable to discharge his duty for any reason whatsoever, the chief justice, after having been informed thereof, and having conferred with his colleagues of the locality in which he resides, shall, according to the determination they may come to, require one or more of the judges of districts other than those of Quebec and Montreal, to discharge their duties temporarily in such district for the holding of any term or of the court, provided that such judges can absent themselves without injury to the administration of justice in their districts.

It is a well known fact that the judge in the adjoining district, Judge Lynch, of the district of Bedford, has certainly not sufficient work to occupy all his time or half his time.

It is true, he goes and sits in Montreal now and again, but, if there is such a necessity to have another judge in the district of St. Francis, all that has to be done is for the chief justice to appoint, for instance, Mr. Justice Lynch of the district of St. Francis to help Mr. Justice White. He would have jurisdiction in the district of St. Francis; he has now by law; but he would exercise his functions in the district of St. Francis and would have ample time to exercise the same functions in his own district. But suppose there is some inconvenience in putting into operation article 2321, if the Government called the attention of the Quebec Government to the fact that this is a useless expenditure to make this difficulty might be obviated. It seems to me it would be very easy for the Government if they do not want to go to the extent of making the radical change that I suggest, at least to propose this change and give the district of St. Francis and the district of Bedford to these two judges, Mr. Justice Lynch and Mr. Justice White. There are other judges in the same position as Mr. Justice Lynch. Take, for instance, the judge at Sorel, the judge of the district of Richelieu; take the judge of the district of Beauharnois; take the judge of the district of St. John—all these judges have leisure time and could very easily go to Sherbrooke and sit there, each of them, at least three months in the year. So, it seems to me this Government would be doing a wise thing and would deserve well of the country if, under the very favourable circumstances under which they are they should say to the Government of the province of Quebec: We will not appoint this judge, but we want to come to some understanding with you by which you will change the system, the old, out-of-date system, which you have in the province of Quebec.

Something has been said of the salaries of the judges in general, and the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) said that the salaries were too low and the judges too numerous. There is no doubt of that—the salaries are ridiculously low. Take, for instance, the city of Montreal. Anybody who knows how expensive living is in the city of Montreal must know that the judges cannot live on the pittance of $5,000 a year that they receive. What is the consequence? The consequence is that they are obliged to do other things than exercise their functions as judges. Some are testamentary executors. I do not think that is quite a proper thing for them to do, and it takes up a great deal of their time. Others are professors in universities. There are other things also that judges do to make a little money and to try to bring their incomes up to what is necessary for the expenditure which they have to make in order to live in Montreal. Now, if the number of judges, instead of being increased were decreased, then, it seems to me, the Government could bring in a measure increasing the salaries of the judges. And, apart from a very few members, I think that such a measure would be well received in this House; and I think it would be well received by the country at large. Now, I submit that I have shown conclusively by the statistics I have furnished the House, that an additional judge is not necessary; and, therefore, this very economical Government is voting $4,000 a year quite uselessly. It is no answer to my argument to say that it was I who had the law passed in the province of Quebec increasing the

number of judges. If I was wrong, that is no reason why these gentlemen should do wrong. They should rather seek to correct the wrong.

I have no quarrel with the Government on account of the appointments to judgeships in the province of Quebec up to this date. Mr. Justice Langelier is certainly an ornament to the bench, and, since his appointment has given the greatest satisfaction to the bar and to litigants. In Mr. Justice Lavergne, we have a most painstaking and conscientious judge; and Mr. Justice Lemieux has certainly the varied experience both in criminal and civil law to make him an excellent judge. But I wish to warn the right hon. Premier that if the appointment which is mentioned as about to be made for the district of Arthabaska is made, the right hon. gentleman will be doing a thing he will regret, and will be raising to the bench a man who has no business there and who certainly will not be a worthy colleague of the gentlemen who are on the bench in the province of Quebec to-day.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). My hon. friend (Mr. Casgrain) has certainly spoken with a candour for which he is entitled to some consideration. But the very candour of his remarks shows the difficulty and deficiency of our system. At the present time, as has been remarked already more than once, under this system we have the duty settled upon us of of paying the judges, while the duty of organizing the courts is placed upon the local legislatures. Of course we have to act upon the acts of the local legislatures. But, in the matter of organization of the courts, we are largely to be guided by the opinion of the Attorney General of the province at the time, who recommends the changes. If the Attorney General, who recommends the changes to the Federal Government, and who asks the legislature to vote in favour of the appointments of the new judges and the organization of districts, at the same time—not three or four years afterwards but at the same time—has the candour to say to the Federal authorities: While I put this on the Statute-book you must not mind it; it does not represent my own views, but, in this matter, I am simply acting from political motives—if the Attorney General does that, he naturally relieves the Federal Government of very serious difficulties. But my hon. friend will not be offended, at me or at the Government, I hope, that we took his action as meaning something, that we thought that when he was exercising the great and important powers of Attorney General of the province of Quebec, he was not deceiving the public but was acting upon his own judgment. Of course, we may have been blamable in one thing—and that was believing that he was serious when he told the legislature of the province of Quebec that they should have another judge put upon the bench. We thought we had to deal with an hon. gentleman who had reputation at stake and was honest in intention. We could well understand if he were to say that he had since changed his views. But he tells us, with great candour: I was merely acting from political motives. And he goes on to suggest that we were proceeding upon the same motives. I leave him his suspicion and his acts. We took him seriously. I must say, to the credit of the hon. gentleman, that his views, though they were, at that time—I was going to use perhaps a harsh adjective—they were not so devoid of force and value as he would have us think at the present time. I must tell him that he has no reason to disparage himself on this occasion, he is well supported by authority, and he does not do himself justice when he belittles his own judgment as he has done. He was not in the House, I think, the other day when I quoted the opinion on this subject of the appointment of a second judge for the district of St. Francis, of no less a person that the chief justice of the district of Montreal, Sir Melbourne Tate, in the month of September last. I will quote his opinion again for the benefit of my hon. friend:

> While it is right and proper that justice, civil and criminal, should be administered in each district, I do not know of any paramount reason why a judge should be required to reside in any of these districts, with the exception of St. Francis, and perhaps Ottawa. In the former, the work is too heavy for one judge, who has several circuits to attend besides the one at the chef lieu.

Now, I take occasion at once to agree with the statement which was made a moment ago by my hon. friend, that the work could be done, not by a second judge to reside at the chef lieu in Sherbrooke, but by Mr. Justice Lynch, or any of the other judges residing in adjoining districts. But that is not the view taken by the chief justice himself. Mark his words:

> While it is right and proper that justice, civil and criminal, should be administered in each district, I do not know of any paramount reason why a judge should be required to reside in any of these districts, with the exception of St. Francis.

So the chief justice of the Superior Court in the district of Montreal is of the opinion that a second judge should be appointed under the statute made by my hon. friend, and that in order to discharge his duties, he should reside in that district. Therefore, my hon. friend had no occasion to disparage his own judgment as he has done, because I may say that his opinion on such a subject is as good as that of any one in the province of Quebec. Now, is not the opinion of Sir Melbourne Tate conclusive that in this case there is not, as was stated by my hon. friend, any political or sinister motive on the part of this Government, but we are simply acting in the best interest of the

administration of justice in the province of Quebec, and especially in the district of St. Francis ? My hon. friend stated a moment ago that there were judges in the province of Quebec who had very little work to do, and I am prepared to admit that. But I must say that unless he is able to modify the geography of the province, there must always be there certain judges who will have less work to do than others. He has referred to the case of Gaspé, and according to his statistics, the judge for the district of Gaspé has almost nothing to do. The hon. gentleman stated that in one year the judge had only two cases to try. I think he gave statistics for the year 1889-90. The Solicitor General has just placed in my hands a report of the judicial statistics of the province published in 1895, showing that in the previous year there had been in the district of Gaspé 44 Superior Court cases taken out.

Mr. CASGRAIN. That was a very exceptional year, to my own personal knowledge.

The PRIME MINISTER. If only two writs were issued in 1891, was not that also an exceptional year ?

Mr. CASGRAIN. I gave the statistics of six years, and that was the average.

The PRIME MINISTER. Let it be so, and if it be so, there is very little work for a judge in Gaspé. I find that in 1897 there were 31 cases, but I will take the argument of my hon. friend as he made it a moment ago, that there is very little business in the district of Gaspé, not enough to occupy the time of one man. But how would he remedy it ? The district of Gaspé is a peninsula, at one end of the province, with no railway communication except with a small portion of the district. Under such circumstances, it is impossible not to have a judge resident in the district of Gaspé. A judge has been resident there from time immemorial, and I do not think that justice can be administered in the district of Gaspé unless you have a judge residing there, and unless, as I said, you could modify the physical geography of that part of the province, we shall have to submit to such exceptional conditions. It is only yesterday that our attenion was called to the case of two young men who came to their death under most cruel circumstances. Somebody is guilty of the death of these two men, guilty either of murder or of manslaughter, and yet justice could not be done because there is no judge in that territory.

Mr. FOSTER. There was a judge.

The PRIME MINISTER. If there had been a judge who had only two cases to administer, justice would have been vindicated in the case I refer to, though probably the hon. gentleman would criticise the expenditure. But I must say to my hon. friend that there is a great deal to be said in favour of the legislation which he introduced some years ago in favour of remodelling the judicial system of the province of Quebec. I am in favour of that principle, and I do not see why members representing rural districts should object to it. I do not think the case was fairly presented to them. But if my hon. friend is to change the number of districts and remodel the administration of justice in the province of Quebec, and if he is to base his reform upon the province of Ontario, though I could not believe that was his object, he would have to decrease the number of the Superior Court judges, and he would have to create County Court judges. The province of Ontario does not contemplate that judges should be resident in the city of Toronto, and that there should be none in any other part of the province. The system in force in Ontario contemplates that there should be County Court judges distributed all over the province to administer what I may call summary justice, to answer to the instant demands which may be made upon them. But the judges of the Superior Court reside in the city of Toronto, and go from district to district to administer justice only in the higher class of cases. My hon. friend would have to do something of that kind. Let him remember that in the province of Quebec there will be 37 judges of the Superior Court, after his legislation is passed, and 3 judges of the Circuit Court, 40 in all ; whereas in Ontario, there are 64 County Court judges, and 15 Superior Court judges, or 79 in all, administering justice in the same manner as do the judges of Quebec. These 79 judges in Ontario perform the same work which is performed by the 40 judges of the province of Quebec. But the Superior Court judges in the province of Quebec have to administer justice in all classes of cases, from suits of $1, as was stated by the Solicitor General, to suits of $1,000,000 ; whereas the judges of the Superior Court in Ontario only administer justice in certain classes of cases, in what I may call superior cases, and the inferior cases of justice are administered by the County Court judges. Now, there are in Ontario just double the number of judges, less one, that there is in Quebec. There is not in Ontario double the population of the province of Quebec, there is not even one-third more. So my hon. friend will see that if he were to carry out his project he would have not only to diminish the number of districts—in which I am at one with him—but he would have to organize some such system of county courts as they have in Ontario. He would have to increase the number of Circuit Court judges and diminish the number of Superior Court judges. So far I am at one with him, and if I had the honour of being a member of the local legislature when he introduced his Bill, I would have held up both hands in support of it. But that legislation did not carry. My hon.

friend introduced his Bill twice, and I accept every reason he gave why these measures were not carried out. He carried it once to Committee of the Whole, and then he had to withdraw it; and why? Because, as he said, he could not carry it against members representing the rural constituencies. They are a powerful body, they constitute a majority, the city members are a minority; and so long as the rural members are of that opinion, it is not possible for the hon. gentleman or any one to carry out this scheme of reform. I regret it very much.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I said I could not carry it against the rural lawyers. The rural members, not of the legal profession, generally were in favour of the Bill.

The PRIME MINISTER. I do not know whether they were lawyers, for lawyers have not a very good name. If they acted as a majority they appear to have been able to prevent the hon. gentleman carrying out his views. Let me put the case in another form, with the modifications now made by the hon. gentleman. So long as the lawyers in the local legislature are opposed to the measure, not even the hon. gentleman himself could carry out the reform. So the argument in favour of reform must be decided by the lawyers, and the hon. gentleman would be able to carry out his reform except for the lawyers from the rural constituencies. Let us rather say that so long as the public opinion of the province is not in favour of this reform it cannot be carried out, but when public opinion is in favour of the scheme the lawyers themselves will have to come down and submit. The hon. gentleman says we might have a conference with the local government on this subject. It is strange how hon. gentlemen opposite have suddenly become reformers. Confederation has been in existence about thirty years. During that time the Conservatives have been in office no less than 25 years, and during all that period they never thought of carrying out the scheme of reform that is now being pressed on our attention. Let me say that I hope it will not take so long for the Reform party to take up and carry this reform as was occupied by the Conservatives in considering it. The Conservatives—shall I say what is in my mind—are not much good at anything, but they are not worth anything at reform. The hon. gentlemen are sure to bungle it, for the reason that they are not sincere.

Mr. BERGERON. Still you have taken our policy.

The PRIME MINISTER. We have now a Reform Government in Ottawa, and a Reform Government in the province of Quebec, and a better day has dawned on the future of the Dominion. In the meantime, what is our duty? It is simply to act in consonance with the judgment of the province, as expressed by the voice of its legislature. We cannot do anything else. The hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) is also a reformer in his way. He has taunted me for what I have done and said I was a Conservative. I may blame myself that I am too much of a Conservative. I am a Conservative to this extent—I want to maintain the constitution of the country such as it is. It is not perfect, but we must endeavour to work it out with all its deficiencies, and one is regarding this very subject, that the body which has to spend the money has not also to devise the manner in which it shall be spent. That is the devise of the constitution. It is a strong defect, and perhaps we may have to apply ourselves to the task of remedying it. In the meantime I say to the hon. member for Pictou that I am so much of a Conservative that I shall endeavour to believe under any circumstances, until it is proved on the floor of this House to the contrary, that the local legislature is sincere and truthful; I shall be willing to take its recommendation and accept the recommendation as the honest expression of the will of the province. When an hon. gentleman who has held the position of Attorney General of the province of Quebec makes such a confession as he has made, I must bow before his word; but at all events so long as that proof is not forthcoming, I shall always believe when a statute is passed by the local legislature that it is the honest expression of the wishes, wants and desires of that legislature. But there may be at some time an attempt made to deceive us. The hon. gentleman has told us that there has been an attempt made to deceive. We would be bound, of course, to act in order to meet those circumstances. The hon. gentleman says we should come into conflict with the local legislature. If we were to follow his opinion we would disregard the act of the legislature; if we did not it was not in accordance with our view and judgment, we would review its legislation, we would assume it was wrong if it was not according to our way of thinking and according to our standard of right. If we adopted such a system, confederation could not be worked. We would have the same conflicts they had in the United States in respect to state rights, and we do not want that state of affairs, but we need, as much as possible, united action between the provincial and the central Governments.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The hon. gentleman acted on the opposite principle in 1877 in the case of Leeds and Grenville. At that time Mr. Blake, speaking as Minister of Justice of the Government in which the right hon. Prime Minister was a member, gave as his reason for opposing the action of the provincial legislature that the Government were not convinced of the necessity of the Act.

The PRIME MINISTER. The hon. gentleman honours me too much; I was not a member of the Government in 1876. I have enough sins to bear without being called upon to answer for the sins of others.

Mr. BERGERON. The hon. gentleman was elected in the fall of 1877 as a Minister.

The PRIME MINISTER. That was not in the session of 1877. I have only this to say in conclusion. I have stated my opinion, over and over again, that our present constitution, so far as this matter is concerned and other similar matters, is not only imperfect, but is a source of great danger to the country. Some time or other, and perhaps sooner than later, the Parliament of Canada will have to be asked to invite the Imperial Parliament to amend the constitution and remove what is admittedly a great danger to us as a people, but so long as the constitution is as it is, it behooves every true Canadian to endeavour to prevent friction between the federal authorities and the local authorities.

Mr. McNEILL. I am afraid if the right hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat and I were to discuss the question which he opened a few moments ago as to whether Conservative policy or Reform policy was the better policy for this country, we might not altogether agree. I am afraid I should not agree with my hon. friend in thinking that the Reform party was the only party that could reform, and the Conservative party was unable to do anything well. However, that is not just what I propose to discuss at the present moment. I want to take up a moment or two of the time of the House in expressing my views with respect to the question now before the House. With a great deal that has fallen from hon. members on this side of the House I agree. I agree entirely in thinking that it is, to say the least, anomalous that we should be called upon to provide the funds to pay judges, for the appointment of whom we are not responsible.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. They may be responsible for the appointment, but not for the necessity of the appointment.

Mr. McNEILL. The local legislature declares that a judge is required for a certain district, and it seems anomalous that we should be called upon to defray the expenses of that judge without our having the power to decide whether the judge be necessary or unnecessary in that district. It seems to me that as matters now stand, what we have to decide in any particular case is whether or not the recommendation which is made to us is a good one, and whether there be need for the additional judge. So far as the province of Quebec is concerned, as to the local affairs of which I am to some extent ignorant, I have listened very carefully to the views that have been expressed on both sides of the House in reference to these two judges whom it is proposed to appoint. I learned from my hon. friend (Mr. Casgrain) that he approved of the appointment of this additional Circuit Court judge at Montreal. I suppose there is no hon. gentleman in this House whose view will have greater weight than that of my hon. friend (Mr. Casgrain), who was Attorney General for the province, and so we may put that question as to the Circuit Court judge aside. What fell from my hon. friend (Mr. Casgrain) certainly impressed me very much with regard to the St. Francis district, because it would seem that all that was necessary was to have brought a judge in from another district to assist the present judge in overtaking the work. But, from the remarks of the right hon. leader of the Government, it would seem that the very highest authority in the province has distinctly stated that another resident judge is necessary for the district of St. Francis.

The PRIME MINISTER. Hear, hear.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I do not interpret the words of Sir Melbourne Tait as does the right hon. the Premier. Sir Melbourne Tait meant that another judge should be appointed for Sherbrooke, but not necessarily a resident judge.

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes, a resident judge.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Then, let the judge for the district of Bedford reside in Sherbrooke, and that will cover the point perfectly.

Mr. McNEILL. It seems to me that the words read by the right hon. the Premier did imply that Sir Melbourne Tait thought there should be a resident judge there. I do not know as to the possibility of bringing in another judge who is not already appointed to the district of St. Francis, nor do I know that this House is competent to deal with that matter. Does my hon. friend (Mr. Casgrain) say that we have the power to compel one of the other judges to reside in the St. Francis district?

Mr. CASGRAIN. No.

Mr. McNEILL. Then, it comes back to the point which has been admitted on both sides of the House, that there is not that arrangement of judicial districts in the province of Quebec which there should be. However, we are face to face with the fact that we require a resident judge in the district of St. Francis, that we have not the power to transfer another judge to reside there, and the question is: shall we, so far as we are concerned, leave that district without this necessary additional judge? I think this would be a desirable time, when the right hon. gentleman and his party are in power, and when probably the best possible results would flow from

it, that there should be a conference with the local provincial authorities, and that an effort should be made to re-arrange and redistribute the judicial districts in the province of Quebec. In the meantime, as I have said, we are face to face with the fact that for the administration of justice in the district of St. Francis an additional judge is required, and the question for us is whether we shall do our part and give this additional assistance which is asked. It has perhaps been to some extent lost sight of on this side of the House, that while we are asked to provide this additional money for these two judges, yet the Government are taking steps to make a reduction in the expenditure, in the matter of the travelling expenses of the judges, which will more than cover the additional amount necessary to provide for these new appointments. I have spoken in regard to the province of Quebec with a good deal of diffidence, but only after having listened to the discussion with the greatest care that I could lend to it. I must say this frankly, that while I have not that implicit degree of confidence in the measures of hon. gentlemen opposite which perhaps some hon. gentleman behind them may have, I do think, so far as this measure is concerned, that the Government are scarcely subject to the accusation of having brought it in for political purposes. That is my view, and I am not afraid to state it here or anywhere else. In the province of Ontario we have a number of junior judges who are, or rather have been, I believe, every one of them, political opponents of hon. gentlemen opposite. All of these men, or almost all of them, were appointed by Conservative Administrations; and when the Government have introduced a measure to increase their salaries, no man can say that it has been introduced for political purposes. It can only be introduced because they believe that in this matter they are doing what is just and right. I am quite satisfied that they are doing so; and, for my part, knowing what I do of these judges in the province of Ontario, I think I would be very derelict in my duty if I did not rise in this House and say that I was very glad to see this measure of justice accorded to them, and thank the Government for having accorded it. These gentlemen have been discharging most onerous duties for many years past, and if this measure of justice were not granted to them, they would be paid now at a much lower rate of remuneration than any other judges in Canada. They are doing a great deal more work than the senior county judges in Ontario; and yet they are receiving much less remuneration. They have been the revising officers under the Franchise law; and they are being deprived by the new Franchise Act of the remuneration they received for the revision of the lists. They are receiving to-day the same salary they received a quarter of a century ago, although since that salary was decided upon, their jurisdiction has been very much extended, and their work and the importance of their work have enormously increased; and it is only right and proper that their services should receive the degree of consideration they are now receiving from the Government. With regard to the additional judge for the Ontario Court of Appeal, I must say that I think that also is wanted. That court is a court which I think every person who has given any consideration at all to the matter will agree to be one of the most efficient courts to be found anywhere within Her Majesty's dominions. I have not yet heard any one venture to cast the slightest aspersion upon that court, either as to the efficiency or the diligence of the judges. We find that the work of that court is about a year in arrear, and something must be done to deal with that condition of things. The statute passed by the provincial legislature provides for an increase in the number of the judges by one, so that in case of a press of business, the court may be divided into two by taking a judge from another court to act with the judges of the Court of Appeal. So that, so far as my province at least is concerned, I think the course that has been pursued by the Government is one that deserves the support of this House. With regard to the proposed judge in the Yukon district, I presume no one will deny that that is an increased expenditure that is necessary. While I do not profess to understand all the difficulties with regard to the province of Quebec, and while a measure of this kind is no doubt open to criticism—for no Government can introduce a measure of this kind without being open to criticism—still, for my part, I endorse the course the Government have taken on the whole, and I am very much obliged to them for the course they have taken in reference to my own province.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Mr. Speaker, I think I should make a personal explanation. I understood the right hon. Premier to say that I had pleaded guilty to having wilfully misled the people of the province of Quebec and this Parliament in passing the law to which reference has been made. In order that there may be no misconception, I want to state the facts as they really are, and in doing so, I will not give away any secret which I should not give. It was well known that my policy at that time was not to increase the number of judges of the Superior Court in the province of Quebec, but, on the contrary, to reduce the number to sixteen; but after the two endeavours which I made to bring about the reform of which I spoke had failed, then, as it was thought necessary by the other members of the Government to have two judges residing in Sherbrooke, the law was passed. As I said, I was constitutionally responsible for it, but at the same time it was well known that

that law was against my policy as stated in the House and in the country.

The PRIME MINISTER Mr. Speaker, just one word on this point. My hon. friend says that his personal views were in favour of a reduction, but he yielded to the views of his colleagues. I can come to no other conclusion than that his views were one way, and the views of his colleagues the other way. It often happens that the members of a government are not all of the same mind; but after matters have been discussed, a policy is adopted. The policy adopted at that time was to increase the number of judges by one. The measure introduced by my hon. friend was to amend article 2315 of the Consolidated Statutes of the province of Quebec, which article provided that the Superior Court should be composed of a chief justice and thirty puisne judges. This number was increased by one judge, making the number thirty-one. Then the hon. gentleman introduced an amendment to section 2319, which provided that there should be one judge in the district of St. Francis. His amendment provided that there should be two judges in that district, one to reside in the town of Sherbrooke. But my hon. friend comes now and tells us that his own judgment was different. If so, he yielded to the judgment of his colleagues, and introduced that Bill; and now will he tell us that we are not to give effect to the legislation which he introduced, if not upon his own judgment, in deference to the judgment of his colleagues in the Government?

Mr. ANGERS. (Translation.) When the resolution preceding this Bill was introduced, I called the attention of the House to an anomaly, or rather, to an injustice which I thought should be remedied. But, as upon that occasion, the hon. Prime Minister was not in his seat, I think I am warranted in repeating the remarks I then gave utterance to.

The injustice I have alluded to is this: that two rural judges, Mr. Justice Gagné, for the district of Chicoutimi-Saguenay, and Mr. Justice De Billy, for the district of Gaspé, are paid a lower salary than their colleagues receive, $3,500, while the latter receive $4,000. Why not put those judges on the same footing as the other judges? In their capacity of judges of the Superior Court, do they not enjoy the same jurisdiction? I may perhaps be told that they have less work to do than their colleagues have. To this I may reply by invoking the argument resorted to by some hon. gentlemen in order to justify the increase of $1,000 granted to Mr. Justice Taschereau, with the consent of this House. As his colleague, Judge Taschereau, Mr. Justice Gagne has to administer justice in two districts, and the number of cases he has to try is more considerable than they are in several other districts. Let me give a few statistics. But in this connection I may say that this is a ground on which I feel that one ought to tread with caution, since I have heard the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain), when speaking on this very matter, giving statistics to show that in 1889 and 1891 there had been in the Superior Court in the district of Saguenay only two or three cases taken out. Those figures, are, to tell the plain truth, highly fanciful.

Mr. CASGRAIN. (Translation.) The hon. gentleman wishes to know where I took the statistics I have furnished the House. Those statistics were prepared from the official reports showing the judicial business done in the different courts of the province. I have drawn them from the speech which I delivered on the floor of the Quebec Legislature, when I introduced the Bill of 1893. Those statistics were furnished by the officials of the Attorney General's Office, and they are based on the reports which we had received.

Mr. ANGERS. (Translation.) I did not mean to say that in giving those statistics to the House the hon. gentleman had largely drawn upon his fancy, but that they are incorrect. I am a practising lawyer in that district, and I speak with knowledge. I have before me the statistics published in 1894 and 1897, and from those statistics I am able to show that, if it were fair to give Judge Taschereau an increase of salary on the ground that he is doing more work than some of his colleagues, I say that the same argument holds good in the case of the judge for the district of Chicoutimi and Saguenay. If the argument applies in the one case, it ought also to hold in the other case, and, to my mind, it is unanswerable.

To refer again to those statistics, it seems that for the year 1894 there were six cases tried in the Superior Court at Chicoutimi, and I must say that I am surprised at the small number of the writs issued. The way in which those statistics are prepared may perhaps account for this, because here is, I suppose, the way they proceed in preparing those statistics. They only take into account the cases which have been initiated and tried during the year, leaving aside the cases inscribed prior to that date.

Let me give some further statistics showing the number of writs issued in 1894 in some judicial districts: 1894—Chicoutimi, 6; Saguenay, 22.

I leave aside the cases of $100 and $200 tried at Hebertville and Baie St. Paul in the Circuit Court.

Let us now pass to some other districts, and give the writs issued for the same year: Arthabaska, 22; Beauce, 23; Joliette, 26; Kamouraska, 21; St. Hyacinthe, 18.

Let us now take the statistics for 1897: Chicoutimi, 16; Saguenay district, 18; which gives a total of 34 cases. Arthabaska, 20; Beauce, 32; Beauharnois, 34; Rimouski, 18; Richelieu, 16.

Now, I say, without fear of successful contradiction, judging from the quantity of business done, that a gross injustice is being done to the judge of Chicoutimi and Saguenay in not putting him on the same basis as the other judges, and that his salary should be increased to $4,000. I further say that to contend that the salary of the judges of the same rank should be fixed on the basis of the work done seems to me a mistaken policy of economy and one little consonant with the sound principles of political economy. In my opinion, the rule to be acted upon in this matter is that judges of the same jurisdiction should receive the same salary. For, if you act upon the principle that the salaries ought to be fixed according to the amount of work done, there would follow from those premises this consequence, that a judge appointed to the bench with a salary of $4,000 for a district where there are 200 cases to be tried in the year, would be liable to have his salary curtailed, if he had only 100 cases to try the next year. Another reason why the number of cases tried is not the best standard by which you may form an estimate of the competency and attainments of a judge and determine the salary he is entitled to, is this, namely, that in the trial of ten cases a judge may perform a larger amount of work and show greater legal ability and attainments of a higher order than another judge would do in trying forty cases. It is not only the quantity of cases tried that you should take into consideration, but also the quality of the work done; and a judge who has given forty good decisions is entitled to more credit than a judge who has rendered a hundred bad ones. Such things will occur in spite of all. Some judges have an unlucky hand, while there are others who were born under a lucky star. I have just pointed out how to obviate such consequences and troublesome complications. Put all the judges of the same class on a footing of equality by giving them the same salary. I think the arguments I have addressed to the House are most cogent reasons why the Government should accede to my views, and I trust they will see their way clear to remove the anomaly and the injustice which I have pointed out.

Mr. CASGRAIN. (Translation.) If the hon. gentleman will excuse me, I think he should not forget that the judge for Chicoutimi and Saguenay has to travel over long distances during the most inclement season of the year, and that is another consideration which should not be lost sight of.

Mr. ANGERS. (Translation.) I may remind the hon. gentleman that, upon a former occasion, I drew the attention of the House to that point, and I agree with him that it is a consideration which should not be overlooked. As I have already stated, it took Justice Gagné eight days to cover the distance from Malbaie to Quebec, about 90 miles.

As far as the administration of justice is concerned, I have listened with much interest to the remarks fallen from the hon. gentleman who addressed the House. For my part, I am in favour of remodelling the judicial system of the province of Quebec and putting it on a basis which is reasonable; and, as stated by the right hon. Prime Minister, that is a duty which devolves upon the local legislatures. All this House has to do is to take the condition of things which is in existence in each province.

Now, I wish to refer to certain strictures passed by some hon. gentlemen upon the judges of the province of Quebec. These gentlemen seemed to insinuate that judgeships in that province were made sinecures; that our judges had very little work to do, and were living on an extravagant scale, when compared with the justices in the province of Ontario. Let us again refer to the judicial statistics, and see whether the imputations cast on the judges of the province of Quebec are well founded or not, and also whether the praises bestowed on the Ontario judiciary are in strict accordance with the facts.

First, as to the matter of travelling allowances, I am free to confess that in a few cases an exorbitant amount was charged, and I think it regrettable that such a construction should have been put upon the proviso of the statute, "except that three days' absence at least shall always be allowed for." What are the facts? I find that in the province of Ontario, last year, the judges drew in travelling allowances the sum of $27,500. And yet I think I am safe in saying that in the province of Ontario travelling is much less expensive than it is in Quebec, as the whole province is served with railway facilities, while the cost of travelling in several districts of Quebec is much larger, owing to the lack of railway communication. Yet in spite of all these railway facilities, the judges in the province of Ontario last year drew $27,500 for travelling allowances, whereas in the province of Quebec there were paid out in travelling expenses to the judges only $21,012.

There is another point which some hon. gentlemen emphasized, when they represented the judges in the province of Quebec as sinecurists with hardly any work to do. What are the facts, Sir?

There are in the province of Ontario 80 judges, whereas there are only 41 in the province of Quebec. Now, the population of Ontario is 2,114,321, while that of Quebec is 1,448,535, and from those figures it may be inferred that the judges of Ontario have more leisure time than those of Quebec have. I do not mention here the propensity of our people to litigation, which, all things being alike, ought to create more work for our judges.

I wish also to say a word or two concern-

ing the salaries paid to the Quebec judges, as some hon. gentlemen seem to be under the impression that the judiciary in the province of Quebec is more burdensome to the public treasury than that of the province of Ontario. In 1896-97, I find that for salaries to the judges in the province of Ontario there were paid out $221,900, whereas, to the judges of the province of Quebec there were paid only $180,000 in salaries, which gives a difference of $41,900 in favour of Quebec. Those statistics speak volumes, and I submit them to the consideration of the House.

While I am on my feet, I wish to touch upon a last point, to which I may revert later on, in Committee of the Whole. It is an amendment which I would suggest to the Bill now under consideration. At the last session of the Quebec Legislature the following enactment was passed :—

> The three judges of the Court of Review are, however, taken from all the judges of the Superior Court of the province, at the discretion of the chief justice or acting chief justice, as the case may be.

As will be seen, all the judges of the rural districts are called upon to sit in review at the discretion of the Chief Justice. The Solicitor General has justly provided for the travelling allowances of those rural judges who are requested to sit in review. But, in my opinion, the best way to give full effect to that law was to embody in the Bill the very same words of the local statute which authorizes these judges to attend the court. I must express my regret at the present Bill not having been worded in the very terms of the provincial statute ; because this Bill provides for the payment of travelling allowances only when it is certified by the Chief Justice or judge discharging the duties of Chief Justice, that the attendance of such judge was necessary by reason of illness, incapacity or absence of one of the judges resident at Montreal or Quebec, as the case may be.

Mr. CASGRAIN. (Translation.) This clause practically overrides the Quebec statute.

Mr. ANGERS. (Translation.) It does, but this clause the only object of which is to meet the case provided by the provincial statute, does not go far enough.

Mr. SAVARD. (Translation.) It is not my intention to participate at any length in the debate now in progress ; but, as this question particularly concerns the county of Chicoutimi and Saguenay which I have the honour of representing here, the name of which has been introduced into this debate by my hon. friend from Charlevoix (Mr. Angers) when he spoke of Mr. Justice Gagné, I deem it my duty to say a word or two. I must say, from the very outset, that in equity—and on this point I agree with the hon. member for Charlevoix—the judges for the districts of Chicoutimi and Gaspé are as much entitled to an increase of salary as Mr. Justise Taschereau, whose salary by this Bill, is to be increased to $5,000, but I hasten to add that, in my opinion, all our judges are sufficiently remunerated. In my opinion, Mr. Justice Gagné is sufficiently recompensed by the salary of $3,500 which he gets, and Judge Taschereau who is paid a salary of $4,000 gets an adequate remuneration for his services. If Judge Gagné is dissatisfied with his present salary, there is but one course open to him : let him step down from the bench and I have not the least doubt but that there will be found in both districts people willing to succeed him on the bench, and as well qualified as he is to fill up that position.

Mr. BERGERON. (Translation.) Here is a suggestion.

Mr. SAVARD. (Translation.) As to the matter of judicial business, there is no doubt that the judge for the district of Chicoutimi has as much and even more work to do than the judges of Arthabaska, Rimouski, Gaspé and Beauce have to do in their own districts. But, although the judge for Chicoutimi may have more work to do than the judges of the districts I have just mentioned have, that is no reason why he should get an increase of salary. I think he is sufficiently paid, and so are also the other judges. In my opinion, it would be preferable for the Government to amend their measure not as suggested by my hon. friend, but in an opposite direction. It would be far better, according to my way of thinking, to curtail the salaries paid to our judges. The result would be that we would no longer see some of our colleagues seeking high offices and we would no longer hear the supporters of the Government saying that their colleagues are endeavouring to be raised to the bench or to some other position. Although, on principle, I am opposed to an increase in the salary of judges, still I believe that the honourable Judges Gagné and DeBilly are as much entitled to that increase as Judge Taschereau is. Judge Taschereau is no greater ornament to the bench than are his colleagues, Judges Gagné, DeBilly, and Larue. We are told that Mr. Justice Taschereau has to administer justice in the district of Terrebonne. Now, by the fact that he has continued to live in Montreal, where his presence is tolerated, he is not entitled to an increase of salary. The same favour was granted to Judge Gagné who resides in the town of Chicoutimi. The hon. member for Charlevoix (Mr. Angers) has adduced as a reason in favour of giving an increase of salary to Mr. Justice Gagné the fact that he has to travel and thereby incur some expenditure.

Mr. ANGERS. (Translation.) I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon ; he should not put into my mouth the very opposite to what

I said. I never invoked as a plea in favour of my demand the expenditure incurred by Mr. Justice Gagné. Like the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) I only touched upon that question in order to point out the hardships which the judge has to undergo in travelling over long distances in his district, without my taking into consideration the expenditure involved.

Mr. SAVARD. (Translation.) I was just coming to that point. Did the hon. gentleman mean to complain on behalf of the judge about the hardships experienced by the latter in attending to his duties in the district of Chicoutimi, or else did he pretend to say that his expenses were too large? The hon. gentleman has laid great stress upon the hardships which this judge has to undergo in the discharge of his judicial duties. I may tell my hon. friend that, from my practical experience of the counties of Chicoutimi, Saguenay and Charlevoix, it does not take eight days to travel from Malbaie to Chicoutimi. Since we have had a Liberal Government at the head of affairs in this country, a Government pledged to a policy of progress, the trains have run regularly three times a week between Quebec and Chicoutimi in winter, and we have a steamboat running every day in summer, so that Judge Gagné could have saved a great deal of time, by travelling in the cars. If he has found it more convenient to travel during such snowstorms as we have had last winter, I fail to see why the Budget should be answerable for it, and why this House should be invited to vote an increase of salary to the honourable judge.

Mr. BERGERON. (Translation.) He should wait till the storm is over, to travel.

Mr. SAVARD. (Translation.) As everybody knows, during the snow storms which raged last winter, some hon. gentlemen took three days to cover the distance from Montreal to Ottawa. The hon. member for Charlevoix should not forget those facts. If Judge Gagné, when called upon to administer justice to the intelligent electors of my hon. colleague from Charlevoix, has deemed it more convenient to travel in the way he did, it was, no doubt, because he wished to avail himself of the opportunity to visit Quebec and Montreal on his way to Malbaie, the county town of the district. I have quite frequently travelled over that road and I speak with knowledge. I am satisfied that an ordinary man could cover that distance on foot in two days. I was surprised at hearing the hon. gentleman say that Mr. Justice Gagné had taken a week to cover that distance, and I am not far from believing that the good faith of the hon. gentleman was abused. I agree with the hon. gentleman who shares with me the honour of representing this judicial district in the House, that there exists a certain anomaly from the standpoint taken by him in dealing with this question, and, should the salaries of the judges be readjusted, I have no doubt but that steps would be taken to remedy the grievance complained of. I fail to see why, when the salaries of judges were originally fixed, the judges for the judicial districts of Chicoutimi, Saguenay and Gaspé were not put on the same footing as the other judges. Probably this was owing to the fact, and the hon. gentlemen will no doubt agree with me that, at that time, the county of Chicoutimi and Saguenay, as well as that of Charlevoix, were not represented in this House, as they are to-day, by members able to press upon the Government the merits of their respective districts. I fail to see any other reason for the existence of that anomaly, because had it been pointed out at that time, I have no doubt but that it would have been corrected. The districts of Chicoutimi and Gaspé are the two largest districts in the province of Quebec, if not the most populous or the most commercial; and in view of the considerable hardships which the judges have to undergo and of the expenditure involved in travelling they should have been put on the same basis as the other judges. I shall not trespass any further upon the indulgence of this House, but while I am on my feet, I wish to say this: I am glad to see that the Bill now before the House does not provide for an increase of salary in favour of the judges of Chicoutimi and Gaspé, because such an increase, to my mind, would have been at variance with the interests of the county. If those two judges against whom I have not a word to say, are under the impression that they are not adequately paid for their services, let them step down from the bench, and, at all events, the administration of justice will not suffer from such a step.

Mr. BERGERON. I wish to remind my hon. friend the Solicitor General that he omitted, no doubt inadvertently, to answer the question I put to him the other day, and which was again put to him to-day by the member for Charlevoix (Mr. Angers). It was with regard to a conflict of jurisdiction between this Parliament and the Quebec legislature. This resolution provides, so far as the court of revision is concerned:

> But no travelling allowance shall be granted to any judge requested to sit in review, under section 1 of chapter 20 of the statutes of 1898 of the legislature of Quebec, unless it is certified by the chief justice or judge discharging the duties of the chief justice in the district, that the attendance of such judge was necessary by reason of the illness, incapacity or absence of one of the judges resident at Montreal or Quebec, as the case may be.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I am of opinion that, take for instance the district of Quebec, the four judges are quite competent to dispose of all the cases that come before the court of review, and I can see no justification for the additional expenditure entailed by bringing in outside judges

to assist in the performance of that duty. My right hon. leader, however, drew my attention to this clause of the Bill, and expressed the opinion, in which my hon. friend shared, that perhaps we are going beyond our powers in introducing the legislation in its present form; and in order to comply with the request of my leader and my hon. friend, I have amended the Bill so as to make it read:

Shall be certified by the chief justice or judge discharging the duties of chief justice in that district, that the attendance of such judge was necessary in his discretion.

Mr. BERGERON. I understand that this Act was passed by the Quebec House last session at the solicitation of the county judges.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. It had the unanimous support of the bar.

Mr. BERGERON. A great deal has been said about the system of our judicature in the province of Quebec, and I do not want to take up the time of the House by repeating what has been said. I want, however, to emphasize the fact that our system really needs amending. The other day I asked my right hon. friend whether, since we are called on to pay, it would not be proper that he should confer with the local authorities, and in the course of the discussion today the right hon. gentleman mentioned one way by which he could force the Quebec legislature to confer with him on this question. We are not obliged to vote this salary. The Quebec legislature may ask for one or more judges, but we are not obliged to vote the money to pay them. It was decided by this House, under the direction of the late Sir John Thompson, that we need not grant the nomination of the judges they ask for if we do not think they are needed. The right hon. gentleman spoke of the address of Sir Melbourne Tait, chief justice of the province of Quebec. I was present when the chief justice gave that address, and have read it, and I did not understand him to say that there should be new appointments, but merely that there ought to be two judges in Sherbrooke. There are sufficient judges in the province of Quebec at present to provide for two at Sherbrooke by taking one from somewhere else. This new appointment is purely and simply a political one, and hon. gentlemen opposite are taking advantage of the law passed in Quebec a few years ago to make this political appointment.

The PRIME MINISTER. Have we the power, if we called on Mr. Justice Lynch to discharge the duties of a second judge in the district of St. Francis, and if he refused, to compel him to do so?

Mr. BERGERON. I do not say that, but I say that if the Government would refuse to appoint a new man, the chief justice would have to apply to the Quebec legislature to have one of the judges not required in the other districts sent to Sherbrooke. We are legislating here for the whole country, and we should do so on business principles and not on party exigencies, and although the present Government is not responsible for the existing state of things, that does not make it any better and does not justify us in doing anything to continue it. There are now sufficient judges in Quebec——

Mr. CASGRAIN. There are too many.

Mr. BERGERON—but the work is badly distributed. In Montreal the right hon. gentleman knows that there is as much as and probably a great deal more, litigation than in all the rest of the province, and my hon. friend the Solicitor General has gone so far as to say that there is more than in the whole province of Ontario. There are not sufficient judges in Montreal. Three or four more there would only enable the courts to keep up with the work from day to day, but there are judges in the country who have nothing to do. Is it not time therefore that an effort should be made to have the system changed? Let me give you, Mr. Speaker, for the edification of members from the other provinces, an evidence in support of what I say. We had a judge in Montreal, who was respected and esteemed by everybody and who has lately been raised to the position of Lieutenant-Governor of the province of Quebec. I refer to Mr. Justice Jetté. He was looked upon as one of the most painstaking and distinguished jurists in our province. Whether the salary paid to him was insufficient or not, I do not know, but he not only acted as judge, but also as professor at Laval University. I have no doubt that it was not because of the paltry salary paid a professor that he so acted, but because he was fond of study and the teaching of law, but all the same the time devoted to his professorship was not given to the study of the records in the cases on which he sat. More than that, he also administered the Beaudry estate, for which he got a salary, and though I am equally inclined to think that it was not for the salary that he did the work, nevertheless the time he had to give to it was not spent in the study of his judicial records. What was the consequence? It was that when he was appointed Lieutenant-Governor, in over eighty cases which he had taken en délibéré, the délibéré had to be discharged, to the great expense of the clients and inconvenience of the lawyers, and had to be tried over again. Out of these eighty records, there was one case that had been pleaded in 1886, and which had been kept en délibéré by Mr. Justice Jetté ever since. The case had to be pleaded over again, and on Monday last judgment was rendered by Mr. Justice Gill of Montreal. Yet Mr. Justice Jetté was one of the best judges in the province and

enjoyed a reputation which any man might envy. What takes place in Montreal to-day? Judges come in from the country and preside in the Montreal court. That I believe, is a good thing, because some of these judges have told me themselves that if they remained entirely in their own districts, where they had work for only one or two months in the year, they would get rusty in their law. Because it is a good thing for the judges to be occupied and greatly occupied. It is a good thing for them to go to Montreal. What they charge is very little in comparison with the services they render. But when they go to Montreal, do the judges in Montreal work as hard as they should? Altogether for the reasons I have given, I contend—and I call the attention of my hon. friend from North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) to this point—that we are voting $4,000 a year needlessly. This represents a capital which we are virtually throwing away. My hon. friend (Mr. Casgrain), who has been Attorney General of Quebec, says that we have too many judges. But the judges are badly distributed. Now, I would like some improvements in certain particulars. Take, for instance, the case of election trials. In Ontario, when a judge goes out for an election trial, he gets $100, whether the case lasts a day or a week. In Quebec, the judge is paid $6 a day. And these are judges of the very same class and do the same work, and in each case it is in the administration of a federal law. There should not be this invidious distinction to the disadvantage of the Quebec judges. I call the attention of the Solicitor General to this matter. It is an anomaly and should be changed.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. By whom are these payments to judges made?

Mr. CASGRAIN. By your Government.

Mr. BERGERON. I will give the hon. gentleman an example. A judge in Montreal goes to an election trial in Soulanges and is paid $6 a day for three days, or $18. A judge from Toronto goes to Prescott, which is a neighbouring county, and he will sit one day and receive $100.

The PRIME MINISTER. Where is that law? And who is responsible for it?

Mr. BERGERON. The right hon. Prime Minister said a few moments ago that he was becoming a Conservative. I am afraid he will go too far in that direction. He used to call himself a Reformer; and a man ought to be a reformer when there is something to reform.

The PRIME MINISTER. Show us the law.

Mr. BERGERON. My hon. friend the Solicitor General knows that that is the law.

The PRIME MINISTER. I question the statement, because I cannot conceive that such a law can apply to one province and not apply to the other. If any statute of this Parliament provides that $100 shall be paid to a judge in one province for holding an election trial it ought to be the same for all the provinces.

Mr. BERGERON. That is what strikes me.

Mr. BRITTON. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergeron) is quite right. It appears in chapter 138 of the Revised Statutes, section 13:

There shall be paid to the judges for travelling allowances, the sums following, that is to say:—

In the province of Ontario:

To each of the judges of the High Court of Justice of that province, one hundred dollars for each time he holds any court for the trial of causes, in any county except the county of York and the city of Toronto.

In the province of Quebec:

To each of the judges of the Court of Queen's Bench, and for each term (appeal side and criminal side) attended by him elsewhere than at his place of residence, one hundred dollars.

To each of the judges of the said Court of Queen's Bench, for attending any other court, for each day he is absent from his place of residence, six dollars.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The reason for this is quite apparent. In the province of Quebec the trial ought to be held by a judge living in the district. But in Ontario, the judges live in Toronto and have to travel to where the election trial is held. If our judges would do their duty and live in their districts, there would not be any difficulty about this.

Mr. BERGERON. I repeat the argument I used before, which my hon. friend evidently did not hear—that it is a good thing for the judges to go out of their districts and to sit in Montreal and Quebec, and hear cases pleaded by good lawyers. I contend that this difference that I have pointed out in the payment of the judges is an anomaly.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. There is no anomaly about it.

Mr. BERGERON. Now, there is another question I wish to put. When a judge of the Superior Court in the province of Quebec is called upon to go and sit in the Court of Appeal as they often are, will he be paid $6 per day in the same way as the judges of the Court of Appeal are to be paid when they travel?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I hope he will not be paid at all. He is not entitled to anything. The judges ad hoc should be taken from the districts in which the case is tried.

Mr. CASGRAIN. But the judges in Montreal have all that they can do.

The PRIME MINISTER. Paying them $6 a day will not give them less to do.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The judge ad hoc should be taken from the court in which the judge sits. With fourteen judges in Montreal, if we cannot get one for such cases, it will be a very strange thing.

Mr. BERGERON. The idea in the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Fitzpatrick's) mind seems to be that a judge in Quebec or Montreal is different from a judge in the country. But the judges are appointed for the Superior Court of the province of Quebec, and they should be on the same footing, not only as judges but in the opinion of lawyers. Moreover, there are judges in the country who are better administrative judges than some of those in Montreal.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The judge ad hoc is appointed out of the Superior Court, and I say that the judges of the Superior Court ought to take a man from the district and not put the country to the expense of paying for travelling expenses.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Then a man would have to be called from the country to take the place of the judge in Montreal.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. There are fourteen judges in Montreal.

Mr. CASGRAIN. And every one of them has more than he can do.

Mr. BERGERON. I do not wish to take up more time. I have done my duty in calling these matters to the attention of the Prime Minister and the Solicitor General. My right hon. friend spoke of reform and said we on this side wanted reform. That is true. My impression is there are more reformers among Conservatives than there are amongst the Liberals. What have the present Government reformed since they came into power? They have taken the policy of the Conservative party, but in trying to carry it out they have spoiled it. My right hon. friend said he was becoming a Conservative. That is generally the fate of those who get into power. They are great democrats, great reformers, in Opposition, but when they get into power they are Conservatives, which is quite natural. But my hon. friend said something just now which might have been left unsaid. He said he had become pretty much of a Conservative in consequence of standing by the constitution. Let me tell him he has forgotten something about the constitution. There is an article in the constitution called article 93; and since he has become a Conservative on account of standing by the constitution, I want to read that article to him. The Minister of Public Works forgot that article when he went to Winnipeg:

> Where in any province a system of separate or dissentient schools exists by law at the Union or is thereafter established by the legislature of the province, an appeal shall lie to the Governor General in Council from any Act or decision of any provincial authority affecting any right or privilege of the Protestant or Roman Catholic minority of the Queen's subjects in relation to education.

My hon. friend has forgotten this, because he has violated this article of the constitution. He will have to become a little more Conservative.

Motion agreed to.

Bill read the second time, and the House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Nothing was said by the Solicitor General in regard to an extraordinary provision in clause 1, a retroactive subsection of that clause, which involves the compulsory retirement of judges, although they received their commission in the usual way.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The provision is a very ordinary one, it seems to me, that no person shall retain his office as a judge of a county court after he has completed the 75th year of his age. That applies to judges now appointed.

Mr. CASGRAIN. When a judge holds Her Majesty's commission during good behaviour, how can the hon. gentleman change that? I do not think it was ever done before, it cannot be done. You are giving retroactive effect to this law, affecting judges who are appointed under certain circumstances, and with a written pledge that they should have such and such a salary during the time they acted.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It is a most vicious thing in principle. Look at the position the judges of the land are placed in, and for the first time. They become actually creatures of the Administration, though they are supposed to be absolutely independent of the executive. That has been the position of English judges all along. Some of the ablest men in Ontario have served as judges long after the age of 75, and some judges of the Supreme Court of Canada are serving now ever the age of 75.

Mr. CAMPBELL. They ought to have been removed.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The Ontario judge I have in my mind left the bench at a very advanced age, at a time when he was universally regarded to be the most brilliant judge who adorned the bench at that time. The hon. gentleman does not appreciate the great constitutional importance, under the British system, of having a judiciary absolutely independent of the executive. You appoint judges for life, for in-

stance, as these judges have been appointed, and then for the first time you fix their term of service at the age of 75, thereby introducing a new order of things which indicates to the judges of the land that if the Government can shorten their term at that age, they can shorten it at 60, or 50 years of age. Therefore, the reasons which have always led us to keep the judiciary absolutely independent of the executive, cease to prevail in this country. Up to this time, we have followed closely the English example, and the English policy, that a judge's office cannot be interfered with by the executive in this way. I would like to know if the hon. gentleman can give us a case in England, or in Canada, or in any of the old provinces, where the term of a judge has been shortened by the legislature. I have given a good deal of attention to this subject, it has been discussed in connection with the great age at which some judges have continued to serve. I have not found in any research a case under the British system of government where the tenure of a judge was affected after his appointment by Act of Parliament.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I do not understand that the hon. gentleman questions our right to legislate in this way, but he questions the propriety. I would ask the hon. gentleman to allow me to read the law as it now exists:

> Every judge of a county court in any of the provinces of Canada shall, subject to the provisions of this Act, hold office during good behaviour, and his residence within the county or union of counties for which the court is established.
>
> A judge of a county court may be removed from office by the Governor General in Council for misbehaviour, or for incapacity or inability to perform his duties properly, on account of old age, ill-health or any other cause.

The Governor in Council has a right to remove any person who is incapacitated for performing his duties through old age. If he has got that right, has not this Parliament got the right to legislate in such a way as to fix the limit at 75 years of age?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. That is hardly an arguable question. But there is a case where the legislature, on the appointment of a judge, defines what it means by inability, it is following really in the line of good behaviour. For instance, if a judge, after such an examination as a commission would make, showing that he was unable to perform his duties, no doubt, in the case of County Court judges, that being ascertained by a commission, he might be removed by impeachment, if he presumed to remain on the bench after his incapacity was declared. That does not affect the general principle that I refer to as having prevailed so long. But here you say that though a judge is in good health, though he may be the most brilliant man on the bench, as was the Ontario judge I referred to, after he reaches the age of 75, he must be retired. But you make this legislation retroactive, and if you can do that, you practically intimate to other judges that their independence is gone, because unless they remain in sympathy with the executive, it is possible the executive may limit their judicial career by making the age 70.

Committee rose and reported progress.

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

After Recess.

JUDGES OF THE PROVINCIAL COURTS.

(In the Committee.)

On section 3,

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I move that this section be struck out. It seems to me that if there be anything in the argument of the Prime Minister the last clause of this section is unconstitutional, for it is fixing the salary conditionally. I know it is in the local law.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). It is Federal law. It is paragraph 4, chapter 138, which provides that the chief justice of the Superior Court shall receive $6,000, the senior puisne judge residing in Quebec, if the chief justice resides in Montreal, or the senior puisne judge residing in Montreal, if the chief justice resides in Quebec, an addition to either salary of $1,000. That has been the law for years, and is in the revised statutes. If this section were struck out there would be no increase of the judges' salaries.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It is simply following up the argument I made, and this section fixes the salaries.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The only increase here is that of $1,000 for the judge of the district of Terrebonne. I suppose the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) does not raise the constitutional question now.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. No.

Amendment negatived.

On section 6,

Mr. BRITTON. I think there is a little misapprehension in the House in regard to judges' salaries in Ontario, and this is perhaps an opportune time to say a few words on the matter. The main object of this clause is to increase the salaries of the junior judges after three years of service to $2,400, which will make their salary in all $2,600. The junior judges of Ontario have no addition in any way to their remuneration except it be where there is a reference direct to them, whereby they supplement their salaries to some considerable extent. But the senior judges of the county courts are very differently paid, and in many cases they are very amply paid for the work they

do. They have a direct salary of $2,400, an additional allowance of $200, and they have of course the surrogate work. Whether that work is paid for by fees or by commutation the amount is a very considerable addition to their salaries, ranging all the way from $400 to over $1,000 in many cases—I am speaking now exclusive of the county of York. In addition to that they have certain fees pertaining to the duties of their office. The senior judge is a member of the board of county audit and is paid a per diem allowance for that. He is also the selector of jurors for which he is paid a per diem allowance. He also has the revision of the voters' lists, although the junior is competent also to take that work, and for that he has travelling expenses and a per diem allowance when he goes outside the county town to attend to it. In addition to all these, the senior judges as pertaining to their office have references directly to them, and in no sense can it be said that the senior county court judges of Ontario are underpaid for the work they do. I am not saying one word against these officers because the county court judges of Ontario embrace very many able and painstaking men in their ranks; men who are doing a very large amount of work, although they are not overworked by any means as a class. The salary of a judge of the court of appeal as provided in this Bill is $5,000, but as some hon. members know each of the Supreme Court judges of Ontario has an additional $1,000 paid him by the province of Ontario, so that his direct salary is $6,000, and then each of these judges who goes on circuit has $100 allowance for each court he attends. The Supreme Court judges, outside of election trials attend probably eighteen courts during the year, and this gives them an allowance of $1,800, when as a matter of fact probably their expenses in attendance on those courts will not exceed $300. The judges of the court of appeal do not go on circuit, and therefore they do not get the $100 allowance in the ordinary work of their court, but when holding election trials they get the $100. There is, therefore, a direct addition to the salaries of the Supreme Court judges in Ontario of $1,500, which with the $6,000, makes $7,500 for the puisne judges, and the pay is not so small as it seems when we are discussing the matter simply as to a question of salary. One word as to the amendment which was passed in 1897 by the provincial legislature and which made it necessary for the appointment of this additional judge to the court of appeal. The constitution of the court was changed by the Act of 1897, and that made it impossible to dispose of cases of appeal from the divisional court to the court of appeal, except by a court of five judges, and so that Act has tied up the business before the court of appeal and there has been a dead lock so far as the cases from the divisional court are concerned. Therefore it is waiting the provision for the salary of this judge and his appointment in order to do the work. This Parliament is in no way to blame for that. I fancy it would be quite proper for the provincial legislature while they proceeded to add an additional judge to the court, to have made the Act apply only as to work which afterwards come before it, and in the meantime cases could have been disposed of before the four judges. In that way these cases in which there were appeals from the divisional court, need not have been tied up as the hon. the Solicitor General mentioned.

On section 1,

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Although I appreciate and sympathize with the desire for speed, I want to fortify what I said before. I know of no such interference with the independence of the judiciary ever attempted in this Parliament, and I have looked up the only case that seems to approach it in the English House, which was in regard to an inferior court; and the delicacy with which any action of this kind touching a judge of that inferior court was taken, fortifies the objection I made in regard to subsection 2 of section 1, which reads:

> The subsection so substituted shall apply as well to judges now holding office as to judges to be hereafter appointed.

That is to say, the Government propose to interfere with the tenure of office of all the judges who were appointed under specific conditions, and for a specific term. I say that is a breach of faith; it is entirely unwarranted; it violates one of the most sacred principles of the English constitution; and if these principles are to be considered as important now as they have hitherto been regarded in England and in Canada, I am at an entire loss how this provision can be persisted in. I do not question the propriety or fairness of fixing the limit suggested for all new appointments; but I am at a loss to conceive where we obtain any right or reason to lay hands on the vested rights of these judges, and by that means attack their independence, and indeed the independence of the judges to be appointed, of every court, by enunciating the policy for the first time that these judges may have their tenure of office affected by the Government of the day, for any reason which to them seems good and sufficient. I find an immediate reference to this subject in Todd, where the history of the agitation that brought about the complete independence of the judiciary from the executive is treated in this way:

> Previous to the revolution of 1688, the judges of the superior courts, as a general rule, held their offices at the will and pleasure of the Crown. Under this tenure there were frequent instances, from time to time, of venial, corrupt, or oppressive conduct on the part of judges, and of arbitrary conduct—in the displacement of upright

judges, and conniving at the proceedings of dishonest judges on the part of the Crown, which gave rise to serious complaints, and led to several attempts, during the seventeenth century, to limit the discretion of the Crown in regard to appointments to the bench.

Then, later on:

One step only remained to place the judges in a position of complete independence of the reigning sovereign, and that was to exempt them from the rule, ordinarily applicable to office-holders, whereby their commissions should be vacated upon the demise of the Crown.

The lawyers of the House are, of course, familiar with the legislation which took place to bring that about. Then, Todd, later on, discussing the tenure of the judges, says:

The legal effect of the grant of an office during good behaviour is the creation of an estate for life in the office. Such an estate is terminable only by the grantee's incapacity from mental or bodily infirmity, or by his breach of good behaviour. But, like any other conditional estate, it may be forfeited by a breach of the condition annexed to it—that is to say, by misbehaviour. Behaviour means behaviour in the grantee's official capacity

And he proceeds to discuss that phase of the question. Rightly or wrongly, we have given these judges that high estate, for the purpose of putting them in a position where they could act with the most complete independence of the Government of the day or of any political party, knowing that with these conditions their rights would be safeguarded by the common consent of Parliament. The only case I can find that comes at all near this proposition, and that can yet be distinguished easily from it, is a case that arose in the Imperial Parliament in 1867; and in that case, we shall see how quickly the Government appreciated the delicacy of interfering in the slightest way with the office of a judge, for the Bill I am going to refer to could have been justified on the ground that the duties of the office were so increased, in the case of an inferior court, that it could be said that the judge holding the office was incapable of satisfactorily performing them. They were dealing with a specific office and a specific judge, whose tenure of office it was proposed to interfere with because it was proposed to add to the duties of the office and to its importance, and the statement in support of the Bill was that the present incumbent was not fit to discharge those duties. This is the case:

Upon the introduction of a Bill to extend the jurisdiction, alter and amend the procedure and practice, and regulate the establishment of the Court of Admiralty in Ireland, with a view to bring under the cognizance of this court matters of common law in relation to which the presiding judge had no professional experience. Ministers being of opinion that the judge would be incompetent to discharge the additional duties, introduced a clause into the Bill to repeal his tenure of office, so as to permit of his removal at the pleasure of the Crown.

The Bill in that case proposed to remove this judge on the ground of his incapacity, which is not the case here at all. This Bill arbitrarily fixes the age for retirement at 75, whether the judge is capable or incapable, and applied that to judges now holding office. The English Bill provided that he should be entitled, on his retirement, to receive an annuity equal to his full salary. Under those circumstances, the Bill was carried by the majority of the House. I shall read what Lord Cranworth, when that Bill was introduced, said:

Lord Cranworth said that the judge of the Admiralty Court in Ireland held office under an Act of Parliament, which made him irremovable, except upon an Address from both Houses of Parliament; his tenure was, therefore, the same as that of the Lord Chief Justice of the Queen's Bench; yet for the first time in the annals of English history the enactment which fixed his tenure on this footing was to be repealed by this clause, in order that he might be immediately removed. If this gentleman was an unfit person to discharge the duties of the office, it would be proper to say so; but the judge defied anybody to show this. There had been a constitutional safeguard against the removal of judges, and it was now proposed to take it away.

I think I need not elaborate that, but it fully confirms the position I take, that even in that case—a case of almost admitted incapacity—the Bill itself was so criticised by Lord Cranworth, though it was amended so as to provide that if, in the public interest, it was desirable he should be removed, being guilty of no misconduct, then he should get his full salary on retirement. That, however, is not the proposal of the hon. gentleman, and his Bill therefore has not the merits involved in that proposition. Under it Parliament can lay its hand on judges capable of performing their duties, and the hon. gentleman will not say that the judges on the county court benches and in other courts in Canada to-day are not as able as ever in their lives to perform their duties. The proposal is that they shall be absolutely retired, contrary to the conditions on which they were appointed and without any consideration, such as was decided to be necessary in the case I have put. I say that this is a radical proposition and not supported by the British Parliament or any Canadian Parliament I am aware of.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. There is a great deal in which the hon. gentleman has said, but it seems to me that there is no violation of any principle and no attack on the independence of judges in this Bill. All that we do is to say that a judge appointed under a statute which provides that if he become incapable from age to perform his duties, he may be removed, shall instead be removed when he has attained 75 years of age and thus avoid any inquiry.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. As to the future that is a strong position.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. My right hon. friend has to admit two things. First, that we have a constitutional right to do this, and secondly that it is a wise precaution for the future. The only objection he takes is that it is an interference with the quasi contract entered into between the judge and the Government of Canada, and I admit there is a great deal in his contention, but I submit there is no sacrifice of principle.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I shall take the opportunity of moving on the third reading of the Bill, if this clause carries, that this section would be amended by adding to the 11th line after the words "provided that no person" the words "hereafter appointed," and to strike out of the subsection 2 of that section 1 the words "as well as the judges now holding office as"

Mr. McNEILL. Does my hon. friend mean to say that it is to be retroactive ? Are we to understand that the judges who have been acting for years on an understanding with the country, are to be now treated on a different basis ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Under the law as it now stands, any county court judge holds office during his good behaviour, but he may be removed from office on proper investigation, either for misconduct or for inability from any cause to perform his duties. The intention of this amendment is to provide that he shall when he has reached 75 years of age, ipso facto cease to be a judge.

Mr. McNEILL. Even if he is still able to performs his functions of judge efficiently and there be no excuse for dismissing him.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Without any reference to that whatever.

Mr. McNEILL. Is not that a terrible proposition ?

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It is unprecedented as well as terrible.

Mr. INGRAM. How many judges are there on the bench 75 years of age ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. There are two cases, one over 90 and the other over 80, and each of them is absolutely unable to perform his duties.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Then they can be removed under the present law.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Those are the only two cases I know of.

Mr. McNEILL. Some of the ablest and best judges we have ever had, in the mother country, at all events, were very much over the limit of age my hon. friend has laid down here, and it seems to me to be a very cruel thing to make this clause retroactive.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. My hon. friend will bear in mind that there are not many Lord Ushers and there are a good many Justices Stevens. There are only one or two judges that have gone beyond the age of 80 who are of any use. There have been a great many under 75 who ought to be removed, and a few years ago a very serious agitation arose out of some things that transpired in reference to Mr. Justice Stevens, that pointed to the necessity for such legislation.

Mr. McNEILL. My hon. friend has referred to a limit of 80 years, but I am speaking of 75. Perhaps the most efficient judges we have had at Westminster were over 75.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I admit that it is quite a radical change.

Mr. McNEILL. If the judge is unfit to perform his duties, he can be removed under the existing law. Would it not be better to accept the suggestion of the member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) and strike out this retroactive part of the Bill ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I quite appreciate the point made by the hon. member for Pictou, that he does not wish this to be made applicable to those holding office ; and I understand him to say that he will, on the third reading, move an amendment to meet that point.

Mr. McNEILL. If my hon. friend would agree to it, it could be moved now.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I cannot consent to that.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER moved that in section 1, line 1, after the word "person" the words "hereafter appointed" be added, and in section 2 of same section the words "as well as the judges holding office as" be struck out.

Mr. BRITTON. I am not going to argue the point taken by the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper). But I think there is a great deal in it. This is certainly an interference with vested rights. My hon. friend the Solicitor General has omitted to notice what may be the effect of this with regard to superannuation. The superannuation clause provides that if, after service of ten years as county judge, a man suffers from any permanent disease or disability, he can be retired on a two-thirds allowance. But after service of 25 years, he may voluntarily retire on a two-thirds allowance. This Act provides for the compulsory retirement of a judge at 75 years of age. But if a man has been appointed late in life, he may be retired without any provision being made for superannuation allowance at all. I should think that that would not be the intention. There ought to be a saving clause to protect the

man who has attained to the age of 75, and to assure him that he shall not be retired without some superannuation allowance.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I have a great deal of doubt as to the wisdom of this clause as regards future appointments. After what the Solicitor General has said, I think there is all the greater reason to doubt its wisdom. He has said that we have not many Lord Eshers, but we have had a great many Lord Stephens. I suppose the hon. gentleman meant we have not had many judges who have been able to discharge their duties after arriving at the age of 75 with the intelligence which the place demands, while we have had a great many cases of men under 75 who have failed in their mental faculties. That simply indicates that you cannot fix any time limit which will do justice even generally. One man may be as young at 75 as another at 60. We know from observation, those of us who are much before the courts, that that is the case. Many a judge, after he has attained the age of 75, discharges his duties with more vigour and greater capacity than many a man 20 years younger. I think the best way would be to leave the matter as under the present law, and allow a judge to continue to discharge his duties up to any age within which he is capable of discharging them efficiently. I admit that sometimes difficulties arise owing to the fact that a judge may not understand that he has become unfit to fill his place with efficiency. But I think it would be far better for the country that we should grapple with cases of that kind, however unfortunate it might be, rather than fix a definite time limit within which judges must be retired. By such a definite time limit we cannot receive any certain indication whether a judge is or is not capable of then discharging his duties. We know that in judicial life and in political life and in all walks of life. Who would have thought, for instance, of discharging Mr. Gladstone from the duties of political life because he had attained the age of 75 years. It was after that time that some of his greatest political work was done.

Mr. CAMPBELL. How many Gladstones are there ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Not many, perhaps. But the point is that we should not fix this time limit so as to exclude any Gladstones of the law. Be they many or few, the law as it stands, contains a perfect security on that point, because, if a judge becomes incapable of discharging his duty, he may be removed from his position. Therefore, I submit to my hon. and learned friend the Solicitor General that this is not a good policy even with respect to future appointments, and certainly I agree with everything that my hon. friend from Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) has advanced in respect to those judges who are already on the bench.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. We shall have to consider very carefully the question of superannuation. I have not had my attention drawn to that point until this evening. We will look into it more fully, and, to-morrow, I will be able to say how far we ought to go in this matter.

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fitzpatrick) has stated that there are two judges who may be affected by this subsection. I wish to draw the attention of the hon. gentleman to the case of the senior judge in my county, who is 75 years of age, and as competent to discharge his duties as he ever was. Some months ago, rumours were circulated to the effect that if the senior judge would not ask for superannuation, they would find means of forcing him to leave the bench. It strikes me that this section was prepared largely in view of that fact. Only two other judges, one of them something like a hundred years of age, will be affected by this subsection. Now, when the resolutions for this Bill were placed on the Order Paper, we found that the money consideration in the resolution would affect only one or two county judges in the county of Ontario. I consulted the Solicitor General with respect to that point, and he assured me that it would not——

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The only one affected is the county judge of Elgin, who receives $2,600. But he was appointed previous to confederation, and we cannot interfere with his salary.

Mr. INGRAM. Having sent resolutions to the judge to assure him that he would not be interfered with, I find that this section is introduced in the Bill. I suppose that the hon. gentleman has a perfect right to do this, as the section doees not involve a money consideration. But the effect of this would be to compel this judge to leave the bench, though he is as competent to-day as he ever was to discharge the duties of a judge.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Might I suggest to the Solicitor General that if this section is made to apply to judges now upon the bench, it might be well to consider whether those retired compulsorily at 75 years of age should not receive salary in full. That would, to some extent, meet the difficulty that my hon. friend from Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) has suggested.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I am heartily in favour of this section. I think that when a judge has served his country until he has arrived at the age of 75 years, it is time for him to have a rest. While there may be a few judges in the county who are quite competent to discharge the duties of the office at 75 years of age, yet, where there is one competent there are two or three incom-

petent. I know that there are in the province of Ontario many judges who ought to have been superannuated five years ago. I think this clause is a very good one, and I hope the Solicitor General will insist on carrying it through. I only regret that this section does not apply to all our judges. There are courts not more than a hundred miles from the city of Ottawa in which are judges who ought to have been retired five or ten years ago.

I think it is all nonsense to talk about men who are seventy-eight, eighty and eighty-two years of age and over, being able to sit and try the most important cases, cases that affect the welfare of the people of this country. I say it is absurd to argue that such men are competent to discharge the duties of that position. I think the provision is a wise one, and that there is no hardship, because these men will be retired with, I suppose, at least two-thirds of their salary for the rest of their life. It is time that they should retire then, and let somebody else take their places. Before I sit down, I want to refer to one statement that was made by the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron), which, if correct, ought to receive the most careful attention of the Solicitor General. I am amazed that the hon. member for Beauharnois and the late Minister of Justice should have allowed such a state of affairs as that which existed for many years in this Dominion; I refer to his statement that when the present Lieutenant-Governor of Quebec took office there were over eighty records of the courts that had been adjudicated upon, and upon which no decision had been arrived.

Mr. BERGERON. Not adjudicated upon.

Mr. CAMPBELL. One of them, I understood him to say, had been argued as long ago as 1886, and when the present Lieutenant-Governor took his position, these cases had all to be tried over again, the witnesses to be called, and arguments to be reheard, at an enormous expense to the client. Such a state of affairs is simply disgraceful.

Mr. BERGERON. I want to correct my hon. friend. The witnesses had not to be called again, only the arguments had to be reheard.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Then, it is not quite so bad, but I say the late Minister of Justice, who now argues so strongly against this Bill, and condemns the Government for rectifying an injustice that he had allowed to prevail for many years, is very inconsistent, and ought to receive the censure of the people for having neglected the interests that were entrusted to his charge. Why did not the member for Beauharnois bring this matter up? He sat in this House for years, and allowed that state of affairs to exist, and never raised his voice in defence of the people of this country; and I venture to say that if there had not been a change of Government, he would have been silent to-day. I hope the Solicitor General will give this matter his serious consideration, and put a stop to such a scandalous state of affairs as has been disclosed in the province of Quebec. As for Ontario, I have no doubt that a little overhauling of the judges in that province will have a very wholesome effect upon them, as well as upon the people of this country.

Amendment (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) negatived: Nays, 28; yeas, 44.

Mr. POWELL. I made a suggestion to the Solicitor General, but I do not see that any notice has been taken of it. In the province of New Brunswick a county court judge is appointed, not for a judicial district comprising a number of counties, but for an individual county, and the wording of this Act speaks of the court of the united counties. It has no application to the province of New Brunswick at all. Strange to say, the Solicitor General is not responsible for it, by some means, it has been re-enacted two or three times.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. So far as that portion of the section is concerned, I have not touched it at all. The law remains as it was in 1873 when the judges were appointed.

Mr. POWELL. But the Solicitor General will agree with me that the statute has been absurd.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Would my hon. friend suggest a remedy?

Mr. POWELL. By adding a few words like these: Resident in the same county for which the judge has been appointed.

Bill as amended reported.

CIVIL SERVICE SUPERANNUATIONS.

House again resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 76) to provide for the abolition of the Civil Service Superannuation Act, and for the retirement of members of the civil service.

(In the Committee.)

On section 2,

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Section 2 of the Bill was held over, and also section 5, section 2, subsection b. Many views were expressed by hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House as to whether it was a fair proposition to apply the means to any persons now in the service, and in order to do no injustice, the Government has decided to defer to the views presented by hon. gentlemen, and make the Bill wholly applicable to those hereafter appointed to the service. It is proposed to allow persons who have been more than ten years in the service up to 1st January, 1899, in which to elect to

accept the provisions of the Act. I move that the clause be amended so as to read as follows :—

2. This Act shall apply instead of the Civil Service Superannuation Act—
(a) To every person hereafter appointed to the civil service ;
(b) To every person now in the civil service who, before the 1st of January, 1899, with the consent of the Governor in Council, elects to accept the provisions of this Act in lieu of those of the Civil Service Superannuation Act.

Mr. CLARKE. I understand, then, that those who have been in the service ten years will have the option of coming under the Act up to 1st January, 1899 ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is optional with them, but the consent of the Governor General in Council is necessary. There is nothing compulsory about it.

Mr. BELL. This does not affect the provision regarding those who have been less than ten years in the service ?

Mr. MONTAGUE. It is compulsory only on those who come in after the Bill becomes law.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It applies to new appointments.

Section as amended, agreed to.

On section 5,

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I move to strike out in section 5 the third and fourth line and to substitute 4 per cent instead of 5 per cent per annum as the rate of interest.

Mr. McMULLEN. I must enter my protest against the proposed rate of interest. I do not think 4 per cent should be allowed when the Government only gives 2½ per cent to depositors in the savings banks. I move in amendemnt to reduce the rate to 3 per cent.

Mr. ROGERS. I was willing that the rate should remain at 4 per cent if the ten-year clause had remained in the Bill. That clause should not have been changed. I am, however, in favour of paying 3 per cent, and I second the amendment.

Mr. FOSTER. I have some sympathy with my hon. friend (Mr. McMullen), and I should be glad if he would explain the principle on which he moves in amendment that the rate be 3 per cent. Does he mean to say that civil servants are only half per cent better than depositors in savings banks, and on what principle does he give half per cent, and not one per cent or one and a half per cent more ? If there is a good solid principle behind his amendment, I might feel inclined to vote for him.

Mr. SPROULE. I feel like going almost the length of the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen)—though I would not be against giving them 4 per cent—but the hon. member (Mr. McMullen) did not assist us in trying to keep the interest on the poor man's savings in the Post Office and Government Savings Banks up to 3 per cent, and on the contrary spoke in favour of it being cut down to 2½ per cent, while for my part I was very much against that proposal. I have always been opposed to reducing the rate of interest on the poor man's savings in the Government banks, because those moneys belong to the smallest wage-earners in the country. If I had the power of moving an amendment to the amendment, raising the Government rate of interest on savings banks deposits up to 3 per cent, perhaps, I might join with the hon. member (Mr. McMullen) and we would make the rate 3 per cent in both cases.

Mr. McMULLEN. It is right in my opinion that we should allow small depositors, such as artisans and mechanics, in the Government savings banks the same rate of interest we have to pay for money which we borrow in the markets. I hope that yet the Government may see their way clear to do that. I consider it costs us about 3 per cent to borrow money including all charges and we should not allow the civil servants more than that rate. They are the best paid class in this Dominion, taking them all in all, and there is no place they can get 4 per cent on their deposits. If we allow them 3 per cent we allow them a very good rate considering that we have to bear the expense of taking charge of the fund. Three per cent is all they are entitled to.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). The hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) has evidently not given this matter much consideration. He should remember that he is speaking of money which is taken from the civil servants against their will and which is worth a great deal more than 4 per cent to them in many cases. He is not speaking now of funds which men have accumulated and wish to invest, but he is speaking of money which civil servants require for their daily use, and no doubt many of these civil servants will have to borrow money and pay from 7 to 10 per cent for the use of it. It is perfectly absurd to draw a parallel between this civil service fund and money which people throughout the country have saved and wish to place in safe-keeping with the Government. Circumstances are altogether different. For my part I would much rather move an amendment to the Postmaster General's amendment, that the rate be restored to 5 per cent as it was originally intended. Any ordinary man who has no money to save would look upon it as harsh treatment if he were compelled to give up part of his earnings and receive only 4 per cent interest on it.

Mr. GIBSON. I agree that it is not fair to compare the rate of interest allowed by the Government on the money retained

from the civil servants, with the rate of interest paid to ordinary depositors, because you are compelling the civil servant to give up part of his earnings. Surely if the Government does that it is only fair that the rate should be augmented by the additional 1 per cent or 1½ per cent. The idea the Government has in view, as I understand, is to encourage the civil servants to provide money when the time comes for them to retire, and in my opinion they should be allowed a liberal rate of interest on that. I feel like my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Bell) that some encouragement should be given to the civil servants in carrying out this idea. I have always felt that it was a hardship that when civil servants paid into the superannuation fund for a number of years to provide against a rainy day, that when they died their families were left destitute, it was a great hardship that they got no return for the money thus invested. In this respect the present Bill is an improvement on the old law. The idea of the Government is to encourage thrift amongst the civil servants so that when they retire they may have some money to draw upon, and in this connection it is only fair that the Government should allow them 4 per cent.

Mr. ROGERS. I do not agree with the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Bell) that it is any hardship on the civil servants to retain this money from their salaries. As the Bill originally stood compelling those who are under ten years in the service to come under its operation, I felt that it was hardly fair not to give them 4 per cent. But as the Bill now only applies to those who will enter the service hereafter, only it is no hardship to allow them 3 per cent because they know what they are doing when they enter the service. There are many other avocations in life which they can fill if they think these terms are not fair. Perhaps this might be an incentive to many who are looking for civil service positions to look to some other calling in life, and if it did that it would do a great deal of good. I agree with the hon. member for North Wellington that 3 per cent interest is quite enough, especially when you are only allowing 2½ per cent to depositors in the Government savings banks.

Mr. SPROULE. I want to add a word by way of explanation for fear that I may have been misunderstood. In speaking on the second reading of this Bill, when I drew attention to the fact that the Government were allowing 5 per cent on the investments of the civil servants while they only allow the labouring man 2½ per cent on his deposit, I did not intend to convey the impression that I was opposed to giving the 5 per cent, but it was rather with the object of convincing the Government that the rate of interest they were allowing the investors in the Post Office and Government Savings Banks was far too low. In my judgment the Government would be justified in paying a higher rate of interest than the ordinary under such circumstances, so that small investors who put their savings in the possession of the Government might be encouraged to thrift.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I would remind my hon. friend from North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) that there is a good deal of difference between allowing money to be deposited and withdrawn at the will of the depositor at a few days' notice, and receiving and retaining for a generation the deductions from civil servants' salaries. The depositor can withdraw the money whenever he can place it to better advantage and get a high rate of interest, but the civil servant is obliged to allow his money to remain. I would also say to my hon. friend (Mr. McMullen) that the 4 per cent proposed to be allowed here is quite a drop from the allowance contemplated by the Superannuation Insurance Act. By that Act, which was passed in 1893, 6 per cent compounded is allowed on deposits in the insurance fund; and in like manner the amendment made to the Superannuation Act in 1893 estimated 6 per cent as the basis upon which the moneys of officials would be received and held. So that in this Bill we are making some progress in the right direction, in the view of my hon. friend, in reducing the rate from 6 per cent to 4 per cent.

Mr. McMULLEN. The deduction which is made from the salaries of civil servants should be held as a guarantee of good faith and efficient service on their part. In many of the departments they do not give any security, and this is the only security which the country really holds for the faithful discharge of their duties. If they were called upon to give bonds, and pay annually to secure those bonds, that would cost them about as much as the deduction from their salaries.

Mr. McDOUGALL. How is this a security?

Mr. McMULLEN. This is no security at all. It should be held as a security, but it is not. Under the Bill a deduction of 5 per cent per year is made, and that is returned to them with 3 per cent added, whether they act faithfully or unfaithfully. There is no provision that if they get into difficulty and have to resign, or if they become dissipated and have to be dismissed, this money shall be held. I maintain that if we return to them what they have paid in with the 3 per cent, we are giving them all they are entitled to; but to my mind, there is no argument for returning the money to them with 4 per cent, and without any security.

Sub-amendment (Mr. McMullen) negatived: Yeas, 2; nays, 51.

Amendment agreed to, and section, as amended, agreed to.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. For convenience of book-keeping, it is proposed that this Act shall come into force on the 1st of July, commencing with our fiscal year. Therefore, I propose to add the following as section 10:

This Act shall take effect on and after the first day of July, one thousand eight hundred and ninety-eight.

Section agreed to.

Bill as amended reported.

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 157) respecting the repayment of the moneys advanced to the St. John Bridge and Railway Extension Company.—(The Minister of Finance.)

SUPPLY—THE COPYRIGHT QUESTION.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, before the House goes into Supply, I beg to call its attention to a statement made yesterday afternoon by the right hon. the First Minister in the discussion on the copyright question. The right hon. gentleman, referring to the Hall Caine convention of some years ago (I quote from "Hansard") said:

My hon. friend from Toronto, if I understood him, thinks that the recent legislation introduced in England by Lord Herschell would make it impossible to carry into effect the Hall Caine convention. That is the burden of the impression he has attempted to make upon the Government. So far as his question is concerned, the Department of Justice do not agree with my hon. friend; they take issue with him directly. The Department of Justice and Mr. Newcombe, who has given great attention to this subject, I can speak with authority when I say, are clearly of opinion that the Act introduced by Lord Herschell will not interfere with the arrangement known as the Hall Caine arrangement, but that that arrangement can be given effect to by legislation. That is the view which we intend to impress upon the British Government.

Now, I made no statement whatever with regard to the Hall Caine settlement being interfered with by the Lord Herschell Act, and therefore the opinion of the Department of Justice and the Deputy Minister of Justice was not pertinent in that particular regard. Another statement of the right hon. First Minister, and the statement to which I more particularly wish to allude, was this (I quote from "Hansard" again):

The question, as my hon. friend from Toronto knows, is not one of a very wide import. It is important as it affects an important class, but it is more important to that class than to the people generally.

Now I am perfectly certain that nothing was further from the mind of my right hon. friend the First Minister than any intention to create a wrong impression, but he must know that the interests concerned in the copyright business are not only not class interests, but affect some of the largest trade industries in the country. He must be aware that in the making of paper there is invested capital to the extent of millions of dollars and with it immense labour interests which are as well largely concerned in this copyright question. He should know that the trade of type-setting, whether by machine or hand is an important branch of work which will be largely benefited by the passage of a copyright Act. He must also know that the printing business generally, the electrotyping, the stereotyping and the bookbinding interests of this country are all closely allied with the work of book-making and are directly affected by the passage or non-passage of a copyright Act. In fact, the question of copyright has a direct bearing on the labour of every one concerned with the paper and printing trades, from the humblest individual who picks the rags on the street to the highly-paid artist who illuminates the books which are made out of these rags. It is not a question of a class appealing to or dealing with a class, but concerns a large and important constituency which may be benefited to the extent of tens of thousands of dollars per year if encouragement be given to the labour that produces the literature of the country—yes, and upon the success of which depends the intellectual condition of the people. The statement of the right hon. the First Minister is not like the irresponsible statement of an ordinary member of Parliament, but is made, to a certain extent, with a warrant of authority and attested, so to speak, with the sign-manual of the Government by the First Minister. Indeed, it may be looked upon as an official utterance, and the greater weight it carries, the more danger of a false impression being created in not only this country, but also in Great Britain. I think the right hon. the First Minister should revise his opinion—or at least I think he should do so to prevent the impression being made upon the publishing interests of this country and on the minds of friends in Great Britain, that the publishing interests are limited to the important but small extent spoken of by the right hon. gentleman in the discussion yesterday, whereas it really concerns ten or twelve of the greatest industries of this country.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I owe it to my hon. friend to tell him very frankly that I appreciate the motive which has led him to make the remarks he has just given utterance to, and he certainly has said correctly that nothing could be more removed from my intention than to

create the impression that this question of copyright is not an important one. I fully agree that it is a very important one, not only to the publishers—and it is that class I had in my hand yesterday—but to the different industries he has just enumerated. But I call the attention of my hon. friend to this. Important as this question is to the several industries, it is so complex, so little understood, if I may say so, that it has not yet engrossed public opinion as it might have done, and as other questions of lesser moment have done in the past and may still do in the future. That was all I intended to say yesterday on the subject; and in so far as my remarks have led to a false impression, I have only to thank my hon. friend and to tell him that I stand amply and well corrected by the remarks he has just made.

THE POSTMASTER AT BATTLEFORD.

Mr. DAVIN. Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of the House and especially of the right hon. First Minister to circumstances that I think will excite his interest and surprise as well as the interest and surprise of the House. Last year, some time in the summer, an effort was made by certain persons at Battleford to get rid of the postmaster there, a man named Mercer, and complaints were made to the Postmaster General. The Postmaster General insisted that before he would give judgment on the alleged misconduct of Mercer, he should have affidavits before him; and thereupon one Skelton, one Dewan and one Daunais made a statutory declaration on which the Postmaster General acted. The Postmaster General, very fairly and honourably, sent copies of the affidavits, to Mercer to ascertain what reply he had to make. The moment these declarations came into the hands of Mercer, he at once did what you would expect under the circumstance, seeing that they did not contain a word of truth. He took steps to have Skelton, Dewan and Dunais prosecuted, and they were brought before the police magistrate and committed for trial. When the time came on to try them, an adjournment took place at their own request, and I am not sure that it was not at their own wish that a judge was brought from an outlying district, thousands of miles from Battleford, to try them. They were tried in October, and Skelton and Dewan were found guilty of perjury. Daunais' trial was postponed. A very able lawyer, Mr. T. C. Johnstone, prosecuting counsel for the Government at Regina, was retained for the defence, and he went to Battleford and defended them, and raised several points, which were noted by the judge. An appeal was then had to the full court at Regina which sat in December, and which took from December to February to consider its judgment. In February that court gave judgment, confirming the conviction of the two men, Skelton and Dewan.

No sooner was it known that the full court at Regina, which consisted of the ablest judges I think in Canada—certainly three of the ablest judges in the west—had confirmed the judgment unanimously, than a meeting took place at Battleford, and there was great indignation with the judiciary of the North-west Territories for daring to sustain that conviction, meetings were held at the house of Major Cotton, and it was openly stated that a new trial would be had. I call the attention of the Prime Minister to this peculiarity of the case—that before the trial was completed by judgment these persons said they would get a new trial, and they prepared statutory declarations, which were duly sworn, and Skelton started for Ottawa. A telegram was sent to me from Battleford, and a letter was sent to me from Regina from Mr. Norman Mackenzie, who had assisted the Crown prosecutor, because those who were interested in the carrying out of the law thought it was advisable that Mr. Mackenzie should be at Battleford during the trial. Mr. Mackenzie wrote me what was taking place. Early in March I went to see the Minister of Justice and saw him in his room near the Senate Chamber. I congratulated him cordially and sincerely on his having become a member of the Government, and then I told him why I came to him. He told me that up to that time, he had received no papers, no affidavit, no application—and, as a fact, he had not. I said to him: If you receive any papers or application in this matter, will you let me know? He said he would. I said: You will do nothing ex parte? He assured me he would do nothing ex parte, and before he would arrive at any decision he would hear me. Well, I may tell you, Mr. Speaker, that even then I was puzzled to know how any application could be made, under what law, how the Minister of Justice could hear any person or read any paper in regard to that trial. Where was his authority, judgment not having taken place, and, therefore, the trial not completed?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) say that the Minister of Justice has entertained an application?

Mr. DAVIN. What I said was that I did not see how he could, because the trial was incomplete. Well, a considerable time passed, and the next I heard of it was when I received a telegram first, and subsequently a letter from Battleford saying that Skelton, one of the convicted, had come to Ottawa, had brought affidavits, had seen the Minister of Justice and had gone back and declared that he was to get a new trial. This was before the trial was complete. I went at once to the Solicitor General and saw

him two or three times. The result was that I wrote to the Solicitor General a letter recounting to him the promises of the Minister of Justice. I did not hear from the Solicitor General for some time, and so I went to see him. I called at the office several times and after considerable interval—which I find by the documents was from the 21st April to the 10th May—I got a letter which I will read to the House. It consisted of an extract from a letter sent by the Minister of Justice to the Solicitor General. The letter is as follows :—

Ottawa, 10th May, 1898.

Regina vs. Skelton.

Dear Sir,—On receipt of your letter of 21st April last, I communicated with the Minister of Justice, who wrote to me yesterday to the following effect :—

"In reply to the inclosed letter I beg to say that Mr. Davin called upon me with reference to this case some time ago. I told him that no action further than to obtain the papers relating to the trial had been taken, and he asked me that he might have an opportunity of being heard before a new trial was granted, if I had the question before me. I told him I was prepared to hear anything he had to say in reference to the subject, and I am ready now to hear him any time he chooses to call."

Yours truly,

(Sgd.) C. FITZPATRICK.

Well, of course the writer of that paragraph had completely forgotten what had taken place. No papers could possibly have come at the time I first went to see him, and none had come, as a fact. The moment I got that letter I went and saw the Minister, of Justice and he gave me an appointment and he heard me, and I told him that the extract from his letter sent to me in the Solicitor General's was quite inaccurate. He told me he had received an affidavit and had no objection to let me have copies and he would tell me his decision. The moment he said that, I took from my pocket one of the papers I had, and with a pencil I began to take down in shorthand what he said. This is what the Minister said :

I have no objection to tell you how I regard it. The 145th section of the Criminal Code is that which gives a definition of perjury. I doubt whether it is perjury under this section. But section 147 is that under which, as it seems to me, the Minister of Justice might be properly called on to interfere. That section requires that that statement of the declaration shall be one authorized or required by law. An inquiry ordered by the Postmaster General, a statement made, is not one authorized or required by law. Such an inquiry is not a judicial proceeding nor an administrative act required or authorized by law. Then, what was alleged seems to be true. They state in their affidavit that the jury was packed, that this man Mercer was guilty of partisan conduct.

I said to him it was impossible I could make any statment or argument until the papers were before me, but incidentally pointed out that it was impossible under our system in the Territories, to pack the jury, as a large number of names were taken, and six of these were chosen by lot ; that the judge was a complete stranger in the district and one of the ablest lawyers and best judges on any bench, a man who, in holding the balance of justice would not lean a hair's breadth to one side or the other. I asked him as to the statement that what was alleged semed to have been true. He replied : "This man Mercer seems to have had the voters' list in the Conservative committee room." I said that was impossible. I said the voters' list was posted up and added that the statement was not only untrue but that it was physically impossible to see any document so as to swear to it from the position that Skelton was proved to have been in. However, I said, until I see the affidavits I can make no argument. He promised me the affidavits forthwith. Well, the right hon. gentleman knows that I have been asking for copies of the affidavits and could not get them. The time for these men to come up for judgment arrived on the 16th of May last, and when they came up for judgment the Crown prosecutor rose and said that he was instructed by the Attorney General to ask that the judge postpone sentence until the next sitting. Now, let us see what section 748 of the Act says :

If, upon any application for the mercy of the Crown on behalf of any person convicted of an indictable offence, the Minister of Justice entertains a doubt whether such person ought to have been convicted, he may, instead of advising Her Majesty to remit or commute sentence, have such inquiry as he thinks proper by an order in writing directing a new trial at such time and before such court as he may think proper.

Now, I want to point out to the Prime Minister that this section provides only for a new trial. First in order is the application for the mercy of the Crown. There can be no application for the mercy of the Crown until the man has been sentenced. So this clause implies that the man for whom any application is made to the Minister of Justice shall have been convicted and judgment pronounced. But here an application is made with an affidavit and entertained by the Minister of Justice. Now, I will give my own view of what this clause 748 signifies. Before this enactment there were sometimes wrong convictions, and then the mercy of the Crown purged the conviction and the sentence, but the man was a pardoned criminal. Undoubtedly the reason why the English commissioners put this 748th clause into the code was to provide for the case of an innocent man who should be tried and wrongfully convicted, and to provide that such man should not be placed in a worse position than he was before That is to say, that if he was innocent, the Attorney General in England should order that he would

have a new trial, and having a new trial before twelve of his countrymen and being acquitted, he would go free. But this section, though not warranting the conduct of the Minister of Justice, goes much further than was, in my opinion, necessary. It allows the Minister to make an inquiry; he need only entertain a doubt, he need not be convinced of the innocence of the man. He may grant a new trial where, but for the section, he would have felt it his duty to advise a pardon. A new trial is a substitute for either a remission or a commutation of sentence. It gives the widest possible scope, after sentence, to the Minister of Justice. He may make inquiry if he thinks fit to hear new evidence, but again I repeat, only after sentence. Now, I am to some extent in the dark as to the application made to the Minister of Justice, because he has not furnished me with the affidavits. But from what the Minister told me, and which I took down in shorthand, if he had let me see the papers I should possibly have objected to the locus standi of the applicants, and denied his jurisdiction to hear an application for a new trial until after sentence. It is perfectly clear, from the remark he made bearing on evidence, that he considered the weight of evidence, and I would remind the Minister that by section 747 a new trial may be applied for to the Court of Appeal on the ground that the verdict is contrary to the weight of evidence. Was it a fit thing, then, for the Minister of Justice to come to an ex parte decision on so important a point? Did he consult his colleague, the Solicitor General, an experienced criminal lawyer? Did he get a report from any of his officers, from Mr. Power, for instance? The affidavit of the accused impugns the jury. Should not the Minister of Justice have heard the other side, if he was to hear the case at all? Was the Minister of Justice as well able to judge of the weight of evidence as those who heard it given in open court? I press this further view on the Prime Minister, who is himself a lawyer. Section 747 provides an appeal to the Court of Appeal on the ground that the verdict was contrary to the evidence, and by implication excludes the Minister from entertaining an application against conviction on the ground that it was contrary to the evidence? There is no provision on record for revising the decision of the Minister of Justice. He can do as he pleases, yet I think he is not justified in hearing an application in regard to a possible sentence that is still in the future. I wish to show what his position is. He was not courteous in regard to this matter, and I am sorry for it. When I was in the habit of meeting him as a member of the House I always met the hon. and learned gentleman on good terms, and had the highest opinion of him. I am surprised at his action, because I always found Mr. Mills a courteous member in this House, and the impression he left on me was that he was a courteous and kind-natured man. The hon. Minister certainly promised me the affidavit. But I have got it, though not from him. That affidavit read as follows:—

(1) That the trial of Skelton and others took place on the 29th and 30th of October, 1897.

(2) That the parties have reason to believe that the persons comprising the said panel were not indifferently chosen, but that the party who furnished the names thereof to the trial judge was biased and suggested names with a view to empanel a jury that would be unfavourable to any of the accused.

(3) That of the said list five were Liberals and the remainder Conservatives, and that the deponents are convinced that the majority of the persons so selected and placed on the panel comprise those and those only that had a bias against the persons charged.

(4) Of the five Liberals on the said panel, the Crown prosecutor challenged four, and directed one to stand aside.

(6) One of the jurors rendering the verdict was Charles DeGear, a dismissed Dominion official.

(7) The private prosecutor, Mercer, was also a dismissed Dominion official, and he retained an advocate associated with the Crown prosecutor. That objection being raised to the appearance of the said advocate, Mackenzie, the Crown prosecutor informed the learned judge that Mackenzie was associated with him in such prosecution, took part in the trial examination, and cross-examined witnesses.

(8) That the deponents are convinced that the accused did not have a fair or impartial trial, and verily believe that they are not guilty of the charge preferred against them, and believe that if they had been tried by impartial jurymen they would have been acquitted.

(9) That the defendants first elected to be tried by jury, but after the panel was exhibited elected to be tried by the judge without a jury, but the judge refused to try the accused without the intervention of the jury.

The Crown prosecutor is a strong Liberal, and, therefore, could have no party feelings. That is the affidavit which is in the Department of Justice, and has been received by the Minister; and if my information is correct, he saw Skelton when here and heard him make his argument. In the middle of May, Skelton was before Inspector Bazin, J.P., in Battleford, accused of cattle stealing. He asked to be sworn, and in the course of his remarks he said that he was a person who had considerable influence with the Liberal party—and he would seem to have considerable influence with the Liberal party if, with a sentence for perjury hanging over his head, he could come to Ottawa and be heard by the Department of Justice, and get the Minister of Justice to do the extraordinary act of hearing an application presumably under section 748, which only authorizes the Minister of Justice to hear an application if the sentence has been completed. I want to call the attention of the House to what took place when these men were tried. This is the indictment:

J. M. Skelton, of the town of Battleford, in the judicial district of Saskatchewan, in the said Territories, stands charged—

(a) For that he said J. M. Skelton, on or about Friday, April 16, 1897, in a certain solemn declaration made voluntarily before one John Cotton, one of Her Majesty's justices of the peace in and for the North-west Territories, did falsely and corruptly declare and state of J. B. Mercer, of Battleford aforesaid, to the effect and in the words following, that is to say: "We know that the said J. B. Mercer kept in the Conservative committee rooms the Battleford list of voters that had been made out and posted by the enumerator. This, we believe, was done to allow the Conservative committee to examine and revise such lists, and also to prevent their being always open to examination by the public, as required by law. And that by such action injury was done to the Liberal candidate. He, the said J. M. Skelton, being then duly authorized by law to make any statements or solemn declarations.

The further counts in the indictment I do not read, because they were struck out.

Mr. Chisholm, for the Crown, objected to the change, as the expense of summoning a jury had been incurred, and no change in the substance of the charge had been made since the defence had made their choice to be tried by a jury.

The calling of a jury was next in order. Twenty-three jurors had been summoned so as to give a chance of having a new jury on each of the cases to be tried. When they had answered to their names a lively skirmish took place, and the limit of challenge, both peremptory and for cause, was soon reached. J. A. Fraser was allowed to withdraw from the panel on the ground that he was agent for Mr. Mackenzie, the counsel for Mr. Mercer, the private prosecutor. The following gentlemen were finally accepted:—

J. C. DeGear, Alex. Sutter, R. W. Latimer, J. N. Pomerleau, Otto Morin and J. Michael.

The jury having been sworn, Mr. Chisholm addressed them, and read and explained the clauses in the Criminal Code bearing on the case of J. M. Skelton, which they were about to try. He also asked them to divest their minds of any impressions that might have been formed as to the guilt or innocence of the accused, and to confine themselves strictly to the evidence that might be laid before them. The trial was then proceeded with.

John Cotton, sworn: I am a superintendent in the North-west Mounted Police and an ex-officio a justice of the peace for the Territories, and was such on the 16th of April last. I recognize the declaration now shown as one that was made before me on April 16, by Skelton, Daunais, Latour and Dewan; the signatures were made before me, and I recognize that of J. M. Skelton as having been made before me. I wrote the declaration at the dictation principally of Skelton. I was writing and the others were talking, and I cannot state positively who made the dictation. I am not sure whether some of it was written, or whether some of it was given me to copy; the document was read over to the parties before they declared to it. (Here the declaration was filed in evidence.) I see a memo. in lead pencil that was not on it when taken. I acknowledge my signature; all but the pencil memo. was on it when the document was declared.

He describes in detail under the cross-examination of Mr. Johnstone, how the declaration was made, and then Mercer was sworn:

J. B. Mercer, sworn: I am a druggist by profession; I recollect the last general election; I was then postmaster at Battleford, but am not now; I was notified by the department that my services were no longer required. I first heard of the declaration when I received a copy from the department; cannot remember when I first saw it; I got it by mail from the Postmaster General; did not ask for it. I know it to be a true copy of the declaration filed to-day. I recollect the official voters' list used at the Dominion general election on June 23, 1896; know of two copies being posted up—one in the Albion Hotel and one in the post office; saw the one in the post office every day during the time I was in town, and never knew it to be tampered with. People coming in and out of the office could see it; no complaints were ever made to me that it had been tampered with. I never removed or tampered with that or any other voters' list during that election, and never kept in the Conservative committee room a list of voters that had been made out and posted by the enumerator; never took an enumerator's list of voters to the committee room. During that time a list was made out from one that was made up by the enumerator; it was not an official list, but one that I made myself. I saw a partial official list in the committee room; it was in possession of Mr. Littlefield, the enumerator. As far as I know it never left his possession while in the room. I saw Skelton come to the door of the committee room once only. He stood outside the door and did not enter. I am not certain, but think Littlefield and R. C. Laurie, enumerators, were present, and were working on the list. As I remember it was not fastened, but was in loose sheets; do not think the list was completed at that time. If the list was there I had nothing to do with it. Did not see any one with Skelton when he came to the door. From the position I was in I do not think it possible Skelton could have read anything on the table. (The plan of the building was here submitted, and the position of the parties present indicated.) I was at the back of the table; the relative position of the parties as indicated is correct. I was at the back of the table. I measured the distances in the room. From the ground to the doorstep was nine inches; from where he was Skelton could not have told whether the papers he saw on the table were lists or no; I tried myself, and my eyesight is pretty good. Skelton may have been there oftener than once, but I did not see him. A list was posted in the Albion, and I frequently saw it. There was also one in the post office, but I never tampered with either of them. Littlefield, the enumerator, used it as his office; but not before or after the election. Littlefield had no office in town at the time. He lived half a mile or more from the committee room. I don't know whether or not he used the committee room for making up and revising his lists or not. Any alterations to be made in the voters' lists were made on those posted in the Albion or the post office; the enumerator told me so, and that is all I know of it. Skelton came to the committee room between 2 and 3 p.m., when Littlefield and Laurie were there. I don't know what Skelton wanted, but was told he wanted to see the list; did not see Young there. The list was closed about 9 p.m. on Saturday, but I did not care. I was at the committee room after 7 p.m., when I had closed my shop, but don't know how long.

Don't know if Littlefield or the lists were there or not. (A diagram of the room was produced on which witness indicated the position of the parties at the table.) Witness was sitting at the table on which was a partial list ; the two enumerators only were present ; they were working at the list and I was busy making out voters' certificates and doing general secretary's work. I was doing this when Skelton came to the door. Did not tell Littlefield not to give Skelton the list or any information he might ask for. When I left Littlefield was still working on the list. I took a part in the election, and canvassed, but not publicly. Last saw list in my office when I closed up on Saturday at 7 p.m., and it remained posted until after the election was over. Believe the list made in the committee room was the one used at the election; the enumerator was bound to post two lists and keep one. Littlefield's list was in his possession all the time, and was not in the committee room all the time. Did not examine the list when it was in the committee room. I copied my list off the one in the post office.

I wish to say that in accordance with the Act, the list, the only list with which the electors are concerned, is the list that is posted up, and it is required to be posted up there at a certain time in certain public places and it would be a criminal act to remove that list until after the elections. Malcolm Young, sworn, deposed—and mark you, Mr. Speaker, this is from a member of the Liberal committee, who says that he never went to see the lists and failed to find them.

Malcolm Young, sworn : To Mr. Chisholm—I was a member of the Liberal committee in the campaign of 1896 ; I was asked to look after the voters' lists ; saw one at the Albion Hotel and one at the post office ; never went to see the lists and failed to find them. I went to the door of the Conservative committee room in company with Mr. Skelton about 2 p.m. on Saturday ; went to speak to the enumerator and saw Mercer there. I did not go in, and do not remember if Skelton did. I noticed on the table some big sheets of paper, but could not say if there was writing on them ; could not tell whether they were voters' lists or not. Never went to see the lists and failed to find them. I never knew of the declaration until Mercer got it back from Ottawa. I saw papers I took to be the voters' lists, but they were not in Mercer's possession, but in the enumerator's.

E. C. Laurie, sworn, deposed : The centre of the table is nineteen feet from the door. A person of Skelton's height could see on the table from the door. Did not know that Mercer had voter's lists there. The lists we were working on were in charge of Littlefield. Never knew Mercer to have any charge of any books or lists there except the committee books.

What I want to point out is that the centre of the table was nineteen feet from the door, and the floor was nine inches from the ground outside, and what Skelton swore was that standing outside the door and looking in, he was able to distinguish the voters' list on the table nineteen feet away. He must have had such a magnifying glass as Sam Weller spoke of which would enable him to see all round a corner.

Littlefield, sworn, deposed : Was enumerator for North Battleford at the election in 1896 ; posted one list in the Albion Hotel and one in the post office eight days before the election, and they remained posted until after the election. I saw them every day, and never found them missing when I looked for them.

The Minister of the Interior, who is a lawyer, and is familiar with the Act passed two or three sessions ago, knows that this list being posted up eight days before and remaining there the enumerator entirely filled the condition of the law.

On Saturday before the election I was in the Conservative committee room preparing my revised list ; Young and Skelton called in the afternoon ; R. C. Laurie was working at his own lists and also helping me ; Mercer had nothing to do with my lists ; the Conservative committee went by their own private lists ; Young and Skelton only came as far as the door ; the scond time they called, I went to the door and say Young, who wanted to see my lists ; Mercer never had my lists in his possession, and a person at the door could not see what papers were on the table ; my business was to keep the revised list in my possession.

J. E. Beliveau, sworn—To Mr. Mackenzie—I reside in Battleford and keep the Albion hotel ; was proprietor at the time of the last Dominion general election and remember seeing voters' lists posted in the hotel and in the post office, and saw the one in the Albion right along and would have noticed it if it had been removed ; changes were made on it every day by Littlefield, but it was never removed until it had been posted the time required by law ; last saw the list in the post office the night the lists were posted when Mercer was closing the office.

All this shows that the enumerator had acted carefully, according to the requirements of the Act. Now, it is not necessary that I should read the evidence more in detail. The House will see that the case was proved to the handle.

This closed the case for the Crown and the defence called no witnesses. Mr. Johnstone renewed his objections—1. That the charges are not laid as they should have been ; and 2nd, That the evidence adduced does not support them.

His Lordship said clauses B, C and D were not well laid, and the charge would have to rest on clause A.

Mr. Johnstone—There is no evidence to go to the jury ; the copy of the declaration is not evidence against Skelton. "We know" does not mean that we all know, but that two or three may, and that may not necessarily include Skelton. The declaration was ambiguous. It did not follow that Skelton knew ; two out of four might know, and he might safely sign.

His Lordship said all who signed the declaration must be amenable to the penalties just as much as if each one had said "I know."

Mr. Chisholm for the Crown spoke, and then Mr. Johnstone, and then his Lordship gave the case to the jury ; and I may say of Judge Wetmore that on the bench of Canada, in any province, there is no abler or more upright judge. These are the questions that he put to the jury :

1. Was the declaration false ;
2. Did Skelton know it to be false ; and
3. Was it made with intent to deceive.

If you find that it was false, that Skelton knew it to be false, and that it was made with intent to deceive, then you must bring in a verdict of guilty.

The jury retired, and after a short absence brought in a verdict of "Guilty."

Skelton was admitted to bail in the sum of $500 for himself and two secureties in $250 each to appear at a sitting of the court to be held on the 16th of May next.

In the case of the Queen vs. Dewan, the evidence was practically the same as in the other case, so that I will not trouble the House with reading it. I have told the House all that occurred; but I want to point out one or two facts before I sit down. On the 12th of March I received a letter from Mr. Mackenzie, of Mackenzie & Brown, dated the 8th of March, in which he said:

Dear Sir,—You will likely remember the perjury cases that arose last year in Battleford against J. M. Skelton, Thomas Dewan and Charles Daunais out of false affidavits declared by these three men for the purpose of removing J. B. Mercer, a Conservative, from the postmastership at Battleford. These cases were set down for trial for August, but they asked for an adjournment, giving as their reason that the counsel was unable to attend. The adjournment was granted and the case was fixed for October. At the trial every technical objection conceivable was raised. The jury found Skelton guilty in his case, Dewan was convicted in his case, and Daunais' trial resulted in a disagreement. The judge overruled the accused's objections at the trial, but stated a case for the Court en banc here. The points were all argued again in December, and in February unanimous judgment was given overruling the objections and sustaining the convictions, so that now the three men come up in May, Skelton and Dewan for sentence and Daunais for a new trial.

Immediately on getting that letter, and also a letter of the 3rd of March from Mr. Clinkskill, which I have in my hand, I went on the 12th of March and saw the Minister of Justice, and I wrote to Mr. Mackenzie what the Minister of Justice had stated to me, that nothing would be done ex parte and I got the following letter on 18th March, 1898, from Mr. Mackenzie, of Mackenzie & Brown:

Dear Mr. Davin,—I am in receipt of your favour of the 12th instant and am very much obliged to you for the trouble you are taking in this matter. I noticed in the papers a discussion on the proposed amendments in reference to granting new trials, and certainly think the move was a wise one. If the Minister of Justice had agreed not to act ex parte, I agree with you it would hardly do to bring the matter up on the floor of the House, as you would have an opportunity of looking into the matter before any decision could be given by him. It is impossible for me at present to send you copies of the judgments of the full court as it will be some days before I could get them completed. Some days ago I sent R. F. Chisholm, the Crown prosecutor at Prince Albert, copies which will probably now be in Ottawa, and as reporter for the "Canadian Law Times" I forwarded duplicates to that report so that you will probably see the judgments in full in the next issue of the "Law Times" as quickly as if I forwarded it to you and in time for you to act on it.

And so on. I have here the "Law Times," volume 18, No. 8, for May, 1898, containing the judgment of the full court in this case, which will be found on page 205:

Crown case reserved by Wetmore, J., upon an indictment and conviction of the defendant for perjury and heard by Richardson, Rouleau, and Scott, JJ.

The original charge was that the defendant at Battleford, on or about the 16th day of April, A.D. 1897, in a certain solemn declaration made voluntarily before a justice of the peace in and for the North-west Territories, did falsely, wilfully, and corruptly declare and state of J. B. M. to the effect and in the words following, that is to say: "We," meaning the defendant and others, "know that he," meaning J. B. M., "kept in the Conservative committee rooms the Battleford list of voters that had been made out and posted by the enumerator. This, we believe, was done to allow the Conservative committee to examine and revise such lists, and also to prevent their being always open to examination by the public, as provided by law, and that by such action injury was done to the Liberal candidate."

Upon the defendant being arraigned upon this charge, he applied, before pleading to it, because it did not allege, in the language of s. 147 of the Criminal Code, that the statement set out in such paragraph was one authorized or required by law to be made on solemn declaration; and because it did not allege that the statement was made with intent to mislead; and because the offence set out was not founded upon the facts or evidence disclosed in the depositions taken at the preliminary examination, and the charge was not preferred by the Attorney General nor by his direction nor consent, nor with the consent of a judge; and because the preliminary inquiry was held against three persons, including the defendant, and not against the defendant alone.

The judgment then recites what took place, and then proceeds:

At the preliminary examination of the defendant before a justice of the peace, after the examination of the witnesses for the prosecution, the defendant was addressed by the justice in these words: "Having heard the evidence, do you wish to say anything in answer to the charge? You are not obliged to say anything unless you desire to do so, but whatever you say will be taken down in writing, and may be given against you at the trial." Whereupon the defendant made a statement, but, before making it, he was, at his own request, sworn. The statement was taken down in writing and signed by the defendant, and was offered by the Crown in evidence and received at the trial, against the objection of the defendant.

Section 147 of the Criminal Code enacts that "every one is guilty of an indictable offence * * who, being required or authorized by law to make any statement, oath, affirmation, or solemn declaration, thereupon makes a statement which would amount to perjury if made in a judicial proceeding." Perjury is defined by s. 145, and one of the ingredients of the offence is that the statement must have been made with the intention to mislead. By s. 611, s.-s. 3, it is provided that the statement of a charge may be in any words sufficient to give the accused notice of the offence with which he is charged, and form FF in the schedule, which expressly refers to s. 611,

gives examples of the manner of stating offences under it, while s. 982 provides that the forms, varied to suit the case, or forms to the like effect, shall be deemed sufficient in law.

Held, that the forms FF are intended to illustrate the provisions of s. 611, and their effect is not confined to the offences stated in them ; and, as, if the charge here had contained an allegation of intent to mislead, it would not have been given the defendant any better notice of the offence than he had, it was unnecessary. The statement in Taschereau's Criminal Code, p. 675, dissented from.

2. That the charge was founded upon facts and evidence disclosed in the depositions taken before the justice on the preliminary examination ; that such preliminary examination was sufficient for the purpose and that the fact that it was held against three persons was immaterial, there being separate informations, but only one inquiry.

3. That the trial judge had power to allow the charge to be amended as it was amended ; the Crown counsel had the right under s. 11 of the North-west Territories Amendment Act, 54 and 55 V. c. 22, to substitute another charge in respect of the same offence, and having that right, he could amend the original charge, instead of substituting a new one. In the North-west Territories the Crown prosecutor is the accuser, not the grand jury, as in England.

4. That the trial judge was justified in refusing to allow the defendant to withdraw his election. Regina vs. Brewster, decided by this court, followed.

5. That the defendant's statement made before the justice was properly admitted in evidence.

6. That the offence as charged and proved was an indictable one under s. 147 of the Code. The object of s. 26 of the Canada Evidence Act, 1893, was to provide a means by which certain statements not authorized to be made on oath could be verified. The permission to receive a solemn declaration includes authority to make it.

7. That the objection that the personal pronoun "we" was used in the declaration was not a good objection. Each one of the declarations may be taken to have alleged his own personal knowledge of the matters set out in the declaration.

I think I have placed this matter sufficiently before the Government. It is an extraordinary thing that before judgment by the Court came one of the men down to Ottawa, armed with a declaration, and the Minister of Justice thinks that under section 748 he has the power to hear their application for a new trial, and he does hear it, and he tells a member of this House that he received affidavits and promises to give him copies—which, however, he has not yet given him—and tells him what his view is, and his view seems to be that the application was, to some extent, based on the ground that the conviction was contrary to the weight of evidence. But, as I pointed out to the right hon. gentleman, the Minister of Justice was estopped from hearing any application of that kind by section 747, which expressly provides for an appeal to the Court of Appeal, when the verdict is against the weight of evidence. Under section 748, the application to the Minister of Justice must be for the mercy of the Crown, but how there could be an appeal for the mercy of the Crown until there was some reason for extending mercy I fail to see. A more practical end can be reached probably from what I have done to-night, than if the judgment had been pronounced and action had been properly taken, because now we may be able to prevent a gross miscarriage of justice through the Justice Department. These men have not yet been sentenced, and expect to escape through their great influence with the Liberal party. One of the men who was up the other day before the magistrate for cattle-stealing swore that he had great influence with the Liberal party. No doubt, he has been a very active man, and we have here apparently political influence introduced for the purpose of interfering with the course of justice. I place the facts before the House, and though I have been very badly treated by the Minister of Justice, I still feel that there may be possibly some explanation, because I am surprised that so kindly a man as I knew him to be in this House should have promised me those affidavits and not given them to me. But, at any rate, I have done my duty not merely to the North-west but to the whole country, because the whole country is interested in the way this Criminal Code is administered by the Department of Justice.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I owe it to my hon. friend (Mr. Davin) to give him a few words in answer, and they must be a few words only after the long statement he has made in reference to the case. Though I have not given of late much attention to my profession, still, upon the statement he has made to-day, I owe it to myself as well as to him to tell him that he has been labouring under a very serious misapprehension, of which fact he will be satisfied on hearing what I have to say. Before I come to that, however, I desire to say that I cannot follow him in the gossipy matters he has introduced in this debate. He has taken upon himself to state that there was a caucus at the house of Major Cotton and that Major Cotton had been heard to say that there would be a new trial——

Mr. DAVIN. I did not say that Major Cotton said that.

The PRIME MINISTER. Somebody in Major Cotton's house and in Major Cotton's hearing, then, and that all the Liberals about Battleford had been saying that the administration of justice would be interfered with, that the law would not be allowed to take its course, but that somebody, a power behind the throne, would see to it that James Skelton went scot free. All that is gossip. There is no statement upon which anything can be based, no record or other evidence has been introduced to prove the statement. Moreover, if introduced, they would not be relevant at all to the matter in hand. My hon. friend has com-

plained, and it is not the first time he has made the same complaint before the House, that he has not been treated by the Minister of Justice with the courtesy which the Minister should have extended to him. In my opinion, if any one has reason to complain of the treatment received I think it is not my hon. friend so much as the Minister of Justice. What was the statement made a moment ago by the hon. gentleman? That he went to the Minister of Justice, and while engaged in a private conversation with him discussing this question in a friendly way, my hon. friend took out his pencil and was taking notes——

Mr. DAVIN. Will my hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) allow me. I stated that I took a paper out of my pocket and made notes upon it. Those notes were made openly in the presence of the Minister of Justice.

The PRIME MINISTER. I must say that my hon. friend's views of courtesy and my own do not agree. My hon. friend was discussing the question with the Minister of Justice in a friendly way. I take it that this was a private conversation which, whether noted or not, should not have been revealed.

Mr. DAVIN. I do not take the view that this was private.

The PRIME MINISTER. I take a different view. Of course, it is a free country and every one has a right to his own view on matters of courtesy as on everything else. But I hold that the Minister of Justice has more reason to complain that there has been want of courtesy on my hon. friend's part than my hon. friend has reason to complain of the Minister of Justice.

Now, the hon. gentleman has stated on more than one occasion, and he repeated it this evening, that the Minister of Justice had promised him a copy of the affidavits which were to be placed in his hands.

Mr. DAVIN. Which at that time were in his hands. He promised them first before they came and subsequently he told me that I should have them, and he promised them again when I saw him at the right of the Speaker's Chair.

The PRIME MINISTER. All I can say is that had I been in the place of the Minister of Justice, I would not have given my hon. friend a copy of these affidavits, nor would I have promised them. Of course, the Minister of Justice acted differently, and I have nothing to say. But I would not have given copies of the affidavits under similar circumstances. Here was a case between the Crown and James Skelton. My hon. friend had no interest in the case and no more right to ask for these affidavits than anybody else in this room. When the Minister of Justice had taken action, and the hon. gentleman could call that action in question and review it. But, until the Minister of Justice gave his decision, nobody had the right to intervene in the case. But if the Minister of Justice promised the hon. gentleman these affidavits and afterwards neglected to implement his promise, that is a case between my hon. friend and the Minister as to which, of course, I have nothing to say at this moment. But I come to the gist and gravamen of the charge made by my hon. friend. He says that the Minister of Justice interfered with the case after conviction and before judgment, to prevent sentence being pronounced against James Skelton.

Mr. DAVIN. If the hon. gentleman will allow me, I will state the charge. The charge I make is that the Minister of Justice, is without any authority from any Act of Parliament to receive an application from persons convicted before sentence had been pronounced, and next that he has done what my right hon. friend says—interfered with the course of justice.

The PRIME MINISTER. During the trial, that is to say before the sentence of the court was pronounced, the hon. gentleman says, somebody, let us say James Skelton or somebody else on his behalf, lodged an application with the Minister of Justice. And I must say to my hon. friend that he stated, and stated correctly, that on the 16th May, when the case was again called to be proceeded with, the agent of the Minister of Justice, who is the Attorney General, stated that he had received a letter of instructions from the Attorney General not to go on with the case but to suspend it to another term. Now, that is the gravamen of the charge he makes against the Minister of Justice.

He says that the Minister of Justice was not within his duty, that he could not have acted until sentence had been passed under the terms of sections 747 and 748. I have only this answer to make to my hon. friend, and he will see that he has been labouring under serious misapprehension. The Minister of Justice is the Attorney General for the North-west Territories, he is the prosecutor for Her Majesty. The Minister of Justice is the Attorney General for Canada, he has jurisdiction in all the courts of Canada, he is the prosecutor wherever Her Majesty brings suit, and he was prosecuting that indictment against James Skelton. If the Minister of Justice was the Attorney General prosecuting that indictment in the court at Battleford against Skelton, the case was in his hands, and he was simply within his rights when he gave instructions to his agent to postpone the case. If that case had been brought in Manitoba or Quebec or Ontario, where the Attorney General is the Attorney General for the province, and upon an indictment, the prosecutor is then the Attorney General for such province, and the Minister of Justice could not have interfer-

ed in the case, he could not have ordered a suspension of proceedings. But as the Attorney General for Canada was prosecuting that indictment, he had power to stay the proceedings or to go on with the case. The Minister of Justice having received the complaint that the jury had been packed—I have no opinion to offer at this moment upon that point—but application having been made to the Attorney General, whose agent was prosecuting that indictment at Battleford, saying that the jury had been packed, the Attorney General ordered his agent not to proceed with the case until he had an opportunity of investigating that allegation. That is all there is to this case. I need not tell my hon. friend that the Attorney General prosecuting the indictment against James Skelton, was quite within his rights when he ordered a stay of proceedings until another term.

Mr. DAVIN. I may be permitted, I think, by the House——

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. SPEAKER. Only by the unanimous consent of the House.

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

(In the Committee.)

Immigration—Salaries of agents and employees in Canada $40,000

Mr. DAVIN. On May 23rd we went through in one night an immense mass of estimates, and they were passed without discussion on the understanding that on this one item that was reserved, we could discuss anything connected with the Department of the Interior. I think the Minister of Finance will bear me out.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not know that I said we could discuss everything in the Department of the Interior, but it was understood that everything comprised within these items could be discussed, that we should not be tied to any one.

Mr. DAVIN. What we want to discuss is immigration just now. I want to say to the Minister of the Interior that, looking over the reports of the Interior Department in regard to immigration, I find that a large mass of immigrants coming into this country are Galicians. Far be it for me to say anything against any class of men, no matter how poor they may be. I find from the reports of the department that up to December, 10,864 immigrants came in, of whom 4,363 were Galicians. The hon. gentleman will remember that the Galicians that were taken up to Yorkton were miserably poor, and were declared by persons who were well acquainted with them to be unfit for settlement. Not only that, but we have the authority of an hon. member of this House, a supporter of hon gentlemen opposite, who, speaking of this Galician immigration said: "This is not an immigration, it is a deportation." It seems that we are not getting from Galicia the best Galicians.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Who is the gentleman that used that language?

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver). I received only to-day a letter from Yorkton complaining bitterly of that Galician immigration. The fact is that we are getting an ineffective immigration, and the amount of money spent on immigration is much larger than the results we obtain from it. In one place after another we find men employed apparently for the purpose, not of inducing immigration, but of rewarding supporters. For instance, in the State of Michigan, we have Mr. James Grieve, who was a member of this House.

Mr. McGREGOR. And a good member too.

Mr. DAVIN. He was appointed, however, by the party which declared that members of Parliament should not be rewarded.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. DAVIN. No members were to be rewarded for their services; we were not to have any nepotism.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. OSLER. It is too bad that we cannot have reasonable common sense courtesy shown by members on the back benches.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I ask members of the committee to listen to the discussion.

Mr. DAVIN. At St. Paul we have Benjamin Davies, a relative of the honoured and titled gentleman who presides over the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and he has a salary of $1,500 a year. He is a brother of the Minister, and was put right into St. Paul as immigration agent.

Mr. CLARKE. Who is that?

Mr. DAVIN. He is a brother of a Minister, who was one of the loudest denouncers of nepotism when he was on this side of the House. Then we have T. O. Currie, at St. Paul, with a salary of $1,200, and J. Crawford, in Kansas.

An hon. MEMBER. Who is Currie?

Mr. DAVIN. He was an organizer in the west. Thus we now have a large number of gentlemen compared with the number that were formerly employed, and the results are very small compared with this large expenditure.

Mr. McGREGOR. They are coming.

Mr. DAVIN. They are coming like the swift service across the Atlantic. That has come with great rapidity—we have heard about it for three sessions. One of the great men of the Government has been across the

Atlantic, but he has not given us a fast line yet. There is one M. V. McInnes, at Detroit, with a salary of $1,500. Then there is Mr. Swanson and W. G. White at good salaries. We had this matter up in the committee, but no satisfactory explanation whatever was given. It will be remembered that one of the most eloquent members of the Liberal party was dissatisfied with the settlement of the Manitoba school question and had to be provided for. Mr. Devlin was sent to Ireland. In England the staff has been changed. In Scotland also the staff has been changed, and even from the Governor General's home an agent has been sent to Scotland. The Scotch are the best immigrants, they are not surpassed and rarely equalled.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Next to the Irish.

Mr. DAVIN. No, I will not put them next to the Irish. I consider the Scotch among the very best immigrants that can be brought into this country. What has been the result of these efforts? We have had a total number of immigrants from England of 1,519. The total number from Ireland was 69. This was the beggarly result of taking one of the most eloquent members from this House, but one who might prove dangerous, and sending him to Ireland. Of Scotch there were 205. Of Germans, who are also among the best class of immigrants, 520; Scandinavians, 474; immigrants from the United States, 712. The Galicians number 4,363. Can the Minister of the Interior tell the committee how much Kaleslaw, the Austrian agent, is paid?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There is no such agent in the service. The only agent in Austria is Prof. Austeroff, who receives $600 a year and some allowances.

Mr. DAVIN. We are told by Mr. Smart that he receives $2,500 a year and allowances. If the Galician immigration is a deportation, and these people are being excluded from Galicia, why should we pay to bring them here? The result of the immigration efforts in the United States was only 712 immigrants, and this was the result of giving large salaries to brothers of Ministers and others. Mr. Jury has sent over 1,000 immigrants from England, while the great bulk of our immigration came from Galicia, the number being 4,363. I saw in a paper the other day that an immense cargo of these people were bound for Canada, and I may say that the people of this country consider it a very serious matter, if these people, who are certainly not ideal immigrants, are to be swarmed over the entire North-west.

Mr. SPROULE. I noticed with a good deal of interest the account given of the Galicians who were brought to Canada, and especially did it attract my attention after reading an article regarding the very destitute condition of these people of the North-west. And, when I heard the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) give a description of the class of people who reach this country from Galicia, I could well understand how it was they were in such a destitute condition. It occurred to me that they were not by any means the right class of people to bring to Canada. We have enough indigents of our own to draw upon the charity of the people of this country for their support, without bringing in these people from the eastern countries. I have here a newspaper which gives a description of some of these Galicians, and now that we are voting money for emigration it is, I believe, well that I should read it. This quotation is from a Winnipeg paper who had a correspondent at Yorkton, and it is dated 9th February:

Yorkton, Feb. 9.—Having heard that the people of the Galician colony at the Beaver Hills, west of Yorkton, were in a most desperate condition, your correspondent obtained the services of an interpreter and left town for the colony in order to ascertain for himself the facts of the case, which are as follows:—

At noon on Sunday, the 6th instant, I came to the first of the Galician hovels, 32 miles out from Yorkton. This was a dug-out, about 9 x 11 feet, and from floor to ridge pole about six feet. In this wretched abode—which resembled a rabbit burrow more than anything else—lived, or rather existed, for some five weeks in fearful agony poor Stifan Panchuik with both feet and one hand rotting off—yes, literally rotting off—from the effects of frostbite. There is not the slightest exaggeration in the statement. The men who lifted him off his rude couch of hay laid on poles to bring him to Yorkton can testify to the truth of it. One of them told me that he could never forget the sight he saw when he entered the hovel and discovered Panchuik lying upon his elbows and stomach with his feet elevated, and seemingly wearing a pair of black slippers; but upon a closer examination he found that what he took to be slippers were really Panchuik's feet, the line of demarcation between the living and dead flesh consisted of a rather deep furrow of about a third of an inch in width of a pinkish hue and exuding pus and putrid matter, the stench of which was unbearable. This gentleman also told me that Mrs. Panchuik insisted upon accompanying her husband to Yorkton, and upon arrival of the party at Theodora, the lady of the house discovered Mrs. Panchuik to be in a most pitiable condition, as she was clad on this night—which was one of the coldest this winter—in only a sheepskin coat, chemise, serge rug, and long boots without stockings. The coat had no buttons, and the front of the coarse linen chemise was open. How the woman escaped being frozen coming that eight miles passes comprehension. That her state was not discovered by the gentlemen who were moving Panchuik was due to the darkness of the night. Before proceeding further on the journey she was supplied by kind willing hands with sufficient clothing. If this case had been attended to in time, this "poor victim of misplaced confidence" might possibly not be in the position he is to-day, viz., a cripple, who is without means of support. Mrs Panchuik told me, through the interpreter, that having baked the last flour in the house her husband

said he would walk to Yorkton and try to get work, so that they would have something to eat. She made him take two of the loaves for the road, saying that she would try and get some flour for herself and children from the neighbours until he came back. He was unable to obtain anything in Yorkton, and started for home on foot, as he had come. Weak from long fasting, he got tired, then got wandering about, and, as a result, was lost for two days and one night. She said: We have eaten nothing but flour and water, with a little milk, this winter, and the flour is bad. She said that Mr. L—— had brought them a little meat while her husband was sick. I was told by her that in Galicia they always raised plenty of vegetables and pigs, and never had to live on bread and water over there. There was no furniture of any description here, except a few rough seats; the stove was made of mud. No blankets or bedding. I got a sample of the flour (?) here; it was either middlings or shorts, but certainly not flour. Mrs. Panchuik told me that this was what the Government issued her.

The next place visited was also a dug-out, about 10 x 15, with walls about 3½ feet high. In this house slept every night four families. No partitions or privacy of any description; no blankets; a few pillows, and hay was all I saw in the way of bedding. Food—bread and snow water. I was told here that the shipping agents in Hamburg had sent circulars through Galicia urging the people to sell out and come to Canada, as the Queen of England would give them everything needed for a start as a loan, and all that they would need was sufficient to pay their passage and $10 to pay for the land. I asked them to give me one of the circulars; but was told that a man named McKorski or McCrosky in Winnipeg, had got them from them as soon as they arrived. One of the men, named Tanasco Muskoluk, said that Mr. Genik told them in Winnipeg that if they came out here they would get a cow for each family, some hens and a year's provisions of flour for all, of which they understood they would have to pay later on when they were able. Muskoluk said that they wrote for this, but as yet they have only got a little flour. This man also told me that his baggage is at the station at Yorkton, and that as he is unable to pay the charges on it, he has not any clothing for himself, wife or children, except the inevitable linen shirts and what he is wearing. I then visited a place where two families were living in a dug-out about 12 x 12—13 souls in all. Food, same as in other cases, with the exception of a little milk, obtained from a cow with a diseased udder, one side of which is so badly ulcerated that they cannot milk on that side. No bedding; mud stove; children look unhealthy; I was told that the children slept on top of the stove to keep them from freezing. These people were told by the shipping agent to sell their sheepskin coats as this was a warm climate and they would not need them. They say that they never experienced such a cold winter as this.

I visited several other places that day, but to describe each place would be too monotonous, as all the places were, as regards food and bedding, in the same sad plight, the only difference being that some had a little more shorts than others. One place I came to on the following day I must describe. It is the residence of Mr. Handibuboa. House, "dug-out," 12 x 14, mud stove, mud roof, mud bed, and mud and wattle door!!! This man must be ingenious, to say the least of it. He told me the same story as regards promises made in Hamburg with this difference, that he says Mr. Genick, and a dark-complexioned officer in Winnipeg, whose name he does not know, repeated these promises to him in Winnipeg, namely, that he would receive from the Government a team, wagon, plow, harrows, harness, and a cow, and that he would be helped until he was able to get along. He said that he was sorry that he had left Galicia, but he hoped for better times. He has one child, and it looks very delicate. Handibuboa said that if it was not for the help he had received from the English settlers, that they would have starved.

When I arrived at the next place, which was Wan Hlayi's, they were just preparing the last flour in the house for that night's supper, and did not know where they were going to get their breakfast from. While I was at another house the next morning, on my way to Yorkton, a woman arrived who had just walked over from her own house, about two miles distant, to borrow a meal of flour. She came in crying, and said that her two remaining children were starving, and that she did not know what to do. She volunteered the statement that one of her children had died before Christmas for want of proper food, and she was afraid the others would die too. I asked several of the English-speaking settlers their opinion of these people as settlers, and in every case was uniform that the Government must be crazy to imagine that these Galicians, without any money or means of subsistence, will be a benefit to the country. They say that they will have to leave if the Galicians stay, as they cannot see them starve before their eyes, and it is impossible to give them effectual help without ruining themselves. The land that they are settled on is more suited for stock-raising than farming, and stock-raising is a little too much for the means of these people, whom the hon. the Minister of Interior referred to in his address to the people on the occasion of his last visit to his pets at this place, as the most "desirable class of emigrants that ever came to "Canada." He surely must have meant "undesirable," and if he did most people will agree with him.

On my return to Yorkton I was told that Mr. McCreary was looking for me, and also that that gentleman had denied my report as being incorrect. I met him at his request, and also, on being asked by him to furnish him with the names of the destitute, I replied that I would do so with pleasure, on one condition, which was that he would forward relief to them. He said, "I have seen your interpreter, and have engaged him to go with relief in the shape of beef and flour to-morrow." On this I sent him a list of the names. Judge of my surprise the next day to find that so far from keeping his promise, that my interpreter, Mr. Grunert, should go with the relief, that no relief was sent. Mr Genick, the Government interpreter, refused to take Mr. Grunert, and left himself for Beaver Hills in a light rig, taking with him some 25 pounds of beef, and I believe one bag of flour.

This corroborates the statement made by the hon. member with regard to the class of people who are sent to Canada. I understand that two nationalities inhabit Galicia. Those of German descent, are industrious and well-to-do people, and they are becoming crowded in the country, while the poorer and more helpless class, who are unable to do anything for themselves, are being sent out. That Government, with the desire to keep the better class at home, advertise the

advantages of the North-west of Canada for the poorer class ; and, with the assistance of the steamship companies, they are sending to Canada a class of people who are practically paupers and are not likely to succeed. I think we are wasting our money in bringing out this kind of immigration. We have enough destitute people of our own to support, without bringing in the paupers of other countries. The information given by the Deputy Minister was that last year 4,363 Galicians were brought out. First, an attempt was made to settle them in colonies by themselves, but it was found that it would be injudicious to do that, for fear many of them might die of starvation. Therefore, it was decided to distribute them amongst the English-speaking people of the country ; and they have been a great burden to these people, who with their humane instincts, will not allow them to die of starvation. But it is a great mistake to impose that burden upon our people. We were told that there were altogether 10,700 immigrants brought into the country last year, of whom 4,363 or nearly half, were Galicians ; 1,519 were English, the class of immigrants who are suited to our country, and who seem to get along, no matter in what part they settle ; only 69 Irish, and we regret it that there were not more of them, because they make good settlers ; 205 Scotch ; 520 Germans, and a few Scandinavians. This was the immigration of last year ; and for that we are keeping up an army of agents at a very great cost. When we look at the number of people we have employed as agents, in Great Britain and Ireland, in European countries, and in the United States, it seems to me that we are getting a very small return for our very large expenditure, especially when we consider that nearly half of the whole number we got last year may fairly be regarded as paupers, who are likely to be a burden upon our people from the time they come into the country. We have an agent at Detroit, Mr. McGinnis, who gets $1,500 a year. I have not been able to ascertain how many immigrants he has brought in. Then we have Mr. Grieve, an ex-member of this House, whom I met in North Grey, and who I understood was doing the work of the Government in anticipation of the salary he was to receive. He gets $1,200 in Reid City. Another, a Mr. Bennett, gets $900. Another, a brother of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies), whose smiling face is before me, is pensioned on this country to the tune of $1,500, and is sent to the western states to do immigration work there. We have not seen whether he has succeeded in sending in any. He is engaged in South Dakota. Then we have a man named Swanson, who gets $1,500. W. J. White gets $1,800 ; W. Ritchie gets $900 ; Caven, $900 ; Crawford, $900 ; T. O. Currie, the great Patron organizer, who did his work so effectually for the Reform party in 1896, is now receiving his reward to the tune of $1,200 a year and expenses. Then we have Father Paradis, who gets $600. In Great Britain we have Mr. Jury, the celebrated atheist of Toronto, who is stationed in Liverpool. How many immigrants he has succeeded in bringing to this country we do not know. In Wales we have Mr. W. L. Griffith. In Dublin we have another ex-member of this House, Mr. Devlin, who gets $2,000 a year, and who with all the other agents in Ireland has succeeded in bringing to this country 69 Irish immigrants during last year. In the north of Ireland we have Mr. Webster, and in Londonderry we have Mr. O'Kelly. In Glasgow we have Mr. Murray at $2,000 a year, and in Inverness, Mr. Stewart, at $100 a month. We have agencies at Paris, Birmingham, Bristol, Dublin, Dundee, Glasgow, Liverpool and London, and last year they succeeded in brining to Canada 1,519 English, 69 Irish and 205 Scotch immigrants. That is the sum total of the immigration from the British Isles, the only immigration of any value that reached the country. Before hon. gentlemen opposite came into power, we were told that they were going to boom immigration, and they have boomed it by expending a large sum of money and giving employment to their needy political supporters, who are to-day getting their rewards for the active work they did during the last election. But the great question to my mind is, has the country received an adequate return for this large expenditure ? Will the country be pleased to know that these men are pensioned upon it to the amounts I have stated ?

Mr. WALLACE. What about their other expenses ?

Mr. SPROULE. I do not know ; I have not totalled them up. I wanted to get the aggregate expense, but I could not get it. I am told, however, that it is twice as much as it was in any previous year. If we could ascertain the aggregate expenditure, and divide it by the number of immigrants that have come to the country, we would find that each immigrant we get costs to the country a large amount of money. I believe that we are warranted in stating, from the information we possess, that these Galicians are not suitable to this country, and the Government are not justified in bringing the paupers of other nations to have them supported by the liberality of Canadians. Immigrants from the British islands are always welcome, and the same may be said of Germans and Scandinavians. Of the latter we have very few coming of late, but the expenditure is kept up just the same. I think the Minister of the Interior should give us some information with regard to the operations of his department in this line. We would like to know the total number of immigrants brought to Canada last year.

I think that for the thousands that have been given us of English, Irish, Scotch, Galicians, Germans and Scandinavians, we should know what we have had to pay. If the hon. gentleman would be good enough to give the total number, then we could arrive at an approximate estimate of what each immigrant cost the country.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). I feel that I ought to give the committee as much information as I can, and I shall just briefly give the figures. The number of immigrants we got in 1896 from all countries was 16,833. In 1897 there was in increase, the number being 19,304. Up to the end of April, 1898, it was 5,216. To make a comparison between the three years, I might give the figures for the first three months of each year. From the 1st January to the 30th April, 1896, there were 3,776; from the 1st January to the 30th April, 1897, the number was 4,294, and for the same period this year, it was 5,216. So that there is a fair amount of improvement and progress. The number has almost been doubled from 1896 to 1898. The information is perhaps of more value, if we take the number of immigrants arriving in Manitoba and the North-west Territories at the points of entry and who are agriculturists. I find that in 1896 the number was 4,196. In 1897, the first year for which I could in any way be held responsible, the number was 10,874. And for the first three months of 1898, it was 15,605, showing 15,605 in the first three months of this year as compared with 4,196 in the whole year of 1896. My hon. friend asked what has been the result of the work in the United States. His reference to the agents we have there are quite correct, so far as the names are concerned, and I have this to say of them that I think we have an intelligent, capable, and hard-working lot of agents, who are doing the very best possible to secure a desirable class of immigrants to our North-west country. They succeeded in getting, during the first three month of this calendar year, something like 4,000 agricultural settlers, who went to Manitoba and the North-west Territories, and I regard that as an extremely satisfactory result.

My hon. friend referred, with some degree of particularity, to the question of the Galicians. I will have to share with the hon. gentlemen upon the other side of the House the honour of discovering the Galicians. Out of a total number of settlers in Canada who came here in 1896—and we would not, I fancy, be held responsible for any of the immigration work done in that year, because no steps were taken in that branch of immigration by this Government until the beginning of 1897—there were nearly 3,000 Galicians. The total number was 16,835. During the period when the hon. gentleman's friends were in power, they had therefore also entered, to some extent, into the Galician industry, and while it is true that 4,000 came last year, 3,000 came during the last year for which the hon. gentlemen are responsible. I do not blame them for what they did in connection with Galician's immigration, and I do not share, in any degree, the views of the hon. gentlemen with regard to the undesirability of these people. Having spent the greater portion of my life in the North-west, I have had the opportunity, to a very considerable extent, of familiarizing myself with the conditions of life there, and therefore know pretty well the class of people we must get if we are ever going to settle that country with an agricultural population. I do not share the belief of the hon. gentleman who has spoken adversely of these people. I remember distinctly when the Mennonites and Icelanders came to Manitoba, and I remember that at that time almost the same kind of criticism was addressed to these people that has lately been made against the Galicians. But we have found that although the Mennonites and the Icelanders were not a very attractive lot of people when they came to the North-west, yet after overcoming the difficulties of the start on prairie life, they became the most valuable settlers we have in Manitoba and the North-west. For my part, having seen all classes there, I have no hesitation in saying that the Galicians compare quite favourably with the Icelanders or Mennonites when they first came. It is true that a certain number of camp followers will gather around any large body that may move in any direction, and the same thing occurs in connection with the bringing of people from central Europe. If the agents collect with care 1,000 or 2,000 people whom they consider desirable immigrants and forward them through the agencies placed at their disposal, it follows that along with these people is bound to come a certain number of other people whom the agents did not collect and for whom we are not responsible. The result is that when these parties come out, let us be as careful as we will, there will be a certain number not possessed of sufficient means to make a separate start. It is a complete answer to the charge that these people are paupers to point to the fact that the Canadian Government has never contributed a dollar to their passage money nor has the Government of Austria.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood the Deputy Minister to say that they would subsidize steamship agencies to bring them out.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Our general policy is to pay a bonus to steamship agents for all the bona fide immigrants they take to this country. That applies to the Galicians as to the Germans and others.

Mr. SPROULE. In Galicia to get rid of them, they pay also fees to the steamship companies to take them out of the country.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I never heard of it, and I do not believe it. If that were so, I would have known it. My information is to this effect, that not only is that not so, but that there is a constant struggle going on between our agents and those acting in the interests of other countries that desire these people, particularly the South American Governments which are making efforts to get them. To telegraph to our agent that we do not desire these people, would result in the agents ceasing to make an effort to send them here, and they woud go to some country in South America. I have taken some pains to make an examination into the condition of these people, and the probability of their making successful settlers, and I have come to the conclusion that they are a desirable class of settlers, and that it is desirable for us to continue to a moderate extent, for some little time, the work that is being done in that direction.

In the first place these are people who, for generations, have been agriculturists. My hon. friend will remember that the agents of the late Government once or twice made the serious mistake of collecting people from the cities. That could only result in disaster. People collected from among the unemployed of the cities will not likely become successful agriculturists. The result in this case proved it. But these Galicians have been agriculturists for generations, and when they are placed on the land and given a fair and reasonable opportunity to get on, they do get on. They do not go into farming on a large scale; they are not what we call wheat growers nor what we call ranchers. But they start in such a way that they are able to make a living, and I have no doubt that in a very short time they will be reasonably prosperous and that before long they will develop into a thoroughly prosperous agricultural community. These people are not the proletariat that they have been represented to be. They are people of good physique and of fairly good agricultural knowledge and fairly competent in a mechanical way. Moreover, they are people of good moral habits, who will never in that respect give us any trouble whatever. I fancy that a community of these people will be found as good-living a set of people as is to be found in any country. I went last year myself—I was sorry I could not go earlier in the season, but I went there in the fall—to visit the colony at Yorkton. I went from shanty to shanty and saw these people in the houses they had built for themselves. If my hon. friend had been with me he would have had an entirely different opinion from that he has expressed. I consulted the managers of the road and the most intelligent men I could find in the neighbourhood where these people had settled, and, while I have no doubt there are persons who are prepared to criticise adversely anything done that is a little out of the ordinary course, I find an almost unanimous consensus of opinion in favour of the work done. Mr. W. R. Baker, manager of the Manitoba and North-west Railway upon which the town of Yorkton is situated, who knows everything they have done and whose company transported them under his own supervision, told me that he was satisfied with what was done and believed that these people would be good settlers. I am able to say further that numbers of men who were interested in this question—because the people in the west are greatly interested in the question of immigration—have gone up and examined the people for themselves. My hon. friend from Macdonald (Mr. Rutherford) who is in the House at this moment, at first shook his head and told me that he had grave doubts about these Galicians who had come out. He went up the Dauphin line, examined the settlements, and came back with this opinion entirely changde, and said he was satisfied that it was desirable to continue the work, because the people would be good settlers. It may be that some such an occurrence as that mentioned by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) has taken place in regard to one or two of these people. But I can tell the hon. gentleman that we have been receiving these people now for three or four years. In 1896, 3,000 came in; in 1897, from 4,000 to 5,000, and there has been a very considerable number this spring; but so far we had never known that any of them have starved to death, having managed to eke out an existence, and their condition is improving. The amount of money we have spent in giving them a start is comparatively a mere trifle. Now, I wish to impress my hon. friend with this idea—that it is no light matter to succeed in this work of immigration. And if we think that we are going to people the prairies of the North-west without taking a great deal of trouble, we shall find ourselves mistaken. If the hon. gentleman will look into the history of the western railways he will find that they have spent an amount of money and taken trouble to bring in population that would surprise him. We are told by leading men connected with western railways, that for every head of a family settled along the line of the railways through the agency of these companies, the companies have incurred an average expense of $500. If the hon. gentleman will take the 15,000 settlers who have come in during the last three and a half months and divide them into the amount of money expended, he will find that we are working to vastly greater advantage than the railway companies of the west. I am free to say, while I do not desire to take more credit for it than I am entitled to, that I feel greatly encouraged with the success our agents have met with. I think we should be doing wrong to Canada if, when a movement has begun and we have succeeded in improving the conditions of

affairs as much as we have in a year and a half, we should relax our efforts and run the risk of going backwards. In 1896, when hon. gentlemen opposite had nearly ceased their efforts, immigration had nearly ceased. In one year the late Government spent over $500,000 in promoting immigration. We have never contemplated asking Parliament for such a large amount of money. But the hon. gentleman will find that in proportion as the expenditure on immigration has become smaller the immigration has fallen off. For ten years there was an average expenditure of about $225,000 a year, but, in proportion as the expenditure was reduced, the immigration fell off. If this vote were wiped out, instead of 15,000 coming in in three months, next year there would be only 2,000 or 3,000, and, in the following year there would be practically none. Wherever we are doing work we are contending against active and enterprising agents, and there is the strongest competition in every place where any effort is made to secure immigrants. I have had in my mind specially, during the work that has been done, the necessity of taking only agricultural immigrants; and, so far as I know—in fact I am in a position to state positively—no inducement has been held out to any person of any other class to come to this country. I believe it would be a mistake to induce others to come. So far as the difference in nationality is concerned, I may say to my hon. friend that the results in Ireland have not been satisfactory to me. But this is because of the fact that the agents who were working there have been labouring under very great difficulties. My hon. friend from West Assiniboia brought before the House last year the fact that when Mr. Devlin went to Ireland he was met with a most violent attack from the home rule press, and it was made almost a political question that no person should give him any aid or comfort in inducing people to leave Ireland.

Mr. Devlin addressed himself to overcoming that difficulty with great determination and with great success, and he finally succeeded in getting the very press that had been denouncing him to acknowledge that there was merit in his work, and it was worth while for the people to listen to what he had to say. I have great hope that in the course of a little time he will succeed in giving us a number of desirable settlers. We have to remember that our efforts are somewhat like those of an army. We fire off an enormous number of bullets, not expecting that every bullet is going to find a billet, or kill an enemy. We have to direct our work to those places where we think it is likely desirable results can be accomplished; but we do not think that it is desirable to stop at once because at first large results are not accomplished. If, in the course of another year, no substantial results are accomplished in Ireland, then, of course, it will be desirable for us to withdraw our staff from that place. The expenditure in connection with the Galician immigration is not large. The salary of Professor Oleshow, the only agent we have, is $600 a year. We have paid so far for the work he has done for us, $2,600 for printing and expenses, and we require to pay him under the arrangement which we have made with him, a bonus of $2.50 a head on those that are actually landed in this country.

Mr. SPROULE. How much per head to the steamship companies which bring them out?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We do not pay anything to the companies. The ordinary passage is about $20 across the ocean; we contribute absolutely nothing to the passage of an immigrant. The one principle that I have proceeded upon has been that if a man was worth having, he could pay his own passage to this country. We have not assisted the passage of any immigrants with the exception of one party of servant girls, who were brought out under the supervision of Mrs. Livingstone, and whose passage money is to be repaid. It was simply an advance for a short time, and I am satisfied the arrangement will result in the repayment of the money.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that he had paid a bonus to steamship companies for each passenger brought in.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Not to the steamship companies, but to the booking agents. I may explain that these booking agents in Europe are not in the employ of the steamship companies in the ordinary sense, though there are, of course, salaried agents. The experience of railway companies and governments that have had anything to do with continental immigration is that if you do not pay the usual bonus to the steamship agents you do not get anybody. The agents, for instance, book immigrants at these European ports. If word went over there that we were not going to pay the usual bonuses, they would simply boycott Canada within a month, and we would not get a single immigrant from those ports until we renewed the arrangement. When I say not a single immigrant, I mean none of the class of people that are generally known as immigrants. It is one of those things which every one learns at once, on turning his attention to this subject. We cannot ignore the booking agents.

Mr. INGRAM. What control has the department over the class of immigrants that come to this country, if these people themselves get bonuses? I read in this report:

The sub-agents receive commissions according to the following scale, namely: For every male

adult (18 years or over) $3, for every female adult $2, and for each person under 18 years of age $1, payable on the exchange of certificates issued by the sub-agents to their clients for settlers' rate tickets on the Canadian Pacific Railway, thus insuring their actual arrival in the country, the certificate being exchanged at the boundary.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The bonuses to the booking agents do not apply to sub-agents in the United States. We have a number of agents in the United States, and I may say that we have endeavoured to apply the same rule, and to follow the same practice in the United States which the western railways have followed in the province of Ontario. Gentlemen who are familiar with the history of the province of Ontario for the last fifteen or twenty years know that for many years the railway companies in the western states had arrangements with the ticket agents of the Canadian railways in the province of Ontario, and that these ticket agents were the most active agents in sending out people from the province of Ontario to the western states. That practice resulted in tens of thousands of our best people going to the western states. We have endeavoured to turn the tables upon them, and we have employed a large number of their agents in the western states in the same way upon commission, and so far with desirable results.

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. gentleman will remember that a few years ago strong objections were raised to immigrants coming from the old country, such as mechanics and labourers who are not employed upon farms in the North-west Territories. We understood that the bonusing was discontinued by the late Government and that the present Government had again introduced that system of granting bonuses to settlers coming to this country.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We have not commenced that system again.

Mr. INGRAM. Is there a system of granting these agents a certain sum per head for each immigrant induced to come to this country?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The practice which the hon. gentleman referred to was the practice of assisting with passage money. Objections were raised to that, it was said that persons thus brought out were practically paupers. The principle of the objection was this: That if a man had not enough money to pay his own way to this country, he was so nearly a pauper that he ought not to be brought here. We have not gone back to the system of paying or assisting passages. The payment to these booking agents is not a payment upon the passage money of the immigrant at all, but it is in the nature of a payment to him as an agent to work up immigration and bring the people here.

Mr. INGRAM. Are these agents instructed not to encourage skilled mechanics?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes, they have positive instructions not to encourage anybody except agriculturists, and so far as I know they follow that rule.

Mr. TAYLOR. I see the hon. gentleman has expended about $40,000 under the head of Canadian agencies. We all expected, when he assumed the control of his department, that he was going to inaugurate a vigorous system of immigration. In view of the amount of money that is being expended I have no doubt he is endeavouring to do so, but I find by the Auditor General's Report that at Quebec we have a small army of men employed and paid large salaries; but not satisfied with paying them salaries, the department clothes them as well. W. Anderson is paid $730 salary, that is $2 a day, but, in addition, he receives a summer suit costing $15, a winter suit costing $25.50, rubber coat, $5, rubber boots, $4.50, boots, $5, cap, $3.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I am following the example of my predecessor; there has been no change.

Mr. TAYLOR. I think that is an innovation.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No. They are men employed in the buildings and they are given uniforms. I think it is quite proper, as did my predecessor, that these men should be in uniform, because they are recognized as the men in charge.

Mr. TAYLOR. There is a large staff. F. X. Beaulieu, 33 days at $1.50; summer suit, $20.92; rubber boots, $4.50; rubber coat, $5.50; boots, $5; cap, $3. There are fourteen of such agents or employees.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Most of them are men employed around the immigration sheds, and are paid the same as labourers.

Mr. TAYLOR. All these men are furnished with summer suits, winter suits, rubber coats, the total expenditure being $11,443. I find in Ontario the expenditure was $1,301. For Canadian agents the large sum of $40,000 is expended. When a man is paid $2 a day he should furnish his own uniform, and the department should not be called upon to furnish them with winter uniforms, rubber coats and boots.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Did not the late Government furnish these men with boots?

Mr. TAYLOR. No, I never saw it done before.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Have you read the Auditor General's Reports?

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. gentleman can refer, if he pleases, to the Auditor General's Report, and he may endeavour to find items

to contradict my statement that this has not been done before this year.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There has not been any change in the practice of furnishing clothing to men around the immigration buildings.

Mr. SPROULE. I am glad to notice that the Minister has learned after a few years' experience what those who preceded him knew long ago, but it was interesting to hear the hon. gentleman speak to-night and give various reasons why we are unable to get more immigrants to this country and the importance of making heavy expenditures in the immigration department.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I do not think the hon. gentleman ever heard me speak or ever read any remarks made by me and reported in which I spoke in any different sense.

Mr. SPROULE. I remember what has taken place for many years back in this House when the hon. gentlemen now on the treasury benches condemned the increasing amount expended for immigration, and when the amount was reduced until during the last year of the late Administration there was expended only $98,000 or $100,000.

Mr. CAMPBELL. You did not obtain any results from the expenditure.

Mr. SPROULE. The results were equal in proportion to the expenditure to the results obtained during the last year. We did not have such a large immigration of paupers. When the Minister of the Interior said we expended $500,000, and kept coming down and down, it must be admitted that we did so because hon. gentleman opposite were condemning us and saying that our own people were not employed in the country, that those we were bringing in left in a little while, and there was no justification for the expenditure. Do hon. gentlemen opposite contend to-day that the people we are bringing are remaining in the country? The expenditure is altogether too large. The first thing done by the Minister of the department was to increase the expenditure. I do not blame him for that, but I blame hon. gentlemen opposite for their inconsistency; while they had been for years condemning the expenditure made, they now defend the increased expenditure by the present Minister. Their inconsistency, however, is quite in keeping with their actions in the House during the last few years. When the Minister of the Interior has stated that among the Galicians no one has died from starvation, what importance does the hon. gentleman attach to the information I read? Does he attach no importance to it? A party who went there with an interpreter, after spending one or two days in the district, stated there were seven, eight or nine families in the most destitute condition any one could possibly imagine; that at least one child had died of starvation, and if the woman, who travelled two miles to borrow flour, had failed to secure it, another child according to her statement, would have died shortly afterwards. I say in the face of these statements, and I have every reason to believe them correct, it is difficult to understand how the Minister of the Interior can say that the immigration of Galicians has been a success and he knows of no cases of want in the country.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Your party brought in the Galicians first.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. member for Kent (Mr Campbell) appears to have no better answer than a simple interruption, which is not relevant. In the face of that fact, we must come to the conclusion that the Galicians are not a suitable class. No doubt a certain percentage are suitable, a small percentage is to be found among any class of immigrants who are suitable, but I believe the great bulk of the Galicians are unsuitable. I believe they are only paupers sent out of their own country and brought here, and they become indigent and dependent on the charity of our people.

Some hon. MEMBERS. How will they vote?

Mr. SPROULE. Hon. gentleman opposite will know more about that than I do. They always manage to corral the foreigners, the Scandinavians and Galicians, and get them to vote as they want—whether they buy them I do not know. I do not know their politics and I care less. The question is, are they suitable citizens in this country and will they succeed? They become a burden on us as soon as they reach Canada, and I consider it is a matter of some importance to endeavour to prevent a large number of these people coming here to fill up the country and add to the burdens of our people. All that we can bring from the British islands are desirable immigrants, and we should get as many of them as possible. I do not wonder that so few English-speaking immigrants have come here, because for years past hon. gentlemen opposite have instructed them, through their speeches, that Canada was a good place to avoid, and now when these gentlemen want them to come to Canada, they cannot get them. I do not want to be understood as opposing a liberal expenditure on immigration, but I remind the right hon. gentleman that he and his friends have for years opposed a liberal vote for immigration in this House, and in order to satisfy them the Conservative Government cut down the appropriation until it was only about $100,000 a couple of years ago. We are to spend double that amount this year, but the return we are getting for that $200,000 is very small. The country requires immigrants, and I hope we will do better in the future. I can only say that up to the present time this Gov-

ernment have not been able to show the Canadian people that they have been very successful in their immigration policy.

Mr. OSLER. I must say, Sir, that immigration is one of the most difficult problems the Government have to deal with. I cannot agree with my hon. friend from Grey (Mr. Sproule) in some of his remarks. Although I do not live in the North-west, I have very large interests there, and I keep very closely in touch with what is going on, and I have come to the conclusion, from what I have been able to gather, that so far the Galicians have been, on the whole, a good class of settlers. I do not think it would be wise to encourage a too rapid immigration of these people, for I believe they should be brought in slowly so that they may be absorbed in the country from year to year. I repeat that the information I have received from my friends in the North-west is to the effect that, taking them altogether, the Galicians are a good class of immigrants. In bringing 4,000 or 5,000 men such as they into a strange country, of necessity there will be cases of hardship. I am quite sure that in the original settlement of Ontario there were cases of hardship, and many, I dare say, died, and some, doubtless, of the pioneers were frozen to death. In the consideration of a question such as this, we should not look too closely to individual cases of hardship. I must say, Sir, that I was very much pleased with the speech delivered to-night by the Minister of the Interior on immigration. It is a difficult question to deal with, and I give the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) credit for doing the very best he can in the premises. To my mind, satisfactory immigration does not so much depend upon the amount of money expended as upon the price of the commodities that are raised in the country to which you bring your immigrants. During the last ten or twelve years the price of grain has been so low that it gives the key-note to the want of settlers in the North-west Territories. I guarantee that if my friends on the Government side will keep up the price of wheat to 80 cents a bushel in the North-west, they soon can stop spending any money on immigration, for the immigrants will go there of their own accord. While it is very desirable to get immigrants into the North-west and while, so far, the Mennonites and that class of men have been prosperous and desirable settlers, I think it would be an unwise thing to bring in too many Galicians in one year. Four or five thousand a year is quite as many as that country can absorb.

Mr. SPROULE. How does the Minister (Mr. Sifton) justify paying a bonus of $5 each for the Galicians, and only $2 each for the English, Irish and Scoth immigrants ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We pay on the same scale that others pay to the continental agents, namely, $5, and we pay on the same scale as others do to the English agents, namely, $2. We do not feel disposed to raise the rate, and if we lowered it we would get no immigrants.

Mr. SPROULE. Are the Canadian Pacific Railway authorities, who own so much land in the North-west assisting in any way to bring immigrants to the country.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The operations of the Canadian Pacific Railway are entirely separate from those of the Government, and while our people come in contact with theirs once in a while, I cannot give any detailed statement as to what they do. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company people claim that they spend a large amount of money in immigration.

Mr. SPROULE. Do they make any reduction in the cost of transportation ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. They give us a very low rate and they give our agents free transportation. When our immigrants get stuck at Winnipeg, and have not got their tickets right, the Canadian Pacific Railway very often carry them for nothing. They do everything they can for us without getting any profit out of it in many cases.

Mr. RICHARDSON. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) complained that when the Liberals were in Opposition they objected to the expenditure of money for immigration. I can tell the hon. gentleman that any person who is familiar with the facts will agree that the Liberals had good reason to complain about this expenditure in past years, for, as a matter of fact, notwithstanding the amount of money spent yearly in seeking to promote immigration to the North-west, that country did not actually hold the natural increase of its population, more people left the country than were brought into it. The money was wasted : the immigrants did not remain there, and many of them were no good anyway. In one case, we had an instalment of Jew pedlars sent from Chicago, who were no use as settlers, and who in some cases took to thievery, and were obliged to be maintained at the expense of the country. But, Sir, under existing circumstances, it is wise that we should go in for a vigorous immigration policy. The conditions have entirely changed in the North-west within the last year or two. We are having good times in Manitoba and the North-west, and the people who are going in there are staying there, and the population is rapidly increasing, and making substantial progress. Whether or not it be that Providence is acting in conjunction with my right hon. friend the Prime Minister, the fact is that at the present time the North-west is in a prosperous condition. Excellent progress is being made, and if we can get our vacant lands settled it will be money well spent

even though it costs us a large sum. Now, Sir, with regard to the Galician immigration. Along the line of the Dauphin Railway, I had an opportunity of observing how these people were progressing, and the general verdict of the settlers is that these Galicians are making substantial progress. I am disposed to agree with the member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler) that it might not be well to send too many Galicians in at a time. But these lands have remained vacant for many years, and if these people continue to make the progress they seem to be making now, then I think the Minister of the Interior is to be commended for encouraging the Galician immigration. I do not say that they are the most desirable settlers, but they have come in to take up lands which long lay vacant; they are assimilating with our own people, and I believe in the end they will make reasonably good settlers.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) took exception to the statement of the Minister of the Interior with regard to the practice of providing clothing in Quebec. He said it was quite an innovation, and was not to be found in the previous reports. I have sent for the Auditor General's Report for 1895-96, and I find the summer cap and the winter cap, the $18 overcoat and the rubber boots—the whole outfit which my hon. friend referred to.

Mr. OLIVER. The question of Galician immigration is like almost all other questions, in that its appearance depends chiefly upon the point of view; and it is quite possible that those who come into more intimate connection with the Galician immigrants may look upon their immigration with a different eye from those who have not had that opportunity. As one who has come perhaps more intimately into connection with them than any other member of the House, I may be allowed to say a word or two. It was to the district I represent and the town in which I live that the first Galician immigrants came. Near that town is a large Galician settlement, and therefore I have had opportunities of observing those people that perhaps have not fallen to the lot of other members of the House. The point I wish to make in regard to this matter of foreign immigration I will try to make by illustration. It has been hinted in this House to-night that an objection exists to the importation of mechanics to this part of the country. I believe there is such an objection. The people of this part of the country object to the public money being used for the purpose of inducing such immigration; and that objection was considered so valid that the immigration of mechanics has ceased. Our position in the locality I speak of in the west is, that our trade is working on the land, and the immigration which provides more workers on the land than the employers can employ or pay wages to, is not a desirable immigration for us. In any new country, in our new country at any rate, there is always a very large proportion of poor settlers—people who come in the hope of being able to earn enough money from their richer neighbours to start them on their farms. When too large a number of that class of people come in, it becomes practically impossible for many of them to succeed in that way. That is our position in regard to this Galician immigration. A large number of these people have come in, and in a large majority of cases they have been in very poor circumstances—in such circumstances that they were compelled either to work at any wages they could get, or starve. The consequence is that their advent into that country means that the young men from the eastern provinces of Canada who might desire to go up there and take farms, hoping to start themselves by wages earned from their richer neighbours, are practically debarred from doing so. So that to-day if a young man from Ontario asks, "What are the chances of my going to Edmonton and earning something there to start me on a farm?" the only answer that can be given to him is that the chances are not good, and that the reason is there is an overplus of cheap labour there, in the shape of this Galician immigration. As I say, this matter all depends on the point of view. It may seem to people here that the country can be built up satisfactorily on these terms; but it does not seem so to us there. To our minds, you are not succeeding in building the country up to the extent that you think you are, because the presence of these Galicians to a certain extent prevents the presence of those young men who, being our own countrymen, would be more desirable settlers. That is the position, as I understand it, with regard to this immigration of a poor class of people.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. You do not want to weaken the other parts of Canada, do you?

Mr. OLIVER. I will make this statement, although it is not pertinent to the question, that of all the countries in the known world, the provinces of Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island have been the greatest fields for emigration within the past twenty years; that is to say, they have lost a larger proportion of their working population to their neighbours to the south than any other part of the world has lost to another country. It seems to me that instead of our shutting our eyes to that plain fact, it would be business for us rather to try to direct this natural overflow of our own people to the settlement of our own country, instead of letting it drift to the United States; and in doing that, let us not think that we are weakening our own country, but rather strengthening it.

Mr. INGRAM. How would you do it ?

Mr. OLIVER. The hon. gentleman may answer his own conundrum.

Mr. INGRAM. If the hon. gentleman will excuse me, I know that that is a very pertinent question with the labouring classes of this country. It is a difficult problem to solve, and we would like to know what to suggest to the Government. It is with the best of feeling that I ask the question.

Mr. OLIVER. I am not prepared just now to give an answer to the question, which was brought out on the spur of the moment. Perhaps at another time I may be able to do so. If the statement I make is irrefutable, it is for the hon. gentleman himself or any one else to suggest a remedy. A member of society in this part of the country who, owing to circumstances, is not able to use his natural abilities to the fullest extent, and has that opportunity opened to him by removing to that part of the country, from being a dead weight becomes a profitable producer of wealth for Canada. Instead of weakening the country you strengthen the country by giving him that opportunity. In past years we have been losing our population by tens and hundreds of thousands, so that to-day there is in the United States nearly as large a population of Canadians and descendants of Canadians as there is in Canada. I do not think we can gain anything by shutting our eyes to that fact. We are to a certain extent shutting the door in the faces of our young men who desire to move to that country, by inducing what is to a great extent a pauper immigration, which for evident reasons is as undesirable in that country as it is in this. Now, I do not wish to discuss the matter at any length ; but I think it is only fair that the House should be informed in regard to the nationality of those people.

It has been said that the Mennonites and Icelanders are agriculturists and that, therefore, as a natural consequence, the Gali cians, being agriculturists, are also good settlers. Well, these people are of the Slavonic race, entirely different from the Mennonites or Icelanders. They are the native population of Russian-Poland, of which Galicia forms a part, and although they are and have been agriculturists from time immemorial, the Russian Government, about a hundred years ago, actually induced immigration into Russia from Germany of Mennonites, the progenitors of those who afterwards came to Manitoba, for the purpose of improving agriculturally the country of which these Slavonic people are the natives. Russia imported German farmers for the purpose of making the country more productive than the native Slavonic farmers were able to make it, which is fair evidence of the respective values of the two peoples, and which shows that the Germans are, in the nature of things, much more desirable than the Galicians, although both are agriculturists. In the case of the Austrian province of Galicia ; that is settled partly by Germans, who were brought in by the Austrian Government because the original owners of the soil were not satisfactory farmers. And the Germans have increased so much, that they and the native Galicians crowded each other, and it became a question for the Austrian Government whether the Germans or the Galicians should leave the country. The Germans began first to leave and some of them came to Canada, but the Austrian Government, taking alarm at this movement, took measures to stop it and replace it by a movement of Galicians, so that we are informed to-day by the Deputy Minister of the Interior that we can get thousands of Galicians from Galicia but no Germans whatever. That is why I used in this connection the word "deportation" instead of "immigration." It is a movement of population urged by the Austrian Government for the purpose of actually getting rid of these people, and it is only fair that the House should understand these facts. It is not fair to make a level comparison between these people and the other races, and particularly not fair to make a level comparison between their value and the value of our own people. It will be found that the feeling is very general in the west—among the people where I live at any rate—that our own people are the best, that the best the country has is not too good for them, and that if there is any preference, they are the parties who should have it. And if the question is whether our own or some other people shall have the country, no matter how good the others may be, our people should have it and should not be crowded by pauper immigration.

Mr. DAVIS. My hon. friend from Alberta does not seem to have any great love for the Galicians. He starts in by saying that they are going to furnish cheap labour for the settlers of the west. Well, that is what we want. Transportation costs us so much and we have to haul so far that we must have cheap labour, and cheap labour is a thing that farmers in these times will be glad to have. With reference to the Galicians I want to get all I can into the district I have the honour of representing. I believe that they will make first-class settlers. It will take a while to get them into the hang of things in this country, but they are thrifty people who will adapt themselves to its conditions and become as good settlers as we can get, provided they are placed in a proper manner. I do not think they should be settled among other people but in colonies, placed in close proximity to other settlements where they can learn the ways of the country, and then in a short time they will make good settlers. I tried this year to get a colony of them into the district of Saskatchewan,

close to the colony of Mennonites, and I am confident that if they settle there, they will give a good account of themselves. The Mennonites, I think, is the best class of immigration we can get into the west. It is the best we have got so far. We have immigrants from all parts of England and Scotland, and all over the world, but those Mennonites are the most thrifty settlers we have got. In one district 70 families settled at a place called Rusthern. They have only been there five years, and this year they exported 100,000 bushels of wheat, sold at 70 cents a bushel, or $70,000, making $1,000 per family. And that is for wheat alone, not taking into consideration the stock they sold; they raise great quantities of cattle and also go in for dairying. This year they built a large roller mill and paid for it themselves, without help from anybody, and are shipping their flour to British Columbia. There are some shrewd business men among them, storekeepers, who handle the wheat and ship it out. If the hon. Minister of the Interior would get us more of that class of settlers, he would be doing a good thing for the country. I am sure that we would like to get all the Canadians we can because the Canadian is the best settler we can get, but that is merely displacing population, taking it from one place and putting it into another. What we want is to get people from the outside, if we are going to increase our population and our resources as they ought to be increased. We have all classes in my district—English and Scotch——

Mr. TAYLOR. And the Irish.

Mr. DAVIS. Yes, a few came from Gananoque. The Scotch are about the best we can get and the Irish come next, and the English make very good settlers, too, but I cannot say as much for the settlers brought in from the other side of the line by the late Government. The hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule) said that the Government are spending a great deal more than was spent by the late Government on immigration. I must say that if they do not spend it to any better effect than the late Government did, we might consider it thrown away. I have a little experience of what they did. They brought in a lot of delegates, who travelled around the country having a good time. Some gentlemen with a little pull would get appointed immigration agent and be given a trip for the good of his health to the United States, and there he would see some of his friends and take them junketting through this country at the country's expense. Then they went away and that was the last we saw of them. Another class of settlers which these hon. gentlemen brought in was a class of Frenchmen from old France. They are from Paris, the most of them—boot and shoemakers, tailors and all kinds of tradesmen, including a good quantity of cooks. They were settled on some lands, and they knew so little about farming that they planted grain with a pick axe. If that is the best style of settler the late Government brought in, I would much rather have the Galicians.

Mr. RICHARDSON. What about the Jews?

Mr. DAVIS. We have only two or three in my district, the majority went up to Calgary. I would rather have the Galicians than those who plant grain with a pick axe. However, I think good progress has been made this year. Between 12,000 and 15,000 immigrants have gone into the North-west this year, and before the fall we will probably have as many more. I am sure the Minister of the Interior is doing all he can to settle the country, and so far he has been very successful.

Mr. OLIVER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davis) who has just sat down was very pointed in his objection to the removal of people from one part of Canada to another as not being good policy. He has also told us a great deal of the progress and prosperity of the German settlement at Rosstown, but he forgot to tell us that the Mennonites of this settlement came from the constituency of the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson), the case proving my theory that that class of people do make the best settlers.

Mr. DAVIS. In reply to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) I may say that I believe a few of these Mennonites did come from Lisgar, but the majority came direct from Russia.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. This question of immigration is a very important one in Manitoba and the North-west, and I think every credit should be given to the present Minister of the Interior for what he has done to promote immigration to our country. I was somewhat amused at the remarks of the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) We have heard a good deal from that hon. gentleman this session about Edmonton and the Edmonton district, and I hope that the hon. gentleman will live long to tell us about the beauties of his district. But he unconsciously perhaps rather gave that district away when he said that agriculturists were not wanted there, that the very class of people we desire to come into Manitoba and the North-west, the people who can go on the land, who will join the great army of producers who support us all, are not wanted there. That is another argument against the policy pursued by the late Government of bringing people in and putting them in far-distant districts where the country is new and where there are not markets offering such advantages as are to be found in Manitoba and many parts of the North-west Territories. In Manitoba we hire agricultural labourers, and we can take any number of Galicians and furnish them with employment, because we have people who are capable of paying

wages; people who have succeeded in agriculture; who are settlers in every sense of the word—they have settled on the land and they can settle their wages bills.

Mr. CLANCY. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Rutherford) agree with the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) in his opinion of Frenchmen.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. In my opinion the hon. member for Saskatchewan is quite right. He referred to the fact that these people came from the city of Paris. I do not care what city they came from, whether it be Paris, London, Dublin or Glasgow, we do not want them in the Northwest. We want people who will cultivate the soil and become good farmers. I might say that it is my experience, after many years' residence in that country, and I think my statement will be endorsed by every one who has observed the progress of the country, that every man who has received an agricultural training, and is capable of working and economizing, can go into any portion of that country where he is within the reach of a reliable market and can make his way with his own two hands and nothing else. There is no country in the world where the poor man who desires to work and is industrious and economical can succeed so well as he can in Manitoba and the Northwest Territories.

Now, with reference to the Galicians, I wish to say a few words. When I first saw these people I was not favourably impressed with them. I do not think that any one would be favourably impressed with people who have come across in an immigrant ship and an immigrant car, seeing them near the end of their journey. Their costume is peculiar and their appearance strange. But one thing notable about them is that they have very fine countenances. They are intelligent-looking people, and, after only a few months' residence in the country, it is wonderful to see the change in their dress and customs. I took the trouble to go up twice to the Dauphin settlement and look at these people. I found they were getting along well. They were able to adapt themselves to the circumstances of the country much better than does the average immigrant that we get from Great Britain. One thing they understand clearly, that it is necessary to keep warm in winter. They build their houses warm and comfortable. They are not paupers. There may be some paupers among them, I suppose, but the majority of them have some money. They are getting along well. They are very industrious, and I have every reason to believe that they will continue so. I am sorry that the hon. member for Alberta has deemed it his duty to give his district such a bad name, although we have heard a great deal in praise of it from him during the session.

Mr. TAYLOR. I wish to reply to the Finance Minister, who referred to the Auditor General's Report of 1885. I have turned it up here and I find I am correct in my statement that there has been an innovation. In 1895, the staff, consisting of nine men, were supplied with a uniform suit. In 1897, this economical Government increased the staff to fourteen, and not only furnished them with a uniform suit, but two pairs of boots and rubber coats. But in 1895 you cannot find a pair of rubber boots or leather boots.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I found the rubber boots.

Mr. SPROULE. I wish to give a short item of the report of the Minister of the Interior in support of what I said in regard to these Galicians. He speaks of them as Ruthenians. He says:

> A number of settlers from Austria, called Ruthenians, have come out recently, some at the instances of Professor Oleskow, but many on their own account. They appear to be closely allied with the Galicians, several parties of whom from time to time arrive here. They speak a language difficult to interpret, very few strangers having heard it. Their circumstances are poor, many being entirely without means. A number arrived here after winter had set in, and, as it was impossible to send them away from the immigration building in a perfectly destitute condition, it devolves upon the department to accommodate and feed a few of them until the spring, or until they can be otherwise provided for. This is accordingly being done, and the cost is but trifling. This, however, is a condition which was never contemplated, and steps should be taken to prevent its occurring again. Our agents at points of embarkation should be instructed to watch for any contemplated movement on the part of the Ruthenians, and be empowered to prevent them from coming unless provided with the necessary funds to carry them over at least a year or two.

That is the report of his own agent, and I think it justifies everything I said with regard to it.

Mr. DAVIS. I wish to refer to what was said by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy). He tried to make capital out of the fact that I said something about French immigration into my district. As I understood him, he thought to make out that I brought nationality into the question. I was not even thinking about nationality. I merely said that these people were from Paris, and I would rather have a Galician, because he is a farmer, than a man who knows nothing about farming. We have some farmers from old France, and they are good farmers, as good as can be had in any place. What we want in the Northwest Territories is not cooks or tailors or anything of that kind, but farmers, whether they come from France, Germany or Russia.

Mr. OLIVER. The hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Rutherford) saw fit to put words into my mouth that I did not use. He intl-

mated that I had said it was not desirable for agriculturists to come to Edmonton. The idea I wished to convey was that it was not desirable for pauper agricultural labourers to come to that district. We want agriculturists, but we want those who are able to employ labourers, not those who are only seeking employment for their labour. If there is employment for the Galicians in the constituency of Macdonald, the hon. gentleman should put in a petition and have them dumped off here. I merely ask that they be not sent to a place where they cannot all get employment, and where they crowd out other men who need employment.

Mr. DAVIN. I did not say anything against the Galicians; I complained of the disproportion between the Galician immigration and the immigration from Scotland, Ireland and England. Can the hon. gentleman say what proportion the Galician immigration bears to the immigration from the United Kingdom?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Of the 15,605 entering Manitoba and the North-west Territories as agricultural settlers who have reported to our officers, 1,372 were Galicians. The hon. gentleman will remember that I only started to work at the immigration branch about the 1st of January last year, and the result of that work would not manifest itself much until the beginning of this year.

Mr. DAVIN. How is the rest of the 15,000 made up?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I have not got all the nationalities divided, but from England we had 1,147 up to the 30th of April, during the first three months of this year; 70 Irish, 203 Scotch, 293 Germans. The balance of the 15,000, with the exception of the Galicians, were not grouped. 164 came from Scandinavia and a large number from the United States.

Mr. DAVIN. As regards immigration from the United States, the more we get of it the better it will be for the country. Any that we have had, both under the late Government and since this Government came into power, have been perfectly satisfactory. But it seems to me the personnel of his staff in the United States is open to the criticism that there is an element of favouritism in it. Now, I want to ask the hon. gentleman about his Canadian agents. What about the agent, R. L. Alexander, at Calgary?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I have forgotten about him.

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. gentleman no sooner came into office than he dismissed him.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I remember distinctly answering the hon. gentleman last session about that. I recommend him to look up my answer in the "Hansard."

Mr. DAVIN. The answer was to the effect that his services had been dispensed with, and we got no reason whatever.

Mr. SPROULE. What kind of literature is the hon. gentleman distributing, and in what countries?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I hope the hon. gentleman will spare me from giving a description of the immigration pamphlets. I will send a sample of each one to the hon. gentleman in the morning.

Mr. SPROULE. Could he give us an approximate idea of what kind of pamphlets they are distributing?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The hon. gentleman has seen the hand-book, surely. We take the portion of the hand-book which relates to the western portion of the country, and circulate that. Our method in the western states is simply this. We advertise in the newspapers, and that secures communications from persons who desire to settle here. Then communication is opened with the department here, and we send our pamphlets to the addresses furnished by the outside agents. I cannot give the hon. gentleman the exact cost for printing and advertising. The printing is done in the Bureau here. In England it is done through the Hgh Commissioner's office, and this year the estimate is $10,000.

Survey of Indian reserves..... $500

Mr. DAVIN. When the Indian Bill was before the House on the second reading, I asked some questions about the management of the Crooked Lake Indians, and the reason for removing the Indian Commissioner's Office from Regina to Winnipeg, or from a central point in the Territories to Winnipeg. The only reason the Minister gave was that Mr. Forget said that he would rather go to Winnipeg. My information is that he did not recommend that his office be changed to Winnipeg, but he wanted to be removed to Ottawa. I make the statement now that I am fully convinced Mr. Forget recommended that he and his office be removed to Ottawa, and he expected to be removed here. There is no logical ground for removing the Indian Commissioner from the centre of the North-west Territories, where almost all the treaties have been made, to Winnipeg, where there is only one and a half treaty. Any one looking at the map will see that there are about six and a half treaties in the Territories compared with one and a half and two treaties in Manitoba. The majority of the treaties are in the Territories, and it is well known that Indians require to be brought into contact with what they call the head man. They were accustomed to come to the Indian Commissioner's Office and meet him, and had a good effect on the

government of these wild tribes. Crooked Lake reserve is in a wretched condition. During 1897 those Indians who were accustomed to raise crops that took prizes at the exhibition and who had progressed as farmers, became demoralized, no longer do any farming and will not stay on the reserves, all because of the changes made in the personnel and management by Mr. Forget. Any one who will read Mr. Forget's report, embodied in the Indian report, will find that he admits that things are not in a satisfactory condition.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. That the crops were not good.

Mr. DAVIN. I have a letter from a person who is thoroughly acquainted with Indian matters, and he says he never saw the Indians so discontented. In his letter he says:

I must say that I never saw the Indians in such an unsettled state of mind, and yet I hear Mr. Sifton say everything is going on well and the Indians were never so contented.

The Indians have been looking out for Mr. Forget this whole winter, and no sign of him yet.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I hope they are not going to tomahawk him.

Mr. DAVIN. They may even do that, but I would not like to have him scalped.

He has promised to go round and see the Indians on the reserve; but he is not yet here. I am of opinion that a great many will leave for Turtle Mountain and Montana, and many of the Indians brought over from Montana have returned.

Mr. COWAN. I rise to a point of order, and ask that the document be laid on the Table.

Mr. DAVIN. There is something the matter with the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cowan). The state of the Crooked Lake reserve now is even worse than is described in this letter. There was a very prominent gentleman from Grenfell here a while ago and he told me it was impossible to exaggerate the demoralization on these reserves. I repeat what I said on a previous occasion, that it is not this year you will find the result of the policy of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton), but it is next year or the year after you will know the fruit it will bear. I should like to have from the Minister a statement as to why it is that Mr. Forget has been placed in Winnipeg. The theory in the west is that the Minister was about to act on Mr. Forget's advice and was going to bring Mr. Forget to Ottawa, but having previously moved the land office from Winnipeg, he found he had brought a hornet's nest around his head and in order to soothe them he gave them the commissioner's office and located Mr. Forget at Winnipeg, greatly to his chagrin.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) is entitled to the information he asks for. To relieve his anxiety in regard to my comfort, I may tell him that I am not subject to any criticism for the removal of the commissioner's office, but Winnipeg being a little larger than Regina it does not attach much importance to the presence or absence of an officer of that kind. I cannot say that Mr. Forget did not suggest that he should come to Ottawa. I had a great many conversations with Mr. Forget and I would not be prepared to say that he did not suggest it, but I do not remember that he ever made that suggestion to me. Whether he suggested it or not I never had the slightest idea of removing Mr. Forget to Ottawa. He was removed to Winnipeg precisely for the reason I gave the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) before, namely, because he could do his work much better from that point. I received a letter similar to that which the hon. gentleman read, complaining of the state of the Crooked Lake Reserve, and I took occasion to have a careful examination into the matter, the result of which was that it was found there was nothing whatever in the statement. I think I can produce that report of the state of the reserve which was made in consequence of the inquiry. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) will find that the gentleman who inaugurated the proceedings with regard to the Crooked Lake Reserve is not a political friend of his, but rather a political friend of mine whose hopes of securing an office on that reserve did not materialize. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) will remember that a few days ago he was holding me responsible for crops which were not good on the Crooked Lake Reserve last year, and he held me responsible for that in consequence of changes which I made on the 1st of July. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) has been thinking the matter over since and seeing that I could not be responsible for the condition of the crop last year he takes to prognosticating what is going to happen next year. I submit that neither he nor I can tell what the crops are going to be next year.

Mr. DAVIS (Saskatchewan). The hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) has taken exception to the commissioner's office being removed from Regina to Winnipeg, and the ground of his objection is that if the commissioner's office were at Regina in the centre of the Indian reservations, the Indians could see the commissioner more frequently. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) has lived many years in the Territories and he is well aware of the fact that not one out of a hundred Indians ever see the commissioner more than once in two years, no matter whether he lives at Regina or Winnipeg. The hon. gentleman talks about the demoralization on the Indian reserves, but I am quite sure he will admit that the changes made at Battle-

ford and elsewhere have been beneficial. The last year the old officials were there four or five hundred head of cattle died.

Mr. TAYLOR. I rise to a point of order. I think the discussion should be confined to the item.

Mr. McCLURE. I should like to inquire of the Minister whether this item covers anything for new schools in the province of Nova Scotia, and if not, I wish to press upon him the importance of making early provision for the establishment of some new Indian schools in that province? The Indians of the North-west are of immense importance, but there are Indian reserves in the province of Nova Scotia where there are large numbers of children, sufficient to maintain a school, and no school has been established, except those which are established by charitable funds. I wish to impress upon the Minister that if this item does not cover money to establish schools there, he should make that provision at an early day.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The item does not contain any appropriation for the purpose to which the hon. gentleman has referred. There is considerable difficulty attending the working of the Indian business in the province of Nova Scotia; but it has not been the policy of the department in past years to spend a large amount of money on Indian education there, and I have simply followed that policy. I shall be very happy to discuss the matter with the hon. gentleman, with the hope of possibly doing something next year; but at present I am not able to say anything more definite.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I would like to call the attention of the hon. Minister to a case which I think has been before him for some months, with reference to an Indian woman who is a patient in the insane asylum in the county of Cape Breton. The authorities of the county have been called upon to pay the cost of keeping her, and I understand that a claim has been sent by the municipality to the department, and I want to know what the Minister proposes to do with that claim.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I do not at this moment remember the details of the claim.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I called the hon. gentleman's attention to it by letter, and he simply acknowledged my letter, and said that the matter was before he department. It is the duty of the department to support the Indians, and this patient should not be a burden on the municipality. I maintain that the Minister ought to give the information to the House.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I had entirely forgotten the particular circumstance to which the hon. gentleman referred, and he would probably admit that that is not at all remarkable; but my impression is that it has not been the custom of the department to pay for the keep of Indians under such circumstances. My impression is that I decided against the payment of the claim; but I will look up the papers in connection with it and give the hon. gentleman the decision arrived at, and the ground on which I came to the decision.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Does the Minister pretend to say that an insane Indian pauper becomes a charge to a municipality or county or to any other authority outside of the department of the Interior?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I do not remember the exact circumstances of the case or the decision I gave, and the hon. gentleman will have to wait until I have an opportunity of looking up the papers I cannot compel my memory to recall it.

Mr. McDOUGALL. It is not necessary that the individual case should be remembered at all. The principle is the same. If an Indian becomes an insane pauper, I want to know if the rule of the department is to provide for that Indian pauper. Here is a principle involved, and I want to know whether it is the obligation of the Department of Indian Affairs to maintain and support that Indian pauper, or is it the obligation of the municipality or county?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The hon. gentleman has asked me a fair question, and I will give him my answer. I think it is the obligation of the municipality.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I beg to differ with the hon. Minister. Why does the Department of Indian Affairs undertake to provide for those Indians who are unable to provide for themselves? It is in duty bound to do so.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Not at all. I would refer my hon. friend to the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague), who has a large Indian settlement in his constituency, and who I am sure can give the information.

Mr. MONTAGUE. They are not insane Indians there.

Mr. McDOUGALL. This is the case of an insane Indian pauper, and I maintain that it is the duty of the Department of Indian Affairs to look after that Indian pauper.

Mr. DAVIS (Saskatchewan). I would ask the hon. gentleman if he is sure the woman is an Indian. I am told they are not pure Indians down there, but half-breeds, and therefore they would not be treated as Indians.

Mr. McDOUGALL. My impression is that if the hon. gentleman was down there he could not tell the difference.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I want to controvert the statement of the

hon. member for Haldimand that the Indians in his constituency are not insane. I think they are all insane, because they voted for him.

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis), in coming to the defence of the Minister, said that I could not deny that the dismissals made in the Indian Department in the north had been beneficial. I utterly deny that anything like propriety has been followed——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. We are now discussing the items concerning the Indians in the province of Quebec and the province of Ontario. We shall come later on to the item for the Indians of the North-west Territories.

Mr. DAVIN. Have we not the right to deal with the whole question on any item?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. When there is an item providing for the appropriation of certain moneys for a certain part of the country, I think we must wait until we reach that item before discussing it.

Mr. DAVIN. Why did you not call my hon. friend from Saskatchewan to order?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I did.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I suppose the hon. Minister of the Interior will look into the case suggested by my hon. friend from Cape Breton (Mr. McDougall).

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The hon. gentleman put the question as to whether there was an obligation on the part of the department, and I said I did not think there was. If it came to a matter of law, the municipality is liable, but not the department; but as a general rule, where there is sufficient appropriation for it, the department has provided for a case of that kind.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Why does not the hon. gentleman provide a sum in the Estimates now for that purpose?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There is a provision in the Estimates of this year for the relief of that class; and if the case mentioned was brought before the department and laid over, it was laid over because there were no funds, but it will be considered first at the commencement of this year.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I am quite satisfied with that statement.

Mr. SPROULE. I see an item here for the removal of a lot of Indians from Oka to Gibson, $200. There has been an item every year for years in the Estimates with regard to the removal of these Indians. When does the hon. gentleman expect to have the last of them removed, and how much will it cost?

Mr. MONTAGUE. That was fully explained last year by the present Minister of the Cabinet without portfolio (Mr. Dobell).

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I think the movement is almost stopped now. It is very unlikely that any more will go up.

Mr. SPROULE. I heard a year or two ago that they were coming back to Oka as fast as you took them out. At the rate they are moving back and forth, this item is likely to appear in the Estimates for twenty years longer.

Department of Indian Affairs—Manitoba and North-west Territories $729,052

Mr. DAVIN. I want to say with reference to the dismissals on the Saskatchewan, that it is quite clear they were dictated by partisan views. Take the dismissal of Williams, a thoroughly loyal man, and his replacement by a rebel. Nolin and Lepine were two rebels. Lepine is now dead, and the Minister was so ashamed after the appointment had been made——

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No such appointment was made.

Mr. DAVIN. It was made, and after the papers criticised it, it was undone again.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It was not done at all.

Mr. DAVIN. P. J. Williams was the son of an Ontario farmer and a loyal man, who had served his country and the Indian Department well. Daunais is employed still by the Indian Department, although he is at present under one of the greatest criminal charges that can be brought against a man. If we go to the west, you will find that Grasse was dismissed from the Indian Department service, although an efficient man. All over the territory we have dismissals from the Indian Department which cannot be justified, and were clearly dictated by the view as to the political complexion of the parties taken by Mr. Forget. Take a very cruel case, the dismissal of Dr. Orton; could the Minister defend that? When he was asked why Dr. Orton was dismissed, he answered that he was not competent.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I said that he was unfit for the office, and I say so now.

Mr. DAVIN. So far as I ever heard, he was a most efficient medical man.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I did not say anything against his medical skill, but I say that he was unfit for the office.

Mr. DAVIN. I was told that he is an efficient medical officer and did his work well. Take the employment of Dr. Edwards, in Regina. Personally I have the greatest respect for him and I have no desire to criticise him personally, but he is employed at a

large salary to do the work that was being done by two or three medical men, at much less cost and more efficiently than it could be done by one man. You had Dr. Cotton in the jail at Regina and Dr. Willoughby at the industrial school at very small salaries compared with the salary of Dr. Edwards. The only reason that I can think of for the dismissal of these gentlemen is that they were Conservatives. And the Government wanted to put in a Liberal. That is, of course, contrary to the promise made to us that none but offensive partisans would be dismissed. These men were not offensive partisans. I would like to know also why Grasse was dismissed. He was on the Stony Indian reserve forty miles west of Calgary. There was no charge against him. I should like to know also why common courtesy was not shown to Dr. Orton and, if he had to be dismissed, why he was not treated according to precedent. He complains bitterly of the way he was treated. And why is Daunais kept in the employ of the department with a criminal charge hanging over his head ?

Mr. DAVIS (Saskatchewan). In reply to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin)——

Mr. DAVIN. I want a reply from the Minister of the Interior——

Mr. DAVIS (Saskatchewan). I wish to say a word about the dismissals in the Saskatchewan district. The hon. gentleman mentions Mr. Williams. The only reason the hon. gentleman complains of this dismissal is that Mr. Williams was, he says, a loyal man. He did not say when he was loyal or how. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman is aware that for some time Mr. Williams was totally unfit to perform the duties of his office, being paralyzed. About 400 head of cattle died on the reserve during the last winter he was in the employ of the department causing a loss to this country of about $12,000. I do not blame Mr. Williams, as he was not able to discharge the duties of his office. A live young man was appointed in his place, one thoroughly acquainted with Indian work and he has given a good account of himself. In the Battleford district, under the former Administration, there were eight farm instructors and they cost the country about $60 a month each. Four of these have been dismissed, and the other four are doing the work and doing it more effectively. Then, take Duck Lake. There was a clerk there costing the country something like $1,000. His services has been dispensed with and the agent has to do the work. The agents' salary has been reduced by $300. Taking the three districts, you will find a saving of over $5,000 a year by the changes made by the Minister, and the work is being done much better. There is one item I would like to have stand over, and that is the item for industrial schools.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Take it on concurrence.

Mr. SPROULE. I notice in item 212, $5,000 is charged for travelling expenses, but there is no similar charge for the other provinces.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The amount of travelling to be done in British Columbia is very great. We have no inspectors in Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, so there is no charge for travelling expenses. In Manitoba and the North-west Territories the travelling is charged to general expenses, and as to Ontario and Quebec, the hon. gentleman will find under item 213 two inspectors, one of Indian agencies and one of timber, and travelling expenses of these officers.

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. Minister has not given me an answer with respect to Dr. Cotton and Dr. Willoughby.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The doctor who formerly attended the Muscowpetung agency and who was, under the new arrangement given the File Hills and Touchwood agencies, received a salary of $600 a year, and the medical attendance of the Assiniboine agency was given, on call, by a doctor who was paid for each visit. The expenditure in the Assiniboine agency varied. Up to April, 1896, Dr. Willoughby was paid for actual attendance on the pupils of the school. At the rate for which he was so paid for the months of January, February and March, 1896, his services would have called for a payment of $744. An arrangement was made by the department which had nothing of a permanent nature in it, under which he did the work for $40 a month. This brought the medical work of the school and the two agencies to a little under $1,200. The salary Dr. Edwards is getting is $1,400, but he is required in return for that to make regular visits instead of waiting until he is called for. It is for that purpose that he was given a larger salary.

Mr. SPROULE. Is it not about time we were closing business for to-night ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). Let us get through the main estimates. We must get through some time. There is nothing here of a controversial nature, nothing calling for discussion.

North-west Mounted Police..... $353,750

Mr. SPROULE. I understood the policy of the Government was to reduce the force. What is the full strength of the force now, and what is the policy of the Government with regard to keeping that up in Manitoba and the North-west Territories ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The policy of the Government is the same as that announced last year, that is, to keep

450 or 500 in the North-west Territories against the 750 that were kept there before. The balance of the force is going to be employed in the Yukon territory.

Government of North-west Territories....$357,859

Mr. DAVIN. In regard to that I want to point out that the time has come when we should no longer have to send our insane patients to the Manitoba side. We ought to have a vote in the Estimates for the local government so that they can have care of our own patients. The expense is too great to send them from the Territories to Manitoba, and it is altogether an unbusiness like way of doing it. I would ask the Minister if he is going to drop the arrangement and give a grant to the local government for the purpose of dealing with our insane patients ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It would be impossible for me to make a positive statement of the intention of the Government. We recognize that the existing arrangement is not a permanent one. The people of the Territories cannot be expected to be kept in the same position as they are now in. It is a matter we will have to deal with at an early date.

Mr. SPROULE. We want to know something about the number of schools out there. I see there are $282,000 for schools. How many of these schools are you keeping up, and what is the number of children in each of them ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. That is in the nature of a subsidy to the Territorial Government, it is paid to them, and they distribute it. It is just like a provincial subsidy.

Mr. SPROULE. You do not have anything to do with the schools ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Nothing to do with them at all.

Mr. DAVIN. Before the present party came into power I tried to impress upon their predecessors that the amount put into the Estimates for the Government of the Territories is quite inadequate.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The hon. gentleman ought to give us credit for increasing it.

Mr. DAVIN. In fact, at present, on the basis of the subsidies to the provinces, calculating what the Territories should have had from the beginning, there is owing to the Territories at this moment by the Dominion Government a million dollars.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Every province makes the same claim.

Mr. DAVIN. I urge on the Minister that any work that can be properly done by the Government of the Territories can be better done by that Government than by this Government. The Minister, I believe, realizes that. Therefore, I hope he will, as soon as he can form a calculation as to what the Territories are entitled to on the same basis as the subsidies given to the provinces, put the young giant of the North-west Territories into his true position, and give him his freedom in the true sense.

Services of North-west Mounted Police in the Yukon Provisional District.. $346,250

Mr. DAVIN. This is a very large sum, though I suppose it is not in excess of what it should be.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. This sum is made up by a calculation of the Controller of the Mounted Police as to how much it will take to convey, pay and maintain 250 men there. He has figured that out mathematically, as carefully as he can.

Dominion Lands—Chargeable to income $94,233 25

Mr. DAVIN. I want to ask the Minister concerning his treatment of certain officials in the land offices of the North-west Territories, and amongst others, to call his attention to the case of Dobbin, of Regina. In regard to John Dobbin, I made a strong appeal to the Minister, and not only did I, but I believe the Liberals appealed to the Minister in his favour. Here was a man who had served the country well, against whom no charge of being an offensive partisan could be made, and yet this man was dismissed.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Our unfortunate friend, Mr. Dobbin, had his services dispensed with because it was evident he had taken a very active and effective part in assisting to elect my hon. friend. When his case was up he had so many friends on the other side of the House that I was quite sure the ground upon which I had removed him was well taken. I did investigate his case, and came to the conclusion that the charge was well founded, that he had taken a very active part in promoting the hon. gentleman's election. He was removed for that purpose, and I did not see any ground for reinstating him.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I suppose the Government appointed a gentleman who had not taken any part in the elections.

Mr. SPROULE. The Minister has reorganized the Interior Department. Can he furnish information with respect to the number of employees in the commissioner's office and their salaries ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The commissioner's office at Winnipeg has been abolished.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the commissioner's salary ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. $3,200. We have abolished the office at Winnipeg and placed the commissioner in the inside service here.

Mr. DAVIN. Who is the commissioner?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Mr. Burgess was the commissioner. His place has not been filled yet.

Mr. SPROULE. Do the Government intend to appoint another commissioner?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. Who is the superintendent of mines?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The same officer, Mr. Pierce.

Mr. DAVIN. I desire to ask about the dismissal of John Walker, caretaker of the basin at Banff?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I consulted with the hon. member for Alberta (Mr Oliver) about this staff, and I think, though I cannot say positively, that he informed me that Walker was not an efficient officer and recommended his removal.

Mr. DAVIN. The information I have is that the member for Alberta did not want the man dismissed. Here is a letter signed by Frank Oliver. It is dated Edmonton, Alberta, July 13th, 1897. It is addressed to Mr. John Walker, and is as follows:—

> Your letter of 6th instant to hand. I very much regret to have lost your good opinion, but I beg to remind you that an investigation was held into park affairs generally, as it was thought desirable to make certain changes. I can easily understand that those changes do not meet the approval of the parties affected; nevertheless, I hope they will be for the better.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I now recollect that Mr. Stephenson was sent to the park to make an investigation, and he reported at considerable length. I went over his report with the member for Alberta and certain changes were decided on and Walker's removal was one of them.

Mr. DAVIN. Here is another letter dated November 23rd, 1896, from Mr. Oliver. It is as follows:—

> I do not expect that Walker will be interfered with unless the charges can be substantiated, or unless some change is made in the department of the park. I am glad you gave the information in regard to Walker's predecessor.

In the investigation which took place there was nothing proved against Walker, who was an innocent and an efficient man. I have here a copy of the petition that was forwarded to the Minister. It asks for his reinstatement, the petitioners stating that they were unaware of the cause of the dismissal, that during the whole time Walker had been in his position he had been a most courteous official and had rendered good service, that he had not shown the slightest feeling of partisanship in any election contest, and that the petitioners comprised both parties in Federal politics, and they submitted that Walker should not be dismissed without charges being made and investigated.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The hon. gentleman knows that in cases of this kind everybody signs petitions.

Mr. DAVIN. I cannot take such a view of my fellow-citizens.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I have had a petition in a certain matter signed by a prominent gentleman, and I shortly afterwards received a counter petition signed by the same name.

Mr. DAVIN. That is a joke. Here you have three pages of names certifying that this man was a good officer and never took part in politics.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There was no question of partisanship; the officer was inefficient in the discharge of his duty.

Surveys $150,000

Mr. SPROULE. In what localities are the surveys to be carried out this year, and how many survey parties are going out?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We will have thirty or thirty-five parties out. About $21,000 will be expended in the Yukon district, about $6,000 in British Columbia, and the remainder in Manitoba and the North-west, where we try to keep a little ahead of settlement.

Expenses of delimiting the boundary between Canada and the United States. $25,000

Mr. SPROULE. What progress are they making with regard to this?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We have taken this appropriation from year to year, but during the last three or four years only a small proportion of it has been expended. It is possible that during the coming year the whole vote may be expended, in view of the fact that an arrangement is going to be made to endeavour to bring the matter to a conclusion.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It is one of the matters to be referred to the commission?

Mr. SPROULE. Is this for the commission, or have you surveyors delimiting the boundary in the Yukon district or what?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It has nothing to do with the Yukon district. There are several points in the maritime provinces and British Columbia where the boundary line has not been fully settled.

Cost of arbitration respecting the accounts between the Dominion of Canada and the provinces of Ontario and Quebec (payments on account of services rendered may be made to members of the civil service, notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Civil Service Act)..... $5,000

Mr. SPROULE. In what state of advancement is the settlement of these accounts to-day.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The matter has made some slow progress and the best sign of its coming to an end is that the appropriation this time is smaller than usual.

Mr. SPROULE. That is practically no information at all. We have known for years that the progress is very slow. The provinces are very anxious about this matter, especially the province of Ontario, and they look to the explanations given during the voting of these items for information as what position they stand.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think the provinces quite understand that the process is a very slow one.

Resolutions to be reported.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. SPROULE. What business will be taken up to-morrow ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I understand the Minister of Finance intends to take up the resolution respecting the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal then some small Bills, and then Supply.

Motion agreed to. and the House adjourned at 2.20 a.m. (Friday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 3rd June, 1898

PRAYERS.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

MANITOBA DEBT ACCOUNT.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to-morrow to consider the following proposed resolutions :—

1. That it is expedient to provide that the sum of two hundred and eighty-four thousand four hundred and fifty-six dollars and forty-seven cents, being the cost of the erection and furnishing of the Legislative Buildings and Government House at Winnipeg, which sum was charged against the "Province of Manitoba Debt Account," may, on the first day of July, one thousand eight hundred and ninety-eight, be credited to the said account, and that the interest payable to the said province on the said first day of July, one thousand eight hundred and ninety-eight, on the balance at the credit of said Debt Account may be calculated on the balance at the credit of said account after the said sum of two hundred and eighty-four thousand four hundred and fifty-six dollars and forty-seven cents has been credited thereto as above provided.

2. That it is expedient to provide that the Government of Canada may, on the said first day of July, one thousand eight hundred and ninety-eight, pay to the Government of the province of Manitoba the sum of two hundred and forty-six thousand four hundred and forty-five dollars and forty-four cents, being the sum of the amounts which would have been payable to the province of Manitoba by the Dominion, in excess of the amounts actually paid as interest from time to time payable on the balances at the credit of the said Debt Account, had the cost of the erection and furnishing of the said legislative buildings and Government House at Winnipeg not been charged against the said Debt Account, together with interest at the rate of five per centum per annum on each of the amounts so payable to the said first day of July, one thousand eight hundred and ninety-eight.

Motion agreed to.

SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved :

That when this House adjourns at the second sitting on Friday next, it shall stand adjourned until Saturday at eleven a.m., and that there shall be two sittings on that day, one from 11 a.m. to 1 p.m., and the other from 3 p.m. until the adjournment of the House, and that Government Orders shall have precedence at such sittings.

Motion agreed to.

MONTREAL HARBOUR WORKS.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding moved that the House resolve itself into committee to consider a certain proposed resolution respecting an advance to the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal in addition to the amount authorized by Chapter 10 of the Statutes of 1896 (first session).

Mr. FOSTER. I think it would be well to have some explanation with respect to this resolution, and as fully as possible. Two millions is a large amount of money ; it is a loan, but there are consequential considerations which I think make it necessary we should know very clearly what is proposed.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The importance of providing adequate facilities for handling the great volume of trade which passes through the port of Montreal is one which will be generally recognized. It is the great summer port of the Dominion, and

a very large part of the trade of the country passes through it. I am glad to know that with the improvement of trade, a still greater future is before it, and without dwelling on this point, the House will no doubt agree that whatever is reasonable and necessary to provide for harbour facilities should receive the support and assistance of the House. The form in which Parliament has hitherto granted assistance to the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal has been by lending its credit so as to enable the commissioners to borrow money on terms more favourable than they otherwise would obtain. In that way substantial help has been given to Montreal while not imposing any burdens on the Dominion treasury. Two years ago an Act was passed appropriating for this work $2,000,000 as a loan to the Harbour Commissioners at 3½ per cent interest. A considerable portion of that loan was applied to the payment of outstanding indebtedness, part to the Dominion Government itself; altogether, $1,190,000 of the $2,000,000 has been drawn, and there is at this moment another sum of $100,000 which has been authorized, and so practically we have $700,000 left of the $2,000,000 authorized in 1896. That sum is, of course, entirely inadequate to provide for the increasing trade of the port; indeed, at the time the loan of $2,000,000 was agreed to, it was generally understood that it was only partial, and that probably it would be necessary at no distant date to have the amount enlarged. It is proposed by this resolution to authorize a loan of $2,000,000, and in this case, owing to the improvement in Canadian credit, and the better opportunity afforded for providing money without imposing any burdens on the treasury, we think we can do a little better by fixing a lower rate of interest, and therefore we propose that this loan to the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal be made at 3 per cent, the Government receiving debentures by way of security for the amount. The resolution speaks only of the amount to be loaned, that being necessary as a basis for a Bill; but when the House comes to deal with the matter by Bill provision will be made as to the manner in which this money shall be expended. It will provide that out of the $2,000,000 authorized by this resolution, $750,000 shall be applied to works at what is called the east end of Montreal, including the construction of a dry dock. The remainder is to be applied to the construction, as far as it may go, of the works on the plan which has already occupied very much attention in Montreal, and which is described and known as plan 12a, which has received the approbation of the mercantile community there. The only additional fact which I need state is that all the works carried out under the operation of this resolution and the Bill founded on it will have to be constructed ted to the Minister of Public Works and approved by him, as under the Act of 1896. With these brief explanations, I think the matter may be placed before the House, and if any information as regards details of the proposed work is required, the Minister of Public Works, who has given great attention to the subject, will be glad to furnish it.

Mr. FOSTER. I should like to ask if the Government proposes to attach a condition to the loan and to thus far restrict the Harbour Commissioners? I think it is necessary at this time that we should be given some details regarding that part of the work for which $750,000 is kept out; what it is, what has been determined in regard to it and the plans?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). In 1890, plan known as No. 6 was approved by the Department of Public Works. There had been some hesitation and delay before approval was given. A commission composed of engineers had been appointed, but ultimately they came to the conclusion that this plan was the best, and it was approved. Speaking generally, it consisted of building what are commonly called the guard pier, in widening the shore wharf and erecting four wharfs varying from 1,200 to 1,500 feet in length. Up to date, plan No. 6 has not been carried out; although that plan was approved in 1890, nothing has been done, except the building of the guard pier. I call the attention of the ex-Minister of Finance to this matter because, after discussion, I think we will all agree that the policy now being followed, which is only the consequence of what had been practically decided upon by the late Administration, is the proper one. Plan No. 6, I say, was approved in 1890.

Mr. FOSTER. Was it not in 1896?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, it was in 1890. Plan 6 was approved; but instead of going on with these plans, the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal went on spending about a million dollars on the Windmill basin, an expenditure which was never authorized. Those who say that plan No. 6 was the best and that it was urgent, that it should be proceeded with, cannot very successfully explain the delay which has taken place. However, I will not dwell at any length on that point. Sufficient it is for me to remind the House and the country of the admitted fact that the port of Montreal is one of the worst equipped harbours in the world. Every one who has travelled is unfortunately obliged to recognize that fact, and yet the harbour of Montreal is the most important harbour in Canada. When I took office I found myself in this shape. In 1896 the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal had come to the Government and had received from them an authorization for an advance of two million dollars;

one million to be applied to pay their floating debt and the other million dollars to be applied to carry out works with the approval and consent of the Minister of Public Works. The Windmill basin had been begun and was so far advanced that although it had never been authorized by the Government I thought it would have been a very bad policy to stop that work, and so I allowed the Commissioners to go on. I may say here that in 1894 the Harbour Commissioners had applied for an advance of $4,000,000, and I have got in my hand an extract from the minutes of the Harbour Commissioners' meeting which refers to that application, and which reads as follows :—

Extracts from the minutes of a monthly meeting of the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal, held on the 10th April, 1894.

Present :—Henry Bulmer, Esq., Chairman ; Hon. Edward Murphy, Victor Hudon, Richard White, W. W. Ogilvie, N. A. Hurteau, Esquires ; J. O. Villeneuve, Esq., Mayor ; C. H. Gould, L. E. Morin and Andrew Allan, Esquires.

The following motion was then made by Mr. Hurteau :

That in view of the rapidly growing trade of the harbour of Montreal and the imperative necessity for providing for its certain early extension and in view of the financial position of this Board, as shown by the accompanying memoranda, and to enable the Commissioners to meet the obligations already assumed in the carrying out of the plan number 6, keeping faith with the city of Montreal, and to grant such facilities as will ensure the continued successful competition of Montreal with foreign ports by avoiding the possibility of additional charges upon the shipping and trade of the port, be it resolved :

That an application be made to the Governor in Council for such assistance as will enable the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal to secure, in addition to the $1,000,000 for which they have present authority, a further sum of $3,000,000 bearing interest at a rate not higher than 3½ per cent. This sum to be used during the next four years for the following improvements :—

$2,000,000 to complete the arrangements with the city of Montreal and sanctioned by the Governor in Council, and known as plan No. 6, with the proposed wharfs at Maisonneuve ; $1,000,000 to build an inland basin at such place in the eastern end of the city as may, upon examination, be found most advantageous, and $1,000,000 to complete the basin at Windmill Point, and other parts of the harbour not included in plan No. 6.

That a committee consisting of the Chairman, the Mayor, W. W. Ogilvie, N. A. Hurteau, Richard White and any other member wishing to join, be named to proceed to Ottawa and urge upon the Government the granting of the assistance referred to in the foregoing resolution :

After consideration the resolution was carried on the understanding that the Commissioners' claim against the Government of $1,000,000 must not to be lost sight of, and that the increased expenditure involved would not cause the harbour dues to be increased.

That the chairman be requested to go to Ottawa and arrange for an interview between the Government and the deputation.

Certified a true extract.

(Sgd.) ALEXANDER ROBERTSON,
Secretary.

Now, Sir, the deputation appointed by this resolution came to Ottawa, and, as I have said, the Government did not see fit at the time to grant that application, and instead of granting them an advance of $4,000,000, they simply allowed them an advance of $2,000,000. Out of this $2,000,000, $1,000,000 went immediately to pay the floating debt of the Harbour Commissioners, and out of the last $1,000,000, as my hon. friend the Minister of Finance has stated, $300,000 has been employed to carry out works, but, I repeat, none of that money has been employed to carry out plan No. 6, with the exception of the guard pier. No wharf has been built, and the shore wharf has not been widened. Well, Sir, the Harbour Commissioners, in view of the increased trade that has come to us have again applied for assistance. We had a great deal of discussion as to the plans to be adopted, and I may say that I gave my best consideration to that important question. I did not act on my own judgment, for I am not an expert in harbour improvements, although I took the trouble to visit some American harbours, and although in the past I have visited some European harbours. But I took advice from the best available authorities, and last year when the manager of the Bristol docks came to Canada I had a great deal of intercourse with him, and visited the harbour in Montreal in his company. There was with us a gentleman whose name I forget for the moment, but who is the manager of one of the great Liverpool docks. I may say that the manager of the Bristol docks went so far as to call upon the Prime Minister with me and to beg him not to accept plan No. 6, as it had been accepted years ago, but to carry out a more modern plan. Let me remind the House that when plan No. 6 was prepared about ten years ago, the ships which were then visiting the harbour of Montreal were of a comparatively small size, ranging in capacity from 4,000 tons to 6,000 ton at the utmost. To-day there are vessels visiting the port of Montreal with a carrying capacity of between 10,000 and 12,000 tons. Circumstances have changed since. We are deepening our canals ; we are every year improving the St. Lawrence channel, the carrying capacity of trans-Atlantic vessels is increasing every year, and consequently we have to grapple with quite a new condition of affairs, and that is the reason why plan No. 6 which, in the past, might have been a good plan would be a very bad plan to-day. The main features of plan No. 6 were long wharfs, 1,500 feet long and narrow basins 300 feet wide between long jetties 1,200 and 1,500 feet long. When our canals are deepened, and big ships from the ocean and big ships from the west come to Montreal to exchange their freight, it would be quite impossible for these big ships to move freely in those narrow basins. It must not be forgotten that a great part of the grain trade in Montreal will have to be handled

with floating elevators, and between the docks the big ships I have spoken of and the elevators will have to be accommodated. That is the reason why, after having carefully considered and discussed the question, I made up my mind that plan No. 6 could not be carried out in the interest of Canada. Under plan No. 12a, instead of erecting four long piers, with narrow basins, we intend erecting three wharfs of a moderate length, with wide basins.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose my hon. friend means the Harbour Commissioners when he says we ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes. I only say we, because I am obliged to give my assent to their plans. The exact dimensions of the wharfs, as shown on plan No. 12a, to which I have assented, are as follows :—The first wharf, near the entrance to the Lachine Canal, that is, 1,000 feet from the entrance, is 1,000 feet in length and 300 feet in width. The basin between this pier and the second pier will be 590 feet wide. The second wharf will be 1,020 feet long on one side and 980 feet wide on the other. Between this pier and the third pier, there will be a basin 570 feet wide. The third pier as shown on the plan would be 850 feet long on the inside and 800 feet long on the other side. I may say I intend again discussing the length of this pier with the Harbour Commissioners, for this reason, to which I call the attention of every man interested in the future of our trade. Between the end of the guard pier and the end of this pier, there would be an entrance of only 590 feet in width, which I think is not great enough. Between the Lachine Canal and Victoria pier, the last pier, there is a distance of 3,600 feet, and it is in that distance that the improvements as shown on plan No. 12a will be carried out. As to this plan, there will be no more difficulty. The question is finally settled, only this one point remaining in abeyance. The Harbour Commissioners will have to decide, with my approval, whether the piers will be high level or low level piers. My own personal opinion is that we should have low level piers, that is to say, a little higher than we have now. My opinion, backed I do not say by a majority of the Harbour Commissioners, but by a great many business men, is that if we erect in the centre of the harbour of Montreal high level piers, which will be 27½ feet above ordinary low water, there will be a great danger of driving away from that part of the harbour craft of a moderate size, and the commercial community of Montreal have no interest in doing that—very far from it. Still, I will not force my views on that point on the Harbour Commissioners. I am sure they will consider the matter with the utmost care.

Mr. BERGERON. May I ask my hon. friend one question ? So far as low level is concerned, is there not something to be taken into consideration in connection with the loan of the city of Montreal ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No. These works and the shore works might be built at a low level without interfering in any way with the protection works which will have to be built, simply as a parapet, on Commissioners' Street. The idea under these plans is, as I have said, to erect these works and at the same time to widen the shore wharfs. The present width of the shore wharfs varies from 100 feet to 40 feet. In other words, they do not give sufficient accommodation to the trade. Last year I saw with my own eyes freight from the west carted from cars at a cost of 40 and 50 cents a ton, because there was no accommodation on the wharfs. There were no tracks available and no handling facilities. We intend, then, to widen the shore wharfs to a width of 240 feet from one end to the other, so that we shall be in a position to equip these shore wharfs with railway tracks and all modern appliances, as we shall also equip the other wharfs. Then, instead of carting the freight from the cars to the ships, as we are doing to-day, at a great cost and to the great detriment of Montreal, we shall be able to load and unload directly from the cars to the ships and from the ships to the cars, as is done in every properly organized port in the world. Last year, in company with the chief engineer of my department, Mr. Coste, and a few friends, I visited the wharfs in the port of Boston, and I saw there a ship loading at one time hay, cattle, grain and general produce, because alongside of the wharf there was an elevator, near the wharf there were cattle yards, and the ship was directly connected by rails with the cars.

Well, we intend doing the same thing in Montreal. My hon. friend the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) has asked why it was that in the Bill $750,000 is to be applied to works in the eastern part of the harbour. The Bill will also contain a provision that plan No. 12a be included, so that there may be equal justice to all. In other words, the proposal of the Government is this, that all the works necessary to equip the harbour of Montreal with modern equipments be carried out at the same time in the west and in the east. Plan No. 12a will be carried out immediately. I am anxious that the Harbour Commissioners should proceed at once with the work because we have lost too much time already, so that the Bill will contain provisions for the carrying out of plan No. 12a and also for future improvements. My hon. friend, the ex-Minister of Finance, no doubt will agree with me that when we ask that the port at the foot of the current be equipped immediately, we are following the only reasonable policy that can be followed at present. This part of the harbour is the most favourable for the locating of elevators. We cannot think of locating grain elevators in the centre of the

harbour, and we intend to build one or two wharfs which shall be equipped with all modern appliances, and we expect that grain elevators will be built on the shore. There is a splendid site there to erect grain elevators. There will be plenty of water, with a little dredging, and we should mature some plan of equipping one or two wharfs in the eastern part of the harbour and placing the railway companies in the position to erect elevators there, and thus give to the grain trade a chance to settle in Montreal. What have we seen lately? For lack of accommodation in the harbour of Montreal, the Parry Sound and Arnprior Railway were obliged to locate their elevator at Coteau. Mr. Booth told me last year that if we would equip the harbour at Montreal, he would send his trains there, but that at present he cannot do so because there is no accommodation for such a trade. When our canals are deepened and the full swing of the grain trade will be in operation, I make this prophecy that we will ship from the port of Montreal 100,000,000 bushels of grain yearly. The St. Lawrence route is the shortest, and if we equip it in such a way that it will be the best, there is no reason why we should not handle an immense quantity of grain in Montreal. To-day we cannot handle that trade with any chance of success, because in matters of trade the cheapest route is the best. As stated in the House a few days ago, the St. Lawrence channel is being improved from day to day, and in a year or two it will be improved more than it is now. Our canals will be completed, and new elevators are being erected everywhere. At Owen Sound, Port Arthur, Coteau and Kingston, &c., we will spare no efforts to direct that trade to the St. Lawrence route, and it is with that great object in view that I have been looking at the improvement of the harbour of Montreal. Out of the $1,000,000 that remain by virtue of the Act of 1896, I have now in hand $709,000 at the disposal of the harbour commissioners. The city of Montreal has voted a million as its share of the improvements. We propose to-day to make a new advance of two millions to the Harbour Commissioners. Those three amounts added together form $3,400,000. Mr. Préfontaine, mayor of Montreal, and one of the members of the harbour commission, tells me, at the last meeting of the harbour commission, Mr. Kennedy estimated that the carrying out of plan No. 12a will cost about $1,800,000. The Harbour Commissioners have in hand $3,400,000, out of which they will have to use $750,000 for works in the eastern part of the harbour, and the balance will be required to complete the Windmill basin and other improvements that they may choose to carry out.

Some discussion has taken place as to the dry dock. It has been said that we should not insist on building a dry dock in Montreal. I am very much surprised to hear the criticism made on that work. There is not a well organized harbour in the world that I know of which is not provided with a dry dock, and the attention of the Government has been repeatedly called to the great urgency of erecting a dry dock in the city of Montreal. I hold in my hand a number of petitions sent by the commercial community in Montreal. In 1894, the following petition was forwarded to His Excellency the Governor General in Council:—

> We, the undersigned, representing the various steamship lines and the shipping interests generally at the port of Montreal, beg to represent to Your Excellency in Council:
>
> The disadvantage of not having and the absolute necessity of the speedy construction of dry docks is borne in upon us more and more each season of navigation. As each season brings its crop of disasters, it shows the greatest disadvantage we labour under in not having up-to-date dry docks to accommodate ocean steamers of the present date and those of much greater length and tonnage which may be naturally looked forward to. An important port of the size of Montreal without a dry dock for ocean vessels is a strange anomaly.
>
> We know of no port with the annual tonnage of the port of Montreal that has no dry dock to accommodate large vessels, which here seem to be entirely ignored.

Then this petition is signed by the following firms:—

Kingman, Brown & Co.
Wm. Johnston & Co. (Ltd.), H. G. Johnston, Local Director.
Harlan, Ronan & Co.
I. C. Coal Mining Co. (Ltd.), Wm. Nelson, Secy.
Alex. Stoddard & Co.
Henry Dobell & Co.
J. & B. McSea.
Hamburg-American Packet Co., James Thom, Manager.
Standard Marine Insurance Co., of Liverpool, John Popham, Atty. for Canada, President Board Marine Underwriters
McLean, Kennedy & Co., steamship agents.
Reliance Marine Insurance Co., E. L. Bond, Atty. for Canada.
Transatlantic Marine Insurance Co. (Ltd.), Arch. Nicoll, Agent.
Indemnity Mutual Marine Assurance Co.
The Nannheim Insurance Co.
Fierman's Fund Insurance Co.
James J. Riley & Sons.
Western Assurance Co.
J. J. H. Routh & Sons.
Commercial Union Assurance Co. (Ltd.), Ewan McGregor, Branch Manager.
The North German Insurance Co., E. L. Bond, Chief Agent.
H. & A. Allan.
H. E. Murray.
David Torrance & Co.
Muderloh & Co.
Union Marine Insurance Co. (Ltd.), of Liverpool.
British and Foreign Marine Insurance Co., Liverpool.
Thames & Mersey Marine Insurance Co. (Ltd.)
Boston Marine Assurance Co., of Boston, E. L. Bond, Agent.
North Queensland Insurance Co., of Australia, E. L. Bond, Agent.

Now, since I took office, memoranda has

been sent me. In June, 1897, a petition was sent to me, from which I will read :—

Wherefore, because the port of Montreal is a natural and most important port of the Dominion, and because all other harbours throughout the country have been made at the cost of the Government, your petitioners humbly pray Your Excellency in Council that the Dominion Government will undertake and proceed with such work in the central portion of the harbour as will afford increased wharf accommodation, and also construct at some convenient point dry dock facilities.

In February another petition from the same party was sent to me. They insisted that the Lévis dock be lengthened, and they concluded by saying :

That the incoming council be requested to keep in view and urge upon the Dominion Government the necessity for dry dock accommodation in the city of Montreal for ocean vessels of the largest class.

As I said in 1894, the Harbour Commissioners, when they applied for an advance of $4,000,000, had decided that $1,000,000 of that advance would be employed in building an inland basin in the eastern portion of the harbour. Instead of the inland basin, to which objection has been taken, and which doubts had been expressed, we intend to get a dry dock able to accommodate the largest ocean ships. A dry dock is not an expensive work when it is properly designed and carried out, while the inland basin would have been a very expensive work indeed.

These are the main features of the scheme we have now before us. There has been a good deal of discussion since 1888 as to the improvements in the harbour of Montreal. There are different interests in the city of Montreal. I beg to remind the House and to remind those who have not carried out the work they should have carried out, that the interest of all the money that has been spent on these harbour works, as a point of fact, must be paid by the trade of the old country. There is a vast amount of trade of Canada passing through Montreal, and it is on that trade that the money is raised to pay the interests on the money which has been spent and which is to be spent on the prospective improvements. There are some people in Montreal who are opposed to any improvements. I am sorry to say so. I have been in close touch with the business men of the city during the last year as to these works. There are private interests which have been fighting any improvements, because they think these improvements would destroy their own trade—just as the cabmen have in the past fought against electric railways and street railways. We have to pass over the heads of these men in the interest of the country. We have to make Montreal a national harbour in the broadest sense of the word. And it is from that point that I have endeavoured to act. For me there is no east end and no west end ; there is only the harbour of Montreal, the great national harbour. And I am glad to have found that a great deal of interest has been taken in these works in all parts of the country. I have received hundreds of letters, I may say, from shippers, from farmers even, in the west, complimenting me on the stand I have taken and on this question. I have endeavoured to stand by the broad national policy of Canada for the Canadians. I say I have received letters from farmers. All the west is interested in these works. If we improve the harbour of Montreal in such a way as to handle freight cheaply and quickly, the low rates that will be charged will mean better prices for the producers, better trade for the country, and better results for all those who ship from west to east or from east to west.

I think I need not say more at this moment. I shall be very glad indeed to answer, either when we get into committee or now, any question that hon. gentlemen desire to ask. As I have said, it is better that we should understand the question thoroughly.

Mr. BERGERON. I would like to ask a question. Before we go further in the discussion, I desire to know what would become, under this new plan, of the little island called he Island of Millions, opposite the harbour ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. What my hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) calls the Island of Millions, is what is designated on the plan as the guard pier. That guard pier was built with a view to making, in the centre of the harbour of Montreal, a still-water basin. Of course, the wharfs will be built on the north side, where they are now. The first idea was not to build the guard pier to the Victoria bridge, but that plan has been changed, and the gap which had been left will be filled in this year so as to allow railways to circulate freely on the guard pier. The first idea was to leave a gap so as to allow the water from the lake to come down to the harbour and clean it. But the guard pier has been built so near the Victoria bridge that that method of cleaning the harbour had to be given up. Moreover, the erection of the Windmill basin changed the position altogether. The water that flowed through the small gap between the Victoria bridge and the guard pier did not flow into the harbour of Montreal.

The current went right down to the St. Lawrence. Provision is made in these plans for a new sewage system that will drain the harbour from one end to the other under the shore work. The position of affairs, as I said, has been altogether changed by the Windmill basin, which was not authorized, but that we find there, and that we cannot destroy. Although it will not represent the large amount of money which has been spent upon it, it will be found after all to be a work of some utility. But the guard

pier was considered and is still considered by the Harbour Commissioners as a primary necessity in those improvements, the idea being to dredge all the area between the wharfs and the guard pier so as to make a large still-water basin. It is expected that later on wharfs will be built alongside the guard pier, and that the Grand Trunk Railway, because we do not see that any other railway will take advantage of it, will circulate freely its trains on that guard pier.

Mr. BERGERON. Did not an idea prevail that some wharfs would be built, that that guard pier would be a wharf and be used as such?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Quite so.

Mr. BERGERON. It seems to me that this new idea, carrying the tracks and bringing the cars over there, would be to do upon that pier what he intends to do upon the other pier.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Quite so. That is the reason why, when visiting the work last year with the manager of the Bristol docks, and with Mr. Wainwright and my chief engineer, I came to the conclusion that now that the works had proceeded so far, the gap as intended was out of the question, and it was better to utilize that guard pier, which is a mile and a quarter long, upon which to circulate trains, and to build a wharf alongside of it.

Mr. BERGERON. How much work will be required to finish that guard pier and put it in working condition? As it is to-day, it would be impossible to bring any vessels there. It will have to be provided with wood on the south side. What is the depth of water there? what is the width of the pier? and how could sheds be erected there, and still be in a workable condition when the cars are passing?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The first need is to dredge the basin so as to allow ships to go near the guard pier, because to-day there is scarcely any water there. The width of the 27-foot channel is really 500 feet now. We take part of that channel to build the new wharf, and we will have to dredge the basin between the guard pier and the new docks. The dredging will serve at the same time to fill the wharf. As to the cost of making the guard pier a workable pier from a commercial standpoint, that is a matter that we have not to deal with now. The Harbour Commissioners will have to deal with it later on. I suppose that the Grand Trunk Railway will be very glad indeed when the guard pier is completed, to be given accommodation and running facilities on the pier, and do that at their own expense. The new works, as I said, will be equipped with switches, with rails and so on. My notion is that those rails and those switches on the wharfs should be under the immediate control of the Harbour Commissioners, so that no particular railway may have a monopoly. From one end of the harbour to the other, all railways should have equal rights, and that is a reason why railway accommodation should be placed directly under the control of the Harbour Commissioners.

Mr. FOSTER. At this time there is no available opportunity left for me to notice the many glittering generalities in which my hon. friend indulged, or his prophecies with reference to this matter, or the bit of universal fireworks with which he ended his exposé in the appreciation of the east and the west which had been showered upon him for the stand he had taken. There are some things in which we might agree; there is one thing in which I hope that my hon. friend would agree with me. I think the circumstances at this hour and place ought to afford an object lesson to every sensible man in this country. Here we are within two days, or three days at most—in two days if the Government could have its way—of the prorogation of this House. We have—I counted them a moment ago—a beggarly remnant; and I hope I am not reflecting upon any hon. member when I say this, of the magnificent House of Commons of Canada, to the number of twenty-five or twenty-eight.

Mr. ELIAS. But two important committees are meeting this morning.

Mr. FOSTER. I cannot help that. Two committees are meeting this morning and this House is meeting simply because the Government has not imported business methods into its conduct of the House of Commons, and are trying to crowd everything within two or three days of the end of the session, thus compelling us to come early in the morning, interfere with the sittings of committees, and to sit here until early next morning. Under these conditions, for a government to bring down a vote of two million dollars, whether it is a loan or an absolute gift, is politically indecent. There is no doubt in my mind about that. This matter of the harbour commission and of Government aid, is no new thing a la Yukon, which crops up in an instant on a plea of unexpected circumstances. This is a matter which has been before the Minister since he became a Minister, and has been before Ministers before he became a Minister. But the hon. gentleman concludes that it is best, for what reason I do not know, to leave the whole of this immensely important matter over to the Friday preceding the Saturday on which the Government has asked that the House should finish its business, which I believe it is impossible to do. Is this a business Government or is it not? If it is a business Government, I appeal simply to business men—Is this a proper way in which to vote public moneys? Is it a proper way to treat the city of Mont-

real? My hon. friend may answer me: But this is a loan, and the loan will be paid back. It may, or it may not. I cannot disassociate my mind from the antecedent history in these matters. I cannot disassociate my mind from certain statements which have been made by the Minister of Public Works himself. The Minister of Public Works was most fortunate if he did not leave the impression upon the public mind within the last year that he proposed at least that the city of Montreal should have its harbour works largely done for it out of the public treasury, not by way of loan, but by way of absolute gift, on the plea that it was the commercial metropolis of the whole Dominion, and that the burden should fall entirely upon the Dominion. I say, if the Minister did not mean to leave that impression upon the country, he was most unfortunate in the methods of his expression in place after place, and in city after city in this country. The harbour of Montreal has been an example to the people of this country who have had to do with the Government in the way of a public loan. It has made harbour loans and paid interest, and it owes the Government nothing. But there are other examples which are not so gratifying and pleasant to contemplate, and if by any manner of means this Government either by implication, such as the Minister has thrown out, leads the people of Montreal to the conclusion that this, though shadowed under the form of a loan, is really to be an amount appropriated as a gift; or if the Government by annexing conditions which the business people of the city do not think should be annexed to this transaction, take a certain proportion of this money and apply it to different sections of work to which the business people think it should not be applied and leave a moiety or less of the loan to be used for legitimate purposes, but the whole amount of interest to be paid, and consequently weakening and overburdening the revenue receipts of the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal, one of two things must happen: either the port of Montreal will be overburdened and consequently become an extra dear port; or the Government must come to the rescue and to make it cheap must remit the loan and change it into the form of a gift. With regard to that matter this is not the time to enter into a discussion of it. There are very many things to be said in favour of Montreal as a potential port, as a national port, which would naturally enlist the sympathy of members of this House on both sides. If I may be pardoned a personal allusion, I may say that since the very first time I met in an official capacity the business men of Montreal and the Harbour Commissioners, I have had full sympathy with their desires and aspirations, and I am not at all inclined to say that I would not treat the city of Montreal in this respect in the broadest and most generous way which this Parliament could possibly treat it, consistently with the interests of the rest of the Dominion. What I complain of is this, that the hon. Minister has precluded this Parliament taking any sensible cognizance of his plans and purposes. It is impossible to do it in the state and condition which at this late hour of the session supervenes. My hon. friend comes down to-day with a resolution and plan and goes into elaborate explanations. I for my part demand that before I am called on to vote on this resolution I shall have an opportunity of looking into these matters. I am not a technical authority, neither is the hon. gentleman; but every hon. member, and especially those who take an interest in these works, can form an opinion from a more or less thorough investigation, as to what is proposed. When an hon. gentleman has the plan before him and gives explanations, it is after all Greek to the rest of the House, and independent members must have some opportunity of looking into these proposals before we act as business men in the premises. So the hon. Minister is not treating Montreal and its interests fairly in neglecting to bring down these proposals early exposing them to the House and allowing members taking an interest in them an opportunity of examining the plans, of making suggestions if they are weak, or if they are perfect, of giving them hearty and earnest support. I appeal again to the right hon. leader of the House, and I say he is not treating this country and this Parliament fairly as a leader of the Government in postponing these important subjects until the very last and dying hours of the session. I am bound to take cognizance also of what appears in the public prints. One objection I have to this proposition is that the Government come down with a condition. The Harbour Commissioners are appointed in a certain way, and they are fit for their positions or not fit. They must be to a certain extent under the supervision of the Government, but I hold that so long as we have Harbour Commissioners and we expect them to do their work as such, we must place on them the responsibility of preparing their plans and recommending their plans and carrying them out, and we should not interfere with them, unless there comes a collision between those plans and what may be considered to be for the general interests of the country. Then the supervising power of the Governor General comes into force. But that is very different from sitting down to consider the recommendation of any one Minister and laying out a plan and saying that the Harbour Commissioners may obtain a loan and pay interest thereon, but at the same time to attach a condition that the Harbour Commissioners shall make the expenditure in a certain place and under certain plans of construction. What do we know of those plans of construction after the half hour exposé of them by the Minister? What

appreciation of them can we obtain when we are called upon to adopt a certain condition, whereby we are rendered perfectly impotent and it is made altogether impossible for members to give an intelligent vote on these propositions because of the lack of time for investigation and examination. The Minister of Public Works applies a condition. He has a theory of his own. It may prove to be one of the best theories, and it is said to be supported by a certain number of people. He may be right or wrong in that mattea, but we cannot take the opinion of the Minister of Public Works given during a half hour speech and vote blindly, taking his assertion at its full value and throwing the responsibility upon the Government. That is not quite the way in which these things should be managed. When I look at the public prints there is a great diversity of opinion on this subject. I am bound to take cognizance of what appears in the public prints, and I am bound to take cognizance especially as to what appears in the public prints of the city in which these works are supposed to be carried out. Those public prints give us the idea of a considerable diversity of opinion prevailing, a diversity of opinion at first existing it is said among the members of the Government. When the hon. Minister of Public Works was using the word "we" every other minute, and saying what "we" are going to do, he did not look particularly lovingly towards his colleague to his right (Mr. Fisher), but perhaps he had the editorial idea of "we" in his mind, and from long use and wont he was thinking he was in his sacred sanctum penning a pungent editorial for his daily paper, and he used the word in that sense. My hon. friend beside him was said to be guilty of rank fanaticism. They seem to be now united, and Mr. Bickerdike and some of the others, are they all at one now? It does not appear to be so. The Board of Trade of Montreal is not at one with this scheme, and this is the case with respect to other public bodies. Many prominent and old business men do not appear to be at one with the hon. Minister on this scheme, and that pious and godly paper of long standing, wide circulation and great influence in every part of the country has actually passed its opinion upon the Minister of Public Works, and to a reflected degree upon my hon. friend, who is commonly supposed to be the watchdog of the treasury, whom the Huntingdon "Gleaner" and all other old guard journals have been elevating on a pedestal and kneeling down before him as the guardian in all matters of financial policy and expenditure while the present party is in power.

The "Daily Witness" speaks of this thing openly as a boodling transaction, as a job, and couples my hon. friend (Mr. Tarte), the hitherto irreproachable Minister of Public Works, as being in some way connected with the scheme; in a way which is not healthy for the body politic and will not be good for the future business interests of the city of Montreal.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The "Witness" cannot prove what it says.

Mr. FOSTER. How many short months ago was it that my hon. friend, the Minister of Public Works, had all his war paint on, feathers fluttering in the breeze, tomahawk bared and glittering, after a certain candidate for the mayoralty of the city of Montreal; but that is all now buried in the common idea of the area at the east end, which is to be turned into a glorious graving dock, and as two brothers they are pushing the scheme towards its ultimate and final completion. Well, Sir, there are some words uttered by the Montreal "Witness," which being a godly and pious paper, must be taken as true.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. As gospel.

Mr. FOSTER. Must be taken as true until they are very fully disproved. No one can deny that the Montreal "Witness" has been a very powerful supporter of the Government at present in power; sometimes asserting the claim of being an independent paper, and sometimes standing by that claim for a day or so. I notice, however, that the Montreal "Witness" ultimately always comes to the point of final support of the Liberal party, and although I would not predict in this case, I should not be surprised at all if after this immense outburst, we may find a month or two later that the "Witness" had even come to see that this which it now declares to be entirely bad, may have some redeeming features about it. However, this article is worded so strongly that I am not going to say that that will happen; but what does the "Witness" say? It heads its article: "A crippling plan and a political job!" and it says:—

A CRIPPLING PLAN AND A POLITICAL JOB.

Last fall, when the question of the harbour's improvement was being discussed the "Witness" exposed pretty thoroughly the designs of Mr. Tarte in attempting to force his crippling plan upon the city and commission in place of the more commodious one which had the approval of all the interests concerned. We showed clearly that Mr. Tarte's anxiety to restrict the shipping accommodation in the central portion of the harbour was with the end of creating an apparent necessity for the useless expenditure of money at Hochelaga, where there are already more wharfs than are used, and these of recent construction. We also pointed out that there was a scheme to saddle the public with the expenditure of huge sums of money in connection with harbour expenditure, if possible, upon docks at Maisonneuve. This scheme was proposed by men principally connected with the management of the Canadian Pacific Railway, at the suggestion of the late Mr. Hurteau. Sir William Van Horne, the president, was a shareholder in the company; so was Mr. Shaughnessy, the friend and benefactor of Mr. Tarte;——

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Which is not true.

Mr. FOSTER (continuing to read)

——so was Mr. Osler, the legal director of the Canadian Pacific. Mr. Préfontaine was also at that time a shareholder in the company. This precious organization is called the Montreal Land Improvement Company, and it bought up some of the land of the site of the proposed docks, with very much more in the neighbourhood. Mr. Préfontaine sold out his stock in the company in a very ostentatious fashion, loudly declaring that one of his reasons for selling was that it was not proper for him as a member of Parliament to have an interest in a scheme benefiting by grants, but that his sale of his interests would leave him free to work for the scheme. It was said by Mr. Tarte's defenders at that time, if not by Mr. Tarte himself, that he was opposed to this dock scheme, and that anyway Mr. Tarte was not likely to promote a scheme in which his enemy, Mr. Préfontaine, was deeply interested.

Very smiling enemies they appear to be now. (Reading)—

We do not know whether Mr. Préfontaine's sale of his interests freed Mr. Tarte also from scruples about aiding the scheme, or whether Mr. Préfontaine and Mr. Tarte have reached an agreement, but anyway it is plain enough to-day that Mr. Tarte and Mr. Préfontaine are hand and glove in the scheme. Mr. Tarte, as Minister of Public Works secures the granting of a loan of two million dollars at three per cent to the Harbour Commission on condition that half of it shall be expended upon the dock scheme, and Mr. Préfontaine does his part by trying to induce the Harbour Commission to accept the loan on this condition.

If the Harbour Commission accepts the loan it will saddle itself not only with the responsibility for this precious piece of boodling jobbery, but for the paying of the interest not only upon the expenditure upon Mr. Tarte's crippling plan of harbour improvement, but also upon the cost of the political jobbery of Messrs. Tarte and Préfontaine.

These are very strong words.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Very.

Mr. FOSTER. They come from a very candid friend, and their candour and their strength together make it impossible for us as public men to ignore them. (Reading)—

It is asked to sanction and begin a scheme which will in the end probably cost it millions of dollars upon an advance of one million dollars by the Government. Mr. Tarte is treating the commission in this matter of harbour improvement as if it was a prodigal spendthrift, and as if he was a usurer making exploitations upon its necessities. He offers it one million dollars to spend upon its own needs upon condition that it accepts and pays the interest on another million, and spends it upon political jobs. Mr. Préfontaine and Mr. Mackay, who assured the business men of Montreal that if they accepted the crippling plan of Mr. Tarte the cost would be borne by the Government, are not now ashamed to let the commission know that, having accepted the crippling plan upon that condition, the Government is not going to fulfil the condition they undertook on its behalf, but is going to make the commission, that is, the harbour business, bear the burden. Mr. Préfontaine tells the commission that the increase in business is expected to pay the increased charges incident upon the extravagant expenditure upon Mr. Tarte's crippling plan and the boodling dock project.

We give in another column a history of the Quebec graving dock, which, under Mr. Tarte's old party and during the time that Mr. Tarte was a leader in that party and manager of the funds, was a source of such profit to political jobbers as to throw a sort of halo of glory around similar projects in the eyes of all such boodlers. The Montreal dock scheme is beginning well and under good auspices. It is extraordinary that Mr. Tarte should have been able to induce Sir Richard Cartwright to propose a loan of two millions, guaranteed by the Government, one million of which is to be spent upon a project which has not yet been planned out, for which there have been no regular estimates or engineer's designs, and with which a jobbing scheme is very manifestly connected. It is discouraging to all who hoped for pure, honest, economical government to find Sir Richard Cartwright taking the place of Mr. Tarte in proposing this most iniquitous loan to Parliament, as he did yesterday. If he has not only become complacent toward expenditure upon political jobbery, but willing to lend his reputation for honesty as a shield to Mr. Tarte's reputation in the House in order apparently to render the House less suspicious as to the proposal, to whom is the country to look for defence against dishonesty and extravagance ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). Stop. What is that ? I would like to ask my hon. friend to read that again. What is he talking about my proposing a loan ?

Mr. FOSTER . The hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) is anxious to hear it again.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Then I will ask the House to pardon the repetition, and I will read it for the benefit of my good friend :

The Montreal dock scheme is beginning well, and under good auspices. It is extraordinary that Mr. Tarte should have been able to induce Sir Richard Cartwright to propose a loan of two millions, guaranteed by the Government, one million of which is to be spent upon a project which has not yet been planned out, for which there have been no regular estimates or engineer's designs, and with which a jobbing scheme is very manifestly connected.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. It does not matter, because I do not shirk any responsibility, but I did not propose the loan, as a matter of fact.

Mr. FOSTER. I think my hon. friend (Sir Richard Cartwright, for the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), gave notice that the resolution would be taken up at another time.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. That is a little error.

The PRIME MINISTER. I will have to interrupt my hon. friend (Mr. Foster), and to read an authority on a point of order.

Mr. FOSTER. But let me satisfy the colleague of the right hon. gentleman.

The PRIME MINISTER. I cannot, because it is against the rules of the House.

Mr. FOSTER. Would my right hon. friend be guilty of such discourtesy to his colleague (Sir Richard Cartwright) as not to allow me to gratify his curiosity.

The PRIME MINISTER. I want to call the attention of my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) to a rule of the House, to which he called my attention the other day, and which reads to this effect :—

No member, in speaking, can refer to anything said or done in a previous debate during the same session—a rule necessary to economize the time of the House. Neither is it regular to refer to arguments used in Committee of the Whole, nor to an amendment proposed in the same. Neither may a member read from a printed newspaper or book comments on any speech made in Parliament during the current session.

I think my hon. friend is reading from a news article commenting on the proceedings of this House.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Did you remember that rule the other day when you read General Gascoigne's letter ?

The PRIME MINISTER. I did not ; and I am afraid my hon. friend did not. I do not want to press the point ; but the observance of the rules of debate sometimes depends on whose ox is gored.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Let the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) read on. Let him read George Washington Stephens' article.

Mr. FOSTER. I am very glad my hon. friend is not going to deprive the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) of the pleasure in store for him, and I will now proceed, I suppose, with the permission of the House. Says the Montreal "Witness" :

The Montreal dock scheme is beginning well and under good auspices. It is extraordinary that Mr. Tarte should have been able to induce Sir Richard Cartwright to propose a loan of two millions, guaranteed by the Government, one million of which is to be spent upon a project which has not yet been planned out, for which there have been no regular estimates or engineer's designs, and with which a jobbing scheme is very manifestly connected. It is discouraging to all who hoped for pure, honest, economical government to find Sir Richard Cartwright taking the place of Mr. Tarte in proposing this most iniquitous loan to Parliament, as he did yesterday. If he has not only become complacent toward expenditure upon political jobbery, but willing to lend his reputation for honesty as a shield to Mr. Tarte's reputation in the House in order apparently to render the House less suspicious as to the proposal, to whom is the country to look for defence against dishonesty and extravagance ?

Now, my hon. friend has a kind and loving heart, I am sure, although it took many of us a long time to discover it. It took a revolution in the political life of this country to take off the rather indurated layers which interpose between my hon. friend's genuine goodness of heart and its manifestation to the public. But will my hon. friend, in the face of that appeal, fail any longer to come to the rescue ? and will he allow such ardent supporters of the Montreal "Witness" and the Huntingdon "Gleaner," to call in vain, and to say in the end, "Well, he is asleep, or he is walking, or he is talking, and cannot listen to us—our god is useless." Now, Sir, as to my hon. friend's point of order, I am inclined to think it was not correctly taken. I am not reading from an anonymous criticism of any remarks which were made in this House. I am reading what a public paper says as to a business project, and I think I am perfectly in order in reading an extract from the public press, a book, a document or anything of that sort with respect to a matter of this kind.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. If not, you are in very good company.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, most illustrious company I am in ; and if Mr. Speaker will be as kind to me as to my hon. friend, after I am through, he will amiably suggest that I can put myself in order by moving a motion with the consent of the House. But the "Witness" is not the only one, nor is this the only occasion on which it has taken up this matter. The "Witness," in a succeeding issue, takes it up again, and goes into it most thoroughly. I am not going to weary the House by reading a second article or a third article. There is sufficient in the first to make plain what the public press is saying about it. But there was a meeting of the harbour commission, and we had the interesting testimony of others. We find that the mayor, who is, I believe, ex-officio a member of the harbour commission, was present. A discussion took place. Mr. Bickerdike made a statement there which throws light upon a reputed occurrence which took place between certain members of the Government and certain gentlemen from Montreal, and in which very heated expressions were said to have been used, and some very strong language indulged in, and in which, if it is true, the czar-like pretensions of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) were most fully and most distinctly made known ; for I believe it is stated that he turned round, with threatening dexter finger to my polite and sauve and quiet friend the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher), and said to him, "Have you forgotten, Sir, that you were elected by my influence ?" and when the fourteenth member

of the Cabinet ventured to say something in the same line of condemnation of the dock scheme, his dexter finger was then pointed to the member for Quebec West (Mr. Dobell) and he gave him a gentle reminder that all he had to do was to turn over his little finger, and farewell to all political prospects of that hon. gentleman.

Mr. BERGERON. That is quite correct, too.

Mr. FOSTER. And my hon. friend says that is quite correct.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Are you sure? Well, it is not correct.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, it is well to have a czar in the Cabinet, but it is not pleasant for the junior members of the Cabinet that his pretentions should be published in such a way.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). Will the hon. gentleman have the goodness to tell us on what authority he makes these statements?

Mr. FOSTER. They were made in an interview——

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In a Tory paper in Quebec.

Mr. FOSTER. In "L'Evenement;" and to show the inherent probability of them, we find that the most potent, consistent and fair Liberal paper in the province of Quebec believes that what the Tory paper stated is true. There, Sir, you have concurrent testimony, and everybody knows that concurrent testimony is the strongest possible testimony. It cannot be conspiracy, you know, because they are not friends together, and consequently the inherent probability is rendered all the more apparent. But, Sir, Mr. Bickerdike is not a myth; he is not a reputed interview in "L'Evenement;" he is not an imaginary shadow in the office of the Montreal "Witness." Mr. Bickerdike is an entity; he is a very potential entity; he is a very potential Liberal entity in the city of Montreal; and Mr. Bickerdike states in so many words that the Minister of Agriculture is not in favour of this east-end dock scheme; and he takes occasion to say so to His Honour the mayor and a member of the Harbour Commission. Mr. Bickerdike says:

The Minister of Agriculture himself told me that he considered the commissioners should be free to spend the money where it would be of greatest benefit to the port. He had confidence enough in the commissioners, the majority of whom were put into their positions by the Ministry, to be sure that they did not desire to cut their own throats. He, Mr. Bickerdike, was certain, if the Government were left alone, that it would lend the money unhampered by such restrictions as now proposed, confident that the commissioners would use it wisely and without any sectional bias.

Mr. FOSTER.

Who is the troublesome individual that, according to Mr. Bickerdike, will not leave the Government alone? Where is he? Was he after the Government or some member of it? Is there now a combination between one member of the Government and that worthy individual to go for some other members of the Government, to call forth this plaintive cry from Mr. Bickerdike, that if somebody, name not given, would only leave the Government alone, the Government might be trusted to do right. Mr. Hodgson also threw a little light on this matter. Mr. Hodgson is also a good friend of hon. gentlemen opposite, perhaps a little too frank sometimes, and probably not versed in politics to such a degree as to lend caution to his utterances on some occasions. Mr. Hodgson says:

I was much opposed to the idea at first, but after hearing the whole facts of the case and the feeling of the Minister of Public Works, I changed my mind. My idea was that plan No. 12a ought to be completed, and that any further works must be down there, but I know that the Government is desirous of getting the thing through in its present shape, and I understood the dry dock alone is only a matter of two hundred and fifty thousand dollars.

Mr. Bickerdike.—Let me understand you, Mr. Hodgson. Do you assert that the Premier and the Minister of Agriculture are in this thing?

What thing? It must be this scheme which the "Witness" characterizes in such candid language——

Mr. Hodgson did not reply in the affirmative.

Then, Mr. Bickerdike says again:

In spite of anything that has been said to the contrary, Mr. Thompson, it is not the Government which is doing this.

It is that troublesome individual, I suppose, who will not leave the Government alone, and whose constant endeavours, day and night, are directed to turning them from the path of rectitude in which they desire to walk, according to their pre-election pledges. But the mayor of the city shows a broad spirit, when there is a suggestion by Mr. Thompson that this matter may lie over for a little while until he can see what his constituents think about it. The mayor says:

The Mayor.—What is the use, Mr. Thomson? You have made up your mind to oppose us, and so it would be the same thing if the vote were taken now.

Mr. Thomson.—No, sir. If my constituents are of a different opinion from me, I promise to come back and vote for you, although it would be contrary to my opinion and much against my judgment.

Mr. Bickerdike.—Let us adjourn for two days, and learn what the public thinks about it.

The Mayor.—What has the public to do with it? The important fact for us to remember is that the session closes on Tuesday night next, and no adjournment is possible if this thing is to be put through.——

Of course this gentleman who troubles the Government and tries to turn them from the path of rectitude knows exactly when we are going to adjourn.

——Besides, gentlemen around the table had had an opportunity to consult the Government, and they knew that it was this or nothing, so what was the use of acting like children?

Mr. Thomson expected that indignation meetings would be held unless more time was given, it was not fair.

The Mayor.—What do I care for your indignation meetings; no indignation meetings would disturb me at all.

The mayor does not care for the public, they having nothing to do with it, he does not care for indignation meetings, such meetings do not disturb him at all. So long as he can get his friend the Minister of Public Works to put this part of the vote through and the city council to put the other part through, and the scheme is allowed to run, the public may be blanked. Indignation meetings—what effect have they upon him? Now, I have read this to show what is appearing in the public prints, and to show this House that there are circumstances connected with this which render it in the highest degree necessary that time should be given for a thorough discussion and investigation. We have no time now for that. We are asked to vote this and to vote it to-day, with the House rather empty and with the unrest and desire prevailing to leave which the approaching end of the session always brings. Two things I want to be brought out from this. In the first place, I think the Government is taking great responsibility upon itself, when it endeavours to force its preconceived plan and methods as conditions of the loan, which it will give on no other condition. I want to ask my hon. friend, the Minister of Public Works, if, when he comes down for a vote of $750,000 in the shape of this loan for a certain work, he has his engineer's estimate and plans of the work and everything connected with it? Why, he would not ask this Parliament to give him a vote for a $10,000 post office without having his plans and estimates before this House. Has my hon. friend the engineer's plan and estimate of the cost, or is he going upon generalities, investigation and plans which are to be carried out and improved in the future?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No work will be begun without a plan being carefully prepared. We only want to have it provided that $50,000 will be taken out of that advance to equip works in the eastern part of the harbour and also towards constructing a dry dock. When the Bill is in committee, I intend to make an amendment to this effect. I am anxious that the works in the harbour shall begin immediately. We are all agreed as to that, and I shall move an amendment, because there are no plans ready for the dry dock, that two or three months be given to prepare plans of the dry dock and to equip the piers in its eastern part. I am anxious that the work shall begin immediately in the centre harbour, according to the plans which have been approved by all the commercial community of Montreal. The present plans have been approved by all its commercial bodies, but I will move an amendment to that effect that two or three months be given to prepare for the eastern work, so as to allow the immediate commencement of the work on the plans which have been approved. As to the plans for the dry dock, it will not take much time to get them. We are only deciding that a certain part of them will be applied for works, the plans of which will be prepared.

Mr. FOSTER. That shows what is the cardinal weakness of the plan. Plan 12a is to be carried out. It has the assent—whether it has the cordial assent or not—of the different bodies——

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It has the hearty assent of all these who have not private interests to serve in Montreal.

Mr. FOSTER. It is said that this assent was given to a certain plan which the Minister approves, under the idea that by this compromise Government aid will be obtained for the work. That statement is made.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This plan 12a is less expensive than plan No. 6 was, so that there was no more reason why the Government should carry out that plan than that the Harbour Commissioners should agree to it. This plan 12a is less expensive, and it has been adopted, after consideration and after having consulted such men as the manager of the Bristol docks and the manager of one of the great docks of Liverpool and the commercial bodies of Montreal, who have given their approval to it. Now that they have approved it, we are ready to go on.

Mr. FOSTER. I am not taking any exception to the expenditure on 12a plan, which is apparently sanctioned by the different bodies. It has been accepted as a compromise, and therefore can be proceeded with. Everybody is agreed as to plan 12a, and the Minister's action is perfectly clear and satisfactory to Parliament on that basis. But on the other hand, there is strong opposition to this dry dock.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, there is not.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend may seek to minimize that opposition by saying that it is only the vested or selfish interests which are opposed to it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Private interests.

Mr. FOSTER. In the last analysis, you will find that in all these schemes there are

interests which you may call selfish. All interests nearly are so, but it does not settle the question at all to say to this House that the strong, prominent, clear-headed business men who set their faces against the scheme, are simply selfish. Their interests are bound up with those of the city and port.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The vast majority of the business men of Montreal and ninety-nine per cent of the public opinion of Montreal are behind my scheme to-day; it is only those who are prejudiced, and whose private interests are served by not having any improvements carried out in Montreal, who are fighting it now. And I say that there are only men who are prejudiced or have private interests at stake, and who desire to have no improvements carried out for Montreal who are fighting us.

Mr. FOSTER. I will leave my hon. friend (Mr. Tarte) to settle that with the business men. I take things as they appear. I will not say that all the business men who oppose this scheme are moved by blind prejudice or any other unworthy sentiment. They, no doubt, have their interests, and these interests are large and legitimate. Before the hon. Minster of Public Works turned over a stone in Montreal these men and their predecessors were building up the business greatness of the port.

Mr. EDWARDS. It is not the business men of Montreal, but the business men of the country, the producers and shippers that build up the harbour and the business of Montreal.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend (Mr. Edwards) directs my attention to one end of the proposition, which is quite true and all the truth, unless you look at the other end of the proposition.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. These people have left the port of Montreal in the most disgraceful condition of any great port in the world; and all to serve private interest. I do not speak of all our business men, of course, but I say that a certain clique in Montreal have prevented improvement in order to serve their private interests. Plan No. 6 was approved about ten years ago, and it was through their efforts that it was not carried out. They were afraid that great navigation companies would come, that big ships would seek the harbour, and ruin their trade.

Mr. FOSTER. I hope my hon. friend (Mr. Tarte) will thank me for allowing him to make another speech in the middle of my own remarks.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. *I do.*

Mr. FOSTER. That is all right. I am going to leave this matter to be settled between my hon. friend (Mr. Tarte) and the business men. I think it is a somewhat severe statement, however, to characterize the solid business men in Montreal as he has done. What I think the hon. gentleman would be perfectly justified in doing would be to get the land to carry what is agreed upon, plan 12a. But does the hon. gentleman know that the lands are purchasable, and at what cost they can be purchased? Because, as I understand it, the lands have to be bought. Neither the city nor the Government own this property.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am glad my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) calls attention to that. I may say immediately that the syndicate with which the hon. member from Maisonneuve (Mr. Préfontaine) was supposed to be connected, and with which the "Witness" connects my name, though they know perfectly well that I have not a cent of interest in it, does not own one foot of land in the place where these works are to be located. There is an abundance of land. The works already built belong the Harbour Commissioners—all the wharfs and the water front. If it is necessary to buy land, it will only be for the dry dock, which will require very little land.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend (Mr. Tarte) must not take up too much of my time—though I am glad to have the information he gives. I did not raise the question whether the improvement company owned the land upon which the dry dock was actually to be built, I raised the general question. The harbour commission does not own the land, I understand.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No.

Mr. FOSTER. Therefore, the land will have to be bought or expropriated. Nothing definite is known as to the price. The hon. Minister of Public Works knows nothing about that, nor does the harbour commission. But everybody knows that the moment this improvement is definitely decided upon there will be a rise in the value of real estate.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We are not going to say where the works will be located.

Mr. FOSTER My hon. friend (Mr. Tarte) has stated that the land syndicate does not own property in the vicinity where this public work is to be built. But those who own land in that vicinity, there can be no doubt, will be greatly benefited, because there will be an increase in value. What I want to point out is that the Minister of Public Works, or the harbour commission, has not the land, nor has the hon. gentleman the engineer's plans nor an estimate of the cost. They have nothing but a project; and that project is opposed by reputable business men and great business interests in

the city of Montreal. When it suits my hon. friend he can quote the board of trade as a very important body; but when it suits him he minimizes it, and says that it is selfish and prejudiced.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I did not say that. I said that some of the men who have been opposing these improvements have been influenced by their private interests.

Mr. FOSTER. When the hon. gentleman makes an assertion of that kind, it would be only just that he should name the persons who are selfish and prejudiced and not leave that assertion to cover all.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am doing that too.

Mr. FOSTER. It is unfair that every opponent of the scheme should be left under that imputation. He should not use that argument unless he is quite willing to exonerate those who are not moved by prejudice, and he can only do that by naming those who are. The hon. gentleman is a man of strong opinions, and he makes his statements, as it were, ex-cathedra and very strongly. That is not always a fault in a man, but it sometimes does injury to others. From this time, the business men of Montreal will be trying to settle the question which of them are working through selfish interests and who are exonerated from that charge. Now, I think my hon. friend should be willing to allow that portion of his scheme to remain until the next session of Parliament. He will not interfere with the work of the plan 12a, the part that is approved by the business community; and by doing so he will avoid incurring the suspicion of rushing something through Parliament which is denounced by the press that supported him and by business men of Montreal, who have reputations and large interests. When he has engineers' plans and can give us an estimate of the cost of what he proposes to build, we shall have something to go upon. But the proposition he lays before us to-day, I think, under the circumstances, he ought not to press to a conclusion. I hope my hon. friend will consider my suggestion.

Now, with reference to the greater question—it must be remembered that if you are ever going to get anything from the port of Montreal—and we all have high hopes of it—you must try to have a port as cheap and as well equipped as possible. A port that is not equipped, though it is cheap, is not of much use; while a port that is well equipped, if its charges are very high, has but little chance in the competition for trade. In proportion as you load up the harbour commission with what they think are works not germane to their business, you make it necessary for them to impose heavy charges. The ultimate result of this is to throw the burden on the country. The business men want to see a graving dock included among the improvements, but they do not want to be compelled to add the interest upon it to the charges of the harbour. Let the Minister of Public Works treat the port of Montreal as generously as he has treated the city of Quebec and other ports. Where is there a dry dock that has been built in any city by the people of that city? In Kingston the dry dock was built and is owned by the Government. In Quebec the dry dock was built and is owned by the Government. What the business men of Montreal have a perfect right to ask is, that if the Government wants to have a dry dock, and, if we, in consultation with them, think it well to have a dry dock, this scheme should be dissassociated from the works that the commission has to carry out with the loan that is here proposed, and the revenues of the commission not burdened with these charges. In doing that he will not do anything that will militate against the harbour of Montreal, he will not be equipping works which, as I have before mentioned, the board of trade is opposed to.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. and the Chamber of Commerce approved of it.

Mr. PREFONTAINE moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

The PRIME MINISTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 1 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Second Sitting.

FRIDAY, 3rd June, 1898.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

QUEEN VS. SKELTON—PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. DAVIN. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to make a personal explanation. Last night I called attention to the fact that I had received a letter from the Solicitor General, in which there was a paragraph taken from a letter of the Minister of Justice, saying that he was ready to hear me at any time in regard to the case of the Queen against Skelton. I had an appointment with the Minister of

Justice and went to see him, that is, I saw him at the suggestion of the paragraph quoted in the letter from the Solicitor General, saw him to hear me in regard to the case of the Queen against Skelton.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is this a personal explanation ?

Mr. DAVIN. A personal explanation, I am not going to argue anything.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is it correcting a report of a speech ?

Mr. DAVIN. No, it is not correcting any report, it is a personal explanation.

Mr. SPEAKER. If it is of a purely personal character, the hon. gentleman is in order, but he must be careful not to introduce anything that will involve discussion.

Mr. DAVIN. It is a purely personal explanation. As I said, I went to see the Minister, and he began to say to me : I will tell you my opinion, I will tell you my views. Thereupon, I took up a paper the length of a foolscap envelope, and began to take down what he said. He looked at me taking it down in short-hand. At the close of the conversation, I said to the Minister it was impossible that I could make any argument without having the papers before me. Now, the right hon. gentleman, in reply to me—I have no doubt it was said in the hurry of debate, in fact, I find it hard to believe that the right hon. gentleman would deliberately make the suggestion that he will find he did make—he said that the Minister of Justice would have cause to complain of me for taking notes of a private conversation. The right hon. gentleman will see that this was as purely a public thing as if I went into the Supreme Court to argue. I was representing certain people of the North-west in regard to a public transaction, at the invitation of the Minister, who said that he was ready to hear me. Of course, the right hon. gentleman only knows me in this House, he does not know me intimately, privately, but he knows many friends of mine. I do not think it would deliberately occur to him that I would do anything ungentlemanly, especially so ungentlemanly as to take a surreptitious note of a private conversation. It was entirely a public matter, and I say with deference to the right hon. gentleman's judgment, that I think he owes it both to himself and to me to set the matter right.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Well, Mr. Speaker, I certainly owe it to the hon. gentleman to give you frankly my views of the question as he has presented it. My impression was, from the way he had put his case, that the interview which he had with the Minister was altogether private. I cannot admit, for my part, that the hon. gentleman represented the people of the North-west Territories at that interview, but of course I am giving my own opinion merely. The hon. gentleman knows, and I do not know, the conversation which he had with the Minister of Justice. To me it seemed like a private conversation, but if he judged at the time, and if he led the Minister of Justice to understand that the matter was not a private interview, but a public conference, of course I have nothing more to say upon the subject. That is a question of appreciation for my hon. friend and the Minister of Justice. In my opinion, when I spoke, it was a private conversation, but I accept the statement of the hon. gentleman that it was not a private conversation, but a public conference with the Minister of Justice, and so far the matter ends.

GRANTS IN AID OF PUBLIC WORKS

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 161) respecting the payment of grants in aid of the construction of public works.

Mr. FOSTER. Perhaps the hon. Minister will explain the Bill.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The Bill is framed for the purpose of enabling the Government in certain eventualities to make payments on account, or, what would be a more accurate description, to make payments on progress estimates of amounts granted in aid of public works. We have found in one or two instances that companies which have actually earned very large amounts have been unable legally to collect them, and the Government have been consequently legally unable to pay them by reason of the fact that the section which under the existing Act has to be completed fully for a distance of ten miles, has not been wholly completed, through no fault of the contractors, no inability on their part, but by reason of circumstances wholly beyond their control. The Bill provides :

Whenever by an Act of Parliament a grant in aid of the construction of any work has been made payable on the completion of sections thereof or otherwise, the Governor in Council may authorize payment on account thereof according to progress estimates to be furnished by the engineers of the department of Railways and Canals, notwithstanding that the work so aided, or any section thereof, has not been wholly completed, where the non-completion thereof is not due to delay on the part of the contractors or to pecuniary causes, or to causes within the reasonable control of the contractors, and where the amount proposed to be paid as having been earned by the contractors will not be less than $64,000, after withholding from the amount which would be earned by the completion a sum sufficient in the option of the Minister of Railways and Canals to cover the cost of completing the whole of such work or the section thereof with respect to which payment is being made.

The sum which is named in the Bill is the limit of the whole subsidy now authorized in regard to ten miles of the road at the increased rate, under the special clause introduced last year. The circumstances under which the difficulty has arisen are these. We had applications from the Canadian Pacific Railway for payment of a large amount in respect to their contract, and it was found they could not be paid for sections continuously by reason of the fact that there were some portions of the work on the section which they were yet required to do under contract, the cost of which would be very insignificant in amount, but which, though insignificant, would have to be done before payment for the whole section can be made. It was felt by the Government that with proper safeguards, such as have been introduced in the Bill, by which not less than $64,000 could be paid at any time, after making sufficient allowance for the completion of the work, no public interest would suffer, and that the company prosecuting the work under a contract might reasonably be aided to that extent.

Mr. SPROULE. That Bill would allow the Government to dole out the subsidy as the work proceeds.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Not to any very great extent. The amount to be paid under the circumstances would not be less than $64,000, which meets the double subsidy for a full mileage of ten miles. So the Act could not be made applicable in a great many cases or in a small way, only where the work is a very large one, and then only under the conditions which are contained in the Bill, where the work has not failed of completion through any fault of the contractor in any way.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not want to express an opinion on the Bill on the mere explanation so far given, but I want to call the attention of the right hon. leader of the House to the matter. We had a certain promise that all the important legislation was down and there was nothing else to be laid on the Table of the House at this late date except some unimportant or local matters. As I catch the object of the Bill it is a most important measure and one which requires very serious consideration. I may overrate its importance; but I would suggest to the hon. gentleman whether it would not be better to postpone legislation of this kind at this stage of the session. We have gone along very well for twenty-five years, and I think we might go to the next session without undertaking such legislation as this. It is departmental, of course, but it has to do with the moneys of the country expended on great public works. We have had a settled policy, and this proposal is to make a very radical change in the system we are pursuing. It is worth the consideration of the House whether it would not be better to defer the Bill until next session.

The PRIME MINISTER. I suggest that the Bill had better be read the first time.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

The PRIME MINISTER. I can quite understand that the Minister of Railways will appreciate the reason adduced by the hon. member for York. But I also hope that hon. gentlemen will come to the conclusion that the Bill is absolutely harmless, that it does not introduce any new principle, but simply facilitates as to companies earning subsidies the power of drawing moneys on works in progress. There has been no difficulty generally in respect to the payment of subsidies on sections of ten miles, but I understand that in certain parts of British Columbia the difficulties of construction are very great, and I trust after a conference between my hon. friend and the Minister of Railways, the Bill will be allowed to pass.

Mr. FOSTER. I throw out the suggestion—but let the Bill be read the first time.

Mr. HAGGART. The law was formerly as it is now proposed to be enacted, but it was changed to secure the safety of the department and the public, and it was provided that until a section of ten miles was completed no payment should be made. If this Bill were passed, any railway company could get a certificate of the engineer for four or five hundred dollars and they could ask from the Government different amounts, which although practically secured, would result in the work never being done. I can see difficulty with respect to the Crow's Nest Pass road in regard to making advances without a ten mile section being absolutely completed.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. And Victoria Bridge and other works.

Mr. HAGGART. Even with the present law the hon. gentleman has been able to get over the difficulty in regard to the Crow's Nest Pass Railway and other works. There is a way to overcome it, as the hon. gentleman knows.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Only partly.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

TRANSPORTATION OF SUPPLIES TO THE YUKON.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I should like to call the attention of the Minister of the Interior to the promise he made at the time the Minister of Militia promised to bring down papers touching the arrangements made for the transport of supplies to the Yukon. There were some papers which

the Minister of the Interior promised to bring down, as well as those which the Minister of Militia promised to lay on the Table. The Minister of Militia has brought down a memorandum of the papers in his department, but none have come from the Minister of the Interior.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). I will see if there are any papers, and if so, I will bring them down.

CUSTOMS DEPARTMENT—CHANGES IN OFFICIALS.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). The hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. McDougall) has mentioned in the House once or twice that he was not able to reach a motion of his asking for a return of changes in the officials of the Customs Department, amongst others in Cape Breton County. I have prepared a return so far as it relates to the Customs Department, and I move for leave to lay it on the Table of the House.

Motion agreed to.

YUKON MINING LEASES.

Mr. FOSTER. I wish to call the attention of the Minister of the Interior to the order of the House in reference to mining leases. The hon. gentleman was good enough to facilitate the information to a certain degree by giving the names of applicants and of those to whom leases had been made. I would like, however, to have the information as to the general correspondence. It may not be possible to bring it down this session, but I would ask him to have it prepared so that it may be procurable at as early a date as possible. I do not want it left over until next session.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). I gave instructions that this return should be prepared as rapidly as possible, and it is being done now.

MILITIA CONTRACTS.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Has the Minister of Militia the papers yet in regard to the contract for supplies to the troops ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). I will inquire in the morning.

MONTREAL HARBOUR WORKS.

The House resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into committee to consider a certain proposed resolution respecting an advance to the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. gentleman from York (Mr. Foster) I beg to state at once that the first objection that he makes to the resolution now before the House does not, in my opinion stand, in view of what the former Government, of which he was a member, did in 1896. In that year, a law was passed by the Government in which the member for York was Finance Minister, and in which the precaution that he pretends is necessary to introduce into this Bill, did not appear. He says that no plans are provided for part of the work to be executed under this loan, and as a matter of fact no plans were provided in the law which he himself assisted in passing in 1896. I read the following clause from the Act of 1896 :—

5. The corporation may borrow the sum of one million dollars, or its equivalent in pounds sterling, for the purpose of paying and redeeming the said Montreal harbour bonds and debentures now held by the Government of Canada, and the said demand loan due by the corporation to the Government, and all bonds or debentures issued by the corporation now outstanding and falling due during the year one thousand eight hundred and ninety-six, and all loans and advances made to the corporation, and all interest due on any such bonds or debentures, loans and advances,—and also a further sum of one million dollars, or its equivalent in pounds sterling, for the purpose of constructing, extending and improving the wharfs, structures and other accommodations in the harbour of Montreal, in such manner as the corporation, with the consent and approval of the Minister of Public Works, deems best calculated to facilitate trade and increase the convenience and utility of the said harbour.

There is nothing whatever provided in that law as regards plans, and there is not a word mentioned as to how this million dollars was going to be spent. I am credibly informed that no plan of the work proposed to be done was ever presented to the Government at that time. Therefore, the reproach of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) against this part of the resolution providing for the expenditure of $750,000 in the east end of the port of Montreal, does not hold water. I go further and I say, that the resolution now before the House provides all the guarantees necessary that the port of Montreal will be equipped as it should be, and that it will answer the demands made on the Dominion Government ever since 1889 when the question of protecting Montreal against inundations, as well as harbour improvements generally, were discussed and agreed upon between the interested parties. I repeat that this Bill offers all necessary guarantee, and it is a result not only of the representations that were lately made to the Government both by the Harbour Commissioners and the City Council of Montreal, but it also answers the demands that were made by former Harbour Commissioners. One would ima-

gine from the speech made by the hon. member (Mr. Foster) and the articles which he quoted from a certain newspaper in Montreal, that the scheme of dry docks and shipping accommodation in the east end of the port of Montreal was something extraordinary, or, as the newspaper called it, a piece of political jobbery. Let me tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) that there is nothing at all new in the project. It is exactly in conformity with the resolution of the harbour board passed on the 10th April, 1894, which was placed in the hands of the Government then. I regret to be forced to make these long citations, but it is necessary that I should do so in order that I should put the case clearly before the House and the country, for it is important that all the facts should be perfectly known. The resolution of the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal to which I refer, is as follows :—

Extracts from the minutes of a monthly meeting of the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal, held on the 10th April, 1894.

Present :—Henry Bulmer, Esq., Chairman ; Hon. Edward Murphy, Victor Hudon, Richard White, W. W. Ogilvie, N. A. Hurteau, Esquires ; J. O. Villeneuve, Esq., Mayor ; C. H. Gould, L. E. Morin and Andrew Allan, Esquires.

The following motion was then made by Mr. Hurteau :

That in view of the rapidly growing trade of the harbour of Montreal and the imperative necessity for providing for its certain early extension and in view of the financial position of this Board, as shown by the accompanying memoranda, and to enable the Commissioners to meet the obligations already assumed in the carrying out of the plan number 6, keeping faith with the city of Montreal, and to grant such facilities as will ensure the continued successful competition of Montreal with foreign ports by avoiding the possibility of additional charges upon the shipping and trade of the port, be it resolved :

That an application be made to the Governor in Council for such assistance as will enable the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal to secure, in addition to the $1,000,000 for which they have present authority, a further sum of $3,000,000 bearing interest at a rate not higher than 3½ per cent. This sum to be used during the next four years for the following improvements :—

$2,000,000 to complete the arrangements with the city of Montreal and sanctioned by the Governor in Council, and known as plan No. 6, with the proposed wharfs at Maisonneuve ; $1,000,000 to build an inland basin at such place in the eastern end of the city as may, upon examination, be found most advantageous, and $1,000,000 to complete the basin at Windmill Point, and other parts of the harbour not included in plan No. 6.

That a committee consisting of the Chairman, the Mayor, W. W. Ogilvie, N. A. Hurteau, Richard White and any other member wishing to join, be named to proceed to Ottawa and urge upon the Government the granting of the assistance referred to in the foregoing resolution.

After consideration the resolution was carried on the understanding that the Commissioners' claim against the Government of $1,000,000 must not be lost sight of, and that the increased expenditure involved would not cause the harbour dues to be increased.

That the chairman be requested to go to Ottawa and arrange for an interview between the Government and the deputation.

Certified a true extract.

(Sgd.) ALEXANDER ROBERTSON,
Secretary.

Following that proceeding of the Harbour Commissioners in 1894, other resolutions were adopted in the same sense. The Harbour Commissioners appointed two of their number to see at what price and on what conditions they could buy the land necessary for the inland basin. They came to Ottawa, and had an interview with the Government. The Government did not give them any satisfaction, but let the matter drag until 1896. In the meantime the matter was not lost sight of. I have here a copy of a petition signed by twenty-eight members of Parliament, some of whom have still seats in this House. That petition is dated the 12th of July, 1894, and one of its clauses reads as follows :—

That the inner basin constructed near the limits of Hochelaga and of the town of Maisonneuve, with its entrance by way of Ruisseau Migeon, would be of incalculable advantage to navigation and commerce.

That a system of dry docks constructed at that same point would also be of incalculable advantage and benefit.

This is signed by twenty-eight Conservative members of Parliament, among whom I notice the name of the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron), the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. LaRivière), the hon. member for Compton (Mr. Pope), and some others who have since become Senators. So that the question of a dry dock, the question of an inland basin, the question of improvements in the eastern part of the port of Montreal, were considered as a whole by the people of Montreal as far back as 1894. As I have stated, the Government did not act until 1896, and the result was the law which I have just quoted. This law, having been passed without specifying in any way how the money should be spent, it naturally follows that the Government were acting on the representations made to them by the Harbour Commissioners, by the members of Parliament and by the shipping interests in 1894. The shipping interests sent a petition to the Government, representing how necessary it was to have dry docks in the east end of the city of Montreal. This petition was signed by the Union Marine Insurance Company, the Standard Marine Insurance Company, the president of the Board of Marine Underwriters, the British and Foreign Marine Insurance Company, the Reliance Marine Insurance Company, and by all marine insurance companies, by all the shippers and steamship proprietors, and by many others interested in the trade of Montreal, and not only Montreal, but of Canada. There was also a petition dated the 6th of July, 1894, and signed by over 1,200

citizens of Montreal, to the same effect. There were resolutions passed by the city council of Montreal time and again, setting forth these facts, and insisting that something should be done. As I have stated, nothing was done till 1896. But the difficulty was that the Harbour Commissioners, being granted only $1,000,000, were put in this position, that with that sum of money they had to execute the improvements contemplated under plan No. 6, and all the other improvements as well, though the improvements under plan No. 6 were contemplated to cost over $2,000,000. The dispute began among the Harbour Commissioners themselves. They did not know where to expend the money. They said, what is the use of starting, for instance, to widen Commissioners Street or to extend the wharfs in order to allow the city to go on with works to guard against inundation? So they went on patching a little here and a little there, and spending a part of the money in the Windmill basin, but doing nothing of real utility. The result is that the harbour of Montreal is really in a worse condition to-day than it was in 1894 or in 1896, before the loan of $1,000,000 was granted to the Harbour Commissioners. The Harbour Commissioners have spent barely $200,000 of that money, and there remains still in the hands of the Government $810,000, of which about $100,000 is due for work that has been done, so that there remains to be applied, according to that law, $700,000 in round figures. Now, the Government say that on representations made to them during the month of April last, they have considered the whole matter. It is a very complicated one. The first proposition that was laid before the Government in April last by the Harbour Commissioners was to the effect that the Government should assume the interest on the debt due by the Harbour Commissioners, which debt amounted in round figures to $3,500,000. This debt was contracted for harbour improvements in former years, and bears interest at different rates, some of the bonds which are redeemable in eight or nine years, bearing as much as 7 per cent. The interest account of the Harbour Commissioners is, in round figures, $165,000 per annum. The Harbour Commissioners said to the Government: If you advance us $3,000,000 more, including the $700,000 still available under the law of 1896, and consolidate that debt at 2½ per cent interest, a little less than you are paying—for, I understand, the Government have borrowed money at 2¼ per cent—the interest account of the Harbour Commissioners will not be increased; we will continue to pay the same amount of interest every year as we are paying now, and we shall have at our disposal $3,000,000 to be spent in the improvements we contemplate. It menat that the Government would have contributed for the first eight or nine years about $50,000 per year, which contribution would decrease according as the bonds were redeemed and replaced by 2½ per cent bonds. The Government could not see their way clear to do that. It would have involved the payment to the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal of about $1,000,000 in the course of the next 23 years. But instead of that, the Government said to the Harbour Commissioners: We will advance you $2,000,000 immediately, and leave you the right to spend the balance of the $1,000,000 you have the right to borrow under the statute of 1896, but we will make the interest 3 per cent. Their offer really amounts to this. Suppose the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal would borrow the $2,800,000, as well under the law of 1896 as under this proposed legislation, their interest account would be increased by about $80,000 a year. We are not, and the Harbour Commissioners understand that perfectly well, going to spend this $2,800,000 all at once. That is impossible, even if the commissioners desired to do it. The money will be spent in about three or four years. How are the Harbour Commissioners going to meet the interest? We calculate, like good administrators, that the revenue will go on increasing. If we had kept the tariff as it was two years ago, our revenue would have been 20 per cent more, because it was reduced to that extent. But even taking the revenue as it is, the increase this year shows 40 per cent up to date compared with last year. So that we calculate that as the revenue is increasing, we will be, when these improvements are finished, in a position to meet the interest without charging anything more on goods carried to and from the port. This is a reasonable ground to take, but some of the Harbour Commissioners who oppose the scheme, say: Oh, we have plenty of accommodation, and rather than see the interest account increase, we would prefer to have no improvements whatever. That is a very small, picayune policy. It may suit these gentlemen who have some kind of business in the port to-day, but is one which should not be adopted by this Government, especially when they consider that the port of Montreal is the national port of the Dominion. Will anybody pretend that the port of Montreal can be considered really a port fit to compete with foreign ports, without being equipped with the necessary improvements?

The common sense plan, plan 12a, which is a modification of plan No. 6, and which gives better accommodation at reduced cost, is the plan agreed upon, and the first thing to do is to carry that plan to execution. The execution of that plan will cost, according to the estimate of Mr. John Kennedy, given at the last meeting of the Harbour Commissioners, held on the 31st May last, about $1,800,000, or $100,000 less than the amount that will be at the disposal of the Harbour Commissioners after deducting the

$750,000 for the improvements in the east and the $700,000 which the corporation of Montreal is bound to contribute for flood inundation protection. So that the interest account is not changed at all, if part of that money is applied to a dry dock and deep water wharfs in the port. These gentlemen who go before the Board of Trade and the Corn Exchange of Montreal and say that the Government should assume the whole debt and pay all the cost of these improvements, are either not sincere or not logical. If this would increase in any way the interest account of the Harbour Commissioners, I would understand their opposition, but it does not. If you do not make these improvements, will you have what we require, namely, a fully equipped port? Everybody will say that you will not. I know it for a fact—and I say it from my seat, but am not allowed to mention the name—that one of the largest milling companies in the country is ready to build an elevator and even a mill in Montreal, in that part of the harbour where they can have access to deep water wharfs. They cannot have access now because the wharfs, except the one which is used by the Montreal Sugar Refinery, are all low water wharfs. Although they cost $700,000, some of them are perfectly useless because the water is not deep enough. In order to accommodate, not only the trade of these people who have done a fair business around Montreal since a number of years, but the trade that we contemplate bringing to that port, we must have deep water wharfs, and we cannot have them elsewhere than in the eastern part of the city. You are not going to build these deep water wharfs beyond Victoria Bridge. You are not going to take out 27 feet of rock in order to build deep water wharfs beyond that bridge. It would be nonsensical to talk of such a thing. So it is admitted that the only place we can build them is at that eastern part of the island; and as the jurisdiction of the Harbour Commissioners extends to Longue Pointe, there is lots of ground to be taken.

It is all very well, when fictitious opposition is made, to cry out that this is proposed because some parties have land in that part of the city. If allusion is made to me, let me say that I have more property in the west, towards St. Henri, than I am interested in, in the other end of the harbour. I do not look at the question from that point of view, but as one of public benefit to the whole city and the Dominion. Is it in the interest of the trade and commerce of the country that the port of Montreal should be properly equipped? If it is, and if this will not change the financial position of the Harbour Commissioners as regards the interest account, why should there be any opposition to it? There is opposition, not to the scheme itself, but to the dry dock proposal, by some parties who give as their reason that these docks have been built in Quebec and elsewhere by means of money from the Dominion treasury. If the Government were disposed to give us $500,000 to build that dry dock and administer it and enjoy the revenue from it, that would be satisfactory, but they are not disposed to make us a grant of that amount. They are ready, however, to meet us half way and advance the $2,000,000, with the $700,000 we have at our disposal already, on certain conditions. We are interested, and so is the Government, in having this national port fully equipped as it should be, and they insist that the money shall be expended in such and such a manner. Is it a better guarantee for the trade of the country that it should be that way or that all these should be left out? Some days ago I was arguing this point with one of the opponents of the scheme. He said: Drop the dry dock, drop the deep-water wharf, and I will vote a million for improvements. This gentleman is the representative, I regret to say, of large shipping interests. I said: My dear sir, that would only be playing into the hands of those who say there is jobbery in this and that the money is going to be squandered. The only guarantee that this money will be properly spent and applied to the improvements necessary to make the port of Montreal what it should be, is to fix it by law. The Harbour Commissioners and the Minister of Public Works, whoever he may be, will be obliged to obey the law. I think that is a fair way of arguing it, and is the only way to put the question.

Now, I do not want to answer what has been stated in the newspapers about this question—there is no use in that. The report of the meeting I attended, which appears in the "Witness," or some other paper, has been referred to. If the arguments they use are no better founded than the report of that meeting, they cannot have much force. The report, for instance, says that I said that I did not care about public opinion. The idea that a man who has been in public life for 25 years, and who occupies the position I do, by the unanimous choice of my fellow-citizens of Montreal, would say that I do not care what public opinion is, would be to ruin myself politically and as a citizen of Montreal. What I stated about public opinion, and what is wrongly reported is this: One of the gentlemen said that if we voted the money in that manner, there would be an indignation meeting. I said: Sir, I defy you to call an indignation meeting, and for every thousand persons that you have there, I will have a hundred thousand to support me in the stand I take on this question. He did not accept the challenge, and he will not accept it. But the opposition, as I have said, is illogical and unreasonable, and I am afraid it is even worse; I am afraid that it is narrow-minded. I am

afraid that certain people fear that the trade and commerce of Montreal and of the country will expand in such a way that their fleet of steamers and canal boats will not be able to compete. We have heard of these small jealousies before. For instance, three years ago a great firm of shipowners, the Elder-Dempster Company, began to send their steamers to the port of Montreal, steamers with a tonnage of as much as 12,000 tons. When that was mentioned first, all these narrow-minded people pooh-pooned the idea. They said that no such steamers would come to Montreal for more than one season, that they would lose so much money that they would be taken off the line. But the steamers have come for the last three years, and this year the fleet is composed of 15 steamers. They have kept on coming and increasing, and still there is complaint that they have not the necessary accommodation. It is the same way about elevators. These people say: It is all very well to talk about elevators. There is an elevator of 150,000 bushels—I think that is the capacity—and it does not pay. How then do you think that elevators with a capacity of half a million bushels will pay? So it goes—we must not have elevators, we must not have harbour accommodation; it is always the same narrow policy preventing the expansion of the trade of the country and of the port of Montreal. Of course, it is too bad that we should meet with such opposition; but it must be faced and overcome in the regular way, by the force of public opinion.

Now, it has been stated by the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) that the Government, and the Minister of Public Works particularly, were guilty of having delayed the adoption of the plan during the fall of 1897. In answer to that I want to say that the Government have acted with more diligence than their predecessors. Representations have been made only lately to the Government by the Harbour Commissioners and the city. The last memorial was sent on the 19th of April last. So, the Minister and the Government have not been guilty of delaying this important matter even during the session. But, as regards the adoption of the plan during the summer of 1897, let me say that the Harbour Commissioners, the Board of Trade, the Corn Exchange and the Chambre de Commerce could not come to an understanding as regards the modifications to be made in plan No. 6. They knew very well that that plan had to be modified. It had been made in 1889 or 1890, and approved by the Government. But the conditions were changed entirely and it had to be modified. It was not until late last fall that we could come to an agreement. But suppose the Minister of Public Works had told the Harbour Commissioners to go on with the plan, they would have discovered that it would be useless to proceed with the money they had at their disposal, that they could do no effective work to carry out the arrangement which had been made with the city. So, instead of being accused of delaying the work, the Minister of Public Works has taken the necessary precaution to see that these works should be executed in a proper manner and according to the plan which would give the accommodation required. The hon. member for York has thought proper to refer to some little difference of opinion beween the Minister of Public Works and myself. But on this question we have always been in accord. The Minister of Public Works has taken a broad view of this question from the beginning. I have had many interviews with him, and he has always declared that, in order to render justice to the country and the port of Montreal, he would never accept any but a comprehensive plan which would cover all the improvements necessary. I give him credit for that. I know the energy he has. He has carried his point. Now, under this law, if it passes, we know that we shall have the harbour of Montreal equipped as it should be.

Now, there may be personal differences. But this is a question of public interest, not only for Montreal, but for the country, and these little unpleasantnesses can be left aside. There is no suspicion to be cast on the line of conduct I have followed in this matter, nor on the conduct of the Minister of Public Works. Perhaps I may be allowed to draw attention to another phase of the question. It is not only the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal and the trade of the country which are interested in these improvements. You must go back to 1890, and look at the arrangement that was made between the city of Montreal and the Harbour Commissioners, with the sanction of the Government. The city has just suffered from heavy damage from floods in its trade and commerce to the extent of a million dollars, and the people decided to do something to protect the city against these inundations. They consulted engineers, they appointed a commission, they consulted all the interested parties, railway companies, and so forth, and they came to the conclusion to adopt the plan that I have mentioned, plan No. 6, the completion of which would entail upon the city an expenditure of a million dollars. The city went before the legislature and obtained power to borrow a million dollars to execute certain improvements, in conjunction with the Harbour Commissioners, to protect the city against inundation. This Bill was submitted to the people, who voted for it. Thereupon, what did the city do? Not only did the corporation borrow a million dollars, but spent nearly $500,000 in preliminary works, in providing a temporary dyke, in changing the sewerage system, in widening Commissioner Street, in building tunnels to communicate to the railways, under Berri Street and Beaudry Street, and other works,

amounting altogether to over $500,000. So that the city having made this arrangement in good faith with the Harbour Commissioners, which was sanctioned by the Governor in Council in 1890, went on that spent, as I say, over $500,000. I forgot to mention the pumping stations which were established. There was a temporary dyke which cost in round numbers over $200,000. This dyke was erected on Commissioners Street, it was considerd at the time too narrow. This dyke was supposed to last for five years, and was built of earth and timber. But it has proved to be useless, so much so that when the city was threatened with another inundation last spring, if the water had risen six inches more, the city would have been inundated, and the dyke would not have served to keep the water from overflowing the streets. The pumping engines were working splendidly, the surface water and the sewer water were all disposed of, but if the flood had risen six inches more, the lower part of the city would have been inundated. Now, the city is in this position, and we have stated it in our memorial to the Government. We say that we have spent over $400,000 in temporary works to prevent inundations. We have contributed besides to certain works of the Harbour Commissioners nearly $250,000. There is only one thing left for the city to do, and that is to claim back those moneys and do its own work with whatever plan it may have on hand. The aid granted by this resolution is given to the Harbour Commissioners and settles the whole matter. The city will be in a position, as soon as the plans are completed, to carry out its part of the work and to pay over to the Harbour Commissioners what it owes on the guard pier. I am aware that in certain quarters there is dissatisfaction because the Government have shown sufficient business ability to make this arrangement. However, this arrangement will make the Government popular in the city of Montreal. This question has been pending for over twenty-five years, and now it is going to be settled once for all, and the credit of the settlement will to a certain extent belong to the Government. Certain parties are not satisfied. Well, we cannot help that, we are perfectly satisfied. If it was necessary that this scheme should be submitted to the general public of Montreal, it would be endorsed by 90 per cent of the population. The only difficulty, as I have said, is on the part of the Corn Exchange. on the part of the underwriters, and of the Board of Trade. But the Chambre de Commerce de Montréal has passed a resolution favouring it in the most formal manner. The only difficulty with these other public bodies is this: They say, If you want the dry dock let the Government pay for it. When they say that if the city wants dry docks the Dominion Government must pay for them, then the Dominion Government has a perfect right to say: If you do not want the arrangement that has been proposed, we cannot grant the assistance that you ask us to give. We are advancing you two million dollars at 3 per cent. We are making a fair offer and we are settling a difficulty which has been pending for the last ten years. We are doing justice to the city of Montreal and effecting a great improvement on behalf of the general trade of the country. I know that the proposition to build dry docks is called a piece of jobbery, but that cannot be helped. I have here a report of the council of the Board of Trade for 1897. Time and again the attention of the Government was brought to this question. Here is a petition that was sent to the Government on the 27th of June, 1897, by the Board of Trade of Montreal, signed by John McKergow, president, and Mr. Hadrill, secretary. I will read one clause:

> That inasmuch as the commerce of this country and of the western states will follow the St. Lawrence route when proper facilities are afforded, it is desirable in the general interests of this Dominion that the port of Montreal be promptly provided with all necessary harbour and dry dock accommodation.

This petition was duly approved by the Board of Trade of Montreal. But now they say: We do not want these dry docks, they are no longer necessary, if you ask us to pay for them. Of course, if you pay for them, they are necessary. Is that logical, is that reasonable? There was another resolution passed by the marine underwriters, signed by Mr. E. L. Bond, who has published the correspondence this morning in the "Herald," and who takes the same line of argument that I have just mentioned. He admits that the dry docks are absolutely necessary, but thinks the Government should build them:

> Little or no progress has been made towards the extension of the dry dock at Quebec or the establishment of one in the vicinity of Montreal. These matters appear to have been overshadowed by the discussion on harbour improvements.

So that it is everywhere admitted that the dry docks are necessary. In the report of the previous year we find a similar opinion expressed by the underwriters:

> The necessity for increased dry dock accommodation, so as to take in the larger class of steamers now coming to this port has been frequently emphasized during the past season, and the association has approached the Department of Public Works, strongly urging that a dry dock suitable for modern vessels be built at Montreal as soon as possible, and that, to some extent, to meet the present need, the Quebec dock be enlarged.

That dock is only 400 feet long and cannot admit the large steamers running at the present time. As to the construction of a dry dock at Montreal, that is absolutely necessary. The only objection that could be

made to the scheme would be that instead of a wet basin, as was proposed in 1894, which would have involved an expenditure of probably two or three million dollars, it is intended to have a dry dock, which is more necessary at the present time. The Government should be congratulated on the stand they have taken in the matter. They are coming to the help of the trade of the country, and they are settling a question which should have been disposd of long ago. No later than last year I happened to mention the proposed establishment of a dry dock in Montreal in the House. I subsequently received a letter from Mr. E. L. Bond, as follows :—

Montreal, 8th June, 1897.

Dear Mr. Préfontaine,—In my capacity as a member of the council of the Board of Trade, and president of the Board of Marine Underwriters, I desire to acknowledge our appreciation of the stand you have taken in connection with having any additional dry dock accommodation given to the port of Montreal. A large dock is a decided necessity, and the port of Montreal certainly deserves recognition. If the underwriters can be of any service in backing you up, kindly let me know, and whatever influence we have will be brought to bear.

Faithfully yours,
E. L. BOND.

R. Préfontaine, Esq., M.P.,
Ottawa.

Mr. Bond is president of the Marine Underwriters. I have here a resolution adopted by the Chambre de Commerce, as follows :—

THE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE DISTRICT OF MONTREAL.

Special Meeting of the Council.

Wednesday, 1st June, 1898.

The Hon. Alphonse Desjardins, Chairman.

After consideration the following motion was made by Mr. J. X. Perrault, seconded by Mr. Damase Masson, and carried, without a dissentient voice :

Resolved,—That this chamber affirms again the imperative necessity of building a dry dock, as well as that of extending the deep water wharfs in the Bay of Hochelaga, so as to allow elevators to be constructed and trains to circulate upon them, in compliance with the motion proposed by His Honour the Mayor of Montreal, now under the consideration of the Harbour Commissioners.

Certified a true extract.
S. COTE,
Secretary.

This resolution endorsed in the most formal manner the scheme as now submitted. As is well known, I stated many times that there are some people who are not satisfied. We cannot help that ; so long as the majority are satisfied, the Government will have done its duty. It is proposed by the Minister of Public Works, in order to afford a further guarantee that plan 12a shall be carried out at once, to submit an amendment to the Bill, providing that two months be allowed to prepare plans and estimates for the dry dock and deep water works. It is perfectly right that all guarantees necessary should be given in order that the public may be satisfied. There is no question as to one part of the city being antagonistic to another part of the city. Those who live in the east end are as good citizens as those who live in the west or the upper part of the city, and it is no question of east and west but of the whole city. I would not be faithful to my duty if I did not, as representing both the city and the harbour of Montreal, ask fair-play for every part of the city. I do not represent the west or the east. I am in favour of plan 12a and the improvements in the centre of the city being proceeded with at once and without further delay, with the necessary guarantee that all parts of the scheme shall be carried out. As I have stated repeatedly in other places, this Bill will have the effect of relieving the burdens of the port of Montreal.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I do not desire to prolong this discussion, but one or two remarks made by the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) call for a little rejoinder at my hands. I may say, in the first place, that with regard to the question of the construction of a dry dock at Montreal, the contradictions of sinners have been many and great. So far as I have been able to ascertain, the real ground of dispute between eastenders and westenders is not so much whether a dry dock should or should not be built, but it is whether the Dominion or the city of Montreal should pay the interest on the outlay. That appears to be the principal object in dispute, an object which most of us need not very particularly concern ourselves about. But I have to say to the hon. member for York that I think he acted unjustly and without due regard to his own dignity and position in the House when he availed himself, sheltered by an anonymous article in a newspaper, whether respectable, pious or temperance, to virtually bring charges of boodling against my hon. friend, which he was not willing to father himself. I do not consider that a fair mode of carrying on political warfare.

Mr. FOSTER. It was not an anonymous article.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Was it signed by anybody ?

Mr. FOSTER. It was an editorial.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. An editorial is anonymous. It may have been written by Tom, Dick or Harry, and it does not involve the fact that it was written by the editor or signed by him, and there is some reason in the French practice of articles being signed with the names of the writers. But I want to call the attention of the House to this fact. In the article read by the hon. member for York, and incorporated in his speech and to a very considerable extent under the shelter of his

personality, though he did not attempt to make the charge direct, the charge amounted to this, that a conspiracy to defraud the public treasury was alleged against two hon. members, the hon. gentleman who has just spoken and my hon. friend beside me. I am not going to be the conscience keeper of anybody but myself, I am not going to undertake to dictate what an hon. gentleman sees fit to do on his responsibility, and I am not going to allow myself to be placed in the position of dictating to my fellow colleagues what schemes they should recommend to this House or to Council. When a scheme is recommended I shall judge it to the best of my ability. If it is not in the public interest, I shall oppose it; if it is in the public interest, I shall support it; but I shall not be influenced one hair's breadth in my judgment of any scheme presented in this House or Council by any anonymous accusation brought against any friend of mine or even against any enemy of mine. At this very moment there is before this House a report, the adoption of which will presently be moved, which contains these words: "The chairman of the committee on the Drummond Counties Railway investigation asked the two Conservative members at the close of that investigation what they had to say as to the question of the charges of corruption made over and over again in every organ of hon. gentlemen opposite against my hon. friend and other members of the party. And, Sir, what was the answer made to those charges then? On the part of the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Haggart)—and he will correct this statement if it is not correctly made—the hon. member said, "We never made any charges of corruption." The hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Powell) stated: "Candidly I never heard anything in the House about corruption." If those charges were not directly made in this House, I think they were insinuated by a great many members who spoke on the subject. They were insinuated in other places and more than insinuated. They were taken up and and the changes rung on them from one end of the country to the other. My hon. friend was held up as a corrupt man, and it was declared there was a corrupt bargain in regard to this Drummond Railway contract. What did the Government do? On the first day of the session they gave hon. gentlemen who were their accusers every opportunity to prove their charges, and for four months they had the chance, if they dared, of coming forward and substantiating a charge against my hon. friend. These cowardly slanderers who did not hesitate to circulate this calumny under the disguise of anonymous charges in the press, never dared to appear before our committee; never dared to advance a charge against my hon. friend (Mr. Tarte). That, Sir, should be a lesson to hon. gentlemen opposite, and especially to a gentleman who occupies the position of the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster), not to incorporate under the guise of a newspaper editorial charges of boodling or corruption which he is not prepared to substantiate himself. And I say to my hon. friends opposite: If any of you believe that in this proposition made by my hon. friend beside me there lurks any germ of boodling or corruption, come forward like men and demand an inquiry and you shall have an inquiry. Speaking for my colleagues, I pledge my word that if any of you dare to father that charge, if any of you dare to allege corruption, you shall have an opportunity of either substantiating it or being disgraced as calumniators. But unless hon. gentlemen are prepared to do that, they have no right, directly or indirectly by innuendo or in any shape or way, to bring forward a charge that they are not prepared to prove and substantiate.

Now, Sir, one other point, and only one. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) complained, not altogether I think unreasonably, that this important measure had been brought down at a very late period of the session. Under ordinary circumstances I would admit that there was a good deal to be said for that contention, but I want to call the attention of the House to this fact: Never—and I speak with knowledge—never, I think, in any single session of Parliament since confederation, have there been so many days devoted to the consideration of Government business, and Government business alone, as there have been during this session of four months. Never have I known such a close attention to and so many days granted to Government business. Never had the Opposition so many chances to bring forward any charges or discuss any matters; never were opportunities more wasted. Now, Sir, I do not at all say that during the last week or ten days the hon. gentleman from York (Mr. Foster) has wasted the time of the House; but I am in the judgment of the House, whether the greater part of the last ten days has not been consumed in discussion of very trivial subjects, to the injury and prevention of discussion on other and much more important matters. Had the Government been allowed, this measure would have been brought down a week ago. Had the Government not been interfered with by motions—which I must with all due respect to the gentlemen who moved them, characterize as very unimportant—the hon. gentleman from York (Mr. Foster) would have no occasion to complain of the difficulty of discussing this measure at full length. Possibly I might venture to suggest to my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) opposite, that although I acquit him for the last ten days or fortnight, during a long period of the session he himself occupied an unreasonable length of time, and I think I remember not less than four speeches of four hours duration by my hon. friend (Mr. Foster).

Mr. FOSTER. Your memory is too long.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMECE. It is inconveniently correct, I am afraid. I recollect on one occasion when my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) was delivering a somewhat fiery address on the subject of the misdoings of the present Government, I took occasion to send to the library for the orations of Demosthenes, and I found by actual calculation that the four phillipics of Demosthenes had occupied just exactly the same space as was occupied by one attack of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster).

Mr. FOSTER. Demosthenes never had such a set of sinners as you to look after.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. That may be. But there is a distinction, too, the difference being, that the orations of Demosthenes have lasted for 2,000 years as models of vituperative eloquence, and I am rather afraid my hon. friend's (Mr. Foster) won't last for two thousand minutes.

But, Sir, as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) objects to my reference to these Pagan classics, I may tell him that I compared him the next time with another book. I took the revised version of the scriptures and I carefully scanned the length of space occupied in "Hansard" by my hon. friend (Mr. Foster), and I found that the least of his speeches occupied precisely the same space as was contained in the revised version aforesaid, by the whole book of Job with the Lamentations of Jeremiah thrown in. Now, I would just say to my hon. friend: He is a good debater, but I would suggest to him that he be merciful as he is strong, and I do say that in my judgment he would be twice as effective if he were exactly half as long.

Mr. BERGERON. If the present Government stay in power for any length of time to come I can tell them they will see many Jobs and lots of lamentations in Canada. I shall not refer just now to the Drummond County deal, for that will be a matter of discussion later on; but I may point out that the composition of the committee which inquired into that transaction offered very little inducement to persons to bring charges against the Minister of Public Works or any other Minister. I know that my hon. friend (Sir Richard Cartwright) is a just man, and I would remind him that when the late Government held certain investigations in 1891 there were lawyers employed by the Government who acted for and against those who were accused, a thing which was not allowed in the Drummond County investigation. My hon. friend (Sir Richard Cartwright) has said that were it not for some frivolous discussions in the House this resolution might have been brought down a week ago. Let me tell him that he is making a mistake in that. It could not have been brought down before, and it is only brought down to-day because my hon. friend from Maisonneuve (Mr. Préfontaine), who is a very clever man, has been able to give two or three days respite to the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal, so that he may have this Bill passed through the House and then make them swallow the contents of it.

I regret very much that in a discussion of this kind we are not allowed to proceed with it entirely as a matter of business, and without ting-tinting it with political colours. Hon. gentlemen in this House who have heard the discussion and who do not thoroughly know the working of our harbour board in Montreal may be somewhat surprised, and I do not wonder. It looks something of a mystery, and I remember that years ago when I first came to Parliament it was a mystery to me. I thought it extraordinary to see the amount of money that was being spent by gentlemen who were not responsible to anybody, and when Parliament was called to help the harbour board one way or another, nothing could be answered in the House to give information to the representatives of the people as to how the money went. But, Sir, whatever they be, we have a harbour board in Montreal and the condition of affairs existing there now seems very simple to me. I do not believe there is a member in this House, from whatever province he may come, who would not approve of everything which has been said both by the Minister of Public Works and by my hon. friend (Mr. Préfontaine) in favour of our doing everything possible to put the port of Montreal in a position to render to the country—I say the country generally and not the city of Montreal alone—what is expected from it by Canadian trade. I go further, I am ready to sanction everything that has been said by the Minister of Public Works and by my hon. friend (Mr. Préfontaine) in favour of having docks in the city of Montreal, whether you put them at Maisonneuve or elsewhere; and I admit frankly at once, that Maisonneuve is the only place to put them. I say further, that we should facilitate the building of elevators and of everything else in that direction which would increase the capacity of the Montreal harbour for the accommodation of the great trade which is coming to it. But, Sir, in what position are we? We know that what the Government is doing to-day is simply granting help by a guarantee to the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal to enable them to borrow money, for which we are responsible, at the rate of 3 per cent. We do not give them money. Thre is a body called the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal, which is composed in the majority of friends of hon. gentlemen opposite, gentlemen in whom they have confidence. I think they are men in whom we should have confidence; if they are not, surely hon. gentlemen opposite are responsible. These gentlemen say to the Government: We desire to borrow money; you are

good enough to guarantee the interest on that money; we borrow that money to beautify the harbour of Montreal, or, to speak more correctly, to put the harbour of Montreal in a proper condition; but if you attach a rider to that, where is the good you are doing to us? The Harbour Commissioners say: We want $2,000,000 to put the harbour in a proper condition; you are ready to guarantee the interest on that money; but why do you want us immediately to take $750,000 for a purpose which may be very good—for we believe there should be dry docks and as many elevators as possible, to facilitate the shipping of the millions of bushels of wheat which we would like to see pass through Montreal from western Canada and from the States; but we do not want to provide all these things with the money which we have at our disposal for the improvement of the harbour proper. It seems to me that is quite natural. Why has not my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte), or my hon. friend the mayor of Montreal (Mr. Préfontaine) impressed upon the minds of the Harbour Commissioners the reasons which they have given here in Parliament. I understand that the gentleman who is most opposed to the plans of the Government to-day, Mr. Bickerdike, is one of their best friends. Now, I do not want the House to suppose that this is a fight between the east and the west. I hope the days of such fights in Montreal are over. It is not a fight between English-speaking Montrealers and French-speaking Montrealers; and I think it would be put an end to immediately if my right hon. friend who, in the last election, carried nearly seven-eighths of the seats in the district of Montreal, would come down here with a motion asking Parliament to vote a certain amount of money to build dry docks in the harbour of Montreal. Why should the Harbour Commissioners be called upon to provide them out of their own money? Because, I repeat, we do not give them a cent. If they gave $750,000 to build a dry dock in Montreal they would be giving their own money. They say to the Government: We would like to see dry docks, but why do you not build them out of public moneys as you have done at Kingston and at Quebec? It seems to me that we could arrive at an agreement in this matter if the Government of the day were really impressed with the idea of the Minister of Public Works, that these dry docks are absolutely necessary, which I believe is true. The Minister of Public Works has said many good things here this morning in favour of the harbour of Montreal; but I think he would have rendered a great deal better service to the harbour of Montreal if, instead of making these fine speeches, he had been at work, even two years ago, helping to get the harbour of Montreal put in a proper condition. There is no doubt there has been a division among the Harbour Commissioners themselves. They had a plan called plan No. 6. I am not conversant with the different plans; but I have read that the majority of the Harbour Commissioners were in favour of that plan. But the Minister of Public Works has been able to drive them to accept another plan. My hon. friend from Maisonneuve (Mr. Préfontaine) said a short time ago that plan No. 12a was generally accepted. Well, it is generally accepted; but some of the Harbour Commissioners are not in favour of it. They say that they are willing to accept plan No. 12a, which is the plan of the Minister of Public Works, rather than have nothing at all. But to say that they are perfectly satisfied with it—I would like to hear every one of them say that before I would believe it. Now, I want to say to the members of this House from the other provinces that the harbour of Montreal stands in a peculiar position. It is a national harbour; it is the harbour of the whole country; it is the harbour through which everything that goes to western Canada or that comes from western Canada passes; yet, if you look at the public records of this Dominion, you will find that not a cent of public money has been expended for that harbour, in the proper sense of the word. With a Board of Harbour Commissioners, a body that has been recognized in years gone by, and that is recognized to-day by the present Government, I say it does not look like the action of business men to fight that board, half the members of which have been appointed by the Government, or to do what my hon. friend from Maisonneuve has insinuated just now—refuse them a cent of money unless they accept the conditions imposed upon them by the Minister of Public Works and that hon. gentleman. This morning I heard the Minister of Public Works speak of the Windmill Basin as having been built without having been authorized. It struck me at the time as a pretty strong assertion, and I see by what I heard my hon. friend from Maisonneuve read that the Windmill Basin was asked for and accepted by the Harbour Commissioners and authorized in 1894.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No.

Mr. BERGERON. That is what the hon. gentleman read. I took a note of it at the time, because I could not understand the statement of the hon. Minister of Public Works. We know that the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal cannot make an expenditure of money where it has not been authorized; and when my hon. friend from Maisonneuve tried a few moments ago to raise a political discussion over that, saying that it was a most popular move on the part of the Government, it struck me that my hon. friend, if he had thought a moment, would have known that the Harbour Commissioners who passed those resolutions in

1894 in favour of a dry dock at Maisonneuve were Conservatives; while those who refused to build dry docks at Maisonneuve, the particular work which my hon. friend seems so anxious to have carried out, are Liberals. So that, if the move is a popular one, there is a diversity of opinion on the subject between the present Government and the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal, who are, most of them, nominees of hon. gentlemen opposite. My hon. friend from Maisonneuve said a moment ago that Mr. Bond had written a letter to the Montreal "Gazette" of this morning—and he wrote something similar in a roundabout way a short time ago—in favour of dry docks at Maisonneuve and everything else my hon. friend advocates. The merchants of Montreal are all in favour of those works, but they want the Government to construct them. I also favour the dry docks at Maisonneuve, the elevators, and all the harbour improvements the Minister of Public Works desires. I say it is a proper answer of Mr. Bond to say to the Government: We want these improvements to be made out of Government moneys, and not out of the moneys of the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal.

I believe that the hon. Minister of Public Works waited until this period of the session because that adjourned meeting of the Harbour Commissioners will allow the Government to put through their measure, and when it becomes law, as probably it will, they will say to the commissioners: Accept our gift of a guarantee with the rider put on it—that is, take $750,000 out of your money to build docks or you will not get any.

Mr. HAGGART. I wish to make a personal explanation in reply to the Minister of Trade and Commerce. If he had taken the evidence and read the full text of it, given before the Drummond County Railway Committee, he would perhaps have better understood my remarks. If I remember rightly, Mr. Lister, who is the chairman of the committee, asked me and Mr. Powell if we had any further evidence to produce in reference to the charge of corruption against the Minister of Public Works. I told him that I never heard any such charge having been made in this House. He replied that if it was not made in the House, it was made in the country and in the press. I answered that the only charge I noticed in the press was that implied in the remark of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies), that if these charges of corruption were investigated, it might be found that others than the Minister were interested. That was the statement I made, and Mr. Powell spoke with reference to a charge being made in the House.

Mr. LISTER. The exact words are given, which were used by myself as well as those spoken by the hon. gentleman and his colleague. They are in the report and speak for themselves.

Mr. HAGGART. But it is only a part of the conversation that is in the report.

Mr. LISTER. It is all there.

Mr. HAGGART. I beg your pardon; it is not.

Mr. PENNY. The question of the Montreal harbour is a very vexed and difficult one, and I am very glad that the Government have found some solution. The solution they have reached is one that should be accepted by all who are anxious to see the improvements carried out as speedily as possible. The hon. Minister of Public Works has now reached a conclusion which, in my opinion, he should have reached a long time ago. He has now decided what he thinks is necessary for improving the harbour of Montreal, and if he had done this about a year ago, he would have prevented a long and bitter controversy. The absolute necessity of doing something to improve the harbour is acknowledged on all sides. What we require is to have the harbour equipped with modern wharfs and appliances. We require wharfs which will permit lines of railway to run as near as possible to the ship's sides and on which elevators can be built. There is a great deal more grain passing through the port to-day than ever in the past. The Parry Sound Railway is bringing in a great deal, and other sources are bound to add to the quantity. I was told only a short time ago by a gentleman interested in the carrying trade that if we had been able to handle it and if he could have found out that the canals would be opened early enough this spring, most of the Leiter wheat, which went to Europe, would have passed through the harbour of Montreal. Montreal is the furthest inland ocean port to-day, it is the business metropolis of Canada, and on its welfare depends that of the whole country. That is why the Harbour Commissioners are asking the assistance of the Government. It is very unfortunate that a question which should never have been raised was introduced into this controversy. I refer to the jealousy between the east and the west. There is absolutely no foundation for the supposed jealousies between these two ends of the city. There is as much English capital invested in the east end of the city of Montreal as anywhere else, and lately a great deal of French Canadian capital has been invested in the western portion of the city. The proposition now before the House is, in my opinion, a very good one. The greater part of this money will be spent in the west, or older part of the harbour, and the smaller amount in the eastern part. I know it is contended that the latter expenditure is unnecessary; but if we are to increase the export trade of the country through the port of Montreal, we must provide improved wharfs, on which elevators

can be erected, and that part of the harbour is the only portion where this can be done. Objection is also made to the dry dock ; but, as has been pointed out, the underwriters and the shippers there have asked for it, and if the building of a dry dock will reduce the rates of insurance on vessels coming to Montreal, that alone will be a very great advantage, because the high insurance rates are one of the great drawbacks to the St. Lawrence route. Marine insurance is very onerous to importers and exporters. For my part, I am in favour of the proposed scheme. It will give Montreal what it requires in the way of improved wharf facilities, and I am satisfied that when finished it will please all parties. There is only one other point I would like to refer to. I have not seen the Bill, but the hon. Minister of Public Works promised me that a clause would be inserted, providing for equal facilities to all railways running into the harbour, and I hope that any elevators which may be built will be opened to all railways carrying grain.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not care to say much about this, because there is a great deal in it of which I know nothing, but there does seem to be ground for suspicion that this scheme is not altogether right. The broad fact that an excited and animated controversy has taken place between the mayor of Montreal and the Board of Commissioners—and, if we may believe what we see in the press, between different members of the Cabinet—with regard to how this expenditure is made and where it shall be made, justifies the suspicion that there is something wrong. The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright), with a good deal of warmth, sent a challenge across the floor of the House. I thought it was as empty a challenge as I had heard for a long time, and it seems to me rather humiliating, coming from the source it did. I should certainly have expected better from that hon. gentleman. It appeared that the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) this morning read extracts from a paper giving the impression that there was a suspicion of corruption connected with this transaction with either the Minister of Public Works or the present mayor of Montreal. It seems to me that when you find in any respectable and responsible paper like the Montreal "Witness," an account of what took place at a meeting, we are justified in believing there is something in it.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). Make a charge, then.

Mr. SPROULE. It is well enough to say: Make a charge. We may not be in a position to make a charge, but we find that those who ought to know most about it make very strong insinuations. This newspaper is responsible for every line it writes, and nobody knows that better than the hon. Minister of Public Works and the mayor of Montreal, the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Préfontaine). I read this article, not very carefully, I admit, but the inference I drew from it was that the present mayor of Montreal, a member of this House who advocates this loan, owns a lot of property in the very locality where it is proposed to spend this money, and the Government is asking this House to vote the money on certain conditions, one of which is that a certain amount of it shall be spent in that locality. The Harbour Commissioners do not believe that it would be wise to bind themselves to spend the money there, and the Montreal "Witness" insinuates, as I understand it, that if the money is so spent certain parties will benefit, one of them being the mayor of Montreal. The Minister of Trade and Commerce gets up and says: I dare you to make your charge, when he knows that we are not in possession of sufficient information to make a charge; but, if we can believe the reports of what took place, we have enough to justify a very strong suspicion. According to the "Witness," the mayor of Montreal proposed a resolution embodying his proposals. But Mr. Bickerdike objected to any section being named :

> The mayor replied that he was anxious not to have the phrase "east end" used, as there were some who objected to everything that was proposed for the east end, and others who objected to anything being done in the west end. As for the bogey of dear land raised by Mr. Bickerdike, he could sell the commissioners plenty of land at ten cents per foot.
>
> Mr. Bickerdike (innocently)—But not on this very section, I suppose ?
>
> The Mayor.—Yes, on this very section.
>
> Mr. Bickerdike.—I thought so.

He could not sell the land unless he owned it. So, when we see this hon. gentleman helping to pass a Bill in this House to give a loan to the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal on condition that they shall spend part of the money in the locality where he owns this property, is there not justification for the suspicion that there is a transaction behind by which he is to profit ? Does not this arouse such suspicion as to justify us in calling attention to the matter, so that the hon. gentleman may have an opportunity to make such explanations as will justify his course or satisfy the House that there is nothing in the statement in this paper. With regard to the other statement of the paper, it seems to me pretty strong :

> Mr. Tarte and Mr. Préfontaine are in such haste in rushing through their political job that they ask the Harbour Commission to commit itself to a project which has never been undertaken by the commission, for which no site has been chosen, for which there are no plans, the cost of which has not been even roughly estimated, and the commission to bind itself to proceed with the expenditure upon the unplanned, unconsidered work as fast as it proceeds with the work in the central portion of the harbour, which has been demanded, considered and planned, and even half executed, during the last

fifteen or twenty years. There is one thing that was made very plain yesterday, and that is that the Government as a whole has not required that the commission shall commit itself to this dock jobbery. We should judge from Mr. Bickerdike's statements that the Premier and the Minister of Agriculture were opposed to the job, and that Mr. Tarte alone in the Government is trying to force the job through. The commission is apparently to get the two millions for expenditure as it thinks best, and should not commit itself.

I confess that that is my own opinion—it should not commit itself. The Harbour Commissioners are charged with the responsibility of doing this work and of spending this money so as to be of the greatest benefit to the trade of the port of Montreal. Is it likely that this money will ever be returned to the Dominion treasury? From the experience of the past, I think we may reasonably say that we do not expect it will ever be paid back. It is true that the interest may be paid upon it, as the Harbour Commissioners, I understand, have always promptly and honestly paid their interest. But suppose that, as is intimated here, the shipping of the port should drop off, or that improvident expenditures should prevent them from paying the interest, what then? The Government would have to forego the collection of this money, principal and interest; that is, we should virtually have to make this a gift to the city of Montreal. I do not object to the expenditure if it is made properly and wisely and under proper precautions. But I do hold that the Harbour Commissioners, who are charged with the responsibility of looking after it and laying it out, should be the best judges where the money should be spent. I do not think we should vote this large sum and surround it with conditions such as are desired by the hon. Minister of Public Works and the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Préfontaine).

Mr. DESMARAIS. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I regret that I am not conversant enough wtih the English tongue to address the House in the language spoken by the majority in Parliament, so as to make myself perfectly understood by all my hon. colleagues. Still, as the representative of one of the most important constituencies of the city of Montreal, I deem it my duty to give expression to my views, while at the same time voicing the opinion of my constituents on the question now under consideration.

There seems to be a perfect consensus of opinion on one point, namely, that the time has come to equip the Montreal harbour with all the necessary improvements worthy of its commanding importance. There seems however, to exist a difference of opinion on one single point. But I submit that the cause of this difference of opinion is not such that it ought to prevail under the circumstances; because it is only private interests which are opposing the measure brought down by the Government.

I will not undertake here to enter into a review of the Montreal harbour question. My hon. colleagues are conversant with what has transpired within the last few years in this connection; they know the struggles that have taken place and the personal differences that now exist concerning this vexed question. They are aware of what occurred when a plan was adopted for the carrying out of such improvements as were considered useful and even necessary by all parties. The experience of the past may assist us in reaching a conclusion as to whether the Government have taken the proper steps under the circumstances. They had to solve a problem of the utmost importance. All are agreed as to the imperative necessity of carrying out the contemplated improvements of the harbour of Montreal. For years past, those works have been deferred to the great prejudice of the trade and shipping interests of that city. The Harbour Commissioners have wasted valuable time, without reaching a reasonable conclusion, such as could be expected from business men. And while they were debating and trying to reach a conclusion as to the scheme to be adopted for carrying out the contemplated improvements of our harbours, they went on spending about $4,000,000, whereas, with half that sum they could have secured much more advantageous results.

Everybody admits that plan 12a submitted by the hon. Minister of Public Works is the best, and it has met with general approbation. As just stated by the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Préfontaine), while all were agreed as to the imperative necessity of those works in the interest of the general trade of the country, they went on arguing and spending. Those who are familiar with the harbour of Montreal, fail to understand why such huge sums of money have been expended, against the very nature of things, to build a harbour between the Victoria Bridge and the Windmill. A very large expenditure would have been saved had those works been constructed in that part of the harbour which affords the greatest natural facilities, and where the current is less swift. It would have cost much less to carry out this scheme of shipping accommodation and the improvements required by those interested in the carrying trade.

While millions were being spent on that part of the harbour, they went on debating upon whether it were advisable to build a dry dock, wharfs, elevators, in order to provide the necessary accommodation for the railways which enter the city at the east end. Meanwhile, the grain and coal trade were suffering from lack of accommodation. And even now, when the imperative necessity of the speedy construction of those works is borne upon us, they still go on deliberating upon the desirability of carrying them out, without reaching such a conclu-

sion as would be calculated to promote the interests of the harbour of Montreal; and should the Government be willing to let the matter drag, those gentlemen would continue arguing and debating the question for years and years, and public interests would be sacrificed to the private interests of a few narrow-minded individuals. Mr. Speaker, it is perfectly proper that all guarantees necessary should be given, under the circumstances. What are the objections which are urged against this scheme? They say: The Harbour Commissioners ought to know best what plan is more likely to meet the needs of the harbour. They say further: We want those improvements to be made by means of money from the Dominion treasury, and not out of moneys contributed by the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal. Now, I ask, what money did the Harbour Commissioners personally expend? What capital have they invested in that corporation? What personal sacrifices have they made? No, Sir, the Harbour Commissioners are but trustees appointed by the Government to administer those moneys in the public interest: The Government are entitled to know, and we also, as members of this House are entitled to know whether those trustees, whom we have appointed to that place of confidence, are fulfilling their duties to the extent demanded by public opinion. As I said a little while ago, in framing our future course, we ought to benefit by the lessons of our past experience.

The works included in plan No. 12a will not be built in a single year. It will take two or three years to carry them out. The money will be spent in proportion as the works are built. And meanwhile the development of the business and shipping interests will only be promoted in proportion to the extent that those improvements will be carried out. Meanwhile, I say, the enormous flow of grain trade which now passes through the port of Buffalo and other American ports could be diverted towards this country, if the harbour of Montreal was equipped so as to handle it. Now, the interests of a large portion of Montreal are bound to suffer just to give satisfaction to some parties who are interested in a certain part of the city. In my opinion, it is good policy to provide that all the works necessary will be carried out at the same time. Some people feel surprised at hearing it said that the Harbour Commissioners do not know their own mind about those improvements. The resolution now before the House does not say: you shall not carry out the plan of the dry dock or the wharfs necessary, but it merely says: You shall carry out the plans approved by the Minister of Public Works. The same thing was done in the past.

I heard a little while ago, the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) say that, after all, he did not know whether this loan of two millions was merely an advance or an absolute that the Government was making to the Harbour Commissioners. For my part, I think it comes to the same; and I submit that those who supply the money have a right to tell the commissioners: You shall spend that money in such or such a way. I will go futher, Sir, and say that, had not the Government provided for the necessary guarantees being given, I believe that public opinion, in Montreal, or a large majority of the voters would have protested against what they would have considered as a want of foresight on the part of the Ministers. I represent a division of Montreal which is in the east end of the city; but in that division is found the Bonsecours Market, opposite the centre of the Montreal harbour. The east ward which is also included in my division, is in the centre of the city. I am speaking here from the standpoint of the general interests of the city of Montreal, although I more particularly voice the opinion of my own constituents, among whom are to be found not only French Canadians but Englishmen, Irishmen and Scotchmen. I think that out of a majority of 1,369 voters who registered their votes in my favour at the last election, twenty-five per cent were men who did not belong to my nationality. So, I am not speaking from a sectional or racial standpoint, but from that of the general interests of Montreal. Now, I say that when we find men appealing to sectional or racial prejudices, we have the right to resent those heated appeals and to put a stop to them, whenever we find that they are detrimental to the general interests of the country.

In view of our past experience I believe that the Government have taken the proper course in adopting the resolution which is now before the House. They were bound to do so, in order to give satisfaction to public opinion and to the business men of Montreal who endorse this scheme. The hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Préfontaine) has read to the House the resolution passed, on the 1st June, by the French Chamber of Commerce of Montreal. The gentleman who presided over that meeting was the Hon. Mr. Alphonse Desjardins, one of the colleagues of the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) in the late Cabinet. It was certainly not in order to make political capital that Mr. Desjardins acted in that way. This resolution was carried without a dissentient voice, and apart together from party politics. Those who accuse the hon. gentlemen on this side of the House of introducing politics into this question are the very men who are open to that reproach. It was the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) who introduced party politics into this debate, as shown by his speech. The hon. gentleman is in favour of the building of a dry dock, and of the contemplated harbour improvements, but he wants those improvements to be made out of Government moneys. What are the facts of the

case? The Harbour Commissioners are going to have two million dollars at their disposal, and, as a matter of fact, the Government only requires them to apply that money in a certain way. They say to the commissioners: "You are going to have $2,750,000 at your disposal for harbour improvements. You shall apply a portion of that sum to the building of the works which you consider necessary in the east end of the city." That is the only condition required. They say that the Government are trying to make political capital out of this question. Sir, I have no hesitation in saying that this is a progressive policy, one which everybody endorses. As to the insinuations which have been made, the hon. gentlemen who have thrown them across the floor of this House have done so, in order to make political capital. The hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule) has just read to the House an editorial published in the Montreal "Witness," in which charges of boodling are brought. Those of us who live in Montreal and are familiar with what transpires there are at a loss to understand on what ground those insinuations are based. Those gentlemen approve of the contemplated harbour improvements; they say that the trade and shipping interests would be greatly benefited by the building of deep-water wharfs, on which elevators could be erected; they also favour the construction of a dry dock; but they no sooner hear it said that the works are going to be carried out than they cry out that it is a piece of political jobbery, because the mayor of Montreal happens to have some property at Hochelaga. If the mayor of Montreal owns property in the centre of the city he is also interested in lands in the west and east. From the fact that a gentleman represents the city of Montreal in this House, owns property in that city and is interested it its general progress is he debarred from devoting his attention to the measures calculated to bring about the execution of those works?

That those improvements must be carried out leaves no room for doubt in the minds of the pepole; but some people no sooner hear it mentiond that those improvements are about to be carried out than they cry out that it is a political job; they use this cry of boodling as a bugbear, as a scarecrow set up to frighten birds from the fields. They thus hope to frighten timorous minds. They resort to insinuations. They say: "Such and such a fact has transpired; therefore there ought to be something wrong in that transaction; something contrary to the public interest." Such are the tactics resorted to by those people, while claiming that those improvements are an imperative necessity for the country. I fail to understand why the "Witness" voices those insinuations, and that paper I am sure would find it difficult to prove those charges of corruption. They are ready to admit that it is necessary to build docks, wharfs, elevators and to equip the Montreal harbour with up-to-date improvements, in order to bring in all the trade possible; but, as I said, they no sooner hear of those works being about to be carried out, than they raise the cry of corruption. Such language, Sir, if I may say so, is preposterous, nonsensical. If, instead of introducing the resolution now before the House and to which those gentlemen object, saying that the Government ought to build those works out of public moneys; if, I say, the Government had granted but $1,500,000 to the Harbour Commissioners for the carrying out of plan 12a, and had appropriated $500,000 for the construction of a dry dock or some other improvement in the east end of the city those same gentlemen would have got up and cried out: What! is it true that the Government are going to build a dry dock, wharfs, docks, elevators in the harbour of Montreal. Years ago, when the roads were bad, they used to say that it was Papineau's fault. This illustrates well the fact that do what they will, the Government are always to blame. I am not going to weary the attention of the House longer this evening. In my capacity of representative of one of the most important divisions of Montreal, I have deemed it my duty to voice the expression of my constituents. Liberal as well as Conservatives, who all endorsed the policy of the Government on this question. I may say that we are all delighted with the measure introduced by the Government and which is now under consideration, nay more, I undertake to say that, if the Government had not adopted the sound policy which the hon. gentlemen opposite have found fault with, it would have been my duty to vote against this measure, out of respect for the opinion of my constituents and in order to protect their interests. All the members for Montreal are satisfied with the guarantee and the conditions annexed to this measure. This shows how strongly the large majority of the population of the great metropolis feels on this subject. Surely, we may as justly pretend as the commissioners themselves that we represent here the public interests of the city of Montreal. I have no hesitation in saying that we are more responsible than they are for the general interests of Montreal and of the country at large; and it is our duty to declare that we endorse in the most formal manner the action taken by the Government in this matter.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). I listened with some surprise to the remarks of the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) who was not above repeating what he has done on many former occasions, that is, suggesting wrong but hesitating to make a charge. We are engaged in considering a scheme of national importance. Coming from the west, I can say that I know of no proposition laid before Parliament this session or last session

that, in my judgment, so intimately concerns the development of our country as the one now inviting the attention of the House. Yet we find hon. members, the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) beginning it, followed by a good pupil, the member for East Grey, who, without having the courage to make a distinct charge, would perhaps paralyze this great movement by playing the role of Iago, dropping poison where he is afraid to come out boldly and make a charge. This public work concerns not merely Montreal but every part of Canada, at all events, every portion of Canada that contributes any commerce. I think all Canada may be said to contribute commerce for the east and to draw commerce from the east. There is no portion of Canada that more needs development to-day than the harbour of Montreal. This is of national importance. Canada is rich in harbours. We have Halifax, Quebec, St. John, Sorel, Three Rivers, Montreal, but of them all there is none of such commanding importance as Montreal. We of the west are producing as never before, grains, live stock, products of all kinds, and we seek a market. There is only one way in Canada by which we can export our products, they must go down through the great lakes and into the St. Lawrence for thousands of miles, or they must find their way through American channels. We in the west seek to unite the provinces, to unite the whole Dominion, by pouring our streams of commerce down through its natural highway, the St. Lawrence. Yet hon. gentlemen are found to-day seeking to gain some little temporary partial political advantage by seeking to create a halt in this great movement by suggesting wrong-doing. Sir, hon. gentlemen have a distinct duty to perform, a duty to the country, they owe a duty to Parliament and a duty to their own colleagues. The member for East Grey cites a paper which, he says, suggests wrong-doing, but he would not father the charge. He does not know, he says, as much as the writer of that paper knows. Sir, the writer of that paper is amenable to the subpœnas of the land, the writer of that paper is amenable to the order of this House.

Mr. SPROULE. That is just what I said.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The writer of that paper may be compelled to come before this House and prove, if he can, the truth of anything that is suggested. And yet an hon. member is found in a cowardly way to read the article——

Mr. SPROULE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I ask that that statement be taken back. I never was afraid of expressing my opinion. I ask your ruling as to whether that expression is proper.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Let me discuss the point of order.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Chair; Chair.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Campbell). I understand the hon. gentleman wants to speak to the point of order.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I understand the point is taken that I have no right to use the term cowardly to a member of this House who suggests wrong on the part of the Government, but takes shelter behind an editorial and will not take the responsibility, he suggests wrong without making a charge in this House. Is that courageous or it is cowardly? Which is it?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Chair; Chair.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Campbell). I do not think that the expression is out of order.

Mr. SPROULE. I desire to appeal from the ruling of the Chair. I move that the Speaker be called in, and we will have his ruling.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Rather than delay the proceedings of this House——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPROULE. I insist on the Speaker being called in.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I understand my hon. friend from East Grey desires to appeal from the ruling of the Chair, and I understand that my hon. friend who has made use of that expression wants to withdraw it.

Mr. FOSTER. There are two points. The Chair is filled now by a gentleman who has made a ruling, we want to know whether his ruling is correct, so that Mr. Speaker may put a gentleman in the Chair who will give a correct ruling in this House.

The PRIME MINISTER. Does my hon. friend mean to say that when the ruling of the Chair has been appealed from, there can be no debate?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

The PRIME MINISTER. Well, my hon. friend is ready, and he has my full concurrence, in saying that he wishes to withdraw the expression entirely.

Mr. SPEAKER takes the Chair.

Mr. SPROULE. Mr. Speaker, I rose to a point of order a few moments ago, and desired the ruling of the Chair as to whether the expression "cowardly" used by the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) towards a member of this House, is in order. The Chair rules that it is, and I appealed from his ruling to yourself, whom I have the pleasure of now seeing in the Chair.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I presume I can also make a statement.

Mr. SPEAKER. There is a question of order before me now, and any hon. member has a right to speak on a question of order.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The point of order, I presume, if you, Mr. Speaker, had been in the Chair, would not have been raised. But as you were not in the Chair, perhaps I may be permitted to state the facts. The facts are that in your absence, the hon. member for East Grey quoted from an editorial of a paper insinuating that the Government was guilty of some corruption or improper dealing in connection with the proposed grant to the harbour trust. The member for East Grey declined to make a charge, because he was only quoting from hearsay and, therefore, was not possessed of information that would warrant him in making the charge. In speaking to the House on this question, I said that this was not the first time that similar tactics had been resorted to by hon. members opposite.

Mr. SPROULE. And by yourself also.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am speaking now of hon. gentlemen opposite. The words used, I thought, were actuated by a cowardly spirit, the hon. member quoting what he would not father, in distributing what he thought was poison without he himself being responsible. At the same time I was prepared, and I am now prepared to say, that no one more desires to conform to the rules of debate, and for that reason I say that if the remark is regarded as unparliamentary, or even if not unparliamentary, as I will not import unnecessary acerbity into the debate, I withdraw the expression.

Mr. FOSTER. That is not discussing the question of order. The hon. Minister is going on to inform you, Mr. Speaker, what he thinks in regard to an hon. member. The opinion does not amount to much, and we can well be spared it.

Mr. SPEAKER. I am very glad the question is settled, as I like all questions of this kind to be settled in the House, and the expression, which certainly transcended the rules of debate, has been withdrawn by the hon. member who used it. With regard to appeals to the Chair, the Chair is assumed as being in his place all the time, and this is not an appeal. In this case the Chair has only given fuller consideration to the point than was expressed from the Chair a few moments ago.

Mr. SPROULE. I did not understand you, Mr. Speaker, to give any ruling.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Now that peace has been restored——

Mr. FOSTER. I should like to know what penalty has to be meted out to the other Chair.

Mr. MULOCK.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. To come back to where we left off the debate, I may say that if I used an unparliamentary expression, I cannot alter my opinion, whatever it may be, and I think hon. gentlemen opposite should have the courage of their convictions, if they have them, and put them on record before the House. I am desirous, coming from the west, to see this public highway developed at the earliest possible moment; but I am not desirous of seeing the development at the expense of the honour of Parliament, of the Government and of the country, and if it takes ever so long a time, I would desire to see the fullest possible investigation as to any possible wrongdoing before Parliament is committed to this proposal. This is the time for hon. gentlemen opposite to make their charges. If they have no charges to make, let us proceed to deal with the business of the country as it should be dealt with. I say in regard to this proposition that it is one in which the west is chiefly concerned. Montreal has a direct interest in it, but not more so than the grain-growing portions of the Dominion, Manitoba, the North-west Territories and Ontario itself. It is, therefore, a work of national importance, and while hon. gentlemen may express a doubt whether the Montreal Harbour Commissioners may continue to be able to pay interest on the bonds, even if default were made, about which there is no ground for apprehension, I should like to know if there could be any better expenditure of public money than that made in promoting the great national highway, the harbour of Montreal and the St. Lawrence. We are pouring out millions to deepen the canals; we have spent $40,000,000 on the Welland Canals and the St. Lawrence. For what purpose has the money been spent, except to bring our produce down through the St. Lawrence, past the harbour of Montreal to the sea; and this is a necessary work if the money already expended is to bear fruit. So I cannot understand any member from western Canada, especially if he comes from an agricultural district, seeking to delay or obstruct a movement of this kind, which is not only advantageous to the locality but is a matter of pressing importance to all parts of the country.

Motion agreed to, and the House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.

On section 1.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I may be permitted at the outset to give an explanation. The hon. ex-Minister of Finance has thought fit in the great interest that he takes in me, as he has said frequently, to read an article from the "Witness." Pressure of business has prevented me from reading that article. But I will make this statement: If the "Witness" will

state in a clear and distinct manner that I am interested, directly or indirectly, to the extent of one cent in any part of the city where the works are to be constructed, if I have a dollar of interest in this scheme, if I am going to derive one cent of benefit, I will proceed against them to-morrow morning. There cannot be a clearer statement than that I now make. I will state this further: If the ex-Minister of Finance will state out of Parliament that I am interested directly or indirectly in this scheme, I will prosecute him also.

Mr. FOSTER. I will state here and outside that I believe the hon. Minister is interested in the scheme.

The PRIME MINISTER. We will now wait until the hon. gentleman repeats it outside.

Mr. FOSTER. I will repeat it outside. I will take my hon. friend and walk along the corridor with him and tell him I believe he is interested in this scheme.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that I am financially interested in this matter?

Mr. FOSTER. I did not say that.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Here is the kind of politician we see. He has made a statement which, if I had not challenged him, might have been interpreted as a direct accusation against me. I ask him again the question, which I have asked him on some other occasions: is he acting in a manner worthy of a political leader of men? He knows I have not one cent of interest in the scheme, that what the "Witness" insinuates is altogether untrue, and yet he comes before the House and by stating I was interested in it, has tried to create in this Chamber and outside an impression that I was financially interested in this scheme.

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, oh.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman may laugh.

Mr. FOSTER. I really did not think my hon. friend was so much in earnest as not to see the point of the statement I made. I am afraid he has altogether misunderstood me. I think he will come to understand my statement in a little while; but there might be some one who did not understand the spirit in which this was said on my part and so might misunderstand it. When the hon. gentleman rose and asked me with such an earnest air if I would state in this House he was interested in the scheme, I rose and said: Most certainly the hon. gentleman is interested in the scheme. I could not conceive the hon. gentleman coming before the House urging in such a earnest and forcible manner the adoption of this scheme without being interested in it; and I am surprised the hon. gentleman did not see the joke, but he was apparently too much in earnest to see it. It may be trifling, but sometimes we pass a joke of that kind. But if the hon. gentleman understood me to say in my last statement that I would state in the House or outside that he was corruptly interested, then, of course, I would not want that impression to be on his mind or prevail outside. Of course I do not want that impression to be on his mind. I suppose I am too serious to make a joke with my hon. friend (Mr. Tarte), but I tried to make a joke with him then. Now with reference to the other. I stated before I read that article why I read it. I said: This is a responsible public paper, and not in one edition but in two or three editions it has followed up that line of statement and argument; and I said: That paper being a supporter of the hon. gentleman, it is something which it is worth calling his attention to. I read it and called his attention to it. I made no statement nor did I insinuate that the hon. gentleman himself was financially or corruptly interested at all. I would not make such a statement unless I had grounds for it, and if I had grounds for making it I would make it very quickly.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I accept the explanation in the very same sense as that in which it is given. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster), however, must not forget that he read an article in which I seemed to have been accused of some improper motive. I state again that I have no personal interest in that scheme, either direct or indirect. The Montreal "Witness" has been conducting a very violent war on me in connection with that scheme. I am very sorry indeed to have lost the friendship of that influential paper. When I made up my mind that the plans for the improvement of the Montreal harbour would cover not only the west end, but the whole harbour, I was told that if I did not yield to the pressure that was brought upon me, that if I went outside the centre of the harbour to make improvements I would be driven from political life. Well, I like political life; I am very fond of it, I do not deny, but before I would yield to any threats like that I would rather twenty-five times over be driven out from this House. I said to those who threatened me: I will go right on doing my duty to the best of my ability, and that I have done. The "Witness" has been very unfair to me, and if it were permitted to use a strong expression, I might say it has been shamefully unfair. I never deserved the treatment that I have received from that paper. I excuse them to a large extent because when that warfare was begun against me last year Mr. Dougall was away, and the paper was in the hands of a man who should never be at the head of

a great newspaper. So much for the "Witness."

Mr. FOSTER. Go for it in "La Patrie."

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. "La Patrie" is all right, and is making first class war against my friends on the other side of the House. It has been stated in the "Witness" that there was great trouble in the Government as to that scheme. All those who know how newspaper work is done, and I know something about it, cannot fail to understand that the report which has been copied from "L'Evenement" is altogether incorrect; taking it as a whole, there is not one word of truth in it. My colleagues and myself are on the best possible terms. There was no fight between my excellent colleague the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) and myself. We have agreed to the scheme which is now before the House. He has agreed to the plan, and it is true I have agreed to some suggestions that were made to me, and the plan as it is propounded in the resolution has the full approval and sanction of every member of this Government.

Mr. FOSTER. It must have, before you could go on with it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not think it is necessary for me to say anything more.

Mr. HAGGART. There is a part of the resolution which I do not understand. The $2,000,000 is for the purpose of assisting two schemes, one known as No. 12 and the other to build a dry dock. As I understand $750,000 is for the dry dock and the balance of $1,250,000 for plan No. 12. Can the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal take $1,250,000 for part of the scheme without going on with the dry dock?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The $750,000 will be employed in building wharfs in the eastern end and in the erection of the dry dock. The balance will be employed in carrying out plan No. 12a, and for improvements which may be later on decided by the Harbour Commissioners. This $2,000,000 is supplemented by $700,000 that still remains in my hands and by the $700,000 that is at the disposal of the city of Montreal. The works in the centre of the harbour are closely connected with the flood protection works of the city of Montreal, for which the city has voted $1,000,000.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman did not understand me. I want to know whether the total grant is dependent upon the two works being built.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. HAGGART. Or whether one can be built independent of the other.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No. There is a clause which provides for that.

Mr. HAGGART. It does not appear in the resolution.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It will read concurrently in the Bill.

Resolution to be reported.

CIVIL SERVICE SUPERANNUATION.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock) moved third reading of Bill (No. 76) to provide for the abolition of the Civil Service Superannuation Act, and for the retirement of the members of the service.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). I wish to move:

That the Bill be not now read the third time, but that the order for the third reading be now discharged, and that the Bill be referred back to the Committee of the Whole House, to be amended by inserting the word "five" instead of "four" in section 5.

The effect of this amendment is to increase the rate of interest to 5 per cent as it originally stood in the Bill. Under the circumstances, the money taken under this system from the civil servants may be regarded as a species of life insurance fund. To fix the rate of interest on that at any point less than the civil servants could secure by investing that money in an ordinary life insurance company would seem to me to be unfair treatment of the Government employees. If I am not mistaken, the basis upon which almost all the life insurance calculations are made when it comes to be a question of re-insurance, is a basis of 4½ per cent at least.

I therefore feel that the country could very well afford it to give the civil service employees the benefit of the rate of 5 per cent. I know, from conversations which I have had with many members of the civil service, that they regard it as unfair that they should be required to place in the hands of the Government money on which they will receive only 4 per cent. The money to them is worth a great deal more. Many of them are so placed as to be able to realize even more than 5 per cent from their moneys when managed by themselves. During the discussion of this matter in committee, the question of the proper rate of interest to be paid on these moneys was mixed up with the question of the rate of interest paid by the Government on the deposits in the savings banks of the country. The question whether the Government have done right or wrong in reducing the rate of interest on the savings banks deposits has been settled, and cannot now be discussed; and it is unfortunate if that reference to it has had the effect of lowering the rate to be allowed on the moneys compulsorily taken from the civil service, and which may be regarded in the nature

of life insurance investments such as are supposed in well-managed companies to make a return of about 5 per cent. I think it would be only fair and reasonable that the Government should make these men as well off when they place their insurance investments in the hands of the Government as they would be if they resorted to the ordinary life insurance companies of the country. I therefore make this motion which I have placed in the hands of the Speaker.

Mr. FOSTER. Whilst I will vote for this motion, because it proposes to bring the Bill back to the original intention of the hon. Postmaster General, I am very strongly opposed to the Government taking the advantage of young men who come into the service of imposing upon them the condition that they shall, whether they wish to or not, invest a certain amount of their earnings in an unremunerative way; and the more so because this amount of money, with the accrued interest, is not meant to be held as any guarantee for the conduct of the individual or the employee. If it were to be so held, the Government might have a stronger reason for adopting this provision than they have; but in reply to an amendment or a suggestion of the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), it was decided by the Minister and accepted by the House, that this money should be absolutely the money of the employee, not to be held as a guarantee of his conduct, or to be forfeitable as a penalty. The Bill simply provides for making a compulsory investment for the young man. Now, let us see how it works. Suppose the young man is getting a salary of $800, and suppose he is thirty years of age, five per cent of his salary amounts to $40 a year. Why do you take that? In order that, if he dies, his family may have something coming for their support. Now, suppose that instead of making him pay the $40 a year, you give him the privilege of going to the Finance Department and investing a portion of that in a $2,000 policy at the rate allowed by the Finance Insurance Department, that young man could, if the rules allowed him, get a policy of $3,000 with the 5 per cent that you are making him invest in our 4 per cent investment. If one month, two months, five years, six years afterwards, that young man were to die, his family would draw $3,000 for their benefit.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Suppose he does not die.

Mr. FOSTER. If he does not die, he is earning his salary.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Not necessarily.

Mr. FOSTER. And he is having at the same time the option of making a better provision for his family in the event of his death, and is having the investment of his own funds. This young man, we will say, has for four years invested his $40 a year in this compulsory way at 4 per cent, and will then have in the funds for his wife and family $175 or $180. With what equanimity can the hon. Postmaster General look that young man's wife and children in the face, and reflect that had it not been for his law the young man could, with that 5 per cent of his $800, have made a provision of $3,000 in hard cash for his wife and family? I want to present that view, and I think it is a strong view. If you want to make a man provide for his wife and family, make it necessary for him to take out insurance in some reputable society or company in the insurance scheme of the Finance Department which has been provided by Parliament; and let him invest his money as he pleases, or in a way which would result in a hundred or a thousand times greater security than you offer for his wife and children in the event of his death. I think this is really a hardship; and as you do not hold the money as a guarantee of good conduct or as a penalty it seems to me that you ought not to mulct these young men in this way. Let them be the judges of their own investments, or if you wish to make an absolute provision against death, make it necessary that they shall take out insurance.

Mr. BRITTON. The man's health or his family history might not allow him to take life insurance.

Mr. FOSTER. Then he would have the option of investing his money in some other way, as he might think best for himself.

Amendment negatived, and Bill read the third time and passed.

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

After Recess.

LAKE CHAMPLAIN AND RIVER ST. LAWRENCE SHIP CANAL COMPANY.

The House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 99) to incorporate the Lake Champlain and River St. Lawrence Ship Canal Company.—(Mr. Préfontaine.)

(In the Committee.)

Mr. CHARLTON. This Bill is one which, I think, in the public interest, should at least be allowed to stand over until next session. Of course, the provision is made, I understand, that the consent of the Governor General in Council and a proclamation is required to carry it into effect. I have always maintained that government by Governor in Council is a kind of government to be avoided, except in exigencies; and under the circumstances surrounding this measure, I doubt whether it is in the interests of the country, or whether the cir-

cumstances of the case render it necessary or advisable to take that course with regard to this measure. I should be very far from wishing to be understood as objecting to the investment of capital, or to the prosecution of an enterprise, conceived and carried forward in the public interest, and I disclaim any attempt to play the part of an obstructionist; but I think there are grave reasons why this Bill should be at least carefully considered, and I do not see, unless I had different light on the question, how I can abate my opposition to it. The question of promoting commercial relations between the west and the seaboard and of securing to Canadian routes of transit as large a proportion of that great and growing trade as possible, is one of extreme importance. Those familiar with the trade of the great lakes must be struck with not only the enormous magnitude of that trade but with its rapid increase. A fraction of that trade only, the trade from Lake Superior passing through the Sault Ste. Marie Canal, employs more than twice the amount of tonnage that passes the Suez Canal annually. That is only a fraction of the trade, the greater portion going through the ports on Lake Michigan. This carrying trade of the illimitable west is a commercial prize of the first importance, one to the importance of which the American forwarders and merchants are fully alive. In 1824, that far-seeing statesman, DeWitt Clinton, projected the Erie Canal for the purpose of wedding the waters of the great lakes and the ocean at New York. That canal was a means of making New York the emporium of this great western trade. That trade has mainly followed that route since that time and follows it at present. Buffalo, last year, handled 160,000,000 bushels of grain that passed through that port in transit on its way to the seaboard. A large proportion of that enormous flow of trade went down the railway lines and a very large proportion also went down the Erie Canal. It is evident that a trade which makes the city of Buffalo the fifth commercial port in the world is a trade the importance of which is a matter of great consequence to us, and the carrying of which is also a matter of great consequence; and if we wish to secure that trade or any considerable portion of it to the seaport of Montreal, we shall have to adopt methods of a very costly character, and there is one work only which will secure it. If Canada constructs a ship canal or a canal admitting vessels of a draught of 20 feet of water, from Lake Huron to the dock at Montreal, this grain can be laid down in the city of Montreal for but a fraction more than the cost of laying it down at Buffalo. Montreal is an ocean port, while at Buffalo it must pay the charges of transport from Buffalo to the seaboard, which, by the canal, is three cents per bushel. This would give to Montreal advantages which would secure to it, during the season of navigation, a large portion of that western trade. I believe that this canal will be constructed, and I believe that Canada will secure from the construction and operation of that canal a very large portion of this western trade. If that canal ever is constructed, then it follows, as a matter of necessity, that there shall be an extension of it to the Hudson. And if that time ever arrives when the Ottawa ship canal is an accomplished fact, and when it is found necessary to extend that canal southward to the Hudson, if this charter now under consideration is granted, and this company becomes the possessor of this valuable franchise, we shall have an embarrassing factor in this case, which it will cost this Government a great deal of money to remove and which it will be necessary for this Government to remove.

There are two classes of franchise. There is that class sought for by capitalists and enterprising men, who propose to engage in the construction of works that are of public utility and desirable in every sense, in the interest of the country. There are others which are sought for, not in the public interest primarily, but in order to secure to those seeking them advantages not legitimate, as advantages that may be properly sought for by capitalists. This would be a valuable franchise. Whether the parties who secure the charter proceed with the work or not, in the event of the construction of the Ottawa Valley Canal, they would be in a position to dictate terms to the Government or to embarrass the Government in any course that it might, in future, desire to take for the extension of that canal southward. I think, in view of the magnitude of the interests involved, and in view of the fact that we may legitimately become competitors for that vast trade, which, as I said, was represented by 260,000,000 bushels of grain in transit through the city of Buffalo alone, and which is growing year by year, and in view of the possibilities of the future, I hold that we should consider very carefully and in all its bearings any application of the kind embodied in this Bill, the effect of which is to hand over to a private company control of that route or a portion of it. For these reasons, I am very firmly of the opinion that the granting of this charter is not in the public interest, that it would place the parties who seek this charter in an advantageous position and enable them to make out of it, ultimately, a very large sum of money, and make it at the expense of the country. I have no desire to impede business operations or to embarrass those desiring to invest money in anything which is conducive to the public interest, but I am so firmly of opinion that we ought not to

proceed at this stage of the session with such a measure that I feel it my duty to move that the committee do now rise.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. There is probably a good deal in what the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) says in regard to the national interests involved in this measure. But when the Bill was considered in committee it was thought that these interests were protected. There is no immediate prospect of the Government undertaking to build this work. Public works of this nature are often undertaken by private capitalists when the Government will not or, probably, for various reasons, cannot entertain the proposition. If the development of the country were left altogether, so far as works of this kind were concerned, to the Government and the expenditure of public money, I dare say we should have very slow development. So the principle has been adopted in the past of granting franchises and allowing companies that can raise the capital to go on with works of this description. In case it may be thought desirable that this canal should be taken charge of by the Government of the country, there is a clause which provides as follows:—

Her Majesty may at any time assume the possession and property of the canal and works, and all the rights, privileges and advantages of the company, all of which shall, after such assumption, be vested in Her Majesty, on giving to the company one month's notice.

It appears to me that that does away with the objection that has been raised that the public interest would be endangered by granting this franchise. I suppose that the Government would have the right to take the work out of the company's hands in any case, but the section I have read provides specifically that this may be done. In the committee it was proposed, and I thought it had been so decided that the Government should be at liberty to take this work off the company's hands on payment of the actual cost of construction. Then, in further answer to the position taken by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) it has been provided, in view of the present state of the country and the circumstances connected with the development of canals, in view of this being an international scheme, in view of the commission that is to be appointed, and in view of the interest taken in these matters, that this Act shall not come into force or have any effect except on proclamation issued by the Governor in Council. Thus, before anything could be done by the company, the Government would have an opportunity to consider every phase of the question as to whether it was desirable that the company should be given this privilege or not. It was considered by the great majority of the committee that this would be protection for the country. It certainly throws the responsibility upon the Government to say whether or not the Act should come into force. Though there might be something in what the hon. gentleman says in a general way as to guarding the interests of the country in regard to works of this kind; but I am inclined to think that unless this Parliament granted franchises of this kind, we should have very slow development. In looking over the public works that have already been built, we find that nearly all have been first undertaken by private companies. Even the Welland Canal, if my memory serves me right, was started by private individuals who could see further ahead and were more willing to invest moneys than the Government of the day. We see charters granted to companies now being created to build canals and other public works. If it is in the public interest that that policy should be changed and that the Government should undertake these works, the hon. gentleman's position is a strong one. But I am not sure that it is not in the public interests, at the present time, that private individuals who take a different view from that taken by the Government or who are able to raise money when the Government does not feel like spending it, should be allowed to undertake these works. Such a work as this would require a very large amount of money, and an amount, which, probably, it would be difficult for the Government to get from Parliament for such a purpose. With the provisos that are introduced in this Bill, I think it might well be passed and leave it to be considered by the Government, say on the advice of any future commission or in any way that may be deemed desirable, to decide whether or not the proclamation shall be issued bringing the Bill into force.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). When this subject was before the House a few days ago, I stated that the Government would look into the matter, would consider the powers asked for under this charter, and determine whether or not the Bill should be allowed to go into operation even with the restrictions, which are to a certain extent safeguards, that are provided in it. But I have only to call attention to the 8th section to convince the committee that under no conditions can the Bill be allowed to go into operation as it is now framed. The powers given to the company are these:

The company may lay out, construct and operate a canal from some point on the south shore of the River St. Lawrence to some point on the Chambly Canal, the Richelieu River or Lake Champlain.

These powers are of the widest possible character. They can choose any point on the whole south shore of the St. Lawrence without any restriction. They can locate their canal east of Montreal or west of Montreal. They can locate one end of their

canal on the Chambly Canal, or on the Richelieu River, in Canadian territory, or on Lake Champlain, which would be in American territory. Under these powers, there is one consideration apart from those mentioned by the hon. member for Norfolk. A canal could be built from Lake Champlain to the St. Lawrence west of Montreal, and pass entirely by the city of Montreal. Now, I am sure it is not the intention of the committee that if a canal is ever to be built to tap Lake Champlain in American territory, and thus to carry the waters of the St. Lawrence to the Hudson River system or to the ocean—it is certainly not the intention of Parliament that such a canal should pass altogether away from the city of Montreal. If a canal is to be built, it seems to me it should stipulate that the terminus on the St. Lawrence should be near the city of Montreal, so as to bring into that city the trade which the canal would obtain. I pointed out to the promoter that under these terms it would not be possible for the Government to allow the Bill to pass. Still, I do not think the committee would be justified in adopting the motion of my hon. friend from Norfolk, which would absolutely kill the Bill. I think the best thing is for the committee to rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again, so as to allow the promoters to take whatever course they may think fit to adopt, and I make such a motion.

Committee rose and reported progress.

DAWSON CITY ELECTRIC COMPANY.

The House again resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 118) to incorporate the Dawson City Electric Lighting and Tramway Company.—(Mr. Morrison.)

(In the Committee.)

On the preamble,

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Will the promoter of the Bill explain its scope, and the powers which are sought to be obtained by it?

Mr. FOSTER. Is the Bill as it appears in our book of Bills the same, or nearly the same, as it came from the committee?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). It first came before the Miscellaneous Private Bills Committee, and, as I understand, it came to us in the form in which we have it here. But we amended it largely, and inasmuch as it asked for power to construct a tramway, we sent it to the Railway Committee afterwards. I have not seen the Bill as reprinted at all.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. As the Minister says, the Bill was referred to the Railway Committee, but only to consider that clause referring to the building of a tramway. The committee amended and passed the clause giving them power to build the tramway, and to that amendment the chairman agreed. Probably it will be found satisfactory to the House.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Did not the Private Bills Committee make a lot of amendments?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes, a great many.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Then, we cannot understand it.

Mr. MORRISON. The amendments which were made were very simple, in my opinion, although they may have been somewhat lengthy. The first amendment of any importance was made to section 9, requiring the consent of the Governor in Council. There was only one amendment to section 8, and that was in the last line.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I think it is unfair to ask this committee to consider a Bill that has been amended in two committees, these amendments not being printed, and the members of the committee knowing nothing about them.

Mr. MORRISON. It was quite proper to send the Bill to the Private Bills Committee, and there the question arose with reference to a railway or tramway, and it was decided to send it to the Railway Committee. There the only important amendment was that made in section 9, requiring the consent of the Governor in Council. I think the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries is quite mistaken when he says that large and important amendments were made. In section 8 there was only a literal amendment, changing ten shares to forty shares. The amendment to section 9 reads as follows:—

> The company may, with the consent of the Governor in Council, subject to such regulations and restrictions as he may impose or direct, so that the navigation of the river shall not be injuriously affected.

This amendment was made in the Railway Committee. The Bill is emasculated very much, but that simplifies the matter. Sections "c," "e" and "f" of section 9, are all cut out. There are slight amendments to various other sections. Then, there is a new clause added which reads as follows:—

> The company shall not commence the construction of any one of such lines of tramway until the proposed route thereof shall have been approved by the Governor in Council, and provided that as to any portion of any of such lines as shall lie along or through any mountain pass or river gorge, or portion of either of them, having, in the opinion of the Governor in Council, room only for one line of rails, every other railway or tramway company whose authorized line necessarily runs through such pass or gorge, or portion of either of them as aforesaid, shall upon such conditions, terms and regulations

as the Governor in Council from time to time makes in that behalf, also have the right to operate its line of railway or tramway by the exercise of running powers or otherwise as the Governor in Council determines over such portion or portions of the line of the company hereby incorporated as shall lie along or through any such pass of gorge, or portion of them as aforesaid.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I submit that we are going on with a Bill that has not been reprinted and which contains a number of amendments.

Mr. MORRISON. I think the hon. gentleman will understand from my short explanation what the amendments are.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. gentleman who is the promoter of the Bill understands the Bill and the amendments, but I submit there is not another hon. member who can understand from the hon. gentleman's explanation the amendments and how they apply to the Bill There is no use in consuming time further

Mr. MORRISON. It is not unusual, I think, to proceed with amendments to a Bill without having the Bill reprinted. It is immaterial to me whether this Bill goes over or not; but I do not see any difference between this Bill and the other Bills that I have seen passed without being reprinted, and that very recently.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I have no objection to the Bill itself. It has, however, been the rule that when a Bill has been emasculated, it should be reprinted in order that members may understand it.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I do not think it is quite fair to say that it is the rule to have Bills reprinted when amendments are made. When this Bill was before the Miscellaneous Private Bills Committee it was carefully considered, and some amendments were made. Then it came before the Railway Committee with respect to clauses relating to tramways, and amendments were introduced. Those amendments, I think, can be understood by the committee without reprinting them. It seems rather unfortunate at this stage of the session that any difficulty should have arisen, but if there is no other objection to the Bill, I think the reprinting of the Bill with the amendments should not be pressed.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I have no objection to the Bill.

Mr. CASEY. There is no rule about reprinting. If any one objects to the Bill he may, of course, ask to have it reprinted; but unless there is some special opposition offered, I do not see why we should not trust the various committees that have dealt with it.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There was no special opposition to the Bill in the Miscellaneous Private Bills Committee; but my recollection must be very faulty if the Bill now before me has not been materially altered since it left that committee. I should like to ask the hon. member with respect to section 8, which gives the powers to the company. We struck out the subsections. This is not the Bill as it passed the Private Bills Committee. We inserted some other clauses.

Mr. MORRISON. The amendments are there.

Mr. SPROULE. When this Bill was before the committee we recommended that it be reprinted as changed and remodelled. If we pass it at the present time, we pass it in the dark.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It is fair to say that my recollection was correct. Section 8 has been altered, and nearly all the subsections struck out. The section now provides that "the company may, with the consent of the Governor in Council, first had and obtained, and subject to such regulations and restrictions as he may impose so that the navigation of the river shall not be injuriously affected, take, divert and appropriate at such points on the Yukon River," &c. The words "and its tributaries" were struck out. The powers asked for were very large powers, and those granted were very much limited, and they were surrounded with restrictions to protect the public interests. I was quite satisfied the committee never allowed the Bill to pass in its present shape.

Mr. MORRISON. I did not understand that such was the objection of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. The Minister, on his own confession, must have known the amendments had been made; so I cannot understand the philosophy of his contention.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am dealing with the Bill as it stands here. The Bill as it is here is not the Bill as it passed through the Miscellaneous Private Bills Committee.

Mr. MORRISON. I did not contend that it was. I cannot see why the hon. gentleman should object to the amendments not being read.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not object.

Mr. FOSTER. There are very many members who are not on committees, and they surely should not be cut off from the right to look carefully after legislation. An hon. member takes up his Bill book and studies a certain Bill that will come up, and then he finds that the Bill has been radically changed and altered completely. Is a member to be simply at the mercy of the hon. gentleman who is promoting the Bill, and is he supposed during the few min-

utes when that hon. member is explaining the amendments to be able to gather their effect? That is not legislation. Of course it has been done. The House has more than once taken Bills which had been materially changed and put them through on the faith of the promoters. But it is a slovenly mode of legislation. As it is we make mistakes in legislation, and we are none to careful in regard to Bills for private companies, which are too economical often as regards reprinting amendments to their Bills. My hon. friend rather testily said that he did not want the Bill to pass if the committee were not willing to pass it. The Bill, however, may yet be reprinted, and there is plenty time to pass in view of the present state of public business and the new Bills that have been brought down by the Government, and there may be Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday in which to get it through. The legislation of private committees would go more easily if amendments were printed and placed before members, but some of the companies apparently wish to do as little printing as possible. I do not want to block the hon. gentleman's Bill, which may be a good one. There was a clause in the original Bill allowing the company to take the waters of every river flowing into the Yukon, which was preposterous. I was prepared to deliver a light gun charge against it on that ground, but I find there are other things in the Bill. I object to this system which is creeping in during the last year or two more than ever before, of legislation by Governor in Council. This kind of legislation which puts everything into the hands of the Governor in Council for the methods of carrying it out, ought to be pretty carefully considered both on the grounds of the executive itself as well as upon the grounds of parliamentary control. In some cases it is absolutely necessary, but in many cases it may be very vicious. If the Bill is urgent and cannot be reprinted, I do not wish to interpose a direct objection that it shall not go through, but I do think that the Government should give it to be understood that these things must be before the members in legible and perfect shape.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. My hon. friend (Mr. Morrison) seems to be labouring under an entire misapprehension of my position. When I saw the Bill as it came from committee, I was disposed to object to it going through, because I was under the wrong impression that the amendments inserted in the Miscellaneous Private Bills Committee had not been inserted. I assure the House that the Bill received a great deal of consideration from the committee, and the only reference to the Governor in Council was in the first place that they were limited to take the water from the Yukon River, and in the second place, that they must submit to the Governor in Council a scheme showing that the quantity of water they took could not in any way interfere with the public use of the river. I thought with these limitations there was no fear of the public interests being injured by the Bill.

Mr. MORRISON. I do not wish to be placed in the position of being apparently the first to violate these rules. I do not wish to be put under any obligation to hon. gentlemen on either side of the House in regard to this matter, and certainly after what has been said if these hon. gentlemen wish to urge it, I would be very pleased to see the Bill reprinted, but I will of course take very good care to see that other Bills are treated in the same way.

Mr. FOSTER. There will be no Private Bills Committee until Wednesday, and the hon. gentleman may have a slim chance of getting the Bill through. I would advise him to pocket the little remarks we have made and go on with it.

Mr. MORRISON. I do not want to be lectured.

On section 9,

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There is one feature of this section which requires a little more consideration. Hon. members will observe that in sub-clause (a) it is defined that this company shall have power to do certain things within a radius of 15 miles from Dawson City, and subsection (d) authorizes the construction of tramways within the aforesaid district and limits. I was unable to be present at the meeting of the committee on account of the necessity of attendance in the House here, but I think this clause requires more consideration. In the absence of any definite knowledge as to Dawson and its surroundings, and in the absence of any municipal authority there, this provision might be attended with future results of an injurious character, if we were to set these companies afloat with power to lay tramways whenever and wherever they please. It may be possible that Dawson will become quite a town.

Mr. FOSTER. It might be 15 miles around.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It might; no one can tell what the possibilities are. It may be that the town site will become exceedingly valuable, and therefore, I do not think that the urgency can be so great that we would be justified in this Parliament now in giving this company power to construct tramways in the manner set out in this Bill. I have myself quite a strong objection to it, but having called the attention of the committee to the fact, I do not wish to offer any strenuous opposition, nor do I wish my hon. friend (Mr. Morrison) to suppose that I would be

adverse to having this Bill pass. I do think that portion of the Bill ought to be eliminated, and ought not to be pressed.

Mr. HAGGART. Does the Government intend to allow them to erect a dam across the Yukon River?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No power is given to them for that.

Mr. HAGGART. Yes, the amended Bill gives them power.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The dam would not be across the river.

Mr. FOSTER. This is a tremendously wide clause. You are dealing with a country of which you do not know the future possibilities; but one thing is known, that the rights of this company extend for a radius of 15 miles around Dawson City, a city which is just beginning its career. Its career may not be a great one; but it may be a very notable one, and at its very birth-time, you are taking away from what may be a future municipality, all its rights and powers with reference to these matters, and handing them over to a private company. I do not see how you are going to get water power on the Yukon River for electric light unless you dam the river, and surely the river is not to be dammed.

Mr. SPROULE. I objected to this provision when the Bill was before the committee. It seems to me that it is giving this company all the water powers within a radius of 15 miles around Dawson City.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It is confined to the Yukon.

Mr. SPROULE. Taking Dawson City as a centre, the company will control the water powers for 15 miles, as I understand the Bill. If any other company wanted to use any water powers within that radius, this company could prevent it, for you are practically giving it a monopoly of these things. We can see in the city of Ottawa and the city of Hull what a monopoly like this can do; it gets the city absolutely at its mercy. I regard this as very dangerous, and as introducing the principle of monopoly, which should never be allowed. Because these powers are given in a section of country that we know very little about, they are all the more dangerous on that account.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman's criticism might be applicable to the Bill as it was first introduced; but there are two controlling elements which dissipate his criticism almost entirely. The first is, that the power is not granted within a radius of 15 miles on all the tributaries to the Yukon, but it is confined to the Yukon. The second is that in erecting any works the company must not interfere with the navigability of the river. Consistently with not interfering with the navigability of the river, they can have the power, and with that condition I do not see any objection to giving them the power.

Mr. SPROULE. That shows the importance of having the Bill reprinted, as we do not know what changes have been made in it. If all the objectionable features are eliminated, I have no objection to its passing.

Mr. HAGGART. Who is to be the judge whether the works of the company seriously affect the navigability of the river or not? They might erect these works, and they could not be removed. The only recourse against them would be an action for damages. They should not have the right to erect a dam on a navigable stream.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The right of navigation is a paramount right, and we preserve it in the Bill. If the company erected a dam which interfered with the right of navigation, there would be no need for an action for damages, for anybody could knock it down.

Mr. HAGGART. Under the Bill the company have a statutory right to erect the dam upon a navigable stream, and it could not be removed unless it seriously affected the navigation of the river.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. They have not a statutory right absolutely, but a limited right, subject to the right of navigation. They are not to interfere with navigation.

Section agreed to.

The time for the consideration of private Bills having expired, the House proceeded to Government Orders.

THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 146) to amend and consolidate the North-west Irrigation Acts of 1894 and 1895.—(Mr. Sifton).

CUSTOMS ACT.

Bill (No. 152) further to amend the Customs Act was read the second time and the House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). The Act limits the granting of ships' stores to vessels sailing for a longer voyage than thirty days, and that limit is expunged. We are also adding a provision by which we may regulate and determine what ships' stores may be used by a vessel when in port.

Mr. FOSTER. Are you enlarging the list of what you call ships' stores ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. We are enlarging the class of vessels which may be entitled to take ships' stores.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). And also extending the different classes of goods known as ship stores.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. That would depend on the regulations. We do not vary in that respect from the old plan. Departmental regulations will have to be considered and determined just as at present. It is not intended to enlarge with reference to the kind of goods that may be used. The primary object of the first clause is to take away the time limit of vessels. It has not been closely followed, and if a law is found inconvenient it should not stand in the way.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). Your object is to do away with the time limit of thirty days. It seems to me it is rather dangerous to make the time unlimited, because in that case you furnish a ready excuse for a shipper to purchase a large supply in bond. If I recollect the experience of the department, it was that this clause was abused heretofore by shippers purchasing in bond a larger supply than they actually needed, and they were suspected of doing so for the purpose of disposing of them, and the revenue was defrauded to that extent.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. That will have to be guarded against in the regulations that are framed. The probability is we will make regulations that such quantities may be allowed for such and such a period, according to where the vessel may sail.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). Extending the privilege in this way will make it much harder to guard against abuse.

Mr. WALLACE. I think the Minister here has opened the door much too wide. The thirty-day limit might be continued, or, at least, there should be very strong safeguards. Take the vessels on our inland waters on the boundary, and serious abuses may arise. Take a ship going from Windsor to Detroit, or from Windsor to Port Huron, and then touching at a dozen Canadian ports until she reaches the Sault, where she will touch at the American side as well as at the Canadian. Under this Bill, I do not see how the Minister can prevent that vessel from doing what is practically a coasting trade. The Minister could not well make regulations that would be contrary to the Act, and coal, for instance, could hardly be excluded by regulation. This Act will take away from the Minister the power which he and the Government ought to have to control these matters. Ships' stores are very extensive. They include supplies of every kind—coal, rope and cordage and many other things. There is even tobacco. The Minister might, probably, exclude that if he pleases ; but I think that tobacco was included in ships' stores when I was Controller of Customs. There are some articles, such as coal, that he could not well exclude.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. It is provided in that Act that the Minister of Customs may define and limit the kind and quantity and class of articles arriving in Canada as stores of vessels. The points that the hon. gentleman has made must be considered by the Minister and the regulations made so as to avoid the difficulties he has pointed out.

Mr. WALLACE. But the hon. Minister could not exclude coal, for ships, in certain localities particularly, would need to have that provision.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. What point does the hon. gentleman mean ?

Mr. WALLACE. Say, for instance, the city of Montreal, where, I am informed, a large proportion of the coal is imported from Pennsylvania. The Minister could not exclude coal without making the restriction universal. But if he allows that in the inland waters, there will be a large loss of revenue.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. That is true, but the hon. gentleman will admit that we can regulate the quantity. There have been cases under my predecessors where the 30-day limit has not been adhered to.

Mr. WALLACE. The 30-day limit is too long, and to abolish that limit altogether is no improvement.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I think it is safe. I shall act in a conservative way with it. The matter has been pretty well thought over by my deputy, who thinks it well that we should amend the law in this way. As the hon. gentleman knows, things have been done for which there is no express statutory authority ; and it is better to have the power vested in the department. I quite admit that one must be very careful about the regulations that are made so that the privilege may not be abused.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). As I recollect, the advantage to the country of this privilege has always been doubtful. It was granted to our vessel owners and ship owners, in order to enable them to purchase goods in bond for ships' purposes. I think that the experience of the two departments is that this was abused even with the 30-day limit. The shipper had to make an affidavit or declaration that he had not purchased more ships' supplies than would last 30 days, and, as I recollect, we always thought that too long. It is a surprise to me to find that that limit is to be abolished.

Under this, power might be given to take on ships' stores for six months.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Wood, Brockville) has in mind the question of revenue. But it is desirable that we should secure to Canada what trade we can. There would be no object in having the law so framed that we should not only lose the revenue but lose the trade. If you do not give them facilities for purchasing in this way, they go to another country to purchase, and we lose the trade, and the revenue too.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). It is just a question of so restricting the privilege as to guard the revenue against loss. Take the article of tobacco, which the Department of Customs declared was properly an article coming within the terms of ship's stores. I am satisfied from my recollection of the experience of the Inland Revenue Department, that we felt that a loss ensued to the revenue on account of the privilege accorded to shippers regarding tobacco as an article of ship's stores, but inasmuch as under the old law and regulations only a supply to last for thirty days was allowed, the loss to the revenue was limited. But I fear there will be a greater loss where there is no time limit; in other words, the declaration that the ship's officer will now have to make will be for a ship's voyage. The department heretofore could say to his application: Very well, but this must be only for thirty days; having regard to the size of your vessel, number of the crew, and so forth, we can form a fair opinion of the quantity of ship's supplies you require for thirty days' voyage. Now, the difficulty is going to be that you will be entirely at the mercy of the shipper who makes the declaration as to the length of the voyage.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Every precaution will be taken in that way. I think it will be quite competent for us to frame such regulations as will guard against any abuse in that direction.

Mr. WALLACE. What other changes were made in that clause?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. There is a definition of spirits, limiting the kind and quantity and the class of articles arriving in Canada, and the spirits which may be used on board such vessel in Canadian waters, or which may be treated as surplus stores of vessels. That is dealt with in section 166 of the Act, but it does not define the quantity that may be used as ship's stores when the vessel is in port, and we think it is desirable that power should be taken to limit the quantity that will be allowed to be consumed and to be treated as ship's stores when the vessel is in port, and if they have any excess, duty will be paid upon it.

Mr. BRITTON. Is there similar legislation in the United States in reference to Canadian goods warehoused there and delivered to American vessels? This seems to me to be legislation in favour of the importation of American goods warehoused here and delivered out for use on vessels free of duty.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I would not speak positively, but I think they have regulations in reference to ship's stores similar to this. The hon. gentleman, perhaps, knows as much about that as I do; my impression is that they have something corresponding. But our object is to take power to define and to limit the quantity of goods that may be used, so that an excess may not be brought in.

On section 2,

Mr. HAGGART. How do you arrive at an allowance for evaporation?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. There is no provision in the customs law to cover this point. Many representations have been made with reference to it, and we propose to follow out the English practice in this respect, at least not going beyond a certain point. The evaporation or loss is reckoned upon a regulated scale for the time the spirits are in bond.

Mr. HAGGART. I cannot understand how the hon. gentleman will apply it to the customs on importations. Supposing an article is purchased seven years old in England. After that, there is no allowance for evaporation. Then it comes here and you make an allowance for evaporation.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. We only make an allowance for evaporation and absorption by the wood, so much a year while the spirits are maturing. I am not ready to state exactly what the maximum allowance is, but if I am not mistaken, I think after seven years, when the spirit has been allowed to mature for that time, the allowance is as high as 21 per cent. But we do not make that allowance without being certain that it reaches the maximum, and if we find it is below the maximum, of course we only allow the actual allowance. But there is a maximum that in no case can be passed, even though the loss be greater than that maximum.

Mr. HAGGART. I want to draw attention to this fact, that spirits imported may be bought in England which have been subjected to the maximum allowance for evaporation of seven years, and after that there is no allowance. You bring it over here and put in bond, and again commence to make an allowance up to 21 per cent.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. It is for the loss while it is in our bond.

Mr. HAGGART. That is the actual loss, but you must remember that the limit is

fixed in England. It is not only for the purpose of allowing for evaporation, but after a certain time it is to prevent frauds, and there is nothing to prevent 21 per cent being taken out, taking out another allowance after the allowance is made in England.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The observation of the hon. gentleman will be useful to me, and I am glad that he has made it. It will be upon my mind when we are making regulations in reference to this matter. I apprehend the point he makes, and I am glad he threw out the suggestion.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I understand the Minister to say that the allowance will be reckoned upon the deficiency which exists at the date of entry in the warehouse on its arrival in this country, in other words, during the period in which it is in bond here.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Yes.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). Will the hon. gentleman tell me upon what principle the allowance is reckoned ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. It is according to the time limit that we may have taken. For instance, when in casks of 20 gallons and upwards, for one month and in special cases, it is from ½ per cent to 1 per cent ; for two months, 1 to 2 per cent ; six months, 1 to 3 per cent ; one year, 3 to 4 per cent ; two years, 4 to 6 per cent ; seven years, 5 to 8 per cent.

Mr. WALLACE. I never heard such demand for the legislation proposed. If there has been any difficulty, I never heard of it among importers.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. My hon. friend may have been more fortunate than myself. I have had a good many complaints made in regard to losses. Some of these entailed very great hardship. At the present time these losses cannot be dealt with unless claims are made and proved before the Treasury Board.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). The privilege of allowing importers to keep spirit in bonds is altogether for the benefit of the importers. In some of these cases, especially when spirits are kept one, two or three years, the Government is practically acting as warehouse keeper.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. All the bondings are for the convenience of merchants. Wines and liquors pay very heavy duties, and when leakage occurs it is an important matter. Bonding liquors is not, however, a special privilege granted to liquor importers, for any other goods can be bonded.

Mr. WALLACE. In the case of other goods which have the same privilege, there is no shrinkage. Such goods may be destroyed while in bond, whereas spirits and wines will become matured. The proper course to follow in case of loss is to have it proved before the Treasury Board. I should like to know the reasons why the Minister has submitted the present Bill.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. On account of shrinkage incident to the bonding of wines and spirits, involving loss, which is not the case with regard to other goods, and also the high duties placed on liquors. We have simply followed the English practice, and in my opinion it is the proper practice, due care being exercised that no undue advantage be taken of the revenue.

Mr. WALLACE. Spirits are improved and not destroyed by age, as is the case frequently with other goods, and yet if the importer finds his goods destroyed he has to go before the Treasury Board and claim compensation, whereas in the case of liquors the department can deal with it off-hand. There is no justification for treating liquors in a more favoured way than any other class of goods. The Minister has not justified his course by saying that he is following the practice in England. It is probably an old law there, which they will shortly have to repeal, and there is no evidence that it is satisfactory. There might be circumstances in England justifying such a law, which do not exist in Canada. In England liquors are kept in bond for a much longer period. Besides we are employing lockers who visit the warehouses every day, and we are making a very small charge in the shape of a tax. An importer can place goods in bond, have a locker at his service every day and pay the duty when he takes them out. For example, a man can put in bond DeKuyper's gin, which costs only 25 or 26 cents a gallon, but the duty is ten times as much. He can go around and sell it for $2.50 or $2.75, although he has only paid about 25 cents a gallon for it. He can make the transaction a cash one, and then pay the duty and take out the spirit. We should not give the importers any special advantages, and there is no justification for the Minister's action

Mr. HAGGART. I think this is in the Inland Revenue Act instead of the Customs Act in England.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I am not particularly wedded to it, and if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace), in his experience, thinks it unwise, I have no objection to let it go out.

Mr. WALLACE. I think it unwise, or I would not object to it.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I do not share the hon. gentleman's fear, and I think there are cases occurring in which it would be convenient, without loss to the revenue of any kind. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) objects to it, we will

drop the clause, as I want to get on with the Bill.

Subsection "q" struck out.

On subsection "r,"

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). This subsection is entirely new. There were some regulations adopted by the department as to empowering collectors at the different ports to act as tea testers to some extent, and I wish to ask if this section contemplates the appointment of an inspector of tea?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Not necessarily. The present mode of testing tea is by analysis, which is a tedious process, and it is proposed to depart from that and to have recognized standards of tea which can be obtained from the department, so that wholesale houses may send these standards to their buying agents. They can then purchase tea that may be imported into the country with some assurance. This is a system that is adopted in the United States at present. We find it impossible under the present system of analysis to overtake all the samples that are comnig in. A great many inferior teas have been offered in the country, and we have to be more careful and rigid in our inspection. We think this provision will very much facilitate the work of the department in that respect.

Mr. WALLACE. I am quite in sympathy with the object of the Minister, but I think this means of carrying it out a failure. The system of analysis discovers if there are any substances injurious to health in the tea and you cannot tell that from appearance or from standard samples. We know that other vegetable leaves are incorporated with the genuine tea, and that there is artificial colouring brought in, so that the standard would be of no use in detecting these things. I am, of course, in favour of every means of keeping deleterious teas out of the country. Can the Minister inform us when this system was introduced into the United States, and whether it has been successful?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I trust the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) will not object to this clause, for I am sure if he were in the department now he would find how necessary it is. These standards are to be prepared for the convenience of the trade, and the wholesale trade are very anxious to have them. They do not want to run the risk of making large purchases of teas which may be rejected when they reach Canada.

Mr. WALLACE. Will the standard be the poorest quality they can import?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Yes, it must not be below that. If a man buys teas equal to the standard it would be a guarantee that he was moderately safe in making the purchase. But if there are any deleterious subjects introduced into the tea or any artificial colouring, we still have the other test, and we are not obliged to admit such teas. These standards will be of a certain use in giving assurance that when they bring such tea to Canada it will be allowed in. If the tea they bring in is up to the standard in some respects and below it in other respects, it could not be considered as being up to standard.

Mr. WALLACE. I understood the Minister to say that the wholesale grocers had asked for this?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Yes, they want these standards.

Mr. WALLACE. And these standards are the poorest quality of tea that you will permit to come into the country?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Yes, they will be standards of the different kinds, and anything below them will not be fit for importation or consumption.

Mr. WALLACE. Although the Minister tells us that this is the plan adopted in the United States, I would like to know whether he has any knowledge that it has been successful there in accomplishing the object intended. While their laws are very elaborate in many respects, I know that our laws are quite superior to theirs with regard to most of these matters.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I have a good deal of sympathy with the object aimed at by the Minister in this clause, but I think it is likely to be more honoured in the breach than the observance. Suppose that the department adopt certain standards which will represent the lowest quality of teas of the respective classes which can be imported into the country, and suppose that a consignment of tea is landed at the port of Montreal, and the collector thinks the tea does not come up to the standard, while the importer is of opinion that it does; the real question whether this Act will be workable or not will depend on the correctness of the test then made. I submit that the only accurate test that can be made will be to send the tea to the official analyst, and detain the consignment in the meantime, because neither the opinion of the collector nor the opinion of the importer will be sufficient to settle the point.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I think the hon. gentleman will admit that by adopting these standards we have gone a great way in lessening the difficulty in this matter. No doubt we shall find some cases in which we may have to resort to analytical tests; but I can assure the hon. gentleman that this test has been applied in the United States, and in many cases the tea has been rejected and has not been allowed to be sold in the country. The temptation is to

send such tea to Canada, and we have been forced to make a regulation that in the case of teas imported direct upon a through bill of lading the appraisers of the various ports shall use their own judgment, and need not send a sample of the tea to Ottawa unless they doubt its fitness for consumption; but that in the case of all teas coming from the United States which have not passed the test there, a sample must be sent here to undergo the analytical test. The trade have asked for this, and we thought it wise to adopt it. As soon as it is known to the trade that any tea that has not come up to the standard in the United States will be detained here and cannot be delivered until a sample is sent to the department and undergoes an analytical test, these teas will not be bought.

Mr. WALLACE. One thing that might be done would be to declare that any tea that was rejected in the United States could not prima facie be imported into Canada.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. That is what we have done.

Mr. WALLACE. Why not put it in this clause?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. That is not necessary. We gave instructions to that effect to the collectors.

Mr. WALLACE. The instructions to the collectors are not a warning to the importers. Put it in the Customs Act, so that the importers can read it.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The trade know it thoroughly now.

Mr. WALLACE. And the man who gets a copy of the Act in a foreign country and sends the goods here, would be put on his guard, too.

Subsection agreed to.

On subsection "s,"

Mr. HAGGART. Have we not power now to carry goods in bond through the United States?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The Act is not as explicit as it will be when this clause is adopted. This is to give clear and definite authority for the transportation of goods in bond under regulations when carried outside the limits of Canada, with the intention of carrying them into another part of Canada. The section 245i of this Act provides for the transportation of goods in bond through Canada; but there is no clear and specific clause dealing with the transport of goods in bond when they pass out of Canada to come back again; and this is to make that clear.

Mr. HAGGART. You have the privilege of sending goods in bond from one part of Canada to another part of Canada through the United States.

Mr. PATERSON.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. This does not affect the bonding privilege, but it makes clear that if goods go out of Canada and return to Canada, they may be admitted free of duty, as if the passage was wholly through Canada. The Deputy Minister of Justice gave his opinion that there was not as clear and express authority as was desirable.

Mr. WALLACE. This business is carried on to an enormous extent, and the practice has been, when a car goes out of Canada, to have it sealed at the boundary with the seal of the Canadian customs, and when it comes into Canada at another point, the seal of the Canadian customs is broken, and the goods are admitted free.

Subsection agreed to.

On the preamble,

Mr. WALLACE. I would like to call attention to a fact which has been stated to me, that goods shipped from Port Arthur and other points, intended for export, are counted twice in our exports. I am told that the amount thus twice counted will exceed $4,000,000, so that the excellent showing which the hon. Minister made with regard to exports is, if this statement is true, unduly magnified. I called the attention of the Minister to this at the beginning of the session, and I presume he has made some inquiries.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I mentioned it to the officers of the department, and they said it was not the case.

Mr. WALLACE. I was informed that our own wheat was shipped from Fort William as for export, and that same wheat was shipped to Montreal as for export. I would like to have a statement of the number of bushels from each port, and any further information, and not simply the statement of the officers that the report is not true.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. If the hon. gentleman had asked me for any such statement, I would have had it prepared.

Mr. WALLACE. I supposed that in a matter of such grave importance, the hon. gentleman would have had a complete investigation made.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that a different system prevails now with reference to tabulating these facts than what prevailed when he was in office?

Mr. WALLACE. This is not tabulation.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Well, in the system of tabulation, or in any other respect.

Mr. WALLACE. With regard to the export of corn, a change has taken place, because the conditions are different.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. But you were speaking of wheat. We do not grow corn in Manitoba.

Mr. WALLACE. I had better ask the Minister that question.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. There is none that I am aware of.

Mr. WALLACE. But suppose there is no difference in the method of tabulation, it is not the method of tabulation, but the information which the officers get there that would cause the mistake. The conditions are changing from year to year, and the arrangements are not the same last year as they were three or four years ago. The Minister should be able to tell us whether, when a cargo of wheat is shipped from Port Arthur on to Montreal, and then sent from Montreal across the Atlantic, that shipment is credited to our exports twice. I am led to believe that it is, and we ought to have from the Minister something more than a verbal statement from his officers here, who would probably not know anything about it.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). There is a good deal in what the ex-Controller of Customs has stated. It is not the fault of the Minister at all and might not be the fault of the department, but due to the condition of the law. I would suggest that the Minister would refer more particularly to the statute governing the outward clearing vessels. Masters of vessels clearing from the port of Montreal have to give detailed statements of their cargoes to the collector of customs, and masters of vessels with outward cargoes, clearing from Port Arthur, have to give similar statements to the collector of customs at that port. Therefore, you will find the same cargo credited twice to our exports. I think a mistake may have arisen in this way.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. If the hon. gentleman thinks so, I will inquire, but I do not.

Mr. WALLACE. Here is another case. A cargo leaves Fort Willian for Buffalo, and another cargo leaves that port for Ogdensburg. The cargo sent to Buffalo is put into a bonded warehouse, either for export to New York, or anywhere else, by whatever route the owner finds it most advantageous to ship, for Buffalo is a central point from which you can ship by the St. Lawrence, New York, Baltimore, Philadelphia or Boston route. They find that the most convenient and profitable route is by Montreal. It is taken out of bond and goes down to Montreal and gets credit at Montreal for being an export of Canada. But it received credit at Fort William as being an export of Canada. And here are perhaps a quarter of a million of business credited twice as exports of this country.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. For what port would the vessel from Fort William get her clearance ?

Mr. WALLACE. For Ogdensburg.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Not for Montreal ?

Mr. WALLACE. No. It could not get a clearance for Montreal, for it could not go to Montreal, as the canal is too small. But, being shipped to Ogdensburg, it is shipped to a foreign country, and gets credit as being an export. It is there put in a bonded elevator, and is thence transferred to small vessels to be taken to Montreal. There it gets an outward entry on the Atlantic steamer, and is credited again as being an export to Liverpool. The Minister, I am sure, has no means of disproving that.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I can only say that, if it prevails now, the comparison is not affected, because it prevailed when the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) was in office.

Mr. WALLACE. That will hardly be accepted——

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I say it is the same for purposes of comparison. I do not accept the hon. gentleman's statement as being in accordance with the facts. I will inquire into it, for, of course, this is a subject worthy of consideration.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. gentleman is making a guess at it and cannot state anything of his own knowledge.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. It is what I am told by my officers.

Mr. WALLACE. But the hon. Minister has not been informed on the matter.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. When the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) mentioned the matter before, I spoke about it to my officers, and they told me that the same system was in operation now that had been in operation before.

Mr. WALLACE. But, as there were no shipments by this route before, the argument would not apply, and the system of crediting these exports twice would affect the comparison. This system of sending via Ogdensburg is of recent origin. The same remark will apply, to a very large extent, to the exports at Buffalo

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. There were exports by Buffalo before.

Mr. WALLACE. Yes, but not one-quarter as much as to-day. The exports in that way have grown wonderfully in these years. And the hon. Minister apparently has no answer except to say that it was the same under former Governments, and that can scarcely be considered an answer.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I do not see how it is possible that exports can be entered twice.

Take, for instance, a cargo of flour, of which I have exported a good deal. Before the cargo can leave the station you have to get an outward entry showing the destination and route of the flour. But if it goes via Montreal, it goes through and no entry is made in Montreal; the entry is made when you get the outward entry from the collector of customs at, say, Toronto. If a cargo of wheat were shipped from Fort William to Buffalo, it could not leave without having an outward entry showing that it is consigned to some foreign port, and that would go with the cargo. I do not think that any Canadian wheat that goes to Buffalo is reshipped to Montreal. It would go to New York. It might be consigned direct to Montreal for export, in which case an outward entry would not be required until it went to Montreal. Then, you would have to get your papers and show the export in Montreal. I do not see how it is possible that double entries could be made.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. member for Kent (Mr. Campbell) cannot see it. Others may be able to see it. For instance, he may have a cargo of flour at Toronto Junction to send away. Of course, he has a destination for that flour. He has sold it in Newfoundland or in the maritime provinces or to be sent to England. In the latter two cases, it would be an export, and the destination would be shown on the bill of lading. But, in the case I have mentioned of wheat sent to Buffalo or Ogdensburg, the grain is sent to be placed in the elevator in bond. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Campbell) says that no Canadian wheat goes via Buffalo. I would like to ask the hon. member for Kent what becomes of every vessel of more than fourteen feet draught that takes wheat from Fort William or that takes Canadian wheat from Duluth?

Mr. CAMPBELL. I said that no Canadian wheat went to Buffalo and was then reshipped to Montreal. Of course, plenty of Canadian wheat goes via Buffalo and New York.

Mr. WALLACE. That is a point I positively contradict. I am asking, suppose a vessel of more than fourteen feet draught takes Canadian wheat from Duluth to Fort William——

Mr. McGREGOR. It goes in bond. You understand it without haggling so long over it. It must go to a bonded elevator in Buffalo if it is to be reshipped to Canada.

Mr. WALLACE. Anybody knows that, the hon. gentleman is not giving any information to the House.

Mr. McGREGOR. I do not think you are.

Mr. WALLACE. Perhaps not. I am trying to give a little information to the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Campbell) and to the Minister of Customs, but they do not seem to be very receptive. I am not going to attempt to give any to the hon. member for North Essex, because that is too large a job.

Mr. McGREGOR. You cannot do it on wheat.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. member for Kent said there was no Canadian wheat that went via Buffalo. What authority had he for making that statement? Every cargo of Canadian wheat that comes down Lake Erie, if the vessel is more than 14 feet draught, it can not go through the Welland Canal, it has to be transhipped on the cars and sent to Buffalo and put into an elevator. There are enormous quantities that come down in the fall, and instead of leaving it at Fort William for the whole winter whence they could only remove it by a long line of railway travel, they bring it to Buffalo where they have elevators and whence they can send it to American ports or to Montreal or Halifax. It goes there and is stored there. Suppose a million bushels come down in a vessel, that is not going through to England, it may be sold in Canada, it may go to Toronto Junction or anywhere else. I know that large quantities have come from Buffalo, it is put on a smaller vessel at Buffalo and comes down through the Welland Canal to Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River, and then loaded on an Atlantic steamer at Montreal. It is charged as an export when it leaves Fort William and is shipped to Buffalo, is it not? Most likely it is, because it cannot be shipped in any other way. It must be shipped as an export there. Then when taken out of bond it is identified as Canadian grain, and is brought down the St. Lawrence and unloaded there. In these cases when it was from Montreal, an export entry is made of it in Montreal, and the same bushel of wheat becomes an export at Fort William and an export at Montreal, and is charged twice in the Trade and Navigation Returns. The Minister of Customs says: Suppose it does, that does not amount to anything because that happened when you were in office. Well, that is hardly a very complete reply—that your predecessor had not looked after those things. But those matters were not of consequence at that time as they are to-day, because the export of those grains were not so large, the thing was then just beginning to go in those routes, and because attention had not been called to it. But that is now a very important matter, I called the attention of the Minister to it months ago, and I think we are entitled to a report showing how many bushels of wheat came to Port Arthur along the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway. There is only one inlet from the North-west to Fort William, for Canadian grain. It would be easy to ascertain how many bushels of that had gone out from

Fort William as exports, and how many bushels of that had gone out from the port of Montreal. It is something that could be easily traced. The Minister has the machinery in his department to trace it, he has not done it, but he said he asked his officials and they said such a thing could not be. The Minister should give it a specific attention, and be able to communicate the facts to us. There is nothing more important than to have an exact knowledge of those things, and if there are any defects and they are pointed out, they should be remedied at once. Another matter that is quite in line with this is with reference to importations of corn. I made a statement, copied from the returns which the Minister placed in my hands in the early part of the session, of the exports from and imports to Canada for the last three months of the calendar year of 1897, which showed that a very large quantity of corn was being imported into Canada and entered for home consumption, and the hon. gentleman opposite stated that was exported from the country again. Well, the Minister did not say so. If he had, there are two things to which I would call his attention. The first is that this was entered for home consumption and was so stated in his report, and it could not have been the other way, because if it were in transit that would be mentioned. Goods are entered in transit, quoted in transit, when they are actually in transit through the country and come, say, to the ports on the Georgian Bay, Owen Sound, Collingwood, Midland and Parry Sound, say American corn coming to the port of Montreal or to Boston by Canadian railways, and shipped there. These goods are in transit, they are so stated in the manifest, in the entries, and they are not entered for home consumption at all. But if it be that they were entered for home consumption, that they were actually in transit and were entered for home consumption, then what occurs? That we get a great deal of Canadian exports, say of 10,000 bushels of corn, not one bushel of which was grown on Canadian soil. If it is American corn that is just passing through, then the Minister of Customs is taking credit for the export of a Canadian produce which is not a Canadian product at all.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. That has no connection with this section.

Mr. WALLACE. I think it is germane to this section. The fact of goods passing through American territory and coming back to Canada and vice versa, is quite cognate to the clause which is now under discussion.

Bill, as amended, reported, and read the third time and passed.

CUSTOMS AND FISHERIES PROTECTION ACT.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson) moved second reading of Bill (No. 153) further to protect the customs and fisheries.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). Perhaps the hon. Minister will explain the changes between the Bill and the existing law?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. This is a new Bill giving powers with respect not only to customs but to the fishery preventive service. It adopts certain provisions lacking in our present law. It is framed on the provisions of the English and American law on the same subject. The necessity of these provisions has led to the introduction of the present Bill.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

Bill considered in committee, reported and read the third time and passed.

DOMINION ATLANTIC RAILWAY COMPANY.

The following resolution was considered in committee, and reported:

That it is expedient to ratify the award of the Honourable G. W. Burbidge in favour of the Dominion Atlantic Railway Company, and to authorize the payment to that company of the sum of one hundred thousand dollars for the commutation of its privilege with respect to the drawback of customs or import duties.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 162) to confirm a certain award in favour of the Dominion Atlantic Railway Company.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first and second times, considered in committee, reported, and read the third time and passed.

IDENTIFICATION OF CRIMINALS.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick) moved second reading of Bill (No. 156)—from the Senate—respecting the identification of criminals.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. Would the Solicitor General give us a short explanation of the Bill?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The idea is to introduce the Bertillon signaletic system which is used for the purpose of identifying criminals. This legislation is introduced, as the result of a conference held in Toronto by police officers, and it has been recommended to us by Mr. Sherwood, Commissioner of the Dominion Police, an officer in whom we have great confidence in matters of this sort. The expenditure will not exceed $100 in the beginning for each of our penitentiaries, and then Mr. Sher-

wood anticipates that for an additional expenditure of $75 a year we shall be able to carry the system out. We will not only have the photograph of each criminal but such measurements of his body as will enable any criminal past eighteen years of age to be identified; it being an established principle in medicine that a man after 18 years old does not change so far as certain features of his body are concerned. There is to be a central bureau at Ottawa where the police officers throughout the country will send the result of their examination of criminals, and there has been an arrangement entered into, especially with Chicago and New York for an exchange of these measurements.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. This is a capital system and I believe its introduction will assist in the suppression of crime. I saw the system in operation in Paris where it has been wonderfully successful, and where it has been carried out in a very perfect manner. The results obtained from it certainly justify its introduction in Canada.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and the House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. It seems to me that the words in this clause would sanction the introduction of a very objectionable system in French criminal law which takes place before the juge d'instruction where the prisoner is subject to examination and cross-examination. While that may be all right in France it would be very objectionable in connection with our British system.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. It is not the intention, and it would be very deplorable if we introduced the procedure adopted by the juge d'instruction of France. I do not think that could be considered as part of the Bertillon system. I have here a card giving the result of the application of the system with physical measurements, and so forth, and it does not give the age of the prisoner, so that apparently they do not ask him a single question. The only thing that would be asked the prisoner under this form would be his nativity and occupation.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I think those questions must be in connection with an examination made outside of the room, for I saw a prisoner who had just been arrested brought into a room, and from start to finish not a question was asked nor a word said to him, nor did he open his mouth. He was simply directed where to sit. A photograph of him was taken, his foot was measured, a certain part of the arm, his head, and so forth. After that he was taken to another place, so that perhaps I was wrong. Then the judge in the court had this card to assist him in his inquiry. I may say that in that case there were some hundreds of thousands of these cards put away in drawers, and it took Dr. Dawson only from eight to ten minutes, after the measurements of this prisoner were given to him, to find the record of the man, who had been arrested and convicted of a crime previously.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). May I ask the Solicitor General whether the system is sufficiently defined by this name?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Of course, I must speak with some degree of caution on this subject, because I do not feel that I am possessed of sufficient information to enable me to speak positively; but I know that it is invariably described as the Bertillon signaletic system, and in the report of the conference of which I have spoken it is so referred to.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Of course, I think it is extremely desirable that the system should be introduced here. The only doubt I have is as to its being properly identified by this name. There is provision in the Bill that the Governor in Council may, by Order in Council, make provisions with the same object in view; but it might be necessary to go into the question of fact as to what system it was, so that it might be advisable to have something in the Bill to define the system by means of this card.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The system is so universally known by the name given to it in the Bill that there is very little danger of misapprehending it. I may say that when the system was introduced in Ontario, it was described by the same words as are used here.

Mr. HAGGART. Does this apply only to convicts? or, if a person were simply arrested, would he have to go through all this process?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I may say to my hon. friend that I would not be a party to any attempt to subject to these measurements a person who was simply arrested, perhaps having been out in the evening. So far as we are concerned, we cannot make it apply to anybody except persons who come under the criminal law, and who are liable to be sent to the penitentiary.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

IMPORTATION AND EMPLOYMENT OF ALIENS.

Bill (No. 155) to amend chapter 11 of the statutes of 1897 intituled, "An Act to re-

strict the importation and employment of aliens," was read the second time, and the House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This Bill is designed to amend the Alien Labour Law of last session. Section 9 of that Act says:

This Act shall apply only to such foreign countries as have enacted and retained in force laws or ordinances applying to Canada of a character similar to this Act.

It becomes necessary to prove the existence of these laws in foreign countries, and the Bill now before the House simply proposes a means of doing so.

Bill reported.

SUPPLY—THE HONEY LOCUST PLANT.

The FINANCE MINISTER (Mr. Fielding) moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. McLAREN. Before going into Supply, I wish to draw the attention of the House to a couple of letters I have here—one from the Stratford Hedge Fence Company, and the other from the Brantford Hedge Fence Company—with regard to the manner in which the San José Scale Act is affecting their business. I shall first read the letter from the Stratford Hedge Fence Company:

Stratford, Ont., May 30, 1898.

A. F. MacLaren, Esq., M.P.,
Ottawa, Ont.

Dear Sir,—We have written the Minister of Customs, requesting him to have honey locust plants placed on the exemption list, as we are obliged to import them in order to carry out our contracts with farmers, the supply in Canada being exhausted. We, therefore, find the operation of the Government's action prohibiting the importation of nursery stock to be extremely embarrassing, and take the liberty of writing you to express our desire that you use your influence and that of your friends in inducing the Government to grant exemption towards honey locust plants, which are not affected by the San José scale.

It so happened this year that the Brantford Hedge Company had provided for their business by sowing, in 1896, honey locust seed, which was expected to produce plants enough for their own requirements in 1898, 1899 and 1900.

By arrangement this company divided with the other five companies the whole of these plants, so that the demand was nearly met this year, but at the expense of using plants under the standard size and at the same time using up the stock that was required for 1899 and 1900. The position that the whole six companies are in is, that they have made contracts with thousands of farmers amounting to hundreds of miles of hedge, to supply plants to replace in 1899 and 1900, to say nothing of the new planting.

The session is about closed, and it is absolutely necessary that we should have this matter provided for at once. It would be folly for the companies to send out salesmen to secure orders for fence before being assured that the plants would be forthcoming. The magnitude of the business may be judged from the fact that there are thousands of miles of hedge fence already planted, and a very large amount of capital, mostly that of farmers, invested in the business.

Trusting you will do your utmost in this matter, we are,

Yours very truly,
STRATFORD HEDGE FENCE COMPANY
(Limited).
Per WALTER MILLER, Secy.

The following letter I have received from the Brantford Hedge Fence Company:—

Stratford, May 31, 1898.

A. F. MacLaren, M.P., Ottawa, Ont.

Dear Sir,—We have found the operation of the Government's action in prohibiting the importation of nursery stock to be extremely embarrassing. We have hitherto imported from the United States nearly all the honey locust plants we require, although we have grown some plants in Canada. It so happened that the Brantford Hedge Company had provided for their business by sowing in 1896 honey locust seed, which was expected to produce plants enough for their requirements in 1898, 1899 and 1900. By arrangement this company divided with the five other companies the whole of these plants, so that the demand was nearly met this year, but at the expense of using plants under standard size and at the same time using up the stock that was required for 1899 and 1900. The position that the whole six companies are in is, that they have made contracts with thousands of farmers, amounting to hundreds of miles of hedge, to supply plants to replace in 1899 and 1900 any that are missing from the hedge row, to say nothing of the new planting, and there are no honey locust plants left in Canada. The season is about closed, and it is absolutely necessary that we should have this matter provided for at once. It would be folly for the companies to send out salesmen to secure orders for fence before being assured that the plants would be forthcoming. The magnitude of the business may be judged from the fact that there are already thousands of miles of hedge fences already planted, and a very large amount of capital, mostly that of farmers, invested in the business. Trusting that you will do your utmost in this matter, we are

Yours very truly,
THE BRANTFORD HEDGE CO. (Limited),
A. J. McPHERSON,
Sec. Treas. and Mgr.

I may also state that I telegraphed Mr. McPherson, who is at the head of the Brantford Hedge Fence Company, asking him if he had ever found any of the San José scale on the honey locust plant. He replied as follows:—

Have made inquiries of nurserymen and others, and have not heard of any San José scale being seen on honey locust. If you can't get exemption, secure Government inspection of plants before shipment.

A. J. McPHERSON.

The proposition of these gentlemen is that if the Government cannot grant exemption of the plants, they should send an inspector across the line to inspect the plant before shipment. I spoke to the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher), and to the hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson), with regard to this matter. My hon. friend, the the Minister of Agriculture, replied as follows :—

Ottawa, June 2nd, 1898.

Dear Mr. MacLaren,—I have conferred with Dr. Fletcher, the Dominion Entomologist, in regard to the request of the Stratford Hedge Fence Company, and find that it is impossible to grant what they ask. I inclose you copy of Dr. Fletcher's memorandum in regard to it.

Yours very truly,
SYDNEY FISHER,

I will now read the memorandum from Mr. Fletcher : —

Memorandum for the Hon. Minister of Agriculture in re Honey Locust for Hedges.

This question of exempting the honey locust has already been considered by the department, and the entomologist believes that the Minister's opinion that this tree should not be exempted from the provisions of the San José Scale Act is in perfect accordance with actions already taken by the department. One large company has been to considerable expense cabling to Europe for plants, and the Stratford company has made large sales this year at advanced prices to meet the present demand. There will certainly be some little delay in the filling of these orders, but the inconvenience to this industry cannot be compared to that in other lines of horticulture.

For the present I regret to say that I must urge the Minister strongly not to relax in any way the restrictions of the Act.

J. FLETCHER,
Dominion Entomologist.

I do not know that I need say anything further with regard to this business. We have thousands of miles of this hedge fence in western Ontario, and the stoppage of erecting those fences entails great loss to our labouring population. A great many men are employed in this industry, planting, trimming and wiring the fences, and I would strongly urge the Government to adopt the suggestion of having these plants inspected in the United States before shipment. By taking this precaution, I am confident that all danger of infection would be avoided. It is too bad that this business should be stopped, more particularly when so many of our farmers are members of these different hedge fence companies and deeply interested in them. What makes the hardship still greater is the fact that a great many hedges were more or less destroyed last winter and the plants are absolutely required to repair the damage.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I agree with my hon. friend from Perth (Mr. MacLaren) that this is a very unfortunate matter. A great many miles of this fence have been planted throughout the province of Ontario, and as hon. members know this matter of fencing is a very serious and expensive one to our farmers in many sections of the country. A number of the fences which they formerly used were too expensive, and consequently many farmers adopted this locust plant for fencing. What success has attended the experiment, I am not at present able to say, but I have seen many miles of it—very little of it over a few years old—which appear to be quite successful wherever treated properly. The House will see how important it is to the farmers that this industry should be encouraged. I can add very little to what my hon. friend has said, not having personal knowledge as to whether plants are likely to be attacked by the San José scale or not, but the parties interested assert very positively that the plants have never been attacked by this pest. If that be the case, it is just possible that the officers of the department are more strict than is necessary, and we know from experience that in our departments officers are liable to have hobbies and sometimes carry them to extremes. The matter to be settled, I think, is as to whether the officials in the department, who report that this plant is subject to the attack by the San José scale, are right or not. Then as my hon. friend has said, in view of the demand for this important purpose of fencing, some arrangement might be made until this question should be definitely settled to establish a system of inspection. That would satisfy the parties interested. I quite agree with him that the large number interested in this business are the farmers. A great many miles of this fence have been planted. I hope the Minister of Agriculture will take this into serious consideration and try to see that no injustice is done and encouragement is given to the planting of the honey locust fence.

Mr. CHARLTON. This question has assumed a rather peculiar form, Mr. Speaker. The San José Scale Bill which passed this House was passed at the solicitation, I understand, of nurserymen. At that time I opposed the passage of the Bill on the ground that the very course that it is now urged should be adopted could then have been adopted with safety—that is the adoption of a system of inspection of stock and the taking of precautions such as have been adopted in the state of New York and other nursery centres in the United States. It seems from papers read by the hon. member for Perth (Mr. MacLaren) that the parties now pressing for the removal of those stringent regulations are nurserymen or, at least that a nurseryman has placed a paper in my hon. friend's hands. This establishment has sold all its own stock and desires to continue the business of filling orders, and to do so, find it necessary to import stock from the United States. They put their case in the hands of the hon. gentleman who has presented it so ably to-night. I have no doubt, Mr. Speaker,

that precautions can be adopted which will render the importation of that stock quite safe. But I have no doubt that the importation of all nursery stock could be rendered quite safe. I had no doubt of it when the Bill was passed. The nursery stock of New York is certified by the state entomologist—not only stock to be exported, but stock sold for domestic consumption—to guard against the San José scale. And if in addition we had a system of inspection here, and required these nurserymen, as they offered to do, to bear the expense not only of that inspection but of fumigation and any other steps that might be necessary for safety, I hold now, as I did when the Bill was passed, the importation of this stock could be rendered safe, and that it should be permitted. My hon. friend from North Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) says that the farmers are interested in this matter with reference to the honey locust. So they are, and they are interested also in the matter of setting out peach trees, plum trees, apple trees, and so on, and the effect of the law has been, I understand, to increase the price of nursery stock to the extent of about 40 per cent. I understand that the nurserymen of the Welland district and other sections where we have nurseries, instructed their agents, less than a week after the Bill was passed, to increase the price of the stock orders for which they were soliciting, to the extent of 40 per cent more. Of course, it is perfectly proper to guard against the introduction of this pest. I believe the pest was introduced upon one occasion from a nursery in New Jersey, and obtained a foothold. Great care should be taken; but I do not believe that the stringent and drastic measure adopted by my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) was entirely necessary. If the regulations in force are to be mitigated and set aside in reference to the honey locust, there is as good reason for setting them aside in the case of all nursery stock. I believe that the honey locust is as liable to be infected from this pest as the plum, apple, or peach, and that precautionary measures taken with reference to the introduction of the honey locust can be as well applied to the introduction of other nursery stock. If it is in the interest of the farmers of Canada that the introduction of this hedge plant should be permitted, because the supply is exhausted and they desire to get it, it is as much to their interest to allow the importation of other stock. If the regulations are to be set aside, I do not think that any exception should be made in the case of the article under discussion. As to the degree of loss or the extent of calamity that would follow the exclusion of this stock for use as a hedge plant, I am very doubtful that a great amount of damage would be inflicted upon the country. I do not know the character of this hedge fence, but I am doubtful whether it is not like some other plants that have been in use for a time and have gone out of use. I remember, as a farmer, that, years ago, willows were said to make a good fence, and hundreds of miles of willows were planted. They grew 30 or 40 feet high and were useless as a fence, unless you stretched barbed wire between them. They shaded the fields and took the strength of the soil for a rod on either side. They had to be taken away in most cases, and the farmers had a great deal of trouble in extirpating them. I do not know the qualities of the honey locust, but I do not think it will answer the purpose as well as the Osage orange. But I think about as good a fence as any is a line of cedar posts with woven wire. If the Minister of Agriculture grants this petition, I would counsel him to go further and remove the disabilities that rest upon farmers with regard to other stock, which he may as safely do as to remove the disability with regard to the honey locust.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I wish to ask the attention of the Minister of Agriculture to cases of this character. In my constituency there are some men who ordered nursery stock before they had any intimation that this Bill would be passed. They ordered it under such circumstances that the property in the stock passed to them when it was put on board the railway train. When the stock arrived at the border it could not come into this country, and the result was, that it was destroyed and these people have had to pay for it. Now that is neither more or less than the expropriation of the property of those people for the benefit of the country, and I think in all fairness that those who have suffered in this way ought to be compensated for any loss resulting from the passage of this Act. If they have ordered their stock so that they are bound to pay for it, and that stock cannot come into the country in consequence of the pasing of this Act, it is clear that they are sustaining a loss for the benefit of the whole country, and are in the position of a man whose property is expropriated for the purpose of a railway or any other improvement. I would like the hon. gentleman to take cases of that kind into consideration.

Mr. ERB. As a practical farmer, and one coming from the neighbourhood of Stratford, from which this request comes, and as having some practical knowledge of this hedge plant, I desire to say that I do not altogether agree with the importance that some attach to this question, as appears in the letters that the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Maclaren) has read. I had some of this hedge plant on my own farm, and speaking for the locality in which I live, I make bold to say that its prohibition from this country will not be much regretted by the farmers. My own experience with this plant, and I may say that the experience of my neighbours has been similar to my own,

is that this plant is not suitable for hedge purposes, in our locality at any rate. I have yet to hear of a single farmer who has this hedge who has given a second order for the same kind of fence. It is a plant that makes a very uneven growth in our soil, and even where it has attained a sufficiently strong growth, we find that the plant is very liable to be barked by the mice and the rabbits. I have had a stretch of that fence barked by mice last winter, and many of my neighbours have met with the same experience. Therefore, I do not think it would be right, simply because the hedge fence companies ask for this, that the Government should make any exception in the case of hedge plants on the representations that have been made. I will admit that some farmers may be interested in having this hedge plant introduced, but they are men who have put their money into hedge fence companies. The farmers as a rule, in my locality, at any rate, are not very much concerned about the introduction of this plant or its prohibition. I would not like to see the Government make any exception in the case of this plant that they are not willing to extend to nursery stock, for I think the fruit industry is far more important than that of hedge fencing.

Mr. CAMPBELL. While this subject is under consideration, I think it is only right for me to say that a large company in the county I have the honour to represent have invested considerable money in this hedge fence, and it is a serious matter to them indeed, for the Government to prohibit the importation of their stock. I think I could not do better than read a letter which I received the other day from them :—

Chatham, Ont., June 1st, 1898.

Archibald Campbell, M.P., Ottawa, Ont.

Dear Sir,—We have found the operations of the Government's action in prohibiting the importation of nursery stock to be extremely embarrassing. We have hitherto imported from the United States nearly all the honey locust hedge fence plants we required.

We have been incorporated as a company by the Ontario Government with a paid-up capital of $25,000, and also have on hand with the farmers of Essex, Kent and Lambton, contracts to the amount of about 125 miles. These contracts have all been planted out, besides a large number of new contracts for planting in the spring of 1899, none of which can be completed unless the Government allows the importation of the honey locust hedge plant, which, if they do not, will mean the failure of the company, as well as being responsible for the non-fulfilment of our contracts, which will mean a loss of thousands of dollars, not only to our company, but to the farmers of this section of the country, and we are only one of six companies in this province who have been placed in the same lamentable position.

Then again, the honey locust, as a hedge plant, has a history of over 2,000 years, and which has never been attacked by a blight of any description, and remains free to-day. Then again, the state of Illinois, from which our plants are imported, is said to be free from San José scale. Mr. A. E. Windsor, of Havana, Illinois, the man from whom we buy our plants, grows no kind of nursery stock except the hedge plants, nor is there any nursery within fifty miles of his farm of any description. Hoping you will use your influence to have this embargo removed from our fence plants, we remain,

Yours truly,

THE CHATHAM HEDGE FENCE CO. (Limited).
B. D. WALLACE,
Secretary.

This letter fully explains itself, and it requires no further comment from me. The House can readily see, and the Minister will no doubt note the fact, that it is a very serious matter with them. Having had contracts before the prohibition of this plant was passed, they are put in an embarrassing position, and I trust that some means can be taken by the Minister to enable them to continue their business and fulfil their contracts. I have no doubt the matter will receive his best consideration.

Mr. McMILLAN. I have watched the progress of the honey locust fences in our locality since they were first introduced. I was asked at one time to go down into the county of Oxford and examine the fences there, and come back and report favourably, but unless I would promise to report favourably, I need not go, and I did not go. It is seven or eight years since these fences were first introduced into the locality where I live, and not a single farmer has ever given a second order for such a fence. Every one I have talked with considers that a fraud has been perpetrated upon them by the agents who sold them the plants. A great many of these fences have been ruined by the mice. In three or four townships where a large number of farmers tried that kind of fence, I do not know of a single one that serves the purpose, and wires have had to be strung along the fence. It is no benefit to the farmers of our locality, so far as I know. The members of the hedge fence companies are mostly people in the cities and towns, the shareholders are mostly inhabitants of the cities and towns. There is one company in Stratford who sent their agent to me time and again to try and decoy me away from my brother farmers and to give them an order, but I never did anything of the kind. I say to the Minister that if it is in the interests of this country to keep the San José scale out, he should not allow himself to be turned aside from that object by the representations of these hedge fence companies on the ground that their hedges are not infected by this scale.

Mr. CLANCY. There are a great many farmers who have planted this kind of fence, and the question is whether the companies who are engaged in the business should be shown some consideration. It must be remembered that this legislation has been passed very suddenly. It may be said that it is put upon fruit trees as

well, and that the one is not in any worse position than the other. It has not been shown that the honey locust is affected by this scale. That being the case, under close inspection it might be admitted. I am not going to press its admission on the ground so much that contracts have been entered into and should be fulfilled, because the general interests of the country might be so important that this should not be done; but as it has not been shown that the plants are attacked, it might be brought in under careful inspection. It is imported by few persons, and therefore the difficulty of dealing with a large number of small quantities would be obviated. It might be allowed perhaps to come in from parts of the country which are known to be entirely free from the scale, such as Illinois. The hon. Minister shakes his head, but my information is that it is free. The plant is yet on its trial, and we should not be too hasty in condemning it. I have seen very good fences made of it. It must also be remembered that our fencing material is rapidly disappearing, and perhaps this might prove a useful fence for the country. If it is excluded for a considerable number of years, it must be remembered that so much time is lost to the farmers, because long periods are required to produce fences. I hope if the Minister can arrange any reasonable way to admit this plant under proper precautions, it should be done.

Mr. GILMOUR. I entirely agree with the remarks that have fallen from the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Dilman) and the hon. member for Huron (Mr. McMillan), and in my opinion the Minister should not be lax in his precautions to prevent the importation of this fencing material into this country. If we should prohibit any trees coming here at all, we should stop the honey locust. It has come in, to a very great extent, during the last few years, and if a rest is given to its importation, the farmers will better understand this plant, and think less of it for fencing purposes. The fencing is not of much advantage, as it requires attention every year. In the old country hedges have been abandoned on account of the rise of wages. I hope the Minister will not relax the precautions taken regarding the importation of this fencing material, because I consider that if importation was prohibited for a few years it would be better understood by the farmers of this country.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). I wish to thank the hon. members who have spoken on this question, because I think among them they have pretty clearly given an answer to each other, and practically there is very little for me to say. I will, however, make a short statement of the facts since the San José Scale Act was passed, I have applications from almost all parts of the country and all interests, and I might say in behalf of almost every conceivable plant, to allow special exemptions from the Act and to enable certain individuals to have the privilege of bringing in that particular plant. I need not say that had I listened to these temptations the San José Scale Act would have been entirely inoperative. The fact is, that this plant belongs to the family of acacia, and is specially named as one of those families subject to the scale; and while I cannot state positively from any special knowledge, that the honey locust is liable to scale, it belongs to the family specially liable to scale, and it would be very extraordinary if it escaped on every occasion. As to the question of the value of this particular plant for hedge purposes, the question has been pretty thoroughly threshed out to-day. There is evidently a divergence of opinion, and it is not my purpose to decide it. The plant is one I do not know myself. It will not grow in this part of the country or where I live, it being far too tender for this part of Canada. It is possible to grow it in the southerly and more favoured portions of Ontario, but there is a very serious objection to it in the minds of many people. The difficulty has been pointed out by the hon. member for Norfolk, that if we allow one class of plant liable to the scale insects to come in and prevent others, we are really committing an injustice. We must, I think, be consistent in the working of this Act, and as the Act was originally passed for the express purpose of defending the country, our horticulturists, tree-growers and farmers, from the introduction of this most dangerous and insidious enemy, I conceive it is my duty and the part of wisdom to try and carry it out and so accomplish the object for which the Act was passed. It is not very easy sometimes to resist the importunities and representations made, but I am glad to know that up to the present time, at all events, those who made applications have seemed to be satisfied that the interests of the country, however their own individual interests might be affected, should be protected, and it would be a matter of extreme regret if Parliament, even if there is any doubt existing in the matter, having decided to enforce the Act, should, during the last days of the session, seek to do something that would impair the efficiency of it. A suggestion has been made as to inspection, and also as to fumigation. As I said at the beginning of the session, if there is any reasonable scheme which can be successfully elaborated by which the opportunity can be given to continue the importation of stock from abroad, I shall be glad to work out such a scheme; but the testimony of those working in the United States, where the various states have tried to protect themselves against each other, has been on the part of the most noted and eminent autho-

rities, entymological and botanical, that inspection is inefficient and fumigation is dangerous. If, however, after a year's experience, we find anything can be done to remove the evils we found existing during that year, I shall be only too glad to work it out. I think, however, it would be unfortunate if, as regards this particular plant, we should relax our efforts, and I must ask hon. members to concur in that view.

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

(In the Committee.)

To provide for the purchase of 500 copies of the "Parliamentary Companion".. $1,000

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). I propose to change the name of the book from the "Parliamentary Companion" to the "Parliamentary Guide."

Mr. FOSTER. When was the last "Parliamentary Companion" issued?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think it was immediately after the general election of 1896.

Mr. FOSTER. It took in the members elected in 1896.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, up to the general elections.

Mr. FOSTER. How much does the edition cost?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The usual practice has been that the Government purchased 500 copies at $2 a copy.

Mr. FOSTER. Why are we now issuing a Parliamentary Companion if we had one after the elections of 1896?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The work, of course, is not confined to the Dominion Parliament, and since that time we have had three provincial elections, and in all probability we shall have another before the work is out. It is desirable that the book should be complete not only as respects the Dominion Parliament but as respects the provincial legislatures. It is not unusual, I believe, to have an issue between elections as affecting the Dominion. This is a new edition to be published.

Mr. FOSTER. Who is publishing that?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is to be publised by Mr. Magurn.

Mr. FOSTER. It has been usually published by some one else, has it not?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The last volume which was purchased was issued by Mr. Gemmill.

Mr. FOSTER. Is Mr. Magurn alone in the publication of this book, or is Mr. Gemmill associated with him?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think they were to some extent associated, but I believe now they are not. I believe Mr. Magurn is proposing to issue this book himself.

Mr. FOSTER. On material he gathered himself?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. So I understand.

Mr. FOSTER. I was looking for some information I had, and my information amounts to about this; that there was an arrangement by which Mr. Magurn was to get the thing piloted through if the information was gotten up by somebody else, and that after it had proceeded a certain distance, Mr. Magurn having succeeded in piloting it through, the other collaborateur was not so successful in getting the arrangement carried out upon which the joint business was commenced.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am not in a position to state what the arrangements was between Mr. Magurn and Mr. Gemmill. All that I know is that Mr. Magurn announced his intention to issue the book and the Government now recommend to Parliament the purchase of 500 copies. What may have occurred between Mr. Gemmill and Mr. Magurn is a matter I do not know anything about.

Mr. BERGERON. Who are those books to be given to?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think it is the custom to give one to each member and senator.

Further amount required for printing notes $10,000

Mr. FOSTER. What is the reason for the increased number of notes.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The appropriation in the estimates for the past year was $35,000, but owing to the large increase in the circulation it became necessary to have a larger quantity of notes, and we find that $45,000 will be required for the coming year. For the following year, however, we are only asking $40,000. Of course if there should be some unusual extension of the currency we might in the Supplementary Estimates of next year require more.

Mr. FOSTER. How are these new notes comparing with the old in the matter of wear?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have not had the matter brought to my notice, but I believe they are equally durable.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the hon. gentleman get a report on the durability of the notes. I suppose the Minister is aware that the execution of the new notes is not nearly up to the execution of the old notes?

Mr. FOSTER. It is a matter of very common opinion throughout the country, and if my hon. friend had any careful supervision he would find that these new notes are not so durable as the old. I have seen some of them bleaching right out.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have not had my attention drawn to any difficulty about the quality of the notes. The officers of my department keep a close eye on the quality, but they are of course not experts, and I will be glad to have a more careful inquiry made. If the notes are not up to the standard I shall see that the contractors are obliged to make them so. I have heard no complaint of the quality of the notes.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. There has been great complaint about the figure "one" on the dollar bill. It is not neat enough, and in some cases has been changed into a four, and there has been a good deal of dissatisfaction in the country as numbers of people have been cheated.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The figure "one" is naturally unsatisfactory to a man who would like to have a four dollar note. The only difficulty I have heard in regard to the figures has been that an attempt was made to raise the notes by taking tobacco stamps which happened to be nearly of a similar colour and transferring them to the Dominion notes, so that in a few instances people were imposed upon. My attention having been drawn to that I am having the $1 notes so altered that the word "one" will appear so often that it will be difficult to mistake it.

Mr. HAGGART. What supervision is there over the manufacture of those notes and stamps. If I understand it aright it is let by contract to the party who prints them.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. HAGGART. In England there is a very accurate account kept of the manufacture both of notes and postage stamps. It is done under the supervision of the Inland Revenue Department, and it is so close that it almost amounts to a suspicion that someone may possibly do wrong, so that the greatest possible supervision is exercised. When I was Postmaster General it was our intention to get the stamps manufactured in England by the same person who manufactured them for the British Government, and the British Government offered to give the same supervision over them through its Inland Revenue Department as they do in regard to their own stamps. Of course, the printing and manufacturing of them will have to be done here; but there ought to be some more accurate supervision than there is at present.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is no change in that respect from the practice of my predecessor. But I quite agree with my hon. friend that we cannot be too careful of the supervision; and I shall be very happy if any method can be devised by which it can be improved.

Governor General's Secretary's Office—Further amount required for contingencies $2,850

Mr. FOSTER. This makes the total for sundries $13,900. Last year the amount was only $11,300. What is the reason for the increase?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have not the explanation at hand.

Mr. FOSTER. Let the item pass, but bring the explanation.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I shall be happy to give it on concurrence.

Queen's Privy Council for Canada—Allowance for private secretary to Hon. R. R. Dobell, to be paid notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Civil Service Act $600

Mr. FOSTER. Who is this secretary?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The secretary of Mr. Dobell, who is also an officer in the Privy Council Department is Mr. Hawkins. I may say that Mr. Dobell pays him a much larger salary than this. This is a proportion of the amount. Besides attending to the duties of private secretary to Mr. Dobell, who spends his time entirely at the capital during the session and has a good deal to do, although not a holder of a portfolio, Mr. Hawkins also renders services as a clerk in the Privy Council.

Mr. FOSTER. But while he is acting as private secretary to Mr. Dobell, he does not do any work in the Privy Council?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No.

Mr. FOSTER. But he draws his salary in the Privy Council?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is the only public money he receives. Mr. Dobell pays the remainder of his salary.

Mr. FOSTER. Has Mr. Geoffrion a private secretary?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. He has not. He is not able to spend as much time at Ottawa as we would like him to do, or as Mr. Dobell does.

Department of Inland Revenue—Further amount required for contingencies..... $150

Mr. COSTIGAN. On an understanding, which I believe has been arrived at, that members shall have the privilege of speaking generally on any item in the Supplementary Estimates, not having taken part in the discussion of any of the Estimates before, I venture to make a few observations in order to lay my views before the House on the subject of increases, especially in the Department of Inland Revenue. I will begin

by stating that I regret exceedingly that the Government have changed the manner of payments to the civil service generally in connection with the increments fixed by law up to the present time. There may have been a laxity in the manner in which the law was carried out before; but in my opinion it would have been better to have improved the practice than to wipe out the system, which was a non-political means of giving to every official a fair increase proportionate to his work, standing and efficiency. That, however, I look upon as something that has gone by; I only mention it en passant. But there remains another matter on which I feel very much more earnest; that is, the increment that is claimed by the excise men in the Inland Revenue Department. While I do not want to say anything to minimize the claims of the inside service as affected by the changed policy, I do not intend to try to make a case in favour of the excisemen, which I believe will show their claims to be away beyond and above the claims that can be put forward by any other branch of the service, and so strong that I think the Government will find it necessary to give them very serious and favourable consideration. The civil service law provided a minimum salary at which the clerks entered in each class, and fixed a maximum which they could reach by annual increments. The salaries of excisemen, without exception, are fixed at a minimum of $500 with a maximum of $1,000, without classification, it being left optional with the Minister to give an exciseman on entering the service, $1,000 if he considers it wise to do so. The House will see the difference between their position and the position of the clerks in the different departments in that respect. All the clerks in the different departments are graded as first-class, second-class, third-class, special class and chief clerks, with a minimum and a maximum salary for each class, and means provided by which, after a clerk reaches the maximum in one class, he may pass out of that to the next higher class. In the excise service the law left a wide margin, providing that the salary of an exciseman might be $500 or might be $1,000. In view of that condition of things, the Inland Revenue Department, during the time I had the honour to preside over it, thought it would be much safer and more in the interest of economy, and in the interest of the country, not to amend the law, but to supplement the law, and a set of regulations were made and adopted by Council, which gave them the effect of law, by which, not the civil service law nor Parliament, but the department itself, arranged three different classes of excisemen and fixed the maximum salary of a third-class exciseman at $750. Another restriction was placed on that service. Before a man could receive an appointment at all as a third-class exciseman, he was obliged to undergo a technical examination, which was more rigid and severe than any other examination prescribed in the public service. Only after having passed that examination could he be appointed as a third-class exciseman, and then he could only be appointed; on probation at $500.

Then he could be only appointed on probation at $500, and he could not be confirmed in his position until he had served to the satisfaction of the department for six months. At the end of that term, if his services was satisfactory, an Order in Council was required to confirm him in the position of a third-class exciseman at $600 a year. In other words, having passed the examination, he entered the service as a probationary exciseman. He entered at $500 a year, and was paid that rate until his probationary term of six months was served. Having succeeded in becoming confirmed in his position by Order in Council, he then drew a salary of $600 a year, and received $30 per year increase until he reached the maximum fixed—not by law but by the department—at $750. When he reached that maximum he might continue in the service another 20 years without an increase, unless he passed the next higher and more difficult examination, which entitled him to the grade of a second-class exciseman. Therefore, he had to serve six months before he could start at $600 per year. Then he had to serve five years as a third-class exciseman, before he could reach the maximum of that class, namely, $750, and the only means by which he could be promoted to the next higher grade was by passing a higher and more difficult examination. When he passed that rigid examination and became a second-class exciseman, his salary was $750, and he was entitled to receive $30 per year increase until he reached the maximum of that class, which was $850. Having reached $850, he might remain in the service twenty years longer without a single dollar being added to his salary, unless he passed the still more rigid examination, entitling him to rank as first-class exciseman. Then his salary went on increasing until it reached the maximum of $1,000, which would imply a service of about twelve years.

Parliament has not changed its mind because the item in the Estimates is worded the same as it always has been:—

> Salaries of officers and inspectors of excise, and to provide for increase depending upon the result of excise examinations.

It does not say that the increase is optional or by choice, but that depends on the result of the excise examination. Parliament having voted that item, I believe its intention was to keep faith with these men, and pay those who have passed the examinations and complied with the conditions imposed on them, the increases to which they are entitled. I say it would be an act of cruelty to these men if, after having imposed such

regulations as made it impossible for them to get a dollar of salary or a dollar of increase except by that slow process I have described, we were not to give them any benefit when they had performed all the conditions required by these rigid regulations. I would regret, so far as my share of the responsility goes, the initiation of a set of regulations tending so much to keep down public expenditure in that particular service, if such glaring injustice to these men was to be the result. Had these regulations not been passed, and the law been left as it was, will any one dispute this fact that, in a great many cases at least, men's ability, their efficiency, their influence, which we all know must count for something, would have secured their appointment at the maximum of $1,000 on entering the service, and for the last twelve years the country would have been paying these men $1,000 right along. But by these regulations, which were not obligatory under the law, which the Civil Service Act did not require, but which were made in the public interest and the interest of economy, the department placed these men in an exceptional position. I do not want to prolong the discussion. I think I have made myself clear as to the facts of the law and the object for which these regulations were introduced, and I have nothing to add, without reflecting or drawing unpleasant comparisons or underrating the work of any other branch of the service of the country, I have no hesitation in saying that the excise service in Canada will compare favourably with any class of public service in this or any other country I know of. Trained from the bottom to the top, submitted to most rigid examinations, acting under discipline from the start all the way through, they are the most trained officials in the public service to-day. And necessarily so, because the department presides not only over one but a group of technical subjects, that require technical knowledge to be efficiently managed. Therefore, I hope that, so far as the increment in this department is concerned, there will be no question at all about the excisemen. I do not put their claim on the ground of giving these men what they deserve as a matter of favour. They were made to come in at the lowest rung of the ladder, when the law did not require that, and we have exacted from them five, eight and ten years service to reach a point, which they might have reached much sooner within the law, but which was kept back from them for years by the regulations which the department passed. When they have performed their part of the contract faithfully, I hope there will be no disposition to deprive them of the little advance that comes so slowly in the course of years of faithful service.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). Following up what my hon. friend has just said, I would point out to the Minister of Inland Revenue that the case made out by my hon. friend does not, in any sense, come within the meaning of the statutory increase of the Civil Service Act. That is one thing, but the case put by my hon. friend is quite another thing. As he stated truly, the officials in the Department of Inland Revenue enter at a very much lower salary generally than the officials of any other department in the entire service. As he has stated also, they go through an educational process from the time they enter until they reach the maximum of their respective classes. These rules were founded upon common sense and reason, because this being an educational department, the officials, in so far as their knowledge goes, have very much the status of a profession. A set of regulations was deemed necessary in order that only those should receive an increase in salary who would study and become worthy of it and fit to discharge the somewhat, if not altogether, technical duties, appertaining to the work of that department.

Now, there is a broad distinction in the treatment that should be meted out to the officials of the Inland Revenue Department, and to the officials of any other department, in so far as concerns paying the statuory increases. It is more a breach of contract in the case of these officials than in the case of the officials of any other department. I hope that this matter, having been brought to the attention of the Minister, he will see the justice of the contention that they should be paid the sum that was specially voted by Parliament for this purpose. It is wholly unlike the case made out here respecting the officials in other branches of the service. Whatever force there may have been in the argument so very strongly advanced by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) and other gentlemen on that side of the House as to it being a matter wholly optional with the Government whether the ordinary statutory increase should be paid or not, there is no doubt that Parliament having specially voted this money for increments to the civil servants connected with the Department of Inland Revenue, there is no justice in withholding it.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. I have on several occasions called the attention of the Government to an outstanding claim against the Department of Inland Revenue in connection with the McCarthy Act, which, some years ago, was put in force in Manitoba. Officials were appointed by this Government to put that law in operation, whose wages were never paid. I had expected that the Government would have in the Estimates an amount sufficient to cover the whole outstanding claim. I think it is almost a shame that the Government should have a man claiming back wages for such a long time. He was appointed by the Government, as I have said, and should have been paid for the services that he was

called upon to perform as inspector for the district I have the honour to represent. The name of the claimant in this case was Mr. Allaire, of St. Boniface.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. An order was passed as far back as 1885, which appears to have settled that matter. But I took the trouble to inquire of Mr. McGee, the Clerk of the Privy Council, in order to see that Order in Council; and they have not been able to find it. So the matter remains as it has been since 1885. I have done everything I could, because there is really some fairness in the claim. My hon. friend (Mr. LaRiviere) knows that I have taken a great deal of trouble about it, and I am ready to continue, if there is anything that can be done.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. I know I have given the Minister a great deal of trouble, and he has very courteously looked into the matter at my request. We had a return brought down three or four years ago at my request, in which return the name of my friend of St. Boniface appears as having a claim against the Government. The information was secured from the department over which the hon. gentleman presides. There must be some records there, as the return was brought down with Mr. Allaire's name.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I would ask the Minister if he is not going to say something about the claim advanced with regard to the payment of yearly increments.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I cannot say more than what appears in the Estimates, which have been adopted, and which show clearly the way in which I considered the matter. The amount has been voted, and the reason for it is admitted in the Estimates, and I sincerely hope that there will be no reason for the officers, who are certainly entitled to it, having any reason for complaint.

Department of Justice—
Salary of Hector Verret at $200 per annum for 44 days from 3rd February, 1898, to 18th March, 1898, both inclusive, $24.11; to increase salary of Messenger G. R. Cleland to $360 per annum from 1st January, 1898, $30; further amount required for contingencies, $2,500; total.... $2,554 11

Mr. FOSTER. What is the explanation of this large deficiency of contingencies?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). In 1896-97 there was an overdraft of $2,300 on account of contingencies, and this appropriation is for the purpose of covering that overdraft and restoring the balance.

Mr. FOSTER. But how did my hon. friend (Mr. Fitzpatrick) come to make that overdraft?

Mr. LaRIVIERE.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I made an inquiry about it, and my investigation resulted in this—that it has been the custom in the Department of Justice, for several years past, to overdraw this account.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the hon. gentleman made a sufficient estimate for next year?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes.

Department of Public Works—
To pay C. O. Beauchemin & fils, for 12 volumes, entitled "Rapports Judiciares Revisés du Judge Mathieu," (ordered by the Hon. J. A. Ouimet, Minister of Public Works, 24th December, 1894, $72; further amount for printing and stationery, $700; total..... $722

Mr. FOSTER. What particular use does my hon. friend (Mr. Tarte) make of these books?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have found the account for the books and had to pay it.

Mr. BERGERON. Where are the books?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not know.

Mr. BERGERON. How about stationery and printing?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The appropriation of $7,245 was subdivided as follows: Printing and stationery $3,100, sundries $4,145. We do not spend that amount for sundries but we have not enough for stationery and for printing.

Department of Marine and Fisheries—To provide for clerical assistance for balance of fiscal year, 1897-98, printing and stationery and sundries $2,200

Mr. FOSTER. What is the explanation of the increase?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. According to a memorandum supplied to me, as to the first item, part of the salary provided is paid out of the contingency vote which was not provided in the estimates. A stenographer had to be supplied in connection with the Behring Sea case. Concerning printing and stationery, from the extension of services in connection with the department, the amount placed in the main estimates is not sufficient. The item for sundries is made up of telegrams, postage, newspapers and travelling expenses.

Department of Militia and Defence—To pay Lieut.-Col. MacDonald the difference in salary between that of first-class clerk at $1,800 per year, and that of chief clerk and chief superintendent of stores, at $2,800, from 1st October, 1897, date of taking over the work, to 30th June, 1898, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act to the contrary, $750; clerical and other assistance, $1,000; printing and stationery, $1,400; sundries, $500; total..... $2,900

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. For a number of years a certain amount of money has been taken from the vote for the next year. This is the smallest amount that we can get along with. Clerical assistance is partly due to the fact that we have extra work now in looking up the names of persons who are entitled to receive a medal to be given to the men who served in repelling the Fenian invasion of 1867 and in 1870. As for printing and stationery, I am informed by my deputy that every year we had to take a vote really from the next year.

Mr. WALLACE. I would like to hear an explanation from the Minister as to the cause of the increase of salary of Lieut.-Colonel MacDonald from $1,800 to $2,800.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The office held by Lieut.-Colonel Macpherson at $3,000 a year and the office held by Lieut.-Colonel MacDonald at $1,800, have been combined into one office, and we are now paying Lieut.-Colonel MacDonald $2,800 for doing the work that we were formerly paying two officers $4,800. Lieut.-Colonel MacDonald took the duties over on the 1st of October, and since that date he has been discharging the duties of the two offices.

Mr. WALLACE. I think that is no explanation. If Colonel MacDonald does not require to work over hours, he can easily perform the duties of his office. I am certain there was no necessity for the two officers to perform the duties that Colonel MacDonald is performing very easily. He has a large staff of officers who do the work that is required. To say that he is performing services that two men were paid for, is to say that one or the other of them, or both, did not have much to do. I think he will be amply paid by the minimum salary of a chief clerk in the department. The Minister has not said that he is doing two men's work.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I quite agree with my hon. friend that it is better these men should have plenty to do. But the fact is that Colonel MacDonald is now doing the duties which he has done for the last twenty years, and in addition the duties which were performed by Lieut.-Colonel Macpherson for the last twenty years.

Mr. WALLACE. Does he work double hours, or do it all in the same time?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I said that for eighteen years we have had two officers, one receiving $3,000 and another receiving $1,800. The one office having been abolished the work would be performed by Colonel MacDonald, who was receiving $1,800; but I thought it would be fair to fix his salary at $2,800 for performing the duties of the two offices, and I do not think that is more than he should receive. As regards the staff, there is no increase. The work is being done by one less highly-paid official than during the last eighteen or twenty years.

Mr. WALLACE. The great saving effected is that Col. Macpherson gets a superannuation allowance of $1,800——

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Almost exactly $1,500.

Mr. WALLACE. $1,800, he having had ten years added, and that amount with $2,800 salary paid to Colonel MacDonald, gives a total of $4,600. The pay of the two officers was $4,800, and this economical Government has thereby effected a saving of $200, and the work cannot be as efficiently done now as it was performed by Colonels Macpherson and MacDonald together, because Colonel Macpherson was known as an efficient and excellent officer. Even according to the Minister's own figures, the present expenditure is $4,300, or a saving of $500. The Government could have saved $600 more by giving the new appointee the minimum of a chief clerk, $2,200, and they would have obtained as efficient services. It must also be remembered that the departments watch each other, and jealousy is aroused when officers in one department find they are only receiving one-half or one-third the salaries of similar men in the Militia or other departments. I can tell the Minister that in Ottawa there are many as intelligent and diligent clerks as Colonel MacDonald who do not receive half his salary. Great dissatisfaction is caused by giving an increase of salary as in this case of $1,000.

Supreme Court of Canada—Additional salary to Mr. Justice McGuire as Judge of the Yukon judicial district at rate of $1,000 per annum from 16th August, 1897, to 30th June, 1898..... $873 97

Mr. FOSTER. What is the salary paid to Mr. Justice McGuire?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. $5,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Is he allowed living expenses?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. There will be a provision in the new Act, if I am able to get it through, to pay such sums for living expenses as may be decided by the Governor General in Council. There will be special provision made for the Yukon district.

Mr. GILLIES. I desire to take this opportunity of calling attention to the position of the county court judges in the province of Nova Scotia. When county courts were created in 1876, the salaries paid then were the same as now. The jurisdiction at the time the court was created was very limited. The extent of the jurisdiction was in civil matters of assumpsit $500 and in other matters ex contractu, $400, and they had no criminal jurisdiction whatever. As

time went on the civil jurisdiction was extended, and a few years ago, when the Speedy Trials Act came into operation, a very wide criminal jurisdiction was conferred on the county court judges. The Solicitor General is aware that when any criminal matter occurs between term, it is brought to the notice of the county court judge. When a prisoner is brought to jail, the sheriff must notify the county court judge, and immediately he has a trial. In county court district No. 7, which includes the counties of Cape Breton, Richmond and Victoria, which is of large extent and has a population of about 70,000 people, and where there is a great deal of criminal litigation, as the hon. Solicitor General will see from the reports in the department, the judge presiding in that district, Judge Dodd, is kept pretty much employed the year round in trying criminals. When the jurisdiction under the Speedy Trials Act was placed in the hands of the county court judges no provision was made for travelling expenses, and the amount of $200 for this purpose is the same as it was when the Act was passed in 1876. I call attention to this, and I hold it is very unfair to ask county court judges to go, every time they are notified, very long distances to try prisoners when there is no provision whatever made for their expenses. The same argument would apply to the adjoining district No. 6, comprising the counties of Inverness, Antigonish and Guysborough, presided over by Judge McIsaac. It is a hardship on the county court judges to call upon them to travel to Sydney, Arichat, Antigonish, Port Hood and Guysborough every time they are called upon, while no provision is made to meet their expenses in carrying out the law. I would like to ask the Solicitor General, more particularly in view of the fact that I brought the matter before him personally some time ago and he was disposed to listen to the application only he feared the extra expense; is it his intention next year, because I suppose he cannot do it this year, to make some provision for an increase in the travelling expenses of the county court judges in Nova Scotia?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. As my hon. friend (Mr. Gillies) is aware, the judges in the county courts of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick receive $2,400 a year and in addition $200 for travelling allowance. In the province of Ontario until the Bill of this session was introduced the junior judges only received $2,000 per annum without expenses, so that the judges of the maritime provinces had an advantage to the extent of $400 a year, over the junior judges of the province of Ontario. In future the judges in Ontario would get exactly the same amount as is paid to the judges of the maritime provinces. I cannot very well see any reason in favour of the maritime provinces that would not apply with equal force to the province of Ontario, and my hon. friend will see at a glance what that would amount to.

Mr. GILLIES. The Solicitor General will bear in mind that in Ontario they have two judges, a senior and a junior judge for nearly every county.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Not quite.

Mr. GILLIES. There are sixty-four county court judges in the province of Ontario now. They do not travel beyond the territorial bounds of their counties but in the province of Nova Scotia they are district judges properly speaking, because every circuit extends over a combined number of counties. District No. 7 is comprised of the large counties of Cape Breton, Victoria and Richmond, and District No. 6 comprises the large counties of Inverness, Guysborough and Antigonish, with only one judge in each district. In the province of Ontario each county would have a judge, and therefore the cases of Ontario and Nova Scotia in this respect are not at all parallel. Again, the Solicitor General will remember that when the county or district courts were created in Nova Scotia the salaries then were the same as they are now, and also the amount allowed for travelling expenses was the same as at present.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. That applies to all the judges.

Mr. GILLIES. It should also be borne in mind that the conveniences for travel is not so perfect in Nova Scotia as it is in the province of Ontario, where you can ride from one part of the province to the other in railway cars. The county court judge in Ontario does not go beyond the confines of the county for which he is appointed.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. He may be called upon to do so.

Mr. GILLIES. Yes, in special cases, but in Nova Scotia the judges travel over a large territory and are consequently subject to a heavier outlay than a county court judge in Ontario. In District No. 7, Mr. Justice Dodd had to travel last week over 150 miles to hold a court, and then he was called upon to go to Baddeck and he had to travel 150 miles in another direction. No county court judge in Ontario has to do that.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I am not in a position to give my hon. friend (Mr. Gillies) any undertaking that would be of any value without consulting with the Government. I draw my hon. friend's attention to the fact that there seems to me some resemblance between the case referred to in the maritime provinces and these cases in Ontario where they have got what they call district judges. These district judges are appointed in the district north of Lake Superior, and they have an immense area to cover and receive for travelling expenses

$500 or $300 more than the county court judges, because of the exceptional position they occupy, the arduous nature of their duties and the very large district to which they are assigned. There might be some resemblance between this case and the case mentioned by my hon. friend (Mr. Gillies). I wish, however, my hon. friend to understand that I can give him no promise that the judges of the maritime provinces will be brought up to the position of these district judges in Ontario. There seems, however, to be some reason for making a comparison between the two cases.

Mr. GILLIES. My hon. friend (Mr. Fitzpatrick) might also consider that if $200 was considered sufficient travelling allowance twenty years ago when the duties of these judges was so much less than they are now, surely considering that they have to respond to every call made upon them under the Speedy Trials Act, their case now is deserving of some consideration.

Mr. BRITTON. The salary of the Yukon judge is increased from $4,000 to $5,000, and I understand travelling expenses are to be paid, but I suppose the judge will now be assigned a place to reside in and that his travelling expenses will only be allowed from that place, and his living expenses will not be allowed in addition to the $5,000, of course after his installation.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The discussion on this matter will, I think, be more appropriate when we come to the Bill which provides for the very point my hon. friend (Mr. Britton) refers to. I do not thing any one will cavil at the propriety of increasing the salary of the judge of that district from $4,000 to $5,000. The question of the living allowance will be discussed in the Bill.

Mr. MONTAGUE. It might be worth the while of the Solicitor and the Department of Justice to consider the question of grouping some of the smaller counties in the province of Ontario.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. We cannot do that; it is within the power of the provinces. That is one of the anomalies we are called upon to deal with.

Mr. BRITTON. There is a grouping in our county so far as the work is concerned. There is an arrangement by which the judges now do one another's work. There is provision made by the province of Ontario, I believe, although I speak subject to correction, by which they are allowed additional fees for doing work in other counties. They are allowed travelling expenses and a per diem allowance. They go into other counties as a means of supplementing their salaries.

Mr. MONTAGUE. It is not a matter in the power of this Parliament, but it is certain that there are counties in Ontario that have not work enough for a county judge, and they ought to be combined with other counties.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think that in Ontario there should be districts uniting several counties, so that the county judges would go round a certain circuit. I think that would be better both for the bar and for those who are forced to go to law. I know that in some counties there is a good deal of feeling with regard to county judges practising in their own districts. It is supposed that they sometimes give advantages to favoured lawyers. I do not know whether that is the case or not, but I think it would be better if the provinces were divided into districts and the judges were to go around those districts.

Mr. WALLACE. I see by the accounts which have been brought down that Mr. Justice McGuire is helping himself to all kinds of necessary clothing—boots, overcoats, fur coats, waterproof coats, socks and all the rest—and is charging them to the Government. The Government have paid the bills to the amount of hundreds of dollars; and now it is proposed to give him an increase of salary of $1,000. This gentleman gets $5,000 a year, and I presume that his duties are very much like those of a county court judge. His qualifications are no higher, at any rate.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes, they are. He is a judge of the High Court of the North-west Territories.

Mr. WALLACE. Does that make his qualification higher? The county judges have to have ten years' experience as barristers, and they have to pass the same law examination as other judges, who, no doubt, would be very glad to take county court judgeships if they could get nothing better. I rose to make a gentle protest against this increase in Judge McGuire's salary, which, I think, is an entirely unnecessary piece of extravagance.

Legislation—House of Commons—additional amount required..... $38,500 90

Mr. POWELL. I do not like to complain very much; but I wish to state that the arrangements made for sessional clerks are not of much practical benefit to the members of this House. For the first time since I have been a member of the House, I have had occasion to resort to their room and make use of the sessional clerks, and I found that the capacity of those men were utterly inadequate to any respectable demand. I had to take the work away, and shall probably have to pay for it myself, for the Drummond County Committee did not certify it so that it could be paid by this House. I am complaining now in all truthfulness, and not in any spirit of magnifying a little deficiency. A portion of the work done for me by these people did not even approach respectability.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. What was the character of the work ?

Mr. POWELL. Typewriting and stenography. I am not nice about these matters, and I say without fear of successful contradiction that any one of the numerous typewriters I have had in my office in the last ten years is worth the whole lot that I saw there engaged in the work I asked to be done. The only respectable clerk I heard about was one who was turned away on the ground of being a political partisan. In the appointment of sessional clerks, I think some little regard should be had to men's qualifications other than their political status. I do not care whether they are black, gray or green, Tory or Grit, so long as they can do the work. It seems necessary that some examination should be had before men are taken on the staff. If you go into that department with a piece of work that requires any skill, you will be so disgusted that you will not repeat the action.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. They have plenty of experience, for two-thirds of them have been there for years.

Mr. POWELL. Whether they have had much experience or little I do not know. I am simply calling attention to the fact that you cannot get work done there. Mr. Borden (Halifax) and I had about twenty pages of typewriting which we wanted to get done. We could not get it done there in a way that would be fit to look at, and we had to apply to a stenographer outside in the city, and had to pay for the work out of our own pockets.

Mr. McMULLEN. I would say that I have had some work done there, and it was quite satisfactory ; but it was done by a man who has been quite recently appointed. The staff of sessional writers, as the hon. gentleman knows, are permanent officers of this House. They are not changed every time the Government is changed. He will find men there to-day who were there ten years ago.

Mr. POWELL. I am not stating anything about their political complexion. I do not know whether they have been there ten years or twenty years. I only know that my experience of consulting them on this occasion has been such that I will not consult them again.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Now that we are discussing this item, we may as well understand what work these clerks are to perform. I wish to ask whether it is intended that they shall do secretarial work for members ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I was a member of the House for some 13 or 14 years before I became a member of the Government, and I applied several times, as my hon. friend did, to ascertain if I could not get any work done by the sessional clerks, and I was invariably told no.

Mr. WALLACE. You should have gone for information to the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen).

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not know of any member who has had any sessional clerk doing secretarial work for him.

Mr. FOSTER. I know of one who is a close friend of the hon. gentleman.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I think the statement made by the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Powell) is a very serious one. I regret that neither the Speaker nor the Clerk happens to be in the House, because efforts were made by the present Government to improve the status and character of the sessional clerks, but we were powerless in the matter, as a resolution had been passed by this House, as far back as 1891, declaring that, in the opinion of the House, the sessional clerks should be placed on the same footing as civil servants, and not liable to dismissals on a change of Government. None of the clerks have been dismissed by the present Government.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I know of one sessional clerk who was appointed at my request, and who was certainly one of the best stenographers in the province, and he was charged with taking part in my election and was dismissed without any investigation.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Not by the Government. A civil servant who devotes his time to politics instead of his work is liable to dismissal.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). This man was a sessional clerk.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Whether he was a sessional clerk or not, if he makes himself obnoxious to members by taking a violent part in elections, he is liable to be dismissed. What I am pointing at is the more serious matter brought to the attenion of he House by he hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Powell) I hope the Clerk of the House and the Speaker will take note of it. If these men are incapable, as my hon. friend has said they are, it is in the public interest that they should be dismissed. I must say that some years ago, when I was acting on one of the very large committees, I had occasion to have work done by the sessional clerks, and I found that they did their work fairly well. If the staff now do not do their work well, it is time a change was made. But the Government are powerless in the matter.

I was anxious to get a clever young man appointed as sessional clerk, but could not succeed, nor has any of my colleagues been able to get any one appointed. These appointments are made by the Speaker of the House and the Commission on Internal Economy. So far as that commission is concerned, they never gave any authority that any of these clerks should be employed in a private capacity, as it is suggested they are.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The Speaker had occasion to go away early and did not think we would reach this item, but he left me a memorandum. It does not happen to deal with this particular aspect of the case, and I would rather the item stood over.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Even if the item be allowed to stand, I feel called on to say this. I have had the honour of sitting here a great many years, and I think I have called very seldom upon the sessional clerks to do any work. I do not dispute the case of the complaint of the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Powell). He may have been disappointed in the character of the work done, but I think he went too far when he said that there was not a man of any capacity on the staff. I have personal knowledge of some of the men in that branch of the service, who are competent, reliable and courteous public officials, and it is only fair that I should bear this testimony on their behalf. My hon. friend may have met with the men who did not give him the satisfaction he had the right to expect and furnished him with cause for complaint, but it is unfortunate that he should make the sweeping charge that there was not a man on that staff fit to be retained there.

Mr. POWELL. I meant my remarks simply to apply to these with whom I came in contact. I never subjected the individuals to an examination as a whole. I simply spoke to three or four whose work was brought under my own personal observation and the work they sent in was done in the way I have mentioned. There may be very good men on the staff. I was simply speaking of the stenographers and typewriters. I do not know how many there are.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There are 25. The number is limited to that by resolution.

Mr. POWELL. I have never seen 25 in there. I have only seen four or five.

Mr. BERGERON. They are distributed through the committees.

Mr. POWELL. I am speaking of the four or five who work in Mr. Stewart's room.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There are eight or ten there.

Mr. POWELL. Four or five applied for the work, and it was done so unsatisfactorily that we gave up sending it to them. If I have made a statement too sweeping, owing to my ignorance of the sessional staff, I would be sorry that it should be held to apply to the good men. The suggestion I would make is this, that those who are employed there as stenographers or typewriters should pass some kind of an examination so that we could have some guarantee of competency.

Mr. INGRAM. We have a man in No. 6, who comes on duty very early in the morning and remains on duty, in some cases, until daylight the next morning. It is very unfair to expect him to do his duty, under the circumstances to the satisfaction of those who occupy No. 6. A second man should be employed to relieve him at times.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. He has no longer hours than the ordinary messengers below.

Mr. INGRAM. He is at his duty at all times, and the messengers below are not.

Mr. ELLIS. This item governs "Hansard," and the Speaker has nothing to do with that. I want to call attention to the very great cost of "Hansard," but I had perhaps better let it stand until the leader of the Patrons (Mr. Rogers) is here. I would like to call the attention of the committee to the fact that in three years the "Hansard" has cost $177,000.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. If the item is to stand, why not take up this discussion when the item comes up again?

Mr. ELLIS. It is not worth while. We can finish this discussion in a short time.

Mr. BERGEON. Then if the item stands, the whole subject will probably be gone over again

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Let "legislation" generally stand.

To provide for unforeseen exepnses of special committees of the Senate at the present session of Parliament, printing debates and contingencies..... $5,000

Mr. McMULLEN. I would like to know who stands sponsor for the Senate in this House that we can get an explanation of this vote?

Mr. FOSTER. I think we shall have to ask the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) to stand as sponsor for that.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is a general vote for Senate purposes. First it appeared as a vote for the committees, but it is a vote for general purposes.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think we should have some further explanation, something more definite. Is this to pay some lawyer's fees or what is it for?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Part of it is to pay for committees. Whether that

includes payments to lawyers or not, I am not aware.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think we ought to have that explanation.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. If you had it, what better off would you be ?

Mr. McMULLEN. We are not bound to vote it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If the hon. gentleman wishes it to stand, I will be glad to have it stand.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Shall this item be adopted ? Carried.

Further amount to pay outstanding accounts in connection with Territorial Exhibition held at Regina, 1894, including $3,625.97, being a re-vote, the same having lapsed in 1896-97..... $4,000

Mr. MONTAGUE. Does that cover all these Regina accounts ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, all those that were reserved to be inquired into, and also one or two accounts that have come in since it was known that the Government were paying these accounts. I have asked for an amount somewhat larger than the total in order to cover any others that may come in.

Mr. McMULLEN. Is the Minister ready to give a guarantee that this is to be the end of the presentation of these everlasting exhibition accounts ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes.

Mr. McMULLEN. It is a grand thing to know that.

Quarantine—To pay a gratuity to W. Mc.K. McLeod, late inspecting physician at Sydney, N.S..... $500

Mr. McDOUGALL. I would like to ask an explanation of this vote.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I may say that Dr. McLeod, inspecting physician at Sydney, N.S., wished to resign and placed before me the fact of his long service of 14 years, and some facts in connection with the reasons why he was not put upon the superannuation lists. He was appointed in 1883, and he informed me in a letter in which he suggested his resignation that he had not known, when he was first appointed that he could be put upon the superannuation list ; and when he found it out, it was too late for him to go upon the list. And, while it is true that he had not paid into the superannuation fund, I think, in view of his services, he was entitled to a small gratuity. Therefore, I propose to give him $500 on his resignation.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I do not object to paying this amount to Dr. McLeod. I believe, in view of the way in which Dr. McLeod was treated that he should have had a larger amount. The hon. Minister will remember that a year ago I called his attention to the way in which he dealt with the quarantine officers at the port of Sydney. At that time the hon. Minister undertook to dismiss the quarantine officer at the port of North Sydney whose duty it was to board all the vessels that came to port requiring inspection. The Minister then ordered Dr. McLeod, who was then living in the town of Sydney and near the quarantine hospital, which it was his duty to attend, to leave his home and residence there and go to live in the town of North Sydney to take the place of the man he had discharged. I knew perfectly well, at the time, the plan that was in view on the part of the Minister or, at any rate, on the part of those who were advising him. The aim in view from the start was to get rid of Dr. McLeod and put a friend of the party in his place. It was not expected by any of those who knew Dr. McLeod that he could conveniently or possibly leave his home on Sunday and go to North Sydney and undertake the work of boarding ships. His health had somewhat failed some time before, and he was not equal to doing the work at North Sydney and also attending to the quarantine hospital. I knew what the outcome would be. The hon. Minister dismissed a very popular, energetic young doctor at North Sydney, whose duty it was to board vessels, and asked Dr. McLeod to abandon his home and property in order to do this work. When the Minister explained his plan I knew it was quite impossible that it could be carried out as he proposed. Dr. McLeod, not being able to do the work the Minister ordered, was obliged or advised to resign. When he took office 14 years ago he gave up his practice or lost it in consequence of devoting himself to the duties of his office, when he resigned, of course, he could not get back his practice. He consequently had to go to the States and he is in the States now. The hon. Minister goes to work and appoints a young doctor of short experience to the position. The new doctor that was appointed is a brother of the Premier of Nova Scotia, the Hon. George Murray.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The name of the Premier of Nova Scotia is Murray, the name of this doctor is Rynders. I do not thing they are brothers.

Mr. McDOUGALL. They had different fathers, but they had the same mother. I consider that the treatment that Dr. McLeod received at the hands of the committee, was not at all fair, and the treatment of the doctor he first dismissed on the plea of economy, was most unfair. He was one of the most popular young men in the county, belonging to one of the first families. If it was on the plea of economy that the Minister discharged Dr. Johnson, when he

found that Dr. McLeod was obliged to retire, why did he not reinstate Dr. Johnson? The whole scheme was planned with a view to put another man there.

Mr. McMULLEN. From the statement the hon. gentleman has just made. I think we are justified in striking out this $500 altogether. He says that the doctor was not capable of perfoming his duties.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I did not say that, I said that the condition of things was made so difficult for this doctor that he could not do the work. His health had failed, and he was obliged to abandon it. I contend that the amount of $500 is insufficient, and that the gentleman who was treated in this way should have had greater consideration.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think in view of Dr. McLeod's long services, for whatever reason that he chose to resign, we should not drop this vote. I confess the statements of the hon. member are entirely new to me. I was not aware of the circumstances which he has described, therefore I am not responsible for them. I would be sorry to strike out the item. I think it would not be fair in consequence of the long services of Dr. McLeod.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to say a few words upon this item of $720 to Mr. W. H. Lynch, for 12,000 copies of "Scientific Dairying," placed in the department in 1888, and not paid for. I have thought for a good many years that if ever there was any man in this part of the country that deserved well at the hands of this Government and the country, and who was treated somewhat shabbily, it was this Mr. Lynch. I have known him since he came around in 1881, and have always regarded him as one of the most energetic and able men who ever took a hand in the promotion of the dairying interests of Canada. My first recollection of him was when he was lecturing down in the maritime provinces and afterwards in Ontario. About that time he was brought before the Committee of Agriculture and Colonization, and gave evidence which we regarded as most valuable. Through the persuasion of several members of the committee and of others who were interested in dairying, he was induced to commence writing letters and giving lectures on dairying. I believe he gave his first address in New Brunswick about that time on the methods of butter making. He was then writing letters to agricultural papers. I collected a great many copies of them for several years. The idea was to continue to agitate so as to induce the Government to establish a dairy commission if possible, or appoint a dairy commissioner. Shortly after that he made a visit to New York and there met for the first time, at Cornell University, with an expert who came along with him and gave a lecture in the city hall of Ottawa, at a gathering of the Fruit Growers' Association. This Prof. Arnold was regarded as the ablest man in his business on the continent of America. That agitation was continued until 1882, and for the first time he published a pamphlet called Scientific Butter Making. I remember looking carefully over that pamphlet, and getting a number of copies for distribution, because every one who got a copy of it spoke of it in approving terms, and many who did not, applied for copies afterwards. It seemed to be in their estimation one of the best works that had been got out. He then went into Ontario, where he was invited to give lectures before the Board of Trade, and the organization who developed into the Department of Agriculture. He addressed an association in Toronto at that time. The Dominion Government commenced to agitate the question. The Committee on Colonization was then the Committee on Immigration and Colonization, and it was changed to the Committee on Agriculture and Colonization, and he was invited by them to begin an agitation for a Dominion dairy association. I remember the opposition that was offered at the time, it was to the effect that as the provinces were doing the same kind of work there was no need for duplicating it by the Dominion. He wrote another pamphlet on butter and cheese which was published about that time. There was somewhere about 70,000 copies published, and we got a large number for distribution. About the year 1888 there was a call made for a convention. This was through his agitation. I remember being with him when he got up his first circular which he sent out to the dairy associations of Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia, and, I think, Manitoba. He succeeded in bringing together the most interesting company of men engaged in that line that I ever saw in the capital. We had a most valuable meeting which lasted for one or two days, I forget which, and the result was that a committee was appointed to wait upon the Government and ask for a vote to establish a dairy department and appoint a dairy commissioner. The Government did not see their way clear at that time to do it, but a request was made to put a small item in the Estimates to defray the expense of publishing and distributing a report of the meeting. At that time the Postmaster General made provision for its free distribution through the post office. I think $2,000 were put in the Estimates for that purpose and the dairy association was organized. The application made to the Government resulted ultimately in the appointment of a dairy commissioner and the establishment of the Experimental Farm. I remember feeling strongly in favour of the appointment of Mr. Lynch as dairy commissioner. I talked to him about the matter, and he made the most unselfish speech I ever heard. He said: I have been engaged for some years in

promoting this work, and though I have received very little return for assisting in organizing the dairy association which culminated in the request presented to the Government being granted and the appointment of a dairy commissioner being decided upon, yet it would look too much as if I had been making an office for myself, and I could not accept it under any consideration. Mr. Lynch has done most valuable work, for which he has received little or no recognition. He drifted away from this part of the country and I did not see him for several years. A work was got up by him for the Government of which they took several thousand copies, and there was, in addition several thousand copies issued and stored away in one of the departments and laid there for several years. He expected to have been able to sell them, but did not succeed at the time, and I know he borrowed the money to publish the book through some mistake or forgetfulness. The parties in charge of the department overlooked the fact, or forgetting that he was the owner asked me to tell the members of the committee that if they wished for copies for distribution they could get as many as they liked. I distributed 3,000 or 4,000 amongst the committee, and I was told members could obtain copies there. We were not aware that the books had not been paid for, and I was very glad to accept the invitation to distribute them to the farmers of the country. They were much appreciated, and I heard only recently that the books had not been paid for. I see a very small item in the Estimates for the payment of those books, $720. From my personal knowledge of the transaction, and I have some knowledge of it, because I was requested to ascertain the cost of publishing a number of copies, the Government will not pay one-fourth of the cost. As one who takes an interest in the work in which Mr. Lynch is engaged, I think he is receiving a very meagre compensation for the work. It is only due to him that I should say this, because I have always regarded him as the pioneer so far as regards the establishment of the dairying department on the Experimental Farm. He was the first man who went to England to ascertain what products were suited for that market, and in what shape and condition they should be put up for the market. He is not in any way connected with the department, and if a favourable opportunity presented itself it would only be justice to him and an act of kindness to employ him where he would be of service to the Government and to the country, and I have no doubt if they paid him a handsome salary the country would regard it as defensible, and not only an act of kindness but an equitable act in behalf of a deserving man.

Mr. McMULLEN. The statement made by the hon. member justifies me in moving that this item be struck out. The hon. gentleman stated that he got 3,000 or 4,000 copies of this book and circulated them in his constituency. Members of Parliament usually have to pay for the stuff circulated in their constituencies. The gentleman is well deserving of the speech he delivered on his behalf. The hon. gentleman said he got 3,000 or 4,000 copies.

Mr. SPROULE. I did not.

Mr. McMULLEN. I took a note of it..

Mr. SPROULE. I said I got 3,000 or 4,000 copies for distribution, and I distributed 1,000 or 2,000 myself.

Mr. McMULLEN. You said you distributed 3,000 or 4,000 copies.

Mr. SPROULE. I distributed them among members of the Agricultural Committee, not among my own constituents.

Mr. McMULLEN. If the hon. gentleman got the material, he has a right to pay for it. I find this item is for a debt contracted in 1888, ten years ago. I cannot understand why the Minister of Agriculture should load up his Estimates with items contracted ten years ago, and give Mr. Lynch, regarding whom the member for East Grey has been speaking in laudable terms, payment of his account, and that it should fall to the lot of the Reform party to pay such an account. I am surprised that the Minister should have agreed to pay the account. I do not think we should pay it, or at all events, the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) should pay half of it. I move that this item be struck out on account of the statement made by the hon. member for East Grey.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman is distinctly unfair, and whether he intended to misrepresent me or not he has done so. It was understood that the books were free, and they were given among members of the committee, who distributed them to their constituents. After that I was instructed that a number of copies remained and could be had for distribution. I notified the committee and told them where to get them, and I got some myself. Everybody had the right to do so. We believed they had been paid for, and we distributed them believing they were for free distribution. I got no more than any other member.

Mr. McMULLEN. My hon. friend must have known that those pamphlets were furnished and that the gentleman would have to be paid for them. We want to know why they have not been paid for before this. The present Government is asked to close up the accounts of hon. gentlemen opposite and pay accounts contracted ten years ago, especially accounts spoken of in such terms by the hon. member for East Grey. If there was any man whose services appear to have been appreciated by hon. gentlemen opposite, they were those of Mr. Lynch and he should have been paid by them. Why did they leave it to the present Government to pay him, and

leave the account unpaid for ten years? I got none of those pamphlets. The hon. member for East Grey distributed them among his own friends, and I have no doubt every ratepayer in East Grey got one of them. Why should we be asked, after ten years, to pay the debt? It is outlawed and should not be paid.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The item is worded in a very peculiar way. I never heard anything about the pamphlet when I was in the department.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Mr. Lynch's work has been described somewhat by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule). Mr. Lynch wrote the pamphlet in question and those of us who were members of the House of Commons at the time when he was doing his dairy work in this country know very well what immense services he rendered to the farmers of this country and to the dairy interests. The facts are these. Mr. Lynch wrote a book called "Scientific Dairying" which was for a long time the vade mecum of dairymen, not only in Canada, but in the United States. He had an edition published of something over 100,000 volumes and the Government agreed to take 75,000, leaving some 30,000 on his hands. He sold a portion of these to the different local governments, and the publisher tells us there were about 15,000 left which the publisher wished to get rid of, and obtained leave to put them in the Department of Agriculture buildings. Mr. Lynch tried to get the Government of that time to take them, but they were not prepared to take any more, because, I suppose, they thought 75,000 copies would do the work. About that time Mr. Lynch went to the west to engage in mining business.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Oh, that's enough; he wants the money badly then.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The reason this matter never came up since is that Mr. Lynch has been away. He came back not long ago, and knowing him as I did in times past, and the valuable services he rendered to the country, I felt it was only just to pay for these books which were utilized by the people of the country and served the purposes they were intended for. This vote pays for 12,000 copies which were not in any other way accounted for, at the rate he was paid for the 75,000.

Mr. MONTAGUE. In view of the statement of the Minister of Agriculture, the statement of the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) was altogether unwarranted. We did not order the books and we contracted no debts. This is a gratuity.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The members of the House took these books and sent them to their constituents. I do not suppose they knew they were extra copies above the 75,000 ordered, but the members utilized them because the people of the country demanded that book.

Mr. McMULLEN. The matter appears to be getting worse all the time. The Minister (Mr. Fisher) has attempted to explain why we should pay this. It appears Mr. Lynch left this material in the Department of Agriculture and actually when he was away in the west, hon. gentlemen opposite, the hon. member for Grey included, raided the place and took the stuff.

Mr. FOSTER. Ably assisted by the present Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. McMULLEN. The present Minister of Agriculture had nothing to do with it.

Mr. MONTAGUE. And the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) shared in the spoils.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) says he received some benefit from this material.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen) is putting words in my mouth which I never used. He is either getting so deaf or so completely blind to what is fair that he is bound to misrepresent.

Mr. McMULLEN. I can hear and see just as well as the hon. member (Mr. Montague) can and perhaps a little better sometimes.

Mr. MONTAGUE. You used to see better when you were in opposition.

Mr. McMULLEN. There was gross neglect on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite including the member for Haldimand who was Minister of Agriculture. If this is an honest debt it should have been paid long ago.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The present Minister of Agriculture admits it was not a debt and so far as I am concerned I never heard of it.

Mr. McMULLEN. To put it in a mild term hon. gentlemen opposite apparently appropriated this man's property, and the hon. member for East Grey appears to have got an allowance of three or four thousand copies. The Minister of Agriculture of the time should be held responsible for he allowed this man's stuff to be stolen.

Mr. SPROULE. Then the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) shared in the plunder, because I think I can prove from the records of the department that he distributed these books himself. At that time the young man in charge of the department notified me as chairman of the committee on agriculture to announce that these books were there for distribution. He was not aware that they were not paid for. I made the announcement in the committee and the members went and got them, in-

cluding the member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen).

Mr. WALLACE. The matter can be very easily settled because I have a very good recollection that the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) appropriated the other 75,000 pamphlets himself, the Government having paid $720 for the 12,000. I remember very well that he had nineteen of the twenty-five sessional clerks engaged for three weeks sending them out to his constituents and friends in the country. The member for North Wellington should pay for the 75,000 and the Government will pay for the 12,000 which were distributed equitably amongst the members. Anyway I do not see why the hon. member (Mr. McMullen) should make such a fuss about $720 when he is voting $49,000,000, going it blind in every instance, and out of that $49,000,000 the only thing he raises a row about is the $750.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am not surprised at the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) making such a grossly exaggerated statement.

Mr. WALLACE. Solemn truth.

Mr. McMULLEN. I presume there was a certain portion allotted to me out of the 75,000 copies.

Some hon. MEMBERS. How many.

Mr. McMULLEN. It is so long that I do not remember.

Mr. WALLACE. Well, I do.

Mr. McMULLEN. I have sat in this House for sixteen years and I can honestly declare that I never stole any man's stuff yet, and others cannot say that. They appropriated this man's stuff, to use a mild term, and they have allowed him to remain unpaid for eight years, and now they ask the Government to pay.

Mr. FOSTER. What does the Minister intend to do with this $5,000 for the Omaha Trans-Mississippi Exhibition ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. This is an agricultural exhibition at Omaha and I am preparing an exhibit to send there.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Who is the commissioner ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We have no commissioner. My hon. friend the Minister of the Interior has several immigration agents working in the western states, and they will be at the exhibition. I am sending only one man to the exhibition to look after the exhibit. I think we shall be able to make a very creditable exhibition of the products of Canada there.

Cattle quarantine—Further amount required for compensation for the slaughter of hogs and sheep, and all expenses connected therewith..... $12,000

Mr. MONTAGUE. We ought to have an explanation of this.

Mr. SPROULE.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am sorry we have had to pay so much for the slaughter of hogs and as compensation. This amount appears large, partially because a very severe outbreak of hog cholera took place towards the end of the last fiscal year, and the accounts did not come in until after the appropriation was settled and voted by this House. We had to pay about $5,000 in the first two or three months of this fiscal year, which ought to have been charged in 1896-97.

Mr. MONTAGUE. What percentage do you pay ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. When the hogs are actually diseased, we pay one-third. When they have been in contact and exposed to the disease, and have to be slaughtered to prevent them spreading the disease, we pay three-fourths. Some times hogs when opened are found to be not diseased, and they are sold.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The proper way is to cut the pieces out.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not think my hon. friend, as a surgeon, would recommend that.

Mr. SPROULE. That is what they did at the Humber.

Mr. McDOUGALL. When did the hog cholera break out ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It broke out in the last fiscal year.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Is the country pretty free from it now ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We have had hardly any cases during the last three months, but I may say frankly that when the hot weather comes the cases generally increase.

Mr. MONTAGUE. What has been done in the way of slaughtering animals affected with tuberculosis ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There is no compulsory slaughter for tuberculosis. When anybody asks me, I send an officer or authorize a veterinary surgeon in the neighbourhood to test cattle for that disease. I do that free of expense, for the purpose of encouraging the people to make the test. We have warned them distinctly that they will not get compensation, and we require them to sign a formal request to the department when they ask for the test. At the same time, the law requires that any animal which is proved to be diseased must be quarantined and isolated. When I came into office I found the impression prevailing in my department that when an animal was affected with tuberculosis its slaughter was compulsory. I did not myself look into the matter for some time afterwards; but I found that my officers misinterpreted the law. I did pay compensation to some people

who had been instructed to slaughter their cattle, but the moment I found that the law did not require slaughter, but simply isolation, we gave a warning to that effect to everybody whose animals were found to be diseased; and since then I have refused compensation.

Mr. INGRAM. How long ago was that?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I cannot tell the exact date, but it was early last year.

Mr. MONTAGUE. If the hon. gentleman will look into a case, I will give him, privately, the name of a man who, a few years ago, was compelled to slaughter a whole herd of cattle, and who did not receive any compensation. I hope he will deal with that case as he has dealt with the others.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I shall be very glad to do so.

Mr. INGRAM. Will the hon. gentleman state how the veterinarians are paid for the examination of hogs?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have once or twice appointed men by the month. When a severe outbreak took place, and we found that we were employing men practically all the time, I made an engagement with them at so much a month. Otherwise, they were paid so much a day for the time they were occupied.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Was the hog disease confined to certain districts, or was it general?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hog cholera was almost wholly confined to the western part of Ontario. I regret to say that lately there has been a severe outbreak in British Columbia, no doubt imported from the United States. The disease is very prevalent in the United States, especially in the west, where hundreds of thousands of dollars, I dare say millions of dollars worth of hogs have been slaughtered in consequence. This question of hog cholera has occupied more of my time and given me more worry and bother than anything else since I have been in office; but we have been able to confine the disease to the western part of Ontario by the most stringent regulations. Once or twice it has spread to other districts, and in almost every instance it has been traced directly to the purchase of hogs in that district. For instance, one of the first cases after I came into office was in the county of Glengarry, where 250 hogs had to be slaughtered. The disease was traced directly to a carload of hogs which had been purchased in western Ontario and brought down there. Another case of the same kind was discovered in the county of Huntingdon in the province of Quebec.

Mr. SPROULE. Did you pay anything for those slaughtered at the Humber?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not know anything about that. The hon. gentleman must not import into this Parliament the politics of his own province.

Mr. SPROULE. I am not importing politics at all. The law provides that when animals are affected by disease, they shall be slaughtered.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I can only tell the hon. gentleman that no application was made to me for compensation.

Mr. SPROULE. Before the hon. gentleman came into office the law provided that certain inspectors would be appointed to inspect cattle going out of the country, and grant certificates, so that they could go in to the United States. I asked the hon. gentleman if he would appoint inspectors in two localities from which cattle were being exported at the time. The places are Shelburne, Markdale, Flesherton and Dundalk. The law contemplates a proper inspection and a certificate being given. But the way it has been carried out is simply a farce. I am told that they send to Owen Sound and get a certificate from a man who has never been within twenty-five miles of the cattle, and that goes along with the cattle.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Is that correct?

Mr. SPROULE. Yes.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. If the hon. gentleman will give me, privately, the information, I will take steps to see that that kind of thing is stopped.

Mr. SPROULE. I can give the hon. gentleman the information and the name of the veterinarian from whom the certificates are got. Unless a good veterinary surgeon is appointed, the shippers, who send their cattle out usually twice a week, will be obliged to bring in a veterinarian from outside or send the cattle on without a certificate and have them inspected at Toronto or somewhere else on the way. That they could not do, and, in the absence of a veterinary surgeon, they were obliged to do the next best thing they could.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Will the hon. gentleman write me a line about this.

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. Minister says we have nothing to do with the Humber piggery.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I cannot inform the hon. gentleman whether any of our inspectors inspected any of the hogs in the Humber piggery, because we have a good many certificates coming in, and I cannot say whether one came in from that place.

Mr. INGRAM. When that matter was investigated by the Public Accounts Commit-

tee of the Ontario Government, the evidence went to show that it was through the negligence of the Dominion officials those hogs were sold. I would like to ascertain which Government is really to blame for the killing or the selling of hogs that were not fit to be eaten.

Mr. CAMPBELL. It was proven distinctly that they were all fit to be eaten. Both Dr. Sweetapple and Dr. Smith proved this.

Mr. INGRAM. According to the evidence, that is not the case. The person who killed the hogs swore positively that they were unfit for human food, and I want to draw attention to the fact that the committee was comprised of partisan friends of hon. gentlemen opposite, and on that account a proper summing up of the case was not given out to the public.

Mr. CAMPBELL. At that investigation, Dr. Smith, the Dominion inspector, and Professor Sweetapple both declared that they had examined those hogs and passed them and that they were not unhealthy. More than that, Mr. Hunter, the man who bought the hogs and sold them——

Mr. INGRAM. And who dared not produce his book.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Is it likely he was going to buy diseased hogs ? He had every one of them examined, and swore they were perfectly sound and fit for food. More than that, every man who bought them, in Toronto and elsewhere, came forward and testified that they were in proper condition.

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. gentleman is mistaken. That is not borne out by the evidence. I challenge the hon. gentleman to produce the account book of Mr. Hunter, giving the names of the persons to whom he sent these hogs. If he can, he can do more than the committee could. Why did not Mr. Hunter produce the book ? Because he knew that if he did, it would ruin his business, and for that reason he declined. That pork was sold to the citizens of Toronto and Montreal—diseased pork at that, as proved by a competent man who knows what are diseased hogs. The hon. gentleman has said that Dr. Smith and Dr. Sweetapple examined these hogs. They did nothing of the kind. They examined a certain number but not them all. If they had, they would have found diseased hogs among them.

Mr. CAMPBELL. You can very well leave that to the people of Toronto and the surrounding country. Mr. St. John, who brought that up in the legislature and made it a question in the late election in the county of York, at every meeting held, was defeated by a large majority.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman ought to know that Dr. Smith never examined one of them after they were killed.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes he did.

Mr. SPROULE. Dr. Sweetapple examined a portion of them, and two of the men who killed them swore that they were diseased, and the one taken away was diseased.

Mr. POWELL. I would like to ask the Minister of Agriculture on what principles public moneys can be given as compensation for the slaughter and quarantining of animals and refused for the slaughter and quarantine of nursery stock. I called his attention not long ago to the case of an individual who lost some hundreds of dollars in nursery stock, which he had purchased before the passing of the San José Scale Act, and the hon. Minister said he could not see any principle on which it could be paid for. To my mind it is impossible to distinguish between the two cases.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). Was it diseased ?

Mr. POWELL. It is not allowed to come in at all. I imagine it was not diseased, but my hon. friend has lost his nursery stock. He suffers a loss of two or three hundred dollars.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Why not send it back ?

Mr. POWELL. It was paid for.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The question of diseased animals is settled by Parliament, the Minister having been authorized, under certain conditions, to pay compensation. There is no such statute in connection with nursery stock. I must say that, so far as the compensation is concerned, the practice has been for some time back to pay compensation for hogs. That was done on the ground that if this disease be circumscribed and localized it would be well worth the while of the country at large to pay for that circumscription and localization. It has been found practicable to localize the hog cholera by the methods carried out. I have been asked why cattle killed by reason of tuberculosis were not compensated for. Tuberculosis is not nearly so prevalent as people thought. I may take this occasion to say that since I have been testing animals for tuberculosis. I have been most gratified to find that the prevalence of this disease is not nearly so great as was supposed.

Mr. POWELL. And not one-quarter so bad as in Holland.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. My officers have found not much more than 5 per cent of cases of disease. And I may remind the House that, as a rule. the test has been made where there was some sort of suspicion that the disease existed. When we began testing wild statements were made that from 25 to 50 per cent of the cattle-

in the country were diseased. The percentage is so small, as the disease is spread over different parts of the country, and it is impossible to localize it, and therefore it was not thought advisable to compensate for cattle killed.

Mr. POWELL. I understand the statement of the hon. gentleman that there is a statute in the one case and not in the other. I would suggest to the hon. Minister that, while he has no authority from Parliament to pay, yet it is only fair that, losses having been suffered by these people, this should be taken into consideration by the Government, and an item introduced in the Estimates compensating them. I do not mean at the present session, but hereafter. I recognize the difficulty of dealing fairly with these people, and the great danger of the Government being imposed upon with absurd claims.

Mr. INGRAM. This item ought to stand until we have this evidence before us.

Mr. MONTAGUE. There is another item in the next Estimates.

Mr. FOSTER. It is now past two o'clock, and I think we have stayed here long enough.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I would ask the hon. gentleman to consent to the votes for the Railways and Canals Department. I have the Railway Committee to attend to-morrow.

Mr. FOSTER. It is absolutely impossible that we can go further. We are meeting every morning and sitting late every night.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It will not take long.

Mr. FOSTER. It will take so long that we simply cannot do it. Besides our men are away. I must appeal to my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) not to keep the House any longer.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. An intimation was given to me that hon. gentlemen opposite were as anxious to stay as we were. But if they think we have gone far enough, I will not press them to go further.

Resolutions to be reported.

REPORTS.

Report of the Minister of Justice as to penitentiaries of Canada, for the year ended 30th June, 1897.—(Mr. Fitzpatrick.)

Annual Report of the Department of Public Printing and Stationery, for the year ended 30th June, 1897.—(Mr. Fisher.)

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. FOSTER. What will be taken up to-morrow?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The final stage of the Montreal Harbour Bill, some smaller Bills and then Estimates.

Mr. FOSTER. Is my hon. friend able to say about the time the House is expected to prorogue?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We have hardly felt able to form a definite opinion until we see the progress made with the Estimates. I am expressing my own opinion simply when I say I think we can prorogue on Thursday—possibly earlier.

Mr. FOSTER. All legislation is down that we are to have this session?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I stated that there would be no more Supplementary Estimates. But I have learned that there was an omission of one item—Intercolonial accommodation at Lévis. It is a re-vote.

Mr. FOSTER. If the hon. gentleman is to bring down other Estimates, I would remind him that one of our fellow members has been very ill for a great part of the session. I refer to Major Beattie, of London. I would ask my hon. friend whether a sum could not be included for at least a portion of the time he has been ill

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think the Estimate is printed and the Message received, and will be ready in the morning. However, we will consider the matter.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 2.20 a.m. (Saturday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

SATURDAY, June 4th, 1898.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

PRAYERS.

MONTREAL HARBOUR WORKS.

The Resolution adopted in committee on the 3rd instant, respecting an advance to the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal in addition to the amount authorized by Chapter 10

of the Statutes of 1896 (first session), was reported, read the second time, and concurred in.

FIRST AND SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 163) to grant further aid to the Harbour Commission of Montreal.—(Mr. Fielding.)

THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 155)—from the Senate—to amend Chapter 11 of the Statutes of 1897, intituled, "An Act to restrict the importation and employment of aliens."

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 157) respecting the payment of the moneys advanced to the St. John Bridge and Railway Extension Company.

SUPPLY.

The House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Additional amount for publishing debates (re-vote $6,949)	$20,000 $20,000
Additional amount to cover expenditure during recess for French translation (including Experimental Farm Report, $468, and report of Dairy Commissioner, $250)	3,000
Additional amount for sessional clerks, including two clerks for Whips' rooms	3,568

Mr. MONTAGUE. We might, Mr. Speaker, say a word this morning as to what are the duties of the sessional clerks as regards the requirements for work for the members.

Mr. SPEAKER. I had not the pleasure of hearing the objections that were raised last night, but briefly speaking there are 25 sessional clerks appointed between the provinces as they used to be before I became Speaker. Among those there are eight who are employed exclusively in doing the work of the Post Office during the session, and in that way we avoid having permanent clerks appointed there. The sessional clerks are under the direction of the Clerk of the House, but under the immediate direction of Mr. Stewart, who distributes the work among them that may be required to be done during the session for the convenience of committees and of members.

Mr. FOSTER. Could we get an idea as to what are the privileges of members with reference to these sessional clerks? I have been in Parliament since 1882 and for my part I have never had a line of writing done by a sessional clerk. I have never thought that I could get it done, but I am here to state that there are members of this House who simply have clerks of their own on the sessional staff. I do not hesitate to refer to names; I refer to the member for King's, N.B. (Mr. Domville). The young man whom he has brought here has been, if I am not very much mistaken, practically a clerk for the member himself. There ought to be some method of measuring the hours of attendance of those clerks and the work that a man does, and if Parliament is going to give each man a private clerk it would be a splendid thing no doubt if the country wants to do it. I go into my own room and work my fingers off writing, while another member has practically a private clerk. There is no doubt about that and it is known to be so.

Mr. MONTAGUE. That is the point I wish to discuss, because it certainly is the case that some members of the House use these sessional clerks as secretaries, while others are regarded as having no right to do so.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. I may say that my experience is somewhat in the other direction. I have never had anything to do with the clerks directly, but I have found Mr. Stewart, who is in charge, singularly obliging, and very prompt with the work I have given him to do—for instance, in making extracts from some report in the library for the purpose of a debate here, or copies of returns to the House.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That is not private work.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. On every occasion when I have sent to him, I have been surprised at the promptitude with which he has performed the work, and I supposed that was the purpose for which these clerks were there.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I made a statement across the House that I had not got any work done; but if the hon. gentleman understood me as saying that I had never had any return copied, that is a mistake, for I understand that that is what the clerks are there for. I have had dozens of returns copied.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. That is my experience also. I have had returns copied; but I understand that some of the clerks are employed in private rooms as private secretaries. At any rate, they are not in the sessional clerks' room.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We will inquire as to the fact. The hon. member to whom reference has been made is not here to answer.

Mr. SPEAKER. My information and knowledge on the point is quite different from what the hon. member for Provencher

(Mr. LaRivière) states. Attempts have been made by members who thought the clerks were not busy, and could be taken into their rooms, to have the use of them in that way; but the Clerk of the House and myself, after talking the matter over, have absolutely forbidden that. There was one attempt of this kind rather persistently made. It was mentioned by the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster). The hon. member referred to is not in the House; he thought, I suppose, that that was the use of the clerks. My own experience, before I was in the Chair, and when I sat on the opposition side of the House, was exactly the same as that of the hon. member for York. I really did not know that members could properly get as much work done in that office as they can; and I think it is quite proper that any member who desires to have copied public papers or returns or anything to facilitate the public business of the House, should have the right, not to get a clerk and take him away, but to go to Mr. Stewart and place the matter in his hands; and he will attend to it very promptly. I think the clerks are quite efficient too, because it has been our effort, in filling vacancies, to get stenographers and typewriters. I think the efficiency of the staff is a good deal greater than it was.

Mr. CLANCY. It seems to me that there might be some restriction imposed in this respect. The work of copying returns seems to be well understood. There is many returns that are not ordered to be printed, because they are not of sufficient public interest; but they may be copied. With regard to individual members getting other work done, there is great danger of going over the line. I confess that it is very difficult to draw the line at the right place; but there is no doubt that no member should use a clerk for his own private work.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman knows that often a return is brought down which is not of sufficient importance to be printed. He wants it, I want it, somebody else wants it; we cannot all have it at the same time; and unless copies are made by Mr. Stewart, the return would be useless. So that I think members have a right to have copies made of such return.

Mr. CLANCY. I quite agree with that.

Mr. SPEAKER. Since I have been in the Chair, I think it was last session, I found that members were in the habit of sending their voters' lists and other things to the office to be copied and entered in pass-books. I will not say on which side of the House the hon. members to whom I refer sat; but I thought that should not be allowed, and I stopped it.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). I think it is quite reasonable—and I speak without prejudice, because in all my life I have never used a clerk for any purpose. Gentlemen in the position of the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) and other prominent members of the Opposition, should be allowed some clerical assistance. I would have found that useful myself on some occasions when sitting opposite, and I think none of us would object that it should be fairly and fully understood that the leading members of the Opposition should have one or two clerks put at their disposal. Their position is becoming a recognized one, I hope they will long continue to fill it, and I want to make them comfortable.

Mr. ELLIS. I understand that this item covers "Hansard," to which I would like to call the attention of the House. I do not desire to make any attack on "Hansard," but I would like to call the attention of the committee to the steadily increasing expenditure for it. As I stated last evening, in the last three years "Hansard" has cost the country $177,000; and since 1891, it has cost altogether $364,000. The expense steadily grows, and I think there ought to be some effort made to limit it. I do not want to pronounce a sweeping judgment on the speeches; I do not want to be a censor as to what speeches should be published and what not; but we know that in the committees of the House there are long discussions which are really not of great importance, and which take up time. Sometimes, I think they are simply made to occupy time; and the question is whether these ought to be printed or whether any restraint should be put upon them. There is no doubt that among a great many members on both sides of the House there is a feeling that "Hansard" has become too expensive, and I know of a great many members who would vote for its abolition. The hon. member for Western Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) thinks "Hansard" is a part of the history of the country. There may be a difference of opinion about that; but if it is a part of the history of the country, these are times in which a condensed history is more valuable to the people than one extending over many volumes. I would like one or two hon. gentlemen who are prominent in the House to give some expression of opinion on this subject, because the evil has become so great that some day or other it may have to be grappled with in a summary way.

Mr. FOSTER. How is that extra expense incurred—because more volumes are printed, or because there is a larger staff?

Mr. BERGERON. In one year there have been two sessions. Taking the hon. gentleman's figures since 1891, the cost would be $37,900 a year.

Mr. ELLIS. I will give the details of the expenditure. In 1890-91, it was $31,369; in

1891-92, $72,252; in 1892-93, $50,605; in 1893-94, $32,202; in 1894-95, $49,733; in 1895-96, $69,812—that would apparently include two sessions; and in 1896-97, $58,050. It is really a very large expense. I may say that the reporters' salaries have not increased. They have run at about $17,500 a year since 1891. The expense of translating was $17,575 in 1892, and $20,304 in 1896-97. There is a much greater variation in that. The expense of printing is also subject to fluctuation on account of the number of words used in the session. For instance, last year it was $15,556, and the year before, apparently including two sessions, it was $34,130.

As a member of the Printing Committee and of the Committee on Debates, of which my hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) is also a member, we find that there are constantly increasing little demands for these additions, which it seems almost impossible to resist and which, in the number of years I have been here, have added considerably to the cost.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. This question is one that has been brought to the attention of hon. members from session to session. I do not agree in what my hon. friend has said in regard to the continued increase in the cost of "Hansard" being a criterion of its actual cost. If an increase has been made in the cost, it is simply because of unavoidable circumstances. In one of the years mentioned by my hon. friend, we had two sessions. In another we had a very long session, and in order to satisfy the members of this House extra copies of a very long debate—the debate on the school question—had to be printed so as to distribute to the members of this House a certain number of copies. The bulk of the increase in the cost of "Hansard" is simply in the printing. And my hon. friend has just shown, by giving the figures, that the salaries of the reporters have not been increased nor those of the amanuenses, and the cost of translation was only increased by the fact that we had two sessions in one year, and by the extra allowance given the translators in the long session of 1896.

This question of publishing the debates of Parliament has attracted the attention not only of this House, but of the Imperial Parliament as well. In the Imperial Parliament, before they had what is now called the "Hansard," after the name of Mr. Thomas Curzon Hansard, who founded that institution, they had to make up a parliamentary history of the proceedings of both Houses compiled from the reports of newspapers and other historical accounts of what took place in the Imperial Parliament from the year 1066 until 1803. It was only in 1803 that a regular official report of the debates was published in England, and this work was afterwards entrusted to Mr. Hansard, who published the official report from 1878 to 1888. In 1888, a special joint committee of both Houses was appointed to consider the propriety of publishing a full report of the debates in the British Parliament. The "Hansard" at that time only covered the debates that took place after 12 o'clock at night, and during the sittings of the House in committee. These were compiled with the reports in the leading newspapers, and the whole was published in a concise form. That, however, proved unsatisfactory, and an inquiry was made by a special committee, before which several of the leading English statesmen, including Lord Salisbury, gave their opinion that the fullest and most complete reports of the proceedings of both Houses should be printed for distribution. In fact, most of these men insisted on not only a full report but a verbatim report, giving the exact words of the speaker. This, of course, brought out some objections. It was even stated that it might so happen that in a British Parliament some members had not mastered the English grammar sufficiently to speak the language as it should be spoken, but it was stated that such faults might be corrected, but that the report should, with that exception, be verbatim. Here is a portion of the report:—

> Such a system exists at present in many foreign countries (that of giving full reports) and in many of our colonies, and there is much to be said in its favour. It would undoubtedly secure a complete and accurate record of parliamentary debates, which might be of historical value and interest.
>
> It is, however, necessary to realize and, if possible, to formulate clearly the nature and character of such official report. The committee have arrived at the conclusion that an official report must be verbatim, and, except, perhaps, as to gross grammatical errors, uncorrected.

This was the opinion of the committee.

> That the reports must be verbatim, because the length at which each member should be officially reported cannot be left to the discretion of the reporters, nor would it be desirable to impose on any committee of Parliament or department of Government the responsibility for condensation of speeches.
>
> The report must be uncorrected, except as to grammatical errors, because, if produced as it should be, under conditions ensuring as nearly as possible absolute accuracy, further corrections might involve the alteration of what has actually been said, and would so far prejudice the credit and interest of the report.

It will be seen by this that not only was it decided that a full report of the debates, in spite of the cost of the same, should be published, and I may say that the cost there is a great deal more in proportion than it is here. It costs a great deal more, even taking into account the proportionate lengths of the reports and the lengths of the session, to report the debates in England, and in the United States as well. The officials in connection with such reports receive larger salaries in Great Britain and the United States, and even in some of our

sister colonies of the British Empire. Therefore, I say that our "Hansard" is, on the whole, not costing more than it should, under the circumstances. I have here the evidence of Lord Salisbury, given before that commission, and with the permission of the House I shall read a portion of it, which is not very long. But before I give that, let me refer to a very interesting part of the report of the committee itself, which is as follows :—

The debates in Parliament form a most important, if not the most important, part of our history. It seems absurd and false economy on the part of a great nation to leave to chance the records of the most important factor in the making of its history. As time goes on, the materials for such a record decrease instead of augmenting. There is a steady deterioration, we will not say in the character, for that in some papers is still very high, but in the amplitude of the parliamentary reports in the daily press. Some thirty or forty years ago, the reports of the speeches in Parliament were almost verbatim in every single one of the morning journals ; now the reports of even important speeches, except in the case of the "Times," are brief, almost to lines.

The historical student will find an almost verbatim report of the maiden speech of the late Lord Beaconsfield on 7th December, 1837, in almost every one of the morning papers of that period. As Lord Beaconsfield was but a private member when he made that speech, and for many years afterwards, the speech, if delivered now-a-days, would be unrecorded, or recorded in but a few lines.

But the committee do now ground the desirability of an official and full report upon the material thus supplied for the history of the leading members of Parliament, though the growth or change of their opinion is an important and interesting part of the history of their country. A proper record of parliamentary proceedings would likewise be an excellent guide to the study of the changes in the manners, ideas, opinions and legislation of the country. The history of a parliamentary debate is similar to the description given of a newspaper. The first day it is read with eagerness, the next day it is thrown away ; after the lapse of some years it is worth its weight in gold. The ancient volumes of "Hansard," imperfect as they are, are often intensely interesting reading, for the light they throw on dead statesmen or past condition of society, legislation and controversies. In an age which has seen the growth of a truly scientific method of historical study, it is curious to find that the desirability of a full report of parliamentary proceedings should still be in question.

The proposal that the reports should be mainly made up, not by independent reporting, but from reports culled from the different newspapers, means the whole dependence on newspaper reports, in face of the undeniable and universally acknowledged deterioration of these newspaper reports.

The existing reports collected by Mr. Hansard, though perhaps as good as could be expected under the circumstances, are yet so far from excellence that many members have ceased to even open the reports of their speeches which are sent to them for correction. Knowing that the reports, in any case, would be travesties of what they had said, they were indifferent as to whether the travesty was great or small, and refused to take interest in, or accept any responsibility for, the report. Such a state of things deprives "Hansard" of almost any authority.

Under any system but that of a verbatim report, the majority of speeches—all those, in fact, except the speeches of Ministers of great position and of great oratorical power—will be usually reported in the third person. A report in the third person is a bad report, not merely, nor indeed so much, because it is unduly brief, as because it is an incorrect report. The third person report has the tendency to bring down all speeches to a monotonous and dull level, for it is the individual reporter who is represented in them, and not the different speakers, diverse in temperament, thought and diction. Behind the report in the first person the reader can see the personality of the speaker. Such a report of a speech has colour, reality, the variety of life, while a report in the third person is bad, not only because it is too brief, but because it gives a false impression, and is, therefore, in the higher sense, an incorrect report.

This will enable hon. members to appreciate more fully the value of a verbatim report from a historical point of view. Recurring to the statement of Lord Salisbury, of which I spoke a moment ago, I quote the following question and answer :—

Lord Salisbury was asked, "Have you any observations to make to the committee with regard to the effect of the imperfect reporting of the House upon observations made by you in your official capacity ?" And his answer was, "I think the reporting of the House is defective, and that its defects frequently have injurious effects upon the public interests. The observations made by Ministers in either House of Parliament are taken as official statements of the most precise and formal character, and they are, consequently, if they affect any questions of importance, telegraphed at once to any part of the world which may be interested in the subject-matter to which they relate. Those Ministers, therefore, whose departments concern external affairs, Ministers for Foreign Affairs, for India, or for the Colonies, frequently find that the statements which they make in Parliament are telegraphed at once, as reported, either to foreign courts, to the colonies, or to India. With respect to the colonies, I know nothing ; but it has sometimes happened to me that statements of mine, misreported either to India, or to foreign courts, have produced considerable misconception, and it has more than once happened, though not frequently, that that misconception, before it could be corrected, has produced results which I regretted."

Now, Sir, this is just on account of the fact that the portion of the debate published up to 12 o'clock was taken from the newspapers, instead of being reported by the official reporters of the House. The committee then not only decided that the reports should be verbatim and uncorrected, but that they should cover the work in committee, which is found there to be as important as the debates with Mr. Speaker in the Chair. This investigation took place in

1888, and it was decided that from that date all the reports should be in full and should cover debates on: 1. Private Bills. 2. Debates in committee on Public Bills. 3. Debates in Committee of Supply. 4. Post midnight debates. So as it has been found in the British House of Commons that the fullest and most accurate report of their proceedings ought to be published in the "Hansard," I do not see why we should go back on an institution that, I may say, is cited as a model in other countries; for in his report in 1888, Canada is mentioned as having a full report of the debates of its House of Commons, and cited as an example. As we have been cited as an example in the mother Parliament, I think it will be a very bad step on our part to undo what has secured to us such a good reputation.

Now, there may have been complaints about certain parts of the work, but I believe—and I may say I speak from experience, having had the honour of occupying the chair of the Debates Committee during the last Parliament—we have the best staff of reporters that can be secured in Canada. Our reports, I may say, are a model; and it must be a surprise to other members, as it has been to me that the poor speeches sometimes made by them are turned out so well and so nicely in the reports of the debates—not that the reporters change the sense of the speeches, but that they put them in such an acceptable shape that the members may be proud of them. The members of our staff of reporters have been selected, irrespective of their politics, from among the best men on the staffs of the newspapers. They are men who received a good training even before their appointment, and since they have been grouped together they have improved by experience, and now a member cannot notice any difference between the part of his speech reported by one reporter and the part reported by another. They run, as it were, in the same groove, and they have gained such experience that their reports, as I have said, are a model.

Now, with regard to the cost of the Official Report of Debates, I repeat that the cost is mainly in the printing of the same. The printing of the debates, I may say, has not been controlled by the committee. We send our copy to the Printing Bureau and, whatever charges are made by that bureau we have to stand, whether they are high or whether they are low. Whether those charges can be reduced is a question which I intend to bring before the Debates Committee next session if I have the honour of still being a member of the House and of the committee. I shall look carefully into this matter and I hope, with the co-operation of my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Ellis) that we may, perhaps, find a means of reducing the expense of the printing of our debates.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I may say that I supported the introduction of "Hansard" in this House some twenty-two years ago. I thought at that time it would be well to preserve for future reference the speeches that were made here. I do not know that I have changed my views very materially since, although I notice that the expenses are increasing very largely. I have an idea that this vote has an important bearing upon the cost of legislation, and influences it very largely. The hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) asked for explanations as to the cost of "Hansard." I think that in various ways the cost of "Hansard" not only increases in itself, but it increases the cost of legislation generally. It is said by some, although I will not say so, that it prolongs the session, that it means the multiplication of speeches, that many speeches are made on the same subject and are almost identical in character and are recorded in the "Hansard." Comparing the "Hansard" in this country and in the old country, I find that in this session so far—I do not know how many pages of "Hansard" there will be before the session is over—in May, however, it numbered 6486 pages. I find that in the British "Hansard" last year there were 6151 pages.

Mr. CLANCY. How long was the session in each case?

Mr. LANDERKIN. The session in the old country generally runs six months; I believe sometimes seven or eight months. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) knows the length of the session there, probably, as well as I do. I would not undertake to state it definitely. But there is a less copious——

Mr. MILLS. Do not they count by columns here and by pages in the British "Hansard"?

Mr. LANDERKIN. I do not say whether they counted in columns or pages, I am giving you what I have got as to the cost of these prolonged sessions and the increased cost of legislation. If there is an increase in the cost of legislation it is largely due, perhaps, to the existence of "Hansard." The hon. member for York is anxious to know about the increased cost of "Hansard." I think I can satisfy that hon. gentleman. I have had special actuaries engaged in looking over the "Hansard," I believe they were conscientious men, computing the number of speeches that were made in the House. They have made a report to me and they report that they did not find a single day, in which the member for York had not spoken.

Mr. FOSTER. May I ask the hon. gentleman if it was late in the evening?

Mr. LANDERKIN. It was late in the evening. I understand they found that the member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) had not spoken for four days this session, and they came to me in breathless alarm to ask if there was anything the matter with him during that time. I believe there should

be an allotment of space in the "Hansard," there are some gentlemen in the House who monopolize nearly the whole of "Hansard." I can point out three gentlemen on that side of the House who have taken over a fourth, nearly a third, of the whole "Hansard" during this session, and I will give you their names. I suppose they are proud of their efforts. I notice the hon. member for York, on one subject, made 37 speeches, and they were all long, and were all taken down in the "Hansard." And they were very good speeches. They say that he doesn't often speak without saying something, but he says it over and over and over again. Now, I will give you the result of that hon. gentleman's labours during the present session and the session of 1897. In 1897 the member for York made 1,453 speeches in this House, that is an average of 25 speeches a day. That is a pretty good effort for a man of his size. I don't wonder he is thin. I don't wonder that he looks like Cassius; he is long drawn out. He filled 363 pages of "Hansard." He spoke as much as 30 and 3-7ths of the members of the House during that session.

Mr. BERGERON. Three-sevenths?

Mr. LANDERKIN. Is the hon. gentleman asking me who was the three-sevenths?

Mr. BERGERON. I see what you are after.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) spoke 1,023 times, he was a good second. He is eligible for the Queen's plate next year, but he did not win last year. He occupied over 250 pages last year. The hon. member for East Grey, my colleague (Mr. Sproule), made a very good third. I think with a little coaching, which I will be able to give him during the recess, he will overtake the member for York. He spoke 290 times last session, and filled over 100 pages of "Hansard." So that between these three illustrious statesmen they occupied nearly a third of the "Hansard" of that session. Now, is that fair to their colleagues over there? There is the member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy), he is thirsting for fame, why not give him a chance? He only spoke 250 times this session. There is the member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper), he is getting his spurs whetted. Why not give him a chance? I believe on all law questions he advises the Opposition. Now, there is an injustice in this. I will just ask the members of the House whether they think it is right that three members should monopolize nearly a third of the "Hansard" when other members have an equal right with them? Now, the cost of legislation, in 1897, was $1,134,772.04. Of this, the hon. member for York is responsible for $162,110. The "Hansard" cost $70,000, and he is responsible for $10,000 of that sum. He is going to be the most expensive member in the House. Now, we will take this year. The session is not ended, therefore I cannot furnish complete figures. But hon. gentlemen opposite threaten us with more speeches. They say: If you don't do so and so we will make more speeches. They have been making speeches and speeches, and after a while we will see how they total up. I will show you the practical results, so that they may be published in the constituencies. For 1898, the actuaries who were engaged in the compilation of these figures, told me that they could not find some copies of the "Hansard," and they do not make a full report; but so far the results are very gratifying to these three gentlemen. I find that the member for York spoke this session, and that was up to about the middle of May, 1,066 times.

Mr. FOSTER. I am not yet up to the standard.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I think, though, that when we get a full report—there has been some pretty good days lately—that he will get up to the old standard. The member for West Assiniboia came a better second this time, he spoke 792 times, I think in the last few days he has been gaining very rapidly. The member for East Grey has made 409 speeches this year. I understand these three gentlemen have taken up this year a third of the "Hansard." I think if we were to add the member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy), we could safely say that the four of them have taken up a third of "Hansard." Now, is this not a serious matter? I notice this session that the member for York made 47 speeches on one subject, and they were all the same. That is a pretty good record, they are all down in the "Hansard." I will not say they were not good speeches. But it was time the gentleman should give others on that side a chance. There is the hon. member sitting opposite me (Mr. McDougall), he is burning with speech. Sometimes he is crowded out. The hon. member for Beauharnois is not in it, so to speak, either, he has no chance. These three gentlemen I have mentioned take up almost the whole of the time of the House, about one-third of the "Hansard" is filled with the efforts of those gentlemen. Well, if this is going to continue, I don't wonder at the cost of legislation; I do not wonder at the session being prolonged when hon. gentlemen, not feeling just as gentlemen should feel when they are associated with other gentlemen in the legislation of this country, want to crowd all the others out. I do not believe in this monopoly of "Hansard." It will come to this, that there will have to be a committee, and there will have to be an allotment of space, if such things go on much longer. I think the innate sense of right and wrong should govern the members of this House, and they should not intervene in debates on

every conceivable occasion. How is it in England? I have not made a calculation, nor have I had one made for me, but I venture the statement that if you take the English "Hansard," you will not find a member of the Government nor a member of the Opposition who have intervened in debates nearly the number of times that those hon. gentlemen have done here, and the English sessions are twice as long as ours. Now I think the member for West Assiniboia has told us several times this session that if certain things were not done he would keep the session a month longer. I think I have heard others say the same. The hon. member for West Assiniboia made a long speech. Going home he was standing by the gate, when a reporter passed, and he heard this soliloquy:

My name is O'Davin,
I soon will be havin'
The House to myself
If I keep on this way.

My words are abundant,
My speech is redundant—
I can speak from the morn
Till the close of the day.

If we heard the soliloquy of the hon. member for York, it would be the same as that of the hon. member for West Assiniboia and also of the hon. member for East Grey. I rather take pride in the hon. member for East Grey—I think he is running the race with talkers. Sometimes it has been said that language was given to conceal thought. That is the view the hon. member for York takes of it. With his display of language he can conceal his thoughts just as well as any one I have ever heard of. I hope after this time the hon. gentleman will endeavour to conceal some of his language so that it will not appear so often in "Hansard." If he would only conceal his language as he does his thoughts, he would become an admirable statesman. It is continuous talking. It may be considered by these hon. gentlemen that they are forging to the front, and that by the number of speeches they deliver they are going to outclass others. I do not know how the country will take it, but they are very expensive members of the House, and if there is any increase for legislation, the blame for that increase must fall on those hon. members.

Mr. BERGERON. You had better repeat your remarks in regard to the hon. member for East Grey, who has just come in.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I was praising the hon. member for East Grey when he was not present. His arrival has spiked my guns. After all the herculean efforts on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite we have had a general election and thirty-one by-elections, a list of which I have here.

Mr. BERGERON. What about the election in Bagot?

Mr. LANDERKIN.

The PRIME MINISTER. It is all right.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The hon. member for Bagot died in March. The hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) was here.

Mr. BERGERON. I have been here every day, and you have not been here.

Mr. LANDERKIN. You have been here day after day and month after month.

Mr. BERGERON. Has the hon. member forgotten the parliamentary rule?

Mr. LANDERKIN. I do not mind the House taking exception to my wasting my time on the hon. gentleman, and I will come to order. As the hon. gentleman has referred to the election for Bagot, I will give some facts. The hon. gentleman was here at the time when the late lamented member for Bagot died. He hesitated day after day and week after week, and a month and a half elapsed before he officially mentioned the death of that respected member, and then blamed the Government for not bringing on an election. If the constituency is disfranchised temporarily I lay it at the door of the hon. member for Beauharnois, who had not the courage to make the official announcement of the vacancy caused by the late member's death. When he did call attention to the vacancy, he wanted the election brought on so that the old list might be used, which had been prepared by themselves. He did not think of the new voters, he wanted the election held on a list four or five years old. That is what I have to say about the Bagot election. We have had thirty-one by-elections since the general elections. Hon. gentlemen opposite have had the advantage of the "Hansard" for the purpose of recording their speeches; but they have lost eight seats since the general elections. The wave or reaction that set in swept their friends away at every by-election, with the exception of two. In twenty-nine out of thirty-one by-elections the people have come to the support of the Government led by my distinguished friend, Sir, Wilfrid Laurier. They know and the country knows that it is in the interest of Canada to perpetuate that reign, and I must tell hon. gentlemen opposite that they can go on and speak by the hour, by the day, by the week and by the month, so long as this Government conducts the affairs of the country in the business-like manner in which they have commenced, so long will they continue to preside over the destinies of the Dominion.

Mr. BERGERON. Have you got your promise?

Mr. LANDERKIN. I heard the hon. gentleman say, and he did so in a boasting manner, that Sir John Macdonald promised to make him a Senator.

Mr. BERGERON. No, he offered it to me.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The hon. gentleman boasted of it in this House and in his speeches, and now he says to me: "Have you got a promise?" I do not look for promises, I look for performances.

Mr. BERGERON. We are having one now.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I believe it was Sir Mackenzie Bowell that offered him a seat in the Cabinet, after the seven angels had gone out of it. I like to drop that name "traitor;" the Premier used it, but I am not so bitter in politics as he, and I simply say that when those seven angels fell from the Cabinet then a place was offered to my hon. friend. I have heard him interfering in debates occasionally on that subject. I would advise the hon. gentleman, who has been promised so many things and got nothing, to hold his tongue.

Mr. BERGERON. Promise and offer are not the same thing.

Mr. LANDERKIN. In regard to this item under consideration I think there should be some supervision exercised over "Hansard," —some fair-play over the distribution of the speeches in "Hansard." I do not believe in three members monopolizing one-third of that beautiful volume. I think the other members should have a chance. I have known hon. members rise half a dozen or a dozen times behind one of those hon. gentlemen, who would look back and say "Sit down, I have the floor," or words to that effect; and the poor supporter would crouch down, while little Billy Bennett had not a chance to speak for a month——

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

Mr. LANDERKIN. I mean the hon. member for East Simcoe. I take it back.

Mr. FOSTER. I rise to a point of order. I have no objection, if the leader of the Government is willing at this time of the session to have time wasted on altogether irregular matters, that he should take that ground; but the very discourteous way in which the hon. gentleman has gone into the subject will very likely lead to reprisals. The Chair would consult the interests of the leader of the Government if he would keep hon. gentlemen opposite to the point under discussion. I have noticed the Chairman has been very particular in keeping gentlemen on this side of the House to the point.

The PRIME MINISTER. The hon. gentleman knows as well as I do that every member has the right to speak in the way he thinks proper so long as it is within the rules. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) imagines that it is part of my duty as leader of the Government to supervise in advance speeches which are delivered. I have not that view. My hon. friend (Mr. Landerkin) has made a speech in which there was a good deal of reason and in which there was a good deal of general good-natured badinage, over which there is no reason to get angry. Of course, he made use of an expression which was not parliamentary, and for which he expressed regret and withdrew at once.

Mr. LANDERKIN. That is another speech which the hon. member (Mr. Foster) has got embalmed on "Hansard." It is about the best speech he has made, because it is the shortest, and if he continues in that line it will be very acceptable to the House. What I would like the member for York (Mr. Foster) to do, and what I would like my friend and colleague from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) to do, and what I would like my hon. friend from West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) to do, is to give the other members of the Opposition a chance to see what they can do. Let them make their speeches for "Hansard," but do not do it all themselves. This is one of the most important items in the Estimates. It is for the House to consider the increasing cost of "Hansard." If there is not to be some regulation of the "Hansard" which will prevent hon. gentlemen on one side or the other repeating and repeating their remarks, and getting them printed at the expense of the country, I think the time has come when the subject should receive the serious attention of the House. It is all right that members should have their views placed before their constituents, but I believe there is a grievance in the present system. I do not say that I am opposed to the continuance of "Hansard," but if two or three men are to monopolize the "Hansard," such a state of things should not exist, and I ask the House and the Government to consider this question with a view to remedy the wrong.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. The impression appears to exist that the length of the session depends upon the "Hansard." Now, to refute that I wish to put on record a statement of the length of the different sessions of Parliament since 1841, that is, for 56 years, with the number of days that the session lasted, and the difference between the length of the session before "Hansard" was published, and the length since "Hansard" has been published. The sessions were just as long before "Hansard" was established. This work has been prepared with a great deal of labour by Mr. Alphonse Desjardins, one of our official reporters, and prepared at my request, when I was chairman of the committee in the last Parliament. Mr. Desjardins has since completed the work of bringing it up to date. This table will be very valuable for the information of members of the House, and I would ask the privilege of handing it to the official reporter without reading it so as to save time. It is as follows:—

SESSIONS OF PARLIAMENT OF CANADA UNDER THE UNION ACT OF 1841.

NO OFFICIAL DEBATES PUBLISHED THEN.

Sessions.	Date of Opening.	Date of Prorogation.	Length.
1st—1841	June 14	Sept. 18	97 days.
2nd—1842	Sept. 18	Oct. 12	35 "
3rd—1843	" 28	Dec. 9	73 "
4th—1844-45	Nov. 28	Mar. 29	122 "
5th—1846	Mar. 20	June 9	82 "
6th—1847	June 2	July 28	57 "
7th—1848	Feb. 25	Mar. 23	27 "
8th—1849	Jan. 18	May 30	133 "
9th—1850	May 14	Aug. 10	89 "
10th—1851	" 20	" 30	103 "
11th—1852-53	Aug. 19	June 14	300 "
12th—1854	June 13	" 22	10 "
13th—1854-55	Sept. 5	May 30	268 "
14th—1856	Feb. 15	July 1	137 "
15th—1857	" 26	June 10	105 "
16th—1858	" 25	Aug. 16	173 "
17th—1859	Jan. 29	May 4	96 "
18th—1860	Feb. 28	" 19	81 "
19th—1861	Mar. 16	" 18	65 "
20th—1862	" 26	June 9	76 "
21st—1863	Feb. 12	May 12	90 "
22nd—1863	Aug. 13	Oct. 15	64 "
23rd—1864	Feb. 19	June 30	132 "
24th—1865	Jan. 19	Mar. 18	59 "
25th—1865	Aug. 8	Sept. 18	42 "
26th—1866	June 8	Aug. 15	69 "

Average length of sessions; 99 days and a fraction.
Members of the Parliament of Canada under the Union Act of 1841: 84.
Number of Provinces; Two—Upper and Lower Canada.
Population: 2,200,000.

SESSIONS OF PARLIAMENT OF CANADA UNDER THE CONFEDERATION ACT OF 1867.

NO OFFICIAL DEBATES PUBLISHED.

Sessions.	Date of Opening.	Date of Prorogation.	Length.
1st—1867-68	Nov. 6	May 22	198 days.
2nd—1869	April 15	June 22	69 "
3rd—1870	Feb. 15	May 12	87 "
4th—1871	Feb. 15	April 14	59 "
5th—1872	April 11	June 14	65 "
6th—1873	Mar. 5	Aug. 13	162 "
7th—1873	Oct. 23	Nov. 7	16 "
8th—1874	Mar. 26	May 26	62 "

Number of Members, average 200
Provinces 7
Population 3,500,000
Average length of sessions ..... 89 days.

WITH HANSARD.

Sessions.	Date of Opening.	Date of Prorogation.	Length.
9th—1875	Feb. 4	April 8	64 days.
10th—1876	" 10	" 12	62 "
11th—1877	" 8	" 28	80 "
12th—1878	" 7	May 10	93 "
13th—1879	" 13	" 15	92 "
14th—1880	" 12	" 7	85 "
15th—1880-81	Dec. 9	Mar. 21	103 "
16th—1882	Feb. 9	May 17	98 "
17th—1883	" 8	" 25	107 "
18th—1884	Jan. 17	April 19	93 "
19th—1885	" 29	July 20	173 "
20th—1886	Feb. 25	June 2	98 "
21st—1887	April 13	" 23	72 "
22nd—1888	Feb. 23	May 22	89 "
23rd—1889	Jan. 31	" 2	92 "
24th—1890	" 16	" 16	121 "
25th—1891	April 29	Sept. 30	155 "
26th—1892	Feb. 25	July 9	135 "
27th—1893	Jan. 26	April 1	66 "
28th—1894	Mar. 15	July 23	131 "
29th—1895	April 18	" 22	96 "
30th—1896	Jan. 2	April 23	112 "
31st—1896	Aug. 19	Oct. 5	48 "
32nd—1897	Mar. 25	June 29	97 "

Average length of sessions under the publication of the "Debates" .98 days and a fraction.
Average number of members 213
Provinces (including a large territory to govern) 7
Population 5,000,000

Mr. CLANCY. After the speech we have heard this morning from the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) the House might well consider whether it would not be a proper thing to abolish "Hansard." I am comparatively a new member of this House, and therefore will not pretend to dictate as to what should be done, nor offer an opinion upon it, but I say that the "Hansard" would become a very useless record of the House if it were to be devoted very seriously to such speeches as we have heard from the hon. member (Mr. Landerkin). I am not disposed to say that the speech has not been delivered with a great deal of characteristic humour that belongs alone to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Landerkin). He really has no parallel, and I do not know any other hon. gentleman that we could compare him with. I appeal to hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House if the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) has ever seriously devoted himself to a Bill or a measure in this House, or has risen in his place to offer any useful suggestion as to legislation. He certainly has not done so since I have come to the House. The hon. gentleman has been in the House, I am told, for 25 years, and I do not believe that he can show that he has made one useful or serious speech, or that he has applied himself earnestly

to bring about useful legislation. It ill-becomes him to set himself up as a critic. I do think we should consider whether we should maintain "Hansard" any longer, if it is to be the receptacle for such things as we heard this morning.

Mr. MONTAGUE. It is a pity that when we were discussing a serious question, seriously as to the "Hansard," that a measure of party feeling should be brought in. For my part I want to put myself on record as being favourable to the abolition of the "Hansard" entirely. The local legislatures, especially that of Ontario, have no "Hansard," and I find no fault amongst the members as to the manner in which the debates are published by the enterprise of the daily press. On going to the library I find that a very good record of the debates of the House exists in clippings from the daily press before the "Hansard" of this House was published. There can be no comparison made between this Parliament and the Parliament of Great Britain as regards its "Hansard." The debate of the Parliament of Great Britain is real debate, and if this House could be brought to the level of the Parliament of Great Britain as regards the length of speeches, and as regards the character of its debates—I mean as to condensation—I should be favourable to the existence of "Hansard," but as it is I am opposed to the existence of "Hansard" and will vote for its abolition. I think this House may very well next session appoint a committee of inquiry into the whole matter, when I feel that a majority of the members who desire to promote business will be found to hold the views which I am expressing now.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. My hon. friend (Mr. Montague) has referred to the record of the debates which took place before "Hansard" was established. He must remember that in these days the newspapers devoted a good deal more of their space to political matters, but to-day, with the exigencies of giving news from all parts of the world, and with the facilities for obtaining that news, the newspapers are compelled to condense the reports of Parliament. You will notice that the reports published in even the leading newspapers of to-day are condensed in such a manner that in fact only a very few important speeches are published, and even these are shortened. They do not, and cannot devote the same amount of space to us that they were able to do in former years, on account of the diversity and the amount of news they have to publish in order to satisfy their readers. Therefore, if "Hansard" were abolished, the newspapers could not afford to give more extended reports than they do to-day. In fact, I wonder how they can give to the proceedings of this House so much space as they do, with the number of subjects they have to deal with.

Mr. TALBOT. I simply rise to say that I give my entire approval to every word that has been uttered by the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague), and I think the country at large is back of him in what he has said. The "Hansard" would be all right if it were a correct illustration of what is said in this House; but unfortunately we have a revised edition, in which members who have said things they are sorry for take means to have those parts of their speeches struck out. I consider that the revised "Hansard" is not a correct proof of what is said in this House, because I find that some members strike out almost entire columns of what they have said.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I wish to say that the hon. member is mistaken with regard to that, because it is well known that the "Hansard" committee have a rule that enforces on the reporters the necessity of not allowing any alterations to be made in speeches. Corrections are allowed, but no alterations are allowed to be made, and no member is allowed to strike out any portion of a speech which he may have delivered.

Mr. McMULLEN. I desire to say a word on this question. I believe it would be quite proper to abolish "Hansard" altogether unless we can bring the expenditure within a reasonable limit. I concur in what has been said by the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague). A very respectable account is published in the newspapers of the utterances in the Ontario legislature on both sides of politics. A very fair report of what was done in this House was published in the newspapers before we had a "Hansard" at all, and it would be done again. With regard to the staff we have, I desire to say that I think a more efficient staff could not possibly be got. I quite agree with the remarks of the hon. member for Haldimand in that regard. I think our reporters are equal to any who can be produced in any part of the world. With regard to the shortening of debate, if we could apply the closure in this House, as is done in England and in the United States and prevent long speeches on all subjects, and bring a debate to a close, it might be possible to reduce the expenditure of "Hansard." Certainly something should be done in that direction, or else "Hansard" should be abolished altogether. I think a great deal of the printed material which is sent to the members of the House might also be done away with. Since I have been a member of this House I have received as much stuff as would fill a very large library, a large proportion of which is useless to me. I was in the office of a member of Parliament a short time ago, and I noticed that he had about a cord of stuff there which was never opened, because it was still tied in strings. I asked

him why he did not open it He said he had not time, and that the stuff was a nuisance to him, and he did not know what to do with it. The printing and paper for all that has to be paid for. In the statement of the cost of "Hansard," I presume that the cost of printing and material, such as paper and ink, is not included. Unless a considerable reduction can be made, I would be in favour of abolishing "Hansard" altogether, and leaving the publication of reports of the proceedings of this House to the enterprise of the press.

Mr. SPROULE. I think hon. members would like that very much, if we could make it retroactive, to extend for about fifteen years back.

Mr. CASEY. I have very little sympathy, in fact I have none, with this cry about the expense of "Hansard." It is the easiest thing in the world for any one to get up and say that such and such a thing is expensive and we ought to abolish it. That is no way to approach a question of expenditure. The question is, whether the thing obtained is worth what it costs, I have no hesitation in saying that the publication of our debates has been worth what it costs, even while I admit that those debates contain a vast amount of rubbish, to which I have probably contributed my share. But, Sir, with all the rubbish, the absolutely needless stuff that has been crammed into them, they do furnish the means of holding men to what they have said in this House, and maintaining a record as between the Opposition and the Government and individual members of the House. It is absolutely impossible to preserve that in any other way. The talk about the press reporting us is merely nonsense. The press only reports what the reporters in the gallery believe will be interesting to their readers, and that report is again cut down by the editors before it gets into the papers.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). It would not be so if "Hansard" were out of the way.

Mr. CASEY. It would be exactly so if "Hansard" were out of the way. It was exactly so before "Hansard" existed, and when the hon. gentleman was not in this House.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon.

Mr. CASEY. The first year the hon. gentleman sat in this House was 1874, and that was the first year in which we had a "Hansard."

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). We had no "Hansard" in 1874.

Mr. CASEY. It was inaugurated during that session. Perhaps it did not come into operation until the next session. I was here before 1874, and I know that the papers did then just as they do now; they reported what they thought their readers would take an interest in, without reference to what importance the matter might have afterwards as to Government policy or individual action. That is not their business; they are not expected to look after that. They would be very foolish to waste their time and space in reporting what they did not think their readers would want. It is absolutely necessary for us to have such a report as "Hansard." In England it is supplied by private enterprise, because the people there want such a report, and I believe the Government there also contribute to the "Hansard" reports. But here it is absolutely necessary for us to maintain such a report, if only for the purpose of enabling public men to have published in the local papers or in the larger papers of the country an account of what they say on important questions. As to the manner in which the reporting is carried on, I do not think there are two opinions in this House. I can hardly suppose that there is anywhere a more perfect report furnished than that which has been furnished by the staff of this House for many years past. I have seen a great deal of copy coming from these gentlemen for revision, and precious little revision in it was needed. My hon. friend from Bellechasse (Mr. Talbot) says he has seen whole columns struck out.

Mr. TALBOT. Parts of columns.

Mr. CASEY. Parts of columns struck out. I have no doubt at all that many of us would like to strike out a great deal of what we said; but it has been my experience that if you struck out anything more than what was reduplications, the editor of "Hansard" would refuse to accede to your striking it out.

Mr. TALBOT. Have you tried?

Mr. CASEY. Yes, I have tried. If your words were misunderstood, you have a perfect right to change them, but if there is a total change of sense attempted to be made by a member, I have found that the change has not been carried out. A man may revise his remarks so as to perhaps put them in somewhat better shape or make them more clear, but no alterations in the sense are allowed. I have every confidence in the perfect fairness of the reports of this House, and I have the highest possible opinion of the honesty and value of this publication, even though it cost as much as it does. The question of economy in the publication is another thing, and if anybody can suggest a way by which the cost can be reduced, without impairing the value of "Hansard," his proposition will have my support.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I shall merely take up the attention of the House for a very few minutes. I wish to refer to what the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Talbot) has said. I am a member of the Debates Committee, and I was very sorry to hear him say that the revised edition was really a farce.

Mr. TALBOT. I did not say anything of the kind.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. If what he said were true, it will be worse than a farce, and what he said was that members, in the revision, struck out whole columns. I must say that his statement is utterly unfounded, because so far as my experience goes, members are only allowed to make immaterial alterations by striking out repetitions and improving, perhaps, the phraseology, but if they attempt to do anything more than that, the editor of "Hansard" invariably declines to allow the alterations. With regard to the expense, I am not disposed to cavil at the amount we actually pay for "Hansard" yearly, which I think is some $40,000. That amount I do not consider too large, because I believe we have as excellent a report as could possibly be obtained of the proceedings of this House. I know intimately almost every member of the staff, with some of them I have worked on newspapers in years past, and I know that they are clear-headed, clever newspaper men, with an excellent idea of the politics of the country, and I do not think it would be possible to find in Canada a better staff to do this work. The question of expense is not the issue, as I see it. If the existence of "Hansard" prolongs the sessions two or three weeks or a month, I would feel that we would be better without it. There is no doubt a great deal of matter in "Hansard" that is of no use to the country or to any person in existence, and if we could get rid of that sort of thing, it would be in the best interests of the country. I am disposed to agree in the suggestion of the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) that we should appoint a committee to take this matter up and go fully into it next session, in order to see if some amendment may not be suggested which would have the effect of making it more concise and reducing the expense.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I wish to say that in my remarks I had not the slightest desire to reflect upon the staff, because I believe it is a first-class staff, but simply to discuss the question of the necessity of continuing "Hansard."

Mr. McNEILL. I am quite sure that we have all contributed a good deal of rubbish, as my hon. friend from Elgin (Mr. Casey) says, to the columns of "Hansard," but on the other hand I venture to say that there is to be found in it an immense deal of most valuable information upon questions which are constantly coming up. When hon. members desire to inform themselves with reference to those questions, the most natural mode that suggests itself of getting into the track, if I may say so, of the subject is to refer to the "Hansard" and see what has been said in the past, and I know that in my own case the result has been to throw most valuable light upon many subjects I wished to discuss. As to the opinion that the session will be shortened by the abolition of "Hansard," my own view is that the very opposite would be the result. I think that we would, in that case, have needless discussions as to what any member has said in this House. There would be a statement made from the one side that an hon. member had said so and so, and he would rise to contradict that statement. Another member on the opposite side would corroborate the statement of the first speaker, then members in sympathy with the hon. gentleman whose remark was quoted, would rise in his support, and we would have endless discussions of that kind which would prolong the sessions very much more than they are prolonged by the existence of "Hansard" as it is. It seems to me that the suggestion that the newspaper press can take the place of "Hansard" is simply absurd. It is absolutely absurd to suppose that the press, however desirous of giving as full reports as possible of the proceedings of the House, could possibly give the public the information contained in the columns of "Hansard," and how much that information is valued by the public every member is aware. Because we all know how frequently requests are made to us for copies of "Hansard" which we cannot supply. There is another point of view from which I think we ought to regard this matter. We have at present a most valuable and efficient staff of stenographers for the purpose of producing this report. If we should abolish "Hansard," what would be the result? At the end of a session or two, we would have to re-establish it, and in the meantime our present staff would be scattered to the four winds of heaven, and we would find great difficulty in supplying this House with so valuable and efficient a staff again as the one we have now. I do not think that the proposal to abolish "Hansard" is one that ought to be entertained by this House for a moment.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) asked me about the cost of sessional clerks and messengers. The average session is 100 days, and in the Supplementary Estimates we have added 25 days to that as the additional number for which we will have to pay the sessional clerks and messengers, and the amount in the supplementaries was added on an exact calculation made by the officers of the

House of what we require in order to pay these officials for the extra 25 days. That will only bring us up to and include Tuesday next, and there will probably have to be provided an additional small sum for a few days more.

Mr. FOSTER. What about the item with reference to the leather trunks ?

Mr. SPEAKER. A balance of 59 of the whole number of leather trunks to be supplied at the beginning of Parliament was not delivered at the close of the last financial year. The calculation is $22 for each of these 59 trunks allowed. Provision is made for ten new members who have since come in, each to have a trunk.

Mr. FOSTER. I have just one suggestion with reference to that. I think it would be altogether advisable, if the practice is to be continued of members in each Parliament having trunks, to have the whole matter in the hands of the Serjeant-at-Arms and the Speaker instead of in the hands of private members.

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not quite understand the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster).

Mr. FOSTER. The practice has been, I think, that the Printing Committee, or a committee of the Printing Committee, has had control of this matter, until finally, as a matter of practice, it is left in the hands of one man, and he a member of the House, who takes it upon himself to get the business done by contract or in some other way. I do not think that is a kind of business that a member of the House ought to be asked to do. Stationery comes to us through the regular channel of the economy of the House of Commons, and I think this ought to be treated in the same way. I know that the practice is the same as it was in our time, but the practice is not a good one.

Mr. SPEAKER. As I understand, by resolution of the House moved by the right hon. leader of the House last session, the supplying of leather trunks to members ceases with this Parliament.

Mr. FOSTER. That is all right.

Mr. BERGERON. Just before this matter came up, I was going to say a word in support of what my hon. friend from North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) has said as to the briefness of the newspaper report of many important debates of this House. The other day we had a very important discussion upon the remodelling of the judicature of the Dominion. It covers a great many pages of "Hansard," but I find that in one of the most important papers in the Dominion, the Montreal "Gazette," it occupied only half a column. I suppose that other hon. members have the same experience that I have, so it is not too much to say that every day we receive requests from people outside to send them copies of "Hansard." And, Mr. Chairman, it is always the unrevised "Hansard" that is wanted. And, since I am on my feet, I would make the suggestion that we should be allowed more than one copy of the unrevised edition. Sometimes, by applying to a colleague who does not happen to need his copy, we can get two copies of an issue. I would like to propose that we should have at least ten copies each of the unrevised "Hansard." This would not add much to the expense, as we know that, when the type is on the press, extra copies are easily run off, and the paper is not expensive. Many judges and members of the legal profession have applied for copies containing the debate I have referred to, and, already, applications are coming in for copies containing yesterday's debate on the Montreal Harbour Commissioners.

Mr. INGRAM. Are we to understand that no leather trunks will be distributed after this ?

Mr. SPEAKER. My recollection is that that is the effect of a resolution that was passed on motion of the right hon. Premier.

Mr. INGRAM. Did Mr. Speaker say who was the person who contracted for the last leather trunks ?

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not know ; I think they were procured on the authority of one of the committees, and I think that a contract was made. I know that I did not have anything to do with it.

Mr. INGRAM. I wish to say that the leather trunks which were contracted for during last session of Parliament, as well as those of the last Parliament are simply frauds. The prices paid last term and this term are out of all proportion to what the trunks actually cost. The workmanship is inferior, and $22 apiece should buy much better trunks than those supplied.

Mr. McDOUGALL. They are not worth $10.

Mr. INGRAM. No ; I have never seen trunks of more inferior manufacture, and I have had some experience where trunks are manufactured. If a contract is to be made again some person with technical knowledge of the matter should have something to say about the prices.

Mr. ELLIS. I am a member of the committee that had the matter in charge, and I am able to say that the hon. gentleman at the head of that committee, the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson) gave personal attention to the matter and endeavoured to get the best trunk that could possibly be got for the money. He gave the matter an amount of attention that, probably, no other man would have given ; and, if the results have not been satisfactory, I am very much surprised. I think there was some trouble with regard to the failure of the contrac-

tor. It seemed to me that a very good trunk was furnished.

Mr. McMULLEN. The first leather trunks were contracted for by an hon. member who is not in the House with us, greatly to our regret, the late Dr. Bergin, who was chairman of the Printing and Stationery Committee. The last contract was made by the hon. member for Lincoln and Senator Sir John Carling. As to what has been said, I quite agree with it, at any rate in part. I never saw a greater fraud than the first trunks. I have not examined the second to see how they are made. They look fairly well, but the others also looked fairly well. I agree that great care should be taken in getting the trunks if they are to be continued. But I am glad to know that this giving of trunks will be abolished, because they cost altogether too much.

Mr. BERGERON. I would ask, Mr. Speaker, if every trunk has been taken away by the member to whom it was addressed, or have our Patron friends refused to accept theirs?

Mr. SPEAKER. The Speaker has nothing to do with that matter; it is in the hands of the chairman of the Printing Committee, and the Serjeant-at-Arms certifies before they are paid for. I do not happen to know whether the trunks were taken away or not.

Mr. BERGERON. I desire to call attention to the stationery provided for us, which is really of a very inferior kind. I think it would be just as well not to have any. I do not call it economy to save on an item such as this when we are voting money by the millions.

In the old days we had very good stationery that cost but little more than we are paying now, but the stationery to-day is useless. We might as well not have any at all as to have what is given us in the boxes supplied at the beginning of the session. I think the right hon. gentleman who moved at the commencement of this Parliament that the stationery should not cost so much, might change that rule and give us better stationery again.

Mr. McNEILL. I agree that the stationery at present supplied us is very inferior, not worthy of the stationery which is supposed to come from the House of Commons. Now, I want to make the extravagant proposal, that in place of having that stationery supplied in pasteboard boxes which come to pieces in taking them home, it should be put in a plain deal box, such as are used to send us the "Hansard" in, such boxes as we can take home without their going to pieces on the way. May I be allowed to add this to what I said before with regard to the value of "Hansard"? I think we can very often appreciate the value of "Hansard" when we desire to discover what has been said with reference to some important subject which has been discussed in the local legislatures where there are no "Hansards." When we go to the library we find that an abortive attempt has been made to secure a record of the proceedings. We find a few clippings from newspapers pasted into a book which has to take the place of a "Hansard." These newspaper clippings are most meagre and they are unreliable. That example will show us the value of "Hansard" by showing us in what position we should be placed if we had no "Hansard."

Mr. SPROULE. I wish to say one word with regard to these trunks, because the reference made by Mr. Speaker might be misunderstood in the country. The reference might lead to the impression that I had applied for and got an extra trunk.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member misunderstood what I said. I said that one was sent to the hon. member by mistake, and when the mistake was discovered it was sent back.

Mr. SPROULE. That puts a different face on it. I knew nothing about the trunk until it was left in my room, nor did I know there was one coming.

Post Office Department—For clerical assistance, $1,500; for printing and stationery, $3,000; total..... $4,500

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). Is that item for clerical assistance necessary?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. We have increased the number of money order offices during the year from 1,349 to 1,742. There has been a general expansion in the service. The increase in the number of money order offices involves further books and accounts, and further stationery. There has been an increase of nearly 33 per cent in the number of offices opened during the year. I have all the details of the clerical assistance, if the hon. gentleman desires them.

Post Office..... $732

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The explanation of that is that a temporary clerk only has $360 a year, and when he becomes permanent, he is entitled to a larger salary, $480.

Mr. MONTAGUE. In regard to this $100 for Mr. B. F. Shepheard, third-class clerk in the Victoria post office, there is an item for him in the Supplementaries for 1899.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Mr. B. F. Shepheard is a clerk in the Victoria post office who goes out to meet the steamers from Japan when they are in quarantine. He is obliged to supply himself with a special suit of clothing, and it is a very disagreeable task.

Mr. MONTAGUE. But there is no fumigation going on now.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes, every vessel is quarantined for a time. The hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Prior) brought this case to my notice, and I think it is a very meritorious case, and this gentleman is entitled to indemnity. This $100 is probably not more than enough to indemnify him for the destruction of his clothing. The item my hon. friend refers to in the other Estimates is to increase his salary by the sum of $50, and it is for the next year. This is for the current year.

Mr. INGRAM. Has not the hon. gentleman several temporary railway mail clerks that have been in the employ of the department for years? How long must they serve to be considered permanent?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There are a good many temporaries. I have not increased the number of permanents. This Mr. C. J. Hollister, who is made permanent, has been an officer on the temporary list for some time. We cannot put them all on.

Mr. INGRAM. I know there are many temporary railway mail clerks that are engaged every day they run, and it seems unfair to keep those gentlemen as temporary when they should be appointed as permanent, and when they actually have become permanent.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. We cannot get over that difficulty all at once. As vacancies occur, I suppose the temporaries will gradually be transferred into the permanent list.

Mr. INGRAM. How much longer will these gentlemen have to serve to be made permanent?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. We cannot deal with them faster than vacancies occur.

Mr. INGRAM. They are now filling the position of railway mail clerks and have been for years; the only difference is that they are not permanent. They are quoted as temporary mail clerks, and by that means are deprived of any increase of salary.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That is a state of affairs I found in the department. I am meeting the hon. gentleman's views to some extent in transferring this gentleman to the permanent list.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. gentleman is going to subject the mail clerks to an examination; what is to be the standard?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. We have not adopted any standard. The plan I contemplate is this: Some of the mail clerks did not understand the distribution, and we would have to put three clerks into a car to do the work that one good man could do. One of the mail clerks who underwent an examination recently failed, I understand, to get a single mark, did not seem to know where to put one single letter without having to turn up his directory. The inconvenience to the public in letters going astray is considerable. The system of examination, which I hope will be approved of, simply requires them to know the work in which they are engaged, to know where the letters are to be despatched.

While perhaps it would not be fair all at once to subject the present appointees to a system of promotion solely on the results of the examination, at the same time I trust such examination will in time come to be regarded as the sole ground for promotion. There occurs to me the case of an old officer, who is nearly sixty years of age, and he complains very much at being subjected to a competitive examination for promotion. Whilst I wish the result of the examination ultimately to be the sole test of the right of promotion, I do not think I can apply it fully during the next year or two. Taking the maximum of marks as 100, any one coming within a reasonable range of the maximum would be eligible.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Take a mail clerk who has obtained a low percentage: is it the understanding that he will be required to go up again?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That would be a very proper regulation. These matters, however, are left with the Controller.

Mr. INGRAM. Take a man who has been a number of years in the service, would it not be unjust to compel him to pass the examination and obtain, say, 90 per cent?

Mr. MONTAGUE. The examination is partly on the distribution of mail matter in the cars.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Largely so.

Mr. MONTAGUE. It is hardly fair to examine a man who is on the main line of the Grand Trunk or Canadian Pacific Railway, and who gains experience every day, and at the same time examine a man whose experience has been on a local line.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think all the employees in the different classes should be subjected to the test of that class. Some regard should be had, however, for the opportunities possessed by men to qualify themselves.

Mr. CLARKE. Is it the Postmaster General's intention to give the statutory increases to junior clerks and letter carriers? I understand a saving has been made by reducing the number of clerks employed.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There has been a reduction in the number of mail clerks, there being now thirty-six less than formerly; but I do not suppose that doing away with the services of these men should have an effect otherwise than the application of the money to meet the proper needs of the service. In the main Estimates, there is an item to increase the salaries of a large number of the staff clerks and letter carriers, all drawing less than $480 a year.

Mr. CLARKE. I suppose that will apply to letter carriers drawing less than that sum. Will they get the statutory increase?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. They will receive $30 increase. It happens to be the same sum as was formerly called "statutory increase."

Mr. HUGHES. I desire to inquire if a temporary clerk would have to serve six months before he could commence to be on the permanent list. Suppose a competent mail clerk, who is now temporarily employed in the service, desired to become permanent, would he have to serve six months on probation at the rate of $300 before he could be placed on the permanent list? In such a case would the Postmaster General be prepared to afford such man an opportunity of being placed on the permanent list?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There has been no change in the law of late. I understand the law is this. If a man is appointed as a probationary mail clerk, at the expiration of six months he can be made permanent, at $480 a year. If he commences as a temporary clerk, his years of service does not count technically as probationary service for permanent appointment. That is the rule laid down by the Auditor General, and it is a very illogical rule. My hon. friend from North Victoria (Mr. Hughes) brought to my attention such a case as he now refers to, and I am looking into it. If the Auditor General continues to hold that view, it will probably suggest the desirability of the Act being amended.

Mr. HUGHES. No doubt the Postmaster General is aware that the Government of New Zealand has a right to place a mail clerk on steamers running from there to Canada.

Resolutions to be reported.

The PRIME MINISTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 1.10 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Second Sitting.

SATURDAY, 4th June, 1898.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The House will probably close in the coming week, and, unless some provision is made for the private Bills on the paper, and those coming from the Senate with amendments, it will be impossible for any private legislation to be carried on. Therefore I beg to move:

That an hour be devoted to private Bills on Monday next, from 8 p.m. until 9 p.m., as on Wednesdays and Fridays under rule 19.

Motion agreed to.

A JUDGE FOR SASKATCHEWAN DISTRICT.

Mr. DAVIS (Saskatchewan). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the Government if anything is going to be done about appointing a judge for the Saskatchewan district, or is Judge McGuire going to return there? We have been now ten months without a judge, and as we are 250 miles from Regina, all our business has to be done through agents. The consequence is that the expense of people having business is doubled, and the people are anxious to know whether Judge McGuire is coming back, or whether anybody else is to be appointed in his place?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I am sorry I cannot give my hon. friend an answer at the present moment. The Solicitor General is not in his seat, and I shall have to call the attention of the Minister of Justice to the matter.

REPRESENTATION OF NORTH SIMCOE AND WEST HURON.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to ask the First Minister if any arrangements have been made for holding elections in North Simcoe and in West Huron, which have become vacant—the former by the death of the late member, and the latter by the appointment of the late member to office.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The Government have not made any provision in that respect, and my hon. friend will realize at once for a very obvious reason—because no official notice of these vacancies has yet been given to the Speaker.

Mr. SPROULE. I suppose this might be accepted as an official notice.

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not know that a conversation across the House can be accepted as a proper official notice.

The PRIME MINISTER. The hon. gentleman will have to give notice.

Mr. SPROULE. I now give notice, then, that these two constituencies are vacant, and I ask that the usual course be adopted of filling them at a convenient date.

Mr. SPEAKER. What constituencies ?

Mr. SPROULE. North Simcoe and West Huron.

Mr. SPEAKER. Will the hon. member state the cause of the vacancies ?

Mr. SPROULE. North Simcoe was rendered vacant by the death of the late member, Mr. McCarthy, and West Huron was rendered vacant by the appointment of the late member, Mr. Cameron, as Lieutenant-Governor of the North-west Territories.

Mr. SPEAKER. The notice which has been given will be entered on the Minutes, so that the warrant of the Speaker will issue.

JUDGES OF PROVINCIAL COURTS.

On the Order,

Third reading Bill (No. 150) an Act further to amend the Act respecting the Judges of Provincial Courts.—(Mr. Fitzpatrick.)

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I am sorry to say that the Solicitor General has had to leave suddenly for Quebec ; but I bring this order at once, so as to give my hon. friend from Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper), who I understand is not to remain very long in the city, an opportunity of making the remarks he intends to make. I may say that the Government have come to the conclusion to propose this amendment to the Bill :

Provided that any judge now holding office who shall, by reason only of his having completed the seventy-fifth year of his age, be or become disqualified to hold or retain his office, shall be entitled to a pension under section 15 of this Act, although he may not have continued in office for the number of years mentioned in that section.

I give notice of that amendment, as I am not sure that we can move it now. I think we shall have to move it by resolution.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. The announcement of the right hon. Prime Minister is, of course, satisfactory, so far as it meets the point raised by the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Britton) ; but it does not, of course, touch the question I myself raised when we were in committee. I do not propose to repeat the argument I made in support of my contention, and I only call attention to the fact that the amendment, while gratifying as far as it goes, shows the importance of the amendment I propose to put in your hands. The Solicitor General, after that discussion, gave notice that he would move the following proposed resolution :—

Resolved, That it is expedient further to amend the Act respecting the judges of provincial courts by providing that in the case of any judge of a county court in any province and who now holds office and who becomes disqualified by reason only of his having completed the seventy-fifth year of his age, such judge shall, notwithstanding anything in the said Act, be entitled to a pension, during his natural life, equal to the amount of his annual salary at the time of his ceasing to hold office.

That, however, has been dropped, and the Government have apparently decided not to adopt what would have made the Bill more acceptable, and have removed it from a considerable part of the criticism I offered. The action of the Solicitor General, I say, is satisfactory as far as it goes ; although I think it would involve probably a larger discussion than we had a few nights ago, as to whether there was wisdom in adding so much as that would add to the expense of the country for the purpose the Government had in view—getting rid of the judges at the age of seventy-five years. Without repeating the arguments I urged, whether that resolution had been proceeded with or not, my objection would still remain, that by this retroactive section of the Bill we are entering the thin end of the wedge of the destruction of the independence of the judiciary in this country, because to my mind the moment the county judges understand that the Government may ruthlessly interfere with their tenure of office by making the age limit seventy-five years, they will also understand that the party, or the Government in power, or the Parliament for that matter, may reduce the age to 70 years, to 65 years or 60 years, and consequently they are absolutely at the mercy of the Executive, and so independence is gone. I think in my argument the other night I was successfully able to show that no such legislation had ever occurred in England or in this country up to the present time, and this satement was not contradicted by the hon. the Solicitor General. Indeed, he seemed to sympathize considerably with the view I have put forward and yielded to the extent of putting on the notice paper the resolution which I have read, and which has been dropped. I should explain that I object to the provision of the Bill which increases the number of Superior Court judges in the province of Quebec, so long as the official statistics which were given in the House, and the opinion of the late Attorney General (Mr. Casgrain) are unanswered. The reason is, that there are a large number of Superior Court judges in that province with comparatively nothing to do, while the congestion of business is in one or two districts only. The remedy

is in that case not an increase of the judges, but a re-arrangement of the judicial districts, and of the duties of the judges. The same argument, however, does not apply to the increase of the salaries of the county court judges of the province of Ontario, and I have not at any time questioned the propriety of the Bill so far as that is concerned. I move, therefore:

That the Bill be referred back to Committee of the Whole House for the purpose of amending section 1 by adding the words "hereafter appointed" after the word "person" on the eleventh line of the first page, and by striking out of the fifteenth and sixteenth lines the words "as well to judges now holding office as," and also to strike out clause 3 of the Bill.

I move that, seconded by my hon. friend (Mr. Ingram).

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). This subject has been so often debated that I do not think my hon. friend (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) expects any answer to the arguments which he has advanced. I would simply remark that he made an argument in reference to his proposed amendment which is not at all warranted, when he stated that the words "superannuated judges of seventy-five years of age" was practically an interference with the independence of the judges, and that henceforth the judges would be at the mercy of the Executive. My hon. friend (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) will see that his argument is untenable. The judges cannot be at the mercy of the Executive even if Parliament decides that they are to be superannuated at the age of seventy-five years. The judges cannot be and are not above the law; they cannot be and are not above Parliament, for Parliament can always alter the law upon which judges have their tenure of office. They may be dependent on Parliament in that respect, but they are not dependent upon the Executive; the two things are different.

Sir CHARLES HIBBERT TUPPER. One word of explanation; my point is this. I do not deny that Parliament can fix the age as proposed in this Bill, but while Parliament is doing this, and not the Governor in Council, as the right hon. gentleman says, still I have shown that hitherto in Canada, as in Great Britain, the independence of the judges was so regarded that Parliament would not, and was never advised, to let it be supposed by the judges that Parliament would be asked to interfere with the tenure of office as created by the appointment.

Amendment (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) negatived on a division.

Mr. SPEAKER. The question is now on the third reading of the Bill.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). I move that the debate on the third reading be adjourned; the right hon. gentleman has given notice of amendment.

Mr. ANGERS. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I am of opinion that section 9 ought to be amended, so as to give effect to the provincial statute, which provides that the judges from the rural districts may be called upon to sit in review by turns. The judges ought to be called upon to sit in review whether the judges residing in Montreal or Quebec are able to sit or not. And if that section is not amended, the travelling allowances will be paid to them, only when the chief justice has deemed it necessary to call them to sit in review, that is to say, by reason of illness, absence or incapacity of one of the judges resident at Montreal or Quebec.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). (Translation.) The object of the motion now before us is that the debate on this question be adjourned from now till to-morrow or after to-morrow. Meanwhile, the Government will take into consideration the suggestions which have been made by my hon. friend, the member for Charlevoix (Mr. Angers).

In the meantime, I may say that, for my part, I am not very partial to the provincial legislation on that subject; accordingly, I intend to ask the hon. Minister of Justice to call the attention of the Attorney General of the province of Quebec to the character of that legislation. It enacts that the judges of the Court of Review are taken from all the judges of the Superior Court of the province indiscriminately; that is to say, that not only is that court composed of the judges of the Superior Court residing in Montreal or in Quebec, but that the judges of the other districts are called upon by turns to sit at Quebec and at Montreal, whether they be able to perform their duties as members of that Court of Review or no. I fail to understand the reason why this enactment was passed by the legislature. A judge of Quebec or of Montreal who is unoccupied, may sit in the Court of Review, and I do not understand why the other judges should be called upon to leave their districts, in order to come and take the place of those judges, when the latter can perform that duty. As I said, I fail to see why the judges of the rural districts should be called upon to come and sit in review at Quebec or at Montreal, in the place of the residing judges, when the latter are able to fulfil that duty, a course which involves a useless expenditure. The remarks fallen from my hon. friend are worthy of consideration and I propose to give them my attention before the debate comes up again.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

SUPPLY—THE TRUNK CONTRACT.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. GIBSON. Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I ask your permission to make a personal explanation with regard to the supply of trunks to members of the House of Commons. I understand that some reflections were made by the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) about the manner in which the trunks were supplied to the members of the House of Commons, and I wish to say, at the outset, that the committee which had charge of this matter, received a very gratifying letter from the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) in which he held that, in his opinion, the trunk supplied to him was better than what he expected and far better than those supplied to the members of this House in 1891. May I be permitted to say the reflections which were cast on the late chairman of the Printing Committee (Mr. Bergin) from 1891 until the end of that Parliament, to the effect that he had been a party to condoning a fraud that was perpetrated upon the House of Commons by the contractors supplying trunks that were not worth what the House of Commons paid for them, were utterly unfounded. If I remember correctly, the Government was charged $25 for each trunk in 1891, and the late Mr. Bergin, who was then the chairman of the Printing Committee, was called upon to go to Montreal and certify to the number and value of the trunks supplied. When he went there, he found how the whole matter stood and explained it in committee. He found that the trunks were not worth the money and refused to certify the contractors' account, and stated so to the committee, and I am glad to be able this afternoon to vindicate the memory of my good friend, the late Dr. Bergin, from this unfounded aspersion on his good name. My hon. friend from Haldimand will bear me out when I say that Dr. Bergin stood convicted, so to speak, for five years, under the lash of the criticism of members of this House, of having allowed the Government to be defrauded by having consented to trunks being supplied by the contractors to members of the House of Commons, which were not worth the money the Government paid for them, and no doubt the same criticisms would have been made in this Parliament if the committee had not taken the precaution of calling on members on both sides to examine the trunks for themselves and see whether they were worth the value represented. At the time when the late Dr. Bergin was chairman of the Printing Committee, the trunks were ordered by the Speaker of the House of Commons, Dr. Bergin refused to certify to them, and it was not on his certificate or order, but on the motion of the then Speaker (Mr. Ouimet) that the late Government paid the contractors $25 apiece for the trunks which the members of this House declared were not worth the money, and for the inferior value of which Dr. Bergin was held responsible. In the present instance, before the committee came to any decision as to the quality of the trunks submitted to them for approval, they decided that samples should be sent to members representing both sides and examined by the members on both sides of the House, and I may say, Mr. Speaker, that if that committee had had any idea of defrauding the country, they had ample opportunity for doing so, because some of the contractors were willing to subscribe from $1,200 to $1,500 if the contract were awarded to them. I am not speaking in any vain glorious way when I say that I told the gentleman who made that proposition, that I would be ashamed, as a chairman of that committee which had authorized me to buy the trunks for the members, to have ever even entertained for a moment such a proposition. I told him further that if a ten-dollar bill was to be given with each trunk, I wanted it put into the value of the trunk and not into my pocket. Members on both sides were consulted with reference to the tenders submitted to the committee, and they unanimously decided to accept the trunk that we bought. Unfortunately, for myself, the contractors failed, and I became surety and carried the contractor through the Bank of Commerce until such time as other contractors came forward and filled the balance of the contract. I did this, knowing full well that Parliament would see me through. I wish no better testimony as to the value of the article supplied by McLeod, Hawthorne & Company than that which the committee received from the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague), and I only want to draw the attention of my hon. friend from York (Mr. Foster) to the facts of the case. Without casting any reflections on the present Speaker, whom we all admire, the reason why the matter was not left in his hands was because in 1891 it was in the hands of the Speaker at that time (Mr. Ouimet), and Dr. Bergin felt that he had been made a catspaw of by him. I therefore felt that the new contract ought to be in the hands of the Printing Committee, through its chairman, and not as before in the hands of the Speaker. One member in Dr. Bergin's time left his trunk in the store of Mr. Borbridge, the contractor for the Senate, but not for the House of Commons, and told him to sell it for $10, but that trunk, I believe, is still in the hands there. The member to whom I refer paid Mr. Borbridge $15, and left with him his House of Commons trunk, receiving in return a trunk equal to those supplied by Mr. Borbridge to the Senate, and as I have said, that trunk still remains in Mr. Borbridge's store, as no one would give $10 for it. I think it is only fair to say, without casting any reflection on our Speaker, that the committee—whether wisely or unwisely, it is for the House to judge—left the matter to be dealt with

by myself, and I felt that I would not undertake the responsibility of making a choice without consulting members on both sides. I therefore consulted Mr. Taylor, the Conservative whip and Mr. Sutherland, the Government whip, and we decided on a trunk which, I think has met with the approval of the members, or at all events, whether it has or not, whatever the trunk may have cost, the contract has not put anything into the hands of the committee or any member of it.

Mr. McDOUGALL. What did those trunks cost ?

Mr. GIBSON. $22 apiece.

Mr. McDOUGALL. The hon. gentleman has spoken about the trunks which the members received in the last Parliament. I may say that I received one of them, and examined it to see what it was made of and how it compared with those which the Senators were getting. Having examined it, I went down to Mr. Borbridge, who had the contract for the Senate, and offered him the trunk which I had received from the contractor for the House of Commons and $10 in addition, if he would give me in return one similar to the kind furnished the Senate. He refused, and, therefore, I kept the trunk. That was in 1891. This Parliament I took occasion to examine one of the trunks at the Russell House delivered to members of this House, and I came to the conclusion that there was very little difference between it and the one I had got in the previous Parliament. I made up my mind that one trunk of that kind was enough and would not take another. Then there was some delay, on account of failure or some other reason, in getting the trunks, and a few days before I left the House last year I was in Montreal and went into the store of the contractors. I understood that the next supply would not be delivered for some time, but having found what kind of trunks they were, I said to the gentleman in charge that I did not care to accept one of that kind again, because I had one like it already. I would rather take a valise or something of the kind instead. I took the value of the trunk in what I could buy there for $10, or $12 at the very most, in preference to taking an inferior trunk. The hon. member (Mr. Gibson) says that the members were consulted and were asked to examine samples of the trunks before the order was given. This is the first I have heard of it, and am as constant in my attendance as any other member.

Mr. GIBSON. I would like to inform the hon. gentleman (Mr. McDougall) that the samples were in the Tower Room for two weeks before the contract was given.

Mr. McDOUGALL. The same samples might be in this House for two years and members know nothing about it. A few members may have examined them, but what the hon. member now says hardly justifies the sweeping statement he previously made that the members all satisfied themselves as to the trunks before the order was given. I heard nothing of it, and the hon. members about me here say the same. I, for one, do not consider that the trunk was worth one dollar more than the trunks we got at the previous Parliament—both were bad.

Mr. LISTER. Members had better buy their own trunks

Mr. McDOUGALL. I was about to say—I am not in favour of accepting trunks under circumstances of that kind. Better do without them than defraud the country in the way it has been defrauded. We are charged with getting a benefit from this which we did not get, and it would be far better that we should not accept anything of the kind than have it done in that way.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not know who gave the contract in the last Parliament for the trunks for this House, but the contract for the Senate was given by the late Senator Reid. I saw the trunk he got as a sample. My attention was drawn to those supplied for the Senate and those supplied for the Commons. The ones that Senator Reid got for the Senate for the same money as ours cost, were worth $8 or $10 more than the ones we got. At the time I offered to exchange mine and take a Senate trunk and give, I think, $6 or $8 more, but I could not get it. The Senate trunk was made differently from ours. It had rows of large headed nails up the corners on both sides and over the top, and, between two layers of leather it had the steel band-wire, which keeps the trunk from breaking in. The Senator used an awl in several places to prove that the steel was there, and it was found in every part. As to the second batch of trunks, I do not see any difference between them and the first, even to the locks. As to samples having been submitted for the inspection of members, this is the first I heard of it. I saw no sample before the trunks were delivered. If I had, I should have refused my consent to the purchase of trunks like those we received.

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

(In the Committee.)

Post Office—

To provide for permanent appointment of Mr. C. J. Hollister.....	$120
To compensate Mr. B. F. Shepheard.....	100
To pay mileage to Mr. F. W. Blizard..	512
	$732

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). I would like to ask the Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) what progress is being made by him in preparation for

giving us an accelerated service in the city for drop letters specially posted. I think he said that steps were being taken to establish an accelerated service in large centres of population.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). What I intended to say was that we were introducing a system of immediate delivery, not of drop letters specially, but of letters from any point; and that that system would probably come into operation about the 1st of July. There is a special sum for that purpose, and the letters will be delivered up to a late hour at night.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I presume that the intention is to deliver drop letters in this way also.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Any letter that has an "immediate delivery" stamp on it will be treated as an "immediate delivery" letter; but I do not fancy that in cities, where there is a pretty frequent delivery, advantage will be taken of it for drop letters, though the system will apply to drop letters as well as to others.

Mr. ELLIS. In places of what size does the hon. gentleman intend to introduce this system?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. In all cities where there is a letter delivery system.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Would the Postmaster General allow me on this item to refer to the closing of a post office in Nova Scotia?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have no objection. But, of course, I am not able to carry in my memory, probably, the facts as to the matter to which the hon. gentleman (Mr. McDougall) desires to refer. If he would prefer it, and will give me memo. of the subject, we can take it up on the Supplementary Estimates for 1899.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I may not have an opportunity to be here then. Sir Charles Tupper, on leaving, left some papers in my hands with the request that I should bring the matter to the attention of the Postmaster General. The papers were forwarded by the parties who complain in this case. The subject referred to is the closing of a post office at a place called Pirate Harbour, in Guysborough, N.S. The following letter was addressed to Sir Charles Tupper:—

Pirate Harbour, March 2nd, 1898.

Sir Charles Tupper, M.P., Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—Inclosed you will please find petition from the people of this place to the Postmaster General, protesting against the closing of the Pirate Harbour post office, with the correspondence in the matter. The petition, which was forwarded on the 11th of March last, and also my letter to Mr. Fraser concerning it, have been treated with silent contempt. I am informed by Mr. Robert Peeples, ex-postmaster here, and am pleased to hear, that you are going to make inquiry concerning the grievous imposition by the Government on the followers of their own party here. They have had my support in the past previous to the last local election in Nova Scotia, but I promise you not in future.

I am, yours truly,

(Sgd.) ALFRED F. PEEPLES.

The following is the letter addressed to the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser):—

April 5th, 1897.

D. C. Fraser, Esq., M.P.

My dear Sir,—I wish to bring to your notice that the people of Pirate Harbour sent a petition to the Postmaster General a month ago protesting against the closing of the Pirate Harbour post office. No reply has yet been received. The Liberal committee here say it is the intention of the Government to open a post office again at Pirate Harbour.

Please see Mr. Mulock and ascertain what he intends to do in the matter. The post office was closed on the first instant in the midst of a community who are three-fourths your supporters, and they feel very indignant over the post office deal.

I remain, yours truly,

(Sgd.) ALFRED F. PEEPLES.

Here is the first petition:

To the Honourable Postmaster General,
Ottawa.

The petition of the undersigned residents of Pirate Harbour, in the county of Guysborough and adjoining districts of Steep Creek and Middle Melford, respectfully showeth:

That there is a scheme now on foot among a few people living at Mulgrave Station to cancel the Pirate Harbour post office and carry the mails one and a half miles further north to Mulgrave Station, against which your petitioners most earnestly protest.

Your petitioners showeth that the people of Pirate Harbour have enjoyed the undisputed right of their post office for over forty years, and from the convenience afforded by the train touching at Point Harbour platform on arrival and departure from Mulgrave we have been served with a daily mail from the east and west for the last seventeen years.

Your petitioners further showeth that from the fact of the train on arrival and departure from Mulgrave touching at the platform at Pirate Harbour, makes it convenient and appropriate to exchange a daily mail at this point. The residents of Steep Creek and Middle Medford, who are served tri-weekly only, have a decided advantage also in tapping the Pirate Harbour office on arrival of the train for their mails. Another advantage your petitioners fully appreciate is that the Pirate Harbour office is open or accessible at all hours from 6 a.m. to 9 p.m., a privilege which we would not have under the rules of the Mulgrave post office. Your petitioners herein wish to express their confidence in the present postmaster at Pirate Harbour, who holds the reputation of discharging the duties of his office in a strictly impartial manner. The advice and prayer of your petitioners, therefore, will be to leave the Pirate Harbour office and continue the forwarding duties from the said office as in the past.

Signed by seventy names. This is the letter accompanying the petition:

To the Honourable Postmaster General,
Ottawa.

Sir,—Inclosed please find petition with 75 names. The majority of those petitioners are supporters of Mr. D. C Fraser, M. P. for Guysborough, who supports your Government. The Pirate Harbour post office costs the Government nothing for rent, fuel, light, twine or sealing wax. Consequently the removal of the office to Mulgrave would not save anything for the Government, while it would entail a hardship on the people of Pirate Harbour without giving any additional benefit to the people of Mulgrave. I inclose for your information a rough sketch showing you how the train approaches Pirate Harbour on arrival and departure from Mulgrave. The location of the Pirate Harbour post office suits the people here very well, and I have never heard any complaints against the postmaster, and can see no reason why the office should be shifted.

I may say, while writing, that if you inquire from Mr. D. C. Fraser you will find that myself and my brother, and Thos. H. Peeples, my father, have always supported Mr. Fraser with our votes, and I hope and trust you will give this petition your favourable consideration.

(Sgd.) ALFRED F. PEEPLES.

That is the condition of the matter of the closing of that post office. I would like to remind the Postmaster General that a great many of those petitioners are fishermen who, during the season, are away from their homes the most of the day, and it is a great inconvenience for them when they return to have to go to a more distant post office, and at an hour when perhaps they would not be admitted to that post office. This convenience would cost little or nothing to the department. I cannot see, for my part, what reasons the Postmaster General could have for closing that office and depriving that large number of people of this convenience.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). I take all responsibility in that matter. I found, for example, at Mulgrave three post offices within a distance of two miles, when the change of Government took place; and as I found in my county that there were fishing sections six or eight miles away from a post office, and I did not wish to entail any more expense upon the department than was necessary, I said: Close these three offices and open one central office. There is no person from Pirate Harbour up to the Cove that has to travel two miles to get his letters. And that is not more than we have to do in the town of Canso, having 3,000 of a population. At Canso, the people all round about as far even as the Direct Cable Company, have to go to one office; they have to travel as far at Canso as at Mulgrave. As I wanted to open up offices among the fishermen who had no office at all, I said: One good office here is better than three, especially as I knew that they had been opened for political purposes.

Mr. McDOUGALL. This one was open for 40 years.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). I don't care if it was 500 years ago. That was the first office; the two others were opened for political purposes. The people there, both sides of politics, are satisfied that the right thing was done.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Notwithstanding this petition?

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). That means nothing. I can get up a petition to behead the hon. gentleman. I do not heed these things.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Try it.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). I do not need to try it. I would have to keep them away if I gave notice that I wanted to do such a thing. The offices of Port Mulgrave and Mulgrave Station were within less than a mile of each other, and mistakes frequently occurred in sending letters to one office that belonged to the other, and I did the same thing there. I did not think it right to keep a post office open when it was not in the interest of the country. I did the same thing in Caledonia. There were three offices in a country district within two miles of each other, and I closed one of them. One of them was opened just to satisfy a political chap that wanted to get an office. I do not think it is too much for people who live near each other to go two miles for their mail, as they do in the town of New Glasgow, a town of over 4,000. There people have to travel just as far to get their mail as they do at Port Mulgrave.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Oh, no. I have seen it.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). I know what the distance is better than the hon. gentleman's eyes. I tell the hon. gentleman that there is no person at Pirate Cove who has to go further for his letters than people have to go at New Glasgow, where the post office serves 4,000 people. While I am willing to give every possible convenience to people to get their mail, I say it is a scandal to have three post offices within two miles. I know that some Liberals wanted the third office kept open, and the hon. gentleman is surprised because he happens to find a Liberal name on his petition. The people of that district who understand it, are one upon this matter. I know that some of my friends thought that it should not be done, but I explained it to them, and they are perfectly satisfied. I am satisfied, and I will take all the risks.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Because the hon. gentleman don't intend to go back to his constituents.

Mr. FRASER. The hon. gentleman thinks he is smart. I say if I want to go back there there is no person can prevent me from going back. I am ready to go back

at any time against the hon. gentleman and all their forces, and more than that, I am ready to go into their constituencies. I say I take the whole responsibility of that, and I will do it again. I obtained a good post office in my county by closing two post offices, and I will do it again, even if some Liberals object. In my county post offices were formerly established and opened to serve the purposes of political charlatans. If the hon. gentleman thinks by having a large number of post offices unnecessarily, I may say to him that I would advise the Postmaster General to act as he has acted already, and as I have advised him to act in two or three instances. I have explained to my constituents the benefits derived from having one good post office rather than two or three, for it must be remembered that fishermen have sometimes to travel six or eight miles for their mail. I take all responsibility for this action, and if the hon. gentleman thinks he can make political capital out of it, I am satisfied to let him hold that opinion.

Mr. MILLS. I rather think the cat was let out of the bag when the hon. gentleman made the statement. He said he wanted to open up post offices in order to get political followers into office.

Mr. FRASER. I said no such thing. I said I wanted to close two or three post offices and open in place one good one.

Mr. MILLS. The same as was done in Annapolis County. I referred to the cases last session and incidentally this session. In Lower Granville there were three offices on one line of mail route. I take exception to the statement of the hon. member that a number of post offices is not conducive to the business welfare of the community. When they are on the same route they can be established at a cheaper rate and have better facilities than if there is to be a separate mail route for an individual office. Between Lower Granville and Victoria Beach there is a daily mail route. On that line there were two post offices, one in charge of the ex-Warden of the county, J. H. Thorne, and the other in charge of Capt. David Covert. They were informed that complaints had been made against them of partisanship at the last elections, and they were brought before the post office inspector. An investigation was made, the charges were not sustained in any way, and the inspector then informed these postmasters that they had better resign, but they refused to do so. What did the Government do to get these men out of their positions? They abolished the two post offices at Karsdale and Thorneville, and established one office between them, and put in as postmaster the man who made the charges against them. They put in a self-confessed forger, and self-confessed perjurer, who was a ward-heeler and who appeared before Judge Savory in connection with the revision of the election tests of 1890. That man was a self-confessed forger and a self-confessed perjurer, and he admitted himself to be in the pay of the Attorney General of Nova Scotia for the purpose of getting names of voters placed upon the lists in 1890. That is the way these things are done. From the manner in which the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) assumed responsibility, one would imagine he was the Postmaster General. But will he take the responsibility of these acts? I do not think he will; and I doubt whether the Postmaster General himself will be willing to assume the responsibility for such an outrage as was perpetrated on the people of Lower Granville. The Liberals of Lower Granville, as well as the Conservatives, are in arms about the action of the Post Office Department. The case brought forward by the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. McDougall) is on all fours with the case to which I have referred. The Government were determined to assist somebody and they succeeded.

Militia—	
To provide for salary of Major Cartwright, A.A.G. at headquarters, from 15th February, 1898, to 30th February, 1898, at $2,800	$ 1,050
For pay of permanent corps, schools of instruction, &c.—Further amount required	25,000
For salaries and wages of civil employees, outside service—Further amount required	5,500
For provisions and supplies for permanent corps—Further amount required	10,000
To provide for supplies, transport and expenses of militia force sent to Yukon	100,000
For transport—Further amount required	10,000
Dominion Cartridge Factory—Further sum required to meet wages and general expenses	10,000
Total	$161,550

Mr. MONTAGUE. Who is this officer, Major Cartwright?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Major Cartwright was brought here from the permanent force in Toronto. He has taken the position of Assistant Adjutant General.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Then he is not a relative of the Minister of Trade and Commerce.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. His son.

Mr. CLARKE. My hon. friend from East Toronto (Mr. Robertson) has on the Order paper some questions respecting the militia, and I doubt there will be any further opportunity of asking them before prorogation. As we are now discussing militia items, I desire to ask for my hon. friend the information he desires to obtain. He wants to know as follows:—

1. How many of the subaltern officers appointed to the permanent force since 10th July, 1896, were in possession of long course certificates when appointed ?

2. How many of the officers so appointed have since obtained long course certificates ?

3. How many of these officers are not in possession of long course certificates ?

Will the Minister answer that question ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I am unable to answer the question at the moment. I will, however, furnish the information when the further Supplementaries are considered by the committee.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Will the Minister state the rules on which young men are admitted to the military school at Fredericton, and on what grounds they are discharged after being there a short period ? I am acquainted with the case of a young man who went to the military school at Fredericton at great expense, and after he had been there a few weeks or a month was ordered home. The reason given to me for this action was that the young man was a Conservative.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Nothing could be more untrue and unjust than to make a statement of that kind. I do not charge it against the hon. gentleman ; but it would have been only fair if the hon. gentleman had sent me notice that he would make a charge of this kind. I can assure him that if he will send me the name and the particulars, I will investigate the matter. But there is not the slightest particle of political partisanship in connection with the administration of the military schools. We never inquire as to a man's politics at all. I presume the hon. gentleman is referring to the men who are sent from the different militia battalions throughout the country to these schools of instruction.

Mr. McDOUGALL. This man was never under instruction in any way until he went to Fredericton. The man's name was McKenzie. I forget his christian name now.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. But he was not a member of the active militia.

Mr. McDOUGALL. No.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Then he had no business to go there.

Mr. McDOUGALL. There were a number of young men from the neighbourhood who went there, but it happened that their politics were different and the others got not only one term but two terms.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I do not know that the hon. gentleman (Mr. McDougall) understands what he is saying, but I am sure I do not understand what he means. No man can enter these schools unless he has joined one of the militia corps of the country. We provide schools at the different depots to teach non-commissioned officers and officers of the active militia. The colonel in command of a battalion makes a request through the proper channel to have some of his officers or men received at a given school, and in the maritime provinces that is at Fredericton. If there is room there these men are received and in all cases they are received in the order in which the names are sent in. No question is made as to politics. We know nothing whatever of their politics. As a matter of fact four-fifths of the commanding officers of the militia are Conservatives, but the department does not know any difference between a Conservative or a Liberal. We receive in these schools every man who is properly recommended and is a member of the active militia, in the order in which application is made, and if there is room for them.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I know personally these young men about whom I speak, as they are from my neighbourhood. Two brothers, one Archibald McDougall and the other, Daniel McDougall, attended the military school at Fredericton and before they went there they were never under one single hour's instruction in their life. They were never members of any corps.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. They could not go there without belonging to a corps.

Mr. McDOUGALL. They never had any connection with any corps belonging to the militia, and the other young man was precisely in the same position in that regard.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Would the hon. gentleman (Mr. McDougall) give me their names ?

Mr. McDOUGALL. Daniel McDougall and Archibald McDougall ; they served their time one or two terms.

Mr. WOOD (Hamilton). Were they Conservatives ?

Mr. McDOUGALL. These two were Liberals. The man who was sent home after a short time was John McKenzie, I think.

Mr. MILLS. Was he a member of any corps ?

Mr. McDOUGALL. No.

Mr. MILLS. Was he a Tory ?

Mr. McDOUGALL. Yes. The three young men lived within a mile of my place, and I might say my authority is the father of this young man McKenzie who complained to me about how his son was treated, and he could not understand it except that the young man gave away that he was a Conservative.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Could the hon. gentleman give me about the date McKenzie went there ?

Mr. McDOUGALL. As near as I can remember it was September or October last.

Mr. CLARKE. In this item there is $100,000 to provide for supplies and transportation for the Yukon militia force? Is it a fact that the heavy guns for the contingent were sent over the all-American route via Seattle?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. My information is that most of the guns, not all, are being sent over the Stickine River route. There are no heavy guns.

Mr. CLARKE. The rapid-firing guns.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. They are taken apart and not heavy in that way. They were taken over the Glenora route.

Mr. CLARKE. How did they get to the Pacific Coast?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. By the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. CLARKE. That is what I want to know, and I asked that information some time ago.

Mr. MILLS. Who has been appointed caretaker of Fort Ann at Annapolis?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. A gentleman by the name of Owen has been appointed to take charge without any pay. He agreed to exercise an oversight there, but is not under any salary. A man by the name of Amberman, I think, has been put into one of the houses on the ground and he is the direct caretaker, but he reports to Mr. Owen.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. J. M. Owen?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes, I think so.

Mr. MILLS. Is that a permanent arrangement?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. No, a temporary arrangement.

Mr. FOSTER. Where are the papers asked for with reference to this $100,000 item?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I gave them to the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) two days ago.

Mr. FOSTER. Have they been brought down to the House? Were they laid on the Table?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) read a telegram the other morning and at the afternoon sitting of the House he complained to me that he had not received the papers. I was not in the House at the time, but I said they were in my desk and at his request I handed the papers to him. He has not sent them back, but I suppose he can lay them on the Table of the House.

Mr. FOSTER. He cannot and have them incorporated in the records of the House. That must be done by the Minister. I am informed that the papers in reference to the supplies have not been brought down.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. All I was asked to give was information in regard to the contract for transportation, and I gave the fullest information I could in regard to it. As to the supplies I have here the fullest information with regard to them, from whom we purchased them, and the prices paid, and I will give them now or any other convenient time.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend may not have understood it; but I am quite sure that both the hon. member for Pictou and myself asked for all the papers. I remember suggesting to the hon. member for Pictou to ask as well for any that might be in the Department of the Interior. The whole question of supplies came up. It is very well for my hon. friend who has the papers, and understands them, to state their contents; but we would like to have the papers themselves.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. There are no "papers" in the proper sense of the term. The contract was entered into, after a certain number of tradesmen had been communicated with by Colonel Lake, the Quartermaster General of the department, and I asked him to prepare a memorandum with regard to the whole question, and I have it here, it gives all the information which I am able to give. We did not ask for tenders by advertisement, and I am prepared to state the reasons why we did not. I am prepared to give the names of all who submitted tenders, and the prices at which the goods were purchased, either now or when the corresponding item in the next Supplementary Estimates is being considered.

Mr. FOSTER. We might as well have the statement now.

Mr. TISDALE. What system did the hon. Minister pursue? Did he ask a certain number of gentlemen to make offers, did he send a circular out, or did he deal with one individual?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). I want to say, in reply to what was said by my hon. friend from York, that I was here when the discussion took place, and my understanding certainly was not that we were asked to bring down any papers relating to the purchase of supplies. I did not understand that that was the subject of discussion at all. I understood that the subject of discussion was simply the question of transportation. Accordingly, when I gave directions respecting the preparation of the papers, like my hon. friend

the Minister of Militia. I gave directions for the preparation of those relating to the transport contract, and I laid them on the Table of the House. If my hon. friend wants the papers relating to the purchase of supplies, there is no objection at all to bringing them down. It was simply a misunderstanding.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. This is the statement of the quartermaster general, and it will give all the information I have:

The points to be noted with regard to the allotment of tenders for stores for the Yukon force to the successful tenderers appear to me to be as follows:—

The first order given for the preparation of the force contemplated that the force should start in ten days' time from the giving of the order. As every detail had to be worked out, from the settling of the uniform to be worn, the amount and nature of the daily ration each day, down to the actual detail of the men to compose the force, it is evident that we were very much pressed for time, and that practically it was all but impossible to advertise in the press for tenders for these supplies to be submitted in the usual way. As a matter of fact, several firms were invited and did submit tenders. For instance, Messrs. H. N. Bate & Sons, the Hudson's Bay Company, Mr. J. Strachan, of Montreal, the Ogilvie Milling Company, Harris Brothers, Hamilton, Mr. J. Jamieson, of Ottawa, the Bovril Co. (Ltd.), and one or two others.

Secondly, in allotting these contracts, considerable attention had to be paid to the uncertainty of the conditions of the route and the means of transport. For instance, it was for some time uncertain whether the stores would be conveyed by sleighs, by toboggans, by pack transport or by men. Further, we were constantly receiving additional information about the route. It was, therefore, most desirable, it may be said essential, that we should have our contractors close at hand in order that we might direct them as to the method of packing, and answer the numerous questions of detail which arose in the course of the fulfilment of the contracts. I may say that from the time that the contract was allotted to Messrs. H. N. Bate & Sons to the time the goods were delivered to the railway company for transport, we were in almost daily communication with their representative, as to the manner in which the stores were to be packed and preserved for keeping, &c. In the case of the Hudson Bay Company, to whom a cosiderable portion of the contract was allotted, we had personal instructions given to them by the officer commanding the force, and we were, in addition, fortified by our knowledge of the vast experience of this company in packing.

At the same time, that it may be seen that the prices paid by us to our contractors were not excessive, a list of the more important articles, and the price for each, is attached, together with a list of the prices current in the wholesale market at the present time. It may also be remarked that it was a matter of common knowledge from newspapers that a force of men would be sent to the Yukon district, and that they would, of course, require supplies; and it may be stated that the Hudson Bay Company submitted their tender solely on information derived from the press. It was, therefore, open to any other contractors to have adopted the same course.

It is true that the expedition did not start until May, although ordered early in March; but it must be borne in mind that throughout the whole of the period it was impossible to say how soon the force might be required to move, and it was, therefore, necessary to be prepared with our arrangements without loss of time.

It will be remembered that there were two main supplies of stores: first, the supplies actually taken with the detachment itself for its use; secondly the reserve supplies for delivery by sea, and via the mouth of the Yukon River. Having arranged for the delivery of the first consignment by certain contractors, and having explained to them all the conditions attending the transaction, there was evident advantage in giving the further contracts to the same people, and avoiding a repetition of process of giving instructions. Further, these contractors were in a position to secure us, as they did secure us, against the extra expense which would otherwise have been incurred consequent upon the great rise in the wholesale prices of all provisions, which was brought about early in April by the war between the United States and Spain.

In addition to what is said there, I may state that when the decision was first come to to send a force into that country, we expected that it would go forward on the ice up the Stikine River. The time was very limited. As stated by Colonel Lake, if the force had started at the time we originally expected, there were only about ten days. It turned out differently. We found that, owing to the water on the ice at the mouth of the river, it was necessary to wait. We might possibly have asked for tenders by advertisement in the newspapers, but I think the reasons stated by Colonel Lake ought to be sufficient to justify us in the course we pursued. In any case, we made contracts of a much more favourable character than could have been made a few weeks later. As a matter of fact, the goods have been purchased at probably 20 per cent less than they could be purchased now. I may say further that at the outset we took occasion to ascertain the difference between the prices here and the prices on the coast, and we satisfied ourselves, through our district officer commanding at Victoria, B.C., Colonel Peters, that the prices here plus the freight to Victoria were lower than the prices on the coast.

Mr. CLARKE. I notice by the statement the hon. Minister has read, that tenders were asked from firms in Montreal, in this city, and in Hamilton. Was there an opportunity given to any of the Toronto produce dealers to put in bids?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I am not aware that there was.

Mr. FOSTER. What was the amount of the actually used supplies, the amount of the reserved supplies, and the value of each?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I think the first supplies were in quantity about eighty tons.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the amount of money involved in the actually used supplies and what in the reserve supplies ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I am not able to separate them in that way. The total cost of the supplies is about $32,000 or $33,000.

Mr. FOSTER. It is absolutely necessary for discussion that we should know what the actually used supplies and what the reserve supplies cost. The hon. gentleman pleads that exigency prevented his calling for tenders for the actually used supplies, but he can have no such plea for the reserve supplies.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I can tell the hon. gentleman approximately. Between $20,000 and $22,000 for the reserve supplies, and $10,000 and $12,000 for the used supplies.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Why did not the hon. gentleman ask for tenders in Toronto ? It seems extraordinary that he should go to Hamilton and London and other cities much smaller than Toronto and pass Toronto by. I have no objection to his calling for tenders from the business men in these smaller cities, but it does seem extraordinary that these supplies should have been asked for only in cities represented by Liberals.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. There is no reason. This matter was left to my officers, and no one who asked for the opportunity of tendering was refused.

Mr. MONTAGUE. What public notice was given ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. There was no public notice given.

Mr. MONTAGUE. How did the hon. Minister expect people to ask for an opportunity of tendering when no public notice was given that the supplies were required ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. It was currently known and spoken of in the newspapers, and some of the tenders that were received were due to the fact that it was publicly known that we were purchasing supplies.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Does not the hon. Minister see that he has himself shown that there was quite sufficient time to call for tenders ? He says that it was a matter of current report in the newspapers. It seems that there was plenty of time for the newspapers to discuss it, but not sufficient time to advertise for tenders.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I have read the statement of Col. Lake. This was a kind of business requiring very special care with reference to packing, and it was important that the officers here should, as far as possible, have the matter under their control. Col. Lake gave that as a reason, and any one who knows Col. Lake will agree that he would not make that statement unless he deemed the matter of first importance.

Mr. MONTAGUE. For my part, I cannot conceive of an officer of the intelligence of Col. Lake passing by the great city of Toronto without having some reason for doing so. When the hon. Minister throws the whole responsibility upon Col. Lake, he throws a responsibility upon him which it is not at all pleasant, I fancy, for him to assume. I think we ought to have further explanation as to why parties in Toronto were not asked for tenders.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I do not throw any responsibility on Col. Lake, but have simply read what he has written in his own report. I am not able to give any further reason, and there is no reason—I do not know what the hon. gentleman means by a reason.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The reason is this. The city of Toronto, with a population of nearly 200,000, undoubtedly must have men much better equipped to supply the requirements, if experience, capital and extent of business are to be taken into account, than can be found in the city of London, with a population of 45,000, and that is no discredit to the city of London. There must be some reason why this is done.

Mr. TISDALE. I thing it is hardly fair to Col. Lake to shift all the responsibility on him. The purchase of supplies must be made under the responsibility of the Minister.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Of course it is. My hon. friend misunderstands me, if he thinks I do not accept full responsibility.

Mr. TISDALE. I quite understand that he must, but still the question is whether he ought not to have exercised his responsibility by taking the course suggested. The hon. gentleman says that he did so because it is a case of exigency, but if he had time to correspond with Kingston, London and other cities, he had equal time to correspond with a larger city like Toronto. There can be no doubt that Toronto is well equipped with firms in a position to tender, because we all know that large contracts for supplies for the Klondike and Yukon are made there, and that there is scarcely a mining company which does not get circulars from Toronto firms offering to furnish supplies. There are other establishments in British Columbia besides the Hudson Bay store. The hon. gentleman's reply is hardly satisfactory, when he confines himself to saying that Col. Lake did so and so because the exigencies did not allow him to do more.

I submit that the precedent is not a good one. The Minister ought not to have confined himself to simply telling the quartermaster general to procure the supplies, but he should have asked: What supplies do you want? and then see that opportunities were given to business firms to tender by advertising for tenders, or if there was not time to advertise, by sending out circulars. Had the Minister done this, he would have secured the best supplies at the cheapest rates, and have put himself in the position of not being open to the charge of favouring any particular firms or localities.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. My hon. friend knows that the quartermaster general is specially charged with this branch of the work, and I think it is quite proper that the Minister should be advised by him in a matter of this kind. It is the duty of the quartermaster general to see that these men are supplied with food, to see that they are supplied with it at the proper time, that the food is of proper quality, and that it is in proper quantity. These are very important considerations, when you are sending a body of men into a district such as these men have gone into. Colonel Lake conscientiously believed that he was pursuing the best course. The time was limited to ten days, in the first place, so that there was no time to advertise generally in the newspapers. And when a second supply had to be got, as these parties had proved satisfactory, and it was thought that the experience they had gained would be an advantage and enable them to fill the second contract better than if we began anew with others. Now, with regard to the parties from whom we bought the supplies, while I am on my feet, I would like to read the names. First, I have here a list of persons from whom the purchases were made or from whom applications were received, and the names of those who have been recommended for patronage but were not asked to supply:—

Adams Bros., boots, Toronto.
S. & H. Borbridge, leather, Ottawa.
Bryson, Graham & Co., dry goods, Ottawa.
T. Burns, catering, Ottawa.
Butterworth & Co., tools, hardware and supplies, Ottawa.
Bovril (Limited), dried vegetables, Montreal.
H. N. Bate & Sons, groceries, Ottawa.
A. Congdon, felt boots, Winnipeg.
W. G. Charleson, tools and hardware supplies, Ottawa.
Cole's National Mfg. Co., duck covers, &c., Ottawa.
W. C. Edwards & Co. (Limited), lumber, sashes, Ottawa.
Daniel Green, felt boots, Dolgeville.
Granite Mille, socks, St. Hyacinthe.
Graves Bros., tools and hardware supplies, Ottawa.
Graham Bros., seeds, Ottawa.
P. Garneau, Fils & Cie., dry goods, Quebec.
Jas. Hope & Sons, stationery (books), Ottawa.
Hudson Bay Co., diaries, Winnipeg.
James Johnston, blankets, Montreal.
Keer Vegetable Evaporating Co., Kentville, N.S.
Ottawa Boot and Moccasin Co., boots, Ottawa.
Lewis Bros. & Co., rubber sheets, Montreal.
Geo. May, lace leather, Ottawa.
J. A. Musgrove, goggles, sponges, combs, Ottawa.
G. Marsolais, Monday & Co., clothing, Montreal.
McClary Mfg. Co., tin pails, Montreal.
McDougall & Cuzner, anvils and blacksmith's supplies, Ottawa.
Z. Paquet, dry goods, clothing, Quebec.
Peterborough Canoe Co., canoes, Peterborough.
J. A. Desrivières, lumber, Ottawa.
O. Robillard, tinware, Ottawa.
The C. Ross Co., dry goods, Ottawa.
Sunson Bros. & Co., lime juice, Halifax.
J. Skinner & Co., drugs, Ottawa.
C. Shaw & Co., lamps, Ottawa.
J. A. Seybold & Co., duck suits, sweaters, &c., Ottawa.
Thomas Sonne, adjustable canoes, Montreal.
W. E. Sanford Mfg. Co., clothing, Hamilton.

We have purchased more from W. E. Sanford & Co. than from any other clothing firm. We found them able to do the work in the time, and their work was satisfactory.

Mr. CAMPBELL. What was their politics?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. We did not take the politics into consideration in purchasing.

Tower & Lyon, hand-cuffs, New York.
James W. Woods, blankets, stoves, general supplies, Ottawa.
The Harold A. Wilson Co., athletic supplies, Toronto.

Mr. CLARKE. What was purchased from the Harold A. Wilson Company?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I cannot tell the hon. gentleman.

H. Walters, axes, Hull.
Richardson Woollen Mill (Willet), cloth, Chambly.
Wm. Strachan, clothing and general supplies, Montreal.
T. Bellemare, moccasin boots, Ottawa.
Geo. Blanche, clothing, Montreal.
Harris & Co., captain's biscuits, Hamilton.
Cluff & Stewart, clothing, Vancouver.
Canadian Government Creameries, butter, Ottawa.
R. J. Graham, evaporated apples, Belleville.
Macdonald Bros., mosquito nets, Montreal.
Pritchard & Andrews, stamping, Ottawa.
Antigonish Condensed Milk Co. (Hugh Tudile, agent), Vancouver.
The Westport Woollen Mills, blanket supplies, Westport.
Hugh Carson & Co., tump lines, Ottawa.
W. C. Caldwell & Co., blankets, Lanark.

Mr. EARLE. Have you purchased from all these people?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. No.

Mr. EARLE. There is no information, then, in that list.

Mr. FOSTER. Of what benefit is that list if the hon. Minister does not distinguish between those who supplied and those who did not supply? Again, how much did each supply? Again, at what price? Again, where was the competition? If only one firm was asked for groceries and another firm for boots, there would be no competition.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I am going to give the hon. gentleman the prices:—

Flour, per barrel—First order, $5.65; second order, $6.10.

Mr. WALLACE. Delivered where?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. At Vancouver.

Mr. EARLE. What flour was that?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I suppose the hon. gentleman refers to the brand. I cannot give that.

Mr. EARLE. That makes a great difference. If the hon. Minister asked for flour on the Pacific Coast, we could give him very good flour, regardless of brand, at a much lower figure, had we had an opportunity to offer.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I can assure the hon. gentleman (Mr. Earle) that the goods we have bought are the best of their class, without exception.

Mr. EARLE. But that does not say what the class is. I speak from knowledge of the provision trade, being in that trade myself. When the Minister uses the argument that it is necessary to buy here because the merchants are experienced in packing goods, he should know that that is a specialty with the people of the Pacific Coast; that they are accustomed to pack for mining camps, and that there are not more experienced merchants in the Dominion in that particular line of business. I think it is regrettable that they have not had an opportunity of offering at least for the supply of these goods. I feel satisfied, quality for quality, purchases could be made at a lower figure on the Pacific Coast than the cost of purchasing here and sending to the Pacific Coast. The Hudson Bay Company and many other large firms who are in a position to buy goods to the very best advantage laid in immense stocks of staple goods for the purpose of supplying the Yukon trade, purchasing last fall when the markets were very much lower than they are at the present time, and securing many lines of goods that it is almost impossible to purchase now. I am satisfied as I can be about anything that if we had an opportunity—I do not say myself, for of course I could not take part—that on the coast they would be able to compete successfully for that trade. The Government has had experience in purchasing for the mounted police. The coast merchants have been able to supply goods at short notice. The Government have an agent who supervises the shipment of these goods. He is on the spot and devotes his time to looking after supplies to be sent to the mounted police. So, there would be no difficulty on that score. On the score of experience, there is no place in the Dominion where they have had the experience they have had on the Pacific Coast, in the packing and preparation of supplies to go into that country, either by pack train, by men, or sleighs, or in any other manner. I regret very much that the Government have not seen fit to give our people at least an opportunity of competing for so large an amount of supplies as are going forward at the present time.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. All I can say is that means were taken to ascertain the relative prices, and I was informed that the prices of goods supplied in the east delivered at Vancouver, were better than the prices quoted at Vancouver.

Mr. EARLE. Will the Minister tell us how that comparison was made? Was it a mere statement of the officer he mentioned who possibly dropped into a place and inquired the price? That was not competition.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I think a gentleman occupying the position that Colonel Peters occupies, who has to do work of that kind, would do it properly.

Mr. COCHRANE. It appears to me very strange that this officer should be charged, without any suggestion from the Minister, with all the responsibility of purchasing these enormous supplies that were to be provided for the maintenance of the militia in the Yukon district. He says that he has unbounded faith in his officers. I do not doubt it, we all have faith in his officers. But there is a little suspicion in my mind, perhaps not well founded, that notwithstanding all that confidence, perhaps, there were some friends that the Government wanted to favour, and the Minister might have given an intimation.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. All I can say to the hon. member is that as for giving any of these contracts to political friends of the Government, nothing would give me greater pleasure than to give a good contract to a political friend, provided he was able to discharge the work, and at as good prices as anybody else, and supply as good goods as anybody else. I venture to say that when the prices we have had to pay are critically examined, and the quality of the goods examined, it will be found that the country has made a most excellent bargain, and we

have saved a good many thousand dollars in purchasing the goods at the time we did.

Mr. CLARKE. Without tender?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes, without tender. With regard to the remarks of the hon. member for Victoria, B.C. (Mr. Earle), I may say that in addition to correspondence with parties in British Columbia, we got a list of prices early in March which were being paid by the North-west Mounted Police in British Columbia for goods, and we found that the prices at which we were offered the same goods here, delivered on the coast, were better than the prices which had actually been paid up to that time by the North-west Mounted Police.

Mr. EARLE. I may say that all the supplies that have been purchased for the mounted police have been purchased in exactly the same manner. The order has been taken to the house which filled the order, and there has been no competition in any shape of form. To my knowledge, one firm there has filled all the orders for provisions that have gone to the mounted police, and I have heard others of the same political faith complaining that they had not an opportunity of offering for those goods. It is quite possible the hon. Minister may have paid more than he would have paid after inviting competition.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I did not know that the goods were not bought by tender. But it is a fact that the prices which were quoted to us here were better than the prices which were being paid there. Now, as to the other goods. Flour per barrel, the best quality of flour, and which, by the way, is supplied by the Ogilvies——

Mr. EARLE. Ogilvie makes two grades of flour, both of them are good. One is the Strong Baker's, and the other is the Hungarian flour that sells for very much more. If a man came into our place and asked me for the best brand of Ogilvie's flour, I would give him the Hungarian, though orders have been filled up here by what they call Strong Baker's, that is worth some 40 or 50 cents a barrel less. It is good flour, but it is not first-class flour, as the Minister of Customs can tell him. So that when you get goods purchased by a gentleman like Colonel Lake, who knows nothing at all about them, you do not know, unless you have an opportunity of comparing the quality and prices, whether you are buying to advantage or not.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Now that the hon. gentleman reminds me, I know that the Hungarian was the brand. The prices are $5.65 and $6.10, delivered in Vancouver. Butter per pound, 25 cents. The present price of the same flour, as I find here, is $7 to-day.

Mr. EARLE. That is simply absurd. That is the highest retail price, where they sell by the sack.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I mean in both cases. I asked for a statement of the prices we paid, and I have here, prepared by my officers, the prices paid by us and the prices to-day. The first order of flour was $5.65, the second order, $6.10. Price of the equivalent on the 10th of May, $6.50; on the 20th of May, $7.

Mr. CLANCY. Why does the hon. gentleman make a comparison with the prices to-day?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. It is not altogether upon the principle that I have heard comparisons made in this House for many years as to the increase or reduction in price owing to the high taxation being put on goods; but it is because I wish to show that the country, as a matter of fact, has saved a good many thousand dollars because we took action when we did and bought our goods promptly. Whatever else may be said, it has not resulted in loss but it has resulted in a decided saving.

Mr. FOSTER. What has that to do with the principle of buying by tender and contract?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Whether it has anything to do with the principle or not, I have endeavoured to give the reasons why I pursued that course. As an effort is being made to make a point against the department in this matter, it is only fair that the country should know that, as a matter of fact, we have saved money to the country by the course we have pursued.

Mr. FOSTER. In my opinion there is no connection at all between them. The only test of whether the country could have saved money by the hon. gentleman's peculiar proceeding is to have proved it at the time when he made his purchase, by the principle of tender. He bought by private contract. He would have given the country the best possible proof as to whether he saved or lost money, if he had asked for tenders and bought by public competition. That is the way we would have tested whether there was a saving or otherwise to the country. But to say by comparing prices of a private contract made in a certain month with the market rates two months afterwards is unsatisfactory, especially when in the meantime there has been, for example, a great rise in the price of flour.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The hon. gentleman can take it in any way he pleases. It is the fact I stated, and the country will be interested in it. I was not making an argument on it.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman did more than state the fact; he based an argument on it.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The prices paid were as follows:—

STATEMENT showing prices paid for supplies for the Yukon Detachment, also what the market prices have been since for the same description of supplies.

Description	Prices paid, 1st order.	Prices paid, 2nd order.	Prices quoted 10th May.	Prices quoted 20th May.
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
Flour, per brl	5 65	6 10	6 50	7 00
Butter, per lb	0 25	0 29½	*	*
Rice, per 100 lbs	3 68	3 63	3 93	3 93
Tinned meats, 4 lb. tins, per dozen	5 66	6 22	7 02	*
Tinned meats, 2 lb. tins, per dozen	2 90	3 19	3 57½	
Bacon, smoked, per lb	0 10½	0 11 7/8	0 13⅜	
Biscuits, per lb	0 05½	0 05½	0 06	0 06½
Lard "	0 08¾	0 08¾	†	†
Beans, per bushel	1 95	1 95	‡	‡

*Prices firm. †Prices very firm. ‡Advance in ordinary beans from 85c. to $1.15.

Except for butter, all these prices have been firm or advancing since first purchased by the department.

Mr. EARLE. I should like to ask the Minister how the officer on the Pacific Coast arrived at the conclusion that the prices there were excessive, higher than those for which the goods could be laid down on the coast by merchants in the eastern provinces.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. We asked merchants for current prices there and we asked for current prices here, and we compared the two rates. We did not ask the district officer on the coast to make a comparison, but we simply asked merchants there for a list of prices.

Mr. CLANCY. It is perfectly clear that the hon. gentleman gave an intimation to his own friends to send in offers. The hon. Minister has not stated how any merchants came to make an offer. Perhaps the Minister will tell the committee how it occurred that any person came to give an offer, obtained a description of the goods wanted, what intimation they had, and if there was any day fixed when the offers would be considered. No reliable trader would send in an offer on a newspaper report; before doing so he must have information of the quantities and classes of goods required. What intimation was given, general or particular, to merchants to send in offers?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I thought I had already told the committee that certain firms were corresponded with and asked to send samples. In every case the department asked for samples of goods which firms proposed to supply together with the prices.

Mr. CLANCY. Was it a general circular?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. No, it was addressed to certain selected firms.

Mr. CLANCY. Has the hon. gentleman given the names?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes.

Mr. CLARKE. I understand the document contained the names of those to whom letters were written asking for tenders for supplies, and also the names of persons who applied to be given an opportunity of furnishing supplies. Will the hon. Minister give the names of those to whom communications were sent from his department.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I will supply the list when the further items in the next Supplementary Estimates come up for consideration.

Mr. CLARKE. Upon whom would devolve the responsibility, when the answers had been received, of selecting the goods and materials to be supplied?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. There is a board of officers in the department that examines samples sent in.

Mr. CLARKE. Can the hon. gentleman give the names of the officers who examined the flour, for example?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I think Colonel Lake, Colonel Macdonald and Captain Benoit.

Mr. EARLE. When the hon. Minister speaks of the Hudson Bay Company, does he mean the company at the coast or at Winnipeg?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. At Winnipeg.

Mr. EARLE. Were any circulars sent to merchants and traders on the Pacific Coast?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. No.

Mr. EARLE. And they had no opportunity of making offers, or any knowledge of the quantities of goods required?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I think the Hudson Bay Company had the knowledge of the quantities.

Mr. EARLE. The Hudson Bay Company only?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. So far as I know now.

Mr. FOSTER. The Minister has given no satisfactory explanation to the committee.

I have seldom seen a Minister who has received three or four weeks' warning as to what information is required, come down and endeavour to get voted $100,000 on the incomplete and scrappy information volunteered to the committee this afternoon. The hon. gentleman's stand is a peculiar one. Here are $32,000 worth of supplies wanted. It is admitted by hon. gentleman opposite that for only $10,000 worth there can be any plea of urgency; the other $22,000 worth is going to be sent by the summer route to the Yukon. Two things remain for the Minister to do. He has to show to the satisfaction of the committee why, even if there was actual urgency for a portion of the supplies, he should not have asked for tenders. The very fact that the hon. gentleman wrote as far as London, as far as Halifax, as far as Kentville, is proof positive that he had plenty of time to ask for tenders. On a matter of this kind, the information travels very quickly. What was the hon. gentleman's excuse? Let the members of the Government just think of it: the principle of asking for tenders for supplies in order that the public may know, is ignored. The hon. gentleman, when asked how the public was to know that these supplies were wanted, simply answers that it was current talk in the newspapers. So that is the policy of this Government; when great contracts are to be given, involving $32,000 worth of supplies, all that is necessary is that there should be a little talk in the newspapers, and if any one does not hear of it, it is his own fault. Did any one ever hear of the doctrine of giving contracts by tender reduced to such an absurdity? Is that to be the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite? It is the policy in this case. The Minister should have a complete statement of the correspondence, the prices, the firms that competed, the relative prices of the firms that competed; and he should have laid that statement on the Table of the House, or at least he should have the information tabulated so as to be able to give it to the committee this afternoon. I take the liberty to say that, so far as I am concerned, this $100,000 is not going to be voted without information. It is a duty I owe to this committee to ask, and to persist in asking, for that information before this item is passed. Will the hon. gentleman tell us of what firms he asked for grocery supplies?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Bate & Co., I think.

Mr. FOSTER. Is there any competition in that? There is no competition unless you ask for tenders for similar articles from firms that may compete with each other. The tenor of the scrappy information which the hon. gentleman has given us that when he wanted boots he went to some one, when he wanted groceries he went to some one, when he wanted clothing he went to some one, when he wanted butter he went to some one; but the essence of competition is that you shall get tenders from several persons dealing in the same kind of goods. I say this is a gross abuse of the principle of asking for supplies on tender. The Minister did not take the first step he ought to have taken. He had $32,000 to put somewhere. He did not consult the interests of the country; he did not have any regard to the principles on which he should have asked for tenders for these supplies. He simply asked for supplies from his friends, whoever they might be, by a private letter, and without competition, as I understand, because he did not ask competing firms in the same lines of articles to tender. If there was any urgency at all, with regard to the $10,000 worth of supplies, what position is the hon. gentleman in with reference to the $22,000 worth? They were supplies which were not to go away from Vancouver until probably the last of June, and with regard to them he had no excuse at all. The excuse he gave to the House was this. Having asked Mr. Bate privately for a lot of goods at his own prices, and finding that Mr. Bate could supply those goods, he came to the conclusion, when the actually used supples were exhausted, that he should get from Mr. Bate the general supplies in the same line, making up the $22,000. There was no idea of urgency. There was ample time to find for what other grocery firms could supply these goods. The hon. gentleman says they must be scientifically packed. Well, the statement of my hon. friend is complete on that point. If there are any people in the world who know the business of packing such goods, it is the people of the Pacific Coast. They advertise to the world their ability in that respect. I ask the hon. Minister if he obtained a report from his officers as to what supplies would be necessary, and as to the general method by which these supplies might be obtained. He brings a statement made by Col. Lake, after all the work has been done, that statement having been evidently prepared for the consumption of this House. But surely there must have been some plan. A general does not start out to supply its commissariat without having a reasoned plan for its proper officer, and surely my hon. friend did not start out to supply $32,000 worth of goods for his troops without having had a thorough report from his officers as to the plan on which they should be obtained, the quantities necessary, the qualities, and all that sort of thing. Where is that report? The circulars the hon. gentleman issued—where are they? The House asked for them. We have not one of them. Where is the comparative statement of prices? We have not one of them. In the matter of groceries, and I suppose in other things, there were none. The hon.

gentleman has not treated this committee as he should have treated it.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I want to say to the hon. gentleman that there were other firms that tendered for groceries besides Bate & Co. A Montreal firm, and I think the Hudson Bay Company, also tendered for groceries. There were at least three, and perhaps four.

Mr. FOSTER. I took my hon. friend's word, when I asked him if any other firm besides Bate & Co. tendered for groceries. and he said no. Did he ask Bate & Co. for a certain line of articles and the Hudson Bay Company for another line of articles? We do not know. We have nothing before us to inform us, and the hon. gentleman himself cannot inform us. The hon. gentleman had better let this item stand, and he will have time enough between this and Monday to get these papers in order and give them to the House; for, so far as I am concerned, I will not consent to this vote passing on the amount of information we have.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I am quite willing to let the item stand, but might it not be as well to have the discussion on the next item?

Mr. FOSTER. After the man is dead, there is no use getting the apothecaries together to find out what is the best medicine. In the case of the Estimates for railways, we have succumbed to the bland influences of the hon. Minister, and allowed some items to go through without sufficient criticism. In this case, we will try to find out the best medicine before the sick man dies.

Mr. CLARKE. If this item is to stand, would it be too much to ask the Minister to bring down the information as to the methods of getting tenders for the transportation of the supplies? I understand that 500 or 600 tons have gone by the American route. I would like to know why that is done, and whether or not tenders were asked from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and other transportation companies?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The item stands.

Dominion Cartridge Factory—Further sum required to meet wages and general expenses $10,000

Mr. FOSTER. What is that for? What is the total amount?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. It is due to the superior quality and increased cost of the ammunition. It amounts in all to $65,000.

Mr. TISDALE. Does the $25,000 cover any increased pay to officers of the permanent schools?

Mr. FOSTER.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. That item is owing to the fact that a larger number of the militia and non-commissioned officers and men are attending the schools.

Mr. FOSTER. Does that item for which $1,050 is asked, include a statutory increase?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. No.

Mr. FOSTER. Is this a new office?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. There was always an assistant adjutant general up to 1896, and when I came into office the present adjutant general held the position of assistant adjutant general, there being no adjutant general at that time. The then assistant adjutant general was promoted and we did not fill that position until Major Cartwright was appointed. But just prior to the change of Government a new position had been created, known as the deputy assistant adjutant general. As long as that officer held his position I did not think it necessary to have an assistant adjutant general, but that officer resigned in November last, and the adjutant general complained he could not get along without another officer, and so instead of appointing a deputy assistant adjutant general we abolished that office by Order in Council and went back to the old system of having an assistant adjutant general.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not quite understand what the Minister's new plan is with reference to the retirement of officers in the army at a certain age or after a certain length of service.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The former age limit of a lieutenant colonel was 63 years, and that limit has been reduced to 60. The late Government limited the term of office to five years with the power to extend it to eight years. We have made that provision retroactive. When the order was first made it only applied to future appointments, but the present general and staff recommended very strongly that it was desirable to make it applicable to the whole force and this was done. I myself believe it to be in the interest of the force to give opportunity for promotion as rapidly as possible. We have had men holding the position of colonels for twenty or thirty years and that was no encouragement to men of the right stamp to enter the militia force.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know much about military matters, but I think that is a good principle. Do I understand that no colonel can be in command according to this rule after he is sixty years of age?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. And no colonel can remain in command of his regiment longer

than eight years? Does the Minister propose to carry that rule out strictly, or is it merely at his will?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Oh, no; the intention is to carry it out as strictly as possible. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) will understand that owing to the system which has been in existence so many years, and in rural battalions, it is not always easy to get a commanding officer right off. In any case where it is reported there are good reasons to the contrary the commanding officer is retained. We hope that by carrying out this rule young men of the right stamp will enter the militia with the idea of promotion. We are experiencing some difficulty in carrying out this regulation because we do not always find an officer of the right calibre to command a battalion to succeed the commanding officer, and, therefore, exceptions will be made.

Mr. FOSTER. The Minister's statement is qualified only by this, that if in any regiment the colonel has served eight years or is more than 60 years of age, he will be retired if there is a competent man to take charge of the force? Is that the rule?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes, that is the intention.

Mr. FOSTER. The exception is where the Minister is not able to get a suitable commanding officer?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes, I think the exception to the order states: "under special circumstances."

Mr. FOSTER. I hope my hon. friend will carry the rule out in that sense.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. We are trying to.

Mr. TISDALE. I presume the rule depends on the Minister and the Major general commanding, and that is the only possible way it can be arranged. If it is carried out in that spirit it will be an excellent rule, but if not it will be the duty of the Opposition to criticise it, and so long as I am in the House I shall do so. I tell the hon. Minister (Mr. Borden) that so long as he keeps party politics out of the militia I shall be glad to support him, and I am sure gentlemen on this side of the House who take an interest in militia affairs will be glad to do the same thing. I have hopes that the hon. gentleman will carry out the rule. It is in that spirit that we rely upon him to support this regulation, and in order to keep faith with the militia and with the country. While it is a rule that can be very easily abused yet it is a necessary rule to trust to the Minister of Militia for the time being if we want to have an efficient force. I believe that the hon. Minister will do his best in that regard. If he does I can assure him that we will do our utmost to strengthen his hands to make the force what it should be and what we all hope it will be.

Intercolonial Railway—To pay for land claims and damages and engineers' and other charges in connection with Indiantown Branch	$4,000

Mr. FOSTER. What are these damages?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). The item covers the land damage respecting the claim made by Mr. Knight on the Indiantown Bridge, and it also covers a portion of the expenses and costs in connection with the reference made by the late Government in the Snowball claim.

Mr. FOSTER. Did that go before the Exchequer Court?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it decided?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, there is a distinct award made by the judge against the Crown, and a reference, at the same time, to other items, in respect of which the judge felt, under the distinct terms of the reference, he could not make a legal award, but recommended to the favourable consideration of the Crown. That portion is under the consideration of the department and no decision has been come to.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the amount of the award?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not remember. The amount of the award was not large, but the sum which the judge thought might properly be allowed by grace of the Crown would bring the amount of principal and interest up to $100,000.

Mr. CLARKE. I do not know whether any other opportunity will be afforded of drawing the attention of the committee to a matter that has been already referred to in the House in connection with the administration of the Intercolonial Railway. It will be remembered that about a month or six weeks ago, attention was drawn by the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Campbell) to an article which appeared in one of the Chatham papers, the Chatham "Planet," respecting the dismissal of coloured porters from the sleeping car service of the Intercolonial. The hon. gentleman read a report which had been presented by a Mr. Archibald, one of the officials of the Intrecolonial, denying the statement made by the newspaper above referred to. My hon. friend from Kent, after reading Mr. Archibald's statement, said:

You will see by the facts that there is not one tittle of evidence for the statements made. They are made out of the whole cloth, without any

evidence at all. That is usually all the foundation there is for statements emanating from that source.

The hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Fraser) also took part in the discussion. He said:

I trust that hereafter those who publish these statements will understand, what the country understands, that there must be a terrific dearth of any ground of attack upon the Government, when they are compelled to fall back upon an attempt to raise the prejudices of the coloured population of Canada.

The hon. Minister of Railways, in his comments on the incident, said:

I wish to add that to-day there are really more coloured porters in the employ of the Intercolonial Railway than there have been at any previous period.

In the report of Mr. Archibald, which was read to the House by the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Campbell), the name of Mr. Chas. T. Dixon, one of the porters dismissed, was mentioned. Mr. Dixon is now a resident of Toronto, and has written me the following letter:—

I see in the papers a denial that any of the porters of the Intercolonial Railway have been discharged. Out of the six porters formerly employed on the sleeping cars of the Intercolonial, none are at present employed in the same capacity, and only three of those porters are employed in any capacity by that company. There is not a coloured porter on any of the sleeping cars of the Intercolonial. I spoke above of the three men, formerly porters, being employed now in a different capacity. Those men are Joseph Berry, Thomas Arthurs and James Daniel. They are employed at lunch counters, and receive a salary of $20 a month and board, with no chance of tips, whereas they had received, as sleeping-car porters, $35 with tips. Their present positions are merely temporary, and they are men who have spent 12 and 15 years in the service of the Intercolonial. The other three men who are not in the service of the company in any capacity are C. Dixon, C. Pinhero and R. L. Johnson. The first of these men was discharged in the following manner:—After his last trip of March 8th, he was informed by Mr. Archibald's assistant that only one man was to be run on the cars, and that man was to be the conductor. He was told to work around the office for a day or two. On March 10 he was put on lunch counters, with wages of $20 per month, or a cut of $15 from his former wages. I have a family, and so have all the other porters. After this dealing, Mr. Archibald's assistant gave the following reason for dismissing me, after six years' service, during which there had never been the slightest complaint against me. He claimed that the porters "were not proficient to run the cars." On account of the low wages and the prejudice and meanness underlying this treatment, I have left the Intercolonial and got a position as porter elsewhere, where I have given every satisfaction. The second man, C. Pinhero, was offered a position as second cook, but refused it on these grounds: He is a first-class cook, has been on the private cars of this company for nine or ten months, and would be entitled to the position of head cook in preference to second. He did not refuse on the ground of being physically weak, as alleged by Mr. Archibald. The matter is plainly and simply this. All the coloured porters of the Intercolonial have been coolly discharged, long and faithful service counting for nothing. No notice of dismissal was given, nor were the men given any preference as to remaining or going. They were summarily discharged without a shadow of complaint against them, notwithstanding anything Mr. Archibald may say to the contrary. The conclusion is that shameful prejudice is at the root of the matter, and that, to its disgrace, the coloured line has been drawn by the present Government.

I am, sir, yours respectfully,
(Sgd.) CHAS. T. DIXON.

This is one of the porters referred to in the statement made by Mr. Archibald, and which was read to the House on the 6th of April last. I thought it was only due to the Minister of Railways, in view of the statement he made, that I should read this letter. I hope the hon. gentleman will look into the matter, for he must admit that if the statements contained in this letter be true, they constitute a substantial grievance which should be remedied.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have not heard anything further since the discussion of some weeks ago, and supposed that the matter had been satisfactorily adjusted, and all difficulties removed. Since, however, the hon. gentleman now draws my attention to it, I shall make further inquiries. I remember very well that on the particular occasion when my hon. friend from Kent read to the House the letter which was sent to him by Mr. Archibald, Mr. Pottinger wrote me at the same time and inclosed a copy of the same letter. He concluded his communication by stating that, in point of fact there were more coloured porters in the employ of the Intercolonial now than for some time previous. I can only repeat the assurance that there is not any disposition at all, I am sure, on Mr. Pottinger's part, and certainly not on mine, to draw any such distinction. But I may add that in the readjustment of the sleeping car service, which must necessarily take place at a very early date, if there be any foundation for any such complaint as to the coloured porters and waiters every opportunity will be taken advantage of to have it all rectified, because we have in the opening of the spring service necessarily to put on a very large addition to the sleeping car accommodation. I will see that the matter receives attention.

Mr. CLARKE. And that the men who have been on the road for many years will be replaced?

Mr. FOSTER. I shall not carry the subject further now in view of what the hon. Minister has said, but I hope he will give us information before the Supplementary Estimates are through, of the existing state of facts. Those I have heard of and which have come to the notice of the committee

to-day, through the letter read by my hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Clarke), seem to indicate that there has been a real displacement of the coloured porters, and my hon. friend owes it to all to look thoroughly into that matter and give us definite information before we leave. The impression is that the coloured porters have simply been fired, that they have gone out and are actually out, and the service goes on without their being in it or without other coloured men being put in their places. Of course, if coloured men are discharged because they have been guilty of some misconduct, nothing can be said, but it does appear that from lack of instruction or misapprehension, or from intention, the colour line has been drawn, and that would be very unfortunate.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The difficulty arose in this way. When the winter service was established the design of the management was, if possible, to reduce the force in each of the cars, and, instead of having two, where that could be arranged to have one person do the work that had been done by two. I can imagine that some trouble would necessarily arise in selecting which of the men should go and which remain; but I had the assurance, which was confirmed by the statement furnished by Mr. Archibald, that any of those which had to be, for the time being, set aside, were getting employment in other branches of the railway service, so that they were not actually losing their appointments.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Were not some new men put on?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I beg the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Blair's) pardon. I am sure there was one.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I can say with all confidence that one of the older employees were set aside for the purpose of making way for new men. We have been carefully keeping that in view, and I am sure that Mr. Pottinger would have no disposition to depart from the custom.

Mr. McDOUGALL. There was a young man from Antigonish put on since the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) took charge of the department, and he has been permanently employed since, although some of the older ones have been only temporarily employed.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I desire to call the Minister's attention to a question with regard to which I shall ask for information when we discuss the Supplementary Estimates for 1899. It is with regard to a new bridge across Sulphur Creek at Dunnville, erected last year. The question is: "Why was a large quantity of stone thrown into the stream beneath the bridge, and upon whose report was it done?" 2. What quantity of stone was used there? 3. From whom was it purchased and at what price? 4. Was any other stone purchased from the same parties or other parties in connection with the public works at Dunnville in 1897 and thus far in 1898, and at what prices have such purchases been made?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think my hon. friend (Mr. Montague) is making inquiry of the wrong department, for I have not the slightest knowledge of the subject referred to, nor has my deputy.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I am quite sure I am correct. This is done under the superintendent of the canal service at Dunnville. The bridge is over a waste weir, the construction of which was made necessary by the dam.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I will inquire into the matter.

Mr. CLANCY. I should like to ask the Minister if he will be able to furnish the information upon which he stated that there were more coloured men employed by the Intercolonial Railway now than formerly. The statement has been made that, while there were six porters employed, there are none employed now. If they are not employed in that capacity, what capacity are they employed in? It is quite certain that these have been displaced by some means or they have been given positions amounting to a process of freezing out. Which it is, of course I do not know. I will not charge the Minister with drawing the coloured line because, perhaps, he can furnish a satisfactory explanation, and it would be unfair to prejudge him. But the hon. gentleman and members generally will realize that the opportunities open to coloured men are very limited. All employments are not open to them, practically they are almost driven to one. If they are deprived of that, it is a very serious matter. Owing, I am very sorry to say to prejudice, they are not tolerated in many lines of employment. When the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) furnishes information it should be of the definite kind that will enable us to feel that he has fairly met the charge that is, inferentially at least, made against him.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Hon. members will understand that my personal knowledge of these matters is extremely limited. It is impossible for any Minister of Railways and Canals to keep within his own knowledge the minor details of the management of the railway. Whatever may be necessary in the interest of the service in the way of putting a man on this car or that car must of necessity be left to the discretion of the management; and I cannot pretend to be informed as to thousands of changes that may take place in the detail of administration. If the hon.

gentleman (Mr. Clancy) would like me to ascertain how many coloured people there are in the service, I shall take steps to do so. Let me add that it is one of the difficulties which, I suppose, must inevitably attend the management of the Government railway that people of all classes, Englishmen, Irishmen, Scotchmen, Frenchmen, Orangemen, Freemasons and every other class keep watch as to whether the numbers of their class employed in the railway are increasing or diminishing. If a man drops out there is a racket because, he was, let us say, a Freemason, and there is no Freemason put in his place. It involves difficulties, and makes it impossible to do what is really in the interest of the road. I know that my hon. friend does not wish to add to those difficulties, but I mention these circumstances to show how impossible it is to avoid little complaints being made that are, after all, not very material and which don't touch the proper administration of the railway.

Mr. INGRAM. Are you in the habit of having special conductors between Halifax and Montreal to have charge of what is called Pullman cars in which these porters were engaged ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, I understand that has always been the custom.

Mr. INGRAM. Then I call attention to this letter which was read some time ago by the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Campbell) :

> At the first of last month, when the dining-cars were put on, we had only five sleeping-car porters regularly employed, and they were running between Halifax and Montreal.

Then again he says :

> Owing to the buffets in the sleeping-cars between Halifax and Montreal being discontinued, it was decided to run only one man on each sleeping-car, the conductor.

Will the hon. gentleman tell me if they are running buffets in Pullman cars ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. In some they have, but not in all.

Mr. INGRAM. If they run buffet cars in connection with sleeping cars, and if you have special conductors in place of the five men employed as porters, are they doing the work of porters in that respect also ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They have been doing it up to this date.

Mr. INGRAM. Since the dismissal of these porters ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. One person is doing the work formerly done by two in the car service.

Mr. INGRAM. That is to say that the conductor collects the tickets, provides the meals, does the cooking, looks after the berths, and keeps the car clean. Is that what the present conductor does ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There has been heretofore so little travel on the sleepers during what is called the winter service, that one man is all that has been needed.

Mr. INGRAM. If this letter that I have quoted is correct, then as a practical railway man I know nothing about it. In the first place it says :

> Owing to the buffets in the sleeping-cars between Halifax and Montreal being discontinued, it was decided to run only one man on each sleeping-car, the conductor.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. A buffet is put on most of those cars for the purpose of accommodating passengers.

Mr. INGRAM. Then according to this letter written by your official, each sleeper must be a buffet car, or be used as a buffet car. There is mentioned here a connection with the sleeping car. A buffet has nothing to do with a sleeping car. I want to know if it is a coloured man who has charge of it, or is it a white man ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. He is a white man.

Mr. INGRAM. He performs the duty of a coloured man and a white man ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

To pay for improvements to Dalhousie wharf $3,600

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There is an extension of the wharf accommodation there. One of the two grants that I found, asked for and required by the department when I came in, was for the purpose of extending and enlarging the wharf in connection with the railway. The lumber business there is growing rapidly, and I presume the ex-Minister thought it was necessary to enlarge the wharf accommodation at that point. But he did not ask for quite enough to complete the work. He asked for $3.000, and the work will cost $6,600.

Increased accommodation at Moncton.... $40,000

Mr. POWELL. Is that for the station ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. POWELL. There was a different course of procedure adopted by the late Government in regard to this expenditure. In place of charging it to capital, they were going to divide it between capital and income. There was a very fair building there for general offices which was burnt

down and replaced by a building that cost about $30.000, and that new building was charged entirely to income account.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not think my hon. friend will say that it was intended by the late Government that any portion of that should be charged to income.

Mr. POWELL. Yes.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. What evidence have you ?

Mr. POWELL. The only evidence was that it was at my instigation the station was built, and that is the arrangement that was made, that about $40,000 should go to capital account, and the balance be charged to revenue account.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My department never heard of any such proposition, and never approved of it.

To pay for replacing a wooden trestle by masonry culvert and solid embankments. $2,450

Mr. POWELL. In respect to that grant, there is a very large embankment on the Intercolonial Railway between St. John and Moncton where the trestle was replaced by earth falling, costing from $10,000 to $13.000, and that was charged to income account and not to capital. Here is a departure in that respect.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. In this case there was a wooden trestle that had stood for a great many years and finally required to be renewed. The cost of replacing it by another wooden trestle would be about $1,500 ; the cost of making a permanent embankment there is $3,930. The cost of replacing the trestle as it was before is to be deducted from the whole cost.

Mr. POWELL. That is not the point. I say this wooden trestle was replaced by earth filling. The wooden trestle could be replaced for from $400 to $500, and by earth filling for upwards of $1,000. The earth filling was charged to income account and not to capital account. That is on the line between St. John and Moncton.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend has called attention to another of the many cases which are this year being shown of a change in the methods of distributing expenditures upon the Intercolonial Railway. I stated this very fully on the vote of $50,000 for strengthening bridges on the Intercolonial. It was shown in that case that the Minister of Railways was charging to capital similar expenditures to those which had been charged to revenue by the late Government. That was admitted by the Minister of Railways. The same course is pursued throughout the Estimates.

Mr. GIBSON. You charged renewal of rails on the Intercolonial to capital account.

Mr. FOSTER. I ask the Finance Minister if it is true that when we changed the fifty-six pound rail for sixty-seven pound rail on the Intercolonial Railway, the expenditure was charged to capital ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think the hon. member for Lincoln is in error in that respect.

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Dickey admitted it was.

Mr. FOSTER. This rather discounts the statement of the hon. gentleman on this point. He, like the rest of us, is sometimes wrong.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I should like the hon. gentleman to correct his own errors. He was in error when he said that I acknowledged this was the same class, that I was charging to capital expenditure which had formerly been charged to income, because I made no such statement. I clearly discriminated between the classes of expenditure.

Mr. FOSTER I am very much mistaken if, in the course of the debate the other evening, the Minister did not acknowledge the expenditure came within the class formerly charged to income.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I should like to go as far as possible to meet the view of the hon. gentleman ; but I cannot go against the facts.

Mr. FOSTER. Then we shall have to discuss it again.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The discussion can stand over, I think, till Monday.

Resolutions to be reported.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 164)—from the Senate—to amend the Companies Act.—(Mr. Fielding.)

Bill (No. 165)—from the Senate—respecting Loan Companies.—(Mr. Fielding.)

The PRIME MINISTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 6.10 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 6th June, 1898.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

PRAYERS.

REPRESENTATION OF NORTH SIMCOE AND WEST HURON.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that my attention having been called by the hon. member for the East Riding of the county of Grey, in his place, to the fact of the demise of Dalton McCarthy, Esq., member for the electoral district of the North Riding of the county of Simcoe, and of the acceptance of an office of emolument under the Crown, to wit, the office of Lieutenant-Governor of the North-west Territories, by Malcolm Colin Cameron, Esq., member for the electoral district of the West Riding of the county of Huron, I have, in accordance with section 8 of chapter 13 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, issued my warrants to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to make out new writs of election for the said electoral districts.

JUDGES OF PROVINCIAL COURTS.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick) moved that the House, at its next sitting, resolve itself into committee to consider the following proposed resolution :—

Resolved, That it is expendient to provide that any judge now holding office who shall by reason only of his having completed the seventy-fifth year of his age be or become disqualified to hold or retain his office, shall be entiteld to a pension under section fifteen of Chapter 138 of the Revised Statutes of Canada although he may not have continued in office for the number of years mentioned in that section.

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY.

The House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Further amount required to pay expenses in connection with the Quebec Land Slide Commission, and the payment of claims thereunder, 1897..... $187 45

Mr. FOSTER. What are the details of this expense ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). After the award had been made, it became necessary to make the payments. We sent the money down to the Messrs. Cook, of Quebec, the legal agents of the department, and they charged $100 for their services in connection with the payment of the award, amounting to something like $47,000. The other items are : advertising the payment of the award in the "Daily Telegram" newspaper, $5 ; and stenographers' accounts, $82.45 ; making in all $187.45.

Mr. FOSTER. What were the preceding expenses ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. They amounted in the vicinity of $1,300. The House voted something like $50,000 to meet the claims, and we kept something like $3,000 within the amount voted.

Mr. FOSTER. You had to put that in the hands of legal agents, had you ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. We had to pay over the cheques. In some of the cases a father and mother had been killed, and the payments had to be paid to minors, and we had to have a tutor appointed. We had to get legal discharges, and therefore had to get our legal agents to attend to the matter.

Legal expenses in re Belgian and German treaties..... $3,569 61

Mr. FOSTER. Give us the items of this ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The payments are : Hon. Edward Blake, who acted as counsel in the case with the Minister of Marine and Fisheries for the Government before the law officers, 500 guineas ; Mr. Vesey Knok, junior counsel, 120 guineas ; and A. Russell & Co., solicitors, £82 9s. 3d.

Mr. FOSTER. That is the amount, or part of the amount, we pay for the blunder of the Government ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). For the triumph of the Government.

To assist in publication of Vol. V, "Cases on the British North America Act," by J. R. Cartwright..... $ 250

Mr. FOSTER. Is this Sir Richard Cartwright ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. This is simply carrying out the precedent established by my hon. friend from York (Mr. Foster).

Contribution for Canadian Law Library, London, England..... $ 250

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. This is our contribution to the library for the use of Canadian lawyers who are in England on law business. Each province contributes a certain amount, and we have agreed to give an equal amount.

Mr. FOSTER. How much do the provinces contribute ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Ontario and Quebec are the two I know most about. They contribute an amount equal to what we do.

Mr. FOSTER. Where are the books kept?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. In the same building as the Canadian Agency—over the Canadian Offices, in the library room.

Mr. FOSTER. Does this cover the rent?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I think it is expected to cover the cost of the books only. We do not pay any rent unless it is included in this amount.

Expenses of Chief Justice Strong in connection with sittings of Judicial Committee of the Privy Council..... $1,900

Mr. FOSTER. How many times did he sit?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. All last summer, and he rendered considerable service, as far as Canadian cases are concerned.

To assist toward the relief of the sufferers by the forest fires in the counties of Prescott and Russell during the summer of 1897..... $10,000

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend will see that this is an unusual vote.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There has been a precedent, I think, in former years. The fire in St. John's, Newfoundland, is a notable case, and I think there have been contributions in the cases of fires within the Dominion, though I do not remember any. This was an exceptional case, owing to the fact that the country was very sparsely settled, and there was an absence consequently of concentrated charity.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend will see what a grave precedent he is setting by this. With the suffering and destitution of the poor people who were burnt out in the vicinity of Ottawa everybody, of course, has the fullest sympathy, but when we once set the precedent of the Dominion Parliament contributing to the relief of those who have suffered from fires in rural districts, or even in town districts, the Government will see that they are venturing upon a course which may lead to endless trouble and very large outlay. It will give room for the exercise of great political pressure. The Government will be urged to give something in respect of such and such fires because it will help their friends. Fires take place in rural districts every once in a while, and in such cases there is usually very little insurance. In large cities fires frequently occur, but the insurance almost always, to a certain extent, covers the loss, and while it is not pleaasnt for anybody to appear to oppose a vote intended to relieve the necessities of these people, at the same time Government and Parliament have to be very careful lest we open the door to numerous demands.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I quite appreciate the force of the remarks of my hon. friend, and still more the spirit in which he gave utterance to them. I must say, he approached the subject free from any bitterness or party spirit, and addressed himself to the calm consideration of the House. In this question we are not establishing any precedent. Some ten years ago, a conflagration took place in the city of Hull while the House was in session, and the following day, owing to representations from both sides, it was resolved to vote an appropriation to relieve the sufferers. Each case must be taken by itself. The reasons which induced Parliament to come to the relief of the population of Hull were that the population which suffered from that conflagration was composed of labouring men whose little holdings had been swept away, and who had no capital or resource of any kind. The ground on which their houses stood was not even their own, and they were absolutely destitute and unable to provide for themselves. Every year there are conflagrations in different parts of the country, but, as a rule, these can be attended to, and are attended to by their own neighbours. Two years ago a conflagration took place at Tignish, in Prince Edward Island, and our attention was called to it by the member who then represented that constituency. We looked into the matter, and were told by the people in the neighbourhood that they were able to provide themselves all that was needed for the relief of the sufferers. But this case was different. The conflagration raged for days in a newly-settled community. It took place in the early part of October, and all the labours of the year of these new settlers were swept away in a few hours. Their crops and houses were destroyed, and they were made absolutely destitute just at the opening of the winter. A committee was appointed to provide relief, and the committee appealed to us, and told us that with all the assistance they had from Ottawa and other parts of the country, private charity was not equal to the task of affording anything like adequate relief. Under the circumstances, we thought it our duty to ask Parliament for a small appropriation, and I may say that it is smaller than the one the Government were asked for; but we thought we could not do more than give a moderate, compassionate allowance to those who had to start life over again at the beginning of a severe winter. I would not like the case to stand as a precedent. I quite agree with my hon. friend that such votes are dangerous, but it is absolutely impossible to lay down a hard and fast line, and you must take every case as it presents itself.

Mr. HUGHES. To whom was the money paid?

The PRIME MINISTER. To the relief committee through Mr. George Perley.

Mr. HUGHES. A few years ago a very disastrous fire occurred, which destroyed not only the homes of settlers, but the Barnardo Home for boys. The Government is, in a sense, responsible for permitting the Barnado Home for Boys to come into the country.

The PRIME MINISTER. To which Government does my hon. friend (Mr. Hughes) refer?

Mr. HUGHES. To the Federal Government—they control immigration.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). What power have we to prohibit British subjects from coming into Canada?

Mr. HUGHES. At all events these fires occurred. Application was made by the then member for North Victoria, as I was informed by that gentleman. It is only a few months ago that there occurred in that same district another fire caused by one of these same boys. Now, though I do not object to assistance to relieve distress, the Government will see at once that if they are going to assist the poor who are left homeless in a fire in Russell or Hull, they will have to do the same in case of a fire occurring in any part of this Dominion. I think that the Government will find that they have set a precedent which they will be asked to follow up in many parts of the country.

Mr. FOSTER I remember that when I was a member of the late Government, these requests were not infrequent. I recall particularly one very distressing instance, that of the town of Allisfon, Ont., which, my hon. friend may recollect, was almost entirely destroyed by a fire some five or six years ago. The circumstances were quite as distressing as in this case. It is true that it did not involve the cases of new settlers, though this was a comparatively new town also. It was not a rural but a village population. The poor people were swept out of their homes and lost everything they had. The strongest pressure was brought to bear upon the Government on the plea of charity; and, I must say, our friends pressed it very strongly as well. We felt that it was impossible to accede to the request made, and, although there had been one or two cases before, notably the case of Hull, we felt that we must decline the request, and we did decline it. Now the town of Windsor, N.S., suffered a terrible disaster last year. Poor people by the thousand had everything belonging to them swept away, and numbers of them had no insurance whatever. While the statement of my hon. friend is good in one respect, it is rather bad in another. He seemed to say that, granted the conditions of a sparse population and new settlement, where the people had everything swept away, the Government felt they ought to give a compassionate allowance. Well, we have a great deal of new country opening up in Canada, and fires will occur in the North-west and in Manitoba and all that great region; and I do not see with what force the Government can refuse to assist settlers there who have everything burnt up by prairie fires, which fires often threaten and which burn up immense values of property every year. I am afraid these two cases of Hull and Prescott and Russell were acceded to because of the propinquity of the places. Probably had they been distant they would not have appealed so strongly to the sympathies of the Government, and such relief would not have been granted. I hope my hon. friend will make a very strong statement with regard to this matter, as to the question of precedent, otherwise I am afraid we shall either cause great dissatisfaction and sense of injustice or greatly burden the resources of the country.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERES. I am glad the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) has brought this question up. Personally, I am in accord with nearly everything he has said. I can see that intolerable evil would be before us in the future if this case viewed as a precedent were not carefully guarded. This is not a case in which the Government acted at all hastily. We refused to act until charitable relief had been exhausted. In the first place, we put it to those who applied that it was a matter for the provincial government to attend to. They applied to the provincial Government and got a grant from that Government—I speak under correction—of $10.000, at first $5.000 and subsequently $5.000. Then we told them their duty was to appeal to the charitable public, that surely a case of this kind would appeal most strongly to the wealthy people of Montreal and Ottawa. It was only when they came back saying they had exhausted in every conceivable way their means of obtaining relief, and the question had to be faced what the poor people were going to do for the coming winter that we took the matter into consideration. It was very reluctantly and after a strong case had been made out that we yielded as far as we did, and then only to supplement the relief given by the Provincial Government and the charitable public. My right hon. leader has referred to the case of Tignish. The Government refused to interfere in that case, because we felt that it would create a bad precedent and that it was a case with which the charitable public and the Provincial Government ought to deal. In every other case, we have refused to interfere on the same principle. I think that this, without being made a precedent, might be allowed on the ground that we really only supplemented the aid given by the Provincial Government and the charitable public, and then

only after the assistance from these sources had been exhausted and there was much still to be done to prevent a large number of people from being without homes during the coming winter.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The discussion will serve a very useful purpose if it draws attention on the part of the public at large to the necessity of having some line governing these things. I do not mean to say, of course, that there could be an absolute line, for circumstances will arise which will justify the Government and Parliament in departing from a rule laid down. This may be such a case. But I think it would be a pity if the idea got abroad that it was the duty of the Dominion Government to make such grants in every case. Before the grant was made we had to consider the difference between this case and another which might seem, at first glance, to be on all fours with it. For instance, there was the case of the town of Windsor, N.S., the destruction of which was accompanied with great distress. It may be because it was a town and that a disaster of that kind makes greater impression on the world at large than the destruction of a rural community, but the fact was that there was a most liberal response on the part of private charity to the demands of the town of Windsor. And when we found on looking into the case that the contributions were so generous, we decided that it would not be right for us to act in the matter.

Mr. FOSTER. But if there is an impression that the Government will give, that dries up the sources of private charity.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is a good deal in that. I think it should be understood that, subject to possible exception, which must be very strong cases indeed, grants of this character should not be made by the Dominion Parliament, but should be attended to by the municipal and provincial authorities in any case where the need exists. Though I justify the grant made on the ground stated by the Prime Minister, I think it would have been better if the Provincial Government had given all the money necessary. If they had to deal with the matter over again, I think they would realize that that would be the correct course. Though glad to join in giving this aid, I am likewise glad that this matter was brought up so that we may not have a precedent that may be dangerous hereafter.

Amount required to pay balances due to the "Hansard" reporters who reported the evidence given before the Royal Commission on the Liquor Traffic, in accordance with the rate agreed upon by the chairman of the commission, confirmed by the judgment of the Exchequer Court in the case of Bradley vs. The Queen; also to pay Messrs. Horton and Owens for their services during the time they acted as secretaries to the Commission, as follows :—

Mrs. Richardson, widow of late T. J. Richardson	$ 349 55
S. A. Abbott	396 15
A. Horton	483 45
T. P. Owens	465 15
E. J. Duggan	87 00
J. O. Marceau	3 30
A. Desjardins	5 95
	$1,790 55

Mr. FOSTER. This is all in pursuance of the judgment ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In consequence of the judgment.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it all rendered necessary by the judgment ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I understand, speaking from memory, there is no judgment on these particular items, but judgment was given in one particular case, and these being of a similar character, we accepted the consequence of the judgment.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I would like to know the total cost of that Royal Commission, if it can be given.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am afraid my hon. friend will have to put a notice on the paper.

Further amount required for Hudson Bay Expedition—Printing reports, &c..... $4,000

Mr. FOSTER. What is the total cost of the Hudson Bay Expedition ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Twenty thousand dollars was voted in 1897-98, $19,585.79 was spent, and a supplementary vote is now required of $4,000 to meet the deficiency. That means that the whole cost will be about $54,000. That pays for the preliminary arrangements, vessel, season's work, and everything.

Mr. FOSTER. Now will my hon. friend state briefly what he got out of it ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not know whether my hon. friend saw the report of Commander Wakeham, which has been published, and copies of which have been given to nearly all the members. It is a very valuable document. The instructions given to Commander Wakeham were to proceed to the mouth of the Hudson Bay Straits at a period prior to there being a possibility of a vessel getting through, to be there the first moment of time when a vessel could get through the straits. He was then to force his way gradually through the straits, and having done so to return again immediately, so as to be sure that it was not by mere accident that he happened to squeeze through—to return to the mouth of the straits and to go back and forward, while the ice was float-

ing in the straits, to a degree which would prevent commercial navigation. The "Diana," the vessel that he had charge of, proved to be in every way a most efficient boat, a remarkably good boat, and discharged her duties well. Although there were a good many complaints before the "Diana" was chartered about her inability to do the work, complaints which were based on a misunderstanding, very largely, of the vessel itself, the results have proved that Commander Wakeham was singularly happy in his choice of a vessel. He could not have got a better vessel, he tells me, than the "Diana" turned out to be. After cruising in and out of the straits for some time in order as far as possible to establish the first point of time during which these straits were navigable——

Mr. FOSTER. When was that?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I have not got the date before me at the moment, my hon. friend will see it in the report which is printed. I may say that on this expedition Commander Wakeham was accompanied by a skilled photographer, and we are not confined simply to the printed page to show what were the conditions of the straits; but at different times the condition of the straits and the ice of the straits were photographed, and you have on the page opposite to the printed page, the photographic view of the condition of the straits through which the vessel passed from time to time; so that a person can form a very fair idea of the condition of the ice in those straits at the several periods when the photographs were taken. After he had established the feasibility of the navigation of the straits of the Hudson Bay, then he proceeded into the bay itself, landing, I may remark en passant, the two bodies of men sent from the Geological Survey and who were carried by the "Diana" up to the mouth of the Hudson Bay, landing one upon the north side of the bay and one upon the south, for the purpose of pursuing their summer's work of geological investigation. Then the "Diana" proceeded into the bay and remained there during the summer months, testing how far that bay was rich or otherwise in fish. The results were not satisfactory so far as fish were concerned; they were in fact distinctly disappointing in that particular object of the expedition. The instructions Commander Wakeham had before he left, were to take back the geological parties to St. John's, Newfoundland, early in September, at which time they desired to return, but in no event to be absent from the mouth of the straits at the period when the ice began again to take, so that we might determine definitely the latest period during which the straits were navigable in the autumn. After leaving the surveying parties at St. John's, Newfoundland, he returned and kept passing up and down the straits until stopped by the ice and fog. Commander Wakeham concluded that he had remained as long as it was possible for a vessel to remain for the purpose of commercial navigation, and then he returned home. He gives us a careful diary of every day's proceedings; and his report of the condition of the straits in reference to the ice at the various periods, confirms, to a large extent, Commander Gordon's conclusions. I do not understand from a careful comparison of Commander Gordon's conclusions with those of Commander Wakeham, that there is any substantial difference between them; and I think now the fact may be accepted, and will be accepted generally, by the people of Canada, both east and west that Commander Gordon's conclusions were about as nearly accurate as they could be. The book is very interesting reading, and the information he gathered there more than justifies the expenditure which the Government undertook. At any rate, it will settle, in my humble judgment, any agitation which might be raised by the people of the west on the ground that there was a possibility of navigation for commercial purposes through those straits for any longer time than Commander Gordon reported.

Mr. FOSTER. This is very satisfactory in one respect, and not very satisfactory in another. I do not see what my hon. friend could have expected to gain over and above what Commander Gordon gained. Commander Gordon was, to say nothing in disparagement of Commander Wakeham, a very excellent man, fully as good, I think, to say nothing more. He spent three times as much time as Commander Wakeham, and his expedition did not confine itself to one year, and his observations were made during the whole of the winter season, two seasons, I think. It was as exhaustive an investigation as could be made, and much more exhaustive than that attempted to be made under the direction of hon. gentlemen opposite in one season. So that I do not think my hon. friend could have expected anything more should have been done in that short season than in a poor way to confirm what Commander Gordon had previously found as the result of his more extended observations. But the Premier, when at Winnipeg, made a promise; so there had to be an investigation set on foot, and an investigation was set on foot. No less than $23,000 or $24,000 of the people's money has been spent, and nothing has been gained except a fragmentary endorsation, such as it must necessarily be when an expedition is confined to one short season, of the exhaustive investigation made by Commander Gordon. I suppose the matter will now rest until just before another election, when a demand will be made for another investigation, and another crew will be sent out to tide over a very critical moment in party affairs.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman is not quite fair in this matter, because the motion made for the expedition was received with great cordiality and unanimity on both sides of the House. The hon. leader of the Opposition challenged the conclusions arrived at by Commander Gordon, and before I had the honour of holding a portfolio, he carried in Council, as the hon. gentleman certainly said in this House, a proposition to bring down the very vote which I afterwards brought down. The leader of the Opposition contended, on the authority of Admiral Markham, that the conclusions arrived at by Commander Gordon were not to be accepted as conclusive. At all events, I am correct in saying that the hon. gentleman intended to bring down a similar vote, and when he made such an outcry about the matter and held that the conclusions arrived at by Commander Gordon should not be accepted, when a large number of the western members who were interested in the construction of the railway north challenged and criticised Commander Gordon's conclusions, when a large body of the people contended that the value of the fisheries in Hudson Bay was enormous and illimitable, when men east and west contended, backed up by the authority of the Arctic explorer, Admiral Markham, that if another expedition were sent out, the reports would show that the straits were open one month longer than Commander Gordon reported—all these contentions were such as to compel the Government to endeavour to put the matter at rest: and although Commander Wakeham was not able to change the seasons, he was able to make a report which would be satisfactory for all time, or at all events, in our time.

Mr. FOSTER. That will not be long.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It will be satisfactory, at all events, until better methods of navigation are discovered, for perhaps steamers in the near future will be able to force their way through ice 10 or 12 feet thick.

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend has not quite rightly interpreted the remarks of the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster), for his complaint was that we had not spent enough money. He said we had not obtained sufficient experience in one season, but that such could only be obtained from several season's work, and therefore the hon. gentleman's criticism amounts to an invitation to spend more money under this head.

Mr. FOSTER. The point of my criticism was that when the former Government sent a thoroughly capable man, properly equipped, with an expedition which spent two or three seasons in making a thorough investigation, the present Government cannot be expected to secure equal results by an expedition of one season. Next session any member of the House may rise and say the Government should send another expedition there, and allow it to remain three or four seasons.

Mr. SPROULE. The weakness of the argument of the Minister of Marine was that by sending an expedition for one year he proposed to set matters at rest for ever. The former expedition was for a longer time, and the report was much more exhaustive in many respects. If an investigation continued for three years did not settle the controversy, an expedition for one year certainly could not do so, and if full information was needed, an expedition should continue during several seasons.

To pay J. C. Roland, wharfinger at Sault Ste. Marie, balance salary for 1896.... $291 66

Mr. GILLIES. I draw the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to the fact that some days ago he promised to bring down a report respecting two officers in my county who have been dismissed, Lenoir and Cameron. The hon. gentleman told me they had been dismissed on the report of the Fishery Commissioner. I have learnt since that there is no report in the hon. gentleman's department from that official. Communications have been made to me since, alleging that their dismissals were entirely for political reasons and made on the representations of political partisans. I should like to know on whose report those men were dismissed, and if the hon. gentleman is not in the position to do so, let the item stand until he brings down the papers.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I remember the promise I made, and carried it out. I prepared a statement for the hon. gentleman, and gave it to the Finance Minister just before I went to Washington, the statement to be handed to the hon. gentleman. I will give him any information he wants in regard to the matter.

Mr. GILLIES. Certain information was furnished me, but it was on another matter. I wish the report of the officer on whose recommendation these men were dismissed.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Cameron was dismissed by the department because he was convicted of selling liquor in violation of the law, and without a license. I will not keep in the public service a man who has been convicted by the judiciary of the province of breaking the law.

Mr. GILLIES. There was no report respecting Cameron.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There was a report by the inspector. I had information that Cameron was engaged in the illicit sale of liquor. I

wrote the inspector, asking him if that was the case. He reported that the man had been convicted several times of that offence; whereupon I dismissed him.

Mr. GILLIES. That settles the case of Cameron. What about the case of Lenoir?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That case was brought up in the Senate by Senator Miller, and the papers were brought down. When I entered office, I asked the Commissioner of Fisheries to make a report on each fishery overseer, classifying him as to his abilities, whether first-class, fair or bad, and whether he would advise the retention of the officer or his dismissal. Among those reported by the Commissioner as inefficient officers whose services need not, or should not, be retained, was that of Lenoir, of Richmond County. Lenoir was removed from office on that report.

Mr. GILLIES. I have now so much information furnished by the Minister from that report, that I want him to bring it down. The report is a public document, and I ask the Minister to bring it down.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I will bring it down. It has already been brought down to the Senate. If the hon. gentleman had moved for it, I would have brought it down. Surely, however, the statement made by a Minister is sufficient.

Mr. GILLIES. The Minister has stated that he dismissed Lenoir on the report made by the Commissioner of Fisheries. It is in his department, and I am entitled to it.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Then, the hon. gentleman can move for it.

Mr. GILLIES. I have asked for the information.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The report has already been brought down, and is in the Senate. Surely, the hon. gentleman does not want two returns made. The Senator for Cape Breton seemed to think there is something behind this matter, and he asked if there was not a recommendation from the Inspector of Fisheries. There is no such report from Mr. Bertram, and he did not ask for this man's dismissal.

Mr. GILLIES. The hon. gentleman is mistaken, if he attributes to me any motive except that of acting in the public interest. I did not insinuate that there was anything behind this matter. The hon. Minister made the statement that Lenoir, who had been in office for many years and was, to my knowledge, a very efficient officer, had been dismissed, and he had not been dismissed on the complaint of Mr. Bertram. Then, I understand there is no complaint from Mr. Bertram.

The hon. gentleman has, purposely or otherwise—I hope it is otherwise—done Mr. Lenoir a very grave wrong. To my own knowledge, Mr. Lenoir was a very efficient officer—so much so that complaints were made broadcast over the county that he was constantly interfering unduly with people by enforcing the law and departmental fishery regulations. If he had not been an efficient officer, would not Mr. Bertram, the inspector for the Island of Cape Breton, under whom Mr. Lenoir was acting, have reported him to the department as inefficient? Until that was done, was it not the duty of the Minister to assume that he was an efficient officer? The hon. gentleman will search the records of his department in vain, and will not find any report, or even a hint, from Mr. Bertram that Mr. Lenoir was inefficient. The hon. gentleman gets his commissioner, Mr. Prince, to make a report upon his officers, and to classify them; and because Mr. Lenoir does not come up to the standard set by the Minister of Marine, he is dismissed without a moment's notice. My information is that Mr. Lenoir, who was an efficient officer, against whom no complaint of any kind was made by his inspector, but who was, in fact, commended several times by his inspector, was dismissed through the urgency of parties in the county of Richmond, who implored the Minister to dismiss him. If there is a report in the department with regard to Mr. Lenoir, it should be laid on the Table at my request. If there is no report, and I am assured there is not, then the Minister may as well own up to it, that Mr. Lenoir was dismissed at the urgent and unreasonable request of parties in the county, who are really doing the hon. gentleman's party no good by the way they are acting, but are getting him into hot water and inducing him to commit acts which he would not commit in his cool moments if he had the proper information.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am sorry my hon. friend should feel so warmly about this. I do not know Mr. Lenoir, and I know nothing about him. I had no reports from the officers in Cape Breton about him at all. Senator Miller, at an early period of this session, asked questions about Mr. Lenoir in the Senate, and these questions were answered as I am answering them now. Senator Miller then moved for the papers, that motion was passed, the papers were brought down, and they have been down for a month. My hon. friend is misinformed if he says my commissioner did not make the report to me in the words I have stated. It is quite impossible for me personally to keep the run of all these fishery officers. I have to depend very largely on the Commissioner of Fisheries, and when the commissioner reports to me that a man

is inefficient and that his services ought not to be retained, I act upon his report.

Mr. GILLIES. I did not say that the report was otherwise than what the hon. gentleman stated. But what I do complain of is this, that there is no report whatever in the department from Mr. Bertram, the inspector of the district, from whom reports of complaints should come in the first instance, and who is the only person capable of judging of the efficiency of Mr. Lenoir. That officer being on the ground, the Minister had no right to apply to an officer in his department, who was never in Cape Breton in his life, who knows nothing of the district in which Mr. Lenoir operated and who knows nothing of Mr. Lenoir except what he heard or learned officially from Mr. Bertram. The Minister was wrong in going to him and asking him for a tabulated statement of the different officers in the outside service. Whether Mr. Lenoir came up to the rank the Minister set down in his own mind that he should come up to, is another thing. It appears that he did not come up to that standard, and, by a sweep of the pen, he is discharged from office, and another person, a partisan, is appointed in his place. I do not know what standard the hon. Minister set up in his own mind that an officer should come up to and maintain before he could be retained in office; and it is only fair that I should know, that the committee should know, that the injured officer should know, and that his friends should know, what inefficiency he was guilty of before the Minister was justified in dismissing him summarily from office, particularly in view of the fact that his efficiency was constantly being reported to the department by the only person who was competent to judge—that was Mr. Bertram, the inspector for the district.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. As I have already explained to my hon. friend, Mr. Bertram made no report in his favour or against Mr. Lenoir, and to say that Mr. Bertram reported in favour of his efficiency is not correct. The hon. gentleman says that there was some standard which I set up, and that if a man did not come up to that standard, I dismissed him. My hon. friend is wrong in that. I thought I made myself plain—I requested the Commissioner of Fisheries to report to me as to the officers under him.

Mr. GILLIES. What report did he make of Mr. Lenoir?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I told the hon. gentleman twice, that he reported that he was inefficient, and that his services ought to be dispensed with.

Mr. GILLIES. Did the Commissioner of Fisheries make that report to you—that he was inefficient and that his services should be dispensed with?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes.

Mr. GILLIES. I would like to see that report.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I have told the hon. gentleman that it has been brought down, and that it has been in the Senate for a month.

Mr. GILLIES. No.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There is no use of our contradicting one another. All the hon. gentleman has to do is to go to the Senate and get it.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's). I understood the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries to say that one of these gentlemen referred to by the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Gillies) was dismissed because he was convicted of contravening the Canada Temperance Act.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Not the Canada Temperance Act, but the laws in force with regard to the sale of liquors, whatever they are.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's). Might I ask the hon. gentleman if one of his appointees has not been found guilty of the same thing?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We will deal with every case on its own merits. I have not known of one. If the hon. gentleman will report any such case, we will inquire into it.

Mr. MILLS. I was going to make the same remark with regard to the Post Office Department.

To pay expenses of investigation in connection with the pilotage matters in the district of Montreal $2,500

Mr. FOSTER. Who was the commission?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It will be recollected that last year, before the House prorogued, there was a strike of the pilots of the Montreal district, which threw the whole commercial community into a state of confusion. The pilots sent a memorandum to the Department of Marine and Fisheries, submitting the grounds of their complaints, and they submitted a Bill to Parliament for their incorporation, thinking that if they got that, they would have sufficient power to remedy the grievances of which they complained. The Bill came before the Miscellaneous Private Bills Committee, and I had it amended in many respects. It went to the Senate, and was there thrown out. When that was done, the pilots went on

strike, everything was thrown into confusion, and the commercial interests were jeopardized. After consultation with the Minister of Public Works, we promised the pilots that if they would resume work, I would have an impartial commission appointed to inquire into their grievances. I appointed a commission for that purpose, composed of Judge Lavergne, chairman, the Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and Commander Wakeham. They sat in Montreal a large number of days, and heard evidence from the pilots, from the Montreal Harbour Commission, and from the owners of steamships, and made a report, which was presented to me a short time ago. I have it in my desk now, but I have not had time to study it and come to a conclusion as to whether I would carry out the recommendations made by the commission or not. I have read it over one or twice, but rather perfunctorily—not with that care that I would wish to give it before coming to a conclusion which I could recommend to my colleagues.

Mr. FOSTER. Had they the power to inquire into the whole system ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes, and to make what recommendations they desired.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Will that report be printed ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. If the House thinks it of sufficient importance to justify the expense, I will have it printed.

Mr. FOSTER. I think it is of that importance if the commission made an inquiry into the whole pilotage system and made recommendations. We all know that it is a pretty close corporation.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The report does not deal with the whole system of pilotage, but with the system between Montreal and Quebec. It will throw no light on the pilotage system of Halifax or St. John.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There was an investigation into the pilotage system of St. John.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There was, but I would not undertake to print the report of that commission, because it is very voluminous. It may be that the importance of the pilotage system will some day justify the printing of that report. However, I shall be glad to place it in the hands of the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Borden) if he wishes to study it. My hon. friends from St. John have both read it, and returned it to the department.

Mr. FOSTER. If the evidence in the Quebec case is voluminous, it might be sufficient, in the first place, to print the findings or recommendations of the commission, without the evidence, and afterwards, if the House thinks it necessary, the evidence might be printed.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I think my hon. friend is right. The evidence is voluminous, while the report is condensed. Mr. Justice Lavergne put the questions, and Mr. Wakeham and Mr. Gourdeau were men of very accurate knowledge ; and they knew what evidence to discard, and what was pertinent.

Mr. INGRAM. Will the hon. Minister say whether the striking pilots were re-employed ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The Minister of Public Works tells me that there were three or four who were not re-employed ?

Mr. FOSTER. What were the commissioners paid ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. They were paid nothing but their expenses. To Judge Lavergne I had, of coarse, to allow liberal allowances, but in the case of my own affairs, they had just their actual disbursements.

Mr. CLARKE. I understand that three or four of the pilots went out on strike and were not reinstated. Why were they not reinstated ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I made the statement I did on the authority of my hon. friend behind me. I was not aware that any had not been reinstated. My hon. frend the Minister of Public Works is not in the House just now, but I shall get the information from him.

Mr. HUGHES. If an officer went out on strike and did not submit, that would be a good reason for dismissing him.

Mr. CLARKE. I hold the opposite view. I think that if a man is of the opinion that he is not well used, he has a right to go out on strike.

The PRIME MINISTER. Without being able to give positive information, I think I may say that the men who were not re-employed were left out because they went out on strike. My hon. colleague the Minister of Public Works will give the particulars when he comes in.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Can the hon. Minister give us any information with regard to the appication respecting pilotage regulations in the harbour of Louisbourg ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There was an investigation also in that case by Captain Bloomfield

Douglas, and after going thoroughly into it he was of opinion that compulsory pilotage there should be abolished entirely. He also made a similar report in the case of St. John, N.B. I have not yet seen my way to act upon it. I am in communication with mercantile and other men in the community, and if I find that the consensus of opinion of the shipping interest supports the view of Captain Douglas, I will be inclined to adopt his suggestion.

Mr. McDOUGALL. If the hon. Minister decides upon doing away with the present compulsory pilotage regulations for that port, he will make a great mistake. That port was not frequented by a very large number of ships until within the last two or three years, and I think it would be advisable, under the circumstances, for the Minister to continue the present regulations, because it is of the greatest possible importance to the port that there should be as efficient a pilotage service there as possible. The result of doing away with the compulsory pilotage would be to exempt a large number of shipping, such as steamers, from the payment of pilotage, another class of shipping would have to pay pilotage, and there would not be revenue enough from the business of pilotage to support it. For that reason, I think it would be advisable for the hon. Minister to stay his hand in making any change in the present regulations at present or for a few years at least.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I promise my hon. friend to go slow.

Sault Ste. Marie Canal.—To pay Messrs. Hugh Ryan & Co., contractors, for the construction of Sault Ste. Marie Canal, the difference between the amount of $4.50 per cubic yard, paid on account of the construction of a masonry revetment wall built of sandstone and the contract price $7.50 per cubic yard for the said wall of limestone..... $27,525

Mr. McMULLEN. How is it this additional sum has been paid in connection with this matter. I understand that Mr. Ryan first contracted to supply sandstone at $7.50 per cubic yard. Afterwards the contract was changed, and he was allowed to use the stone taken from the bed of the canal, and the previous Government allowed him $4.50 per cubic yard for that stone.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). My hon. friend starts out by saying that he would like to know how it is this additional sum has been paid. It has not been paid, and will not be paid unless the House consents to the vote. The contract which was entered into between Mr. Ryan and the Government was for the construction of a revetment wall of lime stone, and, according to the specification he was to be allowed $7.50 per cubic yard for that wall. After he had opened a quarry, put up his derricks, and made all preparations for getting his limestone, it was asserted that the sandstone which he was excavating from the prism of the canal was of very excellent quality and would make as good a wall as limestone. He therefore applied and got permission from the department to substitute sandstone for limestone. When the final estimates came to be made by the officers of the department for this work, the engineer advised and the chief engineer approved of $4.50 being allowed by reason of the fact that the contractor was not putting in limestone but sandstone, leaving the question of balance of $300 to be considered. Mr. Ryan objected to any reduction, claiming that the sandstone was admitted to be as good by the officers of the department, that it made as good work, that the department had consented to the substitution, and that therefore he was entitled to be allowed the contract price. The matter was looked into. The officers of my department and Mr. Ryan discussed it with me, and the conclusion we came to was that, under all the circumstances, seeing that the stone was just as good as that which had been originally stipulated for, and that permission was given to substitute one for the other without any condition at all, without any stipulation for a lower price, and seeing that if such a condition had been annexed at the time it would have been quite open to Mr. Ryan to have gone on with the use of limestone, without any extra expenses, because the distance he had to carry it was inconsiderable, and seeing therefore that there was no reason why he should have preferred to use this sandstone at reduced price, especially as he had all his arrangements made, his quarry opened, the work started, the derricks constructed and everything in shape to get out the limestone—in view of all these considerations I came to the conclusion that I would put the matter before Parliament, and if Parliament concurred, the amount would be paid, otherwise Mr. Ryan would be left to his remedy, whatever that might be. But it seems to me, upon careful consideration of all the facts and circumstances, that there was no good reason why Mr. Ryan should not be allowed the amount he originally contracted for, because the department had consented to the change from limestone to sandstone.

Mr. HAGGART. I would ask the hon. Minister if he has the specifications at hand?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have not.

Mr. HAGGART. I would like, before this item goes through or on some other item, to discuss this matter. If I remember rightly, the Minister said last year that he had a final estimate and that the sum he asked for was for the payment of it. The hon. Minis-

ter must know for the inquiry of a committee was directed to this very item. If I remember rightly the question was as to the classification. It was not a question where the material was taken from. I would ask the hon. Minister what engineer has reported in favour of this $7.50 per cubic yard? Did the engineer in charge or the deputy report in favour of this?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have already stated that Mr. Ryan, the Deputy Minister and myself met, and that the Deputy Minister agreed in the view that, under all the circumstances, $7.50 would be the proper allowance to make. I certainly would never have presented the matter to Parliament in this way and asked for the appropriation in the absence of concurrence of that kind.

Mr. HAGGART. But the hon. gentleman must know that a final estimate was passed, and on that estimate we had the certificate of the engineer in charge and of the Deputy Minister. There must have been a change in the specification, and the hon. Minister ought to have it in writing.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The final estimate I referred to was made by the Deputy Minister and contained this very sum.

Mr. HAGGART. Then, why did not the Minister ask this vote when he made the statement that it was to pay the final estimate?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not remember the statement made at that time.

Mr. McMULLEN. The proposition to pay this increased price is a surprise to me. It appears that Mr. Ryan entered into a contract for this canal on specifications calling for a certain kind of stone, which stone was found at a considerable distance from the canal. Now, after proceeding with the work, they found that they were able to take stone out of the bottom of the canal itself quite as good if not better than the stone which it was specified should be taken from the quarry at a distance. He used this stone on the permission which he applied for, and with the sanction of the engineer in charge, quarrying it out of the bottom of the canal and using it in construction. To pay him the same price as he would have been paid for stone quarried at some distance and carried to the works, I think, would be unfair. I do not think that any man would do that in his own business. If I contracted with a man to build me a house, using stone of a quality to be found some considerable distance from the work, and if after beginning the work, he found that stone of as good quality could be got on the site of the house itself, I do not think I would pay him the same price as if he had brought the stone from a distance. I do not see why we should be asked to pay this additional price. The explanation given by the Minister, I must confess, is not satisfactory to me. I think we should have some other explanations.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There is no other explanation. I have stated the facts fully, and it is for the House to judge whether or not they will concur in the view that this claim is a reasonable and just one. The view I took of it when the facts were presented to me was that if the department saw fit to allow Mr. Ryan to substitute one class of stone for another on the ground that the stone was just as good and the work would be just as good, the department ought to have made some stipulation at the time when consent for the use of the stone was given as to a reduction in price so that Mr. Ryan might judge whether it would be more to his advantage to continue to use the stone specified in the original contract, or whether he would use the other. When a contractor asks the department to consent to the substitution of one article for another, it is quite open to the department to say: We will consent to the substitution, but we will not pay the price we originally agreed to. It is not easy for the head of a department, when a question of that kind arises, to say to the contractor that he must take a lower price, when no stipulation of that kind was made at the time. There is no fair play about that, it appears to me; and it was because the claim seemed to me a strong and reasonable claim that I bring it before the committee. It does not strike me as a matter of consequence to the Government, so long as they get precisely the same value and quality of work, where the material was taken from—that is speaking for one point of view. The price agreed upon was $7.50 per cubic yard for a certain quality of work. The work is done and the contractor seeks to be paid that price. I cannot for the life of me see why objection should be taken to the payment of an amount which is no greater than the sum the Government originally agreed to pay. There is another point, which is being lost sight of. The committee will understand that the main cost in connection with the supplying of stone is the quarrying, particularly the opening up of the quarry and the getting in place of the plant and machinery necessary for working it. What allowance will be made to the contractor for that, I would ask my hon. friend (Mr. McMullen)? It is true that the stone, under the original arrangement, would have to be brought a greater distance than if it were allowed to be taken out of the bottom of the canal. But I, inquired into that and I learned that the expense of transporting the stone would not be very large. The quarry was on Manitoulin Island and the stone could be brought from

there all the way by water, so that the expense of carriage would not be very heavy. However, those are the facts, and with those facts it is entirely for the committee to deal.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman has entirely mistaken the point. It is not as to where the stone was taken, it is in regard to the classification of the work. There were two items, for one of which he was entitled to $7.50 and for the other $4.50. The officers of the department classified the work at $4.50, and it was on that classification that he was paid. I remember it perfectly well. I remember that the price to which he was entitled under the classification was fixed at $4.50 by the engineer in charge of the work and by the engineer of the department. The question was thoroughly inquired into by a committee who investigated the whole matter. One of the charges against the late Government was the payment of that sum to Mr. Ryan of $4.50 per yard. The late Government was attacked by all the members of the Opposition, headed by the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Gibson), an expert, and the majority of the committee found that we had paid too much. But what I complain of is that the deduction was not made because he got the material on the ground in substitution for stone which he could either have got on the Manitoulin Island, or for limestone which, as the hon. gentleman says, he got down near Amherstburg. The payment was made on the classification of the work, and as I understand it, he was paid for all he was entitled under that classification; whether he got the stone at the Manitoulin or down at Amherstburg, it did not make any difference. He got the classification he was entitled to by the report of the engineer in charge of the work and the engineer in charge of the department. Neither changed the classification, and on those grounds I want to see the certificate, either of the engineer in charge of the work or of the deputy of his department, that there is a change from a payment of $4.50 per yard to one of $7.50.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This class of work continued for a long time to be valued and estimated by the engineer of the department at $7.50. Then there was a contention made, I do not know whether there was some trouble made in the investigation or what the reason was, but it was reduced to $4.50, and my chief engineer says it was on the later estimate that it was cut down to $4.50, but marked for later consideration. It was not allowed under a classification, as the hon. gentleman has said, at $4.50, that was not the intention. There never was any fixed or settled allowance at $4.50 under any classification in the schedule, but at first payments were made at $7.50 until the action which I have referred to, when it was reduced to $4.50, and stood at that subject to further consideration. I felt this was a matter which I was responsible for settling in one way or the other either that the matter should come up in this form, or that it should be left to be litigated. I made up my mind that as I had to determine upon it, I would reach the best conclusion I could on the facts, and I have done so. I have presented the matter to Parliament, and I thought that the hon. gentlemen opposite, particularly the hon. gentleman who has presided over this department, would be acquainted with the facts, but since he has raised an objection to the payment of this amount, I have no hesitation in allowing the item to drop, and let the subject be litigated with the department in the usual way.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think that is the best course to pursue. There is no question that Mr. Ryan applied for the privilege of using the sandstone that he was taking out of the bottom of the canal, in place of limestone. Now, having got that liberty, there might be some doubt as to what he should be entitled to receive. But he applied to the department and liberty was given, and as a result, the responsibility, of course, rested upon the late Government.

Crow's Nest Pass Railway—
To pay salary and expenses of superintending engineer $2,500

Mr. FOSTER. Who is superintending engineer?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Mr. Fellowes of Ottawa. He was suggested to me by the chief engineer of my department.

Mr. HUGHES. Is he the officer who was employed on the Trent Canal under the late Government?

Th MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I believe so. There were no politics in it, so far as I know.

Mr. SPROULE. You ask for $2,000 to pay salary and expenses of inspecting engineer on the Drummond County Railway. Is that the gentleman who reported on the Drummond County Railway last year, so hurriedly?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We did not have the same engineer on that railway during the whole of this work. In the first place we had Mr. Kingsford for a short time. He was not able to give close attention to the work on account of some historical labours he was engaged in, and we substituted Mr. H. A. MacLeod.

Mr. FOSTER. With reference to the Crow's Nest Pass, how is it that we have to pay for a superintending engineer? That is not a Government road, it is a road for which an immense subsidy was given. I suppose my hon. friend wants to secure that

the road shall be built according to contract, but why is it that in a road built by a company and for which an immense subsidy was given, we should pay for the inspecting engineer? Why should not the company pay for that report?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Can my hon. friend suggest any instance in all the past in which the contracting company paid for the cost of the engineer's reports and inspection?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know whether there has been any such instance or not, I want to know what the reason is. It seems to me that the company itself ought to pay all the expenses of construction, the same as in the Customs Department where importers have to pay a certain amount of the cost of inspection in certain cases.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If we did pursue that course, it would be of course entirely unprecedented, and one that never has been adopted in the past.

Mr. FOSTER. That may be.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I know in my own province when contracts with railway companies necessitated certain inspections being done, the Government had always to pay the cost of that inspection. It will necessarily have to be borne by the Government, unless the contract provided that the company should bear the expense. I am not prepared at this moment to say that it would be advisable for us to adopt the new plan. It is a very trifling sum, and it is scarcely necessary to insert a special clause in each contract making the company liable for this expense. In this instance the amount is $2,500, but it will not continue very long, and even this expenditure will scarcely justify the Government in pursuing a different course than they have followed in the past. In the case of the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Government had a permanent inspector on the work and we did the same on the Crow's Nest Pass line, this being a heavy and important work.

Mr. CASEY. No doubt the duties of the engineers on the Canadian Pacific Railway are to see that the standard established by the Government is maintained. General surprise was expressed at finding that large and important bridges on the Crow's Nest Pass road were constructed of wood instead of iron, and that second-hand rails were being laid down instead of the new rails supposed to be imported for that road. No doubt the company showed reason for being allowed to build wooden bridges and lay down second-hand rails, and I hope the Minister will tell the committee on what grounds those arrangements were made.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No doubt the hon. gentleman has referred to a matter of considerable importance. We are doing exactly as was done when the Canadian Pacific Railway was first constructed. On account of urgency it was found impossible to get the necessary material there, and so it was necessary that the trestle work should be constructed of wood.

Mr. CASEY. I am not referring to the trestle work, but to bridges over important rivers, the bridge over the St. Mary, and two bridges across Old Man River.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They are of wood, but they are equally strong and are as suitable for the purpose as iron. It was not possible to get those bridges built of iron in the time, and it will be in the interest of the road itself to have them subsequently replaced by more durable structures.

Mr. CASEY. In the interest of the country the bridges should be constructed of more durable material. I had a conversation with the manager of the works there, and he said there was some difficulty about getting the iron. I bring the matter up now merely to get official information in regard to it. I was, however, rather surprised to find some old acquaintances laid down on the road, namely, the celebrated Mackenzie steel rails of 1878, instead of the new rails supposed to be imported for the purpose. I am glad at this late date to be able to bear testimony to the excellent quality of the Mackenzie rails, for when I spoke to Mr. Haney, the contractor, in regard to them, he said that after twelve or fourteen years they were as good as new rails, and they were the best steel rails that had ever been imported into Canada.

Mr. CLARKE. Why were they taken up and relaid elsewhere?

Mr. CASEY. In regard to the road, the company received sufficient subsidy to lay substantial new rails. I am not speaking in a spirit of hostility to the railway, which of course carries out every expenditure in the most economical manner. Was the Government, however, notified of the use of those rails and permission asked to lay down second-hand rails instead of new rails?

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman is evidently endeavouring to show the enduring powers of the Mackenzie steel rails, but he also wants the Minister to offer certain explanations.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. As regards a portion of the main line, we allowed the company to transfer the rails from the main line to the Crow's Nest Pass road, putting down heavy new rails in place of those removed. The main line, where there is the passenger travel, gets the benefit of the new rails, while the other rails spoken of serve a useful purpose on the Crow's Nest Pass road.

Mr. CASEY. I thought the understanding was that new rails of certain weight should be laid on the new road ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The company has been allowed to replace the old line with new heavy rails instead of the new line. They were allowed to do this because the rails taken up were serviceable rails and would do for the business over the Crow's Nest Pass road, and at the same time an improvement is made on the main line.

Mr. CASEY. I do not wish to find fault in respect to this matter, but I call the attention of the Minister very seriously to it for the reason that the company should have been compelled to live up to their contract in respect to the new road. They were receiving sufficient subsidy to build it and complete it with new rails, according to the terms of the contract, while at the same time the company should be compelled to keep the main line in good and satisfactory order. The two things cannot be mixed up. There were certain specifications prepared in regard to the new road, and those specifications should have been carried out.

Resolutions to be reported.

The PRIME MINISTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 1.05 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Second Sitting.

MONDAY, 6th June, 1898.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

DRUMMOND COUNTY RAILWAY—REPORT OF INVESTIGATION COMMITTEE.

Mr. LISTER. I beg to give notice that to-morrow I will move :

That the report of the special committee appointed to inquire into the subsidies granted in aid of the Drummond County Railway, and into all negotiations relating to the acquiring of the said road by the Government, be adopted.

Mr. BERGERON. Does that comprise the evidence and everything ?

Mr. LISTER. Everything.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Is it the intention to have a discussion on this matter ?

Mr. LISTER. Yes.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I think there was a tacit understanding that the matter should not be discussed just at present, and on that understanding some of the members of the committee from this side of the House have gone home.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). My hon. friend has given notice, and if there is any objection to take the matter up to-morrow, we will be very willing to meet the views of the gentlemen on the other side of the House. However, for the present notice has been given for to-morrow.

Mr. MONTAGUE. We have no objection to a discussion of the matter, but on the tacit understanding I have referred to, one member of the committee especially acquainted with the facts has gone home.

Mr. LISTER. There was hardly an understanding. It was talked about, and I said that I would consult the Government about the matter, and I informed the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Borden), a day or two ago, that the report would have to be adopted, and I also saw him to-day about it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). As far as the committee are concerned, I think there was a pretty clear understanding that it would not be desirable at this late date of the session to discuss the question because it is inevitable that the debate would extend over a very considerable period. While it was not understood in any such way as to bind the Government, I think my hon. friend (Mr. Lister) will agree with me, it was recognized, as far as the committee were concerned that it would be better to postpone the discussion until the beginning of next session. I think that was pretty clearly understood. I did not hear anything inconsistent with that in any way until, I think, Saturday morning, when my hon. friend (Mr. Lister) mentioned to me that the matter was likely to be discussed. I pointed out to him the view that had already been taken by the committee, and I understood from him that he was to consult again with the gentlemen on that side of the House, and consequently I did not take any steps to detain Mr. Powell. In fact, I knew it would be useless at that stage to attempt to detain him, because he had a professional engagement which made it absolutely necessary that he should be in Moncton to-day. Then the matter was mentioned to me again to-day by my hon. friend for West Lambton (Mr. Lister), when I made the same suggestion. As far as the discussion is concerned, it is a mere matter of convenience as to when it shall take place. If we had the time we are as ready to discuss it now as at any time, but generally at the commence-

ment of a session there is more or less time lost—at least that is the way it would seem to me—by lack of work being ready. I do not say that is not necessary, but whether necessary or not it is usually so, and it seemed to me it would be a saving of time, and better in every way to deal with this matter at the commencement of next session, when more time is available than would be available now, unless we propose to sit longer than most of the members have anticipated.

The PRIME MINISTER. I would remind my hon. friend (Mr. Borden) that I doubt if we can take up this report next session. I do not think we can, but at all events, as my hon. friend (Mr Borden) has stated, it is a matter of convenience, and my hon. friend (Mr. Lister) has given notice that he would take it up to-morrow. If it does not suit my hon. friends on the other side to discuss the matter at this advanced period of the session, I think we may, perhaps, find it possible to meet their wishes.

Mr. MONTAGUE. May I be permitted to ask the Prime Minister a quesion? What we understand is that the notice stands for to-morrow, and that if it is found to meet the convenience of the members on this side of the House to lay it over, the right hon. gentleman would do that?

The PRIME MINISTER. The notice will stand until to-morrow. In the meantime, there might be a private conference to see what are the views of gentlemen on both sides of the House.

Mr. FOSTER. I should hope that the suggestion would not be seriously entertained that a report of that importance should be adopted without debate.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We would not insist on that.

Mr. FOSTER. I understand from what has been said that it must inevitably occur that if the adoption of this report is to be moved, we shall have to recall our members, many of whom have gone home with the understanding that it was not necessary for them to come back. An important report like that cannot be adopted without serious debate. I know my right hon. friend will consider the matter.

SAW-DUST IN RIVERS.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 166) further to amend the Fisheries Act. He said: Mr. Speaker, this amendment has sole reference to the dumping of saw-dust in navigable rivers. Last year, I introduced a Bill to extend the time for one year, so as to give the mill-owners another year's time in which to provide for the destruction of the saw-dust or its disposal in some other way than by dumping it in the rivers. Six months ago, I sent a circular to each of them, warning them that they need not hope for any further extension, and that they must prepare themselves for the enforcement of the Act; and I met the House with that full understanding. Since the meeting of the House, I have been waited upon by some of those who are largely interested in this business. They stated to me that about a year ago they entered into negotiation with a gentleman who thought he had discovered a process by which the saw-dust could not only be consumed, but utilized and a very important manufacture introduced into this country. They submitted statements to me, and brought to me the gentleman who has the matter in hand, the construction of the apparatus for the purpose of testing the efficiency of his device. After that was done, I said that after the statement I had made across the House and publicly, I did not feel justified in introducing a Bill further to extend the time, unless it was with pretty general consent. I submitted the statements to my predecessor in office (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper), and he said, speaking for himself personally, that the circumstances more than justified the extension. He saw me about it, and said that so far as he was concerned personally, if I introduced the Bill, it would have his support. I then said that a feeling was abroad in the community that one of the largest mill-owners was adopting devices of one kind or another for the purpose of evading the law, and that I would require, for my own personal satisfaction at least, a statement from him to the effect that he was not desirous of evading the law, but that he was prepared unreservedly to submit to the law if it came into operation. I said that I would further require, in order to place the matter fairly before the House, a statement of what proceedings had been taken, and at what stage the proceedings now were, in relation to this alleged discovery and experiment. I have received from Mr. J. R. Booth and Mr. W. C. Edwards, the two gentlemen who are most prominent in this matter, a letter dated the 23rd of May, 1898, in which they make the following statement of fact:—

> We beg to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 20th instant, and in reply thereto have to say that the process for the conversion of saw-dust and mill refuse into commercial products has been under investigation by us for the past two years.
>
> The process has been demonstrated in laboratory form, and Prof. Ruttan, of Montral, has investigated it so far as he was at present able to, and he has pronounced favourably upon it. In verification of this statement, we inclose herewith his letter. We are now building an initial or illustrative plant, and expect that it will be in operation within six weeks. If it is successful, as we expect the foundation will be laid of a large industry, which will include the manufacture upon a large scale of calcium carbide, thus utilizing commercially and profit-

ably all the refuse from the Ottawa River mills.

In view of the progress attending this scheme, we think it is reasonable to ask Parliament for an extension of the time limited by recent statute, whereby the mill-owners have been compelled to discontinue throwing saw-dust and mill refuse into the river for want of better disposition of it. Our present idea is that six months will be sufficient time to demonstrate the possibilities of this scheme, but as the undertaking is large and involves a considerable expenditure, as well as the overcoming of unforeseen difficulties, we submit that it is only reasonable that Parliament should grant extension of the time asked for to eighteen months.

We are deeply in earnest in this undertaking, which touches our interests very dearly, and we are governed by the best advice we have been able to obtain, and we have every confidence in the success of our scheme, and that the benefit we achieve will redound to the advantage of all the mill-owners of Canada.

Attached to that letter is a letter, which I need not read to the House, from Professor Ruttan, confirming the statements made in the letter so far as he is concerned. I have received a supplementary letter from Mr. J. R. Booth, in which he states that he will cheerfully submit to such rules, regulations or restrictions as the Government of Canada may deem fit to impose respecting the disposition of mill refuse. I quote that to remove an impression which exists in Ottawa that Mr. J. R. Booth has been able for a number of years to control the actions of the Government of Canada for the time being; and I think I may fairly say that I have been converted to the view that it is in the public interest that these gentlemen should have a little further extension of time in order to test the experiment which they have entered upon. They have already laid out a large amount of money on the mill for the experiment is in process of being carried on, and, if successful, it will be of great advantage, not only to the mill-owners of Canada, but to the people of Canada, for it will bring into existence a very large and profitable industry, which will give employment to a large number of people. Under these circumstances, I consulted with a number of gentlemen in the Senate and elsewhere who are personally interested in this matter, and I find that the general feeling is in favour of giving these gentlemen this opportunity—that it is reasonable and proper to do so. Although this is contrary to the statement I made in my circular letter to them, that I would not introduce such legislation this session, I may say that these facts were not then brought to my attention. I do not think, however, that there is any possibility of getting the Senate of Canada to consent to a two years' extension, as is suggested in this letter—for eighteen months practically means two years; and the Bill I propose to introduce extends the time for one year only, to the first of May next.

Mr. FOSTER. That ought to be long enough.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I think so. With this explanation I beg to introduce the Bill.

Mr. MONTAGUE. It is about time we had a new speech from the Throne.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS BY MEMBERS.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Before we take up the Orders of the Day, I think we ought to proceed with the questions.

Mr. SPEAKER. By the unanimous consent of the House, we will proceed with the questions put by members.

STORM SIGNALS IN CAPE BRETON.

Mr. BETHUNE asked,

How many storm signals are there in the counties of Cape Breton, Victoria and Inverness respectively? Where is each of them?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). The number of storm signals in the county of Cape Breton is four, in the county of Victoria one, and in the county of Inverness three. Those in Cape Breton are at Sydney, Port Morien, Louisburg and Little Glace Bay; that in Victoria is at Ingonish; and those in Inverness are at Cheticamp, Port Hood and Port Hastings.

APPROVAL OF RAILWAY REGULATIONS.

Mr. CASEY (by Mr. Ingram) asked,

Is the approval of the Governor General in Council, or of the Minister of Railways, necessary to the legal adoption and enforcement by a railway company of rules and regulations for the operation of its railway?

If so,—1. Have any such rules and regulations been adopted and submitted for approval by any railway company since 1st January, 1898; and by what companies? 2. Were such rules and regulations approved in all, or in which cases? 3. Did representatives of the employees of such railway companies applied to be heard by the Governor General in Council or the Minister of Railways, in regard to the approval of such rules and regulations? 4. Were they so heard previous to the approval of such rules and regulations?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I thought this matter had been pretty well disposed of; but I may add to what I stated before that I communicated with the Grand Trunk Railway management, pointing out to them that, as far as I had been able to learn, the chief objection to the rules which have been approved was that they were called into operation at an earlier date than the employees of the road, or the association represented by the gentlemen who have been communi-

cating with hon. members, though it was possible for them to become trained and experienced, as the time was too short for that purpose. As a result they have advised me that they have postponed the date until it would be satisfactorily ascertained that the men were sufficiently experienced and had learned the new signal methods so that there would be no difficulty.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend did not answer the question.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I stated the other day, or the other afternoon, that a body of new regulations was approved on the dates stated here, and that it was necessary such approval should take place before they went into operation.

Mr. INGRAM. Were the employees consulted ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think the hon. member must have failed to recollect what I said the other day. I had not the faintest recollection, nor had the right hon. Premier, of having been asked by the employees to communicate with them. There is no record whatever in my department of any such request. The ex-Minister stated that they waited on him and made such a request, and that he had caused a minute to be made of it, so that when the Grand Trunk Railway filed an application of that kind, there would be a record in the department showing there was objection to it. My officials say there is no such record, the Deputy Minister has not the faintest recollection of such a request, and I did not communicate with the employees before the regulations were approved for the reasons I have already stated.

DR. LAVOIE.

Mr. BERGERON asked.

1. Has Dr. Lavoie, of L'Islet, been appointed by the Government to a position of any kind ?
2. What is the position ?
3. What is the salary attached thereto ?
4. Is Dr. Lavoie performing the duties of his office, and how long has he been doing so ?
5. What place has been fixed upon for the residence of Dr. Lavoie while he holds the said office?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). When Commander Wakeham, who had charge of the gulf fisheries for a good many years, was sent in command of the Hudson Bay expedition, it became necessary to appoint some one in his place, and Dr. Lavoie was appointed by Order in Council of the 1st of July, to take the place of Commander Wakeham during his absence. Dr. Lavoie has remained in that position ever since. Had I not gone to Washington the other day, I would have been prepared to make a regular recommendation to Council fixing his position and salary for the future, but have not been able to do so yet.

Mr. BLAIR.

PUBLIC BUILDING, ARTHABASKA.

Mr. LAVERGNE asked,

Is it the intention of the Government to construct a public building in the town of Victoriaville, in the county of Arthabaska, with a view to accommodating therein the post office and the offices of the customs and excise and militia ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The intention of the Government will be determined by the amount of revenue obtained from the post office, customs and excise.

DISMISSAL OF W. A. KING.

Mr. FOSTER asked.

When was W. A. King, station agent, Antigonish, Nova Scotia, dismissed ? What were the charges against him and was there an investigation ? If so, what was the report of the commissioner and the result of the investigation ? Who has been appointed in Mr. King's place ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). Station agent King was dismissed. The charge preferred against him was offensive partisanship. A commissioner held an investigation, and the result was his dismissal. I cannot say who was appointed in his place, as I have mislaid the information, but will let the hon. gentleman know to-morrow.

Mr. FOSTER. Were the result and the report of the commissioner in unison ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Quite so.

DISMISSAL OF H. W. WOODS.

Mr. FOSTER asked,

Has H. W. Woods, postmaster of Welsford, New Brunswick, been dismissed ? Was there any investigation held in his case ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). Mr. Woods, postmaster, was also dismissed. There was not any investigation held in his case as one was really not considered necessary.

Mr. H. H. NORWOOD.

Mr. FOSTER asked,

Is H. H. Norwood in the employ of the Government in the Yukon district, and if so, in what capacity ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). H. H. Norwood is in the employ of the Government in the Yukon district, in the capacity of inspector of supplies.

LINE OF STEAMERS TO GASPE.

Mr. BERGERON asked,

1. Have the Government promised any subsidy to a line of steamers or to any company or person for a line of steamers to run between Mont-

real, Quebec and ports in the county of Gaspé ?
2. If so, to what company, person or persons ?
3. What is the amount of said subsidy ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). In the absence of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, I may say that last year a line of steamers was subsidized between Quebec and Gaspé. I cannot say positively now, but I believe that the subsidy has been continued this year.

ST. JACQUES MODEL FARM.

Mr. DUGAS asked,

Whether it is the intention of the Government to give effect to the request made by the member for Montcalm and place in the Supplementary Estimates a sum sufficient to provide for the establishment of a model farm at St. Jacques, where the cultivation of Canadian tobacco is made a specialty ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). This is a subject which has engaged the attention of the Government, but they have not come to a conclusion.

MR. JOHN D. MATHESON.

Mr. GILLIES asked,

1. When was John D. Matheson, late lockmaster of the St. Peter's Canal, appointed to that position ?
2. Was he appointed under an Order in Council ?
3. Were his duties performed efficiently ?
4. Was he dismissed, and if so, why ?
5. Were any complaints or charges laid against him, and if so, by whom ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). In reply to the hon. gentleman I beg to say : 1. John D. Matheson, late lockmaster of the St. Peter's Canal, was appointed to that position on the 30th November, 1892. 2. He was appointed under an Order in Council. 3. His duties were performed efficiently. 4. He was dismissed on account of political partisanship. 5. Charges were laid against him of political partisanship by Mr. E. P. Flynn, of Arichat.

INFANTRY SCHOOLS, FREDERICTON AND LONDON.

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON (by Mr. Clarke) asked,

What was the cost of lighting the permanent Infantry Schools at Fredericton and London respectively, for the financial year 1896-97, and the relative strength of the militia at each station ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). The cost of lighting the permanent infantry schools at Fredericton, N.B., and London, Ont., respectively, for the financial years 1892-93, 1893-94, 1894-95, 1895-96 and 1896-97, was as follows :—

	London.	Fredericton.
1892-93.....	$ 190 47	$2,019 98
1893-94.....	190 80	2,125 23
1894-95.....	204 50	1,980 80
1895-96.....	198 60	2,025 89
1896-97.....	199 05	1,757 37

I may explain that the excessive cost at Fredericton seems to be due to the very high charge made there for the use of gas. When I discovered in September last that such large amounts were being charged, I stopped at once the use of gas at that school, so that during this year the expense will be probably very much lower. We are negotiating now with the gas company with the view of making some arrangement for a reasonable sum per year for the use of the gas. The strength of the militia at the two stations is as follows :—

Fredericton—	
Permanent corps	79
Attached	346
London—	
Permanent corps	79
Attached	491

SUBALTERN OFFICERS, PERMANENT FORCE.

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON asked,

1. How many of the subaltern officers appointed to the permanent force since 10th July, 1896, were in possession of long course certificates when appointed ?
2. How many of the officers so appointed have since obtained long course certificates ?
3. How many of these officers are not in possession of long course certificates ?
4. Within what date must a permanent corps officer not in possession of long course certificate obtain it, and are their appointments provisional pending acquirement of such qualifying certificate ?
5. Is it to continue to be the policy of the Militia Department to appoint officers to the permanent force without their first being in possession of the qualifying long course certificate ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). 1. One. Another being a graduate of the Royal Military College does not require any other certificate. 2. None. Three—Van Straubenzie, Nagle and Lister are now undergoing a course. 3. Eight. Thirteen officers were appointed to the force. Of these three were surgeons not requiring L. C. certificate ; one was a Royal Military College graduate and one had a certificate. 4. No date specified. Officers are not appointed provisionally to the permanent corps. 5. No. On and after 1st July next the new regulations with regard to qualifications will come into force. They are as follows :—

A candidate for appointment to a unit of the permanent corps will be required—
(a) To be unmarried, and to be between the ages of 18 and 25 on the 1st of January of the then current year ;

(b) To undergo an inspection by a medical board as to his physical fitness in every respect for military service;

(c) To be in possession of a diploma of graduation from the Royal Military College of Canada, or

(d) To have served not less than 15 months as a commissioned officer in the active militia of Canada, and to have attended at least two annual trainings, or to have seen active service in the field, and to have passed the matriculation examination of a chartered university of Canada, or the entrance examination to the Royal Military College of Canada, and to be in possession of a long course grade "A" certificate in the arm of the service to which he is seeking appointment.

TELEGRAPH LINE ON THE NORTH SHORE OF THE ST. LAWRENCE.

Mr. CASGRAIN (by Mr. Bergeron) asked,

1. Did the Government call for tenders before awarding to Mr. DeCourval the contract for the erection of the telegraph line on the north shore of the St. Lawrence ?

2. If so, who were the parties who tendered, and what were the prices named in several tenders ?

3. Did the Government by an Order in Council relieve Mr. DeCourval of the condition of using none but cedar posts, and authorize the using by him of timber growing along the line ?

4. If so, on what date and for what reasons ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). 1 and 2. No. The contract, which was only for a portion of the line, was awarded to Mr. DeCourval upon a tender made by him, which was examined by the superintendent of the telegraph service, and in favour of the acceptance of which that officer reported to the Minister. 3 and 4. The specification for the construction of the line did not contain the condition of using none but cedar posts, cosequently no Order in Council was required in the matter as no change was made.

THE CASE OF P. COUILLARD DUPUIS.

Mr. CASGRAIN (by Mr. Bergeron) asked,

1. Are the Government aware that P. Couillard Dupuis was sentenced to pay a fine of $75 and costs, for selling liquor to the Indians on the Roberval reserve, in the county of Chicoutimi ?

2. Has the amount of the fine been paid ?

3. Have efforts been, or are they now being made to obtain from the Government a remission or a delay ; if so, by whom ?

4. Is it, in such case, the intention of the Government to grant such remission ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). 1. Yes. 2. No. 3 and 4. Representations were made by the member for the district in favour of Mr. Dupuis ; action was stayed to admit of my going into the matter ; and, after giving it consideration, I directed that, in so far as the Department of Indian Affairs was concerned, the law should be allowed to take its course, and the local agent was so instructed on the 4th ultimo.

Mr. BORDEN (King's).

UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA AND THE "DRIVING PARK."

Mr. LaRIVIERE asked,

1. Has the Government agreed to grant to the University of Manitoba the parcel of land in the city of Winnipeg commonly known as the "Driving Park" ?

2. If so, upon what terms and conditions ?

3. Has the Hudson Bay Company any unextinguished title to said land, or is the disposal of the same subject to the consent or approval of the said company ?

4. Has that consent or approval been obtained, and upon what conditions or restrictions ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). The Government has agreed to allow a portion of the land in the city of Winnipeg, known as the "Driving Park," to be used as a site for university buildings. The terms and conditions have not been settled. The original deed from the Hudson Bay Company is not an absolute deed, but provides that the land must be used for public purposes. No consent of the Hudson Bay Company has been obtained. It is not intended to make any grant which will be inconsistent with the terms of the original lease.

RETIREMENT OF COUNTY COURT JUDGES AT 75 YEARS.

Mr. INGRAM asked,

Was any correspondence addressed to the Government in reference to the propriety of legislating with a view to retiring county court judges from their positions as such officials on their arriving at the age of seventy-five years ? If so, by whom was such correspondence addressed ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I am not aware that there is any such correspondence.

QUALIFICATION OF OFFICERS—MILITIA GENERAL ORDERS.

Mr. TYRWHTT asked,

Were Militia General Orders No. 29 of 1897 and No. 22 of 1898, relative to certificates of qualification of officers, approved of by Order in Council ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). In aswer to the hon. gentleman, I beg to say : No, such approval is not necessary under the Militia Act.

CORRESPONDENCE WITH CARDINAL RAMPOLLA.

Mr. McDOUGALL asked,

Has the Right Honourable the First Minister addressed a letter or any communication to His Eminence Cardinal Rampolla at Rome with statement contained therein to the following effect :—

"Ottawa, 30th October, 1897.

"Eminence,—I made known to you in the month of August last, when Your Eminence did me the honour to grant me an audience, the happy result which the mission of Monseigneur Merry del Val had accomplished among the Catholics of Canada, and the profound impression which his high Christian virtues and his talents as a statesman—I say statesman, and the expression is not too strong—had created in all classes of our population.

"Having now returned to my country for several months, I wish to make known to Your Eminence that, if these happy results are to remain permanent and efficacious, it is desirable, if not necessary, that the mission of Monseigneur Merry del Val should be renewed, or rather continued, and that he should be present in the midst of us for a more or less prolonged time as the accredited representative of the Holy See.

"I have established, since my return, that there is among a certain class of Catholics an underhand agitation against the work accomplished by Monseigneur Merry del Val, a work of pacification, concord and union.

* * * *

"The same reason of state which inspired His Holiness in the affairs of France, and which caused him to prescribe to the Catholics of this country the duty of abandoning the old strifes of the past and to accept the state of things agreed upon, has quite as much force in Canada as in France.

"Such is the opinion of a great number of the Catholics among us. I admit that it is not the unanimous opinion; this very divergence of opinion only renders more necessary among us the presence of a man at once firm and conciliatory like Monseigneur Merry del Val, and of one above all would understand all the danger there is of exasperating the men who are sincere, convinced, and who wish to be faithful to their duty as Catholics, while remaining faithful to what they believe to be their duties as citizens.

"May I be permitted to ask Your Eminence to be good enough to lay these considerations before His Holiness, while assuring him at the same time of my profound respect and of my filial attachment.

"Accept, Eminence, the expression of the high consideration with which I remain, &c., &c."

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I beg to say to my hon. friend (Mr. McDougall) that I have no answer to make to any inquiry as to private and confidential correspondence not on public matters. I would further say to my hon. friend that if he wants to know whether or not I wrote such a letter, he should at least produce the letter in its entirety. In the copy on the Order paper there is a line of asterisks, showing plainly that a portion has been suppressed and the letter has been garbled.

THE PACIFIC CABLE.

Mr. McNEILL. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I should like to ask the right hon. leader of the House (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) if he will be kind enough to give me some information with regard to the proposed Pacific Cable. In view of the discussion which took place on this subject the other night, an impression has gone abroad that Canada was expected to guarantee one-third part of the cost. Was it not the understanding that certain of the Australian Colonies should guarantee one-third, the mother country one-third, and Canada and New Zealand between them one-third.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I am not aware that any definite scheme has ever been arranged or understanding come to. There has been some discussion as to the apportionment of the cost between the mother country and the different colonies, but I am not prepared at this moment to say what was proposed and finally accepted. In fact, I do not think that anything was finally accepted.

Mr. McNEILL. May I ask if that was not the basis of the discussion which has taken place on this subject?

The PRIME MINISTER. That is not my impression. My impression was that Canada was to furnish one-third, but I cannot speak positively. It is a matter which more concerns the Department of the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) who is not present this afternoon, but who will be here this evening. If my hon. friend will renew his question to-morrow, no doubt the information will be given him.

ENFORCEMENT OF THE ALIEN LABOUR LAW.

Mr. CLANCY. I would like to ask the First Minister if he is able to say whether an officer will be appointed at Wallaceburg to enforce the Alien Labour Law?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I suppose there will be no objection to that; on the contrary, I am satisfied that there will be every wish to meet the views of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy).

Mr. McCORMICK. I would ask if an officer has been appointed at Parry Sound to enforce the Alien Labour Law?

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes, that has been done. I understand also, from information I have just received, that an officer has been appointed at Wallaceburg as well.

BELL TELEPHONE COMPANY'S RATES.

Mr. CLARKE. I would ask if any decision has yet been reached by the Railway Committee of the Privy Council on the application by the Bell Telephone Company for permission to increase their rates?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). No decision has yet been given.

JUDGES OF PROVINCIAL COURTS.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL moved that the order for third reading of Bill (No. 150)

further to amend the Act respecting the Judges of Provincial Courts be discharged, and that the Bill be referred back to Committee of the Whole this day for the purpose of further consideration.

Motion agreed to.

PENSIONS TO JUDGES.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following resolution :—

Resolved, That it is expedient to provide that any judge now holding office who shall by reason only of his having completed the seventy-fifth year of his age be or become disqualified to hold or retain his office, shall be entitled to a pension under section 15 of chapter 138 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, although he may not have continued in office for the number of years mentioned in that section.

Motion agreed to, and the House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. INGRAM. I would like to know on what principle judges of county courts who arrive at the age of 75 years should be legislated out of their position, and that Superior Court judges, even when they arrive at a greater age, are not interfered with ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The judges of the Superior Courts are appointed under the constitution, the British North America Act, and we have, therefore, no right to legislate in this manner with regard to them; whereas, judges of the county court are simply statutory appointments, and under statutes passed by ourselves, and we have a constitutional right to legislate in this manner with regard to them.

Mr. INGRAM. I observe that a resolution in respect to judges found its way on the Order paper last Saturday, and when it was reached the leader of the House asked that it should be dropped. If there were good reasons for placing it on the Order paper, those reasons must still hold good. I say it is a great injustice to legislate judges out of their positions, whether they are county court or supreme court judges. I cannot but believe, notwithstanding the answer I received from the First Minister, that the judge in my own county was particularly aimed at by the legislation that was introduced and withdrawn, and by this legislation. I have it on the best authority that some aspirants who are looking for that gentleman's shoes, are now in the city trying their best to secure the position.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not quite understand the provision about superannuation.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The position now is that a gentleman who is retired merely because he has reached his 75th year, is entitled to superannuation exactly the same as if he had only served five years.

Mr. MONTAGUE. It is possible under this clause to appoint men who are 55, 60 or 70 years of age to the bench, and then retire them at 75.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Then they get nothing. This applies simply to those who now hold office. In the future if we appoint a man 70 years of age and he goes out at 75 he is not entitled to anything.

Mr. INGRAM. Will the Government promise for the next two years that they will not undertake to reduce the age limit ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I would advise my hon. friend not to borrow any trouble for the future. Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I desire to enter my protest against fixing an age of arbitrary retirement. I want to point out to the Solicitor General and also to the Prime Minister, that there does not seem to be any greater reason for a time limit to county court judges than for a time limit in respect to the age of the members of the Government, or of the members of this House. I observe, from consulting the Parliamentary Companion, that one of the members of the right hon. gentleman's Government is in his 74th year, another one is in his 69th year. The late Minister of Justice was appointed in his 77th year, and he was in his 79th year when he was appointed Lieutenant-Governor of Ontario. I also observe that the hon. leader of the Opposition, who has not been noted as particularly inactive, or as distinguished by any want of energy during the present session, is in his 77th year ; and that the leader of the Opposition in the Senate is vigorous in mind and body in his 75th year. I also observe that one member who occupies a seat on the Government side, is in his 75th year, two others are in their 73rd year and one in his 70th year. I do not know much about the other provinces, but in the province of Nova Scotia the president of the legislative council, a good Liberal and a very worthy gentleman, is in his 76th year, another gentleman who has been known as the leader of the Opposition is in his 77th year ; and two members on the Government side of the House there, who are very active both physically and mentally, are in their 74th and 76th year respectively. Now I have a long list here of English judges with which I will not weary the House, but I refer the Solicitor General to the names of Lord St. Leonards, Lord Brougham, Lord Campbell, Lord Chelmsford, Baron Parke afterwards Lord Wensleydale, Lord Cranworth and Lord Lyndhurst, all of whom not only did active work after they arrived at the age of 75 years, but in many cases were appointed

to the very highest positions after attaining that age. Some of them were appointed to the position of Lord Chancellor after they had attained the age at which it is proposed to drive county court judges summarily off the bench.

For instance, Lord Cranworth, who was born in 1790, was given by Lord Palmerston the position of Chancellor of England when he was of the age of 75 years. It is perfectly clear that apart from the proposed enactment, there is power to dispense with the services of any of the judges who have attained the age of 75 years, and who are not competent to perform their duties; and in my opinion there is no greater reason for fixing the age for the retirement of county court judges than in the case of members of Parliament or members of the Government or members of the Senate. It is bad legislation; there is no logical reason for it whatever. My hon. friend beside me (Mr. Bergeron) suggests there is some reason for it, which I hope does not really exist. I must take it for granted that the Government in putting forward this legislation are sincere and think it is right. That being so, I think it is my duty to point out these instances, which indicate that men in many other walks of life perform most important functions, just as important as those of county court judges, after they have reached 75 years. There is no greater reason for restricting by a time limit the performance of duty by county court judges than by members of Parliament, members of the Government or members of the Senate.

The PRIME MINISTER. I must say to the hon. gentleman that having the honour to occupy a very prominent position at the bar in his province, he should have met the suggestion in a different spirit from that which he has exhibited to the House. My hon. friend has taken a line of argument which he knows well as a lawyer is a very unsafe one, to argue from exception in order to establish a general rule. My hon. friend has cited the case of the leader of the Opposition, who being 76 years, has discharged and discharged with unabated vigour and ability his important functions, functions as important as those of a county judge. But my hon. friend also knows, and for my part I know, that the case of the leader of the Opposition is a very exceptional one. I do not know a man of 76 years endowed with the same vigour as happily for his party and for the country too as is the case with Sir Charles Tupper. But because Sir Charles Tupper and a few other men have been able to show at the age of 76 years unabated vigour, does it follow that a rule should prevail that the same conditions should be expected in all cases. There is a greater authority than his or mine which says that the span of life of man is three score years and ten. When a man reaches that age the presumption is that he is no longer fit to discharge important duties. The hon. gentleman has cited the cases of Lord Chancellors. I was somewhat surprised to find him compare county court judges with Lords Brougham and Lyndhurst and others.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I was doing so only in point of physical vigour.

The PRIME MINISTER. The Lord Chancellor of England discharges duties of far greater importance than county court judges, but in point of physical vigour perhaps it requires greater energy, stamina and endurance to discharge the duties of a county court judge, to go on circuit over corduroy roads, sleep in bad hotels, hear division court cases, a class of work which is most taxing on the energies and resources of any man. I shall be very much surprised if my hon. friend has not met in his own province judges of 75 years whom he thought it would be better in the public interest should be superannuated. I appeal to the hon. gentleman's experience whether in taking the power to limit the period of usefulness of some of the old judges, we are not consulting the best interests of those who are compelled to go before the county courts in Ontario especially and in some of the other provinces. There is no politics in that, and I would be sorry if it should be considered from that point of view. But I appeal with confidence to legal gentlemen on both sides of the House, for I believe they will sustain the action taken by the Government in this matter.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I may mention to the right hon. gentleman that there is one judge in Canada at the present time who at the age of nearly 85 years is discharging his judicial duties and discharging them with undiminished activity, with very great ability, and with apparently as vigorous an intellect as ever he possessed. Of course as the right hon. gentleman says, that is an exception, but I think that possibly the right hon. gentleman misunderstood me. My suggestion was that if you now have means to get rid of a judge who is not capable when he attains the age of 75, why should you fix an arbitrary time limit which will exclude some men at least who at that age are fully capable of performing their judicial duties with universal satisfaction.

The PRIME MINISTER. This law would not apply to the judge the hon. gentleman refers to.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am quite aware of that.

Mr. TISDALE. I presume the Government have decided upon this course, and if so they should certainly do justice to those judges who are already appointed, and who when they took office had the right to believe that so long as they were capable of filling the position they would get full

salary. These gentlemen who now occupy the position of judges have for a long time been retired from other walks of life; they are in consequence unable to earn any emolument beyond their pay, and surely the least that should be done would be to give them their full pay on retirement. This proposed legislation is ex poste facto legislation, and is, I think, of a very unfair character. I appeal to the right hon. gentleman that if this argument is good when applied to the judges of the inferior courts, it is stronger still when applied to judges of the Superior Courts, and many are in favour of retiring all judges under similar circumstances on full pay. Every argument that could be advanced to apply this law to county court judges certainly could be used with stronger force to the judges of the Superior Court, who are charged with greater responsibilities. I protest against changing the conditions of the law which these gentlemen believed they would be under when they accepted office. They are now, it seems, to be summarily dismissed by Act of Parliament at a less rate of pay than was guaranteed them by the law when they were appointed. I protest in regard to that. Speaking for myself I do not feel so strongly about the other part of the law as I do about this provision. Surely this country can afford to be fair to its judiciary. The judiciary of Canada, from the county court judges through to the judges of the highest courts are a credit to Canada, and under all circumstances whether, from a political point of view or otherwise, they have as a general rule so conducted themselves as to meet with the universal approval of the people. So far as I am concerned I probably would have raised no objection to the resolution which was withdrawn the other day giving these judges the same rate of pay on retirement as they have at present, but I do protest respectfully and strongly against this change being forced upon them, by which, after they have served the country for long years they are summarily dispensed with at a decreased rate of pay. In all my parliamentary experience, although other gentlemen who have made a close study of the subject may know better, I do not remember that Parliament has ever passed such a law affecting a large body of public servants, but more especially so in regard to a class who hold such a high record in this country as do the county court judges. I regret very much that the Government saw fit to introduce this legislation, and I protest against it.

Mr. McNEILL. I was so much gratified at the course the Government took in introducing this measure, and taking upon themselves the responsibility of doing something which perhaps was not a very popular thing to do, because I belive they thought in doing so they were simply doing what was right and just; I say I was so much gratified with their course in that instance that I am sorry to be obliged to differ from them now in regard to any part of this measure. I feel with regard to this proposal just as I did with regard to the civil service: that it is setting a very bad precedent. It is setting the example of holding as of no weight or value explicit and implied contracts in this country. It is not a precedent which will redound to the good of this country in the long run. It is not a precedent which can be held down fast to this particular matter; it is in point of fact letting loose the forces of anarchy in Canada. If you strike at the root of the sanctity of contract you strike at the root of the rights of property. That is really what this amounts to, and if the Government set the example of legislation of this kind in one case and another, the day will come when the people of Canada will be very sorry for it. That is my opinion, and it is because I hold that opinion so strongly that I feel it absolutely necessary to differ from the Government on this point. I had hoped that when the existing judges were being obliged to retire they would be allowed to retire on their full pay, and I am very sorry there has been any change in the policy of the Government in that respect. So far as the matter of age is concerned, it seems to me that the question is, as to whether it be true that it is an exception to find a judge of 75 years who is able to discharge his duties. My impression is that the very reverse is the case. I am quite satisfied that hon. members of this House who have been in the habit of practicing at the bar, would very much prefer as a rule to argue before and have their cases tried by a judge of 75 years, than a judge of 35 years. I think it does not matter how able a young man newly appointed to the bench may be, he cannot have the knowledge, he cannot have the experience, he cannot have the matured judgment that a judge of 75 years has. If it be true that it is only the exception to find a judge of 75 years who is able to discharge his functions properly, then that is another matter, but I do not think it is so at all. If my right hon. friend will look at the record in England he will find that it is not merely the exception that a judge of 75 years is able to discharge his functions. If I am not very much mistaken the present Lord Chancellor was over 75 years old when he was appointed Lord Chancellor. I believe that Lord Westbury was much over 75 years when he was sitting in Appeals in the House of Lords, and I should like to have seen any member of this House attempt to cross swords with Lord Westbury at that time, under the impression that his intellect was in any way impaired.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not think that your example is a very good one.

Mr. McNEILL. Was not Lord Westbury, when over 75 years of age, a man of great ability and force ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. He was a marked failure as to his mental qualities after the age of 75 years.

Mr. McNEILL. It is for the first time that I ever heard that suggested. I have had the pleasure of sitting and hearing Lord Westbury deliver judgment ; I have had the pleasure of hearing him cross swords in argument with the ablest advocates of the bar, at a time when I am satisfied he was over 75 years, and I never heard the suggestion made by any one that he was not then a perfect giant in intellect. At the same time there were sitting with Lord Westbury in the same court, Lord Chelmsford, who was also over that age, and Page Wood, then Lord Chancellor who also, I am satisfied, was more than 75 years.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Lord Hatherly.

Mr. McNEILL. Yes, Lord Hatherly. I know that Lord Colonsay was over 80 when he was sitting in the same court at the same time. I question very much if there was any single judge, except Lord Cairns, and the Lord Chancellor of Ireland, who sometimes sat there : I question if there were any of the judges who sat there, from day to day, who were not over 75 years, and that was the highest court of the Empire. I do not think it is correct to assume that it is only the exception, when you find a judge of 75 years who is able to discharge his functions. I repeat, that if a judge of 75 years is as bright as these men I have referred to, or as the present High Commissioner of Canada to London, whose appointment was confirmed by this Government when he was over 75 years ; I repeat that I for my part would infinitely prefer if I had a case to have it tried by a judge of experience and matured judgment, rather than by a young judge.

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend (Mr. McNeill) has given us such a fair support upon this Bill up to the present, that I am very sorry indeed that in this last disposition of it we have not been able equally well to meet his wishes. I must remind my hon. friend (Mr. McNeill) that perfection is not of this world ; there are spots on the sun, and so he must expect to find even little specks on this Government. But I want to impress my hon. friend (Mr. McNeill) with this : that when a judge has reached 75 years of age it is not so much his mind which may have become infirm as it is his body. I appeal to the experience of legal gentlemen who practice in the rural courts of all the provinces and have to deal with the county judges, if it is not a fact that after a judge has come to be 70 years, or 72 years, and more especialy 75 years old, that though his mind may be as bright as a dollar, and though he may preserve all his mental qualities he is most reluctant very often to undertake the physical duties which fall to his office. They are most reluctant to go on circuit in winter, on account of bad roads, cold weather, and so on. They refuse to do that on one pretense or another, consequently the interests of suitors suffer. There are many judges, who, at the age of seventy-five, are just as bright and as able mentally to discharge their duties as any others, but who would not be able to go through the same physical exertions as they were when they were only forty or fifty years of age. That is the reason why it has become imperative on us to introduce this legislation. It is no pleasure to us to do so, quite otherwise ; and if very old judges were able to travel, there would be no reason for introducing it.

Mr. McNEILL. There is a great deal of force in what the right hon. gentleman has said, and I believe it is much the strongest argument which has been offered on this subject. Of course, where a judge is found to be too infirm to discharge his duties, there is at present power to retire him.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Where ?

Mr. McNEILL. I supposed it was not disputed. Does the hon. gentleman deny it ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There must be a public scandal before a judge can be removed from the bench.

Mr. McNEILL. Waiving that point for the moment, would it not be right and just to these men who accepted a position on the bench, and gave up their practice with certain prospects in view, that they should have their full salary in the event of their being compelled to retire ? It would not make a great deal of difference to the country in the cost, and it would certainly prevent a very bad precedent being established.

Mr. INGRAM. The right hon. gentleman has just advanced a reason why this resolution has been introduced into this House ; and I take it that he has done so because those who represented the junior judges, when they came to this Parliament to interview the Government, as well as several private members of this House, stated that the reason they wanted an increase of salary was that the senior judges did not do their share of travelling and perform their share of the duties. I was not aware that this provision was to apply to county judges over 75 years of age. If it is to apply to them, I can speak for one county judge over 75 years of age, Judge Hughes, the senior judge of the county of Elgin, that he performs his duties and takes his share of the travelling ; and, unlike other senior judges,

he has divided the surrogate court fees with the junior judge. His other duties he performs, in my opinion, and in the opinion of the gentlemen who practice before him, as satisfactorily as does the junior judge. Listening to the arguments of the right hon. gentleman, and to the arguments of the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Borden), I would suppose that the Government had no power in their hands to remove a county court judge who happened to be incapable. If my memory serves me correctly, a few years ago there was a certain county court judge in the province of Ontario as to whom the rumour went abroad that he was troubled with softening of the brain, and the Government were at a loss how to remove him. I understand that Sir John Thompson amended the Act, and a Superior Court judge was appointed to inquire whether the judge was able to perform his duties. The Superior Court judge did inquire, and made a report to the effect that the county court judge was incapable of performing his duties, but, whether fortunately or unfortunately, the county court judge died in a short time and was removed in that way. So I say that if the Act as it stands at present provides a means by which incompetent or incapable judges can be removed, what is the necessity of introducing a resolution of this kind, and preventing a man such as the judge of the county of Elgin from remaining on the bench, though able to perform his duties to the satisfaction of those who practice before him and the public generally? I think it is a great injustice, and I rise for the purpose of protesting against it.

Mr. CLANCY. I would like to ask the Solicitor General, what would be the retiring allowance of a judge appointed, say, at the age of 66, having served ten years?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. He would be entitled to his full two-thirds.

Mr. CLARKE. May I ask the Solicitor General if in any other part of the British Empire there is an enactment in force similar to the one he proposes here?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I am not aware that there is; but I would remind my hon. friend that one or two years ago there was an outcry in England because of the advanced age of the judges on the bench; and a series of articles were published at the time drawing attention to the matter, and asking for a remedy. I am quite sure these articles were written in 1893 and 1894, and I have sent for them so as to have them before this debate closes. At the same time, I would draw my hon. friend's attention to this, that under the English system a judge is appointed under the Constitutional Act during life; but with us there is a distinction between the judges of the Superior Courts, who are appointed and hold their offices under the British North America Act, and the judges of the county courts who hold their offices merely under a statute; and there is no principle of law more firmly established than that there is no vested right in an office as against the public.

Mr. INGRAM. Suppose a change of Government takes place, what is to prevent the incoming Government from introducing a resolution to remove all county judges who have arrived at the age of seventy?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. It would absolutely have the right to do so.

Mr. INGRAM. Would it not be interfering with the independence of the bench?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. As to the county court judges, their tenure of office is merely statutory, and no tenure that depends on a statute can be considered as permanent. That is a broad principle of law. Their tenure is necessarily subject to the caprice of the legislature. The only brake on that is a due regard for the public interest. I beg to call the hon. gentleman's attention to the case of Lord Fitzjames Stephen, who tried the Maybrick case. It was freely asserted at the time that he was utterly incompetent to try that case.

Mr. McNEILL. He was an exception.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. That may be, but it was in consequence of it that an agitation arose in England as to the necessity of limiting the period of years during which a judge may sit on the bench.

Mr. INGRAM. Can you not remove a county court judge now?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. What my hon. friend has stated is absolutely correct and in accord with the terms of the statute.

Mr. INGRAM. Why not leave it that way?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. That would not enable us to meet all the cases. I do not think it is quite fair for me to refer to individual cases, but I may say that there are two, in one of which the judge is 92 and admittedly incompetent, and in the other the judge is over 80 and utterly incompetent because of age. I suppose it might be possible for us to meet such cases by way of investigation, but if every time it is well ascertained and publicly known that a man has become incapable of performing his duties because of advanced years, we must appoint a committee to investigate his record, where are you going to stop? It is far better to have a limit of years fixed beyond which a man cannot go. Reference has been made by the hon. member for Halifax to a judge of a High Court. There is a limit reached in the lives of the whole of us when, because of our physical infirmities, however bright our mental faculties may continue, we are not able to give to the public that full measure of work which the public are entitled to expect. I know whereof I speak, because I have

occasion personally to see the many disadvantages which result from men of advanced years being obliged to sit from day to day in court, whose minds are sufficiently bright, but whose physical powers cannot stand the strain. I have heard the bar appealed to not to proceed with cases beyond a certain hour, because of the condition of one of the judges.

Mr. CLANCY. Does the hon. gentleman mean that when a county court judge reaches 75 years, he will have to retire by reason of his age, irrespective of his mental capacities ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. When a man has completed his 75th year, he will be retired, no matter what his mental condition may be. And even if a judge is not 75 years of age, the statute will still apply if he should become incompetent by reason of some infirmity.

Mr. BERGERON. How many county court judges will fall under this new law ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I think the limit will be five or six.

Mr. BERGERON. Why has the hon. gentleman restricted this to the county court judges ? In the Revised Statutes of Canada of 1886, I find that all the judges are put on the same footing in the clause dealing with superannuation, except that in the case of Superior Court judges all over the Dominion, when they have sat 15 years and are incapacitated, they can claim two-thirds of their salary as superannuation, but in the case of county court judges, they must have sat 25 years before they can make a similar claim. The two classes of judges seem, therefore, in that Act, to be put on the same footing.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Under section 96 of the British North America Act, the Governor General in Council has the exclusive power of appointing judges of the Superior, district and county courts in each province. Section 99 provides that the judges of the Superior Court shall hold office during good behaviour. There is no provision at all as to the term of office of a county court judge. As the constitution provides that the Superior Court judges shall hold office during good behaviour, we cannot interfere with them. That is a constitutional appointment, but as this section of the British North America Act does not apply to county court judges, whose tenure of office is fixed by statute, we have the right in their case to interfere.

Mr. HAGGART. Is there no power to alter that as regards Superior Court judges?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. There is not. We cannot appeal to the English practice for guidance, because there the judges are appointed under a constitutional Act—the Act of Settlement—but if we go to the United States, where they have exactly the same condition of things as here, where they have judges appointed under the constitution and judges appointed under statute, you find that a long series of decisions has settled this principle : "It is a general rule that where an office is created by statutory, as distinguished from constitutional legislation, it is wholly within the control of the legislature which created it."

Mr. HAGGART. I have heard that discussed before, and I have an idea that the majority of lawyers, especially some of the Ministers of Justice whom I have had the pleasure of hearing discuss the matter, looked upon it as a statutory appointment and that we have the power of altering it and fixing the tenure of office. I can understand your position if your power is limited under the British North America Act, and there is no provision at all in the Act itself which gives you the power of amending that particular part of the Act, but I had an idea that there was power given under the Act and that you could exercise the right by statute of fixing the age of retirement of judges and also the time at which they could be superannuated.

Mr. BERGERON. I understand that the constitutional objection is the only one raised to the putting of all the judges on the same footing. In reply to that objection I might say that Sir John Thompson, when Minister of Justice, and in the session before the last that he was here, I think, had decided that the Supreme Court Act should be amended, and this was one of the clauses of the new Act—that at 80 years of age a judge should ipso facto be on the retired list and receive full pay. I do not quite appreciate the argument of my hon. friend the Solicitor General when he says he stands entirely upon the fact that the judges of the Superior Court are appointed during good behaviour, because I believe the Supreme Court judges are appointed in the same way. If the Minister of Justice decided to do this in the case of the Supreme Court judges, I do not see why we should not do that same thing here. With all deference to the opinion of my hon. friend, I do not see why we should make such a distinction between the two classes of judges. If we are to do this in the case of the county court judges I would propose that we fix the age at 80 instead of 75, because I cannot hide from myself the idea that a great many judges will be found to be sick and incapacitated, making new creations necessary, and saddling the treasury of the country with the expense of eight or ten new judges.

The PRIME MINISTER. If I rightly apprehend the remarks of my hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron), his idea would be that if the provision of the Bill is to be passed which makes it compulsory for county court judges to be retired at 75 years of age, the

same principle should be extended to other judges.

Mr. BERGERON. I say that I am surprised that it is not so.

The PRIME MINISTER. But does my hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) advocate it ?

Mr. BERGERON. I say, put it at 80 years, and I would advocate it being applied to all the judges.

Mr. ERB. May I ask upon what grounds James P. Woods, late judge of the county of Perth, was retired, and whether he was entitled to superannuation allowance according to the Act in force at the time and, if not, upon what grounds did he receive a superannuation allowance ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. In the case of Judge Woods there was an investigation. I cannot give the grounds of it, but, as a result, it was found that he should receive a superannuation grant. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Erb) would like more particulars, I shall be glad to get them for him. But I should like to refresh my memory as to the points, because one does not like to speak of a judge without being absolutely sure of his facts.

Mr. CLARKE. I would like to ask how many judges affected by this law are now over 75 years of age ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I said a moment ago that I had not made such an examination as would enable me to answer very accurately, but I thought five or six would be the limit.

Mr. CLARKE. Including county court judges ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes, this applies exclusively to county court judges. I can appreciate what my hon. friend from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) said about the constitutional opinion of the late Sir John Thompson. But I would rather argue on the statute that on an opinion that I have never heard.

Mr. HAGGART. Does the hon. gentleman say that the British North America Act ranks the judges of the Supreme Court differently from those of the Superior Court ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. That is a nice question. Of course I do not know the Act by heart, therefore I give my opinion for what it may be worth. The Act provides that we shall have the right to appoint judges of the Supreme Court and that the federal authority has the right to create the Supreme Court. We did create it, and we fixed a term of office. More than that, I am not prepared to say.

Mr. HAGGART. Perhaps, then, my argument was incorrect in regard to the Superior Court. I contended that they could fix a time for the Superior Court judges.

The PRIME MINISTER. Who were "they."

Mr. HAGGART. Perhaps there is no written opinion in the matter. But I have heard different Ministers of Justice argue that. I am inclined to the opinion that Sir John Thompson held the idea that it might apply to Superior Court judges.

Mr. INGRAM. I move that the word "seventy-fifth" be struck out and the word "eightieth" be inserted instead, seconded by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule).

Mr. SPROULE. I think this ought to be accepted. If before his eightieth year a judge is incapacitated from performing his duties, he can be retired, and if he is not, it is unreasonable that he should be retired.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I think the Government should accept this proposition. I do not see any reason why a man capable of discharging his duties at 75 should be retired.

The PRIME MINISTER. I will tell my hon. friend the reason. If this were applied to judges of the Superior Court in certain parts of the Dominion, not in Ontario but in Quebec where the judges reside, each in his own district and administer justice there, I could understand it. But my hon. friend (Mr. Fitzpatrick) stated a moment ago the reason why this has become absolutely necessary, not because the mental faculties of the judge is impaired, but because his physical powers are not equal to those of a stronger man. He is obliged to go on circuit——

Mr. INGRAM. I beg to say——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

The PRIME MINISTER—and judges of that age are more reluctant to go on circuit than younger men would be. Take a judge whose mental faculties are vigorous at 75 years of age, he is still not able to undergo the same physical exertion as a man at 40 or 50.

Mr. INGRAM. Do I understand the Prime Minister to say that I said that, or did he refer to the Solicitor General ?

The PRIME MINISTER. I was answering my hon. friend from Haldimand (Mr. Montague).

Mr. MONTAGUE. I quite understand the strength of the point that the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) makes. But, I am sure, the hon. gentleman knows there are a number of judges in the province of Ontario appointed for an individual county in whose case the physical endurance required is very small indeed. These judges in certain counties have junior judges. I am quite satisfied that, so far as the province of Ontario is concerned, men will be taken from the bench and retired on pensions who

are perfectly able both intellectually and physically to do the work required of them.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I know there has been a good deal of discussion upon this point for some years past. But I fear that the clause as it now stands will be opposed to the public interest in some cases. There are judges in my own province—I know one, at least—who will have to retire if this becomes law, and in that gentleman one of the most efficient county court judges we have will be retired simply because he has reached the age of 75.

Therefore, I think that not only would it be hard on the judge himself, but it would be hard on the district that he serves, a very large district. Now, I would make this suggestion it has been proposed to extend the age to 80 years, but I do not approve of that. Let the Government, if it will, lay down the rule that 75 years is the age at which a county court judge is expected to retire, but let the rule only be called into operation by Order in Council, so that in case he still remains efficient he will be allowed to retain his seat. Parliament having now freely given the power to the Government, the law would only be put into force and such judges retired as might be considered no longer able to discharge their duties properly, after reaching the age of 75 years. In that case no judge would be taken from the public service so long as he is able to perform his duties efficiently.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). The suggestion made by my hon. friend has some plausibility about it, and at first blush it would appear as if it might be accepted with advantage to the public. But I think the hon. gentleman will see that his suggestion permits the introduction of the very element he wants to exclude, that is, it permits the element of political influence being introduced. The Government, for the time being, might force one man to retire and let another man remain on. It is open to that objection.

Mr. MONTAGUE. This Government is like Cæsar's wife.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Of course, both sides of the House assume that this Government will always do what is right; still, although this Government may be here for a great many years, we are legislating for all time. The other objection to it is that it would affect the independence of the judiciary; they would then be more or less dependent upon the action taken by the executive for the time being. I think my hon. friend will see that whatever age we adopt it is necessary to make the limit an arbitrary one, one under which a judge would be obliged to go out on reaching that age, irrespective of the wish of the executive for the time being.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I do not know whether it is usual to do it, but I think there ought to be a provision that all the facts with regard to the retirement should be placed before Parliament.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. When it depends exclusively upon age, he goes out as a matter of course.

Mr. TISDALE. I think this would put the judiciary in a position to be suspected, at all events, of being under the control of the Government of the day. It would be unfortunate if the judges were to be put in that position, as it would weaken their influence and reputation.

Amendment (Mr. Ingram) negatived.

Mr. INGRAM moved that all the words after the word "to" in the third line be struck out, and the following be inserted in lieu thereof: "Full pay during the balance of his lifetime."

Mr. SPROULE. I would strongly oppose that, because if you do that——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I consider the amendment would be out of order, because it could only be made upon the recommendation of the Governor General.

Resolution reported, read the second time, concurred in, and referred to committee on Bill (No. 150).

JUDGES OF PROVINCIAL COURTS.

Bill (No. 150) further to amend the Act respecting the Judges of Provincial Courts, was again considered in committee, amended, and reported.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL moved third reading of the Bill.

Mr. ERB. I would ask that the third reading of this Bill be deferred until the Solicitor General has had an opportunity of giving the information that I asked for.

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend will have many opportunities, if he so chooses, to bring that question up again, either on motion to go into Supply, or on other occasions. It is important that this Bill should go to the Senate as soon as possible.

Mr. ERB. In that case I withdraw my objection.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the third time on division, and passed.

MONTREAL HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved that the House resolve itself into committee on Bill (No. 163) to grant further aid to the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal.

Mr. FOSTER. I am obliged to occupy a few moments in speaking on the question of the principle upon which the hon. gentleman is proceeding. I think the state-

ment the Minister of Public Works made to the House which was most depended upon to influence hon. members, was, among others, that there was a perfect agreement upon plan 12a, and on the ground of that agreement, the Minister urged the adoption of that portion of this Bill. The objection which I made, and which others made, was as to the condition which the hon. gentleman imports into this loan. He simply says to the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal: I have initiated a plan, which consists of two branches; 12a is a plan which has originated from my department, and I have presented it to you; I first put it to you in the shape of a plan called the three piers plan, and then, as modified, it became known as 12a; that 12a plan was assented to and practically agreed to by all the bodies concerned in the harbour commission. Then, in connection with that, the Minister says, in order to do justice to all parties—whatever he may mean by that—he has determined what the Harbour Commissioners never determined, what the Board of Trade never determined, what the other constituents of the harbour commission never determined, that of the loan made to the commission, $750,000 at least be diverted to a project for work in a different part of the city from where the central work is to be carried on, and in carrying through this loan to the Harbour Commissioners he made it an essential condition that this other work should be carried out pari passu together with the plan 12a. It will be well to see what is the other version of that matter. Let me go back a little. In 1867 the new harbour commission was organized under the auspices of Sir George Cartier, upon application for that purpose by the business people of Montreal. They had before that time done a large amount of work in the St. Lawrence. That board was organized at that time and given existence by virtue of Act of Parliament, and the constituency of the harbour commission was made up of appointees of the Government, appointees by the Board of Trade, the Corn Exchange and the shipping interest of Montreal. In the first place, I believe those different interests combined, outside the Government interest, had a majority on the board. Afterwards it was so changed that the Government appointees numbered five, or at least a majority, that being done on the ground that the Government, supplying the funds by way of loan, should have the supervising power. I am satisfied that from the first it never was the intention, nor in 1896, that the Government should do more than approve of the plans which originated with the Harbour Commissioners themselves, who were conversant with the port and who had grown up with the gradual progress of the work. What I complain of at the present time is that the Minister of Public Works, under virtue of that clause, is actually not only withholding his approval of plans which the Harbour Commissioners have approved and declared were the best, but the hon. gentleman has originated plans of his own and forced them on the Harbour Commissioners against their wish and better judgment, and he is now using a very strong leverage in the forcing process by informing the parties that a loan could only be obtained by assenting to the proposals of the Government. I have before me the 55th annual report of the council of the Montreal Board of Trade, and I propose to take up a little time while I read sections culled from that report. I find that Messrs. McLennan and Thompson were the representatives of the board of trade council on the harbour commission. Mr. McLennan went off the board for business reasons, which he explained, and on April 21st, 1897, in a letter to the Board of Trade, he gave a very lucid survey of what had been done by the Board of Harbour Commissioners, and notes especially late developments with respect to the progress of the work. He notes this fact, that as a result of a conference between the Government and the Harbour Commissioners at a certain time, plan No. 6 was agreed upon, and the guard pier, I believe, is part of that plan, and it was almost immediately commenced and carried forward. In 1894, the petition from the harbour commission was placed before the Government, which my hon. friend has read, calling for $2,000,000 for the execution of the plan known as No. 6, calling for $1,000,000 to build an inland basin at such place at the east end as might be found most advantageous, and $1,000,000 to complete the basin at Windmill Point and other portions of the harbour not included in plan No. 6. On receipt of that petition there was a commission appointed by the Government, and it is well to note what the Government commission actually recommended. That was an able commission too. Thomas Monro, Louis Coste and W. P. Anderson were members of it, all of them skilled men in their various departments, and the result of that commission was to recommend:

> First, plan No. 6 should be first proceeded with, but, as above shown, the average surplus revenue for the immediate future would not warrant an expenditure of more than $2,000,000, and the plan as originally designed could not be completed for that sum. The guard pier, which is an essential feature of the scheme, should first be completed, but the accommodation which the proposed wharfs will give is proportionately greater than could be handled, in a part of the city where the approaches are congested, and where access by railways must always be difficult; and the undersigned therefore recommend that the Harbour Commissioners be requested to modify that part of plan No. 6 involving the construction of wharfs in such a manner as to give only one-half of the wharf frontage now proposed and, further, that the question of building high level wharfs be considered, as there appears to be little demand for permanent sheds on the

wharfs, in consequence of the proximity of the city warehouses.

Bear in mind that that commission recommended, after careful examination, that plan No. 6 be proceeded with, but on account of the lack of funds should be proceeded with in a modified and careful way. The report then goes on to make another reference with regard to the future trade and the necessity of a central location for the purpose of carrying on that trade, where a different kind of business would be done, as the storage of heavy freight, and for lumber, cattle and grain and the like of that. What is the reference of the commission with regard to that. The recommendation is: That this shall be a future work undertaken; that it must be looked forward to, and they make an express recommendation that that part of the work should not be a burden upon the revenues of the harbour commission in order to avoid overloading the port with heavy charges; but that the dock and the facilities which in the future might be constructed there should be at the expense of the Government itself, and not at the expense of the harbour commission. What they say is:

The undersigned consider that in the event of their construction the cost should be borne by the Dominion Government, and the work placed under its control, not because the revenues of the harbour of Montreal should prevent the commissioners from undertaking them, but because the national importance of the trade to be provided for warrants the Government in assuming this as a Dominion work, with a view to preparing for commerce reaching Montreal as a terminal ocean port for transhipment inland; and they respectfully suggest that a thorough survey of the river and shore be made so that the best and cheapest plan can be designed as a preliminary to this work of extension.

I think it important that the House should know just exactly what this commission recommended and the lines on which they recommended it. Mr. David G. Thompson on the 5th January, 1898, he being the representative of the council of the Board of Trade on the harbour commission, also wrote a letter to the Board of Trade, and he makes this statement:

During the summer months a number of plans were discussed by the commissioners, the council of the Board of Trade and the shipping interests, resulting in the adoption of what is known as plan 12a, the construction of said plan to be undertaken by and at the expense of the Government.

I want to emphasize that point as appearing in Mr. Thompson's report to the Board of Trade. This again is from the report of the council of the Board of Trade; on page 16 I read:

And while the Harbour Commissioners have recently approved the three-pier plan known as 12a as a compromise likely to be acceptable to the Government, your council is still of the opinion that the modification of plan No. 6, known as plan No. 19, is the best plan, in that it utilizes the limited space between the entrance to the Lachine Canal and the Victoria pier to the best advantage.

That was the opinion of the council of the Board of Trade, and although at one time they were favourable to a compromise on 12a, they were favourable to it simply under the compulsion of the Government; that is, under the idea they say they had, that that work was to be undertaken by and at the expense of the Dominion Government.

On March 26th a letter was addressed to the Minister of Public Works expressing the council's anxiety that the long-delayed work of harbour improvement here should now be vigorously prosecuted, and intreating the Minister to forthwith give such orders as would ensure the immediate construction of at least one of the piers provided in the plan which formed the basis of an agreement between the Harbour Commissioners and the city corporation, and had been sanctioned by Order in Council and by Parliament.

That was plan No. 6. At the conclusion of that meeting at the request of several members a deputation was sent to Ottawa and they waited upon the Minister of Public Works, and the Minister of Trade and Commerce, and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries; and the Minister of Public Works replied:

That he was not prepared to accept the plan submitted (that is, plan No. 6), that he would have a plan prepared in his own department, and would shortly come to Montreal and discuss it with your council.

Then a special general meeting of the board was held on the 13th of May, 1897, to elect a harbour commissioner, and the following resolution was passed:—

That the members of the Montreal Board of Trade hereby respectfully urge on the harbour commission and the Government the immediate and energetic pushing forward of the harbour improvements as previously confirmed by this board, and known as plan No. 6; and they express the hope that no interference in the direction of an alteration of that plan will come from the Government that may delay the giving to the port of the much-needed improvements.

Still, the council of the Board of Trade adheres to plan No. 6. On the 19th of May the question of harbour improvements was considered with the following gentlemen present. Hugh McLennan, Edgar Judge, President of the Corn Exchange Association, Hugh A. Allan, Robert Reford, Thomas Harling, H. G. Johnston, and D. A. Watt. The report goes on:

A deputation went to Ottawa, and this deputation met the Cabinet on the 26th of May, and presented a memorial urging that the Government would not place any restriction on the Harbour Commissioners that would hinder them from speedily and energetically going on with the work of central harbour improvement, and that no portion of the harbour revenue, whether derived from regular income or the proceeds of

bonds, should be permitted to be diverted to other works in other parts of the harbour until the completion of that work.

The report says further :

Hon. Mr. Tarte, in reply, expressed his desire to provide further accommodation for the greatly increased trade which he believed Montreal would enjoy in the future, but he emphatically declined to proceed with the work under present financial arrangements, as the revenue of the harbour would, in his opinion, be insufficient to provide for the cost thereof.

Now, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Tarte) thinks that the revenues of the harbour commission will be sufficient not only to provide "the cost thereof" of plan No. 6, but the cost of $750,000 for a dock besides. The report says :

Informal interviews obtained with the members of the Government by the members of the deputation, left the impression that the plan would not be carried out without considerable alteration to meet the Minister's views, but that the Government was disposed to spend a considerable sum of money in connection with harbour works at this port.

This is an important point.

A few days subsequent to that interview a plan emanating from the Department of Public Works, was received through Alderman Préfontaine, M.P., who intimated that if approved the Government was willing to assume the cost of the works it provided for.

That was the hon. gentleman's three-pier plan.

That plan, which is now known as the Hon. Mr. Tarte's three-pier plan, was submitted at a conference meeting of the council, the Corn Exchange committee of management and the shipping interest, held on the 31st of May. While it was evident that the four-pier plan was preferred to the three-pier plan submitted, the meeting, being desirous to avoid opposing the Minister, adopted a resolution approving the carrying out of the three-pier plan, with a lengthening of the piers, provided this work was done at the cost of the Dominion Government, the resolution also urging that the Government should relieve the trade of the Dominion by making Montreal a free port. That resolution was presented to the Minister of Public Works at Ottawa on the 1st June by a deputation of the council and the shipping interest, which explained the modifications they desired to the three-pier plan, which modifications were promised by the Minister.

These modifications were subsequently made, and the plan became known as the 12a plan. The important point of that is this, that the unanimity of the different bodies on the 12a plan was brought about by Mr. Préfontaine's suggestion and by the intimations which they had from certain members of the Government, that if this were agreed to as a compromise, the Government would stand the expenditure. It was by that bait, and under that compulsion that the different interests agreed to the compromise. Well, Sir, what do we find next ? We find next a petition to the Governor General in Council dated the 7th of June, 1897, in which among other things, the council of the Board of Trade pray :

Your petitioners humbly pray Your Excellency in Council that the Dominion Government will undertake and energetically prosecute such works in the central portion of the harbour as will provide the increased wharfage accommodation so urgently needed, and also construct at some convenient point dry dock facilities, in order that the port may be enabled to handle the greatly increased trade that is looked for in the near future ; and your petitioners further pray that, considering the national character and importance of such works, and the need for cheapened transportation and terminal charges, your Government will assume their entire cost, and also keep in view the necessity of making Montreal a free port at an early date.

Well, Sir, the negotiations went on until at last the Minister's 12a plan came out, with the proposition such as is presented to us to-day. The report goes on to say :

The council was greatly disappointed at the outcome of this interview, for it had been given to understand informally that the Government would assume the cost of the new works, and, for that reason, as before stated, the council had accepted the Minister's three-pier plan, although not entirely approving it.

Then they took another step. They got another meeting of the council, the Corn Exchange Committee of Management and the shipping interest, and they passed a resolution approving plan No. 19, which was plan No. 6 altered ; so that all these three bodies were thus, with the Harbour Commissioners, agreed in favour of that plan, when they found that the Government were not proposing to shoulder the cost. On the 11th October, the council was represented at a conference meeting held at the Harbour Commissioner's office attended by the delegates from the different constituencies of the harbour commission, and also by the Premier, the Minister of Public Works and the Minister of Agriculture. Of that interview, the report says :

The proceedings on that occasion were very unsatisfactory, for while the delegates from this board, the Corn Exchange Association and the ocean shipping interest supported plan No. 19, La Chambre de Commerce and the Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company endorsed the Minister's three-pier plan, so that an aspect of division was presented which did not really exist among those most concerned. At council meeting of 3rd November, another plan was submitted, being a four-pier plan sent to the council by the Minister.

Whatever else may be said, the Minister is most prolific in plans.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I did not send that plan.

Mr. FOSTER :

But as the piers thereon were short, and placed at such an angle as would render impossible their lengthening in future, it was not approved.

Then, on the 15th of November, the commissioners adopted this further and final resolution :

Resolved, 1st. That plan No. 12a, now submitted, drawn up by the commissioners' chief engineer, at the direction of the president of the board (being a modification of the three-pier plan of 21st July, submitted by the Government), which said plan No. 12a the president expects will be approved by the Minister of Public Works, is hereby accepted and approved by this board, it being understood that no portion of the cost of carrying out the said plan will be borne by the Harbour Commissioners (that is, that the cost will be borne by the Government), and that the plan be on the high level.

2nd. That a copy of said plan and this resolution be sent by the secretary to the Department of Public Works at Ottawa for the information of the Minister of Public Works.

The report of the Board of Trade continues :

In communicating this resolution the Harbour Commissioners said that the plan was known as plan No. 12a, and was a compromise prepared by the harbour engineer under the chairman's instructions upon the line of the Hon. Mr. Tarte's three-pier plan.

It will be seen from the foregoing résumé that your council made, in the first place, as instructed by your board, strenuous efforts to obtain the prosecution by the Dominion Government of plan No. 6a. When this was found impossible, the plan of the Government engineer (modified as to length of piers) was accepted on the condition that the Government would defray the cost of the works therein provided ; and finally, failing to obtain any definite assurance that the Government would assume the cost of carrying out the plan it favoured, the council, with the other interests most concerned, agreed upon a plan (No. 19), which, in their estimation, provides the largest possible amount of accommodation in the harbour where it is most needed.

Your council deeply regrets the meagre and unsatisfactory result obtained after the expenditure of so much labour and time upon this important matter. In all its negotiations and efforts, the council has striven to meet the conflicting views of the shipping interest and the Minister of Public Works, with a sincere desire to see a commencement of the important work of harbour improvement, even if such were confined at first to one or two new piers.

I think I have read sufficient to show the position of these gentlemen, who are characterized by the Minister of Public Works before this House as men working from prejudiced and narrow, selfish interests. It is impossible to say that an important body like the Board of Works of the city of Montreal is a clique, or is acting simply from prejudice, in view of the fact that their opinion is coincided in by the Corn Exchange and the shipping interest almost unanimously. Now, Sir, it appears from these representations that the unanimity as to plan 12a which the hon. gentleman talked so much about, is a unanimity which was purchased by a promise conveyed by Mr. Préfontaine and others, and understood as such by the harbour commission and all the other bodies, that if plan 12a were accepted as a compromise, the Government would provide the money and carry out these works at their own expense. But what these bodies do protest against is this, that you shall give them this loan, for which they shall pay you a rate of interest greater than the rate you get your money for, and be responsible for it out of the harbour revenues, and make it an indispensable condition of their using that money and getting the needed central improvements, that they shall build what they do not want to build at the present time, and what they say the harbour revenues will not support at the present time, namely, this $750,000 improvement in the other part of the city. I do not believe it was ever intended, so long as there was a harbour commission, and so long as it simply borrowed the money from the Government, or got it elsewhere, that the Government supervision was ever to be more than to see that the money was expended for harbour improvements. If a plan that was submitted by the Harbour Commissioners was shown by expert testimony to be unsuitable, the Government could withhold its approval. But the Government went beyond that. The Minister of Public Works submitted plan after plan to the Harbour Commissioners and ultimately compelled them to take his plan or nothing. What Montreal is suffering for is not the extension work, the dock and the like of that in the eastern part of the city. What it wants is that if the Government is going to give it a loan, that it shall let this 12a plan or 19 plan and go on with that even though the other waited for a time, if the Government did not feel disposed to take that other part up themselves and provide their own money for it. This House must acknowledge that it is not simply a little clique of nobodies in the city of Montreal, who are actuated by most selfish motives and mere prejudices, that is pursuing this plan of improvements in contradistinction to the plan proposed by my hon. friend. They are men who have grown up with the city, who have immense business interests in the city, who have money involved in the city's progress, and consistently take this line and urge it. The only reason why they have compromised even to the extent of 12a plan is because of the inducement held out to them that if they compromised on that, the Government would be at the expense of the improvements, which the Government now do not propose to do. Consequently, their argument is that you refuse us the needed improvements, unless we carry on what we consider is not pressing at present. You make us pay for the whole of it out of the revenue of the port, and by this additional work you impose on us, you will overburden the revenues of the port and make it a dear instead of a cheap port. The Montreal " Witness " returns to its position with reference to this matter. The Montreal " Gazette " has very strong articles from men who are not nobodies. I am quite sure, on the same line, and it might not

be uninteresting to the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce to read the "Witness" further—not an anonymous article but an editorial:

> Two or three years ago, who would have assaulted a Government so effectively as Sir Richard Cartwright had it proposed at the fag end of a session to force a loan of $750,000 upon an unwilling commercial community, to be spent upon a project which has never been designed, the cost of which has never been estimated carefully by engineers, the desirability of which in the form proposed is denied by the very commercial interests which it is supposed to serve, against which the Board of Trade, the Corn Exchange and the shipping interests have all publicly protested? The men who favour this scheme are two politicians, Messrs. Tarte and Préfontaine, interested in the vote of the constituency in which the expenditure is to be made. Who, two years ago, would have opposed such a project brought forward in such a manner so strongly as Sir Richard Cartwright? Why does he pretend to treat with scorn and to insinuate slander against those who oppose such a scheme and methods now? Is it because he is a member of the Government which now does these things, because he is a colleague of the Minister who forces such methods upon the Government, because, in other words, he is in office? The responsibility of the "Witness" for its utterances is as individual and it just as gravely realizes the responsibility of the utterances of Sir Richard Cartwright, and his insinuations of animosity against the editorial articles of this paper are unworthy of Sir Richard Cartwright.

My hon. friend on the other side and the Postmaster General, in the most approved ante bellum style—a style he seldom puts on now, but in which he used to indulge, when flinging insinuations across the floor, with great freedom, that he never dared to back—now wants cowardly villains on our side of the House, who read newspaper articles to inform the members, to have the courage of their convictions and make charges. Is he looking for charges? Has it come to this that current public opinion must not be read before this House and enter as a factor into the decisions we make? We are not legislating for the localities in which we live, and we need to learn the views of those deeply interested, and whose interests are voiced by the public prints in those communities; and it is part of the duty of public men to bring the voice of the outside public, as represented in the public prints, into the discussions in this House, on the necessity or feasibility of any scheme submitted to us. It surely is not against good parliamentary methods that we should bring public opinion to bear on our deliberations; and it does not follow that because I read an editorial and responsible article I am making an insinuation or charge. I read it for the information of the legislating body, so that they may know that there is also this shade of public opinion in contradistinction to the phase of public opinion which the hon. gentleman gives in support of his scheme.

If we were the Government and on that side of the House and we had endeavoured to bring in a thing like this at the fag end of the session, not only Sir Richard Cartwright and the Postmaster General, but every man who is now a Minister and had then a seat in this House, would have hurled his strongest and deepest invective against us, and rightly too. It is next to politically indecent that at this time of the session we should be asked to vote $2,000,000 for any purpose on which a state of divided opinion is shown by the public press in the very locality interested. I appeal to my hon. friend: You have secured by methods which are not of the best, an agreement on plan 12a; you will get your interest on the amount; the harbour of Montreal has paid every dollar it ever owed the Government and has expended money of its own in cases where, in other localities and in less important matters, the Government has made the expenditure, the Montreal Harbour Commissioners are not beggars but men who pay their way as they go; when you give your money you get good interest from them—therefore, do not put upon them this absolute condition compelling them to carry out a pet scheme of your own, which, to say the least, has very strong opponents amongst the commercial classes, whom this loan is intended presumably to benefit. It is better to drop that for a year at least, and give to the commission the power to go on and expend upon the 12a plan, which is admitted useful and urgent, and take away from them this arbitrary and unwise condition of making them responsible for a work in the east end of which they would have to shoulder the expense. As regards the charge of corruption or the like, I will put one thing straight to my hon. friend. Will he deny that there is a large and influential speculative interest in this matter, which is following this with the keenest eye, which is backing with the strongest arguments, which is pulling every political wire which can be pulled. Will he deny it?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Let the hon. gentleman go, and I will answer the question when he is through.

Mr. FOSTER. Will he deny that when the Government comes down, and in advance of having a single plan, a single estimate, a single preparation made by which they can tell us the cost of expropriating the land, the cost of getting all that is necessary whereon to build, the cost of building—will he deny that when they come down and say that they are going to make it incumbent upon the Harbour Commissioners to put a dock and wharfs and the like in a certain part of the city, they are not taking the very best plan possible to make speculation rife in that part of the city. These two things are undoubted. Now, my hon. friend may feel as hardly with reference to myself and others as he chooses. I say there is this speculative element which might well be called a selfish interest,

which will be immensely benefited if these works go on in that part of the city, and that the whole influence of this element is pulling for these works. Put with that the fact that the commercial interests, as represented by these bodies that I have mentioned here who are opposed to it. Take, in conjunction with that further fact that these dry docks and graving docks in other parts of the country have been built by the Government out of Government funds.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). There is an exception to that—the dry dock of Halifax.

Mr. FOSTER. It costs this country $10,000 every year.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The citizens of Halifax had to contribute $10,000 a year for twenty years. The Government of Canada contributed the smallest part of the subsidy.

Mr. FOSTER. But the Government contributes $10,000 each year for the graving dock. has done so for years past, and will do so for years to come.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It has been said and repeated that the Government of Canada builds these dry docks elsewhere.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) is wrong if he says that I said these Governments built these docks elsewhere.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) said so this moment.

Mr. FOSTER. No. If the hon. gentleman refers to the speech, he will find that I named the cases—the dock at Kingston, the dock at Quebec, and I think I mentioned the dock at Victoria built by the Government. I knew quite well, for I happened to be in the Government at the time, and this transaction went through my own department, that under the Act a company had built the Halifax dock, and that the Government of the Dominion was paying a large sum of money each year toward its support.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). Will my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) allow me? Does he say that the dock at Victoria was built by the Dominion Government?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. As a whole?

Mr. FOSTER. No, not as a whole. The British Government, on certain conditions and for certain reasons, helped and assisted in completing that dock, but the major part of it was built by the Dominion of Canada, and it is a Government work—that is what I am speaking about. The city of Montreal has actually shouldered the expenditure which in other sections of the Dominion has been done by the Government entirely. It would be a slight thing for this Government—and if the proposition were made I do not think it would encounter any opposition worth speaking of—after all that has been done by the city of Montreal, and having regard to its national character, to construct such a work with its own funds if it be necessary. The cardinal objection of the commercial men of Montreal is that this is forced upon them against their will, and it is a matter which, if carried out at all, ought, in justice and fairness, to be carried out by the Dominion Government. I am sorry to have been obliged to take so much time, but I thought it important that what I consider to be the views of these great commercial bodies should be laid before this House.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am glad that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) has brought this question up again, because it affords me an opportunity to answer some arguments which have been used elsewhere, and which he has repeated here. There are in Montreal a certain number of people who believe there is no necessity whatever for any other improvements; and knowing the position as I do, I do not hesitate to say that the opposition that is manifested to-day comes from this very quarter—from men who shelter themselves under one pretext or another, but who, in the bottom of their hearts, do not want any improvements in the port of Montreal. And the best evidence of the truth of what I say is that plan No. 6, though approved in 1890, has never been carried out, and these men have been the real masters of the harbour of Montreal during that time. These gentlemen do not realize that there has been a change. They believe that they are still masters, that the same Government over which they had such influence is in power. They are making a mistake; there is no doubt about that. I have a great deal of respect for these gentlemen as commercial men; but I cannot forget two things—first, that these gentlemen are foremost political opponents of ours, nearly every one of them, and, second—a thing upon which I will speak my mind freely on the floor of Parliament—these gentlemen, as Harbour Commissioners, came to the Department of Public Works in 1890, and asked to be authorized to carry out what is currently called plan No. 6. Now, I call the attention of every hon. member to this fact, that instead of carrying out plan No. 6, Messrs. McLennan, Thompson and Ogilvie have simply built, with the funds of the harbour commission, the Windmill basin in their own personal interest. Everybody in Montreal knows that. I hope every hon. gentleman pays attenton to what I say, the ex-Finance Minister especially. I say that

the Harbour Commissioners applied to be authorized to carry out plan No. 6, and, instead of carrying out that plan, these gentlemen simply built out of the harbour commission funds the Windmill basin, which basin, I say it again, when it is completed will cost one million dollars—and they dare to speak of speculation. Let any member of the House come to Montreal to-morrow, and he will find that the Windmill basin has been built simply with the object of digging a canal in the interest of Messrs. Ogilvie and McLennan. These men were members of the harbour commission. Mr. Thompson is still a member. They are fighting the battles of the past. As I said, there has been a change, and this Government is bound to no clique and to no personal interest. I found plan No. 6, approved in 1890, unfulfilled, not executed. I found, more than that, that the harbour commission themselves, in applying later on for help from this Government, went back on this same plan No. 6. I have in my hand a petition forwarded by them in 1894, in which I find the declaration that since the arrangement was made to carry out plan No. 6, which had received the formal sanction of the Government, the conditions and requirements of the trade had changed, and that an inland basin and enlarged dock facilities were necessary. So, in 1894, as we see, these gentlemen recognized the fact that conditions had changed

What were they asking? Let the ex-Minister of Finance follow me closely here. What were they asking in 1894? The amount of money necessary to carry out plan No. 6, and at the same time to build an inland basin in the eastern part of Montreal. The same men who were then pressing the Government to give the money for that project, come to us now and say they don't want any improvement in the eastern part of Montreal. The very same men who were then asking for one million dollars do not want anything to-day. Why? Because they have other plans for their own personal purposes, and because they do not want any other part of the city to have any improvements. Well, Sir, I am here to protest against the selfishness of those men, I am here to protest against the selfishness of some of those men in Montreal who think that the whole trade of this broad Dominion can be accommodated in 3,600 feet of harbour. My hon. friend has gone over all the phases of the long struggle which has taken place in regard to those harbour improvements. It appears that since 1890 those men have been steadily opposing any improvement which was not made in their own personal interest. Plan No. 6 has not been carried out. The harbour of Montreal is one of the worst equipped ports in the world, and yet they would like us to stand still. Plan No. 12, which has been adopted, which has been forwarded to me, is the result of long negotiations. When I took office I soon discovered that plan No. 6 would not be accepted. As a matter of fact, I do not know in Montreal and business men who would stand by that plan now. This plan, I say, was the result of compromise, of negotiations. I met the Harbour Commissioners and the members of the Board of Trade at the last important conference that took place in Montreal in the month of November. The right hon. the Prime Minister was kind enough to come to Montreal, and my colleague the Minister of Agriculture also accompanied us. What took place that day? All the representative men were present. Mr. Thompson was there, Mr. McLennan was there; and the result of the conference was the adoption of a motion, unanimously carried, accepting this plan 12a, and asking me to build two piers, to begin with two wharfs. As a matter of fact, I do not hesitate to say that this plan No. 12a is the result of all the conferences that took place. Of course, those who do not want any improvement, will oppose any plan, they will oppose plan No. 12. Having failed to carry their plan No. 6, they will oppose any other plan. But we are not bound to stand idle when we see the trade coming down to our port. My hon. friend is under a great misapprehension if he thinks that it has been intimated to the Harbour Commissioners that if they accepted this plan No. 12 it would be constructed out of the public funds. Why should any member of this Government take such a position? Plan No. 12a is less expensive than plan No. 6. Those gentlemen were ready, as they said in 1894, to have plan No. 6 constructed with the funds of the Harbour Commissioners. Here is a plan which is much less expensive. Trade has vastly increased. Why should we ask the people of Canada to assume the burden of carrying out this plan at the public expense? Does my hon. friend advocate such a policy? I am sure he will not. But, Sir, I am very much surprised to hear my hon. friend say: Well, you are simply loading Montreal with the interest on that sum of money. The harbour of Montreal does not belong to anybody in the city of Montreal, to a few people who live in that city; the harbour of Montreal belongs to this great Dominion. It is the trade of Canada which pays the interest on every cent which is spent there. I do not see why half a dozen men should have the right to dictate to this Parliament what we shall do. I am always ready to listen to representations made to us by business men of standing; but when we are threatened, when we are told that we must do this and we must not do that, there I draw the line. I say that the improvements in the eastern part of the harbour of Montreal are just as important as those in the centre of the harbour. What we are aiming at is to carry out a plan which will give satisfaction to all parties

concerned, and which will give the needed accommodation to trade. If my hon. friend would consider the great increase of the grain trade, he would not take the position he takes to-day. He knows the harbour of Montreal, I hope. Is he in a position to rise in his place and say that permanent grain elevators could be erected in the centre of the harbour? There is no man who can say that. I am sorry the hon. senior member for Ottawa (Mr. Hutchison) is not in his place. He has an interest in the Prescott elevator, and he has represented to me time and again that we should build in the eastern part of the city wharfs on which, or near which, elevators could be erected. Wharfs built in the centre of the city will be of great importance, and will be very useful; but I say that if we want accommodation for the grain trade and we expect next year to ship 100 million bushels of grain from Montreal, we must necessarily equip the eastern part of the city. But I am told that we are loading the port of Montreal with a debt she will not be able to pay. I am surprised to hear such language. The harbour of Montreal has always had a pretty large revenue, although I am bound to say there is no corporation which has been administered in a more loose way than the port of Montreal. Since the new commissioners took office, they have decreased the expenditure; but all those who know the state of affairs, are justified in saying that $20,000 or $25,000 a year could be saved by making reforms. Moreover, is it not a fact that the trade is increasing every year? Those works are not going to be executed all in a day, it will take two or three years to complete them; but when those works are completed, if the trade is not increased to such an extent that the revenues of the harbour will be sufficient to pay the increased expenditure, I shall be very much surprised indeed. Now, Sir, a good deal has been said because in the Bill there is a condition providing that a dry dock shall be built. I read to the House two or three days ago, the petitions that were sent to the Government for many years back insisting on the urgent necessity of building a dry dock in Montreal. Well, that dry dock, I make this prophecy, will be the best paying business of the whole harbour of Montreal. We have a dry dock in Lévis, and in looking at the result of its operations last year, I find that my department has realized a revenue of $6,000 a year over and above expenditure. I do not see why a dry dock located in the port of Montreal should not more than pay its expenses. My hon. friend the ex-Minister of Finance has insisted very strongly that there is a large speculative interest which is waiting the result of this Bill. Montreal is a city where large speculation is carried on, there is no doubt about that. There is speculation in both the east and west end of the city. The virtuous commercial gentlemen who caused Windmill basin to be constructed in their personal interest, at a cost of over $1,000,000, had the element of speculation in them. There will not be an inch of land bought for carrying out the work in the east end of the city from a syndicate, consisting of men of both political parties.

Mr. FOSTER. I did not say there was.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There was an insinuation.

Mr. FOSTER. I neither said it nor insinuated it. I suppose the quantity of land required is not more than sixteen or seventeen acres. The purchase of that small quantity of land from the syndicate is not what the syndicate is after; it is the appreciation of property in the vicinity of these public works there.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. According to that argument, because some men, of both political parties, bought property there ten years ago, there should never be any improvement in that part of the city. That is a fine argument, that is a broad argument for the hon. gentleman opposite to use. If the hon. gentleman would do me the pleasure of visiting the harbour of Montreal after the session, I prophesy that when he returns he will be of my own opinion. Where would the hon. gentleman establish grain elevators except in the eastern part of the harbour? There is no other locality suitable. Then the hon. gentleman would not have us compete for the grain trade because fifteen years ago half a dozen individuals bought property there. Is it reasonable to present such an argument before Parliament?

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

After Recess.

IN COMMITTEE.

Bill (No. 99) to incorporate the Lake Champlain and River St. Lawrence Ship Canal Company.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 118) to incorporate the Dawson City Electric Railway and Tramway Company.—(Mr. Morrison.)

DAWSON CITY ELECTRIC COMPANY.

The House resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 123) respecting the Dawson City Electric Company, Limited.—(Mr. Morrison.)

(In the Committee.)

On section 8,

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I called the attention of the committee, when the other Bill was

under consideration, to the fact that it gave power to construct tramways within a radius of fifteen miles of Dawson City, without any limitation other than the Governor in Council might impose. On my objection to that provision, it was struck ont. I have the same objection to the similar clause in this Bill, which is perhaps open to more serious objection than the other, inasmuch as the other authorized the construction of only one tramway, while this authorizes the construction of an unlimited number within a radius of fifty miles. I move that this clause be struck out. This company is obtaining large powers. There is no provision at all in the Bill under which any of the provisions of the Railway Act can apply.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). Yes, there is.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There was not in the Bill as I saw it. The powers of this company are very large. It has the power to sell electric light and electric power, and to construct telegraph and telephone lines, and I think it is rather making a farce of this thing to invest the company with the additional power of building railways and tramways wherever they choose. I think we ought not to pass legislation in this way. To test the sense of the committee, I move that this clause be struck out.

Mr. MORRISON. With the greatest respect, I submit that the clause is perfectly safeguarded. As a condition precedent to commencing the construction of any tramway, the company must have the consent of the Governor in Council. Then, if the consent of the Governor in Council is granted, subsection 2 provides that the company shall not commence the construction of any such line of tramway until the proposed route shall have been approved by the Governor in Council. When the section is safeguarded in that way, I cannot see what possible objection there is to it. With all due respect to the hon. Minister, I think it is rather hard to have an amendment introduced in this Bill, after it has run the gauntlet of the two committees. If the amendment had been proposed in committee, the promoters would have been prepared to meet it, but I submit that it ought not to be pressed now. The power to build tramways is sufficiently hedged in by other conditions in the Bill and the public sufficiently protected, and there is no question that Dawson is a growing city and that a tramway there will shortly be an absolute necessity.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Before the hon. Minister presses his motion, I would point out to him that the object of the Bill which has just passed through committee was electric lighting, and in that Bill there was a clause providing for an electric tramway; but the main object of this Bill is electric tramways, which is quite a different thing. While it has, in certain cases, power to build electric works as well, its principal object is electric tramways.

Mr. SPROULE. It seems to me that the objection to both these Bills is simply this. While the approval of the Governor in Council must be had before the road can be built, His Excellency in Council will have to keep in view the fact that law was passed for the purpose of giving the company the right to build.

Mr. MORRISON. Let me read the amendment—"with the consent of the Governor in Council first had and obtained, and subject to such regulations and restrictions as he imposes and directs, and so that the navigation of such rivers and streams and creeks shall not thereby be injuriously interrupted."

Mr. SPROULE. That is what I say—subject to the approval of the Governor in Council, but he must always keep in view that this law contemplates the right to build.

Mr. MORRISON. What objection is there to building a tramway in Dawson City?

Mr. SPROULE. Taking this Bill and the other together, it seems to me that any company holding them both can control the electric lighting, tramway building and all the water powers around that city and leave it practically impossible for any one to compete with them in these lines of business.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. While the other Bill was under consideration, I pointed out the same objections and made a motion that the sub-clause which authorized the construction of tramways should be struck out, and I have no doubt that was done. The same reason which led the committee to follow that course in the other Bill would make it imperative on us to strike this power out of the present Bill. I know it appears very ungracious to oppose the hon. gentleman's Bill, but I feel that I am not opposing it as respects its general purposes. It is not entitled a Bill to incorporate a company for the construction of tramways, but simply an electric company Bill. The railway comes in apparently as a subordinate matter. I did feel that when the clause was struck out of the other Bill, there ought to be hesitation in striking it out of this. By and by, after things have taken more definite shape in Dawson City, after it shall have had municipal organization and the people have had a chance to make up their minds as to what they want, it will be time to incorporate tramway companies, and subject them to some sort of regulations, and know what we are doing. We do not now. This may turn out to be a great mistake. While I do not feel like pressing the motion, I do submit to my hon. friend whether it is not only reasonable and fair that the power

which was excluded from the other company should also be excluded from this.

Mr. MORRISON. Of course, it is no personal concern of mine, but I contend the power should not have been struck out in the other. As my hon. friend from Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) has stated, the substance of the other, in any case, is electric lighting particularly, but the main object of this is to build a tramway. You will take the life out of the whole Bill if you take out the tramway power. Transmission by tramway is as essential there as light by electricity, and I submit that this clause should not be struck out through the fear of some remote contingency. There could be no harm done by passing the clause, as it is hedged around by so many restrictions that the Government have the thing entirely in their own hands.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We do not know anything about it.

Mr. MORRISON. We ought to get the benefit of the doubt when our object is to benefit the country. I cannot see where there is any public interest invaded or principle violated, and I would therefore respectfully suggest to the Minister not to press this motion.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The whole matter is subject to the approval of the Governor in Council, and it seems to me it is in the hon. gentleman's own hands, and no doubt he would be very careful.

Mr. SPROULE. It must be remembered that it is subject to the approval of the Governor General in Council, but on the assumption that the railway is to be built. All that the Governor in Council can do is to put on such restrictions as he sees fit. If he were to say that in his judgment the railway should not be built, its promoters would contend that Parliament had already decided that question. I thought the principle was wrong when it was before the committee, and I think it is wrong now that it is before the House.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think that the view which was presented by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) is really the sound view. The question is whether power conferred and made subject to the consent of the Governor in Council does not indicate the intention of Parliament to be that the powers shall be exercised, and that the only question for the Governor in Council to consider is which is the preferable mode of exercising that power—that the Governor in Council is only intended to have the power of regulation. Under such a section the Governor in Council could not properly refuse to act upon the ground that the power ought never to have been conferred. It places upon the Governor in Council a responsibility which I do not think there is any great anxiety to assume. I am sure, as Minister who, under present arrangements, will be more largely charged with responsibility in this regard, I shall be very sorry to be called upon to exercise such responsibility. However, Mr. Chairman, as my view does not seem to find favour with the committee I have no wish to force it upon hon. members, and I have no desire to press my amendment.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I think that the committee ought to act consistently. I have no preconceived or determined opposition to this clause whatever. But a Bill came before the House last Friday, I think, to incorporate the Dawson City Electric Lighting and Tramway Company, having a similar provision in it and almost similar powers as is given under a previous clause in this Bill with regard to tramway construction. But the committee struck out a similar clause to this, and here we pass a similar Bill leaving it in. If that is to be done, I think the clause in the other Bill ought to reinstated.

Mr. SPROULE. I think that it ought to be struck out in this.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Do you not think that you ought to have the same in both ?

Mr. TISDALE. Do I understand the hon. member to wish that they shall not have the power to build an electric railway?

Mr. MORRISON. The Minister of Railways does not press his objection.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Does the hon. promoter of the Bill (Mr. Morrison) remember if I was right in saying a clause similar to this was struck out of the other Bill ?

Mr. MORRISON. Not the subsection. The subsection was passed, but the original clause was taken away. They have not the power to build tramways.

An hon. MEMBER. Then this should be struck out.

Mr. MORRISON. I think the better way would be to pass this, and reinstate it in the other one.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My view is different from that of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. In my opinion the clause should not be in either Bill. It is rather unreasonable that we should set up two companies with unlimited powers to build tramways wherever they please in that locality.

Mr. FOSTER. Although the Minister feels that way so strongly, he says : If you do not like my amendment, I will withdraw it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I feel just as strongly as before. But the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) cannot fail to observe that I do not find very much support. I do not think at all that I should carry the whole responsibility in this thing.

On section 10,

Mr. HAGGART. Is there any clause which allows them to build on property belonging to the Crown? Because if it is only an empowering Act, it is of no use except under the consent of the Government, for they cannot expropriate against the Crown, and if I am well informed all that land belongs to the Crown.

Mr. SPROULE. Before the Bill is reported, I wish to say one word with regard to it, which will apply to the other as well. It is much to be regretted that hon. members having such Bills on the Order paper should allow them to remain until the dying days of the session, so that they go through without that careful watching and consideration which we usually give to Bills that are passed through this House earlier in the session. Nearly one-half of the members have now gone home, and the rest of us are anxious to get away as early as possible, therefore, the business of the House is rushed through with much greater haste than is the case earlier in the session. The hon. member who is promoting this Bill has had this and the other Bill on the paper since early in the session. What reason was there in keeping them back until this late date?

An hon. MEMBER. To rush the business.

Mr. SPROULE. No, because when they were called they were held back by the promoter, not by the Government. Suspicion naturally attaches to these Bills when they are brought forward in the dying days of the session.

Mr. MORRISON. It is not our fault that they were held over repeatedly. That Bill ought to have been considered some time ago.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

ALBERTA AND YUKON RAILWAY, NAVIGATION AND MINING COMPANY.

The House resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 124)—from the Senate—incorporating the Alberta and Yukon Railway, Navigation and Mining Company.—(Mr. Casey.)

(In the Committee.)

On section 8,

Mr. FOSTER. If ever there was an omnibus Bill, this is one. There is no power under heaven nor on earth that this Bill does not ask for and does not get.

Mr. CASEY. It was understood in the Railway Committee that very special powers should be given to all railways operating in these totally new countries for bringing in and supplying their men and all that sort of thing. These powers have been given to every railway operating in those parts, and it was agreed by the Minister of Railway and Canals and everybody else that these powers should be left in, since they have been given to other companies.

Mr. FOSTER. The powers given in this Bill are enormous. In the first place the Bill is remarkably bold in its title, the title claims three separate and distinct fields of work. It is to be a railway company, a navigation company, and a mining company, you combine three great lines of operation. Now, when you come to the powers they have, those powers are excessive. It has power to construct, equip, acquire, charter, navigate and dispose of steam and other vessels upon rivers. It is not a navigation company simply, it is a shipbuilding company, it is a steamer-building company. It has power to construct, to equip, to acquire, to charter, to navigate, to dispose of steam and other vessels upon rivers, lakes and streams, in territory served by said railway or tributary thereto, or connecting therewith, and upon the inland waters of the North-west Territories and British Columbia. It is not confined to the Yukon.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman evidently did not catch my explanation. The railway is chartered only to run from the international boundary as far north as the Saskatchewan.

Mr. FOSTER. I find the company may:

(a) Construct, equip, acquire, charter, navigate and dispose of steam and other vessels upon the rivers, lakes and streams in the territory served by the said railway or tributary thereto, or connecting therewith, and upon other inland waters of the North-west Territories and British Columbia connecting therewith or adjacent to the proposed line of railway, and may carry on generally the business of transportation in connection with the said railway and vessels.

Mr. CASEY. There is no navigation available on the route of the railway.

Mr. FOSTER. It is not like a mining company, which has to go to work and get capital subscribed and pay $1,000 to the British Columbia treasury, but the company simply comes here and pays the parliamentary fees.

In the Bill the company seeks power to:

(b) acquire and work mines, mineral and mining rights in British Columbia and the North-west Territories, and crush, smelt, reduce and amalgamate ore to render marketable the produce, and may develop such mines, and crush, smelt, reduce and amalgamate the ores and

products of any mines, whether belonging to the company or not.

So it is a general smelting company, not, however, for its own ores, but for any ores—it seeks powers to do work for the world. It is to :

(c) Construct, or aid in, and subscribe towards the construction, maintenance and improvement of roads,——

It is a road-building company. But it has also the right to build :

——tramways, docks, piers, wharfs, viaducts, aqueducts, flumes, ditches, quartz-mills, ore-houses, smelters, saw-mills and other buildings and works which are necessary or convenient for the purposes of the company.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The Bill has been very materially amended.

Mr. FOSTER. It has not been amended. Not satisfied with being a general railway company, the incorporators also desire to be a general navigation company, a mining company, a ship-building company, and a smelting company. It also seeks to :

(d) Erect, use and manage works, machinery and plant for the generation and distribution of electric power and energy.

For the purposes in the title of the Bill ? No, for all purposes. The company seeks power to :

(e) Acquire and utilize water and steam power for the purpose of compressing air or generating electricity for lighting, heating and motor purposes in connection with the railways, vessels and works of the company, and may also sell or otherwise dispose of surplus electricity or other power generated by the company's works and not required for operating its railway or other works.

Here are further powers asked to :

(f) Carry on in the province of British Columbia, and in the North-west Territories, the business of carriers, forwarders and transportation agents, and all other business incident thereto or connected therewith.

They may also take up

——the business of wharfingers, shippers and vessel owners ; and may, for all or any of the said purposes, purchase, hold, lease or otherwise acquire timber, lands, buildings, docks, works, boats, vessels, vehicles, goods, wares or merchandise and other property, real and personal, movable and immovable.

The company may also

——improve, extend, manage, develop, lease, mortgage, exchange, sell, dispose of, or turn to account the same ; and may establish shops or stores on the said lands ; and may purchase and vend general merchandise, clothing, provisions, stores, machinery and supplies, and may deal in mineral products, ores, mines and precious metals, and generally may do all such other things as are incidental or conducive to the attainments of the above objects.

The Bill mentions every thing under the sun. It is the most absurd Bill I ever read.

Mr. CASEY. I am obliged to rise to a point of order. I want to call the attention of the Chair to the fact that the hon. gentleman is quoting a section which has already been passed.

Mr. FOSTER. That is not all. I think when such a Bill as this is submitted, all the sections should be read by the Chairman.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman has probably accomplished his purpose in talking this Bill out. I hold, however, that he has no right to discuss section 5 when it has been passed, as well as two or three intervening sections. I want the Chairman's ruling on this point.

Mr. FOSTER. Before you give your ruling, Mr. Chairman, I want to call your attention to the fact that I asked to have the sections read, but you paid no attention to my request. I had no idea that such powers were asked in the Bill, and as soon as I got the Bill and examined them, I rose to discuss them.

The PRIME MINISTER. On the point of order, I wish to say that the hon. member was not discussing section 5, but the merits of the Bill, and was pointing out the immense powers conferred by the Bill.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Bain). To my mind in all these matters we have always afforded very wide latitude in discussions in committee. It would be exceedingly undesirable to attempt to limit the freedom of discussion.

Mr. FOSTER. Then I will go on and recount the powers asked by the company. The company seek to

(g) Acquire by lease, purchase or otherwise, any rights in letters patent, franchises or patent rights for the purposes of the undertaking and again dispose of such rights.

The Bill contains one streak of modesty, and it is put in the last clause :

(h) Subject to all such regulations as are imposed by the Governor in Council, construct, purchase, lease or otherwise acquire and hold lands, buildings and other erections for the purpose of supplying water for the use of its works, railways and branches.

I call the attention of the Government, and especially of the Minister of Railways, to this Bill. If legislation like this is permitted to go through the House without being looked into, it is making a farce of legislation. The powers of this company extend over the whole North-west of Canada.

The hour of private Bills having expired, the House proceeded to Government business.

MONTREAL HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved that the House resolve itself into committee on Bill (No. 163) to grant further aid to the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). When the House adjourned at six o'clock, I was discussing different points raised by the ex-Finance Minister. He has tried to make a point by stating that plan No. 6 was approved some years ago, and the commercial bodies of Montreal still favoured that plan. The hon. gentleman is mistaken as to the fact. At the last conference which was held in the city of Montreal on the 10th of October last, the whole question was fully discussed, and a full report of the conference was published in the Montreal "Gazette" of the following day. Perhaps the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) who seems to take a great interest in this question would like to hear what the Montreal "Gazette' said in an editorial article on the result of that conference. On the 11th October the Montreal "Gazette" wrote as follows :—

> The conference on the harbour improvements has been held. It has resulted in the passage of a resolution utterly meaningless as an expression of view as to what plans should be finally adopted, but from its very vacancy, a legitimate outcome of the gathering, every interest and every fad had its interest. It would be very difficult to say which received the most general support. All that was evident was that if the greatest good is to be had from the expenditure made on the harbour the advice of an engineer who understands the river and the traffic and the conditions under which the traffic has to be carried out, must be taken and adhered to. Boards of trade and chambers of commerce, and even harbour commissioners, only seemed capable of coming to a disagreement and of muddling those who would approach the subject with an unbiassed mind. In plain English, the meeting was not creditable to the Montreal business community.

As the Montreal "Gazette" very properly said there was a great difference of opinion expressed, although it was very clear that the consensus of opinion was that the Government should have a free hand, and that was shown by the adoption of the resolution urging us to go on with the erection of two works, the size of these works to be decided by me. As a matter of fact entire confidence was expressed at that time in the Department of Public Works. Well, Sir, what is the difference between plan No. 6 and plan No. 12a. Plan No. 6 which was adopted nearly ten years ago provided for the erection of four wharfs varying from 900 to 1,500 feet long, with a breadth of 230 feet, and between basins 300 feet wide. Plan No. 12a provides for the erection of wharfs 300 feet wide, between basins respectively 590 feet and 570 feet wide, or in other words, plan No. 6 has been changed so as to accommodate the largest class of ships which are now coming to Montreal. This plan is not my plan ; this plan is the plan which has been adopted by the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal after all the discussions to which allusion has been made, and it is because of that fact that instead of erecting four narrow wharfs we are going to erect three wide wharfs. It is on account of that fact I have lost the friendship and the confidence of the Montreal "Witness." Well, upon my soul, I am ready to lose their confidence over and over again on account of such a thing as that.

Now, Sir, the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) should not be surprised at the opposition to this plan which he has read. The improvements we are going to carry out in the harbour of Montreal will interfere with a great many private interests, and these private interests, as I said this afternoon, have so far controlled the Board of Trade and the Harbour Commissioners. Let nobody suppose that the Board of Trade is unanimous on this point. There is a great deal of division about it. I know every one who is opposed to the improvements and I know those who are favourable to them. Take such men as Mr. Torrance, take such men as Mr. Andrew Allan, take such men as Mr. Thompson ; they are members of the harbour commission. Mr. Thompson is well known as being the manager of a fleet of old-fashioned floating elevators in Montreal, elevators twenty and twenty-five years old. Mr. Thompson understands right well that if permanent elevators are built his small fleet of old-fashioned elevators are gone. He understands all that, and no man understands that better than Mr. Thompson. Now, Sir, I have nothing to say against the Allan Company surely. They have rendered very great service to the trade of Canada in the past, but it must not be forgotten that the Allans have allowed themselves to be outdistanced in the race for trade. The Allans have opposed the fast line. Why ? Because they had no ships able to do that service. Instead of moving on in the race of progress —well they have not gone as rapidly as they should have gone. I am very sorry indeed that the old spirit of Sir Hugh Allan is no more in some of the representatives of the Allan Company, and I may add at once that I trust that the young element in the Allan Company will go back to the old traditions. So it is, Sir, that some business men who have followed carefully the movements of the trade in Montreal are not surprised at the opposition which is raised against these harbour improvements. What has been done ? Last year in order to control the freight rates for the trade of the lakes, some of the men who are opposing the improvements in the port of Montreal managed to exclude from being insured, what are called Pinflats. And why ? Because these Pinflats were competing with them. They have played the very same game now ; they are fighting every one who comes in to the race of trade against them. I do not see in his seat to-night my hon. friend from Ottawa (Mr. Hutchison), but when the Prescott elevator was built some of these men that are opposing the improvements in the harbour

of Montreal did everything they could to prevent Mr. Hutchison and his friends carrying their grain to Montreal at reasonable rates, and the Prescott Elevator Company have been forced to build steel barges to bring their grain to Montreal. Well, Sir, it is time that that monopoly which has retarded the progress of the port of Montreal shall be broken down. I know that I have taken risks; I know that I have taken great risks. Those men are strong and powerful, but the people of this country are stronger than any monopoly. Sir, I stand here as representing the great interests of Canada. We are deepening our canals; we are going to spend ten or twelve millions in this great work; and when we are providing all the necessary means for bringing the trade of the west by the St. Lawrence route, these men are trying to prevent the Montreal improvements which are absolutely necessary for the accommodation of that great trade. I protest against their action; I protest against it in the interest of Canada. It is not very surprising, indeed, to find that Mr. Allan and Mr. Torrance do not want any improvement; it is not surprising to those of us who know how things are handled in the port of Montreal. Would you believe me, Sir, when I say that these two companies, the Allan and the Dominion, have monopolized two-thirds of the space in the port of Montreal. They are very well provided for, and they do not care for others. So much is this the case that three years ago, when the Elder-Dempster Company came to Montreal with three ships, they had any amount of trouble to find accommodation; and last summer, when the same company had sixteen ships, they had still more trouble to find accommodation, because these two companies who had the control of the Harbour Commissioners, and who have a great influence in the Board of Trade, have monopolized so much of the harbour. I do not blame them; they are working in their own interest. But it seems to me that they should have more reason; they should allow everybody to live, and they should not set themselves against progress. This plan is a most reasonable one. It provides for accommodation in the centre of the harbour. When the guard pier is completed, the Grand Trunk Railway Company, as I stated the other day, will not fail to take advantage of that work. I expect to see elevators built on that guard pier as soon as it is completed. So far as the centre portion of the harbour is concerned, the plan which I hold in my hand will provide great accommodation. The works for which we provide in the eastern part of the harbour are as necessary as those in the centre, if not more so—why? The grain trade can only be handled properly by means of permanent elevators; there can be no dispute about that; and I want to know where you can locate elevators in the centre of the harbour except on the guard pier. The only place where permanent grain elevators, permanent storage, and permanent warehouses can be erected is in the eastern part of the city. That is the reason why, in 1894, when the Harbour Commissioners applied for additional aid, they insisted, as a condition of that aid being granted, that $1,000,000 should be spent in the eastern part of the city. But now that the famous Windmill basin is built, they do not want any more improvements; now that they have provided for themselves, they do not want anybody else to live. I do not want to detain this committee much longer. I will resume my seat after calling the attention of the committee to these two main points: we have provided in this Bill for the centre portion of the harbour; we have provided at the same time for accommodation in the eastern part of the harbour. The two interests are placated and served. The great interest of the grain trade is secured, and it could not be secured otherwise than by the erection of these works in the eastern part of the harbour. Now, perhaps I should say one word on the financial aspect of the scheme. The harbour of Montreal has always had a large surplus. In spite of the fact that two years ago the Harbour Commissioners reduced their rates by 25 per cent, they had a surplus last year of over $30,000. Is there any man in this House who will say that the trade will not increase, and largely increase, in the coming years? Is it not a fact that these very works will help to increase that trade? And increase of trade means increase of revenue. It seems to me that there is no ground for fear on that point. The improvements which will be made will result in bringing to the port of Montreal the largest class of ships. Last year I had a correspondence with Sir William Van Horne. After having gone over the lakes, after having inspected the St. Lawrence, and after having found that so small proportion of the western trade was coming by the St. Lawrence, I wrote to Sir William Van Horne asking him: "How is it that the people of Canada, who have spent so many millions in building railways and in deepening the canals, have got so small a return?" Sir William answered in a letter which was published in the press: "Bring to the harbour of Montreal large ships, which mean cheap rates, and you will have any amount of freight. What has been lacking in the harbour of Montreal has been ships." Well, Sir, I want to equip the port of Montreal and deepen the St. Lawrence, so as to secure the coming of ships the whole year round, with Halifax and St. John as winter ports. In what condition are we to-day? Even during the summer months one company will not send its best ships to Montreal. The Dominion Line do not send to us their best ships. During the winter months, the Allan Company are fighting for an

American port against the Canadian port. I say it again, let us equip the port of Montreal, the port of Quebec, the port of St. John, and the port of Halifax. Let us then secure the presence in Canadian waters of ships which will carry our trade. That is the object I have in view. As I said a moment ago, you cannot break a monopoly without fighting hard. I have fought to the best of my ability. In a few months even those who have opposed these plans, will be obliged to come to reason. My hon. friend the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) has spoken with disdain of the swamp lands that are going to be sold in the east. I make this prophesy, that on the lands of which he spoke with such disdain, before a few years have passed there will be an immense trade, elevators to handle that trade, and large wharfs and ships as there are in Boston and other rival ports. I do not see any reason why every bushel of grain raised in the west should not be taken by the St. Lawrence route, and the cheapest rate that will be secured in the port of Montreal will be the best price for the producer of the west. I am sorry to have taken up so much time, but I think the subject is one of great importance, and that is why I may be pardoned for having been longer than I intended.

Mr. CHAUVIN. (Translation.) If the hon. Minister of Public Works will allow me, I would like to put a few questions to him. Who has paid for the building of the dry docks and other harbour works in the other cities of Canada, for instance, at Quebec, Kingston, Esquimault and Halifax ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). (Translation.) At Halifax, the expenditure was partly borne by the Imperial Government. At Esquimault, the dry dock was built partly by the Imperial Government, and partly by the provincial government, which had commenced the works, which were completed by the Dominion Government. At Quebec, the Lévis graving dock was built out of the moneys voted by the Dominion Parliament; but the harbour works at Quebec were built out of the moneys of the Harbour Commissioners.

Mr. BERGERON. (Translation.) At Halifax, we make a yearly outlay of $10,000.

Mr. CHAUVIN. (Translation.) Could the Minister tell me in an approximate manner what sums have been contributed by the Dominion Government since confederation to the works of the harbour of Montreal ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. (Translation.) The Dominion Government did not directly contribute to the works carried out in the harbour of Montreal. It is, no doubt, within the recollection of my hon. friend that, in 1888, the Government assumed the whole debt of the Montreal Harbour Commission, which then reached three million and some hundred thousand dollars. My hon. friend will also recollect that, since that time, we have advanced a sum of money out of which further improvements have been made.

Mr. BERGERON. (Translation.) That was only a loan.

Mr. CHAUVIN. (Translation.) If I put those questions to the Minister, it is not because I find fault with what the hon. gentleman intends to do in favour of the harbour of Montreal; on the contrary, I only wish to point out to Parliament and to the country that Montreal has not had its fair share of the public moneys, for the extension of the harbour. The old Government having come to the conclusion of granting public moneys for the building and extension of public works in the various ports of the Dominion, I do not see why this Government of the day should not also vote a considerable sum of money for the extension and improvement of the harbour of Montreal.

Mr. BERGERON. (Translation.) Hear, hear,

Mr. CHAUVIN. (Translation.) Because the Government have not thought it desirable to build out of public moneys——

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. (Translation.) For the time being.

Mr. CHAUVIN. (Translation.) For the time being, the contemplated works in the harbour of Montreal, this is no reason why we should refuse our concurrence to the Government who have just decided, at the request and with the approval of the Harbour Commissioners, to advance to the latter the money necessary for the extension of the harbour. I will go even further, and tell the Government that they have not gone far enough in the step taken by them in the interest of Montreal. Montreal is not wont to go a-begging, like so many other cities of the Dominion; it is an opulent and self-reliant city, with great spirit of enterprise and progress; but it is the most important city of the Dominion, by its geographical position and its maritime trade, and it is entitled to receive still more than it is receiving from the Government.

I do not wish to oppose the resolution now under consideration; on the contrary, I heartily approve of the efforts put forth by the hon. Minister of Public Works and by the mayor of Montreal, the member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Préfontaine). I congratulate them on having secured those advantages for the harbour of Montreal. It would not be fair on our part to blame them for the opposition and difficulties they may have met with at the hands of their colleagues. On the contrary, the Minister of Public Works is to be congratulated on the fact that he was strong-handed enough to silence the opposition of his colleagues in the Cab-

inet and to secure what the Government now propose to give. The French Canadian Chamber of Commerce, of Montreal, which represents half the trade of Montreal, and the majority of the French trade of the province of Quebec, has endorsed in the most formal manner the stand taken by the Government on that point, and I deem it my duty, as a taxpayer residing in Montreal, and in my capacity of representative of a neighbouring constituency, to support this measure, because it is calculated to contribute not only to the progress of Montreal, but also to the development of the country at large. The province of Ontario, for one, is the most directly interested in the extension and improvement of the harbour of Montreal, and in the works which the Government of the day propose to carry out. I say that it is in the general interest of Canada that the Government should carry out those works and give the Harbour Commissioners all the money necessary to that effect. I would have been happy to see the Government, out of gratitude for the confidence placed in them by the population of our people, who gave them such a large majority in the province of Quebec and in the district of Montreal, avail themselves of this opportunity to equip the harbour of Montreal with all the improvements it stands in need of and which it is entitled. Meanwhile, I entirely endorse the measure now under consideration, and I am glad to lend my concurrence to the Government, notwithstanding the fact that they have not seen their way clear to do more, for the time being. I am delighted to find that by the step they have taken, the Government are showing their good-will towards the city of Montreal. I am satisfied with the action taken by the Government in advancing this sum of money to the Harbour Commissioners. I deem it my duty to support their policy and to tell them on the floor of the House that their action is entitled to the support and endorsement of all the hon. members, because it tends to the development of interests of considerable importance. While promoting the interests of Montreal, they are, at the same time, promoting the interests of the Dominion at large, whose prosperity is intimately linked with the commercial expansion of Montreal.

Mr. SPROULE. I object to this, first, because it is too late in the session to ask Parliament to deal with such a large sum of money and to give it into the hands of either the Government or any one member of the Government, to have it spent subject to his will or approval, and that is practically what it is. We have reached a stage in the session when there are not more than one-third or one-half the members present. The others have gone home. This matter has been held back until the dying days of the session when it is most unlikely that it will receive the careful attention which Parliament ought to give so important a subject. I object to it because it will impose an additional tax upon the people, and run the debt of Canada up to the extent of the $2,000,000 more which is to be lent to the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal, provided they spend the money according to the will of the Minister of Public Works. I object to it because it is forced upon an unwilling people who have protested against it in every possible way. They have brought to bear on the Minister of Public Works every argument they could advance. Every interest involved in the harbour of Montreal, the Board of Trade, which I submit is a very wide and powerful interest in Montreal, the Corn Exchange, the City Council, the shipping interests, the Underwriters' Association, and the people of Montreal—all have protested against using this money according to the dictates and will of the Minister of Public Works, but nevertheless he is bound to force this through Parliament in the dying days of the session and compel his followers to swallow their convictions and give him license to spend that money where he pleases.

The Harbour Commissioners of Montreal, have not only managed that harbour but the channel between there and Quebec so successfully that it is 27 feet deep. They succeeded in doing that without running into debt, and have paid the interest on every dollar put into that improvement. Let me quote from the "Witness" to show that what they have done they did wisely and well:

> The harbour commission of Montreal, which has not only managed the harbour, but the channel to Quebec, has regularly, in good years and in bad, paid punctually every cent of interest and even put by a surplus. There has never been any suspicion that it would not in the future, as it has in the past, make its plans and manage its expenditure so as to be able to pay the interest. This commission had plans of improvement designed by the best engineers, approved by its own experienced engineer, approved by the experienced city engineer, approved by the City Council, approved by the Board of Trade, by the Corn Exchange, by the shipping interests, by the underwriters' associations, a plan long considered over, pondered and debated, and not hastily arrived at. The Minister of Public Works, under the power obtained above, refuses to sanction the plan which was the result of such long and united consideration and experience, and plan after plan, some of them too absurd to stand examination, and all allowing the one thing in common, and affording less space for berthing ships in the central portion of the harbour than the plan of the commission. By false promises, conveyed through Mr. Préfontaine, Mr. Mackie and others, that the Government would assume the cost of this plan, a modification of it was on that condition accepted by the trade associations and the harbour commission.

But the hon. Minister went back on that promise. In the face of the interests involved can the hon. Minister of Public

Works say that he is justified in asking Parliament to give him the control of two million dollars, to spend according to his own sweet will and where he thinks best. The hon. gentleman said he had no respect for the judgment of these men, and, therefore, would follow his own. But whose opinion ought to have the most weight. That of the Minister of Public Works, who has never been engaged in shipping, who has no interest that we know of in vessels or transportation companies, nor steamship line, or railways or grain elevators. And he places his judgment against that of the men who have helped to build up the harbour of Montreal, who have assisted in making the channel between Montreal and Quebec 27 feet deep, who have assisted in building up great steamship lines running between that port and almost every great port in the world.

Mr. PENNY. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) if he is aware that there is a block of several hundred thousand bushels of wheat in Montreal, owing to the lack of capacity to handle it and ship it?

Mr. SPROULE. Yes, and I understand that if the Harbour Commissioners had been allowed to exercise their own will, there would have been proper provision long ago for handling the grain; but that they are hampered by the Minister of Public Works, who will not allow them to provide accommodation that in their opinion is necessary. I say that the Minister is putting his judgment aganst that of these men who have built up that trade, who control the railway and shipping corporations, and he objects to allow them to map out the work according to their judgment in the interest of the trade. He says that those who do not want improvements will oppose any plan. Who does he mean when he speaks of those who do not want improvements? Do not the shipping interests want them, the railway companies and the transportation companies? They are not opposing improvement but they are opposing the unwise expenditure of money, because the plan now proposed is not, in their judgment the best.

The hon. gentleman said a short time ago that he was always prepared to listen to men whose interests are of importance. Is the interest represented by the Board of Trade of no importance? Are the shipping interest and the underwriters' interest of no importance. Do the representatives of the city council speak on behalf of interests that are of no importance? Now, let me see what interests of importance are represented. Here is a letter. I will read it and let it speak for itself:

Dear Sir,—We, the undersigned members of the shipping interest, hereby enter our protest against the proposals for harbour extension, laid before the harbour board by Mr. Préfontaine, and call upon you as their representative on the commission, to oppose the same by every means in your power.

We are of opinion that the plan No. 12a, if built at the expense of the harbour, will afford additional berth room for shipping and revenue from dues to an extent altogether inadequate to meet the cost for interest and maintenance, and will thus become a burden upon the trade of the port rather than a benefit.

We also demand, as a common right due to Montreal, that the graving dock proposed by the Government be built and managed as other graving docks are built throughout the Dominion, and that no portion of harbour moneys be used for this purpose.

And we further declare our preference for the discontinuance of all extensive harbour enlargement by the commissioners, otherwise than on the former undertaking, that the works are to be constructed at the public cost with the view of hereafter opening the harbour to the commerce of the Dominion free of all tolls and charges whatsoever.

We are,
Your obedient servants,
(Signed) Henry Dobell & Co.
H. & A. Allan.
Hamburg-American Packet Company,
James Thom, Manager.
Robert Reford & Co. (Limited).
David Torrance & Co.
Elder, Dempster & Co.
Beaver Line Company,
D. W. Campbell, Manager.
Carbray, Routh & Co.
J. G. Brock & Co.
Wm. Johnston & Co. (Limited).
Dominion Coal Company (Limited),
Kingman & Co., Agents.
McLea, Kennedy & Co.

Are these men and the interests they represent of no importance? The hon. gentleman cannot deny that these are fair representatives of men of standing in Montreal. But he pays no attention to the representations of these men; and in open defiance of their opinion he puts forward a plan to spend this money according to his own judgment. He says elevators are wanted; the shipping interest do not want elevators.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. They want their floating elevators.

Mr. SPROULE. Do not the vessels carry the grain, and do not the railways bring it to Montreal? Do not the parties who control the steamship companies and the railway companies want elevators? I think they do. They must be as desirous and as anxious as the Minister can be to have these elevators built, but they want them built in the locality, where, in their judgment, they will best serve the interest of the trade and afford the conveniences necessary for carrying on the trade of that great port. I contend that this should not be forced on, because it is being forced on against the opinion of those who are most directly interested, the great representatives of the steamship lines, the railway lines, the Board of Trade and the Underwriters Association.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is not a railway opposed to this.

Mr. SPROULE. Is there a railway in favour of it ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. Have we a single word from any of them ; have we a scratch of the pen from any railway manager supporting the hon. gentleman ? Not one. Therefore, I take it for granted that they cannot be interested in supporting this proposal or they would have spoken in its favour. I oppose this scheme, and I think the House should oppose it. I think it a most unheard thing that this Parliament should vote so much money and put it under the control of any Minister, which we are practically doing, if we give the Minister power to loan that amount of money and have it subject to his own will—for that is practically what is proposed. The hon. Minister said that, in reply to the remark of the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) as to there being property that will be enhanced in value, that that is bound to occur in any case. No doubt. But if it is true that a syndicate has control of the property and may be influenced largely in what they are doing by the locality in which this money is spent, they are largely helping to benefit themselves. I desire to say, so far as I know, the Minister of Public Works is not interested in this property. I do not wish to be understood to say that he is influenced by such considerations in doing what he has done. But when men own properties they are generally willing to have the expenditure of public money upon property in close proximity to their own, because it enhances the value of their own. Is it not probable that the corporation or syndicate who control the property are urging very strongly that the Minister should have the expenditure made there so that their property may be enhanced in value ? I think it is the most natural assumption in the world. But even though that land was not owned by interested parties who are urging the Minister to make an expenditure there, I would object to it all the same upon other grounds, namely, that he is doing it in opposition to the judgment of those who have successfully controlled and made the harbour of Montreal what it is. Their representations should always obtain favourable consideration at his hands. They, above all others, must know best the needs of the city, and how the money could be best spent, and if it is not so spent, they above all others ought to receive the blame.

The PRIME MINISTER. It is quite evident that my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) did not hear the remarks this afternoon of the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster). The hon. member for York has taken an attitude quite the reverse, in many respects, of that which has just been taken by the hon. member for East Grey. He objects, first of all, to these resolutions because, as he says, they are going to increase the public debt to the amount of about two million dollars. Now, my hon. friend is too old and too experienced a member of this House to use such language. I believe he knows better, and if he had reflected at all, he would not have made that statement.

Mr. SPROULE. I objected to forcing it through the House at this late stage of the session, not to the expenditure if properly made.

The PRIME MINISTER. That is one of the objections taken by my hon. friend, and I will let it pass for what it is worth. But he stated this would increase the public debt by two million dollars.

Mr. SPROULE. Certainly.

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend ought to know better. He knows very well the public debt is not increased by two million dollars when the Dominion of Canada borrows two million dollars with one hand and with the other hand receives bonds fully equal to the outlay so made. Therefore the debt will not be increased by one dollar. My hon. friend should not so far forget himself not have made that statement.

Mr. SPROULE. Does the hon. gentleman propose to loan the two millions dollars ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Certainly.

Mr. SPROULE. Where is it to come from if it is not to go against the debt of the country ?

The PRIME MINISTER. When we speak of debt we always speak of the net debt ; and if we borrow two million dollars with one hand and loan two million dollars with the other hand, we are just in the same position as we were before. But I will call his attention to something more ; I will call his attention to the remarks which were made by the hon. member for York this afternoon. One of the objections which were taken by the hon. member for York this afternoon was in reference to the improvements in the eastern portion of Montreal. That is all. As to the rest, everybody is agreed. But the objection is made in the city of Montreal that the improvements contemplated in the eastern portion of the harbour should not be charged to the harbour commission, but that the money should be advanced by the Government. There is no contention that the improvements are not required, that they would not be beneficial to the country, that they would not be beneficial to the city of Montreal ; because again and again these improvements have been petitioned for. The only objection which is taken in Montreal is that the character of these improvements is national, that as similar expenditures have been made in other parts of the country by the Dominion, a similar aid should be granted to the harbour of Montreal ; the contention is that the harbour of Montreal

should not be burdened with that expenditure, but that it should be assumed by the Federal Government. Well, my hon. friend from York stated this afternoon that he was almost a believer in that proposition himself; he stated, in fact, that if these improvements had to be made they should be made at the expense of the country, and not at the expense of the harbour of Montreal, that the burden should fall upon the whole trade of the country, and not upon the trade of Montreal alone. Well, so far so good. That disposes of that argument of hon. gentlemen opposite. There are before the House to-day two propositions, we have to choose at this moment between two propositions, either to put the burden of these improvements on the harbour of Montreal, or put it on the whole Dominion. My hon. friend has to make his choice between two alternatives, because he will not find a single authority in Montreal stating that these improvements are not needed there. He may search the press, he may examine the resolutions passed by the different bodies to which he has alluded, and the speeches made upon this question, and he must come to the conclusion that the only objection made in the city of Montreal is that the harbour should not be burdened with these improvements. On the other hand, while the hon. member for York has taken the position I have described, later on in his speech he made this remark, and it is a remark that has just been endorsed by the member for East Grey, that there is speculation in connection with these harbour improvements. Well, I have only this answer to make to that argument. If there is speculation to take advantage of these improvements in the eastern part of the city, would there be any less speculation if they were made by the harbour commission? Will there not be just as much speculation if they are made by one body as by the other? I think that disposes of the suggestion of boodling and speculation of which we have heard so much, it is all in the air, there is no foundation for it, so far as I am able to find. The last argument he made was that we should refrain from making these improvements, though they might be needed, because certain parties would benefit by the increase in the value of the property. Such an argument is not worth answering. Were we to heed that argument, we should never make improvements in any part of the country because certain parties would always benefit therefrom. Wherever we spend money, whether in Montreal, St. John or Halifax, the adjacent property will benefit by that expenditure. Will the hon. gentleman tell me, or will anybody on that side of the House contend, that we should allow the trade of the country to suffer because somebody is going to reap an advantage out of the expenditure? Such an argument is not worth being uttered on the floor of this House. But my hon. friend has another objection, he says that several bodies object to these improvements, he says the shipping interests object to them, that the Board of Trade objects to them, that the Corn Exchange objects to them. But on the other hand, let me remind my hon. friend that the Chambre de Commerce has pronounced in their favour, my hon. friend from Terrebonne (Mr. Chauvin) has pronounced in their favour, and the Hon. Mr. Desjardins, at one time a Minister whom the hon. gentleman supported in the late Government, has declared himself in favour of these improvements. If there are arguments on one side, there are arguments on the other side. If some parties ask that this should be done, what ought the Government to do except to exercise its best judgment in the matter? And so in bringing this proposition before the House, the Government are ignoring these jarring interests in the city of Montreal, and are keeping in view the best interests of the whole country. We have already delayed too long in taking action on account of the conflicting representations made to us from Montreal, and the conflicting interests which have been unable to agree; we have lost time, trade is flowing into the harbour of Montreal, and that harbour is not sufficiently equipped to meet the demands upon it. The trade is suffering, and we must take action at once. We have lost too much time already, we have concluded to take action, and we propose that these works shall be commenced within the next month. Within a month or so men will be at work in the city of Montreal on these proposed improvements. Now, if my hon. friend has any more objections to make, I have one more answer to give which will cover them all. We had better make a mistake than do nothing at all, we had better make a mistake than to lose another year. I think the policy that we are inaugurating will meet not only the favour of this House, but of the whole country as well.

Motion agreed to, and the House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. SPROULE. I desire to say a few words in answer to the right hon. Premier. His contention was that the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal objected to the expenditure of this money only because it was not given gratuitously by the country for the construction of the harbour works, or, in other words, because it was proposed to be a loan to them.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. They did not object to that.

Mr. SPROULE. The right hon. Premier made that statement. The Premier said their contention was—and the hon. member for York assented to the statement—that the money should be spent by the whole coun-

try and not be a loan to the Montreal Harbour Commissioners, that they should not be compelled to take it as a loan. Really, the Harbour Commissioners objected on two grounds. The first objection was, that the money should be spent by the Dominion Government and should not be borrowed by the Harbour Commissioners, and whatever accommodation the shipping interests required, the necessary expenditure should be made on that harbour as on any other harbour in the country. Their second and equally important objection was, that the money should not be spent as the Minister of Public Works wanted it expended. If the Harbour Commissioners objected to the loan on one ground alone, why did they make this statement:

This commission had plans of improvement designed by the best engineers, approved by its own experienced engineer, approved by the experienced city engineer, approved by the City Council, approved by the Board of Trade, by the Corn Exchange, by the shipping interests, by the underwriters' associations, a plan long considered over, pondered and debated, and not hastily arrived at. The Minister of Public Works under the power obtained as above, refuses to sanction the plan which was the resultant of such long and united consideration and experience,——

They objected to the expenditure, also on the following grounds:—

——and presents plan after plan, some of them too absurd to stand examination,——

The Premier said the only objection offered was because the money was not spent there as in other places. But another objection they offered was this:

——and all having this one thing in common, all affording less space for berthing ships in the central portion of the harbour than the plan of the commission.

The commissioners objected to the expenditure being made according to the will and whim of the Minister of Public Works, and against their best judgment, and not on the plan they had adopted and according to what they believed was desirable in the interest of the harbour of Montreal and the trade that must pass through it.

Bill reported.

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

Crow's Nest Pass Railway—To pay salary and expenses of superintending engineer	$2,500

Mr. FOSTER. When we were on this item before, two singular facts were brought out. One was that the Crow's Nest Pass road trestles were being put in where iron bridges should have been built; and the other was, that old rails were taken from a portion of the Canadian Pacific Railway main line and placed on the Crow's Nest Pass road. Are there not specifications according to which the road was to be built; and if so, has the work been carried out according to these specifications? What did the specifications provide?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). The road is being built according to the specification. The hon. gentleman mentioned the fact that some of the bridges are being built of wood. That is true; we do not require them to be built of iron. We are building the road exactly according to the specification prepared for the main trunk line of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the weight of the rails required?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Fifty-six pounds.

Mr. FOSTER. Are the rails on the Crow's Nest Pass road of that weight?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. CLARKE. What were the duties of the officer to whom $2,500 was to be paid, the supervising engineer?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. His duties were to inspect the work; he is continuously employed on the work, going from place to place.

Mr. CLARKE. Was it any part of his duty to report the methods adopted by the contractors; did he make any report as to the way in which the workingmen were treated during the period of construction.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, we have received no report from the engineer on that subject. He had no instructions to that effect, it is not usual to give instructions of that kind. If we had anticipated any difficulty we might have required him to report; but we did not anticipate any difficulty and did not give him such instructions.

Rideau Canal—	
To pay J. K. Read, late lockmaster at Hog's Back, for certain outbuildings and improvements to lock-house done by him at his own expense	$ 200
To rebuild sill of Lock No. 2 at Long Island	750
To take down and rebuild upper wing wall at Burritt's	30
To repair bulkhead at Old Sly's	450
To complete payment for land damages at Kingston Mills	350
	$1,780

Mr. BRITTON. Can the Minister tell me to whom the land damages at Kingston Mills were paid?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We made an offer to settle; the offer was not accepted, litigation en-

sued, and the claimant recovered with costs, as is very usual. I have not a memorandum with me of the name of the person to whom the amount was paid.

Mr. BRITTON. Are there any more claims as to land damages in that vicinity ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am not aware of any more, but I am afraid the time will never come when there will be no claims for such damages.

Mr. BRITTON. I understood that the settlement made some years ago included an absolute release as to past damages and future damages ?

Mr. HAGGART. Is Mr. J. K. Read superannuated ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. He had at his own expense erected a building which we found convenient to use for the new man, and we had it valued and this is the valuation placed on the building. I do not know whether Mr. Read has been superannuated or received a gratuity.

Mr. MONTAGUE. What became of Old Slys ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Old Slys fell into decay and we had to fix him up.

Intercolonial Railway—To pay the estate of the late Mr. A. Kirk for damages by fire $689 37

Mr. CLANCY. What Mr. Kirk is that ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Adam Kirk, I think.

Mr. McDOUGALL. What is the nature of the claim ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. A claim was originally made by a man named W. B. Chisholm. He was occupying these premises, and this building and he made his claim to department in the usual way, and it was sent to the Justice Department, and the Justice Department sent it down to their agent. It was admitted that the fire had been caused by the Intercolonial Railway, and that the owner was entitled to damages, and a report came back to the effect that the damages to be paid to Mr. Chisholm amounted to about $900, and the amount was paid. Subsequently, it came out that Mr. Kirk was really the owner of the property, that he had the legal title to the buildings and to the farm, and that the amount ought to have been paid to Mr. Kirk instead of to Mr. Chisholm. When the matter came to my notice I had the title carefully searched, and I found that Chisholm had not any title to the property at all, had parted with the title to Kirk some time previous to the fire, and that the damages really accrued to Mr. Kirk, and not to Mr. Chisholm. I had Mr. Chisholm communicated with, and he was called upon to explain by what right he had received this amount of damages, and his reply was that although he had given a deed of the property some little time before for a loan to Mr. Kirk, yet that he was occupying the premises at the time and he had a right to the re-conveyance of the property upon paying the amount of the mortgage against him, some $900. Of course, that claim could not be entertained for a moment, and it was thought proper that although the amount had once been paid it should be paid over again, and that we should resort to the best means that were open to us to recover the amount back from the person who had improperly received the same in the first instance. On the strength of the statement which Chisholm made to me in his correspondence, to the effect that he had the right of redemption in this property, I had an officer go to inspect the property and give me an estimate of its value as it stood after the fire. I got such a valuation, and Mr. Kirk having died in the meanwhile, I informed his executors that while I recognized the right to Mr. Kirk to have been paid in the first instance instead of Chisholm, yet inasmuch as it appeared to me that there was an equity of redemption in Chisholm upon payment of the amount of what was in effect a mortgage, though not so upon the face of it, that the executors of Kirk would be entitled from the department only the balance of the loss after the value of the land had been deducted. That was the conclusion which was reached and I am therefore asking for $689 instead of $900, the amount which was originally claimed and paid to Chisholm.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Do we understand there is no money yet paid on the claim ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Although probably the department might pay the amount, I felt it was a proper thing to present it to Parliament and get the authority to pay before any payment has been made. No payment on this has yet been made.

Mr. HAGGART. Do I understand that the fee of the property was in a man named Chisholm ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It does not appear that there was any examination of the title at all at that time, because we had the title examined. In fact, I had the original deed, which showed that some two or three years before the fire occurred a conveyance of the title absolutely in fee had been made by Chisholm to Kirk.

Mr. HAGGART. Surely the money would have been paid through the Department of Justice, and that department would have been entirely responsible for it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My deputy informs me that the first payment was made through Moncton, and not through the Department of Justice.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). Will the hon. gentleman tell me when the claim was first made by the Kirk estate ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My deputy says he does not exactly remember when the claim was first made by Kirk.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). It is apparent that the claim was first made by Chisholm, although some years before that time, he had conveyed the property to Kirk ; but afterwards Kirk, having got the property, put forward a claim himself.

Mr. MONTAGUE. What explanation does Kirk make of not having made a claim before ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My communications have always been with Kirk, through the hon. member for Antigonish (Mr. McIsaac). The first knowledge I had of it was shortly after coming into the department. Mr. McIsaac communicated with me for the executors, who were then preferring the claim. Whether Kirk had died shortly before, I cannot say.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). This item had better stand until we see the report of the Minister of Justice in the case. I think the Minister will agree with me that there is something very suspicious about it, although it may be quite capable of explanation. The owner of the property stands by and sees the tenant make a claim which the owner is entitled to make, and he does not make that claim until long after. Then it appears that he is paid as well as Chisholm.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not see that it can be quite in that position. The claimant Kirk was not in his lifetime a resident of this locality at all, as I understand, and would not probably be cognizant of what was going on. He may not have heard, until just previous to the time he gave notice to the department, that any amount had been paid to Chisholm in respect of this claim. I have not any evidence that he did have any such knowledge.

Mr. MONTAGUE. There is evidence that the gentleman died without ever having made a claim. I am told by gentlemen on this side of the House that Mr. Kirk did live in that vicinity. It is an extraordinary thing that a man should own a farm, with a tenant on it, that the tenant should put in a claim for compensation for buildings that were burnt, and that the man who owned those buildings should go to his rest without having made a claim.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Is the hon. gentleman informed when Mr. Kirk died ?

Mr. FOSTER. The Minister who wants us to pass the vote should know that, and tell the committee. As it appears to the committee, it is a wrong proceeding. If the claim made in the first instance, was investigated by the Minister of Justice, we ought to have his report. I think the suggestion made by my hon. friend from Brockville (Mr. Wood) is the best, that the item should stand until we have the report of the Minister of Justice on that first case.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There is no doubt that the title to the property was in Kirk anterior to the fire.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Was it a mortgage or a deed ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It was a deed. I had the deed, and I am not sure but that it is now in the department. There was, I am informed by my deputy, no report from the Justice Department in respect to the payment in the first instance. I have no objection to let the item stand if there is any information in the Department that I have not brought down.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Was the property that was burned in the county of Antigonish ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am not really sure, but that is my impression ; but I thought Mr. Kirk resided in another county.

Mr. McDOUGALL. If Mr. Kirk resided in the county of Antigonish, no building of that kind could have been burned in that county without Mr. Kirk or those in his employment knowing it within a few hours.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Does the hon. gentleman know when Mr. Kirk died ?

Mr. McDOUGALL. I think within the last two or three years. I cannot understand why the claims should have been paid to Mr. Chisholm if it is true that he gave an absolute deed to Mr. Kirk. I can well understand that if Mr. Kirk only held a mortgage, the money might properly be paid to Chisholm.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I cannot see how anybody else could be entitled to the money except the owner of the property.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). Did not the Minister say that the tenant would have a right to redeem ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). That would be virtually equivalent to a deed ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My hon. friend is making a misapplication of a well-known principle. The position of the claim, as I understand, is this. The absolute title passed to Kirk from Chisholm before this fire occurred. When the matter was presented to my notice by the hon. member for Antigonish (Mr. McIsaac) I caused an investigation to be made. I told Mr. Chisholm that he had received his money, that he had no title to the property at the time he received it, and I asked him on what authority he claimed for and received it. His reply was that although he had not the legal title, yet he had a right to the money, under his understanding with Kirk, though there was nothing in writing. On the payment of the $800 or $900, which Chisholm had borrowed from Kirk, Chisholm would be entitled to a reconveyance of the property. It was virtually mortgaged, although if it had been mortgaged and appeared so on the record, the mortgagee would be entitled to the money.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Does not the hon. Minister see this ? A man may mortgage his farm, which is not worth $3,000, for $1,000. When the fire occurred, an arrangement may have been come to between the parties, whereby the man who really owned the farm, subject to the payment of the mortgage debt, should collect the insurance money or damages.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I should imagine that Chisholm who was called on to make an explanation and appeared to be anxious to make as good a showing in his own behalf as possible, would have put that forward if it could have been alleged with any show of justification, but he did not. The value of this property, with the building on it, never exceeded the amount of the claim that Kirk had upon it. The value that was put upon the building destroyed—and we know that Governments are not usually allowed to undervalue property they destroy—did not exceed the amount of the loan. If there had been a very large value in the real estate, sufficient to cover any claim Kirk might have, in excess of the value of the building, I could understand Kirk saying : Well, it does not make much difference whether I or Chisholm gets the money, as I have ample security for my claim in the farm property. But that was not the case in this instance. When we are called upon by persons whose property is destroyed to pay damages, we can only deal properly with the owner of the property. To say now that Kirk stood by and allowed the money to be paid Chisholm would compel the Crown to establish that there was an understanding which would entitle Chisholm to get the money and preclude Kirk from afterward setting up a claim for it. We are not in a position to establish any such fact. There is not a title of evidence to show any such understanding, and when Chisholm is called upon to explain why he demanded and received this money from the Crown, as though he were the person who sustained the loss, he does not suggest any consent or agreement between himself and Kirk. On the contrary, he says that his position was practically that of a mortgagor and he was entitled to the money as a mortgagor.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. Minister has said that Chisholm has some equity in the property. He sent an officer down to value the equity, and the officer found out that the difference between the amount paid by the Crown to Chisholm and the value of Chisholm's equity was $689.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. HAGGART. How are you to get that money ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is not the question we have to determine.

Mr. HAGGART. Surely the Crown is entitled to the equity.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Has the hon. Minister any correspondence to show that Kirk made any claim for damages from the Government before the Minister had charge of the department, or any objections made by Kirk to the payment of the money to Chisholm ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not think there is any objection of that kind.

Mr. MONTAGUE. If the man Chisholm has an equity in the property, surely the Crown has a right to that equity. What is the property worth ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. In the neighbourhood of $200.

Mr. MONTAGUE. And there was $1,000 owing on it ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. $900.

Mr. MONTAGUE. So that the man who has the mortgage is $700 out.

Mr. INGRAM. Surely the hon. Minister has a claim agent employed on the Intercolonial whose duty it is to investigate when a fire occurs and see what the actual damage is.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) really misunderstands the situation. There was a building on this property but it was burnt down by the Intercolonial and was valued between $800 and $900 by the railway department of

that day. Now, I felt that, before being called upon to pay over again the value of that building to another person, I should be justified in ascertaining the value of the property which this man still held—that is to say, which the estate of Kirk held in their own hands which would go in reduction of this mortgage claim.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. Minister must have misunderstood my question. What was the whole farm worth, buildings and all ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not know, but the farm buildings were valued at between $800 and $900. But the farm without the building was valued at $200. The dwelling house, the house, the barn and contents and crop were destroyed at this time, and the farm now—whether it is only a small plot or not I cannot say—conveyed by this is valued at about $200.

Item allowed to stand.

Beauharnois Canal—Contingencies and repairs $4,700

Mr. BERGERON. Would the Minister be good enough to give us the reason for this appropriation, which is not in the Estimates of last year ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am advised that we were under the impression last year that it would be possible for us to reduce the staff, and we did not estimate for as much as we usually obtain for that purpose. But it was afterwards found that it was absolutely necessary to restore the staff to about the original strength, and this sum is to cover the sum short-estimated on the year's service.

Mr. BERGERON. I know that my hon. friend (Mr. Blair) dismissed a great many employees, but they were replaced immediately.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Not immediately—not until the session of Parliament was over and we had strong pressure brought to bear on us because of the shortness of the staff.

Mr. BERGERON. My hon. friend seems not to understand me. They were replaced as soon as they were dismissed.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergeron) is wrong.

Mr. BERGERON. Not at all. The hon. Minister, I have no doubt, refers to others, such as lockmen and so on, who are discharged in the fall because it is not necessary that they should be employed in the winter, but remain until the spring, and, in the ordinary way are re-engaged. Is this the only reason that the Minister has for this amount for contingencies and repairs ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is the reason and the only reason.

Mr. BERGERON. Since we are on the subject of this canal, I would like to ask the hon. Minister another question. There is a wharf at Valleyfield which was leased to the St. Francis Towboat Company. The lessees, I am told, are Cossette and Deschenes. Does the hon. Minister know how the change was made and the amount of money the new lessees paid the Government for the wharf ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My deputy does not know of any change. And for my part, I have heard nothing about the point.

Mr. BERGERON. There is no use discussing it longer then. But will the hon. gentleman take a note of it, and, before we go into concurrence, give me the information about it ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman will please give me a memorandum, and I shall be glad to get the information.

Mr. BERGERON. Now, there has been a change in the first lock at Valleyfield. The lockmaster Loiselle, appointed lately, since the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) came into office, has been sent to lock No. 7, and the lockmaster at No. 7, Bertrand, has been brought back to Valleyfield. Can the hon. gentleman explain that ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I will inquire, and get the hon. gentleman any information I can on this important subject.

Mr. BERGERON. I imagine what the reason is, but I want to know it from the hon. Minister. I fancy that this nomination of the Minister has turned out so badly that a change had to be made. The superintendent of the Beauharnois Canal has been changed also. The man appointed by the late Government was Boyer, and Beique had been superannuated. The present administration has dismissed the new superintendent and reinstated the old one. Mr. Beique lives at Valleyfield. I want to know if it is with the permission of the Government that he does live at Valleyfield, and does not occupy the house built by the Government there at considerable cost, and whether the Government deducts from the salary of the superintendent the $300 which is usually deducted for the very nice lodging they furnish him ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am informed that he is paid the same salary as when he was in the service before.

Mr. BERGERON. What about the lease of the house. My hon. friend will find

that $300 is, or used to be, kept out of the salary of the superintendent for the use of the house furnished by the Government. There is a house built at Millersville at considerable expense, as that place was looked upon as the best for a superintendent because it is opposite the Government shops. Now, Mr. Beique lives in Valleyfield, and the other house is unoccupied.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. He is not allowed anything for the house. He gets the same salary as he did before.

Mr. BERGERON. The superintendent, whoever he is, is allowed $300 for that house; that is to say, instead of having a salary of $1,700, he gets $1,400 and a house.

Mr. SCRIVER. He is charged $300.

Mr. BERGERON The superintendent does not live in the house, it is unoccupied today. He lives in his own house in Valleyfield. I want to know whether he is allowed to live in Valleyfield by permission of the Minister.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. He must be allowed, or else he would not do it.

Mr. BERGERON. Then what becomes of the house which was built for the superintendent?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The house is there still.

Mr. BERGERON. What about the rent which is generally charged to the superintendent for that house?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If the hon. gentleman wants me to say whether there is a probability of Mr. Beique returning to this House at an early day, I would rather be inclined to think that he may do so. He had a house of his own after his removal. He naturally looked up a place of residence, and if he was living in a house when we reappointed him, he was living in the house he had removed to after his dismissal, and he continued there, and I believe he is there now. But I would not be surprised if he moved into the new house in Valleyfield; and if he does so, I presume that will be agreeable to my hon. friend.

Mr. BERGERON. No, I have no interest in it. I am not in charge of the canal. I am only asking whether this $300 which are retained from the superintendent's salary for a house, is made up to him.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think it is likely he will occupy it.

Mr. BERGERON. When he was appointed it must have been understood that he would remain in his own house.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There is no arrangement that he must permanently remain there.

Mr. BERGERON. What is his salary today?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. $1,400.

Williamsburg Canal—To provide for a gratuity, equal to three months' salary as collector of canal tolls, to George Reid, late collector, whose services were dispensed with.....	$187 50

Mr. BRODER. Is there another person appointed to the position formerly occupied by Mr. Reid? I understand Dr. Williams was appointed as collector and paymaster. I would like to know at what salary.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There were two persons employed on that canal, and the services of Mr. Reid were dispensed with. No one has been appointed in his place. I am not aware of any one named Williams being appointed. If he is employed there, it is not by the department.

Mr. BRODER. I want to ask the Minister about the lockmaster at Morrisburg lock, Mr. Casselman. He was appointed in 1873, and was dismissed last fall very summarily. Afterwards he received a letter from the department saying he was reinstated, although there was another man put in his place. He went back to the lock, and was informed from the department that he was to be under the control of the newly appointed lockmaster, but that he would be at the same salary he had been drawing as lockmaster. Since then they have put him in as lock labourer, and while they claimed he was too old to be a lockmaster, they put him in as a lock labourer, and have given him a third man as assistant. There are now three men on the lock as labourers. This man so far has had no satisfactory reply from the department as to his superannuation. Is it the intention of the department to deprive this man of his rights of superannuation after he has paid into the fund since 1873? Or is he to be lowered to the rank of lock labourer and lose his rights of superannuation? I think this man has been harshly dealt with. I would like to know that his rights will be properly respected. Perhaps the Minister is not aware of all the facts.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I had a good deal of correspondence with Mr. Casselman, in which he is asking for superannuation. I have no wish to deprive him of the right of superannuation when the time comes that it may be necessary to superannuate him, but we have not thought it necessary to superannuate him yet.

Mr. BRODER. I understand he occupies a lower position now and is no longer lockmaster.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. He is receiving the same salary.

Mr. BRODER. He is no longer lockmaster, and I believe obtains a less salary, and that will affect his superannuation.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. He is getting exactly the same salary as before. If there has been anything done that would affect his superannuation rights to which he is entitled, I will see that it is adjusted.

Mr. BRODER. I am glad to hear that statement made by the hon. Minister. The man is ready to take superannuation, as he is no longer lockmaster, but is acting under a newly appointed lockmaster, and he cannot find out the reason of his removal from his old position. He has not been receiving lockmaster's pay recently; whether he has been reinstated or not I do not know, but I accept the statement made by the hon. Minister. I desire to call the hon. Minister's attention to another case. Certain lands belonging to Thomas and Charles Corley and Mrs. Morrison have been expropriated along the canal. I understand the parties have been offered a very small compensation by the Government. Access to the St. Lawrence River from their farms has been cut off, and any person can understand what that means when the people have a large herd of cattle which hitherto had been able to go to the river and drink at leisure. In my opinion and in the opinion of the people in the locality, they have not been offered sufficient compensation for their land. The offer made by the department was in such form that it must either be accepted by them, or they must fight the Government. The Minister will, I hope, treat them fairly, and I bring the matter to his attention and hope their claim will be fairly met.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have no disposition to keep from these people anything to which they are entitled. The valuator of the department has been employed in this locality for many years, and his instructions are whenever reasonable terms can be obtained to come to an understanding with the owners. I have always found that he has treated the people reasonably and even liberally, and I do not think he is likely to overlook the special position of these men. The people usually are not contented with the valuator's estimate unless it is a liberal one. No inference can be drawn that because the offer has been refused, a liberal offer has not been made to these people, but I will ask the valuator whether he has taken into account the water front privileges to which my attention has been drawn.

Mr. BRODER. I have not stated that these people were unfairly dealt with, but I think, taking into consideration the circumstances, they deserve more liberal treatment than some other cases.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I desire to refer for a moment again to the Reid case. I should like the Minister of Railways and Canals to give me a definite answer tomorrow on two points: first, whether Dr. Williams has not been actually engaged in collecting canal tolls; and second, whether it is the intention of the Minister to fill the place Reid formerly held?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I may say now that no appointment has been made in Reid's place; Dr. Williams, I am informed, is not on the pay roll.

Mr. BRITTON. In regard to the case of Reid and Ross, the principle seems to have been adopted by the Minister of Railways that three months' gratuity is to be given when services are dispensed with. Last year I called attention to the case of Dickey, superintendent of one of the divisions of the canal, and my recollection is that he did not receive the amount of the gratuity.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. He was allowed it.

Expenses of investigations on Government railways and canals..... $2,500

Mr. INGRAM. Perhaps the hon. Minister will explain this item.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The item is to cover expenses connected with investigations. It is required to cover expenses incurred, although the amounts are not fully adjusted. I think the amount will not all be required.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). What were the investigations?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There were cases of employees interfering in elections.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). And these investigations have cost $2,500.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Not quite. I am asking for this sum to settle claims when they have been adjusted by the Department of Justice.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). It seems very strange that the Minister has not concluded these investigations.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They are not all concluded.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). If so, they will probably be continued two or three years longer. I think we ought to have full particulars of the amount already expended in that direction when we are asked to pay

this $2,500 to compensate persons who in many cases I fear the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) thinks he is indebted to for political services rendered.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Can the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) tell the names of those who conducted the investigations ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Hon. gentlemen opposite I think are in possession of returns which give all the information and the returns will show that quite a number of investigations have necessarily been held. Under our arrangement with the association of employees on the railway we were to hold those investigations in a somewhat formal way. I do not mean "our" arrangement, but I mean a Government arrangement entered into as early as 1893. It was then agreed between the department on the one hand and the associated employees on the other, that removals would not take place of officials in certain classes until after an investigation had taken place and a report of the evidence made showing the result of the inquiry. Charges have been preferred against quite a few employees in the service for active interference in elections in various parts of the country through which the Intercolonial Railway runs, and investigations have been held in order to meet the requirements of the arrangement I have referred to. One or two of these are still pending, there is certainly one which is pending, if I recollect aright, and there is one which has only recently been concluded, and the bills have gone to the Department of Justice. Some of the bills have not been fully closed and I require this amount to close the matter up.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I do not in any sense wish to waste time, but I am sorry that I cannot consider that a satisfactory answer. The Minister must know that we are not supposed to carry around reports of returns brought down to the House, as to a number of officials into whose conduct investigation has been held. The case he cited as to the arrangement in 1893 between the employees and the Government could have no connection with investigations held by the Department in the case of officials against whom charges of a partisan character have been made.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Oh, yes.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). Well, I have no doubt the hon. gentleman has appointed his own political friends to conduct this investigation.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I certainly have not appointed my political opponents.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I do not think you would. Therefore, his political friends must be paid, and we have a right to know how they are to be paid.

Mr. INGRAM. This to my mind is a most extraordinary item. As I understand it the general manager and superintendent of that railway are paid high salaries for the purpose of conducting the business of the railway, and a portion of their duties would be to see that the employees carry out the instructions of the company, and if they fail to carry out the instructions of the company, the railway company, whether controlled by the Government or by officials subject to the orders of the Government, have the duty to investigate the misconduct of employees. I do not see why $2,500 should be paid for that purpose. When the employees disobey any regulation of the railway company they are called to headquarters to have their cases investigated. There is no cost attached at all, and if they have not done their duty they are simply dismissed. If this item is for the purpose of paying political partisans to hold investigations in order that they may receive $10 a day in compensation for being political heelers, then it is not in the interests of the Government or the railway. I never heard a worse defence of an item in the Estimates than the Minister has given to the House. If these men were dismissed for partisan purposes let the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) say so, if they were dismissed for violating the rules of the company let us know it, and we will be able to distinguish the difference between the two.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Was there a man named Ross employed to investigate these charges against these employees ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes ; there was a gentleman of that name.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Is any of this amount to pay him or to pay the witnesses, or to pay those who were employed in connection with the evidence ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think a portion of it would probably go in that way.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Was anything paid Mr. Ross or the witnesses, or those employed in connection with the evidence ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have not a particle of doubt that there have been payments made to Mr. Ross.

Mr. McDOUGALL. How much ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I cannot speak from memory.

An hon. MEMBER. Who is Ross ?

Mr. McDOUGALL. I do not know the man at all ; but I am informed that he gave

a roaming commission to some party heelers to go around the country and see if they could get any evidence against employees, and cheques were sent from the railway authorities to pay these people $5 a day, I believe, for going around the country to hunt up evidence. One man in particular I know who did this, succeeded in getting evidence to remove another man, and he got his position.

Mr. MONTAGUE. This is one of the items with respect to which we should have the details. If it were a vote for 1898-99 I could understand the Minister giving an indefinite answer, but he does not pretend that any large proportion of this is going to be spent during the present month of June at the end of which these Estimates expire. This money has been expended and in all fairness the Minister ought to be able to give us the details for which the money is required.

An hon. MEMBER. And the object.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The object will be seen from the items. The investigation of the conduct of employees in connection with the ordinary running of the railway does not cost any cash, for the employees case is investigated at the headquarters of the superintendent, and there is no cost, except, perhaps, the loss of time of the man should he be found innocent of the charge. This is evidently for investigations into partisan conduct. This is a very disputed point in the House, and it is one on which the Minister should be prepared to give information in detail.

Mr. HAGGART. Particularly as it is altogether unnecessary. The Minister does not require the report of a commission for the purpose of discharging an offensive partisan, nor do any of his colleagues in the House. All they require is the statement of a member of Parliament on his honour, that a certain person has been guilty of offensive partisanship, and the person is dismissed at once. There is no inquiry made into the man's conduct, to ascertain whether he is guilty or not. Is it because there are not sufficient accusations against parties from the supporters of the hon. gentleman behind him, that he must appoint a commission for the purpose of fishing out others?

Mr. MONTAGUE. Will the hon. gentleman allow this item to stand, and give particulars as to what parties these sums are to be paid to, how much is to be paid to each per day, what expenses are to be paid, and what business each is engaged in?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not think it is unreasonable for the hon. gentleman to ask me to furnish particulars of the expenditures that have been made this year, and I shall be glad to furnish that information. But there are some accounts which have not yet been paid, some which are coming in. One rather important account is going before the Justice Department now.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. gentleman can give us these details, and we will be satisfied.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not want to treat these claims or accounts as settled, as though I was going to pay them in full, so that I am not able to state what these bills amount to.

Mr. MONTAGUE. How much has been paid?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. $865 this year.

Mr. MONTAGUE. And $1,700 is to be paid?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, may be paid.

Mr. MONTAGUE. How much are the total claims that are now in?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There are claims in amounting to over $1,200, and there is one more that I know of coming in this year.

Mr. FOSTER. How much has been paid from the beginning altogether?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The accounts will show.

Mr. FOSTER. There is another question which I think the hon. gentleman should be prepared to answer, that is, whether he proposes to change the system of employing these men and certifying to his own accounts. When, for instance, accounts are sent into the proper certifying officers, and they report that they cannot pay them because there are no certificates attached, does the Minister propose to solve the difficulty by writing his own order to pay, and dispensing with the proper vouchers? This is the way it was done in the case of Mr. Wilson, who was a friend and heeler for the hon. gentleman for many years.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. You must be more respectful to the judges.

Mr. FOSTER. That is not my fault; the appointers of judges should be more careful as to whom they place on the bench. Mr. Wilson was an old worker for my hon. friend, and he was appointed as a commissioner. The hon. gentleman left himself plenty of leeway when he put his Order in Council through the Council. He did not put it through as the other Ministers did, saying how much he proposed to pay to his commissioners; but he put through a peculiar kind of Order in Council, which allowed him to pay not more than $25 per day—giving him as Minister not a definite instruction from Council; but giving him

a range between $1 per day and $25 per day that he could pay his commissioners. The hon. gentleman appointed Mr. Wilson as one of his commissioners, and Mr. Wilson went to work and did the business, he was required to do. Mr. Wilson sent in no accounts in detail at all. He gave no intimation as to where he sat or what cases he tried. He simply sent in an account for a lump sum for his pay at $20 per day, and for certain expenses, to the amount of $800 or thereabouts. In the regular order of things, his account went to the proper certifying officer. There was nothing to which the officer could certify. There were no attendant vouchers, and no items as to the work he did or the days on which he did the work. The certifying officer, of course, could not certify to the account. It was paid, however, because the Minister cut the gordian knot by simply writing his initials across the bill, and Mr. Wilson's account was paid. That is not the way in which accounts are certified ; that has never been the rule, and is not the rule in the departments at the present time. The amount that was paid to Mr. Wilson at last was not $20 a day, which he thought he ought to have, but $15, which the Minister thought was a very good wage for him, and it was. The Minister employed other lawyers, and he used his right of selection as to the salary to be paid them per day, paying them $10 per day. They were obliged, however, to give the items in their accounts—the days on which they held investigations, the places where they held them, the witnesses they employed, the fees they paid the witnesses with the vouchers of the witnesses who had received those fees. In Mr. Wilson's case, although he tried a great many cases, I am told, we do not know the number of cases he tried, nor do we know anything about the witnesses. We had no vouchers from him ; there was nothing of details from him ; there was nothing at all but a lump sum and the certificate of the Minister himself. I say that as long as you attempt to run things in that way, you are open to just and fair criticism ; and, so far as I am concerned, if this sum of $2,500 is to be paid in that way, without vouchers, certificates, or anything of the kind, I do not think this House ought to vote it. The Minister had a case before him in which he ought to have been especially careful to have the vouchers—the case of his own appointee, his own intimate friend and political worker, whom he paid in that way, by appointing him on a commission. He should have been especially careful, when it was a matter all in the family, to require this man to have his vouchers like other workers. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) and the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) had investigations, and in those cases there were vouchers, showing the dates, the payments to witnesses and constables, and so forth. These men worked under the common rule, which is the only safe rule ; but with Mr. Wilson, the Minister's own particular pet, the hon. gentleman did not require him to put in any vouchers, but paid him a lump sum. This may be a business Government, but there is not a man on that side who can say that that is a proper way in which business should be done. The Minister would have consulted his own interests if he had carried out the wholesome rule which requires vouchers.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The statement which the hon. gentleman has just made would be more valuable as a criticism if he had given a full statement of the facts and had adhered to such facts. In the first place, the hon. gentleman displayed a degree of questionable taste in referring to Mr. Wilson as a party heeler. Of course, the expression could only be used in a contemptuous way, and I think it was quite unfitting in the hon. gentleman, who would himself claim to be treated with respect, to withhold the same measure of respect from a gentleman who stands in every particular just as well among the people who know him as does the hon. gentleman himself. Mr. Wilson is a gentleman who occupies a very reputable position in the community where he resides. He is a large practitioner in the law. He has for many years been a member of the provincial legislature, and in every way has always conducted himself so as to merit the esteem and confidence of the community, and because he is a follower of the Liberal party, and a colleague and supporter of mine in politics, is no reason why the hon. gentleman should assume to refer to him in these contemptuous terms. I think, therefore, that the hon. gentleman's criticism with regard to Mr. Wilson was, at the outset, tinctured with a bias and prejudice which would essentially colour any conclusion he would arrive at. Mr. Wilson's claim did not go to the Department of Justice, if my memory serves me right, and was not refused by that department at all. It was the first case which arose in relation to these investigations. He was deputed by me as a gentleman in every way qualified to go to Moncton and hold a series of inquiries it was necessary to hold there. The condition of things which existed at Moncton with regard to the Intercolonial Railway was a scandal and a disgrace, and it became necessary that the facts be ascertained in the most formal manner and on oath, and Mr. Wilson went there and discharged that duty. I do not know that any person who was present during the examination that took place had reason to reflect upon the manner in which Mr. Wilson conducted the investigation. When his reports came before me, they simply confirmed my knowledge of the facts as to the length of time he was occupied in

the investigations. He was at Moncton away from Home and business for many days. The evidence was taken down in shorthand by an officer whose name was Robb, I think, and who was a reliable person. That examination is in the department, and the record shows the time and occasions when Mr. Wilson was engaged in Moncton on these inquiries. I did not require to have any more evidence than these documents to prove the correctness of Mr. Wilson's bill. I felt that $15 a day was a reasonable amount to allow him. It was a matter largely in my discretion, because I could form the better judgment as to what his services were worth. Knowing the time he was there, I allowed him his Bill less $5 per day, which I deducted from the charge he made. There was another item, and only one, which was open at all to criticism in any way, and that was $55 for his hotel board while there. I knew that in all reason that was a fair and proper Bill. In strictness it might have been as well for him to send the Bill along, but I knew that $55 for the length of time he was there attending the investigations was not an excessive sum, and therefore did not require him to send the bill. There was a small sum of $4 paid for one railway fare, which I did happen to know that he himself paid. I procured passes on the Intercolonial for the other trip, and as to the fare to and from Fredericton, where he resides, that amount was properly stated in the bill, and he could not have had vouchers for it, if I had gone the length of insisting that he should furnish vouchers to establish facts with which I was already familiar.

Mr. INGRAM. As I understand, the customs Department, the Post Office Department and every other department of this Government, a person can get into by performing political work. But I had yet to learn that that was to be a qualification for employment on the Intercolonial. There has been an agitation in this country in favour of the Government owning the railways and controlling the telegraph lines, but if the policy of the Government is to be on the lines stated by the hon. gentleman, then the sooner the people abandon the idea of Government control of railways and telegraph lines the better. I find here that Mr. Wilson was called to Moncton to investigate into the partisan conduct of employees of the Interclonial, for which he was to receive the sum of $20 or $25 a day. Moncton is the headquarters of the Intercolonial, where Mr. Pottinger and other officers are stationed, and it seems to me that if there is an order given to the employees on the Government railways forbidding them taking part in any political work, then it is within the power of the officials at Moncton to enforce that order and dispense with the services of the men who have broken it. You will never conduct a railway properly if you will bring in outsiders to hold investigations into the conduct of employees. What practical knowledge can a lawyer have of the requirements of a railway employee? If you want to get rid of the expense of holding such investigations and you have not the kind of rule I have mentioned in the rule-book, then insert such a rule, that any employee engaged in party politics will be dismissed. Your manager and superintendents will then be in a position to dismiss the men who violate the rule, and it will not cost the country a cent. Neither the present nor any other head of the department can control the Intercolonial to the advantage of the country, if you are going to continue the course you are now pursuing. I am not condemning the Minister for inaugurating a new idea, but I am condemning the system as it has existed for years. I believe that partisanship has been an influence on the railway for years to the disadvantage of the people and of those who are charged to conduct the Government railways. If you take away from the officers their right to control the men, the moment you restrict them in the management of the affairs of the road, you begin upon a course that is not in the interest of the country. I find here that Mr. William Wilson has put in his bill:

To 36 days' inquiry under commission to examine into and report upon cases of partisanship against officials of the Intercolonial Railway at Moncton, at $20 per day	$720

I can imagine superintendents and managers of railways throughout the country meeting a statement of that kind—that a lawyer who has no practical knowledge of railway matters is engaged at $20 a day to inquire into the conduct of employees on the railway. The further items of this Bill are:

Expenses at hotel at Moncton	$55
Railway fare to and from St. John, 6 trips at $3	18

Imagine a gentleman being engaged for the purpose of going to Moncton to investigate matters connected with the railway, and he paying his fare over that very railway.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman is astray. If he was better acquainted with the geography of that country he would know that the Intercolonial does not run from St. John to Fredericton.

Mr. INGRAM. And I want to tell my hon. friend (Mr. Blair)—whether he has had railway experience or not I do not know—that among railway companies, if they require to send a man for their own purposes over a neighbouring railway, they ask for transportation.

One fare, Moncton and return	$ 4 00
Coaching	3 50
Hotel expenses in St. John	5 50
Drafting two reports, $50 each	100 00

The total is $906.05. Imagine other railway companies conducting their business on that

line. They would not have a dividend once in twenty years. I am not surprised that the Government railways are going behind from year to year. I want to tell my hon. friend, as one who has had some opportunities of observing how other railways are conducted in this country as well as some of the railways of the United States, that this is really the worst I have ever noticed. I would ask the hon. gentleman to take courage and inaugurate a different system. Let him entrust his officials with greater power, and if they do not discharge their duty satisfactorily, let him dismiss them and get others who will. I am not speaking as a partisan in this case, but I am stating what I believe to be in the interest of the people as a whole and pointing out a policy that will bring about thorough discipline on the railway. The other evening I spoke about gentlemen representing constituencies through which this railway runs. I know that they must be annoyed by these people asking employment on the road, and I can imagine one of these gentlemen going to the officials and begging them to give John Brown a position, because Brown is pestering him to death. Then, again, perhaps my hon. friend from Inverness (Mr. McLennan), if the road runs through his constituency, goes to the superintendent or general manager and says that John Brown has been a partisan and has been doing all he could against him and he wants him dismissed. These influences at present work from the Liberal side. But suppose we have a change of Government and the Conservatives, returning to power do the same thing. I say it would be wrong, and you will never have discipline so long as the road is managed on that basis. Let the hon. gentleman issue a rule instructing the officials that, so long as an employee is capable he shall be retained in the service of the department while his services are required and there is work for him to do, and that in future letters of recommendation outside of the officials of the company will receive no attention. If he will do this he will save himself trouble, and, he may have the satisfaction, after the new system has had time to show its benefits, of showing a surplus on the year's operations.

Mr. BERGERON. Although it is not quite in line with my hon. friend's (Mr. Ingram's) speech, I desire to make one or two observations. Not much of this money used for paying a commission of investigation has been spent in my county. I do not complain of that, as it has meant a saving to the country. Officials are dismissed anyhow, and the investigation commission is merely an additional expense. But, in the county of Beauharnois there was an employee, a very able man who had the best certificates from his superiors at the department at Ottawa, and who received a very high salary, and he was dismissed purely and simply upon the ipse dixit of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte). I refer to the case of Mr. Danis. He was dismissed on the ground of being an offensive partisan and he was refused an investigation. He was replaced by a gentleman by the name of Brodeur. This gentleman acts for the Department of Railways and Canals, for the Department of Customs and for the Department of Inland Revenue. I have it upon very reliable authority that Mr. Brodeur is the editor of "Le Progres de Valleyfield," a Liberal paper. I do not complain of the paper, because it has been fighting me for twenty years and has never done me any harm. But I desire to draw the attention of the Minister of Railways and Canals to the fact that, having dismissed one man on the ground of offensive partisanship, he employs a partisan to replace him.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) is wrong.

Mr. BERGERON. I would ask the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals to take a note of this and let me know at the first sitting whether this man is editing this paper or not.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Oh, oh.

Mr. BERGERON. That is a fair question.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am afraid I cannot undertake to do that.

Mr. BERGERON. Here was a man dismissed for offensive partisanship, although I denied it. An investigation was refused. The man who takes his place is acting in a most offensively partisan way. If the hon. Minister could read the articles that appear against me in the paper he would know that I do not characterize the case too strongly. The hon. gentleman says he cannot do what I ask. He can do it if he wants to.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Let the hon. gentleman make a statement.

Mr. BERGERON. My hon. friend the Minister of Public Works may be sincere in what he says, but he does not know. Now, I have put the matter before the Minister of Railways and Canals and the House in a very fair way, and I will take the means of proving that this man is doing what I accuse him of doing.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am sure my hon. friend is mistaken. Somebody told me a short time ago that Mr. Brodeur was editing the "Progrès de Valleyfield." I inquired about it, and was told that it was not the case at all. If my hon. friend is in a position to give evidence, he had better do so.

Mr. BERGERON. I will make this offer to my hon. friend. If I prove to him that

this man is editing that paper, will the hon. gentleman treat him as he treated his predecessor ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will answer my hon. friend when he has made his proof. The hon. gentleman is not in a position to prove what he says.

Mr. BERGERON. I ask the same question of the Minister of Railways and Canals.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have no hesitation in saying that if the hon. gentleman furnishes to me clear evidence that this gentleman is editing the "Progrès de Valleyfield," I will feel it my duty to consider the case.

Mr. HAGGART. I would ask the Minister of Railways and Canals, when his department comes up for consideration again, to bring down to the House any correspondence between His Excellency the Governor in Council and any member of the Council in reference to dismissals for political partisanship, or any recommendation that has been made by the Council to his Excellency.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. So far as my knowledge goes, I can furnish the hon. gentleman now all the information I have. It is to the effect that there has been no correspondence, I have had none, seen none, and heard of none.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Before we pass from this department, I would like to call the attention of the Minister to a return which was brought down a short time ago giving the names of employees relieved from duty by dismissal or otherwise from the Welland Canal and the Welland Canal feeder, from the 1st of July, 1896, to the 1st of March, 1898, giving years of service, retiring allowance, and names of newly appointed employees. I see by that return, which bears the signature of the Secretary of State, that the hon. gentleman has removed no less than 147 individuals who were employed there under the late Minister of Railways and Canals, and he has lessened the burden to the public by appointing in their place, 159. I congratulate the hon. gentleman upon the master stroke of economy which he has exercised in this regard.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I feel much flattered that I should have earned the encomiums of the hon. gentleman. I may say at the same time that if there are names of 159 men, I think it will be found that some names have been entered twice. It cannot be that 159 are employed to do the work that 114 were doing.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I am astonished that this list was not a little larger. I know there are three or four where there used to be only one.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My deputy says there is no difference.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Well, I know better than the deputy. I know when the hon. gentleman was constructing the bridge last year, and when the main road was blocked for a few days and it was necessary to adopt a roundabout road through a little piece of woods, the hon. gentleman was exceedingly kind to us, and I appreciate it very much, because at one point when we did not know where to turn, he had two men at the corner to tell us, and they did their duty manfully and well.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Will the hon. gentleman tell me what point that was ?

Mr. MONTAGUE. That was in connection with the erection of the Silver Creek bridge. I may say that we have a spectacle there that we never had before in the history of public works in connection with the Welland Canal feeder. We have had a superintendent there who is a very excellent man, he is not only a good workman and a conscientious man in every particular——

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Do you mean Mr. Thompson ?

Mr. MONTAGUE. No, I mean Mr. Scott; I would say the same in regard to Mr. Thompson. Mr. Scott is in charge of the work there, he has had a large number of men engaged by the day doing work in connection with repairs. He has always selected his men, year after year, without any interference from any man. Mr. Scott is in sympathy with hon. gentlemen opposite, he voted against me, or he opposed me, I do not know whether he voted at all. But we now have the spectacle presented of no man being able to secure employment on the Welland Canal feeder or construction gang, without he has the signature of three Liberals who form the Liberal committee in that district. I am stating what I know positively. I do not get this from Mr. Scott, I do not get it from any Conservative who was ever employed on the works. It is as common talk as the debates are in this House.

Mr. McCLEARY. I want to remind the Minister of Railways and Canals of a discussion he and I had last session in reference to dismissals on the Welland Canal. When I intimated that 100 men had been dismissed from the canal, the hon. gentleman said there was not half that number. The return says there were 147. Not only ought there to be some explanation made for dismissing these men, but I think the Minister of Railways and Canals has not been at all careful as to the men who have been appointed to take the important places of

the officials that have been dismissed on the Welland Canal. Although there were 147 men dismissed, I venture to say but one investigation was held as to the reasons for dismissals. That investigation was held in connection with the foreman mechanic, Mr. Walton. The only charge, I believe, proved against him was that his daughter, in company with a number of ladies in the town in which I live, during the election of 1896, was on a platform when the then Premier of the Dominion, Sir Charles Tupper, was there, and she read an address that was presented by the ladies of the town. I am sure he was dismissed not because of any partisan action of his, but simply because the political heelers in the county of Welland had been pestering the Minister for months to do what he did. That he was an efficient man no one could doubt; that his place was filled by a man not fit for it in any way whatever can not be denied. A change has been made since, and a better man has been placed in the position. One man appointed as divisional superintendent whose qualification is that he was an ex-hotel-keeper. I know one case where a young man was placed in an important position who had never done anything but run a liquor store. In another case, where the foreman mechanic at Port Dalhousie was dismissed, the man sent to fill his place was a horse-shoer. Imagine a man appointed to take charge of thirty-five or forty mechanics, with a large planing mill and all the requisite machinery in the building, without any more ability to perform the work than a page in this House. I do not so much blame the Minister, but I blame the practice under which this can be done. I want to remind the Minister of a little debate we had last session, when he denied that upwards of 100 men had been dismissed. I looked upon the return, and I found that 159 men took the place formerly filled by 147, and I know of my own knowledge of several men who have been employed whose names did not appear on the list.

Mr. GILLIES. The Minister will remember that I asked him a question respecting a man employed as lockmaster on the St. Peter's Canal. The question I put to the Minister was:

1. When was John D. Matheson, late lockmaster of the St. Peter's Canal, appointed to that position?

His answer was that he was appointed in December, 1892.

2. Was he appointed under an Order in Council?

The Minister's answer was, Yes.

3. Were his duties performed efficiently?

The Minister's answer was, Yes.

4. Was he dismissed, and if so, why?

The Minister's answer was that he was dismissed for political partisanship.

5. Were any complaints or charges made against him; and if so, by whom?

The Minister's answer was that complaints were laid by E. T. Flynn. The Minister should have looked very carefully into the case when the complaint came before him from this particular source. Mr. Flynn was the Liberal candidate at the last election. He conducted a petition against me in a most partisan manner, although he was at the time an officer of the present Government. Last April he was appointed collector of customs at Arichat at $800 a year. He worked on the case for months against me, as he deposed at the time of the petition, although at that time he was engaged as a Government officer. The Minister dismissed John D. Matheson, one of the best officers in the service. To this statement every officer in his own department will agree and subscribe. He is no doubt aware from the slight evidence produced against Matheson that there was no ground for the complaint nor any cause for his dismissal. He took the responsibility of dismissing Matheson, although there was no more efficient public servant in the service, and this man from his appointment in 1892 down to the day of his dismissal had never taken part in politics. The Minister sent a gentleman named Patterson into the county to investigate complaints made against Matheson. I desire to know whether any part of this sum of $2,500 is intended to pay Patterson for services rendered in holding the investigation, and if so, what amount. I give the Minister notice now that I will deal with this matter again in the manner that it deserves. On the St. Peter's Canal there were seven hands employed, besides the lockmaster. They were Daniel B. Stone, Neil McMullen, Edward Linloff and K. D. Mackenzie, whose positions were permanent. The others did not occupy the same positions, but were temporarily employed, their names being Neil Mackenzie, Kenneth McKay and Damien Beranger. I asked the Minister if any complaints had been made gainst Stone. He replied that Stone was laid off and another man had taken his place as the service was being reorganized. That was not the case. The Minister's answer was incorrect, because the man was not laid off but was dismissed. He was a most efficient man; there were complaints made against him, but they emanated from political partisan sources. The same remark applies to McMullen. Linloff was dismissed without a moment's notice; he is a man with a large family, who was appointed in 1882 or 1883, and had built a small home there. He is a man well qualified for the position of lockmaster. He is able, honest, sober and trustworthy. I think the man voted for me; but when I ran my last election I never asked a single

man employed on the canal how he was going to vote. Linloff was a permanent employee. When I asked about his removal, the Minister told me that Linloff was simply laid off, and Murphy took his place. These three permanent employees were dismissed without any investigation being held and a gross injustice was done them. As to the other three men who were temporarily appointed, it was very wrong to lay them off, because they were efficient, sober and attentive in every respect, but they were not appointed by Order in Council, and were simply on during the navigation season. The others were very harshly dealt with and how the Minister came to dismiss them I do not understand. I ask: Is any portion of this vote intended to pay the investigator, and if so, how much? Why were Stone, McMullen and Linloff dismissed in the summary manner they were?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I will look a little more fully into the matter but subject to correction my answer is, that no portion of this sum will go in that way. If on further inquiry by my deputy he finds I am in error in that I will correct it to-morrow. As to the other question the answers I gave to my hon. friend (Mr. Gillies) were given as received by me, and the hon. gentleman is wrong in assuming that they were in a permanent position.

Mr. GILLIES. I am right.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The Deputy Minister says to the contrary. He says they are dropped off for a while and a period intervenes and we may or may not continue them when the canal is open.

Mr. GILLIES. The Minister will find that I am absolutely correct, and that he is entirely wrong, and that the Deputy Minister should consult his record more carefully if he gave the information now stated to the House. Stone, McMullen and Linloff, as well as those who took their places were permanently on the canal from the first of January right up to the 31st of December. They were there to attend the locks and to keep the ice clear, and to attend to other matters during the winter. The Minister should know all this before attempting to deal with this question. Neil McKenzie, Kenneth McKay and Damien Beranger were on temporarily during the summer or navigation season. I cannot imagine why the Minister treated these men as he did. If the Minister looked into the matter with the care that a gentleman of his experience and position should, he would have hesitated a long time to deal with these men as he did. The treatment of Mr. Matheson, the lockmaster, was so harsh that I cannot do justice to it at the present, but will refer to it at a future time. The Minister will yet find out that this outrageous wrong will not be permitted to go unexposed. Upon this he can rely, and he knows me well enough to know that the undertaking will be carried out. I believe that the Minister acted in this way on information communicated to him too impulsively by E. P. Flynn and other irresponsible persons who never did any good whatever to the party of which he is so distinguished an ornament.

Mr. CLARKE. In view of the disposition shown to-night by the Minister (Mr. Blair) to investigate the case presented to him by the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) may we not appeal to him, in view of the statements made by the members for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) and Welland (Mr. McCleary) to cause an investigation to be made into the Welland Canal? It is a perfect farce to have reports made to this House from time to time that men have been discharged from the public service because they have been alleged to be violent partisans, if it is a fact that no men can get employment on these public works unless they are recommended as violent partisans by supporters of hon. gentlemen opposite. It is a disgrace to the administration of affairs in Canada if the statements made by the hon. members for Haldimand and Welland cannot be contradicted. It has not been alleged so far as I have heard that the labourers who were employed from year to year on the Welland Canal acted as violent partisans. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Montague) is prepared to substantiate his statement that no person can get employment on that canal, no matter how capable he may be, unless his recommendation is signed by three well-known Liberal partisans. I appeal to the sense of fair-play of the Minister, that if there is any of this $2,500 left after paying the claims already put in, he will devote it to paying a commissioner to ascertain whether this disgraceful state of things exists on the Welland Canal, that has been related to-night.

Mr. INGRAM. Is it not a fact that the officials of the Intercolonial Railway have complained to the Minister or his deputy on account of their freedom of action being interfered with in the matter of politics?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am not informed if there has been anything very marked or very recent in that direction.

Mr. INGRAM. Has there been any such complaint to the Minister or his deputy since the Minister took office?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The officers of the Intercolonial Railway?

Mr. INGRAM. Yes.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There have been no such complaint. There is one thing that I have insisted upon and that is that upon the Inter-

colonial Railway the men and the officers should not be restrained in their freedom of action in any way. I have given the employees of the road to understand, in the most clear manner, doing so particularly during the by-elections which have taken place in those districts which are traversed by the Intercolonial Railway, that the department would not permit, sanction, or countenance, in any shape or form, any interference with their freedom of action. I have done that in the most explicit way.

Mr. INGRAM. Or the officials ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Or the officials either.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I suppose you have given the same orders on the Welland Canal ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We have not had any by-elections there.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Because, having dismissed all Conservatives, you ought to give to the gentlemen who have been appointed freedom of action.

Mr. McDOUGALL. The hon. Minister, I understand, created a new position on the railway last season in the work of ballasting. I know of my own knowledge two instances in which the men had nothing to do but to select men according to their politics for employment on the repairing of the track. That was on the Cape Breton branch of the Intercolonial Railway. These men were employed for no other purpose, and did nothing but go around with their hands in their pockets, pointing their fingers at the men who ought to be refused employment because they were not supporters of the Liberal party, and those who ought to be employed because they were.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. What are the names of these men ?

Mr. McDOUGALL. The name of one of them is Neil McNeill. He was employed in the county of Victoria. The name of the other is Daniel McDougall, filling the same kind of position in the county of Cape Breton. On the very work where he was employed, the foreman had to do the work with an insufficient staff, because they could not get Liberals enough in that particular district, and they would not take Tories. A whole train was employed doing half work, because they could not get enough Liberals.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In what district is that ?

Mr. McDOUGALL. That is the district between Grand Narrows and Sydney.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is getting better now.

Mr. FOSTER. I have a very sad case, which came under my notice to-day. This is the case of a railway porter named Pierre Michaud, who has been employed as such at the station of Trois Pistoles for twenty-five years—in fact, ever since the road has been built. He has used up the greater part of his strength in the company's service, and last winter he had his leg broken while unloading freight from the cars. This accident laid him up and has made him very poor. The only thing against him is that he objected to the station being turned into a political committee room. He has been thrown out without any consideration. The other case is that of Fred. Belanger, track foreman on this section. He has been in that position for twelve years, and was recommended to the place by the Grand Trunk Railway because of his experience. He has been dismissed, and his place has been taken by a lad eighteen years of age, who never worked on a railway. I hope my hon. friend will take note of these two cases. Before I sit down, I will make one protest against the labouring men in the employ of the Minister on Canals or on railroads being intimidated from any exercise of their political rights as voters. I do not think that is fair to the labouring men.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We all agree to that.

Mr. FOSTER. I believe that the labouring men have a grievance in that respect. Men who are wealthy and have a position can protect themselves, but the great mass of labourers in the country are intimidated by the fear of losing their situations, and consequently their freedom of political action is interfered with.

Mr. CLANCY. Perhaps the Minister of Railways and Canals can give the information which he promised the other evening with regard to the dismissal of these coloured porters on the Intercolonial Railway.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I can give the information up to date. I have a letter which I received this morning from Mr. Archibald, who is in Montreal. Mr. Archibald states that there was one, and only one, of the coloured porters who was not continued in or had not the offer of being continued in the employ, and that was one who had not given satisfaction in the service, and who could not be retained. I presume that Mr. Archibald will not be accused of having any political bias in his conduct. He has been in the service a long time, and is known not to be in sympathy with the present Government or the Liberal party, and I take it that the statement which he makes in this regard will be accepted by my hon. friends opposite. He gives the names of the different porters, and states that when it became necessary to reduce the staff in connection with the sleeping car service, and

to employ one person instead of two when the slack time came on, instead of the coloured porters being dismissed, they were retained in the employ, and were given practically as good salaries as they had been receiving before. A coloured man who is taken into the service, if he has had no experience, starts at $20 a month; if he has had some experience before, he starts at $25; and $35 is the maximum salary allowed. When their services as porters was not necessary in connection with the sleeping cars, they were offered, and most of them accepted, employment as waiters or otherwise, and were offered salaries of $20 a month and their board; so that they were doing very well.

They are down for re-employment as soon as we take on the summer service, when we shall require two men in a car instead of one as during the winter season. There was one coloured man whose name has been mentioned here, Mr. Dickson, I think. He was taken in but only remained a short time in the new employment. He assured me he could do better elsewhere and he had gone elsewhere. He is now in Toronto and it was from him the letter was read the other day. The real trouble with these coloured porters is that they are in the habit of getting tips while on the sleeping car service, and their tips amount to more than their salary, so that they are better paid than any of the employees on the train. When they drop out of that they lose the tips, and their salary does not count.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Is there not another difference, that some of them have homes of their own, and when at home the board allowance they get is of no advantage to them at all.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There would be no doubt a little difference in that respect. On the service between Halifax and Montreal they might be home a day or a good part of the day in a week, so that that would not amount to a great deal. There is no disposition on the part of Mr. Archibald or Mr. Pottinger or anybody else to pass over coloured porters, but there is every disposition to give them reasonable opportunity of employment, and when the service takes on its summer strength, some of them will be reinstated. One will not go back, but the others probably may if they desire.

Mr. CLANCY. In the meantime, the hon. Minister has not explained the statement he made the other day, that there were more coloured men employed on the Intercolonial now than at any former period. Here is something that appears rather strange. Six of those porters were employed, and in the fall, they were all either dismissed or given positions equivalent to dismissal, by that freezing out system to which my hon. friend referred. It is a well known fact that the salary of $20 per month, where they are at their own homes a great part of the time, is a very small salary, and that the men in those positions depend largely on their tips. In other words, their salaries are paid by the travelling public rather than by the railway company. It is rather strange that five out of the six—men against whom there was no complaint—were dismissed from the car service and found themselves without employment or had to take a kind of employment at such reduced rates that they were unable to live. It is unfair to say that they were offered positions, unless the positions offered were as good as the one they lost. I am afraid the hon. gentleman will have to give a better explanation than he has given so far from what appears to have been a case of drawing the coloured line. Men of that kind when dismissed find it very difficult to get employment again, because of the strong feeling against them on account of their colour. They have not the same chance in the race that other men have, and, therefore, the Government should be the more careful not to act unjustly towards them.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The item stands.

Nova Scotia—	
Halifax Dominion Building—Remodelling present system of electric lighting, overhauling gas pipes, &c., revote of lapsed amount	$ 1,000
Windsor Public Building—Reconstruction of building destroyed by fire on 17th October, 1897 (Governor General's warrant).....	15,000
Windsor Drill Shed—Reconstruction of building destroyed by fire on 17th October, 1897 (Governor General's warrant)	3,000

Mr. FOSTER. What will the Windsor public building cost?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Fifteen thousand dollars.

Mr. FOSTER. And the Windsor drill shed?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. About $6,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Both let by contract?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, the first one by day's labour. We could not do otherwise. We were repairing walls that had been destroyed.

Mr. CLARKE. What is the population of Windsor?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. About 4,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Is the whole building to be built by day's labour?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have not yet made up my mind. In a month

I will see whether it is better to ask for tenders or do the work by day's labour. I have no strong leaning one way or the other.

Mr. FOSTER. This is another of the many cases in which the hon. gentleman says he does not propose or does not know that he will propose to let these things by contract. Some time or other we will have to come to the point of knowing whether the Government is going to give up the principle of building by contract.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is no use in taking that stand. If the hon. gentleman would go back to the past, he would find that the St. John's court-house, which was destroyed, was rebuilt by day's labour at an expense of $200.000.

Mr. FOSTER. Not at all.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Do not say no. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) is wrong. He paid $200,000 for the construction of a building done by day's work.

Mr. FOSTER. No.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not say no, I have the figures here. I will give them.

Mr. FOSTER. Do not get cross.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Not at all, I am very cheerful. I have a good case.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I do not wonder that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Tarte) is delighted if he has a good case, for he has had a bad one for so long.

Mr. FOSTER. While my hon. friend (Mr. Tarte) is looking over these figures, perhaps he will allow me to ask him a question. In what condition was this Windsor building left by the fire ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It was destroyed. Only the walls were left standing and two-thirds of the walls have to be rebuilt.

Mr. CLARKE. Was it not possible to get tenders for the reconstruction of those walls ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No.

Mr. CLARKE. Why not ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Because it was not found feasible.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I think the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Clarke) is very hard to please if he is not perfectly satisfied.

Mr. FOSTER. Did my hon. friend (Mr. Tarte) want to do this work in this way in order to give work to the people of Windsor who had been burnt out ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We started the work as soon as possible after the fire in order to give work to them.

Mr. FOSTER. That is a reason.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. But that is not the reason for doing the work in this way. The building was destroyed to such an extent that it would be impossible to ask for tenders, because it would be impossible to ascertain the amount of damage. I sent down a very old employee of the department, an experienced man, and who reported to this effect.

Mr. MILLS. That building was entirely destroyed. I do not believe that there was one brick left upon another. The work is not a matter of repair, or even of reconstruction—it is the putting up of a new building. The giving employment to the people of which the hon. Minister has spoken was a good thing in itself, and I dare say that this House would warrant him in undertaking a part of the work by day's labour on that ground ; but to say that tenders could not be asked for because proper specifications could not be made out is perfectly absurd.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend (Mr. Mills) knows that section of country, and, no doubt was over the ruins very shortly after the fire. He said the building was totally destroyed while the Minister would lead the committee to suppose that the building remained but needed to be rearranged, consequently, tenders could not be asked for.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I did not say that, I said the greater part had been destroyed, and there is no doubt about that. That is the reason I am asking $15,000.

Mr. FOSTER. If the building is destroyed, it is not a class of building for which he cannot give a contract if he wishes. I see he got a Governor General's warrant for a part of the cost of this building. If he did this in order to give the people employment, that would be a very good reason, but surely, the hon. gentleman will not upon reflection say that it was a class of work that he could not easily get contracts for.

Mr. TAYLOR. I see that the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Ellis) is in the House. I suppose he would be able to either sustain what the Minister says or uphold the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Mills).

Mr. ELLIS. No, I did not go over it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. He would tell about the St. John custom-house.

Mr. MILLS. The injury to the Government building in the St. John fire is slight as compared with that at Windsor. This was a case of almost total destruction, but in St. John's it was not so bad as that.

Quebec—

Rimouski—Post office and custom-house, &c., to complete payments.. $1,500

Mr. FOSTER. This completes the thing ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. I see there is not much for Quebec here. Is there nothing for a public building at Valleyfield, which has been promised ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergeron) should not forget that these estimates are for this year. Valleyfield is very dear to me, and I will make it all right there.

Mr. BERGERON. But I would like it to be done as soon as possible. The hon. gentleman has promised Valleyfield a post office building, and they are relying upon his promises. I do not see anything in the estimates for next year.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The people of Valleyfield are highly pleased with me.

Mr. BERGERON. The hon. gentleman has given them something, but he has promised them more.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. And I always keep my promises.

Ontario—

Toronto Inland Revenue Building—To pay Toronto city corporation the Dominion Government's share of the cost of paving the lanes around this building with asphalt, as per agreement	$ 534 29
Toronto Post Office—For fitting up rented rooms at Grand Trunk Railway Union Station	1,000 00
Public Building, Ottawa—Scoria block pavement in tramway to boiler-house, Parliament Building, &c.	2,033 50
	$3,567 79

Mr. FOSTER. What is the proportion paid for the asphalting about the inland revenue building ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The total cost is $2,326. Our proportion is paid as agreed with the municipal council.

Mr. CLARKE. What about this item of $1,000 for the Toronto post office ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The Postmaster General had not enough room to handle his mail matter at the Union Station in Toronto, and we either had to erect a new building or to make an addition to the post office. We rented a room there for $450, and this is required to fit it up.

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON. With regard to this expenditure of $1,000 for fitting up this room at the Union Station and renting it for $450, I think that the money could not have been better spent by the Government. The selection of that room at the Union Station has enabled the post office department in Toronto to make considerable progress in facilitating the transmission of both papers and letters. The mail matter received from the east and west and north early in the evening is now sent out on the evening trains instead of being sent up to the Toronto post office and perhaps lying there from twelve to twenty hours, as it has sometimes done, owing to the press of business at the central post office. This expenditure on the part of the postal department has given a great deal of satisfaction to merchants and the business community in Ontario who are interested in the prompt delivery of the mails.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I wish to say a word in behalf of the gentlemen who congregate in No. 6, a large and important element in this House. The furniture of No. 6 came in with confederation, and the carpet at the same time. We do not speak for ourselves so much, because we hope to leave there shortly, and it will be in the interest of hon. gentlemen opposite to put down a decent carpet and to get new chairs.

Mr. TARTE: I will have this room fixed up.

French translators' office, Sussex Street—
Additional accommodation..... $300

Mr. BERGERON. I am glad to see the hon. gentleman making some repairs to these offices on Sussex street. They were in a terrible state. I wish to mention to the hon. Minister that the translators have no telephone, and when we want a translator we have to send a messenger down there. If we could talk to them by telephone it would be very handy.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman is right, but unfortunately I am already short in my telephone appropriation.

Summer-house—Repairing and painting, &c. $600

Mr. TAYLOR. I want to ask the Minister how it is possible to expend $600 in repairing and painting that summer-house ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Only a portion of the $600 has been spent, and some of it is now being spent. I have here the details of the whole thing.

Mr. FOSTER. How in the world could you spend $600 ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will give the explanations which have been furnished me. We have in our department a very good carpenter, Mr. Breton, who has been employed there for twenty-five years. He is a really capable man. He made an estimate of the work, and told me it was necessary to spend $600 in repairs. I referred his estimate to the chief architect, who confirmed and signed it. There was a new foundation made among

the repairs. I have complete details of the work which I would like to show to my hon. friend.

Mr. FOSTER. You can build that house for $600.

Mr. McCLEARY. It is not worth $300.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman is quite mistaken.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. member for Welland (Mr. McCleary) is a builder.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If there is a builder on the other side of the House, I am prepared to send him the estimates.

Mr. TAYLOR. If that is the kind of work done by day's work, the sooner the Minister of Public Works throws up his portfolio and gives out every job by tender the better. Any hon. member who looks at the job will say that it could be built from foundation to roof for $300. I will furnish a contractor who will put up a prettier building than this for that sum. If the hon. gentleman wants the building duplicated at the other corner, I am prepared to get the work done for $300. If that is a sample of work done under the Government it is a scandal. I was out there several times and saw a dozen men loafing and putting in time there. But it is just a sample of the way the Government is now building a fence and rebuilding the Parliament buildings, by doing work at three or four times the proper cost, in fact, simply squandering the public money. It is a most outrageous job to pay $600 for repairing this summer-house. I think one half should be struck off; $150 would be an ample sum to pay for the work done, and there is not a contractor in town who would not have taken the work of repairing it at that amount.

Mr. MILLS. We would like to know the size of the summer-house.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) has been talking in his usual way. We know he is a clever cabinet maker and clever in parliamentary affairs, and he now turns out to be a carpenter, and of course he knows all about it. I have, however, more confidence in the officers of my department than in the hon. gentleman. My chief architect is a more able man even than the hon. member for Leeds, and when the chief architect submits an estimate I accept his statement. The size of the summer-house is 40 x 40.

Mr. TAYLOR. Perhaps the foundations may have those dimensions. I have every confidence in the chief architect, but will he say that it has cost $600 to make his repairs?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. He will say so.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. Minister endeavours to throw all responsibility on the officers of the department, and especially on the chief architect. My word is as good as that of the Minister. I make this statement that if the hon. gentleman wants the building duplicated I will have it erected for $300.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am perfectly prepared to take my hon. friend at his word. There may be some good Tory friends who would be willing to put up the job. I heard that the hon. gentleman had been around the summer-house. A few days ago I asked my chief architect if he would revise his estimates and he went over them again. Mr. Ewart has told me within the last few minutes that every cent of the $600 is required. I do not shelter myself behind my officers, but as I am not an expert I accept the estimates submitted to me by the chief architect.

Mr. McDOUGALL. What wages have been paid to the men employed?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The same rate of wages as prevails in the city; some men have received $1.50, and others $2 a day.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Was the material prepared at the factory or by hand?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Some at the factory and some by hand.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Any private individual who would do the work by day's work, would buy the material at the factory.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Here is another carpenter.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I know a good deal about carpentering, and I have had enough experience to speak on it. It is well known that at the present time all this material can be purchased at the factory at half the price it can be made by hand.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have said that some parts were made at the factory and others by hand.

Mr. DAVIS. This is a very extraordinary discussion. It appears to me that the word of a Minister should be taken in this case, especially when it is supported by the statement of the chief architect. Here are gentlemen discussing this matter who are not practical men. The chief architect says that $600 is not too much.

Mr. TAYLOR. He says nothing of the kind.

Mr. DAVIS. The Minister says he says so. There are times when things do cost a great deal of money. I know that during the regime of hon. gentlemen opposite, out in my county a flagpole thirty feet high cost $150. Hon. gentlemen opposite are getting very particular now.

Mr. HENDERSON. It seems to me that throwing the responsibility of the expenditures on the chief architect is about played

out. I for one do not intend to take the word of the chief architect. I for one think the members of this House are responsible for the expenditures, and not the chief architect. I think the time has come when the Minister should cease to make that an excuse for an extravagant expenditure. Does the chief architect represent the people of this country? If he does, there would be some excuse for it, but he does not. He is simply an officer of this Government. He may be right, or he may be wrong. There are men in this House who are just as competent as the chief architect to say whether that building is worth $300 or $600. I am not a carpenter, although the Minister threw out the insinuation that any gentleman who spoke on this side of the House was a carpenter. I do not know whether he intended to imply that a carpenter's was a dishonourable occupation. To my mind, a carpenter's is a very honourable occupation.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We all know that.

Mr. HENDERSON. A week or two ago I chanced to be in the neighbourhood of this summer-house, and counted the number of painters at work there. There were half a dozen that day. I smiled and remarked, "These men know how to spend money." The men winked and smiled back and said, "Yes, they can do it." They were putting in a very pleasant time. It was utterly absurd to send half a dozen painters to work on that job. If this is the result of day's work, I think the Minister had better give up the idea as soon as possible, and adopt some other plan.

Mr. CLANCY. If the hon. Minister of Public Works defends that as a sample of the expenditure in this country and shifts the responsibility for it on his architect, I am sure this country will hesitate before they willingly believe any other statement the hon. gentleman makes. It does not require the ability of an architect or even of a carpenter to judge of this matter. A man possessed of plain common sense can see on the face of it that it is absolutely absurd that these repairs should have cost $600. I am afraid the hon. gentleman has cast a reflection upon his own officer. The people of this country will have little confidence in any one who states that the repairs on that building would cost anything like $600. I have no doubt that the money has been spent, but that it has been badly spent, there can be no doubt.

Mr. TAYLOR. I will make this statement. Let the Minister put a notice in the papers calling for tenders for the work that has been done there—and it can be easily pointed out—simply putting in a new floor around the outside of the walk, a new sill and a new railing, and painting, and if it is not done for $150, I will pay the cost of calling for the tenders.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman is altogether mistaken.

Mr. TAYLOR. I am not mistaken. I know what I am talking about. I have done as much work as the hon. gentleman, and probably a great deal more. I have erected a great many buildings, and I say that if the hon. gentleman brings a commission of three carpenters to-morrow, and they do not say that $150 is the outside price for doing those repairs, I do not know anything about the matter.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If my hon. friend is right there is no other conclusion for me to draw than that the officers of my department do not know what they are about. I am not expected to be a carpenter and I do not know anything about it. If my hon. friend is right, Mr. Ewart should not keep the position he is in now, for a man who would deceive me or make such a blunder would not deserve to be where he is. Mr. Breton is another practical carpenter and these two men have made that estimate for me. I did not make the mistake myself, if there is a mistake, because as you know I do not know a word about carpentering.

Mr. McDOUGALL. The Minister has got the political shackles on his officers and they have got to go to a certain place to get the work done and a certain place to get the lumber. Let the Minister tell his officers to get the work and the supplies wherever they like, and he will get it done cheaply.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The truth is that the men who do this work are men who have been employed for years and years in the workshops that I would not dismiss. They are old Conservatives, and I have let a lot of good old men stay there.

Mr. TAYLOR. If the Minister had gone to his chief architect and said that he wanted to call for tenders the architect would have given him the figures it could be done for by tender. But I have no doubt the Minister went to his chief archiect and said I want that report and what it cost by day's work. The chief architect no doubt knew the class of men the Minister would employ.

Mr. DAVIS. That is very far-fetched.

Mr. TAYLOR. Not a bit of it. My hon. friend beside me counted six painters out there and I counted eight walking about at $2 a day.

An hon. MEMBER. Where were you before you counted them?

Mr. TAYLOR. If these hon. gentlemen opposite want to get this item or any other item through they will respect gentlemen

on this side of the House. We pay them every respect when they are speaking, but from the commencement of the session gentlemen on this side of the House have been interrupted by three or four gentlemen opposite, whose names I will not mention, although I could. We have just as much lung power on this side of the House as they have, and can sit up just as late at night. I say for the chief architect that he no doubt framed his estimate based on the idea that the Minister would do it as he is accustomed to, by day's work, employing three or four men to do one man's work. Let the Minister call for tenders, and I will pay the expenses for these tenders if the tender exceeds $150.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. All right, I will take my hon. friend at his word. I will ask for tenders during the recess.

Mr. TAYLOR. No, no. Do it while the members are here. Call to-morrow for tenders, and it won't take any time.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Oh, that is ridiculous.

Mr. TAYLOR. You can do it easily in a couple of days. I say there is not an hon. gentleman on the opposite side of the House who will say that this is a cheap job at $600. Go out and look at the work, any of you. Is the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) in the House?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Yes.

Mr. TAYLOR. Let him look at that job out there, and see if he would pay $600 for it. I ask hon. gentlemen on that side of the House to justify the expenditure if he will not reply. Is there any gentleman opposite who would give $300 to have a duplicate of that summer-house built on his own grounds? I understood from a carpenter at work out there that under the late Government nearly all the work was prepared by machinery, but now the Minister has adopted the new plan of getting it done by hand.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have not. There is no use saying that.

Mr. TAYLOR. Well, that is what some of the men told me.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. They have not told my hon. friend that.

Mr. TAYLOR. I want the Minister to take that statement back. My word is just as good as his in this House. I saw a carpenter there boring holes with an augur——

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Would the hon. gentleman give me the name of the man who told him that?

Mr. TAYLOR. I will tell you as near as I can, but I want the Minister to first take back his statement.

Mr. TAYLOR.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Very well, if I have said anything which is not correct I will take it back. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) tell me the name of the man who told him what he says he was told?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Well, then I will accept his statement, and I will take back the expression.

Mr. TAYLOR. I do not know the man's name, but I will describe him. I asked him how long he was employed and he told me he came on so many months ago and came under the new Government, so that he is one of the Minister's own employees. He was boring holes by hand in these newell posts that are going around the railing. The Minister will know who the man was who was doing that work.

Mr. MILLS. He was a Grit.

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes, I am pretty sure he was a Grit. I asked him why he had not the work done by machinery, and he told me the department had changed their system; that the old Government had it all done by machinery, but that the present Government had it done by hand. So it costs ten times as much. That is the new system.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Why do you say that, when it is not true?

Mr. TAYLOR. That is a sample of how the vast amount of money is spent all over the country by day's work. I would like to see the details or have them read to the House so that they may go on "Hansard," that the people may know the money that has been expended on that summer-house.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will read the details, they are as follows:—

110 lineal feet of balustrade at 50c....	$ 55
2 large posts.....	15
20 small posts	20
1,650 ft. (B.M.) flooring, moulding and bases	60
Labour	125
Scraping roof, painting it and all woodwork, 1,200 square yds., two coats at 15c.....	180
Painting 80 lawn seats, two coats.....	80
Cedar	10
Unforeseen	55

Hon. gentlemen will see that it was not the building alone that was done for this, but all the surroundings and seats were painted. All those who have seen the work and who want to speak in good faith will agree that it is not expensive, if I can judge by the opinions of such men as Mr. Ewart and Mr. Breton.

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. Minister has accused his officers of not being competent. He says again that his architect is a thoroughly competent man, and he winds up by

saying that if he is so incompetent he should displace him.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I never said that in my life.

Mr. INGRAM. I draw the hon. gentleman's attention to this, that it is nothing better than what is going on in the Western block. Not later than the other day I heard a responsible gentleman say that he watched these men raising a stone there and that from the time they took hold of the stone raised it and placed it finally, it took them one and a half hours. If that is the method pursued in performing work I can understand why it has cost so much; if the hon. gentleman instructed an architect to see that the work was properly done, no doubt it could have been done for much less.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The work was under the direction and immediate supervision of Mr. Adams who has supervised public works for the last twenty years. It was he who had charge of the custom-house of St. John, under the hon. gentlemen opposite which was built by day's labour. My hon. friend speaks of the men which were employed on that building. All the workingmen there are union men, and if my hon. friend thinks I did wrong in engaging union men, let him say so. I made it a point that all union men would be engaged there so that I would be sure of having picked men.

Mr. INGRAM. That was not my statement at all but of supporters of the hon. gentleman who made that statement to me.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS The hon. gentleman should repeat a statement he has not verified. It is altogether inaccurate. The men who are working there are union men and the man who is supervising them is Mr. Adams, a man of ability and push. It is unfair for the hon. member to repeat tales which are of a nature to injure men who are doing their duty to the best of their ability. I am surprised that my hon. friend, who is himself a member of a union and takes some interest in union men, would make statements like that in the House.

Mr. INGRAM. If the hon. gentleman presses me too close, I may name my informant and he will rise behind the hon. gentleman. He did not tell it in confidence, and to-morrow, when the item comes up again, I will, with his consent, make the statement. While I like to see men fairly paid for a fair day's work, whether employed on a Government or a private building, my duty here is not that of a representative of any labour union but of a constituency comprising different classes of people, and when I see work done by employees of the Government that is not properly done, I deem it my duty to call attention to the fact. Not only one but two or three supporters of the Government can tell the hon. gentleman that a great many of these men are not given a fair day's work for a fair day's pay.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS They are wrong.

Mr. INGRAM. What about the $600 for the fire escape in the Langevin Block?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS It was not built to be habitable, and last year the Department of the Interior moved up there. There is a very large number of people employed there, and the Deputy Minister of the Interior and the Minister requested me to give them a fire escape.

Mr. CLARKE. Was that by day's labour?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS It is done by contract. Mr. Bailey had the contract.

Coteau Landing—Dredging..... $11,000

Mr. BERGERON. What does the hon. Minister intend to do in the way of dredging at Coteau Landing?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Mr. Gauthier has the work. It was not given by contract as I am paying $8 an hour, and if I get good dredges of the same quality all the time, I would pay that amount.

Mr. BERGERON. What Gauthier is that?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS Thomas Gauthier.

Mr. BERGERON. Is he doing the work himself?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS He supplied us with the dredge and also a second dredge a few days ago.

Mr. BERGERON. The hon. gentleman knows that Gauthier is not doing that work at all but has given it to Macdonald, the contractor, who has already got work at the entrance of the Soulanges Canal.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I know that Mr. Gauthier supplied me with the dredges and when they do the work, I care not whether he works them himself or not.

Mr. BERGERON. Where did Mr. Gauthier get dredges?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not know.

Mr. BERGERON. Mr. Gauthier is a real estate agent and a very respectable man but he has never done any dredging in his life. He has purely and simply been given by the Minister of Public Works that job, and he transferred it to the contractors on the Soulanges Canal, Macdonald & Co.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). Gauthier does not own the dredge?

Mr. BERGERON. No, he never had a dredge in his life and never saw the place in his life. I do not think there is in these estimates anything that shows so plainly of plain jobbery as the item we have now before us.

Mr. CLARKE. Were tenders called for in this case ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There were no tenders. I followed the custom that I found established in the department. Perhaps I have not been right. While I am on my feet I may say since criticism has been directed against this method, I have been going fully into the dredging work of the past. I have found that the work of the department dredges cost about the same as the hired dredges, and I suppose it is on account of that fact that the price was established. During the coming year, I shall try another method which may cost a little less, though I am not sure of it. I propose to try the hiring of the dredges only, we to engage the crew. As to asking for tenders, it may be as well that we should discuss that now. On many occasions it is altogether impossible to ask for tenders. The reason is obvious. Dredging work is very unequal. At times the dredge will only have to take off six inches or a foot of material at the top, while at times the dredge will have to work on a solid face of ground. In the latter case, of course, the dredge will do a great deal more than the former. In this case at Coteau Landing, the dredging will cost about 8 cents per yard—let us say between 8 cents and ten cents. It is very cheap indeed. If my hon. friend will look up the accounts of the past, he will find that they have paid at times as high as 35 cents per yard ; and to-day there are very few dredges in the Department of Public Works which can do the work for less than 10 cents or 15 cents per cubic yard. For instance, dredge No. 9 which was working in the Kaministiquia River——

Mr. MONTAGUE. Is she getting a new hull ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. She will have a new one, and I intend to leave her for work in Ontario. When I am obliged to use some antiquated, old-fashioned dredges, of course, we cannot do as much work. My officers have prepared statements and I intend to investigate the question in order to see whether the system can be changed to advantage.

Mr. FOSTER. I think this is a case which ought to attract the attention of the committee. I do not know that I ever came across a case which seemed worse than this on the face of it. In the first place, where is this place at which $20,000 worth of dredging is being done. At what wharf ?

Mr. BERGERON.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The work, as I said, is at Coteau Landing, the terminus of the Ottawa, Arnprior and Parry Sound Railway. There are 300,000 tons of freight at Parry Sound to be sent over this line. Mr. Booth has built an elevator at Coteau Landing. The Department of Public Works are doing here what they are doing everywhere else.

Mr. FOSTER. Is the Department of Public Works dredging at the terminus of every railway in the country ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We are dredging at Midland, where the Grand Trunk Railway has an elevator ; and we are spending $40,000 at the port of Collingwood—that work being undertaken under the hon. gentleman's regime. We are doing dredging of that kind everywhere.

Mr. FOSTER. In these cases the hon. gentleman has named he is making harbours for towns. But here you have simply a railway running down to the water carrying its own trade. The hon. gentleman is simply doing dredging for the railway company, that is all.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is to accommodate trade, as in the other cases.

Mr. FOSTER. That is only one of the points that struck me. The question naturally arises whether we are to dredge the end of every railway track that debouches on a river or lake. I remember that in my time we refused to do any dredging for the private wharfs in the city of St. John.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is not a private wharf.

Mr. FOSTER. If we did have a dredge near a private wharf we charged the owner so much a day. The main question is as to whether the public funds can stand the strain upon them if every corporation that wants facilities at the debouching point of its railway is to have dredging done. That is only one point. If there is a case in which a contract should be asked for and the Government allow tenders so that the country may get the benefit of the competition, surely it is where there is a large expenditure of money on work of this kind. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Tarte) does not even go to dredging men. He goes to an independent gentleman in the city of Montreal, Mr. Gauthier, who does not follow the business of dredging and does not own a dredge, and says to him: I am going to get $20,000 worth of dredging done and I will give you $8 per hour, and you furnish the dredges. Then all Mr. Gauthier has to do is to hunt up the men who have the dredging plants and make a contract with them. Now, does he get a percentage or does he not ? If he gets a dollar an hour or even fifty cents an hour it means just so much that the Government pay to him, a friend of its own, for acting as mid-

dleman. What is the hon. gentleman's department for, with his deputies, his engineers, his assistants and officers, hundreds upon hundreds of them? Are they paid for such work as that? It seems to me they are. Where are we going to stop if all these contracts are to be farmed out this way? I am not criticising this now from a party point of view. I do not care whether it was done cheaply or not, it is the farming out system against which every public spirited man protests, and must protest if he does his duty. The harbour of Toronto was bad enough, but the harbour of Toronto was done in scraps. But after all there is about $20,000 of dredging that was to be done, and Mr. Phin is middleman in that case.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. No, he is not.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. He owns a dredge.

Mr. FOSTER. But here is $20,000 worth being done at Coteau Landing, and a gentleman from Montreal is farming it out.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Well, what difference does it make whether the gentleman is from Montreal or from Toronto?

Mr. FOSTER. It does not make any difference. But does my hon. friend seriously argue that that it a proper way of doing the public works of this country?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is no use for the hon. gentleman to put on virtuous airs; I am simply following the system which he followed himself for many years.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). But the late Government never appointed middlemen.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I found the price established. I have Public Accounts showing the figures where dredging was done for the very same price I am paying here. Whether I have been right or wrong, I have simply followed the precedent that had been established for years and years. The hon. gentleman asks if we are going to build harbours for private companies. In this case I am not doing the work for a private company, I am simply dredging a channel so as to allow the barges to take freight there. I am doing at Coteau Landing what I am doing in other ports of Ontario, what I am doing at Midland, at Owen Sound, at Collingwood, at Belleville, at Picton. The dredging at Coteau Landing will cost the country 8 cents a yard, and I want to know if it is possible to get dredging done for less than that.

Mr. FOSTER. I will answer that question. By whatever amount per hour Mr. Gauthier gets his fee, by that much you will pay more per hour than you ought to pay.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman does not know that.

Mr. FOSTER. Does my hon. friend seriously state that Mr. Gauthier does that work out of pure love for him, or the Government, and that he does not have his profit upon every hour of work?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not know that at all.

Mr. FOSTER. Will my hon. friend state that he does not think Mr. Gauthier does?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am not going to inquire into Mr. Gauthier's private affairs.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the hon. gentleman tell us why he went to Mr. Gauthier; he knew he was not a dredger?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Mr. Gauthier came to me as he had a perfect right to do, and as every other man has a right to do. He offered me a dredge, and I asked him how much he wanted. Well he says, what is the usual price? and I told him. I asked him how much his dredge could do. Now, this dredge is doing 800 to 1,000 yards a day, and I say that dredging which costs 8 cents per yard is very cheap dredging indeed. No man who knows anything about dredging will dispute that. The ex-Minister of Railways and Canals will testify that he has paid as high as 20 and 25 cents; they are paying that to-day.

Mr. MONTAGUE. How many yards are to be dredged out here?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. About 200,000 yards, I think. What was the position? Here was a railway company which had about 300,000 tons of freight If we had not been able to supply accommodation at Coteau Landing, they would simply have shipped all that freight to Boston and New York instead of sending it down by the St. Lawrence route to Montreal. I did not do that alone, I was authorized by Council. I think I have made a very good thing of it indeed.

Mr. FOSTER. What I find fault with is that the hon. gentleman is farming out this dredging business at $8 per hour. It is a most vicious system. My hon. friend knew well when Mr. Gauthier came to him, that he was not the owner of a dredge and was not dredging. He knew that Mr. Gauthier proposed to find a dredge somewhere, and to make his profit upon the transaction.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Does my hon. friend think that Mr. McDonald would have asked less? Mr. McDonald knew the prices very well, and he would have asked the very same price. Of course, the hon. gentlemen are pleading for their own political friends.

Mr. FOSTER. That is a bit of unfairness that don't go down at all. Cannot

we argue this now just on the merits of the case? I want to know whether this Liberal Government proposes to adopt that system. It is a vicious system, it is a system that honest men ought not to carry out. It is open to all kinds of corruption, and the hon. gentleman is advertising to this country that he is going to farm out the public works. That is what it means, that is what destroyed the Roman Empire more than anything else, the internal corruption that took place on account of the farming-out system. My hon. friend gets up in the face of his colleagues and actualy argues for a system of that kind.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. And I rise in the face of my colleagues and in the face of Parliament to say that I am doing for 8 cents an hour dredging for which my hon. friend paid in the past as high as 35 cents.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman must be aware that dredging at one place is quite different from another. But that is not the question. The point is, that the hon. gentleman is picking out his friends and giving them contracts for dredging to the amount of ten thousand or twenty thousand dollars.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I have no information in regard to this particular dredging in question, but I desire to say a word in regard to the assertion respecting farming out this work at Toronto to Mr. Phin. This was not the case, to my personal knowledge.

Mr. CLARKE. Were tenders asked for the work at Toronto harbour?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I do not know whether the rate is too high or too low, but it has been established by the department for many years. In regard to the point about farming out the work, I say this: if Mr. Clarke wanted to do dredging work, and I knew he had a good dredge and was capable of doing it and did the work to the satisfaction of the inspector and took out the number of yards indicated, I would not ask him to make an affidavit as to whether he owned a dredge himself or had partners. Much time of the committee is spent by hon. gentlemen opposite in making assertions that are not correct. In the present case there is no question of farming out. In this particular case the contractor works on the dredge and owns the plant.

Mr. CLARKE. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman is prepared to substantitate the statement he has made. I assert that the contract was given to Mr. Phin and that he did not at the time own a dredge. He went to Mr. Coghill and hired a dredge at $22 per day; he employed his own help and received $8 per hour for every day it was there. I do not know Mr. Phin or what claim he has on hon. gentleman opposite. I contend that where there is dredging to do it should be given out by public tender, and the way dredging is done to-day is most unfair and unsatisfactory and unbusinesslike. The Minister of Public Works admitted that dredging done under the Phin contract cost 14½ cents per cubic yard. I turn to the Auditor General's Report for 1897, and I find that the dredging at Toronto was done by Murray & Cleveland at a cost of 12 cents per cubic yard. How is it that we are called upon to give Mr. Phin 2½ cents per yard more than was paid by the late Government? Why should Mr. Phin average an additional profit of $15 a day? It is a scandal and a shame that when dredging to the value of $6,000 or $10,000 is required tenders are not called for. It used to be a cardinal principle of hon. gentlemen opposite that tenders should be asked for, and I understand an Order in Council requires that if any work exceeds $5,000 public tenders should be called for. If tenders are received I have no objection to hon. gentlemen opposite, other things being equal, giving their own friends the preference, but it is not fair to the people that Mr. Phin or any other gentleman should be given the contract for dredging in Toronto when he has no plant and is a regular middleman, because he hired the dredge from Coghill and received $8 per hour when it could be done for $6, and paid 14½ cents per cubic yard when 12 cents was previously paid. The hon. Minister says that he has dredging done at 8 cents, and I ask him why then does he pay 14½ cents to Mr. Phin? Would it not be safer and would it not disarm criticism if tenders were called for the thousands of dollars of dredging, and have the work done under the superintendence of efficient officers? There would be no criticisms from this side of the House if that plan were adopted. Objection is not made because the political friends of hon. gentlemen opposite obtain the work, but because others are not afforded any opportunity to compete. It is a vicious system, and the sooner the people understand it and Government take action to remedy it the better. If I made any statement that is not true, I am prepared at any time to withdraw it.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. To my personal knowledge the hon. gentleman was misinformed. I believe Mr. Coghill never owned a dredge; if he did it was many years ago.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Will the Minister of Customs say whether Mr. Phin owned a dredge when the contract was given to him.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I understand he has a dredge.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Had he a dredge at the time of contract?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I understood so. The other night I listened for a long time to Mr. Phin being described as a painter and tailor and other trades. I knew that he was a member of a contracting firm, that he was a practical man and

had been engaged on large works such as the approaches of the Sarnia Tunnel. I believe Mr. Phin owns his plant; at all events, he is doing the work. I suppose some companies own plant, and I do not expect every member of that company to be on a dredge but some attending to business elsewhere. I consider that 8 cents for dredging is very cheap. The member for West Toronto (Mr. Clarke) has pointed out that Cleveland & Murray received 12 cents and Mr. Phin 14½ cents per cubic yard. I do not know everything about that, but I presume that in Toronto harbour it will be just as the Minister says, one place will be very much more costly to dredge than other places. That very illustration at Coteau Landing is a proof of it. If the Minister says that dredging is being done at Coteau Landing at 8 cents a yard, that does not make me believe that dredging at 14 cents in another place is money wasted, any more than it does when he says that work done under the late Government cost 30 cents. That would not lead me to believe that 30 cents was an improvident payment, because the presumption is that the work was much more difficult, and I can quite understand that, although I am not a practical man. Hon. gentlemen opposite have proceeded so long and so far upon assumptions that I knew were incorrect in reference to other points, that it makes me doubt the information they get as to all points.

Mr. CLARKE. I am prepared to make good all the information I have given to the House, and so that remark does not refer to me. I had the documents in my possession to read to the House, but I sent them home on Saturday. However, I can get them down again before the House closes and give the source of my information. I assert that Mr. Phin was given that contract without tender. He leased a dredge last year from Mr. Coghill, in Toronto, and he tried to beat Coghill down this year to a much lower figure than he paid him last year; and Coghill would not comply with that and Mr. Phin procured another dredge. I am informed that Mr. Coghill tendered to do that work to the Minister or to an officer of the department at $6 per hour, rather than the $8 per hour which Mr. Phin is receiving.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Clarke) has no intention to be unfair, but when he makes a comparison between the dredging work done by Murray & Cleveland and the dredging which is now going on in the Toronto harbour he is unwittingly unfair. My hon. friend (Mr. Clarke) must not forget that Murray & Cleveland had a contract amounting to about $300,000 in which there was a certain amount of dredging, but there was also included the erection of two long jetties. There could be no comparison between their work and the work now being done. They simply asked 12 cents or 12½ cents for that dredging in connection with all their other works, so that no comparison can be made. The only point remaining is this: The ex-Finance Minister (Mr. Foster) tells me: You have no right to hire a dredge from a man who does not own a dredge, and my answer is this: I found the precedent established; my predecessors were hiring dredges at $8 an hour, and I thought I was perfectly safe in hiring dredges on the same conditions, and then whether a man owns or does not own a dredge himself does not matter much for me.

Mr. FOSTER. If that is the policy of the Government then we understand it and we need not debate it any longer.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Will my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) permit me to finish, and then we will understand each other. I quite admit that the system which has been in existence for years and years needs revision. Since I was criticised in the House I went fully into the whole thing with my officers, and for the incoming year I will try to change the system. I cannot do more than that. I am still a new Minister. I found the system in vogue and I thought I was perfectly safe.

Mr. FOSTER. I rise to ask again: What system did the Minister find established? Did he find the system established and in operation in this country, of farming out this dredging work?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I find the system established that in 1891-92, 1893-94, and up to 1895-96 my friends were hiring dredges at $8 an hour.

Mr. FOSTER. What friends? Who were hiring dredges?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The Department of Public Works.

Mr. FOSTER. We do not understand each other yet.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am very sorry.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend (Mr. Tarte) is intelligent enough to understand, just as my hon. friend (Mr. Paterson) is intelligent enough to meet the point without quibbling around every side of it and never meeting it at all. That is not the question between us. My hon. friend (Mr. Tarte) says he found the department hiring dredges at $8 an hour. I never disputed that. I never found fault with him on that ground alone. What I find fault with him for is that in this particular case before us, not that my hon. friend is hiring dredges at $8 an hour—although I will take it upon myself to say that whether it is this Government or any other Government, they should call for tenders in the hiring of these dredges——

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That is not always possible.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, that should be the rule, and I believe it is possible if the Minister wants to make it possible. But what I want to come to is this: The hon. gentleman (Mr. Tarte), I do not think did find the system in vogue of farming out this matter of contracting for $8 an hour, of giving it to a man who is not a contractor, of going to a man who does not own dredges, going to a man who has nothing to do with the dredging business, but who simply undertakes the commission of hunting around and finding a dredge for the Minister, and the Minister paying, not the man who does the dredging, but the middleman who does the hunting around for him. That is what I call farming out. Here he takes Mr. Gauthier, against whom I have nothing. Mr. Gauthier is not in that business at all, as I understand it, and the Minister gives it out and Mr. Gauthier farms it and takes his percentage or profit upon it. Without doubt Mr. Gauthier does that. We are not children here; we know Mr. Gauthier won't take that trouble unless he gets something for his pains and if we had him here he would no doubt tell us what he did get, and that he had a right to it. Here is a $20,000 job without any contract, but Mr. Gauthier farms it out. Is that a system which we ought to carry on? That is not the system the Minister found. That is a system which he is taking up himself. If that is the statement of the Minister, and if that is the position of the Government, I will never rest until the people of this country know that system thoroughly from one end to the other. In season and out of season, that bad, and miserable, and vicious system shall be attacked just as strongly as I and those who are with me can do it, and until the country knows this thing is going on.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am perfectly prepared to take issue with my hon. friend before the country.

Mr. FOSTER. Very well.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) is pleading for his own political friends.

Mr. FOSTER. I tell the Minister that I am not pleading for my political friends.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Practically my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) is.

Mr. FOSTER. I say I am not. I say that during the late hour while we have been discussing this question, I have not thought of my own political friends, nor have I thought of party at all.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Very well; I accept the statement.

Mr. FOSTER. I am honest in my statement, I am protesting against this system, and I detest the system.

Mr. FOSTER.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. What I mean to say was that practically speaking my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) was speaking for his political friends.

Mr. FOSTER. I was not.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not mean to say that his criticism is willingly unfair, but I repeat that the system which has been followed in the past, of hiring dredges at $8 an hour ought to be revised. Let us take the case of Coteau Landing as an instance. I am doing dredging there for 8 cents a yard. My hon. friend is practically speaking for his own political friends. The Conservative party was in power for twenty-five years, and all the dredges in the country, I suppose, belonged to friends of my friends on the other side. Provided that I do not pay one cent more, I do not see why my political friends should not have their share of the work.

Mr. FOSTER. Now we have it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend knows that I am not in the habit of hiding my views. My hon. friend has been in the habit of paying as much as twenty-five cents a yard for dredging. When I do not pay anything more, I do not see why a political friend of mine should not have the same right as a friend of hon. gentlemen opposite. We are not in power simply to give everything to my hon. friends on the other side, provided public interest is served. I say again that the system has lived long enough; conditions have changed; and I think the best thing for the Department of Public Works to do is to equip itself with dredging plant, and that is why I am building this year two additional dredges. I claim that with dredge No. 9, for which a new hull is being built, I shall be able to dredge for four or five cents a yard, what hon. gentlemen opposite in the past paid from 15 to 20 cents for. The system has to be changed; but I claim that I have committed no wrong. In this case, I went before my colleagues and obtained an Order in Council. I did not ask for tenders—first, because there was no time to do it; and, second, because I was following a precedent already established. But I repeat, I will revise the system, after going carefully into the figures with my officers.

Mr. CLARKE. May I ask, how many yards have been dredged at eight cents a yard at Coteau Landing?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am told that there have been about 10,000 yards, but I would not pledge myself to that.

Mr. CLARKE. As the hon. gentleman has frankly admitted that he has come to the conclusion that the system is wrong, may I ask him if there will be time to call for tenders at Kingston?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend forgets that we are doing our work with our own dredge there.

Mr. CLARKE. I am glad to hear that. If the hon. Minister would keep dredges and do the work himself, he would save the expense of the middlemen. I understood his arguments to be that his political opponents had been in power so long that their friends had all the dredges, and his political friends who got the work had not dredges, and would have to rent them from political opponents.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Some of them have dredges.

Mr. CLARKE. I do not find fault with the hon. gentleman giving work to his political friends if their tenders are equally low with others. What I protest against is giving this work out without calling for tenders.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It was done in that way in the past.

Mr. CLARKE. If that is the only justification the hon. gentleman has to offer, I have nothing to say but this, that I would be very pleased if for the future he would either call for tenders or have the Government dredges do the work.

Mr. HAGGART. Is there any necessity for dredging there at all? If I remember rightly, the steamers of the Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company go to the wharf What depth are you going to dredge?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Fourteen feet. I am dredging the channel to enable the boats to come and take the freight there.

Mr. BERGERON. These barges have to go through the Beauharnois Canal, which has only nine feet of water.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Now that we are deepening the canals, it is better to dredge the channel there.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I understand that the point raised by the hon. ex-Minister of Finance is in regard to the status of the parties to whom dredging is let. I think it only fair that the Minister should bring down the names of the parties to whom dredging was let by the late Government. From personal knowledge I do not think many of them had a knowledge of dredging.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. Minister says that Mr. Gautheir came to him and offered dredges. I would like to know who gave Mr. Gauthier the information that a large amount of dredging was to be done, and how he came to offer a dredge when he did not own one? I would like to know if any of the hon. gentleman's officers approached Mr. Macdonald, who had dredges and was doing work.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I never approached Mr. Macdonald.

Mr. TAYLOR. I would like to know how Mr. Gauthier knew that this large amount of dredging was to be done. I would also like to know if Mr. Gauthier, besides being a political friend, is not a relative of the hon. Minister.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am not a relative of his at all.

Mr. TAYLOR. Is not the hon. Minister's son married to Mr. Gauthier's daughter?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I could not help that surely.

Mr. TAYLOR. Surely this is farming out in the family, if this be the case. I have received this information, and it certainly shows a case of farming-out in the hon. gentleman's own family.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. This is a question in the public interest put by the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster). The public interest, of course, is not served, but on the contrary, it is injured if higher prices are paid than were paid before. He had not found fault with what was done before.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend is not representing me rightly. I have stated over and over again, that contracts ought to be called for. Now, I want to argue this question fairly, and I put it to my hon. friend, whose moral sense ought to be strong, whether he is willing to stand up to-night and to argue in favour of the system of farming-out this dredging work. I thought that the position of the Minister of Public Works was bad enough before, but his last attempt at explanation makes it ten times worse. He acknowledges the whole thing. It is a little piece of political acuteness. All the Tories have the dredges, and there was no chance for the Liberals to make anything. Therefore, the hon. gentleman did not call for tenders, but gave the contract to his friends, and let them farm it out to the Tory who had the dredges. We cannot, as a Parliament, subscribe to that condition of things.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The point I wanted to make, when the hon. gentleman interrupted me, was this. He used the term farming-out. Eight dollars an hour is being paid now. I understand the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) to admit that that is precisely what was paid by the late Government. If that be the case, and there is the same supervision by the same Government officers, the country is not losing unless the price has fallen in the meanwhile. The hon. gentleman admits that we are getting the same work done for the same money as the old Government did.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, suppose you do.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. But he says the country loses the difference between what the man who runs the dredge charges and what the other man gets. That does not follow, because the owner of the dredge, in the other case, would get precisely the same money. I think the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) is unfair when he seeks to show that the country is losing money whereas it does not lose any money.

Mr. CLARKE. With reference to what the hon. Minister has said, so far as I am personally concerned, I differ entirely from him as to whether the country is losing money or not by adopting the plan followed by the Minister of Public Works. The argument of the hon. Minister is that the present Government are doing exactly the same as the last Government did, and the country is not losing anything because we are pursuing the same course. Well, if the system is wrong it ought to be remedied. I repeat that my information is that Mr. Phin did not own a dredge when given a contract in Toronto harbour. He paid $20 and $22 per day to Mr. Cargill for the use of a dredge. No matter what course was adopted by the late Government, if that course were not in the public interest, it ought not to be adopted by this Government. I think it is in the public interest to call for tenders for dredging work, and am pleased to hear the Minister of Public Works say he would press the Government to change the present system.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman should extend the system of tender to everything he buys. When I was controlling the Railways and Canals Department of the Government, I made it a point not even to buy a pound of nails or a gallon of oil without public tender. I required requisitions from the officers, and in case of any dispute as to the standard of the materials furnished, I always referred it to the school of science at McGill, Montreal. There is no reason why every bit of material from one end of the country to the other should not be got by tender. Not a pound of nails, not a gallon of oil, not a single bit of material used by the Government should be bought in any other way. Let there be free and open competition.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) is mistaken; he forgets facts that he ought not to forget.

Mr. HAGGART. I do not forget anything—not even the Curran Bridge.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In that case it was not given out by contract. the work was simply farmed out. The day's labour was farmed out, to the knowledge of the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Haggart) himself. And yet the hon. gentleman says that he never did anything as a minister except by public tender.

Mr. HAGGART. Nor did I. Not even in the Curran Bridge.

Mr. TALBOT. You farmed out the labour.

Mr. HAGGART. The labour was received by tender. The material was furnished by tender, every bit of it.

Mr. DYMENT. If the hon. member (Mr. Haggart) called for tenders for all the work done under his control he was most unfortunate in some of the tenders he received. Contracts on the Sault Ste. Marie Canal were sublet for just half of what he paid.

Mr. HAGGART. But it was let by tender. If the gentleman farmed it out, it was no fault of mine. The contract was let by open competition.

Mr. DYMENT. And the work was done at half price.

Mr. HAGGART. I do not know about that. The contract was made by my predecessor, but I know that the gentleman who got the contract tendered.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The result of the tender system must be bad if the hon. gentleman as Minister could let a contract at, say, $1 and have it sublet to an American contractor for 50 cents.

Mr. FOSTER. Then the hon. gentleman is opposed to the tender system?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. What I say is that the facts given by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) seemed to be against it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not wish to discuss the system of tenders generally; but when the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) says that he adopted the tender and contract system for all the supplies on the Intercolonial Railway, I can only say that he is mistaken. I know Liberal firms in Halifax and other places in the maritime provinces who were not permitted to sell a dollars worth of material to the Intercolonial Railway. I am not saying now what is right and what is wrong, but when the hon. gentleman says that he adopted that system I can only tell him that he is utterly mistaken.

Mr. HAGGART. I am not mistaken, I found some persons in Halifax and some in St. John who were in the habit of furnishing some things to the Intercolonial Railway. The system was all changed and a new one was established from end to end of the system, extending to even the small purchases.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not know that any good object is to be obtained by our contradicting each other across the floor. But if the hon. gentleman will look into the facts and inquire of the officials, I am confident he will find that he is wrong.

Down to the change of Government in 1896, full supplies were got without public tender, and leading firms in Halifax had no opportunity to tender for this business.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The Deputy Minister stated that when he was on the floor of the House the other day.

Mr. CLARKE. I understand that the Minister of Public Works has agreed, at the suggestion of the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) to bring down the names of all the parties competing down to 1896. Will the hon. Minister bring the facts down to the present day ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Resolutions to be reported.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies) moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to and the House adjourned at 2.45 a. m. (Tuesday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 7th June, 1898.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

PRAYERS.

EXPENDITURE ON PRIVATE PIERS AND WHARFS.

Mr. MARTIN. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would ask the hon. Minister of Public Works when the return he promised of the expenditure by the Federal Government on private piers and wharfs will be down.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I promised my hon. friend to bring that down to-day. I will take a note of it, and as soon as my deputy is here, I will instruct him to have it brought down.

THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 163) to grant further aid to the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal (Mr. Fielding).

SUPPLY.

The House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Kingston Harbour—Dredging $6,000

Mr. FOSTER. In the last discussion the hon. Minister promised to give the cost of the ordinary dredging.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If my hon. friend would kindly wait until the Supplementary Estimates are being voted and my deputy is here, I shall give him the information. I have had a full statement prepared, but have not got it under my hand.

Stikine River—Examination, &c..... $14,000

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Mr. Coste has gone up with the boat "Sampson," which was employed on the Fraser River to remove snags. He has brought out all the material necessary to improve the channels and make a survey. My intention is to give him a credit of $30,000 for a survey of the Stikine River and for improvements on the Stikine and the Hootalinqua and Lewes Rivers. He is starting from the Stikine River en route to Dawson in order to make a survey of the navigable rivers and the most urgent improvements.

Mr. FOSTER. You have practically given him carte blanche.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, I could not do otherwise. We are working in an unknown country, and I gave him carte blanche recommending him to be very careful.

Mr. SPROULE. By this vote you could only use the money for the Stikine River ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend is right. The wording should be changed to make it read "on the Stikine and other rivers in the Yukon district."

Mr. EARLE. I know something of the Stikine River ; $14,000 will do all the work necessary on that river. Fourteen thousand dollars will pay for all the work that is necessary to be done on the Stikine River this year. The work is not heavy, but it is expensive work, and certainly work necessary to be done.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I thought so.

Dredging—Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick..... $10,000
Dredging—Quebec and Ontario..... $10,000

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I move that the first item be reduced to $8,000

and the second to $3,000. Having looked into the matter, I find that with this we shall have enough to work our dredges.

Mr. HUGHES. Where is this $3,000, appropriated for Ontario and Quebec, to be spent?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is for dredges already at work. One of them is at Midland. I cannot recall the names of the other places at the moment.

To pay W. C. Harris, architect, for professional services rendered, 1887 to 1894, in connection with the construction and maintenance of Public Buildings, Harbour Works, &c., in Prince Edward Island..... $142 05

Mr. FOSTER. How is it this was not paid before? There was a vote.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). I went to the then architect, Mr. Fuller, at Mr. Harris' request and he told me that the bill was all right and he had been trying to get it through the Estimates. When, last year, my hon. friend asked me to look into it, I was able to say that I knew all about it; that I had been trying to get it for Mr. Harris.

Mr. FOSTER. It is all right, is it?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes, he is a good Tory.

Excise—
Further amount required for contingencies..... $4,500
Further amount required for preventive service..... 3,000

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). This appears to be a very large amount for contingencies. Will the hon. Minister kindly explain.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière). I am glad my hon. friend (Mr. Wood, Brockville) has asked for an explanation, as I would not like to take up the time otherwise, but I desire to lay the facts before the committee.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Carried.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. There is no deficiency in the department——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Carried.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I suppose it is all right.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). Still, I would like the explanation.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. It will only take one minute. We have a number of temporary employees who cannot be put on the salary of permanent officers and we have been obliged to take from contingencies in order to pay them. But though this has to be voted there is no deficiency but, on the contrary, a surplus in the department, as we have not expended the sums voted by Parliament. I hope I shall be able to have the temporary officers pass the examination and be appointed as permanent officers, so that we shall no longer have to pay them in this way.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Carried.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). It is very evident that hon. members do not want to get away and if they are willing to stay, I am. But the hon. Minister has only gone over the revenue and expenditure of his department. How many temporary officers are there?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. There are 22 in the excise branch; 11 appointed by my hon. friend (Mr. Wood, Brockville) when he was head of the department, and 11 by myself. We cannot get these officers appointed permanently as the examination, which they must pass is held only in November of each year. I was going to notify them that if they will not qualify themselves by passing an examination next fall, they will have to look for some other employment.

Mr. MILLS. The Minister and the House being in such a good humour, I think I should not allow this opportunity to pass without pressing upon the Minister something to which I have already called his attention, that is, the appointment of an excise officer at Springfield, by the name of Lambert McNayr. I know very well that a recommendation coming from me will meet with the approbation of the Minister, and no doubt he will accede to my request.

The PRIME MINISTER. Hear, hear.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I would like to know how this $3,000 for preventive service is paid.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. As my hon. friend knows, the raising of the tariff, both on spirituous liquors and on tobacco, has given rise to a great increase in smuggling. We have been obliged to act with much more activity than heretofore, and this is the reason why we have been obliged to ask for this extra amount. When one compares the number of seizures made during this last year with the number that are generally made, one can see the ground for this increase. I may add that in 1894-95 the amount voted for the preventive service was $15,800, which is $800 more than we are asking this year, with this additional sum of $3,000. The difficulties we have to encounter are so much greater, that the House will understand why we have felt obliged to ask for this sum.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I am not altogether satisfied with the explanation the Minister has just given. When the duties were increased upon tobacco, it was pointed out from this side of the House what the

result would likely be. I have no doubt it has to some extent led to an increase in smuggling that article, without a corresponding increase in the revenue. That was pointed out. I think the hon. Minister will find that this vote in 1895-96 was reduced down to about $7,000 or $8,000, and it would have been just as well if the Minister had said that in 1895-96, under the old regime, that vote stood at about $7,500. Now, in the last session of this Parliament the hon. gentleman raised that to $10,000, and he gave the very same reason for the increase he has given to-day, that is, that, owing to the increased duties upon tobacco, there was an increase in smuggling. In the main Estimates an additional vote of $2,000 has been asked for, bringing the vote for the preventive service up to $15,000. Now, I do not think myself that this vote ought to be adopted by the committee, because it forms a very convenient fund for the Minister to avail himself of in order to supply the pressing demand of political friends for appointments. Persons appointed to do that work are not required to pass any examination. I wish to point out to the Minister that the policy of the department at the time the old Government resigned was to impress upon the permanent staff in each of the inland revenue districts the necessity for acting in the interests of the service in the way of detecting smugglers. It is as much the duty of the permanent staff to do that as it is of the preventive officers. A circular was sent to all the officers notifying them to that effect, when the vote was reduced in 1895-96, and I think, with very good results. The committee will understand that in the matter of smuggling tobacco and of illicit distillation, there is seldom a case detected. But it comes down to this, that it is only to protect the department in enforcing the regulations regarding the importation of tobacco in packages, that this work is necessary. I think the increased vote since the hon. gentleman assumed office is larger than necessary for the proper protection of the revenue service.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I will not try to exculpate myself from the charge of employing those votes for political purposes; I think it would be perfectly useless to try to do so. When, last year, in good faith, I asked for an increase, it was because last year the duties were raised both on tobacco and on liquors; therefore, I foresaw that we would eventually have much more work to do in order to protect the revenue. Since then we find the work we have to do is in excess even of what we anticipated, and that is why we are obliged to ask for this increased amount. I need not say that I have tried to the best of my ability to do my duty fairly, and to serve the country. I am sorry that we have had to exceed the amount which was allowed to us last year. I would like to notice, however, that notwithstanding the increased smuggling of tobacco and liquors, the revenue has actually increased on tobacco especially, owing to the increase in the tariff on tobacco from 10 to 14 cents. We have actually collected more on tobacco than we collected the year before. We have about $150,000 collected on tobacco more than the year before, notwithstanding the smuggling incident upon the increased duty.

Mr. WALLACE. Would the Minister give us the figures for the two periods?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I have a statement up to the end of March, because it will be remembered that this question came before the House early in the month of April, and my hon. friends mentioned the great deficiency we must expect in the collection on tobacco, so these figures are only for the first nine months. I have taken three years, beginning with the first nine months from the 1st of July, 1895, to the 31st of March, 1896. The collections on tobacco, cigars and cigarettes were $2,230,000. For the same nine months in 1896-97, the collections were $2,308,000. For the nine months of the current year, we got $2,634,000 on tobacco and cigars. Furthermore, we got $100,000 through the customs collected on tobacco in virtue of the new tax, so that altogether, for the first nine months of the current year, we got $2,735,000. So the excess of the collections this year on tobacco and cigars over 1895-96 is $502,000.

Mr. WALLACE. Would the Minister give us tobacco alone, separate from the cigars?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I have got them together. I would have to make a new circulation. I may explain why the difference now is not so great as it was then. In May the revenue fell very much as compared with the revenue for the preceding nine months. So that at the end of last month, including cigars and tobacco, the revenue only exceeded that of last month by $133,000. The idea of raising the tariff was not only in the hope of getting a higher revenue, but in order to meet the wishes of the agricultural class and encourage the growth and cultivation of tobacco. To give an idea of the results, I may say that for the first nine months of last year only 300,000 pounds of Canadian tobacco were manufactured, while the quantity for the last nine months exceeded 1,200,000 pounds. The result has been an increase four-fold in the production of Canadian tobacco, and not only Canadian tobacco consumed by the farmers, but the quantity manufactured in factories. It may be said that this increased quantity of Canadian tobacco will reduce the revenue from imported tobacco. It will no doubt displace 900,000 pounds of imported tobacco, on which a duty is collected of 35 cents, compared with 5 cents on the Canadian article.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I wish to refer to a matter left over in the main estimates in relation to the establishment of wheat standards in Manitoba and the North-west. Has the department made any changes in the standards as they found them when they assumed office?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. The principal change is in regard to excluding frozen and smutty wheat from the third class. When I entered the department I was carried away by the enthusiasm of some hon. members of the House who wished the department to raise the standard of wheat, first class from 60 to 62 pounds and second class from 50 to 60 pounds. Fortunately before the project was carried into effect I realized that it would be a mistake, so we left the standard and classification as we found them, and only strengthened the restrictions in relation to smutty and frozen wheat.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I regret that time does not allow the committee to go into this important subject which has caused much agitation among the farmers in Manitoba and the North-west for many years, a difficulty which the Minister apprehends more now than when he assumed charge of the department. Smutty wheat was never allowed in Manitoba No. 1 hard. Is it the intention of the department to sanction any changes being made at the meeting of the Board of Standards at Winnipeg? Has the Minister had any correspondence with the Winnipeg Board of Trade on the subject?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. It is not the intention of the department, unless very good cause is shown, to sanction any change in the standards. In my opinion they are high enough already. I tried to make them higher, but fortunately I stopped in time, and acknowledged the mistake I made. It is important there should not be too much red-tape in matters of this kind. Providence has given, such bountiful harvests and rewarded the work of our farmers by giving them such good prices for their produce that I would be very sorry to do anything that would interfere with the success they have achieved. About six weeks ago a deputation called at my department and they suggested that we should appoint a commission in order to investigate the whole question, but after consulting with my officers I hesitated in view of the cost that a commission would entail, and more especially as we know pretty well where the difficulty lies. The principal complaint is about mixing the grain after it leaves the elevators at Fort William and Port Arthur, but when once the grain in inspected we cannot help the mixing of it and in many cases the grain is shipped without being inspected. I do not think it right to meddle with the standard of weight without having very strong cause. I nearly burned my fingers by meddling with it the first year and prudence dictates that I should look into the matter very carefully before taking action.

Mr. McDOUGALL. What about this weights and measures vote?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. The Auditor General refuses to pay temporary officers out of the salaries voted for permanent officers and so we have to pay them out of contingencies.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). We will assume that the total amount voted by Parliament last session was not expected by the hon. gentleman on the general administration of the department, as happened every year I had any thing to do with the department. There is always a large surplus, comparatively speaking, over and above the general expenditure which Parliament voted for the Inland Revenue Department. I want to point out that during my time we always estimated in such a way that we never required so large an amount as this to be voted for contingencies. Is this large excess required to meet the expenditure necessitated by the appointment of new officials?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. It will be seen from the accounts of the weights and measures branch that our receipts this year were considerably higher than last year, and, as my hon. friend (Mr. Wood) knows if you want to swell your receipts in that department you have to increase your expenditure. You are obliged to send your officers travelling into the remotest parts of the country in order to inspect. As my hon. friend (Mr. Wood) did, we have not exceeded the total vote of that department.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). It means that this large addition to the contingencies account is caused by the addition of extra men, because the hon. gentleman (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière) estimated sufficiently at the last session of this Parliament to meet the general expenditure of that branch. I would like to know how many extra men have been added to this branch since the last session?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. We have not got extra men. We have the same temporary men we had last year but we have extra expenditure. Those temporary men are paid out of the contingencies and their salaries amount to about $4,500, and the remainder is for the expenditure in connection with the revenue. In last year's Estimates the salaries of the weights and measures branch were $7,000 less than the last year. In last year's Estimates we asked $49,010 while this year we are asking only $42,010. We are doing our best to reduce the expenditure in the department, but it is not so easy to make reductions as in other departments which are carrying on

considerable work and making great outlay. All our outlay in the Inland Revenue Department is to pay salaries or travelling expenses and matters of that kind. Last year we superannuated 11 officers in the department of weights and measures, and this accounts for the diminution in the vote.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). A year ago the hon. Minister asked for a reduced amount for his branch on the ground that he was saving expenses by lessening the number of officials. The increase this year is caused by an increase in the number of officials.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. No. There is another decrease of $7,000 this year. Last year I asked for $49,010, while this year I ask for $42,010. So we are continuing to decrease the expenses. If I had been allowed to take from the money voted for salaries the amount required to pay the temporary officers and the extra expenditure required on account of our more active inspection of weights and measures, I would not have required to ask for this vote, but I could not mix the two things together; and since we have borrowed from contingencies in order to pay our temporary officers, I am obliged to ask that this money be recouped. At the same time, deducting this $6,000 from the amount allowed us, it still leaves a balance in favour of the department.

Mr. McDOUGALL. I wish to call the attention of the hon. Minister to a vacancy in the weights and measures inspectorship for the district of Cape Breton.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I have undertaken to replace Mr. Tremaine; but there have been some difficulties in the way, and in the meantime I send an officer from Pictou in order to make the inspection of the scales at the coal mines. According to law the inspection is to be made only once in two years? But I think it is perfectly ridiculous to inspect only once in two years the scales of coal mines which are so severely tried by enormous weights being dumped upon them every day. Last year I took upon myself to send an officer to inspect those scales, and in the Weights and Measures Bill this year I have provided for a more frequent inspection of all scales subject to severe strains, such as those used in elevators, at coal mines, and in connection with railways.

Culling timber $1,345

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I am very sorry to observe that the expenditure in this very effete and useless department shows an upward tendency. It has been, I think, well understood by this House for many years that the expenditure of that department should be decreased, to say the least. Four or five years ago, we introduced some very important changes, largely reducing the expenditure of this branch. It is an expenditure which I have never hesitated to say ought not to exist. The people of this country ought not to pay all the expenses of keeping up a culling branch for the benefit of the exporters of square timber going down to Quebec, because that is what it amounts to. There was a period in the history of the country when there might have been some necessity for its existence; but like everything else that obtains a strong foothold, it has been easier to establish it and continue it than to uproot it. The late Government, finding a strong opposition to the abolition of that branch, undertook to place it on a better footing by decreasing the expenditure all round, with the view of very soon doing away with it; but I see here an increase in the expenditure, especially in the item of contingencies.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. My hon. friend is sorry to find that increase of expenditure, and I would feel very sorry too if I were not glad; because I have the best reason in the world for explaining it. During the first nine months of last year the revenue was $6,380. This year, during the same time, the revenue has been $12,372, double what it was the year before. The second point is this: Perhaps my hon. friend has forgotten a detail which I mentioned to the House last year when I asked for the increase of this branch by getting two new cullers appointed. We received petitions from all the leading houses connected with the timber trade, representing that there were only four cullers left by the late Government, who were quite unequal to the extra work that had to be done, and offering to tax themselves 25 per cent more in the fees they paid for culling if we would appoint two cullers named by themselves. One was O'Brien and the other Kelly, two men who were so favourably known to the timber trade that they actually proposed to increase the fees they paid for culling in order to meet the salaries of these two cullers.

Mr. POUPORE. Would the Minister say whether the office is self-sustaining under the new provisions?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. The office would be much more than self-sustaining this year but for the fact that the revenues have to pay not only all the working expenses, but $6,200 for the retiring allowances of the twenty-two cullers who have been removed.

Mr. POUPORE. Does the Minister expect that under this arrangement the office will be self-sustaining in the future? Because the square timber and deal trade had diminished so much in Quebec that it was thought unnecessary to have so large an expenditure for this service, and that the office should be made self-sustaining.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. There are only six cullers now, after the

addition of the two I have mentioned. Those two are paid for by the timber men, and my hon. friend must be aware of the petition for their appointment, and no doubt signed it himself. In the first nine months of this year we have collected $12,372, and if it were not for the retiring allowances of $6,200 which we have to pay, the institution would be self-supporting.

To provide for the printing of law stamps.. $500

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. There has been no expenditure for law stamps since 1892. The revenue is from $4,000 to $5,000 annually, and the stock now purchased will last several years.

Mr. McMULLEN. I find that the clerks of the Supreme and Exchequer Courts get a commission for selling law stamps. I should like to know why that is allowed. The registrar of the Supreme Court gets $2,600 a year and $600 a year as editor of the reports, and a commission of $132 on the sale of law stamps. The registrar of the Exchequer Court gets a salary of $2,000, and an additional $225, and a commission on law stamps sold last year of $174.85.

Mr. HAGGART. There should be no commission paid an officer who receives a salary.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend will have to renew his question when the Solicitor General is in his place.

Amount required to cover the expense of fencing, &c., in the Rocky Mountain Park of Canada $25,000

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. This is for the purpose of keeping in a herd of buffalo. The range is 400 or 500 acres, fenced partially by the mountain, partially by water, and the balance by this fencing. We have three buffaloes there, presented by Mr. Blackstock, of Toronto, and there is a herd of seventeen or eighteen presented by Lord Strathcona, which is at present at Winnipeg, and fourteen of which are to be moved to the park.

To provide for expenses of commission in Crow's Nest Pass Railway inquiry.... $6,500

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON. I had intended to speak last week, when my hon. friend the junior member for Pictou (Mr. Bell) raised the question of the Crow's Nest Pass work; but I am not notoriously friendly to the Canadian Pacific Railway, and I thought I would give careful reading to the report of the commission, and thus escape the charge of prejudging the case. I have read the report of the commission very carefully, and, as the Government is apparently not contemplating any immediate action, I am going to say what I have to say here and now. I suppose that this House will be asked to accept the theory that the sufferings of these unfortunate men on the Crow's Nest Pass work were unavoidable accidents.

I am convinced that the outrages which the report of the commissioner records were not accidents. These outrages were incidents in a conspiracy to steal the labour of hundreds of our fellow countrymen for the benefit of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Apologists for the Canadian Pacific Railway can talk as they please about Mr. Haney and the sub-contractors of the Crow's Nest Pass road; Mr. Haney and his understrappers may be more or less responsible agents of that conspiracy, but the real authors of that conspiracy are the rulers of the Canadian Pacific Railway. What have we to do with Mr. Haney and his understrappers? The Government did not negotiate with Mr. Haney, but dealt with Sir William Van Horne and Mr. Vice-President Shaughnessy. It is all right for these gentlemen to hide themselves and their corporation behind Mr. Haney and his assistants. The Canadian Pacific Railway did not hide itself behind Mr. Haney last session, when it was trying to tap the treasury for enough money to build this railway. Parliament has to accept the responsibility of giving that money to the Canadian Pacific Railway, and Parliament has the right to ask that the Canadian Pacific Railway, including its president, Sir William Van Horne, and Mr. Vice-President Shaughnessy, yes, and every director of the road—shall accept responsibility for the crimes and outrages which have marked their use, or rather cruel misuse, of this country's money. If these men were underpaid, and starved, and in some cases left to die, they were wronged as a result of the policy adopted for the construction of the Crow's Nest Pass Railway. This policy which doomed its unfortunate victims to starvation and death was not the work of Mr. Haney or his assistants. They were merely the hands entrusted with the work of carrying out the policy which originated in the greed of the Canadian Pacific Railway government at Montreal. I cannot believe for one instant that Mr. Haney was sent out to the Crow's Nest Pass road to improvise a system of stealing enough labour to build that railway. I am persuaded that he had to accept a ready-made system of tyranny, cruelty and oppression. Mr. Haney had to look for his orders to the men who employed him, and, in this Crow's Nest Pass work, Mr. Haney with the other tools of the company was simply working out the plans of those who sent them. I find in the report of this commission proof that the Canadian Pacific Railway proposed to take the labour of human beings at wages which would allow a hard working man to pay his own way, without one single cent for his wife or children, and, at the end of a year's hard work, he would have a profit of something less than $6 over and above all expenses. I maintain that when the Canadian Pacific Railway decoyed, enticed and entrapped men to the Crow's Nest

Pass work on these terms, its proceedings amounted to a conspiracy to steal the labour of helpless men. I only use the word conspiracy to describe the method of the Canadian Pacific Railway because I cannot find any stronger word in any dictionary in the Parlimentary library. I am not, however, interested in Mr. Haney or humbler individuals. It seems to me that they simply carried out a system of oppression, tyranny and robbery. They seem to have worked the system to the very limit; but I do not believe that they created that system. That system was created by the magnates and rulers of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Let me say again that the Government of this country did not make any agreement with Mr. Haney or his hired help. The Government dealt with Sir William Van Horne and Mr. Vice-President Shaughnessy; and the Parliament which voted such an enormous subsidy to the Canadian Pacific Railway which these men represent has a right to fasten full responsibility, yes, the fullest responsibility upon them for the terrible wrongs and atrocities that have been done by their agents.

The Crow's Nest Pass road bargain, Mr. Chairman, ought to have satisfied even the gluttonous greed of the Canadian Pacific Railway, apart from the coal lands which Messrs. Cox & Jaffray and other friends of the Canadian Pacific Railway grabbed from British Columbia. The Canadian Pacific Railway itself got over three million dollars of cold cash from the treasury of this country to build a railway for its own profit and, incidentally, for the benefit of the country. The Canadian Pacific Railway got the price of the road from the country, and yet it must start in to plunder the poor, helpless labourer. That great corporation puts one hand in the national treasury and the other in the pockets of its victims. The Canadian Pacific Railway is big enough to snatch the dollars of the country, and is small enough, contemptible enough to steal the pennies of the workingmen. It is as clear as daylight; it is perfectly clear to me that the plunder, the swindling of the workingmen was the head and front of the Canadian Pacific Railway programme for the building of the Crow's Nest Pass road. I suppose that the Government is to blame, but how could the Government be expected to know that the Canadian Pacific Railway would be guilty of the crimes and atrocities that are disclosed in the report of the Crow's Nest Pass Commission. I have never shared the admiration for the Canadian Pacific Railway which inspires both political parties in this House, but until I was confronted with evidence from which there was no escape, I was not prepared to believe that so great a corporation could be so short-sighted as to adopt a policy which forced its agents to do what has been done for the benefit of the Canadian Pacific Railway in this Crow's Nest Pass work.

There seems to be no limit to the grasping greed of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The country has gorged it with money until it has accumulated power to rob the country; and it appears to me, after reading the evidence that it has accumulated power to murder the citizens of this country. I suppose the only satisfaction this country will get will be that, some day or other, we shall see Sir William Van Horne in the attitude of the late Boss Tweed asking "What are you going to do about it?" That is the question—What are we going to do about it? I appeal to the Government, to every honest member of the Government, to act in regard to this matter in such a way that the people of this Dominion, the people of this continent—yes, the people of the world at large, may know that the Parliament of Canada has a care for the humblest of Her Majesty's subjects. I have read carefully of the sufferings of my two young fellow-countrymen of Nova Scotia, and I felt humiliated as a Canadian that Canada should be disgraced by such barbarity. As a member of this House I feel humiliated that Her Majesty's Government through the apathy of the Deputy Minister of Justice should sit with folded arms while the agents of the Canadian Pacific Railway were using the technicalities of the law to browbeat and silence the honest men who were trying to expose the cruel neglect by which these young men were done to death. I am strongly in favour of economy in the expenditure of every department of Government, but, Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to vote for any appropriation that may be necessary to track down the perpetrators of these crimes of the Crow's Nest Pass. I hope that this Government will make and quickly make a searching and drastic inquiry into the question of the responsibility of the Deputy Minister of Justice for suppressing the inquest into the death of these young Nova Scotians; and, if he has failed in his duty, I for one shall be prepared to vote for his instant dismissal. I trust that the Government will act courageously in the whole matter regarding what has already been done, having given this report my most careful consideration I am surprised that the commissioners have not suggested some definite means of bringing the offenders to justice. I am not singular in holding this view, there is a considerable amount of criticism in the country, that the report of the commission is lacking in this particular. I should look, Mr. Chairman, for the real criminals at the head office of the Canadian Pacific Railway, at the Windsor station in Montreal, some day when the board of directors is in session. And if justice were done, the president and vice-president and every single director would, at the very

least, be brought before this House to answer to the question why the country's children should be robbed and murdered by their greedy handling of this country's money. If any hon. gentleman thinks that robbery and murder are words too strong to be used in this connection, I can only say that my belief is founded on the evidence I have read that the way the Canadian Pacific Railway paid these men was robbery and the way it used these men was murder.

I find that there are precedents in the records of the Imperial House of Commons which would justify Parliament in calling on the Canadian Pacific Railway directors to account for the wrong done under their auspices.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). I would suggest to my hon. friend (Mr. Ross Robertson) that there generally sits beside him a director of the Canadian Pacific Railway. He might begin with him.

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON. I do not bar any director of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. But the hon. gentleman ought to begin with the gentleman beside him.

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON. The director of the Canadian Pacific Railway who sits in this House is amenable to you as well as he is to me, and he is as open to criticism by me as he is to the hon Minister of Trade and Commerce. In 1881 a Select Committee of the British House of Commons was appointed to inquire into the question of the hours of labour in the railway service. The committee took the evidence of a man named Hood, station master on the Cambrian Railway. This station master in his evidence stated, as to the work of signalmen on the road, in connection with an accident that occurred, and that he had to work for thirty-six hours at a stretch.

The select committee adjourned for recess, I suppose that means prorogation, and in May, 1892, the attention of the committee was called to the fact that Hood had been dismissed from his position as station master on the Cambrian Railway. His dismissal was summary, and he had served this company faithfully for over twenty years, the select committee decided that his dismissal was in consequence of the evidence given by him before the commission at the session of 1891. The select committee decided to report the entire matter to the House of Commons. The chairman of the select committtee, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, presented the report of the committee, and it was agreed that the dismissal of this man Hood constituted a breach of the privileges of Parliament, and the directors of the Cambrian Railway were summoned before the bar of the House to receive a reprimand at the hands of Mr. Speaker. You will find these facts in the diary of the Salisbury Government 1886 to 1892, by Henry W. Lucy. I do not know, Mr. Chairman, much about the technicalities of constitutional or parliamentary law: but it seems to me that if the Imperial Parliament could call the directors of the Cambrian Railway to account for the dismissal of one employee this Dominion Parliament ought to have something to say to the directors of the Canadian Pacific Railway for the robbery, for the death and murder of so many of its employees in the work on the Crow's Nest Pass Railway. Their method of spending the money so freely voted to the Canadian Pacific Railway by Parliament, constitutes, to my mind, as grave a breach of parliamentary privilege as was committed by the officials of the Cambrian Railway, who dismissed the station master Hood because of the evidence he gave before the parliamentary committee. I would sooner see the authors, the perpetrators of these crimes on the Crow's Nest Pass road serve a term in jail at the hardest kind of hard labour than receive a reprimand at the hands of the Speaker, but if the arm of the criminal law is not long enough to reach them, I think that at the very least they ought to be brought to the Bar of this House.

Mr. CLARKE. I will occupy the time of the House for but a few minutes, recognizing the desirability of expediting the business of the House as much as possible. Unlike my hon. friend from East Toronto (Mr. Ross Robertson), I have not had the opportunity or advantage of reading the report which has been presented by the commission appointed by the Government to investigate the methods adopted in the construction of the Crow's Nest Pass Railway; and I have had to depend upon a synopsis which has appeared in one of the papers of the report which was presented to the House. I cannot, therefore, speak as definitely or as positively as my hon. friend who has just addressed the committee can speak, but I am bold to make this assertion, Mr. Chairman, that if the analysis of the report which I have read correctly epitomises the report itself, the methods adopted on that work are the most disgraceful that have ever been written in the history of the development of this country. I have no hesitation in saying that the record which has been presented to the public in the report of the royal commission discloses a condition of affairs in connection with the construction of this railway that is a disgrace to Canada that is a disgrace to civilization. Why, Sir, the hon. gentleman who has just spoken has told us what the net result would be on an able-bodied man working on that road for twelve months. According to the synop-

sis which appears in one of the papers, if I may be permitted to quote two or three lines from it:

A man living in this city, Ottawa, and working the average number of days per month that it is possible to work, 21½, and receiving $1.50 per day for every day which he worked, would, at the end of 12 months, when he returned to Ottawa, have only the miserable pittance of $5.10 left.

This is the condition of affairs brought about by a system of tyranny introduced and practiced by the contractors and sub-contractors that is an abomination and a disgrace. The findings of the commissioners are of themselves sufficient to justify the Government and Parliament in taking the most drastic measures that are possible or that can be devised, to compel the contractors and sub-contractors to recoup those poor workingmen and their families for some at least of the losses which they have sustained by the treatment which has been meted out to them. The commissioners' findings, as I see in this report, are practically as follows:—

The company and its contractors have not lived up to their agreement with the workingmen.

No arrangements were made to receive the men upon their arrival at Fort Macleod.

The men were compelled to sleep on frozen ground in the open air without blankets or shanties, open cars or tents, without fire of any kind.

No measures were taken to keep the men clean—in fact, the surroundings were simply disgusting. They were kept in filthy hovels, swarming with lice and vermin, and without ventilation or light.

The contractors were undoubtedly to blame for having allowed the men to sleep under tents in January, with thermometer down to 30° and 40° below zero.

The food given to the men was in many cases frozen, and in any case bad.

The men were subjected to all kinds of bad treatment when they dared complain.

The men were charged for the transportation of mail which they never received.

The men were left at Fort Macleod many weeks without work, and when put to work were charged for board during the time they were idle.

They were made to pay railway fare both from and back to the east, in contravention of the contract by the agents.

Some of the contractors and sub-contractors charged exorbitant rates for the food and goods furnished the men.

It is clearly established that the men were deprived of medical care when sick.

The men were dismissed without any reason given, and were left hungry, cold and moneyless to find their way home.

Sick workingmen were refused food, and in some cases sub-contractors, when they refused to work when ill, dismissed them.

The wages paid the men were not high enough to meet their expenses.

Now, surely, Mr. Chairman, that is a finding on the part of the royal commission that justifies the use of the strongest possible language with regard to the treatment which has been meted out to these men. I think the finding of the commission will justify the Government of Canada in taking prompt and energetic measures to correct the abuses and the evils which have characterized the construction of this road up to the present time. I say that whatever action the Government takes they would be heartily supported by both sides of this House, and by the people of this country, although I suppose that nothing that can be done will wholly right the wrongs which have been perpetrated on hundreds, if not thousands of the people of Canada who have not been able to make their voice heard as potently as it ought to be heard, and whose grievances remain up to the present time unredressed. I do not wish to prolong this debate, but I desire to emphasize the view that the Government would be justified in resorting to almost any measure, not only against those who have been the authors of those grievous wrongs upon those poor labourers, but against any official of the Government who has been so negligent in his duty as to have made no effort to prevent these wrongs being perpetrated, and by whom no inquiry has been made up to the present time into the sad circumstances surrounding the death of those two young men from Nova Scotia, who were allowed to die like dogs without medical attendance and without fire, in the depth of a Northwest winter. It is a sad and disgraceful story, Mr. Chairman, and I repeat that I hope every power that is available to the Government will at once be put forth to redress the wrongs of those who have been so grievously outraged. The Government may rely, I repeat, upon the hearty support of members on both sides of this House in bringing to speedy justice those whose conduct has been so reprehensible.

Mr. INGRAM. I think that the Government ought to appoint a commission for the purpose of inquiring into the general management of railways throughout this country. I heard a statement made by the Minister of Railways and Canals yesterday that is not in accordance with the facts. Some discussion has arisen with respect to the rules and regulations that are about to be enforced on the Grand Trunk Railway system throughout the country. He stated that the only objection the men had to these rules and regulations coming into force was that they had not had sufficient time to understand them. Now, I know, as a practical man who has had experience with the different railways of this country that certain of those rules and regulations are inhuman. I would like to ask any hon. gentleman in this House how he would like to stand on a box car for miles in cold winter weather, when there is no necessity for doing

so. I know that men are forced to do so on the Grand Trunk Railway, the Canadian Pacific Railway, and other leading railways in this country; they are compelled to do two men's work in place of one, and if they decline to do so, they are dismissed from the service. I know, as a fact, that in years gone by men were employed as baggage men and express men, each having a separate department; but to-day the same man does both express work and baggage work, and it is impossible for any one man to do that work satisfactorily.

They make mistakes with respect to express packages and are held responsible, having in many cases to pay for losses, the result of the men being overworked. A commission should be appointed to inquire as to the excessive amount of work these companies are compelling the men to perform. Reference has been made to the Crow's Nest Pass road and to recent occurrences there, and no doubt every hon. member has received letters complaining of the way the labourers employed on that road were treated. As, however, the matter has been fully explained by the hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Ross Robertson), I have nothing further to say on that point. But I desire to ask the Government, if they are aware that rules and regulations respecting the railways are changed almost from day to day. Even men who have been employed twenty or twenty-five years on a road are not able to carry out the rules and regulations of any company. Certain rules are placed in the rule book that the company knows no practical man can carry out; in fact, if he attempted to carry them out he would be dismissed from the service. They are put there for the purpose of protecting officials of the company from actions for damages, and so on. It is impracticable to carry them out. So I say that when the Governor in Council is called on to approve the rules of a railway company, the persons who are to carry out those rules and regulations should be consulted, as well as the railway corporation, before the Governor in Council sanctions them.

Mr. WALLACE. I think this is a matter that involves the most serious and prompt attention of the Parliament of Canada. The hon. member for East Toronto said the Government should see the directors of the company about this matter. I think we should rather see the Government direct, it being responsible to Parliament, and the Government, having the facts before them, because the commission went west many months since and made an investigation and returned long ago. The very day they returned they were able to give the salient facts of the case and a general statement of the case to the Government, and the Government were bound to take immediate action and protect the lives of our citizens there and give justice to those men who have been so inhumanly treated. When we remember that for the construction of the Crow's Nest Pass Railway, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company has been given the enormous bonus of $11,000 per mile, and the Government when they proposed to Parliament that amount were aware the contract would be given to another company or to some middlemen, and when, by its charter, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company obtained the control and ownership not only of the timber lands and such agricultural lands as might lie in the locality, but also enormous coal areas unequalled on the continent of America, the property being subsequently acquired by a syndicate composed of Cox, Jaffray & Co., and their colleagues, it is evident that the Government should have safeguarded the public interest. From statements brought out in the committees and in the newspapers it appears that the Canadian Pacific Railway and this syndicate which acquired the coal lands obtained property far more than sufficient to build the Crow's Nest Pass line. Men went out there and became sick; it was considered the best think to do was to allow them to die and be buried and then they could no longer be troublesome. I hold the Canadian Pacific Railway Company directly responsible as well as the Government, which well knew these facts months ago, and yet they made no effort to protect the lives of the men working on the road. We have all heard statements of the ill-treatment to which these men were subjected. Every hon. member no doubt has received correspondence with respect to the matter, but until the report of the commission was published by authority, we were not in a position to realize the cruel barbarity perpetrated on these workingmen. We can fairly demand from the Government that steps be taken to remedy the gross injustice done to these men who have been lured out west to build this road, many of them going at a time of the year when the greatest precautions ought to have been taken to protect them in the arduous work they were called upon to perform. But we have received no information from the Government in respect to this matter. I should like to hear from the right hon. First Minister what steps have been taken or are proposed to be taken in order to remedy a state of affairs that has proved a disgrace to the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am exceedingly sorry to think that the men sent out to the Crow's Nest Pass road have been treated in the very barbarous manner stated and proved by the investigation which has taken place. In justice to the Canadian Pacific Railway I am bound to make a statement. I wrote to Mr. Shaughnessy, the vice-president of the Canadian Pacific Railway, asking him if a number of men from my constituency

went out to work on the road he would give them employment. He said he would ask Mr. Haney to do so, and stated what wages were being paid. He sent instructions that enabled them to get out there at the rate of 1 cent per mile, with the understanding that they would give them a return ticket at the same rate. I forget the arrangement in detail. After arriving out there within a few days they telegraphed to me that they could not stand the work, that the general treatment was not at all what they expected. I immediately wired Mr. Shaughnessy and asked him to immediately forward instructions to the manager to have these men sent home and give them free transportation. He complied with my request at once. He telegraphed Mr. Haney to give free transportation to the men as were not satisfied. He furnished it, and the men returned. I cannot say whether the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have been fully cognizant of all the wrongs perpetrated there or not. I would hardly think they would be, but certainly the man who has been guilty of the inhumanity that has been outlined by that report deserves some punishment. There is no question about that. It is hardly fair to load the officials of the Canadian Pacific Railway with the entire responsibility. They may not have been aware of all that has taken place. I know that in my case Mr. Shaughnessy treated the men I sent out most liberally. They were not satisfied with the work and with the board, and he immediately ordered that they should have free transportation home.

Mr. WALLACE. All the workmen have not a prominent supporter of the Government at their backs.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. The speeches which we have heard from hon. gentlemen this morning are worthy of the most earnest attention of this House. That this great Canadian Pacific Railway corporation, which has for long been made almost free of the public purse of Canada, which has been so largely bonused and endowed by the people of this country, and which for the building of the Crow's Nest Railway received such munificent assistance from the Parliament of Canada, that this corporation should have been guilty of such conduct as has been proven by the report of the commission to investigate the grievances of the men employed, is, to me, beyond comprehension. I do not wish to dilate upon this subject, but it certainly appears to me to be very remarkable that there is not a remedy in view, and I hope that the Government and the members of this House will not allow the matter to drop.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. I trust that there will be a full and free investigation so that the responsibility may be placed upon the proper shoulders. If there is no legal punishment that can be inflicted upon the men who are guilty, I trust that they will be held up to the obloquy and the contempt of all the people of Canada.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I think that the House will at least be of the opinion that the Government have not been dilatory in this matter, and that they have proceeded as hastily as it was possible for them to do. Complaints were made some time last fall of the treatment which the men were receiving on the Crow's Nest Pass Railway construction work, and the Government at that time thought it advisable without losing a moment's time, to have a commission appointed to proceed to the Rocky Mountains and to investigate the matter. The selection of the commissioners, I think, gave universal satisfaction, and judging from their report they acquitted themselves efficiently. I must observe to my hon. friend (Mr. Wallace) that when the commissioners came back from the west they had not completed their labours but continued their investigation here, and examined witnesses in Ottawa, Hull and Montreal. It is only a couple of weeks ago that the Government received the report of the commissioners. Now, I believe everybody will admit that in the pressure of business incidental to the closing of the session, the Government has had no time to look into this report and to take action. But, it must be one of the earliest duties which will engage the attention of the Government as soon as the session is over to consider this report, and to see what steps can be taken to further the ends of justice. Unfortunately whatever may be done at the present time, yet as is always the case under similar circumstances, there are wrongs which are beyond the power of being remedied; there are wrongs which must ever stand against the good name of Canada. For these, I cannot see any possible remedy whatever. In some cases, however, it may be possible to bring the culprits to justice, and if that duty devolves upon the Government certainly the Government should not hesitate one minute to perform it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The PRIME MINISTER. I had not the opportunity of hearing all this discussion, but as I came into the Chamber I understood that I heard the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Clarke) imputing blame to some officer of the Government, I do not know to which officer he particularly referred. The words I took from the hon. gentleman were: He hoped that if any officer of the Government had been instrumental in preventing justice from being done that officer would be dealt with. I can assure the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clarke) that that is a duty which is in the hands of the Government. I can assure the hon. gentleman

(Mr. Clarke) that if any officer of the Government has in any way contributed to the ill-treatment which was inflicted upon these men, or contributed to prevent justice from being meted out to the guilty parties, that officer can expect no mercy at the hands of the Government and he must be treated as he treated others in this respect. I would like to have from my hon. friend (Mr. Clarke) or from any other gentleman who has given attention to this matter, some particulars, and I would like to know if they can tell me where the blame lies, which is the officer of the Government who has been guilty, which is the officer of the Government who has been negligent in this matter.

Mr. CLARKE. If the right hon. gentleman refers to the discussion in this House a few days ago and which was introduced by the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Bell). I think he will find some remarks made by the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) in relation to his efforts to get an investigation into the death of these two young men.

The PRIME MINISTER. So far as I understood the discussion the other day, I understood some blame was attached to Mr. Justice Rouleau for having interfered with the coroner holding the investigation.

Mr. FOSTER. That was not stated by the hon. member for Pictou, because in the conversation I had with that hon. gentleman, he intimated to me that as a matter of law he would not be prepared to say that Judge Rouleau had not done his duty.

The PRIME MINISTER. I do not say that the statement was made by the hon. member for Pictou, but I said that from the discussion which took place on that occasion I inferred that blame was attached to Judge Rouleau, for having issued an injunction against the coroner. Judge Rouleau has acted in the discharge of his duty and I do not see that we can interfere with him, and in a sense Judge Rouleau is not an officer of the Government; he is not responsible to us. If there is any other officer of the Government implicated I would like to have my hon. friend tell me.

Mr. CLARKE. The officer of the Government so far as I have referred to him, is an officer in the Department of Justice. A recital of the facts in the House the other day related here that efforts had been made by a gentleman in this House to have an investigation take place and the paltry information that he got was that there was no appropriation for the purpose.

Mr. OLIVER. As reference has been made to the discussion which took place the other day, and as there has been a reference to my action in this matter, I say that I am not in a position to state what are the duties of the officers of this Government, but I will say that in my humble estimation—and I make the charge on my fullest responsibility as a member of this House—that the reason that justice was not done in the case of the two men, Macdonald and Fraser, was because the Deputy Minister of Justice, Mr. Newcombe, refused to put the machinery of justice in motion in that behalf, although requested to do so by myself repeatedly.

Mr. INGRAM. Will the right hon. the Premier give a promise to this House that in future commissions appointed to inquire into matters concerning railways, he will appoint some practical man on the commission. I will state my reasons for this request. I have a case in point now of an engineer on one of our leading railways who was a great many hours on duty, and when he asked to be relieved from duty he was refused permission, and in consequence of refusing to go out was dismissed from the service. We must all recognize that when employees, especially engineers, are a great many hours working on a railway they are liable to fall asleep, and thus not only endanger their own lives, but the lives of the travelling public. For that reason I think it is only fair that a practical man should be put on such a commission. Judge Dugas or Mr. Pedley were certainly not practical men, and it would have been very serviceable to them if they had associated with them a third party who understood something about the construction of railways, and the way in which men ought to be treated in the construction of railways.

The PRIME MINISTER. Perhaps it would be well to dispose of one item of the discussion before we go to another. I may say, in answer to the hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Ingram), that the Government, in the commission they appointed on this subject, endeavoured to carry out the very suggestion which the hon. gentleman now offers to the House. The commission was presided over by Mr. Justice Dugas, and everybody will admit, I suppose, that to carry on an investigation of this kind, a judicial gentleman, with legal training and accustomed to such work, is most acceptable. Then we asked the labour organization to have a representative to represent them; and on their representation we appointed Mr. Appleton to look after the interests of the organization, as this was chiefly an investigation into an alleged wrong committed on labouring men. Coming back to the question put by my hon. friend, I understood that the party he had in his mind and whose name he did not utter, is the very officer who has been just named and designated by the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver)—the Deputy Minister of Justice. Do I correctly understand the hon. gentleman?

Mr. CLARKE. That is quite right.

The PRIME MINISTER. I am not prepared to say at this moment, as I have already said, that we shall be in a position to deal with this question in the dying days of the session; but, as I have said, this is one of the subjects that must engage our attention as soon as the session is over, and, of course, the first duty of the Government, before any other is undertaken, will be to call the Deputy Minister of Justice and make him acquainted with the grave charges which have been made against him today on the floor of this House.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I may be allowed to say one word appropriate to what the hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Ingram) has brought to the attention of the House. I am in receipt of a communication, which to my mind is of very great importance on that subject, and one which ought to be brought to the immediate attention of the hon. Minister of Railways. It appears that in the old rules the following rule or regulation was inserted :—

> No excuse for neglect of duty on the ground of overwork can be accepted. No man is compelled or expected to work if he reports himself as unfit for duty, either from want of sleep or from any other cause. But when trainmen report themselves for duty and take out a train, they are expected to keep wide awake and continually on the alert, and it must be distinctly understood that a violation of the rules or failure of duty cannot be excused on the ground of want of rest.

It appears that in the new rules, which have received the sanction of the Government, that rule, so important to the public safety, is omitted. I have discharged my duty in drawing the attention of the Government to that fact, so that they may take prompt action to see that that very important rule, the most important to my mind of all the rules governing the train service of the men, is re-inserted.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). In bringing this matter before the House, I did not intend to reflect at all on Judge Rouleau. I merely pointed out the fact that he had delayed his decision for two months. I did not attribute any motive to him for this delay, because I have no right to do that; but the result of his delaying his decision for two months was to make it impossible that the inquest should be continued. Another coroner, two months after the death of those men, could not ask a jury to view the bodies, so that the interruption of the action of Coroner Mead practically put a stop to the inquest. Where I think the responsibility lies is in the Department of Justice. I do not at all mean to say that I am going to blame the Deputy Minister of Justice. I think the Minister of Justice is responsible. It is rather extraordinary that this House should be asked to believe that the Department of Justice are going to throw the responsibility of their neglect, if neglect has occurred, upon their deputy. I will briefly recite the facts of the case. Early in March I put on the paper a notice of motion for all the papers in connection with this matter. I waited a month in order to get an opportunity to make that motion. At last I formally made the motion. A month afterwards, I called the attention of the Government to the fact that I had not received the papers, and I gave the Premier a memorandum in regard to them. Two or three weeks afterwards I repeated that I had not received the papers and again sent a memorandum to the Premier. A fortnight afterwards I wrote a letter to the Minister of Justice, saying that I had moved for these papers and that I was very anxious to get them. I have never received the papers, and I have never even had the courtesy of a reply from the Minister of Justice. It is evident that the effect of all this conduct on the part of some one connected with the Department of Justice, has been absolutely to quash this inquest. It has absolutely destroyed all the evidence on which the friends of the men who were murdered—I do not think that is too strong a term—could secure redress in some form. The great object on the part of the Canadian Pacific Railway, or Mr. Haney, their contractor, was to protect the company from money damages, and they have succeeded, largely in consequence of the inaction of the Department of Justice. The cardinal moment was when Judge Rouleau took the very proper course of telegraphing to the department for assistance. That assistance was never received, and in the presence of the hon. member for Alberta was refused. There is great blame attaching to somebody connected with the Department of Justice.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). Is it not fair that Mr. Newcombe should be heard before he is absolutely condemned ?

Mr. BELL (Pictou). I am not charging Mr. Newcombe. I am not, nor is any person in this House, disposed to charge anyone but the Minister of Justice and the Government of which he is a member.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). That is not correct. Mr. Newcombe was expressly charged and named by one hon. member.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). I am not charging him.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) did.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. And the hon. member for Toronto.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). I am sure it is not creditable to the Government to try to shoulder the blame for this upon the deputy. That is not what we are disposed to do. We have nothing to do with the deputies. My

remarks with regard to my attempt to secure information from the Department of Justice did not apply to the deputy. I have never spoken to the deputy at all. I dealt entirely with the Department of Justice through the Government, and so far I have never had even the courtesy of a reply.

Mr. MONTAGUE. No one has been attacking the Deputy Minister of Justice, and all the little anger shown by the members of the Government on that score, if not assumed, comes in virtually in defence of their Minister of Justice. No one in this House supposes for a moment that the Minister of Justice was not acquainted with the facts. When telegrams were sent to the Minister of Justice on such an important matter, the deputy would undoubtedly consult his Minister, and the Minister is responsible for the acts of his deputy in such matters.

Mr. CLARKE. The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce said that I made charges against the Deputy Minister of Justice.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). I did not refer to the hon. gentleman at all. I referred to the other member for Toronto. The hon. gentleman is not the only member for Toronto.

Mr. CLARKE. I mentioned the name of the Deputy Minister of Justice, and I do not desire to recede from the responsibility of having done so. Unfortunately, I was not present at the discussion on the motion of the hon. member from Pictou (Mr. Bell), and had to depend on the report in "Hansard" of the proceedings on that occasion. What I did say, when I was addressing the committee, and when the right hon. First Minister came into the Chamber, was that if any dereliction was shown on the part of any officer, I hoped that the Government would not be slow in meting out justice to the offender. I repeat that now with all the emphasis of which I am capable, in the hope that if the Deputy Minister of Justice or the Minister of Justice himself, or both, were derelict in their duty, the Government and the country will punish them roundly and mete out to them the justice they deserve.

Resolutions to be reported.

The PRIME MINISTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. CLARKE. Before we rise, might I ask the right hon. First Minister if any information or request has been received by the Government, during the past 48 hours, from the Imperial authorities, respecting the deportation of Senor Carrenza and Senor Du Bosc.

The PRIME MINISTER. I am sure my hon. friend will admit that any communications which may have taken place, we are not in a position to give to the public.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 1 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Second Sitting.

TUESDAY, 7th June, 1898.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

SUPPLY.

The House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

To provide for expenses of commission in Crow's Nest Pass Railway inquiry.... $6,500

Mr. BERTRAM. Before this item is passed, I wish to say a word in connection with this commission of the Crow's Nest Pass Railway. I have read the report of the commission, and there is one thing that the finding has established beyond doubt, and that is that a great wrong has been perpetrated upon a large number of men who were working on the Crow's Nest Pass Railway. That wrong is something that reflects dishonour on Canada, and whoever may be responsible for it—whether it be the contractors, the general manager of construction, or the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, they ought to be made to suffer for that wrong. I am sure that the Government and the Parliament of this country will not tolerate such a state of things in this Dominion. I cannot help thinking, on looking over the report, perhaps rather hurriedly, that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company did not exercise that due care they ought to have exercised in the construction of a work of this kind, more particularly when a large amount of the public money of Canada was going into its construction. I think it was the bounden duty of the Canadian Pacific Railway to see to it that the men who went up to work in that region should at least be properly fed and properly housed. They do not appear to have been properly fed and housed; and there appears also to have been great opportunity for disagreement as to what they were expected to receive in the way of wages. It is certainly a fact that cannot be denied that men who were working for a considerable length of time after paying their board and transportation charges and other charges deducted from their wages, had practically nothing left. I do not wish

to detain the committee, but I must say that I trust the Government will see that it is their duty to do everything that lies in their power to bring in some remedy, so that such a condition of things cannot exist in the future and that some one shall be made to suffer for the wrongs already done. When I read the report, I felt that I should like to hear at least the reply of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. I say that any employer of labour with such a damaging statement made against him as is made by the commission against the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, should see it to be his duty to set himself right, if he could, to show that his name was not tarnished. So, I believe it would be the duty of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to try to meet this very serious charge brought against them—because it is a very serious charge. I was glad to hear the words of the leader of the House that he would consider it to be the duty of the Government to take steps immediately after the close of the session to see what can be done in this matter. Language cannot be too strong in speaking of a report of this kind. I admit that it might make some change in one's feeling on the matter if we had the complete reply of the company to some of the statements made, but, as I have said, enough has been established by the commission to show that grievous wrongs have been perpetrated upon a large number of Canadian working-people. Therefore, I hope that the expression of opinion in this House with reference to this important question will have a deep effect upon the Government and will show that this Parliament will not stand idly by while wrongs of this kind are being perpetrated.

Mr. JAMESON. I have much pleasure in endorsing the opinion of the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Bertram), who has just resumed his seat. I had, perhaps, more opportunities than many members of this House to learn some of the facts, living as I do so close to the scene of action. I knew, perhaps seven or eight months ago, how the Canadian Pacific Railway Company had been treating their men, and I think there is no question that this is one of the most disgraceful episodes in Canadian history. I believe in no other case has a great railway corporation taken advantage of its immense power to oppress the people under its control to the extent that the Canadian Pacific Railway has done. I must say that I am not surprised at it. I have lived in the North-west for seventeen years, and the course that this company has adopted towards the settlers there has been quite in line with their action in this matter. The people of Canada are beginning to realize that it is about time that something should be done to prove that the people are the masters and not the servants of this railway corporation. As we hope so soon to be free to go home, I do not intend to take up much time; but I have here a brief synopsis of what has been proved by the commission as to the action taken by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in this matter. This is taken from the "Voice," the labour organ in the city in which I live:

> Exorbitant prices have been charged to the men for overalls, shirts, tobacco and other things. Overalls were charged for from $1.25 to $1.50, and prices paid for them in Winnipeg by contractors were from 55c. to 63c.

You can see from that, Mr. Chairman, that the systematic robbery was going on by the authority and under the direction of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

> Complaints of the cost of transportation from Macleod to the works were loud and frequent.
>
> Working the possible average number of days, labourers paid at the rate of $1.50 a day would, after deducting his expenses, have at the end of the year $5 each. Working 26 days in the month, he would have $86, and if paid $1.75 and charged $5 a week for board, and working 21½ days per month he would have $21 at the end of the year.
>
> The men found that after working two, three or four months they were not in a position to provide the necessaries of life for their families, and having to pay his fare home it was impossible ever to see his family under these conditions. Under such conditions, the commissioners say, the labourer felt like a prisoner in a strange land, and many of them started for home on foot, to walk from 1,000 to 2,500 miles, and instances were found where remnants of food, orange peel, and so forth, thrown by passengers from the passing coaches were used to satisfy the hunger of these men.

Now, I do not wish to detain the committee. I rose, in the first place, to express my sympathy with the statements made by most of the members who have preceded me. I wish also to make a suggestion to the Government. The Government should do something. We are giving to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company the sum of $3,500,000 for building this railway. Now, the workingmen on this road have undoubtedly suffered grievances. There have been violations of contracts with these men; there have been deaths caused by the negligence of people under the charge of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Now, though we cannot restore the lives of these men, we can certainly do something to force the Canadian Pacific Railway to pay damages, pecuniary damages, for their sufferings. These outrages occurred where there are no courts practically; and for many other reasons, it is impossible for the wronged men who are still living, to obtain redress from the courts. They cannot sue, they have not the means to sue. What the Government can do is to retain out of the subsidy enough to compensate these men or their relatives for the damages which they have suffered. I think it is the duty of the Government to devise some means by which that can be done.

The people of Canada should not pay this $3,500,000 to this company when it has been proved so conclusively by agents of the Government, by men specially appointed by the Government, that these damages had been incurred, that these violations of contracts have been suffered. Let the Government, by Act of Parliament, or by appointing a commission, or in some other way so provide that sufficient money shall be retained to compensate these men for the grievances they have suffered.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I spoke on this question very briefly the other day, but there is one point to which I wish to direct the attention of the Government. There is a general report throughout the North-west with reference to the superintendent of the construction on this road and how he is paid. I understand that he received a large salary, but it is reported that the Canadian Pacific Railway give him a percentage of all that he can save in construction. It is said that the Canadian Pacific Railway estimated that the road would cost a certain amount of money, and they said to Mr. Haney: If you can reduce the cost below that we will give you a percentage on what you save—possibly the percentage would be 25 or 50 per cent. Now, the Government is going to inquire into this matter, and it is very important that they should take up that phase of the question, because the House will see that the result of such an arrangement is to offer an incentive to the superintendent of construction to take advantage of the men; and I think that every member of this House and every citizen of Canada who has read the report will agree that the poor men who went out there to earn a livelihood have been treated in most brutal fashion from start to finish.

I agree with those who claim that the blame should be located exactly where it lies. I am not disposed to agree with one hon. member who sought an excuse for the Canadian Pacific Railway officials in this matter on the ground that they probably did not know. It was the duty of these people to know; they received $3,500,000 from the Dominion for this work, the Canadian Pacific Railway carried on the work under a superintendent of construction, and the country has been ringing for months with regard to the brutalities practised on those men. The moment the attention of any official of the Canadian Pacific Railway was brought to this matter it was his duty to inquire into these reports. They must not be excused in any respect. If lives have been lost, and it has been proved that they were lost, as a result of gross neglect, then it is the duty of the Government to see that the blame is placed at the door of those responsible for it, and that justice should be done, no matter how high in position the men may be who are guilty.

Mr. ROGERS. I agree with all that has been said with regard to the injustice that is practised by railway corporations, both in western and eastern Canada. It verifies the old saying that corporations have no souls. We see that truth exemplified in many ways in matters that have been brought before this House. I have not thoroughly looked into the report of that commission, but I see by the newspaper articles that the charges are well founded. But what I want to bring out is the great need of a railway commission being appointed by this Government to look into the many grievous wrongs perpetrated by these great corporations upon our people. If that commission had been in existence, possessing the powers that it should possess, these wrongs should never have gone to the extent that they have gone. We ought to have a commission with power to investigate grievances of this kind, and stop them from going any further. It is impossible for the members of the Government oftentimes to look into these matters at once. We have here an item of $6,500 to pay for this Royal Commission, and we know that there have been many other investigating commissions appointed from time to time. Now, if we had a railway commission such as I suggest, it would save all this necessity of appointing special commissions, and it would be in the interests of economy to do so. This railway commission could report to the House in a condensed form the result of its labours. Such a commission would also be able to deal with a great many of those matters that now take up so much time of the Railway Committee and of this House, with the consequent trouble to which we are put. An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure, and I believe such a commission would be able to prevent a great deal of the injustice of which we have heard from the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Ingram) and the hon. member for Brockville (Mr. Wood), injustice perpetrated both by the Grand Trunk Railway and other great railways. I know that there is truth in what those hon. gentlemen say. I have some friends working on railways, and I know they have to suffer injustice frequently. We have about 17,000 miles of railway in this country, in aid of which we have given over 100 million dollars, and surely we have a right to say how these great corporations shall expend our money. We know that the railway corporations are the greatest corporations we have in this land. A railway commission would remove from the political arena many of the questions which now creep in here and are treated from a party standpoint, and it would help to settle disputes regarding freight rates, passenger rates and discriminations. All these questions would be controlled by this commission, and this House would not be called upon to investigate them. I hope the Government will see their way to appoint such a commission. I think it would be a great stroke of economy, and the individual rights of the community would be better looked after.

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON. I would like to say a word with regard to a remark made by the Minister of Trade and Commerce before recess, on a statement of mine concerning the Department of Justice, and alluding to the speech made some days ago by the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Bell) and the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver). When I spoke to-day I merely stated that I felt humiliated that Her Majesty's Government in Canada, through the neglect of the Deputy Minister of Justice, should sit with folded arms while the agents of the Canadian Pacific Railway were thwarting the efforts of those who were endeavouring to expose the cruel wrong done to these unfortunate men. We have no proof yet that there was any communication between the deputy of the Minister of Justice and the Minister of Justice. My hon. friend from Pictou communicated with the Minister of Justice, and he did not even get the satisfaction of an answer. Certainly, any one who will read the statement made by the member for Pictou and the member for Alberta—both those gentlemen have the reputation of being not only honest but truthful men—I think would be convinced that there is something materially wrong in the Department of the Minister of Justice, and that there should be a searching inquiry to find out whether the Minister, or the deputy Minister or any other official has endeavoured to aid the Canadian Pacific Railway in its attempt to get out of responsibility for the death of these unfortunate men. There is no doubt that this matter is creating a great deal of comment in the country. I am not alone in my expression of opinion that the people of this country are wondering what influences were brought to bear upon this commission that they did not suggest some means by which the perpetrators and authors of these cruel atrocities could be hunted down. The Minister of Trade and Commerce referred to the suggestion I made with regard to the directors of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and he alluded to the fact that one of the directors of that company was a member of this House. I, for my part, will show no favour to any one, whether inside or outside this House: and if this House should order the directors of the Canadian Pacific Railway to stand at the Bar of this House I hope that they will all stand here manacled or unmanacled, and that the director of the Canadian Pacific Railway who is a member of this House, will stand in his seat as did the Cambrian directors in England, and be then and there admonished by the Speaker of this House.

Mr. CLARKE. I would like to ask the Minister of Public Works, who is disposed to give us information, whether he has in his employment a gentleman named J. B. Charleson, and whether that gentleman was employed for a considerable time in engaging labourers to go up and work on the Crow's Nest Pass Railway?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The first time I heard of Mr. Charleson having anything to do with the engagement of men, was when I read the report. I believe it is his son.

Mr. CLARKE. Will the Minister give us that information at a later stage? I would like to know who the gentleman is, if he is an employee of the Public Works Department, and how many days or weeks he was engaged in procuring labourers?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. He never left the office, I am sure.

Mr. FOSTER. Will my hon. friend say that Mr. Charleson was not on the coast?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I did not say that. I say that Mr. Charleson never left the office on such a mission. He was sent out by me on departmental work.

Mr. POUPORE. I know it is the son of J. B. Charleson who is referred to by the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Clarke).

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I know that Mr. J. B. Charleson employed in my department never had anything to do with it, to my personal knowledge.

Mr. FOSTER. Has his son something to do with it?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I suppose so, because I know that the father never had anything to do with it.

Mr. CLARKE. I am merely asking for information. Was J. B. Charleson, an employee of the Public Works Department, engaged in employing men to work on the Crow's Nest Pass Railway during the period he was an employee in the Public Works Department? How many days was he engaged in that work, and was he paid by the Public Works Department during that period?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. So far as my knowledge goes, J. B. Charleson now employed in my department had nothing to do with that matter; but I am informed by the hon. member for Pontiac that the son of Mr. Charleson was so employed.

Mr. POUPORE. I am aware that the son of Mr. Charleson travelled through our section and engaged batches of men at Pembroke and Renfrew. He had an arrangement with the Canadian Pacific Railway to send forward men to be employed on the work. I know J. B. Charleson had nothing to do with the engagement of those men. It was the son of Mr. Charleson who was employed, and he resides in Mattawa.

Mr. WALLACE. Was there not at that time more than one Charleson engaged in the Department of Public Works? It was a matter of rumour that an employee in the

PublicWorks named Charleston was actively engaged in hiring men for the Canadian Pacific Railway to work on the Crow's Nest Pass road. If such was the case, it was very irregular. If the individual was the son of Mr. Charleson, he had a perfect right to do so, and I am glad the matter has been brought up.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Certainly.

Mr. OLIVER. I wish to correct the impression that might be circulated owing to the remarks made by the hon. member for North Wellington, who stated that in the case of certain men hired in his constituency when they became dissatisfied with the condition of the work, they were given free transportation back to their homes. I wish to point out that that was not the universal condition. I was credibly informed at Fort Macleod that when the men, finding the conditions unsuitable to them, left their employment, they were at once prosecuted under the Territorial Masters' and Servants' ordinance and convictions secured against them, and—I am not certain on this point—I think a number of them were sent to prison.

To provide for expenses in connection with the enforcement of the Alien Labour Law in Manitoba and the North-west Territories $2,000

Mr. CLARKE. Has any appropriation been made for the enforcement of the Alien Labour Law in other parts of the Dominion? I observe this sum of $2,000 is for Manitoba and the North-west Territories.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. This is for the present year. There is an appropriation for the coming year under the heading of Department of Justice.

Mr. CLARKE. How long is it since the Alien Labour Law inspectors worked in Manitoba and the North-west Territories, and were they engaged in preventing alien labour being employed on the works on the Crow's Nest Pass road?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Officers connected with the immigration branch were instructed to act under the Alien Labour Law last August. They were given formal authority under the Act by the Minister of Justice, and they worked from Port Arthur through the Rocky Mountains, at various points where attempts were made to bring in American labourers. Attempts were made to bring in large bodies of American labourers, and although the committee will understand that a law of this kind cannot be thoroughly enforced, it was carried out on the whole very successfully.

Mr. CLARKE. I must congratulate the hon. Minister in being able to keep out large bodies of alien labourers seeking employment there. The circumstances under which the Crow's Nest Pass road was built and the conditions under which the labourers worked were not satisfactory. I should like to ask whether any complaints were forwarded to the Interior Department or to members of the Government by the alien labour law inspectors as to the treatment of the Canadian labourers by the contractors or sub-contractors?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The complaints led to the appointment of a commission to make inquiry as to the condition of the labourers.

Mr. CLARKE. Were complaints forwarded by the alien law inspectors?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The commissioner of immigration, who is chief officer of the immigration branch in the west, went, under my instructions to certain points for the purpose of finding out facts in connection with the importation of alien labour. He took with him the superintendent of immigration, and together they endeavoured to ascertain if there was anything in the complaints made in regard to the treatment of labourers, or whether it was merely newspaper talk. I am now speaking from recollection, but the result of the communications which followed after the commissioners visited the neighbourhood of Macleod was that I decided to ask the Government for a commission, because I believed the complaints were well founded.

Mr. FOSTER. What is this expenditure for, and to whom was it paid?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The expenditure comprises the expenses of the officers of the immigration branch who were employed on the work at different points in the west. The amount paid was small, the principal amounts been for expenses while travelling.

Mr. FOSTER. What work did they do?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. They travelled from point to point, and obtained information as to the movement of labourers, and also as to efforts made to bring in labourers from across the line. They had considerable difficulty to encounter because agents at that time were endeavouring to bring in a considerable number of foreigners from the United States, and it was difficult to distinguish between labourers and agricultural settlers, as the agents always claimed that the labourers were coming in as agricultural settlers. The immigration officers travelled from place to place and gave instructions to the collectors of customs, and endeavoured generally to enforce the Alien Labour Law. Their efforts were successful, without our agents being compelled to take legal proceedings. I know their efforts had a certain effect, because I received complaints from men who had been stopped, and also from Mr. Gault, of the Gault mines, who complained that labourers had been prevented going in there.

Mr. FOSTER. Do the officers submit any reports of the number of people they deported ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The correspondence from the immigration commissioner in Winnipeg will show pretty fully all he did.

Mr. FOSTER. I call the attention of the Minister of Public Works once more to the question I have put him, and I would like him to inform himself thoroughly. This is a matter which resolves itself into a question of veracity and fact. I am informed most positively that Mr. J. B. Charleson, sr., an employee of the Public Works Department not only employed but shipped men, not one man but many men, did it not one day but many days, and engaged in it from time to time as a regular business, all the time being an employee of the Department. There is some great mistake, either with the Minister or with my informant. More than that, I have seen dozens of the returned men from the Crow's Nest Pass who made their complaints to me, who know Mr. Charleson, know he is an employee of the Public Works Department and say they were employed by him. All these things put together make me ask the Minister to inform himself thoroughly and to take the occasion of letting the House know what is right in this respect.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Mr. Charleson never left the office to my personal knowledge on such a mission as this. I will get the information this afternoon and give it to the House.

Mr. FOSTER. I did not read the report of the commission, but I am informed that it says that Mr. J. B. Charleson engaged hundreds of labourers for the Crow's Nest Pass work.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The first intimation that I had that Mr. J. B. Charleson might be mixed up with that was when I read the report. Since then I am informed that it was his son. In the pressure of business I had not time to make further inquiries.

Mr. SPROULE. Would the Minister of the Interior tell me if these immigration agents who are employed to administer the Alien Labour Law were not paid for their time and travelling expenses from the Immigration Department ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. They were salaried officers and did not get anything extra in connection with the Alien labour.

Mr. SPROULE. Were there travelling expenses paid from the same source ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. How then is there an item for travelling expenses ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It will recoup the immigration vote for what has been paid out of it.

Mr. SPROULE. How do you keep an account of what has been spent in one case and what has been spent in the other ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. When the accounts came in they did not distinguish, but when examined they were separated. This vote is taken to recoup the money paid out of the immigration vote, and it is also taken to pay some outstanding accounts.

Mr. SPROULE. I understand you pay certain immigration agents in the States $3 a head for men sent to this country.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Agricultural immigrants.

Mr. SPROULE. Is it true that some of these were deported under the Alien Labour Law, and that the officers were paid first for sending them in and afterwards for sending them out ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Agricultural immigrants not sent in by a salaried agent are paid for at so much a head. We knew that as soon as we undertook to enforce the Alien Labour Law that the labour agents in the States would endeavour to send in railway labourers under the guise of agricultural settlers, and as a matter of fact they tried to do so and our officers at Winnipeg had the greatest difficulty in separating the sheep from the goats. The officers, however, are men of great experience who know pretty well the class of agricultural settlers and they separated them without great difficulty. Some of the people who were sent back raised a cry and claimed they were agricultural settlers, but as a matter of fact I do not think there is a single case in which that is true. I watched the operation of the thing very closely and I believe that to be correct. It is very difficult to enforce a law of this kind. I may mention that the other day I was advised that a carload of Italians had passed Winnipeg. The immigration commissioner boarded the train and found the Italians in the second-class car, and the man in charge, evidently an Italian who could speak English, told him they were going to work on the Crow's Nest Pass. He wired me and I advised him to take the necessary proceedings at Macleod to test the matter. The Canadian Pacific Railway people say that these are Italians who have been working in Canada for a number of years and that we have no right to stop them. On the other hand we thought we had evidence that they had been brought from New York, and the question will be tested before the courts at Macleod. A great

deal depends on the discretion and judgment and firmness of the officer in charge, and I think we have a very excellent man in the commissioner of immigration at Winnipeg.

Mr. SPROULE. My information is that the agents in the States took advantage of men being anxious to work on the Crow's Nest Pass Railway and sent them in as men who were to settle in the country, and collected pay for every man they sent in.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. They could not possibly do it.

Mr. SPROULE. The Minister admits that the United States agents sent them in, but I understand it was the Government's own agents. Can the Minister tell me how many were deported under this law?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I cannot. The officers stopped a number at the frontier at different times, and that was sufficient without taking legal proceedings to deport.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). How does the Minister ask for this specific amount of $2,000 unless he has had some means of calculating it?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I will get the information and lay it before the House.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). The item had better stand.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Very well; let the item stand.

Mr. INGRAM. The amount asked for here is $2,000 for the North-west Territories, while next year's estimate asks $3,000 for the whole Dominion. Does the hon. gentleman expect or intend that the $3,000 which he asks for the coming year will cover the expense of seeing that the Alien Labour Law is properly carried out throughout the Dominion?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. All I can do now is to explain what has been done during the past year. The hon. gentleman will have to apply to the Solicitor General with regard to the Estimates for next year.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The item stands.

Classification of old records in the office of the Privy Council, to be paid, notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Civil Service Act..... $1,000

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON. I understand that this item belongs to the department of the right hon. the First Minister, and I would like to know what these records consist of. As the right hon. gentleman must be aware the records of the Dominion are scattered in three or four different departments. The Privy Council Department has some of the records, the Secretary of State's Department has another portion, and the archives branch of the Department in Agriculture has another portion, and there are not a few in the Library of Parliament. This item brings to my mind the fact, of which I have been informed, that some time last year, when a large number of papers were being removed from the Privy Council Department to the paper mill to be turned into pulp, a number of valuable papers, as they afterwards turned out to be, were lost or dropped by the carters who were taking away the stuff, or were found by the parties to whom the stuff was sold. In one case, a bound volume, being a copy of the "Upper Canada Gazette," which was being carted away from the Privy Council Department, but was fortunately dropped in the street, and was picked up either by one of the carters or by a member of the Dominion police. I need hardly say that that book could not be replaced for less than $500 or $600 to-day. So valuable are some of these volumes of the "Upper Canada Gazette," that a complete set for 1814 or 1815 would bring at least $1,000. It seems to me that there should be no such distribution of valuable documents in half a dozen different places; but that they should be under the care either of the Department of Agriculture or of the gentleman who is styled the Keeper of the Records, or to be placed in the Library of Parliament. There is no complete copy of the "Upper Canada Gazette" either in the Library of Parliament, in any of the departments at Ottawa, in the public library of Toronto, or in the library of the provincial parliament at Toronto; but it is possible that a collection very nearly complete might be made up from the different places where the old and valuable official papers is stored. I think the right hon. First Minister should make an inquiry into what I have stated. I am informed on good authority that the volume of the "Gazette" which was lost and which I refer to was handed by the Dominion policeman to the chief of the Dominion police, Mr. Sherwood. When my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) brings down his Estimates next year, I think he might include in them an appropriation of $30,000 or $40,000 for a building in which all the valuable records of this Dominion might be placed. At present, they are in non-fire-proof buildings; they are scattered through the east and west blocks as well as in the centre buildings and Langevin Block; and if any of these buildings should be destroyed by fire, the country would be deprived of important records of a very valuable character. I may say that I would not look upon it as at all extravagant if such a vote were asked for by the hon. Minister. Any one who visits the Department of Agriculture to-day will see that the room which has been selected there for the archives of this Dominion is not at all suited to the purpose. The room that was originally selected years ago, and was long occupied for this purpose in the west block was a far more suitable one. But if we can have nothing better than the accom-

modation now provided in the Department of Agriculture, I think that if we are having a classification of the records, I think the right hon. First Minister should see that they are all kept together in one place or another and not scattered, as at present.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I am really very much obliged to my hon. friend for having brought this very important subject to the attention of the House. I may say at once that I have felt for a long time that statements such as he has given utterance to are only too well-founded. The archives of the Government—and they are at this time most valuable, reaching far back into the history of the country, in fact, to the French regime—are scattered in different places—the hon. gentleman stated in three or four different places, but I believe there are more than that. For my part, I sincerely agree with him that we should have a custodian of the records, an officer specially charged to look after them, classify them, keep them in order, and be responsible for their safety. Unfortunately, at the present time, they are very much scattered, some being in the Privy Council Office, some in the office of the Secretary of State, and some in the department of the archives under Mr. Brymner. In my judgment, a special department ought to be organized, where all the records from the various departments of the Government, after a certain number of years, say five or ten years, should be sent there to be classified and kept. My hon. friend has also made the offer—and I thank him for the suggestion—that he would support an appropriation of some $40,000 or more for the construction of a building consecrated to that object. I am afraid that $40,000 would be scarcely adequate for a building of that character. I may say to my hon. friend that there is another valuable collection, not of old records, but of scientific objects, in this city, which should also be looked after, that is, the treasures we have in the Geological Museum. Those treasures are very much exposed; they might be destroyed at any moment; and I think we owe it to the country that that valuable collection should be preserved. Perhaps the Government will look into the question of having a special building, which could be divided into two departments, one for the Geological Survey and the other for the old records of Canada. I am very much obliged to my hon. friend for having brought this matter to our attention.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I think the hon. gentleman will find in the records of either the Secretary of State Department or his own, some reports which were prepared by the committee appointed by the late Government for the purpose of looking into this matter of the union of all these different branches of the record departments in one department.

Mr. BRITTON. All will agree as to the necessity of the classification of these old records and their preservation. I rise merely to call attention to a matter to which I referred last session. I find that this work is done by those who are in the employ of the Government, and that payment is made to them, notwithstanding anything that may be in the Civil Service Act. I think the Government have gone the full length of giving extra pay to civil servants for work of this kind. No one objects to the civil servants being well paid, but when it is considered that a civil servant cannot go outside the routine work prescribed for him in his department without getting extra pay, although he is well paid already, we ought to cry a halt, except in cases where the circumstance really calls for extra compensation.

Additional amount required to meet expenses of the Canadian International Deep Waterways Commission	$959 49

Mr. FOSTER. Will that finish the expenses?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think so.

For a line of steamers to run between St. John, Halifax and London (revote)	$25,000
For a line of steamers to run during the winter season of 1897-98, between St. John and London, Liverpool or Manchester (revote).....	15,000

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I may just explain that these two items are not any additional charge on the revenue. They are merely a subdivision of the vote of $40,000 granted last year.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Has the Minister made any provision for subsidizing the service between Newfoundland and Cape Breton?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The only item is item 53 for steam service between Halifax, St. John, Newfoundland and Liverpool, $15,000.

Mr. McDOUGALL. The service I refer to must be known to the hon. gentleman, because the facts were before his department for several years.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Nothing has been provided for it.

Mr. McDOUGALL. It is the steamer "Bruce" connecting the Newfoundland Railway with the Intercolonial at the harbour of Sydney, Cape Breton. The principle traffic between Nova Scotia and Newfoundland is done over the route twice a week, and after a few days it will run three times a week each way. There is very much traffic being developed there, both freight and passengers. It was expected all along that during this session provision would be made to subsidize that service.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. My impression is that that service has to be provided by Mr. Reed, under his contract with the Government of Newfoundland, whether we do anything or not.

Mr. McDOUGALL. There is a provision in the arrangement between Mr. Reed and the Government of Newfoundland in that direction, but it does not follow that Canada, if we want to benefit by the communication with Newfoundland, should not assist that service.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I am bound to say that my impression is we are paying quite as much as we ought to pay for these various steam connections, and I would require to see an exceedingly good reason before recommending anything more than I now recommend, and there are votes which it sometimes strains my conscience very much to ask for.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Is it not absurd for the hon. gentleman to continue a subsidy to a service between Halifax and St. John, Newfoundland, which only goes once a week or fortnightly, while the other service goes twice a week. The one that goes twice a week is the one that should be subsidized. The proposition originally made to the predecessors of the hon. gentleman was that the subsidies given to the different lines of steamers calling at St. John's, Newfoundland, on their way to Liverpool, should be given to that service which is to connect the Intercolonial and the Newfoundland Railway. I cannot see the propriety of giving $15,000 or $20,000 to a service that the public only get the benefit of once or twice in a fortnight, while a service that people get the benefit of two or three times a week each way gets nothing. That service now is carrying the Canadian mails from Sydney to Newfoundland, and has been since last fall making trips twice a week.

To provide for repairs to steamer "Stanley" $5,000

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. After the "Stanley" came from her winter work, she was found to be a good deal damaged, particularly in the tanks and boilers. I had her inspected by the inspector of hulls and boilers in the maritime provinces, and he reported that she should be put in dock and a certain number of repairs put on her before entering into active service next autumn. It was intended to send her to Glasgow and have the sheathing taken off and straightened and having her generally repaired. That would cost about $50,000, but after it was determined that a special boat had to be provided for the customs protection service in the maritime provinces and the St. Lawrence, it was determined to put the "Stanley" on that work, and she has been repaired sufficiently to enable her to do that work, and is now in the customs protection service. On the first of June she took her place on the station. It was found last year that the small sailing vessel we had was not fitted for the work.

Mr. FOSTER. She should be a costly vessel.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We found that the difference between running her and a vessel such as we proposed to build for the special purpose, is not very much. She is one of the fastest boats in the Dominion service. These $5,000 are taken to provide for these repairs, but I find I will not require it all. I do not know how much I will require. The balance will be spent in the fall after she is through the customs protective service, and goes on the slip to have her tanks and boilers fixed.

Further amount required for winter mail service $3,800

Mr. MARTIN. I would like to ask the Minister if he proposes any improvement in the service, and if so, what?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Martin) knows that we have a sum in the Estimates for the building of a new iron steamship to assist the "Stanley" in carrying the winter mail service. But as to the Cape service, of which he speaks, there is no proposition to alter it at present.

Mr. MARTIN. I have already called the hon. Minister's attention to the baggage and freight rate over that route. The exorbitant rate of 3 cents per pound, or $60 per ton, is charged. I would like to know from the hon. gentleman if anything is to be done about it?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Captain McElhinney, who has made a special study of this service, has gone to Scotland with the specifications of the new ship for the purpose of calling for tenders in case we get the vote from Parliament. The statement of my hon. friend (Mr. Martin) has been submitted to him. Until he returns I cannot make any definite statement on the subject, but the hon. gentleman may depend upon it that the question will be given full consideration.

Scientific Institutions—Amount required for purchase money for land for the new observatory near Toronto..... $400

Mr. FOSTER. Are you building a new observatory?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman will remember that when the British Association were here, they appointed a special committee to examine into the working of our observatory, and they found that owing to the numerous street rails in Toronto, a part of our work was rendered absolutely use-

less. The committee waited upon me and pointed out that it would be necessary to build an observatory not less than three or four miles from any possible electric railway. Mr. Stupart selected a site which can be purchased for $400. I have asked a vote in the Supplementary Estimates for 1898-99 for the purpose of constructing a building. It is not an expensive matter, but absolutely necessary.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The site is just east of Toronto, I understand.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes.

Additional amount required to pay salaries of officers of the Meteorological service $500

Mr. CLARKE. What is the reason for this ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Mr. Stupart, who has charge of this branch, appoints additional officers here and there during the year, and I found that he had appointed in different parts a number of officers whom the sum previously voted did not enable me to pay.

Fisheries—Amount required for repairs to fishery protection service steamers. $10,000

Mr. FOSTER. What is the explanation of this ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. This is to pay for the expenses connected with the repair of the steamer "La Canadienne." As the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) will remember, she was run into by the "Yantic" last year and cut down to the water's edge, and had to be placed in dock and repaired. We had insurance upon her amounting to $11,500, and, of course, I shall be recouped this amount after the repairs have been made. The insurance companies are only awaiting the adjustment to pay the money.

Fisheries—To pay balance legal expenses of fisheries reference appeal to Privy Council $5,608 38

Mr. HAGGART. What is the effect of the judgment ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I have not received the full text of the judgment yet, and the hon. gentleman knows as much as I do about it, having read the summary of it in the newspapers. I am waiting anxiously for the text, because this is one of the most important judgments ever pronounced by the Privy Council. I gather that it has been adverse to the contention of the Dominion.

Mr. FOSTER. What were the payments in this case ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The amount I had voted for this appeal was $8,000. Mr. Christopher Robinson, Q.C., was retained and was paid $5,000. Messrs. Day & Russell were paid about $2,000, and there were some small amounts, making a total of $7,446. Then we have the solicitors' accounts in London, $8,108, of which we have paid $1,946. With the balance left over of $553, this amount of $5,608.38 is necessary.

Further amount required for Behring Sea Claims Commission..... $20,000

Mr. FOSTER. Is that ended yet ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes. I had an intimation from the United States Government the other day that the money would be paid, and they hoped, in a day or two. It was introduced originally in a special Bill in Congress, but they found a difficulty in getting the Bill through and they put the amount in the General Appropriation Bill. That Bill is passing through Congress now. It is to be paid before the 17th of this month, and when it is paid over all we have to do is to divide it according to the award.

Mr. FOSTER. Can my hon. friend (Sir Louis Davies) give the total cost of this Behring Sea business ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes. Of course the hon. gentleman understands that we have paid out a good deal, we have to get back some. The British Government have agreed to pay one-half the divisible expenditure, which amounts to $16,000. We had an appropriation of $30,000 in 1896-97, and $20,000 in 1897-98, making a total of $50,000. Of this $49,944 has been paid in expenses, divisible expenses, counsel fees and allowances of Judge King and the balance we have here is required to pay unpaid accounts of the commission. The full amount that it will cost Canada is $70,000. It is a matter to be considered by Council whether the country should bear the entire expense. Provision was made, as the hon. gentleman will recollect, when the claims were originally submitted to arbitration, that the Government should determine what portion, if any, the successful claimants should bear.

Mr. FOSTER. That is, the sealers ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That is, when I come to appropriate the award I shall have to go before my colleagues and they will have to determine under that original proposal whether the Government of Canada shall defray the entire cost of all the litigation, or whether the successful litigants who were successful because of the interference of the Dominion Government, will bear a proportional part of it, for instance, whether you take 5 per cent or 4 per cent or 2 per cent, as the case may be, off their award before paying, and so reimburse the Government. But suppose you do not do that the cost will

be $70,000 less $8,000 of the divisible expenses which the British Government will return to us. Now the appropriation made by the United States was $75,000 in the original instance, and they got a larger appropriation afterwards: their expenditures were very much in excess of ours. I may say here, I take this opportunity of saying it, that I think we have been peculiarly fortunate in the selection of an arbitrator and in the selection of the counsel and agents who conducted the proceedings before this arbitration commission. It will be a matter for congratulation, I am sure, to the whole Canadian people irrespective of politics, that our conduct of this arbitration has resulted so successfully to Canada.

Mr. BRITTON. May I ask if the private litigants, those who were interested in the result, were represented on this commission by counsel?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. A few private litigants chose to retain extra counsel of their own right, with which we have nothing to do.

Mr. BRITTON. But that might make a difference with the Government in the final result.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It is a fact that they did retain our friend, the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper), who had great personal knowledge of the matter, to assist the counsel appointed by the Government.

Immigration $68,800

Mr. FOSTER. Here is a very large supplementary vote for which we must have full explanations.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. With regard to the item for salaries of agents and employees in Canada and foreign countries, the expenditure for the last year was conducted, during the first portion of the year, with a view to possibly being able to cut off some of the expenditures during the winter, and while during the early months of the year I expected that a certain portion of the expenditure might be cut off during the latter portion of the year, the expenditure at that time was at the rate of about $200,000 a year, which was the appropriation. But as this year came on the efforts which had been made had resulted in such an interest being taken that I felt I was not justified in cutting off any of the expenditure, but on the contrary incurring a certain amount of increased expenditure in the work of advertising and distributing literature. The clerks, agents and employees that we have in Canada total up, for salaries, $38,729.06; whereas, the appropriation was only $35,000, and we ask for $3,800 more to make up the deficit. The list of agents and employees in foreign countries, for salaries, totals up to $22,155, the appropriation was $17,500, so we ask for an additional vote to make that up. The bulk amount of $60,000 asked for general expenses may be divided in that way, and to the extent of about $20,000 for bonuses for immigrants whom we have received from foreign countries. But in addition to that, we have spent about $8,000 in affording necessary assistance to immigrants in the country during the first month of their stay. The remainder is made up of expenses of agents whom we have sent on special trips to the United States principally, and in literature, which we have been circulating during the latter months of the year. The expenditure, therefore, would be done upon the basis of about $200,000 a year, and on account of what appeared to me to be successful work and the necessities of it in the latter portion of the year, I have expanded the work in almost all lines, but particularly in the line of advertising and printing. The work, therefore, has gone on through the year upon a scale of about $260,000 or $265,000 per year, the increase being largely in the latter months of the year.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend has given what he thinks sufficient reason why, when he had asked for $200,000 and the House granted him that sum, he has increased the work during the year without consultation with the House, but going on his own opinion, he proceeds to expand that by a sum of $68,000. It does not seem as if there was much use in a Minister coming to the House and developing his plans, taking the House into his confidence and getting the House to entrust him with a certain amount of money for the work of the year, if, after the House has turned its back, the hon. gentleman goes to work and expends by more than a third, the large vote which is given to him. He proposes to expend $268,000 when the House authorized him to expend only $200,000. Now, I draw the attention of the Government to this fact: if they are going to get Estimates in that way, and then are going to spend a third more without the money being granted, and without coming to the House again, why, there does not seem to be the least use of calling the House together and going through the farce of making Estimates. There may be occasions in which unforeseen and very urgent circumstances will warrant the Minister in overstepping the bounds of his appropriation. There is a bond of confidence between the Minister and the House. He makes a pledge to the House, and the House takes him on his pledge, and the money is voted on that ground. But here the Minister sits down and says: Well, the House has given me $200,000, but I am going to work to expend $268,000, and I will depend upon a party vote in the House to give me that

money. That is, I think, rather a grave practice to be imported into our expenditures. I do not think it proper. I think I can appeal to my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce, who is an old parliamentarian and who knows something about these things, as to whether that is a correct principle to go upon. Now, what excuse has the hon. gentleman given? He thought things were going along well, and he took it into his head to spend $68,000 more, largely in printing and advertising. I think with the large vote we gave him, he should have confined himself to that expenditure. He could early in the year have laid his plans before the House, and asked the House, if he thought it was a very urgent matter, to grant him this money. But it is now the middle of June, the whole of this money is practically spent, and the Minister simply making estimates for himself and makes expenditures for himself. I am certain this is not a right principle. How can we carry on our financial work if expenditures are to be based on the whim of the Ministers entirely outside the authorization of this Parliament?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I do not think that any person will for an instant deny that the principle laid down by the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) is perfectly sound; and I should be sorry to be held responsible for enunciating the principle, either by statement or by practice, that a Minister might, at his own will, incur large additional expenditure over and above what Parliament had given him. But as the hon. gentleman has himself admitted, there are circumstances which may at times justify a Minister in exceeding the appropriation, although it must be done with the greatest care, I perfectly understand, and with the full knowledge of the facts that he is answerable to Parliament for the results of what he does. I have explained to the committee the circumstances of this case that I thought would justify me in doing what I did, not upon my individual judgment, but upon my judgment and the judgment of my colleagues, because I apprehend that the member for York does not imagine that any Minister would exceed an appropriation of $200,000 by $70,000, without consultation with his colleagues and without their authority. I may say that I had that. The appropriation could have been brought to Parliament very much sooner. From time to time in the early portion of the winter when the question came before me of incurring additional expenditure, I fully expected to be able to get the estimate before Parliament in the early portion of the session so as to get the authorization of Parliament for the expenditure of the money. But my hon. friend, who has been a member of a Government, knows how business sometimes presses, and things that ought to be done are sometimes left undone at the exact time when they ought to be done. So he will perfectly understand how it was that the estimate was not brought down in the early part of the session, but was put off from time to time until it is now found in the Supplementary Estimates for this year. I admit that it was not regular, and were it not for the fact that for the first time since 1883 there has been a large and decided movement of the agricultural class towards this country, I would not consider myself justified in incurring that expenditure; but in view of that large movement of agricultural settlers into Canada, and particularly into Manitoba and the Northwest Territories, I would doubtless have been deemed blameworthy if I had not taken the necessary steps to stimulate that movement and take care of the immigrants, as I did when I found the vote was not sufficient. Hon. gentlemen opposite would have said that I had thrown away a golden opportunity if I had neglected to take advantage of this movement. It may be that the Government and myself especially are somewhat to blame for not bringing down the Estimates at an earlier period of the session, but these matters are delayed sometimes on account of more pressing business.

Mr. FOSTER. It does not alter the principle whether an individual Minister or a collection of Ministers, exceed the vote. The Ministers are simply authorized to do what Parliament authorizes them to do; they are authorized to spend the money that Parliament votes. The hon. gentleman tries to make the seat on which he must drop a litte easier by padding it, with his colleagues. Is there any report on which the hon. gentleman acted?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. An Order in Council would not alter the case.

Mr. FOSTER. It appears that the hon. gentleman has not even a report to Council to add to the padding to put on the seat on which he must fall. He has not shown a report authorizing him to take $68,000 of the public money on mortgage, and trust to the House to give him a bill of indemnity. What were the special circumstances in question? We have had generalities enough; let us have the special circumstances that were so urgent and imperative as to decide the Minister to permit this great overstepping of what are the well acknowledged rules of executive expenditure of a parliamentary vote. Let the committee have also a statement as to how this amount was expended; let the committee have a statement of the payments that are in the meantime suspended, because this is the middle of June, and there are only about twenty more days left. $68,000 cannot have been expended in this time; where is the $50,000 or $60,000 which must be earned up

to this date? Is the hon. gentleman running his department on credit or in what way is he getting along? I hope he is not running notes.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The information required will necessitate an abstract of the expenditure for the year. The item will, under these circumstances, have to stand.

Mr. FOSTER. The item will have to stand, for we cannot give $68,000 to the hon. Minister on his own honest face.

Mr. HENDERSON. This item is a most extraordinary one. Last year the hon. gentleman came down to the House and asked an appropriation for immigration, which was granted. He was authorized to expend that sum and not one dollar more; but without the consent of Parliament, on his own individual whim, contrary to every fixed principle and well established rule of parliamentary expenditure, he spent $68,000 more than he was authorized to do. That is very improper conduct and it should receive the censure of this Parliament. No individual has the right to do so and this House has no right to come forward and make indemnity for such action. I move that the whole item be struck out.

Mr. FOSTER. Let the motion stand, together with the item.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The item stands.

To provide for the repayment, in accordance with an agreement made on 27th September, 1881, to the Seminary of St. Sulpice, the value, at 50 cents an acre of 21,209 acres of land not used for Indian occupation in the township of Gibson, Ontario, with interest from 26th January, 1892, to 30th June, 1898..... $14,696 05

Mr. FOSTER. The committee would like an explanation of this item.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. This amount is for the repayment to the Seminary of St. Sulpice of the value of 50 cents per acre, of the land in the township of Gibson, Ont., which has not been used for occupation by the Indians, who were moved from the Oka reserve. It carries interest from 26th January, 1892, to 30th June, 1898, and interest on the above then due to the 30th June, 1898. The amount is paid under an agreement, and the Solicitor General has advised that the Government is liable to pay the money.

Mr. CLANCY. Perhaps this would be a good time for the Minister of the Interior to give the committee some information with regard to Mr. John Beattie, former Indian agent at Highgate, who was dismissed last year. Mr. Beattie was in the service for eighteen years and upon some mere unproved charge—unproved because there was no investigation held—he was summarily dismissed, and without getting his superannuation, was paid the paltry sum of $121 which he paid into the fund.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Where is Highgate?

Mr. CLANCY. It is in the judicial county of Kent, and would have relation, I think, to a band of Moravian Indians. Mr. Beattie communicated with the Minister of Justice on the 3rd of December, 1897, and this is what the Minister said in reply:

I received your communication of the 2nd inst., and do not at all question the accuracy of your statement. I shall discuss the matter with the Minister of the Interior, and shall be pleased if he is able to recommend to Council a retiring allowance for you. So far as I am personally concerned, I see no reason why you should not receive it.

Afterwards Mr. Beattie received $121 and some odd cents from the Department of the Interior, being the amount he paid into the superannuation fund with 5 per cent interest. Mr. Beattie is advanced in years. He had been eighteen years in the service, and to treat him in that way was most extraordinary. No complaint was made as to his efficiency as an officer, but he was dismissed for alleged partisan conduct, and if the Minister is to lay his heavy hand on an old man on an unproved charge like that, I say it is very unjust. I do not propose to say that Mr. Beattie was innocent of the charge, for I know nothing about it, although I do venture to say that I know as much about it as the Minister, and that is absolutely nothing. Although Mr. Beattie may have been guilty of being anxious for his party, whether that charge be right or wrong, it should not have brought upon this man's head the punishment which he received. He was eighteen years in the service. For the first five years his salary was $200, for the next five years $400, and for the last eight years $500, so that he would be entitled to a superannuation of $180 a year.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. How old was he?

Mr. CLANCY. I cannot say, but he was a man quite advanced in years. He is past that period of life when he is able to earn for himself, but I do not say he is a pauper, because he is not at all a man of that class. Even though Mr. Beattie offended in the worst form charged against him, it seems to me he was treated harshly. I hope the Minister will reconsider the question, and will do Mr. Beattie the justice of giving him superannuation, or allowing him a gratuity. I say that the Minister is not possessed of that definite and absolute knowledge that would warrant him in dismissing Mr. Beattie, and while I make that statement I am not saying that Mr. Beattie may not have taken some part in the election. Even if he did, I repeat that this is an exercise of power which a man in

private life would disdain to be guilty of. I do not discuss the question that the Minister was pressed by his friends to dismiss Mr. Beattie and give his place to one of their political supporters, but I will say that he is guilty of a manifest act of injustice if he does not give Mr. Beattie the superannuation to which he is entitled.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I must confess that I have not at the moment any personal recollection of the case to which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) refers. It appears, however, from my hon. friend's statement that this gentleman was dismissed for political partisanship, and I fancy the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) will admit that from what he himself said, I am justified in drawing the conclusion that Mr. Beattie was guilty of partisanship. The only question is as to whether under the circumstances, this gentleman should have received the superannuation allowance or receive the amount he was entitled to under last year's Act. I have no objection at all to taking what my hon. friend (Mr. Clancy) says into consideration, and to look the matter up, and if the gentleman's age and the circumstances seem to require special consideration, I certainly would not have any objection to give the case whatever consideration it merits.

Indians—Nova Scotia—Additional amount for medical attendance and medicines.. $1,000

Mr. GILLIES. How many Indians are there in Nova Scotia in charge of the department?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I have not the information with me.

Mr. GILLIES. Can the Minister say the amount that was paid in Cape Breton for the medical attendance and medicine furnished to the Indians there last year?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I cannot divide the statement to show what was paid in Cape Breton. The expenditure for the whole of Nova Scotia up to the 31st of March was $1,950, and it is expected that it will be about $3,250 altogether during the next year.

Mr. GILLIES. If the Minister would consult the records of his department, he would find that the charge for medical attendance and medicine furnished to the Indians in the province of Nova Scotia is growing at an alarming rate, last year we voted $2,200 for that purpose. That is an extraordinary amount for the small band of Indians now in that province; I do not think they number over 1,200 or 1,500 altogether. One would have thought that sum would have been amply sufficient; but when we find that it is exceeded by $1,000, the figures are sufficiently alarming to cause the Minister to pause when the accounts come in before paying them. I protest against this unnecessary extravagance. If the money were expended in some way that would promote the comfort of the Indians, instead of being squandered on imaginary medical attendance, the Minister would be doing a kindness to the Indians which he is not now doing.

Mr. KAULBACH. I desire the Minister to inform me of the name of the agent now acting in the counties of Queen's and Lunenburg, the late agent having been removed; and also the cause of the removal of the old agent.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I will give the hon. gentleman the particulars a little later.

Indians—New Brunswick—To provide an additional amount for medical attendance and medicines $500

Mr. McALISTER. I would like to ask the Minister of the Interior if an allowance is made to the medical agent for medicine as well as for medical attendance.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The same rule does not apply in every case.

Mr. McALISTER. I would ask whether any charge was preferred against Dr. Venner, the Indian medical attendant at St. Annes, before he was dismissed; and, if any charges were preferred against him, what they were, and whether they were investigated?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I shall look up the correspondence in order to give the hon. gentleman the information. I think the question was put on the Order paper, and I answered it.

Mr. McALISTER. I do not think there was any answer as to whether any charges were preferred against him, and whether there was any investigation.

To provide for the erection of a fence between the Indian reserve, county of Antigonish, N.S., and the lands of D. Chisholm $100

Mr. McDOUGALL. I would like to ask the Minister if he can explain what this expenditure is for?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. A man named Chisholm has land adjoining the Indian reserve, and he made application to the Indian Department to build half of a line fence between the Indian reserve and his property, if he would build the other half. I do not know what the law is in Nova Scotia; but the law in Ontario used to be, and the law in Manitoba is now, that one person has a right to require another to contribute half the cost of building a line fence between their properties. This is what we are doing in this case.

Mr. McDOUGALL. The law in Nova Scotia is that each individual builds one-half of the division fence between them; but I never heard of any other case in which the Department of Indian Affairs provided for the

building of a fence between an Indian reserve and the adjoining properties. I know of several Indian reserves in the Island of Cape Breton, and I know that the fences between them and adjoining properties are being kept up, but I never knew that the Government applied a dollar to them.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I suppose the hon. Minister will apply this principle to the other provinces and the other reserves ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I suppose that we shall have to do it if it is shown that there is likely to be difficulty, as there was in this case. It was shown that the farmer was subject to annoyance, and that he had to have a fence or go off his farm. I saw that it was a great injustice to him, and I felt that the department should not perpetrate any injustice on a private individual.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The principle would be the same in every case.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It would, but I would not like to say that the department would agree under all circumstances to put up half of a line fence. If a case of urgency occurred, then I think the department should do it.

Mr. MILLS. In what way was the farmer annoyed by his property being near the reserve ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I do not remember at present. I think it was by the Indian cattle. But it was shown to me very clearly that he was compelled to have this fence.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Can the hon. gentleman tell me the length of the fence ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Twenty-three chains long.

Mr. MONTAGUE. The hon. gentleman has made a special case of this. The hon. gentleman has said it was because an annoyance to the farmer existed. That annoyance would exist in every case in which a fence was constructed by a farmer between his property and an Indian reserve, to which the Indians did not contribute. If the hon. gentleman is going to provide on the part of the department for half a line fence between this reserve and the farmer in Nova Scotia, he must apply the same principle to every reserve in the Dominion, or else we cannot allow this item to pass.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. As a matter of fact, in Ontario, for instance, the farms are practically all fenced, and we would be called on in very few cases to put up fences.

Mr. MONTAGUE. They have all been fenced largely at the expense of the white men, and white men having built their fences in other portions of the Dominion, why should we pay for building half this man's fence ? If we vote this, the hon. gentleman cannot resist the claims of parties who have constructed the whole line fence between their farms and Indian reserves in various portions of the Dominion.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I do not think the hon. gentleman will be able to make out a principle that because the Government makes a payment on account of a thing of this kind, we are to pay everybody else. It may seem to be natural justice, but if the hon. gentleman undertook to carry the principle into the finances of Canada, Canada would be bankrupt in a very short time.

Mr. McDOUGALL. There are a great many properties adjoining Indian lands in the province of Nova Scotia. The hon. member for Richmond has property adjoining an Indian reserve near the town of Sydney, and has always been obliged to keep up his fences, and I cannot understand what influences the hon. Minister to provide $100 in this case. Only a few days ago, I brought up the question of providing for the maintenance of an insane Indian who is in the county asylum, and the Minister, who had some weeks or months ago, refused to provide for his maintenance, although it had always been the custom of the Department of Indian Affairs to provide for the maintenance of Indians of that kind, said he could provide for that out of an item in the Estimates. Will the hon. gentleman point me out one item out of which he can pay for the maintenance of this Indian ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. In the main Estimates, page 64, item 208, the hon. gentleman will find that out of the second item, relief and seed grain, $2,000, we can pay that claim.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the fence made of ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Barbed wire.

Mr. SPROULE. For 92 rods of barbed wire, $100 seems an extravagant sum.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Then the hon. Minister is going to take $3,000 or $4,000 out of the relief which should be given to the other Indians, for the purpose of paying this claim. He will be thus depriving the other Indians of their reasonable proportion of seed grain, food and clothing in order to meet this claim. How can he justify that ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It is impossible to please the hon. gentleman. He blames me for asking too much and at the same time for asking too little. I did not tell him positively that I would pay this claim, but that I would consider it, and if paid it will be paid out of this vote. I quite agree that if $300 are paid out of

this $2,100, there will be that much less left for the rest of the Indians.

Mr. GILLIES. If the hon. gentleman is going to provide $100 for building this fence, I beg to give him notice now that I intend applying to him to furnish an allowance for building a fence that I have been keeping up for years between property I own myself and the Indian reserve at Sydney.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. How many chains ?

Mr. GILLIES. It is a considerable stretch of a fence. If it is right for the Minister to make provision for the construction of a fence between the lands of one proprietor and an Indian reserve, it is certainly right he should do so in another and similar cases.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. If the hon. gentleman will not let me get this item through, he will have no chance for his fence.

Mr. GILLIES. I wanted no chance so far and never made application. I never assumed that the Government would be so kind as to come in and assist me in building these line of fences.

Mr. MILLS (Annapolis). When the people of Lochiel, in the county of Annapolis, where there is an Indian reserve, find out that wire fences are being built by the Government to keep out Indians and other annoyances, they will make application to have fences built for them, and these applications will be made by some good Liberal friends as well as Conservatives. There are a few Liberals out in Lochiel, and when they see this vote pass, they will put in similar applications. The only fence they have there now around the Indian reserve is what is known as the Virginia fence, composed of fir poles. I would ask the hon. Minister what the other half of this fence is composed of ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We are not building the other half. I don't think it is built at all yet. I cannot give the hon. gentleman the information ; but I hope that next session I shall be able to tell him the exact principles of construction of our half. The arrangement was that we were to build a similar kind of fence to that which the owner built, and the estimate made by the officer of the department was that the twenty-three chains would cost $100. If it costs less than that, I shall be glad of the saving.

Mr. SPROULE. By building the fence, you admit your liability to maintain it, so that this will become a permanent charge.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Not necessarily.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Who is this Mr. Chisholm ? Last night we had the case of a Mr. Chisholm from Antigonish who was paid because another man's house was burnt. Is this the same Chisholm ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I do not remember.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Chisholms are pretty numerous in that county.

Mr. McDOUGALL. So are Grants.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Evidently the request for this comes from the same source as the other. It is the duty of members to represent the grievances of their constituents. I have no doubt that this comes from the hon. member for Antigonish (Mr. McIsaac) ; and as we have paid for the house that did not belong to Chisholm, we are helping now to build his fence. It would be better to let the item stand until we know if this is the same Chisholm.

Mr. CLANCY. I would ask the hon. Minister if in other cases of the same kind he will act in the same way ? There are many Indian reserves adjoining the land of private individuals. There must be some thing special in this case or the hon. gentleman will have laid down rules which the Government will be expected to follow. Whether the principle is sound or not, I am not arguing at this time, as it is not necessary to do so. But I would like to know if the Minister is prepared to undertake the expense of building a portion of the line fences in other cases in which the circumstances are similar.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I suppose the department must deal practically upon the same principle with everybody. But, as I said to the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague), I would not care to say that in every case the department will build a fence. We shall have to consider each case to see whether there is a hardship in the case of the individual or not.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) find out if this is the same Chisholm who got pay for the burnt house, and let us know to-morrow ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I will.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Shall this item be adopted ?—Carried.

An hon. MEMBER. No, that stands.

Indians—New Brunswick—To provide an additional amount for medical attendance and medicines..... .... $500

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to be informed if there has been an epidemic amongst the Indians of the maritime provinces. There seems to be an increase of $1,800 for medical attendance.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I can only say that the department is con-

stantly struggling to keep down the cost of medical attendance and medicine for the Indians. There is a constant dispute between the department and the medical attendants for the Indians of the maritime provinces, and the records of the department show that there has always been such a dispute. On the 3rd March the expenditure in Nova Scotia was $1,950, from an amount of $2,200, leaving a balance of $250. This expenditure included an amount of $577 for attendance which took place before 30th June last, but the accounts had not come in before the appropriation was spent. The same thing occurred the year before I was in office, and the appropriation has been running behind. I am bringing it even, and that is the cause of the increase. I admit that there is cause of complaint regarding these medical accounts. I have tried two or three different times to make arrangements which I thought would result in diminution of the account, and, so far, not with the success I could desire. I hope to give the matter further attention.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I desire some information with regard to the physician on the Six Nation reserve. The department, at large expense, built a very fine residence in the centre of the reserve for the medical man. I understand now that the medical man is not compelled, as formerly, to reside there, but that he resides in the city of Brantford. I know that the late Government required the medical attendant to reside in the residence on the reserve.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I am not aware that I have given any direction that the rule should be changed. I think I am safe in saying that there has been no change in the rule.

Mr. MONTAGUE. If the physician does not reside in the residence on the reserve, the hon. gentleman will require him to reside there, of course?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I think so, yes.

Mr. MONTAGUE. A man living in Brantford cannot do the work. I think it is fifteen or sixteen miles distant. The work calls for the service of a medical man and his assistant, and the late Government required the medical man to reside in the centre of the reserve, and so he did.

Mr. CLANCY. My information is that the medical man resides in Brantford.

Mr. FOSTER. I wish to call the attention of the Minister to a point to which I directed his attention earlier in the session, with reference to the Tyendinaga Indian band. I understand that this is a band that is supported by its own fund. A dispute has evidently arisen between the band and the Minister with reference to the medical attendant. As I understand it, the medical attendant is paid by the Indians themselves out of their own fund. This band had a medical attendant by the name of Dr. Newton, who was their choice. But the Minister, in his reckless haste to dispense patronage, deposed Dr. Newton, and appointed one or two, and I think there were two, other doctors, and attempted to make the Indians pay them out of the funds of the band. Now, the band has over and over again protested against that, and I have here a resolution, though not of late date, passed by the band by a vote of seventy-five to three, asking the department to give them back their Dr. Newton, and pay the salary out of their fund, out of which the department is now paying the other appointee whose name, I believe, is Dr. Hicks. Now, it seems to me that if a band is independent in that way, and has its own funds, administers them under the supervision of the Government, and has a medical attendant in whom it has confidence, who is paid out of their funds, and the band wishes to continue him, the Government is going a long way for a petty bit of patronage to dismiss that man and appoint a partisan in his place, and demand that the Indians shall pay that partisan.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I am quite satisfied that the hon. gentleman's statement does not convey a correct impression of the facts. I may say to hon. gentlemen that in case anything is done upon the Indian reserve that does not meet with universal approval, there is usually a petition got up on both sides, sometimes both petitions are signed largely by the same men, and it is exceedingly difficult for anybody to tell whether the Indians are in favour of a certain thing or not. The Indians, like the white men, sometimes sign a petition without paying very much attention to what it is. The difficulty of the department in many cases is to find out really what they want. As to the exact circumstance of this particular case, I cannot at the moment remember, but I am perfectly satisfied I would not have dismissed a medical attendant whom the Indians wished to retain.

Mr. FOSTER. Then my hon. friend will have to revise his own statement, because to the questions put to him, he answered in the affirmative. I have not time to look them up now, but I will call the attention of my hon. friend to them to-morrow, and will ask him to give the information. Surely my hon. friend will not take the ground that when a band have their own physician, and wish to retain him and pay him themselves, the Government is going to step in and dismiss him, unless he is incompetent.

Mr. CLANCY. As the question of medical attendance is before the committee, I want to point out to the Minister the case of Dr. Mitchell, the medical attendant of the

Walpole Island band of Indians for many years. The Indians, as the hon. gentleman knows, are a very strange kind of people, and when they have been acquainted for some years with their medical attendant, they were not disposed to part with him. I call this case to the attention of the hon. gentleman, because it is a parallel case. Dr. Mitchell was dismissed on the ground of partisanship, and a political opponent was put in his stead. Now, I have no hesitation in making the statement here, because I live very close to that reserve, that there has been no demand on the part of the Indians for the dismissal of their physician. There can be no fault found with Dr. Mitchell's successor, because he is a very estimable man, but there is an objection to severing the relationship that grows up from long acquaintance with these people. This band have their own moneys, the Government does not contribute a dollar, and it does seem to me a great stretch of partisanship, for the purpose of serving a political friend, that the department should take it into their heads to dispose of the money of these Indians to satisfy their political friends. I have no doubt that if a petition were circulated, the greater number of the Indians would ask that Dr. Mitchell be restored.

Indian Affairs—Manitoba and the North-west Territories $7,900

Mr. DAVIN. Would the hon. gentleman give us some explanation about that?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. This item contains, first, the salary of J. H. Antliff, D.L.S., from 1st of July to 30th September, 1897, $300. This gentleman I found in the department when I came in, and I subsequently removed him to the surveyor general's branch. But I found when I came in that the department had not a sufficient appropriation for his salary. A supplementary vote was taken during the last fiscal year, and during this year he was allowed to remain on three months longer than I had anticipated.

Mr. DAVIN. I find in a return that I asked for, that in the Indian Department in the North-west Territories, a regular army of officers, some of whom were known to myself to be good officers, were dismissed, and I cannot understand why. Among them were Mr. D. McCara, Mr. D. McLaughlin, and Mr. W. Pocklington. The latter gentleman was employed in the storekeeper's department in Regina, and I find here it is said that he was superannuated. Would the Minister tell me what superannuation he got?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I cannot tell the hon. gentleman what it was. He can find it in the list.

Mr. DAVIN. I find here Mr. J. J. Campbell, of Moose Mountain, dismissed for political partisanship, on the 31st of May, 1897. Well, I never heard that Mr. Campbell was guilty of the least partisanship, or showed any political sympathy whatever. Does the hon. gentleman know what his political partisanship consisted in?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Not at the present moment.

Mr. DAVIN. I would like to call the hon. Minister's attention to the case of J. A. Sutherland, of Crooked Lake reserve, who resigned on 31st May. Why was he asked to resign?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Did he resign? I thought he was dismissed?

Mr. DAVIN. I understood he was dismissed.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. If the return says he resigned, no doubt he resigned.

Mr. DAVIN. There is not a hint that Sutherland was guilty of partisanship.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No; it is alleged he resigned.

Mr. DAVIN. I am in a position to say he did not resign voluntarily. Since Mr. Sutherland retired or was dismissed from the Crooked Lake reserve, that reserve has gone from bad to worse and at this moment is in a miserable condition. The management of Indian affairs there is in the worst possible state of demoralization. I read a letter the other evening from a gentleman who is well informed on the subject, and who says that the Indians are thoroughly demoralized and are leaving the reserve. Then there is Mr. Calder, dismissed for political partisanship on 31st May. If Calder was dismissed for political partisanship, the very nicest apothecary's scale was used to weigh his conduct. P. L. Grasse was also dismissed on May 31st for political partisanship, and D. Pierce, dismissed for political partisanship. What is meant by political partisanship? We were assured by the right hon. Prime Minister in 1896 that no man would be removed for political partisanship, unless he made himself offensive. The hon. gentleman said that a man voting or holding Conservative opinions would not be sufficient to remove him, but he must take an active part in an election, either he must go on the platform or write in the newspapers; and I agree with the Prime Minister that we should then give him an opportunity of becoming a public man. Then there is W. Anderson, clerk, superannuated, office abolished. Then we have Geo. McNabb, of Touchwood, which is in my constituency. If he was active in supporting me I would know of it, but I never heard that he gave me any assistance, and I do not know that he voted for me. Then there is the case of W. Lambert, farm instructor, dismissed for political partisan-

ship, a man who is one of the best farm instructors I know of. Whatever he may have done, he certainly never spoke on the platform or wrote in the press. There were no investigations held in these cases; that is not the way the Minister of the Interior acts. His colleague, the Postmaster General, although I believe he swung the axe with a certain amount of vigour, I commend because in many cases known to myself he investigated the case of these officers of the country and gave them a chance for their lives, and at all events told them what the charges against them were. Then there is T. Baker, of Touchwood, dismissed for political partisanship. I know that Baker never spoke on the platform and never wrote in the press and never made himself active. Then there is J. H. Gordon, of Duck Lake, in the same position. F. C. Cornish, services dispensed with; reasons not given. Then I find the name of H. W. Halpin. It is here stated that on 17th July Halpin's services were dispensed with.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Halpin is still in the service.

Mr. DAVIN. Then there is John Carney, I spoke the other night of C. J. Williams. F. A. D. Bourke, Wilson, DéGear and Taylor. Then there is T. Scott, interpreter on the Piegan reserve, dismissed for political partisanship.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The hon. gentleman is a long way from the Piegan reserve.

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. gentleman must have noticed that I spoke in pianissimo tones. I reiterate my protest against these dismissals and against the unjust, impolitic and foolish dismissal of John Dobin.

Indian Affairs—To provide an additional amount for the travelling expenses of Inspectors McRae and Chitty $500

Mr. WALLACE. I call attention to the dismissal of Wentworth F. Wood, of Kamloops.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. He is in the service of the department of the Interior, I think, and not of Indian Affairs; he is either a land agent or Indian agent. He was removed altogether because of inefficiency in the discharge of his duty. If my hon. friend will make inquiries, he will find there could not be any political motive because he is the son of a strong Liberal and supporter of the Government in the east, who interceded in his behalf. I gave him further trial, but he did not perform his duties properly, and I dismissed him.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. gentleman is mistaken in regard to the individual. Mr. Wood is a business man and has had considerable business experience. I know the gentleman very well, and I speak from personal knowledge when I say that the charge of inefficiency was never made against him. Inefficiency was not given as the reason for his removal.

No such reason was ever given until this moment so that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) will need to look up the matter if he thinks it worth while—but the hon. gentleman does not think it worth while to investigate these matters very carefully until he is dismissing a man from the service to make room for somebody else. I know Mr. Wood to be a painstaking, conscientious and good business man who looked after the affairs of the Indian Department carefully, and there was no more efficient Indian agent in the service. The only charge made against him was that he had taken part in politics, which I am informed on the best authority was not at all true. The statement as to his inefficiency is totally inaccurate. However, this is not such a case of hardship as the Minister might intend it to be, because in the case of competent men who are young it is often just as well that they are relieved from Government positions, and I fancy Mr. Wood has done much better since he was dismissed.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) is entirely mistaken, if he says that any charge of political partisanship was made against Mr. Wood. I did not dismiss him because of political partisanship, for my impression was and is now, that Mr. Wood, if he was anything at all, was a Liberal.

Mr. WALLACE. Whose son did the Minister say he was?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The son of a gentleman living in eastern Canada, who is a supporter of the Government.

Mr. WALLACE. Living whereabouts?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I think he lives in Montreal, and when it was rumoured this man was to be dismissed his father wrote me a private letter saying he was aggrieved, and referred to the fact that he was a supporter of the Government and claimed the matter should be looked into, although if the son was incompetent he did not wish him retained. This took place more than a year ago, and my impression is that the matter hung fire for a considerable length of time, until finally I considered that in the best interests of the service Mr. Wood should be removed. I state most emphatically to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) that at the time Mr. Wood was removed I believed him to be a Liberal and the son of a Liberal, and he was not removed for any reason except that it was in the public interest he should be.

Mr. WALLACE. I cannot tell the politics of his father and I do not think it is

of much consequence, but I can say that this is the first time it has ever been said Mr. Wood was inefficient. I wish the Minister to bring down a copy of the paper dismissing him from the service.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I will do that.

Mr. WALLACE. Mr. Wood received a letter some time during the middle of the month that his services had been dispensed with on the first of the month previously, and I am quite sure that the reason stated in that letter was not inefficiency. Before these Estimates go through I want to get a copy of the letter written to Mr. Wood dispensing with his services.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I will bring it down.

Further amount required for insane patients in Manitoba asylums..... $6,750

Mr. DAVIN. I renew my appeal to the Minister to get us out of the anomalous position of having to send our insane patients from the North-west Territories to Manitoba. Place us in a position to have an asylum of our own and to keep our insane patients in the North-west Territories, and thus save the cost of sending them away. We are now practically having responsible government and on the threshold of provincial autonomy, and I believe that our insane patients should be kept at home instead of being sent to Manitoba.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I can only repeat that the question of dealing with matters of this kind in the North-west Territories is a difficult problem. We have the case of the insane and of the blind and of the deaf and dumb, and as the hon. gentleman knows the care of these people in the provinces is with the province itself. But the subsidy to the North-west Territories has not been exactly on the same basis as the subsidy to the provinces, and the Territorial Government claims that it ought not to be called on to defray these expenses. Just so soon as the Federal Government commences to defray these expenses the House will see that it means a large capital expenditure for buildings, and a large annual expenditure for taking care of these buildings and the inmates. Nobody realizes more fully than I the difficulty of dealing with these cases, and nobody realizes more than I the necessity of providing better facilities than we have at the present time. The case of the blind and of the deaf and dumb in the Territories is regarded as particularly distressing. I remember that in Manitoba there was considerable agitation before a deaf and dumb institution was provided there, but as soon as it was provided it was filled up and is more than full now. I have applications from persons in the North-west Territories for the accommodation of deaf and dumb children for whom there is no means of providing now. The same can be said with regard to the blind. All these classes of afflicted persons will have to be dealt with together. All I can say at the present moment is that I realize, as fully as the hon. gentleman does, the necessity of dealing with the matter. I do not regard the present arrangement at all as a finality; and as soon as the question can be taken up and fully considered, I hope to present some scheme to the House for dealing with it.

Mr. SPROULE. Can the hon. gentleman tell us how many patients from the North-west Territories have been in the Manitoba asylum in the year, because I see there was an expenditure last year of $36,000?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. In 1896, there were 75 patients. During the past six months there have been an average of 95. It will take this $6,000 to pay what we owe to the province.

Mr. McMULLEN. The fact that there are some 95 patients from the North-west Territories in the insane asylum in Manitoba indicates that it has become a serious question whether it would not be better, and possibly cheaper in the end, to make some provision for that unfortunate class within the Territories themselves. I had no idea that there were so many as the hon. Minister states. Of course, it might necessitate the erection of a building; but when you take into consideration the enormous expense of conveying patients such long distances by rail to Manitoba, and also the expense imposed on relatives who wish to visit them, in my opinion the suggestion of the hon. member for Western Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) is worthy of serious consideration, whether it would not be better to erect something in the way of a home for this unfortunate class in the North-west Territories.

Mr. SPROULE. I think there is a great deal of force in what the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) says. The estimate for the coming year is $50,000 instead of $36,000, as it was last year. That is a very large increase. Even for an average of 95 patients, it seems to me that $50,000 is a very large expenditure. If it is going to grow at that rapid rate, the question arises whether it would not be cheaper to erect buildings for them in the North-west Territories.

Mr. DAVIN. The Minister has referred to an even more serious matter than the treatment of the insane. He has referred to the more distressing fact that in the North-west Territories, we have no provision for deaf and dumb children. I will mention a case, and ask the attention of hon. gentlemen opposite. In the winter of the present year, a man came to me who had a deaf and dumb child, and asked me what he

could do. I referred him to a member of the local Government, Mr. Haultain. Mr. Haultain told him he had no funds for that purpose. I then referred him to a leading Liberal friend of mine, who is supposed to have something to do with patronage, and said: "You tell that gentleman to write to the Minister of the Interior, and perhaps he will be able to do something; but it might be even the fact that the Minister of the Interior has no funds for the purpose." Nothing was done. I wrote the Minister myself. The difficulty is this, that we have not yet grappled with the needs of the Territories in regard to our insane patients and deaf mutes, and the sooner it is done the better. The best way to grapple with those needs is to give the North-west Assembly funds for the purpose of providing for them, in proportion to their population and the taxes they pay—on precisely the same basis as you give funds to the provinces; and you will find that the local government will provide for their insane patients and deaf mutes.

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

After Recess.

The House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Further amount required for surveys, examination of survey returns, printing of plans, &c..... $40,000

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The amount we estimated last year was $90,000, but we expended all that money and are sending out a considerable number of parties this year. Some have gone out and others are remaining behind, because we have not the money to pay their expenses. This will be required to furnish these parties with funds during this fiscal year to get into that country. The amount of work we are doing under this class of expenditure is much larger than of late years, because it is necessary to do a large amount of work to keep ahead of settlement.

Mr. HAGGART. This is a grant for this year's expenditure?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We have not overrun the appropriation. This money is required to furnish the parties who are going out now. Some we are holding back and some have started and are waiting at different points in order to get the money to push on this year's work.

Mr. HAGGART. Surely the hon. gentleman does not require $40,000 between now and the first of July?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes, we have to advance a considerable sum to the parties as they go out, in order to furnish supplies.

Mr. DAVIN. Where are they going?

Mr. DAVIN.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The parties who have not yet gone to work are the following:—A party for the purpose of making a subdivision survey at or near Whitemouth, consisting of nine men; a party for making subdivision surveys in the Swan River district, nine men; a party for outlying surveys in Prince Albert district, seven men; a party for making subdivision surveys, under Mr. Saunders, in southern Alberta; a party for making subdivision surveys in northern Alberta, under T. K. McLean, eight men; a party for making a subdivision survey of Beaver Hills, nine men, under Mr. Duberger; miscellaneous surveys, British Columbia, under J. E. Ross, eight men. Irrigation surveys are being held back until an appropriation is received in order that we may get the parties started.

Mr. SPROULE. Last year you had $95,000 for these. Is that all spent?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes, and we are waiting to get more in order to furnish the parties going out.

Mr. SPROULE. Now you want $40,000 more?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. How much do you advance for each party as it goes out?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It depends on the distance they are going, the number of men they will have, and the supplies they require. The work is all done under the Surveyor General, and this estimate is his estimate of what he requires.

Mr. SPROULE. Do you advance the men enough to get supplies for the whole season? I should think it to be much easier for them to get supplies now than it was years ago.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It does not make any difference how much we advance. If we advance more to-day, we will pay less at the end. It depends on where the survey is to be made. If they are going to some place where you cannot get supplies conveniently, they get a full outfit. These surveyors are experienced men, and a good deal is left to their discretion. I could give the hon. gentleman a list of what each man gets, but I do not think that would be of much use to him.

Mr. SPROULE. It might be used in this way. Sometimes you make advances to men and they do not do the work. Are you sending these men by the day or by contract.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There is no contract work at all.

Mr. SPROULE. How much do you give them a day?

Mr. DAVIN. Counting the number of men the hon. gentleman gave us, this makes about $7 a man.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. If the hon. gentleman will figure up the number of parties he will find what they receive—that is besides irrigation surveys. It would be about that amount.

Mr. MONTAGUE. When the hon. gentleman took his estimate last year, 1897-98, did he not expect he would have enough ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes, I did, but I may say this, that I am guilty of going against the advice of the Surveyor General in the estimates last year. He recommended a much larger amount than I estimated. He recommended about $150,000 or $175,000. I thought we could keep the expenditure down to $90,000 or $95,000, but I find that, from time to time, during the year, we were pressed to make additional surveys in certain places, on the ground that the settlers were there waiting to take up land, and it was difficult to refuse such applications. I have not overrun the appropriation, but if I do not get this appropriation, it means that these men who are now delayed in their work cannot get out. I spent last year all we had and this is required to furnish the men who are going out now.

Mr. MONTAGUE. This should lessen next year's vote.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There will be a similar amount in the appropriation for 1898-99, but next year I hope to get the men started in plenty of time.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman's friends when in Opposition, always contended that there was too much money spent on these surveys, and the amount of land surveyed was not taken up by any means. They said that we surveyed without the land being settled and when there was no need for a a survey. But since the hon. gentleman has been in office, the expenditure seems to have jumped up very rapidly. The estimate this year is a good deal over $100,000, including this supplementary estimate, in addition to what was voted last year, and next year the hon. gentleman asks for $150,000. Settlement must be going on very rapidly to justify the expenditure of so much money on additional surveys. How does the hon. gentleman pay those surveyors ?

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). Has the hon. gentleman made any new additions to the staff during the past year ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We have added to the parties. When we send out more parties we must have more surveyors. I have discontinued the practice of sending out young men not specially versed in land surveying business as assistants. We now have surveyors as assistants. These assistants get $3 a day and their expenses. The result is, as the Surveyor General reports, that they can do very much more work with surveyors as assistants than under the old system. The hon. gentleman asks what the men in charge of the parties get. I cannot give him the exact figure, but I shall be able to do so in a short time. Some of these men are permanent officers of the department, that is, they have been permanent officers. They work here in the winter and go out in the summer.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). This is a very good arrangement to provide all the Dominion and provincial land surveyors, all who are favourable to the hon. gentleman's Government, with a summer's job. I do not suppose that a provincial land surveyor is any better as a chain-bearer than the young men who were formerly engaged in the work at very much less remuneration. It appears to me that, after the extensive work we have done in the way of surveying in the North-west, we have a right to expect that instead of an increase, the expense would become less year by year. I suppose the hon. gentleman may not argue that the settlement of the habitable lands in the North-west is so rapid as to justify him in coming down to this House and asking for an increased expenditure for the survey.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I would certainly say that, with the exception of the survey in the Yukon district, the surveys have been made upon the pressing application of persons in the district where such surveyors are wanted—subdivision surveys for the purpose of meeting the wants of the settlers. We have had some additional expense owing to the fact that lines had to be re-traced in certain places where the survey marks had been obliterated—posts taken away, and so on. In such cases, to prevent very great confusion, it has been necessary to re-trace the lines in a considerable number of cases. But I can assure the hon. gentleman that, outside of the Yukon district, we are doing no work except such as is necessary for the convenience of the people who are just going in.

Mr. DAVIN. The most of this $40,000 will have to be debited to the year 1898-99, and added, therefore, to the $150,000 the hon. gentleman has mentioned.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Of course, what we do not spend before 1st July lapses.

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. gentleman has given us a list of surveying parties, containing an average of about eight men, making up altogether fifty-seven men. At $3 a day, and taking the full thirty days to the month, that would only amount to a few thousands and nothing like $40,000. I should

think that $10,000 would cover all the hon. gentleman wants.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I explained that it was necessary, in sending out these parties, to equip them, furnish them with money ahead for their expenses and for their outfit.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to ask the hon. Minister a question or two. I have listened very attentively, but I confess I do not understand this case. Have any of the parties yet started ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Not of the ones I mentioned.

Mr. FOSTER. Now, does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) say that the vote he took last year, of $95,000, is sufficient to meet the expenses for the year of these parties' operations.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There are some other parties besides those I have spoken of. They will be out of money in a short time if the appropriation is not passed permitting the department to forward the money. I presume that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) wants to know if the men we have out in the field to-day do not get any further appropriation, would we have to pay them ? No, we should have to call them in.

Mr. FOSTER. How many parties have already been sent out ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Ten parties have already been sent out. This, of course, is exclusive of the parties in the Yukon district, the men for which are there and a party for the irrigation survey, who are on the ground.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, when the hon. Minister gets his present number of parties equipped, he will have eighteen parties in all in the field ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes, and in addition to that, the men in the Yukon district and on the irrigation survey.

Mr. FOSTER. How many men in each party that is out ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There would be an average of eight.

Mr. FOSTER. How many men in the irrigation party ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Their men are not hired yet. There is the chief, Mr. Wheeler, and the assistant, Mr. Peterson. But my information does not indicate that the other men have been hired yet.

Mr. FOSTER. How many men are there in the Yukon on surveys ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The surveyors took up two or three men as assistants, and they will have to hire the other men there. The force will be about two men to each surveyor. One party in exploring the Stewart River, I presume ; that is what they are expected to do. The others are all attached to the Gold Commissioner's office, and their instructions are to act under him, and probably they would be engaged in the surveying of mining claims.

Mr. FOSTER. Is my hon. friend charging that to Dominion lands ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. To Dominion lands.

Mr. FOSTER. Explorations, examination of rivers, and the like of that. It does not seem to me that the vote was ever intended for that purpose, it was intended to survey Dominion lands for settlement.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I do not think so, necessarily. The hon. gentleman will find that the surveying that has been done in the Yukon district heretofore has not been for settlement, but it has been charged to this vote.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think it was a proper charge. What Parliament contemplated with that vote was that the money should be used to survey lands in the North-west for settlement. I do not think it was meant to be used for making surveys of rivers, mining claims, or anything of that kind. I am quite certain of that. I am also quite certain that if you are to use this vote for that now, you are making all comparisons between this and previous years impossible, because you are enlarging the scope of the vote. Take the history of that vote and the debate upon it from time to time, and you will find that was the purpose of the vote. We had settlers coming into this country. It has been a vexed question as to whether this should be paid out of income or capital. The Minister of Trade and Commerce has taken the ground for years that this should go as a charge to income in the usual way for settling up the North-west. The basis of the vote most assuredly was, the one purpose of it was, to survey those lands for the purpose of settlement. Now, if my hon. friend is exploring rivers in the Yukon, and is tracing out mining claims in the Yukon, and doing all that sort of thing, he is doing with this vote what Parliament never intended. Is my hon. friend attaching surveyors to the Gold Commissioner's office in the Yukon to survey out claims of miners ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes. My hon. friend knows, of course, that in the first instance mining claims are generally staked out by the miners themselves. Then it very often happens that disputes arise, and in such cases the sur-

veyor is sent out by the commissioner to make a survey, and he on return files his plans. I said that these men would probably be occupied during the summer largely in that work. They have been doing that work, that is, surveying plots of land and connecting those surveys with the survey of the River Yukon. The hon. gentleman is aware that we have not any township lot survey in the Yukon district. But these men are doing all the survey work that has been done there, including the survey of town sites and plots for purposes for which application may be made. As to the point the hon. gentleman makes in reference to the application of the vote in former years, it may be, possibly, discussions of the kind referred to have taken place. But it is certainly a fact that work of this description, perhaps not surveying mining claims, but similar work to that which I have described, other than surveying mining claims, has been charged to this vote before.

Mr. FOSTER. I want to call the attention of the Government to that, because we are now taking up classes of expenditure and charging them to a vote which is as blind as it can possibly be. I apprehend that the vote for irrigation work has been charged to this vote for surveying.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. I think that is entirely wrong. How are we going to know the result of a policy which takes up the work of irrigation? It is entirely new work to this country. It is work which we are interested in, and which serves other countries which pattern after our example, just as we take the example of other countries in irrigation. Now, if the hon. gentleman is charging the cost of irrigation to the surveying of Dominion lands, why, there is no basis at all upon which you can estimate by statistics the result of what is an experiment, to a large extent, though successful in many cases. I want to ask the hon. gentleman to separate his irrigation vote and make it for irrigation purposes, and then the House will know exactly what it is spending upon irrigation. But when the House gives you a vote of $150,000 for surveying Dominion lands, and you take the right to spend as much of that vote as you please, without consulting the House, for irrigation purposes, you are doing what the House has not authorized you to do, and the House is certainly working in the dark. The same with reference to mining claims. Surely the hon. gentleman is not going to take the public funds of the country to defray the cost of surveying out mining claims in the Yukon. In British Columbia, if I take up a claim and he takes up a claim, and if there is any clash in respect to the claim, we have to get that settled by getting a Crown grant, after a survey for a Crown grant. We have to pay our own surveyors, the dispute can only be settled when the surveys are made, and the actual bounds are set out, not by the Government, not at the expense of the Government, but at the expense of holders of the claims themselves. The same in the province of Ontario. Provincial money does not survey the claims of the claim holder in Ontario, that is all at the expense of the mine owners, or the claim holder himself. In Ontario you have to pay about $2 an acre for a survey; in British Columbia you have to pay some $500 or $600 in order to get a survey made for a Crown grant. Surely the Dominion, in the Yukon, is not going to take the burden of surveying out individual miners' claims.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It may be perfectly correct to say that it would be more satisfactory to have this irrigation vote separated from the other. There is a good deal in what my hon. friend says in regard to that. But he can hardly blame me or the Government, because in bringing up a vote in this form this year, we are following the practice that has prevailed heretofore. The Surveyor General's estimate comes in in the same form in which it came in other years. I have no objection next year to bring it in in the other form. I think, perhaps, it would be more satisfactory.

Mr. FOSTER. In connection with irrigation, the expenditure should be put, not to capital, but to current expenditure. It is a question whether or not this vote should not be charged to income. I have listened often with a great deal of attention to the arguments the present Minister of Trade and Commerce used on that line; but as the item was commenced to be charged to capital, we held to that practice, because, after all, the amount came out of the public chest and comparison could in that way be more easily made. The irrigation vote should be kept by itself and put to income. I protest, if the practice has been begun, against public funds being used for surveying claims of individual miners. Let each man pay for the survey of his claim, as is done in every mining country in the world.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. As to irrigation surveys, I do not know whether they should be charged to capital or not. The hon. gentleman attaches great importance to the statements made by the Minister of Trade and Commerce, but they did not change the hon. gentleman's practice of charging surveys to income. In regard to the irrigation service, I have no objection next year to bring it down as a separate vote. I accept the hon. gentleman's suggestion, and perhaps the course he proposes will be more satisfactory. As to the mining claims, I do not want it to be imagined that we propose continuously to employ Dominion surveyors to survey mining

claims. In view of the enormous number of claims surveyed we thought difficulty might be obviated by having this work done under the present system until some kind of organized government was established in the Yukon, and that much money and trouble would be saved by having two or three experienced surveyors there who would settle disputes by surveying claims. Mr. Ogilvie told me that on three different occasions he had prevented what threatened to be a serious riot by going and surveying the mining claims in dispute. I do not intend that the present system should be permanent. But I thought it prudent to have these surveyors there until the Government is organized.

Mr. FOSTER. I think the hon. gentleman's idea is a good one, to have some well-known Dominion surveyors there, who would be authorities on the subject of mining rights. But no man starts to the Yukon with the idea of having his claims surveyed at the Government's expense. Although the hon. Minister may have Dominion surveyors there, it would be a good thing to charge a small fee for the survey, which fee would be really paid.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes, when the district is organized.

Mr. FOSTER. If the vote of last year was sufficient, the hon. Minister does not need $40,000 to be voted in the Supplementary Estimates. Every day's pay and all provisions must be bought before now and the 1st of July to come within this vote; all work done and provisions purchased after that date will go into next year's vote. So the hon. gentleman can only ask the amount necessary to fit out the survey parties, and $8,000 or $10,000 would be sufficient, provided the hon. gentleman has not over-expended the vote of $95,000, as he did on the immigration vote.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No.

Mr. FOSTER. There is no other reason why this vote should be asked, unless there is a deficiency lurking in the background. If the hon. gentleman has over-expended without the authority of Parliament, let him admit his transgression, but if not, there is no reason for asking for $40,000, which it is impossible to spend between now and the 1st July in fitting out these parties.

Mr. SPROULE. I notice in this item that there is an amount to pay a gratuity to the widow of a surveyor. That is charged to capital. Further down $5,000 is asked to pay a gratuity to William Ogilvie in recognition of his distinguished public services in surveying the Yukon. In both cases the items are for surveys and explorations; yet the first item is charged to capital and the later is charged to income. The book-keeping is defective.

Mr. SIFTON.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The hon. gentleman is not correct in regard to the items in question. The annuity to the widow is charged to capital because it properly belongs to the surveys. The latter is charged to income because it is a gratuity to Mr. Ogilvie, and it could not be charged to capital account.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood that the amount voted to Mr. Ogilvie was in connection with surveys. Both the items should be charged in the same way.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I do not think so. Expenses in connection with regular surveys and explorations are charged to capital. When the Government decided to ask Parliament to vote Mr. Ogilvie a gratuity in the nature of a honorarium for distinguished services, that could not be charged to capital account. Still, I have no doubt my hon. friend the Minister of Finance would be willing to do it to oblige the hon. gentleman.

Mr. SPROULE. I am not raising any special objection; but it seems to me that the book-keeping is not done on a proper system because it does not enable you to separate the items, and get an idea of how much is spent for one purpose and how much for another. That is the only objection I raise.

Mr. HAGGART. The item speaks of "printing of plans, &c." You do not need any plans, and what is the "&c.?"

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There will not be anything required for the printing of plans, but this is the form in which the Surveyor General's note was taken, and it is followed; that is all.

Mr. WALLACE. This vote will not be available, say, for two weeks; that is, after the 20th June; so that, from the 20th of June to the 30th of June you are going to spend $40,000. The hon. gentleman cannot do it.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. If we do not spend it, the vote will lapse. The hon. gentleman will understand that the memorandum was made up on the 2nd of June, and it was expected at that time that the vote would be available before now. But as soon as the vote is passed, and the moneys become available, they will be forwarded to the parties who are out, and the parties who are not out will be started.

Mr. WALLACE. Then, are we to be told that men are sent on long expeditions without any money, and that the Dominion Government is to tell them, We have no money for this purpose, but we will send the money later on? I think it is a very humiliating position for a Government to be in. I think the Minister of the Interior has got on the soft side of the Minister of Finance and has got him to go down to the bank and say to the bank, Advance some money to the Min-

ister of the Interior, and we will vote the money later on. That would be a highly improper way of doing business—incurring expenditure for $40,000 without a Governor General's warrant, without an estimate having been made beforehand as to the necessity of this expenditure, without Parliament having been consulted in the earlier days of the session. This Parliament met on the 3rd of February, more than four months ago. If this money was required to send out expeditions and gangs of surveyors to distant parts of the Dominion, the hon. gentleman might have come down in the earlier days of the session and have said, This is a specially urgent case, and we ask Parliament to vote this amount. Instead of doing that he comes down in the last hours of the session, and asks in the Supplementary Estimates for $40,000 which cannot be spent legitimately or properly in the ten days that will elapse between the time the Governor General's sanction can be given to it and the 1st of July, when the vote will lapse entirely. I think it is a most extraordinary state of affairs. The Minister has not explained it at all to the satisfaction of the House. He has not told us the particulars that woud justify him in asking for this enormous sum in addition to what was voted last year and what was considered adequate—because he presumably made an estimate of the year's work. The House did not prorogue last year till close to the 1st of July, and the hon. gentleman should have then known what his plans were for the year, and should have had them carefully considered and laid before the House, and asked for a vote which would have been sufficient and justifiable. Instead of that, within a few days of the expiration of the fiscal year, he comes here and asks Parliament for a vote of $40,000. If there ever has been a sample of unbusiness-like methods and dealings, this is one. When the Minister of the Interior comes and asks Parliament for this vote, he is bound to give the fullest explanations of the vote, and state the reasons why he did not ask for what was required a year ago. Before this money is voted, the Minister is bound to give Parliament the fullest explanations.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I have given the House all the information which the hon. gentleman asks. As to what the hon. gentleman says with regard to the impropriety of the Government incurring obligations before Parliament has sanctioned the expenditure of the money, what I have said in regard to that answers what he says. I say that the money has not been spent; but I am surprised that my hon. friend has only now learned that principle of parliamentary law. If he will look back over the accounts of the Government of which he was a member, he will find that the principle of parliamentary law which he has enunciated was constantly violated. He will find that in the Post Office Department, for instance, the Postmaster General had to take a special appropriation of something like $600,000 to pay the accumulated deficits which had been carried in that department from year to year, the expenditures of one year having been paid out of the votes of another. I would not justify doing that because hon. gentlemen opposite did it when in office; but I should think that the hon. gentleman would remember some of these little facts before making his criticisms. As far as this particular vote is concerned, there has been no exceeding the appropriation. What I am asking the vote for is what I have explained to the committee.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the hon. Minister ought to be prepared to give us some information with regard to the number of the surveying parties he is proposing to send out and how much it will take to equip each of them. Surely he had that estimate before him when he submitted this appropriation to Council, because it was only by means of such an estimate that he could justify asking for the money. How many surveying parties are there, how much is required to equip each party, what is the number of men sent out, and what supplies do they need in the shape of money? I think we are entitled to all these details before we vote the item.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I think the committee is entitled to know from the Minister the particulars of this very large appropriation. It is very unusual to ask a sum of $40,000 in the Supplementary Estimates for the current year. It shows a very great lack of proper information, either on the part of the departmental officers or of the hon. gentleman himself to come to Parliament last session and get a sum to meet the expenses of the surveys for the present year which was not sufficient. The hon. gentleman would never have got his colleagues in Council to consent to such an item unless he could lay before them particulars to make up this sum. He should certainly furnish this information more specifically.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I can give the hon. gentleman the separate items of the work in the different districts.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). The Minister will understand, that the main question is as to the particular item he requires for the period between now and the first of July. I understood him to say a moment ago that part of it was for paying the equipment of survey parties that had already gone out. But that does not take up the whole $40,000.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It is for some who have gone out and some who are going out. The surveying for the summer of 1898 of course is partly in

the fiscal year 1898 and partly in the fiscal year of 1899.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). But the hon. gentleman does not intend any portion of this amount to defray expenses of survey parties which, though it goes out now will extend its operations after 1st July next, which will be in the fiscal year 1899.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. What I was going to explain is that the estimates of the Surveyor General, while they must be made for the fiscal year are yet made with a view of the parties working in the summer partly in one fiscal year and partly in another. The total amount of the survey in contemplation, including what will be done during the spring of this year—that is before the 1st July—is as follows:—For Manitoba and North-west Territories, $128,350; irrigation surveys, $14,340; British Columbia, $6,000; Yukon district, $21,000; office staff and expenses, $26,210. That is a total of $190,000, which is equal to the $150,000 for next year and the $40,000 we are asking for now.

Mr. HAGGART. How much is chargeable to income?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. None of it. The office of the Surveyor General in connection with the survey of Crown lands is chargeable to capital.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not wish to be too persistent, but I think the Minister ought to tell us how many surveying parties he intends to send out that are to be paid out of this sum, and how much he intends to advance each of them for supplies?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There are 22 parties altogether, some of them are out, as I have said, and some of them are not. Those that are not yet out will be supplied with whatever is necessary, varying in the different cases. The Surveyor General exercises discretion in dealing with each particular case. The parties that are out now, will, of course, after the vote is available, have funds forwarded to them.

Mr. SPROULE. How did the hon. Minister equip those he has sent out?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We paid it out of the appropriation we had.

Mr. SPROULE. If this is paid out of the appropriation he had he does not require to pay it again. How much does he propose to advance to each party for supplies?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I could not give the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) the exact amount in each case.

Mr. SPROULE. But the hon. Minister must have had that information before he submitted the item to Council, otherwise he could not have got it through Council. The Surveyor General must have furnished him with an estimate, otherwise he could not have come to any intelligent decision as to what he required.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The Surveyor General generally makes up a statement showing a bulk sum for each party.

Mr. SPROULE. Cannot the hon. gentleman give that statement.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I have not it under my hand just now.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. Minister stated that he required $190,000 for next year, of which $150,000 is voted, and that virtually this $40,000 is for next year. Then he states that some of this $40,000 is to be applied to surveying parties already out and to those going out. Surely he cannot make these two statements balance. Then the hon. gentleman must know that we are entitled to be informed how much of this money is to be expended on surveying parties already out up to 1st July, and how much does he intend to apply to new surveying parties going out.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I cannot tell the hon. gentleman that, but this will be forwarded to each party to keep them going until 1st July.

Mr. HAGGART. But that may be practically the expenditure for the whole season, including a part of the next fiscal year. Cannot the hon. gentleman state at once that he is not going to apply this money for the starting of new surveys as the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) has shown it is impossible for him to do any practical work in the ten days at his disposal. We are entitled to know the amount by which he has exceeded the estimate and what he requires for a new survey party.

Mr. WALLACE. But another point was this. The hon. gentleman is going to send out 11 parties. How is a party that is sent out when the season is half over going to do a proper season's work? These parties should have been sent out three months ago.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The hon. gentleman finds fault with the ones I did send out. He cannot blow hot and cold.

Mr. WALLACE. I think we are quite consistent in our argument. If the hon. gentleman were as consistent in his course, there would not be so many reasons to find fault with him. How can those parties who are going out now do a season's work? If they are to do a proper season's work, they should have been started months ago. How many are there in each party? There will be about $169,000 spent on these survey par-

ties, and 22 are sent out, making about $700 for each. I would like the hon. gentleman to tell us what are the various classes of men that make up a party.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The surveyors, who are on the permanent staff of the Surveyor General, get $125 a month, those who are employed temporarily get $5 a day. The assistants, who are surveyors, get $3 per day, and the chainmen and labouring men get $1 a day, and, of course, their expenses. The average number in each party is eight men.

Mr. McDOUGALL. Does any of this go to pay the expenses of the party that left under Mr. McEvoy about ten days ago, by way of Edmonton?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The hon. gentleman is thinking of the Geological Survey, which has nothing to do with this item.

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. gentleman has given two or three different reasons for this expenditure. He told me that it would be spent on surveying parties that were to go out, and that seven were going out, making a total of 57 of a staff. If you take $3 a day and their rations, and the number of days during which this can be done, by no ingenuity can you make up more than $10,000. That makes $30,000 not accounted for, and he cannot spend that after the 1st of July. The hon. gentleman indicated to my hon. friend on my right that some of it would be spent next year, but when it was pointed out that that could not be done legally, he told us that was to pay some surveyors who were already out. He told us that there were 22 surveying parties, and implied that not only would this go to pay the seven parties who are going out but also to pay some of the money due to a portion of the 22 parties. The hon. gentleman had better make a clean breast of it. He has exceeded his appropriation, he owes the money, and this is to pay his indebtedness.

Mr. FOSTER. How much of the vote of $95,000 is expended at this date?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. My information is that it is all expended.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman might just as well acknowledge that what he has done is to over-expend the vote, and he wants $30,000 to make up his over-expenditure. He got authority to spend $95,000, and he spent $30,000 more than he had authority to spend.

Mr. WALLACE. I shall just make a little calculation on the figures given by the hon. Minister of the Interior. $125 a month for the chief, $90 for his assistant, and $1 a day for the six other men—all that makes $295 a month. Say eight months, which will be longer than they will be out, that will make $2,370 for wages. Taking a dollar a day for board, and that is an exaggerated estimate, will give $1,920 for the eight months. Then adding $400 for railway fares, and you have a total of $4,680 for each survey party. Twenty-two parties were sent out, which will make $103,000 for all, and the hon. Minister asks $169,000, or $66,000 more than he can reasonably account for. If matters were looked after properly, this $40,000 would not be required at all, for the appropriation of last year was largely in excess of the demands made upon it.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It is possible that the $40,000 will not be spent and will lapse.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. gentleman says that 22 parties were sent out. Now, each of these parties cost $4,680 for the season, or $103,000 in round numbers, yet he asks for $169,000 for this service. He is bound to explain why he asks such an enormous amount. He has not given us any details that would justify us in voting this amount.

Mr. HENDERSON. When we reached the item of $68,000 for immigration, I thought perhaps we had touched the last of those acts of maladministration of the Minister of the Interior in spending more money than had been voted by Parliament. But I regret very much that circumstances now brought out disclose another instance of the same character, and from all the information I can get from the admissions of the Minister, this item of $40,000 is really required to cover money that has already been expended, and expended without the authority of Parliament, illegally expended, improperly expended, and, as I said before, expended in a way that deserves the very severest censure of this House. What are we sitting here for away into midsummer? Simply to register and legalize the illegal acts of a Minister of the Crown. I think it is an injustice to ask members of this House to remain here for any such purpose. If the Minister wanted more money last year for surveys than $95,000, he should have come down fairly and squarely and asked for that money. I have no doubt it would have been granted to him if he had told the House that such was necessary in anticipation of the increased requirements of the country. But he did not see fit to do so. In his judgment, $95,000 was then quite sufficient, but as the season went on he discovered there were other means of employing more people and spending more money than Parliament had authorized. It appears to me that he has largely over-expended his estimate, and now, in a covert way, he is endeavouring to cover up his illegal act by getting the committee to vote a Supplementary Estimate. In the first place, he leads the committee to believe that he intended it for the purpose of paying surveyors that were being sent out, but more recent disclosures go to show that that money is not intended to

be paid to surveyors going out, but to recoup the department for money that has already been expended. I think we cannot censure the Minister too severely for these acts of maladministration and improper conduct; I hope we have heard the last of this thing, and that it will not come up again. If it does, I think that the committee will be perfectly justified in striking out the item from the Estimates altogether, as I proposed we should do this morning, and I feel like moving that we should be so in the present case.

Mr. WALLACE. I think the Minister had better drop the amount. He has not shown anything to justify him in asking the House for this vote.

Dominion Lands—Chargeable to income. $3,900

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. In this vote we take a sum to pay balance of salaries to John Satchell, Mrs. Norton, Miss Earle, Miss McMaster and Miss Crawford. There are no new appointments.

Yukon Provisional District—Sum required to provide for the salaries and expenses connected with the administration of the Yukon provisional district, to cover Governor General's warrant, $45,000; also, $5,000 for the purpose of paying a gratuity to Wm. Ogilvie, D.L.S., in recognition of his distinguished public services in connection with the survey and exploration of the Yukon district..... $50,000

Mr. MONTAGUE. I want to say a word or two on what I consider was a very improper business method on the part of the Minister of the Interior. I do not object to this vote of $5,000 to Mr. Ogilvie, I do not fancy that there is a man in this House who will object to it. He has been, it seems, an incorruptible and valuable public servant, and I am sure that we all agree with that vote. But I do rise for the purpose of objecting to the manner in which the Minister of the Interior has placed before the country the report that Mr. Ogilvie wrote under the direction of the Minister of the Interior upon the Yukon country. Now, Sir, we have had the various reports issued through all the years in one uniform way, first printed by the public contractors who had regular terms and arrangements between themselves and the Government for printing these reports; afterwards we had them printed when the Printing Bureau was established, under the direct control of the Queen's Printer in the Printing Bureau, which is quite capable of printing all these reports. I think I am quite within the judgment of the House when I say that no public report has ever been issued in Canada which would have found so quick and widespread a circulation as the report which Mr. Ogilvie wrote upon the Klondike gold fields I am bound to say further that there was no public report, whether issued at home or abroad, that would have done Canada more good and been a better advertisement for Canada among the people to whom we are looking for immigration into our new Canadian territory. It was, therefore, desirable that in the very cheapest possible manner, with a view to its widest possible distribution, that report should have been issued by the Department of the Interior. I am sure there is not a member of this House who did not expect that the Minister of the Interior would have that report issued from the Printing Bureau in the usual way, that thousands of copies would be distributed, not only through Canada, but through other portions of the Empire and in foreign lands, to convey as much information as possible to those people with regard to those gold fields in our Canadian North-west. Well, Sir, I am sure that every one was surprised to find that instead of that report being issued for public distribution by the Department of the Interior, printed at the Printing Bureau at a trifling cost, the work was put into the hands of a private gentleman in the city of Toronto, Mr. D. A. Rose; that Mr. Rose has the exclusive right to issue that book, that he is permitted to charge 50 cents for that book to every person who purchases it, whether at home or abroad. I do not intend to make any lengthy remarks upon it, but I desire to express my condemnation, and in doing so I am sure I am expressing the condemnation of the people of Canada at that method of publishing this important work. In the first place, the book is exceedingly dear at the price of 50 cents. Mr. Rose did not take the work of publishing it for pleasure—he thought he would make a profit out of it. I am told that the work has been retailed at 35 cents, 50 cents being the price on the back of the book, and I am further told by publishers that the work could be supplied for about 20 cents.

Mr. DAVIN. Ten cents.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I am giving the outside figure. The work could be published for 20 cents, and I am informed that 300,000 copies were issued in this country, the United States and Great Britain. I estimate that if the book was sold at 50 cents there would be $90,000 of profit made by Mr. D. A. Rose upon a book which is issued under the authority of the Department of the Interior and should have been published at the Printing Bureau at Ottawa. This is the first public report of Canada that has contained advertisements and been made an advertising medium. There are 150 pages of reading matter, and the balance are advertisements which enormously swell the profits of the publishers. The advertisements cover a very wide range from blankets to hemorrhoid cures, Sunlight soap, condensed soups, Klondike sleeping bags, evaporated onions, dog biscuits and fluid beef. All

these are authorized by the Department of the Interior and published under the authority of Canada. I do not suppose any one desired the Department of the Interior or any department to make a profit out of its publications, but the whole country desired there should be a very wide circulation of this book, and if it was intended to make a profit, it would have been better, instead of voting this small sum of $5,000 to William Ogilvie, who has been the means of opening up that region, to have given him the profits on this publication rather than given them to Mr. D. A. Rose, of Toronto.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I am only surprised that we have not heard the question of the publication of this pamphlet discussed by the other side of the House at an early period of the session, because one would have thought from the large amount of space devoted to it by the press which supports hon. gentlemen opposite that it was one of the issues upon which they were going to defeat the Government as soon as Parliament met. I think hon. gentlemen will find, when they scrutinize the transaction, that it is not one which in any way reflects discredit on the Departmen of the Interior, but rather the contrary. In the first place, the reports issued by the various departments of the Government in former years have not been noted for being got out very rapidly. If the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr Montague) will cast his memory back he will find that Mr. Ogilvie had made reports about the Yukon district before this Government took office, and that those reports were never considered worthy of publication except when published in connection with the report of the Department of the Interior, where nobody would likely find them or pay any attention to them. I took steps the first year I was in office as quickly as possible to collect in proper form the reports of Mr. Ogilvie of the later dates, those reports which seemed to be valuable, and they were published last year. Something like 10,000 copies were distributed. Those 10,000 copies cost the department about $1,350. When Mr. Ogilvie was about to return from the Yukon, I made up my mind that it was necessary there should be available to the public something in the nature of an official guide to that country and an official description of it. I was brought face to face with this difficulty, that nobody could tell how many copies would be required, that except some one specially acquainted with the trade, no one had the faintest idea how many copies would be required or what the expense to the department would be if it undertook to supply them. The conclusion arrived at was, that it was not the duty of the department to furnish gratuitously to intending miners in the Yukon a book of this description when the expense could be defrayed by a small payment, and that the duty of the department to the public would be amply served by securing the proper and prompt execution of the book and placing in the hands of the public a sufficient number of copies for circulation in Canada among those who under ordinary circumstances would be considered entitled to them, and placing on the market a sufficient number of copies so that they could be secured by the public at a reasonable rate. If the book had been published in the ordinary way by the Department of the Interior through the Printing Bureau, 10,000 copies of the book, such as we got later on, to say nothing of the work of translation, would have cost us about $3,500 or $4,000. We got the 10,000 copies for nothing, without the outlay of any money. This estimate of $4,000 is furnished by the Printing Bureau. So what I am entitled to say is practically this: I have secured the publication of the work and obtained 10,000 copies for nothing, and have thus saved the country $4,000, and I do not think hon. gentlemen opposite will be able specially to find fault with the transaction. If the Printing Bureau had been called upon to do the work at the time of the year it was done, the book could not possibly have been got out in the time it was issued or with any reasonable promptitude without seriously interfering with the ordinary printing work of the Government; it would have required an increased or special staff, and possibly some additional appliances, but of that I am not sure. So it was practically necessary to get the work done outside if we wanted it done promptly and the other work of the Government carried on as it ought to be carried on. The question then came up, whether if this should be done in the way suggested, a contract of some kind should be let or not? Then the proposition being made to me by Hunter, Rose & Co., it became possible to secure 10,000 copies without payment by the Government of a single dollar, and accordingly I made the contract which has been laid on the Table. The contract provided that we should get 7,000 copies in English and 3,000 in French, that the maps and photographs used in connection with the work should remain the property of the Government, and we should reprint the maps or photographs at any time we thought fit. In addition, if a large sale of the book took place as anticipated, although I never felt so sanguine about the matter myself as did some other gentlemen, we had this additional arrangement that on all copies over 40,000 we should receive a royalty of 5 cents upon each one. So that if it is true, as the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) says, that 300,000 copies have been sold, the profit of the publishers will not be anything like what the hon. gentleman says, because after deducting the first 40,000 copies, the five cents royalty on the balance would give $13,000 of the profit to the country. I think the hon. member for Haldi-

mand would find it very hard to get practical printers to follow his arithmetic. The last information I got with regard to the circulation of the book was that it had not been anything like as large as was expected.

Mr. DAVIN. What circulation has it ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The last report I got was some weeks ago, and it was that the circulation had not then gone over 40,000. I have not asked for an exact statement. The sale has not been anything like what was expected, for the reason I anticipated, that just as soon as this book was out it was pirated by railway companies, transportation companies, news companies and the publishers of various leaflets and guides. The maps were pirated, the plates were pirated, and the letter press was pirated, and no one would attempt to follow these pirated works, many of them issued by irresponsible institutions. The result was that the sale of this publication was not anything like what was anticipated, and I am perfectly certain that the hon. member for Haldimand must have been imposed upon when he was told that the circulation was 300,000. My hon. friend says that the price was too high. I do not think he will find the average member of this House to agree with him. I think the average member of this House, taking up that book, and looking at the maps, the plates and the letter press, will say that there never was better value given for 50 cents in Canada than was given in that book. The maps were specially prepared. They gave information that had not been theretofore given in many cases, and in addition to the new information, a general map was inserted, which was of great service to those who were not familiar with the general outlines of the country, and I am told that this map has been of the greatest service in showing the relation of that district to other parts of the country.

Mr. FOSTER. Who furnished the maps ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We furnished all the maps, the photographs and the letter press. That we would have done in any event. Whatever the book may be worth, in my judgment the price was not too high. A person buying a book upon that subject, certainly could not complain if he had to pay 50 cents for the information given in the way it was given in this book, with the maps, photographs and general information supplied. The difficulty that was found with this book in England, where it was expected that it would have a very large circulation, was that the price was too low. The persons who took charge of it there, I was told by Mr. Ogilvie, who has just recently returned from England, dropped it altogether, because they said that the price at which they were bound to sell the book was so low that it would not pay them to advertise it. The consequence was that in England, on account of the lowness of the price, the sale of the book almost entirely failed. I do not think the committee will agree with the argument advanced by the hon. member for Haldimand that this country has lost anything because this book was not printed and sent everywhere free. I do not think we have suffered because the Klondike is not known. I think it is widely known, as widely as any circulation of literature could make it known ; and when we have placed 10,000 copies of the book for free circulation, I think we have done our duty to the country in that respect. My opinion is that the publishers have made practically nothing out of the book, because the 10,000 copies we got would be a fair profit on the publication of 40,000, and my impression is that when the matter comes to be summed up the publishers will find that although they expected to make a considerable sum of money, they have not succeeded in so doing. The idea has been suggested that the royalty chargeable on the book, if there were any, should have been allowed to Mr. Ogilvie himself. I thought of that ; but I concluded that if Mr. Ogilvie's services merited recognition at the hands of the Parliament of Canada, it would be a much more graceful act for us to recommend a straight vote, which Mr. Ogilvie would get without any question, rather than to leave him to depend on the uncertain results of the sale of this book. It is an entirely erroneous idea to suppose that the scientific reports of the Government are all distributed free. The reports of the geological survey, which are of an analagous character, are not distributed free. These reports are charged for, the statutes are charged for, other important documents are charged for, and it does not at all follow, because certain official papers are issued free, that when a publication of this kind is issued by the Government, it is the duty of the Government to supply it to anybody and everybody without their paying for it.

Mr. ROSS ROBERTSON. I suppose the main point of this question is whether the Government and the country got value for the property which the Minister of the Interior gave away to certain favoured gentlemen in Toronto. I understand that 10,000 copies of this report were given to the Government ; and if we can find out what the cost of these 10,000 copies was, we can have some idea of the value placed by the Minister of the Interior on this monopoly. I was anxious not to talk at random on this question, and so I obtained from Mr. James Dudley, an expert printer in Toronto, an estimate of the cost of from 10,000 to 50,000 copies of this printed report. He did not give me a mere guess, but he gave me an estimate of the price at which he was prepared to do the work. His offer was to supply 10,000 copies at 13 cents for each

copy. This sum included everything—the engraving, the lithographing, the maps, the binding, and the printing, and his figures show that all told, the Toronto publishers gave $1,300 worth of work for all the rights in the publication of this report. The printers' profit would have to be deducted from this $1,300. The firm would probably make at these figures from $150 to $175, or possibly $200 on the 10,000 copies of this report, so that the Minister of the Interior gave away this report, and all that the country gets for this monopoly is less than $1,200 worth of job printing.

Another point is this. What is this Ogilvie report worth? I think it has had an enormous sale, according to the estimate I have received, and an edition of 50,000 copies would only cost 12 cents a copy. There are 200 pages of matter in this report, including the advertisements, and it weighs, including the advertising pages, about 16½ ounces, or, say, a pound, and the paper is worth six cents a pound. Was it in the interests of the country that Canada should be advertised by giving the widest possible circulation to this report. Never was there in the world such a chance for the circulation of a public document. It would have been no great work at all for the Government to have undertaken the distribution of this report at cost price. At 25 cents a copy, the country would have made a handsome profit. Of course, it would not have been wise to issue the report without securing copyright in the United States, for then the American publishers could have issued unauthorized editions. These reports, issued by the Americans, could have been garbled so as to divert travel and immigration to the United States. It was necessary, therefore, to avoid that danger, but the danger could have been avoided without the gift of a valuable monopoly to two or three gentlemen in Toronto, by an expenditure of not over $800 for printing a thousand copies of the report, and we thus could have secured the United States copyright and have headed off the American publishers and prevented their issuing unauthorized editions.

I do not think it was good business to give away all the country's rights in this report for less than $1,200. Considering the cost of producing the work and the price at which it was sold and the receipts from advertising, the publisher will easily make, on an edition of a 100,000 copies, from $16,000 to $18,000. There certainly could not have been less than $8,000 or $9,000, possibly $10,000 worth of advertising in that report. The Minister of the Interior was generous to these Toronto gentlemen, but I do not think he was just either to the country or to the other publishers in Canada, who might have been only too glad to make a legitimate business offer for the job of printing or for this contract which he gave away to certain favoured individuals in Toronto. Suppose that this bargain will be excused on the plea that the Minister of the Interior had to act quickly. I wish he had more time at his disposal. He always seems to be in a hurry when giving away Klondike reports or Yukon property. He is in too much of a hurry to deal with the Government's business as a business man who would deal with his own business This whole affair is a Yukon job in a small way, and in principle is quite as vicious as the larger transaction.

Mr. CLARKE. I listened with a good deal of attention to the explanations which the hon. Minister of the Interior gave the committee of the reasons why he handed this Klondike report over to Daniel Rose, and I must confess, with no desire to treat the hon. gentleman harshly, that the explanations he gave were not such as would commend themselves to my judgment or to the judgment of the great majority of the members of this House.

The first explanation he gave was that it was a matter of prime importance that this book should be got out quickly. I can readily understand that it was; but I make the assertion that there is no plant in Canada that can do the work as expeditiously, as quickly, or in better shape than the outfit we have within a couple of hundred yards of this House. It was rather a reflection on the staff of that establishment that a work which they could get out in three or four days at the very outside, if urgency was the only consideration, should have been given to an outside publisher. It was rather a reflection on our printing bureau, conducted right under the nose of the hon. Minister, that negotiations should go on for several days in Toronto with Mr. Rose before the deal was closed, and our establishment passed over.

The hon. gentleman says that the estimate of cost he received from the Printing Bureau for getting out the job was $4,000, and he claims that the country has saved that sum because of the arrangement with Mr. Rose. I venture to affirm that the estimate which the hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Ross Robertson) has given of 13 cents per copy for this book, on the basis of a 10,000 or 20,000 edition, is much nearer the mark as to the actual value of the book than the estimate the hon. gentleman has given. As the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Montague) has pointed out, this is the first time in the history of Canada that an official blue book, a book of such importance as this, was handed over to a private publisher for publication, and the private publisher given a copyright and allowed to charge a certain sum per copy for it. I have in my hand the civil service list of Canada, which contains 250 pages of tabular matter, with no advertisements and no photograhphic plates, while the Ogilvie-Rose publication contains about 50 pages of photographs, 50 pages of

advertisements, and 100 pages of ordinary letter-press. The Ogilvie book, including the advertisements and photographic plates, does not contain more than 225 pages. Now I notice on the title page of the civil service list that that book can be supplied from the Printing Bureau at 15 cents a copy, while the Ogilvie-Rose book is sold for 50 cents a copy. It seems to me that no graver blunder, in a small way or for a small job, could have been committed than that committed by the Minister of the Interior in tying up the publication of this Klondike report in the hands of one firm in Toronto. There never was a book more eagerly looked for by the Canadian, British and American public than this first authentic report as to the value of that Klondike gold-bearing region, and it does seem to me it was only reasonable to expect that the Minister of the Interior would have made the best possible use of the opportunity which the publication of this much looked for report would have given him to advertise this country from one end of the Dominion to the other, from one end of the United States to the other, and from one end of Europe to the other. Why did he not take advantage of the immigration agencies that have been established in the old country, France and elsewhere on the continent to give the widest possible circulation to this book and issue it at cost price? When my hon. friend from Haldimand (Mr. Montague) said that the book should be got out at 20 cents a copy, he largely exceeded the proper estimate. It could be got out at not more than a York shilling per copy. If advantage had been taken of the opportunity which happily presented itself; and if, instead of 50 pages of quack medicine and other advertisements, practically destroying the character of the book, advantage had been taken to give 50 pages of solid, useful information respecting the resources and capabilities of this country, the advantage to Canada would have been of untold value. I regret very much that the hon. Minister of the Interior felt that it was so important on his part to get this book out within a very short space of time, that he neglected the opportunity afforded to him. It seems to me an unfortunate thing that in every transaction in connection with the opening up or development of the Yukon district, the Minister of the Interior pleads haste. Haste was pleaded in the making of the contract with Mackenzie & Mann; it is pleaded now in the giving over of this book and its copyright to Daniel Rose, and only the other night haste was pleaded for making an arrangement, without calling for public tenders, for the purchase of supplies for the military force being sent to the Yukon. Notwithstanding the desirability of getting the work done as promptly and as expeditiously as possible, there was ample opportunity to make a better job of the book and to get it printed at one-quarter the price charged by Mr. Rose, and to give the book, without cost to the country, a much wider circulation than it has received.

I would have been reasonably satisfied if the information which my hon. friend from Haldimand (Mr. Montague) has given to the committee was substantially correct, that this book had received a circulation of 300,000. But I am perfectly satisfied that the estimate of the Minister of the Interior is more nearly correct. But why should the desire to obtain information respecting the wealth of the Yukon that is shown to have existed be taken advantage of to enable Mr. Rose to make from 25 to 30 cents a copy? Was there any reason except that Mr. Rose was a solid, a substantial supporter of hon. gentlemen opposite, that he should be given a monopoly of the printing of this book? I put it to the committee that the arrangement was not a good one for the country, that it did not reflect advantageously upon the business capacity of the hon. Minister of the Interior. It is one of those jobs on a small scale that we on this side have a right to complain of, and I think we are entirely within our right in drawing attention to what we feel to be a dereliction of duty on the part of the Minister of the Interior, deserving of the condemnation of the committee.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). I do not rise to continue the discussion on the line of the hon. gentleman who last spoke, because I think he has been beating the air, considering the fact that the Minister of the Interior gave a complete answer to his criticism with reference to the printing of this book and the propriety of publishing it in the way he did. But I rise to call attention to the extraordinary remark which I understand from the last speaker was made by the hon. member for Haldimand, that this is the first time in the history of Canada when a blue-book was published by the Government at the hands of a private party. Why, the hon. member must have been a member of this House at the time when the late Government gave the Geological Report of the Dominion to the late Thomas White's firm to be published at a cost of $5,000 a year, at a time when this Government had a binding contract with Messrs. Maclean & Roger for the publication of Government blue-books. The result of that was not only that the late Thomas White was paid for the book at what was said to be two or three prices, but the Government actually had to pay damages in a suit brought by Messrs. Maclean & Roger for breach of contract.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I am sure that the hon. gentleman does not think I would intentionally misstate a fact, for I did not know anything about the circumstances to which the hon. gentleman refers.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The few remarks of my hon. friend (Sir Louis Davies) are enough to accentuate the spirit that animates the criticism of this transaction. My hon. friend has just told the committee as the fact—that this very thing which these hon. gentlemen condemn, the printing of a public document outside of a place where, under ordinary circumstances, it should be printed, was done by them deliberately, and without palliation, without being able to plead haste or special circumstances; and it was done in such a bungling and unbusiness-like way that they were sued for damages and had to pay damages. I should think, in view of these facts, these hon. gentlemen would have preserved a discreet silence on that phase of the question.

Mr. MONTAGUE. If the hon. Minister will allow me. I am sure he does not wish to misrepresent me, but I have already said that I did not know anything of the circumstances to which the Minister referred, and I am informed that there are differences between the cases.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I accept the statement of my hon. friend from Haldimand. I think we should have come to the conclusion, even if he had not made his statement, that he did not know anything about it, because if he had, if he had known that a violation of the principle he has declared for had been committed by the Government of which he was a supporter, he would not have brought it up. These hon. gentlemen made a failure, no doubt, they violated the law, they rendered themselves liable for damages. I have not done anything of that kind. There may be a question of policy, whether it was, I will not say proper, in the sense of propriety as contrasted with impropriety—but it may be an open question whether it was a wise thing to do. The hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Clarke) said that he did not think it wise. I do think it wise. Having listened to his arguments, I have not changed my opinion. The hon. gentleman probably has a knowledge of the printing business, and is in a position to speak as to the performance of work of that kind; but I know more about the Printing Bureau than he does. And I can tell the hon. gentleman, while he is quite correct in the estimate of the work by the Printing Bureau, he is wrong in what he says as to the speed with which that work is done. I say, not reflecting upon anybody, that it would have been absolutely impossible for the Printing Bureau to have got the work done within any reasonable time in such a way as to have satisfied the demand for it, without interfering with the ordinary work of the Government. I think that every one of my colleagues knows that to be a fact. I say that the difficulty of handling the Government work, even without any special demand of that kind upon the Bureau is engaging the attention of the Government to the extent of causing them to consider very seriously the question whether the facilities and plant of that institution should not be somewhat largely increased in order to enable it more promptly to deal with the work that it has to do. I say most emphatically that the Printing Bureau could not have done that work within the time within which it had to be done to be of use without seriously interfering with and impeding the work of the departments to be done at that time. I regard that as conclusive. So far as the estimate or the value is concerned, I do not know what the friends in the printing business of the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Clarke) may have furnished him with, but I know that the Printing Bureau charged to the Department of the Interior as the cost of the first pamphlet, of which we got out 10,000 copies, $1,352.44. They gave us also an estimate of what 10,000 copies of this new pamphlet would cost—$3,580. So, as against the estimate which the hon. gentleman has presented. I give this estimate of the experts in the Printing Bureau. Now, my hon. friend says, and in this he seems to be quite honest, and I am sure he is honest, as I think he is entirely mistaken about it, that if we had issued this pamphlet free or at a lower price, and had made use of the agencies of the immigration department throughout the world, we could have circulated the book very much more largely. But I wish to tell my hon. friend that a book cannot be circulated in that way. A book must be advertised—and there was the difficulty we had to meet. We should have to engage in the business of advertising the book and placing it on the market as a publisher does, and these advertisements cost an enormous amount of money. Now, I put it to the committee: Would it have been the duty of the department or would it have been wise of the department to advertise this book and place it upon the market and push it and circulate it as publishing firms do? I do not think the committee would regard it as the business of the Government to do that, or would think that the Government or the country would have been better off if we had done so.

I think if we had undertaken to do that we would have largely failed. As a matter of fact I believe that Hunter, Rose & Co. failed. But Hunter, Rose & Co. were much more likely to succeed in circulating this book than we were, because they are a firm of publishers, and there would be a much greater probability of securing a large circulation by putting the book into the hands of a firm who were making a profit to the extent that the book was circulated. This firm was impelled by every principle of self-interest to make a successful transac-

tion, and the book would be very much more likely to obtain a wider circulation that way than if left in the hands of the officials of the Government. I think the argument my hon. friend has addressed to the committee that we could have circulated this book more widely by keeping it in our own hands, is altogether contrary to the experience that we have had. We would have had to expend a large amount of money if we had undertaken to circulate it in that way, and we probably would not have succeeded as well as the present publisher.

Mr. FOSTER. I want to mention one subject that has been brought up by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who is not now present. It was rather a clever ruse of the hon. gentleman, and was followed by the Minister of the Interior, to take away the attention of the committee and of the public from this transaction to another as different from this as any two transactions could be the one from the other. The transaction of the Minister of the Interior was this: having, by means of the Government funds and the expenditure of Government energy, gathered very valuable information, he gave that information to a private firm of printers, they to return books of the value of $1,000 or $1,200, to have the copyright, and the sole right of sale of that book, to use it for an advertising medium as far as they chose to use it, retaining the sole ownership of the book and to have all the profits that came from it. That is one transaction. The transaction with reference to the printing of the Geological Report by the "Gazette" Company in Montreal was an entirely different transaction. Whether it was a wise one or not, it was on an entirely different plane. At that time, instead of the Government Printing Bureau doing the work, which bureau the Government did not have at that time, the Government had a contract with McLean & Roger for doing their printing. The "Gazette" office having, as it was supposed, superior facilities for doing work of that kind, because it was done in a better style than the work which was got out by McLean & Roger of the general blue-books of the department—the Government instead of sending that publication to McLean & Roger to be printed, gave a contract to the "Gazette" office. The Government was getting the major part of its printing done by McLean & Roger, and as McLean & Roger pleaded before the court, it should have got all its printing done there. Instead of doing that, the Government employed the "Gazette" office to print the geological report. But just as all the blue-books belonging to the Government came back to the Government as soon as they were printed by McLean & Roger, so the Geological Report belonging to the Government came back to the Government just as soon as it was printed by the "Gazette." It was the simple question of who should do the printing for the Government, but the "Gazette" had no right in the Geological Report.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. What good are the rights?

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend is a lawyer and a business man, and I will let him figure that out. In this case the Minister of the Interior went to a private firm without any competition at all, and placed the results of Mr. Ogilvie's labours for five or six years, and of the expenditure of the department for a greater series of years, at the disposal of this private firm of printers, gave them the stock-in-trade which had been laboriously gathered together at great cost by this country. He said to this firm of printers: You can have the sole copyright of that work if you will take it, and the sole right to sell it, and to stuff it with advertisements and make as much as you can at the rate of 50 cents a copy. In return for that you give us 10,000 copies which, at 10 or 12 cents each, are worth from $1,000 to $1,200. That is exactly the difference. Now, my hon. friend says the Printing Bureau was not able, was not equipped to bring out that little book. I think I have some knowledge of the Printing Bureau. My hon. friend says the Printing Bureau is slow in some cases. I am not so sure of that. My view of it is that the Printing Bureau is not slow in its operations, but that the slowness comes from the preparation of copy by the departments, and the proof reading by the departments. I know that just as soon as the season commences, the Printing Bureau begins to dun the different departments for copy, and by circular and interview ask them to send in copy earlier so as to keep the printers going. But if the departments do not get their copy ready in time, the result is that at certain seasons the work is not turned out very rapidly. But to say that the Printing Bureau, with its type and presses, and its 50, 60 or 70 men, is not able to get out a book of that size, is simply absurd. If the copy had been placed in their hands and they had been asked to get that out, they could have put that book out just as quickly as any printer in this country. So my hon. friend has no excuse on that point. But if he did not want to take up the work of distributing this book, what was to prevent him from asking for tenders? There was a large commercial value attached to that book at that time, and it would have been the simplest thing in the world, if he had chosen, not to get it done by the Printing Bureau, to ask the printing establishments of this country to tender for the printing of that book, and they would pay for the privilege of having that material put into their hands, by publishing it under certain conditions as to the price. My hon. friend had plenty of time. The first letter he received was of November 11th when he had an offer from them to publish 10,000 copies with certain condi-

tions, and that letter was followed by three others. It was not until some time in January that a contract was finally made between the Minister and this printing firm. There was nearly three months of time which elapsed between the first idea of having it printed by a firm outside the Printing Bureau, and the time when the Minister made the contract. A month would have amply sufficed to procure tenders from every printing establishment in the country who wished to undertake this work. Then there was another way that was suggested. There was no better immigration literature, no better catch for drawing the attention of the world to immigration literature and to Canadian literature from a Government standpoint, than this opportunity thus afforded to my hon. friend. He spends tens of thousands for printing of immigration literature to call attention to Canada. The hon. gentleman would have had the most valuable immigration pamphlet which could have been distributed, at small cost to this country, and it would have attracted attention from every part of the world to Canada. The hon. gentleman's case is not parallel with the "Gazette" printing of the geological report. I do not think his excuse is a fair one, that the Government Bureau could not carry out the work, and if he had come to that conclusion what he should have done was to have called for tenders. But this Government has begun a system of totally ignoring the principle of public tender and advertisement for these contracts. We have come up against one after another of these instances, as glaring and gross as they can possibly be ; and yet there is not a member in the ranks of hon. gentlemen opposite who has the honesty to rise and denounce the system as practiced by those Ministers, a system which they denounced for seventeen years when in Opposition, and yet to-day, from the Minister of Public Works, the Minister of Militia and the Minister of the Interior, to say nothing of others, the idea of tender and contract has been dealt a complete and staggering blow ; and this Liberal Government goes to the country as a Government which not only violated its pledges with regard to this work, but which adopts the principle of giving these large contracts to private parties, farming them out to friends for the benefit of their own political adherents. What admission had we in the committee this morning ? The Minister of Public Works had a $20,000 job for dredging to be done, four times $5,000. How is he doing that dredging ? Did he let it out by contract ? Not a bit of it. Did he go among his friends who had dredging plants ? No. He gave it out to a relation of his own, to farm out; that relation is farming it out to-day and taking his commission and his profits on the proceeds. And what excuse was given by this hon. gentleman ? The petty and miserable excuse that with his political foresight he had ascertained that all the dredges in the country were owned by Conservatives, and in order to get even from a party point of view, he proposed to farm out these works, so that a bit of the profits come to men of his party.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. At the same price as you paid.

Mr. FOSTER. A more disgraceful admission was never made in any constitutional country. If the Government can stand it, the Opposition can do so. This thing will ring from one end of the country to the other, and business people will understand what is being done by this business Government. The hon. Minister of the Interior showed contempt for Parliament when he rushed through the Yukon scheme on the plea of urgency just before Parliament met. He shows his contempt for Parliament to-day, when after being authorized to spend $200,000 he spent $268,000 and came down during the last month of the fiscal year and asked Parliament, with all the confidence in the world, to vote him $68,000 which he has spent illegally and wrongfully, and the credits for which are hanging up somewhere, but I do not know where at present. That taste had not got out of the mouths of hon. members before we came upon another vote of the same class. The hon. Minister was entrusted with $95,000 to spend during the year, not a cent more. He has spent $40,000 in addition, and now he comes to Parliament to indemnify him. And this is your Liberal Government—it is arrant hypocrisy, that is what it is. Hon. gentlemen opposite have been weighed in the balance already and found wanting ; their own consciences condemn them, and every business man in the country, not blinded by partisanship, condemns them as well. Yet the Minister of Militia sits there and smiles when an earnest and honest man tries to put things before him for his own help, for his future salvation and for the good of the country. Well, we must do our duty ; we must preach, teach, give line upon line, lesson after lesson ; by and by we will drill this into the public mind whether we drill it into the minds of hon. gentlemen opposite or not.

Amount required to maintain a force of Mounted Police in the Yukon Provisional District, including $300,000 by Governor General's warrant..... $500,000

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Shall this item be adopted ?—Carried.

Mr. FOSTER. What ; what is that that is being carried ?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. This is $500,000 for the Yukon police force.

Mr. FOSTER. And the Minister of the Interior sits there with his hand on his ear and does not give us any explanation.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is not his department.

An hon. MEMBER. He was not asked for an explanation.

Mr. FOSTER. I know I saw the Chairman blush even, when he said it was carried, because he felt that a great outrage was being committed.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order; the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) has not the right to make that imputation, when just a moment ago I permitted him to discuss an item which was not under the consideration of the House.

Mr. FOSTER. I take back that the Chairman blushed.

Mr. McMILLAN. An honest man is not always saying things that he has to take back.

The PRIME MINISTER. I would ask this item to stand for a moment as I have sent for the papers, and will then give the explanation.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The item stands.

Penitentiaries—		
Balance required to meet expenses of Commissions :—		
Kingston Penitentiary.....	$ 1,817	00
St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary.	17,727	76
Manitoba Penitentiary.....	2,402	75
British Columbia Penitentiary—		
To pay D. D. Bourke difference in salary as deputy warden of Manitoba Penitentiary and that of British Columbia Penitentiary from 5th Aug., 1895, to 1st April, 1896, notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Penitentiary Act and amendments thereto	326	00
Allowance for fuel for above period	50	00
	22,323	51

Mr. SPROULE. We must have some information as to the result of these inquiries by commissioners. The reports were presented last year I think, but we have had very little information as to the action taken on these reports.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. As the result of the report of the committee of inquiry into Kingston penitentiary, the deputy warden, the storekeeper and the engineer were dismissed, the surgeon was superannuated, and the services of one or two other officials were dispensed with. My hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) will find that the result of the administration of that penitentiary shows that the expenditure in connection with the commission was perfectly justified.

Mr. SPROULE. Does this cover the amount necessary to pay the whole indebtedness in this respect?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. So far as Kingston penitentiary is concerned, I understand that this will be quite sufficient to cover the expense. I draw my hon. friend's attention to the fact that this expenditure is partly incurred because of the fact that last year serious charges were made against the engineer, and at his request an opportunity was given to him to explain these charges, and as a result we have had a partial investigation of specific charges made against Mr. Devlin, the engineer. The result of that investigation will be placed in the hands of members of Parliament next session, as it is not quite ready to present this year.

Mr. SPROULE. How much did this commission cost?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I am not able to say at the present moment, but it is quite in the vicinity of $6,000 as to Kingston alone. I do not want my hon. friend to take these figures as very accurate, because I have not in mind at the present time the exact amount, but will give it to-morrow.

Mr. CLANCY. Has Mr. Noxon concluded his labours as one of the commissioners?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I think the labours of all the commissioners are now concluded, except in so far as it may be found necessary to have an investigation into Dorchester, N.B. It has not yet been decided whether we will have an investigation there or not, or into the British Columbia penitentiary. I think it is probable we will be able to dispense with the services of the commissioners in respect to these penitentiaries.

Mr. FOSTER. How many commissioners in the case of St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Mr. Noxon, Fraser and Mr. Lafortune.

Mr. FOSTER. How in the world did they spend $17,727?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I have to state frankly that so far as that expenditure is concerned I have to make myself personally responsible for a large portion of it, and I will explain exactly the circumstances. The commissioners commenced their investigation in to the St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary in the month of April, 1897, they proceeded with the investigation and towards the month of August they had practically completed their labours. As the result of the report they made at that time, Mr. Ouimet, the warden, was recommended for dismissal. Mr. Ouimet made representations that the charges which had been made against him, and which certainly would have justified his dismissal, were unfounded and he wanted to have the charges put in a specific form and an opportunity given him to answer them. I took the matter in hands myself personally

and am largely responsible for the continued investigation. The specific charges were drawn and submitted to him, and then we had practically a new investigation so far as the warden was concerned. My hon. friends will find by the report that whereas these specific charges were communicated to Mr. Ouimet about the 15th of September, yet because of the absence of his counsel and witnesses, there were numerous delays all resulting from the action of the warden, and I concurred in these delays asked for by him. I have to take the responsibility of that. The investigation was not completed until the end of December and the report was not made until late in January or the beginning of February.

Mr. FOSTER. Were these commissioners paid for every day of that delay?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. No, they were not paid for every day of that delay, but frequently it occurred that the commissioners would go to Montreal on a fixed day for the purpose of making the investigation, and instead of their being informed before hand they would be told when they got there that the warden's lawyer was absent or that the witnesses were out of town, and delays occurred during the months of October, November and December, for which no one in reality was responsible, except the warden and his lawyer. There was a great mass of evidence, I think hundreds of folios taking during that time which is absolutely useless and absolutely irrelevant.

Mr. FOSTER. Why did they take irrelevant testimony?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. That is more than I can really answer for. I looked it over with care since I found a great deal of it had no bearing on the charges submitted. That is my judgment, but I must say, that because charges of a most serious character were made against the warden every possible facility was given him to enable him to prove if he could that these charges were not founded. I thought it better to err on that side than to feel I had done an injustice to a man who really held a high position in the penitentiary for several years, and had been connected with the institution for a very long period.

Mr. FOSTER. Which was the lawyer on the committee?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Messrs. Fraser and Lafortune were both lawyers.

Mr. FOSTER. How much were these paid each?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The Order in Council under which they were appointed fixed the sum at $10 for each per diem.

Mr. DAVIN. Was the Chairman a lawyer?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. No, Mr. Noxon is not a lawyer; he is connected with the prison system of Ontario, I believe.

Mr. HAGGART. $6,000 seems an enormous sum for the purpose of inquiring into the conduct of the engineer at the Kingston penitentiary.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Every officer was inquired into.

Mr. HAGGART. I understood the Solicitor General to say that this was an inquiry into the case of a man named Devlin.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Oh, no. There is $1,700 there, and a portion of that will be expended in that connection.

Mr. HAGGART. Have we not an inspector of penitentiaries?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes.

Mr. HAGGART. What is his duty and has he reported on any of these things that the commissioners found out, and if he did not why did he not? We have to pay large sums every year for the inspection of penitentiaries, and one would think it was the duty of the inspector to inquire into the efficiency and discipline of the penitentiary. The inspector may have done his duty and the report may be in the Department of Justice and the fault may be with the department. I wish to know whether the inspector had reported on these breaches of discipline which the commissioners have found to exist in the different penitentiaries?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The inspector certainly did make a report, but it did not at all approach in fullness the report made by the commissioners. I venture to say that the present inspector did not make a report on the line of the commissioners at all. So far as Kingston penitentiary is concerned the commission was appointed immediately after the change of Government. At the same time I think it only fair that I should say that the prison inspector cannot be held responsible for the condition of things that has grown up in the administration of our penitentiaries, because he has only been appointed during the last three years. But we really had a condition of things in the penitentiaries that could not be tolerated, and those who have read the Kingston penitentiary report will bear me out in what I now say. In so far as the St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary was concerned the condition of things existing there was even worse than in Kingston. I draw the attention of my hon. friends opposite to the fact that the first Estimates brought down by this Government in connection with the penitentiaries showed a saving of over $80,000 in the administration of the penitentiaries.

Mr. FOSTER. You cannot tell yet, because the Minister of the Interior brought down a saving estimate, too.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. We have ascertained the result by our first year's experience, and have cause to show that we should not criticise too harshly the present inspector. After all he has only been there three years and this condition of things has grown up, not under his administration, but during a long series of years.

Mr. SPROULE. What action was taken on the report of the St. Vincent de Paul commissioners ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The result was that the warden had to leave and the deputy warden also had to be replaced, and the surgeon was replaced and one or two of the other officers.

Mr. HAGGART. I do not want to create the false impression that I was criticising adversely the conduct of the inspector. I do not know anything about that. He may be a very efficient man, and I believe he is, but there must be laxity somewhere or other. Either his instructions were not correct, or he may have made reports to the department which fully justified the appointment of the commission. But if you have an inspector at all he should have, from year to year, made such reports to the department as would have kept the penitentiaries from falling into the disgraceful state the Solicitor General says they are in.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I am not prepared to apportion the responsibility, but I am prepared to speak about the conditions that existed when we took charge of the penitentiaries, and those conditions could not be tolerated if we wanted to have an efficient administration of our penitentiaries. I do not want to speak now about the result of the St. Vincent de Paul investigation because the papers are not before the House, and it was agreed between my hon. friend from Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) and myself that this matter would be laid over until next session, and, therefore, it would not be fair for me to make an ex parte statement without having him present, as he has looked into the matter carefully. I venture to say that the House will find that there was such a state of things existing at St. Vincent de Paul as could not possibly be tolerated. There was no discipline, as has been shown by the recent outbreaks : and we were purchasing our flour in the vicinity of Montreal, at half a dollar a barrel more than we were at Kingston, and beef at two cents or three cents a pound more than we were at Kingston. However, I do not want to go into the details at this time.

Mr. SPROULE. Would the hon. gentleman be kind enough to give us information about the result of the inquiry at the Manitoba penitentiary ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The result was that the deputy warden and one or two other officers—I am not prepared to say who they were—were discharged. That is the penitentiary I know least about.

Mr. FOSTER. Who were the commissioners ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Mr. Wade.

Mr. DAVIN. Is that the gentleman who has gone to the Yukon?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. Has that report been presented to Parliament ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I do not think it has been. I am not aware of its having been asked for.

Mr. FOSTER. Probably the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) could inform my hon. friend of something in reference to Mr. Wade. I think I remember reading a very strong stricture upon the appointment by the Government of such a commissioner as Mr. Wade to make an investigation into the Manitoba penitentiary. I think the conclusion of my learned and hon. friend who edits the "Tribune" was that Mr. Wade was, in plain English, utterly unfit to look into such an important and grave matter. I am sorry the hon. gentleman is not here, because I would like to see that matter tried out between the Solicitor General and him.

Mr. SPROULE. Did the commissioner find many irregularities at Manitoba ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I have not read the report, and, therefore, I am not able to answer the hon. gentleman's question.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I have not yet heard anything from the Solicitor General that would in my judgment justify the appointment of this commission ; for you have an inspector of these public institutions, a part of whose duty it obviously is to report upon the very occurrences which the Solicitor General has just alluded to. As the hon. gentleman says it was understood between him and the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) that there should be no further discussion on the report of the commission regarding the St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary until the next session, just as briefly as he alluded to the mistakes that had taken place in that institution, will I say that not one single fact which he has stated goes beyond the scope of duty of the inspector of penitentiaries. I have not heard anything that would justify the appointment of a commission involving this large expenditure. I would like the Solicitor General to tell me the amounts

that were paid to Mr. Fraser, Mr. Noxon and Mr. Lafortune.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I cannot give these figures off-hand. I shall be glad to give them to the hon. gentleman at the early sesssion to-morrow. I will draw my hon. friend's attention to this one fact, that as a result of this investigation at St. Vincent de Paul, we found accounts paid twice, and we have recovered the money back.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I am sure that I am within the hon. gentleman's judgment when I say that even that fact does not constitute the slightest ground for the appointment of the commission.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. That fact shows that there was something wrong, and if the hon. gentleman wants to put the responsibility upon the inspector, I cannot help his doing so.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). Will the hon. gentleman tell me that that fact ought not to have been investigated by the inspector, and reported to the Minister of Justice ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I cannot say whether it ought or ought not to be ; but it was not done.

Mr. BRITTON. I think that the strictures that the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Haggart) has made in reference to the duty of the inspector, is a perfectly just one. I do not say that the present inspector is at all responsible for any of the irregularities that were made apparent in the Kingston case ; but it is perfectly clear that the state of things that developed on the examination of the commissioners, the former inspector was to a large extent responsible for. There was no inspection. In some instances, there was evidence beyond any controversy of collusion—not perhaps express collusion, but connivance on the part of the inspector with what was done by some officers in the penitentiary and what has been condemned by the commission. The work of the commissioners, if it did nothing else, disclosed that; and made apparent that hereafter the inspector, whoever he may be, must do his duty very differently from the way former inspectors did theirs. As the report has been before the House and has been acted upon, I do not wish to enlarge upon matters which invite discussion, particularly as I do not wish to take up the time of the House at this late period of the session.

Mr. INGRAM. The statement which the hon. Solicitor General will bring down to-morrow will give, I suppose, the amounts paid to each, from the time they started until they finished their duties ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes.

Mr. FORTIN. It is very unfortunate that the motion I made some time ago in this House to have the report of the investigation held at St. Vincent de Paul printed was not carried, in consequence of the objection taken by one member of the House. If the report had been printed, there could be no question as to the utility of the expenditure on the investigation held at St. Vincent de Paul. I have seen a few sheets of that report, and I was amazed at what was brought out by that investigation. I could only state from memory some of the figures, but I remember distinctly that in the construction of the stone wall around the yard of the penitentiary there was such a quantity of stone unaccounted for that it amounts to a value of about $65,000. It is unquestionably something over 200,000 cubic feet paid for by the Government and never accounted for.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I draw the attention of the hon. Solicitor General to the fact that it would be very unfair to have a discussion of what was disclosed by the report of the commissioners, without having the printed report before us. Anything I said was merely in answer to what the hon. Solicitor General stated.

Mr. FORTIN. It is not my fault if the report is not printed, but the fault of an hon. member on the opposite side ; and since some discussion has arisen as to the utility of this investigation and expenditure, I may be allowed to state what I have learned from the perusal of some sheets of that report. In the construction of that stone wall, the Government was charged and paid for 1,100 barrels of cement. The commissioners investigated that item, and found it absolutely impossible to account for the use of at least 700 barrels of that cement. No explanation whatever was even attempted to be given for the deficiency. There were many other irregularities. Prisoners in a penitentiary, though paying the penalty of their crimes, are not usually treated as beyond the pale of humanity, but are supposed to have the same affections as people who are free. They are allowed to communicate with their relatives ; they are allowed to send letters to and to receive letters from their wives, their children, their other relatives and friends. But in that penitentiary, the commissioners discovered the disgraceful fact that for years the letters addressed to convicts had, without any reason at all, never been delivered to them. They had not even been opened, but lay in a heap on the floor of the vault, and no reason could be given for their non-delivery. Some of the scenes which took place before the commission were very affecting. There were married men in the penitentiary whose wives had written them most affectionate letters, letters containing good advice, evidently coming from good, affectionate women, and the receipt of which could not have failed to exercise a good moral effect on those to whom they were addressed. Yet such letters were never de-

livered. The first letter was followed by a second, the second by a third, and by a fourth, and even a fifth, and these remained unanswered, for the very good reason that they were never delivered. One of these women, the wife of one of the prisoners, died in despair at the thought that her unfortunate husband, who had committed a crime in a moment of passion, had completely forgotten her, and stopped all communication with her.

I am very sorry that we have not got the full printed report, because it would show that a state of things existed in that penitentiary which was impossible to tolerate. The whole institution was rotten from the cellar to the garret. No law, no rules were observed. The officers trafficked with the convicts, the convicts were allowed to trade in the institution, the most extravagant expenditures were permitted. Why, the warden actually ordered in writing harnesses for his own personal use to be made upon the model of the harnesses furnished the Lieutenant-Governor of the province of Quebec, and this was charged to the Government. The warden had no less than four or five horses specially kept, at the expense of the Government, for his own personal use. Even one of the servant girls, who happened to have been taken from a neighbouring locality, had for her own personal use two or three times a week one special horse and cab, in which she was allowed to visit her relatives. These are only samples of what the report contains. There are some rather amusing transactions related in it. For instance, there was a certain steam yacht constructed at the penitentiary—constructed, of course, with the material of the institution, and at the expense of the Government. That yacht was supposed to be the joint property of two of the officials. One of the officials died, and the survivor wanted to sell the yacht. To this the heirs or legatees of the other objected. They finally came to an agreement to sell the yacht which was lying at anchor opposite the village. The price was $1,200, I think, but, of course, it never cost a cent to the owners. A bargain was entered into and concluded, and the yacht was to have been delivered the next day. But it disappeared, and what became of it it was impossible for the commissioners, holding an investigation under oath, to discover. Nothing was ever seen of it—neither the hull nor the machinery, nor even the funnel! A second yacht was then constructed, but as the story of its construction is related in the report, it may be as well to wait until that report is printed. But it will show that it was constructed on about the same lines as the first, namely, by the officers of the penitentiary, with the material of the Government. It was and is supposed to-day to be the property of a third person who has probably never paid a cent for either the material or the work. I feel certainly satisfied of the utility of this investigation. I had suspected that the institution was not being properly managed owing to the extravagance that was manifested on all sides.

I am sure that when the report is in the hands of the members of the House, no objection will be raised to the expense incurred by the Government holding this investigation. If any investigation ever justified expense by promoting good administration it was that to which reference is now being made. That expense has been partly explained by the remarks of the Solicitor General who has been so generous, I may say perhaps, a little too generous in allowing the warden all possible, and impossible, opportunities to protect himself, even to the extent of contradicting his own evidence.

Mr. SPROULE. I would ask the Solicitor General, what are the duties of the inspector of penitentiaries?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. To look after the discipline and the expenditure connected with the penitentiaries.

Mr. SPROULE. If the inspector had been doing his duty this state of affairs could not have come up without his having reported upon it.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). Had the inspector—Mr. Stewart, I think, is his name—made a report to the Government as to the condition of the Kingston and St. Vincent de Paul penitentiaries?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Not on the lines of the report of the commissioners.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). Then the department must have acted upon some information they received from others, in that case, did they ask the inspector to report on that information?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. So far as the St. Vincent de Paul is concerned, we had an affidavit setting forth particular charges from a person living in the vicinity of the penitentiary. These charges were referred to the commission.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). And not to the inspector?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. No.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). We may well ask that the duty of the inspector be defined, otherwise we may have a commission of investigation every two or three years.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. His duties are defined. They will find it set forth in the Penitentiary Act and in the Order in Council.

Mr. SPROULE. Has nothing been done to the inspector since that? Does he still hold office?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. And is the Government satisfied with that as a faithful discharge of his duty ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. These are conditions which have grown up slowly. For instance, the matters with regard to the stone occurred previous to the appointment of the inspector.

Mr. SPROULE. I understand the Solicitor General to say that the inspector has been in office about three years. Some of this wrong-doing was going on during that time. And he left it without mentioning it in his report.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. To a large extent.

Mr. SPROULE. Would not that suggest that he was unfit for his position ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Quite possibly.

Mr. SPROULE. And the wisdom of replacing him and putting some one who would better discharge the duties ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Quite possibly.

Mr. SPROULE. If "quite possibly," cannot it be said that the Government have not done their duty in not taking any action.

The PRIME MINISTER. No, because the Government have had this report before them only for a few weeks, and have had no opportunity of looking into it thoroughly and reaching a conclusion on the question.

Mr. SPROULE. I understand the report was in their hands some time ago.

The PRIME MINISTER. No, only since the opening of the session.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I see here an appropriation for a payment "notwithstanding anything in the Penitentiary Act." This seems to be a common practice. There are some half dozen items in these Supplementary Estimates with the proviso added "notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act." I do not speak in a fault-finding way because I understand it is not a practice introduced by this Government; but it seems to me to lead to some anomalous results. You have a statute, the Penitentiary Act, which applies to cases of this kind. That statute has been passed by this House and by the Senate, each having equal and coordinate powers of legislation. But we amend that by a resolution of this House and embody the amendment in a Bill, which, we say, the Senate has no right to amend. I should think it possible, though I do not say that it is the case, that some question of constitutional difficulty might arise with regard to a matter of that kind. It is true that this resolution of ours does not become law until it receives the consent of the Senate. But, though the Senate has a technical right to throw the Bill out, yet, as we say, it has no power to amend it. Therefore we amend the substantive law of the country and practically deny to the Senate any voice in that amendment. I think this practice is one which might well be considered by the Solicitor General and the Government with a view to its abandonment.

Mr. McMULLEN. It is quite clear that the class of people who were in charge of this St. Vincent de Paul were, in many cases a disgrace to the institution and the country. They would rob a grave yard, or steal a hot stove, or steal the chimney of a house. It is a most disgraceful exhibition to be made before this Parliament that men appointed to responsible positions such as these men held, should disgrace the country as they did in their conduct in this institution. I am glad to hear the First Minister say that it is owing to the fact that the Government have not yet had time to mete out to these men the measure of punishment that they deserve. But I hope they will make an example in the case of this institution that will be a warning to officials in all other institutions. It is an amazing thing that these irregularities should have been allowed to continue so long without discovery. Letters were addressed to the poor convicts, and they were not permitted the privilege of reading communications from their relatives. It is a disgrace to humanity, and the men who were guilty of such conduct should not remain at large, they ought to have been hung to a post long ago.

Mr. SPROULE. Have the Government suspended the inspector of penitentiaries, Mr. Stewart, or do they intend to prevent him going on with his duties as heretofore, in view of the fact that he has so clearly neglected his duties ?

The PRIME MINISTER. No, the Government would have been very chary in taking such action with regard to Mr. Stewart, whose position formerly as private secretary to Sir John Thompson, the late Prime Minister of this Dominion, was a peculiar one. If the Government had been hasty in suspending him, no doubt there would have been a charge against the Government of suspending him for political reasons.

Mr. DAVIN. So far as I have followed the discussion, I do not think any charge has been brought home to Mr. Stewart. The Solicitor General himself says that the practices that were condemned by the commission commenced long ago, and matured in years previous to Mr. Stewart coming to his present office. Everybody knows that when a man in Mr. Stewart's position has to go from penitentiary to penitentiary, it is quite possible and probable that these things might go on without his being able to discover them in his brief visits.

The PRIME MINISTER. I have nothing to say at present against Mr. Stewart, one way or the other. But as I understood the

discussion, the sense of right of the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) was shocked that Mr. Stewart, the inspector of penitentiaries, making a yearly inspection, should not have discovered the fact, for instance, that there were thousands of letters in the drawers addressed to the convicts, which had never been opened.

Mr. SPROULE. I still express the same astonishment, because the usual course is that when officials are charged with negligence, they are suspended until inquiry discloses whether they have been guilty of the alleged offence. I would naturally suppose the same course would be followed in this instance, I do not care whether Mr. Stewart was secretary of the late Sir John Thompson, or who he was.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Stewart, or any other inspector of a prison, could not possibly find out where the stealing had been going on for years past, unless some one came to him and made a complaint. Take the point that has been brought up by the First Minister. Was Mr. Stewart expected to ransack every drawer and every hole and corner in the penitentiary? If the Government would take these men who have been proven guilty of this wholesale robbery, and send them up for a term as convicts, I am satisfied the country would endorse them in doing so. But that Mr. Stewart should be held responsible for these improper acts, is out of the question.

Amount required to cover unprovided items, as per Auditor General's Report, 1896-97 (page A—2)..... $38,018 61

Mr. SPROULE. We ought to have some explanation of this over-expenditure.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. These are items that appear every session, they are rather a formal vote. There are a number of small items of over-expenditure, and it has become necessary to get a vote of indemnity. The practice has been followed for years. The hon. gentleman has a full list of all the items in the Auditor General's Report.

Mr. McMULLEN. There is a vote like this in every report of the Auditor General. The items are always set out in the first report of the Auditor General.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. They are not to be in excess of the total appropriations. There are excesses on particular items, but not on the general grants. The total expenditure is entirely within the appropriation.

Mr. SPROULE. It would be quite as illegal to over-expend on a particular branch as on the whole appropriation. So, the same principle applies either to a part or the whole; but there may be certain circumstances to justify an over-expenditure, and then the Minister should have the information available.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No one Minister can explain these matters. In every department there is liability to be an over-expenditure of a few dollars, for it is impossible to make the estimates correct to a dollar. In the Auditor General's Report there is set out the accounts which are exceeded, and amounts which have not been used. If the hon. gentleman will turn to the Auditor General's Report he will find that many sums are not used, and he will also find certain grants were exceeded. In such cases a bill of indemnity is necessary. The only item that really needs explanation is $19,000 for the mounted police.

Mr. SPROULE. If the hon. gentleman will look at Public Works, he will find a considerable over-expenditure.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman will find several small sums. If there are any large sums over-drawn, I shall be glad to bring down the necessary explanation. These small items are set out in detail in the Auditor General's Report, and it is quite unusual to have a debate on them at this stage.

Mr. HAGGART. The old principle was that the Minister should obtain a vote for a particular work, and it would be expended for that specific purpose.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. A large portion of the expenditure is done through credits issued on the departments, and some of the items come about in that way.

Mr. HAGGART. Take Public Works, I find that the amount granted on capital account was $105,000, and the expenditure was $114,825; grants not used, $2,161; grants exceeded, $11,000.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. What book is the hon. gentleman quoting from?

Mr. HAGGART. The Auditor General's Report of 1896.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We are referring to the Auditor General's Report of 1897.

Mr. HAGGART. I thought the new principle adopted was that Parliament voted certain amounts to be applied to particular works, and that this sum should be applied to nothing else.

The PRIME MINISTER. That was in 1896, and not in 1898.

Mr. SPROULE. With respect to the over-expenditure of $19,000, I should like the Minister to make an explanation.

The PRIME MINISTER. The appropriation was not exceeded last year; it remained quite within the amount, although there was some little over-lapping in the items.

That is the reason why we are seeking a bill of indemnity.

Amount required to maintain the force of Mounted Police in the Yukon Provisional District, including $300,000 authorized by Governor General's warrant	$500,000

The PRIME MINISTER. This is an item of $500,000 which we ask in excess of the ordinary expenditure with respect to the new development occasioned by the opening up the Yukon district, that is to say, it is required for the payment of the force we have sent to the Yukon. About the month of August last we had forty men of the mounted police in the Yukon. The gold discoveries and the consequent rush of population made it necessary to increase the force very largely. It was increased to the number of 100, and then we determined to increase it again to the number of 250, and we have now in the Yukon 239 officers and men, apportioned as follows :—

Dawson City, two officers and 31 men; Cudahy, one officer and nine men; Summit of the White Pass, one officer and 20 men; summit of Chilkoot Pass, one officer and 20 men; between Lake Bennett and Dawson, six officers and 77 men, and 27 special constables, interpreters, scouts and dog drivers; Dalton trail, twelve non-commissioned officers and men; Stikine River, two officers and 20 men, four special constables, interpreters, scouts and dog drivers. En route from Edmonton, one officer, two men, three special constables, scouts and dog drivers, and we have one officer at Vancouver; total, 239 men.

It is proposed to increase the force to about 250. I need not tell the House that the expenditure on this force has been very large and that the chief item of expenditure has been cost of transportation. The following gives the details in full of the expenditure :—

Pay of force	$ 11,846	20
Subsistence	36,308	92
Forage	7,507	37
Fuel and light	706	86
Clothing	10,853	26
Repairs and renewals	12,269	65
Horses, dogs, &c	8,569	25
Arms and ammunition	60	55
Hospital comforts	1,687	90
Books and stationery	81	35
Guides and scouts	51	60
Billet and travelling	5,347	33
Transport and freight	207,626	83
Contingencies	955	33
New buildings	7,105	08
Accounts paid from general appropriation, but chargeable to Yukon	30,000	00
Accounts not yet classified	10,511	62
	351,588	50
Accounts waiting payment and other known liabilities	75,000	00
	$426,588	50

Now, there are accounts waiting payment and for known liabilities amounting to $75,000, and we anticipate further expenditure which will bring it to the neighbourhood of $500,000. The reason of this enormous expenditure, I must call it enormous, has been the fact of the exceptional conditions of the country through which we have had to send the force. The House may be interested to know what is the work that has been done by the police force in the Yukon. First of all the police are helping in assisting to collect the revenue at the passes and we have established two custom-houses, one at the summit of the White Pass and one at the summit of the Chilkoot Pass. Our officers have collected already at these two passes about $200,000 in customs duty. It is estimated that up to the 6th of May last 13,000 people have passed through the Chilkoot Pass, and 7,000 over the White Pass, and that 2,000 persons had paid duty at Tagish before the establishment of custom-houses at the summits. At the present time there are nearly a thousand tents at Bennett and probably 30 log huts, four steamers are on the stocks at Lake Bennett, more than 1,400 small boats under construction, in addition to which there are a thousand people waiting for navigation to open on the upper lakes. There are two saw-mills at Bennett; three at Cariboo Crossing; one at Lindemann, and two at Big Windy Arm. Much material is also being cut up by whip-sawing. The first fleet, composed of 8 boats laden with supplies for Dawson, was expected to leave the foot of Lake Labarge under Inspector Starnes about the 16th May. The detachment of police for duty on the Dalton trail arrived at Haines Mission on the 15th April, and after a very rough and tedious trip reached Canadian territory at Tainy Hollow on the 8th March, establishing a camp there and hoisting the British flag. This detachment will push patrols over the Dalton trail in the direction of Fort Selkirk. On the Stikine River the police erected comfortable quarters for 20 men before the breaking up of the ice. Since the opening of navigation constables have travelled on boats as far as Glenora, assisting customs officials whenever necessary.

Mr. HAGGART. How long a period did the $200,000 collected for customs extend over ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Since the month of February.

Mr. HAGGART. You have not the whole collection ?

The PRIME MINISTER. No, but I understand that although the expenditure on the Yukon is very large the whole revenue about meets the expenditure.

Mr. CLANCY. How many persons are actually engaged in collecting the revenue ? I understand there are only a few places where customs duties are being collected.

The PRIME MINISTER. There are at the summits two customs officers, and at the summit of the White Pass there is one police officer and 20 men, and the same number at the summit of the Chilkoot Pass. There are other stations where we collect duty, but these are the principal places.

Mr. SPROULE. Have you yet succeeded in finding out the whereabouts of Major Walsh ?

Mr. CLANCY. Is the chief work of the police force there for the purpose of collecting these customs duties. The right hon. gentleman has laid great stress upon the collection of the revenue, and I would ask if that is the special object of having a large force there ?

The PRIME MINISTER. That large force is distributed all over the territory, from Glenora up to Dawson, but there are at the summit of each of the passes an officer and 20 men just for the moral effect of assisting our customs officers. My hon. friend (Mr. Clancy) will not suppose that it would have been prudent on our part just to put a customs officer at the summit of the Chilkoot or White Pass without giving him any protection. We thought it advisable that we should have a sufficient force there to maintain law and order and to assist the customs officer in carrying out his duty.

Mr. DAVIN. What is the position of Major Walsh as regards the force ? Does he exercise the power that the commissioner exercises in the North-west Territories ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Practically.

Mr. SPROULE. Is this item to pay expenses incurred up to the first of July ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. Did the Prime Minister get the money to send this force out there by Governor General's warrant ?

The PRIME MINISTER. We had a Governor General's warrant of $300,000, and this vote covers the warrant and takes $200,000 in addition.

Mr. SPROULE. Was the warrant issued since the House met ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Oh, no.

Mr. SPROULE. Was it laid before the House during the first fifteen days of the session ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Certainly.

Mr. HAGGART. How did the Prime Minister provide the $200,000 that he expended over the $300,000 ?

Mr. CLANCY.

The PRIME MINISTER. We have expended actually up to date $351,000. We had a special warrant for $300,000. We had in the month of October or thereabouts another special warrant for $45,000.

Mr. HUGHES. I wish to ask the First Minister how the horses left by the Mounted Police in England have turned out.

The PRIME MINISTER. We have received no report.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman is asking $500,000, and it must be spent before the 1st of July. He got a Governor General's warrant for $300,000. He cannot spend the balance, $200,000, between now and the 1st of July. He must have expended nearly the full amount already.

The PRIME MINISTER. We have expended $350,000, and we have accounts to pay which are outstanding of $75,000, and we expect other accounts to come in which will bring the total up to the neighbourhood of $500,000.

Customs—	
Board of Customs laboratory.....	$ 500
Amount required for Customs service in Yukon district (including Governor General's warrant of $2,500).....	6,000
Miscellaneous—Further amount required for printing.....	5,000
Amount required for repairs to the Government steamer "Argus," at Halifax, N.S.....	1,100

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I would like to ask the Minister of Customs for information in regard to the $500 for the board. I notice that in the Supplementary Estimates for 1899, there is a very large sum asked for the purpose of the board—I think some $4,000.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The item of $500 in the present vote is what we expect will be expended during the current year up to the first of July. As the hon. gentleman knows, this is an expenditure necessary by the change in the sugar duties and the return to the polariscopic test.

Mr. DAVIN. As the Prime Minister's items are passed, and he may be leaving the House, perhaps he would allow me to ask him respecting a telegram from London, which has been placed in my hands, and which reads as follows :—

London, June 7.—The Messrs. Petersens have failed to satisfy the Canadian Government, as they undertook to do before May 31, of the completion of the underwriting of $6,250,000 of capital in the new company. This failure causes to lapse the supplementary contract by which the Government extended the time for building and made other concessions.

The general outside idea is that this lapse of the supplementary contract frees the Government's hands.

On the contrary, Mr. Petersen now falls back on his original contract. Unless he is bought out, no fresh steps to carry out the service can be taken until he absolutely fails to place two steamers on the route in July, 1899, though every one realizes that it will be physically impossible to build the steamers in the time.

Mr. Petersen has approached Sir William Van Horne here, but I understand he has received no encouragement. If the Canadian Pacific had intended to touch the project it would have done so before the supplementary contract became necessary. It would, moreover, have avoided the heavy promotion fees attached to the Petersen scheme.

May I ask the Prime Minister what is the truth about that?

The PRIME MINISTER. May I ask first, what is my hon. friend reading from?

Mr. DAVIN. It is a telegram that has been placed in my hands.

The PRIME MINISTER. From whom?

Mr. DAVIN. I do not know from whom. It is headed "London, July 7—Montreal "Star" Special Cable."

The PRIME MINISTER. I have no information upon that subject. We have not received any information of late.

Mr. HAGGART. Has the Minister of Customs expended any of this $6,000 except the $2,500 of the Governor General's warrant?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I suppose there may have been.

Mr. WALLACE. I wish to call attention to the fact that the expenses of the Department of Customs have been increasing enormously each year since the hon. gentleman took charge of it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). So have the revenues.

Mr. WALLACE. But when the revenues were millions more than they were to-day, the expenses were tens of thousands of dollars less. The expenses in 1892 were $904,000, in 1893 $901,000, in 1894 $921,000, in 1895 $917,000, and in 1896 we reduced them to $896,000. The next year the expenditure went up to $945,000, or an increase in the first year of the Government opposite of $48,900. Not satisfied with that, they are asking this year $956,000 in the Main Estimates for 1897-98, and a supplementary vote of $16,450, and now they are asking $12,000, making a total of $985,000, or an increase over 1896 of $89,200. I think there is no justification for this. The Government has put an increased duty on liquors. It does not cause an hours more work to the officials to collect an increased revenue duty on an article, and therefore there is no more labour entailed. The Minister will say that they are opening offices and so on. That may be so, but while there are always places where the expenses are increased, at the same time there are places where the expense may be decreased, and where the necessity for offices no longer exists. The hon. Minister is not justified in so enormously increasing the expenditure of the Customs Department and bringing it up to $985,000, a much larger sum than ever was charged before in the history of the Customs Department, larger than 1896 by $89,000, and larger than the average of the five years preceding 1896 by $77,000 per annum. I think that the hon. Minister should explain those enormous increases in the expenditure of his department.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I cannot explain the enormous increases which the hon. gentleman mentions because there has been no such increases. Let me give the figures to the hon. gentleman. Take the year 1894-95, because he will say that with reference to 1895-96 he was not chargeable for the whole year, but that the hon. gentleman beside him was responsible for part. Compare 1894-95, when the hon. gentleman administered the department, with 1896-97. In 1896-97, of the expenditure charged against the department since I took charge, there is over $11,000 of debts incurred by the previous controller which had to be paid out of that year. For that I do not hold myself chargeable. The hon. gentleman made up an estimate of $874,000 for that year, the Finance Minister having told him to cut the amount of the estimate of 1894-95, which was $924,000, down by $50,000. The ex-Minister of Finance simply said: Strike off $50,000, and no provision was made for the reduction of the expenditure, so it went as usual.

Mr. WALLACE. What year was that?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. 1895-96. I am now taking 1894-95 and comparing that with 1896-97. Deducting from the expenditure of 1896-97 the $11,400 that we had to pay in that year for debts that were due by the late Controller, and for which there was no money provided, the comparison is as follows:—

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF EXPENDITURES OF 1894-95 AND 1896-97.

Appropriation.	Net Expenditure in 1894-95.	Net Expenditure in 1896-97.	Increase in 1896-97.	Decrease in 1896-97.
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
Ontario	302,262 22	297,591 24	.....	4,670 98
Quebec	209,953 24	212,609 66	2,656 42	
New Brunswick	91,024 43	90,582 85	.....	441 58
Nova Scotia	111,334 39	109,558 06	.....	1,776 33
Manitoba	35,005 03	31,681 65	.....	3,323 98
British Columbia	62,228 27	66,770 31	4,542 04	
Prince Edward Island	18,612 96	17,721 58	.....	891 38
North-west Territories	4,360 84	12,369 39	8,008 55	
Inspection	19,612 53	22,587 05	2,974 52	
Miscellaneous	21,876 09	21,831 44	.....	44 65
Board of Customs	25,116 77	25,937 81	821 04	
Laboratory	3,708 09	3,715 56	7 47	
Revenue cruisers	12,000 00	18,086 54	6,086 54	
Preventive service	.....	1,004 99	1,004 99	
Unforeseen expenses	.....	1,672 76	1,672 76	
Gratuities	.....	100 00	100 00	
Totals	917,095 46	933,820 89	.....	.....
Increase in 1896-97	.....	.....	16,725 43	

It will be seen that the expenditure in the older provinces was less in 1896-97 than it was in 1894-95, as follows :—

Ontario	$4,670 98
New Brunswick	441 58
Nova Scotia	1,776 33
Manitoba	3,323 98
Prince Edward Island	891 38

There is an increase in Quebec of $2,656.42, but the collectorship at Montreal was vacant in 1894-95, while the salary paid the collector in 1896-97 was $4,000, virtually a reduction in the expenditure of this province of $1,343.58.

There is an increase in the North-west Territories of $8,008.55, but this is really only an increase of about $5,500, for Calgary which was formerly under Winnipeg, was made an independent port on the 1st January, 1896, and the salaries and expenses of the port for the six months amounted to about $2,500.

This makes the actual decrease in Manitoba slightly over $800. The increases are as follows :—

British Columbia	$4,542 04
North-west Territories (net)	8,008 55
Inspection	2,974 52
Board of Customs	821 04
Cruisers	6,086 54
Preventive service	1,004 99
Unforeseen expenses	1,672 76
Gratuities	100 00

The increase in British Columbia is caused by the extension of business, so is the increase in the North-west Territories, but of the amount $3,000 was contributed by the late Government by the appointment of D. W. Davis as collector at Fort Cudahy in May, 1896.

The increase in inspection is caused mostly by the appointment of Inspector Alex. McKay in May, 1896, at a salary of $2,000 per annum and travelling expenses. The expenditure for Board of Customs shows an increase of $821.04, but there was actually a decrease in 1896-97, as the appropriation not being large enough to meet the expenditure in 1894-95, the sum of $991.08 for expenses of special officers was transferred from the Board of Customs to Special Seizures Fund.

An increase in cruisers of $6,086.54. The statement of the expenditure for this account for 1894-95 places the amount for that year at $12,000. This expenditure is managed by the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and upon inquiry at that department I am informed that the actual expenditure during that year was $16,564, but the vote was only $12,000. It therefore appears that $4,564 in excess of the vote was paid in 1895-96 by the Marine Department, and the actual expenditure for 1896-97 would be really only about $1,500 more than the expenditure in 1894-95, notwithstanding the fact that I employed an additional cruiser on the Baie des Chaleurs in the spring of 1897.

In 1896-97 I appointed Mr. Fred. L. Jones an inspector of customs and of preventive service, to have charge of the revenue cruisers and to inspect the work of the various preventive officers throughout the country. This was an entirely new service, and the cost of it during the past year was $1,004.99. There is also an item of $1,672.76 for "unforeseen expenses." This covers the

salaries and expenses of commissioners to investigate charges against Customs officials and is an entirely new expenditure.

There remains only one small item of $100, covering an amount paid to Customs Officer Vincent Mullins for loss of horse, harness and wagon while assisting a brother officer who was attacked by smugglers. This is an unusual expenditure.

It will be readily seen from the foregoing that while the expenditure in 1896-97 was increased over that of 1894-95 by a little over $12,000—the increase being $16,725 less than the sum of $4,500 paid by the Department of Marine and Fisheries in 1895-96 for expenses of the cruiser "Constance" incurred in 1894-95, such increase has been wholly attributed to the increased business in British Columbia and in the Territories, and in the extension of the inspection and preventive work, and that I have made substantial reductions in the older provinces.

That is a statement of the expenditure as compared with the last year of the hon. gentleman. As to the expenditure in the North-west Territories and British Columbia, hon. gentlemen will see for themselves that it is necessary owing to the increase of business there. British Columbia is opening up rapidly, and the new ports there are doing exceedingly well. With reference to the increased expenditure on the cruisers, I think there is no doubt that it is in the public interest, and that there is not an hon. member but will justify it, not only because it increases the revenue directly, but because it is largely preventive work and will improve the inland revenue returns. I found it in the public interest and for the safety of the revenue, necesary that additional inspectors should be appointed. In Ontario I have appointed two, and in Quebec one, and Mr. Jones is an additional inspector and preventive officer, as I have said. Under the circumstances, I think that the figures I have given should be satisfactory.

Mr. SPROULE. In what districts in Ontario did the hon. Minister appoint two officers?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. They do work wherever they may be sent. Inspector Clappison has his home in Hamilton. Inspector Shaw in Kingston. Mr. Clappison was not in the service before, but Mr. Shaw was a very good officer for twenty years or so in the Kingston office. I suppose I should not take credit for saving in his case, but the fact is that when I took him from the staff at Kingston, I did not fill his place. I regret to say that since we have adopted this system of inspection, the results have shown the need of it, that, in fact, some ports that have not been properly inspected for years and years, and things have been discovered which should not be allowed to go on. Some of the officers have found themselves in irregularities which have forfeited their positions, as well as their good name, and they have pleaded in extenuation of their conduct that if they had been looked after more closely these things would not have happened. Whether it is a good excuse or not, that is one excuse they make.

Mr. SPROULE. I notice by one of the papers that Mr. Jones has seized another cargo of whisky. Has the Minister succeeded in stopping the smuggling down on that notorious island?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. We have succeeded in detecting some of the smuggling, but I think the great benefit we derive from the service is as a preventive service. I think we have got the parties who were engaged in that trade in much greater fear than they were in times past. That is the reason I engaged the new cruiser, which cost the department thousands of dollars which we had not counted upon. The officers have been doing some very effective work in Cape Breton lately. But, as I said before, the great benefit that accrues to the revenue is by the prevention of smuggling, but the resultant benefit does not go to the credit of the department I administer; its good effects are manifested in the Department of Inland Revenue.

Mr. WALLACE. The statement the Minister of Customs has read to the House, while it may be very interesting to him, I do not think conveys very much information to this House, and what information it does convey is misleading. To hear his statement you would imagine they had decreased the expense all along the line, but the fact remains that the expenses have been enormously increased. The Minister takes the year 1895, then he takes his lowest year when he first came into office, and he makes a comparison. But even with that comparison, the expenditure in 1896-97 was $945,000 as against $917,000 in 1895 that he takes, for the purpose of comparison, as being favourable to himself, making a difference of $23,000 increased expenditure. But he says a portion of that $940,000 should be charged to the previous year, $11,000 of it. Well, I suppose that every amount must be charged to the year which it belongs, and if there were $11,000 unpaid at the end of the year when he came into office, that should be charged to the year to which it properly belongs, and the Minister was very derelict in his duty if he did not so charge it. But he has carefully avoided making a comparison with the present year where he has an increased expenditure of $40,000 more than in his extravagant first year. I have added the figures of the sums already voted to him, which amounts to $973,000, and he asks today for $12,600 more, that will make $985,000. I do not presume the Minister has come here to ask us for that $12,600, only that the end of the year is approaching, and he finds that he requires it.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I did not expect that a controller would compare estimates with expenditure.

Mr. WALLACE. We are at the last month of his year. He asked for $956,000 for this year in the main estimates of last year.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. You will be able to compare the expenditure of 1898 when the year is up.

Mr. WALLACE. No, I compare it now. He was voted $956,000 a year ago, he was voted a year ago in the Supplementary Estimates $16,000, that makes $973,000. But he comes to-night and says that $973,000 are not sufficient to run the department for a year, and he requires $12,000 more. To hear the hon. gentleman talk, you would think there were no expenses before he came into office. But he said business has increased in British Columbia and the North-west Territories, and he had to make new appointments, presumably. I would like to ask the Minister to name one port of entry he has established since he came into office in either of those provinces.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Rossland, Kaslo, Ship's Creek, Nelson.

Mr. WALLACE. I established those offices myself when I was in power.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. They were sub-ports.

Mr. WALLACE. I made them sub-ports, but making them full ports involves no further expense, in fact it involves less expense, because they send their reports direct to the city of Ottawa.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Did you make Nakusp ?

Mr. WALLACE. Nakusp was a port of entry when I was in, so were Revelstoke, Rossland, Kaslo, Boundary, and all those places.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I think not. Grand Forks, Midway.

Mr. WALLACE. Yes, we had officers at all those places.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. What revenue had you there ?

Mr. WALLACE. Well, if the revenue was greater, so much the more in favour of the hon. gentleman. The revenue has increased. But we had officers appointed there. At Rossland the revenue had grown up enormously before I left office, to many hundreds of dollars a day. I know it has increased since then.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. So have the officers.

Mr. WALLACE. But there are no more officers in Rossland now than there were then ; there is one additional officer, I know, in Kaslo. The hon. gentleman says : Look at the enormous expense we are put to in this growing country. This expense, these officers, the whole machinery, were in operation before he came into power at all. He cannot claim any credit there. The same remarks will apply to the North-west Territories. Calgary was an outport of Winnipeg ; he made it a port of entry, and that was all right. But the machinery in the North-west Territories was practically the same then as it is to-day. The hon. member for Brockville (Mr. Wood) says that he made Calgary a port of customs before he went out of office. Now, taking the expenses of 1896 at $896,000, and add, if you please, the $11,000 which he says were debts incurred, and that were not paid, you have $907,000. What are the facts ? That the next year he makes it an expenditure of $945,000. But this present year what does he make it? He has made it $985,000 or $40,000 increase over last year. He has read a lot of figures showing there was an increase in one province and a decrease in another. His figures do not convey any information. The amount was $89,000 over 1896 and $77,000, over the average of the last five years of the Conservative Administration. The hon. gentleman cannot get out of the fact that the House voted for customs $973,000.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The hon. gentleman is making a statement wholly without foundation.

Mr. WALLACE. What is the statement without foundation ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. That I said I spent $973,000.

Mr. WALLACE. I made the statement myself. I said the hon. gentleman has spent $973,000. He was voted that amount in the Estimates. If that was sufficient to run the Customs Department last year, he does not require $12,600 additional. Now the hon. gentleman is asking for $985,000, or $77,000 more than the average of the last five years of the Conservative Administration. How many scores of men has the Minister superannuated or dismissed on the plea that their services were not required ? In some instances probably he acted rightly, but the total saving should go to the country. What is the amount of superannuation charges placed on the service during the last two years ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I have not the figures at hand.

Mr. WALLACE. We should have a statement. I know quite a number of officers who have been dismissed. The Minister of Finance asked me to explain where the difference of millions comes in. In 1887 the amount collected was $22,500,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In some of those years there was a duty on sugar.

Mr. WALLACE. No doubt in some years there was a duty on sugar. In 1888 the amount was $22,200,000; in 1889, $23,784,000, and less than $20,000,000 last year. In 1890 the amount was $24,014,000. So I was correct in stating that during some years millions more had been collected than last year.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman stated that without the sugar duties the late Government had these millions of additional revenue.

Mr. WALLACE. I said that in some years we were without the sugar duties, and yet we collected very large revenues. The excuse made by the Finance Minister was that when the expenditure was high, receipts were large.

Mr. McGREGOR. You had a higher tariff then, we have a low tariff now.

Mr. WALLACE. You have a lower tariff by one-third of one per cent, which only represents $250,000 or $300,000 of difference in the amount collected. However, in the figures I quoted there are differencs of $3,000,000 or $4,000,000 in respect of revenues collected by hon. gentlemen opposite.

I desire to take this opportunity of calling attention to the dismissal of Thomas Shannon, of Killarney, Man. There was a charge made against him, of which I have a copy. He was one of the most capable of the customs officials that I ever found. The charge made against him is as follows:—

I beg to complain of the personal conduct of Thomas Shannon, deputy collector of Killarney, Manitoba. He acted as returning officer, he was an active canvasser for the late Government candidate and conducted himself offensively, and the member for Lisgar accused Shannon of misleading the people.

There was no signature to this document. An investigation was held. Shannon asked to have counsel present, but this request was refused by Mr. Macpherson who conducted the investigation. I have here a copy of Mr. Macpherson's letter in which he refused that right to Mr. Shannon. The investigation, so far as I am informed, proved nothing except that Shannon acted as deputy returning officer. I understand that is a judicial position and it was far removed from a partisan position. He acted in that capacity with the consent and approval of his two superior officers, and therefore, practically with the consent of the department. The position of returning officer is a non-partisan one, it is the exercising of a judicial function, and there is no pretense that he did not conduct the election properly there. because I think he is incapable of doing a wrong act. So Mr. Shannon was refused the privilege of having a solicitor to look after his interests, but the accuser, who appears to be the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson), had a solicitor there. Mr. Macpherson wrote to Mr. Shannon:

Counsel is not permitted to take part in the investigation on either side. As far as the preparation of your defence is concerned outside the room in which the hearing is to take place, you may take the advice of counsel.

But he permitted the other side to have witnesses examined and cross-examined by counsel, and this counsel was a Mr. Hugh Sutherland. That investigation took place in May, 1897, and nothing was apparently done until November, when Mr. Shannon got three days' notice, and was dismissed. And who was appointed in his place? Why, it was Mr. Sutherland, who was the prosecuting attorney on the other side. Mr. Sutherland's character is well known there. The Minister was asked in this House by the hon. member for Marquette where was Mr. Sutherland, and he said he was away ill. Well, Mr. Sutherland is away attending an inebriate asylum. This man within a few months of his appointment is away at an inebriate asylum, and it is a standing outrage that such a man should be appointed to a position of that kind. The people of Killarney were so incensed at it that when an election took place a few months after his dismissal Mr. Shannon was elected by an extremely large vote as reeve or mayor, both parties, Grit and Tory, wishing to show their marked disapproval of the course of the Government, and they gave him 376 votes, while his opponent only got 153. That does not prove that Mr. Shannon was not a partisan, but it proves, at all events, that he had the esteem and respect of the community after he had acted as deputy returning officer, and after he had been collector of customs there for some years, and had been in the customs service, all told, for sixteen or seventeen years. This gentleman was very harshly and improperly used by the Minister of Customs. It seems that a member of Parliament came along and said: This man is a partisan. I am told he was working against me in my election, and I demand his dismissal, and that one of our friends be put in his place. The Minister complied with that, and so off goes the head of an efficient Government officer who had broken no law nor rule of the department. Mr. Shannon violated no rule, and he merely acted as deputy returning officer with the consent of his superior. The Minister told us that the man appointed in Mr. Shannon's place was ill, but I tell him now that he is away attending an inebriate asylum for the cure of drunkenness. My information is that he is utterly unfit for the position, and that one fact alone should be sufficient evidence of that. It is not creditable to the Department of Customs that such a man should be appointed, and that a man who served the country faithfully for years should be dismissed at short notice without being paced on the superannuation fund. Has Mr. Shannon been paid back the money he paid into that fund, or

is it like the case of Tennant, that the money has been sent to him after the thing was exposed in Parliament.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Make your speech and I will answer it.

Mr. WALLACE. Well, give the answer now.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I cannot tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) positively, but I think that in all the cases where the services of customs officers have been dispensed with for partisan conduct, they have been given back the money they paid into the superannuation fund. If not, that is my desire and intention. Now, in reply to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace). He says that the figures which I gave to the House for the year 1896-97 gave my year of lowest expenditure, but as a matter of fact he will see that I took the only year for which I am responsible, as the year 1898 is not yet closed. He speaks about the Estimates for 1898, and compares them with the expenditure, but one would think that a person who occupied his position in the Government would hesitate to risk his reputation in making a comparison of that kind. I took the year for which I am responsible in the administration of the department, and compared it with the year for which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) was solely responsible, for I did not think it fair to take the six months of the year for which the hon. member for Brockville (Mr. Wood) is responsible, and make any comparison as to that in the case of the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Wallace's) administration of the department. The trade of the country has increased very much of late, and the population has increased very much, and notwithstanding all this I show there was a difference of some $12,000 in the expenditure only. I pointed to the increase of charges in the North-west, the Yukon, and British Columbia, and I pointed to the revenue service and the preventive service, and yet the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) says your estimates are so-and-so, and why do you come down and ask for any more. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) has been a Controller of Customs and he should know, although he appears to be completely ignorant of it, why I ask for this vote. The reason is this. Though I may have an estimate for Ontario of $10,000 more than I need, or $5,000 more than I need for Nova Scotia, I cannot use the Ontario or Nova Scotia vote to pay for the North-west Territories, and in connection with this extraordinary expenditure that has come about in the Yukon I have not money enough for the North-west Territories to cover that, and I have to ask a special vote; but that does not mean that I may not have thousands of dollars left out of the total vote. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) should know that the Auditor General will not allow me to use the sum voted for one province and apply it to another. It would be very convenient for us if the Auditor General would let us do so, but he will not. Suppose you have $10,000 more than you need in Ontario, and you have $5,000 short in Quebec, the Auditor General will not allow you to apply the surplus in Ontario for the deficit in Quebec, and therefore I estimate what will be sufficient, but in taking the estimate it does not necessarily mean that I will make the expenditure.

Here is a vote for the laboratory. During this session of Parliament we have adopted a new method of measuring the sugar duties; we have reverted to the polariscopic test. The instruments have got out of repair, they must have new glasses, and we have to pay express on these and other expenses; yet the hon. gentleman says, What business have you to come and ask for anything more? That is the argument of a late Collector of Customs who had the management of this department. Here is the service for the Yukon district. We have had suddenly to send men to man the White Pass and the Chilkat Pass, and up to Stikine and Glenora. I thought I had estimated liberally for the North-west, but here is an extraordinary expenditure necessitated. Then the hon. gentleman says, You must have expended all you asked for Ontario, Quebec and all the other provinces. Not at all. We need not have expended within thousands of what was voted. I believe I saved thousands of dollars out of the total vote. Last year the expenditure was $19,000 less than the estimates. But in miscellaneous, I am $5,000 short, and I cannot get the money out of the other votes. Why do I have to ask it? Because under the preferential tariff we must have extra books in every office in the country. We must have a set of books for the preferential tariff and another set of books for the other tariff. The work of the officers has vastly increased. The hon. gentleman talks about his revenue in days gone by, when there was an immense revenue from the sugar duties; but if he would only get the returns of the entries passing through the different ports of the Dominion, he would see how vastly the work of the customs officers has increased. It takes as much time and labour for an officer to pass an entry through the customs on which $100 is levied as it does on which $200 is levied; and with the greatly decreased taxation we have now, the entries are vastly increased. When we bring the revenues up to the revenues of the hon. gentleman, with greatly reduced rates of duty, every one must see how vastly more numerous the entries must be. These are things that are patent to everybody. The work is increasing and expanding, and yet the expenditure has not been increased in the older provinces, but decreased. The increase has taken place in the new ports of the country

that are opening up. I have here a statement of outport collection from 1st July, 1897, to 30th April, 1898—ten months. The hon. gentleman spoke of the revenues during his time, they were nothing compared with these: Kaslo, $48,463.24; Kakusp, $10,805.85; Rossland, $53,445.24; Trail, $18,250.99; Waneta, $8,474.23; Kootenay Lake, $774.36; Rykerts, $380.23; Sheep Creek, $172.70; Ashcroft, $12,474.35; Douglas, $1,606.77; Fort Steel, $19,592.68; Golden, $7,166.01; Grand Forks, $13,718.74; Kamloops, $3,916.61; Midway, $1,031.87; Osoyoos, $5,110.71; Revelstoke, $14,979.26; Vernon, $5,138.53; Huntingdon, $3,215.72; Aldergrove, $889.67; Crow's Nest Landing, $7,701.79; Ladner's Landing, $95.45; Steveston, $130; Upper Sumas, $29.56; Moyie City, $844.43.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). What is the object of quoting these? All these outports were created during the time of the hon. gentleman's predecessor.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. A great many of them were.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). They all were.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I think not. I am showing that the revenue has increased at these ports, and where there is an increased revenue we must have an increase of officers.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). We had all these outports, and the expenditure for them told against the year 1894-95.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. If the revenues have increased, the work has increased, so that we have to put on extra officers.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). Not always. At Montreal and other large ports increase of revenue does not necessarily mean increase of staff.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. But the work of these new offices does require increase of staff.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). We found it necessary to establish these outports, and we had to add the expense of them, and the hon. gentleman cannot adduce that as an argument to justify his increased expenditure.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I do not see the hon. gentleman's argument. The hon. gentlemen got extra officers, and that meant an added expenditure.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). The creation of an outport to a port of entry does not mean an increase in the district.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I am not arguing that. I say that taking the main ports, with the sub-ports, the increase of work has been very great; and for the collection of the revenue and guarding the revenue it has been necessary to put on more men. If there had been no more moneys collected and no more preventive work required, and the expenditure had been increased, there would have been ground for criticism; but if there is need for preventive work at points where it has not been done before, in the interest of the revenue, and greatly increased revenue has come in at certain points, you must expect increased expenditure, and I point out how light this is. The hon. gentleman talks about estimates. He estimated for 1895-96, $874,000 to carry on the customs work of the country, and how much do you think was spent? Over $907,000.

Mr. WALLACE. Nothing of the kind—$896,000.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. But there were debts which the hon. gentleman did not pay, but which were put in the next year.

Mr. WALLACE. I was not Controller then.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. There it is again—the hon. gentleman throws the responsibility on the hon. member for Brockville (Mr. Wood).

Mr. WALLACE. I am stating what the hon. gentleman knows very well, and he is misleading the House when he states differently.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. During the six months the hon. member was in office, he spent more than half of $900,000—considerably more. So that he need not turn it upon the hon. member for Brockville. I suppose in that case he would take credit for his being the estimates and not the expenditure. But I compared the expenditure of one year with the expenditure of another. The estimates are not to be taken into account because under the rule of the Auditor General limiting the expenditure on every item according to the vote given for it, I take care to have a sufficiently liberal vote, but am not bound to expend it.

Mr. HAGGART. Go to the Treasury Board and never mind the Auditor General.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I do not go to the Treasury Board but take the precaution of having a liberal vote.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. gentleman said that during the six months I was in office, in 1895-96, I spent more than half of the $900,000. In the first place, he said that I was responsible for the $896,000 that was expended. I do not want to throw responsibility on anybody else that I should shoulder myself; but as I was in office that year for less than five months, I was not personally responsible. The chief accountant told me that expenditures were kept down so as to be kept within the appropriations and have no further votes made. There was a further vote made the next session, and for

that the Government of which I was a member was responsible. The Minister says that one-half the amount was spent the first six months. Does he not know that the first month of the fiscal year there are large sums placed at the credit of all branches for their contingent expenses, which have to be accounted for later. These amount to many thousands of dollars, and are not an expenditure properly chargeable to July of each year, but over the whole year. While it may be that the expenditure for the month of July is very much larger than one-twelfth of the year, that does not indicate that the appropriation is exceeded. The hon. gentleman says you cannot take the money from one item to pay another. He knows very well that that is done. What is the item ? The whole is included in one item, No. 245, in the Estimates of 1897-98. He knows, taking the port of Montreal, for instance, or any one item of any other place, that is not an item by itself, but the money is taken indiscriminately from the whole. He says that he cannot take from one province what is voted for another. He can and does do so, and the expenditure will show it in many instances. He points to the number of entries and their enormous increase, and says that that entails increased labour on the officials. Well, if the officials got a little work, that would not do them any harm or the Government either. But we are told that the times are good, that there is prosperity all over the country, that the people are importing liberally and largely, and that hard times would mean a more careful and smaller importation ; but if the times are as the Minister says, we will find the entries enormously increased, and no doubt they have increased. I am quite certain, however, that they have not increased more than they did two or three years ago, because we have no more increase in the revenue, and not as much an increase as then, so that every statement made by the hon. Minister is quite misleading. In the first place, he says that the last six months I was in office we had not reduced the expenditure. Sir, we reduced it enormously. In the next place, he says that the money could not be taken from one vote to another. Why, it is all in one vote, No. 255 in the estimates, No. 256 in the excise. The hon. Minister has, therefore, utterly failed to justify the increased expenditure of 1896-97, and cannot justify the enormous increase he is asking the House to provide for 1897-98. There are large amounts for superannuation, which might fairly be added to this expenditure. A new Government has this advantage over an old Government, that they dismiss officials in every direction. In one case the alleged partisan conduct in another old age, and in another the necessity to economize. The Minister has used this power very lavishly by dismissing or superannuating a large number of officials, which ought to greately decrease the expenditure of his department. But instead of decreasing it, he has increased it. Wherever an old officer was to be appointed, up goes the salary, and as a result we have $985,000 asked for this year, a sum never asked for before by the Customs Department of any year of its history.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). Has the hon. gentleman appointed an officer at Bath, in Ontario ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Yes.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I recollect the hon. gentleman ridiculing the late Government for keeping in office the collector or preventive officer in that port, the revenue of which was about $50 a year, and he afterwards took credit to himself for having done away with that port. It is a fact that he has since then appointed an officer to fill the place ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I never ridiculed the appointment of the officer there, but what I did say, I suppose, was that the receipts were very small and that the officer was getting a salary of $450 a year. When he died, it was represented to me that while there was not much revenue, there was the danger of smuggling, and I appointed another officer to act as preventive officer, but instead of giving him $450 a year, I gave him $150.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville. The hon. gentleman's first statement was much more impressive and favourable than what is made to-night. The hon. gentleman at that time, as I said, not only ridiculed the Government for not retaining in office a person who was not required at the post, but he stated the revenue, which was a very small sum, and pointed to that as an illustration of the carelessness of the Government in retaining in office men who were actually doing nothing. Knowing what he had said, I was surprised to hear the Minister saying that he had filled that office, though at one time as I remember quite distinctly, he ridiculed the Government for retaining an officer there.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I think my hon. friend misunderstood the reference I made. But here is an old officer who has been there for over twenty years. I do not interfere with him, but when he dies, I appoint another man ; but instead of appointing him at $450 a year I appoint him at $150 a year.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). That does not do away with the case I put as stated by the hon. Minister. If time permitted me to refer to "Hansard" I could show that his criticism was directed against the necessity of having an officer at that port at all. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman why he requires the large amount of $5,000 for printing. That seems a large sum in addition to what has already been spent.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. We had to get a double set of books on account of the preferential tariff, and our vote was not sufficient.

Intercolonial Railway—To pay Mr. A. Kirk for damages by fire..... $689 37

Mr. SPROULE. We would like some information about this.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) was to bring down some information on this item.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think I gave very full information.

Mr. SPROULE. According to my recollection, this item was allowed to stand in order to give the Minister of Railways and Canals an opportunity to furnish information as to who owned the property.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, I furnished that information. The item was allowed to stand because some hon. gentleman asked it. I thought he might wish to discuss it.

Mr. HAGGART. While we are on this item, I desire to say a few words. I made a statement last evening with reference to the Intercolonial Railway. I stated that every item of supplies required by the Intercolonial, so far as I knew, was set up for tender, and the lowest tender was accepted, the matter being left on recommendation of Mr. Pottinger, or the Deputy Minister. The hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) stated that to his knowledge I was making a misstatement, that a great many parties had complained to him that they had not had an opportunity for tendering for these supplies, and that the contracts were given to political favourites of the late Government. Now the Minister of Railways and Canals is here, and the Deputy Minister of Railways and Canals is here, and the Minister of Finance can consult them and learn whether the statement I made was correct or not. I remember perfectly well that Mr. Pottinger made an estimate of everything required for the Intercolonial—perhaps 100 or 120 items in all. Tenders were asked from different parties. I believe it was open to the whole public to tender. Perhaps the contract for a dozen articles would be awarded to one and a dozen others to another, the whole being distributed over twenty or thirty parties. And, according to my information—I may be wrong, but I believe that I am right—there was not an item except some small items, the need for which could not be known in advance, bought otherwise than by public tender, and, to my knowledge, the contract never was awarded on grounds of politics. At first, after becoming Minister, I awarded these contracts; that is, where the tenders were even, they sent for me to decide between the parties. But afterwards, I gave up the deciding of these matters and left it all to the superintendent. Now the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) has an opportuity to consult the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals and his deputy. Last evening he gave a flat contradiction to what I said. I advise him to consult these gentlemen and find out the facts.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am going to discuss the matter without consulting the Minister or his deputy, because I do not need to refer to either of them. I know the facts of which I spoke. I am not complaining of the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Haggart's) course, or attacking him on that ground. But in discussing another matter the hon. gentleman made the statement that the practice of the Intercolonial Railway had been to purchase its supplies by tender. I asked him if he meant public tender, and he said: Yes. That was the point between us. I undertake to say that that was not the practice. I will leave the Minister of Railways and Canals to speak on the point. My knowlege is that these supplies were obtained from friends of the Government. I do not say that that was wrong, unless the prices were unduly high, and that I did not allege. A list was made of parties who were asked to send in tenders for supplies. Public tenders were not asked for, and Liberals had no opportunity to tender for these supply contracts. A list was found in the department at Moncton when this Government came into power, and this list, which I have examined, contained the names of Conservative merchants who were asked to furnish supplies, and Liberal merchants did not have the opportunity, and no public tenders were invited. I am willing to leave it to the Minister of Railways and Canals to say whether that is correct or not.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I never made any close examination of the list to ascertain whether the names were Conservatives or Liberals. But it is a fact that tenders were not asked for by public advertisement. Circulars were sent out from the department at Moncton to the persons whose names were upon these lists, and I had occasion almost immediately after I came into the department, to add a number of names of men in various branches of business, gentlemen doing business on a large scale. I will not say that these lists did not contain the names of Liberals in the various cities; but I know that they did not contain the names of many prominent Liberals in various branches of business when tenders were asked.

Mr. HAGGART. All I can say is that I never heard of that charge before. I never heard a complaint from a single individual, either in New Brunswick or Nova

Scotia, who was refused the right to tender. What I know is that a great part of the supplies went to Liberals, no distinction whatever was made. If a Liberal was the lowest tenderer, he got the contract. I left the decision entirely to Mr. Pottinger, and I never heard a complaint that a Liberal was left off the list. I believe that a great part of the supplies that were given to the Intercolonial Railway, notable in the very city from which the hon. gentleman comes, St. John, were given to Liberals.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I cannot speak for St. John, particularly, although I have some little knowledge of it, but speaking with respect to Halifax, I say that the hon. gentleman's statement, if he means to include the city of Halifax, that a great part of the supplies were given to Liberals, is incorrect. I am bound to say, as I said last night, that the hon. gentleman is dreaming, it is not at all the fact.

Mr. HAGGART. I do not know about the Liberals in the city of Halifax, but I do know about Liberals in St. John. The charge was made to me by our friends down there that the most of the supplies were given to Liberals. I did not care one cent whether they were or not, I never inquired what a person's politics were.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The real question was whether there were public tenders.

Mr. HAGGART. There were public tenders. The superintendent had orders to send them to every one who is in the business.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I know that the impression prevails in the city of Halifax at the present time, and I have heard it from business men whose word the Minister of Finance would not venture to question, that a marked distinction has been made since the present Government came into power. I am not speaking particularly of the supplies to the Intercolonial Railway. Speaking generally, a very marked distinction has been made in the city of Halifax between the practice which prevails now and the practice which prevailed before. Formerly tenders were invited from people irrespective of politics.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, my hon. friend is mistaken.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am only repeating what men of repute, men whose word the Minister of Finance would not question, have said, that whereas formerly they had to tender in competition with men on both sides of politics, now the greatest care is taken in some departments of the Government at least, not only not to send out tenders to men on both sides of politics, but to prevent Conservatives from having any knowledge whatever that tenders are being asked for. That impression prevails among a great many people in the city of Halifax to-day.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not know the gentleman to whom my hon. friend alludes; no doubt if he alludes to any respectable merchant in the city of Halifax, I would attach the same importance to his word as does the hon. gentleman. But that merchant can only speak of what he knows. He may know that he was formely invited to send in tenders and that he is not invited now; but he will not be in a position to state whether the Liberal merchant formerly was invited to send in tenders. Upon that point, the Liberal merchants are in a better position to give information than Conservatives. I have testimony from Liberal merchants that they were not invited to send in tenders before.

Mr. HAGGART. In order to settle this question let the hon. gentleman bring down the list, and it will show that so far as St. John is concerned, Liberals were invited to tender when I was in office.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If the list is brought down I have no doubt it will show that the former list was made up almost wholly of Conservatives, and the present list made up almost wholly of Liberals.

Mr. HAGGART. This will be shown when the list is brought down. My instructions to the officers of the department were to invite tenders from every one who was in business and who was doing a sufficient large business to be likely to do the work. I never made any distinction between Conservatives or Reformers. I followed a system of open tendering, such as it exists in England. I asked parties engaged in the particular business to send in tenders for supplies.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The question is not what orders were given, but what was done, what was the practice. I assure my hon. friend that if he will look into the matter he will find that practice on the Intercolonial Railway was precisely as I have stated.

Mr. HAGGART. The practice can be decided when the list of those who were asked to tender is brought down. And I venture to say when the list is brought down you will find Reformers were invited to tender as well as Conservatives.

Mr. McCLURE. In the town of Truro, when supplies were wanted by the Government departments, never, until a change of Government, was a Liberal asked to tender. It is a notorious fact in the maritime provinces, which no Conservative there will deny, that until the change of Government, this

list did not contain the names of any Liberals. I do not say it was wrong, nor do I say it was right, but the fact cannot be disputed. In the town of Truro it was the custom to ask certain parties to tender for supplies for the Pullman cars, I know the names on that list. There were Liberal grocers in that town, but not one of them was ever asked to tender until the change of Government, since which time both Liberals and Conservatives are asked to tender. Whether it was done with the hon. gentleman's knowledge or not, I cannot say, but it is useless for the hon. gentleman to deny it to-day.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I would not cast any doubt on the statement made by my hon. friend, which is undoubtedly made bona fide; but I know that the various lists were put in my hands when I assumed charge of the department and I was obliged of necessity, as a matter of fair-play to Liberals, to add a number of names. I did not strike off any names, but I added Liberal names to the list. The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Borden) will, no doubt, acknowledge that Conservative merchants there received circulars after I came into the department, not once but several times, and they had an opportunity of tendering for these supplies.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not know that any intimation was given with respect to Intercolonial Railway supplies except in one letter. I understand there was so much anxiety not to employ Conservatives in Halifax that an electric lighting contract, for, I believe, the North Railway station, was given to a cabdriver there.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You will have to call the attention of your colleague to that statement.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). This is the information I happened to obtain incidentally, but which I have not verified. The name of the party who got this contract is Fleming, who actually drives a cab, and who knows no more about electric lighting than I do. I suppose he will get some one else to do the work.

Mr. ELLIS. No doubt what the ex-Minister of Railways said is true, so far as he knows. I can only remember one case in St. John when any one obtained a contract for supplies for the railway, and it was a notorious fact that the whole business was in the hands of the Conservatives.

Mr. INGRAM. Have the Government a purchasing agent on the Intercolonial?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No.

Mr. INGRAM. Who purchases the supplies?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We have a general storekeeper for minor supplies, but the great body of supplies is furnished by tender and contract.

Resolutions to be reported.

REPORT.

Report of the Experimental Farm (appendix to the report of the Minister of Agriculture).—(Mr. Fisher.)

MESSAGES FROM HIS EXCELLENCY.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) presented a Message from His Excellency the Governor General.

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message as follows:—

ABERDEEN.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons, further Supplementary Estimates of sums required for the service of the Dominion for the year ending 30th June, 1899, and in accordance with the provisions of "The British North America Act, 1867," the Governor General recommends these Estimates to the House of Commons.

Government House,
Ottawa, 7th June, 1898.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved that the Message and the Estimates be referred to Committee of Supply.

Motion agreed to.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE presented a Message from His Excellency the Governor General.

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message as follows:—

ABERDEEN.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons, further Supplementary Estimates of sums required for the service of the Dominion for the year ending 30th June, 1899, and in accordance with the provisions of "The British North America Act, 1867," the Governor General recommends these Estimates to the House of Commons.

Government House,
Ottawa, 3rd June, 1898.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved that the Message and the Estimates be referred to Committee of Supply.

Mr. HAGGART. What are those amounts?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The first estimate, which is for the current year, is for $2,731, the balance of legislative expenses, the session being a few days longer than we formerly estimated. The second estimate, being for the year 1898-99, is composed of two items: $48,500 for increased accommodation at Lévis, Intercolonial Railway, chargeable to capital, and $20,000 to provide for the expenses of the proposed joint high commission between Great Britain and the United States for the purpose of

settling oustanding differences between the two countries in respect of Canada.

Motion agreed to.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. HAGGART. What will be done to-morrow ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We will take the Bills that remain and probably continue Supply, and sometime during the day Manitoba matters will be taken up.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 1.30 a.m. (Wednesday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 8th June, 1898.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

PRAYERS.

DEPARTURE OF HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR GENERAL.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I ask leave of the House to present for its consideration a resolution which is more pleasant than those which we have been discussing of late, though it refers to an event which, I am sure, will cause universal regret in this country. The people of Canada are already aware that the connection of His Excellency the Governor General with our country is about to be severed, that he has obtained permission to be recalled from his duties at an early date. The administration of His Excellency, I believe, has been marked by such devotion to Canada that it will be with universal regret on the part of the people that this inevitable event takes place, though it would not have taken place at this time but for private and domestic reasons affecting His Excellency alone. I think I shall command the unanimous approval of the House if I move an Address to His Excellency, to which I invite the concurrence of both sides. I move, seconded by Sir Richard Cartwright, that an humble Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, as follows :—

To His Excellency the Right Honourable Sir John Campbell Hamilton-Gordon, Earl of Aberdeen ; Viscount Formartine, Baron Haddo, Methlic, Tarves and Kellie, in the Peerage of Scotland ; Viscount Gordon of Aberdeen, County of Aberdeen, in the Peerage of the United Kingdom ; Baronet of Nova Scotia, &c., &c., Governor General of Canada, and Vice-Admiral of the same.

May it please Your Excellency :

We, Her Majesty's dutiful and loyal subjects, the Commons of Canada in Parliament assembled, on the occasion of the approaching termination of Your Excellency's official connection with this country, hasten to assure you, the representative of Her Most Gracious Majesty, of the unswerving loyalty and devotion of the Canadian people to the Crown and Empire of Great Britain, and to express the hope that you will in person convey these assurances to our beloved Queen.

It is our pleasant duty to assure Your Excellency of the high appreciation by the people of Canada of the unfailing courtesy and assiduous care with which you have presided over the affairs of the Dominion for the last five years, a period which, it must be no small gratification to Your Excellency to know, has been characterized by a marked growth of progress and prosperity, and to testify to the generous and kindly interest which you have displayed in all that pertains to the welfare and advancement of the people, irrespective of distinctions of class or creed.

We are also highly sensible of the great degree in which the literature, science and art of the Dominion have benefited from the deep and practical interest which Your Excellency has taken therein.

The important services which Your Excellency has rendered to this country have been heightened by the zealous co-operation of Her Excellency the Countess of Aberdeen, whose untiring efforts to promote the social and moral welfare of our people have endeared her to all classes of the community.

We beg to convey the assurance that Your Excellency and your distinguished consort will bear from our shores our profound respect and esteem, coupled with our warm wishes for your future welfare and happiness, and we indulge the hope that this country may continue to have in Your Excellency a friend and advocate in the councils of the Empire.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, in rising to say a word with reference to the usual and customary Address to the Governor General of Canada on the occasion of his departure after having fulfilled his term of office, from this country, I desire to make a few remarks and to make them in a perfectly frank and hearty way. The Governor General, as the representative of Her Majesty the Queen, is not, in a country like ours, where freedom of thought and freedom of expression are marked characteristics, free from the exercise of that right of criticism which in this age finds its subjects in every class and every sphere of life. But that criticism in connection with the Governor General, whenever it has arisen, has always been, I am sure, and I hope it always will be, tempered by that sentiment of respect and loyalty for the person of the Queen, of whom he is, for the time being, the representative in Canada, which is becoming in a people who are governed by constitutional forms and noted for their loyalty to the Queen and to the Empire.

It would, of course, be folly for me to conceal the fact that one point of difference has arisen in the administration of His Excellency the Governor General with reference to constitutional procedure between the leader of the Liberal-Conservative party and His Excellency. That position has been

plainly and frankly and honestly stated; and in speaking to this Address at the present time, I desire it to be fully and clearly understood that the leader of the Liberal-Conservative party, that I myself as sharing his views, and, I believe, a large part of the Liberal-Conservative party in this House and in the country do not differ from the expression of those views as they have been given voice to in this House and in the country.

Having said that, however, I am free to state that a point of difference in constitutional procedure does not at all blind those who honestly hold to their view to the many excellencies and many distinguishing traits of the Governor General's administration and course in Canada. We in Canada have two periods of especial interest in Her Majesty the Queen in relation to the representation of the Crown in this country. One is when the new Governor General approaches our shores; the other is when, after an acquaintanceship of five years or so, it becomes necessary, in the course of official procedure, that the connection that has existed shall cease. We have been particularly fortunate in the Dominion of Canada, that with reference to all our Governors General either at the period of anticipation of their undertaking office or at the period of their leaving office, there has been no occasion for any other expression than that of the most cordial good feeling and appreciation toward the distinguished men who, from confederation, have successively occupied that position.

I make no exception in this case, so far as I am concerned. There are some characteristics of their Excellencies' official connection with this country which are particularly gratifying to the people of this country. I do not think that that show of official function which is always becoming in royalty and the representatives of royalty, has ever been more graciously or more successfully administered in Canada than by the present occupant of the position of Governor General and his distinguished lady. Those representations and functions of royalty are sometimes thought to be of little use, that as mere representations they are to a certain extent cold and repressive. But I must say that the generous and hearty spirit of personal sympathy and co-operation of their Excellencies the Governor General and his consort have given to these a warmth and a heartiness which have brought the Queen and royalty, the representative head of this great Empire, in nearer and dearer relations to us than even they were before. I think no Governor General has taken greater pains to represent his Sovereign in the social way in which it has been so charmingly done than have His Excellency and the Countess of Aberdeen. Moreover, they have transferred that generous hospitality and that care from the city of Ottawa, and have made the cities of this country, from Halifax to Vancouver, the recipients of their favour and their good graces. No Governor General has tried to make himself more intimately acquainted with the people in the different sections of Canada than has His Excellency Lord Aberdeen. There is a second life in this country which is growing into greater prominence year by year as the hardness of the early conditions of a newly-settled country gradually pass away, and that is the life of literature, science and art; and I think it is appropriate that a special allusion should have been made to their Excellencies' kind and generous interest in all that pertains to the literary, scientific and art life of this country. That is a well-merited compliment, if it can be called a compliment, which has been paid in another section of the Address, that they have been characterized by a hearty sympathy with the people of Canada, entirely irrespective of any class or any race distinctions. All have been equally the recipients of their private and official hospitality. And, Sir, as to the message with which we entrust their Excellencies as they leave our shores, that message is certainly a noble message and a great trust for His Excellency the Governor General to convey personally to the Queen. The sentiment of unswerving loyalty to the person of the Queen and of the Empire itself is in no country under the sun, not excepting Great Britain itself, more spontaneous and more general than it is in this Dominion of Canada. From five millions of as progressive, as intelligent and as happy a people as exists under the sun, there goes, without any shadow of reserve, one hearty 'God save the Queen and God preserve this nation," entrusted to the care of His Excellency the Governor General, and to be dutifully laid at the feet of our gracious Sovereign the Queen.

Motion agreed to.

The PRIME MINISTER moved:

That a message be sent to the Senate informing their Honours that this House has passed an Address to His Excellency the Governor General on the occasion of the approaching termination of His Excellency's official connection with this country, and request that their Honours unite with this House in said Address.

Motion agreed to.

THE SESSIONAL INDEMNITY.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved that at its next sitting the House resolve itself into committee to consider the following proposed resolution:—

That it is expedient to provide that for the present session of Parliament and for each session of Parliament hereafter held, the deduction of eight dollars per day mentioned in section twenty-six of the Act respecting the Senate and House of Commons, being chapter eleven of the Revised Statutes, shall not be made for fifteen

days in the case of a member who has been absent from a sitting of the House of which he is a member, or of some committee thereof, during such number of days; but this provision shall not operate to extend the maximum amount mentioned in section twenty-five of the said Act, nor in the case of a member elected since the commencement of the present or of any subsequent session shall it apply to days prior to his election.

Motion agreed to.

KINGSTON PENITENTIARY COMMISSION.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). I promised yesterday to bring down a statement of the amount paid to the commissioners appointed to investigate the affairs of Kingston penitentiary:

E. A Meredith	$1,298 05
James Noxon	2,214 82
O. K Fraser	1,901 37
R. J. Ellbeck (secretary)	1,937 77
Bouchette (secretary)	468 00
L. A. Lafortune	1,000 00

Mr. INGRAM. Can the hon. gentleman say how long a time Mr. Noxon has been on the commission?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I have not got the number of days he was employed, but this amount includes his travelling expenses. The per diem allowance was $10 a day. I can ascertain the number of days.

Mr. INGRAM. Can the hon. gentleman state at what date last year he commenced?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I will give that information.

THE PACIFIC CABLE.

Mr. McNEILL. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to call the attention of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, who is present here to-day, to the question of the Pacific cable. I asked a question about it from the Prime Minister the other night, and he said that when the Minister of Trade and Commerce was present he would probably be able to give the information I desired. I have a letter addressed to me by Sir Sandford Fleming on the subject, a portion of which I will read. Sir Sandford Fleming said:

> I am glad to be in a position to furnish the information you ask for.
>
> A conference of Australian Premiers met in Melbourne early in March last, presided over by Sir George Turner.

The letter gives the names of those present.

> At the conclusion of the conference a summary of the proceedings was issued for publication. The following appeared in the Melbourne press, March 12, 1898, with respect to a better cable service:—
>
> The next matter dealt with was the laying of another cable between England and Australia, only touching at British territory. One proposal was for a cable across the Pacific to join the Canadian telegraph service, and the other was for a cable from England via Gibraltar, St. Helena, Cape Town and Natal to Glenelg.
>
> It was agreed in regard to the Pacific cable, that if Great Britain and Canada would contribute each one-third of the cost the four eastern colonies, Queensland, New South Wales, Victoria and Tasmania would favourably consider the proposal to provide the remaining one-third of the contribution.

My hon. friend will observe that New Zealand was not represented on that occasion, and those four Australian colonies agreed to contribute one-third, provided the other two-thirds were supplied elsewhere. At this late period of the session I will not read the whole of this letter, but I wish to add that I have a letter also from the Premier of New Zealand, addressed to Sir Sandford Fleming.

Mr. SPEAKER. I suppose the hon. gentleman is founding a question on his statement.

Mr. McNEILL. Yes. I do not want to move the adjournment of the House, or to occupy one moment more time than is necessary. The letter from the Premier of New Zealand is as follows:—

> Referring to my letter of the 12th ultimo, acknowledging the receipt of copy of my letter to Sir Wilfrid Laurier on the subject of the Pacific cable, the Right Hon. Mr. Seddon now directs me to say, in reply, that he hopes to hear that no efforts will be spared on the part of Canada to ensure the accomplishment of the scheme for a cable from Australia to the United Kingdom by way of the Pacific. The New Zealand Government strongly favour the Pacific cable.

Since then there has been a further communication received from New Zealand by Sir Sandford Fleming, and I imagine that it is not improbable that the Government have very recently received a communication from that colony. There has been a further meeting in Australia in respect to this matter, and the Australian colonies there represented decided in favour of the Pacific cable as against the other proposed route of the Extension Company. What I want to call the attention of my hon. friend especially to is this, that four of the Australian colonies have declared themselves prepared to guarantee one-third part, if the other two-thirds be guaranteed. From what fell from Sir Charles Tupper, no doubt the mother country will be prepared to guarantee her share. Therefore, we in Canada and New Zealand stand together, each prepared to do something towards guaranteeing the other one-third. It is clear that it is not necessary that Canada shall guarantee the remaining one-third, as New Zealand is ready to join in that guarantee. It is a question, of course, as to how much New Zealand may give of that third, and how much Canada may give; but the position of affairs at the present moment is that the Australian col-

onies are prepared to guarantee one-third, the mother country one-third, and the remaining one-third may be made up, not by Canada alone, but by Canada and New Zealand together. I should like to ask the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce if he is in a position to say whether this is a correct statement of the position of the matter to-day.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. No further communication has been made to the Government on this subject, since the last time the question was brought up in the House, and therefore I am not in a position to add anything to the remarks I made on that occasion. The question of cost will engage the consideration of the Government during the recess, but no alteration has taken place during the last two weeks.

Mr. McNEILL. I wish to call my hon. friend's attention to the fact that from what he stated the other night I thought he was under the impression that Canada was expected to do as much as the Australian colonies and as much as the mother country. It is not so. New Zealand will contribute to the guarantee along with Canada.

JUDGES FOR CHICOUTIMI AND SAGUENAY AND GASPE.

Mr. ANGERS. (Translation). Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I should like to ask the leader of the Government whether any action has been taken with regard to the increase of the salaries of the judges for the districts of Chicoutimi and Saguenay and Gaspé ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). (Translation). In reply to my hon. friend I may inform him that the Government have taken no action in regard to the salaries of the judges in the districts of Chicoutimi and Saguenay and Gaspé.

THE FAST LINE SERVICE—THE PETERSEN CONTRACT.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the Orders of the day are called, I should like to ask the Minister of Trade and Commerce if he is disposed to make any statement to the House further with respect to the Peterson contract, and how it stands at this date, after 31st May has passed.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). There is no further information to be communicated. We will probably hear definitely on the subject not before eight or ten days yet. I understand a special adjourned meeting of the board will be held shortly for the purpose of communicating their decision to the Government.

THE PROPOSED QUEBEC BRIDGE.

Mr. FOSTER. I should like to ask a question of the hon. Prime Minister. It was current in the newspaper press that the Prime Minister had promised a subvention to the Quebec Bridge I do not know whether the sum was mentioned or not, but I think it was somewhere up to one million; and it was also current in the newspapers that the promise would be implemented at the coming session of Parliament, as it was the intention to prosecute the work on the bridge at once. The second Supplementary Estimates are down and I notice nothing for the bridge. May I ask my hon. friend whether it is proposed to bring any thing more down with respect to that matter this session; or if he proposes to let Parliament rise, and then by Order in Council pledge the Government, and Parliament as far as he can, to any definite sum ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I do not think I should answer this latter portion of this question, for the very obvious reason insinuated in that last part. My hon friend has no right to assume that the Government would withhold from Parliament its policy in order to endeavour to circumvent it in another way. I have stated more than once that I was in favour of the construction of a bridge at Quebec, and that it was my intention to ask my colleagues for an appropriation in that respect; but I could not do so at this session, though I would ask my colleagues to do so, and Parliament to do so, at the other session. That is my view; in so speaking I do not speak on behalf of the Government, but for myself personally. I could not gather from my hon. friend's remarks whether he is disposed to favour the view of aiding the Quebec bridge, or whether he is opposed to it. As we are exchanging views now I would be very much obliged to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) if he would give me his views on the subject.

Mr. FOSTER. I have too great respect for the constitutional rules of the House to enter into a debate of this kind.

PROVINCE OF MANITOBA DEBT ACCOUNT.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved that the House resolve itself into committee to consider the following proposed resolution :—

1. That it is expedient to provide that the sum of two hundred and eighty-four thousand four hundred and fifty-six dollars and forty-seven cents, being the cost of the erection and furnishing of the legislative buildings and Government House at Winnipeg, which sum was charged against the "Province of Manitoba Debt Account," may, on the first day of July, one thousand eight hundred and ninety-eight, be credited to the said account, and that the interest payable to the said province on the said first day of July, one thousand eight hundred and ninety-eight, on the balance at the credit of the said

Debt Account may be calculated on the balance at the credit of the said account after the said sum of two hundred and eighty-four thousand four hundred and fifty-six dollars and forty-seven cents has been credited thereto as above provided.

2. That it is expedient to provide that the Government of Canada may, on the said first day of July, one thousand eight hundred and ninety-eight, pay to the Government of the province of Manitoba, the sum of two hundred and forty-six thousand four hundred and forty-five dollars and forty-four cents, being the sum of the amounts which would have been payable to the province of Manitoba by the Dominion, in excess of the amounts actually paid as interest from time to time payable on the balances at the credit of the said Debt Account, had the cost of the erection and furnishing of the said legislative buildings and Government House at Winnipeg not been charged against the said Debt Account, together with interest at the rate of five per centum per annum on each of the amounts so payable, in excess of the amounts actually paid from the date when the same would have been payable to the said first day of July, one thousand eight hundred and ninety-eight.

Mr. FOSTER. I did indulge the hope up to this very moment, that the Government did not intend to ask the House to pass the legislation foreshadowed in items 29 and 31 with reference to the Government of Manitoba and certain funds and subventions. I do not know that I could add anything in force to the protest that we have already made on this side of the House against the Government bringing down on the eve of prorogation, new legislation involving large subventions and expenditure of money. Before the leader of the Opposition left, there passed across the floor of the House certain remarks with reference to what measures would be brought down and as to the condition of the Order Paper, and if I do not mistake, the leader of the Government promised at that time—and we have been acting on that promise since and facilitating the work of the session—promised at that time that all the new and important legislation appeared on the Order Paper, and that with the exception of two measures that he named there was nothing else to come down except it might be something of a merely local nature. If my right hon. friend attempts to evade the essence of that promise——

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) will pardon me; I specially mentioned the very resolution that is now before the House.

Mr. FOSTER. This resolution.

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Then if my right hon. friend mentioned that, my criticism in that respect falls to the ground. If the right hon. gentleman excluded this item as he tells me he did, it takes away my ground of criticism in that respect, but it does not weaken to any extent the force of the protest we make on this side of the House against leaving this important legislation until the very eve of prorogation, when a great majority of the members on this side of the House at least, thinking that the important business of the session was over have left for their homes. I notice that hon. gentlemen opposite have filled their seats again very well. They know what they are going to do, and they bring their members back when they have determined as to what they shall do.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That is not so.

Mr. FOSTER. At the same time the criticism remains perfectly unassailable, that no Government has the right to bring legislation of this importance before the House in the dying hours of the session. How many members of this House understand either of these two questions which are to be decided? They are provincial questions and consequently there is an element of interprovincial importance attached to them. Never in the history of this Parliament has it been possible to make any readjustment with reference to any one province, unless at the same time or later readjustment had to follow in the case of other provinces. Other provinces then are vitally interested, the exchequer of Canada is vitally interested, and it goes without saying that legislation of this kind ought to be introduced in the earlier part of the session so that members might be in a position to discuss the questions involved and all correlated questions, at leisure and after a thorough investigation. All such investigation and thought as that is absolutely precluded when this legislation comes down at the present time. Now, the right hon. gentleman cannot plead that it was urgent or unexpected. The arrangements which he has made years previously and of which this—I shall not say is the final outcome—were well known to my right hon. friend. This was known to the right hon. gentleman as well when the House met as it is now. On what plea could the hon. gentleman refuse to lay this matter before the House in the earlier part of the session, and on what plea does he bring it down when the energies of the House have been dissipated by the length of the session, and when the restlessness that supervenes on the eve of breaking up is apparent everywhere? I venture to say there are not ten men in this House who understand either of these questions or what is involved in them or have looked into them. I have not for my part, and I have followed important questions with more or less care ever since I have been in public life. Yet, we are called upon to ratify a computation and the basis on which it is allowed and altogether a very large subvention amounting to nearly half a million dollars to one of the provinces of the Dominion; and we are called upon to do it between the

intervals of the leave takings of the members of this House. I say that it is not a line of parliamentary action which any gentleman can defend, and the hon. gentlemen opposite are without the least excuse because they knew what they were going to do or should have known what they were going to do; knew what they were asked to do long before this period of the session. Even after they put these resolutions on the Order Paper they have kept them and kept them until this side of the House is decimated, and until there is no possibility of coming to a discussion of the matter with anything like that leisure and care which should be exercised in relation to important matters of this kind. Now, what could result if my right hon. friend leaves this legislation for another session? We shall be here again in the course of six months, and why is it that there is this deadly urgency? Is it because there is supervening in the distance, a political commotion in the province of Manitoba, when for help granted help is to be asked in return; when for facilities that have been put at the disposal of hon. gentlemen opposite, facilities are asked in return, and for political purposes. It is rumored that there is to be an election in the province of Manitoba during the course of the year. Is this one of the cards that is to be put in the hands of friends of hon. gentlemen opposite for good services already rendered. If so, Sir, I submit this is not sufficient reason why we should be called upon to discuss these great financial matters and to decide them at the fag end of the session.

I earnestly hope my hon. friend will yet come to the conclusion to defer this legislation. If this Opposition did its duty, it would stand by its seats here day after day and month after month, as a protest, if nothing more, against this method of legislation. Insult is added to injury, to use the common phrase, when this supervenes upon the millions that have been placed before this House within the last week. Three millions of supplementary estimates—supplementary estimates containing new matter of the most debatable kind. I have looked them over carefully, and I venture to say that no supplementary estimates have ever been placed before the House which contained so much debatable and doubtful matter as the supplementary estimates which are before this House to-day. Yet we are asked to swallow them in a day. Two millions of dollars are to be paid as a loan to the Harbour Commissioners—a loan behind which we stand, and which ultimately, if contingencies happen, we will have to shoulder. But with the lightest heart imaginable this is entered into by hon. gentlemen opposite, and passed within a week of the end of the session, and under the circumstances I have detailed. That is not all; but I will defer taking the time of the House in recapitulating. Now, I make an earnest protest against that method of legislation. If I had not lost all faith, I would make my appeal, with some certainty of its being answered by hon. gentlemen opposite, on the ground of the pledges they made, and the policy they enunciated during seventeen years of opposition. Who more than the Liberal party have thundered and inveighed against this method of action, or any approach to it? Who more than this party who are now opposite to us have been looked to by the men in the country who do not believe in this kind of legislation? And yet, Sir, I must say that the events of the past two years have weakened my belief that these gentlemen were doing anything else than masquerading during the seventeen years that they were in opposition, but were simply making pledges which they knew or found out afterwards it was not to their interest to implement. I have no confidence, then, on that ground in being able to prevail with my hon. friends. But possibly my hon. friend may find that outside, in this broad commonwealth of ours, there is a sturdy and honest public opinion, if it can be got at, and that that business opinion is not in favour of such methods of legislation as this. Hon. gentlemen may smile. My hon. friend who is now Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) has taken occasion several times during the last ten years, when he was on this side of the House, and when he was before the country, to asseverate before high Heaven that he believed there was no honest political sentiment in this country and that the people looked with perfect indifference on any act of corruption that may have been committed by any political party. I believe after events have shown that the hon. gentleman is honest in holding that opinion, and he proposes now as an administrator to act upon it, and to set his seal to the course of action which, if there were any lively public opinion in the country, would condemn him, as the "Witness" does condemn him, as the Huntingdon "Gleaner" does condemn him, as the "Simcoe Reformer' does condemn him, as the old guard, old line Liberals in this country do condemn him; who, even if under their beards, mutter something which at least is not a compliment, and utter it often and pretty deeply. Once more, then, I appeal to my hon. friend to withdraw this legislation, and let us pass the urgent business of the House and go to our homes.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). Mr. Speaker, the resolution which I have placed before the House is designed to correct what we regard as a mistake made some years ago in the accounts between the Dominion of Canada and the province of Manitoba. We have had under consideration during the past year three claims or applications from the Government of Manitoba. One of these relates to the School

Lands Fund, and is the subject of a resolution now before the House, which, I may remind my hon. friend opposite, far from being sprung on the House, has been on the notice paper for a considerable time, and was actually on the notice paper at the close of last session, when we were not able to proceed with it. Therefore, so far as that item is concerned, there has been ample notice. That, however, is a subsequent resolution, which I will deal with in due course. The second application from the Government of Manitoba has reference to a sum of $110,825.07, which was placed to the credit of the capital account of the province in the year 1884. In the year 1885 there was a settlement of the disputed accounts with Manitoba, which settlement found expression in an Act of the Dominion Parliament of that year. A clause in that Act required that the settlement of the matters therein referred to should be regarded as final, and that the Manitoba legislature should accept it as such. The Manitoba legislature did accept that settlement as final and conclusive; but a question has arisen as to the proper interpretation of the settlement, the Manitoba Government disputing the interpretation the Dominion Government have placed upon it. In the original arrangements with Manitoba, a certain amount was placed to the credit of the capital account of the province. That amount was based on a population of 17,000. In 1885 a readjustment took place, in which a settlement was made on the basis of an assumed population of 125,000, and under that arrangement a large sum was placed to the credit of Manitoba. Now, it has been contended by the Government of Manitoba that the sum of $110,825.07, which was placed to the credit of the province in 1884, was to be held as a distinct and separate sum, and was not affected by the settlement of 1885. Therefore the Manitoba Government have claimed that the province should continue to be credited with that sum. That claim we have not been able to entertain. We have been obliged to take the view that the settlement of 1885 was intended to include, and did include, the $110,825.07 which was placed to the credit of the province by the Act of 1884. On that branch, therefore, of the Manitoba Government claim, we have not been able to agree with them, and have not asked Parliament to make any appropriation. The third claim, and the one with which we deal in the resolutions before the House, has relation to the construction of the legislative buildings and the Government House, and the furnishing thereof, in the city of Winnipeg. The claim of the Government of Manitoba was for the cost of the buildings and the furnishing. When this resolution was first drafted, it was made to cover the furnishing as well as the buildings. On closer examination we have come to the conclusion that the case in favour of payment of the furnishing account is not a strong one, and I intend in committee to so amend the resolution that that portion of the claim, not a very large one, shall be struck out. Therefore, in dealing with this resolution, we may assume that it is for a somewhat smaller sum, though not very much so, and applies merely to the cost of the legislative buildings and the Government House. In the British North America Act, section 108, it is provided:

> The public works and property of each province enumerated in the third schedule to this Act shall be the property of Canada.

In the third schedule mention is made of "Custom-houses, post offices, and all other public buildings, except such as the Government of Canada appropriate for the use of the provincial legislatures and governments." Under that clause of the British North America Act, Canada became possessed of all the public buildings belonging to the Governments of the several provinces, but by Order in Council gave back to the various provinces, subject to the conditions of the Act, such buildings as were necessary for provincial purposes. Under that clause and the Order in Council founded thereon, the old provinces that existed in 1867 were allowed to use public buildings which were the property of Canada, but were assigned or transferred to the provinces for the purposes indicated in the Act. There has always been a question—perhaps my legal friends will say there is none—as to whether these transfers gave to the provinces any title to the property. It has been held that these properties still, in a certain sense, belong to Canada, and that the provincial governments have consequently not the power to dispose of them, but only to use them for provincial purposes. However that may be, it was the undoubted policy of the Dominion in 1867 to transfer to each province sufficient property in its public buildings to carry on its provincial government. Manitoba, of course, was a new province, created and taken into the union at a later day, but it does seem to have been contemplated from the beginning that the principle which was laid down respecting the older provinces should be applied to Manitoba, and that she was entitled to receive out of the public treasury sufficient appropriation to provide for public buildings to enable her to make a start in provincial government. In 1882, Sir Hector Langevin made a statement in this House on the subject, when asking an appropriation for the erection of these buildings in Manitoba. He was asked by Mr. Casgrain: How is it we are obliged to build Parliament Buildings for Manitoba? Sir Hector Langevin replied:

> When the other provinces came into confederation, they had their parliamentary buildings, and these were allowed by the Federal Government to be used by the provinces. As Manitoba was a new province, and had no buildings, Parliament last year voted a sum for the pur-

pose of constructing a public building and a residence for the Lieutenant-Governor.

It therefore seems to have been understood from the beginning that the federal treasury was to supply Manitoba with buildings for the purposes of provincial government. In 1885 there was a settlement between the provinces of Manitoba and the Dominion Government in certain matters, and a large sum was placed to the credit of Manitoba in her capital account, and in the Act, chapter 50 of the Statutes of 1885, the following section will be found, to the latter part of which I draw particularly the attention of the House :—

The capital sum on which the province is entitled to receive half-yearly payments of interest at 5 per cent per annum, as fixed by 33 Vic., chap. 3, and as readjusted or increased or readjusted by any subsequent Act, shall, from and after the 1st day of July, 1885, be calculated on a population of 125,000, at the same rate per capita as was allowed on the estimated population under the Act 33 Vic., chap. 3——

I want to draw the attention of the House particularly to these concluding words :

—and shall be charged with such advances as have been already made to the province, and with such expenditure as has been made therein by the Dominion for the purposes of a strictly local character, and with a further sum of $150,000, which the Dominion Government may advance to the province to meet the expenses of construction of a lunatic asylum and other exceptional services.

The whole question turns on the words declaring that : Manitoba shall be charged with the sums which have been expended in that province on works of a strictly local character. Under that clause, the Finance Department, as far as I can learn—I have not been able to find that the matter was ever the subject of legal opinion—seems to have taken it for granted that the sums charged against the province of Manitoba for the purposes of public buildings were intended to be charged against the capital sum placed to her credit, and from that time to the present Manitoba has been charged with the cost of these public buildings, as if they were works of a purely local character. The officers of the department interpreted the Act as no doubt they thought right, but their interpretation was not the result of any determination in Parliament, nor am I aware that the subject was ever considered in any way so as to produce a deliberate judgment. However that may be, from that time forward Manitoba has been charged with the sum of $284,456.47, consisting of $17,430.04 for furnishings and $267,026.43 for the buildings. As respects the furniture, although the Manitoba Government claimed on that also, and at one time we were disposed to think the claim was fair, we think it ought not to be pressed, and we expect our Manitoba friends to accept that vi[illegible]. Leaving the furniture as a proper charge against the local government, there remains the sum of $267,026.43 which has been charged against Manitoba from that day to this, and on which every half-year the payment of interest has been improperly withheld from the province. We think it is quite clear, from the statement made by Sir Hector Langevin, that the understanding in the beginning was that the province of Manitoba was to have been furnished with these buildings out of the money of Canada, and even apart from that, by ordinary methods of reasoning, it would be only fair that Manitoba should be treated as the older provinces were and started with a reasonable equipment to carry on its public business. After the Act of 1885 was passed, certain conversations took place in the House, which support the view that this was still regarded as a federal rather than a local matter. In 1885, during the passing of the Act, a question was put to Sir Mackenzie Bowell as to what sums were to be charged to Manitoba, under the section of the Act which I have read. Sir Mackenzie Bowell replied :

I am not in a position to say. I made special inquiry to ascertain if I could obtain the information for the House, but found that I could not. There has been a large amount of expenditure covering a number of years, and it will require full investigation before the amount to be charged against this increased capital account can be obtained, and will have to be a matter of investigation in the future and agreement between the province and the Dominion.

So that at that time it was not regarded as conclusive that the claims of Manitoba were finally adjusted. In 1886 Mr. McLelan, the then Finance Minister, made the following statement :

A settlement is to be arrived at as to what may be deemed strictly local as chargeable against them, and then what they have drawn as capital. There will necessarily be a settlement between the two governments as to what will be charged against them as strictly local.

That was in 1886.

Mr. HAGGART. Is there any itemized account in the department on which the Act of 1885 was passed ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We could easily obtain that information, but I do not think it would enter into the question at all.

Mr. HAGGART. It enters the question in this way. We wish to see whether the amount that was expended for these buildings was charged then or not, or entered into the calculation.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think not. The settlement of 1885 was arrived at by allowing to Manitoba a certain per capita sum, based on a population of 125,000, which was an assumed population. The amount allowed to capital account of Manitoba, in the first instance, was based on the allowance given the provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick of $27 and some

cents per head. That was afterwards increased, by a readjustment of the provincial accounts, to $32 and a fraction per head. and the capital account in Manitoba in 1885 was fixed by taking that $32 per head and applying it to an assumed population of 125,000. That made the sum which was assigned to Manitoba. The point my hon. friend mentions does not appear to have entered into the calculation at all.

Mr. HAGGART. I understood that there was a further sum of $100,000 credited to them in discharge of all local claims.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, there is no such statement in connection with the settlement of 1885, so far as I am able to discover. It seems clear from the statements made, first, that as under the British North America Act, each province was allowed the buildings it had prior to confederation, it seems only fair and reasonable that the province of Manitoba should be equipped with such buildings as were necessary for a proper beginning of its work as a province; second, it is apparent from the speech of Sir Hector Langevin that it was understood and fully acknowledged that the province should be supplied with these buildings out of the Dominion treasury, and third, though we are told that the Act of 1885 was regarded by some as a settlement of these matters, I have been able to make quotations from the speech of Mr. Bowell and Mr. McLelan, who was Minister of Finance in 1886, from which it appears that the question of what was strictly local and what was not strictly local was a matter still under consideration and not then determined. It does not appear to have ever been formally determined from that day to this; but, in the meantime, the province of Manitoba has been charged with a sum, the interest on which, we think, was fairly due to the province, but has been withheld from her.

My hon. friend (Sir Louis Davies) reminds me that the Manitoba Government, all along, have protested against this, and claimed that they were entitled to what we give them, and also to the other claims to which I made a passing allusion at an early stage of my remarks. The moment the Manitoba Government received from the Finance Department statements in which these amounts were charged against them, they immediately protested, and they have been protesting ever since. And I think I am justified in saying that, in their communications with the late Government the claim was not unfavourably considered as respects these buildings. I do not mean to say that any pledge was given that the claim would be paid; but the general information I have been able to obtain in the matter leads me to believe that the claim was not regarded unfavourably by the late Ministry or some members of it, and that if they had been longer in office, perhaps they might have adjusted it. At all events, the facts have been placed before us in such a way as to impress us with the conviction that an injustice has been done to the province of Manitoba in deducting this amount, and that, in justice and fairness, we should allow the province the sum charged against them for the construction of these public buildings, the legislative buildings at Winnipeg, and the Government House at Winnipeg, and that we should allow them interest on the various sums withheld from them from 1885 down to the present moment. This is the ground on which we ask the House to adopt the resolution I have moved.

Mr. SPROULE. I endorse every word that was said by the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) with regard to the unwisdom of submitting to this House such a proposition as this at this very late hour of the session. It seems to me that the motion is important enough to warrant the most careful consideration on our part. It involves questions that have been dealt with over and over again, that have been settled once, that have been settled twice, settled three times, settled even four times—and now we are asked for a fifth settlement. In view of these facts, and in view of the important principles and the amount of money involved, it seems to me impossible that this resolution should be lightly dealt with. I am opposed to this also because it opens up the question of assistance to the provinces. This is in accordance with the platform laid down by the members of the Reform party in 1893, when they intimated to the various provinces that, in the event of their getting into power, they would be disposed to give the provinces larger assistance than has heretofore been given. We thought that in 1885 a final settlement had been come to with regard to assistance by this Parliament to the provinces. I know that Mr. Blake took the view, and so, I think, did the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright), that the time had come when it ought to be regarded as no longer justifiable for any province to appeal to the federal power for additional aid in carrying on provincial affairs. But we are asked to open the question again, to open the door for every province to come to us and ask for assistance to pay debts incurred by their own extravagance and their own improvidence.

Now, the Minister of Finance says that in these resolutions there are two questions which we are asked to consider in connection with Manitoba. One is to give them a portion of the money we retained as a permanent school fund, the interest of which they would receive to carry on the educational affairs of the province. That is dealt with in another resolution, and, therefore, I must pass it by with a very few words.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Why should my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) discuss it at all, for I refrained from more than mentioning it.

Mr. SPROULE. I only intend to mention it, as it is to be discussed later on. The other part of the Finance Minister's statement is that there is still an obligation due to Manitoba which we have not discharged; that is the cost of the present parliament buildings; and that, as we did not pay the cost of these parliament buildings, or, in other words, we paid it and charged it up to the province, which should not have been done, we are bound to allow the amount of the cost of the parliament buildings to be credited to Manitoba, and the interest of that money from the time that she was entitled to it. Now, as I read it, according to the claim of Manitoba, the interest of that money dates back to 1879——

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). No, it was not charged against Manitoba until 1885.

Mr. SPROULE. But the expenditure was made before that time.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) must have misunderstood the Finance Minister. He put his case on the ground that a mistake was made in 1885 by the Finance Department in charging this sum of money against Manitoba without the authority of Parliament and without the opinion of the Justice Department; and we must rectify that, and interest must be allowed from the time of the error.

Mr. SPROULE. But Manitoba says that she should never have been compelled to pay this amount, and, therefore, from the time they are entitled to the parliament buildings they were entitled to interest on the amount.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Not at all, that is not the claim.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is not the claim, and we are not proposing to pay it.

Mr. SPROULE. Here is the claim set up. First, we will give the revenue of the province, in order that we may understand the mater more fully:

The First Statement of the Finances of the Province.

Cost of government	$30,000 00
Per capita allowance (80 cents per head) on an estimated population of 17,000	13,600 00
Five per cent interest on $472,090, debt at $22.77 per head.....	23,604 50
Five per cent interest on $79,357, as adjusted in 1873.....	3,967 85
	$71,172 35

Then 5 per cent interest on $79,357 as adjusted in 1873 would amount to $3.967, making in all $71,172.35. That was what was going to Manitoba. This was subsequently increased by Order in Council of the 26th October, 1875, and confirmed by 33 Vic., chap. 3, to $90,000 per annum instead of $71,000. But in 1879 the subsidy was re-adjusted as follows:—Cost of Government, $30,000, same as before; per capita allowance, 80 cents per head on an estimated population of 70,000, $56,000; interest on balance of capital, $19,653, making a total revenue of $105,650.04. Then again by chap. 5 of the Statutes of Canada, 1882, the subsidy was re-adjusted again in the following way:—For support of the Government and the legislature, $50,000, instead of $30,000 as at first; per capita allowance upon an estimated population of 150,000, instead of 70,000 as before, at 80 cents per head, would make $20,000; and an indemnity in lieu of public lands of $55,000, giving them then a revenue of $215,000. That was the third time we re-adjusted their financial affairs. The last settlement of the subsidy was made by chap. 50, Statutes of Canada, 1885. It provided that all Crown lands in Manitoba which might be shown to be swamp lands should be transferred to the province; that there should be a grant for the benefit of the university of 150,000 acres of land; that the grant in lieu of public land should be $100,000 per annum. That was in lieu of the public lands which we held, and which the Manitoba Government claimed they had a right to. That the per capita allowance to the province of 80 cents per head under 30 Vic., chap. 3, increased by 45 Vic., chap. 5, based on the population of 150,000 should be subject to be increased as follows:—

A census of the province shall be taken every fifth year, reckoned from the general census of 1881, and an approximate estimate of the population shall be made upon the first day of September next and at equal intervals of time, between each quinquennial and decennial census, and whenever the population by any census or estimate exceeds 150,000 which shall be the maximum on which said allowance shall be calculated, the amount of the said per capita allowance shall be increased accordingly, and so on, until the population shall have reached 400,000 souls. It is provided by section 5 that the ten-year limitation which appeared in 45 Vic., chap. 5, is struck out, and the arrangement is made unlimited as to time. The capital sum on which the province is entitled to receive half-yearly payments of interest, at the rate of 5 per cent per annum, is fixed by the Act 33 Vic., chapter 3, and as re-adjusted or increased by any subsequent Act, shall from and after the 1st day of July, 1885, be calculated on a population of 125,000, same rate per capita as was allowed on an estimated population under the Act 33 Vic, chap. 3, and shall be charged with such advances, as may have already been made to the province and with such expenditure as has been made herein by the Dominion for the purpose of strictly local character, and with a further sum of $150,000 which the Dominion Government may

advance to the province to meet the expenditure of constructing a lunatic asylum and other exceptional services.

This was to cover not only the cost of the lunatic asylum but all other exceptional services.

It is provided that the above grant and payment shall be a final settlement of all claims against the Dominion Government.

In furtherance of that understanding I take up the Act of 1885 of which clause 7 says:

The grants of land and payments authorized by the foregoing sections shall be made on the condition that they be accepted by the province (such acceptance being testified by an Act of the legislature of Manitoba), as a full settlement of all claims made by said province for the reimbursement of costs incurred in the case of disputed territory, or the reference of the boundary question to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, and all other questions.

That was one of the most discussed claims between the Dominion and the provincial Government up to the 10th day of January, 1895. The last portion of that clause admits that it was a substantial settlement of all claims that had been discussed to that date. Now was this claim for the cost of the provincial legislative buildings and the Government House, discussed before that date? Certainly it was discussed, because it is mentioned in those papers over and over again, even as far back as 1871 and 1872, and from time to time it was referred to between that date and the year 1885. Therefore I claim that it was included in the settlement, and this was regarded as a final settlement of that claim as well as the others, notwithstanding any contention that may be held to the contrary now. Now, the Minister of Finance says that there is another clause, clause 6, which says:

And shall be charged with such advances as have been already made to the province, and with such expenditures as have been made therein by the Dominion for the purposes of a strictly local character.

Now, what expenses were made of strictly local character besides the Parliament buildings, the Government House and the lunatic asylum? So far as I know, there were no other expenses; therefore I claim it must apply to the cost of putting up these buildings, and if it did, then the legislative buildings and the Government House were included, and therefore they were included in the final settlement, because that is the only point of dispute, namely, that it does not apply to this. Then if it does not apply to this, it is incumbent upon the Minister of Finance to show that there were other things of a purely local character where expenditure was made that this refers to, and that this did not refer to the Government House, the legislative buildings or the lunatic asylum. I do not think the Minister has done that, it is incumbent on his to do it. But I take the ground that it was a final settlement, and therefore we should not open up this question again; when we open it up again, we established a precedent whereby every province will be appealing to us in the future for further subsidies to carry on provincial affairs. But there seems to be a strong suspicion in connection with it. That this is part and parcel of the settlement of the Manitoba school question.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. SPROULE. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries laughs at it, but let me tell him what one of his own friends says in another place: "Well, if that be a fact, we are just settling all these disputed questions the same as we propose to settle our disputed questions with the United States, that is, to put them all in one lump, we settle it all by one Act." That is undoubtedly the proposal, and you cannot disabuse the public mind of Canada of the impression that in connection with this proposal there was an understanding in the settlement of the school question that this should be a consideration. Canada believes that to-day, and Canada will still believe it, notwithstanding what may be said to the contrary. Now, it is for us to think over what we are paying for the consideration. Are we not establishing a bad precedent? Are we not establishing a principle that will be a dangerous one in the future? Are we not openly violating the final compact that was come to between the various provinces of the Dominion and the Federal Parliament in 1885, when that settlement was made between the Federal Government and all the provinces, and when it was agreed that there should be no more applications to the Federal Government for assistance to carry on provincial affairs? I say that is what we are doing to-day, and hon. gentlemen are carrying out that portion of their platform adopted in 1893, when they told the provinces of the Dominion: If we are brought to power we will relieve you of the debts you have incurred by your provincial Governments in the past, we will give you provincial subsidies that you have not got up to the present time. We are starting with Manitoba this year. The province of Prince Edward Island will come forward next year, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick will follow, and Quebec and Ontario will come afterwards.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Do not make any mistake, Ontario will be here very early, if there is any money in the question.

Mr. SPROULE. No doubt. We shall have again commenced milking the federal cow, and distributing the revenues of the Dominion. When the expenditure is increased and these amounts paid, Ontario will be called upon to pay the larger proportion, it having the greater population. It is a bad principle and a bad precedent to establish.

The Finance Minister has not made out a case in favour of Manitoba receiving this money. That Act was regarded then and should be regarded now as a final settlement of all claims between Manitoba and the Dominion Government.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. I surely will not be accused of partisanship either in favour of this Government or that of the province of Manitoba in presenting the view I take of this question. The whole question, as the Finance Minister has properly stated, is reduced to a matter of book-keeping. Manitoba has no claim and never made a claim in respect to any sum with regard to the erection of public buildings. When Manitoba entered the confederation delegates were sent here by the population of the Red River colony to arrange terms. Among some of the claims made by the people of Red River through their representatives was that the Federal Parliament should provide for the erection of public buildings in the future province of Manitoba. This was so well understood that at a later period the Federal Government, with the endorsation of this Parliament, provided for the erection of public buildings without consulting the province of Manitoba. Plans were prepared in the Public Works Department at Ottawa, these were forwarded to Manitoba, and submitted to the local Government of the time. We were never consulted as to how the work should be done. The work was carried out, public buildings were erected ; whether they should have cost what was expended was not our affair, and in fact we did not look into it because it was none of our funeral, as we were not going to pay for the buildings. They were duly erected and afterwards handed over to the province of Manitoba as their property. A few months afterwards we found out that our capital account was charged with the cost of the public buildings.

Mr. HAGGART. What year was that ?

Mr. LaRIVIERE. I am not positive as to the year, it was after the completion of the buildings and their transfer to the province. It was in 1885, I think.

The PRIME MINISTER. In 1884.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. So our province has been deprived since that period of the revenue we should have received from the interest of that amount ; that is to say, our capital account being diminished to that extent, the 5 per cent which the province was entitled to receive on that capital account has been withheld from it. In rectifying the mistake by carrying to the other side of the ledger account of the province of Manitoba the amount improperly carried to the opposite side, the Government are only restoring by a stroke of bookkeeping, what Manitoba has been unjustly and unfairly deprived of by the action of the officers of the Department of Finance. I may be told that under the settlement of 1885 all the claims of Manitoba were settled. Manitoba never put forward this question, which was disputed between the two Governments, as a claim. It was not a claim at all ; it was merely a difference of opinion as to a matter of bookkeeping. We never claimed that we should get the money ; but we complained that it was taken away from us by wrong action on the part of the officers of the Finance Department. Parliament never endorsed the action taken by those officers, and, as has been stated by the Finance Minister, those officers never consulted either the Government of the day or Parliament. They had no authority, and apparently did not look for any authority for doing what they did. Under these circumstances, I say that in passing this Bill, not in voting to Manitoba a specific sum of money, but in restoring to Manitoba what has been taken from her, the Government of the day are only doing an act of justice. I will not touch upon the outside considerations that may have prompted the Government to act. I say this is an act of justice in favour of my province, and in duty bound I will support it as well, strongly as I may oppose the other resolution that may be put before the House on another subject.

Motion agreed to, and the House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

On resolution 1,

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I propose to amend by striking out the amount for furnishing and leaving the amount payable as $237,026.43.

Mr. SPROULE. How does the hon gentleman reconcile his action with his speech, because his arguments would apply to one part equally with the other ?

The FINANCE MINISTER. That is where I differ with my hon. friend. Take the case of the Government House of New Brunswick. That passed under the control of the Dominion and became Dominion property by the British North America Act. It was transferred by the Dominion to the province of New Brunswick ; but the furnishing never became the property of the Dominion of Canada and were not transferred back, and as we did not supply furnishings for these buildings in the other provinces, we should not be asked to supply furnishings in the case of Manitoba.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There is another proof that the action of the Government is consistent and correct. When the Government of Manitoba, of which the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. LaRivière) was a member, discovered, shortly after the event, that this cross-entry had been made in the Finance Department here against their province, they entered a protest against it. Mr. Norquay came to Ottawa and interviewed the then

Finance Minister, Sir Charles Tupper, and also wrote a letter pointing out how unjust and unfair it was that this item should be charged against the province. In that letter Mr. Norquay quotes the Order in Council passed by the Dominion Government when undertaking to provide legislative buildings for Manitoba.

Mr. SPROULE. Will the hon. gentleman give the date ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes. That Order in Council while declaring it was the purpose and intention of the Dominion Parliament to provide sufficient buildings for the legislative assembly and for Government House, also declared that the Government would not provide the furniture and furnishings. The Order in Council was passed on 20th April, 1879, and reads as follows :—

> That with respect to the erection of public buildings at Winnipeg, the Government of Manitoba be informed that an item will be inserted in the Estimates of the next session of the Dominion Parliament for the erection of plain but sufficient buildings for the legislative assembly and Government House, but that the Dominion Government will not undertake the furnishing of either.

That is perfectly plain. The Dominion Government distinctly pledged itself to the province of Manitoba that they would construct and erect these public buildings, and at the next session provide the necessary money.

Mr. SPROULE. But they did not say it should not be charged against the capital account of the province ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman heard the statement of the Finance Minister, that in every province the Government had provided buildings for the purposes of a legislative building and Government house, and in Manitoba there not having been buildings there for the purpose, the Government came in and said by Order in Council : All right we will apply to Parliament next session for a vote and build them for you. That being done the moment the clerk or whoever he was made this entry charging Manitoba with this sum of money, it became not a question of making concessions to Manitoba, not a question of giving them something they have been clamouring for, but it became a question of correcting a manifest error. My hon. friend is quite entitled to argue that it is not a manifest error and that the terms of the statute were strong enough to cover it, although with that branch of the argument I do not agree, but he is misleading the public when he says that this action of the Government is interfering in any way with the settlement made in 1885. The settlement made in 1885 is binding by statute upon the Dominion and upon Manitoba, but does it follow from that, that if a clerk in the Finance Department charged $500.000 by mistake against Manitoba, that province is to be bound for all time by that mistake ? Not at all. I appeal to my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) then, and I know he is a reasonable man.

Mr. SPROULE. Will the Minister of Marine and Fisheries first give us the date of that letter ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The 18th day of April, 1879, is the date of the Order in Council, and the date of the letter is 2nd April, 1887. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) will see that the statute comprising the settlement was passed on the 20th July, 1885, and the first half-yearly account afterwards would be made up in 1886. The Government of Manitoba were not aware of this until after they had received their half-yearly account made upon the 1st of July, 1886.

Mr. HAGGART. That is a most important statement. What I want is information as to when the first reduction was made in their indemnity ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The 1st of July, 1886.

Mr. HAGGART. Are you sure ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am reasonably sure, because I remember going into it very carefully, and the Minister of Finance will correct me if I am wrong.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think that is correct.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. It was after the settlement of 1885 when everything that was standing in the books of the Department of Finance was charged to Manitoba. All they thought should be chargeable to Manitoba was charged after the settlement of 1885, and the moment we found that out we protested against being charged with that amount.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes. My hon. friend (the Minister of the Interior) tells me I am correct that the first charge against them was on the 1st July, 1886, and when the account went up to Manitoba they made a protest at a reasonably early date. I do not think the delay between the first of the year and the spring, when they came down here could be held to prejudice their case.

Mr. SPROULE. The first protest was made in April, 1887.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes ; the first official protest was made during the currency of the year when the charge was made against them. I think the matter has been put very lucidly already, and I believe I am correct in saying that the mission of Mr. Norquay to Ottawa was not unsuccessful. It is generally believed that the then Finance Minister assented to the proposition he laid down, and that Mr. Norquay's contention that this never was intended and could not be in-

tended in face of the Order in Council passed by the Dominion Government to be charged to Manitoba; that contention, I believe, was assented to by the then Finance Minister.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. It was so much understood by our Government in Manitoba that this amount has always been kept as an asset of the province in our provincial public accounts.

Mr. HAGGART. The Minister of Finance read only one clause of the settlement of the claims of Manitoba. Besides the clause he read there is the following:—

> The grant of land and payments authorized by the foregoing section shall be made on the condition that they be accepted by the province, such acceptance being testified by an Act of the legislature of Manitoba as a full settlement of all claims made by the said province, for the reimbursement of costs incurred in the government of the disputed territory, or the reference of the boundary question to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, and all other questions and claims discussed between the Dominion and the provincial Governments.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I did not read that section, but I stated the substance of it.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Does the hon. gentleman think that this could be considered a disputed question in view of the Order in Council which I have just read which had been passed by the Government of this Dominion, and forwarded to the Government of Manitoba.

Mr. HAGGART. I am coming to that. The hon. gentleman said there was an Order in Council under which the Dominion Government assumed the erection of these provincial buildings. Then if there was no deduction from the amount that was paid to the provincial government before the passage of this Act of 1885, it is a fair question to consider whether it entered into the consideration of either of the Governments before the passage of the Act. But the whole question is, when the first deduction was made from the payment to the provincial government. If it was made before this they would not have a leg to stand upon, but if it was made afterwards then there is something in the argument.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It was made afterwards without question.

Mr. HAGGART. Then the provincial government have a fair right to rely upon the Order in Council of 1878?

The PRIME MINISTER. Hear, hear.

Mr. HAGGART. I remember perfectly well that I was appointed one of a committee to consider this question, and the Finance Department took the ground that the settlement finished the whole matter. I do not say what the opinion of the Cabinet was upon the subject, but it was a fair matter of consideration whether Manitoba was entitled to the amount or not. Are you allowing them 6 per cent?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No; 5 per cent.

Mr. HAGGART. That is all they are entitled to. If the Finance Minister will bring down a statement as to when the first deduction was made and if that deduction was made after the passage of this Act, I think the House would be satisfied that it is a fair matter for consideration whether this legislation should be passed or not.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Before the final stage I will bring down information on that important point.

Mr. McMULLEN. Does this make it compulsory on the part of the Dominion to pay a 5 per cent interest on a part of the debt?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We are crediting back to Manitoba the sum improperly charged against her, and as the provinces are entitled to receive 5 per cent on their capital we do not disturb that. That is a constitutional provision. As respects the balance we propose to pay them in cash, and be done with it.

Mr. MACLEAN. I would like to ask the Minister of Finance why he pays the province 5 per cent, and only pays depositors in the savings banks 2½ per cent?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Because there happens to be a British North America Act.

Mr. MACLEAN. Then you ought to treat the public of this country as well as you treat the provinces.

On resolution 2,

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I propose to amend this by changing the amount to $231,575.47.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. MACLEAN. I would like to ask the Minister of Finance whether he intends to add a clause to these resolutions which will provide for the Dominion getting a quit receipt from the province of Manitoba. We thought that by the previous Act we had got a quit receipt; but now we find we did not.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If we were changing the settlement of 1885, my hon. friend's suggestion might be appropriate; but we are not: we are acting within the intention of the settlement of 1885.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood that the hon. Minister of Finance put up another contention, as to which we might as well get his opinion—that according to the British North America Act the Dominion owned all the provincial buildings.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think myself that a very good argument could be made for that contention—except such buildings as the Dominion saw fit in its wisdom to assign to the various provinces.

Mr. SPROULE. Has it assigned any ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, by Order in Council, the Dominion assigned to the various provinces of the Dominion buildings suitable for the various provincial governments. All the provinces were equipped in that way. They were assigned the use of them.

Mr. SPROULE. That raises another question : why has the province of Ontario put up a legislative building at its own cost ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The province of Ontario used the Dominion buildings for a great many years. If it wants larger and handsomer buildings, I fancy it will have to pay for them itself. If the province of Manitoba wanted a new and handsomer building, it would have to erect it at its own cost.

Mr. SPROULE. If the province put it up, who would own it ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The province would. There is some doubt as to who holds the title of the original buildings that were assigned to the provinces.

Mr. SPROULE. If the Dominion owned the original building, surely it did not pass the title to the province ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is a debatable question.

Mr. ELLIS. I would like to ask if the position taken to-day will not justify the assumption generally that it is the duty of the Dominion Government to provide provincial buildings for the provinces all through. In the province of New Brunswick, we have a provincial building that cost $110,000, which we would like to have the Dominion pay for.

Mr. MACLEAN. After the remark of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that Ontario would be only too ready to make a grab——

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I rise to order. The hon. gentleman has misrepresented me. I only made the remark if the provinces were making demands for a readjustment and for money, Ontario would be well to the front.

Mr. MACLEAN. In that the hon. gentleman reflected on his friends, Mr. Hardy and all his colleagues in Ontario.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I did not.

Mr. MACLEAN. And by this resolution you may be passing an Act under which the province of Ontario may come and ask to be paid for the building in the park.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It was an obligation on the Dominion originally to equip each province with suitable buildings to carry on its business. If out of the great territories of the North-west we should carve new provinces, it would be our duty to provide them with suitable buildings at the start ; but if they wanted to erect larger and handsomer buildings, which would come with the growth of the country, they would have to pay for them themselves.

Mr. SEMPLE. Why is it that the province of Manitoba has not made application to this House until the present year for so large a sum of money ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman is mistaken. The province of Manitoba has been making application to the various Governments of Canada for ten years on this subject. I do not say that it has sent formal petitions to the House : but it has sent delegations to interview the Government. The subject has been before the Government of Canada for a long time.

Mr. McNEILL. When the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) reflected on the province of Ontario and said that Ontario would be at the front, he ought to have remembered that a gentleman in his own province, the Prime Minister of the province, has already been making claims on this Dominion, and that the Prime Minister of a province close to his, the province of Nova Scotia, has been making similar claims. Hon. gentlemen need not make a noise. I do not take up much of the time of the House, and on an important question of this kind. I think I am justified in making a few remarks. This is an evidence of the impropriety of introducing legislation of this kind in the dying days of the session. We will open up this whole subject, and discuss it at length, if hon. gentlemen opposite desire us to do so. The present measure seems to me to be very much like the opening of the water sluices ; and we shall have the flood gates for better terms open in a short time, if we are not careful what we are about. I wish to say for the province of Ontario, that I think it is always the last province to make claims on the Dominion Treasury, but unfortunately it is too much of a milch cow when the taxes have to be paid. The principal amount of the payment, unfortunately, always comes from the province of Ontario.

Resolution to be reported.

POST OFFICE SPECIAL DELIVERY.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). With the permission of the House, I would like to introduce Bill (No. 167) in further amendment to the Post Office Act. He said : The amendment gives power to the Postmaster General to establish a system of special delivery of mailable matter, fixing the rates to be charged and other

details. The Auditor General holds, it appears, that we could not pay for the delivery of these letters unless the messengers had passed the Civil Service Act.

Mr. FOSTER. Will this be a self-supporting service ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. We propose to impose a rate of 10 cents for special delivery. The Auditor General holds that we cannot pay the messengers unless they pass the civil service examination, and I wish to have a clause in the Act which will allow us to pay our letter carriers what extra remuneration would be reasonable. I propose to use them as far as possible, but we shall also require special messengers.

Mr. CLARKE. Is it proposed to have a bicycle service ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. We have not settled on the details, but our intention is to make the delivery self-sustaining.

Mr. CLARKE. You have elaborated no scheme yet.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. We have, but we will feel our way gradually into it. The letter carriers will be utilized in their spare hours, and we may have to engage other messengers.

Mr. BERGERON. Is this intended to pay some of the new batch of letter carriers in Montreal, whom the Auditor General refused to pay some time ago ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. This has no such object. It has no other object than what I have stated.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

The PRIME MINISTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. FOSTER. May I ask my hon. friend to tell us whether or not there is any absolute certainty of no further new legislation being introduced.

The PRIME MINISTER. I tell the hon. gentleman that this absolutely exhausts all the legislation the Government has to introduce, and I may add that my hon. friend the Postmaster General does not desire to proceed with this Bill if the House is not inclined to deal with it.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned 1 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Second Sitting.

WEDNESDAY, 8th June, 1898.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND—SUITS BY NON-RESIDENTS.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the hon. Solicitor General, if he were in his place—and perhaps the matter will be mentioned to him by some other members of the Government—whether he has taken cognizance of a very peculiar statute that was recently passed by the legislature of Prince Edward Island with respect to the enforcement of claims by persons residing out of the province. The statute provides, briefly stated, that no claim of a mercantile character by persons residing out of the province can be successfully enforced against residents of the province unless it is proved, on the trial of the action, that the commercial traveller through whom the goods were sold had taken out and paid for a license under the provisions of the provincial statute. I believe that the enactment in question has excited a good deal of interest among business men throughout Canada, and that representations looking to its disallowance were forwarded to the Department of Justice. What I desire to know is whether the matter is now under the consideration of the Department of Justice.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). I will call the attention of my colleague to the subject.

BOUNDARIES OF THE PROVINCE OF QUEBEC.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton) moved second reading of Bill (No. 160) respecting the boundaries of the province of Quebec. He said : Upon the report of the Deputy Minister of the Interior, under date of 29th January, 1896, the late Government, by an Order in Council of the 6th July, 1896, agreed with the provincial government upon an international boundary line on the northern north-eastern and north-western portion of the province of Quebec. The agreement between the two Governments was confirmed by Order in Council of the late Government of 8th July, 1896. The completing of the arrangements came into my hands when I took charge of the department. An Act has

been passed by the legislature of the province of Quebec ratifying the boundary line, and this Bill is for the purpose of ratifying it by this Parliament.

I lay upon the Table copies of the Order in Council and also a map which shows the boundary line that has been agreed upon.

Motion agreed. Bill read the second time, considered in committee, and reported.

GRANTS IN AID OF THE CONSTRUCTION OF PUBLIC WORKS.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair) moved second reading of Bill (No. 161) respecting the payments of grants in aid of the construction of public works.

Mr. FOSTER. I did hope that my hon. friend (Mr. Blair) would not proceed with this Bill. So far as I am concerned, I must confess that I have been unable to look at it at all. I know that the scope of it is to change the present basis, and so far as I could learn from the explanation of the Minister, to change it for the worse. It is physically impossible at this stage of the session to undertake the investigation of new Bills.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think there is nothing in the Bill which should arouse serious objection.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) has been here from the first of the session and has had all the time to press this Bill forward. Why could not this Bill have been introduced earlier, when we had people here to discuss it and time to discuss it? One penalty that a man ought to pay for negligence in such a matter is to have his Bill kept over until we have time to consider it. I do sincerely hope that it will not be pressed.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) knows that the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Haggart) is still in attendance, he would naturally be informed in this subject. There is no objection to letting the Bill stand over until that hon. gentleman is in the Chamber.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have no objection to this Bill standing over in the meantime, if my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) expresses a wish in that direction.

Mr. SPEAKER. It is allowed to stand, then.

MANITOBA SCHOOL FUND.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved that the House resolve itself into committee on the following resolution:—

That it is expedient to provide that the Governor in Council may, from the moneys invested under the provisions of subsection 3 of section 25 of chapter 54 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, forming the School Fund for the province of Manitoba, pay from time to time the Government of Manitoba, on the request of the said government, such sum or sums as the said Governor in Council thinks proper, not exceeding in the whole the sum of $200,000, the sum or sums to be paid over to be expended by the said Government of Manitoba in the support and maintenance of the public schools in that province; provided always that not more than $200,000 shall be paid to the said government for the purpose aforesaid during the present calendar year

Mr. LaRIVIERE. I hope the hon. gentleman will explain.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The proposal is to pay to the province of Manitoba the sum of $300,000, of which $200,000 is to be paid in one year, the whole payment to be made out of a fund which belongs to the province of Manitoba. In the Dominion Lands Act it was provided that sections 11 and 29 in each township should be set apart for the formation of a school fund. No provision was made for the sale of the lands at the time of the passing of this Act. Not until 1879, I think, was provision made respecting the sale of the lands, though the Act had been passed in 1872 In the meantime, however, authority was given by Parliament for the advance of certain sums out of the Dominion treasury to the Government of Manitoba on account of this school lands fund. The amount authorized to be advanced in the first instance was $30,000, of which $20,000 was drawn. Subsequently a further Act was passed allowing another $30,000 in addition to the $10,000 undrawn. Thus the Dominion Parliament anticipated the grant of this school fund by making advances to Manitoba. Subsequently, sales of land were made, and the school fund began to grow, so much so, that the Dominion Government was repaid its advances and the fund accumulated beyond that. Under the arrangement, the Government of Manitoba was entitled to receive interest upon this fund from time to time, and interest has been paid to the province of Manitoba from that time down to the present. The sales of land were made at an average price of $7.68 per acre, the minimum price being $5. Assuming that the lands were to be sold only at the minimum price, the land to be sold for the benefit of this school fund would result in the accumulation of some millions of dollars. It will be seen, therefore, that in proposing to pay the Government of Manitoba $300,000 out of that fund, we are still reserving a very large sum, which will remain for the future purposes of education. Up to a very recent date the school fund in the hands of the Government amounted to $475,764. Out of that we propose to advance to the Government of Manitoba, as

explained by the resolution, $200,000 in one year and a further sum of $100,000, being a total of $300,000, as I have already intimated. As these lands are of ever increasing value, the sale of them must yield a very large sum for the benefit of education in Manitoba. It will be generally admitted, I suppose, that the needs of the schools fund in Manitoba are greater to-day than they are likely to be at any future time. As the country is settled and villages are formed, it will be much easier for the people of Manitoba to maintain their schools than at the present day with their sparse population. I think, therefore, it is sound policy that in the early days of the province, when they are not as well off as they may hope to be at a later time, we should give them a portion of their capital fund for that purpose, taking care, however, to reserve enough for the future needs of the province. As I have already said, we are giving them only $300,000 out of a fund already in hand of $475,000, and the prospect is that as the years roll on this fund will accumulate in the hands of the Government for the benefit of the schools of Manitoba. The question has been asked me in conversation by one or two hon. members whether this is a fund which can be applied in this way, and whether it is not a trust fund which should be reserved for the future benefit of the schools. I think we are bound to leave that largely to the Government of Manitoba. We have already left to the Government of Manitoba the disposition of the interest on this fund from year to year, and on the same principle, if they are entitled to receive interest from time to time and free to use it to the best of their own judgment for school purposes. I see no reason why we should not give them this portion of the principal fund upon the same terms and conditions, allowing them to exercise their own judgment in the application of these moneys to the purposes of the advancement of education in the province of Manitoba. I do not think I can add anything to what I have said; I have given the substance of the proposal, and if reference is desired to the various Acts of Parliament relating to the subject, perhaps at a later stage I shall be able to furnish the information.

Mr. FOSTER. What conditions are attached to this grant?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The only conditions there are, are set forth in the resolutions.

Mr. FOSTER. What I mean is this: Is the Government of Manitoba at liberty to take this sum and spend it in any way they please, either directly upon roads and bridges and for current matters, or spending it for school purposes and thereby saving out of the current revenues what they should otherwise spend for school purposes, both purposes coming in the end to about the same thing? Or is it a condition of this grant that in addition to what they are now spending for education, they should spend this money also solely for the purposes of education?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The resolution declares that the money is to be spent by the said Government of Manitoba in the support and maintenance of the public schools in that province. The Government would have to receive it from us as a trust in that sense, but we would be bound to leave it very largely to their own discretion, I should say, as to how they should apply the money, but always applying it to the purposes of public education. In that respect the money would stand exactly in the same position as the money advanced to them years ago by former Governments, and in the same position as the money we have been paying from time to time in the form of interest. They all form part of a trust fund, but the exercise of that trust was left to the Government of Manitoba.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend will see that he has changed the conditions entirely. He is not here making a loan, and he is not paying interest. Interest was contemplated to be paid to them by the original Act. But he will see that if the Manitoba Government, for instance, now are spending, say, $200,000 for education, and if, on the receipt of this, they cut down that vote to $100,000, and supplement it by $100,000 of this sum, using the present $100,000 for other purposes, it is exactly the same as if they took this money and applied it to other purposes. Is there any safeguard in that respect? Otherwise if there is not, it is equivalent to putting this in the hands of the provincial government to spend for purposes other than education, which was never contemplated in the bargain which was made, and both sides have a right to see that that bargain is carried out, unless some urgent reason, arising out of the total change of circumstances, intervenes.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The amount would have to stand in the same position as the advances made by the Dominion in former years. No doubt the intention of the Act, and it is also expressed in this resolution, is that the money should be applied to educational purposes. I am not quite clear as to what restriction can be placed upon the province in the line the hon. gentleman suggests. At all events, we advance the money precisely as it was advanced in former years, the only difference being that while former advances were of a moderate sum, this is somewhat larger.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. The explanations of the Finance Minister of the reasons of doing away with this trust fund for educational purposes have been cut very short by the hon. gentlemen, and I readily understand how he should hesitate to take

the position he is now taking in reference to that question. In 1872, of their own action and good-will, the Government and Parliament of that day passed an Act to regulate the sale and administration of the public domain, not only in the province of Manitoba, but in the whole North-west Territories as well. Among the provisions that were embodied in that Dominion Lands Act, as it is called, was one whereby a reservation of two sections of 640 acres of land in each township was set aside, so that when that land was either leased or sold, the proceeds should be devoted to public education in the province of Manitoba and in the future provinces of the Territories. The intention was to make a permanent fund, and the revenue derived from that fund was to be handed over to the several provinces to put them in a position better to aid public education in their respective territories. Section 22 of the Dominion Lands Act, passed in 1872, reads as follows:—

And whereas it is expedient to make provision in aid of education in Manitoba and the North-west Territories, therefore sections 11 and 29 in each and every surveyed township throughout the extent of the Dominion lands, shall be and are hereby set apart as an endowment for purposes of education.

As an endowment for purposes of education. Subsection 1 reads as follows:—

1. The sections so dedicated shall be thereafter dealt with in such manner as may be prescribed by law, and the same are hereby withdrawn from the operation of the clauses in this Act relating to purchase by private interest, and to homestead rights, and it is hereby declared that no such right of purchase by private entry or homestead right shall be recognized in connection with the said sections or any part or parts thereof.

2. Provided, that on a township being surveyed, should such sections or either of them, or any part of either, be found to have been settled on and improved, then in such case the occupant or occupants, conforming to the requirements of this Act shall be confirmed in such possession, and the Secretary of State shall select a quantity equal to that found to have been so settled on from the unclaimed lands in such township, and shall withdraw the land so selected from sale and settlement, and shall set apart and publish the same as school lands, by notice in the "Canada Gazette."

3. Provided further, that the land found to have been settled upon and improved as above, is not embraced within the class of land reserved from the operation of the homestead provision of this Act by subsection 18 of section 34 thereof.

When this Bill was presented to Parliament it originated in the Senate, because the Dominion Lands Department, which was then organized, was under the control of the Department of the Secretary of State, which at that time was presided over by the Hon. Mr. Aikins, a member of the Senate, and who is still a member of the Senate. The hon. gentleman brought in this Bill, and on the 6th of May, 1872, a debate occurred, and some questions were asked by members. On moving the second reading, and in course of his explanation, he said:

The Bill provided that certain reservations be made in every township for educational purposes.

The late Hon. Mr. Bureau, then one of the leading members of that House, and a Liberal, I may add, was alarmed because he did not see in that Bill any provision for safeguarding the different religious beliefs that were entitled to their share of this reservation for the purpose of supporting their respective schools. I take from the newspapers that were published at the time, because we had no "Hansard" in those days, the following as being a report of his remarks:

Hon. Mr. Bureau, speaking on this Bill, made the following remarks:—He was in favour of assisting education by public grants, but every care should be taken to avoid a repetition of such difficulties as arose in this country in the past. No one had forgotten the question of clergy reserves or the seigniorial tenure. He trusted that every guarantee and security would be given to the parties who might receive these lands for the object contemplated by the Bill, so that the issue might be satisfactory to the peace and happiness of the community.

The Bill was then read a second time. Hon. Mr. Aikins explained that the provisions laid down were the preliminaries and would be completed later on by legislation which would provide for the administration of those lands. On 16th May the Bill was discussed in committee on clause 22, which is the clause I have read. Mr. Bureau, being apprehensive as to what might happen later on, if safeguards were not put in the Bill to avoid friction and afford protection on the part of the minority against the majority—for he was a far-seeing politician, and his remarks were apparently a prediction of what happened in Manitoba—proposed an amendment:

That the lands be divided among all religious denominations for separate school purposes, in proportion to their number.

Then Mr. Aikins explained that such a provision could not be incorporated in the Bill, which specially set apart the lands as an endowment for the purposes of education. Had the advice of that hon. gentleman been followed at the time, we perhaps might have avoided the great question of separate schools in the province of Manitoba, because this safeguard would perhaps have prevented other legislation which has been adopted later on. In 1879, as has been stated by the Finance Minister, the legislation on the school lands was completed. It was supplemented by the following section on the consolidation of the Dominion Lands Act. This was in addition and following section 22, which I have mentioned, and it is entered as section 23:

The school lands shall be administered by the Governor in Council, through the Minister of the Interior :

(1) Provided that all sales of school lands shall be at public auction, and that in no case shall such land be put up at an upset price less than the fair value of corresponding unoccupied land in the township in which such land shall be situated.

(2) Provided also that the terms of the sale of the school lands shall be one-fifth in cash at the time of the sale and the remainder in nine equal semi-annual instalments, with interest at 6 per cent per annum, to be paid with each instalment on the balance of the purchase money from time to time remaining unpaid.

Subsection 3, which is a very important one, and should receive the attention of the Government, is as follows :—

(3) Provided also, that all moneys from time to time realized from the sale of school lands shall be invested in Dominion securities and interest deriving therefrom, after deducting the cost of management, shall be paid annually to the government of the province or territory within which such lands are situated, for the support of the public schools therein, the money so paid to be distributed with such view by the government of said province or territory in such manner as may be deemed most expedient.

While it is true that on one or two occasions the province of Manitoba has asked for an advance or loan out of the proceeds of the revenue arising from the sale of those lands, this was only asked as a loan, with the idea and with the intention that this amount would be deducted from, not the capital, but from the interest that would accrue after the sale of those lands had taken place ; but to-day we are asked to hand over this trust fund, or a portion of the capital to the province of Manitoba. The province of Manitoba has no vested rights to those lands or even to that trust fund, except by the good-will of this Government. This reservation of school lands is not a part or parcel of the condition of the entry of Manitoba into the confederation. It was through the generosity of this Parliament that the fund was created, and it was created after the manner of similar funds existing in the western states of the Union. The difference is that the lands there are administered by the different states, not by the central power ; they are never sold, they are only leased, for long terms sometimes ; but the states never part with the lands, the view being that this fund should never cease to exist, but should constitute a perpetual revenue for the benefit of education. In this case we have sold the land, whether rightly or wrongly I do not say ; but I believe we acted wrongly, and now it is proposed to pay away the amount collected from the proceeds of the sale and give it to the province of Manitoba. Is it proposed to give it for educational purposes ? No. If hon. members will read the last Budget speech of the Treasurer of Manitoba they will see that he has put down that amount to be credited to the consolidated fund of the province, and they have not increased the amount voted for education, except by the very small sum of $10,000 or $15,000. We are going to give them $200,000 which they can throw into their public treasury in order to make up a deficit that was created in other directions.

Mr. BERGERON. By bad government.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. I am not going to discuss the politics of the province of Manitoba. This morning I supported a resolution that benefited Manitoba because I thought it was just and right for the province to get what was due her, but in this case I am bound to oppose any proposition which will place the Government of Manitoba in a position to squander a fund that has been created by the will of this Parliament, and which should be held sacred not only by the province but by the Dominion Parliament as well. I shall not, Mr. Speaker, mix up this matter with that of the Manitoba school question, but I am bound to say there is a good deal of affinity and a strong relationship between the two. Whether it is for the welfare of the minority or not I will not discuss at this moment, but, Sir, if it is meant to help the minority what is the hurry about it. Why not wait until that question is entirely settled, more especially as gentlemen opposite say it is almost settled and that the minority will get satisfaction.

Mr. BERGERON. When ?

Mr. LaRIVIERE. Ah, when ; that is just the point, but I will not put the question in that way. Let us wait for another occasion and if the school question is settled as I hope it will be and as I wish it should be, and if it is settled to the satisfaction of the minority and in a permanent manner, then perhaps we may trust the legislature with the control of that land and with that fund. But, Sir, even then, even if it were at the price of the settlement of the school question in favour of the minority, I say that in the interests of the whole community in Manitoba, in the interests of the majority as well as the minority, in the interests of the Protestant community as well as the Catholic community, the school fund of the province should be safeguarded so as to prevent any possibility of that fund disappearing. If we keep on spending the capital of that trust—and it is a trust fund—if we take it away from the consolidated funds of the Dominion of Canada and allow it to disappear, then later on the province of Manitoba, and the other provinces similarily situated in this regard, will come to the central power and they will say to this Parliament : What have you done with our trust fund for education ; what has become of the millions of dollars which you said was there for the support of our schools ? Sir, if we allow this law to be amended there will be before long a general reprobation of our action in the whole community, for we will have de-

prived our children and grandchildren of that precious deposit for the support of their education and the education of their offspring.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to say a few words on this question because I consider it a matter of very great importance. The same principle obtains in the older provinces of the confederation as is involved in the proposal now made to the House in regard to this Manitoba fund. At confederation when the Dominion Goverment took over the school lands belonging to the province of Ontario and Quebec, these lands were set apart to form a perpetual trust fund out of which education was to be maintained in these provinces. From that up to the present time we have never allowed the provinces to break in upon that capital. Yearly they receive the result of the investment of these funds at 5 per cent interest, and we receive annually in the province of Ontario a large sum of money on that account. If it should ever happen that the Dominion Parliament should so far forget themselves, and that the province of Ontario would become so needy as to ask to have that capital handed over to them, and meanwhile squander it, the result, in a few years afterwards, must assuredly be that the province would be obliged to tax itself to a much larger extent than it does to-day for the support of education. As would happen in Ontario so it would happen in the province of Manitoba. The Dominion Government holds these trust funds for educational purposes, and when Manitoba came into confederation an amount of land was set apart for the purpose of establishing an educational fund upon the same lines, and so as to, in perpetuity have an income for the province to enable it to support education. The Federal Government pays to that province the interest upon that fund to the extent of 5 per cent, or whatever is realized from these lands. The fund is held in perpetuity and as it accumulates from the additional sales of land the provinces receive a larger amount every year. I say that if you break in on the capital of that fund, you are not only doing a great wrong to the province, but you are establishing a principle that may result in the other provinces asking the right to control their own school funds. I know that this contention was set up by Ontario some time ago, but the Dominion Government very wisely did not agree to it and have never sanctioned it. Those trust funds are held by the Dominion to-day, and we in Ontario hope they will be held in perpetuity upon the same principle as in the past, and that only the interest on these funds will be paid the province of Ontario. Now, if you do as is proposed in this resolution :

Pay from time to time to the Government of Manitoba, on the request of the said government, such sum or sums as the Governor in Council thinks proper, not exceeding in the whole the sum of $300,000.

Mr. LaRIVIERE.

What will be the result ? We do not know how much that fund is to-day, but $300,000 will be a serious inroad upon it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is $475,000.

Mr. SPROULE. Then you only leave $175,000 of an investment on which to pay the interest to the province. This takes away a very large part of the invested golden egg that yields a return to the province from year to year, and if the province unwisely or extravagantly squanders that, what will be the result ? Why, they will have to look to other sources to pay for their education in the future, and if the burden becomes onerous on them they will apply to the Dominion Government to make up that fund from some other sources and an appeal will be made to this Government to raise the fund to such an amount as will give them a reasonable yearly income for the support of education in their province. We shall be doing a great wrong if we do this. You might just as appropriately hand over to the Government of Ontario the trust funds which we hold for educational purposes in that province as to hand over this money to the province of Manitoba. It is exactly the same principle, and if the argument holds good in the one case, it is just as good in the other. It is true, Manitoba has made the claim on the ground that she is specially needy just now ; but you can always have the same claim put forward by any province when it wants money ; and whenever their friends are in power in the Federal Government, they are likely to make their reasoning prevail. I say that the principle of this thing is radically wrong and unsound, and not in harmony with the principle that obtains in the case of the other provinces, for which we hold trust funds for educational purposes ; and when we give these funds over to the provinces, and they are squandered, another claim will be made on the Dominion Government for additional funds in the future.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Carried.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman says "Carried." If he would carry more brains in his head, it would be more valuable to his constituency ; but if he would exercise more patience when these important questions are being discussed, which affect not only the province of Manitoba, but his own province as well, it would be more becoming, and better for the people he represents. I say we should not give up these trust funds, because if we do, it will not be long before another claim will be made upon us for making them up again, or else, if they are squandered, an additional amount of direct taxation will be entailed on the people of the province for the support of education. We are told in this resolution that this money is to be paid over, to be expended by the Government of Manitoba in the support and maintenance

of the public schools of that province. My hon. friend from Provencher (Mr. LaRivière) says the money is to go into the consolidated revenue of the province. This resolution does not appear to indicate that that is the aim in paying over the money. I am not sure whether it will go there or not; but if it does go into the consolidated revenue, to be expended as the provincial government wish to expend it, that only makes the matter so much the worse. If it could be proven that owing to the province of Manitoba being a new country, and owing to the urgent needs of the schools in every part of the country, where the people are weak and unable to build schools, there might be some reason for granting them some aid; but I maintain that it would not be sufficient ground for doing what is proposed in the resolution here. If, on the other hand, the province should squander the money for any purpose, and not for education, that is a strong argument why it should not be given. But I say the principle is wrong. If you give aid to Manitoba, you cannot possibly escape giving aid to Ontario and Quebec, and to every other province for which you hold trust funds for educational purposes. In my judgment the Parliament of Canada should not consent to this. If we do, we shall be doing a great injustice to the people of Manitoba as well as to the people of the other provinces of the Dominion, because while it is not their money which we are paying to-day, we would in the end be required to pay over their money after this is squandered and the province of Manitoba would not be able to support their schools, and would be obliged to apply again. I think the principle is wrong, and I sincerely hope this House will not grant it.

Mr. HENDERSON. The importance of this subject is the only excuse I would offer for occupying even three or four minutes of the time of the House this afternoon. To my mind, this is a matter of great importance, not only from the standpoint of Manitoba, but from the standpoint of all the different provinces of the Dominion; because I apprehend that what we are doing for Manitoba to-day will very shortly be done for all the other provinces of the Dominion. The province of Ontario was possibly the most fortunate province with regard to trust funds held by the Dominion. Years ago there was $3,351,727 held in trust by the Dominion Government for the province of Ontario on which the province drew 5 per cent each year. This was made up of four different funds, known as the Land Improvement Fund, the Upper Canada Grammar School Fund, the Upper Canada Building Fund, and the Common School Fund. The 5 per cent which the province drew annually from the Dominion Government on this money, formed a very important addition to the revenue of the province; but unfortunately the province of Ontario became hard up. Its expenditure was increased away beyond its ordinary revenue, and it became necessary to appeal to the Government at Ottawa for money to enable it to carry on its affairs and make both ends meet. As far back as 1888 the province of Ontario made a demand for assistance on the Dominion Government and obtained the large sum of $936,000. You may consider that a loan. It was claimed as an advance against these funds. In 1889, while the provincial government were building the Parliament buildings in Toronto, another advance was made to the province of $500,000; and a year after another advance of $130,000 was made. Year after year round sums were paid by the Dominion to the province, so that the province of Ontario owes the Dominion of Canada the sum of $2,000,000, which stands against these funds. Originally we obtained interest at 5 per cent on the total amount of the trust funds; but now the hon. Minister of Finance withholds the interest on $2,000,000, amounting to $100,000, and the ordinary revenue of the province is depleted to that amount. The same thing will occur in the case of the province of Manitoba. Instead of receiving interest on $470,000, it will hereafter receive interest on only $170,000. I believe the intention of the Dominion Government was to pay off the trust funds of the province of Ontario held for common school purposes; and in 1893, power was taken by the Dominion Government to pay that money over, and at the same time, power was taken by the Government of Ontario to receive it. But unfortunately the province of Ontario used this money for ordinary purposes, just as I believe the province of Manitoba will use the money we are about to pay over for ordinary purposes, and not for school purposes at all; and the people will be obliged to tax themselves more heavily than ever for the support of their schools, because they will not have the interest arising from this fund to supplement what they will raise from direct taxation and the ordinary revenues of the province. In the case of the province of Ontario, we have had fair warning. We see that the moneys have been used for ordinary purposes, and not for school purposes at all. The revenues of the province are depleted to the amount of $100,000 each year, as will be the case in the province of Manitoba, only in a smaller way. We should take warning by what has occurred in the province of Ontario, and be careful how we treat these trust funds in the province of Manitoba, which cannot so well afford to dispense with the revenues which it receives from the Dominion. This was not the only result in the province of Ontario, and I think that the same thing will occur in the province of Manitoba. Whilst the province of Ontario was able to borrow lavishly from the Dominion, they became extravagant, and spent more than they should have spent each year.

Then, when the supply was cut off, they found themselves unable to reduce their expenditure down to its normal condition, and the result was that with a depleted revenue they were compelled to borrow money, which now amounts to the extent of $3,000,000, and there is a total loss of revenue to the country of about $200,000. I believe that the same thing will happen in Manitoba. They will use this money for ordinary purposes. The expenditure will be increased, and in the course of a year or two they will not be able to meet the increased expenditure, because they will not have $200,000 a year to draw upon, and the result will be they will start as Ontario did, on the plan of borrowing money from year to year to meet their expenditure. As the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) has so well said, this doubtless will bring about a demand from the provinces for increased subsidies—not only from the province of Manitoba but from the province of Ontario as well. And in the course of a few years, we may reasonably expect this Government to come down to Parliament, and because of the urgent demands from the various provinces, ask us to increase the subsidies, which demands would be totally unnecessary if we insisted on their keeping to the subsidies which the fathers of confederation provided.

Mr. CLARKE. May I ask the hon. Finance Minister what is the total sum, including interest, proposed to be given Manitoba under both these resolutions?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In the resolution now before us, we are giving them nothing, but paying them their own money—$300,000. The resolution we dealt with this morning, taking principal and interest, provided for an amount of between $400,000 and $500,000. This, however, is an entirely distinct matter, as it relates to the payment of their own money, which we have in our own hands.

Motion agreed to, and the House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. HAGGART. In reply to the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Clarke), the hon. Minister said that this was their own money and that we are only giving them their own money. The interpretation which a former Minister of Justice put upon the Act that created the trust was entirely different. If the hon. gentleman will consult the law officers of the Crown, he will find that this is a trust created for our own convenience, which we have the right to change or abrogate at any time, and that it is no part of any money belonging to the province of Manitoba at all.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If it is not their own money, then the late Government and the present Government have been dealing very generously with the province of Manitoba, for we have been paying interest on this money for years.

Mr. HAGGART. No doubt.

Mr. SPROULE. The provincial government of Ontario set up the same claim with regard to our school funds, but the Dominion Government held that it was not our own money and never was, and would not pay it over. The hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Clarke) asked how much is the aggregate that Manitoba would get by these resolutions. According to the Finance Minister, it would be $798,601 which we are expected to pass through in the dying days of the session.

Mr. MACLEAN. I think that if Manitoba wants to get this money and use it, she ought to go about getting it in another way. In order to keep the distinction clear between the province and the Dominion, the province ought to be allowed to hypothecate its income from this fund. Then the whole blame would be on it. Let it hypothecate its income from this fund and issue its own bonds, and do what it likes with them, but do not make us responsible because we will be opening the door for the readjustment of the entire financial arrangements between the provinces and the Dominion. There has been more done to-day towards the re-opening of that question than in the past five years.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I know something about the claims of the provinces in the past, in which I was not an altogether uninterested party, and I am bound to say that this matter can have no relation to any claim of a province and cannot be properly made the basis of any claim by another province. We are actually, by these resolutions, giving Manitoba her own money. If we do not give her this money we pay her interest; and whether we pay the interest or the principal, is, so far as dollars and cents are concerned, a matter of no earthly importance to the Government or Parliament.

Mr. MACLEAN. But we are abandoning a trust to keep this money for educational purposes.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman's friends abandoned the trust years ago, when they passed Acts to advance the moneys of the fund without condition whatever, and gave the moneys to the province.

Mr. MACLEAN. Why should you do it if it is wrong?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Because I say it was not wrong, but right. The only difference with the hon. gentleman is that what was right before, he finds wrong now.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. The hon. gentleman is mistaken. The advance made before was as a loan. $30,000 were paid before as a loan, but now you are making a straight gift, and you take that from the capital account. In the other instance, it was to be taken from the revenue and should have been deducted from the accumulated interest.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I do not think you will find that item in the books.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. The statute of 1879 destroys the contention of the hon. gentleman, when he says this money belongs to the province of Manitoba. The statute of 1879 makes out of the proceeds of the sales of land a trust fund, which is to remain in the hands of the Dominion Government and be invested in Dominion securities. Therefore, Manitoba has no legal claim to that fund, but only to the revenue derived therefrom.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). I would like to ask the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. LaRivière) if he was not a member of the Government of Manitoba when that Government made application to the Dominion and pressed strongly its application to turn over to it the whole of the lands without restriction whatever.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. I was then speaking from an entirely provincial standpoint, but my position has changed since. I have since become a member of the Canadian Parliament, and I have to look upon all matters from a Dominion standpoint.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I just desire to say that the answer which was made by the Dominion Government to the application made to Parliament by my hon. friend from Provencher (Mr. LaRivière) fully confirms the interpretation of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance. Nobody asserts that technically this money is vested in the province of Manitoba. It is vested as a trust fund in the Dominion Government.

My hon. friend the Finance Minister says that this is the money of the province of Manitoba, that we hold it in trust and that the province of Manitoba is entitled to the beneficial interest of the money. The answer of the Dominion Government at that time clearly showed that, so far back as that, the Dominion Government did not dispute that the province of Manitoba had a beneficial interest in the money and was entitled to say how it should be dealt with. They say:

> The Dominion Government has taken no action in relation to those lands without full consultation with the local authorities, and pending sales, has sanctioned advances of $60,000, on account,
> —and pending sales—
> for educational purposes.

Mr. SPROULE. This fund came from the same source as the trust fund for the province of Ontario—Crown lands, the proceeds of which were devoted to educational purposes, being held in perpetuity for the purposes of education in the province, and 5 per cent on the amount held paid every year. The province of Ontario had the right to claim this as Crown land, because the Crown lands of the province belong to the province. But, it has never been admitted by the Dominion that this fund belongs to the province of Ontario; and, if it does not, by the same parity of reasoning this does not belong to Manitoba, because this fund is an accumulation of the proceeds of lands in the province held for the benefit of education. Now, how does that fund stand? From the information given us by the Minister of Finance, we learned that there is $475,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is $475,000.

Mr. SPROULE. That is more than I understood. If the amount were $470,000, they would realize annually, at 5 per cent, $23,500. But, if you reduce that by $300,000, how much do you leave them annually for the support of education? Only $8,500. In fact, you take away all the fund except $175,000.

Mr. MACLEAN. Give it all to them.

Mr. SPROULE. We might as well give it all and destroy the fund. The very fact that you give this now will make them more needy year by year, and they will need to look to other sources for assistance to keep their schools going, or they will be forced to place a larger burden of direct taxation upon their own shoulders.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Some of the arguments put forward by the Minister of Finance are not very apt, it seems to me, in the consideration of this resolution. I do not know that it logically follows that because you have paid interest, or are under legal obligation to pay interest, you are therefore justified in paying the principal. That depends altogether on other considerations. The very circumstance that you are to pay annual interest may be the best of reasons why you should not pay the principal, and that is a point that is often dealt with in courts of law. Suppose that a fund is settled upon a marriage for the benefit of a man and his wife and their issue, the interest of that fund to be paid during the life of the husband, wife and children. It would be a remarkable thing if the trustees could justify themselves on these grounds for paying the principal to them at once. Why, the trustee who acted upon that principle would find himself in the penitentiary inside of

six months. Now, the Minister of Finance tells us also that this is the money of the province. It is not the money of the province, because there is absolute control vested in this Parliament by subsection 3 of section 25. Suppose that the province does not deal with the interest in the spirit of this enactment, suppose that it applies the interest to other purposes than education, this Parliament would be justified in abrogating that trust. We propose now to hand over $300,000 to the provincial authorities to spend according to their own sweet will, and I would like the Minister of Finance or anybody else to tell me what remedy this Government or Parliament would have in case that sum is misapplied. Not the slightest. But if you leave matters as they are, you have control over the principal at least, and you can, in future, deal with the interest if the trust should be violated. Now, the hon. gentleman made what seemed to me an extraordinary statement. He said it is not of the slightest interest to this Government or Parliament what becomes of this sum.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I did not say that.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I understood the hon. gentleman to say something equivalent to that. I am not pretending to quote his exact words. I am willing he should correct me if I have not understood him correctly.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I said that so far as it was a matter of dollars and cents, it was of no importance to the Dominion treasury whether we paid the principal sum or whether we paid the interest. But I said that we were concerned that the fund should be properly devoted to the purposes indicated in the trust.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Then, the hon. gentleman's remarks were almost absolutely irrelevant to the subject before us. The question we are considering is the position this Parliament and Government occupy as trustee under chapter 54 of the Revised Statutes of Canada as to the administration of this provincial fund. And I do not think that any consideration that the hon. gentleman has put forward forms a very substantial reason for putting this principal out of the hands of the trustee and into the hands of the province of Manitoba. I think that the principal money should be retained, because the trust is not created for the inhabitants of Manitoba at the present time, but for the inhabitants of the province of Manitoba for all time to come ; and, when you take $300,000 of this money and hand it over to people who live in the province at the present time and allow them to spend this money for the purposes of schools or anything else, you are violating the spirit of the Act of 1886.

Mr. MACLEAN. To-day we have seen $755,000 voted to the province of Manitoba, and here is another vote of $300,000 for that province. And I take up a Montreal "Witness," and I read the following :—

It is stated in Winnipeg papers that the Dominion Government has given a beautiful block of six acres in the heart of the city, valued at $40,000, for the university site. The Dominion Government has also lately granted a hundred and fifty thousand acres of valuable land.

Where is this going to end ? And what is in the wind, Mr. Chairman ? Is there an election in Manitoba in the wind ? Is there trouble in the province of Quebec calling for concessions on the part of the Government of Manitoba, so that this Government must do something to induce the Government of Manitoba to settle a question which this Government said was settled, but which, it would appear, was not settled at all ? This is a raid by a province upon the federal treasury, and the raiders are succeeding. The Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) attacks my hon. friend from Provencher (Mr. LaRivière) on the ground that he advocated some time ago an attack upon this fund.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I did not attack him. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean) should tell the truth. I simply asked him if it was the fact.

Mr. MACLEAN But you reflected upon the hon. gentleman because he took the provincialist position, and the hon. gentleman himself to-day is taking the provincialist view of it. The Government opposite are not taking the federal view of it, but they are joining in a provincialist raid on federal funds.

Mr. QUINN. What I see before me is a proposition by the Government asking this House to pass a resolution paying from its own coffers into those of the provincial treasury of Manitoba, the sum of $300,000. Now, from the law which has been quoted by the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. LaRivière) it seems clearly established that the funds in the hands of the Dominion treasury today are trust funds held by the Dominion Parliament and Government, not for the benefit of the provincial government of Manitoba, but for the benefit of the education of the people of the province of Manitoba. This Government does not hold this fund in trust for Mr. Greenway, or in trust for the legislature of Manitoba ; it holds this money in trust for the people of Manitoba, and in trust for the people of Manitoba for all time, for a certain and specific object, that is, for the education of the people of Manitoba for all time. There is no explanation given to this House, even now, why such a resolution should be adopted. There is no demand even from the legislature of Manitoba asking that this money should be given by this Parliament. It seems to

be a demand by the Dominion Government itself upon this House to pay out $300,000 of a trust fund, not saying that it is asked for by the people for whose benefit this Parliament holds it, not saying that it is asked for even by the government of that province: but it is a demand to pay over, without any reason given by this Government, to the provincial government of Manitoba a sum of $300,000 which is held by this Government for the benefit of the people of Manitoba. Now, let us try and assimilate this case to one that presents itself to the local legislatures at every session. We often see that men in dying create trusts, or trusts are created by donations, inter vivos, for the benefit of the children born, or to be born. In order that that trust may be broken, in order that that money may be taken from the position in which it was placed by the testator, it is necessary that application should be made to the local legislature, not alone by the person who holds the trust in his hand, not alone by the immediate beneficiary of this trust, but by all persons interested in that trust, and no provincial legislature, I feel bound to say, would assume the responsibility of breaking a trust and of distributing the money held by any individual under a trust already created by donation inter vivos, or by will, without application for the breaking of that trust on the part of those who are immediately interested, as well as of those who are most remotely interested in that trust. Now, to-day there is no demand made to us, at any rate no explanation given to us, that the Government of Manitoba asks for $300,000. There is no statement made to this Parliament that this money is to be used for any particular purpose. There is certainly no demand made by the people who are interested that this money should be paid by the Dominion Government for the education of their children, nor is there any guarantee given, either by the government or people, that this money should be used for educational purposes alone. What would be a proper proceeding to induce any hon. member of this House to vote in favour of this resolution? It should be placed before him that the Government of Manitoba required a sum of $300,000 to invest in public buildings, in school buildings, or in some other manner for the benefit of education; that they were unable out of the ordinary resources of their province to meet this expenditure without raising a loan specially for that purpose; that there were in the hands of the Government of the Dominion a sum of more than $300,000 held in trust for educational purposes; and that the fund which would be raised by them by bonds would cost as much, at any rate, as the interest which was being paid by the Dominion Government to them on the funds which they hold in their hands. Would that alone be sufficient? Would a demand made by the government of the province alone be sufficient in any ordinary case without the local legislature asking for the distribution of a trust fund? No, it would be right then for this Parliament to say to that Government: Not only must you show us that you are going to use this money for the benefit of education generally in the province of Manitoba, but you must prove to the satisfaction of this Government that this fund is required by the whole people of the province of Manitoba; that it is going to be used for the benefit of the whole people of the province, and whenever you satisfy us to that extent, then we are prepared to hand over to you that sum of money. What may be the consequences? Why, we are voting to-day a sum of $300,000 out of the trust funds held by this Government, out of the capital sum held by this Government for education in Manitoba, while there is an unsettled question involving the education of a very large portion of the people, of a large and substantial minority of that province. What guarantee has that unfortunate minority that one dollar of this $300,000 should go to the benefit of their education? Is there not on the contrary an absolute guarantee that every dollar of that money should be expended, not for their benefit, but to their detriment? If once such a sum of money as $300,000 is paid out of that trust fund by this Government, without consulting or considering in any way the claims of that minority upon this fund, is it not a precedent for further demands upon this trust fund to an unlimited extent, until finally every dollar of it is taken and expended for the benefit of the majority, or rather for the benefit of the present government in the province of Manitoba, and, as I said before, to the injury of the minority in that province. Therefore, I hope that this House will not pass this resolution. I think it would be a great misfortune that such a precedent should be laid down as that this Government would have the right to vote such a sum of money without putting before this Parliament sufficient reasons in the form of a demand, first from the Government of Manitoba, and next in the form of a resolution or some representations, both from the majority and the minority of Manitoba, saying that such money is necessary for the education of the people of the province.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I think this is a very serious matter, perhaps the most serious that has been brought before the House during the present session, and there have been a good many important subjects before it. From what I have heard the Minister of Finance say, I think that he almost, if not entirely, ignores the trust that this Government held over the funds in question. That, to my mind, is a matter of very grave importance. I cannot find, in looking over the public accounts of Manitoba, any reference made to this $400,000 as forming part of the assets

of that province at any time in its history. That is in itself the strongest evidence that they never considered this in the light of a provincial asset. But that is the very light in which the Government considers it at this moment. It never was intended under subsection 3 of chapter 25 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, that such a view should be taken of their duty in that behalf. The section reads:

> All moneys from time to time realized from the sale of school lands shall be invested in securities of Canada to form a School Fund, and the interest arising therefrom, after deducting cost of management, shall be paid annually to the government of the province or territory within which such lands are situated, towards the support of public schools therein; and the moneys so paid shall be distributed for that purpose by the government of such province or territory in such manner as it deems expedient.

Now, reasoning by analogy, the trustee of a private fund would have no right to do anything of the kind. He would exercise the duties pertaining to his trust in just the same manner as any other person who carries out the wishes of a deceased person, or of the creator of a trust which is to be carried out by his executors or trustees. When the Parliament of Canada entered into this arrangement with the Government of Manitoba, it was upon the distinct understanding that it was a trust. The Parliament of Canada was not in any sense bound as a matter of law to enact such legislation, so that the Finance Minister is wrong when he says that the Government are but giving back to the people of Manitoba property which was theirs. The people of Manitoba never owned this property; they had simply the right to the interest of 5 per cent on $400,000, by the grace of the Parliament of this country. It constitutes a gross breach of faith—I can stigmatize it as nothing else—for the Government of this Dominion at this late date, after having entered into that arrangement and lived up to it during all these years, now completely to subvert the object for which this fund was originally intended, for if it is placed in the consolidated fund of Manitoba that is the end of it so far as benefit would accrue to the public schools of Manitoba, and that was the ground and the only ground on which the Government entered into that arrangement and set apart the interest on that sum. Have we come to this, that the Government of Canada will disregard almost every principle of legislation, whether it is by precedent or regulation, in order to carry out any aim? I do not know what possible aim they can have in this instance, unless it is to thus endeavour to enter the thin edge of the wedge, the better to enable the Government to enlarge the subsidies given to the provinces and make better terms with the provinces, whose representatives have been approaching this Government ever since their accession to office, asking that better terms be given to their respective provinces. It is a very serious matter. It is carrying out the predictions made by certain portions of the press before hon. gentlemen opposite secured the confidence of the people, and regarding it in that light, it is of so much importance that I do not think the representatives of the people of this country will be doing their duty to their constituents if this measure is allowed to pass this House without our emphasizing by our votes our condemnation of the principle involved in it.

Mr. SPROULE. Will the Finance Minister lay on the Table before the second reading all correspondence and memorials in connection with this resolution?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. member for Provencher (Mr. LaRivière) made a motion on the subject some time ago, and the papers were brought down.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. The correspondence I moved for, was respecting the item we discussed this morning.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The only correspondence is the memorial of the Manitoba Government, which I hold in my hand.

Mr. MARCOTTE. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I cannot allow this resolution to pass without protesting to the utmost of my power against what I believe is a most flagrant injustice towards a portion of the people of the province of Manitoba. Although this resolution was laid upon the Table of the House two years ago, the Government have not yet asked us to vote it; and in so doing, they wished, perhaps, to invite us to consider more seriously the importance of this measure and the injustice which it involves. It is unjust, not only because it gives away a fund set apart for the support and maintenance of schools, but also because it gives it away before the Manitoba school question is definitely settled.

The present Government propose to pay, under this resolution, to the Greenway Government, a sum of $300,000, that is to say, they propose to take this sum out of the fund set apart for the maintenance and support of schools, and of which they were only the trustees. In so giving away a notable portion of this school fund, the Government are sweeping away the only guarantee which the Catholic minority could rely upon, in order to have their rights restored to them. What I rose for to-day was not to ask the Government to grant this sum to the minority, but to press upon them the imperative necessity of meting out full justice to the minority and to grant them a reasonable proportion of the interests arising from that fund, in order to enable them to maintain their schools. What I press now upon the Cabinet is only this, that the interest be paid over the Catholic minority,

ratably to the population of the different religious denominations.

When the province of Manitoba entered confederation, there existed an educational system under which Catholics had a right to their separate schools. The interest accruing from the school fund, under section 25, chapter 54 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, is to be paid over annually to the Government for the maintenance of public schools. But the questions is, what was meant by public schools, as mentioned in the statute. The term "public schools" was then applied to denominational schools to which the minority as well as the majority could send their children. I would like to know why the Government are handing over to the Manitoba Government the moneys appropriated to educational purposes for the benefit of a portion of the province only, whereas, primitively, that school fund was to be distributed indiscriminately between the different creeds and races then forming the population of Manitoba. This state of things no longer prevails there. After the coming into power of the Greenway Government, they enacted that iniquitous legislation of 1890, which deprived the Catholic minority of their denominational schools, and now there are only Godless schools left, called public schools. True, the present Government have attempted to do something, and the agreement arrived at is known under the name of the Laurier-Greenway arrangement. But it has been shown that the Manitoba public schools are only Protestant schools under another name, and consequently, if you are going to pay over to the Manitoba Government as you propose under this resolution, not only the interests, but also the capital of that school fund, all the money will go to the public schools and nothing will be left for the support of the Catholic schools, which are so far from being self-supporting that public collections have to be taken for their maintenance. Catholics cannot allow their children to attend schools conducted under a secular system; they are forbidden by their conscience to do so. Mr. Chairman, I am told that the public schools mentioned in the Act are purely and simply Protestant schools, and if you are going to pay over to them, not only the interest but also the capital of that school fund, I say you are not carrying out the idea of confederation; and this is plainly a breach of the spirit, if not of the letter of the constitution. I feel in duty bound to denounce to the utmost of my power this breach of the law, and I register my protest on behalf of the Catholic population of the province of Manitoba. As I just said, the Dominion Government are throwing away the only means left them to come to the relief of the Catholic minority in Manitoba. Let us suppose, one moment, that the Prime Minister and his followers should redeem the pledges given to the electorate and introduce and pass a remedial law; but we know beyond a doubt that we could not coerce the Manitoba Government into subsidizing the Catholic schools. Now, I ask, what means are the Government going to take in order to afford relief to the Manitoba Catholics, in case the Catholic schools were restored? The only means would be to distribute among the denominational schools the moneys out of the school fund which they are now proposing to give to the Manitoba Government. I will go further and say that, instead of denouncing the Manitoba Government for creating bad feeling and disturbing the peace and harmony which prevailed in this country, the hon. gentlemen opposite are accessories to their wrong-doing, because they are fully aware that the provincial grants go to the public schools only. Let us suppose, for a moment, that the moneys out of that school fund were paid over exclusively to the Catholic schools, what an outcry should we not hear from the Protestant people of the country. Well, we are more broad-minded more public-spirited than that; we do not ask that those moneys should be exclusively granted to the Catholic schools, but what we want is that those moneys should be distributed ratably to the population, as is done in the province of Quebec and some other provinces. Therefore, I hold that if it were not fair to ask the Government to grant those moneys to the Catholic schools exclusively, although we would not be open to censure for affording relief to those who are oppressed, it is unfair to pay over those moneys exclusively to the Protestant schools. I am surprised at not hearing the hon. gentlemen opposite denouncing such a state of things. I protest against this action of the Government, because they are giving to the Greenway Government a reward they are not entitled to, being rather open to criticism for their conduct. Sir, had the voters in the province of Quebec foreseen in 1896 what has transpired since, had they known that, instead of meting out full justice, as they were pledged to do, the hon. gentlemen opposite intended to pay over to the Greenway Government $300,000, even before having settled the school question, and to hand over to them the school fund which would have enabled them to afford relief to the Catholic minority, I say that the result of the elections would have been quite different. Sir, I claim that the present Government, in paying over $300,000 to the Manitoba Government, in defiance of their most solemn pledges, are committing a most daring outrage. The right hon. leader of the House and his followers have pledged themselves to mete out full justice; they went even to the length of pledging themselves to appoint a commission of inquiry which would be presided over by Sir Oliver Mowat, and yet that commission was never appointed, and the Government have failed to redeem the pledges given to the interested

parties, who were told that full satisfaction would be given them. Are they giving full satisfaction to those interested parties, when proposing to pay over $300,000 for the maintenance of public schools? No, Sir, far from that, they are thus doing away with the only guarantee the Catholic minority could rely upon. They are merely doing another injustice, without giving the least satisfaction to the Catholic minority. I do not want to take away from the Protestant schools that portion of the public moneys to which they are entitled. No; in the province of Quebec we are not used to dealing unfairly with anybody. But, in the province of Manitoba, they have despoiled the Catholic minority, and that is the reason why Mgr. Langevin is asking for public collections for the maintenance of those Catholic schools, which the hon. gentlemen opposite are doing their best to wipe away, with the complicity of the Greenway cabinet by proposing a measure under which they are handing over that school fund to the Protestant schools, after having given their pledge to the Catholics that full justice would be done. Instead of giving them any protection, they are removing, under this very resolution, the only guarantee which the Catholics could rely upon, by the fact that they give away that fund. I arraign the Government of the day for having broken their pledges, and for doing away with the only safeguard for the maintenance of the Manitoba Catholic schools; I charge them with violating the spirit of the constitution and rewarding, at the same time, the very men who have fostered discord and disturbed the harmony which prevailed in the province of Quebec and in the other provinces of the Dominion of Canada. The Catholics of this country, Sir, are broad-minded and public-spirited enough to realize that in order to make this mighty confederation a success, and to build up this nation, one nationality or religious creed should not interfere with rights and privileges of another nationality or creed. There ought not to be any friction among the several religious creeds of this country; and the Government ought not to afford relief to the very men who have perpetrated wrong, as they are now proposing to do. I will not trespass any longer on the patience of this House, and before resuming my seat, I wish to protest again with all the energy that is in me against this resolution. My fellow-citizens in the province of Quebec, I hope, will come to realize the character of this measure; they will insist upon the Government of the day redeeming their pledges, instead of coming to the assistance of the Greenway Government, their accomplices in the work of persecution, and granting them $300,000 for the maintenance of public schools which are really Protestant schools. I register my protest in the name of the constituency which did me the honour of returning me to Parliament on the school question; and I hope the Catholic members of this House will register their votes in favour of the interests of the minority.

Mr. MARCOTTE.

Mr. McNEILL. I intend to say only a few words. I wish to protest in the most earnest manner against the passage of measures of this kind in the dying days of the session. The introduction of resolutions such as these is much more objectionable than the introduction of a resolution in the dying days of the session granting a large bonus to a railway. For the passage of these measures means the acceptance of principles which are very wide reaching in their applications. One of these measures involves a raid by provinces upon the Dominion treasury, at least I very much fear that it will prove to be so. In the case of the other resolution we have what is regarded by some of those whose opinion is most entitled to weight in this House, very much like a breach of trust. Surely these are questions which should not be introduced into this House at this time of the session. Surely these are questions that ought to be open to debate in the gravest form; and if the Government be misjudged in any regard in respect to these questions, they must blame themselves for introducing them at this time when they cannot be properly discussed. They may be forced through the House. No doubt these resolutions will be forced through the House. Of course the Government will have the majority to do so. But I do not think the Government will be able to force a favourable opinion from the people of this country in reference to the course they have pursued.

Mr. MACLEAN. I wish to read one clause in reference to this question. Section 363 of the Criminal Code says:

> Every one is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to seven years' imprisonment who, being a trustee of any property for the use or benefit, either in whole or in part, of some other person, or for any public or charitable purpose, with intent to defraud, and in violation of his trust, converts anything of which he is trustee to any use not authorized by the trust.

That is the law of the land; that is the Criminal Code of this country, and for a breach of that law the punishment is seven years' imprisonment.

Mr. SPROULE. Indict the whole crowd.

Mr. BERGERON. I emphasize what has been said by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House in protest against the policy of the Government bringing down such important legislation as this at the end of the session. My hon. friend from Brockville (Mr. Wood) intimated that this was the commencement of a general raid upon the federal treasury, and there is no doubt in my mind that later on the other provinces of the Dominion will seek for similar favours. Let me point out to my hon.

friend from Brockville (Mr. Wood) and to my hon. friend from Bruce (Mr. McNeill that such a thing need not surprise us, for we have the pleasure of having in this Cabinet ex-Premiers from the provinces, who have been brought to Ottawa by the right hon. the Prime Minister to form what has been called by its admirers the greatest Government Canada ever had. These ex-Premiers were not responsible for all the misdeeds of their political friends when in Opposition, and I give them a certificate that they are innocent of the means adopted by the Premier to attain power. But, Sir, these ex-provincial Premiers have doubtless seen that the days of this Government are numbered, and being still in the prime of life—I do not except the Minister of Railways, he will be glad to know—they are anticipating a return to their own provinces after defeat here, and before doing so, they are wisely taking the precaution of putting the finances of these provinces in solvent shape. Let us not forget that this Government is going at a terrific pace in spending public money. The Minister of Trade and Commerce, who was so watchful of the public treasury when in Opposition, seems to be asleep when this session, including this resolution, we are voting away $50,000,000 of the people's money.

Mr. SPROULE. Over $50,000,000.

Mr. BERGERON. Probably over $50,000,000. Those hon. gentlemen opposite who know something about the mattter—I am not speaking of the rank and file of the Liberal members, who would vote anything at all—know very well that this cannot last, if it did these buildings would be besieged from outside, and they know we are going on at such a rate that the whole thing is bound to collapse very soon. More than that, when the right hon. gentleman addressed his memorandum, signed by his own hand, to some of his friends, and which memorandum found its place in a larger one addressed to the head of the church to which he belongs; the right hon. gentleman, I say, spoke slightingly of the Remedial Bill, and one of his arguments was that should the Remedial Bill become law, it never could be enforced, because there would not have been any money to enforce it. Now, Sir, the gentlemen to whom the Prime Minister addressed his memorandum will be very much surprised when they read this resolution, because it gives them a sample of what could have been done if the Remedial Bill had been carried out.

The PRIME MINISTER. Why was it not done then?

Mr. BERGERON. Because the right hon. gentleman and his friends prevented the passing of that Bill.

The PRIME MINISTER. Why was it not in the Remedial Bill?

Mr. BERGERON. Because we had not the right to put it in the Bill.

The PRIME MINISTER. Hear, hear.

Mr. BERGERON. Why does the Prime Minister ask that question when he knows very well we could not tell the province of Manitoba: You shall spend such money for such a purpose. But now the right hon. gentleman himself shows to the world that we have moneys which are devoted to educational purposes in the province of Manitoba in our own hands and under our own discretion. If the Remedial Bill had passed, the right hon. gentleman knows that first of all it would have been sent to the Manitoba Government to enforce it, and if they did put it in force we would have taken it for granted that justice had been done. But if that Bill had not been put into effect by the local authorities, then it would have to be put in force by this Parliament, and whenever this Government was granting money for educational purposes to Manitoba it would have been an easy thing to say to them: Since we give you money for educational purposes, a part of it shall be devoted to the public schools, and another part to the separate schools. This, Sir, is what was expected would be done by those who had the Remedial Bill in hand. That is why the right hon. gentleman and his friends said that the Remedial Bill was no good, and that even if it were accepted by a few persons, as a matter of fact, it would never be put in practice. As this may be the last time we shall have to deal with this question, I want to put on record in the "Hansard" a letter which was addressed during the last elections to Mr. Pelletier, candidate in Laprairie, who when in this House supported the Remedial Bill. This letter was addressed to Mr. Pelletier by His Grace the Archbishop of St. Boniface; it was read on the hustings, and I will read it now in the House so that if there is any one who has been deceived by the memorandum of the right hon. gentleman, he may know the other side of the story. This is the letter:

St. Boniface, June 8th, 1896.

I have only to tell you that the Canadian episcopate are unanimous in approving of my attitude in relation to the Remedial Bill, that is to say, that their lordships the bishops acknowledge that that Bill, inasmuch as it restored to us our school rights anterior to the iniquitous law of 1890, was supremely desirable for us, but it was the duty of Catholics to vote for the Bill.

So that I am justified in concluding that those who, on the 20th March last, voted the death of the said Bill, in place of amending it, betrayed the Catholics and the French cause in Manitoba.

To maintain that I approved of a Bill null and void, or utterly insufficient and wretched, is to assert that the Archbishop of St. Boniface, with his clergy and the most notable and best

instructed Catholics of St. Boniface and Winnipeg, are men without intelligence or without conscience.

If this can be of use to you, you can use it against the calumniators, who would be but too happy to find a disunited episcopate.

Rest assured of my sincere devotedness in O. L. and M.

(Sgd.) † ADELARD,
Archbishop of St. Boniface.

Mr. McGREGOR. What is the date of that letter ?

Mr. BERGERON. The 8th of June, 1896. That proves to whoever wants to know it what has been said very often, but which cannot be said too often in view of the manner in which the right hon. gentleman and his friends are trying to change the facts ; it shows what was thought of the Remedial Bill by the parties who were most interested. Now, Sir, in bringing down this resolution the Minister of Finance said that it did not make much difference whether we paid now in a lump sum to the Manitoba Government or by different sums yearly, because we were not affecting the principle of the award. Well, Sir, we do change the principle, because when the law creating the school fund of Manitoba was passed in 1872 there existed separate schools in that province. That is to say, there were in Manitoba two sorts of schools called public schools—one part Protestant public schools, and the other part Catholic schools. They were on the same footing, and both participated in the moneys which were granted to the province by the Dominion for education. The Government to-day, in doing what they are doing, are putting a stop to that condition of things. For eight years past, the Manitoba minority have been deprived of their share of that fund ; and my hon. friend from Brockville (Mr. Wood) who is a legal authority, and my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean), have explained what must be understood to be a trust fund. I say that the Government, by what they are doing to day, are changing the object of that trust fund, and are depriving the minority of their just share in it. The hon. gentleman may say : But the school question is settled. I say, Mr. Chairman, it is not settled, and the proof that it is not settled is all the work which my right hon. friend has given to himself and those who are near him, in the effort to induce those who have been ill-treated by that settlement, to accept it. The proof that it is not settled are the trips made to Rome by the different parties sent there by my right hon. friend. The proof that it is not settled is the trip of my right hon. friend himself to Rome. The proof that it is not settled is that my right hon. friend went on Sunday to Montreal, and, if I am well informed, went and consulted with His Grace the Archbishop of Montreal. The proof that it is not settled, is that to-day, as my right hon. friend knows very well, a great many of the children of Manitoba do not go to the schools that exist for the majority of that province. Sir, it will only be settled—and my right hon. friend knows that—when it is settled according to right and justice ; and it will never be settled until then. But when that time comes, the minority will be deprived, by the law you are now putting on the Statute-book, of their share in this school fund of Manitoba. Of course, I understand that this is the epilogue of the school question. I understand that as long as my right hon. friend is in power, we shall not hear about it any more, because there are no demagogues on this side of the House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. BERGERON. No, and it would be useless to take either the time of Parliament or the time of the public to discuss a matter which cannot be settled until my right hon. friend leaves the place which he occupies to-day. Now, Sir, since this is the epilogue of that question, let us make an epitome of the whole thing. The school question was commenced by Mr. Greenway, the Liberal Premier of the province of Manitoba, for political purposes. It has been kept alive in the different provinces by the right hon. gentleman and his friends, so as to divert the attention of the public from their lack of policy. The agitation has been carried on in Ontario in one way, and in Quebec in another way ; and the proof of this is the fact that the right hon. gentleman did not say in Ontario what he said in Quebec. He promised in Ontario that there would be no coercion in Manitoba. He promised in Quebec that he would try to settle the question by conciliation, by sunny ways, by sending Mr. Mowat to Manitoba ; and if those methods did not succeed in obtaining for the minority their rights, he would then put in motion the immense machinery of the Dominion Parliament ; that is to say, he would pass a Bill which would have the same object in view as the Remedial Bill. He promised that to his own electors in the province of Quebec. He has not done it ; and when a few days ago he applied to myself a most unfortunate epithet, he was simply preparing the way for the position he will occupy when he goes back to his electors. Mr. Greenway has been a great man, and I do not see why my right hon. friend did not have him knighted when he was giving knighthoods right and left. There have been more Liberals knighted in the last couple of years than there have been Conservatives since confederation. Of course, hon. gentlemen opposite, who are democrats, cannot be there very long, and they must hurry up. Mr. Greenway, after bulldozing the Conservative party with the help of hon. gentlemen opposite, after humbugging this Government with the settlement he agreed upon with the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) without consulting

the minority, is given to-day about $755,000 for having been such a great man with the two Governments. I imagine that the right hon. gentleman expects that he will, though I do not believe it, soften the heart of Mr. Greenway by giving him such a large amount of money, and that Mr. Greenway may be a little milder towards the minority in Manitoba ; but the right hon. gentleman is making an awful mistake. If he has already paid Mr. Greenway so much money, that gentleman will surely continue the trade, and ill-treat the minority of Manitoba, if possible more than ever ; and he is in the right hands when he is in the hands of the right hon. gentleman, because we know that the right hon. gentleman has a majority behind him, principally in Quebec, who will swallow anything.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. BERGERON. That seems to have struck in a good place. What is the epitome of the whole thing The act of Mr. Greenway has carried the right hon. gentleman and his friends into power. The act of Mr. Greenway has given the Liberal party of Canada a chief in the person of the Minister of Public Works. The settlement which was made by the Minister of Public Works was first of all shown to a late lamented friend of ours, Mr. McCarthy, for his approval. We all know the love Mr. McCarthy had for the Catholics and the French ; and he approved of the settlement. The Minister of Public Works was perfectly happy when he saw that Mr. McCarthy approved of his settlement of the school question of Manitoba. More than that : the settlement brought into this House the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton), who probably would never have come to this House but for that coup d'etat of the Minister of Public Works. More than that : we may say that the whole iniquity is consummated ; it is finished. I will leave it to the right hon. gentleman—I will not say it to the Minister of Public Works, because I make a great difference between the two men : but I will leave it to the right hon. gentleman later on, because these things have their return. The right hon. gentleman when he thinks later on, of the way he has treated that minority, will, I am sure, feel remorse for the way he has acted towards those people to whom he promised his protection. More than that : I want to say—and this is the last word I will ever utter on this question—the right hon. gentleman has broken the constitution of this country.

The PRIME MINISTER. Hear, hear.

Mr. BERGERON. Yes, there is no use of the right hon. gentleman trying to smile over it. There is an article in the constitution of Canada which either should or should not be there. It is the third part of article 93, which says :

> Where in any province a system of separate or dissentient schools exists by law at the union, or is thereafter established by the legislature of the province, an appeal shall lie to the Governor General in Council from any act or decision of any provincial authority affecting any right or privilege of the Protestant or Roman Catholic minority of the Queen's subjects in relation to education.

The right hon. gentleman, when he declares that the school question is settled, and that we shall never hear of it any more, is violating that clause of the constitution ; and, Sir, if you can break one clause of the constitution, the whole constitution of Canada is not worth the paper on which it is written.

The PRIME MINISTER. Mr. Chairman, I must declare at once that I have no intention of discussing this question—a very important one, I admit—in the spirit and temper which has just been exhibited by my hon. friend from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron). My hon. friend not only discussed the question but rose to very high flights of oratory. He not only discussed the financial side of the question, but also the constitutional aspects ; and I am sure he will agree with me, when I call his attention to a few facts, that he is no more of an authority on the constitution than he is on finance. He repeated—I do not know how often, for I gave up in despair trying to count—that we were to-day giving this man Greenway —such was his expression—his reward in money since we did not give him a title, and gave a money reward in the shape of nearly $800,000, namely, $300,000 by this resolution and $475,000 by the resolution of this morning. To show the hon. gentleman what is thought of his ideas of finance, I need only reply to him that the money we are giving to Manitoba to-day does, by the admission of everybody, not belong to Canada but to Manitoba.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

The PRIME MINISTER. Some hon. gentleman, in his enthusiasm and readiness to support anything said on the other side, says no, that it is not so. But as my hon. colleague, the Minister of Finance, has asked : If this money is ours, why have we been paying interest on it all along ? It is childish to argue this question. As regards the other resolution which we adopted this morning, I need only refer my hon. friend to the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. LaRivière), who knows more of this question than probably any member of this House, because he was a member of the Manitoba Government when these transactions took place and the wrong was done which we are now attempting to make right. We are not to-day giving a single cent to Manitoba. We are doing nothing else than repairing the injustice which was committed to the prejudice of Manitoba.

I shall come back to the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) in a moment,

but I want to address myself to an observation which was made—and I must say made with a great deal of dignity and force—by my hon. friend the member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill). He called the attention of the Government—and he did it in language which I entirely approve, though I do not share the views he expressed—to the unfortunate fact, as he described it, that this resolution should have been brought down in the last days of the session. I can only say that if we bring down this question to-day, the Parliament of Canada is not taken by surprise. What we complained of in former years, when resolutions for railway subsidies amounting to millions of dollars were brought down at the end of the session, was that Parliament had had no opportunity of canvassing the different applications and giving them the preliminary study necessary for their intelligent discussion, and, therefore, was taken by surprise. But that cannot be said in this instance, because this motion has been on the Order paper since the 22nd April. It has, therefore, been in the power of everybody to obtain information upon it, and to-day nobody is taken by surprise, but everybody is in a position to decide whether it is a demand which ought or ought not to be granted.

I now come to another aspect of the question, and that is whether this is a trust or not. If we are to look into this question as it ought to be looked into—this question whether it is a trust or not—let me say that in this legislation, dealing with and amending to some extent the Dominion Lands Act, we are only dealing with one of the anomalies of which we have too many in this country. Fortunately, in this instance, it is not one that is imbedded in the constitution, but one of our own making, and, therefore, subject to our own unmaking. A certain proportion of the public lands of this country, in the province of Manitoba and the North-west Territories, have been applied for school purposes. I submit this point to the judgment of every man in this House. The education of the country has been placed in the hands of the provinces. The subject of education in Manitoba is in the control of that province. The question of education is subject to provincial jurisdiction. In the case of lands to be applied for the purpose of education, would it not then be far more logical, far more in accord with what ought to be the proper division of legislative powers between the Federal Parliament and the provincial legislature, that the latter should have the control of these moneys? I agree in the statement of the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. LaRivière), made not upon this, but a former occasion, when he applied to have the reversion of those lands to the province of Manitoba. To-day, however, he holds different language. There are two men in him, he tells us, and looking at him, I must say that I am not altogether surprised at that. There is the provincial man and the Dominion man. To-day we have heard the Dominion man, but a few years ago we had the opinion of the provincial man, who stated that in the best interests of Manitoba it would be better by far that these lands should be vested in the province. It was not so decided, and, therefore, I shall not quarrel with my hon. friend on this point. The policy of the Government was different, and the lands have been kept within the jurisdiction of this Parliament. Now, the question may be fairly asked: Why do you now ask for this money? Why do you not continue to give the interest as you have been doing? Why are you giving a part of the capital?

Before I come to the reasons why we are asking Parliament to give this money, let me devote a few moments to the argument made first by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Borden), and then by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) that this is a trust fund. According to the hon. member for East York, we are very guilty in bringing up this resolution, and he said with great solemnity that by statute there is imprisonment for violating a trust. I have only this to say to my hon. friend, and I submit the same argument to my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Borden), who said the same thing, but in different language. He did not put it so harshly, so brutally, if my hon. friend will excuse my using that expression. There is a prison, he said, behind every violation of a trust, and he gave us instances of the kind. I take the very simile he made. Suppose that he entrusted somebody with a certain sum and instructed him to pay the interest to a third party. Of course if the trustee, instead of paying the interest, went on paying out the capital, all the fatal consequences pointed out by my hon. friend from York would fall upon the head of the delinquent. But if the man who created the trust and the party who was to receive the benefit came to a mutual agreement, and both agreed to the payment of the capital instead of the interest, do you think that would be a criminal act?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It would depend altogether on whether the person in whose favour the agreement was made was capable, under the circumstances, of doing away with the trust. For example, in the case of a married woman or an infant, the consequences which the hon. Minister says would not fall would undoubtedly fall. What I ventured to say was that, as this was in trust, not only for the present but for the future inhabitants of Manitoba, you have not all the parties represented here.

The PRIME MINISTER. That means to say that a Parliament can never alter the laws it makes, but that those laws are there for all time. This is a new doctrine. Here is a trust, if you call it so, created by the

Federal Parliament with the consent of the provincial government, and if the provincial government and the Federal Parliament agree to modify that in any way, I think they are acting quite within their rights. However, I do not wish to press that argument very far; I do not wish to press it to the final consequence, for I hold that the Government when it deals with this question ought to be chary in touching what has been done in former years. But I wish to say to my hon. friend from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) and my hon. friend from Champlain (Mr. Marcotte), who spoke in French, but gave us very much the same arguments to the effect that in giving this money we are crushing the rights of Catholics; that this money should be given to separate schools——

Mr. BERGERON. They should get their share.

The PRIME MINISTER. That is the argument of my hon. friend. Is that the law?

Mr. BERGERON. It was the law in 1872.

The PRIME MINISTER. I am very sorry my hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) was not here a moment ago to hear the remarks of my hon. friend from Provencher (Mr. LaRivière) or that, if he did hear them, he did not appreciate them more rightly. Otherwise he would have remembered that when this law was introduced in 1872 and the trust was created, Mr. Bureau, in the Senate, moved an amendment to have this money divided between public schools and separate schools, and this was rejected by the Senate and did not become law. What is the use of presenting such arguments as that?

Mr. BERGERON. What does this prove?

The PRIME MINISTER. It proves that the argument of my hon. friend has no sense in it. He says that this money ought to be kept for separate schools. He is told by my hon. friend from Provencher that a demand was made in the Senate at the time to have this very thing done and it was refused. And now, I have only to point to him what is the law of the country upon this point.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. Would my right hon. friend allow me a word of explanation?

The PRIME MINISTER. Certainly.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. The debate I have referred to occurred in 1872. The Dominion Lands Act merely set apart the school lands for educational purposes, and it was not until 1879 that this trust was created by the Act that was passed at that time. I did not refer to the debate that took place at that time; but at that time the school system of Manitoba included a system of separate schools so that the Catholic as well as the Protestant population of Manitoba was entitled to their respective shares of that fund. I did not bring forward that argument, but I understand that to be the argument of my hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron).

The PRIME MINISTER. This legislation was commenced in 1872, and at that time an hon. Senator, Mr. Bureau, sought to have the fund then created appropriated at once between the public and the separate schools. That was denied. The Act was completed in 1879. Now, let me read to the House the terms on which this trust was created:

> Provided, also, that all moneys from time to time realized from the sale of school lands shall be invested in Dominion securities, and the interest arising therefrom, after deducting the cost of management, shall be paid annually to the government of the province or territory within which said lands are situated towards the support of the public schools therein,——

—Public schools therein——

> ——the money so paid to be distributed with such view by the government of such province or territory in such manner as may be deemed most expedient.

Mr. BERGERON. The right hon. gentleman knows that the separate schools were a part of the public school system and that there were two kinds of public schools, those known as public schools and those known as separate schools.

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend is not satisfied. He says that public schools comprise also separate schools. Very well. Mr. Bureau was not satisfied and sought to have this divided so that the separate schools and public schools could each have a share, and he failed.

Now, the reason why we ask to pay this money over to the Manitoba Government is that in the crippled condition of the finances of the government, they are not in a position to give to education all the assistance they desire, and that in the infant condition of the province it ought to receive. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) stated a moment ago, and stated very truly, that in future years, when the province of Manitoba is more fully settled, it will be easier for it to dispense with this assistance than at the present time. But now, when the population is scattered over immense territories, when the people are struggling, as new settlers have to struggle everywhere, now is the time when this assistance should be given. We believe it is better to take the money lying idle in the Dominion treasury to assist these schools than that a heavier burden of taxation should be laid upon the settler. There is an additional reason, whatever may be said to the contrary. Whatever may be the appeals made in some parts of the province of Manitoba, although, since the law of 1890 localities have been without schools or schools have been maintained by the Catholic population themselves while they were obliged to pay their taxes for other schools, there have

been since the year 1896 more than 100 schools which must receive assistance and which, I am glad to say, whatever may be said to the contrary, have, since the 1st January, received assistance from the public treasury of Manitoba.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. Does the right hon. gentleman say there were one hundred schools opened in 1896 ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Since 1896—that is my information.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. I take exception to that statement, because there is not that number.

The PRIME MINISTER. Upon questions of this kind, of course, I cannot speak with authority. But I have, though not here at this moment in my possession, information that one hundred schools—or thereabouts, I will not say more than one hundred—have been opened since October, 1896. Now, this is why we ask for the appropriation of this money. I must deprecate, for my part, the spirit which some hon. gentlemen, and amongst others my hon. friend from Beauharnois, have attempted to bring into the discussion of this question. My hon. friend from Provencher stated a moment ago that it had no connection with the school question, but some affinity with it. If this has an affinity with the school question, then, in the name of everything that is sacred let us not impart more bitterness to it than there has been hitherto. My hon. friend spoke of the constitution, and he has reminded me of an argument brought forward very often by himself and his friends, that in the position I have taken on this question I had violated the constitution.

Let me say to my hon. friend, and I appeal to his judgment and to the judgment of his friends upon this question, that if the constitution were such as he explained it, if it were applied as his party has tried to apply it, the result in this country would simply be anarchy. He says that under section 93 there is an appeal to this Parliament, and because we voted against the Remedial Bill, he says we voted against the constitution. Sir, whenever a minority establishes a school system in any province as a separate school system, if that minority is affected by subsequent legislation, it has a right of appeal to this Parliament. But does my hon. friend pretend that whenever and because there is an appeal, this Parliament is always bound to reverse the legislation which is so appealed against ? Why, Sir, to what absurdities would that construction of the law lead to ? You have the law settled by the first judgment of the Privy Council that the legislature of Manitoba had a right to establish separate schools ; and you have the point settled by that same judgment that the same legislature which established that separate school system had the right to abolish it. These two things are not disputed. From that law which the legislature passed abolishing separate schools, there was an appeal to this Government, and my hon. friend holds that because there was an appeal to this Government, we are bound to veto that law.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. We are discussing a very important subject. Do I understand the right hon. gentleman to say that the legislature that has power to pass a law establishing separate schools, has also the power to repeal that law, and that was the decision of the Privy Council ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes, that was the decision of the first judgment rendered by the Privy Council.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. It is a question of fact. I understood that the first judgment of the Privy Council only related to the schools that existed prior to the entry of Manitoba into the confederation, and that it bore on the fact that the schools that existed before confederation did not give the minority the right to their separate schools after the province entered the confederation.

The PRIME MINISTER. I have no objection to my hon. friend putting it that way. But at all events, under that interpretation of the law, I maintain that the legislature which established separate schools, whether before or after the province entered the confederation, has a right to deal with them. That is the tenor of the judgment. From that action of the legislature there is an appeal to this Parliament. The hon. member for Beauharnois argues that the moment that decision was given, then that appeal must be granted, and the legislation of the province must be abolished ; that is, that we should say to the province of Manitoba : You have power to legislate, but if you dare to exercise your power, then upon your head falls the strong arm of the Dominion of Canada. No more dangerous doctrine was ever proclaimed. It has been proclaimed from the housetops in the province of Quebec.

Mr. BERGERON. My hon. friend told his electors the very same thing.

The PRIME MINISTER. I never said that to my electors. What I said to my electors was this, and I have stated it on the floor of this House, that the power of interference exists undoubtedly with us, but to possess the power and to exercise it are two wholly different things ; and whenever an appeal is made, the legislation appealed against may be allowed, or it may be reversed, or it may be modified. This is the true interpretation of the Act. My hon. friend has said one thing, however, for which I give him credit. He says that this is the last time he will ever speak upon this question, and if he will keep his promise, I will forgive him everything which he has said up to the present time.

Mr. BERGERON. When I said that, I did not mean to say that I should never be heard from any more on this subject.

The PRIME MINISTER. I thought you were boasting.

Mr. BERGERON. I meant that I should not raise the question again as long as my right hon. friend holds the position he is now in, because it would be useless for me to do so. The right hon. gentleman has referred to the fact that when Senator Bureau moved that the fund should be distributed immediately between the Catholic school board and the Protestant school board, his motion was defeated. Now, what conclusion does the right hon. gentleman draw from that? Evidently it was the opinion of the Senate at that time that the disposition of the fund should be left to the discretion of the local administration. But that does not affect the point I had made, that we are to-day changing the law which created that fund. That fund was for the province of Manitoba. At that time the separate schools were as much entitled to it as the public schools. But now we are doing the reverse, we are putting completely aside these schools called separate, and we are going to give $300,000 purely and simply to the public schools. Moreover, there may be a change in the Government of Manitoba. Suppose a new Premier comes into power, as favourably disposed towards the minority as Mr. Norquay was—because when Mr. Norquay was the Conservative Premier of Manitoba there was never any dispute about the schools of the minority, or if there was, he prevented it. Suppose, then, that the provincial legislature of Manitoba themselves should go back to the state of things which existed before 1890, what money will they have to give to the minority for their separate schools? Where will they get the money unless they take it out of their own treasury? The right hon. gentleman said here what he might have left unsaid, that Mr. Greenway had no more money, the Manitoba Government are too poor to give all the money they would like to give. We all know the Government of Manitoba is a Liberal Government, and if they are poor, it is because they have squandered the money of the province right and left, and have none left. But when Mr. Norquay and a Conservative Government were in power, they had money enough, they never came down to Ottawa asking for better terms, as the hon. gentleman has explained. He says that every province has been asking for better terms. I do not say whether this is so or not. The right hon. gentleman also quoted clause 93 of the British North America Act. The right hon. gentleman knows who put that clause there. It was put there by Sir A. J. Galt, and he knows it was put there to protect the Protestant minority of Quebec, otherwise we never would have heard of it. The Protestant minority of Quebec were afraid that the French majority would do something which would hurt their feelings, and so that clause 93 was put into the constitution. Then the right hon. gentleman said a thing which I regretted to hear him say. He said: It is true that is in the constitution, but we are not obliged to enforce it. Mr. Chairman, when there is a clause like that in the constitution which allows a strong Government to come to the rescue of a weak minority in any province, the Government that does not do so is not worthy of the position it holds. If there was one thing which, in the eyes of the right thinking Protestants, acquired their respect and admiration, it was the sight of Sir Charles Tupper and Sir Mackenzie Bowell standing up for the minority when all their friends were saying to them that they were hurting the party politically. I heard them declare, and I heard the Minister of Railways and Canals say the same thing, that where a minority was suffering a grievance, whether a Protestant or Catholic minority, that the Government in power were able to put in force clause 93, and if they did not come to the rescue of such minority, they would not be worthy of the position they held on the Treasury benches.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood the First Minister to contend that this money was not a trust fund, and, therefore, they could use it as they liked. I refer him to the Statutes of 1891, chap. 6, which provided for an arbitration on the accounts in dispute between the provinces of Quebec and Ontario. The province of Ontario claimed that they were entitled to the common school fund being paid over to them, notwithstanding that the Dominion regarded it as one of the trust funds. The Dominion, in order to relieve itself of that trust, passed an Act in 1884, "An Act respecting the Common School Fund," which was assented to on 23rd July, 1894. It provides:

The Governor in Council may, so soon as an agreement is reached between the governments of the provinces of Ontario and Quebec——

—the two Governments interested in the fund——

——as to the manner in which the fund hereafter referred to is to be divided and distributed between the said provinces, or so soon as the manner of the distribution thereof is determined by the arbitrators appointed under the authority of chap. 6 of the statute of 1891, should the question of the distribution thereof be referred to and determined by such arbitrators, paid to and divided between the said provinces, in the proportion agreed upon or determined by such arbitrators, and in full discharge of any further obligation or liability on the part of the Dominion with respect to said funds.——

Therefore, there must be an obligation and liability.

——the principal of a certain fund held by the Dominion in trust for the said provinces, and known as the Common School Fund; and such

payment shall divest the Dominion of the said trust and of any further liability or obligation in any way connected therewith or relating thereto.

If it requires an Act of Parliament to divest the Dominion Parliament of this trust, it cannot be successfully contended that it is not a trust and that along with it there are not obligations that the Government shall respect in dealing with this money.

Mr. MARCOTTE. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I have listened very attentively to the remarks fallen from the hon. Prime Minister and from the hon. gentlemen opposite and, with due regard to the circumstances, I fail to understand the reason why the hon. Premier is in such a hurry to settle the question now at issue. The Manitoba school question is not yet settled. The hon. Prime Minister is still negotiating with the representatives of the minority and with the bishops of the province of Quebec. What business has he to come and ask us now to vote three hundred thousand dollars? Why not wait for a more favourable opportunity, before paying over those moneys, which, as I said a little while ago, are the only means left to afford relief to the Manitoba Catholics, in case Mr. Greenway should not yield to the sunny ways of the Prime Minister? I fail to see what results, up to now those sunny ways of the Premier have secured. With his sunny ways he went to Rome, but the authorities there found that the settlement was inadequate, imperfect, unacceptable. Well, Mr. Speaker, sine the sunny ways of the hon. Premier have proved powerless, I would like to know why the hon. gentleman does not come and redeem now the pledges given to the electorate in Quebec? As everybody knows, he stated, in his electoral platform, that should conciliatory means prove powerless, he would resort to constitutional means.

Now, I ask, what is there to prevent the hon. Prime Minister from acting now? Conciliating means having failed, it is now time to face the issue. Why does the hon. gentleman remain inactive? Has he not got the promise of his friends behind him, that they would support a remedial legislation? Why should he fear? We all know that not one of them would be here to-day, if they had not pledged themselves to support a Remedial Bill.

Mr. BOURASSA. (Translation.) If the hon. gentleman will allow me, I will claim the right to be excepted from that number, because I never pledged myself to vote in favour of a Remedial Bill, and yet I was returned by a handsome majority.

Mr. MADORE. (Translation.) I stand exactly in the same position.

Mr. LEGRIS. (Translation.) I never took any such pledge.

Mr. SPROULE.

Mr. MARCOTTE. (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, I would ask those hon. gentlemen opposite who did not take any such pledge to rise. I see three of them.

Mr. STENSON. (Translation.) Here is another one.

Mr. MARCOTTE. (Translation.) It is a crying shame for those hon. members. The other gentlemen have had the pluck and the manliness to take such a pledge. Well, I protest against such a state of things, and I ask the hon. gentlemen, with the exception of the four gentlemen who disclaim having given that pledge, to press upon the Prime Minister the urgency of such a remedial law. You have nothing to fear; the only trouble is that you have not the pluck to do it. We have seen on this side of the House, the hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper), a Protestant, pledge himself to pass a remedial law. You have deceived the province of Quebec, and you are only on your trial. In the province of Quebec the electors said: Let us try and see whether a Catholic and a French Canadian will succeed in settling this school question. We have seen the hon. leader of the Opposition, in his admirable programme, boldly stating that he would favour the passage of a Remedial Bill. What are you afraid of? You have nothing to fear from this side of the House, as you have the pledge of the leader of the Opposition that he will support a Remedial Bill. You have nothing to fear from your own supporters, as they have also pledged themselves to support a Remedial Bill. Why, then, should you hesitate? Is it for the pleasure of paying over to Mr. Greenway $300,000?

Nothing is in the way of the hon. Prime Minister redeeming his pledge, but the trouble is he has not got the pluck to do so. He wants to help Greenway, his bosom friend; and not only does he extend to him his sympathies, but he also hands over to him the school fund, so as to enable him the better to assist the Protestant schools in Manitoba and reward him for what he is doing. We would like this school question, which is agitating the public men, and which, in spite of what is stated to the contrary, is bound to come up again, to be settled once for all. The province of Quebec is still keeping up the agitation and claiming back the rights of the Manitoba minority. And, as a matter of fact, what does the encyclical letter say? The Pope says that we must accept partial concessions, but at the same time that we must go on protesting. That is what I am doing. The Manitoba Catholics, through their representative, the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. LaRivière) have protested, and still go on protesting against the injustice of which they suffer. The question is not settled, and so long as it will not be settled, the Catholic minority will insist upon full justice being meted out to

them. The Catholics want their schools to be restored: and were the hon. gentlemen opposite ready to redeem their pledges, this agitation would be set at rest, and there would no longer be any wrangles in this country among the different races and creeds. Were this happy consummation to take place, all the different classes of our population would go hand in hand, without any shock, without anything disturbing the peace and harmony which should prevail in a country like ours, and without any obstacle being thrown in the way of the development of the trade and industries and natural resources of this Dominion.

Mr. FOSTER. Can the hon. Finance Minister give a statement of the money expended on public schools in Manitoba, say, during the last five years?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Not at the present moment.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the hon. gentleman bring down such a statement before the second reading.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have here a statement given by the Government of Manitoba, but it is not in the form the hon. gentleman suggests. I may be permitted to furnish some additional information I promised, and at the same time take the liberty of replying to some remarks made by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Borden), who took exception to some remarks I made. I stated that this fund was practically the money of Manitoba. To that statement the hon. gentleman took exception, and he said that as this Parliament could take it away from the province, it could not be the money of the province. By the same method of reasoning the hon. gentleman could prove that the capital account fund does not belong to Manitoba, because we could by Act of Parliament change it. By the same method of reasoning he could prove that the subsidy did not belong to Manitoba because it could be changed by an Act of this Parliament. There are certain funds belonging practically to the province of Manitoba, and they may be called trust funds, if members please; they are, at all events, funds which avail for the benefit of the province and no one else, and therefore practically they are the moneys of the province of Manitoba. The hon. gentleman said it would be a breach of trust to pay those moneys as we propose. I submit that this is not a trust fund in the ordinary sense of the term. The very fact that we could take this money away from the province of Manitoba is evidence that it is not in the ordinary sense a trust fund. The very power of Parliament which created that fund could certainly take it away. The same power that creates a trust can vary it, especially when the change is not antagonistic to the wishes of the province, but in accordance with it. On a question of breach of trust, a question of principle, the amount is of no consequence. I have shown that the late Government on two occasions introduced resolutions to take a portion of that fund and give it to Manitoba, and surely if the argument of the hon. member for Halifax be correct, hon. gentlemen opposite committed a gross breach of trust.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. It was made as a loan.

Mr. FOSTER. Was it an advance?

The FINANCE MINISTER. It was an advance made chargeable to the fund, whether you call it a loan or not.

Mr. FOSTER. Was it paid back?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Not by the province, but when the fund accumulated it ceased to be a charge against the province. If it had not been given in that way there would be so many more thousand dollars in the trust fund for Manitoba. If this was a trust, it was a breach of the trust on the part of the late Government to introduce two resolutions to take away a portion of it. The hon. gentleman spoke as if the Government were taking the whole of the trust fund, if a trust fund it be, and delivering it to the province of Manitoba. There are $475,000 in the fund, and we propose to give $300,000 out of it to benefit the education of the province, thereby leaving a considerable balance. The hon. gentleman argued as if there never would be another dollar added to the fund; but instead of that being the case, this is an accumulating fund, which before many years will contain millions of dollars for the benefit of Manitoba. The quantity of land appropriated and set apart under the School Lands Act was 2,277,900 acres. The quantity sold up to 1st December, 1897, and none has been sold since, was 84,451 acres, leaving 2,193,449 acres yet to be disposed of. If that land be sold at the average price which that already sold realized, and that is a very moderate statement, for the land will increase in value as Manitoba develops and improves, it will increase the fund to about $15,000,000 for the benefit of education in Manitoba; and yet because we take $300,000 out of this accumulating fund, which will reach $15,000,000 ultimately, we are told that we are going to destroy the trust fund. One of the duties of a trustee is to assist those for whose benefit the trust is established. The hon. gentleman has referred to the case of trustee for a child. One of the first duties of such trustee is surely to see that the child is maintained in proper condition, and though it may not be stated in the deed, the court will instruct the trustee to maintain the child out of the fund. To-day we are taking a small portion of the trust fund, if hon. gentlemen will call it so, and applying it to Manitoba when the province is in the greatest need

of it. On 27th March, 1897, a year ago, in anticipation of legislation being passed last session, the Manitoba Government addressed a statement to the Minister of Finance, as follows :—

Treasury Department, Manitoba,
Winnipeg, 20th March, 1897.

The Honourable the Minister of Finance, Ottawa.

Sir,—I beg to ask that the sum of $100,000 be paid to the province of Manitoba as early as possible in this year out of the Manitoba School Lands Fund in the hands of the Dominion Government.

As a reason for such request, I might state that the schools of the province are greatly increasing in number, and the sparseness of the population makes it exceedingly difficult to maintain schools in all the school districts that have been opened up, while the limited resources of the province make it next to impossible to maintain the grants out of the ordinary funds of the province.

The increasing demands of the public schools have been constant, and the government grant has been increased from $68,380, in 1886-87, to $185,000 in 1897, notwithstanding the fact that in 1892 the grant per school was reduced from $150 to $130. It is considered impossible to at present further decrease these grants, as the result would be to close up a number of schools.

The lands set aside by the Dominion Government in 1883 as an endowment to public schools in Manitoba amounted to 2,000,000 acres, of which, during the past fourteen years, about 70,000 acres, or one-thirtieth of the whole, has been sold. It is impossible to accurately estimate the value of the unsold lands, but a safe valuation, based on present prices, would be between $2.50 and $7 per acre, making this endowment for the lands yet to be sold worth from $5,000,000 to $14,000,000. Taking into account the circumstances of the country and the heavy burdens necessarily imposed on the early settlers in municipal and school taxation, it is astonishing to note that the benefits of this educational endowment have largely been withheld from the people at a time in the history of the province when they were most needed We are of opinion that the province is as much, if not more, in need of assistance from this fund now than it will be in future years, when the development of the province and the growth of the population will have rendered the burdens on the individual school districts much lighter than they are at present.

The request for $100,000 in this year is, therefore, we believe, justifiable and necessary for the following reasons :—

1. Because it is not the intention of Parliament that the trust should enure to the benefit of future generations only. That is shown by the provisions for sale, which were almost immediately acted upon.

2. The scattered settlements render the burden of school taxation at the present time most onerous. If it is intended to settle the province the schools cannot be decreased in number, as the province must offer the best possible educational inducements.

I think in view of the needs of this province, as hereinbefore indicated, it is desirable that the Dominion Government should take authority from Parliament to pay over to this province from time to time, as may be deemed necessary, the proceeds of school lands already sold.

I have, &c.,
(Sgd.) D. H. McMILLAN,
Provincial Treasurer.

Mr. FIELDING. This was written a year ago, and there was a later letter written asking us to make an immediate provision for $200,000.

Mr. SPROULE. They asked $200,000. and you are giving them $300,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We take power to give them a sum up to $300,000 at a future time, but we are only giving them $200,000 now.

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

After Recess.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 99) to incorporate the Lake Champlain and River St. Lawrence Ship Canal Company.—(Mr. Préfontaine.)

Bill (No. 124) incorporating the Western Alberta and Yukon Railway and Navigation and Mining Company.—(Mr. Casey.)

Bill (No. 139) to incorporate the Anglo-French Telegraph Company (Limited).—(Mr. Morrison.)

GREAT NORTH-WEST CENTRAL RAILWAY COMPANY.

The House resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 141—from the Senate)—respecting the Great North-west Central Railway Company.—(Mr. Morrison.)

(In the Committee.)

On section 2,

Mr. TALBOT. I propose to move an amendment to this clause. The clause itself reads as follows :—

The new bonds may be secured by mortgage in the manner and with all the rights mentioned in clause 14 of the company's charter, as set forth in the schedule to and confirmed by chapter 85 of the statutes of 1888.

To that clause I beg to move the following amendment :—

The new bonds may be secured by mortgage as provided in the Railway Act.

Mr. CASEY. Better ask that the clause be struck out first.

Mr. TALBOT. My hon. friend from West Elgin (Mr. Casey) draws my attention to the fact that I should ask that the clause be struck out and this new one inserted. Clause 14 of the old charter reads as follows :—

The directors of the company, under the authority of the shareholders to them given by a resolution of a special general meeting called for that purpose, are hereby authorized to issue bonds under the seal of the said company, signed by its president or other presiding officer and countersigned by its secretary and treasurer, and such bonds shall be made payable at such times and in such manner, and at such place or places in Canada or elsewhere, and bearing such rate

of interest as the directors shall think proper; and the directors shall have power to issue and sell or pledge all or any of the said bonds at the best price and upon the best terms and conditions which, at the same time, they may be able to obtain, for the purpose of raising money for prosecuting the said undertaking: provided that the amount of bonds so issued, sold or pledged shall not exceed $20,000 per mile, to be issued in proportion to the length of railway constructed or under contract to be constructed; provided, also, that no such bonds shall be issued until at least $500,000 have been subscribed to the capital stock and ten per centum of the same bona fide paid thereon; but notwithstanding anything in its charter contained, the company may secure the bonds to be issued by them by a mortgage deed, creating such mortgages, charges and encumbrances upon the whole of such property, assets, rents and revenues of the company, present or future, or both, as shall be described in said deed, but such rents and revenues shall be subject, in the first instance, to the payment of working expenses of the railway; and by the said deed the company may grant to the holders of such bonds, or to the trustee or trustees named in such deed, all and every the powers and remedies granted by this charter in respect of said bonds, and all other powers and remedies not inconsistent with this charter, and may restrict the bondholders in the exercise of any powers, privilege or remedy granted by this charter, as the case may be, and all such powers, rights and remedies as shall be so contained in such mortgage deed shall be valid, binding and available to the bondholders in the manner and form as herein provided.

Instead of this, I wish the general clause of the Railway Act to apply. I refer to clause 94, which reads as follows:—

The company may secure such bonds, debentures, or other securities, by a mortgage deed creating such mortgages, charges and encumbrances upon the whole of such property assets, rents and revenues of the company, present or future or both, as are described in the said deed; but such rents and revenues shall be subject in the first payment of any penalty imposed for non-compliance with the requirements of this Act respecting returns to be made to the Minister, and next to the payment of the working expenditure of the railway.

2. By the said deed the company may grant to the holders of such bonds, debentures, or other securities, or the trustees named in such deed, all and every the powers, rights and remedies granted by this Act in respect of the said bonds, debentures or other securities, and all other powers, rights and remedies not inconsistent with this Act or may restrict the said holders in the exercise of any power, privilege or remedy granted by this Act, as the case may be, and all the powers, rights and remedies so provided for in such mortgage deed shall be valid and binding, and available to the said holders in manner and form as therein provided.

3. Every such mortgage deed shall be deposited in the office of the Secretary of State of Canada—of which deposit notice shall be given by the company in the "Canada Gazette."

Mr. MORRISON. As I understand it, it is only the first part of the amendment he has handed in that my hon. friend (Mr. Talbot) wants.

Mr. TALBOT. The rest was only in case of objection.

Mr. MORRISON. So the amendment would read "The bonds may be secured by mortgage as provided in the Railway Act."

Amendment agreed to.

Section, as amended, agreed to.

On section 4,

Mr. TALBOT. This clause was amended in the Railway Committee, and now reads as follows:—

4. The power to issue new bonds, to the amount of $12,000 per mile, shall, to the extent such power is used by the company, be in substitution pro tanto for the power to issue bonds or debentures granted to the company by its charter and the Acts amending the same; but such new bonds shall not be issued or disposed of until the question of the ownership of the shares claimed by Alphonse Charlebois in the capital stock of the company has been settled by the High Court of Justice for Ontario, or the said court has sanctioned or ordered that such bonds may be issued and the price or terms upon which such sales shall take place.

To this clause, I move the following addition:—

Provided that no new bonds shall be issued or disposed of without the sanction or order of the said court, except for the purpose of extending the construction of the said railway.

One of the principal reasons, in fact the only reason given in the Railway Committee for the passing of this Bill was that the company would be enabled by issuing new bonds and settling past claims to complete this railway, which settlement has been in litigation for eight or nine years—to complete this railway. The reason for this amendment is to ensure the construction of that railway. I have every reason to believe that a great number of creditors so far, have been settled with. On what terms the settlement has been affected I am not in a position to say, but the statement was made in the committee by a member of this House and not contradicted that a claim for $11,000 had been settled for $1,000. There are also other claims, the claim of the subcontractors, Messrs. Macdonald & Schiller, the Crossen estate and the Union Bank, amounting in all to $250,000. I am informed that these two claims have been settled for their face value without any interest, that is to say, that the interest for eight or nine years past has been set aside to obtain a settlement of these claims. There are besides claims by the Hon. F. Clemow, Mr. Allan, Mr. Devlin, and the Murray estate, for $100,000. I do not know if these three gentlemen have been settled with in the same proportion as the Murray estate has been settled with. But we have reason to believe that these settlements were effected in order to put Mr. Delap, who has a claim against the company of about $400,-

000, in the position of holder of these claims. The judgment of the court when it is given, will state in which way these claims shall be settled. But there is nothing to prevent Mr. Delap, once he has a judgment in his favour, from paying himself with the interest, and paying all these claims at their full value. The shares of the railway company will therefore be affected. There is only one creditor who has not been so far settled with, that is Mr. Charlebois; all the others have been settled with. But as I said in the beginning, the only reason given for this Bill was to secure the construction of the railway, and that is my motive for proposing the amendment, which will in effect secure the construction of the railway. After the statements which were made in the Railway Committee and by the solicitor of Mr. Delap, and the strong language which he used, I have no reason to believe that they are sincere in desiring to construct the railway. I want this committee now to stipulate that they will be forced to fulfil the promises that they made, that is, to construct the railway, and that the new debentures which will be issued shall be used for that purpose.

Mr. MORRISON. I think any one reading the discussion in the committee on this Bill, and the statements made by the solicitor and others, will not for a moment doubt the bona fides of these people in going on with the extension and completing it. To that extent I agree with my hon. friend's amendment. I think to a certain extent it is proper, but he has not gone far enough. I am now speaking as a member of this House, as he has done, as I have no personal interest in this Bill. But if my hon. friend will go a little further, I am willing to back him up. I do not wish to see Mr. Charlebois affected injuriously, but for the purpose of securing the construction of this railway, as well as for the purposes embraced in these various sections, I would ask that he have the courage to add this provision: "Provided that no new bonds should be issued or disposed of under the sanction or order of said court, except for purposes embraced in sections 1 and 5 of this Act, and for extending the construction of the railway." I would ask that that be added to his amendment. There will then be no serious objection to it.

Mr. DAVIS. This Bill affects to a large extent the settlers in the riding I have the the honour to represent, because the proposed extention of this road passes through the district of Saskatchewan. This road has been under construction, I think, for 10 or 12 years. Since the grant was handed over to these people and since they started to construct this road up to the present time, they have only constructed 50 miles. They have been continually coming back to this House for an extension of time. Last year they came to the committee and got an extension of time for a year. Again this year they have turned up and asked for another extension of time. Although they have not got it in the same way, they still have got practically another extension of time for a year. There is a quarrel going on between Mr. Charlebois, the contractor, who I believe built 50 miles of the road, and the other gentlemen who claim to have put in the capital to build that 50 miles of road, and while this dispute is going on, the settlers in that section of the country are suffering. This is one of the best franchises, one of the best charters, in the North-west Territories, and if the charter was cancelled, there would be no difficulty whatever in getting another company to start the work and undertake to complete it. The completed section is a valuable piece of road. It runs from a point near Brandon to Rapid City. It is a first class feeder of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and will always be valuable. This company would lose nothing at all, supposing the thing was dropped now, as it should be. They have got an extension of time for another year, and under the Bill as it now stands before the House, they have, I believe, up to the 1st of August of next year to complete. That gives them practically two years, and in the meantime the people out there will be suffering. I think it is time we were done with this fooling, and these people should be compelled to show their bona fides and do something. I do not think any bona fide company would have any difficulty at all in raising enough money to build ten miles of prairie road. In the country where this proposed line runs, it would not cost more than $9,000 or $10,000 a mile to build this road. If this company is a bona fide company, if they wanted to do anything at all, after keeping the people waiting so long, they could build at least 10 miles of road next year. But they claim they have to make financial arrangements, and they have got another extension. Now, as to the amendment of the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Talbot), I do not know how it is taken by the promoters of this Bill, but there is a good deal to be said in favour of this amendment. I think the intention of the hon. member for Bellechasse is to have the money which is realized from the proposed sale of these bonds, used in the further construction of that road, and that will certainly be in the interest of the people in the west. As to what is the intention of the promoters of this Bill, I do not know. I was under the impression that they would accept it, but it appears to-night they do not intend to accept it Under the circumstances, if they cannot accept this amendment, I for one will have to vote against this Bill.

Mr. RICHARDSON. If there is one question that stinks in the nostrils of the people of Manitoba it is this Great North-west Cen-

tral Railway charter. I think the original charter was granted in 1876. It was then known as the Souris and Rocky Mountain Railway, and the company incorporated under that name secured one of the most valuable land grants that any company has ever secured in this country. Believing that the country through which this road was intended to pass would be speedily settled by virtue of the construction of this railway, a great many settlers, some of the very best who have ever gone into the North-west, located along the proposed route. I think as far back as 1876 some of those settlers went in, and year after year they have waited until they have grown hoary-headed expecting this railway to be built. At first some little progress was made, but in order to deceive the settlers and the country from time to time it became necessary for this company to change its name, and it is now known as the Great North-west Central Railway Company. Out of the proposed mileage of 800 or 1,000 miles only 50 miles have up to the present time been constructed, and, as I have said, settlers have grown old waiting for the construction of the road. Parliament after Parliament has been elected, and we find this company coming before the House every year asking for an extension of time. I believe the promoters would not dare to come before this Parliament were it not for the fact that there are many changes in its membership from time to time, and they have come during three or four Parliaments asking for this extension. Members elected in the west have been instructed by their constituents to oppose this Bill with might and main, and the time has come for them to appeal to members of this House to step in and stand between the settlers and the sharks who have manipulated this charter from year to year. The interests of the settlers are paramount, and I apprehend it was the duty of a member of Parliament to protect those settlers and not to protect the men who have been feeding on this carcase. On the first section of 50 miles one of the greatest scandals that ever occurred in the province of Manitoba was revealed in connection with the construction of the road. Almost every sub-contractor on the line was never settled with, and year after year legislation was passed with a view of endeavouring to have something done to secure something for those poor contractors. The game goes on merrily and the promoters come before this Parliament almost yearly and ask for an extension of time.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. Who were the sharks ?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I have no doubt the hon. member knows who they are.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. I should like to know.

Mr. MORRISON. I make this suggestion. I think in justice to myself, my hon. friend ought to be a little more explicit, and I imagine it will turn out that the very interests the hon. gentleman is advocating are the interests to which he refers.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. I ask this question in justice to my hon. friend from Vancouver, as his name is connected with the Bill. Perhaps the hon. member for Lisgar will state who the parties are, and then we can better judge whether the Bill should be passed or not.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I can assure both the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Morrison) and the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Choquette) that they are not included in the list of sharks. In fact I have known those hon. members for some years, and I have the most profound respect for both of them. I hope as years roll on the good fellowship will continue, and they need not feel hurt because any reference is made to them because I can give both a certificate of good character. I am sure they have no malign connection with this charter. I am sorry this interruption has occurred because it has taken up my time, and I wish to lay before the committee very fully the facts in connection with this charter, in order that the indignation of members may be aroused to such an extent that they will wipe out the charter. My conviction is, and hon. members will agree with me, that if those persons who have been quarrelling over this carcase for the last eighteen or twenty years cannot agree now, the time has come to throw the carcase to them and let them fight for it until the end of time, and secure the construction of the line.

Mr. TALBOT. That is the object of the amendment.

Mr. RICHARDSON. If I believed the passage of the Bill would secure the construction of the railway, I would not offer any opposition to it. I attended a meeting of the Railway Committee the other day with instructions from the provincial secretary of the province of Manitoba to oppose the Bill. I made up my mind, after listening to the discussion of the Bill, that it would not be in the interest of the settlers to offer opposition. I came to the conclusion that if we could pass the Bill as originally presented we would get rid of half of those whom I will not call sharks but parasites, who have been handling this charter, making a good living out of it and doing nothing. I thought the Bill as originally framed would be useful in this respect, that we would get rid of these people and construct the road. To-day we find a series of amendments, apparently agreed upon between the parasites on the one side and I do not think I am going too far in saying the sharks on the other. I have therefore made up my mind that the very best thing to do under the circumstances will be to let the sharks and the parasites fight it out, and then perhaps the settlers will have a chance. They

have been waiting for the railway for eighteen or twenty years, and if we leave these promoters with the carcase the charter will lapse and some person will then go in and build the road. I repeat that if the passage of this Bill would assist the construction of the road, I would not raise my finger against its passage. I believe, however, if this Bill is passed the parties will again apply to Parliament for an extension of time. It is considered a howling farce in the North-west; the people there are simply laughing at Parliament for granting year after year this extension. Surely the settlers have some interests, and indeed their interests should be paramount. I appeal to the House and I hope within a very short time we will have an opportunity of recording our votes on this question. Inasmuch as the members representing Manitoba are a unit on this question, and inasmuch as every man from the west comes here in the interests of the settlers to urge that this farce be stopped and this railway built. I hope that if we do reach a vote it will be such a vote as will teach the parasites and sharks to keep away from Parliament in future.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Sit down.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I do not know that I have gone further than I should go in so designating these people, and I am willing to give a certificate to every hon. member in this House that I did not include any one of them among the sharks and parasites. But, Sir, we feel very keenly on this point in the west, and I regret that gentlemen will keep interrupting me in this way, because I want to reach a conclusion within a reasonable time, and if the interruptions continue we will not be able to secure a vote as we all wish. If hon. gentlemen keep quiet, I shall expose, as it should be exposed, the iniquity connected with the manipulation of this charter for years.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Now, Sir, after these preliminary remarks, I will come back to where the railroad started. That country is a very interesting country. You pass over a rolling prairie and then you glide out on to a plateau, and I am told that it is one of the best wheat-producing areas in the entire province of Manitoba.

Mr. SPROULE. I rise to a point of order. Mr. Chairman, I ask your ruling, if the hon. gentleman is not compelled to confine himself to the clause under discussion.

Mr. MACDONELL (Selkirk). The hon. gentleman (Mr. Richardson) is in order.

Mr. SPROULE. I want the Chairman's ruling.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Is the point of order decided, because it is deeply to be regretted that more time is wasted with it. I want to get to the meat of this question.

Some hon. MEMBERS. "Go on," "sit down."

Mr. RICHARDSON. I just feel like saying——

Mr. FOSTER. Might I suggest to the hon. member (Mr. Richardson) that he should concentrate his thoughts as much as possible and get through. There are some very important Bills after this, and I am afraid that at this time of the night it would be impossible to reach these other Bills unless this one is disposed of. I trust my hon. friend will get down to the "meat" of the question, as he says.

Mr. MORRISON. I am willing the hon. gentleman (Mr. Richardson) should postpone his remarks until next sitting in order to get some of the other Bills through.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Will you go on with the other Bills if I take my seat.

Mr. MORRISON. I have no objection.

Mr. RICHARDSON. If I knew exactly the best way to meet the views of hon. gentlemen I would be glad to do so.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order; sit down.

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

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. RICHARDSON. It seems to me I have the floor.

Mr. HENDERSON. I ask that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Richardson) should sit down until I make my point of order. My point of order is that the hon. member (Mr. Richardson) has no right to stand up and occupy the time of the House without saying something.

Mr. RICHARDSON I protest against the insinuation that I have been talking and not saying something. I have said something very material to this point, and if I had not been interrupted I was about to tell a funny story in order to illustrate my point.

Some hon. MEMBERS. You could not.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I regret these interruptions, but I have not forgotten the story and am quite willing to tell it. When I noticed that the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Talbot) seemed to have come to an understanding with the other side. I felt that it was time that the settlers of Manitoba should take a hand in this discussion.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. Mr. Chairman, there is a Bill next to this one which might perhaps pass.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. MACDONELL (Selkirk). I move that the committee rise.

Some hon. MEMBERS. The time has expired.

Mr. WALLACE. I do not think in my experience that I have ever seen such a spectacle as we have seen to-night——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Time.

Mr. SPEAKER. The time for the consideration for private Bills having lapsed, the House will resume in Committee of the Whole on the Manitoba resolutions.

MANITOBA SCHOOL FUND.

The House again resolved itself into committee on resolution respecting the Manitoba school fund.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. QUINN. At six o'clock, Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Finance had spoken on this question for the second time, and in answer to the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Borden) he said that even if this fund be looked upon as a trust, yet under ordinary rules a trust could be dissolved by the consent of the parties who were the beneficiaries of that trust. I quite agree with the Minister of Finance in that. The statement made by the member for Halifax was that in an ordinary case it would be necessary to get the consent of the party who made the trust, the consent of the trustee himself, and the consent of the beneficiary before the trust could be dissolved, and any other disposition made of the money. The Minister of Finance stated that in this instance the consent of the parties had been obtained. Well, Sir, I would ask the Minister what provision had been made to obtain the consent of the minority in Manitoba to this dissolution of that educational trust. I hold that until the consent of the minority of Manitoba is obtained, it will be an injustice to that minority to dissolve this trust in any way, or to give into the hands of the Government of Manitoba any portion of the capital sum held in trust by this Government.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. I would like to know from the hon. Prime Minister whether the legislature of Manitoba has made a request to have that trust fund transferred to the Government or province of Manitoba?

The PRIME MINISTER. I am not aware that the legislature of Manitoba has directly made the request, but the legislature of Manitoba has been made aware of the request made by the Government of Manitoba, and, I understand, has assented, at least by its silence.

Resolution reported, read the second time, and concurred in.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 168) respecting the Manitoba School Fund.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

PRIVATE BILLS.

Mr. BELCOURT. In view of the lateness of the session, and the possibility that the Bills on the Order paper which have been reported with amendments from the Senate may not be reached again, and as these Bills are non-contentious Bills, I move, with the unanimous consent of the House, that these amendments be now concurred in by the House.

Mr. SPROULE. I object entirely to that, because it is quite evident that it was prearranged to talk out the other Bill so as to reach these. We must follow the order of the paper.

Mr. SPEAKER. The motion cannot be made, as objection has been taken.

MANITOBA DEBT ACCOUNT.

The resolutions respecting the province of Manitoba Debt Account were reported.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved the second reading of resolutions. He said: When the resolutions were in committee, the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Haggart) asked a question in regard to which I promised to obtain the information before the next stage of the measure was taken. My hon. friend said that it was important to know at what time this sum for the Manitoba buildings was first charged against the provincial debt account. If it was charged against the account prior to the Act of 1885, he would hold that it was covered by that Act; but if it was charged subsequently, he felt that it would be a fair matter to be adjusted in the way we proposed.

Mr. FOSTER. No, a fair matter for consideration.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. member went beyond that, but I do not wish to dwell on that point. The Act was passed in 1885, but there was a question of interpretation, which was not determined until the following session. That question was, whether the population of 125,000, which was assumed and fixed by the Act of 1885, should apply to the per capita allowance originally placed to the credit of Manitoba, being $27 per head, or whether it should apply to the large figure of $32 per head, as fix-

ed by later legislation. In consequence of the doubt on that point, the matter remained open until the session of 1886, when a declaratory statute was passed to the effect that the calculation should be made at the higher rate of $32 per head, applied to the population of 125,000. Immediately after the passage of that Act a statement of account was made up and sent to the Government of Manitoba. In that statement of account this item was charged for the first time against the province of Manitoba, and immediately afterwards the province of Manitoba entered its protest.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood the Minister to say that the protest was entered on 6th April, 1887.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think I am correct in stating that it was made immediately after the rendering of the account. However, I am answering the question of the hon. member for Lanark, that the charge was first made in the accounts of the Finance Department in the year 1886, and consequently was made a year after the passing of the Act of 1885.

Mr. HAGGART. Would the hon. gentleman further state whether the province got the statement before the passage of its Act accepting it? That Act was passed in 1886, more than a year afterwards.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I understand that the Manitoba Act accepting the statement was passed in 1886, and the account was rendered later in the same year.

Motion agreed to, resolution read the second time, and concurred in.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 169) respecting the province of Manitoba Debt Account.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

THE ELECTORAL FRANCHISE ACT.

Amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 16) to amend the Electoral Franchise Act, and to further amend the Dominion Elections Act were taken into consideration.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The first amendment provides that on page 1, line 27, after the word "list," the words, "or in which a poll may be held," shall be inserted. I have no objection to that amendment, although I think it is unnecessary, and I move that it be concurred in.

Amendment concurred in.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The second amendment provides that on page 2, line 5, paragraph "c," be left out, and in lieu thereof the paragraph "c," framed by the Senate, be inserted. This provides for the substitution in the provinces of Manitoba, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick of the Dominion lists for provincial lists. That amendment I cannot accept, and I therefore beg to move:

That the amendments made by the Honourable the Senate to sections 5, 6, 10, 21a, 23, 26a, 26b, 26c, and 27 of Bill 16: "An Act to amend the Electoral Franchise Act and to further amend the Dominion Elections Act," be disagreed to for the following reasons:—

Because the amendment made by the Honourable the Senate to the Bill, excepting from its operation the province of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Manitoba, and providing for a special revision of the voters' lists in those provinces for elections to this House, is inconsistent with and subversive of the general principle of the Bill.

That the procedure proposed by the Honourable the Senate for securing the revision of such lists, under the authority of this Parliament, is wholly inadequate, and cannot be rendered effective without creating complicated and costly machinery incompatible with the object of the Bill.

That the amendment, therefore, in effect provides for the continuation in the provinces named of the present unwieldy and expensive system of creating special voters' lists for Dominion elections.

That the passage of the amendment by the Senate after its rejection by the House of Commons is inconsistent with the undoubted right and privilege of this House to determine the principles of the franchise under which its members are elected, and is the more unwarranted in that the country has emphatically pronounced in favour of the principle of the Bill.

Mr. FOSTER. There is a little difficulty that I find in passing upon this at the moment. The reasons that are given are somewhat long and complicated. I just rise to suggest to my hon. friend that he should not force through these amendments now, but let them be printed in the Votes and Proceedings as notices of motion, and we will take them up in the morning. It is rather an important matter, and I think it would probably facilitate business and be more satisfactory if this opportunity were given members to study the reasons stated by the hon. Solicitor General. If these reasons are good, they will have all the more weight for being studied.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The subject is not new.

Mr. FOSTER. The reasons are.

The PRIME MINISTER. I do not think the reasons are new at all. They simply embody well known principles, which have been debated in this House over and over again, but if it be more convenient for my hon. friend, I think we might defer to his wishes.

Mr. FOSTER. You will not lose any time by doing so.

Mr. SPEAKER. This will stand as a notice of motion for to-morrow.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The next amendment is to line 35, page 2, and it provides for the insertion of the following words :—"But nothing herein shall enable any person to vote by schedule or otherwise than by appearing personally." The amendment is absolutely unnecessary and useless, but still we do not think it necessary to make any special objection to it. I move therefore that it be concurred in.

Amendment concurred in.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The next amendment is to the 39th line of page 2, and provides for the leaving out from "election" to (a), and the insertion of "or from having his name on the list merely by reason of any provision of the provincial law disqualifying."

I object to that for the reasons already given, and move that it be not concurred in.

Mr. SPEAKER. That will stand as a notice of motion.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The next, or fifth, amendment of the Senate, is the chief difficulty. It provides that on page 6, line 23, after the word "elections," a clause be inserted, framed by the Senate, and described as clause "a" That is the chief amendment, and the other objections I took are in consequence of this amendment. I refuse to accept it, for the reasons I have given with reference to the second amendment, and move that it be not concurred in.

Mr. SPEAKER. That will stand as a notice of motion.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The next amendment, which provides that on page 7, line 17, after the "2." clause 18a be inserted. I shall not object to that amendment, and therefore move that it be now concurred in.

Amendment concurred in.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The amendments, beginning with page 8, line 17, down to page 9, line 12, inclusive, comprising clause 21a, clause 26a, clause 26b, clause 26c, clause 27a, cannot be accepted for the reasons I have already mentioned, and I therefore move that they be not concurred in.

Mr. SPEAKER. The amendments on page 8, line 17, down to page 9, line 12, inclusive, all stand for the same reasons as the second amendment.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The last amendment of the Senate, that to page 9, line 25, providing that after the word "cents." clause 30a, framed by the Senate, be added. I have no objection, and therefore move that it be concurred in.

Amendment concurred in.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL moved that the consideration of the remaining amendments which have not been concurred in, be postponed until the next sitting of the House.

Motion agreed to.

FISHERIES AMENDMENT ACT—SAWDUST IN RIVERS.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies) moved second reading of Bill (No. 166) in further amendment of the Fisheries Act. He said: This is the Bill I explained the other day, to extend the time within which the sawdust is permitted to be deposited in certain rivers.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, considered in committee, reported and read the third time, and passed.

COMPANIES ACT AMENDMENT.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved second reading of Bill (No. 165—from the Senate—to amend the Companies Act. He said: This Bill provides that British and foreign mining companies may obtain licenses to work in the Yukon district on applying to the Secretary of State, filing a copy of their charter and appointing an agent upon whom processes may be served.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and the House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 2,

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Reference is made to the Yukon district. I move that in each case it be made "Yukon district and North-west Territories," as mining operations are carried on in the North-west Territories as well as in the Yukon district.

Amendment agreed to.

Bill, as amended, reported and read the third time and passed.

SUPPLY—MANITOBA AND NORTH-WESTERN RAILWAY.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. DAVIS. Before you leave the Chair, I wish to take up but a very few minutes in bringing before the House a matter of great importance to my constituents, I refer to the charter granted to the Manitoba and North-western Railway. In order to make the facts plain to the House, I shall have to give some details and go into the history of the transactions of this company. The Manitoba and North-western Company were first chartered by the province of Manitoba,

and afterwards by this House. They received a charter from this House away back in 1883 or 1884, to build a road from Portage la Prairie, in the province of Manitoba, to Prince Albert on the Saskatchewan River, in my riding. Under that charter they were to build 50 miles in each and every year until that road was extended to the Saskatchewan. Now, Mr. Speaker, on the strength of this agreement entered into between these contractors and the Dominion Government that 50 miles a year should be built, a great many people, hundreds of people in fact, went into that country and settled, believing that the Government were sincere, that the promoters of the road were sincere, that the terms of this charter would be carried out, and that in due time the road would be built to the banks of the Saskatchewan. But what was their surprise when they found that in 1893 the promoters came back to this House and received another charter under which all the previous charters were cancelled. That charter is contained in the Act 56 Vic., chapter 52, which is entitled: An Act to consolidate the Acts relating to the Manitoba and North-western Railway Company of Canada. Under this Act the old clause providing that 50 miles of road should be built each year, was struck out, and a new clause inserted under which the company were compelled to build 20 miles of road in each and every year until it reached the Saskatchewan River. Now, Sir, I will just read subsection 3 of section 9 of this Act:

> The company shall construct and complete to the satisfaction of the Governor in Council, not less than 20 miles of railway on or before the 31st day of December in each calendar year after the year 1893, otherwise their powers under this section shall cease as regards so much of the said line of railway as is not completed by the said date in each calendar year.

In 1894, or the year afterwards, this company came back to Parliament. They were not satisfied with the charter they received the year previously under which they were allowed to complete 20 miles instead of 50. The new Act was 57 and 58 Vic., chapter 79, an Act respecting the Manitoba and North-western Railway Company:

> Subsection 3 of section 9 of the Manitoba and North-western Railway Company's Act, 1893, is repealed and the following substituted therefor:
>
> The work on the extensions authorized by this section shall be completed within nine years from the passing of this Act, and the company shall complete during the year 1895, and also during each calendar year thereafter, such a portion of its railway not exceeding 20 miles as is from time to time prescribed by the Governor in Council, otherwise the company's powers under this section shall cease as regards so much of said extensions as then remains uncompleted.

You will see under this last Act the company were supposed to build 20 miles of road in 1896, 20 in 1897, and 20 in 1898; well, I am able to say of my personal knowledge that this company has not built any in 1896, nor in 1897, nor do they intend, I believe, to build any more. Still they are holding this charter, and keeping other people from going in and taking up the work they have begun. I think this Government should take the matter into consideration. Of course it was the late Government that granted the charter, but Governments never lie, and I think it is the duty of this Government to take some action to annul the charter. This matter has been brought to the attention of this House time and again, not only by the representative of the district, but by memorials from the North-west Assembly, and also, I think, by reports of the Lieutenant-Governor of the North-west Territories, also by resolutions passed by agricultural societies and boards of trade in that portion of the country. In fact all organized bodies have petitioned this House to take some action in this matter, either to compel these people to go on and build the road, or to cancel the charter, but neither one nor the other has been done. Let me point out the fact that in granting a charter to railway corporations like this, and giving them the right to build just as far as they please, and then to stop and build no more, but at the same time allowing them to draw their land grant, is a pernicious system that has injured settlement in the North-west Territories to a great extent. Speaking of this land grant, the arrangement between the Government and the railroad contractors, as with all other corporations that build roads in the North-west, is worthy of notice from the fact that in order to escape payment of taxes on the lands which they get from the Government by way of subsidy, the companies leave those lands in the hands of the Government, though they have in every case hypothecated those lands as security for money which has been advanced to them for the construction of the road. This is the modus operandi. The purchaser of a parcel of land pays his money to the contractors or to the railway company; the company applies to the Government asking them to send the patent direct to the purchaser. I will cite one case in point. Mr. McMurray, a gentleman up there, purchased a parcel of land some five years ago from the Manitoba and North-western Railway Company, and paid for the same to the company. The company applied to the Government in the usual way to grant a patent of the land, but as the company had hypothecated the lands, the Government could not, I believe, grant the patent. Mr. McMurray is consequently out of his money, and he has not up to the present time, I believe, received a patent for his land, although he paid his money some five years ago. Now, the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Robertson) the other day, in dressing down the Canadian Pacific Railway officials called them murderers and dishonest men. If he were in the House to-night, I wonder

what he would think of this transaction. Here is a railway corporation that sells land and receives the money, knowing all the time that it has mortagaged those lands and that a deed cannot be given to the man who pays the money, and this man has no redress. I think this matter should be taken into consideration by the Government. There is no doubt at all that this railway corporation has an interest in the land, it must have an interest in the land before it can mortgage it in order to raise money. I believe to all intents and purposes the railway corporations own these lands, because they mortgage them for the purpose of raising money; and if they are able to mortgage them they must have some interest and right to them, and, therefore, they should be subject to taxation. It is necessary that these railway corporations should bear a share of the burdens just as much as the settlers, more especially as the labour of the settlers increases the value of the company's lands, for which they are paying nothing. I wish to call the attention of the Government to the fact that this charter has lapsed, and the company should be notified, so that other parties who wish to do so can apply and obtain a charter to build over that route. I believe there is a projected railway running very nearly in the same direction, and it is probably the intention of the parties to seek a charter next year; and in the interests of the settlers this old charter should be wiped out, so that the settlers may obtain relief and some rapid means of communication for getting their produce to market.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I should like to bring a matter to the attention of the Government. I would have brought it to the attention of the Minister of Railways, if he had been present, but in his absence, I would like to mention to the right hon. gentleman who leads the Government. There is an item in the Supplementary Estimates, which we have not yet reached, of $75,000 for the purpose of building or assisting in building an elevator at Halifax, and the right hon. gentleman may perhaps be aware that the City Council of Halifax, on 31st May last, passed a resolution appropriating $50,000 for the purpose of assisting in building that elevator. So there will be available for that purpose $125,000, which it is thought will build an elevator adequate to the requirements of the port. I have received a letter from the mayor of the city, written in behalf of the City Council and also in behalf of the commercial committee of the City Council and Board of Trade, in which he says it is very desirable to proceed with the work at once, and for that purpose to employ an engineer to select a suitable site. The City Council propose to employ at once an expert engineer to come to Halifax for the purpose of advising as to the selection of that site, and they desire to know whether the Government would instruct their engineer to proceed there also for the purpose of advising and consulting with this expert engineer that the City Council intend to employ, or whether the Government would suggest some other alternative proposition, because they desire, as far as possible, to meet the views of the Government and the Government engineer in this matter. As it is very desirable that the elevator should be completed before the close of navigation, or by the time that navigation closes on the St. Lawrence, they wish me to bring the matter to the attention of the Government, as my colleague, Mr. Russell, has been unavoidably detained for a day longer than he anticipated. I hope the matter will receive the attention of the Government.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). I am sure the House will have learned with pleasure that the citizens of Halifax, through the City Council, have shown enough interest to make an appropriation of their own funds, so far as they can do so, of $50,000 to supplement the amount granted in the Supplementary Estimates for an elevator at that port. The hon. gentleman is aware that the Supplementary Estimates have not yet been passed, and therefore we have no power to make any contract or any arrangement by virtue of that proposed appropriation. The theory of the appropriation was that it would be better to provide a moderate sum and build a moderate size elevator rather than to begin by indulging in a large expenditure, but if the city of Halifax feels sufficiently interested to add to the sum, I am quite sure the Department of Railways will offer no opposition to the course pursued. It may be well, however, to understand that while the city of Halifax may through its City Council, vote a certain appropriation, it cannot be available until an Act of the legislature has been passed authorizing payment of the sum.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am sure there will be no difficulty in that regard.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No doubt the wishes of the City Council will be responded to by the legislature. I shall be glad to bring the matter to the notice of the Minister of Railways, and as representing the province and as a resident of Halifax, I am most anxious to see the suggestion of my hon. friend carried out, and the wishes of the citizens in that respect put into effect at the earliest possible moment.

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

(In the Committee.)

Auditor General's Office—
Additional amount for expenses of examining accounts of returning officers under the Plebiscite Bill, including

$650 to be paid to D. McLennan, a graduate of Toronto University, notwithstanding the provisions of the Civil Service Act, under which he is entitled to receive only $430..... $1,000

Mr. HAGGART. I do not understand the wording of the item. Is $650 proposed to be given in addition to $450 ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No. This gentleman is now in the employ of the Auditor General as a temporary clerk ; he is a man of special ability, and the Auditor General wishes to retain his services for the year. At the present time he is receiving only $450 and it is proposed to give $650.

Customs Department—
Further amount required for clerical and other assistance, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act to the contrary $1,750

Mr. FOSTER. I ask the Government whether they are going to pay any attention to the Civil Service Act or not. Nearly every item on the first page of the Supplementary Estimates finishes up with the words "Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Civil Service Act." Surely the hon. gentleman can employ clerks who do not come under the Act. Who is the hon. gentleman looking after now ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Since the main estimates were laid on the Table one of the first class clerks has asked to be superannuated and as his health has entirely failed it will be absolutely necessary to do so. It is my intention when concurrence is asked on the main estimates. to move to reduce the total amount by $1,750. My intention is to get two officers. because another gentleman in the department has also tendered his resignation and unfortunately his health is in such a state that no other course can be followed but to accept. He is a second class clerk. The young man acting as my private secretary will become a second class clerk, and it is my intention to get two officers in this way. As the hon. gentleman knows there are no third class clerks now, and I could not manage it in any other way. but in this way I will be able to do it. There will be no extra expense to the department and we will be in a better position than we were in before in reference to the work.

Mr. FOSTER. Does not the Minister see he is going directly against the law we have passed to get rid of the extravagance of third-class clerkships. The law says there shall be no more third-class clerks appointed, and my hon. friend breaks the spirit of the law by appending "notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act to the contrary." He can gets two clerks at $400 each under the law, if he has not favourites he wants to get in.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. If that be so it is a commentary on the statutory increases. If a clerk who has been getting $1,750 resigns and I can get a clerk to do this work for $350 or $400, there must have been a great deal too much paid before.

Mr. FOSTER. I have been telling my hon. friend that, and therefore third-class clerks were abolished.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. One of the gentlemen to be appointed is to do the work of this $1,750 man.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not care if he is to do the work of three or four $1,750 men. You are going directly against the law.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The hon. gentleman knows that under the civil service I could not take in a clerk except at $1,100.

Mr. FOSTER. You can take in two or three at $400. You are not obliged to take in a man at $1,100. When the third-class clerkships were abolished it was never intended that every new appointee should commence at $1,100, but that there should be writers commencing at $350 or $400, and going up to $600.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I really did not suppose there would be the slightest objection to this proposal. This gentleman has applied for superannuation, and unfortunately it will have to be granted to him, and another second-class clerk is also in that position. I propose to drop the estimate for one when we come to concurrence, and I put in "notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act to the contrary" because if I did not I would have appointed a second class clerk at $1,100.

Mr. FOSTER. Not necessarily.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I propose to get two men for this salary, and perhaps it will not take even that. Owing to the failing health of the gentlemen who are seeking to retire, the department will then be better equipped, and the expense will not be increased in the least. If I were taking my full main estimate and asking for this also, I could understand the hon. gentleman objecting, but I did not anticipate any objection to this.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend evidently does not wish to see the point. The legislation was introduced to give the department a chance of making these savings when such occasions occur, but the Minister chooses to keep to the old and expensive system.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Why does the hon. gentlman say that, when I can get two officers for one. Does he ask me to get an officer at $300 or $400 a year who could perform the duty of a first-class clerk receiving $1,750 ?

Mr. FOSTER. You could do it easily enough. If my hon. friend wishes to make

the Civil Service Act non-effective he is doing it rapidly, but it is his own responsibility.

Mr. BRITTON. I take this opportunity of calling to the attention of the Minister of Customs the case of Mr. Wm. Neish, who was appointed in 1877, under the Government of the Hon. Alex. Mackenzie. Mr. Neish, I understand, is an excellent officer in every way, but he has been put aside and persons have been appointed from outside over his head, as well as persons promoted in the office above him. He is there to-day at no higher salary than at first, unless possibly a statutory increase of $50 for a couple of years. It is right and due to this officer, who I understand is a first-class official in every way, and considered so by his superiors in the department, that he should receive promotion. I think it well in this public way to call attention to his case and to ask the favourable consideration of the Minister to it.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I will be pleased to consider the case, but I suppose the hon. gentleman (Mr. Britton) knows how many requests there are of this kind.

Mr. BRITTON. This is an exceptional case.

Department of the Geological Survey—	
To provide for increases of $50 each for Messrs. Ami, Fletcher and Ellis, $250 to R. G. McConnell, and $200 to A. P. Lowe, technical officers of the Geological Survey	$600
To provide for increase in the salary of James White, geographer, notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Civil Service Act.....	100

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). I wish to give the recommendation of the Director of the Geological Survey in connection with these increases:

Mr. McConnell is a graduate in Arts, with first rank honours in science, McGill University. First employed in May, 1879, and permanently employed since May, 1881. In 1881 and 1882 he acted as assistant to Dr. Dawson on explorations in the North-west Territories. Since 1883 he has been in charge of a field party on geological work in the Cypress Hills, Rocky Mountains, Mackenzie and Yukon (wintering at Fort Providence in 1888), Athabasca and Peace Rivers, Finlay River, and since 1894 in West Kootenay district, British Columbia. His work, reports and maps have been made with great care and efficiency.

Mr. FOSTER. What does Mr. McConnell get now?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. $1,850.

Mr. FOSTER. And you propose to give him an increase of $250?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. So far as I am concerned, I think Mr. McConnell is worth it, and we will dispense with his history so as to make progress.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I want to explain that Mr. Ells and Mr. Fletcher were above Mr. McConnell in the service, and the increase of Mr. McConnell's salary by $250 will place him above Mr. Ells and Mr. Fletcher, who are his seniors in the service, and who are also efficient officers. I am, therefore, asking for $50 each for these two gentlemen to place them upon an equality with Mr. McConnell, and I think the House will consider that fair. I may say that Mr. McConnell refused a salary of $5,000 in order that he might remain in the service of this Government at $2,100. As to Mr. Lowe, the Director says:

Mr. Lowe is a science graduate of McGill University. First employed in 1881, and permanently employed since 1882. In 1886 he was in charge of the Mistassini expedition, and was promoted from $850 to $1,100 for services in connection with that work. Since 1882, Mr. Lowe has been chiefly engaged in the exploration of the Labrador peninsula. His exploratory work and reports have been of the first class, and he is a very efficient officer It is recommended that his salary should be increased from $1,600 to $1,800.

As to Mr. White, the director says:

Mr. White is a graduate of the Royal Military College, Kingston, and has been continually employed on the Geological Survey since 1884. He has had considerable experience in field work, and was appointed to the permanent staff in 1894, as chief draughtsman and geographer, vice the late Scott Barlow. In this capacity Mr. White has ever since done most efficient service, taking entire charge of the work of draughting and compiling maps, &c. The amount and responsibility of such work has of late greatly increased, and it is recommended that Mr. White's salary be raised from $1,500 to $1,600.

Mr. McALISTER. I understand that there is a vacancy in the Geological Department, and I would ask the Minister if it is the intention of the Government to promote those on the staff to fill vacancies that occur?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I cannot say that I have come to any conclusion in regard to that. I have several times consulted with the director, who is instructed to obtain information as to persons who would be competent to fill positions. The position at present vacant is one requiring special technical qualifications --that of lithologist. It is probable that if the director finds a man who is suitable, we may appoint one from the outside, but I cannot say positively at the present moment.

Mr. BELCOURT. Before this item passes, I want to take up the time of the committee for a few moments on the subject of the Geological Museum. During the last session I called the attention of the House to the matter, which I then stated and which I still believe to be of very great importance. I would not trespass on the time

and the patience of the members of the committee in repeating the remarks I made at that time were it not that I have in my hand a document which emphasizes in a very peculiar way the remarks I then made. I regret that I was not in the House yesterday when this matter came up. During last session I called the attention of the House and of the Government to the very great value of the collections gathered on Sussex Street in that old dilapidated building called by the name of the Geological Museum. I cited to the House statements of Canadian and foreign scientists, and extracts from the proceedings of the Royal Society of Canada and from various high authorities, dilating upon the very great importance of those collections, and upon the very imminent danger of their destruction by fire in that building. I was very much pleased that the remarks which I then made received such encouragement from the Prime Minister and other members of the House, and that those remarks were apparently received by the leader of the Opposition and hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House generally, with marked approval. I was glad also to notice that immediately after the session, the Government, realizing its duty in the premises, appointed a commission for the purpose of investigating the condition of this particular building, and also the buildings at Ottawa generally. This commission was composed of the Auditor General, the Deputy Minister of Finance, and the Under Secretary of State. These gentlemen set about their work immediately, and carried on a most careful and diligent inquiry into the condition of the various public buildings at Ottawa, and I have their report in my hand. Although it has been printed, I do not think it has yet come to the attention of any member of the House. At all events, I fancy that very few members have seen it, and I have no doubt that the members of the committee will thank me for calling their attention to it, and will be pleased to hear some extracts from this very interesting and important report. I have examined the report very carefully, I have read it from beginning to end, and I am glad to take the opportunity afforded me as a member of this House to express the thanks we owe to the three gentlemen who so laboriously, diligently and efficiently performed the duty imposed upon them in investigating the public buildings at Ottawa. The report is very elaborate and very carefully prepared, and, after reading it, one cannot help being struck with the great danger from fire to which the buildings at Ottawa are exposed, more particularly the Geological Museum. I will, with the permission of the House, read a few extracts from this report, and I hope the Government will take particular notice of these extracts, and carry further the good work they have already begun. Now that the state of affairs disclosed by this report is under their eyes, and has been brought to the attention of the House and the country, I have no doubt the Government will deem it their duty, at all events next session, to put in the Estimates a sum which will be sufficient to provide a National Museum at Ottawa. Now, I want to read from pages 23 and 24 some remarks made by the commissioners:

Messrs. Courtney, McDougall and Pope visited the Geological Survey this afternoon, and in company with Dr. Geo. M. Dawson, the deputy head, made an examination of the department. Almost everything in this department is of value. Putting aside the Museum, as not coming within the scope of their inquiries, the attention of the commissioners was drawn to a very large number of original manuscripts, maps, plans, plots of survey and field-books, going back more than half a century. In one room are to be found plans of value to the number of 16,000, kept in wooden drawers. The larger correspondence of the department, which is equally insecure, contains many communications from distinguished geologists and scientific men of repute. This correspondence, which goes back to 1878, the commissioners regard as peculiarly interesting and valuable.

Later on, the commissioners say:

The paramount idea was forced upon the commissioners during this visit is the ever-present risk and almost certain danger of fire. Not only is there an entire absence of concrete floors, but the building appears to be a mere shell, its numerous wooden partitions and receptacles for documents adding to its insecurity. This building is joined to a collection of small shops and sheds, and in the event of fire occurring in any of these could hardly avoid sharing in the common ruin. Certain of the scientific work of the department calls for the use of small furnaces, while in more than one room in the basement are to be observed coal stoves, necessitated by the dampness of the place. Pipes for these stoves, in one case at any rate, pass through wooden partitions. Besides this, there is no system of water in the building, in fact no water at all beyond one small tap, which is over a sink. There is no hose, no hydrant—in fact, no precaution whatever against fire.

What has been said with regard to the danger from fire to which the documents are exposed applies with equal force to the Museum, where there are many types which could never be replaced. The library, on the first floor, running inwards of 11,000 books, most of them technical and scientific works, running in series. These are crowded into dark corners difficult of access, and equally exposed to the constant danger of fire, which threatens the whole building. In the herbarium adjoining are 60,000 sheets containing specimens of flora of Canada. These are kept in wooden cabinets dispersed through passages, there being not sufficient room for them in the narrow space allotted to Professor Macoun.

In conclusion, the commissioners were profoundly impressed by the urgent necessity for the adoption of prompt and effective measures to minimize the risk of fire to which the valuable contents of this department are constantly exposed, and also by the inadequacy of space and of general facilities necessary to the proper conduct of this highly important service.

Further on the report then says:

Under the system proposed by the undersigned, in addition to the paramount advantage of safe custody, the records would be disposed in a regular order, the plan of arrangement would be uniform, the number of officers would be reduced to the lowest point, and public convenience and economy would be equally consulted. Without such a building the records must remain as they are until another and more disastrous conflagration shall render further consideration of the subject unnecessary.

I intended to read further extracts, but I fear that owing to the very near end of the session I would not have the patient hearing which this very important subject deserves, and shall not now trouble the committee at greater length. I want to call particular attention to the last words which I quoted from this report. "The records must remain as they are until another and more disastrous conflagration renders further consideration of the subject unnecessary." I hope that next session, when the estimates come down, the Government will provide for the immediate construction of a national museum at Ottawa. I appreciate what the Government has done so far by the appointment of this commission who, by the report they have made, have called the attention of the country to this matter, and I am satisfied that when this report is circulated, public opinion will demand that a building such as the commissioners suggest be constructed for the preservation of the very valuable collections now in the old building on Sussex Street and elsewhere. I hope that the Government will act on this report, and submit to the House next session a substantial estimate for the erection of such a building.

Department of Marine and Fisheries—To provide for the salary of W. J. Quinn and Lucien Bance, extra clerks, $600 each, notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Civil Service Act..... $1,200

Mr. FOSTER. Why is the law broken here?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Because Mr. Quinn, who was appointed by my predecessors in 1896, and who has turned out an exceptionally able man in the accountant branch, will not remain at his present salary of $455, and we have either to increase his salary or let him go, and the accountant says he cannot supply his place. Mr. Bance is also very efficient and his knowledge of French is exceedingly useful in the department.

Mr. ELLIS. I would like to draw the attention of the hon. Minister to a matter to which I called his attention last year, and in which he made me a promise. I refer to the cemetery of St. John, belonging to the marine hospital. It is in a condition requiring the attention of some person. The Government should fall in with the proposition of the trustees of the cemetery and make some provision for the care of the lot.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I did make a promise last year and communicated with the trustee who has charge of the ground. He made a proposition that on the payment of $1,000, the committee would take charge permanently of the lot. Local legislation was passed constituting a board of trustees who have charge of the cemetery, and the part of the cemetery which belongs to the Marine and Fisheries Department is a great eyesore to the city. I think their claim to a certain sum for the care of that part of the cemetery is a good one.

Mr. FOSTER. Will they take care of it for ever for $1,000?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Then close with them, by all means, or you will be appointing a man at $600 a year to take charge of it.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. If I could have persuaded my colleagues, I would have had it in this year's estimates, but next year will bring down a vote.

Department of Militia and Defence—To provide for one messenger, A. E. Watterson $360

Mr. FOSTER. Is this an extra messenger?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). No, a year ago it was intended in the militia branch to substitute a man in uniform for the messenger who was doing the work there. That plan was not carried out. The same messenger was kept on last year and paid out of contingency. Now we are simply putting the vote back where it was two years ago.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend is not putting his messengers in buttons, is he?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. We are not doing it, but the General recommended last year that the system adopted in England in the military branch be adopted here and the men be taken from the permanent force. That was not carried into effect, and now the vote is put back.

Post Office Department—

To provide for an increase of salary of $50 each, to two chief clerks, E. P. Stanton and W. J. Johnstone	$ 100
To provide for an increase of salary of $50 each, to eight third-class clerks..	400
Further amount required for printing and stationery	3,000

Mr. FOSTER. How many statutory increases has the Postmaster General made now?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). No statutory increases; we have recognized the merits of a number of officers

I could not say from memory how many, except in the case of those under $450 whom we have increased all around I think by $30. Mr. Stanton is the accountant of the stamp branch and a very worthy officer. His salary has been $1,850, this makes it $1,900. Mr. Johnstone is the head of the accountant's branch. His salary has been only $1,800 and this will raise it to $1,850.

Office of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada—	
To provide for clerical and other assistance, notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Civil Service Act...	$1,000
To Henry Potter, messenger, notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Civil Service Act.....	360
	$1,360

Mr. FOSTER. Here are two bad breaks.

The PRIME MINISTER. No, only one. If there are two my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) is responsible for one. This is the case of Henry Potter.

Mr. FOSTER. We will pass that. How about the other?

The PRIME MINISTER. I cannot give information about that at the moment.

Mr. FOSTER. That is usually the case, we shall have to pass this too.

Department of the Queen's Printer—	
To increase salary of J. O. Patenaude, third-class clerk, anything in the Civil Service Act notwithstanding	$150 00
P. Mungovan, for four months, at the rate of $400 a year, anything in the Civil Service Act notwithstanding...	133 33
	$283 33

Mr. FOSTER. Why these two?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Unless my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) is prepared to pass this as on the last terms, I shall be compelled to allow it to stand. The Secretary of State has furnished me with a memorandum, but it does not give the salaries paid to these gentlemen. Better let it stand, unless the hon. gentleman will take the information on concurrence.

Mr. CHAIRMAN (Mr. Campbell). Carried.

Mr. FOSTER. We must have the information.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Very well—on concurrence.

Department of Trade and Commerce—	
For clerical assistance, viz.:—Additional to W. A. Warne, $140, and Miss A. C. Kennedy, $70, notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Civil Service Act	$210

Mr. FOSTER. Now, this is intolerable, coming from the source it does.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). The explanation is simple. Both these parties' salaries were very small—about $400 a piece and both have been two years or more in the department. They are not appointees of mine, but of my predecessor. They have been doing very particularly good work, and have been recommended to me as well worth at least $600.

Mr. FOSTER. By the way, has my hon. friend (Sir Richard Cartwright) come to the conclusion that this department is unnecessary, and will he promise to abolish it?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I have observed that it might be of use as a department of foreign affairs.

Mr. FOSTER. I think that a gentleman by the name of Sheppard considers it very useful.

Sundry Departments—	
To provide for the payment for the year 1897-98, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, of an additional salary of $300 each to such private secretaries as are in receipt of no higher salary than $1,200, viz.: the private secretaries of the Ministers of these departments:—Finance, Inland Revenue, Customs, Interior, Marine and Fisheries, Post Office and Secretary of State	$2,100

Mr. FOSTER. Now, here is a wholesale matter that ought to be explained.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is a repetition of an item that has already been dealt with in the main Estimates for the coming year. This is to pay these gentlemen for the year now closing on the basis of $1,500 per annum. That is to be the total amount of their salaries.

Mr. FOSTER. What kind of clerks are they?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. They are not in the civil service. At first it was hoped that these gentlemen would be worked into the civil service, and in that way would get their advance. Several have been provided for in that way, but not the gentlemen here referred to.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the hon. gentleman know of the fierce internecine war carried on with reference to the officials' gallery between perky private secretaries of the new Ministers and old and valued deputies in the service?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). That has been settled.

Mr. FOSTER. With the Minister of Public Works, I suppose, as peacemaker.

Mr. McMULLEN. I do hope that the Government will introduce an amendment to the Civil Service Act——

Mr. FOSTER. Vain hope.

Mr. McMULLEN. Hon. gentlemen opposite should have done it while in power.

I could read to my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) a very long list of violations of the Civil Service Act. But I do not wish to detain the House. Under these violations of the Civil Service Act, extra allowance is made to clerks from year to year. The Civil Service Act should be lived up to or it should be abolished. No civil servant should be allowed double pay. If his salary is not sufficient to remunerate him for the services he renders to the country it should be increased. Under the law a clerk must be appointed at a very small salary or else you must give him $1,100 to commence with. It would be better to recast the Act and provide that when a person is hired in one of the departments, he is to be paid a salary for all the services he will be required to perform within the department. Take, for instance, the Registrar of the Exchequer Court. We pay him a salary of $2,000, a very respectable sum. The year before last, I think, he was allowed $225 extra. He gets $300 for preparing the proceedings of the court for the printer, and then he gets $174 as commission upon the sale of stamps. Now, I contend, this is all wrong. Why, we have no less than 730 men in the employ of the country at this moment who last year drew double pay, that is, pay over and above their ordinary salaries, for supposed services rendered by them. It has got to that condition that every man in the civil service to-day is from morning to night seeking some hook upon which to hang a charge for extra pay and extra allowance. Take the clerk of the Supreme Court. His salary is $2,600 a year. Last year he drew $600 as editor of the reports, and received a commission on selling stamps. The stamps are necessarily sold by him as clerk of the court, law stamps, the revenue of this country, and he has the face to charge a commission for handing those stamps over to those who use them in that court, and he was paid $132 as commission for selling stamps. I contend this principle is wrong, and had I been allowed to go on with the Bill I had on the Order paper this year, it would put an absolute stop to all this kind of thing. The ex-Minister of Finance appears to smile at my remarks. I can read over to him figures showing the manner in which he and his friends abused the Civil Service Act during the last 12 years. I have a statement in my hand which shows that 2,093 civil servants in this country drew in twelve years, while hon. gentlemen were in power, $760,550.30 of extra pay. The average salary of those men during that time was $1,433.42 without any extras. The average of extras was $263.36 I contend this system should be put a stop to. This country has no right to pay men in this kind of way. If, next year, the Government do not introduce an amendment to the Civil Service Act to put a stop to this kind of thing, I shall undoubtedly renew my notice of that Bill, and press it upon the consideration of this House. Let us give the civil servants a fair remuneration for their services, but give them no extras.

Mr. CLANCY. Perhaps this is a good time for the Postmaster General to answer my question with reference to the places where post offices are being rented, and what rent he pays

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). I can say to the hon. gentleman that I think there have been no premises rented by the Post Office Department for the purposes of the post office, since I took office. I find a number of leases made to the department, of premises in a few towns, in Ontario principally, but those leases are null and void if exceeding a year. There is no provision in the Act authorizing us to take a lease at all, so that no lease creating a charge on the revenue can be made exceeding the period of the fiscal year for which we vote the money. I have a list of places: Bowmanville, Oshawa, Shediac, Sackville, St. Roch de Québec, St. Sauveur de Québec, St. Catherine Street, Montreal, Victoriaville, Woodstock Then there is a room in the Union station at Toronto, acquired recently, by the Public Works Department. There is also in Toronto the eastern receiving house and the northern receiving house; and there is a room at the Bonaventure station, Montreal. There are also premises in Sherbrooke, leased for the purpose of an inspector's office, and since the office has been abolished, the premises have been sub-let by the department for the unexpired portion of the term.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman stated that these leases expired at the end of a year. Is rent still being paid?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I did not say they expired. I said there was no legal right to take a lease for a period longer than a year. But I find a number of such leases, whatever they are good for, in existence, and I have not yet decided to deal with them.

Mr. CLARKE. Are large post office buildings only leased for a year in such places as Toronto?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not know what the length of the term is, but the lessors have no claim to recover under leases for any period longer than the year for which the supplies are voted.

Mr. CLARKE. After a branch post office has been established in a certain place for a number of years, it would be a mistake to remove it, unless extraordinary circumstances demand it, because the public become acquainted with the location.

Administration of Justice..... $1,126.03

Mr. ERB. I desire to repeat the question I put to the Government a day or two ago

as to the grounds upon which J. P. Woods, late county judge of Perth, was retired; whether he got a retiring allowance or superannuation, and if so, upon what ground?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. He was not retired, he resigned, but after an investigation. A commission was appointed and held an investigation, after which he resigned. He was entitled to a superannuation allowance, as a matter of course.

Mr. ERB. I desire to say that I fully agree with what has been said during the last few days as to the high standing of our judges as a class. But we cannot close our eyes to the fact that though the judges as a class are of a high character and are deserving of our admiration and respect, still there are exceptional cases. This, I am sorry to say, is one of those exceptional cases. Complaints, I understand, were made against this gentleman. A commission was appointed to make an investigation. So far as I have been able to find out, the investigation was dropped, the judge was allowed to retire or resign, and I see in the main Estimates a superannuation allowance of $1,600 has been allowed him. I wish to enter my protest against this proceeding. Whichever member of the Government is responsible for this act, I do not know, but I feel strongly on the matter. If it is necessary that we should have a superannuation Act, I have no fault to find with judges receiving a retiring allowance whenever they are entitled to it, but I protest against granting a superannuation allowance when the Act does not cover the case, and in this case the individual brought himself into this unfortunate position by his own voluntary act. The charges laid against him were of a very serious nature. As they were dropped, we do not know whether they were true or not; but considering that he saw fit to resign, we can come to no other conclusion than there was some ground for the charges made. Frequent charges have been made against the old administration of abuse of the Civil Service Act and the Superannuation Act. We have here a similar case. I maintain that if the Superannuation Act cannot be carried out without abuse, the sooner we get rid of it the better. We should pay our judges and civil servants fair salaries for work performed. If they see fit, they can save out of their earnings, get their lives insured and make provision for their families or their old age. If they choose to spend all their means, or live beyond their income, let them bear the consequences, the same as other people. These are my views on the subject of superannuation.

Mr. BRITTON. The other evening I asked, in respect to Judge McGuire, of the Yukon, whether it is intended to pay him, in addition to his salary, living expenses. His salary has been increased by $1,000, and travelling expense will be paid him. I suppose there is no permanent capital there yet, and so I wish to know if it is intended to pay his living expenses.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I draw attention to the fact that section 10 of the Bill respecting the judges of provincial courts provides that there should be a judge of the Superior Court in the Yukon, and that he is to be paid such travelling allowances as the Governor in Council may determine.

Mr. BRITTON. But I suppose some policy has been arrived at as to whether his living expenses will be paid when residing at Dawson City.

To purchase cameras and signalizing instruments for the purpose of introducing the Bertillon system for the identification of criminals in the five penitentiaries, and fitting up a central bureau at Ottawa under the supervision of the Commissioner of Dominion Police for recording and distributing the information obtained $1,000

Mr. FOSTER. Is this system to be extended to all kinds of criminals?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Our attention has been called to the fact that it would be highly improper that the system should be extended to ordinary misdemeanours. There is no intention to apply the system to cases of that sort. We can safely leave its application, I think, to the head of the Dominion police.

Mr. FOSTER. Will it apply to Ministers who break the Civil Service Act dozens of times. There are fifteen items in these Estimates connected with the civil service, and there are eighteen violations of the Civil Service Act.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The Ministers are exposed to another system which, however, is more excruciatingly painful.

To pay the surgeon of the Kingston Penitentiary for services as medical superintendent of insane ward, notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Penitentiary Act and amendments thereto..... $300

Mr. CLARKE. I should like to obtain some information from the Government respecting the payment of this amount. Who is the gentleman to whom this sum is to be paid?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The former incumbent of this position, Dr. Strange, received a salary of $1,800 a year, and in addition he was entitled to his general practice. Under the new regulations Dr. Phelan had his salary fixed at $1,500. The intention is to give him an additional $300 because of services rendered in connection with the insane ward. This will make his salary the same as that of his predecessor, but he will not have the right to practice, and he will be obliged to give his

whole time to the service of the penitentiary.

Mr. COCHRANE. I suppose Dr. Strange had to give medical attendance to the prisoners when required. We do not want a man waiting for some prisoners to get sick.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. It was found desirable, under the regulations made previous to the change of Government, to provide that the physician should give his whole time to the penitentiary service.

Mr. SPROULE. How many inmates are there in the Kingston penitentiary ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Something like 350.

Mr. CLARKE. Can the hon. gentleman state the retiring allowance paid to Dr. Strange ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Not at the moment.

Mr. CLARKE. When was he superannuated ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. A year ago ; he is over seventy years of age.

Mr. COCHRANE. He was not superannuated so much, I think, because he could not attend to his practice, but largely at his own wish.

Mr. CLARKE. Did Dr. Strange look after patients in the insane wards ?

Mr. COCHRANE. And the new medical officer receives an increase of $300 for that service ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. He received $1,800, and he had his general practice in addition. The new appointee only receives $1,500, and we ask that he be paid for the future $1,800, the same as his predecessor, but with this difference, that he is not allowed outside practice.

Mr. SPROULE. The object was to show economy by starting out at $1,500, and now you give him the full salary.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. That is not the object. The intention is to reward adequately a man of first-class merit ; a man infinitely superior to any we have in any of the other penitentiaries.

Mr. POPE. Why did you not start him off with a high salary ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Because we wanted to find him out, and we discovered him.

Mr. POPE. How could you want to find him out, if you appointed him permanently at the beginning ? You are in the hole.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I may be, in the opinion of my hon. friend (Mr. Pope), but I do not think any one else cares very much about his opinion.

Mr. QUINN. As the superannuation of Dr. Strange followed on the report of the Kingston penitentiary commissioners, and as that report is a very unique document, it will not be amiss to make some reference to it, especially as I cannot agree with some of the statements made about it yesterday. When questioned by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) the Solicitor General said :

> As a result of the report of the inquiry into the Kingston penitentiary the deputy warden, storekeeper and engineer were dismissed, the surgeon was superannuated, and the services of one or two other officials are dispensed with.

The Solicitor General forgot to mention that owing to the criticisms in this House last session, and owing to the reiterated demands of the engineer, Mr. Devlin, another commission was appointed to investigate the commissioners on whose report these officers were dismissed. Mr. Devlin, the late engineer, asked for this commission and it was appointed. Any hon. gentleman who refers to the report of the commissioners will find that some three pages of it were covered with charges against Mr. Devlin. These commissioners held him up as a man unworthy of any consideration, and it was even insinuated in the House that before this session Mr. Devlin would be behind the bars of the Kingston penitentiary as a criminal. Mr. Devlin persisted in his demands for an inquiry notwithstanding that, and the Minister of Justice, who I presume examined all the evidence taken by these commissioners found there was nothing in nine-tenths of the charges against Devlin, and boiled down the charges to five insignificant allegations of what was termed a conspiracy to defraud the Government. These charges were investigated at Kingston and Montreal, and I have no hesitation in saying that the commissioner who was appointed by the Department of Justice to investigate, will report to the department that there is not one tittle of evidence to support the charges that were made against Mr. Devlin in the first instance. This report of the commissioners resulted in three respectable and honourable men being dismissed from the Kingston penitentiary. They have lain under these charges for more than a year, and now that the charges made by these commissioners have been further investigated, the last commissioner will, I believe, report that there is not one tittle of evidence in support of them.

Mr. BRITTON. Is it fair to anticipate the report of the commissioner ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Let him proceed. The best service that could be done the administration of the department is to allow this to go on.

Mr. QUINN. Two of these men have not been allowed any investigation, but the third has been granted an investigation, and I have no hesitation in stating that the result will be to vindicate Mr. Devlin.

Mr. McGREGOR. You do not know anything about it.

Mr. QUINN. I do know about it, because having taken the interest I did in this matter last session, and knowing the manner in which these commissioners conducted the inquiry, I took the trouble of going to Kingston to be present at the investigation, and I heard the evidence adduced before the commissioner, and I know what I am speaking about.

Mr. McGREGOR. I do not think you do.

Mr. QUINN. I am not responsible for the hon. gentleman's calibre or his power of thinking, but I leave the House to judge whether his thinking is right or not. It was not my intention to refer to this matter, as I understood an arrangement was come to that the report of the St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary commissioners would not be debated this session, but it is necessary for me to say something, as some hon. members yesterday disregarded this understanding and made ex parte statements concerning the report, which should be corrected. Let me say that all these penitentiary commissions have been conducted in a most outrageous manner, and from beginning to end have been a violation of the first principles of justice. In the history of English law in England or any British colony there is no parallel for a commission carried on as was this commission appointed to inquire into the Kingston and St. Vincent de Paul penitentiaries. Yesterday in speaking about this matter my hon. friend (Mr. Fitzpatrick) said:

> The commissioners commenced their investigation into St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary in the month of April, 1897. They proceeded with the investigation, and towards the month of August they had practically completed their labours. As a result of the report made at that time, Mr. Ouimet was recommended for dismissal.

I have too much respect for the Solicitor General to think that he would be a party to what was done by these commissioners, but let me read for his information the demands which were made by Mr. Ouimet, then warden of St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary, at the time the commissioners first began their inquiry, and we shall see from it how the commissioners acted at that time. The letter is as follows:—

> To Messrs. Noxon, Fraser and D. A. Lafortune, Commissioners to inquire into the administration of the St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary.
>
> Sirs,—I have been formally apprised by the Department of Justice that you are sent here as a commission to inquire into the administration of the penitentiary, and also possibly into certain charges made against me personally. I am at your disposal as regards both, and I beg from you to give me communication of any instructions that you may have which might apprise me with the kind of information that may be required from me, and also what are the charges that you intend to investigate against me.
>
> I must also respectfully state that having no legal training, I am unable by myself without a counsel to conduct my defence in a way to do justice to myself and properly bring before your commission the facts upon which your commission shall have to report.
>
> I therefore beg to request your commission to allow me the assistance of the legal counsel to properly defend not only my honour and position, but also to protect and defend the honour of this institution and of those of my co-officers who might be affected by the investigation.
>
> Yours,
> (Sgd.) TEL. OUIMET,
> Warden.
>
> St. Vincent de Paul,
> 20th April, 1897.

The answer given by Mr. Noxon, the chairman of the commissioners, to this letter was:

> St. Lawrence Hall,
> Montreal, 24th April, 1897.
>
> Sir,—The commissioners having considered your request to be represented by counsel during the investigation into the arrangement of the institution under your charge, we have to advise that no one is employed to prosecute the investigation to your prejudice, and it is not essential to an intelligent pursuit of our inquiries that counsel be employed by you to direct us in respect to them.
>
> Should there come under our attention any matters reflecting upon your official conduct, notice will be given you, and ample opportunity offered to call witnesses if necessary to make clear your position in relation to them.
>
> I am sir, your obedient servant,
> (Sgd.) JAS. NOXON.
> Chairman.
>
> Télésphore Ouimet,
> Warden of St. Vincent de Paul
> Penitentiary.

This is dated the 24th of April, 1897; yet my hon. friend made this statement:

> The commissioners commenced their investigation into the St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary in the month of April, 1897. They proceeded with the investigation, and towards the month of August they had practically completed their labours. As the result of the report they made at that time, Mr. Ouimet, the warden, was recommended for dismissal.

So that these commissioners did not, in accordance with the letter which they sent to Mr. Ouimet, give him any notice of the charges brought against him, the evidence heard against him, or the witnesses who gave evidence before him; but, contrary to their letter, they sent to the Department of Justice in August, 1897, a report, as a result of which Mr. Ouimet was dismissed from his position as warden. My hon. friend also said that Mr. Ouimet made representations to the department, and asked for an investigation. That is quite true; he did so. But

my hon. friend makes this specific statement:

> My hon. friends will find by the report that whereas these specific charges were communicated to Mr. Ouimet about the 15th September, yet because of the absence of his counsel and witnesses, there were numerous delays, all resulting from the action of the warden, and I concurred in these delays asked for by him.

Now, my hon. friend, I am sure, stated then what he believed to be accurate in every particular. I do not charge him with any bad faith. I charge him with lack of information on this question, and I charge the commissioners with having made these representations to the Department of Justice in order to cover up their own neglect of duty; because I am informed by counsel employed by Mr. Ouimet—leading counsel of Montreal, whom I am sure my hon. friend would believe, even against the commissionerrs—that only on one occasion was the commission prevented from sitting as usual on account of the absence of Mr. Ouimet's counsel. That was one occasion on which Mr. Greenshields was obliged to be absent from Montreal, and could not attend the sitting of the commission. On every other occasion when the commissioners could not proceed with their investigations, it was due to the absence of one of the commissioners. I think three adjournments occurred, either on account of the absence of one of the commissioners, or on account of the absence of witnesses, or on account of the inability of the commissioners to proceed, due solely to themselves. So that my hon. friend was not quite accurate. He, of course, made these statements on the information he had from these commissioners. There was another peculiarity about this commission which I am sure my hon. friend did not know anything about, or else he would not have tolerated it. When this commission sat in the first instance—that is, the commission of which Mr. Ouimet knew nothing, and on which the recommendation was made to the Department of Justice for his dismissal, and on which he was actually dismissed, and in answer to which he made a demand from the Department of Justice to grant him a subsequent inquiry—when this first commission sat, it sat at the St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary, where the convicts could be examined as witnesses, where the officers of the institution could be brought as witnesses, where the documents that were to be referred to were right at the hands of witnesses and the commissioners. But all that was changed when Mr. Ouimet was put on his defence. There was no sitting at St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary then; there was no chance given to him to cross-examine the witnesses who had given evidence against him, there was no chance given to call witnesses in his defence. They were poor men, and he was obliged to bring them to Montreal to the St. Lawrence Hall, and pay their expenses. He could not, of course, get one of the convicts of the St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary out of the prison to give evidence in his favour, and it was impossible to cross-examine them on any evidence they had given against him. It was impossible for him to have reference to the documents and other articles in the penitentiary which were necessary to find evidence either against him or in his favour. He was put at enormous expense to engage counsel; and when this counsel attempted to cross-examine witnesses on questions that did not bear immediately on the particular charge against him, all reference to them was ruled out by the commissioners. These are matters which the hon. gentleman could not know, but which the commissioners used as a piece of petty tyranny for the purpose of carrying out what they thought they had been appointed for, that was, the dismissal of Mr. Ouimet as warden. What was the fact? I will not state this as a matter proven before the commission; I state it as a matter currently reported through the city of Montreal and through the village of St. Vincent de Paul; that, for example, when the commission first sat to investigate the charges against Mr. Ouimet, commissioners were known to go to convicts in the penitentiary and put their arms over their shoulders, pat them on the back, and promise them rewards, that their terms would be shortened, and that they would give them privileges such as the wearing of moustaches if they would give information against the officers of the penitentiary. For instance, a man named Viau, one of the most notorious criminals, possibly the most notorious criminal in Canada, a man who has spent the greatest part of his life in the penitentiary, was allowed by the commissioners to grow a beard and moustache and to wear civilian's clothes, and was promised, as a reward for the information he would give against the officers, his release from the penitentiary.

Mr. McGREGOR. You would not take his word?

Mr. QUINN. I would not certainly, but the commissioners did. I see that my hon. friend is disgusted at the idea of my taking Viau's word. It was on the evidence of Viau and such men as he that Mr. Ouimet was dismissed.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I do not like to interrupt my hon. friend in his very interesting speech; but I would like him to tell us where he can get evidence that any promise was given to Viau that if he gave information against the officers he would be released, or that he was allowed to wear a beard and moustache. I state, with all due deference to my hon. friend, that there is not a word of truth in that.

Mr. QUINN. I say this is a matter of public report in Montreal and in the village of St. Vincent de Paul. I say the officers of the

institution know this to be a fact, and I guarantee, if my hon. friend will grant another commission to investigate that charge, that I will prove it as a fact. But these are only some of the things.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Do I understand my hon. friend to say here, in his place in Parliament, that he is prepared to prove that the commissioners gave permission to Viau to wear a beard and moustache as a reward for any information he gave to them ?

Mr. QUINN. I undertake to prove that the commissioners went to St. Vincent de Paul on the 24th of April, 1897, that Viau at that time occupied the position of an ordinary convict, that he was interviewed by the commissioners, that as a result of or immediately after this interview he was allowed to wear his moustache, and was allowed to wear civilian's clothes, and that he continued to do so during the whole time of the sitting of this commission. I cannot prove by the men who composed this commission that they made these promises. I have had too much experience of them to attempt to prove it by them, and I would not attempt to prove such a thing by Viau, one of the notorious convicts in the penitentiary, and whom I know too well. But he was one of the men on whom the commission relied to get evidence against Warden Ouimet. What more ? My hon. friend is startled and I do not wonder at it, I know he is not aware of any of these things, but I refer him to Mr. Ouimet's counsel. Let him ask Mr. Greenshields.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I have had several conversations with Mr. Greenshields, and I never heard him make that statement.

Mr. QUINN. I will give another.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Better prove this one first.

Mr. QUINN. My hon. friend does not know that these convicts were taken by the commissioners into a private room in the penitentiary and there examined, and before they left that room were sworn not to divulge the fact that they had been cross-examined by the commissioners. My hon. friend does not know that.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. No, nor do you.

Mr. QUINN. I know it from as good authority as any hon. member in this House. I know it by the word of two members of the Bar of the city of Montreal.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Give us their names.

Mr. QUINN. Mr Leblanc and Mr. J. N. Greenshields.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. They are responsible for the accuracy of your statement.

Mr. QUINN. Yes. My hon friend did not know that, and I do not wonder that he should be astonished. I was horrified, or rather I would have been if I had not had my experience at Kingston penitentiary investigation, and seen the way in which the officers of that institution had been held up to the ridicule and contempt of the convicts, and looked more like criminals than did the convicts, while the convicts who were able to give information to the commissioners looked more like the warden and the guards. The hon. member for Laval (Mr. Fortin) brings as a charge against the warden that a large quantity of the stone and a large quantity of the cement were not accounted for. What are the facts ? The evidence comes from a man named Crane, who made all the measurements. Mr. Crane belongs to Brockville, I understand. He swore to measurements, and I am informed that the measurements were never made by him but by convicts, and were sworn to by Crane as facts. In any event, the disappearance of this stone or cement was not a matter chargable to Mr. Ouimet. It was under the supervision of the Department of Public Works, and all that Ouimet had to do with it was to see that the convicts, detailed for this particular work, were kept at the work and properly looked after. He had no account to take of the stone or the cement. There was an officer of the Department of Public Works to attend to that.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Who was that officer ?

Mr. QUINN. I do not know his name, but I am informed that there was one. The next charge the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Fortin) made was that letters belonging to the convicts were not delivered to them and were left lying in the vault for years, and also that letters given to be posted by the convicts were never mailed. If my hon. friend has read the evidence, and he must have found that the evidence concerning this matter is that Mr. Papineau, the secretary of the penitentiary, was the officer who had charge of that particular branch. It could not be expected that the warden of the penitentiary could be also warden's secretary, the head officer of Public Works, guard and everything else in the prison. He was there as the chief officer, and of course had to see that his subordinates attended to their duty, but the secretary, when asked what had become of those letters, made no answer in many instances. Well, did the Department of Justice dismiss Papineau, who was directly responsible. No, but they dismissed the warden. Papineau was not dismissed but sent down to a position in the Dorchester penitentiary.

There is another great charge made by my hon. friend from Laval (Mr. Fortin) about the sale of goods by prisoners—a custom which has existed in the penitentiary from time immemorial. I can remember as a boy

visiting the Kingston penitentiary, seeing the prisoners offering toothpicks, and little nick-nacks of that kind which they had made themselves, for sale to visitors. That was permitted by every warden from the time of Warden Macdonald, some 30 years ago; and one can readily understand that a concession of that kind would rather help to improve the morals of the convicts. That however, is one of the complaints against Warden Ouimet. I do not know whether it is forbidden by any law of the department, but I do know that 30 years ago it was allowed by Warden Macdonald in the Kingston penitentiary. There is another charge, that of selling goods to the prisoners, but when we come to the evidence, we find that the selling consisted merely of the disposal of some apples by some of the guards to the convicts, and was permitted by the inspector and the department. In any event, it was not such an outrageous violation of duty as to necessitate the dismissal of the warden.

The next statement made by the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Fortin) is that the warden had a set of harness made upon a model lot of the harness for the Lieutenant-Governor of the province of Quebec, without any expense to himself, for his own personal use and benefit. I am informed that that is not the case at all. This evidence shows that this harness was allowed by the department to Mr. Ouimet for use in the penitentiary, and it was used for the purposes of the penitentiary. There is also a charge that he kept four or five horses, and I am told that this is grossly exaggerated, and that there is no evidence to prove it. I am told that he kept two horses with the knowledge of the inspector and the department. These two were used for the service of the penitentiary, and the warden used them occasionally when he required them.

Now, my hon. friends made a great misado about a yacht. Without going into all the details which he went into, about the ownership being in two individual officers of the department, one of whom died, and some difficulty occurring about the ownership, I am informed that the facts are that a certain gentleman had permission to have a yacht built in the penitentiary, and furnished the material, and everything in connection with it. He had it built, with the knowledge of the department, in the St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary out of materials furnished by himself. And, after the yacht had been built, he permitted the officers of the penitentiary to use it for the purposes of the penitentiary for the placing of certain buoys in the river in the neighbourhood, and also for following prisoners on certain occasions who had attempted to escape. Certain materials which had been furnished by him and destroyed by prisoners who were working on this yacht, were afterwards supplied out of penitentiary materials, and no bill was ever sent to him, though he has always been ready and willing to pay for them. It has been the subject of a charge against the warden that this yacht was built at the expense of the Department of Justice, when as a matter of fact according to the information I have, it was built by this gentleman out of materials furnished by him, and if the materials were furnished by the penitentiary it was to supply the place of materials destroyed by the convicts who were working on the yacht, an account of which has not been sent to him or it would have been paid long ago. Now, my only object in referring to this matter at all was that the statements made contrary to the understanding arrived at, I believe, between my hon. friend the Solicitor General and the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) who is absent, and was absent when these statements were made, should not go unchallenged. I do not pretend to state what I have stated from having read carefully every page of the evidence brought before these commissioners. But I do say there is not one fact of which I have spoken in connection with the charges referred to by the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Fortin) that I have not substantiated by reference to the evidence of different witnesses examined before these commissioners. I think the statement of the hon. member for Laval exaggerates the facts as given in evidence before the commissioners. I do not say it goes to exaggerate the finding of the report, because from my experience of the reports sent in by these commissioners, they are prepared to exaggerate any evidence brought before them, or to manufacture it where it has not been brought before them. I should like to see the Solicitor General take the same stand in this matter as he took in the case of the Kingston penitentiary, and though justice may be tardy, I hope he will mete out to the men who have been dismissed, both in Kingston and St. Vincent de Paul penitentiaries, the same treatment as he did to the engineer of the Kingston penitentiary by giving him an opportunity to exculpate himself from the charges made by the commissioners of the Kingston penitentiary last year.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. When the report of the commissioners first came up to be discussed the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) told me he had not had time necessary to examine the evidence to put him in a position to discuss this matter and refer to the evidence and not to mere street gossip for his authority In view of the fact that the evidence was voluminous, we agreed that it would be wiser to delay the discussion until we had time to refer to the documents and evidence, because what hon. gentlemen on both sides want is an intelligent discussion of matters of fact and not an attempt to deal with charges upon the basis of mere street gossip.

The commissioners for the St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary were appointed in April, 1897. At that time they were approached by the warden who asked whether they would allow counsel on his behalf to appear before them. They stated that they had no charges to make against him, that they were appointed to investigate the discipline and the management of the penitentiary; and, very properly, they said: If, after we have made an examination, we discover charges to be made against you, they will be communicated to you, and you will be given an opportunity to answer them and explain them away. They made their examination, and as a result, in the month of August, they came to the conclusion that it would be improper, in view of the evidence they had gathered, to allow this gentleman to remain longer at the head of this important institution. We had riot and revolt in that penitentiary, we had stealing by wholesale. Stone was taken away to the value of $60,000 and used, in part, for the construction of a building by the warden himself. We found it necessary to inform the gentleman that his services would no longer be required. The warden asked that the charges be formulated that he be given an opportunity to defend himself. In September, 1897, we took the evidence and analysed it, extracting from it several charges, and communicated these charges to him. When the charges were made against him, he asked permission to be represented by counsel and to produce witnesses before the commissioners. The permission was granted. Mr. Ouimet had not one counsel, not two but three. He chose Mr. Bisaillon, then Mr. Greenshields, and afterwards he settled on Mr. Leblanc. I do not ask the House to believe anything on street gossip, but I deny emphatically the statements made in regard to these delays. In the month of September, Mr. Bisaillon applied for a postponement of the investigation on the ground that he was about to leave for Europe to attend a meeting of the Privy Council in England. He said he was going to be away for some time, and it would be necessary to substitute other counsel. As a result Mr. Greenshields was chosen, and not once, not twice, not half a dozen times, but more than that, Mr. Greenshields applied to the commissioners for delay, and, on their refusal, he applied to myself personally. The telegram and letters are in existence, I make this statement before this House—and I am responsible as representing the Department of Justice in this House—that I am prepared to produce the documents in support of my statement. Now, we have a prolongation of this investigation from the beginning early in September down to the end of December, and during all that time the delays were occasioned exclusively by Mr. Ouimet and in his interest, as he represented it to me.

I am not going to deal with the report. The report of the Commissioners is before the House. So far as I am concerned I am not going to ask this House, when I come to deal with that report, to take for granted one single phrase, one single line, one single word that is in the report. I am prepared to corroborate it from begining to end by evidence I have in my possession. I am prepared to prove that accounts were paid twice over, accounts paid over that were received back by myself since I have been connected with the Department of Justice. I am prepared to prove the statement made last night by the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Fortin) that stone to the value of $60,000 is not accounted for; I am prepared to prove the statement that he made with reference to cement. I do not ask you to take the commissioners' report, I will deal with it when the time comes. I will not ask you to take the report on the faith of those who made it, on the strength of their character and of their position, but I am prepared to ask you to deal with it in connection with the evidence I can produce in corroboration. I say that is the only honest way to deal with this report, it is the only serious way, it is the only way we are justified in dealing with it, and in taking five minutes of the time of this House in that connection.

Mr. QUINN. Will my hon. friend state that the disappearance of this stone was one of the charges made against Warden Ouimet?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes, one of the grounds of his dismissal.

Mr. QUINN. Does he know that when Mr. Leblanc, counsel for Ouimet, attempted to adduce evidence and cross-examine Crane as to the measurement of that stone, he was stopped by one of the commissioners, Mr. Fraser, and the commission would not allow that evidence, as Crane's report could not affect the warden?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I will deal with that when I put the evidence before the House. I am not going to be drawn out by questions of this sort.

Mr. QUINN. It is on statements made by yourself.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I will deal with it on the evidence. Now, let me come down to the Kingston penitentiary report. This matter my hon. friend is familiar with, he was connected with it, and he acted in the matter by himself and through his partner. What are the facts so far as Mr. Devlin is concerned? The facts are that charges were made against Mr. Devlin. And here let me say that we are entitled, if in our view the proper administration of any department requires it, to dismiss any official in the public service without being obliged to accuse him of thievery or rascality of any sort. It is

sufficient that we should consider his appearance at the head of any department is contrary to the public interest, to justify his dismissal. But in dealing with Devlin, we made specific charges against him—I am not going to forestall the report of the commission—but we made specific charges against him; and I went to this extreme, that after he was dismissed, in order to give him an opportunity to justify himself and to prove that some of the charges made by the commissioners against him were unfounded, I made specific charges and communicated them to him, and he was offered an opportunity to produce evidence to deny those charges, and I appointed practically, a man of his own selection as commissioner. And I say, moreover, that after the investigation was finished, Devlin and his counsel declared that this investigation was in every respect impartial, and that they were thoroughly satisfied with the judicial manner in which the commissioners had conducted the inquiry. I will ask my hon. friend when, next session, that report is brought here, to get up and say what he said to-night, that that report would be favourable to Mr. Devlin. Let him bear in mind what I am telling him now, he will read that report, which is now partially ready, it will be produced, and if my hon. friend's contention is borne out, I will undertake to see that Mr. Devlin is put back in the penitentiary—but I will not say in what capacity.

Mr. FORTIN. I happened to come into the House when my hon. friend from Montreal Centre (Mr. Quinn) had been speaking for some time, and so I do not know whether he referred to me before or not. But I must say from what I heard of his speech that he entirely misapprehended what I said in committee last night. I made no charge against any officer of the penitentiary, I simpy expressed regret that the report had not been printed in order that the members of the House might take cognizance of it. I then went on to state what the perusal of some pages of the report shows. I mentioned that there were charges against the warden in regard to stone, cement, letters, and so forth. But I never mentioned the name of the warden in connection with these things nor of any other officer; I merey mentioned the facts that had been brought to light. I never followed the inquiry, I never preferred a single charge myself, in fact, I allowed the commissioners appointed to hold the investigation, they did not require any assistance, nor did I assist them directly or indirectly. So, when my hon. friend makes the assertion that I charged the warden with doing this or doing that, he is mistaken. I never charged the warden or anybody else. I know nothing of these matters beyond what I see in the report. If he challenges my statements as to the contents of the report, I can quote, for instance, from page 71 with regard to the stone. He will see that the fact I mentioned to the committee last night is borne out by the report of the commission. I know nothing of the evidence, never saw it, never had any desire to see it. Let me read this paragraph from page 71 of the report:

> The result is that the Government paid $107,796.25 for 539,435 feet of stone. Of that stone, 215,448 feet, worth $42,133.72 at contract prices, are accounted for.

Deduct $42,000 from $107,000, and you have $65,000 worth of stone unaccounted for. Now, for the cement we find the same testimony in the report:

> In connection with this work it is also found that some 1,637 barrels of cement were paid for by the Department of Public Works, and only about 650 accounted for.

I stated last night that about 700 barrels were unaccounted for, but the report says that nearly 1,000 barrels cannot be accounted for. I have not a word to withdraw from the statement I made last night.

Mr. QUINN. The hon. member for Laval says he never mentioned the name of the warden or of any other officer. As a matter of fact, the warden is the officer who has been dismissed.

Mr. FORTIN. Not the only one.

Mr. QUINN. He is the most important officer who has been dismissed. When we find that a man has been dismissed from an office and charges of grave irregularities, or fraud, or theft, made or insinuated against him, then we are inclined to charge him with all the irregularities of the position from which he has been discharged. My hon. friend must have known that any language that he may use in that way will be construed, not as against impersonal individuals, but as against somebody. Somebody must be responsible for it.

Mr. FORTIN. I spoke of the institution generally.

Mr. QUINN. Does my hon. friend know that there has been an inspection of that institution annually since Warden Ouimet has been there for twelve years? If he does know that, does he not know that it has always been reported as the best managed institution in the Dominion of Canada, and that Warden Ouimet has been reported as the most efficient officer in the Dominion of Canada? Does he not know as a matter of fact from the annual report of the inspector that the cost of maintaining prisoners there was far less under Warden Ouimet than at any other penitentiary; that the discipline of the penitentiary during the twelve years Warden Ouimet was there was better than in any other penitentiary; that in these reports the inspector has continually given Warden Ouimet the highest character of any warden in the Department of Justice. Yet the hon. gentleman says he makes no

charges against this man. He takes out a certain portion of the commissioner's report, which it was understood between the leader and the hon. member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) was not to be discussed this session, and he based his statement on that report. I would not attach any more importance to that report than the unsworn statement of any convict in the penitentiary. The hon. Solicitor General says it is sufficient if we believe that the presence of an officer in any office is injurious to that department, to dismiss him. He says, in effect, that if the presence of Devlin or any other officer were injurious, he should be dismissed. I grant that, but my hon. friend because he occupies the position of Solicitor General or Minister of Justice—and I should like to see him Minister of Justice—could not set himself above the law and do unfairness or injustice towards a fellowman. He could not on a mere whim and because he believed the presence of a man was injurious to the institution, dismiss him. That would be a most convenient course for hon. gentlemen to take, for a Minister could simply rise and say; I believe the presence of this man in that branch of the department is injurious, and consequently I will dismiss him. But the Civil Service Act prevents dismissals being made in this way, and it is necessary that some criminal charge or quasi-criminal charge should be made. If the hon. gentleman thought that the presence of certain officers was injurious to the penitentiary and that nothing criminal could be proved, why was it necessary to have the commissioners report the parties guilty of crime in order to have them removed. Yet that is what has been done. The Solicitor General did not act on the belief that the presence of these men was injurious to the department. He did not act in the case of Warden Ouimet on the ground that his presence as warden of the penitentiary was injurious to the penitentiary; but he acted on the report of the commissioners, and which I should like to attack. I consider this report as unworthy of belief and of any confidence, I hold it is totally unfit to lay before the House, as the result of a deliberate, fair and honest investigation into the conduct of that penitentiary.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The hon. gentleman said a moment ago that the commissioners stated at the time they called witnesses that there was no connection between the warden and the waste of stone. I will read from the report:

> He is likewise responsible (with Label and Daignault) for the gross waste practised in connection with the building of the new boundary wall and other erections in and about the prison and the very bad workmanship displayed in same, which are elsewhere referred to in this report and the report of George Crain, Esq. The Warden attempts to escape responsibility for this worse than negligence in this matter by saying that the Department of Public Works is responsible, and he was not an officer of that department. But the evidence shows most conclusively that he assumed full control of the work, and was recognized by the Department of Public Works as controlling it; requisitions for Public Works supplies were countersigned by him, and the contract for stone expressly made deliveries of same subject to his inspection—that he did so inspect—that he ordered and directed how the work should be done—instructed not only the clerk of works, but the stonecutters, masons and all others engaged upon the work, and these men took orders from him. He endeavoured, contrary to the wishes of the department, to have stone contracts continued instead of working the quarries with prison labour, as is being now successfully done. It was upon his order that the plans were repeatedly changed, each change of gate plans involving considerable loss to the prison.
>
> It was the warden who disposed of all the stone which was wasted or destroyed. In a word, he had full control of this work, which control was either assumed by or delegated to him.

Mr. QUINN. In answer to the hon. gentleman, I will read from the statement made by Hon. Mr. Leblanc, but I will not compare that gentleman with any of the commissioners. He said:

> Crane, on whose evidence the ex-warden was accused of having allowed tremendous waste of stone and cement, had his measurements made by the convicts, though he swore personally to them, and when he (Mr. Leblanc) wanted to prove that fact, he was stopped by Mr. Fraser, who told him that he would not allow that evidence, as Crane's report did not affect the warden.

I submit that report of the commissioners to the people of Canada, and especially to the people of Quebec, and I will let them weigh the statements of Hon. Mr. Leblanc against those of Messrs, Noxon, Fraser and Lafortune. The Solicitor General stated that if there was no report against Devlin, he would put him back in the penitentiary. The hon. gentleman is reiterating what he stated last session, when he said that Devlin was in Kingston penitentiary, and he would be back, though not as an officer. The hon. gentleman will find himself in the same position again as he found himself then. Devlin will not go back; all the power possessed by the hon. gentleman could not place Devlin back as an official. No one outside of the member for Kingston could put back a man who had been dismissed, because there are too many men of the stripe of that member looking for jobs to allow any honest man to go back there. The hon. gentleman said there was only one pump there. Now he is obliged to admit there are two pumps, and his charge against Devlin was regarding two pumps and not one pump, and his threats in this regard against Devlin were in vain.

> To pay Mr. George F. Bruce, returning officer, and Messrs. Kerr, Macdonald, Davidson & Paterson, solicitors, Toronto, for costs and expenses in connection with litigation arising out of a

partial election for the House of Commons, held in the north riding of the county of Ontario, on the 4th February, 1897 ..... $204 14

Mr. HUGHES. This item has reference to an election that was held in 1897 in the north riding of Ontario, when Mr. Bruce was returning officer. I intend to suggest some amendments to the law so as to prevent such frauds being perpetrated in the future as were then perpetrated, and I trust the Solicitor General will make a note of my suggestions. The Liberal-Conservative party obtained information to the effect that Mr. Bruce, the returning officer, as soon as the declaration was made, was going to place the ballot boxes in the express office and ship them immediately to Ottawa in order to provide against possibility of there being a recount. In this regard the law should be amended so as to prevent any returning officer having it in his power to interfere with what either party might consider as their rights. This returning officer was about shipping the ballots to Ottawa immediately so that there could be no possibility of a recount when legal papers were served on him for a recount of the votes. It was no doubt rather quick work, but the order was obtained in due time from Mr. Justice Mahaffy. Now, Mr. Justice Mahaffy is the only judge residing in North Ontario. The cry went forth that Judge Dartnell, of Whitby, was the judge of the county, but that is not so. It is true he is the judge of Ontario county, but the fact is that Judge Mahaffy presides over the greater part of the townships in the riding of North Ontario, which includes part of Muskoka. As soon as the notice of a recount was served on Mr. Bruce he was summoned to the city of Toronto and Judge Dartnell was also summoned to that city and in a certain law office there, the office of the late Mr. McCarthy, it was arranged that Judge Dartnell should have notice for a recount served on him and a date fixed for the recount, which was prior to the date fixed before Judge Mahaffy. The friends of the Liberal-Conservative candidate who deemed that he was properly elected and were anxious to test it by every fair means, obtained an injunction to restrain Judge Dartnell from acting and I shall read some of the affidavits in that connection. These affidavits will show that the law should be amended so as to make it impossible for one party to have a recount before this judge and another party to have a recount before that judge, one cutting the other out as it were. I understand that in a recent local election a similar thing was resorted to, our friends made application for a recount before a certain judge and the Government friends had a recount before another judge who seemed more suitable for them, a day or two in advance, and thus possibly the ends of justice were not carried out. There is one point in connection with the case to which I am drawing the attention of the House, which is most important, and that is that before the application for an injunction was made, and before it was served a leading solicitor of the city of Toronto, as will be shown by Mr. McCarthy's affidavit, actually sought on Sunday to influence the mind of the judge so that on Monday morning when the application would be made for an injunction, that judge would refuse the application. The matter is put in a very explicit form in the affidavits of Mr. McCarthy, Mr. Arnold and Mr. Aylesworth, three eminent members of the Ontario bar, and so I will draw attention to these affidavits. The first one is :

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE.

Between

Angus McLeod, Plaintiff,

and

Robert M. Noble, George F. Bruce and George T. Dartnell, Defendants.

I, Orvillo Montrose Arnold, of the town of Bracebridge, in the district of Muskoka, solicitor, make oath oath and say :

1. I am solicitor herein for the above named plaintiff, Angus McLeod.

2. Under writ directed to the above named defendant, George Fraser Bruce, as returning officer, an election of a member of the House of Commons of Canada for the electoral district of the north riding of the county of Ontario was holden on Thursday, the 28th day of January, 1897, and on Thursday, the 4th day of February, 1897, and at the said election the above named plaintiff, Angus McLeod, and one Duncan Graham, were the only candidates nominated.

3. On Thursday, the 11th day of February instant, at the village of Beaverton, in the said electoral district, the said defendant Bruce as returning officer at the said election, opened the ballot boxes used thereat and summed up the votes given for the said respective candidates and declared as elected the said candidate Duncan Graham by a majority of thirty-nine votes.

4. Upon the same day and as soon as possible after the said declaration by the returning officer, I, as solicitor for the said Angus McLeod, caused application to be made to William Cosby Mahaffy, Esquire, the judge of the district court of the provisional judicial district of Muskoka and Parry Sound, for a recount of the votes cast at the said election

5. The said application was made in the name of the said plaintiff, Angus McLeod, and under specific instructions given by him to me in that behalf, and is supportd by affidavits of the said McLeod and of one Thomas J. Woods, setting out as ground of the said application that at the said election deputy returning officers improperly rejected many of the ballot papers cast thereat ; and upon making the said application there was duly deposited with the clerk of the said District Court at Bracebridge aforesaid the sum of one hundred dollars as security for costs in respect of the said recount, and thereupon the said William Cosby Mahaffy, the judge of the said District Court, appointed Tuesday, the 16th day of February instant, at his chambers in the courthouse at the town of Bracebridge aforesaid, within the said electoral district of North Victoria, at the hour of 10 o'clock in the forenoon, for the purpose of making a recount of the votes cast at the said election and making a final addition thereof.

6. Afterwards, and on the said 11th day of February instant, I personally served a true copy of such appointment as given by the said William Cosby Mahaffy, upon Duncan Graham aforesaid, one of the candidates at the said election, and also upon the above named defendant, Bruce, as the returning officer at the said election, and upon his election clerk, and thereafter on the same day in conversation with the said defendant Noble I informed him of the making of the said appointment, and that I had served the same as above set out.

7. The said defendant Noble is a solicitor of this court, practising at the village of Cannington, in the said electoral district, and at the said opening of the ballot boxes and summing up of the votes by the returning officer as aforesaid on the 11th day of February instant the said Noble appeared as solicitor or agent attending on behalf of the said candidate Duncan Graham, and in the said election the said Noble was, I verily believe an active supporter of the said candidate, Graham.

8. On the 13th day of February instant the paper writing now shown to me and marked with the letter "A," purporting to be signed by the abovenamed defendant George T. Dartnell, as judge of the County Court of the county of Ontario, was served on Mr. Alfred Hunt, the statutory agent at the said election abovenamed of the plaintiff, Angus McLeod, as I was yesterday informed by the said Hunt, and as I verily believe, but as I verily believe no copy of the said appointment for recount has been personally served upon the said plaintiff, McLeod.

9. I verily believe that the application to the said George T. Dartnell for recount as above set out is made in the interests of and on behalf of the said candidate, Duncan Graham, who has been found by the returning officer to have the majority of votes at the said election, and that unless restrained by order of this honourable court the said defendant Bruce will attend before the defendant Dartnell with the parcels containing the ballots used at the said election and deliver the same to the said defendant Dartnell, and will disobey the appointment and summons issued as above set out by the said William Cosby Mahaffy as such judge of the said district court, and that unless the said defendants are severally restrained by this honourable court from entering upon and proceeding with a recount of the said votes before the said George T. Dartnell, the application of the plaintiff for a recount of the votes as aforesaid will be altogether frustrated and defeated.

10. This application for an interlocutory injunction is made in good faith and under advice of cousel as necessary for the due protection of the plaintff's interests, and to secure to him what he is advised is under the statute his legal right, and this application is not made for any purpose of more delay or for any improper purpose whatever.

There are a great many other affidavits in the case, but I will not read any that are not absolutely necessary. Then, there is a formal notice of an injunction that was issued, which I will not read. Then, there is Mr. McLeod's affidavit. Mr. Arnold attended before the court and served a notice on Mr. Graham. In this Mr. Dalton McCarthy took part. But here is an affidavit that I want to read. I presume it is for work of this kind that this officer Bruce is getting this extra money. This affidavit is as follows:—

I, James McBrien Browne, of the town of Whitby, in the county and province of Ontario, mail clerk, make oath and say:

1. I am a clerk in the post office in the said town of Whitby, and sleep on the post office premises.

2. About 11 o'clock on the night of the 15th day of February, A.D. 1897, Mr. Bruce, returning officer for North Ontario, came to the post office in Whitby and asked me if he could send some mail matter on the train going east on the following morning, and whether or not he would have sufficient time in the morning to get them registered, as he said he would rather keep the mail matter until the morning in his own possession for fear of fire. I told him he would have plenty of time in the morning before the train left.

3. About seven o'clock the next morning Mr. Bruce called at the post office again and mailed and registered a large letter and a parcel of ballots to S. E. St. O. Chapleau, Ottawa, and the same went east on the mail train due at Whitby Station, Grand Trunk Railway, at five minutes after eight o'clock on the morning of the 16th day of February, A.D. 1897.

The facts are that after Mr. Bruce had been brought down to the city of Toronto and put through a course of training as to what would be the best way for him to avoid having these ballots counted before Judge Mahaffy, he went to North Ontario, took the ballots before Judge Dartnell, obeyed the summons to attend before him, although he had previously been served with a summons to appear before Judge Mahaffy, and certainly could not plead ignorance. He went before Judge Dartnell, and, as the evidence shows, he surrendered the ballots there at the dictation of the solicitor in the case. Then, in order to get them back to Ottawa, in order to avoid any action of the court which would compel him to have another recount at Bracebridge before Judge Mahaffy, he went to the post office late at night and made arrangements so that they could be registered in the morning. I must say, under the circumstances, if Mr. Bruce has been put to any expense in this matter, as this vote of $204.14 would seem to snow, I certainly think the Dominion of Canada should not pay for any miscarriage of justice such as undoubtedly took place. If it were earlier in the session and if the night were younger, I would enter into some of the details that were brought out in connection with that election, to show that from start to finish there was a determination to secure that seat by fair means or foul. If ever these ballots had a proper recount, there is not the slightest doubt that Mr. Angus McLeod would have been the member. We have a summing-up of the ballots by the favoured judge, Mr. Dartnell, a gentleman who was, I say it advisedly, for I know whereof I speak, in a certain sense at the mercy of the Liberal party, or conceived himself to be at the mercy of the

Liberal party in that county, and was afraid to act in any other way than he was ordered to act by the lawyers for Mr. Bruce and these people. We find that the summing-up of their ballots was as follows:—For Duncan Graham, 2,414; for Angus McLeod, 2,397; rejected ballots, 13; and spoiled ballots, 8; a total of 4,852. Of these spoiled and rejected ballots there is no doubt that a number of them were ballots that should have been counted; and had the scrutiny been held under proper auspices, I am satisfied that the result would have been in favour of Mr. Angus McLeod. To show that this is the case, a formal offer was made to Mr. A. B. Aylesworth, a Liberal, who was the lawyer conducting the case of Mr. McLeod, that they would hold the recount before Judge Mahaffy on the understanding that he would count Mr. Graham in by one vote. To the credit of the Liberal Conservative party and Mr. Aylesworth, they and he refused to be a party to any such deal or miscarriage of justice. Their offer was to drop proceedings before Judge Dartnell, and consent to go before Judge Mahaffy. I shall now present another affidavit in the case from the late Mr. Dalton McCarthy. My object in presenting this is to give those of us who are not behind the scenes a little insight into the way in which justice seems sometimes to be managed, at all events by gentlemen who occupy positions which should command respect—at all events, who hold such high positions in the legal profession that they seem to consider themselves free to act in a manner which, to my mind, would send many another man to the penitentiary. This is an affidavit by Mr. Dalton McCarthy, and I draw the attention of the House to this section of it:

On Sunday, the 14th February, I was informed that it was the intention of the plaintiff to apply for an injunction to restrain the recounting of ballots by His Honour the judge of the county court of the county of Ontario, and was instructed to oppose the granting of any such injunction.

Fearing that the injunction might be applied for ex-parte, I requested my partner, Mr. B. B. Osler to communicate with the Hon. Mr. Justice Robertson, who I understand was to take the court for the week commencing on the 15th February, to inform His Lordship that I understood that such motion was to be made and to ask him not to take it ex-parte as on behalf of the parties interested I would be prepared to oppose the granting of the motion without any formal notice, and I instructed Mr. Leighton McCarthy to appear in the matter on the Monday morning following before the said judge for the purpose of opposing the motion which he was prepared to do.

Mr. Osler did call on Mr. Justice Robertson on a Sunday and did succeed in so influencing the mind of Mr. Justice Robertson that when the application was made the next morning, it required considerable time and argument to remove the prejudice in his mind, so that it was impossible to get the injunction down on the forenoon train in order to serve it personally on Mr. Justice Dartnell. However, it was telegraphed down and was ignored by order of Mr. McCarthy. I shall read merely one other affidavit in connection with the matter. An injunction was granted, and Judge Dartnell admits having received an official notification by telegram from Osgoode Hall to that effect. In this same connection, the affidavit of Mr. A. B. Aylesworth, who is one of the leading lawyers of Toronto, will, I am sure, receive consideration:

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE.

Between

Angus McLeod, Plaintiff,

and

Robert N. Noble, George F. Bruce and George T. Dartnell, Defendants.

And in the matter of an application against Mr. Dalton McCarthy for an alleged contempt of court.

I, Allen Bristol Aylesworth, of the city of Toronto, in the county of York, barrister and solicitor, make oath and say:

1. I am Toronto agent herein for the solicitor for the above-named plaintiff.

2. I personally issued the writ of summons in this action. The said writ was issued and the affidavit of Orville M. Arnold on which the order of injunction was issued.

3. I made application for the said injunction as early in the morning of the fifteenth day of February, 1897, as I could. Mr. Justice Robertson was the rota judge presiding in the weekly court that week, and I attended at his private room at Osgoode Hall on the said day on his arrival, and about twenty or fifteen minutes before ten o'clock in the forenoon. The learned judge went over the said affidavit very carefully and referred to the statutes at some length before making up his mind to grant the order. He expressed himself as averse to making an order ex parte but I pressed the application as strongly as I could and urged that plaintiff ought not to be required to give any notice of the application as the proceeding he was applying to restrain was appointed to begin at the hour of ten o'clock on the same morning and the application I was making was therefore of such special urgency in the plaintiffs interest that even minutes were of importance. Nearly if not quite half an hour was occupied in discussing the application and finally the learned judge decided to grant the order, remarking that it would at any rate only operate to stay the proceedings before the defendant Dartnell for three days and give opportunity to have the rights of both sides as to the place of the recount determined in the High Court, when Mr. Leighton McCarthy entered the room. The learned judge had granted the order of injunction before Mr. McCarthy appeared but had not yet filled in the blanks or written his initials on the form of order I had submitted to him, Mr. McCarthy entered the room in a very abrupt manner; he seemed to have been hurrying to get there and he spoke excitedly; he did not state for whom he appeared and I did not know till three days later when I heard him say so that his appearance had been on behalf of the defendant Noble. Mr. McCarthy immediately on entering the room asked if this was an application for an injunction in the matter of the North Ontario election and said he wished to oppose the application. I at once objected to his being heard and he and I were both speaking at once. He did

not produce any affidavit or allude to having any but almost at once on beginning to speak he made the statement that the plaintiff and Judge Makaity were partners in business. I interrupted him hotly, denying what he said and charging that in making the allegation he was trying to use improperly to Mr. McLeod's prejudice knowledge of Mr McLeod's aairs which his firm had acquired as Mr. McLeod's solicitors. He retorted with equal heat that what I said was untrue, and thereupon Mr. Justice Robertson interfered, saying he would not have such an altercation before him, and adding "any way the application is an ex parte one." Mr. McCarthy replied, "Oh, very well, if your Lordship refuses to hear me," and left the room very hurriedly repeating his remark as he was opening the door which he at once closed behind him, and he did not return during the time I remained.

4. Mr. McCarthy was not in the judge's room more than, to the best of my judgment, two minutes in all and there was no refusal by the learned judge to hear him beyond what is above described and the statement which the judge made to him before the said altercation took place either that he had made or that he was going to make the order I had applied for.

5. My recollection entirely differs from that of Mr. McCarthy in his statement that to his asking of the judge if he refused to hear him, the judge replied that he did. I do not think that the judge made any answer at all to Mr. McCarthy's remark. If he did, I did not hear any such answer. Mr. McCarthy was leaving the judge's table and stepping rapidly towards the door as he spoke; he repeated his words at least a second time as he was going out; he was not very calm at the time, and he spoke loudly and excitedly, and if the judge made him any answer at all, I certainly did not hear it or if I did I cannot now recall it at all.

6. I remained in the judge's room only a minute or so after Mr McCarthy had gone out. I left all my papers except the writ and copy with the judge, who wished to enter in his book a note of it. After issuing the writ of summons, I returned to the judge's room and brought away the original order to the clerk of the weekly court, to be signed by him and issued in due course.

7. I have been told, but I cannot now remember by whom, that the defendant Dartnell, whose affidavit has been filed on behalf of Mr. Dalton McCarthy in answer to the application of the plaintiffs herein upon request sent to him, the said defendant Dartnell, by wire, came to Toronto on the 12th day of February, 1897, and went to the office of Messrs. McCarthy, Osler, Hoskin and Creelman for the purpose of making his appointment and issuing his summons for the recount of ballots mentioned in the said order of injunction and that he did in the said office make the said appointment, and there sign the said summonses for such recount. I believe the said statement to be true, and among other reasons for my belief is the circumstance that on the 18th day of February last, in a discussion of this affair in the presence of five or six persons, I charged the fact to be as above stated and commented upon it, and the said Mr. Leighton McCarthy was one of the five or six persons taking part in the said discussion and he did not in any way deny or question the truth of the said charge.

Mr. LISTER. Cut it short. It was all up in the courts.

Mr. HUGHES. That is where I got them.

Mr. SCRIVER. Why do you want to read them here?

Mr. HUGHES. The door is open, and the hon. gentleman may walk out if he does not want to listen. There is lots of room outside, and the air is quite fresh. If he does not want to hear me, let him go to sleep, as he usually does.

Mr. SCRIVER. I am not the only one who does not want to hear the hon. gentleman.

Mr. HUGHES. That is the last affidavit I will read. If the Government will give us information what this $204 is for, we will be pleased to hear it. The Finance Minister admits that he does not know anything about it. It undoubtedly was one of the most flagrant stealing of votes that ever was perpetrated in any country. Talk about the North-west ballot stuffing, it cannot compare with the ballot stuffing in the North Ontario election. Let the Conservatives of North Ontario have the Dominion treasury at their back even to the extent of 10 per cent of the amount placed by the Minister of the Interior at the disposal of his friends in Manitoba and the North-west Territories, let there be an investigation into the conduct of that election in North Ontario, even if there is anything proven against the Liberal-Conservatives in the election in Manitoba, we shall be able to put beside it a case that will stand for all time as a disgrace to the Liberal party of Canada. I do not refer particularly to their conduct in coercing—I say coercing—Judge Dartnell into the course he pursued in counting certain ballots in certain ways on the recount differently from the way he would have counted them when he was let alone; but I refer to the conduct of the election beforehand. I am certainly of opinion that this item should not pass, that not one dollar should be paid by the people for any such purpose as recouping Mr. Bruce, whether he was an officer of this House or not, because he got himself into trouble by deliberately disobeying the courts of this country.

For classifying all Canadian patents and preparing drawings of same for classification, and for exchange with the United States in return for their patents, to be paid notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Civil Service Act. $5,000

Mr. FOSTER. Will the hon. Minister please explain this?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). Our patents in Canada have never been classified, that is, they have never been divided and subdivided into classes according to the subjects of the patents. In the other countries where the examination of patents takes place, as in France, Germany and the United States, patents are all carefully classified for the purpose of assisting examiners in their work. In the United States they have about 640,000 patents at the present time which are carefully classified in the way I have described. The United States have offered us a complete classifica-

tion of their patents in return for a classification of ours. To obtain these very great advantages for our examiners, I think will be worth the expense involved.

Mr. SCRIVER. How is the classification made ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. By experts. I propose to put it in the hands of the best of examiners.

Mr. SCRIVER Is it a list of the patents ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It is a list in a sense. The patents are put into classes and subclasses. All we have to send is cuts with the numbers of the patents, they accepting that as a sufficient description of the patents. In return we get, not only cuts and drawings, but also a short resume of each patent which they make in their classification. This is the bargain that has been made by the deputy commissioner of patents and the patent office in the United States. It will cost us about $8,000 to make the cuts and do the work of classifying. This expense I propose to spread over two or two and a half years. This classification of the United States patents, if we were to buy it from them and not exchange, would cost about $20,000, and we should not then have our own classification. I think the bargain is a good one and greatly in the interest of the patent office.

Mr. FOSTER. If the hon gentleman is going to spread the expenditure over two and a half years, what does he want $5,000 for now ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We have to get a certain amount of plant, to do the photogravure work, by which these cuts are made. Besides, I expect that the classification will go on more rapidly at the beginning

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics—
To provide a dwelling at the dairy station, Nappan, N.S..... $1,200

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). As to this question of establishing creameries provided for in the main estimates, the Minister of Agriculture gave me to understand the preparatory work would be engaged in during the coming season. I regret to find that no provision is made for such work in the Supplementary Estimates. Does the hon. gentleman rely on the original vote for this ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It comes out of the usual dairy vote.

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). May I hope the Minister will see to it that the gentlemen who are sent to carry out the work will consult with me as representing the people of Inverness as to the most eligible places to set about this work of setting up dairy establishments or creameries

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I will communicate with the hon. member.

Mr McLENNAN (Inverness). The reason why I ask is because I have had a letter from the secretary of agriculture of the province, Mr. Chipman, bringing me to book for questioning his knowledge of farming in the island of Cape Breton. I maintain that he is not so well acquainted with agriculture in Cape Breton as in other parts of the province, and he cannot be supposed to be as well posted in regard to agriculture in that island as the gentlemen representing its various constituencies in this House. For my part I must say that the gentleman coming from the Department of Agriculture never consulted me as to where he should go. The people of Inverness sent me here, and I think that they will expect that the Department of Agriculture in sending men out to carry on this work, would consult their representative in this matter.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. member knows that when I communicated with Mr. Chipman, who was then Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Chipman wrote to him and asked him his advice and the hon. gentleman never chose to reply to him.

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). Last fall, when these gentlemen, in company with Mr. Chipman went to the island of Cape Breton, they never wrote me and never mentioned one word about it. This spring when they came Mr. Chipman did deign to write me a letter. I did not answer it because I considered that as the representative of the people of Inverness, I had nothing to do with Mr. Chipman, an employé of the Government of Nova Scotia.

Quarantine $5,000

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. This is almost entirely due to the extra expense at Williams Head quarantine, on the coast of British Columbia, where we have crowded incoming passenger steamers from the Orient. Several cases of smallpox and other contagious diseases have been found on the vessels.

Mr. EARLE. While we are on this item of quarantine, I would like to ask the Minister of Agriculture if he proposes to do anything in connection with the lepers of British Columbia ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have not any such intention. The lepers there are in charge of the local authorities, as I understand. I do not think the Dominion Government is responsible.

Mr. EARLE. The Minister, I suppose, is aware that the expense of caring for the lepers falls upon the cities of Victoria and Vancouver where they were discovered.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Does not the local government contribute anything ?

Mr. EARLE. They do not contribute a dollar. But those cities that have had to

pay for the care of these lepers have felt that the Dominion Government, having taken care of lepers under all circumstances, I think, in the province of Manitoba, should also do the same thing in regard to the lepers there. As the Minister is aware, those municipalities are not in a position to treat lepers in the way that they should be treated. They are also very desirous of getting rid of them. It was suggested that something might be done in regard to transferring them, as you did the lepers from Manitoba, to your hospital at Tracadie. At any rate, it seems a great hardship that those two cities, where these lepers are discovered, should be compelled to care for them when they are not responsible for their introduction. The Dominion Government receives a very large income from Chinese immigration there, they receive about two-thirds of the tax, and we feel strongly that they should do something towards the care of these lepers.

Militia—Income $61,200

Mr. LaRIVIERE. I see there is an item here to pay for medals for militiamen serving during the Fenian raid in 1866 and 1870. We had a raid in Manitoba in 1871 where militiamen and even citizens formed themselves into a military corps, and went to the frontier to defend the province from invasion. I believe that our militiamen and our private citizens that enrolled themselves in the militia are as much entitled to medals as those that have served in the eastern provinces. I would suggest to the hon. gentleman to include the raid of 1871 into the province of Manitoba, when the Hudson's Bay Company's fort at Pembina was taken by invading Fenians, and if it had not been for the interference of American soldiers, the province would have been perhaps ransacked by invaders.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I may explain to the hon. gentleman that it is necessary in cases of this kind to get permission of the Imperial Government, or Her Majesty in fact, before granting a medal. So far as I recollect, the Order in Council which was passed simply referred to the years 1866 and 1870; therefore, so far as this vote is concerned, I think it must be limited to those years. But since the hon. gentleman has called my attention to the matter, I shall be very glad to take it up, and we can make it the subject of a further representation. I think it is the desire of Parliament that all who were engaged in repelling the threatened invasion referred to should be recognized and rewarded in this way.

Mr. HUGHES. I would like to ask the Minister of Militia and Defence how many butts there will be on the new Dominion of Canada range?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I think about 50.

Mr. CLARKE. I see in this vote items for new rifle ranges at Hamilton and Victoria. Are these municipalities contributing anything towards the cost of these ranges?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Nothing.

Mr. FOSTER. Are these votes to complete the payment for the ranges?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes. The rifle range at Hamilton has been taken up and expropriated by a railway company passing through it, and rendering it useless. It was necessary to provide a new range, and this sum, it is estimated, will pay for the land and complete the range.

Mr. FOSTER. Who owned that rifle range?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The old rifle range was rented by the Government.

To pay for 25 acres of land at London, Ont., for a training and camping ground, expropriated under Order in Council of 25th March, 1895... ..... $25,000

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. $25,000 is appropriated for the land which has been used for some time for militia purposes. The quantity is twenty-five acres at $1,000 per acre.

Mr. CLARKE. From whom is it being purchased?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The Bank of British North America.

Mr. HUGHES. I would make a suggestion that another year the Minister of Militia should take up the question of the rifle range at Kingston. It is used by the Kingston corps, and the third military district. The range is very dangerous, it being parallel with the main road. I would suggest to the member for Kingston that he should select a suitable location, get the ear of the Minister and have a new range laid out. I am sure the camp went to Belleville largely because the Kingston range was not considered safe.

Mr. CLARKE. Has the land been purchased for the ranges at Hamilton and Victoria?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Not purchased yet, but will be purchased after the vote is passed.

Mr. FOSTER. Have they been selected?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. We have plans in the department for both these ranges. At Hamilton the price is considered very reasonable, but we will take further means to ascertain whether the price is fair or not. At Victoria the present range is reported as un-

safe. It is proposed to move to another location. The site proposed meets the recommendation of the district officer commanding, and all the local officers, and is located at Oak Bay.

Mr. EARLE. The old range, which was selected years ago, is on the beach, but there has always been difficulty in connection with it, especially with the use of modern weapons. The range is too short, and steamers pass in front of it, so that the men have to cease firing whenever any craft are moving in the vicinity. It has been used, but not with satisfaction for many years. The road for travel passes by the range.

To provide for gratuities to the following :—

On account of error in length of service when calculating gratuity last year, viz. :—	
Prof. R. C. Harris, R.M.C.....	$ 45 00
Prof. A. D. Duval.....	28 80
Lt.-Col. C. T. Irwin, A.A.G.A...	652 00
Major J. Fraser, Supt. of Stores at Winnipeg.....	1,127 00
Lt.-Col. d'Orsennens, D.A.G. at St. Johns, P.Q.....	1,347 90
Children of the late Lt.-Col. Prevost, Superintendent of Cartridge Factory	333 33
Joseph Larose, shot at Cote St. Luc	1,000 00
Loronzo McCarroll, for loss of eyesight while on duty as a marker..	500 00
Widow and children of Jas. Cosman, accidentally killed by shot fired by Yarmouth Garrison Artillery.....	500 00
Lt.-Col. P. B. Worsley, D.A.G. at Halifax	3,799 00
Thos. Moor, sr., for loss of his son, killed at Batoche, in 1885.....	1,500 00
Lt.-Col. John Gray, inspector of stores, 9 years and 2 months' service	1,436 75
Mrs. Thos. Christian, for loss of her husband, shot at drill shed, Ottawa	500 00

Mr. FOSTER. Perhaps the Minister will give an explanation with respect to these gratuities.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The first five are items to cover deficiencies last year. Errors were made in calculating the gratuity, the wrong salary being taken in some cases. The principle on which the gratuity is given is this. The officer on being retired receives 10 per cent for every year he has served of the salary he enjoys at the time he is retired. In the case of Col. d'Orsennens, his gratuity had been calculated on a salary of $1,700, instead of $2,200 or $2,300.

Mr. POPE. What was the reason for retiring Lieut.-Col d'Orsennens ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. His retirement was very strongly recommended by the General Commanding, it being reported that to secure the efficiency of the school it was absolutely necessary that Col. d'Orsennens' services be dispensed with. I do not know whether he had passed the age limit, sixty years, or not, but he had about reached the age limit.

Mr. SPROULE. If it is the rule to give 10 per cent of the salary received at the time of retirement for each year served, how does it occur that General Cameron only received $710.10, while all the other officers in the Military College received proportionate amounts according to the system described ? Had General Cameron received the proportionate amount, he would have been paid $2,557, instead of $710.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The Imperial officers who are appointed to positions in the Royal Military College never have received any retiring allowance. Major Cameron received no retiring allowance, simply money sufficient to return him to the place whence he came. That course has been followed in all cases. The Imperial officers have their expenses to this country paid and the expenses for their return paid. That has been the rule in the past. The leader of the Opposition the day he went away called my attention to this matter, and I promised to look into it. I have not had an opportunity of doing so carefully yet, but that is the rule, and the reason I have given is the real reason.

Mr. SPROULE. Was he the only one of the number belonging to the British service that retired ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The only one.

Mr. SPROULE. I respectfully submit that since all the others got a retiring allowance on the basis of the calculation given by the Minister, and as Major General Cameron was the only one who did not, the Minister ought to have dealt a little more liberally with him, and in my judgment he should receive at least the same proportionate amount as a gratuity that the others did.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. These Imperial officers who are loaned to us by the Imperial Government have never yet received one dollar of gratuity. They simply receive their travelling expenses to this country and back to England after their service is ended.

Mr. SPROULE. It might not be out of place for the Minister to establish a precedent.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. That is another thing.

Mr. SPROULE. It is an act of kindness towards General Cameron, and it is no injustice to the country or the service.

Mr. SPROULE. In the case of Colonel Prevost's children, did you allow a pension besides ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. No.

Mr. SPROULE. In that case $300 appears to be a small amount.

Mr. MILLS. On what principle does the Minister reach this amount of $333.33 ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. That would be two months pay. The $1,000 was recommended by the board of officers, who considered the case of the poor man Larose shot at St. Luc.

Mr. MILLS. And $500 seems to be enough for the family of James Cosman, who was killed at Yarmouth.

Mr. POPE. I see one or two instances of $500 here. If that is considered as the price of husbands it is not worth dying.

Mr. FOSTER. Was that Yarmouth case a recommendation of the board ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. In this case there was no board. The general officer commanding recommended : "I forward herewith Colonel Irvine's report and from my knowledge of the case, and considering the accident was not caused by any fault of the man, I consider the Government should bestow a pension or gratuity on his widow."

Mr. MILLS. When did that happen ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. In 1889. My attention was called to the matter by the member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint) and he seemed to think that the widow would be very well satisfied to receive this recognition.

Mr. FOSTER. Had there been previous applications ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes.

Mr. HUGHES. A wounded man who has recovered and is at work gets $1,000, and the other fellow was knocked clean out and his family only get $500.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. It might be that the wounded man would have to pay considerable for medical attendance.

Lt.-Col. Worsley, D.A.G. at Halifax.... $3,799

Mr. FOSTER. How does this come ; it seems a fortune ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Lieut.-Col. Worsley was the district officer commanding at Halifax, and he had some trouble with the department in the time of General Herbert. It is a long story, but to summarize, something like this happended. Colonel Worsley ascertained that an irregularity had taken place in the accounts and he reported it to headquarters, and as a result of his having reported the irregularity he seems to have been suspected of having some improper knowledge beforehand, or at all events that was General Herbert's view. Afterwards a good deal of correspondence took place, and I think Colnel Worsley was suspended although his pay went on. Subsequently he came to Ottawa and negotiations passed between him and the Minister of Militia of that day, the result of which was that a promise was made to Colonel Worsley that if he would resign he would receive an appointment. That promise was not carried out. He did receive an appointment by the day in the stores branch in Halifax for a short time, but when Mr. Dickey came in he dispensed with Colonel Worsley's services. I may say that I know it to be a fact that the promise was made to Colonel Worsley, and I have the documentary evidence to show that the promise was made in the hearing of the then Governor General, but the promise was never fulfilled. Colonel Worsley, I think, was harshly treated. He had the right at the time he retired from the militia to receive the sum of money which is now being voted to him, provided there was no special reasons to the contrary. He was not dismissed, he resigned, and I think it is only fair that Colonel Worsley should receive this amount.

Thos. Moor, sr., for loss of his son, killed at Batoche, 1885..... $1,500

Mr. MILLS. Was there ever an application made for this before ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Thomas Moor was killed at Batoche in action, aged 18, tinsmith by trade, earned $9 a week and contributed in a measure to the support of his two brothers, sister, mother and father. The father is still living, and it is to him this money is to be paid. The father applied, first, for scrip, and second for $500, as he intended to open a small store. The opinion of the board, stated on the 23rd of January, 1886, was :

The board, after due consideration, have come to the conclusion that as Mr. Moor, sr., has only asked for the scrip that would have gone to his son, together with $500, the board feel that they can only recommend that Mr. Moor's request be granted ; but should the case have come up without any amount being named, they would have recommended a larger sum.

The case is similar to that of Private Isaac Thomas Hughes, of the 10th Battalion, who was killed at the same time. His age was twenty years and three months. His salary was $8 per week as a gold and silver plater; an excellent workman ; would now be in receipt of $10 or $11 per week if living ; sent his salary for the support of his mother and father ; the latter, a carpenter by trade, is sixty-nine years old and not in good health. Isaac Thomas Hughes was the only support of his aged parents. They bought a property in Toronto, upon which they had to pay $600 at the time of the death of the young man. The first board sat on the 15th of December, 1885, and reported that it was impossible for them to state any particular amount as a compensation, but as in their opinion it is a very hard case they strongly recommend it

to the favourable consideration of the department. A second meeting of the board took place in January, 1886, and they came to the following conclusions :—

Had this young man been disabled for life, he would, in the opinion of the board, have received a pension of 60 cents per day. The board would, therefore, recommend, that he should receive half that amount, or a lump sum which would produce that amount at 6 per cent. The latter, the board thinks, would be preferable, as this amount would enable the parents to relieve the property from debt which was incurred through relying on the son's assistance to pay for it.

He received by Order in Council of the 16th of August, 1886, $1,825, which at 6 per cent is equal to 30 cents per diem. I have based the additional amount to be given to Thomas Moor, senior, upon what was done in the case of Thomas Hughes, which was exactly a similar case. He received $500, and I propose to supplement that by a further amount of $1,500.

Mr. CLARKE. I know something about this case of the death of Thomas Moor, junior, and I think it was the modesty of the father in making the demand after the son was killed that caused the board of officers to report as they did. I think the additional amount the Minister is granting to the father, who is in poor health, and also the mother, is a reasonable amount.

Gratuity to Lt.-Col. John Gray, inspector of stores, 9 years and 2 months' service $1,436 75

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Colonel Gray was retired shortly after I came into office. I found that he had really nothing to do, and I omitted at that time to place any gratuity in the estimates. He is entitled to this gratuity from the length of service he performed.

To meet outstanding liabilities incurred by Dominion Rifle Association in connection with the erection of a building at Bisley, England $5,000

Mr. FOSTER. What is the whole cost of that building ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE The total cost is $14,918. We gave $5,000 in 1896, and this $5,000 will complete our contribution.

Mr. HUGHES. I may say that this is money well expended. The building is a very fine advertisement for the Dominion of Canada, and was seen by thousands last year. Its cost was greatly increased, owing to the fact that it was put up in the Jubilee year, when everything was at four or five prices in England.

Further grant to Dominion Artillery Association, $2,000 of which is to provide for entertainment of visiting English team $4,100

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. An English artillery team is to visit this country this year, to return the visit paid by our artillery team two years ago, when we won a very important match at Shoeburyness. It is necessary to have this sum of money in order properly to entertain this English team. In addition to that, the Artillery Association find that it is absolutely impossible for them to get on with the amount of money which is granted to them, which is $2,900, and they ask for $2,100 more in order to enable them to carry out their annual matches efficiently and properly, and I think it is money well expended.

Mr. QUINN. I would like to ask the Minister if anything has been done towards establishing a military school in Montreal. A deputation waited on the Minister some time ago, and I think it was understood at that time that some steps would be taken to select a site.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I am sorry not to be able to point the hon. gentleman to a vote in the Estimates for that purpose. It was found impossible to ask for any money for that purpose this year. In the meantime, we are getting the best information together we can, and, so far as I am concerned, at any rate, as the head of the Militia Department, I am very strongly in favour of establishing a depot at Montreal at the earliest possible moment. I believe we would get a better return for the money expended at the city of Montreal than at any other point in the whole Dominion, except perhaps Toronto.

Mr. McLENNAN (Inverness). I would like to ask the Minister if it is intended to increase the strength of the 94th Battalion ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I think there are six companies in that battalion. The battalions run from four companies to eight. I think there are more battalions in the Dominion having six companies than any other number. But I may say to the hon. gentleman that as the 94th is the only military organization in the Island of Cape Breton, except the field artillery at Sydney, and as there are a great many mining centres there, it is very important to have a good infantry organization in that part of the country. I propose, at the earliest possible moment, to increase the strength of that battalion.

Mr. HUGHES. The hon. Minister will remember that we had some conversation the other day with reference to the repatriation of the 100th Regiment, or in other words, a Canadian regiment in the Imperial service. I would suggest that an item be left over so that we may have a discussion in the morning.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I think I ought to state with regard to the item of $15,000, that I have the word of the Imperial Government to return to us that money. They sent us

ammunition which was not what it ought to be, and we are to make it right at our own factories, and I have a letter from the Imperial authorities offering to return the money.

For arms and accoutrements..... $50,000

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. That is intended for the purchase of accoutrements to equip the balance of the militia. The chief item is to provide the garrison field artillery with the Lee-Enfield carbine so that the whole militia may be equipped with the same weapon. The estimated number to be purchased is 2,000. There are also required 3,000 more sets of the Oliver equipment.

Resolutions to be reported.

FIRST READING.

Bill (T) further to amend the Act respecting Public Offices (from the Senate) read the first time.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. BRITTON. As I shall not be here to-morrow, I would ask permission of the House just to say a word with reference to a vote that is to be taken to-morrow. I have no intention of making a speech. A vote is to be asked for $600,000 for rolling stock in connection with the railways of this Dominion. I would urge strongly on the Government that this money be expended in the manufacturing establishments of this Dominion.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 1.15 a.m. (Thursday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 9th June, 1898.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

PRAYERS.

DRUMMOND COUNTY RAILWAY INVESTIGATION.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved:

That the notice of motion of Mr. Lister "That the Report of the Special Committee appointed to inquire into subsidies granted in aid of the Drummond County Railway be adopted," be made the First Order of the Day at the second sitting this day.

Mr. FOSTER. I hope my hon. friend will not press this motion at this time of the session. I think I can say without at all being mistaken, that there was an understanding amongst the members of the committee that this report should not be taken up this session. The committee got through with their labours very late in the session, then it took some time to print the report, and it has only been printed two or three days. With members sitting up until three o'clock in the morning and rushing business through, I do not think any of us can have an opportunity of really informing ourselves about the report. The hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Powell), the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Borden), and the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Haggart) were the members of the committee from our side of the House. The hon. member for Westmoreland has left, and left with the understanding that the question would not be discussed this session, and he has taken with him important papers in connection with it. It would be absolutely impossible for us to make any satisfactory discussion of that matter in the absence of the hon. member for Westmoreland. I submit to my right hon. friend, therefore, whether, under the circumstances, it would not be better to come to an arrangement by which this could be taken up next session. It would be strenuously discussed, and our vital forces would be stronger on both sides, I suppose, if the debate were to take place under other circumstances. I hope my hon. friend does not wish to take the Spanish army at a disadvantage.

The PRIME MINISTER. I think the Spanish army is bottled up; at all events, I see that army is not ready for a fight at this moment.

Mr. FOSTER. We have a Merrimac in store.

The PRIME MINISTER. However, there is a great deal of force in what my hon. friend says. When we are up till three o'clock in the morning and commencing business at eleven, it is evident that the House is in no condition to discuss such a matter as fully, perhaps, as it should be discussed. I do not see just now how we can arrange to postpone a discussion of this question until next session. If the parliamentary ingenuity of my hon. friend can discover a way by which we can take up this report next session, I have no objection to agree to his suggestion, and let the dogs of war sleep in the meantime.

Mr. FOSTER. Then I can guarantee to my hon. friend that the combined ingenuity of the House will be able to discover a way by which that report can be taken up next session.

Motion withdrawn.

THE CASE OF MISS HUBERT.

Mr. GILLIES. Before the Orders of the Day are called I wish to draw the attention of the right hon. gentleman to a petition that I presented a few days ago on behalf of a lady, Miss Hubert, from Arichat. I have been requested, on her behalf, to make some inquiry of the Government whether any steps have been taken in answer to her petition, and if not yet taken when will the Government consider the prayer of this petition ?

The PRIME MINISTER. What is the nature of the request of this lady ? I have not been able to look at the petition.

Mr. GILLIES. It is a lengthy petition, setting forth certain grievances of a personal character, she having been deprived of some property. The petition has been filed with the officers of the House, and can be referred to. I desire now to bring it to the notice of the Government, and to ask them to consider what steps can be taken.

The PRIME MINISTER. The only answer I can give to my hon. friend at this moment is that we will inquire into the matter and see if it is possible, if we are satisfied this lady has a grievance, to redress it.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, probably at this stage we might have a little conversation as to the probable date of prorogation. My hon. friend informed me yesterday that all the legislation was down that it was intended to bring, that the Postmaster General's Bill if, when printed, it was found to be a contentious measure, would not necessarily be pressed. There remains the Bill of the Minister of Railways and Canals, concerning which I would like to have a little consultation with the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Haggart) who is looking into it. That leaves us the Estimates and the legislation which is already advanced towards the final stage. Under these circumstances, the hon. gentleman might indicate somewhere near the time that prorogation could take place. This side of the House is willing to facilitate that as much as possible. There is a good deal of contentious matter in the Supplementary Estimates, but we will try to confine our criticisms to the point, and to the worst points, particularly of the large and doubtful items. With this position it would seem to me that we ought to pass our Sunday, not as a combined House of Commons.

The PRIME MINISTER. I quite reciprocate the wish of my hon. friend that we should spend next Sunday thanking God for the blessing of having reached the end of this session. In order to facilitate this, I move now that item 33, second reading of Bill (No. 164)—letter Q of the Senate—respecting loan companies, be discharged.

Motion agreed to.

The PRIME MINISTER. I have no other order to move at present. But, as I stated to my hon. friend the other day, the Bill moved by the Postmaster General, not having been announced when I gave the Government programme a few days ago, if the Opposition think that Bill is a contentious one we will not press it. There is no more legislation to bring down ; therefore, the whole programme is upon the Order paper. It seems to me that to-day we ought to be able to dispose of all the legislation which is now under way and to dispose of the rest of the Estimates. Then we can take concurrence to-morrow, and I see no reason why we should not prorogue on Saturday—that is so far as we are concerned.

INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Mr. MARTIN. Before the Orders of the Day are called I wish to draw the attention of the Postmaster General to a return which I asked for last session, and to which I called attention several times this session. I should like to obtain the papers.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). The secretary of the department yesterday made quite a find, and he sent over to the Secretary of State a large number of returns. This return asked for by my hon. friend may be among the number, and perhaps he will renew his question at three o'clock.

Mr. FOSTER. Among other papers that have turned up is there a statement as to the exact income from jubilee stamps in 1897 and 1898, respecting which the hon. gentleman has not yet made a return.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I thought I had explained that there was no separate account kept of these jubilee stamps. They were issued concurrently with other stamps. We could separate the number of those issued to postmasters, but there is no separate account of the returns made. If the hon. gentleman will renew his inquiry next session, we may assume that the stamps sent out have been used, and therefore the department will be chargeable with everything outstanding.

Mr. MACDONALD (P.E.I.) I beg to ask the Minister of Public Works if he is going to bring down the return with reference to the dredge "Prince Edward," asked for on 30th March.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). I will take a note of it, and lay it on the Table to-day.

Mr. WALLACE. I desire to ask the Minister of the Interior whether the letter with

respect to the dismissal of W. F. Wood, officer at Kamloops, which he promised to bring down, will be laid on the Table.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). I will lay it on the Table after recess.

THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 130) respecting the boundaries of the province of Quebec.—(Mr. Sifton.)

THE ELECTORAL FRANCHISE ACT.

The House resumed consideration of amendments made by the Senate to sections 5, 10, 21a, 23, 26a, 26b, 26c, and 27 of Bill (No. 16) to amend the Electoral Franchise Act, and to further amend the Dominion Elections Act.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick) moved:

That the amendments made by the Honourable the Senate to sections 5, 6, 10, 12a, 23, 26a, 26b, 26c, and 27 of Bill (No. 16), "An Act to amend the Electoral Franchise Act and to amend the Dominion Elections Act," be disagreed to for the following reasons:—

Because the amendment made by the Honourable the Senate to the Bill, excepting from its operation in the provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Manitoba, and providing for a special revision of the voters' lists in those provinces for elections to this House, is inconsistent with and subversive of the general principle of the Bill.

That the procedure proposed by the Honourable the Senate for securing the revision of such lists, under the authority of this Parliament, is wholly inadequate, and cannot be rendered effective without creating complicated and costly machinery incompatible with the object of the Bill.

That the amendment, therefore, in effect provides for the continuation in the provinces named of the present unwieldy and expensive system of creating special voters' lists for Dominion elections.

That the passage of the amendment by the Senate after its rejection by the House of Commons is inconsistent with the undoubted right and privilege of this House to determine the principles of the franchise under which its members are elected, and is the more unwarranted in that the country has emphatically pronounced in favour of the principle of the Bill.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). So far as regards the reasons incorporated in the notice of motion by the Solicitor General, I do not see anything that will apply in any respect to the amendments having reference to the province of Prince Edward Island. These are included in the amendments in which the House does not propose to concur. I do not see the slightest reason stated for not concurring in those amendments. So far as I understand the law of the province of Prince Edward Island with respect to these matters, and I speak subject to correction, because I have not had such opportunity of making myself familiar with the law there as has the Solicitor General, nor have I the same familiarity with it that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries possesses, I understand that under the law of Prince Edward Island any person who makes an affidavit of qualification is entitled to vote. The voting in that province is open voting and not by ballot—that is at the provincial elections. There is a provision made for testing the right of such a person to vote, and if it eventually appears that he is not so entitled, his vote is struck out. It is struck off from the number of votes given for the candidate for whom that person voted.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). You refer to the election petition being filed, and a scrutiny.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do. That scrutiny, as I understand it, is held in Prince Edward Island on an election petition.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Certainly, because there is open voting there.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). As I understand the amendment of the Senate it is simply designed to give some relief in cases of that kind, and if you do not pass this amendment in what position are you in the province of Prince Edward Island? You have no record at all of the candidate for whom any particular person has voted; you have that person voting upon a mere affidavit; there is no voters' list at all; you have any person able to come and vote who is prepared to make an affidavit. Now, what remedy are you to have in respect to a matter of that kind? Surely my hon. and learned friend (the Solicitor General) must agree that there should be some way of dealing with possibilities of that kind. You may have 500 persons coming in and taking the oath of qualification, and it is absolutely impossible to know for whom they voted, and how are you to deal with that? Are you to deal with that on an election petition; if so it appears to me that you would require to amend the Dominion Controverted Election Act. Of course where a man is bribed or where a man bribes, you can have his name struck off without inquiring at all as to the person for whom he voted; you simply strike off one vote from the number of votes given for the candidate on whose behalf he was bribed or on whose behalf he bribed. But in the present case how are you to deal with it. Suppose a person comes in and votes on his own motion, he does not vote at the instance of either one party or the other, but it would eventually transpire if an inquiry was granted that he had no right to vote at all. Now, the candidate who is elected by votes of that character ought not to hold his seat. As I understand the amendment of the Senate it simply amounts to

this: that when any such person has his vote objected to by either candidate, you can go into that question upon a recount before the county judge and you can there investigate the right of this person to vote. That seems to me to be a very fair provision. My hon. and learned friend may suggest that you can do this by an election petition. I have not had the opportunity of investigating as to that, but whether you have the right or not, it seems to me a fair thing that you should do it in an inexpensive way. You have had no opportunity of testing in the first place the qualification of this voter; his qualification ought to be tested in some inexpensive and prompt way, and the least expensive and most prompt way would be before a county judge, and it would be proper to give to the county court judges in the province of Prince Edward Island the right and the jurisdiction, as the Senate has evidently intended to confer upon them, to test the qualification of any such voter. These amendments are not touched in any way by the reasons which my learned friend (Mr. Fitzpatrick) has put forward, and therefore I venture to submit to him with some confidence, and I also venture to submit to my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, that these are fair provisions and reasonable provisions, and that this House ought not to refuse to concur in them. I think my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will see that a doubt might arise and probably would arise if some such procedure as this is not adopted. Under the present law of Prince Edward Island it is all right in a local election because you have open voting, but if you do not keep any record of the candidate for whom these votes have been given it would be absolutely impossible to deal with this argument. That seems to me to be the whole point of the Senate.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The real point is the secrecy of the ballot.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Quite so, but you have the alternative of one thing or the other. In this province where there is open voting you have this particular provision of the law giving the right of investigation afterwards, and you propose to apply to a system of that kind of voting by ballot. You must either give up in the case in which these voters are objected to, the secrecy of the ballot so far as that secrecy is done away with by such a procedure as this, or, you must leave the door open to the very serious evils which would be created by the non-concurrence of this House in the amendment of the Senate.

Now, with respect to the other amendments to which the reasons put forward by my hon. friend (Mr. Fitzpatrick) more particularly apply. I venture to think that the first reason advanced in the notice of motion does not state the position quite fairly. The ground is, that this amendment of the Senate provides for a special revision. It does not provide for a special revision. It does not provide for a general revision at least; it simply provides for a revision on certain specified grounds at the instance of any voter or person entitled to be a voter. There is no general revision provided for. What is provided for is the right of appeal at the instance of any voter whose name has been omitted from the list, or which considers that the names of others have been improperly added to or omitted from the list. That is in no sense a general revision and it in no sense seems to me merits the condemnation which is contained in the first clause of the notice of motion. The second clause of the notice of motion speaks of the complicated and costly machinery. There is no very complicated and costly machinery provided for here, and even if there were complicated and costly machinery provided for, it surely is not more complicated and more costly than the similar machinery provided for in the other provinces. My hon. and learned friend (Mr. Fitzpatrick) may say that is provided by the provinces themselves, but it is assumed and must be assumed that it is a right thing to have an appeal to a judicial tribunal in the last instance regarding matters of this kind; then I say that even if the procedure is as costly and as complicated as the machinery in the other provinces we should not for a moment hesitate to adopt it. The third clause of the notice of motion is:

> That the amendment, therefore, in effect provides for the continuation in the provinces named of the present unwieldy and expensive system of creating special voters' lists for Dominion elections.

Surely my learned friend (Mr. Fitzpatrick) will not say that this is a very fair way to deal with this amendment. It is not unwieldy, it is not expensive; it simply provides that any voter who has a grievance in respect of himself or in respect to any other voter can go to the county court judge and have that particular matter dealt with, and when so dealt with it will not in any way affect the provincial lists.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I ask my hon. friend (Mr. Borden) to address himself particularly to that point.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I will do so. The provincial lists, when settled by the sheriff, remain the lists so far as the provincial elections are concerned. So far as Dominion elections are concerned, this amendment simply allows any voter, in respect of the names of certain voters placed upon or omitted from that list, to obtain an adjudication from the county court judge. That in no sense touches the validity of the provincial lists for provincial elections. It simply provides that upon the order which

the county court judge shall make upon the appeals to him, the list shall be modified solely for the purpose of any Dominion election. The result will be that you will have in the hands of the proper officer having the custody thereof, a list ready to be used for the puropses of provincial elections, and you will have in the hands of that officer that list for the purposes of Dominion elections, as modified by the order which the county court judge shall have made upon such appeal. Surely, there is nothing very unwieldy or complicated or costly in that. Having that, you simply have in these three provinces the same right of appeal to a judicial officer as already exists in the other provinces of this Dominion. It seems to me that the amendment of the Senate in that respect is in a very simple and very reasonable form. At all events, if it is not in a simple form, and if it can be improved, it seems to me that it is the duty of my hon. and learned friend not to reject it, if the principle of it can be defended, but to suggest such modifications as will make it more simple and less costly, if any such can be suggested. The last clause of my hon. and learned friend's motion says:

> That the passage of the amendment by the Senate, after its rejection by the House of Commons, is inconsistent with the undoubted right and privilege of this House.

Such a principle as this would prevent the Senate discussing any question which would be dealt with by this House. I do not understand that to be the true position in regard to the franchise or any other subject. The fact that any particular amendment has been discussed in this House is no reason why the Senate should be shut off from action upon it; otherwise the functions of the Senate are merely nominal. The Senate has a right, no doubt, to consider the reasons given in this House for or against; but to say that because this House has considered certain reasons in regard to any question to be wise or not wise, therefore the Senate shall be precluded or concluded from discussing that question upon its merits, seems to me to be a very dangerous doctrine. My hon. and learned friend's motion concludes by saying that this action of the Senate "is the more unwarranted in that the country has emphatically pronounced in favour of the principle of the Bill." If my hon. and learned friend states that under the circumstances under which the last Dominion election was held, the country had in view the particular principle which is said to be invaded by this action of the Senate, I think he would be going a little further than he has yet gone on this or any similar subject. My hon. and learned friend knows that the last Dominion election was not to any extent fought on the principle of the Franchise Bill or any principle embodied in this Bill. He knows the truth, as laid down by a recent English writer, Mr. Lecky, in his work on "Democracy and Liberty," that it is almost impossible to get an electorate to pronounce an opinion on more than one important subject at one general election. The matters which engaged the attention of the electorate of this country at the last general election were not connected in any way with the subject of this Bill, so far as it has been modified by the Senate; and to say that the giving of the right of appeal to a judicial officer in these three provinces invades any principle on which the country pronounced at the last general election, seems to me to be trifling with this subject. This principle, or any principle relating to the franchise, was not considered, at all events so far as I have been able to make myself acquainted with the public questions discussed in that election. Therefore, it seems to me that the reasons which have been put forward in this motion cannot be made good, that the amendment which the Senate has made in the Bill and in which it asks the concurrence of this House, is a reasonable amendment, and that this House, upon fair consideration and doing only the barest justice to the three provinces in which at present there exists no right of appeal to a judge, ought to concur in that amendment.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). Mr. Speaker, I would like to make just a remark or two in reference to what has been said by my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Borden), more particularly in its bearing upon the situation in my own province. I have followed this discussion a little closely, though not as closely as I would have liked, during the progress of the Bill through committee, and I have been surprised beyond measure at the persistent determination evinced by my hon. friends opposite, and continued in the other Chamber, to introduce the element embodied in the Senate amendments into the Farnchise Bill. My surprise has proceeded from the fact that that amendment argued, as it appeared to me, an entire want of apprehension of the fundamental principle underlying this measure. The principle of this Bill is that we shall accept the lists which are prepared for the purposes of the provincial elections. The amendment, as proposed in this House, and the amendment as made in the Senate, strikes at the very root of that principle; and my hon. friends opposite might as well ask us to abandon this Bill altogether as to ask us to accept this amendment. It does occasion me no end of surprise to think that those of my hon. friends who are eminent at the bar, and who are justly reputed for their legal knowledge and attainments, should fail to see the blot which lies on the face of their proposition. My hon. friend from Halifax has said that these proposed reasons for refusing to concur in the Senate amend-

ments are not well founded. It appears to me that they might be stated much more strongly than they are, at least one of them. I maintain with all confidence, from a knowledge of the existing provincial law of New Brunswick and of the system under which the lists are made up, that it would be utterly and radically impossible to engraft this amendment upon that system without destroying the lists altogether. My hon. friend cannot find in the amendment as adopted by the Senate the necessary machinery to work out this appeal to the judges. It is not there at all, and you would find yourself in the most anomalous and absurd position when you came to try to work the law out.

What is the law in New Brunswick ? It is that the revisers, after they have discharged their duty, shall send the lists to the county secretary within a date fixed, I think, not later than the 10th November. Those lists remain in the office of the county secretary until the sheriff of the county, not earlier than the 10th of December, takes them up for the purpose of ascertaining and determining what names have been duplicated, and striking out the names of those not residing in any parish which appears on its list, so as to leave simply each name once upon the final list. The list cannot be taken for Dominion purposes out of the hands of the county secretary and touched without ceasing to be a provincial list. You cannot lay your hand on it without destroying it for provincial purposes. It is then no longer a provincial list. After you take it out of the hands of the county secretary by order of a judge, and add an amendment to it, what becomes of it ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Would it not be just as possible, for the purposes of this appeal, to procure from the proper officer a certified copy of the list for the purposes of the Dominion elections ?

An hon. MEMBER. We have not provided for that.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Why not provide for them now ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is not provided for, and you have to provide for it in the most explicit manner, or else you are going to be absolutely lost when you come to work this thing out. From the moment you undertake to touch those lists, you have to take them out of the hands of the local officers and declare them to be Dominion lists and subject to the treatment your section proposes. From the moment they are taken out of the hands of the county officers, you have to follow them through the various channels so that they may be properly constituted Dominion lists, and continued Dominion lists, and cease to be provincial lists for any purpose. When, in reply to the leader of the Opposition, I endeavoured very briefly to show how utterly impracticable that would be, I brought down upon myself the wrath and indignation of my hon. friend, and he amended his motion as then submitted, but he did not put it in a better position, and the Senate have not got in it a better position, because it is utterly and radically opposed to the principle of the Franchise Bill as introduced by this Parliament.

Only a moment's consideration by my hon. friend, directing his astute mind to it and applying the law as it exists in the province of New Brunswick to this condition of things, will show him that we would be putting ourselves in a very absurd position and making an absolutely unworkable Act, as far as the Dominion is concerned, if we adopted this amendment.

Mr. McNEILL. What this House and the country have got to understand from the hon. Minister who has just resumed his seat (Mr. Blair) is that the Government will not attempt to make this amendment a workable amendment, no matter how just it may be. That is what we have to understand from the speech he has just delivered. We have heard him put a number of technicalities before the House and the country as an excuse why men should be unjustly treated.

I desire to say a word with regard to an argument advanced, namely, that because the country has pronounced in favour of a change in the existing franchise law, therefore, the Second Chamber is precluded from making any amendment to the Bill introduced by the Government. In the first place, I deny, as it has already been denied, that the country has pronounced upon that question in the manner alleged. But supposing it had pronounced, supposing it had declared that it was advisable to enact a new franchise law or to amend the present law, what has that to do with the question before the House ? What did we see in the mother country a short time ago. We saw a Government returned to power upon the express issue of Home Rule or no Home Rule. And what followed ? They brought down their Home Rule measure, but it was so stuffed with injustice, as this measure is, that when it went up to the Second Chamber, the Second Chamber, although the election had turned upon that question in a manner in which it cannot be maintained the election in this country turned upon this question, they, without hesitation, threw out the whole Bill. And what did the country say ? It said that the Second Chamber had done right, and sent the party that had thrown out the measure into power with a larger majority at its back than any known in the memory of living men.

Then, with reference to the other argument which my hon. friend the Solicitor General has adduced, as to the infringement of the sacred secrecy of the ballot. He says it would never do to empower an aggrieved candidate in Prince Edward Island

with the means of tracing improper voters, because that would interfere with the sanctity of ballot secrecy. Why, my hon. friend surely knows that in the province of Ontario the very law which he desires to impose upon this House has a provision similar to the one he rejects now and objects to in the case of the province of Prince Edward Island.

Then, he says, we must not interfere with the principle of this Bill. But is he not interfering with its principle when he imposes the ballot on the province of Prince Edward Island? Is election by a ballot the course pursued in that province? Does that province recognize the ballot to-day? No, the voting there is open, and not by ballot. Yet my hon. friend does not hesitate to lay his hand upon the province of Prince Edward Island and force secret voting upon it. And while doing this, he still says that we must not interfere with the principle of the Bill, because we must not do anything that will in any way change the nature of the lists or of the voting now existing under the provincial laws. But what more absolute interference could there be than the change of open into secret voting which is done by this Bill? We need not refer to this question of the principle of the Bill, we need not accept this argument gravely, because we know that the principle of the Bill was violated long ago. At the very commencement of the discussion an amendment to this Bill was introduced by the Government, which, on the face of it, interfered with the power of the local legislature to strike names off the list.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Not at all. Can the hon. gentleman point to a single word in the Bill, as it passed this House, which interferes with the lists as made up for provincial purposes —which either took a name off or put a name on? True, the Bill did provide that persons might vote who were not on the lists.

Mr. McNEILL. I need not answer my hon. friend because he has answered himself The amendment proposed by the Senate is eminently just and desirable. It is so eminently just and desirable that the mere statement of it will, I venture to say, carry conviction to any unprejudiced mind in Canada. I should like to know what independent man in Canada is prepared to say that an elector in the province of Nova Scotia or New Brunswick or Manitoba shall not be allowed to have the same right of appeal to a judge in the last resort as is given to an elector in the provinces of Quebec and Ontario? I want to know, who that is independent, or who that wishes to take a fair view of this question is prepared to say that he will deprive a man whose name has been improperly and unjustly taken off the list, either through incompetence or through deliberate partisanship by partisan officials, of the right to have his grievance heard and adjudicated upon by a competent and impartial tribunal? That is the question. That is what the Senate has proposed, and that is the proposal which the Government are prepared to resist. Why, Sir, I wonder that any Government should venture to take upon itself the responsibility of resisting an amendment so conspicuously fair and so just. And, what is the argument that is presented to us? Why is it that this measure of justice, this elementary measure of justice, is to be withheld from our fellow citizens of these provinces?

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. McNEILL. Yes; I say an elementary measure of justice. The reason, we are told, is that it is inconsistent with the principles of this Bill. That is the most extraordinary reason—I was about to say the most unblushing reason—that I could very well imagine to be presented for opposition to a proposal of this kind.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh; order.

Mr. McNEILL. I wish, Mr. Speaker, that you would kindly ask some of these gentlemen who are, no doubt, impatient for the end of the session, to restrain their spirits.

Mr. LANDERKIN. We want you to speak out and not conceal anything.

Mr. McNEILL. I say that if this simple plain, elementary measure of justice is inconsistent with the principle of this Bill, then, so much the worse for the Bill. If the principle of this Bill is inconsistent with the most elementary measure of justice, then, the Government should never have introduced such a measure into this House. Why, Sir, when this measure was passing through the House, when the House was being induced—I might say when it was being cajoled—into agreeing to the second reading, what were we told? We were told that if any measure of injustice were perpetrated by the province, or if any measure of justice were withheld by the provinces, we had it in our hands to redress the grievance. But, now, what do we find? What are we told when asked for the redress of such a grievance? We are told: You are too late, you have agreed to the principle of the Bill, and you cannot have this measure of justice for your fellow citizens. Now, what did the "Globe" say, what was the organ of hon. gentlemen opposite instructed to say with reference to this matter when this measure was passing through the House?

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The applause is very weak over there.

Mr. COCHRANE. But there is some sense in it.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Raise your voice.

Mr. McNEILL. Mr. Speaker, there is a character whose appearance at the footlights is always greeted with pleasure, with a degree of amusement. I refer to the clown or buffoon. I should be sorry to suggest for a moment an unparliamentary term to be applied to an hon. member of this House, but, if there is such a thing as a parliamentary clown or buffoon, I should like to apply the term to the gentleman who is interrupting me,—but, if it be unparliamentary. I will not apply it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. The House sees the application.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Are you out of a job ?

Mr. McNEILL. The "Globe" says :

> The provinces are not of one mind in regard to the franchise ; and if Quebec is not prepared for manhood suffrage and one man one vote, and we are not satisfied with plural voting and other features of the Quebec system, the simplest way out of the difficulty is to let each province suit itself. Of course, it is the duty of the Dominion Parliament to see that the Franchise law, whatever it may be, shall be fair to all, and it is reasonable that there should be safeguards against unfair provincial legislation.

But now, when we want to take safeguards against unfair provincial legislation, which we know to exist, we are told that it is contrary to the principle of the Bill. Though the organ of the Government was instructed to inform the public that these safeguards ought to be taken and would be taken, we are now told that the Government are not prepared to take the safeguards, but are prepared to deny them to the people of the provinces. It is only right, I think that that should be clearly understood by the country.

Now, Sir, I venture to say that if there was any reason, if any reason could be assigned, why it was right and just that we should oppose this Bill on the second reading, the reason has been given to us now and given to us without measure. The fact that the very principle of the measure is inconsistent with the most elementary principles of justice is, I think, a sufficient reason why this House should not have passed the measure, and a sufficient reason why the House should support this most reasonable amendment sent down by the Second Chamber. Why, Sir, my hon. friend the Solicitor General says that the Second Chamber has no right to send down such an amendment, that it is in violation of the privileges of this House. Why, my hon. friend surely knows a great deal better than that. He knows very well that the Second Chamber in the mother country has been in the habit of dealing with questions of this kind. In 1884, when Mr. Gladstone brought down his famous measure on the Franchise and refused to accompany it with a redistribution Bill, as my hon. friend knows very well, the Franchise Act was discussed in the House of Lords and was rejected by the House of Lords, and the country supported the action of the House of Lords in that regard. My hon. friend shakes his head. There were a hundred thousand people assembled in Manchester in support of the action of the House of Lords. The result of the discussion was that Mr. Gladstone, after standing to his guns as long as he could, had to send for Lord Salisbury and come to an arrangement with him in this regard. During the whole of that discussion there never was a suggestion from either side of the House of Lords that it was not perfectly competent for the Second Chamber to reject the measure or amend the measure. Lord Kimberley introduced the Bill in that House, and at the time of its second reading, if my memory is correct, stated in terms that it was the right of the House to reject the Bill. The Earl of Morley, who spoke for the Government on that occasion, who was then Under Secretary for War, said :

> He did not for an instant deny the constitutional right of their Lordships to reject or amend the Bill.

The Lord Chancellor, Lord Selborne, also speaking for the Government never for one moment suggested as a reason why the Bill should not pass the House that their lordships had not a perfect right to reject or amend it if they liked. In referring to the redistribution Bill which was the cause of offence, for it was said that the House of Lords should refuse to pass the Franchise Bill until the Redistribution Bill was brought down, Lord Selborne met that argument by saying : When the Redistribution Bill comes down it is within the right of your lordships to amend or to reject it. So you have the statement from the Lord Chancellor himself in reference to the constitutional right, if any one ever doubted it, of the Second Chamber to deal with the Franchise of the House of Commons. So far as that argument is concerned, I do not see any force in it, and I venture to say it has no weight whatever. Now, I think that I have given sufficient reason why this House should agree to the amendment sent down by the Senate. I say that if that amendment requires further amendment so as to make its operation more inexpensive and more easily workable, it is for the Government to approach the Senate and to arrange with the Senate such further amendments as may be required. As I said before, there is no difference between the parties in this country in their desire to lessen the cost of the existing franchise law. We all desire to do that ; but I say now as I said before, that it would be a blot upon parliamentary government in Canada, I will go further and say it would be an evidence that Canada was not fit for responsible government, if

there was not statesmanship enough in Canada to reduce the cost of the existing franchise law without depriving this House of its most precious privilege, the right to regulate its own franchise, a right that is possessed by the smallest legislature in this Dominion, but of which the Government desires to deprive this House. I say further still, it would be a still greater blot if, in order to reduce the cost of the existing Franchise Act, it was necessary to introduce a measure, which according to the Government's own admission, is inconsistent with the most elementary principles of justice.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). I wish to say a word or two so far as Nova Scotia is concerned, and to represent the views of the electors in that province concerning the machinery we now have for arranging the franchise. First let me say that this peculiarly applies to Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Manitoba, and the eloquent philippic of my hon. friend from North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) is altogether out of place. I want to say that I never heard an objection from a Conservative in Nova Scotia against the local lists. I will ask the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Borden) if the sheriff of the county of Halifax that he represents, and who, if I mistake not, was made returning officer, while in other counties the sheriffs were not made returning officers—I want to ask him whether that sheriff is not a man who would do right.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I will say to my hon. friend, as I said before, that so far as the integrity of the sheriff of Halifax is concerned, I would not question it for a moment. But I think the sheriff of Halifax would be ready to admit himself that he does not possess a knowledge of the law to enable him to be a capable judge of matters of this kind when he acts as a court of appeal.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). I may say in answer to the hon. gentleman that it does not require very much law to know whether a man has the necessary qualification to entitle him to be placed on the list. I venture to think that an ordinary business man like the sheriff of Halifax, or the sheriffs of the other counties of Nova Scotia, is a better judge of who are entitled to go on the lists than some of our county court judges, for whom I have the very highest respect. It is beclouding things to say that only judicial men can do this kind of work. To say that it requires a great knowledge of law to be good judges of the men who should go upon the list, is not stating the facts. I think the sheriffs in the various districts are really good judges of the men who should go upon the list. I admit there may come up questions of law——

Mr. MILLS. Hear, hear.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). There seems to be one man in this House that fears an honest electorate in his county.

Mr. MILLS. No, he does not.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). I repeat that the sheriffs in the various counties are as good judges, I will say even better judges, in the majority of cases, of who should go upon the list, than the judges themselves. What is the foundation after all of this property qualification? It is the assessment. The assessors who make the assessment know all about the men in their locality. Take any polling district in any county of Nova Scotia. In the first place, the assessor knows every man in the district, and after all, knowledge of the facts is the foundation of righteous judgment. He knows every man in the district, and there are very few, whether young or old, of whom he has not a personal knowledge. I want to state now, to emphasize what I said before, that in my whole experience in the province of Nova Scotia I never heard an objection made publicly, and I think I might go further and say privately, against the methods pursued by the various sheriffs. Their fairness was undoubted. I will give you as an example a case in the county where I live. One family has held the office of the shrievalty of the county of Pictou since the first Philadelphia settlers came over in 1772; the same Harriss family have through all the good reports of Liberal administrations and all the evil reports of Conservative Administrations, held office without a single break. I tell you that in Nova Scotia we only appoint the best men to offices of that kind. They are good and true men. I will make the assertion that in the county of Pictou there never was a man who, either in public or in private, relating to the service of the smallest process up to the highest position of holding a Dominion election, ever complained that a sheriff in the county of Pictou did a dishonourable act. Hon. gentlemen opposite seem to think that because a man is a sheriff he is not as good a man as a county judge. Now, on general principles I admit that a county judge ought to be above suspicion; but in my experience with the sheriffs of Nova Scotia, they have always endeavoured to act fairly in everything they did. I venture to make the statement here in the presence of a much more distinguished lawyer than myself, the hon. member for the county of Halifax (Mr. Borden), that if he reads over the amendment as proposed by the Senate, we could never have a list under which we could run an election in Nova Scotia. The machinery provided there cannot eventuate in a list at all. I have looked that amendment over carefully, and I say the machinery provided there would have the result of preventing any list being made in Nova Scotia, it could not be done. I have all due respect for the Senate, I am not saying a

single word against them. I admit at once that they are part and parcel of the constitution of this country; but while they have a right to discuss and a right to propose, they have no right to insist upon any view they may have as to what electorate shall vote for members of this House who have to go before that electorate. I admit that they are to bring all their wisdom to bear upon legislation that goes from this House, but I will not for a moment admit that they have a right to say what class of voters shall vote for members of this House, because that would be to admit that whether the majority in the Upper House were Liberals or Conservatives, they could control the franchise, and in the interest of their party, have the right to name what men should come to this House. We cannot prevent them, whether they be Liberals or Conservatives, acting in the interests of the party to which they are attached, and I must say they are attached to parties to as great a degree as are members of this House. I venture to make the statement in the presence of members of this House that no greater partisanship was ever shown in this Chamber than has been shown by members in the other House. I do not deny their rights by any means; but I deny them the right, particularly after they having evinced this partisan disposition, to say what men shall sit and vote for members of this House when the Government go before the people. Do the gentlemen in the Upper Chamber show that absence of partisanship which might be expected from them; are their speeches not tinged with partisanship; and when we find them to be of the earth earthy, politicans crawling for a living and characterized by worse partisanship than the politicians in this House, I say they are not worthy of exercising such judgment.

Mr. SPROULE. I ask your ruling, Mr. Speaker, as to whether the hon. gentleman is in order in thus referring to members of the Upper House.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the last expression of the hon. gentleman should undoubtedly be withdrawn.

Mr. FRASER. I withdraw it. I wish the withdrawal to be read with the statement I made. In view of the knowedge I possess in regard to these matters in Nova Scotia, I hold that to accede to the amendments made by the Senate would be to destroy the Bill. What is its underlying principle? It is the local lists hon. gentlemen opposite have the right to discuss the Bill and to oppose the principle, which is that of the adoption of the local lists of the various provinces. I can understand hon. members contending that that is not a good provision; but if that is the underlying principle, as undoubtedly it is—whether it may be faulty or not is another question—the Senate amendments are designed to overturn the underlying principle of accepting the various franchises of the various provinces. For myself I want no hybrid. If we adopt that principle, we must accept it to its fullest extent, whether it is good or bad. The carrying out of that principle must be left with the electorate. An hon. member speaking about the general elections said that this question of the franchise was not an item in it. During the last few days we have had strange experiences, if I can accept the statements we hear on the other side of the House as to what decided the last elections. I hold that every element in the Liberal programme contributed to the decision of the last election.

Mr. SPROULE. As well as the expectation of increased expenditure.

Mr. FRASER. I remember a previous session when the hon. gentleman and myself took sweet counsel together, when we united against an attempt to do a wrong. The hon. gentleman surely has forgotten that union of feeling, and he has now become as cold and icy as death. I remember him kindly on account of those past days and the work then done. When the next reformation comes round I trust this conversion will be more permanent. As regards this Franchise Act, we must either adopt the principle and follow it as regards the local lists prepared by the various provinces or we must sweep away that principle and go back to a Bill under which all the provinces of the Dominion come under a Dominion Franchise Act, one and universal. I only rose in the first instance to say that so far as the province from which I come is concerned, no difficulty has been raised. In my province we are satisfied with the Act. Hon. gentlemen opposite may have different information; I make that statement on my own behalf. I know there are Conservative sheriffs in the province who are fair-minded men. I will instance one who died a short time ago, and who lived in Colchester County, Sheriff Crowe, who was a life-long Conservative, and yet I never heard a Liberal there say a word against him, for he did what was fair. When a man accepts the office of sheriff the whole county looks up to him, and Sheriff Crowe held office with credit to himself and to his county; and it will be found that the responsibility of office which always attaches to a man whenever he gets a place, is the very best safeguard against such officer becoming an open partisan. In view, therefore, of these three facts: first, that there is no objection in Nova Scotia against the local lists as prepared by our sheriffs; second, that the underlying principle of the Bill is the acceptance of the local lists, and that everything else would interfere with them; third, that the amendments proposed would not and could not give a list such as we could act upon at an election because the machinery is defective, I cannot, as one member, agree to these amendments. I wish to take

the broadest possible ground of the right of the Senate to deal with this Bill. But there must be recognized the underlying principle that members who sit in this House shall decide, if even we are to accept a franchise that may work against us, what the franchise shall be, and that we shall never lose sight of this central idea that the House of Commons and the House of Commons alone, in essence and principle, must decide the men who shall vote and constitute the electorate.

Mr. SPROULE. If that be the case, how was it that in the Senate in 1885 the Hon. R. W. Scott moved that the Franchise Act passed by this House be thrown out ?

Mr. FRASER. According to the hon. gentleman I am to accept what Mr. Scott did, and my mouth is to be closed. That is not the case ; nobody authorized him to do it. I am not bound by what Mr. Scott said or did. That is the worst kind of Tory doctrine, that if a gentleman in the Senate makes a statement, another hon. gentleman, because he has the same party affiliations, must accept it.

Mr. SPROULE. If the hon. gentleman's contention is right, his friends are all wrong.

Mr. FRASER. There might come an occasion in which the birthright of many Canadians might be taken away, and the Senate might be called upon to interfere.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. It is not necessary to discuss the abstract black letter right which the Senate may possibly have to consider a Franchise Bill ; but I venture to make this statement that in view of the circumstances under which this Franchise Bill came before the Senate, it is beyond the scope of their well-understood right to interfere with this particular portion of the Bill. The object of the amendment to which I will specially address myself is that which practically provides in effect that in so far as three of the provinces are concerned, Manitoba, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, there shall be for these provinces Dominion lists instead of provincial lists as exist elsewhere. Under the circumstances in which this Bill came before the Senate it was improper for the Senate to interfere with it in the way in which they did.

Mr. DAVIN. Why ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) will restrain his impatience, he will get reasons in a minute. We are by this Bill adopting the principle that obtained in Canada from 1867 to 1885, during which period we had a provincial franchise and provincial lists for federal purposes. During all those years, from 1867 to 1885, this monstrous iniquity that the Senate now undertakes to amend, existed without a word of protest from them.

Mr. McNEILL. Would my hon. friend (Mr. Fitzpatrick) permit me ?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. McNEILL. Would my hon. friend (Mr. Fitzpatrick) allow me to ask him a question ? He said that until 1885 we had the local lists without any protest. Did we not pass an Act in this House in 1882 with reference to that ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I am dealing now with the object of the Senate amendment, and I do not think it necessary, for the purpose of this discussion, to cover the earth or to go back to the time of the Deluge. My hon. friend (Mr. McNeill) refers to the Act of 1882, it is scarcely worth while discussing that, but as he has raised the question, I will say that the amendment introduced in 1882 was intended to provide for these men who were disfranchised because they were public officials, and there was in it no reference at all to the lists. Now, not only had we those lists from 1867 to 1885 without a single word of protest from the Senate, and without a single word of protest from the Conservative party, but when, in 1885, the Dominion Franchise Act was introduced, a strong protest was made by the Liberal party against the introduction of the principle of having the federal lists under the control of federal officers. And, Sir, not only was there a protest made at that time by the Liberal party against the principle adopted, but in season and out of season since that time the voice of the Liberal party has been raised throughout the whole of the Dominion in protest against these federal franchise lists, and in favour of the principle we are now seeking to carry out by this Bill. Not only did we raise that protest in the course of the debate in 1885, but we protested in the election of 1887, the election of 1891, the election of 1896, and in those elections that was the chief plank in the Liberal platform, in addition to the platform laid down by the Liberal party at Ottawa in 1893.

Now, we have the fact that these conditions existed from 1867 to 1885, we have the fact that in 1885 the Liberal party protested against the change, we have in addition the fact that in each recurring election the chief plank in the Liberal platform was a reversion to the condition of things existing before 1885, and we have also the fact that this policy was inserted in the Liberal platform at the Ottawa convention. The Liberal party came into power, therefore, with an express mandate from the people to repeal the Dominion franchise law of 1885 and to revert to the provincial lists, and we find that at the very first working session after the change of Government, the session of 1897, a franchise Bill was introduced by us. Not only do we find that, but we find also that because we wanted the Bill to be thoroughly understood, and that the public

might well know what our intentions were, that Bill was placed before the people for their consideration, and at this session, a franchise Bill was the very first measure disposed of. Under these circumstances, is it possible to conceive for a moment that there can be any doubt, that we, the majority in the House of Commons as now constituted, the supporters of the present Government, came here with an imperative mandate from the people of the Dominion to rid them of the useless and expensive system known as the Dominion Franchise Act, and to substitute this proposed law. Not only did we receive that mandate from the people of the Dominion, but, Sir, when we introduced our legislation in this House, there was not a single voice within these walls raised in favour of the old Dominion Franchise Act, and it went down to its grave unwept, unhonoured and unsung. In view of the fact that our desire is to obey the imperative mandate of the people, in view of the fact that our desire is to rid the people of this country of this incubus in the form of the Dominion Franchise Act, an Act which has cost us in the years it was in operation over $2,000,000; an Act which has not been revised for the last four years and that hon. gentlemen opposite dare not revise because of the expense incurred in the revision; in view of these facts, we are justified in carrying out our promise to the people and in endeavouring as far as possible to place the making of the lists under the control of the people themselves, thus proving that the Liberal party have and always had confidence in the people, as distinguished from hon. gentlemen opposite, who because they did not trust the people wanted to keep the control of the lists in the hands of officials appointed by themselves. In view of these circumstances, even if the abstract right exists in the Senate to interfere with the franchise—a right which I do not concede—it was improper for them to interfere with a franchise Bill passed by this House under the conditions that I have indicated.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. We had this Senate amendment introduced into the House of Commons by the leader of the Opposition, and we had it voted down by one of the greatest majorities that the Government has had during the present session. And, Sir, at the time the debate took place on that amendment, and previous to the vote being taken, we heard a voice from the other side notifying us of the fate that was in store for us when that amendment was moved in the Senate. That premonitory warning proved by subsequent events to have had more authority than we thought at the time. It is now apparent to us that from the very outset this Bill was destined to be wrecked in the Senate; from the outset it was intended that the will of the people should be thwarted by the Senate.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Sir, it was intended from the outset that the Conservative party would make manifest their lack of confidence in the people, and their desire to control the franchise through their own hired and paid officials. Let us now deal with the amendment. So far as that amendment of the Senate is concerned, I say, with all due regard to the hon. gentleman who drew it up, that it was drawn up by a man who had no conception of a franchise Act, who does not know what an election means, and who probably, safe in that haven of rest, felt that he never would be called upon to put the Act into operation. In the first place, if this amendment were put into operation, the effect would be absolutely to destroy the provincial lists in these three provinces. I will proceed to prove that. It would destroy the provincial lists for provincial purposes as well as for Dominion purposes. Subsection "c" of subsection 5 says:

> The voters' lists * * * in the provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Manitoba, shall be the voters' lists as amended under the provisions of section 10a of this Act, which were prepared by the rgistration clerks or revisers for the several polling divisions so established for the purposes of provincial elections.

That is to say, starting from that point, voters' lists are to be the provincial lists. Now, what is provided by clause 10a?

> There shall be in the provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Manitoba, for the purpose of revising and amending the voters' lists to be used in the election of members for the House of Commons, an appeal from said lists as prepared by the registration clerks and revisers.

I draw my hon. friend's attention to that. There is an appeal from the lists, not as subsequently dealt with on appeal in any of those provinces; but as originally prepared by the registration clerks and revisers. Clause 10a provides that the provincial list in the custody of a provincial officer shall be taken before the judge of the county court, and he shall deal with it by striking out any name in it that he finds objectionable, and adding to it any name that he thinks should be on it. That is the list for provincial purposes. That list goes back to the reviser, and what becomes of it? I said a moment ago that the amendment was conceived by a man who had no knowledge of the working of the provincial machinery and had no knowledge of the fact that we cannot deal with provincial lists. We cannot touch them or deal with them in any manner, nor can we control a provincial officer having custody of a provincial list for provincial purposes. In addition to that, we find that section 6 of the Bill provides:

> No person possessed of the qualifications generally required by the provincial law to entitle

him to vote at a provincial election shall be disqualified from voting at a Dominion election,——

And, further, the amendment provides:

——or from having his name on the list.

Not only has he the right to vote as we provide, but he has the right to have his name put on the provincial list. How are you going to provide for dealing with the provincial list? The Senate not only provides for an appeal, but for a man's name on the provincial list without reference to the provincial authorities. How can that be done?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). With all deference to my learned friend's view, I would suppose that merely referred to the provincial list as it is to be used for Dominion purposes.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I take the amendment as it reads. We have to suppose that it intends what it reads, and it says: "or from having his name on the list."

Mr. TAYLOR. That is for Dominion purposes.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Where does it say for Dominion purposes? That may be in the hon. gentleman's imagination, but it is not in the clause. But let us go on, and deal with the peculiarities of the procedure here provided for, and see how nicely this amendment has been prepared, how carefully it has been considered by the Senate, how much they know about the franchise law, and how anxious and desirable they were to make our Act workable. I find here, for instance, that the appeal is from the list, not as it is revised in the province—because there is a revision in all these provinces. In the maritime provinces there is a revision before the sheriff. The amendment does not provide for dealing with the lists after the revision in the provinces, but as it originally stood in the hands of the registration clerks and revisers. In Manitoba, take the list as it comes from the hands of the registration clerk. The law provides that there shall be an appeal to a court of revision presided over by one of the county court judges of the province or by a barrister of at least three years' standing. Therefore, under the amendment, you are going to have an appeal to a county court judge, and while that appeal is proceeding under this amendment, you will have another appeal under the provincial law, and both appeals may come before the same judge. That is the result of this carefully prepared legislation which my hon. friend wants us to adopt. Under the provincial law you have an appeal to the revision court, and under the Dominion law you have an appeal on the same list to the county court judge.

Mr. FITZPATRICK.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Both going on at the same time.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Both may be going on at the same time, and practically before the same man under two distinct and separate Acts. It is to me perfectly inconceivable that any person, having given five minutes serious consideration to this Bill, should have drawn such an amendment or have been responsible for it. Now, let us deal with the appeal in the case of New Brunswick or Nova Scotia, where an appeal may be taken from the revisers to the sheriff of the county.

An hon. MEMBER. It is not an appeal.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Call it what you choose, it comes before him for revision.

Mr. McINERNEY. Only as to certain voters.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The sheriff comes in about a month after the lists find their way into the hands of the county secretary, and he goes through the lists in the way I have stated. Under this Bill, in the meantime, ten days before the sheriff has any right to intervene, this county court appeal is provided in the amendment of the Senate.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. In the province of Nova Scotia an appeal may be taken from the revisers to the sheriff of the county, by whom the provincial lists are finally revised. The time for appeal, under the Senate amendment, is limited to twenty days after—mark you—the voters' list, as first made up, is filed with the officer who, under provincial law, has its custody. Now what is meant by the voters' list as first made up? Take the procedure in Nova Scotia, with which that in New Brunswick is almost identical. Under section 11, 52 Victoria, chapter 1 of the Nova Scotia statutes, the assessors of each assessment district are required to deliver, on or before the 20th January in each year, a copy of the assessment roll and other information necessary for the making up of the lists. On or before the 5th of February in each year, the revisers shall select and prepare from the assessment roll an application based on income, alphabetical lists of the qualified voters in each polling division. On or before the 5th March, they are to post up copies of such lists in three of the most public places in each polling district, with a notice that the revisers will be at a given place, on or before the 5th March, to hear objections to the lists. Under another section, the revisers are required to attend at the time and place appointed, and, after investigating the cases of which notice has been given, to correct the lists accordingly. They are directed then to transmit a corrected list to the clerk of the municipality on or before the 18th of March. There is also

a further appeal to the sheriff, who is to attend at his office on the 21st March, for the purpose of hearing appeals. The lists are then to be made up, signed by the sheriff deposited with the clerk of the municipality on or before the 10th of April, in each year, and shall thenceforth be the register of electors for the county.

Now, assuming that all proceedings have been regularly taken under the provincial law of Nova Scotia, what becomes in the meantime of our appeal? How are you going to get access to the lists? All this is being done under the provincial law, with lists which we say are to be ours. But while the provincial authorities are dealing with those lists, where are we?

An hon. MEMBER. They have a prior right to them.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. They have the exclusive right to them, and the simple fact that, under the provincial law, these lists would be in the custody, for provincial purposes, of these officials, during the time given for our appeal and when the time for our appeal would lapse, is sufficient to show the want of care and attention given by the Senate to their amendment.

I do not wish to take up the time of the House at great length, but I would call attention to the fact——

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That is merely a detail, which could be cured by one sentence.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I do not look upon that as a matter of detail. I state absolutely, and I am quite certain that my hon. friend will agree with me, that it is beyond the scope of our authority, that there is no power in the Dominion which will enable us to deal with the provincial lists.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Certainly not for the purposes of a provincial election, but it is perfectly competent in us, by a very simple provision—if this amendment is wanting in that respect—to enable a certified copy of the lists to be used or a copy of the lists verified by affidavit, for the purpose of appeal in respect of a Dominion election.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I would draw my hon. friend's attention to this, that I am dealing with an amendment supposed to have been carefully considered, an amendment upon which this whole constitution turns apparently, judging by the importance attached to it by the Senate, an amendment prepared by them which they want to impose upon us, and my intention is to show that they never gave the matter five minutes consideration.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). In order to show that that is not quite conclusive reasoning, let me point out the case which I pointed out the other day to the Minister of Inland Revenue, in which this House, as well as the Senate, in 1897 repealed an Act that had been already repealed. If the Senate has overlooked anything in respect of the details of an important measure, that is not conclusive reason that they have not given it careful study.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. If there had been a real, serious and honest desire to deal with this matter, it seems to me that the thing could not have been overlooked. If the Senate had read the Bill, they could not have failed to see this clause which provides for the fact that the list for federal purposes is the copy of the list obtained from the local authority and sent here to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. That is the difficulty to be dealt with if they wanted to deal with it at all. But that was not their desire. Their desire was to create difficulty and trouble and try to bring about disagreement.

Mr. McNEILL. I wish to know——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. McNEILL. I wish to ask your ruling, Mr. Speaker, as to whether it is competent for an hon. member of this House to say that the other Chamber has introduced an amendment for the purpose of creating trouble and difficulty?

Mr. SPEAKER. I am rather inclined to think that when this House or the other is considering amendments made by the one House or the other, it has the right to adduce arguments and draw fair conclusions from them.

Mr. McNEILL. I think I have not made myself clear——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have ruled on the point the hon. gentleman raised.

Mr. McNEILL. I just wish to say——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. DAVIN. I wish to ask a question——

Some hon. MEMBERS Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon gentleman cannot ask a question.

Mr. DAVIN. I rise to a point of order, and not the point my hon. friend made. Has an hon. member the right to attribute motives to the other Chamber?

Mr. SPEAKER. That is an abstract question.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I was not dealing with motives, but with consequences and facts, and I presume a man always intends the consequences of his acts. Let me draw the attention of the House to this other fact. Let us see what machinery is provided here. How do they proceed to dispose of those appeals? It is provided that the judge shall hear the appeals on

affidavits. Let me draw the attention of fair-minded hon. gentlemen opposite to this fact. The appeal is inserted and is to be disposed of on affidavits, but if the judge is requested by the appellant or by the person opposing the appeal, then on evidence viva voce under oath, the judge may make an order in writing directing that the name of such person as voter shall be struck from or added to said list, and in case of more than one appeal from the same voters' list, the judge shall embody in one order the result of his adjudication.

I draw attention to the question of notice to the person whose right to vote is questioned. How do they deal with that :

> In the case of an application to strike off names from the voters' lists, such notice shall be mailed, duly registered, with postage prepaid, at least one week previous to such appeal, to the address of such person or persons whose right to vote is assailed, if known to the appellant.

So all the appellant needs, if he wants to get rid of the obligation to give notice, is to declare that he does not know the address of the voter whose name he was to strike from the list. Here is the provision we are asked to adopt, and then we are told that this is honest and fair dealing with the electors of the country. I say there has been no serious consideration given this Bill, no serious desire to improve the machinery, and do justice to the electors. The whole object of the measure was to prove that we, the Liberals, had confidence in the people of the Dominion, and our confidence was placed in them to this extent, that we wanted to put under their immediate supervision and control the making of their electoral lists. This amendment is an attempt to thwart our desire and interfere with us in the carrying out of that object.

Mr. MILLS. As it is one o'clock, I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. LANDERKIN. There is five minutes yet. You can finish in five minutes.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). Go on.

Mr. MILLS. Very well. I am the one to judge whether I can finish in five minutes or not. When the right hon. First Minister introduced this Bill in the House of Commons he asked hon. members to consider this matter, a most important matter for this House and for the country, in a calm and judicial manner. The Opposition in this House took the Prime Minister at his word, and did make an effort to consider this matter in a calm and judicial manner. Whenever a proposition was made that this Bill should be pressed forward another step, it was granted by the Opposition. We were asked to allow the second reading of the Bill, to allow the principle of the Bill to be endorsed—for the Opposition saw that the Government were determined to carry the principle of this measure—and we allowed the principle of this Bill to be adopted, without discussing it as thoroughly as it should have been discussed, upon the distinct understanding that if there were any amendments to be made in the details of the Bill, they should be fully gone into in Committee of the Whole. Now, the principle of the Bill has been adopted, and no one in this House has any desire now—whatever our wishes may have been before—to disturb the principle of the Bill. No one in the Senate has any desire to disturb the principle of the Bill, and the amendment that has come down to us from the Senate disturbs not one jot, not one tittle of the principle of this measure, but only affects the details, the working out of the Bill. What are the amendments of the Senate ? So far as the one which has been principally discussed is concerned, it gives the right of appeal to a county court judge, really provides for the proper carrying out of the Franchise Acts of the provinces of New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Manitoba. It is adopting these Franchise Acts and merely providing the machinery to carry them out properly in the provinces I have named. We have in Nova Scotia, as has been stated to-day, an appeal to the sheriff. Now, I am not here to cast any reflections whatever upon the sheriffs. I have said before, and I repeat, that any hon. member who sets up that argument and knocks it down only shows that he is talking to the galleries, that he is talking for some purpose, perhaps, inimical to the purpose before the House. I do not come here to talk against the sheriffs, but I have said before, and I say again very distinctly and emphatically, that in Nova Scotia we have a Franchise Act that is intricate in its provisions and cannot be understood by a layman who has no pretensions to more than common knowledge. Hon. members may suggest, the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) may say, that a layman can understand this Act ; but on serious and calm reflection, he will not use that argument before men who understand the Act and who understand him.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman had better move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. MILLS moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 1 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Second Sitting.

THURSDAY, 9th June, 1898.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

A QUESTION OF DISALLOWANCE—PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND—WITNESSES AND EVIDENCE.

Mr. CLARKE. Before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I would like to ask from some member of the Government information as to an Act passed by the legislature of Prince Edward Island, entitled "An Act to amend the Act respecting witnesses and evidence." I have received a great volume of correspondence from the city of Toronto this morning respecting this Act, and have been requested to ask the Government whether their attention has been drawn to it and whether it is the intention of the Government to disallow it. I do not wish to take up the time by reading the correspondence, but I will ask whether the Government have received any representations from commercial bodies respecting that Act and whether the Act will be disallowed ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I did not understand—what is the point ?

Mr. CLARKE. The contention of those who are opposed to the Act and desire its disallowance——

Mr. SPEAKER. I really do not think, that on the Orders of the Day the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clarke) can do more than ask a question.

Mr. CLARKE. I am answering the question asked by the right hon. First Minister.

The PRIME MINISTER. I cannot inform my hon. friend (Mr. Clarke) whether this Act has been received yet by the Government. Our attention has not been called to it until this moment.

Mr. CLARKE. I will send the papers over to the right hon. gentleman if he wishes.

The PRIME MINISTER. I have no objection. I suppose that the people who oppose the Act will communicate with the Government.

ELECTORAL FRANCHISE ACT.

The House resumed adjourned debate on amendments made by the Senate to sections 5, 6, 10, 21a, 23, 26a, 26b, 26c and 27 of Bill (No. 16) to amend the Electoral Franchise Act and to further amend the Dominion Elections Act.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, when the House adjourned, I was about to call the attention of hon. members to the points referred to by the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) as to the mode of operation regarding the electoral list in the province of Nova Scotia. One of the principal things in the hon. member's speech was the contention that we had a quarrel with the sheriffs of that province, and, I presume, a quarrel with the sheriffs of New Brunswick as well. There is not a member on this side of the House, to my knowledge, who has any quarrel with the sheriffs of either of these provinces. They are, so far as I know, honourable men, well qualified for the duties of their sphere of action. But it was a very peculiar thing—and it has been alluded to before in the discussion on this Bill—that the province of Nova Scotia took from the judges of the province the appointment of the sheriffs, so to speak, and made them political appointees. Those men have been appointed from a political standpoint. The men who have been appointed since that Act was passed in Nova Scotia have been political partisans, and they are political partisans to this day.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). Do you mean the Tories ?

Mr. MILLS. All of them.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Then, there were Tories appointed under that Act.

Mr. MILLS. There were some Tories originally in office.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. They were appointed under that Act. The local government had power to appoint them or not, and they appointed Tories.

Mr. MILLS. The sheriffs were retained by that Act, and some of those sheriffs were Tories. But they are amenable to the local government of Nova Scotia, and the direct cause of the passing of that Act grew out of the contention that arose in the county of Annapolis, where it became desirable on behalf of the Liberal party to turn out Dr. Robinson, who was then sheriff of the county of Annapolis, and they could do it in no other way than by passing an Act turning out all the sheriffs in Nova Scotia, so that they could level their guns, so to speak, at one individual in that province. The doctor was turned out, a man against whom no person can make a scintilla of a charge except that he is a Liberal-Conservative, and a Mr. Bonnett was placed in his stead. Afterward he, Bonnett, was also turned out, and one of the most notorious partisans in the county was placed in his stead, a gentleman who

is now dead. If he were alive, perhaps I would say something more, but let the dead rest. Another gentleman has been appointed, more reasonable to be sure, but notwithstanding that, he is a partisan. Now, these are partisan officials to all intents and purposes; and no person, whether Ministers or members of Parliament, can gainsay the assertion that these officials are amenable to the present local government, they are partisan officials. Place a Tory in a position of that kind, place him under a government and he must of necessity be to a certain extent subservient to that government. Therefore, these men are partisans. Now, what this amendment asks is that this power be not given to partisans, but that it be given to men who are clothed with some judicial authority, men who are learned in the law. The member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) says that the Franchise Act of Nova Scotia can be fully understood even by a layman, and better understood by sheriffs who know the people in the district where they have jurisdiction better than any other man. I take exception to that statement. I say that the Franchise Act of Nova Scotia is a most intricate Act. Any lawyer or layman reading it will say that contentions will of necessity arise which no layman could adjudicate upon, and which require a trained mind to settle, a man who is not always in doubt in reference to these matters. A man that is always in doubt and who is a partisan, will give his party the benefit of that doubt every time. But take a man who is educated, who has a technical knowledge of what he has to adjudicate upon, and give him judicial authority, and I contend that man will give his decision according to his knowledge, and he will decide more in accordance with what is right than a man who is always in doubt. We have gentlemen on the other side who are candidates for the judicial bench. The hon. member for Guysborough is a candidate for the judicial bench, if the "Morning Chronicle" and the "Canadian Law Times" are to be believed. I would rather trust a case before the member for Guysborough, who has a trained mind, to a certain extent, in these matters, than I would to a layman, violent partisan though that hon. member may be. Therefore, this amendment is asking only what is right. It is only asking what has been accorded to other provinces of the Dominion, and it should be likewise accorded to Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Manitoba. But what does this Government contend with reference to the province of Prince Edward Island? There they have had that right of appeal to a judicial authority. If this Bill is passed without the Senate amendment, that right will be taken away from the province of Prince Edward Island.

Mr. MILLS.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). What right is that?

Mr. MILLS. I think I can tell the hon. gentleman, although I am not as conversant with the law of Prince Edward Island as with the Franchise Act of the Dominion. I understand that in Prince Edward Island, at the present time, they have no lists. Men can go and openly record their votes. They are subject to being questioned, as I understand it, but they register their votes. But after their vote is registered, upon an appeal, or reference to a county court judge, those men can be marked and known and it can be discovered whether they did have a right to vote or not.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. My hon. friend is quite mistaken. The only way of testing them is to file an election petition, praying for an ordinary scrutiny under the election petition.

Mr. MILLS. I covered that by saying: or a reference to a judge. But if the Government Bill is put through, that right will be taken away, because they provide for a ballot, and the ballot does not reveal how these men have voted. Therefore, the man who may have no more right to vote than a Zulu, can go to Prince Edward Island and answer the questions that are put to him, and have a right to vote, and that is the end of it.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No, not by long odds.

Mr. MILLS. Well, he has to swear to his vote.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. He has to swear to his vote, and if he perjures himself, he will be arrested on the spot.

Mr. MILLS. If he goes away the next day?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No, he does not leave the booth without being arrested.

Mr. MILLS. I say the bars of fraud, the bars of deception and corruption, instead of being put up in this matter, are being torn down, and they are being torn down by this Government with reference to Prince Edward Island. We who contend that the right of appeal to a judicial authority should lie in the provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Manitoba, are putting up the bars against fraud and corruption as well as it can be done. Now, the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals made a speech. He is a gentleman who has a good legal knowledge, but still he is one of those gentlemen that sometimes talk to the galleries. He said we should accept the lists as prepared by the provinces. It was not decided by this House that we should

accept the lists as prepared by the provinces. The resolution passed in this House before the Bill was introduced did not provide that the lists of the different provinces should be accepted, but that the franchises of the provinces should be accepted, and there is quite a difference between the franchises and the lists. What does this amendment provide? It provides that the resolution be carried out in its entirety, because if we do not have the right of appeal from the decisions of the assessors and revisers in Nova Scotia to a proper judicial authority the people will not get their names, as they have a perfect right to do, on the lists under the franchise of Nova Scotia. We will not be carrying out fully and to the letter the resolution passed before this House, seeing we are repealing the Franchise Act of the Dominion, and adopt the franchises of the provinces for our franchise. If the local machinery is not sufficient to put into effect the provincial franchises, then in order to carry out the resolution and the principle of the Bill, it is the duty of this House to manufacture such machinery, and pave the way to put machinery in motion whereby the people who have these rights under the franchises can get their names on the lists. In Nova Scotia the machinery is not there in order to properly get the names of the electors on the lists, so that they can take advantage of the franchise of the province. We have partisan officials, partisan revisers, partisan assessors, from whom appeals should be taken. Give us the judges, and I doubt if there will be half a dozen appeals made to them. Why? They will act as a terror to those partisan revisers and assessors. Give us the judges, and I apprehend there will not be any expense in regard to appeals. These partisan assessors and revisers well know there will be a judicial whip over them, and that if they do not do what is right their acts can be revised and the wrong committed can be righted. It will also have the effect of reducing the expense. It has already been said by hon. gentlemen opposite that there has been no one to defend the late Franchise Act of the Dominion. I have defended it, and I am prepared to do so again. And even if on the ground of expense, I hold that the Franchise Act could have been so amended by arranging for the preparation of the lists year by year as would have reduced the expense to a minimum. The difficulty in regard to expense was being surmounted when the people thought it best to repeal the Act. By the platform of the Liberal party adopted in Ottawa in 1893 it was resolved by that party that the Act should be repealed. I will admit that that was a plank in the Liberal platform, but so far as I am aware it was never mentioned in any of the counties. I had the opportunity in Annapolis County to hear many speeches; and although I did not hear the speeches delivered by the Minister of Finance, I ascertained what the hon. gentleman declared to be the platform of the Liberals in the last elections. In not one of the hon. gentleman's speeches did he refer to the Dominion Franchise Act.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not know whether I referred to that subject in my speeches in Annapolis, but I did so in fifty speeches I delivered in Nova Scotia.

Mr. MILLS. I have typewritten copies of three of the speeches delivered by the hon. gentleman in Annapolis County, taken by an official stenographer, and not one word appears to have been said with respect to the franchise of the Dominion. But there were a great many remarks made with respect to the enormous duty on cotton, flour and many other articles. Not one of the promises made in regard to them has been fulfilled, but this promise in regard to the franchise is going to be fulfilled. Very good. So far as I am concerned I accept the mandate of the people, which was that the Dominion Franchise Act should be abolished and we should accept the franchises of the different provinces for the Dominion franchise. Then, in God's name, allow the people to have ample opportunity to get their names on the lists and take advantage of the different franchises. To put the Bill through in its present shape, this would not be done, by accepting the amendments of the Senate it would be accomplished. I was very much amused in regard to the speeches delivered this morning in regard to this Bill. In the few remarks made by me before adjournment I called the attention of the House to the fact that the First Minister had said we should approach this subject in a calm and judicial spirit, and we did approach it in such a spirit and endeavoured to do what we thought to be right and square about it. In my remarks on the second reading I said I always was suspicious of a Liberal when he asks politicians to approach any matter in a calm and judicial manner and have no politics about it. There is always something behind, and this has not failed to prove true in the present instance. Have hon. gentlemen opposite been calm and judicial in their speeches to-day? We had a speech from the Minister of Railways and Canals; we also had a speech from the member for Guysborough, and as he very seldom speaks in a calm and judicial manner, I was not surprised at his speech; but I was surprised at the speech delivered by the Solicitor General. He has acted in a calm and judicial manner up to the present moment, but he went out of his way to follow the footsteps of the Minister of Railways; they put their heads together to talk to the galleries, or to one particular gallery in this House, and told the occupants: you could not go any further or you would go beyond the bounds of your prerogative. So far as the Senate was concerned the eyes of the people of Canada have been upon that body, their action has

aroused the enthusiastic plaudits of the country, and the members of that body have done their duty in this Parliament.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. MILLS. And the eyes of the people of Canada are still upon the Senate.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. MILLS. The Senate has struck the right and proper path of duty in this matter. They have said to this Chamber: you have done right; you have obeyed the mandate of the people, which was to abolish the Dominion Franchise Act and accept the different franchises of the provinces as your franchise; that is right and proper and we will not go back of it. And they have not done so. But this they say to the representatives of Canada: Allow the people of the different provinces the right to take advantage of these franchises; we are giving you the proper machinery and proper authority to allow the people to exercise the rights which have accrued to them. The Solicitor General said that the Senate prepared this amendment with no careful thought. That is very funny coming from the Solicitor General in view of what we have had with regard to this Bill. A Bill was brought down to this House some months ago, and I would like to ask if that Bill is anything like the one we have here to-day? Has it not been cut, recut and cut again? Did it look as if very careful thought had been given on the part of the Solicitor General or Department of Justice to the preparation of the Bill? Not very long ago the Liberal member for Halifax (Mr. Russell) when speaking of the amendments that were made to the laws of Nova Scotia said that there was amendment upon amendment, that the statutes were being shingled and shangled and shungled and shongled, and so with reference to this Bill, it has been shingled and shangled and shungled and shongled until we get it in its present shape.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I would like to ascertain from my hon. friend (Mr. Mills) whether he has fully made up his own mind as to what amendments should be proposed in order to make the amendments of the Senate workable.

Mr. MILLS. I am coming to that. The Solicitor General told us that the framer of the Senate amendment being secure in his seat did not give this any very careful thought, and such a criticism comes with very ill grace from the hon. the Solicitor General. Sir, the principle of the amendment is there and it is very easy to establish machinery by which it can be carried out. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fitzpatrick) held up the bugaboo of expense, but I can tell him that the expense is a very small thing compared with the injustice that would be done to the people of Manitoba, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, and Prince Edward Island if this amendment be not accepted by the Commons, as it ought to be accepted. I do not wish to prolong this debate, nor do I as a rule intrude very much on the time of the House, for what I have to say I generally say right to the point. Suppose the Commons do not accept the amendment made by the Senate, then I say the Senate will be derelict to its duty and will be stultifying itself before the people of Canada if it does not persevere in its path of rectitude and right. It is a path the people of Canada will support the Senate in pursuing, and the Senate will be doing nothing more than what is consistent with its prerogative and duty if it adheres to the line it has marked out for itself.

Mr. MARTIN. I do not wish to occupy the time of the House, but I do express the hope that the Solicitor General will accept the amendment of the Senate so far as Prince Edward Island is concerned, and I shall state briefly why that amendment is necessary in the Bill. I know the Solicitor General had a very hard time of it to adapt this Bill to the condition of affairs in the province of Prince Edward Island as well as the various and conflicting conditions existing in all the provinces of Canada. He went one step at my suggestion to improve the Bill in relation to Prince Edward Island, and I thank him for it, but one step further is required. In Prince Edward Island we have neither voters' lists nor the ballot, and this Bill proposes to impose the ballot on the province, but to leave us without registration, and therein lies the difficulty. In consequence of our not having voters' lists, the qualification of a voter has to be decided on election day, and when a voter comes to the poll his title to vote is considered and if good he is allowed to vote. But if there are doubts about it the voter goes on the poll-books and is marked "objected to." That is all right under the system of open voting, but it is quite a different thing under the ballot, because once the ballot paper is deposited in the box, hon. gentlemen can very easily understand that it can no longer be identified—and no matter how scrupulous may be the agents in performing their duty, some voters may be passed who have no right to vote, and there is no possibility of telling for whom they voted. There is no remedy for that under this Bill, under a ballot system; but there is a remedy under the present system of open voting.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. There is one observation I should have made this morning and which will come in appropriately now. The difficulty which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Martin) mentions has no bearing whatever on the franchise, but we can very easily allow this Bill to pass, and then by an amendment to the election law, provide for the difficulty suggested by my hon. friend (Mr. Martin), and it is a diffi-

culty. It is, however, an entirely different matter from the franchise.

Mr. MARTIN. My hon. friend (Mr. Fitzpatrick) will see that the province may not change the law, we have to take the law as it stands.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. It is the Dominion election law that I refer to.

Mr. MARTIN. Let me point out the difficulty to the Solicitor General. At present in Prince Edward Island, before Declaration Day the books are looked over, and if any candidate thinks an injury is done him, by there being on the poll book a large number of votes marked "objected to," that candidate demands a scrutiny, which is not very expensive in Prince Edward Island. At the scrutiny they go through the poll book and if any of these votes marked "objected to" are proven to be of no value they are wiped off the book and the correct votes are added up. But the difficulty under this Bill is that when you have a ballot and the voting paper is dropped into the box, you do not know which way the man has voted, although the vote may be marked "objected to," and it is impossible to erase the vote though it proves to be a bad one. If the hon. gentleman will turn to the Act of 1893, section 130, where the scrutiny is provided for——

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It is just as you state.

Mr. MARTIN. Turning to 56 Victoria, cap. 1, sections 128, 129 and 130 of the statutes of Prince Edward Island, passed in 1893, we will find that it provides that if there is any reasonable doubt about the validity of a vote, the burden of proof that it should be rejected shall be on the party to the scrutiny on whose behalf such vote is polled. You see the difficulty at once: when the vote is by ballot, how is it possible to determine for whom the vote is polled? There is no way proposed to mark the ballot. Therefore you cannot demand a scrutiny. The result is this. Suppose that on election day, in any riding of Prince Edward Island, there are 100 votes which under the local law would be marked rejected, you cannot reach them under the Ballot Act, because under the scrutiny it is incumbent on those who call for the rejection of those votes to show which way they voted, and if they cannot prove that, they cannot go on with the scrutiny. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries says that if men make a false declaration, they may be prosecuted for perjury. But what effect has that on an election? What solace is that to the candidate? I do not say that in Prince Edward Isand we have many men who do not respect the sanctity of an oath. In this respect the people of Prince Edward Island compare very well, indeed, with those of the rest of Canada; but my hon. friend knows that we have a considerable floating population there, which may be increased; and the ballot box may be stuffed by the votes of those people. There is another point in regard to this. In the province of Prince Edward Island we have open voting. How is this Parliament going to enforce on that province a ballot? Are the people of Prince Edward Island to be coerced?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. You have not open voting under the Franchise Act.

Mr. MARTIN. Yes, in our province we have open voting, and this law forces the ballot on the province. I do not object to that, if the provision is made in this Bill for the change. This is a very serious objection. I notice that the Solicitor General has not given any reason in his notice of motion why the amendments proposed by the Senate in the case of Prince Edward Island should be disagreed to. The reasons he has given do not at all apply to Prince Edward Island. I do not think there is any principle at stake in this amendment; it is all a matter of detail. The only plea that can be set up against it is that in the case of the few votes that are marked rejected, it may be found out which way they voted. That can only be found out in case of a scrutiny. If there is no scrutiny, those votes are just as secret as any votes in the province of Ontario. I do not think there is any hardship in this. I think my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries acknowledged that an amendment of this kind is required. I understood him to say that this provision in regard to marking the ballots when they are objected to, was one which he would not seriously oppose. Why not leave open voting in Prince Edward Island as it is to-day? If that were done, this provision which we asked for would not be required at all. But if you compel Prince Edward Island to adopt the ballot system, and if you want a pure election and a true indication of the vote in Prince Edward Island, you must introduce into this Bill something on the lines proposed by the Senate. In that, there is no principle involved. It is only providing for the change adopted in this Bill by introducing vote by ballot in Prince Edward Island. I think the difficulty is a serious one. I think the Minister of Marine appreciates it when he suggests that it will be sufficient in cases of this kind to prosecute for perjury the man who improperly takes the oath. It shows the weakness of his case. Does the hon. Minister mean to say for one moment that if a man is robbed of his seat because certain votes have been polled against him by persons who have no votes at all, it is any consolation or compensation to him to know that those who so voted may be prosecuted for perjury? When he sets up that plea, the hon. gentleman acknowledges that this difficulty exists. I hoped that the Solicitor General, with his usual goodness, would have adopted this amendment and made the Bill workable so far as Prince Edward Island is concerned.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There is no doubt that there is a very serious difficulty in the application of this Bill to Prince Edward Island, and the question we had to determine was the choice between two evils—whether it was better to pass the Bill as it left this House, and leave it open to the serious objection which the hon. gentleman has pointed out, that if a man chooses to perjure himself he may get in a bad vote, or whether we were prepared to adopt the amendment which destroys the secrecy of the ballot. I confess that my mind wavered for a long time as to which was the best to do. When I came to consider the fact, I found that the objection, though theoretically a strong one, is practically a weak one. I have been for the last twenty-five years in active political life in Prince Edward Island. The hon. gentleman talks about the value of a scrutiny. To my knowledge there has only been one scrutiny in Prince Edward Island in twenty-five years, and that one proved abortive.

Mr. MARTIN. Will the hon. gentleman allow me? Will he tell me the date when that scrutiny was held?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. In 1879 or 1880.

Mr. MARTIN. Does the hon. gentleman refer to local politics?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN. Is he aware that there was a scrutiny after the last general election?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No, I was not. The only one I have any knowledge of is the one I have just mentioned, and I cited it to show that the law, as it stands now, is an excellent law and works well, there are no bad votes forced or put in at an election.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Perhaps the fact that you have a law may prevent it.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Why amend it? The people vote in their own little districts. It is an agricultural community almost entirely. Every man is known in a polling district, and it is known whether he has a vote or not, and when he comes to the poll, he will not take a false oath in the presence of his neighbours. My hon. friend will admit that outside the cities, the evil is reduced to a minimum. If this amendment were adopted, it would put a tremendous power in the hands of the Government. Every Dominion employee on the railway would go to the polls knowing that the Minister of the day could ascertain how he voted. All you would have to do would be to say "I object," then the ballot is numbered, a corresponding number is put in the ballot book, and the agent and deputy returning officer, when they count the ballots, see the corresponding number in the poll book and know how the men objected to voted.

Mr. TAYLOR. That is the same ballot we have in Ontario, and you call it sacred.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am not very strong against that, my mind wavered for a long time, but I am pointing out the disadvantages, and if I wanted to take advantage of my official position, I think I would rather accept the amendment. But I wish to point out that inasmuch as there never has been any difficulty experienced in 25 or 30 years of the working of the law, and inasmuch as the provisions giving the right to file an election petition and ask for a scrutiny are very rarely acted upon, Parliament is quite safe in trying the application of the provincial law as it exists without amendment. The adoption of the amendment will entirely destroy the secrecy of the ballot, and I think the hon. Solicitor General has thrown out a suggestion which I would ask my hon. friend to consider. My mind is not prejudiced one way or the other. It is my interest as well as his to have an election law fair, and every provision made against having bad votes polled. I know that I shall lose largely if bad votes are allowed to get in. In Charlottetown I have always found the bad votes worked against the party to which I belonged. If the hon. gentleman will think the matter over and determine that an amendment to the election law is desirable, we can get together and agree upon such a measure, next session or afterwards, which would meet the difficulty I acknowledge does exist, but I am afraid that an attempt to meet it in this Bill will, if carried out, have very prejudicial effects, because the destruction of the secrecy of the ballot would destroy the whole civil service vote in the island.

Mr. MARTIN. Does the hon. gentleman not know that the same difficulty exists in the Ontario law? The ballots are numbered, as we proposed to number the ballots here. If that be the case, why does the hon. gentleman make this objection?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I understand that in Ontario they have no Government railways.

Mr. MARTIN. In Ontario every ballot is numbered, but here it is only required to number those objected to.

Mr. DAVIN. Before the motion is carried, I wish to say a few words. My hon. friend the Solicitor General laid down the proposition that the Senators had gone beyond the scope of their functions in interfering with this portion of the Bill, and I asked him why. He said that if I could control my impatience for a short time he would tell me. I listened with the greatest attention to what he said, and although he got eloquent, discursive, argumentative and re-

miniscent, he never told us how the Senate had gone beyond the scope of its proper functions. He went on to say that from 1867 to 1885, the franchise which this Bill seeks to introduce existed in Canada as the Dominion franchise. He then referred to the Franchise Act of 1885, and he said that in 1887, 1892 and 1896 the reform of the franchise was the chief plank in the platform of the Liberal party. He said it was the chief plank. I shall not split hairs with him on that point, but of course we all know that it was not the chief plank. But I want to ask him if the Senate is seized of the planks of the Liberal party in any way, or of any party, from year to year. If it is not, that can in no way bear on the question as to the scope of the duties of the Senate. He then referred to the fact that in 1891 a Bill was introduced. And he dwelt upon the fact, or the supposed fact, that this Bill was intended to return to the people the control of their franchise.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The control of the making of the lists.

Mr. DAVIN. Exactly. Now, in regard to that, the hon. gentleman knows well that in Manitoba our complaint is that the registration clerk deprives the people of the control of their own lists, and what we wanted was an effective appeal against the depriving of the people of Manitoba of the control of their own lists. He then took up the amendment, and said that in the House of Commons this amendment was rejected, and that it was inserted by the Senate for the purpose of wrecking the Bill. And he refers to the fact that some words that fell from this side had had a construction put upon them by himself and others. He went on to say that if the amendment were adopted, it would destroy the Bill, that the Bill would become inoperative, and then he went into a discussion, which I shall deal with very briefly, of the character of the amendment.

Now, I have reviewed the hon. gentleman's speech, and I ask: Did he deal at all with the only question that is really of importance here to-day? This Bill will, no doubt, be adopted on division. We are not powerful enough on this side to prevent it passing. But, Sir, a most serious thing has happened. The course taken by the hon. gentleman and by the Government of which he is a member, the form in which he puts their request to this House to refuse assent to the Senate's amendment is a greater offence than the Bill itself. It is an offence against the constitution.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. DAVIN. Yes. They ask us to register in this Parliament a proposition that is opposed to the well-understood principles of the British constitution.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. DAVIN. I see that such great constitutional authorities and parliamentarians as my hon. friend from North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) dissent. I have a great respect for the hon. gentleman's opinion; he has been a long time in this House. But I say here that the assertion embodied in this proposal is one of the greatest offences against the constitution of this country that has been committed by this Government, and that is saying a great deal. Now, it is important that there should be no mistake about this. Is it to be supposed, for instance, that the Senate had no authority, as asserted here, and as asserted by the hon. gentleman in his speech, to follow the course it did? Here is what we read in the reasons for refusing to agree to the Senate amendment:

> That the passage of the amendment by the Senate after its rejection by the House of Commons is inconsistent with the undoubted right and privilege of this House to determine the principles of the franchise under which its members are elected.

Now, Sir, you observe that the proposition that is stated there is that the Senate has no right whatever to interfere with the principles of the franchise for this House. It does not assert that the Senate has not a right to propose an amendment if it had been proposed in this House and rejected——

Mr. McGREGOR. We can reject it, too.

Mr. DAVIN. I do not see the bearing of my hon. friend's remarks on what I have said; but I will try to ponder it as I go on, and if it has any bearing upon the question, I will deal with it. The assertion is not that if this House rejected this amendment, and an identical amendment is proposed and passed by the Senate, that is beyond the scope of the Senate's right. What it asserts is that in regard to every Bill dealing with the franchise, the Senate has no right to reject it or alter any portion of it vitally. It cannot mean that there must be no amendments by the Senate, because the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fitzpatrick) is accepting amendments proposed by Mr. Mills, the leader of the Senate.

Now, Mr. Gladstone in 1884, when the Representation of the People Bill was before the House of Lords, referred to a speech that Lord Salisbury was supposed to have made:

> I find that in a speech of Lord Salisbury, I rather think in the papers of to-day, there is the following passage:—"The House of Lords has a right to say: 'We do not approve of the measure you bring forward; if you like to accept its rejection, well and good; if you object to its rejection, your remedy is to go to the people.' That I take to imply that the Bill has been rejected."

Mr. Gladstone's speech is found in the earlier portion of volume 291 of the "Hansard." And you will find in the whole course of Mr. Gladstone's speech, the question he deals

with is, whether the Bill had been rejected. He does not at all assail the position taken by Lord Salisbury. What Lord Salisbury says is worth reading as bearing on this general question, which is the only thing I care about. This amendment is sure to be carried, but it is important that we should not allow it to receive the assent of this House without protesting against it as a violation of the constitution. Lord Salisbury calls attention to what Mr. Gladstone says:

That seems a very captious criticism, and although I do not ordinarily take any notice of misconstruction of things that I say, I think that if the Prime Minister condescends to misunderstand you, you are bound, as a matter of respect, to correct him. What I wished to point out is, that I was speaking, when I used those words—as any one who will consult the speech will see—of the general constitutional rule affecting the action of the House of Lords upon the question of dissolution, and it was impossible for me to state it in more limited terms than I did. As a general rule, it is perfectly true that the House of Lords has a right to say: "We do not approve the measure you bring forward. If you like to accept its rejection, well and good; if you object to its rejection,——

That is, the rejection of the Representation of the People Bill. And what could an Upper Chamber do more diametrically opposed to the reasoning of the hon. and learned Solicitor General than by absolutely rejecting a measure that is passed by the Lower House providing for its representation?

If you object to its rejection, your remedy is to go to the people. But in saying that I did not mean, nor does it necessarily follow, that in every particular case coming under that general rule the statement would require to be in equally large terms. The general rule is necessarily larger than the particular instance. What happened in this particular instance was, that we did not reject the measure, which rejection had for its effect that the Bill could not pass until certain necessary and supplementary legislation had been added to it. But what I wish to point out is that I was discussing the general rule.

And the general rule, therefore, includes the proposition that the Representation of the People Bill passed by the Lower House could be absolutely rejected by the Upper Chamber, and that as the strongest thing that can be done with regard to it.

Now I come to the criticism made on this amendment by the Solicitor General. He showed himself a skilful advocate, because the course he was going to take in regard to this amendment was as untenable as the position he takes on the larger issue I have just dealt with. He says this amendment showed want of consideration on the part of the Senate. Suppose it did. If the amendment as a whole is a good one, as I believe in his heart the Solicitor General thinks it to be, would that be a reason for rejecting it? All that is required is a mere verbal amendment. What did he say in regard to this clause 10a, which is the chief clause to be dealt with, which gives an appeal to a judge? I will quote that part of it:

Notwithstanding anything in this Act, or in any Act heretofore enacted or hereafter to be enacted by the legislature of any province, there shall be in the provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Manitoba, for the purpose of revising and amending the voters' lists to be used in the election of members for the House of Commons, an appeal from said lists as prepared by the registration clerk and revisers to the respective judges of the county courts.

The hon. gentleman made this criticism: This is framed as if the promoter did not know there were appeals in Manitoba, that an appeal was provided to the revision court presided over, it might be, by a county court judge, or a revising barrister. Somebody said, and I thought the hon. gentleman adopted the suggestion, that there might actually be two appeals going on, that there might be an appeal to a county court judge, and there might be an appeal in fact under this clause, and also under the Act as it exists at the present time.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Quite right.

Mr. DAVIN. Now, what is the remedy? Suppose that clause is a good clause, what is the remedy for that part of the Bill but to put in three or four words, such as these: "An appeal from said lists as prepared by the registration clerks and revisers," and then add in the words: "and finally settled by the proper officers." That would fix it; there could then be only an appeal from the list as finally revised under the Manitoba law at present. In the next place the hon. gentleman criticised severely the close of the first sentence in the second paragraph:

Such appeal may be, at the instance of any voter or person entitled to be a voter in the polling divisions, the voters' list for which is appealed from, on all or any of the following grounds, viz.: that the names of voters are through inadvertence or otherwise omitted from voters' lists——

That would be to put names on.

——or wrongly stated therein,——

That would be to exclude names.

——or otherwise omitted from voters' lists or wrongly stated therein, * * * and shall be made to the judge of the county court at any time within twenty days after the voters' list as first made up shall be filed with the officer who under the law of the province has the custody of the same, and notice of such appeal shall be given in form "C" in the schedule hereunto annexed.

Now, how is the notice of appeal to be given? First, by posting the same up at least in three public places within the polling division; next, by publishing the same for at least ten days previously to such appeal in some newspaper published in the county and circulated in the polling division, and if no newspaper is published in

the county, then in a newspaper published in the nearest county. So there you have three guarantees that notice shall be given to the person whose name is appealed against, that there is an appeal to the county court judge to strike his name off the list. But there is a further guarantee that he shall be informed, according to this provision, and this is the provision that excited the exuberant ridicule of my hon. friend :

Provided that in the case of an application to strike off names from the voters' list, such notice shall be mailed duly registered with postage prepaid, at least one week previcus to such appeal, to the address of such person or persons, if known to the appellant

My hon. friend became eloquent in his ridicule of the words : " if known to the appellant." But what is the meaning of it ? Would the hon. gentleman have put in : " if unknown to the appellant " ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I would have taken care to understand something about the provision of the law in similar cases, and I would have adopted the old Franchise Act. That would have shown some care.

Mr. DAVIN. Exactly. What would be easier than to make a verbal amendment ? Everybody knows that in every county in Canada there would be little difficulty in finding out the address of the appellant. But suppose his address was not known. Notice of appeal twenty days beforehand has been posted up in three public places, has been published in a newspaper, and is it to be supposed that there would not be sufficient guarantee for his receiving notice of appeal ? I have shown, therefore, that the hon. gentleman never dealt with the real question at issue, the constitutional power of the Senate of Canada, the Second Chamber. I have shown that he never dealt with the vital principle of that clause, but contented himself with a verbal criticism of the first and second portions of it. If I am right in that assumption, I am afraid the reason the hon. gentleman took that course was because he already knows well that the amendment is a reasonable amendment and should be adopted by this House, and would have been adopted if the best minds on the other side had had their way. It would have been adopted if the Solicitor General himself had had his way. I think we had a kind of half opinion expressed by the Solicitor General to the effect that an appeal was desirable, and the Minister of the Interior said an appeal was desirable, but that the Government did not want it. I rose simply to enter my protest against the proposition that is levied at the very constitution under which we live, and which asks this House to stultify itself by giving a reason larger than is necessary for disagreeing with the amendments of the Senate. And I also rose to point out that the Solicitor General found it necessary to stoop to verbal criticism of the principal amendment in order to justify the course of the Government and in order to conceal from this House and the public that he was not grappling with the real issue, and the hon. gentleman was compelled to make a stump speech from his place in this House in order to cover up the position of the Government.

Amendments 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 were disagreed to.

Amendment concurred in on division.

PAYMENT OF GRANTS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF PUBLIC WORKS.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair) moved second reading of Bill (No. 161) respecting the payment of grants in aid of the construction of public works.

Mr. HAGGART. I suppose the hon. gentleman only intends to apply this Bill to the Crow's Nest Pass road and the Grand Trunk Railway bridge at Montreal.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have only those two works in my mind at the present time.

Mr. FOSTER. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will amend the Bill in that direction ; otherwise it will be a general Bill.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not think I can do that.

Mr. FOSTER. Then the assertion has no value so far as legislation is concerned, for it only indicates the present intention of the Minister. I think it would be better to limit the Bill at present, and if the hon. gentleman next session desires to make the Bill more general, he can come down with another proposition.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have no other work in my mind at the present time.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and the House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 2,

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I move the following subsection be added :

This Act shall only apply to contracts made with the Grand Trunk Railway in aid of the Victoria Bridge, and with the Canadian Pacific Railway in aid of the construction of the Crow's Nest Pass Railway.

Amendment agreed to.

Bill, as amended, reported, and read the third time and passed.

MANITOBA SCHOOL FUND—PAYMENT BY DOMINION GOVERNMENT.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved second reading of Bill (No. 168) respecting the Manitoba School Fund.

Mr. FOSTER. Would my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) give the figures in regard to the school expenditure?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The legislative grant for a period of five years, beginning with 1892, of expenditure in Manitoba for school purposes, is as follows:—

1892	$127,436 93
1893	126,968 49
1894	140,562 68
1895	152,386 54
1896	165,094 88

The municipal taxation for the same period of five years was as follows:—

1892	$262,297
1893	329,562
1894	354,493
1895	481,828
1896	472,039

Mr. FOSTER. I do not intend to detain the House for more than five or ten minutes, but I would be loathe to see this pass without stating my objection to it as briefly as is consistent with any degree of clearness. Differing from some hon. gentlemen on the other side, I cannot help but look at this as a matter of trust or endowment. I am not going into the history of what preceded and which has some relation to this matter, and if it were fully gone into, the contemporary and antecedent history of the time would, I think, add some weight to the argument of those who consider that this was a trust undertaken by the Dominion Government, not simply for the provincial administration which might for the time being be in power in the province of Manitoba, but a trust for the inhabitants of Manitoba; those who at the time were inhabitants, and those who should become its inhabitants in the future. Looked at in that light, it seems to be a grave matter for the Government at the present time to practically destroy that trust, because when they assume, on the slight grounds they have given, to take $300,000 of a trust fund which at present amounts to $475,000, they deplete the fund as it at present exists of the greater part of its capital, and they establish the principle that whenever they please they can come to Parliament and make an allocation of the capital of this fund to the consolidated fund of the province. I say, that if we are to go so far as to make an absolute allocation without stipulation for repayment or anything of the kind of a portion or the whole of the capital fund, we can only do it, it seems to me, on the strongest of guarantees that the money which was so allocated should be devoted to nothing else than to the interests of the public schools of the province. I asked for these statistics from my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) because I wished to show that at present there is no claim, I believe, on the part of the Manitoba Government that this $300,000 is needed for and will be devoted to school purposes, nor, as shown by the appropriations that have been made is there any very large increase in the appropriations which would go at all to offset the amount of money which is being set apart to the consolidated fund of Manitoba by this Government. There has been nothing more than a gradual, and, I must say, a very gradual and a very slight increase in the legislative grant for educational purposes in the province of Manitoba compared with the increase in population, which is fairly rapid in that province. Take, for instance, the last three years, and we find that the amount given by legislative grants for school purposes in Manitoba in 1894 was $140,562; in 1895, $152,386, and in 1896, $165,094. There was, therefore, an increase of twelve or thirteen thousand dollars a year in the legislative grant, and that is an increase which is not, I imagine, as great as the increase in the population. It is certainly not as great as the increase in the school population taken by percentages, as I have it before me in this statement. Therefore, it is clear to me, and I think the House understands, that this $300,000 of the capital sum of this endowment is not required to be devoted either to recoup an abnormal increase in the legislative grant towards education, nor for the purpose of using it this year or the succeeding year for public school education. The fact is that the increase in the education grant in Manitoba is not in percentage equal to the increase in the school population, and the amount of $300,000 which is being granted is to go into the consolidated fund of the province of Manitoba to be used for roads and bridges, for railway subsidies, or for any of the purposes which fall under the administration of the Government. Now, it does seem to me that you are doing two things. In the first place, you are breaking the trust which was made by the means which have been mentioned, a trust which was made for high and laudable purposes. Why, Sir, if we take some of the western states of the Union, we will find that there has been no system more popular and more conducive of great benefit in the educational point of view than the system which commenced some twenty or twenty-five years ago, that when a state was new and had public lands, of setting apart a portion of the domain which was to be held as a trust for education; in some cases, for the purpose of higher education and in others for the purpose of common or public education. And as the resources of the state were de-

veloped, as the population increased, as values rose, this part of the public domain which was set apart increased in value until these states had large funds out of which they have equipped great educational institutions of the higher kind, colleges and universities, and in some cases that formed a permanent fund which is largely lightening the taxation of the people in keeping up their schools, or what is better, supplementing that taxation in a more liberal manner than possibly could have been done by the ability of the people to pay for these institutions. I think it was something of this same sort that entered into the minds of our legislators at the time when, looking out upon Manitoba, large in extent, with valuable public lands, they set apart, by solemn enactment, for the future population of the province of Manitoba this area of the public lands to make sure, in all the strife for public improvements, in all the eagerness for public works which is born out of the necessities of the time and the race for progress in a new province, that the interests of education should be absolutely provided for, in so far that out of the public domain there should be kept an inviolable part which should be from time to time turned into funds, the interest of these funds, on fair and reasonable and safe investment, to be a subvention, year by year, for these purposes. I consider, Sir, that the province of Manitoba has been immeasurably helped by the very fact that there was such a trust and endowment as that; and I apprehend that immigrants, seeking a new home, have found this to be one of the attractions of Manitoba; for they have said to themselves: In the future out of these valuable public lands, there will be sufficient revenue to make it certain beyond all shadow of doubt that the most progressive system of education shall be generously and abundantly sustained in that province. And what more powerful attraction is there to large classes of an immigrating population than to be assured that in the country to which they go, and where their children and grandchildren's lot shall be cast, there shall be that public school education which they often missed in the countries from which they come. Now, there is not the least doubt about it, this application and this grant have arisen out of the political necessities of the two Governments—out of the political necessity, we will say, of the Manitoba Government, leaving out of the consideration this Government for the time being. Funds are hard to be got, expenditures are high, and are being called for more and more year by year; and pressure is brought upon this Government to make up the deficiency of funds, if need be, by taking away from this available capital fund $200,000 or $300,000, to be paid into their treasury and so tide their general financial needs along for a short time. What will happen again? The fund is added to year by year by sales, we will hope by profitable sales; but the temptation is still there. Provincial governments are proverbially governments which spend up to and beyond the limit of proper expenditure. The pressure upon them is strong for needed improvements, and for other improvements which might well be deferred for a time. But that pressure upon a provincial government is always steady and strong, and pushes them to the very verge of their resources, either to borrow or to commute, as is being done in this case, the funds of a trust into the use of present financial necessities. Once the door is open, once they find a Government to accede to their demand, what is easier, when two or three thousand dollars is wanted at any time in the future, than to bring political pressure to bear, and come to this Government with a precedent established, and ask for another slice of the capital of that trust or endowment. The way is open to them, and if this legislation is passed, I for my part bid farewell—with a certainty that that farewell is perfectly appropriate—to any stable and considerable fund ever being allowed to remain for the future in the province of Manitoba. Once the door is open, once the pressure brings $300,000, the door remains open, the pressure can be applied again; from time to time it will be applied; and the result will be that the fund will always, from time to time, be drawn upon to provide for the financial necessities of the province. How much better it would have been, Sir, if that fund could have been kept intact; and in the course of ten or twelve years that province would have had for its public school education probably a subvention of $100,000 per year, mounting gradually up, as these lands increased in value; and this would have been not only a benefit to the public school system of the province at large, but one of the greatest advertisements for the province of Manitoba which it could possibly have had. Ultimately out of that endowment, if it could have been kept intact and well managed, I believe the whole public school expense of the province of Manitoba could have been sufficiently provided for. Suppose that $15,000,000 had ultimately been secured out of the sale of those lands, the interest on that sum well invested, would have gone a long way to provide, under a certain and stable school system, for the public school instruction of the people of Manitoba. It is idle to say that because an advance was made for a limited time—an advance which was repaid, which must have been repaid, the money for repaying which was from year to year in the hands of the Government here which made the advance and called for the repayment—I say it is idle to say that an advance is any ground for an absolute allocation of a portion of the capital fund.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to weary the House with a long argument. I merely state my grounds. I look upon this fund as a trust, as a high and benevolent trust; and I look upon this legislation as destroying the purpose of that fund, and therefore I am opposed to it. The Government, of course, have made up their minds. They propose to put it through. I do not think it will be the best piece of legislation by any means which they have put through, and that is not saying much of their legislation if we take the samples that we have had this year.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman has repeated in brief the arguments which were advanced by others in the course of the debate at another stage, and therefore it would be of no advantage for us to have any protracted debate at the present time. Nevertheless, I may be permitted in a few words, to reply to what he has said. So far as the trust funds are concerned, we went over that subject very fully before. Surely, it will not be denied that if this Parliament had power to create the trust fund, it has power to change the terms of the fund, in order better to carry out the purposes for which it was designed. It was a matter between the Government of Canada and the Government of Manitoba. They were the two parties to the trust, because the two Governments must be held to represent the peoples of the two communities, the Dominion on the one hand and the province on the other, and if the two parties to the trust are satisfied to change its terms, I fail to see how anybody can say there has been anything that can be described as a breach of trust.

Then the hon. gentleman says we are establishing a dangerous precedent. I do not see that we need be very much alarmed by the precedent. My hon. friend opposite established it some years ago, and it has not brought any danger in its train. But my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) says there is a difference. He says that they only gave an advance and that we are giving the money. Well, I venture to say that the province of Manitoba would be just as well pleased if we called this an advance. The only difference between the two positions is this, that hon. gentlemen opposite paid the money to the province of Manitoba when they did not have it, and we pay it when we have it, but in both cases, it is a charge on the same fund. I do not understand what my hon. friend means by his attempt to draw a distinction between the payment of money in this case and the payment by the late Government——

Mr. FOSTER. Surely he sees the difference between a loan and a gift.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is no gift. If the amount paid by the late Government were a loan, then it should have been repaid by the Government of Manitoba. Can he say that the Manitoba Government ever paid a cent in return? It was an advance from a trust fund to be charged against the accumulation of this trust fund, and the Manitoba Government never paid a cent in return.

Mr. FOSTER. It amounted to the same thing, if instead of repayment being made by them this amount was kept back from what would become due them.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman was aware that moneys would arise in a future day from the sales of these lands, and knowing that, his Government made an advance on account of future receipts. We simply pay out a portion of the moneys we hold. We do not make any advance but simply pay out a portion of the moneys we have in hand. The hon. gentleman passed through Parliament Acts by which he took authority to pay the province of Manitoba $40,000. That was the statutory provision, and out of that he paid $30,000 altogether, I think. That became a charge upon this fund, and the situation is just this. If that loan or that advance had never been made, the province of Manitoba would have $30,000 more in the trust fund besides the interest thereon to-day. Therefore, as a matter of precedent and argument, there is no distinction whatever between the two cases, with this exception, that the late Government advanced the money when they did not have it, and we are simply giving it when we have it to the credit of the province. We are giving a little more than they gave, but from the standpoint of precedent and principle, the amount does not affect the question.

The only other point is the suggestion which ran through the debates on the other side, that we are giving up the whole fund. We are simply doing what the late Government did, giving a very small amount of a fund which will ultimately reach many millions. We are giving this amount out of a fund which will reach, in all probability, to $15,000,000. Out of that fund they took authority to pay $40,000 and we are taking authority to give $300,000. The purpose in both cases was to assist Manitoba in its earlier days when its needs of educational help are greater than they will be in the future. Therefore the precedent is that which the hon. gentleman established, and there is not the slightest danger when we look to the fact that after paying the moderate sum provided by this Bill, there will be still a considerable sum to the credit of Manitoba and also a vast tract of land, the value of which, as it accumulates in future years, can only be counted by millions.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. The hon. Finance Minister wants to establish a parity between the

advance made a few years ago by the late Government and the advance he proposes to-day to make to the province of Manitoba out of the school fund. It is true that at that time we asked for assistance from the Federal Government; but there was then no fund, and we merely asked for a loan in order to help us to carry out our educational system. But this loan, of course, to be taken from the money that would accrue to the province in the future. It was to be taken out of the revenues accruing to the province from the school lands, and was simply an advance on the interest account. These gentlemen, however, charge their advance against capital account. The interest has been accruing for years and the province never claimed it, because they knew that they were indebted for the advance of $30,000 which they had already received. This Government, however, instead of charging that $30,000 against the $78,000 interest which has accrued, placed the full amount of interest to the credit of Manitoba and held this advance as a charge against capital. To-day we are not asked to advance any money out of the interest account but out of the capital account. That is what makes the difference between the two situations—that of the former Government and the position taken by the Government of to-day. We object to the capital account being interfered with. With regard to the interest, if the Government chose to ask us to advance $300,000 to the province of Manitoba, to be deducted from the revenues that will accrue from the capital account, as soon as the revenue reaches that amount of $300,000, there could be no objection to that.

Mr. FOSTER. And to be devoted to educational purposes.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. Certainly. Instead of doing that, however, we are now giving this to Manitoba, not out of the revenues to be derived from that fund, but out of the capital itself, and you will see that next year the North-west Territories will come down and ask for their share of the school fund, and it will not be long before this Parliament will be overwhelmed with applications, and in the end part with the lands and the whole fund that was created and should be respected and kept as a permanent fund for the purposes of education.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman is entirely wrong when he says that the first advance was to be repaid out of the interest only. The Act, section 2, chapter 13 of the statutes of 1878, distinctly says:

> The said sums may be so advanced out of any unappropriated moneys forming part of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada, and shall be repaid to the said fund with interest at the rate of five per cent per annum out of the first proceeds of sale of the lands mentioned in the preamble.

The House divided:

YEAS:

Messieurs

Beausoleil,	Lavergne,
Beith,	Lister,
Bernier,	Livingston,
Blair,	Mackie,
Borden (King's),	McClure,
Bourassa,	McGregor,
Bourbonnais,	McGugan,
Burnett,	McHugh,
Casey,	McLellan,
Choquette,	McMullen,
Christie,	Madore,
Copp,	Iouin,
Davies (Sir Louis),	Mignault,
Davis,	Monet,
Dechêne,	Mulock,
Dupré,	Oliver,
Edwards,	Parmalee,
Ellis,	Paterson,
Erb,	Pettet,
Fielding,	Proulx,
Fisher,	Rinfret,
Fraser (Guysborough),	Rogers,
Fraser (Lambton),	Ross,
Frost,	Rutherford,
Gauthier,	Sifton,
Gauvreau,	Stenson,
Graham,	Sutherland,
Haley,	Talbot,
Hurley,	Tarte, and
Landerkin,	Turcot.—61.
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),	

NAYS:

Messieurs

Bell (Addington),	McAlister,
Bergeron,	McCleary,
Blanchard,	McInerney,
Clancy,	McNeill,
Clarke,	Marcotte,
Costigan,	Mills,
Craig,	Morin,
Davin,	Pope,
Foster,	Quinn,
Haggart,	Sproule,
Henderson,	Taylor,
Hodgins,	Tisdale,
Kloepfer,	Tyrwhitt,
LaRivière,	Wallace,
Macdonald (King's),	Wilson, and
Maclaren,	Wood (Brockville.—32.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, considered in committee and reported.

PAIRS:

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Angers,	Casgrain,
Campbell,	Kendry,
Featherston,	Carscallen,
Dyment,	McCormick,
Penny,	Ives,
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd),	Tupper (Sir Charles),
Wood (Hamilton),	Gilmour,
Macdonell (Selkirk),	Roche,
Russell,	Borden (Halifax),
Hutchison.	Klock,
Guay,	Dugas,
Bertram,	Reid,
McInnes,	Earle,
Cowan,	Montague,
Britton,	Cargill,
Flint,	Kaulbach,
Bostock,	Monk,

Heyd,	Hale,
Godbout,	Seagram,
Calvert,	Ganong,
Maxwell,	Powell,
Yeo,	Martin,
Jameson,	Roddick,
Somerville,	Maclean,
Lemieux,	Prior,
Lang,	McDougall,
Semple,	Ingram,
McLennan (Inverness),	Gillies,
MacPherson,	Rosamond,
Gibson,	Corby,
Bain,	Bell (Pictou),
Scriver,	Broder,
Desmarais,	Caron (Sir Adolphe),
Bazinet,	Bennett,
Ratz,	Beattie,
Macdonald (Huron),	Robertson.
Joly de Lotbinière (Sir Henri),	Tupper (Sir Charles Hibbert),
Guité,	Kloepfer,
McMillan,	Cochrane,

Mr. SCRIVER. I beg to have my vote struck off. I forgot for the moment I was paired with the hon. member for Dundas (Mr. Broder).

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. member for Montcalm (Mr. Dugas) has not voted.

Mr. DUGAS. I am paired with the hon. member for Lévis (Mr. Guay). Otherwise I should have voted against the motion.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. members for Victoria, Lunenburg (Mr. Kaulbach), Middlesex and Halifax (Mr. Borden) have not voted.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am paired with the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Russell). Had I voted, I should have voted against the resolution.

Mr. KAULBACH. I am paired with the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint). Had I voted, I should have voted against the resolution.

Mr. BERTRAM. I am paired with the hon. member for South Grenville (Mr. Reid). Had I voted, I should have voted against the resolution.

Mr. GILLIES. I am paired with the hon. member for Inverness (Mr. McLennan). Had I voted, I should have voted against the resolution.

Mr. McCORMICK. I am paired with the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dyment). Had I voted, I should have voted against the resolution.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 169) respecting the Province of Manitoba Debt Account.

POST OFFICE ACT AMENDMENT.

Bill (No. 167) to further amend the Post Office Act, was read the second time, considered in committee, amended and reported.

Mr. QUINN. Before this amendment is agreed to, I wish to ask the Postmaster General why it is that the letter carriers in Montreal have not received any vacation during the last couple of years? I would ask also if it is the intention to give them a vacation this year?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Perhaps, if there is to be a discussion on this point, it would more properly come up in Supply; but I have no objection to answering my hon. friend (Mr. Quinn). The letter carriers have their statutory rights, and I am not aware that they have been deprived of them. If they have, and my hon. friend (Mr. Quinn) will give me particulars, I will see to it that it does not happen again, and I will deal with any persons who have been depriving them of their rights.

Amendment concurred in; and Bill read the third time, and passed.

PUBLIC OFFICERS.

Bill (No. 170)—from the Senate—further to amend the Act respecting Public Officers, was read the second time, considered in committee and reported.

On motion for third reading.

Mr. FOSTER. I think subsection 3 needs a little consideration. This has gone through so rapidly that we have not had an opportunity to examine it.

The Governor in Council may from time to time make regulations for the establishment and maintenance of a fund to be derived from the salaries or pay of persons concerned, wherewith to make good to the Crown any loss sustained by reason of the failure of any person to give security as aforesaid, to duly discharge the duties of his office, trust or employment, or to duly account for public moneys entrusted to him or placed under his control.

Does that mean that you are going to ask all your civil servants to form an insurance fund out of which any damages or losses that may be sustained by reason of the insufficient security, or lack of security, should be made good? It does not seem to be optional; but it is "deducted from" salaries.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. In many of the Acts applicable to the various departments there is a provision setting forth at great length the particular security of the bond to be given by each separate member of the staff from whom security is required. That is a cumbersome way of securing the Crown, or giving to the Crown proper security. Probably this Bill is framed somewhat after a Bill that was passed last session in regard to the Post Office Department. In

that department it was found that we had a large number of bonds, thousands of them, and a great deal of labour is involved in keeping track of them and seeing that the premiums were paid. In order to simplify the work and ultimately to establish a fund whereby the department would be its own security, its own company, last session an Act was passed giving the department power to take one general bond, what might be called a blanket bond, from the companies, not a separate bond for each official, and in addition to that, power was given to establish a fund by way of assessment. That fund and that assessment take the place in my department of the security that was formerly given by an individual bond.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. According to the practice in banks.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes, we have begun the system in the Post Office Department, and it simplifies the work very much. For example, supposing that an officer is required to give $1,000 security, instead of his giving a separate bond as now, we give his name to the company under the general bond, and he is at once insured to the extent named. But instead of naming it for say $1,000 as originally, we in my department divide up the security, putting part in the company and insuring the other part in the department by an assessment. That process simply amounts to this: That instead of having to collect two or three dollars from each insured person, sending them notice and collecting it, seeing it is paid and then transmitting it to Ottawa, Montreal or elsewhere, instead of each person being directly taxed for it, it is charged against him, a couple of dollars or so going to the credit of the general trust account, and this simplifies the work very much, it does not cost the clerk any more because it is deducted. It is to the extent he is taxed to maintain the fund that he is insured proportionately in respect to a separate bond.

Mr. FOSTER. I did not know that such legislation went through last year. That comes from rushing legislation through without even reading the different sections, which I think we ought to avoid. If I understand this rightly, if an honest clerk intends to do his duty he ought not to be made to pay an assessment for the purpose of securing or making pay for losses.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is only intended to apply to cases where security is properly required. Wherever to-day an officer ought to give a bond, he shall continue to give security, but instead of being a separate bond as heretofore, it may be as in the first part of this Bill, under one general bond given by a company, and with a blanket policy. That is, the security may be divided, partly being covered by the company's general bond, and partly by his having contributed to the general fund.

Mr. FOSTER. It is confined, then, to those officers who have to give a security?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is not intended to apply to any one else. That is the understanding.

Mr. FOSTER. And secures whatever they have to give. Some will have to give $1,000 and some $10,000.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Quite so.

Mr. FOSTER. Are deductions made, then, from the salaries only of persons who have to give security and only in proportion to the amount of the security they give?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Quite so. It is quite possible to abuse it, and it might be possible to levy the assessment upon a man who did not give security. But that would be a very wrong thing for a Minister to do. But it is only those who ought to give security.

Mr. HENDERSON. Does this Bill apply to the outside service as well as to officers in the departments here?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think it does. It says the Governor in Council may pass a regulation requiring security to be given generally. My own opinion is that it is a very excellent measure. It will simplify departmental work, it will not cost the staff anything more than at present, and ultimately it will enable the Government to do its own insuring at cost price, and will be better for the staff, who to-day have to pay more than they ought, to enable the companies to keep up. It will ultimately result in their getting their security at actual cost.

Mr. HENDERSON. My impression is that the insurance companies have made a great deal of money in the past out of the Government by guaranteeing officials.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the third time, and passed.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). As there are one or two amendments to be made to our tariff resolutions which have been deferred to the present time, I now move:

That the order for receiving reports of Committee of Ways and Means be discharged, and the resolutions be referred back to the Committee of Ways and Means.

Motion agreed to, and the House again resolved itself into Committee of Ways and Means.

(In the Committee.)

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It will be remembered that during one of the discussions some time ago mention was made of an error which appeared to have come into the tariff legislation with respect to the item, "rubber belting," and on a careful examination being made it was ascertained that a mistake had occurred, whether a mistake in the printing or in the copying is not quite clear, but the fact remains that a mistake has been made. In the Votes and Proceedings of 1897, page 464, I find the tariff resolution is dealt with, and the item is expressed in the following words :—

India-rubber boots and shoes, rubber belting, rubber cement and all manufactures of rubber and gutta percha, n.o.p., 25 per cent ad valorem.

That appears as item 214 in the Votes and Proceedings, which will be regarded as conclusive evidence of what the House adopted. I find that the item was discussed to some extent. Hon. members particularly dweit on rubber belting, and it was suggested that the duty be placed at 30 per cent, to which we did not agree, but the intention of the House was that the duy on that article should be 25 per cent. It appears that in transferring that item from the Votes and Proceedings to the Tariff Act the words : "rubber belting, rubber cement," were omitted, and the item appears :

India-rubber boots and shoes, and all manufactures of india-rubber and gutta percha, n.o.p., 25 per cent ad valorem.

The effect of omitting rubber belting and rubber cement was to throw rubber belting into another class, which speaks of belting not otherwise specified, and imposes a duty of 20 per cent, thus establishing a rate which did not carry out the intention of the House. What I now propose is to amend the Tariff Act by taking the words in regard to that particular item as they appear in the Votes and Proceedings, and embody them in the Tariff Act :

India-rubber belting, india-rubber boots and shoes, india-rubber cement and all manufactures of india-rubber and guta percha, n.o.p., 25 per cent ad valorem.

Except as to sugar, which is a subject for special consideration, we do not propose to make tariff changes beyond rectifying that manifest error, which led to the intention of Parliament not being carried out.

Mr. WALLACE. I remember the discussion, and that Parliament arrived at the decision stated by the Minister of Finance. A gross injustice has been done to the manufacturers of rubber belting by the intention of Parliament not being carried out by the Act. Does the hon. gentleman propose to compensate the manufacturers in any way? The Minister of Trade and Commerce shakes his head ; but an injustice has undoubtedly been done. Parliament decided that on rubber belting the duty shall be 25 per cent. Through some means that decision has been set at naught ; and from the explanation of the Finance Minister rubber belting was brought under another classification. It would not have been a great stretch of authority on the part of the Government to have placed rubber belting at 25 per cent, as it was apparent that it came under other "manufactures of rubber." Such action would have been clearly justifiable, and would not have been an exercise of undue authority. An injustice has been done to the manufacturers, because I am told that the importation of rubber belting has been much larger since the Tariff Act was adopted than it had been formerly, the duties charged on it being 20 per cent.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We could hardly go so far as to provide compensation to the parties interested.

Resolution agreed to.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is one other item upon which there was a discussion, and which I asked to have deferred for further consideration. It is a case in which a slight change in the wording becomes a matter of some importance. It is in relation to the duties on sugar, and I have a proposal to make now which will be regarded perhaps as a further step in the direction of Imperial preferential trade. It will be remembered that we provided by the terms of our resolutions to extend the preferential tariff to the products of the British West India Islands. It was claimed that one effect of that preference would be to create unequal conditions in the sugar trade, and that advantages would be given to the refining interests on the Atlantic coast which would not be given to the refining interests on the Pacific coast, inasmuch as the latter draw their supply of raw sugar from sections of the Empire which are not within the scope of the preferential tariff. I am inclined to think that the danger in that direction was somewhat magnified, but still in appearance it would seem to create unequal conditions, and as we think we may be able to remedy that without departing from the principle underlying our policy, but rather extending it, I have a motion to make on this subject. It was suggested by hon. gentlemen opposite that we might extend the benefits of the preferential tariff to the colonies of Queensland, Fiji and Mauritius, which might all supply sugar to the Pacific coast, but we thought the object would be better served by pursuing a somewhat different course. The proposal I have to make is that instead of admitting all the products of Queensland, the Fiji Islands and Mauritius under the preferential tariff, the proposal is that raw sugar from

all portions of the British Empire shall be admitted under the terms of that tariff. That will entirely meet the claims put forward by gentlemen interested in the Pacific sugar trade, and altogether I am inclined to think that it may lead to the encouragement of trade between Canada and the Australasian colonies. At all events it will remove what seemed an inequality and to that extent it is an improvement. I beg to move, Mr. Chairman :

That the second resolution be amended by the insertion of the following as subsection 2 of the proposed new section 17 of the Customs Tariff Act of 1897 :

" Raw sugar including all sugar described in item 436 of schedule ' A ' may, when imported direct from any British colony or possession, be entered for duty and taken out of warehouse for consumption in Canada at the reduced rate of duty provided in the preferential tariff."

Motion agreed to.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In order that this resolution may be carried into effect, I beg to move :

That the sixth resolution be amended by striking out the words " all articles the growth, produce or manufacture of the United Kingdom or of any British colony or possession " in the first and second lines of schedule " B."

Motion agreed to.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I beg to move the following amendment :

Except as herein afterwards provided, this Act shall be held to have come in force on the 6th of April of the present year, 1898.

That is the day following on which the resolutions were introduced, and this motion follows the usual practice.

Motion agreed to.

Resolutions reported, and read the second time and concurred in.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 171) to amend the Customs Tariff, 1897.

Bill (No. 172) further to amend the Inland Revenue Act.

PRIVATE BILL LEGISLATION.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Before we call it six o'clock, I wish to state that I have been approached by some members of the House who are interested in private legislation, to know whether or not the House would agree to take an hour this evening, after eight o'clock, for private Bills. Of course, this cannot be done except with the unanimous consent of the House, and I would like to ascertain the views of my hon. friend opposite upon the subject.

Mr. FOSTER. I have no objection at all ; but have we any guarantee that the hour shall not be absolutely wasted ? If so, it is a precious lot of time to take from our limited store. Last night, it seemed to be the intention of the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr Richardson) to talk out the first Bill that appeared among private Bills on the Order paper.

The PRIME MINISTER. I cannot give any guarantee.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to have the hour for private Bills, as there are some important ones on the paper ; but there is a strong objection, which I think cannot be overcome, to giving them precedence, and we shall have to take the private Bills in their order.

Mr. SPEAKER. My recollection is that of the private Bills on the paper which are undisposed of, there is only one Bill which is the subject of contest. There are four others as to which there only remains the consideration of amendments made by the Senate. Possibly a motion might be agreed to unanimously by the House to take up——

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

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

After Recess.

SUPPLY.

The House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Public Buildings—Nova Scotia—		
Halifax Drill Hall—		
Revote	$20,000	
New vote.....	6,000	
		$26,000

Mr. FOSTER. Does this finish the Halifax drill shed ? And what will be the total cost ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). This will finish the work. The contract is for $195,000, and we now ask $6,000 for alterations, especially alterations in the roof.

Public Buildings—New Brunswick—	
St. John Quarantine Station—Partridge Island—Artesian well	$1,500

Mr. FOSTER. What leads you to suppose you can get water there ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. A survey has been made, and it is estimated that water will be struck at a depth of 300 feet.

Quebec—
Montreal Post Office—To re-cover roof with copper $8,000

Mr. FOSTER. With reference to the first item, is that roof to be re-covered by contract ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. By tender and contract ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Public tender ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Quebec Custom House and Examining Warehouse—New cement sidewalks $1,400

Mr. SPROULE. What kind of sidewalk will this be ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. An asphalt sidewalk.

Mr. CLARKE. Will all this be done by contract and let by public tender ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, it is a small piece of work.

Public Buildings, Ottawa—To pay to the estate of the late Samuel Howell in full and final settlement of all claims for damages caused by reason of the flow of water from the roof of the Langevin Block on their Sparks Street property.. $600

Mr. FOSTER. What is all this ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. When the Langevin Block was erected, the property on which the water would flow was not purchased or leased. I settled one case in the face of an action. I consulted with the Department of Justice, and as we were found liable, I thought it better to settle.

Public Buildings, Ottawa—Langevin Block —Improvement to fire-proof character of the attic and roof, including steel shelving and additional vault accommodation $33,000

Mr. FOSTER. This is a very large amount.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The chief architect went over the ground very carefully with Mr. Marcotte, one of the architects of my department. As my hon. friend knows, the attic in the Langevin Block was not built habitable. Last year, after the fire in the West Block, the Department of the Interior moved into this attic. Unfortunately, and to my great surprise, the attic in the Langevin Block is not built fireproof, and if there was a fire, the roof would certainly be destroyed. The chief architect advised me that it was necessary to provide for that. I find that I can give contracts for $22,000 or $25,000 of the work to be done under this vote, which I shall be glad to do.

Mr. TARTE.

Mr. CLARKE. By public tender ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Public Buildings, Ottawa—Four new boilers in West Block..... $7,000

Mr. FOSTER. Do you get these boilers by public tender ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, we buy them at the market price. By this change, we hope to save between $2,500 and $3,000 a year. In our old boilers we used wood, but, in these we shall use coal. We estimate that a ton of coal is equal to about two cords of wood, and as the price of the ton of coal and the cord of wood is about the same, we hope to save this amount.

Public Buildings, Ottawa—New elevator in East Block..... $4,000

Mr. FOSTER. How many elevators in the East Block now ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. None.

Mr. FOSTER. Do not you think it would be wise not to have one ? It is not a very high building ; there are only two flights of stairs.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Pretty strong representations have been made to me on the subject—by the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) especially, I may say.

Mr. FOSTER. It is all folly.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) should not object to this ; it is a small item.

Mr. FOSTER. It is not only $4,000 expenditure, but continual maintenance.

Mr. SPROULE. It will mean a couple of more men to attend to it, and they will be pensioned on the country at about $1,200 a year for the two.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Oh, no.

Rat Portage Public Building (proper site given free of cost by the municipality). $8,000

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Tenders have been called for and received. The estimated cost is about $24,000 for the whole thing, heating and everything complete.

Sarnia Public Building $5,000

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This building will be of the same kind and cost, between $20,000 and $25,000. All these contracts for public buildings are let by tender.

Major's Hill Park—To complete stone fence on Mackenzie Avenue, with iron railing thereon $3,880

Mr. SPROULE. Is that the stone fence we had so much talk about?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, that will be all this time. I will not build another.

Medicine Hat—Court House, &c., to replace court house destroyed by fire.... $6,000

Mr. SPROULE. What is the cost of that building?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This will cover the cost of the whole building. The contract was let after calling for tenders.

Vancouver Drill Hall, New Westminster District (site given free of cost)..... $20,000

Mr. SPROULE. This drill hall may turn out like the one in Halifax. What is the total cost expected to be?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will not spend more than $40,000. Last year there was an appropriation of $10,000, which was revoted this year in the main Estimates, and this amount is to go on with the work. Our plans are being prepared and tenders will be called for.

Harbours and Rivers—Nova Scotia—
Iona wharf $2,000

Mr. FOSTER. Where is Iona?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In the county of Victoria.

Ingonish, North Bay—Breakwater..... $2,000

Mr. CLARKE. Is Ingonish also in Victoria County?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

West Arichat—To complete repairs to wharf $7,000

Mr. GILLIES. What is this for?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Reballasting and placing a guard rail on the north side. We will do the work immediately.

Petit de Grat—Reconstruction of protection work and dredging..... $1,500

Mr. GILLIES. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if he proposes to construct that wharf this summer and whether by tender and contract or day's labour?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I understand that wharf can only be successfully carried out by day's labour. Part of the work is hand dredging. We are trying to make a little channel.

Mr. GILLIES. Does the hon. gentleman intend constructing that this summer?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Cow Bay—Breakwater repairs..... $500

Mr. FOSTER. How much have you spent there?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. $145,000. We are simply repairing the work. We have had to cut the work in two, so to speak, just to save the best part of it.

Mr. FOSTER. Do we get any contribution towards it?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No.

New Harbour—Breakwater $4,000

Mr. FOSTER. Where is this?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In the county of Guysborough, at the mouth of the St. Catherine River. This vote is to provide for the formation of a harbour for fishing boats.

Mr. McALISTER. Are any large vessels coming in there?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, I do not think so. It is to accommodate fishing boats. This vote is for the commencement of a work, that is if I decide to carry it on. Soon after the session I intend to go down there and inspect the place.

Mr. SPROULE. What does the engineer estimate that the whole work will cost?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I cannot say now.

Mr. SPROULE. I think it is an extraordinary way to ask the House to vote supplies, without any plan, without estimates, and without any knowledge.

Mr. FOSTER. I think that if the Minister has not information enough as to whether he will build or not, or on what plans, it would be better to leave this over until the Minister goes down, and then he can make up his mind. It seems a rather peculiar thing to put an item of $4,000 in just because a member asks you, and then go down and see if you can find some place to spend it. That is what this amounts to. You have no plan, you do not know what you are going to build, you do not know whether you will build at all; but you do intimate to the House that $4,000 will not be the end of it. I understand that the member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) has his future fully provided for, and there is no necessity for this $4,000 as a solace to him. But on another ground, I do not think this vote is justified. The same thing came up during the late Administration, and for a long time the rule was that these votes should be reserved for harbours for commercial purposes alone. It is only of late years, and to a small extent, that the policy has gained ground of spending sums of money for mere fishing purposes

outside of commerce. If the two are combined, you have a very good ground. But if you are going to spend public money for harbours for fishermen along our coast, you will have a tremendous drain on the funds. In one sense, a fisherman is just as good as a merchant; but it is plain we cannot legitimately go on to provide for fishing harbours on a large scale.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. What does my hon. friend mean by the commercial aspect of the question? Works which will yield a revenue?

Mr. FOSTER. No, but for commerce particularly.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. On the Atlantic coast, while we are supplied with numerous natural harbours, there are many points where there are fishing settlements and where a small expenditure of money will make a safe anchorage and enable these people to carry on their avocation and remain in the country, whereas they would otherwise be obliged to leave. While I appreciate the spirit in which my hon. friend has spoken, deprecating that we should enter into dangerous paths, I would not like to accept the principle that we could not give these people a word of encouragement, and that we should in no case build small breakwaters which would enable them to carry on their fishing work in places which otherwise would be so much exposed that they could not continue their business. I think it is a proper expenditure of money for the encouragement of the people on our Atlantic coast, though, I grant, we might overdo it. As to the other point, it is not an uncommon principle, indeed I think it is almost necessary, that occasionally an appropriation should be made upon the representation of the member for the county, the Minister taking care, however, that before he undertakes to make an actual expenditure he causes plans and specifications to be made which will be a sufficient protection to him. But if no appropriation is made until the Minister has sent down an engineer, I think, slow as our methods are, we would find them slower still. I would not like my hon. friend the Minister to say that no vote of money should be given until after we had had a report from the engineer. If a large sum were contemplated to be spent, then I think it would be quite correct to have specific reports from an engineer, but this is a moderate sum, and the Minister will himself inspect the locality before spending the money.

Mr. FOSTER. I am sorry that the Minister of Finance enunciates that doctrine. I do not think that has been the doctrine enunciated by Ministers of Finance heretofore.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is good doctrine, I think.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think it is good doctrine. It means that a member shall come to a Minister and say: I want money expended in my county. Well, where do you want it? I am not quite sure, but I think that at such and such a place something might be done. The Minister says: I know nothing about it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, my hon. friend misunderstood me. I have a report of my engineer. What I said was that I did not know whether his report was correct, that I did not know whether that work ought to be constructed, and that I intended to go down and see for myself.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman has engineers who could ascertain approximately what the work would cost. This is practically placing at the disposal of the Minister of Public Works an amount with which he can go to the people of the district and say: If you are pretty good to me, I will spend so much money here.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). Has the hon. gentleman any report?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have a plan.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the estimated cost?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. $25,000, and that is the reason why I do not want to pledge myself to go on with the work now.

Mr. FOSTER. If we are going to build $25,000 harbours for the fishermen along the coast, they must be centrally located and constitute harbours of refuge, and to such harbours the fishermen have a right within certain limits. But every one knows that the ambition of every supporter of the Government is to have money spent in his county, and although a comparatively small expenditure might suffice, he is raised in importance according to the number of thousands of dollars put into a work in his county. $25,000 is too much money to spend on a small place like this, where there is no town, and when this work will not be utilized as a harbour of refuge for a considerable fleet of fishing vessels.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Some years ago I made a suggestion, which did not meet with a great deal of favour at that time, but which in the present mood of the ex-Finance Minister he might be disposed to support. It seems to me that sums of public money would be far better employed distributed as fishing bounties than in public works, and it would be well for the representatives of the maritime provinces to consider if this would not be a better system to pursue.

Mr. FOSTER. The amount of bounty distributed is $150,000, and with members

like the hon. member for Guysborough, who now wants $25,000 expended at this point, the money would not go far to help the fishermen.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). Can the Minister give any information as to the locality where the money will be spent ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is at the mouth of the St. Catherine River, in Guysborough County, a place frequented by fishermen. It is proposed to build a breakwater and improve the mouth of the river by dredging.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). Is there any city, town or place of considerable importance there ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not know of any city or town near there.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). Do you know the population ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is not very considerable. It is pretty largely frequented by smacks and boats.

Mr. FOSTER. How many smacks ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have not all the details.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman does not know the importance of the place, its population, or whether it is frequented by fishing vessels. All we know is that this is a little river not known outside of the county of Guysborough, and it is proposed to build a breakwater there at a cost of $25,000, according to the engineer's estimate. I would advise the hon. gentleman not to proceed with it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I would consider it not expedient to proceed with the building of a great many works of this kind costing $25,000. In nine cases out of ten, however, such works can be built at half that cost. I would not feel warranted in proceeding with the work under such conditions, and I should consider that $25,000 too large an expense to incur. While I would justify this appropriation being taken so far as its initial stage is concerned, the Minister of Public Works should cause further inquiries to be made before incurring such expenditure. My experience is that engineers are in the habit of making excessive estimates, and that they desire to construct monuments to their reputation in the shape of public works.

Mr. BERGERON. But the people have to pay for them.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. You can frequently build public works that will prove sufficiently useful for less sums than the engineer's estimate, and I am not disposed to commence public works on engineer's estimates, except those estimates have been reconsidered. I know a number of cases where on reconsideration, modified estimates have been submitted. I would not recommend, with the present information, the expenditure of $25,000 on this work, and if it is going to cost that amount, I will not ask the sum to be expended. I state frankly that I have no personal knowledge of the place, but I think from the general knowledge of the population and the country I possess that $25,000 will be a large sum, unless we have more information ; and if it should be found that the work will cost so large a sum, I would not ask the Minister of Public Works to proceed with it.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). Supposing this vote is granted, is the hon. gentleman going to complete the work during the present season ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). Then the hon. gentleman should reduce the item.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I mean that I am not going to expend $25,000 during the present season. I am only asking for $4,000 now. I will not spend one dollar unless I see the place myself and learn how the matter stands.

Mr. CLARKE. It is evident the Minister of Public Works has not made up his mind to carry out the work, and, therefore, he should allow the matter to stand until he visits the province and looks over the ground. When this has been done, the hon. gentleman could next session ask for an appropriation.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). Some questions have been asked about the population at this particular place. Let me tell the committee that these wharfs and harbours are harbours of refuge, not for the population on land, but for the people engaged in fishing along the coast. In addition, those people along the shores are often many miles away from any railway communication, and while their friends who are more favoured are receiving the benefits of large grants to railways, subsidized by the Government, these people get nothing. It is only fair to this section of the community that a certain sum should be given in order to compensate them to some extent for the advantages their neighbours enjoy, who are more favoured by living along lines of railway.

Mr. FOSTER. That is one reason to be given, and I commend it to the judgment of the House, I will not say to the good judgment of the House. But I want to press this point, that if you are going to put into the Estimates an item for $4,000 for the commencement of a public work, and

do so without obtaining any particular information, we are going to adopt a new system of voting supplies. Supply—what does it mean? What does "estimate" mean? It is something you come to the conclusion to build for certain reasons and you find how much the work is going to cost. The late Premier of the province (Mr. Fielding), who it is to be presumed knew his province well, cannot give a scrap of information about this place. The idea is that some part of Guysborough has a post office, another part a railway, and as this section has nothing $25,000 must be spent on it some way in order to heal the amour propre of the people there, and give them an idea that their member has not forgotten them.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend from Guysborough pressed that item on me very strongly.

Mr. FOSTER. No doubt.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. He represented to me that the fishermen there were badly in need of shelter, and I asked the local engineer to make an estimate and to my surprise he estimated $25,000. I will go there and ascertain if I cannot give a good harbour for a sum not exceeding $8,000 or $10,000.

Mr. FOSTER. The Minister (Mr. Tarte) has not shown that there is even need for a harbour there, but he is frank enough to confess that the only reason for asking this vote is because he was pressed to do so by the member for the county.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster)) was long enough a Minister to know how that is done.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, and I have been long enough a Minister to know how to withstand it.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The county of Guysborough has been represented for a great number of years by a supporter of the Liberal party, and as a result no grant of public money has reached that county.

Mr. FOSTER. Worse still.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. It is absolutely necessary that at the earliest possible moment the urgent wants of that constituency which has been so long neglected shall be attended to, and that is one reason why it has been found necessary to provide these harbours in Guysborough County.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If I do not find that a useful work can be built there I shall not expend the money, and I mean every word that I say now.

Mr. FOSTER. And your ingenuity is so great that I have not the least doubt that you will find a way to spend the money.

Mr. MORRISON. I happen to know that portion of the coast where this harbour is to be erected, and I am surprised there are not such facilities already existing there as are sought now. Quite near where this harbour is to be built is the Strait of Canso, which is one of the marine highways between the Gulf of St. Lawrence and the Atlantic Ocean, and at the entrance to the Strait of Canso is the flourishing fishing town of Arichat, one of the largest fishing stations in America. Its fishing fleet scatters all along the coast line of the county of Guysborough, and what is wanted is harbours of refuge, not at the point of departure, but at different points along the coast. There are fishing stations also further east at Main-a-dieu and Louisbourg and Scattarie, and from the time these fishing fleets leave the harbour of Arichat, if they go east there is no safe harbour except Louisbourg between Arichat and Sydney, and going west they cannot find any considerable harbour until they get to Halifax.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think my hon. friend (Mr. Morrison) is mistaken.

Mr. MORRISON. My hon. friend (Mr. Borden) may perhaps correct that. From the time you leave Arichat until you get to Halifax, there is not sufficient protection for the large fleet that is constantly sailing between these points, especially in the mackerel fishing season during the fall. Of course there are one or two places where they might by haphazard resort to, but I am surprised to see that the late Government have left this coast line so unprotected up to the present time. I suppose that north of Portland there is not such a number of vessels passing and repassing as along that coast, and knowing as we do the tempestuous character of the Atlantic, especially in the fall, any person having the slightest knowledge of the requirements for the protection of these people would not for a moment contest the necessity for a harbour of refuge at this point. I believe that money expended judiciously for the purpose of protecting these fishing vessels and the lives of those on board is money well spent indeed, and I have confidence that the Minister (Mr. Tarte) will see that there is no extravagance. There is no point along the coast of Nova Scotia that I know of which more requires to have harbours of that kind than does the coast of Guysborough.

Mr. FOSTER. Probably I can give a better reason than the hon. gentleman (Mr. Morrison) has given. I notice that the Ministers are particularly anxious that this vote should pass, and it is stated that the pressure comes from the member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser). Now, we all sympathize with the member for Guysborough. We

know his many disappointments, his sadness of heart, his aimless wanderings up and down when men who have served the Liberal cause for far less time than he are preferred, and on them is put the fine linen and the scarlet while he has to walk around in corduroy.

But it is stated that the hon. member for Guysborough is to have his heart solaced in the near future, and that there is a large seat waiting for him somewhere; if it is not on the Atlantic coast, it is probably on the Pacific coast. Now, to come down to the real facts, is not what is called the fine Italian hand of the Minister of Public Works showing itself here again, in view of a possible election in the county of Guysborough? And is not the possible expenditure of $20,000 on a new harbour somewhere at the mouth of the St. Catherine River, a gentle reminder of a coming election? Perhaps that is the reason; perhaps that is the potent pressure that is brought.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Is that the way you used to do it?

Mr. FOSTER. No, but since the month of July, 1896, I have been a patient student of hon. gentlemen opposite, and I have come to the conclusion that that is very probably what is in this. Will not the Minister of Public Works take this into consideration? If it is necessary for the hon. gentleman to have a small vote for exploratory purposes let him ask that, and let him say: I will go down myself with the engineer and look over the country and come to the conclusion what ought to be done, and inform myself; so that next year when I am asked for information, I will be able to give it, and be able to explain to the House what kind of work and what expenditure should be given; and this House would vote it cheerfully.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Well, this Government does not like to lose too much time. It has been represented to this committee to-night, by men who know the place, that this part of the coast has been neglected. My hon. friend opposite has not attended to it in the past: and now that we have a Government that has its eyes open, we find that it is time that this part of the country should be recognized. At the same time, I must repeat what I said before: I do not intend spending anything like the sum that has been estimated by the engineer. I think it is only fair that this small appropriation should be voted. It would be unfair, I think, to disappoint those fishermen, who have a right to expect protection at our hands.

Mr. FOSTER. It is the big fishermen over there.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend is too suspicious. Of course, we do not forget that we have elections to carry; but I do not anticipate that this House is going to lose the valuable services of my hon. friend from Guysborough. We expect to keep him for a long time to come. He is one of our most loyal supporters, and he likes to sit in the House. My hon. friend is too suspicious altogether. There is no by-election in view there.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's). Before this item is carried, I would like to say a few words on it. It seems to me that the members of this House are not very well up in their geography. My hon. friend from New Westminster (Mr. Morrison) drew rather a pitiful picture of the coast of Nova Scotia from the Straits of Canso to Halifax; but I would venture the assertion that there is not a part of this great Dominion that is better indented with harbours than that portion of the coast. I have always understood that the county of Guysborough was particularly well off in that respect. When my hon. friend from New Westminster refers to the coast line of Cape Breton from the town of Arichat down to Scattarie, I certainly agree with him that there is no part of the lower provinces that fits out a larger number of fishermen, and there is no part of the coast on which there is less harbour accommodation than the coast of Cape Breton. If the hon. Minister was spending this money to build a harbour on the coast of Cape Breton, where one is much needed, on either the Atlantic coast or the Bay coast, I could well understand it. The very iron-bound coast of Inverness is without harbours. So far as the county of Guysborough is concerned, my impression is that it is well indented with harbours. My hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) knows very well that when looking after the people who are taking lobsters out of season, he had great difficulty in finding the poachers along that coast. Under these circumstances, I think $25,000 is a very large amount to spend on a work of that kind in that locality.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I shall not spend that.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to ask the hon. Minister how far this is from the nearest good harbour, and what is the name of the nearest harbour?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I cannot really say.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Could the hon. gentleman tell me how far this is from Caribou Cove?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I cannot say. I have not a map under my hand.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Does he know whether it is north or south of Canso?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I cannot say.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Will the hon. gentleman tell me which way it is from Guysborough ? We do not seem to be able to find really where it is. Is my hon. friend quite sure that there is any such place ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). Yes. I can testify that there is such a place.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I have heard a good deal of the harbours around that coast in connection with actions on policies of insurance on fishing vessels, and I have never heard of this harbour before. There are a good many harbours near there.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will get a map for the hon. gentleman.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not think there is anything in this vote that is remarkable. The Minister of Public Works has a right to take the statement of a representative of a county that a certain work is useful and necessary.

Mr. FOSTER. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I say that there is nothing wrong in a Minister taking a statement from a member of Parliament in whom he has confidence that a certain work in his county is necessary and desirable, and putting a moderate appropriation in the Estimates for that work, provided that the Minister, before he spends the money, has a proper investigation made by his engineer and satisfies himself that the work is going to serve a useful purpose. I am very much gratified that the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) should suppose that I know all about the province of Nova Scotia. It is not as small a province as the hon. gentleman imagines, and there are a good many harbours in it that I have not seen. The county of Guysborough is an isolated part of the province of Nova Scotia, and I have no hesitation in saying that in years past that county was not properly treated by the late Government, because it was represented by a Liberal.

It is a matter of public notoriety that a gentleman who was a candidate of the Conservative party accompanied the Minister of Public Works on his tour, and stated at a meeting in Guysborough that if the people of that constituency expected to get any public works, they must elect a supporter of the Government. But the county refused the bribe, and exercised its liberty of electing a gentleman opposed to the Government of that day ; and when now there is a fair proposal to give that county the grants included in the Estimates, I do not see anything wrong in that. I am prepared to state that the representations of the member for the county, made in good faith and in the desire to serve the interests of his people, are ample justification for bringing down this vote, and the Minister of Public Works has given the assurance that before one dollar of the money is expended, he will cause an examination to be made.

Mr. SPROULE. That is a most extraordinary doctrine to be laid down by a Minister of the Crown. There are 213 members of this House, and I venture to say that there is not one of them who could not find half a dozen places in his riding where, in his judgment, it would be well to spend public money ; and if the Minister were so susceptible as to accept the word of every member who desired public works in his county, what would the Estimates be like ? I have always regarded it as essential, when a Minister asks for a vote of public money, that, in the case of a new work, he should give the estimate of the engineer as to what it will cost, the site where it is to be erected, what it is required for, and any other information deemed necessary. Without this information, we would not be in a position to justify our voting the money. But the Minister now asks us to vote money simply because the member representing the riding recommends the expenditure. That is practically all the information he can give us. It seems to me that he has been acting on the very same principle with regard to a good many of these harbours in Nova Scotia, for I find there are forty places in the Supplementary Estimates where public money is to be spent. The aggregate expenditure is $95,900 in the Supplementaries, and $38,900 in the main Estimates. I always thought that when making up the main Estimates, works to be taken up were fully considered by the Council and the larger portion of the expenditure estimated for.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Is that your past experience ?

Mr. SPROULE. I have been here a good many years, and it is the general experience in this House. It may not have been the experience of the hon. gentleman when running a provincial government.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have not been a member of this House for many years, but I have carefully followed its proceedings, and my observation is that it has been the practice of the Government to bring down considerable amounts in the Supplementary Estimates for that class of work.

Mr. SPROULE. Much larger than the main Estimates ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman cannot establish that.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In the Estimates of the Conservative party of 1896, the Supplementaries were four times as large as the main Estimates.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman is not comparing the Supplementaries with the main Estimates, but the last Supplementaries with those immediately preceding. There are forty places in Nova Scotia where there is to be an expenditure of public money. We do not know how many of these Estimates are for new work and how many are for works already begun. But it does look as though the Minister and his friends expected an election there or intended to hold general elections. Otherwise they would not propose expenditure at every place where a member supporting the Government requested public money should be expended. The hon. Minister will then come down, when an election is about to be held, and see where it is necessary, in his judgment that the money should be spent. He will tell the people, as he did at Owen Sound: You need a dry dock very badly here, and there is no doubt whatever that if you do your duty by us you may expect that the Government will do its duty by you. Then another location is picked out for a post office, and thus a direct invitation is held out by the Government to the constituency in the event of an election. The Minister will thus go touring around, finding out, in his own judgment, where it will be most profitable politically to spend public money, without consulting his engineer. We have had a sample of that kind of policy in the drill shed at Halifax, which was to have cost a reasonable sum, but which the Minister now says will cost $200,000 when finished. How are we to know that this harbour, when completed, will not cost $100,000 or $200,000, and we are justified in coming to the conclusion that it will cost more than the Minister says it will, because he cannot give us any information about it.

Take New Brunswick, what do I find there? $30,000 in the main Estimates and $41,000 in the Supplementaries. Take Prince Edward Island, I find $40,000 in the main Estimates and $40,750 in the Supplementary. In every instance the Supplementaries are higher than the main Estimates. Take the province of Quebec—$97,000 in the main Estimates and $134,000 in the Supplementaries. If the Minister expects that upon the meagre information he has given us, we are going to vote this money, he must think that we are prepared to go it blind on most of the items submitted in these Supplementaries.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am very much surprised to hear the hon. gentleman make so much opposition over a small vote to the fishermen of Nova Scotia. Why, in one single harbour of Ontario, Collingwood, we are carrying out a contract at a cost of $144,000, and because I am applying myself to the interests of some poor fishermen, my hon. friend rises in a rage. He is not fair. Each part of this country has a right to be fairly dealt with. When I say that before going into that expenditure, I will go down myself and see that not more than $8,000 or $10,000 are spent, I think that is a sufficient guarantee.

Mr. HENDERSON. I would just remind the Minister that Collingwood harbour in Ontario, is one of those points where there is also to be a by-election shortly.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. Minister is most unfortunate in his analogy. Collingwood is one of the most important commercial towns in our country, one of its main thoroughfares both by land and water, one of the entrepots of this country from the North-west. It has half a dozen steamship lines. There is an immense trade going in there for vessels. The hon. gentleman talks about the appropriations spent in Ontario, $234,000, and in Nova Scotia $134,000 in the main and Supplementary Estimates. Compare the importance of the two and see the difference. Collingwood is a large, enterprising town, where there is an immense trade being done, and a through trade by land and water, one of the great highways of commerce, while the other place must be a locality almost unknown, because the Minister does not know where it is and cannot find it on the map.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is unfair to say that.

Mr. SPROULE. I have every respect for the fishermen and would help them as much as any one in supplying their requirements, but I cannot justify the innovation of commencing with new work, the cost of which, when completed, the Minister cannot tell us.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I suppose my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) knows a place called Thornbury?

Mr. SPROULE. I do.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In that place, which is in the hon. gentleman's own county, about $49,000 has been spent in the harbour. It is not a very large place. Yet my hon. friend rises in a rage because I am asking for a few thousand dollars to spend on a harbour for the fishermen of Nova Scotia. I think he should be a little more moderate in his criticism.

Mr. SPROULE. When the hon. Minister speaks of the town of Thornbury, I suppose he knows that the municipality gave $15,000 toward that work, and the sum that he speaks of is the total that has been expended since confederation and even before. It is an important town where the steamers of three great lines on the Georgian Bay call. And the surrounding country is one of the richest agricultural districts in Ontario or in the Dominion. There is an immense business to be done. I have tried over and over again to get $1,000 spent for the accommodation of the fishermen of that locality—

and there is quite a considerable fishing fleet —and I have never succeeded. And when the hon. Minister compares this place with a place in Nova Scotia which he is actually unable to find on the map. I may say the comparison is an odious one.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If the hon. gentleman desires to see it on the map, I have a map here and I will send it to him.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. Minister has found it at last from Belden's atlas.

Mr. CLARKE. Objection has not been taken on this side of the House because the expenditure was proposed by the Minister of Public Works in the province of Nova Scotia or in the county of Guysborough.

Mr. COPP. It seems so.

Mr. CLARKE. Nothing has been said to justify that statement. The criticism is because the hon. Minister comes here without a report from his engineers, without knowing the character of the work he is going to construct or the cost of it, and proposes that we should enter upon a work which, when completed, would cost $25,000. All that he is asked is not to press this vote at present, but to go down and see for himself, as he has not made up his mind as to the work that should be done, and then, after consulting with the engineers, let him come to the House next session with a definite plan and the House will vote the money necessary for the protection of the lives of the fishermen by the construction of a harbour of refuge.

Mr. QUINN. I do not think it at all extraordinary that the Minister of Public Works should take the stand he has taken upon this occasion. When he was driven into a corner with regard to this matter, and finding no better excuse for the expenditure of about $25,000 for this new harbour, he charges the members on this side of the House with opposing this because it happens to be in the county of Guysborough and in the province of Nova Scotia. How any Minister of the Crown can stand up in the House of Commons and make such a statement—except, of course, the Minister of Public Works —I cannot conceive. But it is quite of a piece with his whole character, and, therefore, as I say, it does not surprise me. Only the other day, we heard him, when he was advocating his pet scheme for Montreal, make the most outrageous, the most outlandish statements about men whose names are identical wih the progress and commercial greatness of the city of Montreal. He, a newcomer in the city, whose name was connected with nothing of the advancement of the city and only associated with one particular thing——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I would remind the hon. gentleman (Mr. Quinn) that he is not at liberty to refer to a past debate.

Mr. QUINN. Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not know that I am at all out of order. I am not referring to a previous debate, but I am only showing the similarity of the stand taken by the Minister this evening and the stand taken by him the other day, and showing the absurdity of the proposition he lays down, and how unreasonable it is that, when driven in a corner, in a case in which he cannot give information——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Quinn) was discussing what was said in a past debate.

Mr. QUINN. If the Chair will pardon me, I was not.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Well, that is what I understood.

Mr. QUINN. I was simply stating that the Minister was acting now in the same way as he did the other day when he spoke of these gentlemen in Montreal. Just as he made this statement about the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) that he was opposing this vote because this work is in the county of Guysborough and in the province of Nova Scotia, so, the other day, he stated that Mr. Thompson, Mr. Ogilvie and Mr. McLennan were members of the Harbour Board in 1894 and carried through their pet scheme of Windmill Point basin for their own advantage. And yet the hon. Minister must have known that Mr. Thompson was not a member of the Harbour Commission at that time.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I did not say he was.

Mr. QUINN. The hon. Minister said so in this House. He said these men talked about speculation, but that the Windmill Point basin was built to improve their property. And yet he must have known, if he inquired into the matter, if he spoke with a calmness and caution that should characterize a Minister of the Crown, that neither Mr. Ogilvie——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Quinn) must see that he is referring to a previous debate.

Mr. QUINN. I am simply showing the similarity——

Mr. McCLEARY. I move that the committee rise.

Mr. QUINN. I was showing the similarity of the statements made by the hon. Minister the other day and those made by him to-night. If he speaks with the caution which should characterize a Minister of the Crown, he must have inquired into the truth of that statement. If not, he must have made it without having taken the trouble to ascertain the truth of it. He stated that the Windmill Point basin was built by Mr. McLennan, Mr. Ogilvie and Mr. Thompson out of the funds of the Harbour Commis-

sioners for the purpose of benefiting their own property, and that this work cost a million dollars. If he had inquired into the matter, he must have known that none of these gentlemen owned an inch of property in that neighbourhood at the time that Windmill Point basin was started. If he did not know that, he was guilty of making a statement without having made proper inquiries. I do not speak of these things for the purpose of influencing public opinion in Montreal, because the character of these men is so well known as to be a sufficient protection against any statements made by the Minister of Public Works. But these statements go broadcast throughout the country, and the names of Mr. Ogilvie, Mr. Thompson, Mr. Andrew Allan, Mr. McLennan and others——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I rise to call the hon. gentleman's attention, for the fourth time, to the fact that the subject he is debating has nothing to do with the item before the Chair.

Mr. QUINN. I am speaking to the motion that the committee rise.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. It does not make any difference. On a motion that the committee rise the hon. gentleman has not a right to discuss questions that are not debatable in the usual way. It is the same as a motion to adjourn.

Mr. QUINN. I am not discussing the question, but merely making a statement of what the Minister has said, to show——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order. The hon. gentleman must confine himself to the subject under discussion.

Mr. FOSTER. I am afraid we have not insisted on that rule very carefully heretofore.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). The hon. gentleman is referring to a past debate.

Mr. FOSTER. I think, perhaps, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Quinn) took his information from the Montreal newspapers.

Mr. SPROULE. I respectfully submit that referring to a debate which took place with regard to money that we voted in this session, even though not in the present Estimates, is not referring to a past debate.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). It was not in Supply at all.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If the hon. gentleman wants to discuss that, I do not object, but I would suggest that he take some other occasion.

Mr. QUINN. If the Chair decides that I am out of order——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I have decided four times that the hon. gentleman is out of order, and I thought he understood it. The hon. gentleman knows perfectly well that he has no right to refer to a previous debate. When a question is before the Chair, and a motion is made to adjourn the debate, as has been done now by the hon. member for Welland (Mr. McCleary), or a motion is made that the committee rise, which is the same thing as a motion to adjourn, in such cases we have no right to discuss any other question than the main question.

Mr. BERGERON. I suppose you have forgotten that you yourself spoke four hours on a similar occasion in this House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. For the information of the committee I may perhaps be allowed to quote from the valuable work of Sir John Bourinot:

> It is not regular to move an adjournment of debate on a question for an adjournment of the sittings of the committee to a future time; but certain motions may be made with the same effect. If it is proposed to defer the discussion of a Bill or resolution, the motion may be made "That the chairman do report progress and ask leave to sit again;" and if this motion (which is equivalent to a motion for the adjournment of the debate) be agreed to, the committee rises at once, and the chairman reports accordingly.

So it is a well settled rule that a motion for the committee to rise is the same as a motion for adjournment, and in such case an hon. member cannot go outside the main question.

Mr. SPROULE. When a motion is made that the committee rise, it would be quite proper, it seems to me, that you should submit to the House the reasons why the committee should rise.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. That is quite another thing.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. No doubt a general discussion between my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works and the hon. member for Montreal (Mr. Quinn) would give great edification and some little amusement at a more convenient season. But really if you wish to discuss the numerous items in the Supplementary Estimates, I would suggest to both hon. gentlemen that we have little enough time. Without detracting from the importance of the remarks that the hon. member for Montreal is going to make with reference to the Montreal harbour and basin, a question that was pretty well threshed out a day or two ago, and if a long discussion takes place on perfectly irrelevant matter, it must be clear that we cannot possibly discuss, as the hon. gentleman wishes to do, the items that are coming before us. Of course, I know that if hon. gentlemen opposite wish to protract the session, or to protract this particular

sitting, it is in their power to do so. We are not going to bother ourselves to remain here indefinitely to-night in order to make progress with the business of the House. We are perfectly ready to remain two, or three, or four days, and discuss these items if it is the wish of our friends on the other side. I have often asked as much for myself, and I do not say that our hon. friends opposite are not quite within their right. I think my hon. friend from Montreal will see, on reflection, that he might defer his remarks until to-morrow when there will be no difficulty, in fact, we would be obliged to him, while the Senate are discussing our measures, if he would give us a little interesting lecture on the Montreal harbour.

Mr. QUINN. Simply to satisfy the Minister of Trade and Commerce, I will proceed with the debate in the manner in which I began. I was going to say, then, that the Minister had adopted to-night the very same proceedings that he did in this harbour matter. Before he made the statement that Messrs. McLennan, Ogilvie and Thompson had property at or near the Windmill basin, he ought to have known whether it was true or not. Now, I am prepared to state what I know as a fact, that these gentlemen had not one dollar's worth of property there at that time. My hon. friend the Minister also said that plan No. 6 had been abandoned.

Mr. ELLIS. I rise to a point of order. I respectfully suggest that the hon. gentleman is referring to another debate, which is contrary to the rules of the House.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I have decided that point of order four times. I regret that the hon. member declines to obey the rules of the House.

Mr. QUINN. It was simply at the request of the Minister of Trade and Commerce that I was going on. But I want to say one word in regard to the item under discussion. The Minister to-night stated, in answer to the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Sproule) that he, the hon. member for Grey, opposed this vote simply because it was a vote for the county of Guysborough, and for the province of Nova Scotia. Well, what are the facts? The Minister was asked by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Borden) if he knew where this was on the map, as regards the Strait of Canso, as regards Halifax, as regards any other port in Nova Scotia, if he knew where it was, if he knew what population there was in the vicinity, if he knew how many boats went there, if he knew anything about it, even if he knew there was such a place as New Harbour, and the Minister was obliged to confess that he did not know anything about it. The only thing he did know was that it would cost in the neighbourhood of $25,000. He is asked to produce this report, he has not got it with him; yet the Minister has the temerity to stand up in this House, he, a Minister of the Crown, one of the advisers of Her Majesty—he has the temerity to stand up in this House and say to the hon. member for East Grey: The reason you oppose this is because it is for the province of Nova Scotia and the county of Guysborough. I say that is unworthy of a Minister of the Crown, and it is of a piece with his conduct in the treatment of the subjects to which I have already alluded.

Mr. FOSTER. I think the hon. Minister of Public Works had better withdraw this vote. However, I want to call attention to a few things. He is here bringing down a vote for which he has no basis at all with the exception of the pressure of a member of this House. That is the principle he is importing into the estimates that he is asking. I want to enter my protest against the doctrine enunciated by the Minister of Finance. I have no hesitation in saying that it is a most vicious doctrine, a doctrine opposed to what any Chancellor of the Exchequer in Great Britain or any Finance Minister in this country, who understands his position and feels the responsibility, would dare to enunciate on the floor of the House of Commons. What is the basis of estimates submitted to the House? That the public work is necessary, that it is known to be necessary by the Minister who proposes the vote, that he will have the information, the plan, what he proposes to expend, the probable cost of the work and the benefit of the work to submit to the House to justify the vote. Fancy a Chancellor of the Exchequer in Great Britain allowing a Minister to come down with a vote in this way, and justifying it on the broad doctrine that all you have to do in order to get the House to vote your Estimates is to have a request from a member who represents the county, with the statement of that member that the work is one of necessity. Therefore, you are going to make Estimates on the request of members of Parliament. It is a vicious doctrine, and I am sorry that any Finance Minister has ever boldly proclaimed that doctrine in this House. The Minister of Trade and Commerce will not back that doctrine to-night. All I want to do is to emphasize it and let it go to the country. It is on a par with the statement made by the Finance Minister with respect to the big post office in the little town of Shelburne, that as public money had not been expended there, it was perfectly right to ask that some money should be expended. He made that declaration entirely irrespective of the merits.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No.

Mr. FOSTER. That statement is put forward to-night by implication and argument. I want to emphasize the po'nt, that

the hon. Minister of Public Works has not the remotest estimate of the cost of this work and as to what is proposed to be done, and yet the Minister of Finance is quite satisfied to include a sum in his Estimates on the mere request of the member of the county that the work is necessary.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman is entirely mistaken. He has not understood what I said, or I have not made myself understood. I said that the engineer estimated the cost of the work at $25,000, but I have not made up my mind to spend that sum. It is unfair to say I have no plan, for I have the plan here.

Mr. FOSTER. You are not going to use those plans.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. But I have them. It is unfair to say that I do not know where the work is. It is situated on the Atlantic coast, 20 miles from the town of Guysborough. It is at the mouth of the St. Catherine River. If the hon. gentleman cannot find it with that information, I am sorry. I hope my hon. friend will not oppose longer this item, and he does not expect me to reply to the windbag speeches.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I desire to point out to the Minister that within a distance of 60 miles on the south coast of Guysborough there are 25 harbours shown on the map I have before me, which is not drawn on a very large scale. It is therefore very clear that the coast is well supplied with harbours. It may be that this particular harbour needs a breakwater. If it does, I would not object to its construction if it were necessary in the interest of the people there. The only criticism I have to make in regard to the position of the Minister of Public Works is that he does not seem to have the slightest information about the proposed work, as to its necessity, locality or cost, and without that information I do not think the committee should be called upon to pass this item.

Mr. BERGERON. We are voting money by the bushel. Those members who remember the old days and the criticisms offered by hon. gentlemen opposite when they were on this side of the House must be perfectly astonished that a Government, comprising in its ranks the Minister of Trade and Commerce and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries who would not have allowed an item of this sort to pass in the Estimates, should sit on the Treasury benches and those hon. gentlemen help the Minister of Public Works in carrying this item through. The hon. member for York said that any Minister, and especially the Minister of Public Works, should be in a position to furnish all possible information respecting these items. The Minister says he has stated it is far from his thought that he should come to Parliament and ask for $25,000 to build a breakwater at New Harbour, in county Guysborough, or at Cow Bay.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The latter place happens in the county formerly represented by the leader of the Opposition, and the hon. gentleman might be more considerate in his absence.

Mr. BERGERON. Whether it is in one or the other does not affect public opinion. The people want to know whether this House is voting public money for a good purpose or not. The Minister of Public Works says he does not intend to spend $25,000, but he may spend $8,000 or $9,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am only asking $4,000.

Mr. BERGERON. The hon. gentleman has been long enough Minister of Public Works to know that he may construct a $100,000 work by the system he is pursuing now. We are doing something which is purely and simply outrageous in voting the people's money to this so-called economical Government, which got into power on the plea of economy, and which has since squandered money, and no member of that party was more loud-mouthed than the Minister of Public Works. The Supplementary Estimates for 1899 show items for the province of Nova Scotia alone of $95,000, besides the sums asked for in the main Estimates. If the Opposition say anything by way of criticism or ask legitimate questions, we are told that we are prolonging the session, and one of the Ministers declared a short time ago that is all right if we want to do so, for we could adjourn for three or four days and listen to speeches delivered in the other Chamber where they are killing their own Bill. Members on this side of the House are prepared to vote all the money required, but we want the necessary information. If that were the only item that the Minister has asked us to vote and with reference to which he cannot give us any information, I would excuse it, but it is the same thing with every one of his items. If he were in Opposition and a Conservative Minister were doing as he is doing, what a speech he would make and what a terrible article would be written against the Government the next day in "La Patrie" of Montreal. I am utterly opposed to the granting of this money.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergeron) did not say so when he was down in that county with Mr. Forbes.

Mr. BERGERON. Can the Minister of Marine tell me what I said there?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not repeat the exact

words, but the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergeron) was in company with the Minister of Public Works and a prospective candidate for Guysborough, named Mr. Forbes, and he gave the people of that county to understand that they should support the then Government or they would get no money for public works in the county.

Mr. BERGERON. If all the Minister of Marine and Fisheries knows is as correct as that, I pity him. I never said such a thing as that, either in Guysborough or in any other place. I have never promised the electorate public works, because I believe it is immoral, and I would not have been elected in my own county for twenty years if I had done such a thing. The Minister is giving a bad example to his friends behind him who are willing enough to imitate it, when he talks about public works being promised to electors. I trust that the Minister will now get up and accept my denial.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Perhaps the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergeron) did not say so in so many words. I visited the county shortly after the hon. gentleman was there, and if he did not make the promise the candidate whom he went there to support expressly promised on the platform that these public works would be given, and the Minister of Public Works was there too.

Mr. BERGERON. That is a very roundabout way of getting at it. Whether Mr. Forbes said that or not I do not know, but I know that Mr. Forbes was never a candidate.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. You appointed him a judge afterwards.

Mr. WALLACE. I was present on the occasion in question, and I can deny the statement of the Minister of Marine.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. You were not present.

Mr. WALLACE. Yes, I was there with the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) and Mr. Forbes.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. And Mr. Ouimet ?

Mr. WALLACE. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. And Mr. Tupper, too, and the Minister of Marine is very badly informed. My hon. friend (Sir Louis Davies) went there a few days afterwards, and doubtless he promised a great many things, and this vote is probably a result of his promises. Guysborough is a fine little town and we were hospitably received, but I never saw any traffic there to justify the building of a breakwater. I saw what in our part of the country we would call large skiffs, but there did not appear to be a necessity for spending thousands of dollars to accommodate them. We met our esteemed friend from Guysborough (Mr. Fraser), and we would like to have had him at the friendly meeting we held, but he would not come, and I am sorry for that, because he might have given better renseignement to the Minister of Marine (Sir Louis Davies) which would have prevented him from bringing forward allegations which he cannot prove. But as we say in French, revenons à nos moutons. The Minister of Public Works has not given a single reason to any unprejudiced mind why he should vote this money. He says he will go down to Guysborough during the recess, but when we were passing his main Estimates he promised us that he would go to so many places all over the country that there are not enough days in the year to enable him to carry out all promised visits. He is going to inspect every public building in the whole Dominion, and he is going to inspect every river and ditch in Canada. He says that if it is not necessary he will not spend this money, but there is not a man in this House or in the country who knows the Minister of Public Works and who will believe that if we vote him this $4,000 this money would ever come back to the public treasury. He may visit that place and he may find it unnecessary to build a breakwater, but the $4,000 will be expended all the same. As members of Parliament we are obliged by our oath of office to prevent the public treasury from being plundered. It is our duty to prevent the passing of any such estimate, and I for one will vote against it.

Mr. POPE. I hesitate to rise, but the principle laid down by the Minister of Public Works that every member of the Opposition is in duty bound to assume the responsibility for an item if he does not enter his protest against it, demands that I should enter my protest against this. That was a dangerous ground for the Minister of Public Works to take, because it is liable to prolong the passage of his Estimates through the House. I find from the remarks of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that an election is running in his mind, and I have become more convinced than ever that we are going to have an election in that constituency, and that this vote is part and parcel of the preparation for that election. The Minister of Public Works says he is going to visit Guysborough County. I have no doubt that if the Minister inspects this place he will be able to express more or less of an intelligent opinion, though likely his opinion will not be any more intelligent than that of his chief engineer. But, Sir, in view of the fact that we are going to have an election in the county of Guysborough, a personal visit of the Minister to that constituency is the most dangerous part of the whole thing. The fact that he is going to have this money voted, that he is not hav-

ing the work located anywhere, and that he is going to look over the ground himslf, is the most dangerous part of the whole scheme. For my part, if the Minister of Public Works would assure me that he will not visit Guysborough during the summer. I would be more inclined to support the item. We have experience of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Tarte) visiting constituencies during election time. We know he went to Lévis during a local election, and that he promised the building of grain elevators there, and the result of the election was in favour of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. BERGERON. And there are $68,000 in the Estimates for Lévis.

Mr. POPE. Yes; these visits of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) are very expensive. If he visits all the places he has planned since we came to discuss his Estimates, and if each visit is going to cost $68,000 to the people of the country, he had better double up these Estimates at once, for if he does not he will run out of money on his visits, and he won't be able to get home. I do not think it is the intention of the leaders of the Government in the maritime provinces to any longer prolong the disappointment of the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser).

They have snubbed him to a sufficient degree; they have left him out in the cold; they have injured his feelings, I am sure, to a sufficient extent; and in order that that hon. gentleman might be more or less satisfied with the chilly seat he occupies among the rear benches of this House, I have no doubt that the various Estimates which we find here are not only to console him, but are also a preparation for what is to come after he receives his due reward for faithful services rendered to the party to which he belongs. If anybody in this House is to receive a political reward, I am sure we will all admit that no one in this House is more deserving of it than that hon. gentleman. I believe that the hon. gentleman is shortly to receive recognition, and that when the clock strikes on Saturday, it will strike for the last time upon the hon. member for Guysborough, and after this session we shall have a new representative for that county. This is the reason why the Minister of Public Works is laying out this estimate in this peculiar manner. I may be wrong; this may be merely a suspicion on my part; but no man proposes to spend either his own or other people's money unless he has some object in view. The hon. gentleman says that the estimate of his engineer was for such a large amount that he cannot undertake it. If the plans he has before him are so extensive that he cannot carry them out, they are worth very little as an indication of what he is going to expend; so that we can say that practically he has no plan. He has discovered, since this House opened this evening, even since nine o'clock, that this place is located on the Atlantic coast—I presume on that portion of the Atlantic coast that is in Canadian territory. But he has not the slightest information as to the shipping or the business that is done there. He simply comes and says, "I want $4,000; I do not know when I will spend it or where I will spend it; but if you will give me $4,000, I give you my word of honour that I will not spend $25,000; but I want $4,000 for a special purpose; I want to make the expenditure this summer after the House rises"—if he said a little more, he would say after the by-election goes through. "I want this little bait for these fishermen; they are used to handling bait, and they want this little bait from me." And the moment it is announced that the Minister of Public Works has left the city of Ottawa to make a tour through the lower provinces, and that he is to go into Guysborough, the canvasser will begin to go about, saying, "the Minister of Public Works is coming down, and he has money voted by Parliament for a wharf which he can put anywhere he likes; if he does not put it here, he will put it there." And the hon. gentleman will have the whole line of voters along the coast at his disposal, for he will have the money voted, and he can locate that wharf anywhere he pleases.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. What is the use of saying that? The place is very well known—very well located.

Mr. POPE. The hon. Minister says it is very well located. An hour ago he could not tell us where it was.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman was not in the House. I have stated it all along.

Mr. POPE. I have not been outside of this House since the hon. gentleman took up this item. I have been so interested in it that I could not go outside of the House. I was peculiarly attracted to my seat when I thought of the hon. gentleman's visit to that constituency. I cannot get that out of my mind—that the hon. gentleman is going to pay a visit to the county of Guysborough, with $4,000 at his disposal, at a particular time and for a particular purpose as to which he does not now propose to inform us. I want to enter my protest against voting for the construction of public works without having proper plans and estimates, without at least knowing where the harbour is, and without having information as to the usefulness of the works after they are constructed. On that ground I am opposed to the passage of this item.

Mr. CLANCY. Like others, though very anxious that we should go on with the work of this House, I have been listening with a great deal of interest to this discussion. I must confess that during my short time in this House I have never seen such an exhibition as I have witnessed to-night. We have

on the one hand the Minister of Public Works coming down to this House without a tittle of information and unable to tell whether the place where this work is to be located is east, west, north or south—coming and asking a sum of money to be voted for a harbour on the representation of some local man who is wholly irresponsible to this House. Then, we have an extraordinary declaration on the part of another hon. gentleman who is the keeper of the purse-strings of the Dominion of Canada, that hon. gentleman rising in his place and proposing for the first time in this Parliament, I hope, that upon the mere word of some hon. member of this House that some work is useful, this House, without any further information, should vote a sum of money for that work, on the understanding that the Minister of Public Works should afterwards go down and determine its utility. In other words, he proposes that we should give a blank check in advance to the Minister of Public Works, because the hon. gentleman who has recommended the work is a Liberal. I say that no hon. member's word is good enough for us to vote money upon. If we accept that doctrine, there is not a single item in the Estimates from start to finish that the Minister of Public Works might not with as much reason urge should be voted by this House on the same principle. The hon. Minister has not urged up to this time that this is a case of urgency, or that there was no time to obtain the information, and that he must throw himself on the indulgence of the House. If the House assents to this, they will be assenting for all time to the principle that the Minister of Public Works may ask this House to vote expenditure simply because any supporter of the Government thinks it is required in his own constituency. Rather than put the House in so awkward and dangerous a position, the hon. gentleman should withdraw this item.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I cannot allow the item to stand. I have got all the information that any Minister could be asked for, under the circumstances. I have the plans and all the details before me.

Mr. CLARKE. Read the details.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Certainly.

Mr. WALLACE. Would the hon. Minister, while he is reading the details, send round the plan giving its exact location.

Mr. COCHRANE. I understand that the plan the Minister has in his hands is for an expenditure of $25,000, but he tells us that he is not going to spend that amount. Of what use then is the plan ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have told the House that I have the plans and all the information. The information is to the effect that on the representation of the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser), who has the right to make those representations, as is customary and has always been done in the past——

Mr. CLANCY. Are those plans made upon the information of the engineer of the department or that obtained from the hon. member for Guysborough ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The information obtained by the engineer. The hon. member for Guysborough pressed that work on me, and my chief engineer instructed Mr. Milledge to proceed to New Harbour and make an examination, and the result of his investigation was that he reported that works could be built there at the cost of $25,000. Plans were prepared on the same principle as in the case of the Ontario harbours. The works are located at the mouth of the St. Catherine River, two jetties are designed, and the estimated cost is $25,000. I found that that was a very expensive work, and I made up my mind to go with the acting chief engineer, Mr. Lafleur, and see if those plans could not be amended so as to spend not more than $8,000 or $10,000.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. Minister has now made it perfectly clear that he is absolutely destitute of the information which would warrant him in declaring that this is a work of utility or necessity. What is the information that he gives the House ? The hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) told the Minister that he wanted some work done.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, the member for Guysborough represented to me that the fishermen were largely in need of protection, and that is the reason why I applied for that vote.

Mr. CLANCY. That is what he might be expected to urge. The hon. member for Guysborough had said that he wanted this money spent for his own purposes, of course the hon. Minister would hardly listen to him. The engineer down there was requested to make a report, and the hon. Minister does not accept the report, because he says the report calls for an expenditure of $25,000, and he will not spend more than $10,000. We have nothing to show that the work is needed at all, and I hope he will withdraw the item.

Mr. COCHRANE. I cannot see my way clear to accept this vote, I do not care where money is expended in this Dominion, if it is for the advantage of the public, but I would ask how did these gentlemen opposite acted when they were in Opposition. The very gentleman who is now proposing this vote used to say that the Conservative party was buying up constituencies with their own money. And here we have the Minister of Public Works coming down with

a plan of works that are to cost $25,000, and telling us in the same breath that he is not going to ask us to spend that money, but only to spend $4,000. With the record of the Minister still ringing in our ears in reference to this stone fence at Major's Hill Park, on which he took the responsibility of spending $4,000 by day's labour, what assurance have we that if there is to be a by-election in the county of Guysborough, he will not come down to that county and employ hundreds of men down there by the day, just as he did on this western block when there was an election going on across the river. When that election was going on, I saw five men at the western block holding a ladder for one man to work on, and no doubt a similar sight will be witnessed in Guysborough County. If the hon. gentleman has any respect for his own utterances, he will withdraw this vote. We can well remember the forcible language of the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) in former days, when he would have us believe that there must be something wrong whenever we were spending money, and when he predicted that if his party got into power they would save $3,000,000 or $4,000,000 per year in our expenditure. When challenged, he repeated more emphatically that he would show the country how its affairs could be run with an annual expenditure of $4,000,000 less than that which the Tory party were expending. And what an exhibition they have made of economy. Talk about bushels of money—they have spent mountains of money. They have not only equalled the extravagant Conservative Government, these Liberal economists, but they have spent $10,000,000 more; and they tell us: We will stay here and let you talk, let you extend the session as long as you please. Why did they not bring down their Estimates in time? Why should we be discussing Supplementary Estimates of four million dollars in the dying hours of the session? Why do they hold the whip of a long session over the heads of members to make them swallow the votes whether they like them or not? Out of respect to the opinion of the House, the hon. Minister of Public Works should withdraw this vote.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Hon. gentlemen opposite are so accustomed to certain methods in the carrying out of public works, that they cannot conceive of any other. I am sorry to see a somewhat ungenerous spirit manifested with regard to this vote. My hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) labours under the delusion that I have announced a new and startling doctrine. But I am informed and believe that this House has over and over again voted small appropriations without having plan or special report from engineers.

Mr. CLANCY. But it is wrong.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not admit that it is wrong. There are limitations within which it is quite right. I am informed on very good authority that it is no unusual practice in this House to vote, in the Supplementary Estimates, on the representation of a member of Parliament, small appropriations, subject to examination subsequently to be made by the engineers of the department.

Mr. BERGERON. No, no.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It has always been done.

Mr. BERGERON. I have been here three times as long as the Minister of Public Works, and I never saw it done.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have my information from the highest and best authority, that it has been no uncommon occurrence for appropriations to be voted this way in the Supplementary Estimates, with the understanding that the Minister would send his engineer to see if the work could be carried out or not. As to the usefulness of a public work, I do not admit that that is merely an engineering question. I say that there is no better authority on that point, if he speaks truly and gives you the benefit of his confidence, than the representative of the county. You may call in your engineer to ascertain what the cost will be, and when you receive his report, you may find that the cost is out of all proportion to the usefulness of the work. But as to the usefulness of the work to the people, the representative is as competent to speak as any engineer. I do not say that it would be just to follow this procedure in the voting of large sums, but in the appropriation of small sums I am informed it has been the practice for many years.

Mr. SPROULE. I have been in this House for twenty years, and I have never seen or known of such a practice. As a matter of fact, under the late Government we were asked by the Minister of Public Works to give facts as to the size of the place, the trade to be done and what the effect upon trade would be if the improved facilities were provided. You take the harbour of Collingwood, Meaford, Thornbury, Owen Sound, Goderich, Southampton, Port Elgin, Penetanguishene or Midland—that was the rule universally followed. I myself have furnished figures, from time to time, and I have always advised deputations coming down to ask that appropriations be made to be prepared to give these facts. If we were not able to furnish them, we did not regard ourselves as having given sufficient information to justify the Minister of Public Works to put an item in the Estimates for a harbour.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There is another thing in

respect to the county of Guysborough that will have some weight with hon. gentlemen as to the necessity for voting of money for protection works there. It seems to me that it cannot be generally understood by hon. gentlemen that Guysborough is one of the first fishing counties in the Dominion of Canada. There are more boat fishermen in the county of Guysborough than in any other county in Canada, except Gaspé, and the value of the fish products——

Mr. MILLS. It is lucky for the hon. Minister (Sir Louis Davies) that the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Kaulbach) is not in the House.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That hon. member may be here, or may be absent, it cannot alter the fact. I know that there are more vessels going out of Lunenburg than out of Guysborough ; but we are speaking here of protection for the boat fishermen, and I say, with the exception of the county of Gaspé. and not excepting even the county of Halifax, there are more boat fishermen in Guysborough than in any other county in the Dominion. The fisheries of Guysborough county represent a product of nearly $700,000 yearly. And with the exception of Lunenburg and Halifax, there are no counties in the province that approach it in the value of its fisheries. When you think of thousands of fishermen of that coast being for many years without these necessary works, I think it will be thought not unreasonable that the hon. member for Guysborough should represent to the Minister of Public Works the necessity for paying some attention to their wants.

Mr. CLANCY. If the hon. Minister (Sir Louis Davies) will allow me, I desire to ask him a question. I am seeking for information. Has there been a pressing demand by the fishermen for some time past, and is there now that demand for the work in this particular place ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am not in a position to answer that question. But I am told by an hon. gentleman behind that there has been that demand. I rose merely to call attention to the fact that Guysborough is not an ordinary county with a few hundred or a thousand or fifteen hundred fishermen, but has a larger number of boat fishermen than any other county in the maritime provinces, and except Gaspé, more than any other county in the Dominion. Hon. gentlemen must not be surprised, therefore, if these thousands of fishermen ask for some little recognition at the hands of Parliament. They are engaged in one of the most hazardous occupations that one can be engaged in. Their lives are constantly at stake. They come to me often as Minister of Marine and Fisheries for aid of navigation, and I give them as much as I can with the small sum placed at my disposal by Parliament in the way of lights, and so on. But they want harbours of refuge into which when storms arise they can go to save their boats and their own lives. I submit that there has been shown an ungenerous feeling which should not be shown considering the facts.

Mr. CLANCY. No hon. gentleman in this House objects to expenditure for the safety of the fishermen. What we complain of is the lack of information to enable us to come to an intelligent decision upon this subject. The hon. gentleman has stated, what is no doubt true, that the fishermen are constantly making demands upon him, and yet he himself could not answer a question——

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. My hon. friend (Mr. Clancy) must be just. They would not come to me with a demand for a breakwater. I would have no knowledge of that subject. My hon. friend from Guysborough would, of course, lay the case before the Minister of Public Works.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. Minister (Sir Louis Davies) is too shrewd and keen a debater to be imposed upon by such logic if it came from another. His argument is that there is great need for protecting the fishermen. That is not really the question, as the hon. gentleman will see. We wish to provide everything that we can for the safety of the fishermen. The point simply is that it is proposed to expend the sum of money, and we are asked to vote and that without any information as to the usefulness or necessity of the work. Now if the House were prepared to give this sum of money, what might follow ? It involves a considerable expenditure, according to the estimate that is now given by the local engineer. The hon. Minister is not urging this upon the grounds of utility, he is not urging it upon the ground of saving life and property. I appeal to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who I believe to be fair, I appeal to the Minister of Finance, whom I have learned to admire in many respects, if they are prepared to lay down this new principle, because it is a principle reversing the policy of previous Governments in this respect. Unless the hon. gentleman is prepared to show a case of extreme urgency, I think he should withdraw the item.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am very sorry that I cannot oblige my hon. friend.

Mr. CLANCY. Then I move that the item be struck out.

Mr. BERGERON. There is already a motion that the committee rise.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It was never put from the Chair.

Mr. MILLS. I do not think that the Opposition or the Government are by any means ungenerous with the fishermen of Nova Scotia, or are inclined to be ungenerous. But the Opposition, before they give their sanction to a vote, desire to know something about it. During my short term as a member of Parliament, I have had something to do in getting quite a few matters like this for Nova Scotia, but it has been the invariable rule to allow the application to come from the people themselves. I have not gone to the Minister and asked him to make an appropriation simply on my own authority, but I have done it on the strength of a well-circulated and well-signed petition from the people of the community interested in that work. We place that before the Minister and he then sends down his engineer to inquire into the utility of this work. But it is contrary to usage and to sound principle for a member of Parliament, entirely upon his own ipse dixit, to go to the Minister of Public Works and ask for an appropriation. I agree largely with what the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has said with reference to the necessities of the fishermen in Nova Scotia, and the need of looking after their welfare. I am glad to see the hon. member of Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) coming into the House at the present time, perhaps he can give us some information with reference to this matter that will set the committee at rest. I believe that the fishermen in Nova Scotia have rights that should be looked after, that the lobster fishermen, the deep sea fishermen, the coasting men along the coast of Nova Scotia, have interests that should be looked after. I do not think that the members of the Opposition are inclined to be ungenerous to the fishermen in Nova Scotia, but they desire some information, some reason why the money should be expended. All we know is that the Minister of Public Works says this work will cost $25,000, but he hardly knows where the place is. Under the circumstances I do not blame the committee for being averse to voting this item.

Mr. QUINN. During my absence a few minutes ago, I am informed that the Minister of Public Works, with that elegant diction which is characteristic of him, said he would not answer the windbag speech which the member for Montreal delivered. Sir, I ply put before this committee certain considerations. I drew the attention of the committee to what I considered, but did not characterize, as the balderdash which characterized the language of the Minister in attributing to the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) a desire to oppose this vote because it came from the county of Guysborough in the province of Nova Scotia. I have no hesitation in saying that the Minister is simply following the course he has adopted all his life, and I see that he is followed in this instance by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries; the object is to produce this debate in the county of Guysborough at the proper time, to show how the Minister of Public Works nobly stood by the fishermen of Guysborough against the bigoted attacks of the members from Ontario and Quebec. In other words the Minister of Public Works is pursuing the same course he has pursued all through his tortuous life, he is trying to set one portion of this community against another, trying to attribute to persons sentiment which finds a resting place only in his own heart. Now, let us put the facts fairly before this House so that they may be presented to the electors of Guysborough as well as the statement of the Minister of Public Works, so that they may realize the humiliating position in which that hon. gentleman stands to-night in asking for this vote of money. I said a few minutes ago that the Minister, when questioned by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Borden), could not tell where this place, New Harbour, was, he could not tell how many boats were there, he could not tell what was the population of the town, he could not tell the name of the town adjacent to it, he could not tell how far it was from a thriving town or village, he could not tell anything about it; yet, with this meagre information, he asks the sum of $4,000 to pay for a trip, as he says, down into the county, or to begin a work there which his engineer estimates will cost $25,000. Under these circumstances, I feel satisfied that if hon. gentlemen opposite would act according to their convictions, not carried away by the sympathy which they have for their Government, and the loyalty which they feel towards their Ministers, they would take the same position that members on this side of the House do, and oppose this vote.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). During my enforced absence from the House, I understand that hon. gentlemen opposite have been very much exercised about a small vote for New Harbour, in the county of Guysborough; and the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Mills), with that density that always pervades his intellect, does not know where New Harbour is. I can say that New Harbour is well known in the county of Guysborough. It is one of the best known fishing stations.

Mr. MILLS. When the hon. member for Guysborough says that I do not know where New Harbour is, he states something that is very far from the fact.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). All I know is that when I came in I heard him clamouring for information as to where New Harbour was, how many people there were. Now that his ignorance has been exposed, he wants to show that he knows something

about it. Of course, if I had not been here to bring him up——

Mr. MILLS. Let me tell the hon. member that if there was any one made a speech from this side of the House in favour of the fishermen of Guysborough, it was myself. The hon. gentleman only shows his personal animus in making this attack upon me.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). I would expect that any member from Nova Scotia would know something about the places in Nova Scotia, and when I heard him clamouring for information, I was much surprised that he did not know.

Mr. MILLS. I am afraid that you have been too excited lately.

Mr. FRASER. Not at all, but the hon. gentleman wanted to make a point against myself and my constituency. When I was a member for the county during the time of the late Government, a largely signed petition came to me from New Harbour, asking that something should be done there. The petition was so largely signed that the fact appealed to the then Minister of Public Works, Hon. Mr. Ouimet, who sent one of his engineers there. That engineer made a complete survey and reported to the department what works were necessary, and full information is now in the department. I got that concession from my opponent. The river at New Harbour comes down through a very nice section of the county of Guysborough. At the mouth there is a bar, and the fishermen have sometimes to go to another harbour in their boats in order to be able to get to a place of safety. They have to wait till there is high water before they can get in with their boats, and the proposal is to build a breakwater on both sides of the river, not sufficient to get ships in, but their ordinary boats. New Harbour is inhabited by as good people as there are in Guysborough County, and that means the people in Canada. They are about equally divided politically—at the last election I got a very small majority. I claim nothing for myself or the Government in regard to obtaining this vote, not that I am getting it on my individual account or on account of the party, but because it is absolutely necessary for the people who have lived fifty or sixty years there under the greatest possible disadvantages.

Mr. WALLACE. Is there a town at the mouth of the river?

Mr. FRASER. There is no town; it is altogether a fishing district. The settlement is about ten miles long; in winter the people live there, and in the spring they all move down to the mouth of this river, where there is a little village in which the fishermen live. When they go out fishing and return with their boats, if there is the least surf running they cannot get over the bar, and they have either to stay out all night or go to the next harbour. If there is the least storm, the boats have the greatest possible difficulty in getting in. I want to say distinctly that I pressed this grant on the late Government, and press it now, not because I wish to claim any credit for it, but because the men who will be benefited are as good a lot of fishermen as I know in Nova Scotia, who are about equally divided politically, and who are going to obtain an advantage which they have long sought and to which they are entitled. That is the whole story. Let me say in regard to the county, that we have not been very fortunate in the past in regard to money grants, which is perhaps due to the political density of the people who are largely Liberals. When I was returned in 1891 the first resolution passed by the Conservative Association asked the Dominion Government to give nothing to Guysborough, because it might help me. I did succeed in obtaining a grant, on a very strong case I made out, from Sir John Thompson, $1,500 for works at Whitehead, a place which gave 100 Conservative majority, and it was understood that it was given on account of the way the people voted. I am not finding fault. I am not claiming more than we should claim. I might make almost a similar statement in regard to the vote for Port Hilford. For that port we can claim that for its population it has the greatest number of captains in the world. Out of a voting strength of 200 there are 35 captains with regular certificates, and they are obliged to run with large vessels over nine miles to get into the port. In both these cases $7,000 or $8,000 would do the work. At St. Mary's there is the largest business carried on in lumber in the province, it reaching 10,000,000 feet annually. The people of Guysborough feel gratified at this vote being made, and they will understand that the Government are not doing it with a political object, for they do not need to do it politically, but they are doing it in the interests of the people, who are men obtaining their living from the sea. In the case of the inhabitants of a great city like Montreal, they can put their hands in their pockets, and if necessary carry out their own improvements. I believe the Government was constituted to help people in similar circumstances to these fishermen, and I know the Government is not acting from political motives, but simply in the interests of fishermen, many of whom voted against them.

Mr. WALLACE. It is a most extraordinary proposition that Parliament should be asked to vote this money without the necessary information being placed before the committee. The Minister said he had plans of the proposed work, and I have those plans before me, and they involve according to the estimate an expense of $24,000 or $25,000. For what purpose does the Minister require

$4,000? The hon. gentleman does not know; he simply asks the committee to vote it blindly, and he will see if he can put the money to any effective use. The Finance Minister told the committee, that it was a common occurrence to make similar appropriations. I should like the hon. gentleman to furnish an example, especially as the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) has stated that no such appropriation was ever made under the circumstances stated by the Finance Minister.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It has been the habit of Ministers of Public Works to place amounts in the estimates without plans or information, when there was no time to procure them.

Mr. WALLACE. I have been here as long as the hon. gentleman's Deputy Minister, and somewhat longer, and Parliament has always asked, as the Minister of Trade and Commerce and others know, for the fullest particulars as to the expenditure. What is the use of our coming here at all to vote away sums of money if we cannot get information as to how the money will be expended, and to-night we have no information as to how a single dollar of that $4,000 will be applied. Apparently, from what the member for Guysborough tells us, these people live away up the river, and they have to take their fishing boats five miles up stream for their winter quarters. There are breakwaters to be built here and a harbour to be formed, and $4,000 would simply do no good whatever. The Minister is justified in asking for an appropriation to survey and make plans and investigate this matter, and then submit his estimate to the House, but under present circumstances it is preposterous to ask us to vote this sum of money. The hon. member for Guysborough tells us that years ago when the Conservative party were in power, Mr. Ouimet sent down an engineer, who made plans. Is this plan before us now the plan that was made in Mr. Ouimet's time?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No.

Mr. WALLACE. Where is the plan that Mr. Ouimet had made?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not know that any plan was made, I did not see any.

Mr. WALLACE. The member for Guysborough tells us that plans were made in Mr. Ouimet's time, and yet the Minister does not know anything about it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The Deputy Minister tells me that plans similar to these were prepared in 1893.

Mr. WALLACE. Then, why should you go to the expense of sending down an engineer to make new plans?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There was a resident engineer there.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. member for Guysborough told us you sent down an engineer from here.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). I said no such thing. There is a resident engineer in Antigonish, and they just sent him across.

Mr. WALLACE. What is his name?

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). Mr. Milledge.

Mr. WALLACE. Then, in 1893, Mr. Milledge made a plan of this same place, and he was sent in 1897 to make a plan again? Let us know how the plan made in 1893 compares with this plan. The Minister says he knew nothing about a former plan until he was told about it to-night, and so we see that the House has to give the Minister information about the affairs of his own department. Where is the nearest harbour to the north where boats can go for shelter?

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). I will tell the hon. gentleman—between eighty and 100 miles on the Gulf of St. Lawrence; to the south, the whole Atlantic Ocean.

Mr. WALLACE. Do I understand the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fraser) to say there is no harbour nearer than eighty or 100 miles, because if he does he tells us something that I know is not correct from my own knowledge, which is very limited, but I have been down there. I know there are harbours nearer than that.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). Not north; you get into the woods there.

Mr. WALLACE. You can go to the Straits of Canso.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). That is east.

Mr. WALLACE. Well, it is north-east; the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fraser) is trying to split hairs. Southward and westward there must be harbours along that coast, but the Minister cannot give us any information about that. Can he tell us how many fishermen take their boats for winter quarters up this river, as the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) says they have to take them up.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). They do not go up the river. The whole distance, from eight to ten miles, is inhabited, and the houses are on both sides of the river from the head of the river down to the harbour. It is well settled from the head of the river to the harbour.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. member (Mr. Fraser) said that these fishing boats were

taken to winter quarters five miles up stream.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). Yes, lots of them, but the men who only live a quarter of a mile or half a mile up take their boats home and do not bring them up five miles.

Mr. WALLACE. I see there are shallow flats here that are dry at low tide, so that the boats cannot get over them, and at that part there is, of course, no settlement. They would have to go further up the river before they would come to any ground for settlement on that side of the stream.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). There is a settlement on both sides of the river at its mouth, where it enters the harbour.

Mr. WALLACE. I think this House should be asked to vote money only when its gets information that will justify the appropriation. This House has not been furnished yet with a particle of information as to how this $4,000 is to be expended. The Minister of Public Works has not told us unless it is to start this $24,000 job. If that is the case, we ought to know it, and we ought to have some justification of the expenditure of that $24,000. The Minister, however, tells us that he does not approve of that plan, and that it is not proposed to expend $24,000—that he will see if he cannot reduce the amount to $10,000. It is not true, as the Minister of Finance said, that in matters of this kind estimates were made in advaance, and we had to give our confidence to the Minister to whom we were giving the appropriation. I am sorry we cannot do that; I am sorry that the Minister of Public Works has, by his course, deprived himself of that confidence that we ought to repose in Ministers. Now, Sir, I think the suggestion of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) is the only proper one under the circumstances, that is, that the hon. Minister should withdraw the item or give the House information that would justify it in voting this sum of money.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I did not intend to say anything about this item. I have not said much on any of the items before the House. This debate reminds me of old times; and after the understanding arrived at by the leaders on both sides of the House to expedite the business and get through, I cannot explain to myself the hours that have been wasted in the discussion of this particular item, amounting to $4,000. If the vote had been for $25,000, with the report and the plans which the Minister of Public Works submitted here, I could understand the objections made by some of our friends on this side of the House, that the information was too meagre to justify us in proceeding with the expenditure of $25,000 on a work of that kind. The very plan which the Minister placed before the House was at first used against him. Why? Because he said to the House, When I found, on representations made by a member of Parliament representing that constituency, that a certain work ought to be done, I instructed my engineer to report upon it, as has been the custom heretofore. He found that the report of his engineer involved an expenditure which made him hesitate as to whether Parliament would approve of $25,000 for that particular work. One hon. member on this side of the House said to the Minister of Public Works: "Why do you not go slow? With your report, involving an expenditure of $25,000, and you not being certain that that expenditure would be justified, why do you not ask for a small amount until you can get full information?" The Minister of Public Works rose, and said: "That is just what I am doing; I am not asking for $25,000; I am asking for $4,000;" and my hon. friend sat down, as I think he had a right to do. Now, what does all this talk about want of information amount to? I am not going to say that the information is all that every hon. member for this House might require in detail; but I do say that what struck me very forcibly was that the more information that was brought out, the more objections seemed to occur. The moment it was found that there had been an examination of this work by engineers under the instruction of a Conservative Minister of Public Works, and that plans were on file in the department, the objection was raised that too much expense had been involved—that there has been too many investigations. I think we have had all the discussion we ought to have on this subject. I do not rise for the purpose of criticising the discussion on this side of the House. I do not feel responsible for the expenditures of hon. gentlemen opposite. I was not elected to vote money to them; but I think we were elected not to obstruct, especially at this stage of the session, when we had agreed to confine ourselves to a legitimate criticism of the items. I thought it necessary to say a word because a demand was made on the Minister of Public Works that he must withdraw this item or a vote would be forced upon the House, and I felt it my duty to say why I should certainly vote against any such proposition coming from this side or any other side of the House.

Port Hillford, N.S.—Breakwater..... $4,000

Mr. FOSTER. What is to be the cost of this work?

Mr. BERGERON. Is that in Guysborough also?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes. That is to provide for the construction of a breakwater at Breakwater Point, reaching 8½ feet at low water, to furnish

shelter for the fishermen. The proposed work is to be 500 feet long and 20 feet wide, and to have a depth of 20 feet at the outer end. The total cost is estimated to be about $10,000 or $12,000.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the population of Port Hillford ?

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). About 1,000. The St. Mary's River, to which reference has been made, is the largest river in Nova Scotia, from which about 10,000,000 feet of lumber is exported. The lumber is taken down the river in rafts to Liscomb, near the mouth of St. Mary's River, and there is no harbour between the mouth of St. Mary's River and Isaac's harbour. At Port Hillford there are 35 certified captains, and if there is a storm, they have to go eight or nine miles to find a harbour. They are engaged in fishing, and a number of them go to the Labrador.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the hon. gentleman propose to call for tenders ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Certainly.

Tancock Island, N.S.—Repairs to a wharf $1,500

Mr. FOSTER. Is that owned by the Government ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

McNutt's Island, N.S.—Beach protection. $1,000

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to be applied to the construction of a piece of crib-work, 230 feet long, for the protection of the fishing and small craft frequenting the harbour. The estimated cost is as follows :—14,000 cubic feet, $840 ; unforeseen, $160.

Mr. FOSTER. Will this finish the work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is no work going on yet ; but the beach is breaking away.

Swim's Point, N.S.—wharf..... $2,000

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is at Cape Sable Island, Shelburne County, a large fishing section.

Jordan Bay East—repairs to breakwater. $2,500

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This will complete the work.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Jordan Bay is in the county of Shelburne. It is a shipping place of some importance and the wharf there was damaged last year.

Upper Wood's Harbour—Wharf..... $2,500
Upper Port Latour—Wharf..... $2,000

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Those are both new works. The amounts will not be exceeded. They are in Shelburne County.

Louis Head—Repairs to crib-work, beach protection $600

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That is in Shelburne County.

Sandford (or Cranberry Head)—Breakwater.... .... $3,500

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is in Yarmouth County. I cannot pledge myself to spend this amount, because the estimate of the engineer is $10,500. It is a new work. The money is to be applied to the construction of a new breakwater, 340 feet long, fifteen wide on top, and standing nine feet above high water. The estimated cost of the work is as follows :—120,000 cubic feet of crib-work, $8,400 ; repairs to existing block, $400 ; contingencies, $1,700. It is for the further protection of the harbour. An examination was made by the chief engineer's orders in 1893. I am reminded that there is already a breakwater there, but to make it serviceable it is necessary to build an additional piece of work and repair the old breakwater.

Mr. FOSTER. $10,000 is a very respectable sum of money. What is there around there to require this expenditure ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is a fishing village, and I must remind my hon. friend that already $5,970 have been spent in the past to erect a breakwater there, but the work will be of no avail unless we supplement it with the work I am now asking this vote for.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it a harbour of refuge ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, for fishermen. It is frequented by a great number of fishermen and is on the Bay of Fundy side.

Mr. KAULBACH. I cannot understand why so much is lavished on the counties of Shelburne and Queen's. I find no less than eight or nine items in consecutive order for expenditure in these counties. I am inclined to think that our friend has been acting on the principle that it never rains but it pours. I represent the adjoining county, where there are works required to be done, the necessity of which I have been pointing out to the Minister for a long time, and which are as deserving as, and in some cases more so, than those that appear in the Estimates. I am not objecting to the items for Queen's and Shelburne, but I think that I am entitled to a certain portion of the spoils. The hon. Minister of Finance is in the swim altogether.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. All little systems have their day and then cease to be. You have had yours.

Mr. KAULBACH. I would remind the hon. Minister of Public Works that a breakwater at Mill's Cove has been asked for, and

it is really required there more than at any other part of the coast, for a number of boats have been destroyed by easterly and southerly storms in that bay. It is a part of the bay that is unprotected, and should receive the earliest and best attention of the hon. Minister.

Advocate Harbour—Wharf $2,000

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The total estimated cost $3,000.

Pictou Light—Beach protection..... $2,800

Mr. FOSTER. This is to protect the lighthouse ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. KAULBACH. I have asked for the protection of the light at Battery Point, Lunenburg Harbour, where the sea is making rapid inroads upon the banks of alluvium.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not remember having received any application about this from my hon. friend (Mr. Kaulbach).

Mr. KAULBACH. I have written repeatedly about it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, generally sees that these light-houses are brought to the attention of the Public Works Department. We must protect the light-houses, certainly.

Mr. MILLS. I wish to call attention to a matter I have mentioned to the Minister quite frequently—I mean the remains of the piers of the old bridge in Bear River. This is an old subject. I called the attention of the late Government as well as this Government to it often. I do not bring this forward on political grounds, but simply for the public benefit. These piers are in the mouth of Bear River and are a constant menace to life and property and a serious impediment to navigation. There is a contention, I understand, between the provincial and Dominion Governments as to the responsibility for removing the piers. The Federal Government are responsible for the free navigation of rivers, and so rivers must be cleared by the Federal Government. If there is any question as to the liability of one Government or the other to pay, that is a matter that can be settled after the work is done. So far as the political aspect of the case is concerned, Bear River is the place that gives a majority against me. Bear River is a port with a large number of vessels going to and fro, so these old piers should be removed at once. I would just give the Minister of Public Works warning, that if they are not removed, I will commence a mode of warfare, something like that resorted to some years ago by a member of this House —I will obstruct in every way possible until the thing is done. I will pursue that course next year if I am here. I will commence it the first of the session and carry it through to the finish.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I believe these obstructions have been there for many years. My hon. friend (Mr. Mills) might have begun his warfare a little earlier. He had great influence with the late Government, and he should have exercised it. But no doubt there was a reason for it, and the reason he may just have intimated—he says that the people living at Bear River have been opposed to him. However, I will give my best attention to the question. I am informed that the removal of these piers would cost $15,000 ; but I understand that they are an obstruction to navigation, and so must give our attention to this matter.

Mr. MILLS. I must protest against the estimate given by the Minister of Public Works. I have read the report of the engineer which said that the cost of removing these piers would be $1,000. In fact, $1,000 was placed in the last estimates of the last Government for the purpose——

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There were such estimates, were there ?

Mr. MILLS. That is what I understood. I moved for the papers at the beginning of the session, and they show that this amount was placed in the Estimates. They give also the correspondence on the subject, including the letters I wrote to the late Government. These show that I first made this application a long time ago, and from that time until now I have pressed it. It was promised me by the late Government to have this done. It was debated here, I think, in answer to the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint) it was stated that a letter had been written by the late Minister of Justice, Hon. A. R. Dickey, intimating that this was not for the public benefit. I inquired into that and asked for the papers. The letter is referred to in these papers, but there is no such letter among them. It would be inconsistent with promises given me by members of the late Government if such a letter ever was in evidence. I hope no political consideration will be allowed to affect action in this matter. I may say that the subject was first brought to my attention by a prominent Liberal firm, Messrs. Clark Bros., of Bear River, and I at once made application and have been pressing it ever since.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is in the department a letter written by the hon. member for Victoria to the late Minister of Public Works that he had received an intimation from Mr. Dickey to the effect that the removal of those obstructions are not necessary.

Mr. MILLS. There is no such letter in the papers.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Perhaps not. When I said a moment ago that those works would cost about $15,000, I was not referring alone to the removal of these piers, but I was also referring to the erection of the guiding piers that were applied for.

Livingstone Cove—Wharf..... $3,000

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is in the county of Antigonish. The total cost of the work will be about $6,000.

Mr. McISAAC. I may say that this is one of the most important works that have ever been constructed in the county of Antigonish. Some of the hon. gentlemen opposite know something about that northern coast. I refer particularly to the hon. mem for King's, P.E.I. (Mr. Macdonald), who will endorse me in this respect. The coast line from Pictou east to Cape George is a very dangerous coast indeed, and there are no harbours or places of refuge at all on that coast. This Livingstone Cove is a port which, even in its natural condition, affords the best protection for craft and vessels that may be caught in a storm on that part of the coast. When this breakwater is constructed, it will afford to the craft and vessels of all kinds sailing the Northumberland Straits and the Bay of St. George, very ample protection in the case of storms, as well as affording the fishermen in that locality protection for their fishing boats.

Harbours and Rivers—New Brunswick—
Upper Tobique River—Improvement of channel $800

Mr. ELLIS. What is this for?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. To continue improvements in the channel of the river. The work was begun a year or two ago.

Mr. ELLIS. I beg to call the attention of the Minister to the fact that there has been legislation this session which practically makes that river a private river, and when the Upper Tobique River is spoken of, he must mean one of the branches of that river.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We are constructing wing dams and doing some dredging so as to give an additional depth of water.

Mr. ELLIS. Will this become the property of the company that is incorporated, or is this public? The hon. Minister speaks of dams. There has been legislation which provides for a dam across the river and the river passes into the hands practically of a private company. I want to ask the Minister how he can make that expenditure now?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman has reference to some legislation which has passed this House contemplating the erection of dams down near Passekeag, which is only 28 miles up the river. I know of no intention on the part of my hon. friend to erect any dam at all.

Mr. FOSTER. Surely the hon. gentleman is not going to construct dams on that river.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The reference to dams was made by the hon. member for St. John, who said that some legislation had been passed this year which authorized the erection of dams, which had the effect of making the river a private river. I cannot quite agree with him in that opinion. I do not so understand the legislation, but I do understand that it is absolutely necessary that some facility should be afforded for the use of the drivers upon the upper stretches, and from the forks of the river down some little distance.

Mr. FOSTER. Is this to be expended south of the forks?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is for the purpose of improving the channed and to facilitate driving. There is an immense quantity of logs driven down that river, both forks of the river furnish a large lumber trade, and it is necessary in the interest of that industry that some facilities should be afforded for drivers.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There has been $6,980 spent by the late Government on the same river. It is navigable for small craft.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I can perhaps throw a little light on this subject, especially as the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Ellis) thought fit to revive the Bill which passed this House granting a charter to a company to erect dams and a saw-mill on that river. His contention is that it is a private river. But I do not think that because this Parliament grants a charter to a company to erect mills upon any river it makes that river private property.

Mr. ELLIS. I would remind my hon. friend that it gives power to make a dam as well.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I said a wing dam.

Mr. COSTIGAN. All I want to explain is that the legislation asked here to which the hon. gentleman refers, has nothing to do with this work at all, it is quite independent of it, both as to location and as to use. It is a navigable river in the sense that rivers have been called navigable, and treated as navigable since confederation. The Tobique River has received appropriations nearly every year since confederation, with the exception of a few years, for the improvement of navigation. There are no ships nor steamers going there, and where ships and steamers do not go small craft are substituted, tow boats go to take supplies up to the head

of the river, and lumber is brought down, and improvements have been made there from time to time. It is proposed to build a breakwater up near the forks to improve the navigation of that section of the river, to throw the water into the channel.

Mr. ELLIS. This legislation has been passed regardless of an Act which places the control of the river in the hands of the company. They have the right to dam the river, and the whole control of the river has passed into the hands of that private corporation. If after having had his attention directed to that fact, the Minister thinks it necessary to spend public money for a private corporation, it is his lookout. I will talk to him about that next year, if I am here.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I protest against the idea that one dollar is being spent for a private company.

Tracadie—Additional block—Purchase and repairs $1,200

Mr. McALISTER. What property is it proposed to purchase?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This amount is to purchase a block at the head of the channel, and to carry out certain repairs.

Campbellton—Repairs to ballast wharf. $2,500

Mr. McALISTER. Has a petition signed by all the shippers and business men in Campbellton been sent to the department asking for the purchase of the Mowatt wharf, at a cost of $8,000, to connect the public wharf with the shore?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. McALISTER. Campbellton is the most important commercial town in the northern part of New Brunswick, with a population of 4,000. The public wharf is so built out in the river as not to be accessible except by going over a private wharf, and shipping is very much retarded from the lack of wharf accommodation. Places of infinitely less importance receive grants from $5,000 to $25,000, while nothing whatever has been put in the Estimates for the purchase of the Mowatt wharf. The people of Campbellton feel that something should be done in that direction. The late Government had a survey made, and the engineer reported that the wharf was worth about $6,500, and could be placed in a good state of repairs for a sum bringing the total cost up to $8,000. If that wharf were purchased, the public wharf would then be of some use. Shippers complain from time to time that it is too expensive to use the public wharf. It is impossible for shippers to charter vessels, because the port is so expensive. It is impossible for shippers under the present state of things to ship with any degree of success. I hope the Minister will take this matter into consideration and have an appropriation made for the purchase of the Mowatt wharf, in order to do justice to the people of Campbellton, and afford them better accommodation.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I understand that $8,000 or $9,000 would be required to carry out the work. I shall be in a better position to discuss this matter next session, when I have visited the locality.

Mr. McALISTER. I hope that hon. gentleman, when he visits the maritime provinces, will go to Campbellton.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will do so.

Burnt Church—Wharf $8,000

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This is practically a re-vote. It was in the Estimates for a couple of years and was only dropped last year, the view of the Department of Public Works being that the cost would be more than the sum appropriated to build the wharf. Since then the department has been convinced that the work of a very extensive character which they had in contemplation is not really necessary. We do not build our wharfs in the province of New Brunswick, at all events, on the same expensive scale as the chief officers of the department think necessary in other localities, and I think the people of the Miramichi are quite ready to build a sufficient wharf at this point for the sum asked for.

Mr. FOSTER. Will $8,000 complete?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will try.

Mr. FOSTER. The difficulty was when I was a member of the Government, that it takes all the pressure you can bear on the engineers to get them to look at things in a moderate way. They wanted $16,000 to build that wharf, and I was determined it should not be built until it was brought down to a reasonable amount.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That is one of the reasons why I wish to visit the Maritime Provinces. My engineers ask large sums and my colleagues around tell me that for half the money a useful work could be built. I am glad my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) agrees with them in that.

Prince Edward Island—
China Point—Reconstruction of head pier $2,000

Mr. MARTIN. I draw the attention of the Government to the delay that has occurred in the repairing of this wharf, and I am sorry that the Minister of Public Works did not display his usual push in looking after it before now. It was brought to his attention over a year ago that a block of this wharf floated into the channel.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It will be all right now.

Mr. MARTIN. I am afraid it will take some time before it will be all right.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. You do not complain of the vote being in the Estimates.

Mr. MARTIN. I complain that the work has been delayed, and I see from a letter in the public press that the Minister of Marine has been writing to some people in Prince Edward Island that $2,500 was to be spent on China Point wharf when the Government are asking for only $2,000 now. When I came to Ottawa at the opening of the session of Parliament I questioned the Minister of Public Works, and I thought he replied that a sum would be in the Estimates and the work commenced last spring so that the farmers of that section of the country would have an opportunity of attending to their shipping. Formerly a steamer used to call there three times a week, but for the last year and this year if I am correctly informed had not been able to call at all on account of the Minister not attending to this work. I have here a letter that appeared in the Charlottetown "Examiner," signed by Spectator, which shows the position of affairs in regard to China Point. The Minister of Marine has written down there that $2,500 would be spent on that wharf, and I find the letter says in one paragraph:

> Nothing more was heard about the matter until last fall, when word came from Sir Louis that the sum of $2,500 was to be voted for the purpose of rebuilding our wharf, the work to be completed in time for the spring shipping.

The spring shipping is now over, and this vote instead of being in the Supplementary Estimates should have been in the Estimates for the year ending 30th June, 1898. On the 17th February, I asked this question of the Minister of Public Works:

> Mr. MARTIN asked,
>
> 1. Is the Government aware that part of the wharf at China Point, in the province of Prince Edward Island, has floated up the river, and that the shipping at the wharf has practically terminated, owing to its bad condition?
>
> 2. Does the Government propose to repair the wharf, in order to be ready for the spring shipping?

There was, therefore, ample time for the Minister of Public Works to do the work sooner, but I suppose I have not the pull of the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser), and am not in a position to kick for a judgeship. I am glad, however, that there is even this $2,000 in the Estimates, but I regret that there is not a much more generous vote and the work finished.

Summerside Harbour, re-vote..... $30,000

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. In 1896 this project with reference to Summerside harbour was commenced, and I believe that $22,000 was proposed to be put in the Estimates by my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) for that purpose. Last year we took a vote for $30,000 and called for tenders, and as the lowest tender came appreciably within the limits of the money we thought it ought to be accepted, but the tenderer would not take the contract. The other tenders were so much higher we thought it better to call for new tenders. Representations were made to the chief engineers as to the necessity for cutting down the specifications so that the work could be brought within more reasonable limits. The Estimates were cut down, but the tenders called for were still so high that the Minister of Public Works did not feel called upon to enter into the contract. He suggested that the chief engineer should try to reduce the extent of the work, and my hon. friend (Mr. Tarte) is now taking a revote in the hope that the work can be done without an extremely heavy outlay.

Mr. MACDONALD (P.E.I.) I applied some time ago to the Minister of Public Works for a little expenditure at Chapel Point wharf in Grand River in my county, and I took it for granted from what the Minister (Mr. Tarte) told me that he was going to put it in the Estimates.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. You do not want a special vote for that small amount. The Minister (Mr. Tarte) has made out an order for it, and it is all right.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is a small amount—$300, I think.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's). In the case of an extension of a wharf, I think a special vote is required. It is not repairs.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The order for it to be done is gone.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's). That is all I require. All I have to say to the hon. Minister is that I thank him very much.

Maria, Que.—Wharf $5,000

Mr. FOSTER. Where is that?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In Bonaventure County—in one of the most important parishes.

Mr. FOSTER. What is to be the total cost?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. $15,000. I hope to reduce the cost of all these works. I hope to build this for $10,000.

Mr. McALISTER. I observe that last year there was an item of $2,800 to provide a proper landing at Cross Point, in Bona-

venture County, opposite Campbellton ; but nothing was done, and I see that this year the item is dropped altogether. What is the reason of that ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Because after survey it was found that the cost would be very large indeed.

Mr. McALISTER. Then, why not build it on the instalment plan, like a great many other public works ? I assure the hon. Minister that matters are at present very unsatisfactory. There is a great deal of business transacted between the two places, and the ferry steamer has to anchor three or four hundred yards from the shore and transfer the passengers to small boats. I think this place is of sufficient importance to justify a larger appropriation for this work. I hope the Minister will take the matter into his consideration.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will see what can be done when I go down.

Saguenay River, below Chicoutimi—
Dredging..... $3,000

Mr. FOSTER. How is this dredging done ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. With one of our own dredges, and it is the reason why I want an appropriation. That dredge is now working at Kingston. When the work is completed there, the dredge will be taken down to the Saguenay.

Baie St. Paul, Cap aux Corbeaux—Extension, 200 feet, and repairs to wharf. $10,000

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. At Baie St. Paul there is a pier which was erected about twenty years ago, two miles from the shore above the village, and a few years afterwards, when Mr. Cimon was the member, there was a wharf built at Cap aux Corbeaux. This wharf is too short to afford accommodation for the steamers, and I am extending it.

Mr. CLARKE. Will that work be done by contract ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Doucet's Landing—Dredging..... $4,000

Mr. FOSTER. How are you doing that dredging ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This work will be done by one of the dredges of the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal. It will cost about $63 a day.

Mr. POPE. I do not see anything here for piers in the county of Compton. On the principle laid down by the Minister of Finance, a constituency which pays its share in the expenditure of the country ought to receive some benefit. We have three or four piers in Lake Megantic which need some repairs, and as the constituency does not receive any particular benefit from the expenditure to which it has to contribute, I take this opportunity of asking the hon. Minister to do something for these piers.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have much pleasure in assuring my hon. friend that out of the general vote, I will make all the repairs he requires.

Mr. POPE. I am much obliged to the hon. gentleman. That is all I require.

Mr. GAUVREAU. (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, I hope that the Minister of Public Works is going to give me the same answer he has just given the hon. member for Compton (Mr. Pope), to the effect that out of this general vote for public works he will make the necessary repairs to the works at Heverte and Trois Pistoles.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. (Translation.) It is with pleasure that I will make those repairs out of the general vote for my department.

Mr. MARCOTTE. (Translation). I wish to draw the attention of the hon. Minister of Public Works to the fact that there is no appropriation in the Estimates for the works on the River Ste. Anne. The hon. gentleman ought to know that the works built up to now, if not completed, will only prove detrimental. The property along the river is liable at any moment to be destroyed by the current which flows through those works and the mainland. As I do not see any appropriation for those repairs in the Estimates, it is my duty to protest against it. Those works may prove detrimental to the property. A vote of $5,000 had been placed in the Estimates in order to complete those works. The inhabitants of that locality have made considerable preliminary works, and now that you have dropped this vote of $5,000, the least you can do is to repair those works, which threaten to destroy the property.

If the engineers have reported to the Minister that it would involve a much larger expenditure to complete those works, I have no hesitation in saying that they are wrong. Out of the outlay of $22,000 already made, three-fourths of the necessary works have been carried out, and now those works will prove absolutely useless, or rather positively harmful, from your not having spent the five thousand dollars which had been appropriated for their completion. As I said before, this vote of $5,000 would have covered all the expenditure incurred for completing those works.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have already spent $22,000 on these protection works. They are not federal works, and I thought it time to put a stop to the expenditure. The local government and municipal council should provide the money.

Mr. CLARKE. I would ask the hon. Minister what he proposes doing for the protection of the island at Toronto ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My intention is to build this year two or three additional groins out of the vote at my disposal. I intend going up to Toronto in a few days to see about it. I think the groin we erected last year has done very good service, and I think that two or three more would be sufficient.

Mr. CLARKE. Do I understand that it is the intention of the hon. gentleman to construct two or three more groins for the protection of the island this year ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Kingston Harbour—Dredging..... $15,000

Mr. FOSTER. What dredges are these ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. They are our own, and this is to pay the expense of running them.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the use of having in one place a vote for dredging of from $200,000 to $250,000, which gives the idea that that is the whole dredge vote, and then ask for these other votes. We have votes for dredging pure and simple for each province, and then we have these separate items.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have followed the policy pursued in the past, and I do not see that I could adopt any other. In this case, I expected that I would be obliged to hire a dredge. I tried to do so, and found that all the dredges available would cost a vast amount of money and I made up my mind then to take one of our own dredges and do the work ourselves. I may as well make a statement now on this subject. I have carefully discussed this matter with my officers——

Mr. FOSTER. If you go into the general subject now, we shall lose a good deal of time.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I want to say only one word. I wish to speak so that I may get advice. I have ascertained that some of our big dredges working in Ontario, like the "Challenge" and the "Ontario," cost about $9 an hour, while some of the smaller dredges, like the "St. Louis," cost a good deal less. The average expenditure of the large and small is about $55 a day, the biggest costing about $80 or $90, and the smallest about $40.

Mr. BERGERON. The "St. Louis" about $30.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, more than that. I have instructed my officers to keep a strict account of the expenditure of every dredge. I shall try a variety of systems. I intend to hire one or two dredges and put crews on them. In some cases, I shall have our own dredges. In some cases I shall ask for tenders, for instance, at Goderich.

Mr. CLARKE. And Toronto ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have made my arrangements, otherwise I should have been glad to call for tenders there. I shall try the three systems so that we may know exactly where we stand.

Mr. FOSTER. I want the hon. Minister to promise one thing more, and that is that he will not keep his public works estimates until the day before we are going to prorogue, but will bring them down so that we may have a chance to fairly criticise them.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is something in that.

Mr. FOSTER. It is awful.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. At the same time it must not be forgotten that members of Parliament are not always as prompt as we would like them to be. They are very late in coming to us. I would rather discuss my estimates sooner. I agree that these estimates should be brought down earlier.

Mr. CLARKE. The hon. Minister said that the large dredges cost about $9 an hour. What is their capacity in cubic yards, ordinarily ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. About 600 yards a day. It varies somewhat. I have figures on this subject which I shall be glad to show my hon. friend (Mr. Clarke).

Mr. McALISTER. I would like to ask the Minister if Restigouche is on the dredging programme for this year ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. McCLEARY. I would like to find out where this Jordan harbour is ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is in the county of Lincoln.

Mr. McCLEARY. Well, I thought I knew the county of Lincoln very well, but I never knew there was such a harbour as Jordan harbour there. I would ask the Minister how much money he intends to spend in that harbour ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This will cover the whole expenditure. The work consists of dredging.

Mr. CLANCY. How much work was done on the Sydenham River last year ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The total amount spent was $20,377. I have not the figures for last year. I shall be glad to give to my hon. friend (Mr. Clancy) the information.

Mr. DAVIS. Where is Sydenham River ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In the county of Bothwell.

Collection of Slide and Boom dues, including salaries of clerks connected with the service $1,000

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is the last item, except one.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman had better allow that one to stand, so that we may have a little discussion in the morning.

Railways and Canals—Capital—Intercolonial Railway--Rolling stock..... $600,000

Mr. FOSTER. This is a very important item. I think if my hon. friend does not object, we had better allow this item to stand, and criticise the Intercolonial Railway at a later time. The ex-Minister of Railways and Canals is not here to-night, and he desires to speak on this item.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There would be some difficulty in acceding to the hon. gentleman's request, unless it were imperatively necessary. I have made arrangements for a meeting of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council to-morrow, having fixed the date when I believed the session would be through. There are a large number of people here from various parts of the Dominion to attend the meeting of that committee, and therefore the hon. gentleman will understand how desirable it is that we should pass these items to-night, otherwise I would be compelled to put all those gentemen to great inconvenience.

Mr. FOSTER. Under the circumstances, I would suggest that if this item is taken up to-night, we be allowed to discuss the Intercolonial Railway on some other item.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Quite so.

Mr. FOSTER. Will my hon. friend explain what this vote is for ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is to provide for six first class sleepers, four baggage and express, a dining car, 300 box cars, three postals and four snow ploughs. These are not for the purpose of repairing or making up any shortage in the present supplies, so far as the old portion of the road is concerned, but are rendered absolutely necessary by our business on the new portion of the road.

Mr. FOSTER. How much will these cost that have been enumerated ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The money I have stated here. I have made the prices as low as possible, consistent with the business demands of the road.

Mr. FOSTER. Is this rendered necessary by the lease of the Drummond and Grand Trunk Railway branches ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, by our operating that portion of the railway.

Mr. FOSTER. This is new rolling stock that is necessary in order to operate them ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, and it is much below the average requirements of the road. I have made it, as I said within the narrowest limits.

Mr. BERGERON. Where are these locomotives bought ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I hope to be able to have them all made in Canada. I am now having locomotives made by the Kingston works, and they have given me assurances that they will put their plant into such a shape as that they can turn these out for us with sufficient rapidity to answer our needs.

Mr. McALISTER. These locomotives are not confined to any particular part of the road ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is in respect to the increased demand on that portion of the road.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Have the freight receipts on the Intercolonial Railway increased lately ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I can give my hon. friend a very encouraging statement in that regard. I am not able to state what the earnings and outlay have been since the month of April, because the account for the month of May cannot possibly be tabulated and completed much before the 26th of the present month. I have, however, March and April in full. with the result for the months of March and April compared with the months of March and April during the preceding year. The whole portion of last year from the 1st of July down to the 1st of May of this year, I have also compared with the same months of the year preceding. The total loss on the Intercolonial Railway from July 1, 1896, to April 30, 1897, was $102,028.71 ; the total loss on the road from the same date in 1897 to the same date in 1898, is only $52,894. I have paid, mark you, in the expenditure up to the 30th of April, the rents which are chargeable against us in respect both of the Grand Trunk Railway portion and the Drummond County portion or the line together with the full cost of operating the leased lines. I am able to show an improvement over last year notwithstanding that this is a new road, and notwithing that we have only run it for two months I am able to show an improvement to the extent of $50,000. Then there is another im-

portant item to be taken into account. I found that for the last five years, or thereabouts, it had been the practice not to do any of the repairs on the line, not to do any ballasting nor to put in any new sleepers or new rails, until after the 1st of July; so that we have been running our road for the first portion of the year after the frost has gone out of the ground, under the disadvantage of not having the road lined up, new ties put in, new rails laid down, ballasting done, or the general work of repairs completed. I resolved last fall that I would ask tenders for ties in the fall, and get them during the winter, and would put them in and do the repairs, and do all the other work which would be required for maintenance, as speedily as possible after the frost went out of the ground. There has been already expended in the months of March and April last over $30,000 which has no corresponding item of outlay for the last four or five years during the same period. I expect before 1st July to lay out the sum of $101,000 for this purpose more than was laid out during the corresponding period of last year, and I am, in consequence of that, expending within the twelve months of the fiscal year, commencing 1st July, 1897, and ending 1st July, 1898, no less than $161,000 for repairs, new ties and other works which I am required to do. So within the twelve months of the current fiscal year I am compressing the work of two years, and I am going to be at a disadvantage in my general statement at the end of this year to a greater extent than I will be in any future year by reason of that fact. I felt it necessary to take the bull by the horns, as it were, in order that the road might have the advantage of being placed in first-class running shape and making all necessary repairs at the earliest possible moment. Notwithstanding the expenditure during March and April, and I have all May and June to come—it is over $30,000—I am $50,000 better off to-day than I was twelve months ago.

Mr. ELLIS. I should like to ask one question with respect to construction. In the early days of the Intercolonial there was a firm at St. John which built locomotives. Representations have been made to me with respect to that firm doing some of the work. Is there any possibility of any part of the work being done in New Brunswick?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There will be, if the firm is prepared to enter into a contract. I asked Mr. Manning for tenders before the locomotives now under construction were commenced, and I could not get any encouragement that the firm would be able to take a contract.

Increased railway accommodation at St. John	$ 250,000

Mr. FOSTER. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will give some information.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This sum is for the purpose of supplying the Intercolonial Railway with sufficient terminal facilities to enable the road to do an ocean trade.

Mr. FOSTER. On which side of the harbour?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. On the east side.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the nature of the work?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. At the present time the Intercolonial has no terminal facilities enabling it to do an ocean business on either side of the harbour at St. John. The wharfs, sheds and facilities for ocean vessel business, which are now possessed by the city, lie on the west side of the harbour, and have been constructed in connection with the terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The city of St. John itself has made a large outlay in that connection. It has spent at least $750,000 on the west side and provided sheds, wharfs and all other necessary buildings, and an elevator of a very superior character, and those facilities have enabled the Canadian Pacific Railway to do a large amount of business at St. John during the winter season as a winter port. I have a statement here which shows the rapid increase with which the winter trade of Canada has grown during the last three years at the terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway. During the winter season of 1895-96 the total shipments from St. John of freight carried by the Canadian Pacific Railway equalled 32,600 tons; in 1896-97 this tonnage had increased to 71,000 tons, in 1897-98 it had grown to the very large proportions of 120,000 tons. So the committee will get an idea of the development, having regard to the fact that this is an entirely new business, and has only sprung up within the last three years. The Intercolonial is so situated that at the present time it is unable to take up any portion of that traffic. I believe the prospects are exceedingly promising for the Intercolonial doing a large portion of the winter trade. We have only, I think, to equip our termini at Halifax and St. John, and with our road and improved equipments generally we shall be able to command a very substantial part, if not the whole of the winter trade of the Dominion. I have had calculations made by my officers with respect to the prospects of our doing this trade. I have also been in communication, among others, with the Canada Atlantic Railway Company, not to mention the Grand Trunk Railway, and the Canada Atlantic has given me to understand that there is no reason to doubt but that the Intercolonial Railway will be in a position to take up a very large amount of traffic which now finds its way to Europe through American ports. If hon. gen-

tlemen have visited Parry Sound they will have seen there most extensive arrangements made by Mr. Booth to secure the trade of the west, and it is obvious that the Canada Atlantic Railway is going to be a very heavy freight carrying railway. The road has no United States connections and no American port. It would prefer, under existing circumstances, that the portion of its traffic which does not find its way to the ocean during the summer season, should be carried over our railway and through Canadian ports in the winter, and I believe there is every prospect of our effecting arrangements with the Canada Atlantic people which will ensure to the Intercolonial Railway a very large winter port trade. In regard to the work to be done, we propose to place a wharf, with proper freight sheds and tracks convenient to the elevator at the head of St. John harbour, and almost a stone's throw from our present station. We have our eye upon a property there which I think can be had at a reasonable price. We have an option upon the property from the present owners, and so far as I can form a judgment, and I think so far as public opinion upon both sides of politics in the city of St. John is concerned the price at which this property has been offered to us is a reasonable price. We propose to acquire that property and we propose to improve the wharf which is now upon it. If we acquire this property we will be able to provide, first, for two of the largest ocean steamships, and in addition to that we will have accommodation at the end of our wharf for any smaller sized steamer which may wish to use it. At present this wharf property is being utilized by the Dominion Atlantic Railway Company, which is paying the owners an annual rental, on a lease terminable at short notice, of $2,400 or $2,600 a year. Therefore, in acquiring this property we will be able not only to afford the necessary berth accommodation for the large steamers which now frequent the port, but we will be able also, we hope, to continue arrangements with the Dominion Atlantic Railway Company, realizing the same rental in respect to this property. I may say the property has been offered to me for $100,000, and situated as it is, and realizing the amount of rental which its owners now receive from it, (I understand about $5,500 a year), I think we are getting it at a price which every one will admit is not unreasonable.

Mr. BERGERON. Who are the owners of that property ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It belongs to a company which, I think, is called the St. John Terminal or Wharf Company.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the hon. gentleman propose to fix the price by valuation ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have not yet come to any absolute decision as to that. The owners, I think, rather prefer that the property should be valued, that we should expropriate or that we should submit the matter to arbitration. I have some little hesitation myself in concluding that that would be the best course to take. I have had the opinion of some members of the boards of trade ; I have spoken with some of the leading officers of that board, who are not in any way interested in the property ; I have a memorial from the city council of St. John on the subject, and they recommend this site as preferable to any other available site.

Mr. FOSTER. That takes somewhere in the vicinity of $100,000 ; what is to be done with the other $150,000 ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We will have to do a considerable amount of dredging. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) knows that at the end of the harbour there has not been of late years very much dredging done either by the corporation or by private owners, and we will have to spend quite an amount of money in dredging. In addition to repairing and renewing portions of the wharf we will have to build sheds, and change the track or tracks which now lead to the St. John's bridge, so as to enable us to get the necessary length of pier as I have described.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman has got to extend the property after he purchases it ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. How much will the extension be ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think not less than from 40 to 60 feet of extension. We cannot carry it further than sixty feet, as I understand, because we then strike the harbour line, but that extension, with the additional length which we get by changing the location of the tracks, will give us 600 feet berth room on each side.

Mr. FOSTER. How much will it cost to build the extension and how much will it cost to do the dredging ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am not asking sufficient to complete the work this year ?

Mr. FOSTER. Is this $250,000 not sufficient ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No.

Mr. FOSTER. How much is the estimated cost ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. According to the estimates of my officers, it will take to complete the work all of half a million dollars. $250,000 is all I require this year.

Mr. McALISTER. Notwithstanding that, owing to its geographical position, it is better than any other place that could be secured for the same money.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Unquestionably.

Mr. BERGERON. Is this elevator at St. John, for which you ask $75,000, to be built in the same place?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. Did the city of St. John give a bonus.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We have not asked the city of St. John to give a bonus, because they have already laid out over three quarters of a million of dollars, and before their engagements are carried out it may be their outlay will approach a million of money. The city of St. John has shown a spirit of enterprise which is without parallel in any other portion of Canada.

Mr. MILLS. There is a vote here for an elevator at Halifax. What has changed the policy of the Liberal party with reference to the elevator at Halifax. I can remember the time when the former elevator at Halifax was held up to ridicule and derision. Has anything new transpired to change the policy of the Liberal party in that respect?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There has been a good deal of development in Canada within the last two or three years.

Mr. MILLS. Is that all?

Mr. SPROULE. What is the capacity of this elevator at St. John?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We have not proposed to embark in the matter of elevators on a large scale. The information which I have leads me to anticipate that we can for this sum provide elevator accommodation to the extent of 300,000 bushels. Our Halifax friends are rather more ambitious than that. They propose by supplementing the sum we are granting here, to increase the elevator accommodation at their port. They would like to have very much more accommodation for three-quarters of a million bushels. But I do not propose to go beyond what would be reasonable and prudent at the outset. I am advised that it is possible for us to put up elevators of such a description as will be capable of extension if the business should justify it.

Mr. McALISTER. I would ask the hon. Minister of Railways whether it is the intention to close Nash's Creek and Moffat Stations in the county of Restigouche, as telegraph stations.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Oh, no.

Galops Canal—To pay J. G. Snetsinger interest on $12,000 from the date of expropriation of his property, 12th January, 1894, to date of payment, 13th August, 1897	$2,582

Mr. FOSTER. What is the explanation of that?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This is the balance of interest which Mr. Snetsinger is entitled to, growing out of the expropriation of his property for canal purposes at Cornwall. The valuators estimated his mill buildings at $12,000. The property was taken, but the amount was not paid. He claimed some damages in respect of the loss of a water privilege, which remained unsettled, and I think at this moment the question is in litigation. But the valuators placed $12,000 value on the mill, and the payment was withheld for the period mentioned in the item. The amount was paid on the 13th of August, 1897, but the property was taken on the 12th of January, 1894.

Mr. FOSTER. What was the reason he was not paid? Did the department think the amount was too large?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, but the department thought that Mr. Snetsinger ought to have been willing to give a discharge in respect of his water privilege as well as in respect of the mill.

Mr. FOSTER. Was the expropriation for both the mill and the water power?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think the property was all expropriated together.

Mr. FOSTER. Then the $12,000 was paid for the whole expropriation?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, the valuator placed the $12,000 on the mill alone, and he declined to place any estimate on the water privilege. Mr. Snetsinger will say whether that is correct.

Mr. SNETSINGER. That is correct. The Dominion Government claimed that they owned the water power themselves. I had the lease from the Ontario Government, but the late Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Haggart) told me, and also Mr. Wood, the valuator, that he would not consent to say that I had the privilege at all. He said he thought it was a Dominion and not a local water privilege, and I asked the Government to put a value on the mill itself. They did so, and I accepted that value. That was in September, 1893, and not in January, 1894.

Mr. FOSTER. Was the mill running?

Mr. SNETSINGER. Yes, a running mill.

Mr. FOSTER. And it stopped running?

Mr. SNETSINGER. Yes.

Chambly—To continue and complete the drainage works and culverts at St. Johns, P.Q..... $14,000

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This is a revote.

Mr. BERGERON. Was any money spent before that for the same object?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We have spent $21,000, and this $14,000 will complete the work, the total costing $35,000.

Mr. BERGERON. Last year we voted $25,000 for something of the same kind at Valleyfield. I suppose this amount of money has been paid over to the town?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. Has there been any condition attached to the payment of the money?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We only consented to pay the amount on the town undertaking to relieve us for all time from any future liability. We have a document to that effect.

Mr. BERGERON. Has the town consented to that?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. If they have done so, I think it is a great mistake. If they consented, they must have done so under pressure. I do not suppose the same condition exists in this case. The hon. gentleman understands perfectly that it is a great responsibility which they have taken on their shoulders in freeing the Government from any responsibility in the future.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There was no pressure whatever brought on them. The town was receiving from the Government $500 a year, and instead of that, they simply asked for this sum, which they were glad indeed to get.

Mr. BERGERON. They were receiving $500 per year, which capitalized would mean $12,500, and in giving them $25,000, you are really only giving them $12,500.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. They asked that amount, and were very glad to get it.

Mr. BERGERON. They asked for a good deal more than that.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I can assure you it is all closed now.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. And they are very thankful.

Mr. BERGERON. They were here and did all in their power to prevent that condition being attached to the grant of money.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, they did not ask that.

Mr. BERGERON. The mayor told me they did.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The mayor is not in such close relations with my hon. friend that he would tell him many secrets.

Mr. BERGERON. He told me so here, and asked me to help him in preventing the Government attaching that condition.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend could not do it.

Mr. BERGERON. I know that, but it is my privilege, as a member, to say what I like about it. It was a bad thing to attach that other condition to the grant.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The mayor of Valleyfield knows what he is about.

Welland Canal..... $77,100

Mr. McCLEARY. I wish to ask a question with reference to a change made in the collector's office at Port Colborne. I asked the Minister about a change made in connection with one Thomas O'Neill. I wanted to know when he was removed and upon whose advice, and if he had been reinstated and removed again.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. A vacancy occurred since Mr. O'Neill's removal by Mr. Galbraith becoming a candidate. Before we made a permanent appointment, we were called upon by the superintending engineer to nominate some one for temporary employment. O'Neill was taken on again, on the distinct understanding that he would not be employed permanently. He came on with that understanding and remained until a final appointment was made of a person by the name of Scholey.

Mr. McCLEARY. On whose recommendation?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANLS. I would ask the hon. gentleman not to press that question, because we have to look for advice to those in whom we have confidence, and do not disclose who their names are.

Mr. McCLEARY. Mr. O'Neill was put into the office, the hon. Minister has told us, on the recommendation of the superintending engineer. That is not the information I had. He went on Thursday morning and remained until Friday night, when Mr. Scholey was recommended by Mr. German, and Mr. Misel was recommended by Mr. Lowell. Mr. Misel got the appointment at first, but Mr. German came to Ot-

tawa and countermanded that appointment, and got his man in. It is just to satisfy the hon. gentleman's friends in Port Colborne that I make the inquiry.

To pay amounts remaining unpaid of sum voted by 52 Vic., chap. 3, and 53 Vic., chap. 2, in aid of the Central Railway Company of New Brunswick, the date for finishing work named in contract having expired before final completion thereof, this sum being acknowledged as due, notwithstanding that the changes made in the specifications for the work were not legally authorized $61,461

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This is a sum which remains unpaid on the subsidies granted some years ago to the Central Railway Company. The road is about 44 miles in length, a large portion was built under contract and specifications—more than half of it, at all events, sufficient to entitle the company to be paid $75,000 on account of about $130,000, which will be the whole amount in subsidies when the work is completed. The company applied to the department for permission to place some few trestles on the lines instead of bridges, as were required by the specifications, pointing to the other railways of the same class and character which were practically branch lines of the Intercolonial. We had the matter looked into, and the engineer went over the road and made a report. It would be in accordance with usage and precedent if some of the concessions which the company asked for were conceded, and they were. An Order in Council was passed purporting to amend the specifications in respect of these trestles, and the work went on. On the strength of that Order in Council money was spent by the people concerned in building the road, and the road was brought fully up to the requirements of the amended specifications. When the matter went to the Auditor General for payment, he called attention to the fact that the amendments made by the Order in Council were not legally authorized, or, in other words, that the amendments to the specifications could not then be made by reason of the fact that the time specified in the contract and Act for fully completing the work had lapsed. So it has become necessary to ask Parliament to authorize the payment of this amount. The engineer's reports show that the work has been completed up to the specifications.

Mr. FOSTER. I think we had better wait until to-morrow for the rest.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) has been so reasonable, outside of the early stages of the Supply, that if he suggests we should adjourn, I shall not oppose it.

Mr. FOSTER. No, Mr. Chairman, I have not been reasonable. It has just been simply because of physical weariness that we are obliged to put through $3,000,000 without any chance for criticism at all. But I give fair notice to my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) that if I am living and have any endurance at all, this thing shall not, so far as I am concerned, ever take place in this Parliament again, while I am in the Opposition. If the Government will not bring down its Estimates, new entirely to the House, in reasonable time and give the members time to study them and criticise them while the House is a House; why, I think I can get enough men to stay with me to make it pretty interesting for the Government that tries this kind of thing again. I am not doing this because it is reasonable, but because I am tired out.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend is so strong in his sense of duty, that I am sure he would fight this thing out all summer, and all winter, too, if he were not pretty confident that with such a good Government in power, it is all right to pass these Estimates.

Mr. FOSTER. It is the worst Government I ever knew, so far as Estimates are concerned.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think the hon. gentleman is right on one point—that we should now adjourn.

Resolutions to be reported.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 1.25 a.m. (Friday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 10th June, 1898.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

PRAYERS.

LAW CLERK—INDIAN DEPARTMENT.

Mr. DAVIN. I should like to ask the Government whether it is correct that Reginald Rimmer, of Regina, who was secretary of the Reform Association during the last election, has been appointed Law Clerk at Ottawa, at a salary of $2,000. Has he been appointed Law Clerk of the House of Commons, or what is the explanation?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). He has been appointed Law Clerk of the Indian Department.

Mr. DAVIN. Is his salary $2,000?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes.

INQUIRY RESPECTING RETURNS.

Mr. MARTIN. I desire again to call the attention of the Minister of Public Works to a return promised regarding expenditures on private piers and wharfs.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). The Deputy Minister informed me that he had seen the hon. gentleman and told him that the return was being prepared as rapidly as possible.

THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 168) respecting the Manitoba School Fund.—(Mr. Fielding.)

SENATE AND HOUSE OF COMMONS AMENDMENT ACT.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved that the House resolve itself into committee to consider the following proposed resolution :—

That it is expedient to provide that for the present session of Parliament and for each session of Parliament hereafter held, the deduction of eight dollars per day mentioned in section twenty-six of the Act respecting the Senate and House of Commons, being chapter eleven of the Revised Statutes, shall not be made for fifteen days in the case of a member who has been absent from a sitting of the House of which he is a member, or of some committee thereof, during such number of days ; but this provision shall not operate to extend the maximum amount mentioned in section twenty-five of the said Act, nor in the case of a member elected since the commencement of the present or of any subsequent session shall it apply to days prior to his election.

He said : It has been the custom from time to time to introduce a resolution and Bill at the close of the session, granting a certain number of days during which a member may be absent without loss of indemnity. Instead of passing this resolution annually, it is proposed to fix a certain maximum, and that maximum we have fixed at fifteen days.

Mr. FOSTER. What has been the usual number of days ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Twelve last year.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman proposes to advance the time from twelve days to fifteen days. He always goes one better.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Several hon. gentlemen opposite, for whom I have the highest respect, have asked that a longer time than fifteen days be allowed, and I have endeavoured to strike a happy medium.

Mr. OLIVER. For myself, and on behalf of other members who live at long distances from Ottawa, I desire to register my objection to this extension of leave of absence, and also to its being made permanent. I think perhaps the majority of the members who reside within a comparatively short distance from the Capital hardly appreciate the position in which those of us who live at a very long distance from here are placed by the extension of the session which occurs by reason of the frequent absence of members who live near the Capital in attending to their own business, while the business they should attend to in Parliament is dragging on account of their absence. There are only a few members who live at a very great distance from Ottawa.

An hon. MEMBER. You get more mileage.

Mr. OLIVER. The hon. gentleman says we make it up in mileage. I should like to put the matter in this way. We are not here working on salary. We have our own private business to attend to, and, as we do not always expect to be members of Parliament, if we do not keep up our private business during the period we are members, we lose our means of livelihood. It is more than any matter of salary. It is a matter not only of our present, but of our future that is involved. As members who live near the Capital do not at all—and this is not due to bad intentions—appreciate the position in which we are placed, I take this opportunity of placing it before them. Any member may make arrangements to carry on his business for a reasonable period during his absence, and if so, the indemnity received is ample ; but if the time is extended, as it has been extended this year, to a period of practically five months, it is impossible for any member, under ordinary circumstances, to arrange for a proper carrying on of his business in his absence for that period. So it is more than a matter of indemnity, mileage or money payment ; it is a matter involving to those living at a distance the ruin of their business, if the session is continued beyond a reasonable time. Having taken upon ourselves the responsibilities of members of Parliament, we are prepared to sustain that loss, if it is the interest of the country. If public business require our attendance during five, or even six months, we are prepared to give it, for we are under contract with the people to render it ; but if it is extended to merely meet the views of private members who are able, by reason of living near the Capital, to go home and attend to their business while they are supposed to be attending to the country's business, we object to it, and protest against it most strongly. Every measure which tends to relieve members of Parliament from their absolute duty of attending here day after day is an injustice to those who are unable, owing to their circumstances, to avail themselves of the privilege those members enjoy. I think it is only just and fair that the position of hon. members from a distance should be placed before the House

for the consideration of private members and the Government, so that they will understand the very great injustice being done to those members by any unnecessary extension of the term of Parliament.

Resolution considered in committee, reported, read the second time, and concurred in.

FIRST READING.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE introduced Bill (No. 173) further to amend the Act respecting the Senate and House of Commons.

SUPPLY.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION—MR. MARCOTTE AND "LA PATRIE."

Mr. MARCOTTE. (Translation.) Before the House again resolves itself into Committee of Supply, I wish to call attention on an injurious editorial published in "La Patrie," of Montreal. I think it well first to read this attack, and then register my protest. This is what "La Patrie" says:

> I have too much respect for my readers to reproduce in your columns the medley of words vomited out yesterday afternoon by the member for Champlain. It would be a hopeless task for one to hunt for one single correct grammatical expression in the dishevelled harangue delivered by Mr. Marcotte and reported yesterday in "Hansard." It is simply a disgrace for the House, and one is at a loss to understand how a man who has gone through a complete curriculum can make use of such odd and trivial language as that which is habitually used on the floor of the House by the holy man who represents in Parliament the most pious of all constituencies in the religious district of Three Rivers.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I wish to protest against the foul expressions made use of by the "Patrie" in this article. Possibly, the language which I have used might have been more correct: but I may say that upon the occasion alluded to I did give utterance to my principles and views, as every hon. member is entitled to do, on the floor of this House. I dare say that such words as those used by that journal should not find their way into the columns of a paper which is widely circulated throughout the country. That is a poor way of educating the masses. In my opinion, a paper which is received and read by respectable families should not presume to publish such articles. There is no family with the least notion of good breeding, that would dare use such expressions as those used in that article.

I protest against the rude language used in that article, which should not have appeared in a journal possessed of the least self-respect, and which ought not to be read by any one who has any self-respect.

LAW CLERK, INDIAN DEPARTMENT—APPOINTMENT OF MR. RIMMER.

Mr. DAVIN. Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) what is the necessity of this new office that is created for Mr. Reginald Rimmer. It is apparently a new office. In the Estimates for 1896-97 we have an item of $400 for a solicitor in the Indian Affairs Department, but I cannot find there is provision for a law clerk. I would like to know what new necessity has arisen for a law clerk at $2,000 a year to advise the Indian Department. I feel bitterly about the scamping way that these Estimates have been treated in this House for the last fortnight. The Opposition has almost, for seven or eight days abandoned its functions to criticise these atrocious Estimates. What reason has the Minister for the employment of Mr. Reginald Rimmer, a raw lawyer at $2,000 a year to advise him with regard to Indian Affairs?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). There are lawyers from Regina and lawyers from Regina.

Mr. DAVIN. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. So far as the appropriation for the law clerk for the Indian Department is concerned, that appropriation was made last session, and it was fully explained in the House at the time. The appropriation was made for the current year, 1896-97, and when it was made the appropriation for a solicitor for the Indian Department to which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) has referred, was struck out. I went fully, at that time, into the necessity for the appointment of a law clerk in the Indian Department. I did not make the appointment until the present time because of the fact that for various reasons I was unable to go carefully into many legal complications which have arisen in connection with matters in the Indian branch, and which have been existing for many years. I stated at the time this appropriation was made that a law clerk was very necessary; I say now that a law clerk is very necessary, and that is why he was appointed. When I say he has been appointed I am perhaps not correct, for the appointment has not yet been made, but the appointment will be made and I feel satisfied that the lawyer from Regina to which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) refers will fill the position very acceptably and very ably. There are no doubt excellent reasons why my hon. friend (Mr. Davin) does not like the appointment to be made as it has been made, and does not like the selection; but when I make an appointment for my hon. friend's district I cannot always be expected to meet his views with regard to the personnel of the appointee. The appropriation was made for last year and the

same appropriation will be found in the Estimates this year.

Mr. DAVIN. Well, Mr. Speaker, what I have to say is this——

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) has spoken.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to know how many more presidents of Reform Associations we will have to pension before this Parliament has expired.

The PRIME MINISTER. That depends altogether on the legal qualifications of the presidents of Reform associations. I must protest against the expression used by my hon. friend from West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) when he spoke of a raw lawyer from Regina. It does not follow that because anything comes from Regina that it is raw, any more in law than in legislation.

Mr. DAVIN. It does not follow that if it comes from Regina it is not raw, or that it is not ripe, either.

NORTH-WEST MOUNTED POLICE— REPORTED LOSS OF MEN.

Mr. HUGHES. I received an intimation this morning that a young man, a former member of the battalion I have the honour to command, and a resident of North Victoria, who has joined the Mounted Police, was lost, with other mounted police, in one of the passes of the Yukon. I ask the Minister of the Interior if there is any truth in the report.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I received a long report from Major Walsh, who was at the scene of the snowslide referred to in the Chilkoot Pass a few days after the accident took place. He said nothing about any of the policemen having suffered, and, so far as I know, no report has been received which indicates that this man has met his death at the place referred to.

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

(In the Committee.)

For a direct fortnightly steam service between Montreal, Quebec and Manchester, England, during the summer season, and between St. John, Halifax and Manchester during the winter season.. ..... $38,933 33

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). This, as the House will observe, is a new service. It is thought that very considerable advantage will result from communication direct with Manchester which, as the House knows, is the centre of an enormous consuming population; about 8,000,000 people are represented to be located within some 25 or 30 miles of that city. The steamers will call at our winter ports during the winter season. It is not proposed, I may state, to make this a permanent thing; it is given simply to encourage the creation of a line during the next two or three years.

Mr. SPROULE. Is there any provision for cold storage on these steamers in summer?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. These vessels, both summer and winter, will have refrigerator apparatus and proper cold storage.

Mr. FOSTER. Has any agreement been made with any line of steamers?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I think we will arrange with the Manchester Steamship Company, in which the corporation of Manchester are largely interested, as well as a large number of very prominent English shippers. They will furnish vessels of very large capacity, able to carry 8,000 or 8,500 tons.

Mr. FOSTER. Is the Minister not going to call for tenders for this service.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. We applied to parties in the business, but there were none disposed to offer for it. We did not call for tenders.

Mr. FOSTER. Then how does my hon. friend propose to fix the proper amount of subsidy?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. That was a matter of detail and bargain. They asked a great deal more, and we reduced them, eventually, to the sum of £8,000 sterling per annum, which we now suggest for the consideration of the House. Of course, as I say, it is not intended to be a permanent service. It is done for the purpose of encouraging the opening up of this service. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) is aware that in the summer, going to Montreal, we probably would have no trouble in obtaining steamers enough. The real need for the subsidy lies in the necessity of providing a winter service from the ports of St. John or Halifax.

Mr. FOSTER. Has any contract been entered into?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. It is not decided yet, but the terms of contract have been submitted, and will be agreed to, I think.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the agreement been made?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The agreement has been made, but it is not yet executed. The contract is now being sent forward to these people for

their consideration, subject to the approval of Parliament, of course.

Mr. FOSTER. We should have a very full explanation as to what induced the Government to enter into a private contract for a steamship service. My hon. friend (Sir Richard Cartwright) will see that this is a new departure as far as steamship subsidies are concerned. I am not aware that we have in these important routes, or even in the less important routes, ever violated the principle of calling for tenders and getting a competitive price.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I think that has not always been carried out.

Mr. FOSTER. If it has not, my hon. friend will please point out an instance which it has not. I know he will agree with me that it has been the rule, and I would like to know when, on any important service of this kind, tenders have not been called for, and the contract awarded according to tender. It may be very well, after you have called for tenders and fixed the price, to renew a contract in some cases at the old prices; but even in important cases of renewal, my own practice was invariably to call for tenders again. Only this year my hon. friend has arranged several steamship routes, and in every case it has been done by tender. When the West India service was instituted, it was not done by private contract with any firm of vessel owners, but by public tender and competition, and very keen competition at that. In fact, tenders were twice asked for. For the service between Campbellton and Dalhousie and Gaspé my hon. friend this year followed the rule and called for tenders. The present case is an entirely new departure. There may be very good reasons for it, but they ought to be very good reasons if we are going to have the principle of calling for tenders for steamship services entirely ignored. There are lines of vessels, enterprising and numerous, with Canadian capital in them, or with English and Canadian capital combined; but none of these, it seems, have been given an opportunity of bidding for this service, although they have been putting their capital and enterprise into the development of Canadian trade for very many years. The Government seem to have embarked on a crusade for the utter abolition of the principle of competition in these matters. It is becoming a matter simply of private bargain: and when the bargains, as far as the Government can do it, are fully carried out, they come down to Parliament and ask us simply to vote the money, and we have to vote it—the protest of the Opposition goes for nothing. My hon. friend is the last man in the Cabinet, I would have supposed, who would have given his influence to this system; but he seems to have capitulated to the other members of the Cabinet. I cannot think of a single example in which we have violated that principle—certainly not for any important service.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I think I shall be able to produce some cases in which it has been done. At the same time, I quite agree with the hon. gentleman that where circumstances permit, tenders should be asked for. We were obliged, however, in this case, to decide the matter in a very short time; and I think the object to be attained, the service which is to be rendered, the character and size of the vessels, and all the incidental circumstances taken together, will show that it is a cheap service, as measured by the sums we pay for other services of a similar kind. Of course, the hon. gentleman is perfectly justified in the criticism he has made; I do not at all deny it. But I may point out that for the sum of £8,000 sterling we get a fortnightly service, with vessels of the size I have described, and having to call during the winter at the ports of the St. John and Halifax, and it could hardly by any possibility have been obtained for less. We made a good many inquiries of the parties in the trade in Montreal, and not one of them appeared in the slightest degree disposed to tender for this service. In fact, most of them expressed their opinion to us that the service on the terms we were demanding it, would be necessarily carried on at a loss for a considerable time. The hon. gentleman is aware that the corporation of Manchester have expended a very large sum of money in opening up navigation to Manchester. He is also aware that there is a special advantage, as regards the development of our peculiar trade, in getting access to a centre of population like Manchester; and, while I do not at all desire to contend that as a general rule we should depart from the proper and wholesome principle of calling for tenders, I think that under the circumstances we would have incurred a serious loss if we had allowed this year to elapse, as we would have had to do, if we had not concluded the bargain with these parties. But I admit candidly that the hon. gentleman is perfectly right that special circumstances only should justify a departure from the rule.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend is very frank in admitting that a principle is right, and he is equally frank in violating it. I do not see where the reparation is made by that kind of proceeding. The hon. gentleman rises and says frankly, "As I am wrong"——

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I did not say that. I said that as a general rule no doubt tenders ought to be called for. But the hon. gentleman is an old public man, and he knows that there are cases constantly arising in which it is not for the public interest to call for tenders, but to make the best bargain you can.

Of course, the House can decide whether the Government have done right or wrong. The hon. gentleman has stated what the rule should be; but if under special circumstances the Government think it is the public interest to depart from it, and state the matter to the House, and the House approves of their proceeding, then I do not think it is liable to criticism.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend pursues a line of action which the Government are perfectly at liberty to take at any time they please, and which they are taking most systematically. We have had many cases of this kind during the session. In most cases the Minister would rise and would plead: "Yes, the general rule is a good one; but this is a case of urgency: I believe I have received good value for the money, just as good as if I had called for tender; perhaps I can show the House that I can even save money by it; and under these circumstances I thought it best not to call for tenders." That was the plea of the Minister of Militia (Mr. Borden), in the case of the $32,000 worth of supplies, although he had time in which to call for tenders. He actually placed the orders without advertising for tenders or calling for tenders in any way—without even sending his private circular to different people in the same line. And he comes down to his followers in the House and asks them to support him in this, and they have supported him. The contracts for dredging have been of the same kind. I suppose, if we had a little time, and the Government had not adopted the policy of crowding the whole debate on the Supplementary Estimates, practically on the whole of the Estimates—within the last five or ten days of the session, I have no doubt that the Opposition would have been able to point out case after case of the same kind. My hon. friend says that circumstances in this case made it better for the Government to enter into a private bargain. Well, there may be occasions in which this might be pleaded: but the importance of the rule and the security to the country by carrying out the rule, is so great and so paramount, that I am inclined to think the occasions are very few, if there are any at all, in which such a wholesome rule should be violated. If the Ministry violated it once on the plea that they thought it best, that is an argument that can be used in any case, and it is being used very frequently by hon. gentlemen opposite. I do not think the hon. gentleman has given us in this case any particulars which would enable the House to judge as to the service—the quality of the vessels, the size of the vessels, and so on.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I mentioned that they were 8,500 tons carrying capacity, and they will have an average speed of 12 knots.

Mr. FOSTER. What does the contract bind them to?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. That is what they are bound to. I have sent for the contract.

Mr. FOSTER. And does an old parliamentarian like my hon. friend, with the reputation and character of twenty-five or thirty years of parliamentary practice, come down with a private contract, and with an estimate resulting from a private contract, and is he asking this House, just one day before the last of the session, to vote that amount of money, and has not even yet laid the contract or the papers on the Table.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I have just sent for it and will give it to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster).

Mr. FOSTER. Just sent for it? And yet the hon. gentleman asks for the vote——

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) knows that his friends have wasted the time of the House as it never was wasted before. We began on the 3rd of April in this Committee of Supply and here we are on the 10th June with our business still unfinished. I venture to say that if, instead of wasting the time as it has been wasted—not so much by himself as by those behind him—in perfectly trivial discussion, they had criticised the Estimates in a reasonable and business like fashion, there would not have been any difficulty in this matter. But the time has been taken up by individual members in the discussion of irrelevant and trivial matters that ought not to occupy our attention.

Mr. FOSTER. I have just taken the hon. gentleman to task as an old parliamentarian, as a former Finance Minister, and as one of the foremost men in the Cabinet in the political life of this country—I am quite willing to pay him that tribute, and it is an honest and hearty one. He comes down the day before we are to prorogue and asks us to accept a private arrangement and to pay $39,000 or $40,000 on it for two or three years, and he has not even had the courtesy, to say nothing else of it, to lay a single paper with reference to the negotiations, the agreement and the contract on the Table. He has an excuse to offer for it, and I leave the House and the country to judge the value of it. His excuse is that we have wasted the time of the House, and that he has not been able to lay these papers and that contract on the Table. Suppose we had talked here for sixty days upon utterly trivial subjects, need that have prevented him from laying these papers on the Table of the House?

But he makes this display of fire-works to distract the attention and give him a cover under which to retire. That was not worthy of him. His excuse is no excuse at

all. He might have slipped in between the intervals of talk, he might have even slipped in when the talk was going on, and laid the papers on the Table telling us that they were important and asking our consideration of them. We have wasted the time of the House? I deny and repel that statement Hon. gentlemen opposite have occupied just as much time as we have on this side. How have we been treated as a Parliament? How have we on this side been treated as an Opposition? Seven days before this Parliament was to meet, these precious gentlemen opposite made a private contract with Messrs. Mann & Mackenzie, made it in the very face of the meeting of Parliament, calling for no tender, shutting out elegible men who would have tendered had they known, guarding the doors so that no information should get out and no prospective contractor could get in, except the favoured Mann & Mackenzie. And as part of this bargain they sought to give away an immense part of the country's domain, virtually saying to Parliament: We will do this in your very face and before your very eyes, but without consulting you. They precipitated a long discussion upon that subject: and they taunt us with wasting the time of the House because we discussed this measure thoroughly. We discussed it so well that throughout this country honest Liberals and honest Conservatives alike condemn the course that these hon. gentlemen pursue. They came with a plea of starvation in the Yukon district, and events have proved that there has been no starvation and no prospect of it. They came with a plea of great difficulties amounting to revolution in that country, and time has failed to justify what they said. They came with a plea that no men but Messrs. Mann & Mackenzie were capable of carrying out that contract, and they have found since it was made known to the world that men in every way equal to Mann & Mackenzie were ready to undertake the work at half, yes, at one-tenth that of the cost to the country that these gentlemen proposed. And yet they say that we have trivially wasted the time of the House. What is the use of going any further with the acts of the hon. gentlemen? And after this has been tested by two and a half months of time, the Government themselves have admitted that their action was foolish and unnecessary, that there was nothing in their pleas of urgency—for they have not proposed any reasonable scheme to take the place of the unreasonable scheme which they put before this House in the early part of the session. Why, Mr. Chairman, I cannot find words properly to express my feeling with regard to the way these hon. gentlemen have treated this House. Sir, in old times Estimates were kept back and were not gone into until the Budget Speech had been delivered and the greater part of the session had passed. In my time all that was completely reversed, and the Estimates were brought down within ten days or a fortnight after the opening of the session. My hon. friend can go through the records of Parliament and he will find that for the last six years before the hon. gentlemen came in that was the rule in this House. This gave members of the House an opportunity to get into the discussion of the Estimates and the discussion of grievances early in the session. How has it been this year? Why, Sir, two-thirds of the whole sum that hon. gentlemen have asked for had to be voted after the prorogation was in view, when members as I have said over and over again were either at their homes or so anxious to go to their homes that there could be no fair criticism of these expenditures. And yet the hon. gentlemen opposite say that we have wasted the time; and my hon. friend (Sir Richard Cartwright) has the poor excuse of getting a little angry and making this display of fire-works hoping to be lost sight of in the temporary brilliancy that he has created—only to be exposed, because, as I have said, he could have laid that agreement and contract on the Table of the House in an interval of the discussion at any time.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I mentioned to the hon. gentleman that the contract had not been concluded. Now, the hon. gentleman knows perfectly well that, until a contract is concluded, it is not parliamentary usuage to lay it on the Table of the House. Had it been concluded I should at once have laid it on the Table.

Mr. FOSTER. There must be an agreement which is virtually the contract. The hon. gentleman himself admitted that.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I have not the slightest objection, if the hon. gentleman wishes to hand him a copy of the draft contract which is under consideration. But I must say to him that I do not think his memory, any more than mine, will furnish an instance in which an inchoate contract has been laid on the Table.

Mr. FOSTER. But will the hon. gentleman deny that the agreement is actually made in good faith and that this vote is based upon it?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Of course, we would not bring down a vote unless we had reason to believe it would be carried out, and we do not intend to pay more than the sum estimated. But the hon. gentleman knows that, until the contract is signed by both parties it is not parliamentary custom nor would it be correct to lay it on the Table of the House.

Mr. FOSTER. And the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) knows also that in the case of ocean contracts, it has been claimed—I think he himself has moved an

amendment that the contract should not be signed until it was presented to the House. This is not so important as a fast line contract but it involves the same principle. What are we voting on ? We do not know the conditions of the service or the strictness with what is practically a contract is drawn. We are asked to put a service into operation without knowing any of these conditions. My hon. friend knows I am not criticising this in a spirit of unfairness, but I do think that he has put himself in a false position and he deserves to be roundly scored for it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) and those associated with him seem to suffer from a very severe attack of Mackenzie & Mann on the brain.

Mr. FOSTER. Probably some disappointed parties are suffering just as acutely.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There are some disappointed parties in the matter and none more so than those who opposed the Mackenzie & Mann contract. Whether we undertake to discuss in this House the construction of a fence or the granting of a steamship subsidy, my hon. friend or some of his colleagues will drift back to this question of Mackenzie & Mann.

The hon. gentleman and those associated with him have good reason for that. They know the country is holding them responsible for what occurred. They know that the hon. gentlemen who opposed the Mackenzie & Mann contract are bitterly regretting the course they pursued, because they know that the public opinion of this country is holding them responsible for the policy which has prevented the proper opening up for this year of the Yukon district, which is checking Canadian progress, which is diverting the trade which should be done by the Canadian people into the hands of the people of the United States ; and to-day the feeling of the Conservative party is that the Government should come to their relief and do something to pull them out of the hole into which they have placed themselves by their course. But, Sir, the Government do not propose to relieve them from the burden they have taken upon themselves ; they have assumed the responsibility of preventing this great development of the interests of Canada in the current year, they are taking the chances of the future. On them be the responsibility, and the country will hold them to account for it.

Mr. MILLS. It is all right.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is not all right, because, reading the Conservative press from day to day, we find their organs begging this Government to come down with a new Yukon Bill. But that is not the point. My hon. friend always wants to talk of Mackenzie & Mann, but we had better talk steamship subsidies. The ex-Minister of Finance gave us an exhibition of fireworks based on the assumption that the contract had not been submitted to Parliament. But my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce disposed of all that when he pointed out that the contract is not yet signed. The draft contract is now on the Table, but it will give the hon. gentleman little more information than he has already received from the statement of the Minister of Trade and Commerce. What does this item say ? It declares : " For a direct fortnightly steamship service between Montreal, Quebec and Manchester, England, during the summer season, and between St. John, Halifax and Manchester during the winter season, $38,933." Now, the hon. gentleman has, in addition to that, what the Minister of Trade and Commerce has said, that this is a contract for the short period of three years, that the amount stated there, $38,933, is equivalent to £8,000 sterling, that the steamers are to have a carrying capacity of 8,000 or 8,500 tons, and a speed of not less than 12 knots. All these facts have been stated to the House, and if they were repeated 15,000 times would convey no more information than they now convey. The hon. gentleman tries to convey the impression that there has been some concealment of information from the House. There are several reasons why this contract should be made in the way it is now proposed. When I was in England last year I was asked to visit the Manchester ship canal. During my visit there I was waited upon by a deputation of representative men in the town hall of Manchester, who were anxious to open up Canadian trade. They wanted to know if something could not be done to bring the products of Canada into that great centre of the consuming masses of England. I was much impressed with the representations that they made. Professor Robertson had been over there a short time before, and given them a great deal of information about the valuable agricultural resources of Canada, and of the value of Canadian trade. They wanted to trade with Canada, they wanted to know about what had been done, they wanted to know if we would not grant a steamship subsidy. I told them that the Government of Canada was not in the habit of looking around to find parties to whom to offer these subsidies, but that if they had any proposal, any scheme to submit, it would receive consideration. The promoters of the Manchester ship canal thought that it was better to establish a company over there. The ex-Minister of Finance said that many Canadian companies would have been glad to undertake this business. As a matter of fact, when the moment for decision came, we did make inquiries respecting Canadian companies, and we had good reason to believe that no Canadian company would

undertake to do the service for the amount that we proposed. But I do not hesitate in saying that even though we had a Canadian company offering to do the work, it is to the advantage of Canada that this contract should be given to this company, because it is composed of Manchester people who are interested in the development of trade. They will not have merely the interest of ordinary shareholders in a commercial company, but they will have the additional interest of citizens of Manchester, because the corporation of the Manchester ship canal are largely interested in it through their representative men. These men have great knowledge of trade, and the distribution of products to the Manchester population, and it is natural that this project should have the sympathy of the leading representatives of the Manchester people. That is what we have accomplished by this contract. I am satisfied that hon. gentlemen will appreciate the value of these considerations, and in doing so, they will come to the conclusion that even if we had a Canadian company offering to do the work, it would still be to the advantage of the trade of Canada to accept the proposal that has been made to us by these Manchester gentlemen.

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce apologized for what he did, but the Minister of Finance triumphs in it. The Minister of Trade and Commerce says that the proper thing is to ask for tenders, and he excuses himself for not doing so. But, Sir, as he sometimes makes classical references, his position is that of a Latin writer, Ovid, not remarkable for gravity, but rather for levity: Video meliora proboque Deteriora sequor. I will translate that for the benefit of hon. gentleman opposite: "I see and approve the good, and I follow the bad, or the less good." That is the position throughout this session of the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce. No man sees more clearly than he does what is the true course for a Government to take. He was telling the Conservative Government for seventeen years what is the true course to take on this very point, emphasizing the necessity of asking for tenders. But the moment he gets into office he goes back on it all. It is not in the Department of Trade and Commerce alone that we find this same backward policy, but in the Department of Public Works and in the Department of the Interior. We find the Minister of the Interior, as Superintendent General of Indian Affairs, not calling for tenders but sending round circulars.

The PRIME MINISTER. You are going to have a law clerk in Regina now.

Mr. DAVIN. Yes, his very obedient servant. But the law clerk of Regina will not exercise any censorious surveillance on his conduct in this respect. What I object to is giving out public works without tenders. We have had the Minister of Public Works getting up and saying, Yes, it is a very good thing to ask for tenders. It is the right thing, but in this case I did not do it. And as I showed last session, the Minister of the Interior, when he wants Indian supplies, instead of calling for tenders, sends round circulars to gentlemen in Winnipeg to get prices from them, as was done by the Minister of Trade and Commerce in the present case. Now the Minister of Finance has taunted the Opposition with being greatly grieved that the Yukon Bill was defeated. He says the Conservative press throughout the country are saying: Would to God you would bring in another Yukon Bill. But, Sir, we know what occurred at the caucus. We know very well that the Government wanted to bring in another Yukon Bill, and that the party would not tolerate it. We know that the Minister of the Interior wanted to force a Yukon Bill upon his party, but the party from Ontario would not stand it. Sir, in regard to the feeling throughout the country respecting that Yukon Bill, let me say there never was a policy of a Government repudiated so strongly, or in regard to which the sense of reprobation remained so strong, and will remain so long, as in regard to that patent imposture called the Yukon Bill of my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior. And yet my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce endures it all. What man ever stood up for economy, what man ever stood up for lowering the expenditure, what man ever inisted that it could be reduced, as he did? And now we find him with bloated estimates and bloated expenditures such as this country has never witnessed before, and there he sits in that Ministry, the blind Sampson toiling for the Philistines. He is no longer the man who used to be on this side of the House, because he now gets up and gives the weight of such waning authority as belongs to him, to cover the misdeeds of the men whom he despises in his heart. Take my right hon. friend the leader of the House and the Government, and for whom, so long as he led the Opposition, I had the greatest honour and regard.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. DAVIN. Hon. gentlemen opposite cheer. If my honour and regard are not the same for him, it is not because he has crossed the floor of this Chamber, but because he has abandoned the principles he advocated when on this side of the House, and it is because of the extraordinary and painful circumstance that he has gone through the length and breadth of the country making promises which he does not begin to implement now that he is in power. He came to the North-west Territories and made promises he knew very well he never intended to carry out. We have heard a great deal of the great Napoleon and the young Napoleon of Canada this session, and Napoleon seems to be the god of the idolatry

of one side of this House. When Napoleon going to Italy reached Lombardy he addressed the people, and said: "Nations of Italy I come to break your chains." When he left Italy the chains were rivetted around the Italian nations as they had never been before. So the right hon. gentleman came up like his great fellow-countryman to the North-west Territories, and told the farmers that he was going to break their chains, and yet he has been two years in power and the chains, which he said bound them in slavery of the same kind as that which bound the southern slaves of the United States, are clanking on their ankles and wrists to-day as sorely as when he came there and proclaimed that it was his mission to manumit them. Is there any promise he has kept? He went to St. Roch and promised a better Remedial Bill than that of the leader of the Opposition. He never attempted to carry out that promise. He made a promise to the bishops of his church in Quebec, but he did not implement it. And when they murmured he sent to the Vatican to get authority to muzzle them, and when he prepared a memorandum and was afterwards confronted with it and with his letters to Cardinals, he gave an evasive reply and almost totally denied the preparation of the memorandum, absolutely that he had anything to do with sending it to Rome, although it would have been no use anywhere except at the Vatican, and that it ever emanated from him. It is painful to me, as a patriotic Canadian, under any circumstances to refer to such conduct on the part of the Government as we have to complain of. For a man highly cultured, whom for many years I held in honour and regard, to act in the way in which my right hon. friend has acted is a matter peculiarly painful. The hon. gentleman behind him is in a different position. He is a professed bandit.

The PRIME MINISTER. Order.

Mr. DAVIN. If the expression is out of order, I will withdraw it as far as it can be withdrawn. As a mother of dukes said when she came out of a shop in Cheapside and found her coachman fighting with a tough: What are you fighting over"? The coachman told her, mentioning a word I will not repeat: "Because he called your ladyship a——" Whereupon Nell Gwynne said: "You fool, if you fight with every one who calls me that name, you will have to fight all London." Whether I use the word or not, I am afraid the thing is attributed to the Minister of Public Works all over this country. The young Napoleon who is Minister of the Interior, also made promises. At Moosomin he promised to give the North-west implements free of duty. What had we at Brandon, when he was engineering the fight for my late friend, Dalton McCarthy? He had bills placarded all over the town: "Vote for McCarthy and free implements." We know that the success of hon. gentlemen opposite was partially due to Dalton McCarthy, and the promise made by the Minister of the Interior, as well as the statement of the Minister of Agriculture at Moosomin, and the statement made by the right hon. Prime Minister at Winnipeg, all were to the effect that the farmers of the North-west would obtain free implements. Have they got them? Sir, the Ministry is leprous with dissimulation. A book was published some years ago in London by a man of genius, and there is a character in the book—the hero indeed—represented as the embodiment of the young Appollo. A great painter paints this man, and there he stands as the embodiment of youth and power; and this man becomes dissipated and falls lower and lower morally, and in this book he is represented as sending up a prayer that however much he might become deteriorated it would not be seen in him, but that the natural result of dissipation would appear in the picture: that all the vices would be there. He at last puts away the picture, and when after he has become lower and lower, still retaining the Appollo look of beauty and charm which was native to him, he goes one day into the attic where he had hid the picture, and looking on the lineaments which showed the moral fall of which he had been the subject, the height and depth of which were portrayed in the haggard lineaments and degraded outline, he was so completely overcome that he put an end to his life. I cannot help seeing in the speeches and otherwise traces of the degeneration of this Government in the right hon. gentleman himself. And although I do not consider that the Government will arrive at the denouement depicted in that book and put an end to its own existence, I do anticipate that an outraged country, a country which has been bamboozled, will, or else it would have fallen as low as the Italian nations at the time of Machiaavelli, will not tolerate men in power who say one thing and do the other; that an indignant people, whether soon or late, and come it late or come it fast, it must come, will sweep away from power this Government on account of its tergiversations, and in doing that it will not only uphold justice, truth and honour, but it will I hope be the means of inaugurating a government that will have in it men who will challenge the respect, admiration and confidence of the country.

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend will be included, of course.

Mr. DAVIN. My hon. friend says I shall be included. I throw personal ambition to the winds; my course in this House shows I have not been a man actuated by personal ambition. If I were, I would have taken a different course. I said to Sir John Macdonald when I was pressing the interests of the farmers against my own Government and was supported some time by the right

hon. gentleman who is now leading the Government——

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes.

Mr. DAVIN. I pointed over to the right hon. leader of the then Government and said: "I know the map of Canada as well as any one, and I know that the road I take does not lead to preferment." I preferred to do what the North-west wanted, and what I did remains, rather than take the course which would have subserved towards my own ambition, if I had any. What I did attests the fact that I am not actuated by personal ambition, or that, if I be, it is submerged beneath my loyalty to the country and my loyalty to the North-west, so that I can safely say my guiding star is my love of Canada. I can say of Canada, as a Kingston poet sung:

> For love or fame, or whatever it be,
> I give the wine of my life to thee.

And now let me point out to the right hon. gentleman something he did to extend this session. He adjourned the House from February 22 to March 1 to play into the hands of the local government of Ontario. Yet forsooth we are taunted with taking up the time of the House. I may say here that the Opposition have acted in a too generous way —I do not know what their motive was— in allowing the Estimates to pass. The Estimates for 1898-99 were scamped although you find in regard to some items that they are nearly as large as those in the Main Estimates. I say these Estimates are being scampered through too rapidly, because there is hardly one of them in which there is not an irregularity such as we are dealing with now, and hardly one of the large ones that do not suggest suspicions that we should discuss and probe. Mr. Chairman, it is so long since I troubled the House at any length that I probably have forgotten the way to address it, but I cannot without a protest see the extraordinary exhibition that we had, first of all, apology from the Minister of Trade and Commerce, and then that kind of mock heroics in which the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) can indulge with a good deal of grace and a kind of facile indignation which is not without being amusing. In fact it gives you the idea of something, I will not say infinitely small, inspired by a sense of something infinitely great, and exploding under an extraordinary and unaccustomed pressure.

Mr. CASEY. To-day we have been already treated——

Mr. DAVIS (Saskatchewan). To a trip to Coontown.

Mr. CASEY. Well, that is not the phrase I was going to use, but I think it is very appropriate.

Mr. FOSTER. And we have the flim-flammers on the other side.

Mr. CASEY. I was going to say that we have been treated to our daily fricasee of thrice-stewed absurdities. Now, there are in this fricasee which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) is so clever at concocting, several ingredients which tickle the palate occasionally, but when we have it three or four times a day and every day, and spread out at such length, and width and depth——

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Oh, no, not depth.

Mr. CASEY. Not depth; then "height" of absurdity. When we have it served up in this way and so frequently it becomes simply nauseating. I was once at a watering place where there were two rival boarding houses and each of those had its own little steam yacht which ran on the waters of the bay. The boarders of one house composed a little poem, which they used to sing to the others when they met, to the air of, "There is a happy land far, far away," an air which my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) may have heard in his youth, and the poem ran thus:

> I know of a boarding-house, four miles away,
> Where they make onion hash three times a day.
> Oh how the boarders yell when they hear the dinner bell,
> Oh, how the onions smell—four miles away.

I simply rose to say that this touching little poem always recurs to my mind when I hear my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) making his daily speeches to this House.

Mr. POPE. May I now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, be permitted to refer to the question actually under discussion. I am inclined to agree with the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) when he states that Manchester is a great centre for the consumption of Canadian products, and one that we should make a legitimate effort to reach; but of course the Minister recognizes that we have been already shipping all sorts of commodities to that market. The ship canal people are desirous of bringing trade over their ship canal, but it has not been a paying investment and on there part there is an effort to secure trade which warrants them in coming to Canada with that object in view. They are very largely Manchester people who are interested, and as the Minister says, that no doubt may redound to our benefit if we can bring them into an arrangement with us. But, Sir, the only benefit that I can see which we can derive from subsidizing this line of steamers between Canada and Manchester, is that we should have equal rates between Canada and Manchester, with the rates which now exist between Canada and Liverpool. For instance, we can always ship lumber to Manchester, but the difficulty we had to meet in the past was that we had to pay two shillings and six pence, or three shillings a standard more to Manchester

than we paid to Liverpool. If we are going to give money towards the establishment of a direct line of steamers between Canada and Manchester, it is well that the Government—if they have not done so up to the present, and we do not know they have, because the details are not before us—it is well that the Government should take into consideration the equalization of rates, and make an arrangement with the steamship company, that the rates that shall be charged on Canadian products from Canada to Manchester shall at least be not more than the rates charged from Canada to Liverpool. In that way we will receive a benefit from the establishment of a direct line of steamers, in our being able to place our Canadian products in the Manchester market as cheaply as we can now in the Liverpool market. If we are paying for the privilege by this subsidy, it is only fair that the Government should press this matter on the contracting steamship company, and for two reasons I do not think the Government will have much difficulty in accomplishing that. In the first place, the competition between the city of Manchester and the city of Liverpool, the rival jealousy, if you like to call it, between these two great centres, is so strong that it will come to the assistance of the Government in making this arrangement, and the fact that the ship canal people are very anxious to increase their traffic through the canal, and if possible get it on a paying basis, is another important factor in that direction. While I believe in the establishment of this line I would press upon the Government to use their efforts to secure us some privileges in the way of reduced freight rates on the products we ship.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. Fisher). I wish to draw the attention of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Pope) and of the House, to the fact that in entering into this contract with this company who are themselves interested in the Manchester trade, and who are composed largely of gentlemen who are interested specially in the ship canal, that in itself is a guarantee that the freight rates to Manchester will be made so as to compete to advantage with the rates to Liverpool. Furthermore, in the submission to us of a list of through freight rates from Canadian points to places near Manchester over the different railroad lines centreing at the terminus of the Manchester Ship Canal, we have the assurance that these through freight rates, by reason of an arrangement which the corporation and the city of Manchester, and the ship canal people have made with the various railway companies, the rates will be less from Canadian points to other points in the neighbourhood of Manchester, than the competing rates would be were the goods to be landed at Liverpool. This is a very important point; it is one which it is well hon. gentlemen should understand, and it is one which was a very great inducement, along with others, to us to enter into this contract. I need not again point out to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Pope) that Manchester is the centre of one of the greatest consuming populations in England, and that the markets of Manchester have the reputation of paying better prices for food products of good quality than the markets in any other part of the old country. By reason of our connection with this company, which is composed of men specially interested in the Manchester trade, we believe that we will be able to reach these markets to better advantage than by any other means. I would point out also that in my own departmental investigations as to the placing of our products on the English market, one of the greatest difficulties we have had to contend with is the finding of suitable and safe consignees for our Canadian shippers, and I trust that, by reason of having a large number of the leading merchant houses and business men of Manchester interested in this enterprise, we will be able to make arrangements by which we will be able to get the names and secure connections with consignees in England for our exports from Canada. This is one of the things which I propose to look into very carefully when I go to England, for I believe it is in the interests of our shippers here that we should make some such arrangements. I am satisfied that the encouragement of the trade in our export food products to England will be of the best possible kind, by reason of this arrangement to secure a direct line of Manchester, which is in the heart of the great consuming district.

Mr. HUGHES. When the Minister goes to the old country, I would suggest that he should visit the city of Belfast and look into the question of our being permitted to ship Canadian cattle to that market for the purpose of slaughter. Has anything been done in that connection recently? That is of even more importance to the cattle trade, because I believe that Manchester is not a port of slaughter.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, it is.

Mr. HUGHES. Then, why not Belfast?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Since the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hughes) brought the matter up before, I have received further correspondence from the High Commissioner in England, and the communications which he has had with the home authorities do not lead us to suppose that any arrangement can be made with reference to Belfast.

Mr. HUGHES. If the Minister looks into the matter when he is over there, he will find that the objections are merely sentimental.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I shall look into the matter.

Mr. POPE. Do I understand the Minister to say that special freight arrangements are made with regard to points around Manchester, but that it is not embodied in the contract ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It is not in the contract.

Mr. POPE. Has the Government made any effort to insert in the contract that the freight rates between Canada and Manchester over these lines shall be at least equal to the rates existing with regard to Liverpool ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There is nothing in the contract about that.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. We are negotiating for the right to fix the maximum freight rates, and we have been assured that they will not exceed those to Liverpool.

The MINISTER OF AGRICUTURE. Contracts with the steamship companies generally give us power to deal with the rates.

Mr. FOSTER. How long is this agreement to last ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Three years, we expect, but we are not asking Parliament to make it three years. We are only asking Parliament to make it for one year.

Mr. FOSTER. Are these steamers owned by the corporation of the city of Manchester ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. They are in process of construction. They are being built specially for this line by the corporation of the Manchester Steamship Company.

Mr. FOSTER. That is a private corporation ; it is not the municipal corporation ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. No, but the city corporation are interested in it.

Mr. FOSTER. In the criticism I made, I want my hon. friend to understand, that I am not opposed to opening up communication with Manchester. I have not said that, and I do not want that idea to go abroad. My criticism was entirely on the line of making an agreement in this private way without calling for tenders or obtaining competition with other steamship companies. It may be that the hon. gentleman would not have got to enter that competition Canadian companies that would have performed the service any more cheaply than this company ; but he would have kept intact the very important principle of inviting public competition and giving every one an equal chance, if he had called for tenders, and I am disposed to think that he could have done that and accomplished his purpose just as well. If this corporation had these extra facilities and this extra interest, its prices in the competition would necessarily have been influenced by these considerations, and, therefore, it stood in a first-class position to compete in public competition with any other company. I do not doubt for a moment that this line will be a thorough line. I could not think that this company would build ships or run a line which would not be first-class in every respect. What are the penalties for non-performance of contract, and how are the subsidies to be paid ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The subsidies are to be paid at the rate of $8,000 per annum, in quarterly instalments—the first on the 30th day of the month of September next, and at the end of each three months thereafter.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the vessels carry mails ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. It is not likely that mails will be sent by these boats. Of course, the payments are made upon the company performing the stipulations of the contract as to freight rates and regular sailing.

Mr. FOSTER. Are they to make an average of 12 knots ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. They are to be capable of steaming 12 knots, but that is not made imperative upon them.

Mr. FOSTER. There is no condition as to rate of speed at all ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. This being almost purely a freight line, I do not think we shall be able to obtain that condition.

Mr. FOSTER. I should think it would not be wise to enter into a contract, at this period of freight competition, without contracting for a fair rate of speed. If you leave that entirely to the company, I do not think that is satisfactory. A freight line running from this country to Manchester, to the largest consuming population, with the exception of London, and maybe without that exception, in Great Britain, I should think it would carry classes of freight in the delivery of which speed would count as a factor ; and I should hope that the contract is not silent as to the time within which the vessels should make this voyage. In the West India contract the speed was not to be less than 11 knots.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. As a matter of fact, the vessels did not perform it.

Mr. FOSTER. That is not the fault of the contract. The contract stipulated that they should make a certain rate of speed.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I think the contract does not go quite so far as that. All I can say in respect of that is this: I think the hon. gentleman will find that this particular company will do their very best to render a good service. He knows that in such contracts we are not always able to secure matters of that kind. As to the prices paid, compared with prices paid for other services of a like nature, these people are giving us a very good service for the amount we are paying.

Mr. FOSTER. What time is the service to commence?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. On the 1st of July.

Mr. COCHRANE. I am thoroughly in accord with the Minister in developing a trade with Manchester; but I think it would be a mistake to give a large subvention to a steamship company that would not agree to perform the service across the Atlantic in a reasonable time. The Minister knows that we are trying to develop a trade in peaches, pears and grapes from the western portion of Ontario, and this would require a reasonably fast service. My opinion has always been that where you have a slow service you should get a much lower rate, because if there is not a fair amount of speed, I do not think the good we expect will be accomplished. If you do not keep the company up to a certain rate of speed, is it not likely but that they will be lax in the time they will cross the Atlantic?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. On these liners, as the hon. member will probably remember, we have already made provision for cold storage accommodation. In discussing this matter of the speed of freight vessels with the shippers, I found that regularity and assurance that the vessels would start at a certain date is rather more important than actual speed. The shippers want to know when their goods will go, rather than that they will occupy a day less or a day more in the passage. But I do not deny that speed is an advantage, and I think the company themselves will be interested in carrying the goods as quickly as possible so as to make as many trips as possible.

Mr. POPE. Can the Minister give us information as to the space provided for cold storage, and whether the contract provides for an increase in the rate for goods carried in cold storage?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. What we are asking for is this—such refrigerator space and refrigerator appliances as the Minister may from time to time require. Of course, we will not use this money which the House entrusts to us without endeavouring to obtain the very best terms we can. I may say that the gentlemen who came over here to negotiate with us on this subject are men of considerable position, and they were desirous for their own sakes of carrying out the arrangements in the best possible manner. Their work for the first two or three years will probably be conducted at a loss. Incidentally they are to obtain a contract from the Manchester Ship Canal Company that the vessels engaged in this service shall have the use of that canal free of ship dues, and that free towage shall be given to the company when required—which is an important concession and equals a large part of our subsidy. I mention that in order that the House may understand this is not all give on our side. The Manchester Canal Company are submitting to considerable sacrifices in granting these concessions.

Mr. POPE. With regard to the ship canal, is there any refrigerator accommodation close to the docks?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I understand that there is magnificent accommodation.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The best in the world.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The corporation of Manchester have been at extraordinary pains to have elevators and proper warehouses constructed for the reception of goods carried in refrigerators, and that was one reason, and an important reason, that influenced us in dealing with them. I think the facilities in Manchester are quite exceptionally good, and the hon. gentlemen will understand how important this is, because the ships will sail alongside the wharfs or docks where warehouses for cold storage and other purposes are erected, there will be very little risk of injury in transferring our goods from one to the other. I regard that as of very considerable moment, because in that way we escape the damage which has often resulted in the transfer from the Liverpool docks to the various railway stations to which our goods are transported. And I know from experience that there is no population on the face of the earth, probably, unless it be the great Atlantic cities of the United States, who are likely to be of such large consumers of the best class of eatables that we are in the habit of exporting as the population around Manchester

Mr. POPE. The great space about the canal offers special facilities for constructing these buildings, but I did not know whether the buildings existed or not. Of course, it is absolutely important that these goods on leaving the ships should go into cold storage at once.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There is cold storage in conection with the docks, and there is a very large elevator, equipped in the most modern style. The

company that built the elevator engaged a competent constructor from Chicago, one who thoroughly understood the best and most modern details in connection with a large elevator. This elevator, I think, has a capacity of a million bushels.

Mr. MARTIN. I wish to call the attention of the Minister to the item which was recently passed. I did not catch the explanation he made, if there was one. I would like to know if the contract has been entered into for this proposed steamship communication with Prince Edward Island. I would like to know the date of the first proposed trip, the name of the contractor, if there is a contractor, the amount proposed to be given, and the number of trips it is proposed to make.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. At the present time I am in communication with three parties, Messrs. Furness, Witty & Co., of Halifax, Messrs. Musgrave & Co., of Halifax, and Mr. J. W. Carmichael, of New Glasgow. I hope to make an arrangement with one of these houses for a steamer that will make regular trips from Prince Edward Island to England. It is expected that the ship will be able to make about five trips in the season. The proposal is that the $5,000 be paid for these five trips; and, in addition, I am offering them the usual arrangement for cold storage—that is, in three years I will pay half the expenses necessary to put in cold storage facilities. I have been in communication with these three parties and have been urging them very strongly to carry out the scheme, and I trust and believe that within the next week or two one or the other will have accepted the conditions and made the arrangement.

Mr. FOSTER. Has my hon. friend (Mr. Fisher) not called for tenders for this service?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No. I have been in communication with every ship-owning firm that would be at all likely to undertake it. I have communicated with the several Montreal and other firms and asked if they would undertake the service, but received no satisfactory replies except from the three I have mentioned, and they have said they would try and meet our requirements. The first one that puts in an acceptance will get the contract; so that is practically calling for tenders.

Mr. MARTIN. I must say that the explanation is very unsatisfactory indeed.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The item the hon. gentleman has been discussing has been passed.

Mr. MARTIN. But there was no discussion, Mr. Chairman. It was passed so quickly that I had no opportunity to ask a question. Last year this question was taken up by the Minister and the whole question passed without anything being done.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. There was no vote last session.

Mr. MARTIN. But the question was under discussion.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman will notice that last year there was no vote on account of a subsidy. There was simply an effort on my part to obtain a vessel fitted with cold storage. This year, in consequence of the work of last year, we put in a vote for a vessel that would undertake the service, and we believe we shall be able to accomplish that object.

Mr. MARTIN. I thought tenders were called for and that the Minister had succeeded?

Mr. FOSTER. Why did not my hon. friend call for tenders? Has he also taken the same line as his colleagues of ignoring competition and writing to whatever friends he chooses, and making these offers. He cannot have the knowledge to enable him to write to everybody who might have an interest in tendering for this service. It looks as if hon. gentlemen opposite had started in a course of obstinately and determinedly ignoring public opinion. There can be no urgency in this case, and surely he will not plead that. What can be his reasons for not giving the public the benefit of competition in regard to this service? He can write to his friend Mr. Carmichael and other friends, but he cannot write to all the parties. What objection has he to asking publicly for tenders?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) is entirely mistaken in speaking about friends. The firms I have mentioned are not in any sense friends of mine, and, so far as I know, most of them are not friends of this Government or this party. The firm of Furness, Witty & Company are not Liberals. Musgrave & Company are not Liberals. Mr. Carmichael, it is true, is a Liberal. But he is a large ship-owner and one who might be looked to to undertake such a contract as this. In Montreal the shipping firms there knew that this offer was being made.

Mr. FOSTER. How did they know?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Because they were communicated with.

Mr. FOSTER. Did the hon. gentleman communicate with all?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We communicated with the Elder-Dempster line, the Allans, the Dominion line and the Thompson line.

Mr. FOSTER. Is my hon. friend going to adopt the rule of simply asking for tenders

for these public services by any private letters he may chooose to write ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. When a case of urgency like this arises——

Mr. FOSTER. But why is it a case of urgency——

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. If the hon. gentleman will sit down I will answer him.

Mr. FOSTER. I want the hon. gentleman to answer the question.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman has no right to interrupt me. I will answer him if he will sit down.

Mr. FOSTER. The Minister is there to be interrupted by questions.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am ready to answer the question——

Mr. FOSTER. The Minister is there for no other purpose, and my hon. friend will not make anything by——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. Minister of Agriculture has the floor.

Mr. FOSTER. What I want my hon. friend to do is to answer what is this question of urgency?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. When the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) chooses to sit down, I will answer him; but until he does, I will not. He will get no answer from me if he chooses to insist upon this method of discussion. The hon. gentleman spoke a few moments ago about urgency There could be no offer made until we knew there was going to be an item of this kind put in the Estimates. It was not put in the main Estimates, but it has been put in the Supplementary Estimates, and from that time until the present time there has been great urgency. In consequence of our not being able to put this through without a subsidy, we had to leave Prince Edward Island without cold storage facilities for the whole of last season. We found that we were going to be able to ask Parliament to give a subsidy of $5,000, and so decided upon it a few weeks ago. We wish to have this service commence in the month of June, as it is in the interests of Prince Edward Island and of the country generally that there should be no delay in the establishment of this cold storage service.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend has given the most silly excuse I ever heard a Minister give for refusing to follow the principle of public tender. He says that last year this question was brought to his attention and the matter was taken into consideration. And that is the Minister's excuse for not giving this out for tender. Urgency. How did the urgency arise ? Because he did not put the sum into the Estimates until a few days ago—because, he says, he was not aware that he could get a vote for $5,000 until a few days ago.

It was his business to be aware, it was for the Government not to treat Parliament as if it were simply a register of their votes. But he is there for the purpose, he assumes office with the intention, certainly with the obligation, to consider these things and to give the result of his considerations to Parliament. Why could he not have put it in the first estimate as well as in the last ? The excuse is a most silly excuse, as if he wanted not to give it to public tender in order to get an excuse of urgency, and so he does not put an item in the Estimates until a few days ago, and then comes down and says he kept the item out of the Estimates until a few days ago, and therefore it was urgent. Where is the plea of urgency for not putting advertisements in the papers and asking for tenders to put in at the end of the year ? Here is another gross and unnecessary violation of the principle of calling for tenders. My hon. friend is carrying out what the rest of the Ministers are doing, but he is giving a more silly excuse. He is not nearly so frank as the Minister of Public Works, who gives as the reason that he wants to peddle patronage to his friends, and for the sake of doing that, he gives it out by private contract. But he is bold enough and honest enough, if you can call that honesty, to get up on his legs and say so.

Mr. WALLACE. I think the conduct of the Minister of Agriculture towards the member for York (Mr. Foster), approaching as it does to insolence, is not to be commended in this House by any member. The Ministers appear to think that private members should get no consideration now, and the Minister of Agriculture seems to think that he is lord of the country, and that when he gets on his feet, everything else must drop. He is there to answer questions. The member for York asked a pertinent question, relative to the very matter, and the Minister of Agriculture, in his arbitrary style, demanded him to sit down, and would not hear the question to which an answer was desired. I think he might easily mend his manners in this House, and he would find that he would get along a good deal better. Now, as to the subject-matter of this appropriation, it is just an example of the unpreparedness of the Department of Agriculture. The Minister knows last summer that he had not time to do this. What was he doing ever since ? He says this service must commence in June, it is the 10th of June now. Before the Supplementary Estimates came before the House, why could he not have gone into that when the Estimates were being prepared last January ? He knew it was necessary to call for tenders and have them ready prior to bringing the matter in a pub-

lic manner before the consideration of the House. None of these things were done. But at the last moment he violates the sound principle of asking for public competition, for which in his case there was no excuse or for adopting the course that he did. The country, I can tell the hon. gentleman, will not look with satisfaction at such a slipshod way of doing the business of the Agriculture Department.

Resolutions to be reported.

ADJOURNMENT—CROW'S NEST PASS RAILWAY.

The PRIME MINISTER moved that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the House adjourns I want to call the attention of the Minister of Public Works to the fact that there is an unexplained matter with reference to J. B. Charleson's connection, now undoubted, and for a long time whilst an officer of the Public Works Department, with the hiring and despatching and payment of men for the Crow's Nest Pass Railway. I do not ask for an answer now. I will bring it up this afternoon.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 1 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Second Sitting.

FRIDAY, 10th June, 1898.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

LOUIS GATIEN.

Mr. BERGERON (by Mr. Davin) asked,

Why was Louis Gatien, ex-postmaster at Marieville, P.Q., dismissed ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). Mr. Louis Gatien was removed from the postmastership of Marieville, county Rouville, because of the unsatisfactory situation and management of the post office while under his charge, as shown by the report of the post office inspector on the case.

STEAM COMMUNICATION WITH GASPE

Mr. BERGERON (by Mr. Davin) asked,

1. Have the Government promised any subsidy to a line of steamers or to any company or person for a line of steamers to run between Montreal, Quebec and ports in the county of Gaspé ?
2. If so, to what company, person or persons ?
3. What is the amount of said subsidy ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). No such subsidy as is referred to in the question has been promised. A subsidy has been voted already for a line of steamers from Quebec to Gaspé.

CHAS. E. HOUDE.

Mr. MARCOTTE (by Mr. Hughes) asked,

1. Has Charles Ed. Houde, postmaster of St. Célestin, county of Nicolet, been dismissed ?
2. If so, at whose request and by whose influence ?
3. For what reason ?
4. Was an inquiry made ?
5. What was its nature ?
6. Who has succeeded him ?
7. By whose influence and at whose request ?
8. Is the successor solvent ?
9. Who are his sureties ?
10. Has a petition of all the citizens and principal persons of the place been received, asking that Mr. Houde be retained in the position, on account of having always done his duty ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr Mulock). The answer to the first question is yes. The answer to the other questions, except No. 10, is : that it appeared on evidence that was considered conclusive that the postmaster had actively identified himself with party politics and was an active political partisan. It also appeared that the post office inspector had reported on a complaint that a letter had been tampered with in the post office in question and had arrived at the conclusion on circumstantial evidence, that the irregularity charged had been committed at that office. Mr. Moise Girard has been appointed his successor upon the recommendation of the member of the county. The new appointee is understood to be solvent, and his fidelity is insured in the Insurance Assessment System. The answer to question 10 is that no such petition has been received.

JOHN McCALLUM.

Mr. FOSTER asked,

1. When was John McCallum appointed postmaster of Avoca ?
2. When was he dismissed from the office and why ?
3. Was there any complaint or petition from the people served by the office which led to the action finally taken ?
4. Was there any report from an inspector, and if so, what was its tenor ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). Mr. John McCallum was appointed postmaster of Avoca in January, 1862, on the establishment of the post office. 2. The post office was removed from the residence of Mr. McCallum to that of Mr. Alexander

McPhee (a more convenient situation) on the 17th of August, 1897, and Mr. McCallum accordingly ceased to be postmaster. 3. No petition was received from the people served by the district, but representations having been made that the office was in an inconvenient situation, the post office inspector at Montreal was instructed to inquire into and report upon the matter. 4. The inspector made a report to the effect that Mr. McCallum's residence was an inconvenient site for the post office and Mr. McCallum was then requested to remove the office to a more convenient situation. This he declined to do, and it became necessary to appoint another person, residing in a more central and convenient place, to the postmastership.

THOMAS BERNEY.

Mr. TAYLOR (by Mr. Mills) asked,

Was Thomas Berney, postmaster at Athens, dismissed by order of the Postmaster General; or was he dismissed by the Deputy Postmaster General without the knowledge or consent of the Postmaster General?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). The answer to the first part of the question is "yes," and to the second part, "no."

MIDDLETON POST OFFICE DISTRICT.

Mr. MILLS asked,

1. Has the Postmaster General received a petition from the town of Middleton, Nova Scotia, of which the following is a true copy:—

"To the Honourable William Mulock,

"Postmaster General of Canada.

"The petition, in three parts, of the undersigned adult citizens of the Middleton post office district, in the county of Annapolis and province of Nova Scotia, humbly showeth:—

"1. That the present post office accommodations in the town of Middleton are quite inadequate to the town requirements; the waiting-room is very small, and without any heating privileges, and the whole post office is on a meagre scale, and not at all in keeping with the other public buildings and the private residences in the said town.

"2. That the Commercial Bank of Windsor propose erecting forthwith a new brick and stone structure for banking business in said town, on the most central corner lot within four rods of the site of the present post office, and have signified their willingness to provide ample quarters for a post office in said building with all modern appliances, including fire and burglar-proof vault, lock boxes, register heat, &c., provided they are given an official guarantee that said premises will be occupied as a post office for a period of not less than ten years.

"3. That the council of the Middleton Board of Trade, favouring the proposed new site, recently convened a public meeting of the citizens to discuss the proposition made by said bank, and a resolution was at such meeting passed unanimously in favour of the acceptance of said proposition.

"4. That the rental of the new premises will be only about one hundred dollars per year, while the rental of the present meagre quarters is sixty to eighty dollars per year.

"5. That the proposed change would greatly benefit our town, at a very limited increase of cost to your department over the present rental.

"Therefore, we humbly ask your Honour to take the premises into consideration and to grant us the boon of the proposed change of post office site, and to grant to the said bank the required guarantee for the continuance of at least ten years' occupancy of the premises for said post office purposes; and your petitioners, as in duty bound, will ever pray, &c., &c.

"May 30th, 1898."

2, How many signatures are to said petition?

3. What does the Government intend to do about the matter asked for?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). A petition asking for a change in the site of the Middleton post office, county of Annapolis, was received at the department on or about the 4th instant, and was on that date referred to the post office inspector at Halifax, for inquiry and report. As the department is not at this moment in possession of the petition in question, it is impossible to say whether its terms are identical with the version given in the above question.

NARCISSE LEGRIS.

Mr. BERGERON asked,

Whether Mr. Narcisse Legris, postmaster of Ste. Eulalie, county of Nicolet, is the same Legris who wrote the following letter in "La Patrie" of April 20th last?

Mr N. Legris, mayor of Ste. Eulalie, sends us the following:—

"Ste. Eulalie, 18th April.

"To the Editor of 'La Patrie':

"I see in your paper a question which I strongly favour: the abolition of the Senate. What a grand thing it would be to get rid of the useless incumbrance

"This is no new idea for me—I have for years favoured the abolition of the irresponsible body. The time has come for this great reform, and Mr. Laurier may rest assured that he will have the majority of the people with him.

"We have no need any longer of a Senate which retards the march of progress and prevents the realization of national enterprises, such as the Yukon Railway.

"Your most devoted servant,

"N. LEGRIS."

If so, is it the intention of the Government to dismiss him, on the grounds of political partisanship and improper meddling in public affairs?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). There is nothing upon the records to establish the identity of the postmaster of Ste. Eulalie with that of the alleged writer of the letter in "La Patrie," set forth in the question. But even if his identity were established, it would hardly be conclusive that the sentiment therein given expression to, and a very sound political one, would warrant the conclusion that the author of it was guilty of offensive partisanship.

I. A. HEBERT.

Mr. GAUVREAU asked,

1. Whether it is contrary to the regulations of the department for a postmaster to be a retailer of alcoholic liquors?

2. Whether the Postmaster General is aware that Mr. I. A. Hébert, postmaster of Princeville, in the township of Stanfold, is a retailer of alcoholic liquors, either for himself or for another, or under the style and title of any firm or joint stock company?

3. Whether it is the intention of the hon. Postmaster General to discharge the said I. A. Hébert, from his position, or at least to notify him to make his choice between the position of postmaster and that of a retailer of alcoholic liquors?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. Mulock). There is nothing in the postal regulations forbidding postmasters being retailers of alcoholic liquors. It is provided in the regulations, however, that liquors shall not be sold in the same building in which the post office is kept, unless there is a complete separation between the post office and that portion of the premises where liquors are sold. I am not aware that the postmaster of Princeville is a retailer of alcoholic liquors either for himself or for others under any style or title.

APPOINTMENTS BY THE LATE GOVERNMENT.

Mr. RODDICK (by Mr. Bertram) asked,

Whether the correspondence between the Governor General and Sir Charles Tupper in July, 1896, with reference to certain appointments, was specially brought under the attention of the Imperial authorities, and if so, whether any opinion was expressed by the Colonial Office to the principle laid down and acted upon by His Excellency with reference to those appointments? If such correspondence has taken place, will the Government bring it down?

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Yes. The correspondence between the Governor General and Sir Charles Tupper in July, 1896, with respect to certain appointments, were specially brought under the attention of the Imperial authorities. The correspondence which took place was confidential; but I have the authority of the Secretary of State for the Colonies to state that he approves of the principles on which the Governor General acted, as based on the facts set forth in the letter of His Excellency to Sir Charles Tupper.

SUPPLY—THE ANGLO-AMERICAN COMMISSION.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. BERTRAM. Before this motion is carried, and because I may not have another opportunity, I wish to bring a question to the notice of the House in which the country is deeply interested, a question on which I hold a strong opinion and one on which I think I fairly voice the feelings and desires of the constituency I have the honour to represent—I refer to the Joint High Commission about to meet in the historic city of Quebec. At this moment I might say that it affords me very great satisfaction indeed, and I am sure it affords great satisfaction to the country at large, to know that a commission is about to meet in the ancient and historic city of Quebec to settle all existing differences between Great Britain and the United States in respect to Canada. I do not know anything about to take place in this country which possesses so much importance to the Canadian people as the outcome of this commission, and I am sure it will be watched with great interest. It is not my intention to speak at any length, but to bring forward one or two ideas and place them on record, holding the opinions I entertain. I cannot tell and I suppose we cannot tell, what outstanding differences will be considered. We know what some of them are, but we cannot tell all the questions that will come before this commission. I am anxious to know, and every one will be glad to know whether the trade relations between this country and the United States will engage the attention of this commission, because I feel that is a question of the greatest importance to the country. I will refer to that subject a little later on; but before doing so, I desire to say that I am in hearty sympathy with the present feeling that exists between Great Britain and the United States, and I may also say between the Canadian people and the American people. I am sure we can look forward to the future with a great deal of hope and courage when we think that the long outstanding differences are about to be settled, and I believe will be settled; and if they are settled, I think the future of the English-speaking race on this continent will be a great and commanding future, and, therefore, we are very much interested in this commission. Although we deeply regret this unfortunate war that prevails between the United States and a European country, in which Britain and Canada must maintain strict neutrality, I do not think I am going too far when I say that my sympathy, and I believe the sympathy of a great many people of this country, and particularly of the people of Great Britain, is with the United States in this conflict. There is something, I admit, pathetic in an old European country waging a hopeless contest with the American giant; but still I believe the cause of the American people is the cause of humanity, and that great good will result to Cuba and to the Spanish possessions on this continent if Spain ceases to exercise dominion over them. We can only hope that the country now at war with the United States will see before many days how utterly hopeless it

is to maintain such a struggle, and will, while they can, sue for an honourable peace.

I have every confidence myself that the American people, in the approaching conference, will meet us in a friendly spirit, such as perhaps they have never evinced for us before. The American people, the American Government has, I regret to say, always been somewhat hostile to Canada, and I, for one, believe that if a change of sentiment and feeling takes place, as seems to be taking place, it will be of immense advantage to our country. There is one thing further I would like to say. I believe an opportunity is going to be offered that has never been offered before, because both parties to the controversy are coming together in the very best possible spirit, and it is only when people approach difficult questions in a proper spirit that they are able to find a solution. It is therefore that I say that an opportunity is afforded to the people of this country, to the Government of this country, and to Canada at large, that has not been offered for many long years. But while that is the case, we Canadians must bear in mind that notwithstanding the feeling of friendship between Great Britain and the United States, notwithstanding the feeling of friendship of the Canadian people towards the people of the republic to the south, we must bear in mind that when a conference of this kind takes place, sentiment, to a large extent, has to remain in the background. And, Sir, when we come to the consideration of public questions, business questions, the commissioners acting on behalf of Canada require to be careful to do what is best for the interests of Canada and the interests of the Empire at large. Our experience of former negotiations which have taken place between Great Britain and the United States is that the American negotiator is a hard man to deal with, and we know that the American Government in all controversial questions of that kind has always been a difficult government to negotiate with. I trust, Sir, that all this has passed away, and that we will find them more amenable to reason than they perhaps have ever been in the past. I believe that our trade relations with the United States can be improved to a very great extent. I believe we can have an interchange of natural products which will be of great benefit to both countries, but still, we must come to the consideration of that question realizing that we are trying to make a bargain as to what is best for the material interests of the country. Sentiment, therefore, to a large extent, will have to give way. Our trade relations can be improved; I believe there can be an interchange of products which will be of great benefit to both countries, but just how far that interchange should go, and just to what extent it should be discussed, if discussed at all, is something that I am not able to speak of at the present moment. But, Sir, this I do say: That when we come to the consideration of that, whatever it may be, we will have to look at it from a purely Canadian standpoint as to what is best for the general interests of this Dominion, and I desire to place on record on this occasion, that so far as I am concerned, I have every confidence in the gentlemen who will form that commission representing the Canadian Government, and that confidence is not weakened notwithstanding the criticisms of my friends in the Opposition, which I have had the pleasure of listening to during the whole session. I do not believe that the Government is infallible; I do not believe that all the members of the Government are infallible; they certainly make mistakes, but we all make mistakes, and whenever a man living in this country or in any other country thinks he can manage things without making a mistake in any period of his history, that man is not fit to live in this mundane sphere, but should be translated to a higher realm.

Sir, any agreement or any conclusion that may be arrived at by this conference will have to be ratified by this Parliament, and so far as I am concerned, I have made up my mind that in the consideration of a question of that kind, I shall lay party affiliations aside, and shall support what I believe to be in the best interests of Canada, and shall reject what I believe contrary to her interests. The people of this country will, therefore, take a deep interest in this conference, and will look forward with a great deal of hope to the outcome. I do not wish to take up the time of the House, feeling as I do that the session is about to close, but I cannot refrain from placing my views on record in that connection, and from stating that I hope that when any agreement is brought before this Parliament for our consideration, it will be an agreement that we can all heartily endorse. If that should be the happy result, then, Sir, a brighter future and a more prosperous career awaits our country.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The hon. gentleman (Mr. Bertram) has put a question to the Government, in reference to which I feel it my duty to give him some reply. My hon. friend desired to know whether or not the commercial relations between the United States and Canada would be included in the subjects to be discussed by the conference which is soon to sit in the city of Quebec. At this moment, I can only tell my hon. friend that as negotiations are pending, and so long as the negotiations have not been concluded, I cannot make any statement, although I may say that it is perhaps no very great stretch of imagination to suppose that the commercial relations between Canada and the United States will form

part of the subjects to be debated between the representatives of the two countries. Sir, the Government will not be unmindful of the good and wise advice which it has just received from my hon. friend (Mr. Bertram). The Government, in which the hon. gentleman has confidence, a confidence which he says has not been misplaced, will endeavour to continue to meet his views, and to bring before this House a treaty which, though perhaps it may not be acceptable to all—it is too much to expect that we can satisfy everybody—will at all events satisfy the great majority of the people of Canada. No treaty can be made without a giving and a taking on both sides. There are, however, some difficulties to settle which, in my opinion, are perhaps more important at the present moment than even our commercial relations. There are difficulties outstanding between Canada and the United States which have marred for a great many years the good friendship which should exist between two kindred nations, and even though the commercial relations between the two countries were not to be improved, still if it be possible for us to settle these difficulties and to enter upon a new era between the two countries, my hon. friend (Mr. Bertram) will agree with me that the commission will have accomplished a great deal of good. Of course, the treaty which is to be negotiated will have to be ratified by the Parliament of Canada. It cannot be binding, and will not be made binding until after it has been approved by this Parliament, and when it is submitted for our consideration it will be open to hon. gentlemen to criticise that treaty if it does not realize the views of every member. I must say that I was very much flattered at the good opinion which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bertram) expressed of the Government.

Mr. FOSTER. You were rather surprised, were you not?

The PRIME MINISTER. Well, having heard all the ill spoken of the Government by gentlemen on the other side of the House I might have been surprised, but I am not surprised to know that it made no impression upon my hon. friend (Mr. Bertram). The Government, of course, is not perfect.

Mr. BERGERON. Hear, hear.

The PRIME MINISTER. There may be a few specks on it. I do not say that in any spirit of self-complacency, for if I were to indulge in any such spirit I would say frankly that the Government is just about as perfect as human weaknesses will allow. And, if my hon. friend (Mr. Bertram) will trust us to act in that spirit, I hope he will be quite satisfied with the treaty which it will be our duty to negotiate in a few weeks.

Mr. FOSTER. I have experienced two disappointments within the last fifteen minutes. The first was from my hon. friend from Centre Toronto (Mr. Bertram), because when he rose I expected, of course, that we should have the benefit of his views definitely expressed, with regard to trade matters, especially as his remarks hinged on that from the start. I commend most cordially to the right hon. leader of the Government, who will probably be one of those commissioners, the very clearly defined views which the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Bertram) has enunciated. My second disappointment was at the paucity of the information which the right hon. leader of the Government vouchsafed to the House, rising with that frank air which he can so easily assume, I supposed he was going to take this House into his confidence and to outline at least the basis upon which the Canadian plenipotentiaries would carry on the discussion. He has disappointed me and the House in that respect. But there has been one result from this discussion. We have had a declaration of the utmost confidence of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bertram) in his leader, and we have had a very natural expression of surprise on the part of the right hon. gentleman, who fresh from all the misdeeds of the session, could hardly have expected such a full endorsation from the hon. gentleman from Toronto (Mr. Bertram). But I could not avoid falling into a reminiscent mood. I do not know how long ago it was that my hon. friend from Centre Toronto (Mr. Bertram)—it is not very long—made the avowal in the city of Toronto that he had arranged every line of the tariff which was brought down by my hon. friend the Finance Minister.

Mr. BERTRAM. I never said so.

Mr. FOSTER. Maybe I should not use the word arranged; but at least that he had gone over the items with the Minister.

Mr. BERTRAM. I never said so.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend was so reported, and my hon. friend never denied it, and I can easily bring the reports in the Toronto papers, both in the "Mail" and in the "Globe," to refresh his memory.

Mr. BERTRAM. Allow me to explain here. That matter has often been referred to, and I will tell you now what I actually did, seeing that there has been so much discussion on the point. I never went over the different lines in the tariff with the Finance Minister and stated my views; but I did what a great many other men throughout the province of Ontario did: I sent down a statement of my views in writing regarding every item in the iron schedule, and nothing beyond that. That is all I did in connection with the tariff.

Mr. FOSTER. I am very glad my hon. friend's arduous efforts with regard to the

iron schedule resulted so favourably to his own interest. We are all naturally a little selfish, and I cannot blame my hon. friend for looking after his own interest. But his words, I think, were more inclusive—that he had had a good deal to do with the formation of the tariff. I think we can go that far with perfect agreement. So that it was perfectly fitting that on the eve of these negotiations my hon. friend should endeavour to try his formative hand upon the proposed treaty. But how many years ago was it that my hon. friend who spoke, and my right hon. friend who replied, both of them in such delightfully indefinite terms, were of the firm conviction, held as strongly as convictions were ever supposed to be held by public men, that the only salvation for this country lay in having a treaty of unrestricted reciprocity between the United States and Canada? What change has come over the spirit of my hon. friend's dream? Has responsibility as a member of Parliament and responsibility as the leader of a Government, in each case had its transforming power and effect, and turned these unrestricted-reciprocity, no-custom-house advocates, into either firm advocates of a protective system or apologists for a protective system? For my own part, I confess that I feel a little distrust, a little lack of confidence.

The PRIME MINISTER. I am not surprised at that. I am surprised at your moderation.

Mr. FOSTER. I feel just a little lack of confidence in these gentlemen who are to go to the historic city of Quebec and negotiate with the knowing and keen plenipotentiaries of the United States with reference to the trade question amongst other subjects. I feel a little lack of confidence since our plenipotentiaries will be gentlemen, who not more than five or six years ago declared throughout the length and breadth of this country that the only salvation for the trade and prosperity of this country lay in having an unrestricted commerce with the United States of America. If not the ghost, certainly the not-long-buried remains of that living fad of 1891 to 1893 will be evoked somewhere in the vicinity of the historic city of Quebec, when those keen and wideawake United States plenipotentiaries come to sit down with the gentlemen who so recently put the argument into their mouths, and put the reasons to their hands—the very best reasons they could possibly have—for urging a treaty of commerce on the lines of a taking off of duties or a mutual reduction of duties—a taking off of duties, by preference, on all articles sent backwards and forwards between this country and the United States of America. With that disadvantage these hon. gentlemen will enter into that contest of keen diplomacy, and weakened, as they are, by their past history, I am not sure but they will be equally weak in heart. As they thought that was the only right thing then, what guarantee have we that they will not think it is the only right thing in the coming summer? They change their opinions on all trade and political questions with the facility that a gentleman changes his dress. They have their winter wear, their spring costume, and their summer costume. In that respect I confess to a feeling of fear and disturbance as to what may eventuate along the line which my hon. friend evidently wishes us to infer, but does not go so far as to state openly. My hon. friend was himself born to be a diplomat, I am quite sure. With pretty strong convictions, as I well know, he has yet left the way open for himself, so that when these friends of his, in whom he now has such confidence, come back from that meeting of plenipotentiaries, if they have a trade treaty which looks in the line of protection, he can say they still command his confidence, and if they have a trade treaty which goes in the line of free trade, he can yet, with the facility which he has shown within the past few years in changing his opinions in these matters, still say: I have great confidence in the policy of the Government.

Mr. HUGHES. Before this question passes over, I wish to remind the Government of one or two points. I shall not refer to the manner in which the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) was received in Washington on the last occasion compared with the manner in which he and his colleagues were received some twelve months ago. The exit from Washington on the last occasion, I am pleased to say, was covered with much more glory than the exit on the former occasion. Whatever may have been the cause of that change in the attitude of the Government at Washington, I think it is not due to any action on the part of the present Government. But in any negotiations which may take place between this Government and the Government at Washington, it should be borne in mind that the present sympathy between the two nations may be merely temporary; and while for many years past I have been an advocate, first, of an alliance between Great Britain and her colonies, and, secondly, of an alliance between Great Britain and her colonies on the one hand and the United States on the other, in trade, and even in other matters, yet, in whatever negotiations may go on, it should be borne in mind that the first union should be between Great Britain and her colonies, and on the present occasion, in case the United States should again assume its old antagonistic attitude towards Great Britain, no step should be taken that would weaken in the slightest degree the ties that exist between Canada and the motherland. I throw out this suggestion, though I presume it is not necessary with these gentlemen. I know that the public have received the impres-

sion, and we believe, that they have undergone a change of heart in regard to our relationship with the motherland.

The PRIME MINISTER. That happens sometimes.

Mr. HUGHES. Yes, and I trust that these gentlemen will bear this in view in any negotiations that go on. I would take this opportunity of making another suggestion. The 141st meridian is the eastern boundary of the main portion of Alaska. East of that there is a little strip of territory along the coast that belongs to the United States, and that may cause a great deal of controversy. I would suggest to the gentlemen who will take part in the coming negotiations, whether it would not be worth while to see if an arrangement could not be made by which, in return for the treachery of some of the United States commissioners, in producing improper maps, and so forth, in former negotiations respecting the boundary between the United States and Canada, the United States would cede to Great Britain that part of the coast for some quid pro quo, or whether or not some other exchange of territory might not be made so as to make that strip part of British territory.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). I regret very much that that matter has been brought up, because I think the contention of Canada and Great Britain is that we own that territory now. In reference to the first point raised, the hon. gentleman of course understands that Canada cannot make any treaty, and Great Britain is not very likely to throw anything away, after all the experience she has had in the past.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. BERGERON. Mr. Speaker, before you leave the Chair, and before we grant any more money to Her Majesty, it is my duty, a very painful one, to bring before the House some answers to the aspersions of a newspaper which is the property of one of the Ministers of the Crown. And I am sorry to do it at this time of the session, because I know that every hon. gentleman here desires to go home as soon as possible. But I think I owe it to myself and to the people I have the honour to represent to do what I am doing. My hon. friend from Champlain (Mr. Marcotte) rose in this House to offer an answer to what appeared in the Montreal newspaper "La Patrie." And when I read the paper, I found my name appeared with that of the hon. member for Champlain in the article. Sir, I am not in the habit of reading this newspaper. On former occasions when the discussion on the school question took place in this House, the same paper published two or three very strong and very insulting articles about me; but I decided that it might be just as well to let them go unanswered, thinking that the paper would not mention my name any more in such a way. But now I see it has returned to the attack. Here is what I find written in large letters: "Bergeron and the case of Judas. The member for Beauharnois continues his work of Iscariot."

Mr. CLARKE. What paper is that?

Mr. BERGERON. This appears in "La Patrie" of 9th June. As I have said, I deem it my duty to myself and the people I represent to answer these articles. I have no newspaper at my disposal, and I am not in the habit of asking newspaper men to defend me. This House is the only place where I can defend myself. I have here an article that appeared in "La Patrie" of 16th May, after the discussion in question. I shall put it in "Hansard" so as to show the people in the other provinces who do not read this paper what kind of political discussions we have in the province of Quebec and how the Liberal party there is instructed, so that they may understand how unfortunate a thing it is for the Conservative party to be lacking in newspapers. We have, it is true, some very good independent papers in the province of Quebec, but we have no Conservative organ in the district of Montreal, and as a matter of course, such articles as this may go unchallenged:

WORDS AND DEEDS.

Mr. Clarke Wallace and Mr. Bergeron maintain that the school question is not settled, and have been making speeches without head or tail in their effort to stir up fanaticism and every evil passion, no matter where.

Strange to say, between 1890 and 1896, the same Clarke Wallace went through the country shouting out that the Manitoba schools must not be touched, and meantime, in the province of Quebec, we had Mr. Bergeron promising the people that the Conservative party would re-establish the schools abolished by Mr. Greenway.

During these six years, all the Conservative leaders and their friends played this double game, and in 1896 the question was bitterly discussed, and exceedingly difficult to settle. These men, who did nothing but make speeches, and who thought to get around the school struggle by the use of lying words and contradictory professions, are enraged because Mr. Laurier has redeemed his promises and secured a settlement which is satisfactory to the Catholic and French minority in Manitoba. They did nothing else but talk for six years; they want to talk again; let them talk, we will meet them with acts.

The country is not so blind, French Canadians are not so simple, as to believe that Clarke Wallace is working at this moment to secure justice for our fellow-countrymen. Clarke Wallace is a fanatic, a narrow-minded, ferocious demagogue, who has nothing but scorn for everything connected with our race, our language and our province; and this is the man with whom Horace Bergeron has allied himself in the attempt to revive the school agitation.

In the days of the Tory régime the French Canadians of Manitoba were ill-treated. They asked for justice, they petitioned and protested in every way, and Mgr. Langevin came all the way to our province to make known their grievances;

nothing was heard in every direction but the Manitoba schools; the country was sick and tired of it; the work of Parliament was paralyzed and business interests suffered from the widesprad uneasiness.

To-day Mgr. Langevin is no longer obliged to come and put forth appeals to our province. The French Canadians of Manitoba have no more grievances, they no longer complain; they have better schools now than they ever had; peace is everywhere restored, concord is general, and one feels that there is a deep current of sympathy between the various provinces of the Dominion.

The policy of tolerance and conciliation, the policy of peace and fraternity, upheld by Sir Wilfrid Laurier, has produced these consoling results; it has done more in one year for the good of the country than could ever be accomplished in twenty years by the scandalous alliance of Wallace and Bergeron.

Where was the common sense in the hon. member for Beauharnois fancying that our dear province of Quebec would follow in the wake of a coarse bigot like the member for West Norfolk?

West York they mean, no doubt.

Mr. McMULLEN. Is that all?

Mr. BERGERON. You will be very tired before I finish, if you are beginning now.

Mr. McMULLEN. Not if it is all as good as that.

Mr. BERGERON. I have some better than that.

Mr. Bergeron is a done man; he has destroyed himself. His own friends, his best supporters, shrug their shoulders in pity when they see him destroy himself by playing into the hands of an Orangeman.

Wallace is evidently more wide-awake and cunning than the ex-Deputy Speaker of the Commons. He set a trap for Mr. Bergeron, and that gentleman foolishly took the bait.

So much the worse for him.

That is one article. I have read the whole without comment, and now I have a word to say. This article says: "Mr. Clarke Wallace and Mr. Bergeron maintain that the school question is not settled." That is not quite correct. I maintain that the school question is not settled. The hon. member for West York does not say so. The other day, as the Minister of Public Works, if he had read the papers from Ontario would have seen, the Orange Grand Lodge declared that the Manitoba school question was settled. They are satisfied. The Minister of Public Works knows that, The hon. member for West York is satisfied, and the hon. Minister knows it. When the hon. Minister of Public Works writes in his paper that Wallace and Bergeron aim at an alliance, he knows very well he is not saying the truth.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Will the hon. gentleman allow me.

Mr. BERGERON. Oh, yes.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I not only did not write this, but had not even read it.

Mr. BERGERON. Mr. Speaker, this is one of the ways the hon. gentleman has to get out of a difficulty. He has done it before. During the general election, more than once I read articles which I am going to read in this House and put in "Hansard." I have read articles signed with his name, published in "Le Canadien," which can be seen on file in the library. His answer was: I did not write them, but I take the responsibility of them. He has to do the same thing now. I am not going to apply to some of his employees, to take up my time discussing these matters with his editors and sub-editors. If I attack, I attack himself; and if he does not want me to attack himself, let him tell his valets not to attack me in his paper. When the hon. Minister of Public Works says that there is an alliance between the member for West York and myself, he says what is not true.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I did not write that.

Mr. BERGERON. The alliance was between the hon. member for West York and the hon. Minister of Public Works, when for two or three months they blocked the proceedings in this House and prevented the passage of the Remedial Bill. Now, this article shows the kind of work that is going on in the province of Quebec by hon. gentlemen opposite in trying to rouse these prejudices and bad feelings which it has been their policy to arouse for the last five years, by means of which they managed to get into power, but which will not help them to retain power very long. When the Minister of Public Works says: "Monseigneur Langevin is no longer obliged to come to and put forth appeals to our province," does not he know of what is called "Manitoba Pence"? In every one of our churches orders have been given by our bishops to take money in the churches for the Manitoba schools, and this is done at the request of Monseigneur Langevin, the Archbishop of Manitoba. So when the Minister of Public Works says the French Canadians no longer have a grievance, that they no longer complain, he is saying that which, as a matter of fact, is not true. This is the way he is trying to educate those who read nothing else but his paper. Now, there was another article in "La Patrie" on the 16th of May:

A DESPERATE MOVE.

The alliance between Mr. Clarke Wallace and Mr. Bergeron with a view to a revival of the agitation on the Manitoba school question, is nothing more or less than scandalous.

How are we to account for this backward movement of the Tory party, unless it be that they are at the last gasp, that they have no policy——

I suppose, since the hon. gentlemen have stolen our policy, they think we have not got any more——

——and no leaders left, and that the general policy of the Laurier Ministry is unassailable ?

Now, the hon. gentleman gets many compliments from his friends behind him ; I will show by and by what kind of compliments he received some years ago from the same source.

If there were a leader at the head of the Opposition, if Sir Charles Tupper enjoyed the confidence of the members on the left, if our adversaries were able to agree as to the course to be adopted by their party, and on the man to direct that course, does any one believe that such an attempt would be made to revive difficulties, troubles and animosities which have already produced such disastrous results ? Would an attempt be made to renew the dangerous agitation which prevailed from 1890 to 1896 ?

Now, can anybody be more brazened-faced than the man who writes like that? Nearly all the trouble that has been created on that question was created by the Liberal party. The Conservative party had no other object but to settle it. It could not do the Conservative party any good if they were in power.

Mr. McMULLEN. But they wanted to hold office.

Mr. BERGERON. If they had wanted to hold office, the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) knows that they would have acted quite differently. In order to retain power Sir Charles Tupper had only to abandon the school question, and he would be in power to-day with a large majority. But my object in reading this is to show how the people of our province are educated by the Minister of Public Works. Surely they will not find a word of truth in all this article. Let us continue :

If the Tuppers, the Fosters, the Wallaces and the Bergerons were in a position to assail the general policy of the Laurier Cabinet, if they could find fault with the new tariff, if business stagnation prevailed, if there were increasing deficits, if our rural districts were being depleted by emigration, if we were building Curran bridges, or lapsing into McGreevyism, does any one fancy that Clarke Wallace and Horace Bergeron would attempt to revive the school question ?

No, but the Government is working conscientiously in the interests of the country, business is most satisfactory, trade is increasing, agriculture is prosperous, repatriation has succeeded to emigration, our finances are rapidly approaching to equilibrium, the era of deficits is over, the tariff has been amended without injury to our national industries, in short, all goes well in the best of worlds.

And dredging contracts are left in the family.

In sheer desperation, being unable to assail the beneficent policy of the Laurier Government, and not knowing where to strike, the Tories want to embarrass our friends and galvanize their own supporters by an attempt to revive the school question, and hand it over as a prey to political passions.

They have entrusted the vile task to Mr. Clarke Wallace, the leader of the Orangemen, and to Mr. Bergeron, who would fain be a leader of something ; but surely these men represent neither Mgr. Langevin nor the French population of Manitoba, nor the Manitoba clergy, in their criminal and factious scheme.

Since Mr. Laurier and our friends have taken office, we have enjoyed peace ; fraternity and concord between the several races and provinces have replaced, most happily, the animosities of recent days, and a new spirit, so to speak, has arisen in our country.

For nearly two years now, national jealousies and creed prejudices have been mute, and all our energies, good-will and devotedness have been directed towards the progress, prosperity and development of our noble country. And in Manitoba the principle of conciliation has of itself made such headway, that there has been found to the satisfaction of all parties interested a modus vivendi which has given excellent schools to those of our race in that province and removed former grievances.

Mr. Laurier's appeals to peace and tolerance have produced these splendid results.

The patriotic effort of our leader, for the public good, for the national dignity, and the advancement of our people, have stifled, as though by enchantment, the base and rancourous squabbles which have done us such harm since 1890.

To-day, certain politicians without character, such as Mr. Clarke Wallace and Mr. Bergeron, certain dull champions such as Mr. LaRivière, who have never fought for anything but plunder, a few fanatics and a few ambitions men, want to compromise our well-being, disturb public order, and this era of progress and activity, this glorious period of concord upon which we have just entered ; but the national conscience and the will of the great masses of the people will soon silence the wretched agitators.

Now there are some compliments here. The Minister of Public Works speaks of men without character "who have never fought for anything else but plunder." But the Minister of Public Works who speaks about plunder has fought an election with me, and he has never been able to prove any of the accusations which he brought against me in my county for a month, during my absence, when I was sitting in that Chair. He knows it, and he knows that he cannot touch one hair of my head. The man who is up to his knees in it, talks of people who have never fought for anything else but plunder. He speaks about ambitious men, "men who compromise our well-being and disturb public order," when he for five years has been promenading through the province of Quebec and writing in every paper where he could put his pen, trying to arouse national and religious feelings in this country. Sir, that is the opinion of the Minister of Public Works. Is his opinion worth anything ? Let us see what he said of the man whom he now calls his chief, but whom once he wished to stone ; let us see what he wrote of Mr. Laurier in 1878. I will now read from "Le Canadien," of 4th September, 1878, which was edited at that time by the present Minister of Public Works :

How shall we qualify the act of Mr. Laurier swallowing up his own statements, in order to

court his king and master, Mr. Mackenzie ? How shall we qualify that man who, in order to keep his portfolio in the Ministry, is low-minded enough to allow the interests of his province to be sacrificed ?

Now, on the 11th of September, 1878, the same paper says :

Mr. Laurier has falsified all his pledges,——

Even at that time.

——and now he has made up his mind not to take any more engagements. Are the electors going to stultify themselves by returning to Parliament a man who thus trifled with his promises, a man who, believing himself superior to public opinion, only concerns himself about his own interests and those of a favoured few.

Another article :

LAURIER UNWORTHY OF THE CONFIDENCE OF THE ELECTORATE.

Is Mr. Laurier entitled to the confidence of the electors of East Quebec for having carried out the famous platform of 1872, for having allowed the interests of our city, those of our province and of our country to be sacrificed, without even uttering a single word in their defence ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Will the hon. gentleman state what the answer of the people of Quebec was ?

Mr. BERGERON. I am reading from the paper published by the Minister of Public Works. The hon. gentleman will find the answer contained in different articles. I now read an article headed "Laurier Crouches before our Enemies" :

(From "Le Canadien," Nov. 21, 1877.)

After accepting a portfolio, Mr. Laurier sought re-election at the hands of his old electors of Drummond and Arthabaska, but was defeated, and deservedly so. Now, in that woeful plight, he comes before you, begging humbly of you to return him to Parliament, so as to enable him to retain that portfolio, which he has bought by cringing and fawning before his masters.

Let us calmly consider his acts, his policy, and ask ourselves whether the defeated Minister who is now seeking your votes is worthy of your confidence and support. Did Mr. Laurier in the least concern himself about your interests ever since he had a seat in the House of Commons ? Did he not support Mr. Mackenzie through thick and thin, to the detriment of the dearest interests of our city and of our province ?

Has Mr. Laurier ever stood up and advocated on the floor of Parliament our claims and our rights ? I say, no. Like all the followers of the party in power, he has only been the tool of the Prime Minister.

Here is an article under the title of "Laurier, a second-rate politician." :

(From "Le Canadien," Nov. 26, 1877.)

Should "L'Evenement" condescend to ratiocinate just once, it would be quite at a loss to show us on what ground Mr. Laurier is entitled to be styled "a great statesman," "a genius," which the Rouge press very foolishly bestow upon him. We challenge "L'Evenement" to cite to us a single remarkable act accomplished by Mr. Laurier, since or before he entered public life. Did he ever bring before Parliament a single measure of any kind worth mentioning ? Now, as a public speaker, he is on record for nothing else but his bombastic eloquence, worthy of a college boy. I ask again, what has he done worth mentioning ? What principle did he ever advocate ? What reform did he ever inaugurate?

Is it enough for one to be styled a great statesman to have edited for a few years a small radical sheet, founded by "l'Enfant Terrible" ? Is a man to be called a "genius" the moment he can deliver a few high-sounding, pompous but meaningless phrases ? Is a man to be called clever from the fact that he contradicts himself from one day to another ?

I now read an article headed "Laurier prostitutes his seat" :

(From "Le Canadien," 11th Dec., 1877.)

No sooner had Mr. Laurier taken his seat in the House of Commons, and found himself in the presence of Mr. Mackenzie, than he said : "The victory won by the Liberal party in Quebec is evidence of the confidence reposed by the people of the province in the Prime Minister. I am proud to lay it at the feet of my leader."

Electors of East Quebec, when you returned Mr. Laurier to Parliament, and secured the victory for him, was it in order that he might lay it at the feet of Mr. Mackenzie ?

We were right, therefore, when we stated that Mr. Laurier, like his predecessors, would prove but the humble servant of the autocratic Prime Minister !

No sooner was he back in the capital than forthwith he was seen kneeling down at the feet of his master and resuming the heavy chains which his predecessors had been bound with.

Here is an article headed "Laurier, a political weather-cock as a protectionist" :

(From "Le Canadien," August 12, 1878.)

In order to show that the Liberals were the first champions of protection in our province, we quoted the utterances fallen from Mr. Laurier, in the Legislative Assembly, in 1871 : "Were I living in England," he said, "I would advocate free trade ; but as I am a Canadian, residing in this country, I am of opinion that we need protection. Great Britain is a free trade country because she gets an admittance into the markets of the whole world for the output of her great industries. As for us, Canadians, we should advocate protection in order to create and foster our great industries, and give them the control of the home market, which will expand with the progress of our manufactures."

Why did Mr. Laurier advocate protection in 1871, at a time when the manufacturers did not complain ? Why does he deny it to them now, at a time when the country needs it so badly ? But this is only a sample of Liberal logics. Mr. Laurier adduces the strongest arguments in favour of protection and he votes against it. Such a contradiction would seemingly be a puzzle, did we not know that, like all his colleagues in the Liberal party, he has staggered and fallen a victim to the allurements of power and the benefits accruing therefrom.

Mr. McMULLEN. The Minister must have been a Tory then.

Mr. TURCOTTE. The hon. gentleman has changed his views.

Mr. BERGERON. I have not changed my views. There is no difference.

Mr. TURCOTTE. The hon. gentleman changed in 1886.

Mr. TALBOT. In 1887 he changed.

Mr. BERGERON. The hon. gentleman does not know what he is talking about. He can go and read my programme in 1887.

Mr. TALBOT. I know it perfectly well.

Mr. BERGERON. If the hon. gentleman can read, he can go and read "Hansard," and he will there find how I voted. The hon. gentleman can make a plea like that on the hustings, but not here. The hon. member for Megantic (Mr. Turcotte) can also turn to the "Hansard," if he can read, and he can there see my votes.

Mr. TURCOTTE. You were in my county.

Mr. BERGERON. The hon. gentleman can take my speeches as they appear in "Hansard" and read them to this House, and I shall be glad if he will do so, because some hon. members will then learn something. Here I have another article headed "Laurier, has been over-estimated; he is ignorant":

(From Le Canadien," April 8, 1878.)

We have, over and over again, of late, challenged the Liberal papers to show on what ground Mr. Laurier is entitled to be called a great statesman, a title which is bestowed upon him by the Liberal papers with more enthusiasm than wisdom. They have not thought it worth while to vouchsafe us an answer. According to those party papers, Mr. Laurier is undoubtedly a man of genius, a profound politician. And even had the young member performed no other wonders than delivering a hundred times over the same schoolboy's speech, the same bombast, his Liberal admirers would none the less continue lavishing upon him their incense.

To speak the truth, they have killed their man, politically speaking, with their fulsome flattery, the most inglorious way of dying that there ever was.

We have repeatedly warned our friends, the Liberals, that they were rendering Mr. Laurier a bad service when extolling him up to the skies before he had done anything to place himself above the common level of men, before he had done something remarkable. We told them that "credit which was grounded upon editorial puff was like a house built on sand: both were doomed to ruin." But the trouble is, the Liberal papers disregarded our advice, and continued as before, lavishing their cheap incense on their idol. The result was easily foreseen. When Mr. Laurier was given a portfolio in the Mackenzie Administration, the Liberals repeated in unison: "Now, you may look forward to a change for the better in the management of our public affairs; now you may expect to see the province of Quebec resuming her lost influence; now you are going to see a statesman at work." We knew very well what kind of wonders Mr. Laurier was likely to perform; we were well aware that he would sadly disappoint those people who innocently believed the statements of the Liberal press; but we hardly expected to see our course so fully and so soon vindicated by subsequent events.

We fancied that, after Mr. Mackenzie had shelved him in a subordinate department, Mr. Laurier would be prudent enough to keep silent, and thus preserve unimpaired, for one session at least, his reputation as a statesman. But how suddenly and irretrievably did he fall down from the pedestal upon which his friends had hoisted him, amidst the jeers and cheers of the House and the country at large! And when he fell, he fell like Lucifer—never to rise again! For while public opinion freely condones a mistake, or an error in judgment in a political man, it never excuses a man who makes himself ridiculous. As Minister of the Interior, Mr. Laurier had charge of the Bill further to amend the Acts respecting stamps on bills and notes. * * * * *

We do not intend now to discuss that Bill; we only wish to draw public attention to Mr. Laurier's complete and sad failure, which has for ever destroyed his prestige.

Mr. Laurier has shown a deplorable ignorance of the details of the Act which his Bill intended to amend; he literally got entangled, and the members burst out laughing, while Mr. Mackenzie kept frowning in a very significant way.

Another one:

LAURIER, THE RINGLEADER OF BULLIES.

(From "Le Canadien," Sept. 12, 1878.)

The public feeling, as evinced at the meeting called by Mr. Laurier, ought to have satisfied him that he shall no longer be allowed to trifle with the voters, to scoff at the sufferings of the people, and to falsify his pledges with impunity.

At the opening of the meeting, the majority of those present called out: "Vallière." That was the signal for Mr. Laurier's bullies to spring on the citizens who were within their right when calling for the people's candidate to address the meeting, and protesting against the course pursued by Mr. Laurier ever since he sat in Parliament for East Quebec. Mr. Laurier had, seemingly, the command of the bullies, as we were told by trustworthy and respectable people that he was heard several times crying out: "Strike! strike!"

We sincerely regret those exhibitions of brutal force. Mr. Laurier's political record shows that he has fed all his life on violence. At the last election in Drummond and Arthabaska, an unfortunate father of a family was killed. The poor man fell a victim to the imprudence of those men who, in Mr. Laurier's interests, had urged him to acts of violence.

At St. Roch's Mr. Laurier wants to do what he did at Arthabaska, crush the popular will.

In a word, it is by means of terror and "iron knuckles" that Mr. Laurier means to be returned to Parliament.

Now is the time for all free men to rise against Mr. Laurier's tyranny, who refuses to do anything for us, and whose only concern is to pocket his salary of $8,000 a year.

Another one:

LAURIER'S UNGRATEFULNESS AND FICKLENESS.

(From "Le Canadien," Dec. 7, 1877.)

No sooner had the young Minister been extricated by the electors of East Quebec from the very serious strait he found himself in, by returning him to Parliament and enabling him to keep his portfolio, than he ungratefully came out and stated before the country that his benefactors' usefulness had gone. He has already for-

gotten the pledges he took during the electoral contest, and no sooner had he taken his seat in Parliament than he turned his back on those who had placed in him their confidence.

Were we not warranted, we ask, in warning the electors of Quebec East not to be led away by their feelings, and not to listen to the fine words of the new Minister of the Interior? Were we not warranted in stating that he only aimed at securing a seat in the House, in order to keep his portfolio and his salary? What does that young stranger care for the interests of East Quebec and for the needs of the working classes? He has succeeded in keeping his portfolio and his salary.

* * * *

Here is another one:

LAURIER A HUMBUG.

(From "Le Canadien," June 4, 1877.)

It is rumoured that Mr. Fraser, N.P., of l'Avenir, is going to run against Mr. Laurier, stating that he is sick at heart at being represented by such a time-server. The news at hand from the country are to the effect that the electors are tired of being humbugged by Mr Laurier.

LAURIER INSULTS THE IRISH.

(From "Le Canadien," June 9, 1877.)

While trying to justify his vote on the tax on tea, Mr. Laurier has splendidly availed himself of the opportunity to insult the Irish people. His contention was that as Canadians drink very little tea, the tax on that article cannot be very burdensome to them. He further stated that those who were not likely to complain of it were the Irish, who do without bread in order to buy whisky, tea or potatoes. Besides, as he said to the electors, those who cannot afford to drink tea may drink water.

LAURIER A MAN OF NO ABILITY.

(From "Le Canadien," Oct. 2, 1877.)

Mr. Laurier is no cipher, and still less can be styled a man of talent; he is what one might call a shallow mind, a second-rate politician. He is not a well-informed man, as evinced by his speeches, never rising above the level of popular prejudices, upon which he likes to speculate and, as a matter of fact, therein lies the secret of his popularity, which is tantamount to saying that he will leave behind him a political record that will never prove beneficial to the country nor creditable to his party. By making two or three stump speeches a year, he has built up for himself a reputation as a public speaker, but the fact is that he is a vulgar rhetorician. The public speaker, as defined of old, is the upright man, skilled in uttering what is right; but Mr. Laurier's skill consists in making utteranecs so disposed to arouse in the hearts of his hearers the worst passions.

WE OUGHT TO DREAD A CHANGE OF GOVERNMENT.

(From "La Canadien," Sept. 24, 1877.)

We Canadians are a thoroughly conservative people. We are still young, and our record is but of yesterday. We enjoy all the desirable liberties, provided we only know how to prudently and wisely use them. We respect our institutions, and do not feel like upsetting our Government just for the fun of the thing. Contented with the rights and privileges won for them by the Conservative party, throughout a lease of power of thirty years, the Canadian people, as stated by the "Globe," now require nothing but an honest administration of public affairs.

Can we hope to compass that end with the men now at the head of affairs? We say no, because the Liberals have so far shown by their record that they lack the necessary talent and stamina for making good laws, while in the management of public business they have proved inefficient and extravagant. How can we expect those men to prove honest and incorruptible in the management of public affairs when we consider their past record and recall to mind such administrative misdoings as the too famous purchase of steel rails, and such jobs as those of Fort Francis, of Goodrich Bay, of the Georgian Bay, &c., &c.

J. ISRAEL TARTE.

This is signed J. Israel Tarte, and in fact I should have said that all the others are from J. Israel Tarte also.

Mr. McGREGOR. Tell us about your experience as a Liberal when you were defending Riel and opposing the Tories.

Mr. BERGERON. I can tell my hon. friend (Mr. McGregor) about his clan in Scotland.

Mr. McGREGOR. The clan is all right.

Mr. BERGERON. My hon. friend from West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) knows something about that clan.

Mr. McGREGOR. So do I.

Mr. BERGERON. Now, this is what the Minister of Public Works wrote about the right hon. Premier. Did he write the truth or not? What he said there, is it his opinion or not? If it is what he writes in his paper to-day, how can he and his chief agree together? If it is not, what is his opinion worth? But that is not all. The Prime Minister also one day gave his opinion of men like the Minister of Public Works. Speaking in the Club National, in Montreal, in the month of May, 1884, he said:

We, of the Liberal party, as my friend Mr. Préfontaine has said, are privileged. One must be born Liberal; he cannot become so. Whoever, not being born Liberal, will become one, will not persevere. He will either become a traitor or a renegade.

Mr. DAVIS. What is the hon. gentleman reading from?

Mr. BERGERON. A report of a public meeting.

Mr. DAVIS. Is that a translation?

Mr. BERGERON. Yes, that is the opinion of the Prime Minister in answer to all the insults lavished on him by the Minister of Public Works in his paper, "Le Canadien." Now, I find an article which was published in a newspaper which afterwards became a Liberal organ, but which has to-day disappeared. I am speaking of "Le Canada" of 1895, which published an article on the 26th of October, which I also

wish to have in "Hansard," because in this article the whole career of the Minister of Public Works is pretty well exposed:

For Mr. Tarte there is in the whole world but one clever journalist, but one able politician, and but one honest and disinterested man, and that of course is himself. To hear him talk you would think he was ever and always a persecuted victim. He is ever and always playing a part, that is the part of a victim, until he has become a perfect bore. Then again you find him so loaded up with awful secrets that he continually breaks out in threats against every judge, or politician, or doctor in sight, and against every member of the Conservative party. That he does not break down utterly beneath his burthen is simply because he is one who bides his time. "The day will come, which is not yet, when I will bite the man by whom I am bit." And it is the hope of vengeance that steadies his nerves and keeps him on his feet. He thinks himself indispensable, his pockets are crammed with little scraps, and has little thought for a fellow-worker, an unworthy confrère. He bemoans his troubles, and is envious of the happiness of others. One would think him jealous.

This bundle of self-conceit is quite unable to reflect the sound opinions of others. Himself and nothing but himself. And yet, after all, what is Mr. T.?

He was a clever youth of whom Mr. Dansereau made a journalist by putting him on the staff of a paper, for which he made a reputation for a time, until he one day became too high and mighty in his own conceit and fancied he could stand alone, when of course down he came with an awful crash.

Mr. Tarte considers all politicians as rogues, boodlers and wire-pullers. He is an adept in the work of running down French Canadians and in belittling our French Cabinet Ministers.

Mr. TALBOT. How many times has that paper changed its political colour?

Mr. BERGERON. It has changed it very often. The hon. gentleman knows the man who wrote that:

He has a craze, which is shared to some extent by all our Liberal newspapers, for hunting down French Canadians. But what has been his own record? It would be hard to find a man more seriously compromised or more often involved in equivocal positions—exceedingly hard! He manipulated the funds of certain Conservative election committees. Hence it is that at times—too often, in fact—he threatened to make known dreadful things, which would compromise some Cabinet Minister, or some judge. The "Gazette" dared him repeatedly to speak out, and he then took to silence. Besides, what had he to say? He had told all he had to tell, in fact, too much for his own good! He had compromised himself. And we also defy him to prove that his conscience is not loaded down with crimes and delinquencies. But Mr. Tarte will not speak, for the simple reason that he would have to do his own scavenging.

What did he do with the Whelan moneys in 1882, or thereabouts? He maintains that he gave them to his Conservative friends, at the elections. It is false. What did he do in the Beemer matters about the Quebec water works? He made money and boasted of it himself. What did he do in the matter of the Megantic road? He made money. He himself says so. What did he do as to the Témiscouata Railway speculation? He made $30,000, and has just admitted it in Guelph. And when he found himself master of a fortune of $75,000, what did he do? This we shall see later.

As a journalist Mr. Tarte did not make more millions than his fellow-craftsmen, whom he treats so cavalierly. Their task is a thankless one, and he suffered as others did and do. Mr. Tarte, the politician, has made money. By what means? He is the person who should state it publicly, just as he told it privately on occasion to his Conservative friends. Did these men but make up their minds to follow in his footsteps, this pretentious hero would have to hide his face.

He, the great accuser, the unflinching demolisher, the enemy of every great name, and envious of the success of others, would to-morrow be himself the accused, the convicted, if we were to show him up as he is.

He courted fortune assiduously. For a time he felt himself a great man. He set up a princely establishment in Quebec, and made trip after trip to Europe. In this way he became connected with the clique who was to lead him to ruin. With the downfall of the potentate who for five years held the province of Quebec in his grasp, he also fell, and his fortune melted "like butter in the stove," simultaneously with that of the man who had helped to lay its foundations deep and wide.

Whose fault is it that Mr. Tarte was not made a Cabinet Minister? Is it due to the Conservatives whom he is now denouncing without measure, and whose power and influence in the country excite his envy? No, he has no one to blame but himself. His craze for injuring other people has brought him to ruin and rendered him despicable in the eyes of both parties alike, and an object of suspicion to all. What he formerly worshipped he now casts into the fire. And the men whom he denounced, despised, and looked down upon of old are now his allies. The latter tolerate and endure him simply because he forced himself upon them, and is still doing so. But he is a dead weight on them. To-morrow there will be another shuffle, and then Mr. Tarte will become again—what? What he was from the first—a little man of talent fostered by some Mecœnas.

Mr. Tarte has a newspaper (an ultra paper like "La Verité" or "The Orange Sentinel"), the lowest and most despicable of Canadian journals, as those of that type ever are, the plague of journalism in every country. "Le Cultivateur" swears by Mr. Laurier. If Mr. Tarte were as respectful towards our political leaders as the latter and all Conservative papers are towards the leader of the Opposition, there would be twenty Lauriers of high renown on our political stage. For who lifted Mr. Laurier on to the pedestal he now occupies? Mr. Tarte will not deny that it is due to the respect the Conservatives have for him, in spite of his own lack of self-respect in allying himself with Mercier. The political character of Mr. Laurier has been often and violently assailed, but his social character has never been treated as Mr. Tarte treats French Canadian Ministers of the Crown and journalists of acknowledged standing in the country.

Mr. Tarte is a skilled journalist. He is a bitter antagonist, however, and tricky. That is all. That is the man. There is nothing in his stock-in-trade to entitle him to show contempt for men of his own blood and country, simply because they venture to differ with him.

This article gives the pedigree of the Minister of Public Works, and he has never taken upon himself to bring the man who

wrote that article into court to answer for what he accused him there. Now, I wanted to show the Minister of Public Works what happens to a man who either insults his colleagues in Parliament, or pays somebody to insult them. I have said enough for to-day. I have said enough to show the hon. gentleman that when the hon. gentleman speaks of treason, he speaks without any basis to go upon, and that he is the arch-traitor, if there is anything of the sort here.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER. That expression is not in order.

Mr. BERGERON. I am answering a newspaper in which the Minister of Public Works called me a traitor.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Take it back.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, let the hon. gentleman speak out his mind.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The expression is certainly not in order.

Mr. BERGERON. If you, Mr. Speaker, rule that the word is too strong, I will take it back. But I wish to say this to the Minister of Public Works, that he had better hold his hands from injuring me. Parliament is about to close, I have no paper at my disposal, and I can tell him that I am not going to bring him before the courts, for I do not believe much in that, and have seen too much of that. But I promise him that if he insults me again in his newspaper, I have still something in my desk, which I will give to him next session.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am not directly or indirectly connected with "La Patrie." I did not write or even read the articles to which the hon. gentleman has referred. I have no time to read the newspapers. As for the articles published in "Le Canadien," twenty or twenty-five years ago, I am not very much concerned with them now. Some of the articles which then appeared in "Le Canadien" no doubt were written by me, but I am quite sure that others were written by colleagues of mine who were working with me on that paper at the time. I shall not say anything more except this. My hon. friends, the Conservative leaders, may very well understand why it is they are losing ground in the province of Quebec when they have as allies such men as the hon. member for Beauharnois.

Mr. FOSTER. Just on that point, I may say that this must be the one reason why we are losing ground in the province of Quebec, if it be true that we are losing ground in that province. This reason has been very well illustrated by the style of the articles which have been quoted from "La Patrie." Whether my hon. friend edits "La Patrie" or not is beside the mark. Every one knows his connection with that paper. Every one knows the connection of that paper with the Government and the party to which my hon. friend belongs, and it is not reasonable to suppose that anything unpleasant or unsuitable or not in the line of thought of the Minister of Public Works would appear in "La Patrie." He knows that we may take "La Patrie" as a very good example of the peculiar political arts of my hon. friend. "La Patrie" is the Liberal organ in the province of Quebec. It is the personal organ of my hon. friend, the Minister of Public Works. To it, in the early part of his ministerial career, the hon. gentleman contributed regularly over his own name, until his colleagues called him down from that very unusual position.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That is altogether inaccurate.

Mr. FOSTER. And now he gets the work done, but it is done just as effectively and as much in the line of my hon. friend's peculiar political methods. Here is an article which lately appeared in "La Patrie." I have no quarrel with "La Patrie," if it chooses to rate the standing and inteligence of its readers down to the calibre of its articles. That would be a ground for sympathy with the readers. A little while ago, on the 9th of May, an article appeared in "La Patrie," and here are some of the choice bits :

> The Clarke Wallaces, Fosters and Tuppers are no longer willing to expend a cent in our province ; they want to appropriate to the English provinces exclusively the two or three hundred thousand dollars yearly expended on repatriation and immigration.

What a beautiful spirit that shows ! How that tends to the intelligent instruction of the electors ! What a fine issue that is on which to gain over the electorate of this country ! Then the article proceeds :

> We venture to think that the good people of the district of Quebec will bear in mind, when the proper time comes, this opposition offered by our adversaries to progress and development of the Lake St. John valley. Was it in order to please the province of Quebec, think you, that on Friday last, Messrs. Clarke Wallace, Foster and the other prominent Tories spoke and laboured in the effort to prevent Canada from being represented at the Paris Exposition of 1900 ?

Mr. CAMPBELL. There is no mention of Bergeron there.

Mr. BERGERON. Have you not had enough of Bergeron ?

Mr. FOSTER. I am really surprised at the intelligence of my hon. friend. How quickly he took that up.

> Was it in order to please the province of Quebec, think you, that on Friday last, Messrs. Clarke Wallace, Foster and other prominent Tories spoke and laboured in the effort to prevent Canada from being represented at the Paris Exposition of 1900 ?

Hon. members know exactly what position was taken with reference to the Paris Exposition by these gentlemen. The hon. Minister of Public Works knows. This is the kind of food that my hon. friend gives out to the good people of the province of Quebec.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Read the "Mail" exery day.

Mr. FOSTER. To train and educate the electors of that province, in this solid and intelligent way, and vote for him and his party

They are fanatics who are prepared to sacrifice our general interests rather than have any dealing with France.

That is an honourable sentiment. How that does tend to the up-lifting of the nationality of Canada. How that does tend to make electors broad-minded and free from prejudices—going out of his way to put food of this sort before the French people to make them believe that the Wallaces, Fosters, and the Tuppers and other Tories are fanatics who are prepared to sacrifice our general interests rather than have any dealings with France. Are there any others on that side who have that high opinion? There are. I am sorry that any gentleman is willing to acknowledge it.

The Tory leaders have no objection to our voting moneys for representations at the exposition in Sweden, Norway or Belgium, but we must not spend one cent for a French exposition.

Eminently true, is it not, and eminently high-minded as well?

Is it not clear that they assume a hostile attitude towards the exposition of 1900, simply in order to strike at the legitimate sentiment of our old French province, and to wreak vengeance on us for the humiliation inflicted on them in our province on 23rd June, 1896.

What an appeal that is to broad principle. Not a touch of prejudice in it. That is the paper which is the organ of the Liberal party in the province of Quebec, which is right under the eye of the Minister of Public Works, and for every sentiment in that $30,000 newspaper the Minister of Public Works is responsible. He wields it, it will turn as he directs, he is the responsible man who directs its policy. If he is not, let him, as an honest high-minded man, get up in this House to-day and repudiate the sentiments I have read. Will he do it? No, Sir. He does not want to be held responsible for them. Some one else may write them for him, and he is willing to take the benefit, if there is a benefit, that comes from the distribution of such appeals. The article goes on:

On sundry other questions, the Wallaces, Fosters and their friends have sought to hide their animosity against our province, but the two instances we have given are enough to put our people on their guard against the men now leading the Conservative party and against their detestable tendencies. The course of events in the enemy's camp should encourage us to draw closer than ever to the Laurier Cabinet.

So long as the Laurier Cabinet endorses and thrives by such appeals, so long will it enjoy a triumph which is not well based and which they are quite welcome to enjoy if they wish it on such a basis as this.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman asks me if I would repudiate or acknowledge those articles. I have said that I am no longer connected with newspaper work. I have not even read those articles and I am not in a position to say whether they have been well translated or not. It is not for me to say whether they have been well translated or not. I have grown quite accustomed, through my experience in public life, to suffer at the hands of bad translators. There is not a day that passes but my speeches, my articles, even my signed articles, have been distorted in the translation. Let my hon. friend read the "Mail and Empire," let him read the Halifax "Herald," and a dozen other Tory papers. What will he find there? He will find there every day appeals to racial prejudices. My right hon. friend was pointed to all through the general election as a Frenchman. Every day in the "Mail and Empire" and half a dozen other Tory papers which my hon. friend will not repudiate, the Premier is pointed out as a Roman Catholic and a French Canadian. I disapprove of these appeals, whether they come from French Liberal papers or from Tory papers. I do not think I am called upon to approve or disapprove these articles for which I am not responsible. When I want to be responsible for an article I sign it. As long as I have been connected with newspaper work, I have always signed my articles. Whether they were good or bad, I signed them and I am prepared to stand by them.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I have no desire to take part in the discussion—though it is a very interesting discussion—that has taken place. But I feel it my duty to correct one statement made by my hon. friend from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron). I feel it incumbent upon me to do so because this is the second time the statement has been made in this House; and, I think that I should speak of the matter in justice to myself. And, I am sure the hon. gentleman will understand that I am doing him an act of justice in correcting a statement which he should not have made. I agree with him when he pays every proper tribute of respect to the leaders of the Conservative Government for initiating and carrying out as far as it was in their power to do so, their policy of remedial legislation for Manitoba. But where I thoroughly disagree with him is where he claims that the Conservative Government could have retained power by throwing that question overboard. The hon. gentleman, on re-

flection, will see that in saying this he is casting upon himself as well as upon myself, and upon every sincere friends of that policy the most questionable reflection. I am sure it is not what the hon. gentleman means. And it is because I believe he does not mean it, and because I know I never meant it, that I call his attention to the matter. He cannot mean that the majority of the Conservative party being what they were, they would have consented to the abandonment of that policy. Would the hon. gentleman himself have consented to support them had they done so? Would I have remained in that Government an hour? Would that Government have stood for one hour? No. I correct that point, repeated in this Chamber to-day. Some Conservatives, I know, blame the Conservative Government and question the wisdom of that Government in adopting that policy. I am not going to take issue with those gentlemen now—they have their opinion. That policy was honestly maintained and carried out, as far as I know, and to state that the Government could have retained power by throwing their policy to one side is a reflection upon the integrity and sincerity of the men who committed themselves to that policy.

Mr. BERGERON. As this is a personal matter, I ask leave to say a few words in explanation. I understand and appreciate the motives of my hon. friend (Mr. Costigan). I have no doubt that he speaks sincerely and for my good. But I wish to give the reason why I spoke as I did. In spite of the advice of my hon. friend, for whom I have the greatest respect, I am ready to hold to my opinion and to express it again. I may be mistaken, but I am perfectly frank and sincere in what I say. I desire to be understood as saying that if Sir Charles Tupper, when he became Premier, had felt it right to say: This question came up while I was out of the country, and I have had nothing to do with the shaping of the party policy on it thus far; I cannot undertake to settle this question before we go to the country—if he had chosen to take such a position as to permit him to say in Quebec: I will give justice to the Manitoba minority, and in the province of Ontario: I will never coerce Manitoba—I say he would have been in power to-day.

Mr. TALBOT. Nobody would have believed him.

Mr. BERGERON. I leave my hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Costigan) to settle that with the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Talbot). My opinion is, and I repeat it, that if Sir Charles Tupper had done as the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) did, if he had played a double game——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I understood that the hon. gentleman rose to a question of personal explanation, but——

Mr. COSTIGAN.

Mr. BERGERON. But that is just what I am doing, Mr. Speaker. You cannot confine me to one word. I should regard the reflection upon myself in the remarks of my hon. friend from Victoria as a serious one, if I could not answer it. If Sir Charles Tupper had been able to tell the people of Quebec that he would do more for the Manitoba minority than his opponents would do, and to tell the people of Ontario that he would never coerce Manitoba—he would be in power to-day. I trust my hon. friend from Victoria understands my position. I have a great deal of respect for his opinion. He said he would never have supported a Government that would not render justice to the minority in Manitoba, and asked if I would, I say No, I am very much of his opinion on these matters. I have followed his conduct in reference to the New Brunswick schools, and I honour him for what he did. What I sought was justice for the minority of Manitoba and I am independent enough, thank God, to take a position that I thought was right even if in doing so I found it necessary to differ from my party.

Mr. TALBOT. Has not Sir Charles Tupper on the position he took upon the school question and as spoken of by the hon. member for Beauharnois, secured the approval and support of the whole clergy of the province of Quebec. And if that statement is correct—which to my personal knowledge has dropped from the lips of that hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergeron)—what other influence could he have secured to support him? The people of the province of Quebec did not vote entirely on the question of the schools. They were tired of the fiscal policy of the late Government, and that was the reason for the change in the province of Quebec.

Mr. BERGERON. That does not require any answer.

The PRIME MINISTER. I have only a few words to say. If the leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) were here I would call his attention to the statement made by my hon. friend from Beauharnois and ask him to refer to a speech on the school question that he delivered in the city of Winnipeg. But the leader of the Opposition is not in his seat, so I will make no allusion to the point.

I place myself in the judgment of the House when I say that the House is not at all profited by the discussion we have just had. I would like to say further that if we are to take notice of newspaper articles that we think are unfair to us and bring them forward on the floor of the House, life will be too short, and the session, long as it is, will be very much longer. Every day I am in receipt of newspaper articles, often not at all of a flattering character; but they do not disturb me of

my peace or rob me of my sleep. I can afford to let them alone.

I have this further to say—that these appeals to passion, whether to French passion or to English passion; whether to Protestant or to Catholic, should not be tolerated in this country.

Mr. BERGERON. How about "La Patrie"?

The PRIME MINISTER. I care not whether they come from "La Patrie" or any other paper. So far as I am concerned, if I can only win by means of such appeals, I desire to be defeated on every occasion. I do not want any such appeal as has been made by "La Patrie" to be made to the people of this country. The province of Quebec has no other interest than the interest of the whole Dominion of Canada. We must fight the battle upon these principles, and upon these principles alone.

Mr. WALLACE. I think that the right hon. the Prime Minister might well exert that powerful influence which he possesses, more particularly over the proprietor of "La Patrie," and over the conduct of that newspaper, in order to prevent the publication of such articles in the future, which he condemns so openly. For myself, I am quite indifferent to what "La Patrie" may say about me, and was scarcely aware of his amiable comments as regards myself until they were read by the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron). This is a little family quarrel in the province of Quebec, and I would not dare to interfere; but when a newspaper like "La Patrie" uses such language as this:

Clarke Wallace is a fanatic, a ferocious man agitator.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. WALLACE. Who says that?

Mr. TALBOT. I say so.

Mr. BELCOURT. And I say so.

Mr. WALLACE. I say the man who says that is a miserable, contemptible slanderer, without a particle of truth, and I challenge him or anybody else to produce a particle of evidence to prove the assertion, or the assertion of "La Patrie" either. In my whole career I never vilified any nationality, any religion or any race. This article says that I "have nothing but scorn for everything connected with our race, our language and our province," referring to the French Canadians. Sir, I say there is not a particle of truth in that statement. Those gentlemen know what I have said, because I have said it in the House of Commons. I have said nothing in the country but what I have said here in the House of Commons, taking the same line and using the same language. I can appeal to every member of the House of Commons whether, in all my career, there is anything to justify such a slanderous article as that. The Minister of Public Works says, in an article with reference to reviving the school question, and referring to the Conservative party, I presume:

They have entrusted the vile task of reviving the school question to Clarke Wallace and Bergeron.

Mr. Speaker, I have deprecated here and everywhere any attempt to revive that question so far as the Parliament of Canada is concerned or so far as the province of Manitoba is concerned. I have always said that the question should not be revived, that it was settled, and I pointed out the danger and necessity of watchfulness to see that the question was not brought up again, but that it remains where the Premier told us it was finally settled, and settled by the province of Manitoba. I said that the province of Manitoba had the regulation of its own educational affairs, and there could be no interference with that province. That is the ground that I always took, that is the ground that I take to-day. The Government of Manitoba is responsible to the people of Manitoba for any settlement they make. I stated in an address which I delivered in another place last week, that an effort might be made to restore the system of separate schools in that province, the province might restore that system if they chose to do so, but that it should be restored by no other power than the province itself. But as to reviving the school question, I never thought of doing so. I have always deprecated it. I opposed the Government of which I was a member because I said they had no right to bring this question into the politics of the Dominion of Canada at all, and I have constantly adhered to that position down to the present day. So, that when a newspaper reeking with bigotry, with prejudice, with untruthfulness, like "La Patrie," publishes such articles as that, I think it is timely that attention should be called to it in the proper quarter. The Minister of Public Works says that when he wants to be responsible for an article he signs it; I presume when he does not want to be responsible for his article, he does not sign it. He says he never reads "La Patrie," he does not know what is in it, he is not responsible. Well, he might as well tell that to the marines, for he tells us in the very next breath that he reads the Toronto "Mail," and he asks us to read it every day. I presume he reads it every day, or he would not ask us to read it every day. He does not find time to read his own newspaper, but he finds time to read the Toronto "Mail" every day. Well, as for the Toronto "Mail," I would be as willing to condemn an article in that paper if it contains such sentiments as "La Patrie" as I would to condemn "La Patrie."

Mr. McMULLEN. It often does.

Mr. WALLACE. Then, let the article be brought up and condemned. Let the unfairness, the dishonesty, the bigotry, if there are such in that paper, be pointed out to the House of Commons, and the same condemnation will be meted out to it as this House of Commons will mete out to that vile journal which is devoid of all sense of propriety and of truthfulness, as shown in the article which the member for Beauharnois has read. I think that the Prime Minister has very properly designated the Minister of Public Works when he said that a man to be a Liberal had to be born a Liberal. Liberalism had to be bred in the bone. He had no faith in those who came over to the Liberal party. What is his language as it was read here this afternoon :

> One who is not born a Liberal will not persevere. He will become either a renegade or a traitor.

I quite coincide with the language of the Prime Minister, and I think he has admirably characterized the Minister of Public Works.

Mr. BELCOURT. It would be amusing if it were not cynical to hear the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) get up in this House and call slanderers those who charge him with being a fanatic. Why, Sir, the whole life of the hon. gentleman has been spent in fanning the prejudices, not only national but religious, of a certain element in this country. The hon. gentleman would not have a seat in this House if he had not spent his whole life in fanning the national and religious prejudices of a certain element in this country.

Mr. TALBOT. I would ask the member for West York (Mr. Wallace) if he is responsible for a quotation in the "Citizen" of Wednesday, June 1st, reporting a meeting of the Orange Lodge here for the election of Grand Master. These words are put into the mouth of the hon. member :

> In regard to the Manitoba school question Mr. Wallace said that signs are not wanting that the advocates of the separate schools would seek to recover gradually the restoration of the old order of things, and he cautioned Orangemen to be ever on the alert.

Mr. WALLACE. I will only say in reply to the junior member for Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt), who made a statement that I spent my life in fanning prejudices——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order. The hon. gentleman has already spoken.

Mr. WALLACE. That is true, but the Minister of Public Works made a lengthy speech, a second speech, and he was not called to order.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Privilege.

Mr. WALLACE. I know I have no right to speak, but only to correct a statement, and I rise for that purposes. But I may say the Minister of Public Works made a long argument, speaking the second time. I was going to say this, that so far as my constituency is concerned——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. WALLACE. I am making an explanation, but if the Speaker declares that I am out of order I will not pursue the attempt.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt) ought to be the last man in the House to make the statement that he did, in view of the record of the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace), who was born in the constituency which he has represented for twenty years, and who has received the largest majority of any member of this House at the last election. That should satisfy any one that he is neither a fanatic nor a man who would inflame the passions of the people for the purpose of getting into Parliament. He has occupied positions of trust in almost every line, municipal, educational, and as a member of this House, and if the hon. member for Ottawa will go into the constituency of West York he will find there is not a Roman Catholic or Protestant who knows the member for West York and his family but respects him, and admits that he is a man of good intentions, good purposes and broad liberal mind, and that he will neither oppress nor abuse any one with respect to religion, nationality nor line of life. It comes with very bad grace from the hon. gentleman who is occupying a seat in this House for the first time to reflect on the record of the hon. member for West York in view of the position he occupies in the community where he has resided for fifty years or more.

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

(In the Committee.)

To promote direct communication and trade between Canada and South Africa. $5,000

Mr. FOSTER. We should like some explanation of this item.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Hon. gentlemen are probably aware that very considerable trade has been developed between the United States and South Africa within the last three or four years. It has grown to such an extent that whereas one steamer per month was quite sufficient two or three years ago, now there is a weekly line. We find a very considerable quantity of Canadian produce has been forwarded by that line, for which Canada does not get credit, the goods being entered as United States products. We think the time has come when something can be done

in the way of providing direct trade between Canada and South Africa. We propose to establish an agent out of this vote of $20,000 at Cape Town, and the Government asks this vote for the purpose of sending one ship there as a pure experiment, more particularly because we have received an invitation from the Government of South Africa to take part in an exhibition which is about to be held in the autumn of this year at Grahamstown, and we thought that probably a good many of our merchants and manufacturers, if we had a vessel going there direct, would be likely to avail themselves of the opportunity to send goods out. This is a purely experimental effort. It is quite premature to say whether we should establish a direct line or not, but there appears to be reasonable and fair ground for considering that a considerable quantity of our products might be sold in South Africa.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the hon. gentleman propose to subsidize only one round trip.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Only one trip.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the hon. gentleman propose that the Government shall collect the freight, or make some other arrangements ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. We propose to communicate with the various Boards of Trade and call attention to the expedition, and suggest that merchants communicate with their members in case they are desirous of sending goods in this way to this exhibition or to South Africa generally.

Mr. FOSTER. The merchants will have to pay the freight ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. It will be difficult to induce parties to put one ship on this line.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the hon. gentleman advertise for tenders for the work ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. That would depend on circumstances. We might advertise, but I doubt whether we would obtain a great number of tenders for any enterprise of this kind. We will however, endeavour to obtain the most favourable terms. I know of no vessel at present sailing between any port in Canada and South Africa. The Government will make the best bargain possible, but the hon. gentleman will understand that this is purely an experimental trip, and I do not want to pledge the Government in any form, shape or way for the payment of a regular subsidy for a line to South Africa.

Mr. FOSTER. For a party which not more than four or five years ago were thundering against steamship subsidies, asking that they be cut down to the lowest possible notch, if not altogether abandoned, and attacking them in the House and in the country, hon. gentlemen opposite have experienced a most remarkable conversion. Never in the history of Parliament has such a large sum of money been voted for steamship subventions as this present year by this Government, the members of which, when in Opposition, were in principle, and as a matter of policy, diametrically opposed to subsidizing steamship lines. This last is the most absurd climax of the whole proceedings, when the hon. Minister asks $5,000 for one round trip to South Africa.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The hon. gentleman knows perfectly well, if he knows anything at all about the business of the country, that never for twenty years has there been such an extraordinary and remarkable expansion of the export trade of Canada as has occurred since this Government came into power. The trade of Canada, the export trade especially, has expanded by leaps and bounds, and has attained this very year something like $50,000,000 more than ever before. Under these circumstances it is justifiable and desirable for the Government to make this experiment and adopt methods which would not have been justified during the stagnant conditions which prevailed when the hon. gentleman and his predecessors were in office.

Mr. FOSTER. I remember that the argument used by the present Minister of Trade and Commerce when in Opposition that when there was prosperous trade vessels would come here and seek it, and yet the hon. gentleman to-day gives as a reason why Parliament should subsidize steamship lines the fact that trade has expanded to the extent of $50,000,000. If so, $50,000,000 worth of additional trade is seeking an outlet, and yet the hon. gentleman is willing to expend hundreds of thousands of dollars more in order to secure ships to come here and carry it.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. That is a very good reason for endeavouring to try and obtain additional markets.

Mr. SPROULE. The argument of the hon. gentleman and his friends when in Opposition was that the Government should not go abroad to find markets for our produce and manufactures, because we had better markets in the adjoining country, and we should take advantage of them. He then condemned every proposed subsidy to steamship companies to secure markets in other portions of the world. The hon. gentleman has in this, as in many other matters, followed the example of his predecessors, and to-day his strongest argument is that the Government wish to secure expansion of trade abroad. This expansion of trade has not, however, occurred since hon. gentlemen opposite came into power,

because it had commenced before them, and the expansion of the country's trade has occurred with Great Britain, although hon. gentlemen opposite when in Opposition always had advocated the development of trade with the United States. I do not object to this vote, for it is a step in the right direction. I should like, however, to know whether the Government are going to send out another commissioner.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. No.

Mr. WALLACE. Do I understand that an exhibition is to be held at Grahamstown ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Yes, some time in the autumn.

Mr. WALLACE. I am sorry I cannot agree with my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule), because I think a commissioner should be sent there to give information.

Mr. FOSTER. The Minister says he is going to send a man.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. No, I did not say that. There is a gentleman at Cape Town named Mr. Motley, who may possibly be the agent.

Mr. WALLACE. I am quite in accord with the proposal. We should have some one there who would indicate the class of agricultural products and manufactures that would be in demand in that country, and I suppose they have something they can send us in return.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. There is a pretty large mining population depending on Cape Town, and we hope to send some of our products to them.

For steam communication daily during the season of 1898, i.e., from the opening to the closing of navigation, between Baddeck, Grand Narrows and Iona, and one trip each fortnight to Big Pond and East Bay.....	$4,000
For steam communication daily during the season of 1898, i.e., from the opening to the closing of navigation, between Port Mulgrave and St. Peter's, to extend twice each week to Irish Cove	$4,000

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. These two items represent a vote consolidated in the former Estimates, but which was omitted. Owing to the failure of the company who used to perform these two services in former times we are obliged to find it expedient to divide them and we are obliged to pay a trifle more. When the two services were performed together we paid $7,000, but we ask an addition of $500 in each case when divided. The Bras d'Or Steamship Company has ceased to carry on its operations.

Mr. FOSTER. Will tenders be called for now ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. In these very small matters I think we had better make arrangements with the steamships that are actually carrying on business at that point.

Mr. FOSTER. These steamships will be the best fitted to undertake the competition and to tender.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I am advised there is only one set of steamships in each case.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. Minister must see that he is throwing away the whole system of contract by tender.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. In respect to these small steamship contracts it certainly was not the practice to call for tenders.

Mr. GILLIES. I am quite familiar with this service as one portion of it is largely in my constituency, namely, that from Mulgrave to St. Peters and thence to Irish Cove. This service was performed for several years by the Bras d'Or Steamship Navigation Company, which several months ago went out of business. I brought that to the notice of the department at the time so that steps would be taken to provide for a substitute. I was very anxious that this service should be put up for contract by tender as there were several steamship men anxious to perform the service, but for some reason or another it was not put up to tender. I called over to see the Minister to explain matters as they appeared from my standpoint and I asked that the service east of St. Peters should be continued as often as heretofore performed, more particularly in face of the fact that the subsidy was being increased. Let me ask the Minister of Trade and Commerce at this point if he knows the parties who are to conduct the service from Mulgrave to St. Peters and Irish Cove ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). Mr. Finlayson, the representative of the local government, came here representing the parties, but I do not recall their names. The other service from Baddeck to Grand Narrows is done by one Barrington.

Mr. GILLIES. I am not talking about that service, nor do I ask this information of the Minister of Finance, nor does the matter belong to him or his department. I called upon the Minister of Trade and Commerce two or three times, but he could not recall the names of these parties. I would like to know from the Minister of Finance what business has he to say that Mr. Finlayson had to come here representing these parties, or to make representations respecting this or any other service, when I am in this House representing the county. While I am in this House as a representative of the people I will permit no interference from

any one be he local representative or be he Minister of Finance. I do not interfere with Mr. Finlayson or any one else in local matters peculiarly within their charge, and I think it comes with very bad taste indeed from the Minister of Finance who has been tinkering with these things and getting parties up here to press this matter in a particular direction when my representations were in the hands of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, who I must say was ready and willing to meet my views because they were reasonable views. In that connection I may read to the House a letter which I wrote to the Minister of Trade and Commerce, because I felt that this matter was entirely in his department, and he is a gentleman from whom I received every consideration when discussing this matter with him from a business standpoint. On 5th May, I wrote the following letter :—

Ottawa, May 5th, 1898.

The Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright,
Minister of Trade and Commerce,
Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—I trust that in the arrangements to be entered into with the parties carrying on the steam service from Mulgrave to St. Peters, that you will insist upon the boat running down from St. Peters to Irish Cove at least three times per week. Unless this be done, the people around that large section of country will be deprived all services. There is a public wharf at Irish Cove to which the boat has been running for years, in fact, ever since the wharf was built in 1891, this steamer has been touching there. There is a road from Loch Lomond settlement to the public wharf at Irish Cove, so that the steamer running to this public wharf will be a great accommodation to a large community. If you look at the map of the locality you will understand at once that the inconvenience the people will be subjected to if the steamer will not run down from St. Peters to Irish Cove at least three times a week. Trusting that you will insist upon this being done by the parties that get the subsidy we vote here,

I am, yours truly,
(Sgd.) J. A. GILLIES.

To that letter, I had the following reply from the Deputy Minister :—

Department of Trade and Commerce,
Ottawa, May 6th, 1898.

Jas. A. Gillies, House of Commons, Ottawa.

Sir,—I am desired by the Minister to acknowlegde the receipt of your letter in re service to Irish Cove, and am to state that the matter will rceive consideration, and such service will be provided for as may seem practicable.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
(Sgd.) W. G. PARMALEE,
Deputy Minister.

I sent a copy of the letter which I wrote to the Minister of Trade and Commerce to the two Ministers representing Nova Scotia in the Cabinet, namely, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) and the Minister of Militia (Mr. Borden). On the 7th of May, 1898, I received the following reply from the Minister of Militia :—

Minister's Office,
Ottawa, 7th May, 1898.

Dear Sir,—I am in receipt of your letter of the 5th instant, inclosing a copy of your letter to the Minister of Trade and Commerce with regard to the continuation of the steam service to Irish Cove. The matter will have my best consideration.

Yours faithfully,
(Sgd.) F. W. BORDEN,

J. A. Gillies, Esq., M.P.,
House of Commons, Ottawa.

I am obliged to the Minister of Militia for his reply. Up to date I have had not a single acknowledgment of my letter from the Minister of Finance ; he was busy, I suppose, with the local member, Mr. Finlayson, with whom I have no quarrel whatever and with whose business I never interfere. I think the Minister of Finance must know that I have sufficient intelligence to represent the needs of my own county in this House or in his department or in any other department of the Government. If this be so then it is absolutely discourtesy upon his part to call in any outsider to play the part of an advisory agent in matters that have had my representation and my direction. Now, I cannot understand why the steamer that is subsidized to the extent of $4,000 to run from Mulgrave, the terminus of the Intercolonial Railway on the mainland, to St. Peters, and thence east, should not run as often as she has hitherto done, more particularly in face of the fact that the subsidy has been increased. In 1891, when I first came to this House, the hon. member for York, N.B. (Mr. Foster) was then Minister of Finance. His determination then was to lessen the subsidies to that service, on account of the railway being opened on the Island of Cape Breton from Mulgrave to Sydney. I then asked him—and he argued the question very closely with me—to look at the map, as I have asked the present Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) to do, and see what inconvenience the people there would be subject to if the steamer did not run there. The late Minister of Finance met me in a fair and liberal manner, and the subsidy was left at $7,000, and the steamer ran down there four times a week. I ask the Finance Minister who appears so anxious to interfere in this business if he should not stand by the people of that district, and not by any steamship people. Before I came to this House this year, several steamship men, who are engaged in business around the coast of Cape Breton and elsewhere, came to me and asked me if they would have any chance of getting the subsidy for that route. I asked them to apply. One of them particularly told me that it would be no use to apply, as there was a certain party applying, and

he would be likely to get the subsidy. I endeavoured to press upon the department that as the old Bras d'Or Steamship Company had gone out of business, and the service to St. Peters and down east had become vacant thereby, it was the duty of the department to put the service up to tender and contract, and let the best man get it, and let the country get the benefit of competition. That was not done. This was mainfestly the best course for the Government in its own and in the public interest to take. Probably if the suggestion had come from a Liberal member, or some unauthorized undelegated outsider with peculiar and ill-digested notions upon political morality for which he was punished by a supreme court judgment by a monetary penalty and five years disfranchisement some respect would have been paid to it. But I am firmly of the opinion that the Minister of Trade and Commerce himself if left untrammelled and if he would not pay so much attention to the suggestions, the unreasonable suggestions, coming from certain sources, the public funds of this country would not be misdirected in the way they are in respect to this service. The Minister of Trade and Commerce went over the map with me the other day in his own department, and I assure the committee that my object was really to assist the hon. Minister in coming to an equitable conclusion with the parties who would perform that service. That was one of the objects. The other object was that the people might have the benefit of any service we would be paying for. The hon. Minister went over the map with me, and he saw that my request was a reasonable one, that that large section of country comprising as it does the districts of Big Pond, Loch Lomond and Red Islands, should have the benefit of the steamer running down there at least three times a week. He asked me to write a letter to him to that effect. I did so, and I hope the representations I set forth in that letter will have the weight to which they are entitled. Now, what I wanted the Minister of Trade and Commerce particularly to understand was this, that the steamer running from Port Mulgrave to St. Peters, a distance of only 30 miles, which could be covered in five or six hours both ways, should be made to run down to Irish Cove, a distance of 20 miles from St. Peters at least three or four times a week if not daily. Last year the steamers were running there three or four times a week, though the subsidy paid by this Government for the service was less than it is now. This is not a political matter by any means; I do not want to be charged with anything of that kind. It is a business proposition which I put before the Minister of Trade and Commerce as a business man. This service the country is paying for. It is a service which the people had for years before, when the company that was performing it received a smaller subsidy, and it is a service that we are paying for handsomely, and that the people are entitled to and must have.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I may say that if the hon. gentleman failed to receive an acknowledgment either from my secretary or myself of a letter which he addressd to me, after sending a copy of it to the Minister of Trade and Commerce, it is an omission for which I desire to express my regret, for I certainly had no intention of treating the hon. gentleman with discourtesy. I have been very much driven of late, and a portion of my correspondence has got behind. Having said that, I am at a loss to understand what the hon. gentleman meant by the somewhat extraordinary and offensive expressions he uttered towards myself in reference to this matter. He wanted to know what right I had to let Mr. Finlayson come here and talk on this matter. Mr. Finlayson came here representing people who are interested in a steamer, and I think they had a right to send him or anybody else to represent them. That gentleman came here to make proposals in connection with this service, and I told him to go and see the Minister of Trade and Commerce. He went, and the result is that this item is in the Estimates. If the hon. gentleman knew a number of people who wanted to tender, and if those people came to the hon. gentleman in reference to the matter, it is somewhat extraordinary that he did not send them to the Minister of Trade and Commerce to make their proposals to him. The idea that it has been the practice of hon. gentlemen opposite to take tenders for all these services is an entire mistake. The services are arranged for year after year. The service between St. John and Digby has been carried on for years without tender. The service between St. John and the Basin of Minas has been going on year after year without tender. It is not convenient to invite tenders for all these services, as the number of available steamers on the coast is limited. The Bras d'Or Steamship Company have found it a losing business, and they have had to go out of the business. I have no reason to believe that if we had invited public tenders we would have got any important offers. So far as Irish Cove is concerned, one trip a week was first proposed, but I asked the Minister of Trade and Commerce to make it two trips a week, and that is provided for in the Estimates. If arrangements could be made for three trips a week, I would be glad to have it done; but the hon. gentleman has not shown that any wrong has been done in connection with this service.

Mr. GILLIES. The hon. gentleman is entirely unfair if he says that Mr. Finlayson came here to represent a steamship company.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman asked across the floor of the House who were the parties offering for this service. The Minister of Trade and Commerce did not have the name at his hand, and I stated that the parties, whoever they were, were represented by Mr. Finlayson. The Minister of Trade and Commerce did not have the names at hand, and I stated that the parties, whoever they were, had been represented in the negotiations by Mr. Finlayson. I could give the name of the agent, but not of the principals.

Mr. GILLIES. I understand the hon. Minister of Finance very well. I understand his object and his motives.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman is entirely mistaken. I can assure him. I had no motive other than, as the Minister of Trade and Commerce had not the names of the parties at hand, I thought it would help the hon. gentleman if I would tell him that the parties were represented by Mr. Finlayson.

Mr. GILLIES. The facts are as I have stated. The Bras d'Or Steam Navigation Company performed that service from 1880 or 1881, until they went out of business last year. There was no necessity for asking for tenders when that company was doing the service and doing it well, but the very moment that it went out of business, and other parties had to be called in, it became the duty of the Minister of Trade and Commerce to ask for tenders, I do not care what the Minister of Finance says to the contrary. The service became vacant, parties were anxious to take it up, and that was the time to call for tenders. If the Minister of Finance had done his duty then he would have agreed with my views and have urged them upon his colleagues in the Government in the public interest. However, I want to impress upon the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, within whose province this service peculiarly is, the necessity of this service. I did not go to the Minister of Finance in connection with the matter, it was not in his department and I was dealing with the responsible Minister.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I did not want the hon. gentleman to come to me.

Mr. GILLIES. I would willingly have gone to his department, but did not want to trouble him, knowing that he had other matters to occupy his attention in keeping his kicking followers in line and other kindred occupations, but I wrote to him, representing the matter, and as I have stated had no reply. The service I asked for, namely, three times a week, from St. Peter's to Irish Cove, can be very well and easily done. It was easily done by the last steamship company, which got a smaller subsidy, and surely can be still more readily done by a company that runs a much smaller boat there and to which we give a larger amount. There is no contract entered into yet with any person. There is a small steamer running there, and when the year is over these people will come for their subsidy and get it, for a service they will probably never have performed and if performed at all then very inadequately. I wish to impress on the Minister of Trade and Commerce the fact that the service can be done three times a week from St. Peter's to Irish Cove, and until that service is given, justice will not be done and the people will not be satisfied. I would ask the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce if he would be kind enough to make a note of my representations.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I have done so.

To provide for the construction of a new steamer to take the place of the steamship "Stanley" between Prince Edward Island and the mainland... $180,000

Mr. FOSTER. Is this going to be farmed out?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No, I partially explained this before. The circumstances are these. Nine years ago the Minister of Fisheries had the steamship "Stanley" built to carry out the terms of union by having a winter service between Prince Edward Island and the mainland. That vessel turned out a very great success, but the trade of the island in winter has changed almost entirely from what it formerly was and is gradually increasing. The old practice was to import all our goods in the autumn for the next six or seven months; but since the "Stanley" has been put on the route, the necessity of making enormous purchases in the fall has disappeared, and the merchants purchase from time to time what they want, and there is now a very large trade being carried on in the winter months. Many people suppose that the winter service is a losing one, but that is not the case. I have here the returns for the last nine years. The "Stanley," although she carries Her Majesty's mail, is not credited with any sum for that service, and hers is the only case in which the mails are carried without charge. I have informed the Postmaster General that the "Stanley" has to be credited with the carrying of Her Majesty's mails, whatever that be worth—$4,000 or $5,000 at any rate. The expenditure in connection with that service in the last nine years has been $138,838, and the receipts $96,641, leaving a deficit of only $42,000, which would have been more than covered if the "Stanley" had been credited with a reasonable allowance for carrying the mails.

Mr. CLARKE. How frequently does she run?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Every day when possible. Of course, there have been times when she was kept out eight days, but such cases are very exceptional. This fact has been pressed on me, that if anything happened the "Stanley," the whole service would be stopped for the winter, which makes it necessary to have a second good boat. When the board of trade of the island came here a short time ago, they represented these facts to the council, and showed that the "Stanley" was unable to carry all the freight collected from time to time in the warehouses at Pictou, so that some merchants have had to pay $300 or $400 for freight delayed at Pictou, which the "Stanley" could not carry over. One gentleman brought me his freight bills, to show what he had to pay in Pictou. Captain McElhinney, Captain Finlayson and Commodore Welsh drew up specifications for a new boat on the same lines as the "Stanley," but somewhat larger. Captain McElhinney has gone to submit the specifications to the ship-builders on the other side to get them to tender for the work.

Mr. FOSTER. The other boat cast $150,000?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. $160,000. This will cost in the neighbourhood of $180,000. She will carry about one-quarter more freight than the "Stanley."

Mr. MACDONALD (King's). I am very glad indeed to see an amount in the Estimates for a boat to take the place of the "Stanley." The "Stanley" has been wonderfully successful, and the only thing against her was that she was becoming rather small for the trade. Our winter trade has been growing so rapidly that her capacity was not found sufficient to accommodate it. That trade is making very rapid strides owing to the establishment of a very large pork curing house in the province. The people of Prince Edward Island are turning their attention very much to the growing of pork. This seems to promise to be by far the largest industry in the province. Before six years pass over our heads, I think we shall rather astonish the rest of Canada in respect of that industry. I am glad to see that the hon. Minister has brought down a sum to put on a boat similar and larger than the "Stanley" on that route.

Mr. COCHRANE. In view of the enormous increase of traffic, will the increase of a quarter more of the tonnage enable the Minister to provide for it?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The "Stanley" will be used for the customs prevention service in summer, but in winter she will be on this route as an auxiliary boat.

Sir LOUIS DAVIES.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's). There is a possibility of having too large a boat in this service. If she is too large, she will be unwieldy in the ice.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. All that has been carefully considered by Capt. McElhinney.

Mr. MARTIN. Can the hon. gentleman tell at what time this vessel will be in service?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I cannot tell. The hon. gentleman knows that the shipyards in Great Britain are very much overworked at present. My instructions to Capt. McElhinney were, if he found the cost of building the vessel to be in time for this autumn very excessive, he must make the contract so as to let it run over to next spring. We all hope to have her on the service on the 15th of next September.

Additional for tidal service..... $1,500

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. This is required partly for the remuneration of the inspector who superintends the repairs in the existing tidal stations in the Gulf of St. Lawrence, Capt. Bloomfield Douglas. He was appointed on the representation of Mr. Bell Dawson. Instead of Mr. Dawson going down from Ottawa to inspect the tidal stations at Halifax, St. John and in the vicinity of the maritime provinces, Capt. Bloomfield Douglas, who holds a small position in connection with the department and is a comissioner for investigating wrecks, &c., will make an investigation of tidal stations and carry out these repairs. It has been found necessary to determine the tidal difference in different ports in the Bay of Fundy, that the exact time of the tide may be known at different points, where navigation is often dependent upon the tide. Mr. Bell Dawson reported to me that this was essential, and $650 of this money will be for that purpose.

Salaries and expenses of cattle inspection. $2,800

Mr. CLARKE. I desire to ask if any of this vote is for the salary of a Mr. Sheridan?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No.

Mr. CLARKE. What is it for, then?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. This is very nearly a self-sustaining service. The receipts of 1896-97 were $2,150, and the expenditure $2,586. The inspection fees were reduced during the time of my predecessor, which accounts for the expenditure being slightly in excess of the receipts. In 1893 the fees were, for cattle three cents per head and for sheep one cent per head. This was reduced in 1896 to one and a half cent for cattle and half a cent for sheep. This is for the salaries of two in-

spectors in Montreal, Mr. Pope, and another whose name I do not recollect.

Mr. CLARKE. Not Sheridan ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not think so, they have been there a long time.

To provide for a marine biological station in the Gulf of St. Lawrence.... $7,000

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The British Association for the Advancement of Science first represented the necessity of this station. A short time ago, with the Minister of Militia and Defence (Mr. Borden), I received a deputation representing all the universities of Canada, urging that steps be taken for the establishment of this station. The necessity of this work was pointed out, and it was stated that Canada was the only civilized country that had not a marine biological station. They suggested that it should not be a Government institution, that we should not have the appointment of the officers or the responsibility of carrying it on ; but said that if we would vote $5,000, they would provide a floating biological station and appoint their own caretaker. They said that $2,000 a year would maintain it.

Mr. FOSTER. To be directed by a committee of the universities ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes, with one representative from the Marine Board. I intend to appoint Mr. Commissioner Prince.

Mr. FOSTER. That is all right.

Mr. CLARKE. I notice here an item for the construction of a new observatory near Toronto. Will tenders be asked for the construction of this station ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes.

Immigration $58,500

Mr. FOSTER. There was an item of this held over for further explanation, and as it is five minutes to six and this explanation will take some time, I think we might as well rise.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). I understood that the item was passed—I was not in the House at the time—on the understanding that at a later sitting I was to give an explanation.

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

After Recess.

The House again resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 141) respecting the Great North-west Central Railway Company.—(Mr. Morrison.)

(In the Committee.)

On section 4,

Mr. RICHARDSON. When the hour on Private Bills expired on Wednesday last, we were considering this clause, and we had not reached a decision because I had concluded the remarks I was addressing to the committee on this very important question. Since that time I and my colleagues from the west have been considering this Bill very carefully, and there are several hon. gentlemen who want to speak on it, and, so far as I am concerned, I deem it one of such supreme importance to the people of Manitoba that I do not think I can conclude my observations within less than two hours.

Mr. MORRISON. Why did you support the Bill in committee ?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I may tell the hon. gentleman that I went to the committee with the intention of opposing the measure. I made up my mind during the discussion that if the Bill carried, we would probably have an opportunity of getting rid of one set of people who were parties to the matter, and if we could do that, the result might be to secure the construction of at least a portion of that road this summer. But when the Bill came before the committee, amendments were proposed by those representing Mr. Charlebois, which in the opinion of some of the members would utterly destroy the value of the Bill, and therefore, I deem it in the best interests of the people I represent to oppose it. There are a number of other Bills on the Order paper and I should not like to take the position of blocking those Bills. I recognize that if I conclude the remarks I propose making and my colleagues do the same, the result will be that those other measures will not be reached. I will be quite willing to withdraw for a brief time to allow those other measures that are unopposed to pass, for they would occupy the House not more than five minutes, and then we could resume the consideration of the present Bill. I make that suggestion to the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Morrison), and I ask him now if he is willing to agree to it. If so, I shall be very glad to give way and allow those measures to pass. If he will not agree, then I must insist on making somewhat lengthy observations to the committee. I pause to hear what the hon. gentleman has to say.

Mr. MORRISON. I must admit that the hon. gentleman has displayed characteristic assurance in requesting me to temporarily withdraw my Bill. After the extraordinary course pursued by the hon. gentleman, he could hardly expect that I would make any concession. He may proceed as he thinks best in the matter, and I will proceed in my own way.

Mr. BELCOURT. I remind the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Morrison) that this would not be a concession to the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson), but to the hon. members who have Bills on the Order paper. I would ask him in my own name and in the name of another hon. member to accept the suggestion thrown out. Only a few minutes would be occupied in passing those Bills we have in charge, because the orders are only for consideration of amendments from the Senate. I hope my hon. friend will accept the suggestion, and if he will we shall be much obliged to him.

Mr. MORRISON. The last night this Bill was up I voluntarily suggested to the hon. member for Lisgar the line of action now proposed. It was refused, because the hon. gentleman was apparently looking for gore, and the present state of affairs accordingly exists. The hon. member talked the Bill out to his own satisfaction. Since then hon. gentlemen interested in the Bill and the solicitor for the Bill are most anxious it should pass. No cogent reason can be advanced against it: certainly no valid objection has been made to the Bill up to the present, and I can see no reason why the Bill should not be allowed to proceed in the ordinary way. A manifest injustice will be done somebody if the Bill is stifled in this way by the member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson). In the position in which I am, having charge of the Bill, it is very unreasonable for anybody to ask me to make such concessions as are sought. There is no member in this House to whom I would rather grant a concession than the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt), but I hope he will appreciate my position. There is no man in the House who would vote against the Bill sooner than I if there were reasons shown me why it should not be passed, but I do deprecate the system which apparently is growing in this House of treating Bills in this way, and I trust that members with more parliamentary experience than I have will express their opinions on what we have witnessed here during the last two sittings of this committee. I am surprised and pained to find that hon. gentlemen, as I am advised, and indeed as I see, should resort to this means of obstructing legislation. The hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) spoke for over half an hour at the last meeting, and with all due deference to him I must say that he did not make any argument against this Bill worthy of the merest child. Now, Sir, I have absolutely no personal interest in this Bill. I have taken charge of it after discussing it with the two solicitors of the promoters, and I am satisfied that it should become law. That is the only reason why I am connected with it. I am very sorry indeed to have to take the position I am taking, but the fault is not with me, but with the member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson), who chooses to adopt this factious opposition and will not let the Bill come to a vote in the House. I am ready to abide by that vote whether it be adverse or otherwise. That is the only honourable way out of this difficulty, for I cannot recede from the position I have taken.

Mr. FOSTER. I would advise my hon. friend from Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) to consider the very frank and very fair position taken by the member for Westminster (Mr. Morrison). If this Bill is objectionable let us have the objections stated. There are gentlemen on both sides who wish it to pass, but the situation is complicated in that there are gentlemen interested in other Bills on the Order paper after this one, and these cannot be reached until this one is disposed of. If it be that one or two members can actually prevent the committee of the House of Commons expressing its opinion upon half a dozen Bills, it seems to me that it is rather an extreme position to take. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Richardson) has already expressed his reasons against the Bill, but to say that because he occupies this vantage ground at the end of the session he would use it simply for the purpose of obstruction, is, I think, hardly fair. He may rely on the members of this House to throw out the Bill if it is bad or to adopt it if it is reasonable. I have no particular interest in the Bill except that the matter being before the House for a good many years, and having looked over the principle of this compromise, because it is a compromise, it seems to me that it is a fair piece of legislation for us to pass. I am informed by those interested in the Bill that if it is passed, it will provide the way for money enough to continue that road, and my hon. friend (Mr. Richardson) will be taking a great responsibility if he blocks it. At the next session of Parliament he can move as he thinks best, but if he destroys the Bill now he is certainly no nearer getting the construction of the road, which I imagine is a very important thing for the settlers there. Under this arrangement, I am informed there is a fair prospect for money to carry out the enterprise, and in that case I would very strongly recommend the hon. gentleman (Mr. Richardson) to allow the committee to express its opinion.

Mr. DAVIS. The main reason why opposition has been offered to this Bill by the members from the North-west is that this company is practically securing an extension of time for two years. Let me point out to my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) that the promoters of this Bill have not been able to find a single western member from Manitoba and the North-west to take this matter up, and so they had to go to British Columbia and get a gentleman from New Westminster. I have no wish to obstruct this Bill, but——

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). Would my hon. friend (Mr. Davis) let me make a suggestion?

Mr. DAVIS. I was going to make a suggestion myself, but if you want to make one you can go ahead.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. What I was going to suggest was this. I think perhaps I have a very full knowledge of the circumstances connected with this railway. The terminus of the railway is within sight of my home, where I lived for a great many years, and I am quite familiar with the subject. I must say that I sympathize very much with my hon. friends from Manitoba and the Territories, who have shown a disposition to prevent the passage of this Bill because this has been a burning question in that portion of the country for many years. The feeling of the people there, as has been expressed by some of my hon. friends, is that they have been fooled for sixteen or eighteen years, and they have been told from year to year that this road was going to be built, when apparently there had been no bona fide intention of building it. I am not going to discuss the details of the various transactions that have taken place further than to say, that the persons who have been connected with the road at various times seem to have done everything in the world except to devote themselves to building the railway. I think my hon. friends who are opposing the Bill would be satisfied if something like this would be done. The promoters of the Bill say they want to get these bonds issued for the purpose of settling the liabilities of the road and getting the enterprise into a business shape. The persons opposing the Bill say: That they do not think any concessions ought to be granted unless this road is extended and some guarantee of good faith on the part of the promoters is given. I would suggest to my hon. friends that they agree that a provision be inserted in the Bill that twenty miles of the road shall be built within a certain time to be agreed upon, that that shall be paid for out of the proceeds of the bonds which are issued, and that no bonds can be issued until that twenty miles is built. These people can go ahead and finance for that twenty miles, then they can issue their bonds on the whole line, including the twenty miles, and we will have the arrangement complete and the road extended a sufficient distance to give the people there guarantee that Parliament has been endeavouring to take care of their interests. I think that could be done, and I think from the number and strength of the people who are interested in the passage of that Bill, they ought to have no difficulty in financing for the additional mileage. If they can sell the bonds upon the 50 or 60 miles now built, they could sell bonds on 20 miles more just as well, and so complete the whole transaction, and that would be satisfactory to everybody.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I would suggest that if the member for New Westminster (Mr. Morrison), the Minister of the Interior and the representatives of the company were to retire and have a little conference of five minutes, perhaps, we might be able to reach a conclusion and go on with the other measure. I wish also to say, now that I am on my feet, that I am here to represent the interests of the settlers in that country who have been jollied for twenty years in connection with this road. The only reason why I am doubtful about the action I am taking is the fact that it seems to please Mr. Charlebois, and I think he is one of the men that ought to be got rid of, if possible. It is an extremely difficult position to take, and if they will agree to do anything, if they would only grade 20 miles this year at an expenditure of $20,000, it would be satisfactory to us, and from year to year they could get longer extension of time. But it is absolutely impossible for us to do anything in the Railway Committee. Now we have got them on the hip, we have only about half an hour more, and if they will come down and agree to do something in the interests of the settlers, I will be the first man to take a reasonable view. I recognize the force of the appeal which my hon. friend from York (Mr. Foster) made. I would like to meet his views, but he does not represent the people of Manitoba, and I do represent, at least, a portion of them. But I want to serve their interests, and if any compromise can be suggested which will, at least, result in some little progress being made on this road, then I am satisfied. We have got this company now just where we want them, we have only half an hour, and if we talk this Bill out, their charter expires at the end of this year, and they will be obliged to do something. With reference to the position of the hon. member for New Westminster, I marvel that he should come here and take up a Bill like this, when no representative of Manitoba or the North-west would touch it with a ten foot pole. I want to tell him, and I want every member of this House to understand, that so far as my position goes, I may be mistaken, but at least I desire to advance the interests of the settlers in Manitoba.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I wish to say that the gentleman who is promoting the Bill says, that in consultation with persons who are interested, they are not able to build 20 miles, they are not able to make this arrangement. If that is so the members from Manitoba and the North-west will not allow this Bill to pass.

Mr. MORRISON. Since time has been taken up, it is as well for me to put myself right. I am surprised at the objection of the two hon. gentlemen who have last

spoken to my taking up this Bill. I think it is rather extraordinary that any hon. gentleman should be prevented from putting his name on a Bill which, prima facie at least, is all right, and which, on its face, at least, is proper to be introduced here, without the Bill being boycotted, as it is sought to boycott this one. Things have come to a pretty pass if no member but those in the immediate vicinity of the locality in question should have anything to do with legislation. I am very sorry to hear the hon. gentleman from Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) take that attitude. I was pleased to have an opportunity of introducing this Bill because I think it is a proper piece of legislation, and I am surprised that any piece of legislation which is brought here by honourable solicitors, by men in good standing, by parliamentary agents, should be prevented from getting even fair treatment. It is a pernicious doctrine that because there is a certain local opposition to any Bill it must be rejected. Now, so far as I am concerned, I shall take no responsibility. The Bill is before the House, and I think the House should be allowed to perform its proper function and vote upon it. Then if it is the sense of the House that the Bill should pass, well and good; if not, I am satisfied. That would obviate the whole difficulty. I think that other members besides those from Manitoba are able to judge of the usefulness of this Bill, and why should they be precluded from having an opinion as to what is good or bad for that province?

Mr. TALBOT. As the mover of the amendment to this Bill, I wish to say that I am quite willing to agree to the suggestion of the Minister of the Interior, if the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Morrison) is also willing to agree to the suggestion of the Minister, that 20 miles be constructed this year with the proceeds of the new bonds. In that case I am willing to withdraw my amendment.

Mr. DAVIS. The member for New Westminster (Mr. Morrison) says he took up this Bill because he thought it was in the general interest of the country. Now, I do not think that that gentleman, when he took up the Bill, went round to consult any members representing any ridings in the North-west Territories through which this road runs, to see what they thought of the matter. He has never consulted us at all in the matter, and I think, with all due deference to the member for New Westminster, that members representing the different constituencies in Manitoba and the North-west Territories, know more about what are the requirements of the people there than he does. I think if the hon. member for New Westminster would take more interest in his own backyard and let ours alone, it would be better for all parties concerned. I may say that it is the intention of the members from the west to stop this legislation going through. We are going to stop it because we think we shall be acting in the interest of the settlers of that country who have been settling along the proposed line for the last ten years, waiting for these people to fulfil the conditions. They received that charter in the first place from the Governmen on the direct understanding that the road was to be built to Saskatoon and on to Battleford. They came to this House and got a land grant, and have built 50 miles, used up the land grant, and now they are not prepared to go any further. Last year they got another extension of time for one year, and they have come back again this year for another extension, not in the same way they did before, but with a new proposition, as I said the other night. It means that in place of having one year's extension of time, they may have two years. That is what it actually means, because they have it fixed in such a way that the House will prorogue before anything is done, and that gives them virtually another year. Now, there is no doubt at all that a company can be had to build the road, another company would apply for that charter at the next session providing these people are out of the way.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I would remind the hon. member that the preamble has been adopted, and we are now on clause 4, and I would invite him to discuss that clause.

Mr. DAVIS. Then, without saying more, I move that the committee rise. As I was saying, the interests of the settlers have to be considered, because they settled there many years ago on the strength of this charter being granted to these people. They imagined that this road would be built, and that good faith would have been kept with the settlers.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. On the motion that the committee rise, the discussion must be confined to the particular item under discussion.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I understand that when a member makes a motion——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Let hon. gentlemen keep cool; we are going to have our say on this matter in a quite, pleasant way; there is lots of time. I have a far-away impression, Mr. Chairman, that when a member of the House moves that the committee rise you can talk on everything from Dan to Beersheba.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. That is a mistake. When there is, as in this instance, a clause under discussion, even if a motion is made that the committee rise, the discussion must be on the main question, or reasons must be given why the committee should rise.

The PRIME MINISTER. It is quite evident that we are in the face of a serious and important piece of legislation. There is no doubt that under ordinary circumstances this Bill ought to carry; but it is manifest also, in view of the previous history of this charter, that the members from Manitoba and the North-west Territories, who are most concerned in it, are directly opposed to the Bill; and I think their opinion, unanimous as it is, is entitled to some consideration at the hands of this House. For my part, if the promoter of the Bill would agree to the very reasonable proposal made by my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior, I would say, let us adopt this suggestion and pass the Bill as so amended; but if the promoters of the Bill are not to agree to this very reasonable proposal, I think the committee ought to rise and allow the other business of the House to go on.

Mr. DAVIN. I understand that the promoters of the Bill are ready to agree to grade and construct and iron ten miles by the 31st of December next, and that I expect would meet the Minister's views.

Mr. CLARKE. I think the members of the committee generally sympathize to a great extent with the objections made by the hon. members for Manitoba and the North-west Territories as to the delays which have taken place in the construction of the road, which, I understand, received very valuable bonuses from Parliament. But those who are interested most deeply in the road at the present time are not entirely responsible for the disabilities under which it labours. The matter, I believe, is in the courts; litigation is going on and has been going on for years, and this has prevented the construction of the road. The people who are asking this legislation from Parliament seem to be desirous of getting the road constructed as early as possible. The long vacation will begin in two or three weeks, and very little progress will be made in the litigation until the fall; and if these people will have built and in operation ten miles of railway by the 31st of next December, I would respectfully suggest to the members from Manitoba and the North-west, that that is an evidence of their good faith and of a desire, if possible, to meet the wishes of the settlers. I would ask the hon. member for Lisgar if that proposition would not meet with his approval under all the circumstances?

Mr. DAVIS (Saskatchewan). We are a long-suffering people.

Mr. CLARKE. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman.

Mr. HENDERSON. I trust that the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson) will accept the proposition of the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Clarke). I regret that the members from the North-west take the view that this is a North-west question. I do not so regard it at all. I know that people in Ontario are interested in this road. I know people in my section who invested their money in that section of the country, depending on this road going through, and they feel deeply interested. I, therefore, hope the members from Manitoba and the North-west will not block this legislation.

Mr. DAVIS (Saskatchewan). Mr. Chairman, I made a motion that the committee rise.

Mr. FOSTER. It seems to me that the suggestion that has been made is a good evidence of bona fides. Men are not going to put their money into ten miles of road between this and the 31st of December without going further. We must take into account the difficulties which this company, after its unfortunate history, will have in raising money to finance any portion of this road. We must also take into consideration that it is now nearly the 1st of July, and that it will take a good company to stir about in order to do that amount of work between this and the end of the year. Suppose my hon. friends take the responsibility of talking this Bill out or killing it; how do they speed the construction of the road? Nothing can be done until another session of Parliament comes and a new charter is obtained. Then, I think, there is something due to the actual capital that has been put into this road by gentlemen who are not responsible at all for the delays of the law and for other things in connection with this road; and I think this House ought to have some care for people who have put capital in good faith into this work, which capital is in danger of being lost, not through their own mismanagement, but through that of others connected with the company, and who see in the way proposed here the only method of getting a partial return for that capital.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. May I interrupt my hon. friend? I have consulted with the members for Manitoba and the North-west Territories, and they agree to allow the Bill to go through, with the provision that when the bonding arrangements are made, ten miles of the road shall be built and completed before the 1st of January next. I would suggest, in order to allow the committee to deal with other business, that it be agreed that we be allowed to read the Bill to-morrow morning at the early session, so that the amendment may be nearly drawn.

Mr. TALBOT. The Minister of the Interior might add that twenty miles more shall be constructed next year.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. That is provided in the Bill, anyway. Of course, the committee will understand that no desire will be evinced to make that a part of the bonding arrangement, but the bonds to be issued shall provide for the ten miles to be built this year. Ten miles were

to be completed by the end of the first year, and twenty to be completed next year.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Ten to be completed by the end of this year, and twenty miles next year.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. They are bound under their charter now to do that. They are bound by their charter to build 20 miles this year. The distinction is between the 10 miles this year and the 20 miles next year. The 10 miles this year will be a condition of the issue of the bonds.

Mr. FOSTER. Give them the benefit of the year. It will be the 1st of July before they get their legislation. They will have built, under the proposed amendment, their 20 miles by August, 1899, that is 20 miles a year. Do not let us overload them.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. There are many interests involved and a lot of complications. If the 10 miles are carried out to satisfy these people, we will then have another session of Parliament, when we can deal with any other difficulties. They do not take any risk, because the Bill provides that they shall do that to hold their charter.

Mr. FOSTER. If unexpected difficulties arise, they can be reasonably settled by the Railway Committee next session, and that committee is a reasonable one and disposed to do what is best in the interests of all parties.

Mr. DAVIN. It is understood that this will be taken up bona fide to-morrow morning ?

Mr. MORRISON. I want it clearly understood that hon. gentlemen are a party to this understanding.

Mr. FOSTER. When the Minister of the Interior states that as a condition, and we have our meeting to-morrow morning to do that, I imagine that will be satisfactory.

Mr. DAVIN. What the hon. member for Westminster says is very important. I understand that the Minister of the Interior is speaking as representing the members from the North-west and also the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Talbot), I understand him to speak for his party.

Mr. TALBOT. I want everything to be perfectly understood and no mistakes made. The promoters of the Bill agree that 10 miles will be constructed by the 1st of January, and 20 more miles by the 1st of August next.

Mr. McDONNELL. The proposition was that 10 miles be constructed this year, and the 20 miles by the 1st of August next.

Mr. DAVIS. I understand it in the same way.

The committee rose, and reported progress.

NORTH SHORE ELECTRIC RAILWAY COMPANY.

On the order.

Consideration of amendment made by the Senate to Bill (No. 97) to incorporate the North Shore Electric Railway Company.—(Mr. Préfontaine.)

Mr. MADORE. I have been charged by the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Préfontaine) to ask that this Bill stand.

Mr. SPEAKER. The Bill stands at the request of the mover.

SUPPLY.

The House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

In the Committee.)

Further amount required for the following services :—

Salaries of agents and employees in Canada	$ 5,000
Salaries in foreign countries	3,500
Contingencies and general immigration expenses	50,000
	$58,500

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. Minister promised to give us a full explanation of the over expenditure of $68,000 in the vote of the current year for immigration.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). The hon. gentleman wanted to know the classes of expenditure in which the excess had taken place. I think I can best give that by the following statement. The total expenditure for the current year on immigration is as follows :—

Salaries of agencies in Canada, for the first half year	$19,605 00
Salaries of agencies in Canada, for second half year	19,191 00
Salaries of agencies in foreign countries, first half year	9,328 91
Salaries of agencies in foreign countries, second half year	12,200 00

The increase there took place almost entirely in the United States.

Salaries of agencies in Great Britain, first half year	$ 7,849 98
Salaries of agencies in Great Britain, second half year	7,850 00
Women's Protective Immigration Society, first half year	1,000 00
General expenses, agencies, Canada, foreign counteries and Great Britain—	
First half year	$29,193 38
Second half year	33,000 00
Advertising, printing, copying papers, &c.—	
First half year	$12,700 21
Second half year	50,000 00
Bonuses, British and Continental—	
First half year	$ 4,847 29
Second half year	25,000 00
Locating foreign settlers—	
First half year	$ 5,700 00
Second half year	12,000 00

Various miscellaneous items—
First half year $14,475 00
Second half year 5,000 00

In the item of advertising, of bonuses and location of foreign settlers, there is more than enough of increase in the second half year to account for this $60,000. The statement I have given will show an expenditure for the year of $268,000. This statement will fairly represent the expenditure for the next year. The reduction will be more or less on all the different items of expenditure except agencies, expenses in foreign countries and Canada.

Mr. FOSTER. As to this increase of over $3,000 in foreign agencies, how many agents has the Minister in foreign countries? Of course, I do not include Great Britain.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We have twenty-one working in the United States; four in foreign countries.

Mr. FOSTER. Where are these four?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. One is in Paris, one is working in France and Belgium, one among the Mennonites in Russia, and the other in Iceland. In addition, of course, the hon. gentleman understands, we have a large number of men who act for us on commission in the United States—some sixty or seventy. They do not appear on the pay-roll.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the system of paying on commission?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. They are paid a commission on each settler they send. They give the settler a certificate which he presents to the agent at the first Canadian Pacific Railway station he reaches. The agent forwards these certificates to the department, with a certificate that in their judgment this is a bona fide settler. When these papers reach the office here they are checked over here with correspondence and information forwarded by the agent, and on this the check is issued.

Mr. FOSTER. How much is given as a bonus?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The bonuses are: For each man, $3; for each woman, $2; and for each child, $1.

Mr. FOSTER. What guarantee has the Minister of the suitability of these people?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It works out like this. The commission agent has to report to the nearest salaried agent of the department. He afterwards has to report to the department here. When the commission agent sends the settler and the settler presents his certificate to the railway agent, that certificate is forwarded by the railway company. That is checked over with the information we have from the salaried agent. Then, we have an agent travelling who inspects them and watches them. Of course, I do not say that there is not a possibility of an odd man being slipped in on us; but we have not paid bonuses on anything like the number of men that have been sent. I have been surprised, on looking over the returns, to find that we have paid bonuses on several thousand less than we have actually received. Of course, it is a difficult thing to work out, but there is very little danger of our being defrauded.

Mr. FOSTER. Then you have salaried agents each in a given district——

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The district of each agent is not territorially defined.

Mr. FOSTER. But each works within some area. Is there not danger that the commission man gets his commission for work that is really done by the salaried man?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. That may take place to some extent, of course, but our agents send men directly.

Mr. CLARKE. No commission is paid to them for that?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No. Of course where a man is in receipt of literature from the department, it is sent out through the salaried agent and comes in contact with the commission agent, and is then forwarded under the direction of the commission agent. In that case, of course, it might be said that the immigrant came partly as the result of the work of the department, and partly of the work of the commission men.

Mr. FOSTER. How do you select the commission men?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Our travelling agent went around and picked out the most enterprising station agents in the different places where they could be induced to engage in the work. As I said when speaking on the Main Estimates, I tried to work out very much the same plan that the American railways have adopted in the province of Ontario so successfully for a great many years. The American roads, through the agencies of the Canadian railway agents in the province of Ontario, sent thousands of people to the western states. Having familiarized myself with the way in which that is done, I tried to apply that in the western states, and so far, I think, with considerable success.

Mr. FOSTER. How many more agents have you in the United States the last two years than previously?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We have five more agents of the salaried class, and several others who are connected

with the service in the North-west and whom we send down from the places where they were located to work for the last two months of the winter at different points in the western states. We took them from the places where they were stationed in the various points in the North-west, and sent them down to places where we thought they could work advantageously.

Mr. FOSTER. Over what part of the United States do you have your agents distributed ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We have what we call a general agent at Detroit, Mr. McInnes. He was formerly in the railway passenger service, and appointed on account of his experience in that way. We have an agent named Caven at Bad Axe, Michigan. He was also a railway passenger agent. Then we have an agent and assistant and a clerk at St. Paul, who work out through the states of Minnesota and Dakota. We have an agent at Steven's Point, Wisconsin, one at Reid City, Michigan, two at Kansas City, working through the state of Kansas. We have an office at St. Paul. The agents name is Davies, a brother of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. We have an agent at Chicago who works in the southern portion of Illinois, principally. We have one at Omaha, Nebraska, one at Watertown, South Dakota, another one in Dakota, who is working amongst the Mennonites. Then we have an agent who is travelling in different portions of the United States, with no exact location, who is working specially for the purpose of taking settlers to the Rainy River district. A short time ago, I am told, he took up a party of 100 heads of families. Then we have Messrs. Morin, Rousseau and Corby who have been working principally among the French Canadians in the New England states, and taking parties to the North-west. I think these three gentlemen were in the department when I came in.

Mr. FOSTER. What are the expenses of the St. Paul office ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The salary of the agent is $1,500, the salary of the corresponding clerk or typewriter, is $480. There is an assistant whose expenses can hardly be charged to the office, who works out from the office, his salary is $1,200. I may say that the agent at St. Paul office does not remain in the office. The only one that remains there is the corresponding clerk. The others work out in the country, going round amongst the people generally.

Mr. FOSTER. What allowance do these men receive outside of salaries ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. These men are not allowed anything for living expenses except when they are actually travelling. When Mr. Davies is in St. Paul, he gets nothing for expenses. He gets his salary and his expenses when he is travelling, the same as all the others.

Mr. DAVIN. What was Mr. Davies before he got this position ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It is a year and a half since he was appointed. Speaking from recollection, he was ranching in Montana. He was appointed because he had been living in the states of Minnesota, Dakota and Montana for several years, travelling over them, and was familiar with those states.

Mr. FOSTER. Now, will the Minister give the expenses of advertising. During the first six months, $13,000 were expended, and during the second half of the year $50,000 were expended. That is an enormous amount to expend in advertising.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I can give the hon. gentleman the scheme of advertising and of distributing literature. For the purpose of arousing interest in Canada we adopted this plan. We sent our press agent to the people who print the patent insides in Chicago for Western States newspapers. They sell advertising space. For a certain price we obtained 2 inches or 3 inches in all the patent insides published in a certain county. We have utilized that space in publishing short notices, setting forth that if the people are unable to acquire land in their state they should communicate with the agent of the Canadian Government, giving his address, and obtain information regarding agricultural lands in the Canadian North-west. These advertisements or notices were run in the patent insides in one state for a month or six weeks, they being changed at different intervals, and afterwards in another state or two or three states at one time. Soon after these advertisements appeared our agents receive letters, which are forwarded to the department here, as our agents could not attend to them, and besides in that way the department saves postage, the letters from here being franked. When the letters are sent here the names of the parties and their residences are entered, and the pamphlets and necessary information furnished.

Mr. FOSTER. How much has been expended in advertising in the patent insides ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I cannot give you the items separately.

Mr. CLARKE. How are the accounts kept ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There is a straight contract made for a certain space, and our press agent checks the accounts and certifies them. There is no possibility of fraud, unless the people fail to insert the notices.

Mr. CLARKE. Are the files of those papers available ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We do not get them here. I think it would be a good idea to have them here so that the publication of each notice could be checked. I am not speaking positively as to whether they are here or not, but I do not remember giving instructions to have them here.

Mr. DAVIN. I understand special editions of the Winnipeg "Tribune," the "Globe" and other papers are included in the advertising account.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I shall give the hon. gentleman all the information in due course. In addition to the hand-book we have printed and the sections we have issued, we have adopted a plan of buying a certain number of copies of agricultural papers, the "North-west Farmer," the "Farmers' Advocate," and another journal.

Mr. DAVIN. There is an account here for 15,000 copies of the Winnipeg "Tribune," Jubilee edition.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I will refer to that matter in a few moments.

Mr. FOSTER. The second method I understand is by issuing the hand-book. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will give some further information in respect to that.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We first circulated the hand-book as a whole. We sent copies to the newspapers wherever we thought we could get them to notice it. We sent them to newspapers in the western states, in Great Britain and Ireland, and all over Canada, this being merely for the purpose of giving them information as to what we are doing, and securing their assistance in our work. The hand-book was also sent to the people throughout the western states, if we thought they could assist our agents. Then we took sections of the hand-book referring to particular sections of the country and had them printed and circulated among persons whose names were sent in to our officers. In addition we have circulated copies of the Winnipeg "Commercial," "North-west Farmer," the "Farmers' Advocate," and in the issues we circulated we secured the insertion of special articles written on the different parts of Manitoba and the North-west. We also got copies of newspaper issues—I do not know whether that was done this year or last year—a considerable number of copies of the Winnipeg "Tribune," a special number prepared for immigration purposes, and a large issue of the Toronto "Globe," the copies being sent to the old country.

Mr. FOSTER. Who is your press man?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Mr. W. J. White. He is from Brandon, was editor of the "Sun" and was president of the North-west Press Association. He gets $150 a month and expenses when he is travelling.

Mr. FOSTER. Where was the hand-book printed and who prepared it?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It was printed in the Bureau and prepared by the officers of the department, but some two or three sections of it were prepared by people outside. Mr. St. John, who was formerly the immigration writer of the Canadian Pacific Railway, was employed for several months preparing immigration literature. He edited it, and when he had not the information at his disposal he was authorized to have it done by outside persons whom he thought were competent.

Mr. DAVIN. Who was it prepared the libellous matter on Western Assiniboia?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It is impossible to say who wrote a particular paragraph, but I hold Mr. St. John responsible.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the penalty?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The penalty is the wrath of my hon. friend from Western Assiniboia (Mr. Davin).

Mr. FOSTER. I am afraid Mr. St. John would not suffer much by that.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It is only fair to Mr. St. John to say that it would be impossible for him or any one else to edit a hand-book describing the different parts of Canada without making a slip somewhere.

Mr. DAVIN. What department of Government is Mr. St. John in now?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. He is not in any so far as I know.

Mr. FOSTER. How many of the hand-books were issued?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Twenty thousand as a first issue, but that was run out and the order has gone in for more. We have an immense number of parts of it issued in pamphlet form.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the Minister give us the system upon which he proceeded in subsidizing these papers?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I cannot say that I proceeded upon any definite plan. We are practically all the time in want of large quantities of immigration literature, and newspaper agents and agents of publications are constantly there, and upon a few occasions I thought their plans would be advantageous, but the only papers of that kind I remember purchasing are the "Tribune" and the Toronto "Globe." The farmers' paper that I have circulated was my own notion, and I am satisfied that it has borne good fruit. I thought that farmers receiving such a paper

would be more likely to accept the statements in it as bona fide than the statements in an ordinary immigration pamphlet, no matter how carefully prepared. We went to a great deal of pains to get lists of persons in certain portions of Dakota, and we sent that paper month after month, and the result is that we have had a large number of immigrants from the districts to which these agricultural papers were sent. I had special articles written referring to special sections of Manitoba where there were agricultural lands open for settlement, and these I supervised myself.

Mr. FOSTER. Did you pay the regular subscription ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No, they were special papers got up in a special way.

Mr. FOSTER. Not the agricultural papers which you sent monthly ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes, they were specially gotten up for that purpose. I paid what I consider the ordinary price for them, and I am satisfied that I did not pay too much. The "Globe" and the "Tribune" were sent almost entirely to the old country to be placed in reading-rooms where our agent reported it was desirable, and that they would attract attention to Canada.

Mr. FOSTER. Did the Minister send a photograph of the good-looking editor of the "Tribune" and a note explaining his good qualities ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I forgot, but I will do it next time.

Mr. FOSTER. The Minister was not so thoughtful in that case as in some other cases I could mention. What was paid for the "Globe" and "Tribune" ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I think the Jubilee number of the "Globe" was issued at 10 cents a copy, and I believe we took them at that price.

Mr. DAVIN. According to the Auditor General's Report you got 10,000 copies of the "Globe" for $1,000, but you paid for 5,000 copies of the Winnipeg "Commercial" $1,000, or 20 cents a copy. That is an immense price.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I do not think the hon gentleman would think so if he saw the paper. It was specially illustrated.

Mr. DAVIN. I think the ordinary price is 10 cents.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. But this was a book almost as thick as the celebrated Klondike Guide. I am satisfied we got good value.

Mr. DAVIN. Twenty cents a copy seems to me to be very high. Then, there is $1,000 for 15,000 copies of the Winnipeg "Tribune," that is nearly 7 cents a copy. The "Tribune" usually sells for 3 cents a copy, I think.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The hon. gentleman knows that a special issue of the paper was got up in a special way.

Mr. DAVIN. Although as a rule I agree with my leader, yet with regard to the suggestion that you should have a picture of the hon. member for Lisgar, I hope you will not act on that, because it might flood the country with feminine immigration.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. If the hon. gentleman would allow me to make a suggestion. I think I can arrange with the publishers of the Winnipeg "Tribune" to have a nice half-tone engraving of the hon. member for Lisgar and the hon. member for Western Assiniboia added for two cents a copy extra.

Mr. FOSTER. I think the payment for these papers is a very heavy one. I have not seen the Winnipeg "Commercial" supplement, but it must be a mighty fine one that is worth 20 cents a copy ; and it must be a mighty fine issue of the Toronto "Globe" that is worth 10 cents a copy when you take 10,000 copies. I do not want to depreciate the work of the hon. member for Lisgar, but I do not see why the Winnipeg "Tribune" should be considered worth 7 cents a copy. I think this is a method which my hon. friend has adopted of subsidizing some of the faithful press.

Mr. CLARKE. How were these special editions distributed in the old country ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Through reading rooms in the country districts. Our agents tell us that in the north of England and Scotland particularly, there are reading rooms in the small villages where the farmers of the neighbourhood are accustomed to drop in, especially on Saturday evening, to read the papers. Our agents have been urging us to furnish them with Canadian papers, and it was for that reason that these papers were sent.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the hon. gentleman give an explanation of the item of bonuses—$25,000 as against $5,000 ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We got more immigrants. I have told the hon. gentleman what we paid to the agents in the United States. We pay to the English steamship agents on every bona fide immigrant to Canada $1.75, and we pay to the continental steamship agents on every bona fide immigrant $5. Of course, we have to pay just what others pay.

Mr. FOSTER. On every ticket sold ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Of course, they are all checked here. The

people who come have to be certified as having arrived to settle in Canada.

Mr. CLARKE. The scheme of utilizing patent insides to distribute reading notices throughout the United States seems to be a very good one; but I would suggest to the hon. Minister that a good deal of criticism might be avoided if a file of these papers were kept at some place here so that they could be checked from time to time.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. That is a good suggestion, and will adopt it. It is possible my officers may have them now.

Mr. CLARKE. I would also suggest to the hon. gentleman that if he is buying other special editions, there are papers other than the papers friendly to the Administration that publish splendid editions—the "Mail and Empire" and other papers—which he might procure for special distribution in the old country.

Mr. DAVIN. Was this money for advertising paid without vouchers? Would not the agent in the States, in sending his bill, send in vouchers?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I have no doubt that the press agent has got the agent in the States to certify that the advertisement appeared in the local paper.

Mr. FOSTER. The explanations which my hon. friend has given have been as full as they could be for the limited time we have had, and certainly there are some things in this estimate which I would commend as well worth carrying out. They are an experiment to a certain extent; but they are an experiment which it is worth while trying, and we shall see what the results will be; I hope they will be good. I criticized my hon. friend chiefly on his spending of his own accord $68,000 that had not been voted.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. My hon. friend knows that I have only been following his example.

Mr. FOSTER. No, my hon. friend acknowledged the force of that criticism, and I hope that from this time he will confine himself to the vote the House gives.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There is no doubt that principle is a sound one, but I can offer this excuse——

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend ought not to offer any excuse. He knows what he ought to do.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Even the excuse of bad example.

Mr. FOSTER. That is one of the most vicious things a man can do—justify a bad action because of what somebody else has done.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I think I was led into this by reading the Auditor General's Report on the administration of my hon. friend.

Mr. FOSTER. I would suggest, if next year my hon. friend has in the Toronto "Globe" a full page advance description of some deal like the Yukon, that he get a special edition of the "Globe" sent to Ottawa.

Geological Survey—To meet the extra expenditure on field work connected with sending two parties to the Yukon district $5,000

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. This amount was asked for by the director of the survey on account of the extra expenditure of sending two parties to the Yukon district. Mr. Tyrrell is the name of the officer in charge of the one, and the name of the other officer, I do not at present recollect, but they are both members of the geological survey. Mr. Tyrrell has started and is going by Ashcroft and Cariboo. The other will go by the Skagway route, and each man has a party with him.

To provide an amount to assist in repairing and remodelling buildings at the Mount Elgin Industrial School, Muncey town, Ont $3,500

Mr. FOSTER. I want to call the hon. gentleman's attention to the case of the Tyandenaga band of Indians. I have been looking over the paper, and I find the following facts. These Indians are a self-supporting band. They have had for a long time physicians in attendance, who were at first paid by the Government, but about 1892 the Government notified the band that they would no longer pay the salaries of the physicians, but would defray them out of the money of the Indians themselves. Dr. Newton was their physician at the time and continued to be their physician, and after 1892 was paid out of the Indians own fund. Dr. Newton and Dr. Walker received each $300 and $200 out of the Indian fund for their services. In 1897 the department dismissed Dr. Newton. Everybody knows that an Indian band becomes attached to its physician and does not wish to part with him. Notice was sent to the Indians in December, 1897, that on the 31st December, 1897, Dr. Newton would be dismissed for offensive partisanship. The Indians did not wish to part with Dr. Newton, and they so signified to the department, again and again, by resolution and by petition. However, the department notified them that Dr. Newton would not be paid, and they appointed Dr. Hicks, resident also in Desoronto, in Dr. Newton's place and informed the Indians that from time to time Dr. Hicks would be paid $250 out of the Indian fund. So it goes on to this day. Dr. Newton, attending the Indian, and the Government objecting to pay him out of their funds and compelling the Indian to pay out of their

funds the salary of Dr. Hicks. The last document I have here is a resolution of the Council of 6th March, 1898, which was carried by a vote of 75 to 3, in favour of the retention of Dr. Newton and against the employment of Dr. Hicks. Their contention is that as they pay for their physician, they ought to have the choice. I would like to have the hon. Minister's version on the face of it, this looks rather petty and unjust.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. In the first place, there has always been a considerable number of these medical attendants upon Indian bands paid out of the Indian fund, but the Government has always assumed control of these medical attendants and asserted its authority to dismiss them. So far as Dr. Newton is concerned, the two attendant, when I took office, were Dr. Whitman and Dr. Newton. Dr. Whitman resigned, and Dr. Moore was appointed in his place. Then the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. Hurley) wrote a letter demanding the dismissal of Dr. Newton, on the ground that, to his personal knowledge, he had taken an active part in the election. He said he would not have pressed the charge against Dr. Newton, if Dr. Newton had stopped when the election was over, but after the election he still endeavoured to injure him and took an active political part against him. I remember Mr. Hurley coming to me and saying that this doctor was taking an active part and using his position against him politically, but he said he did not want to make a charge against him, but might communicate with me further. Finally, he wrote me saying that he knew personally the circumstances and demanded the dismissal of Dr. Newton. I had no choice but to remove him. Dr. Newton was notified that his services were dispensed with, and he replied that he was not in our employ but in that of the Indian council. He was again notified and replied in a letter, which I will show the hon. member for York, but do not care to put on "Hansard," and I think the hon. gentleman will admit on reading it that it alone would have terminated the relations if they had not been put an end to before. A resolution was passed at a meeting of the Indians and sent to the department expressing regret that this man had been dismissed, and a communication was received from four of the chiefs saying that they would like to have it reconsidered, but so far no action has been taken.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think the Minister's explanation is satisfactory. Dr. Newton might fairly assume that he was not employed by the department and that his head was not the Minister of the Interior. The Indians occupy, of course, a somewhat peculiar position in relation to the Government. But this Indian band is independent, has its own fund, manages its own affairs and pays its own bills. I do not think the Minister has any right to interfere except where a physician may have been employed who was entirely unfit for the duty from want of knowledge, habits of drunkenness or something of that kind. In such a case there might be a ground for interference by the Minister. But there is no allegation of that kind. It seems to me that Dr. Newton was just as independent of the Government, so long as nothing of the kind could be alleged, as the physician of an insurance corporation, which, in a sense, is under control or the Department of Insurance. I cannot conceive of the principle upon which any Government can dismiss a man who is not in their employ. I do not see how it can dismiss a doctor whom such an Indian band as this wants to retain, or force upon them one that they have not chosen on grounds of political patronage simply.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The Department of the Interior has always asserted the right to dismiss these medical attendants.

Mr. FOSTER. But that can only be on the ground that the medical attendant is not a properly certified physician or has habits which unfit him for his duties. It seems to me that so long as he discharges his duties efficiently, he has a right to take any position he pleases in political matters and make any canvass he pleases. I think it is stretching the powers of the Minister beyond their legitimate range when he exercises them in this way. Moreover, I think it is an extremely petty thing to do that for the sake of mere patronage. If these Indians are not to be deprived of their liberty altogether, why should the hon. gentleman disregard their unanimous wish in such a matter as this?—because it is practically unanimous. The resolution of the band passed on the 6th of March last, says:

> The general council of the band was this day convened for the purpose of considering certain matters affecting the band. Ex-Chief William Green was voted to the chair. The first question considered and discussed was the doctor's salary. After the matter was discussed, it was moved by Isaac W. Green, and seconded by Alexander Loft, sr., that the Indian Department be requested to pay Dr. Newton, of Deseronto, his quarterly salary up to 31st March, 1898, who has been doing duty as medical attendant for the band. Carried—for the resolution, 75; against the resolution, 3.
>
> Moved by Isaac W. Green, and seconded by Alexander Loft, sr., that this council now assembled is opposed to allowing any money belonging to the band to be paid Dr. Hicks, as he has not been retained or engaged by the council of the band to do duty as medical attendant. Carried—for the resolution, 75: against the resolution, 3.

Now, it does seem to me a great injustice, and it is not the teaching that an Indian band should have from the Government, that their fund should not be applied to the payment of their chosen doctor as long as that doc-

tor is a proper and fit medical attendant for them. Surely, my hon. friend will accede to the request of these Indians and will give them their old doctor, the doctor they want. I think the member for the county went a long distance when he made the recommendation, and the Minister went still further when, without warrant, he dismissed the doctor in this way. I must say that if I were the doctor, and, under such circumstances, received such a demand from the Minister of the Interior, I should be apt to write him a very strong letter; and I do not think I ought to be pushed for it. I think the wrong would be in making such a demand upon me as to lead to the writing of such a letter.

The PRIME MINISTER. It is very true that this physician was paid out of the moneys belonging to the band. But it is also true, as my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) knows very well, that although they have the ownership of the money, they have not the disposal of it.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, in a way.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. They are wards of the nation, and they cannot dispose of their money without the Superintendent General of the Indians concurring.

Mr. FOSTER. It is likewise true that the Superintendent General cannot dispose of the money without the sanction of the band.

The PRIME MINISTER. Very true. So it is evident these people, though having the ownership of money and of certain property, are wards of the state and minors and cannot contract, incur debt or do any of the ordinary acts of citizenship without the consent of the Superintendent General, except the one of voting. Now, the appointment of medical attendant was made by the Department of Indian Affairs and the power of appointment implies the power of removal. I grant that it would have been a petty act to dismiss this physician simply for any part he might have taken in the election. His position was somewhat different from that of an ordinary servant of the Government. But my hon. friend must not forget that though the member for the county made complaint against him and asked for his dismissal, it was not so much for his conduct during the election—that might have been passed over—as for his conduct after the election that he was dismissed. I would like the hon. Minister (Mr. Sifton) to send to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) the letter sent by this official to his superior in the department. It shows an absolute want of respect for the authorities whose servant he was, making it necessary that his conduct should be inquired into. The least that a man who accepts public money can do is to be civil in his conduct towards the authorities under whom he serves. But when the authority, when the agent, when the man who is a paid official of the Government towards the wards of the nation, shows an absolute want of respect for those who are in power and authority, whoever they may be, he gives an example to those half civilized men which ought not to go unpunished, if it be of the character which is shown in that letter. If Dr. Newton has been dismissed, he has nobody to blame but himself. For my part, I would not care what his political opinions were in election time. I would not place him in the same category as a postmaster or custom-house officer; I would grant him more independence, more latitude. But the hon. gentleman who represents East Hastings (Mr. Hurley) is, according to the judgment of all, as discreet and as considerate a gentleman as it is possible to find. He is a man of extreme prudence, I believe, and it is to his credit that when he complained of the official, he did not ask for his dismissal. But when he found that after the election this doctor, instead of attending to his business, has been going on, not only talking politics, but actually abusing and showing insolence towards the officer who had for the time being the duty of administering Indian affairs, I think the Department of Indian Affairs would have been wanting in self-respect if they had not visited that gentlemen with punishment.

Mr. FOSTER. With respect to the payment of the money grant, the Indian band has no right technically to dispose of it, it is only formally, because the band makes no disposition of the money unless for a proper object. If it is an extraordinary and unnecessary expenditure, it can be vetoed. But in the general transaction of the business of the band, they are independent in their business in this way, that the assent of the Minister is simply a formal matter in order to check what may be unnecessary expenditure, or one which should not be made at the time. But in the case of the normal expenses of the Indians, it is a matter of course that they transact their own business, and it is only formally approved of. But this is a different matter. The Minister of the Interior proposes to take out of that Indian fund $250 and devote it to purposes that the Indian band do not wish. He is putting his hand into the fund against a resolution of the band, and against the wishes of the band. Is that fair treatment of the Indians? In the second place, the strictures of my hon. friend would be more pertinent if this fact were not patent, that Dr. Newton's services were dispensed with before he told the Minister of the Interior to go to that warm place.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The hon. gentleman will remember that he was notified his services were dispensed with, then he wrote this letter, and after-

wards that resolution of the Indian band came in. If the resolution had come in, and that letter had not been on file, I am satisfied that I would, as I did in several other cases, reconsider the matter. In one case I reopened it, and put the agent back. I remember, for instance, in the case of the land agent at Wiarton, on the representation of my hon. friend from North Bruce (Mr. McNeill), I replaced the agent, the hon. gentleman stating to me that although the officer had reported that this man was derelict in his duties, yet he personally knew that the officer was a good man and doing the best he could under the circumstances. I am satisfied that upon the strong representations of the Indians under these circumstances, I would have reconsidered the position were it not for the fact that he had simply clouted the department, and put on the file of the department the letter the hon. gentleman is aware of. The hon. gentleman will see that there were charges against Dr. Newton. But I did not put his dismissal on that ground at all. If the charge of neglect had been made before dismissing him, I would have had a careful investigation, because I would not have considered it proper to put a slur upon a man's professional character without making a careful investigation.

Mr. FOSTER. The fact remains that the man was dismissed before he made use of the strong expression.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. But he was dismissed before the Indians made their representations.

Mr. FOSTER. He was not an officer of the hon. gentleman when he dismissed him, in fact, he was not in the employ of the hon. gentleman in any way. I do not think my hon. friend is so high and mighty that he can punish anybody in this broad world who does not owe any particular fealty to him, because he uses a strong word.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. If my hon. friend were the Minister of a department, and upon the recommendation of the member for the county, he dismissed an officer in that way, if the departmental notice went out, and subsequently his attention was drawn to the fact that the Indians had asked that this man be restored, and he went and saw correspondence of this kind upon file, I venture to say that my hon. friend would not reopen the case.

Mr. FOSTER. It is very like a case of one darky talking to another: "Now, Sambo, if you were to go in the depth of night and steal a chicken." "But I won't suppose anything like that, because I don't steal chickens"—that would answer my hon. friend. I would not be guilty of the mean act of dismissing a man for offensive partisanship who was a medical attendant of a band of Indians, employed by that band, paid by that band, and owing no fealty to me. This man was simply dismissed for offensive partisanship, and it is because, smarting under that injustice, the man who was dismissed and who was no longer his officer, uses a hard word. It is pretty small potatoes when political partisanship penalties are carried so far.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I certainly repudiate the idea that there was anything mean about this transaction. I doubt very much, from my knowledge of the hon. member for Hastings, if it was mean on his part, either, to recommend this man's dismissal. I remember that the member for Hastings came to my office, and spoke about this matter. He said there had been a charge of neglect, but he did not know whether it was correct, he did not want to say anything about it. I showed him the declaration, and it was agreed between us that without some investigation it would not be fair to put a slur upon this man's character. He said: I do not want this man dismissed, and if he will behave himself and refrain from making use of his position against me politically, then I will leave him alone. Subsequent to that, he wrote to me that this gentleman was continually using his position for political purposes, then he wrote me a formal letter asking for his dismissal. From what I know of the member for Hastings, I venture to say that if he were here he would be able to show conclusively that there was nothing mean about it, that he was justified in doing what he did. I venture to think that, under the circumstances, the department could do nothing else, after that letter was written.

Mr. WALLACE. There is another matter to which I wish to call the attention of the committee. The other evening I asked the Minister of the Interior with respect to the dismissal of Wentworth F. Wood.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I was mistaken in my statement. The hon. gentleman has now the papers.

Mr. WALLACE. The Minister said Mr. Wood was a land agent, and that he had been dismissd for incompetency. I have the papers which the Minister has kindly forwarded to me, and I find the charge was that Mr. Wood took an active and offensive part in the late Dominion elections, not that he was inefficient. The charge is made by Mr. Hewitt Bostock. The letter is dated Ottawa, 13th March, 1897, and is as follows:—

174 McLaren St.,
Ottawa, March 13, 1898.

To the Hon. Clifford Sifton, M.P.,
Minister of the Interior,
Ottawa.

Dear Mr. Sifton,—I have to request that you will, dismiss Mr. Wentworth F. Wood, Indian

agent at Kamloops, from his position on account of the active and offensive part he took against me during the late Dominion election whilst holding his position in the public service. I can speak of my own knowledge of Mr. Wood's having worked hard during the day of polling, 23rd of June, in bringing voters to the polling and using his influence to get them to vote for Mr. Mara; also, of his having made a bet on the polling day against me. I understand that he worked on Mr. Mara's committee, and that strong evidence can be obtained of his having made special trips about the constituency for the purpose of canvassing against me.

Kindly let me know if you require any further evidence.

Yours faithfully,

(Sgd.) HEWITT BOSTOCK.

It does not appear that further evidence was required. Mr. Wood was not given that right, which belongs to every British subject, of being brought face to face with his accuser and having the opportunity of denying the charges, which I am in a position to say are almost entirely untrue. There is one statement which possesses some truth, that Wood "made a bet on polling day against me." What he did was to accept a challenge from some one as to the majority in Kamloops. The committee and the House will not regard that as an offence. The other charges made of taking part in the election are absolutely denied; yet he was dismissed from the public service without being given an opportunity of replying to the charges made against him, and dismissed simply on the letter of a member of Parliament.

Mr. CLARKE. Who wrote the letter?

Mr. WALLACE. Mr. Hewitt Bostock, M.P. This is a most unjustifiable proceeding on the part of the Minister. He did not give the man a chance. If there was a charge against Wood, that he had broken any regulation of the department, he should have been given an opportunity to defend himself, and the Minister should not have been satisfied because an hon. member asked for Wood's dismissal in order to put one of his supporters in his place. It is an outrage to dismiss public officials on that account. This is one of the many specimens of the course pursued during the last elections, and to which we have called the attention of the House. If there were charges of wrongdoing, surely they should have been preferred and Wood given an opportunity to refute them; but he was simply thrown out and another man placed in his position. I believe the other man proved incompetent and was removed, and a third man is now in the position. Is that information correct?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I do not remember.

Mr. WALLACE. Then I can inform the hon. gentleman that the next man was incompetent.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. If I found any officer incompetent I would remove him, as I have done on many occasions.

Mr. WALLACE. Was he appointed on the recommendation of the member who asked for the dismissal of Wood?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes.

Mr. WALLACE. He was removed because he was incompetent. Was the other man appointed on the recommendation of Mr. Bostock?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes. What would you do if you were a Minister?

Mr. WALLACE. I would not dismiss a man without giving him an opportunity of defending himself, nor did I ever do so.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The heads came off all the same.

Mr. WALLACE. There were no dismissals of this kind when I was in office, because I gave every man fair-play and a fair chance for his life. The Minister here acted without any proof, because he could not have known personally as regards the charges made against Wood. The letter reads: "I understand he worked on Mr. Mara's committee, and that special evidence can be obtained." That is no justification for his dismissal. The Minister thinks it is a proper thing to do, and smiles about it. If that is the way the Government is conducted, it is not a very satisfactory state of affairs.

Mr. FOSTER. While this subject of the depths to which the hon. Minister can descend is under consideration, I am under the impression that he went so far as to dismiss the bathroom keeper at Banff for political partisanship. He is a very competent man, and has a very competent wife.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I was told he was not so.

Mr. FOSTER. There is a story in connection with this dismissal. Only five persons could be got to sign the petition for his dismissal, and that dismissal came about in this way. There is a blacksmith resident in Banff who felt that the Liberals were on top, and he being a Liberal suggested to the bathkeeper that he had better get any work done at his forge. The keeper replied that he had always patronized a friend. The blacksmith told him that if he did not get his shoes put on at his place, he would be sorry for it. He did not succumb to the threat, but he had to succumb to the hon. gentleman. It is getting a long way into the mountain, when the Minister of the Interior, the representative of Her Majesty and all the dignity of Government, goes so far as to dismiss a bathhouse keeper.

Mr. DAVIN. I am glad my hon. friend has brought this up because the other night when the matter was discussed, the Minister of the Interior felt what a mean act it was and he shielded himself behind the ægis of the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver). Was that hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) responsible for this outrage ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I do not think there was any allegation of political partisanship so far as I know, but I do not pretend to recollect a year back the cases of all the labouring men in the department. There was a lot of business to do in connection with Banff matters which I may say to my hon. friend (Mr. Davin) and his colleagues, had got into a most unmitigated mess. If Banff had been inhabited by the same class of people that inhabited Batoche, there would have been another rebellion there. It was only because the people of Banff were long suffering Anglo-Saxon people that they stood it as long as they did. I sent a commissioner up there to investigate.

Mr. FOSTER. Who was he ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Mr. E. S. Stephenson, a very good Conservative, a very strong supporter of my hon. friend (Mr. Foster), and also a very good officer, and I kept him in the service and promoted him. He conducted the investigation very well. I remember having a conversation with my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver), and on that date I found a memorandum on file directing that this man should be removed. There is no letter from my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) recommending his dismissal, but it was immediately after I had a conversation with the hon. gentleman that I removed him, and so I presume that the idea was that he was inefficient. My hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) can give his recollection of this, and I have no doubt he will remember having seen me about it. As to Mr. Wood, I want to correct what I said the other day. I stated to the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) that I was quite certain Wood was not dismissed for political partisanship. I had a distinct recollection that there was a charge of incompetency against him, but when I got the papers I found I was mistaken, and I will explain how the mistake occurred. Shortly after I took office a memordandum was submitted to me by the then Deputy Superintendent General, Mr. Hayter Reed, in which he complained of the action of Mr. Wood and practically reported that he was neglecting his duty. After discussing the matter with Mr. Reed, and knowing nothing about the man, I thought he should be removed from office, and if I remember aright I signed a recommendation to that effect, but held the matter in abeyance for some days, and in the meantime, information got out in the department that he was likely to be removed. Representations were made in his favour, and I wrote to him the following letter :—

Department of Indian Affairs,
Ottawa, 5th February, 1898.

Dear Sir,—Shortly after taking office there was submitted to me a report upon the embarrassment which had resulted to the Department of Indian Affairs through your continued neglect to attend promptly to official communications. As it is essential to the proper conduct of the affairs of the department that its agents should deal carefully and expeditiously with all matters referred them, I was disposed, upon the report of your dereliction, to recommend your dismissal. On reconsidering the matter, however, I have decided to give you another chance ; but I wish you to distinctly understand that a repetition of such carelessness as you have been guilty of will be followed by dismissal.

Yours very truly,
(Sgd.) CLIFFORD SIFTON.

Wentworth F. Wood, Esq.,
Indian Agent, Kamloops, B.C.

These were the circumstances upon which I based my statement to the hon. member (Mr. Wallace), that Wood was not dismissed for political partisanship. I find that after that occurred the member for Yale and Kamloops (Mr. Bostock) sent me the letter which the hon. member for West York has read and which is as follows :—

Dear Mr. Sifton,—I have to request that you will dismiss Mr. Wentworth F. Wood, Indian agent at Kamloops, from his position on account of the active and offensive part he took against me during the late Dominion election whilst holding his position in the public service. I can speak of my own knowledge of Mr. Wood's having worked hard during the day of polling, 23rd of June, in bringing voters to the polling and using his influence to get them to vote for Mr. Mara ; also, of his having made a bet on the polling day against me. I understand that he worked hard on Mr. Mara's committee, and that strong evidence can be obtained of his having made special trips about the constituency for the purpose of canvassing against me.

Kindly let me know if you require any further evidence.

Yours faithfully,
(Sgd.) HEWITT BOSTOCK.

I venture to say that no member in this House who knows the member for Yale and Kamloops (Mr. Bostock) will have any doubt that the statement which he makes of his own personal knowledge must be absolutely correct. I had no doubt about it then and I have no doubt about it now, and I do not think the hon. member for Yale can be blamed for asking to have a man removed under these circumstances. My principal reason for rising was to explain the statement I made the other night, and which was made because I had forgotten the second part of the transaction.

Mr. EARLE. What is the date of the letter from the hon. member for Yale (Mr. Bostock) ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. 13th of March, 1897. It was written after seeing me two or three times in regard to

the matter. It is due to the hon. member for Yale (Mr. Bostock) to make the statement that the man who was appointed as Mr. Wood's successor had no complaint, but resigned office to take a better position somewhere else.

Mr. DAVIN. I should like to hear whether the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) accepts the responsibility for the dismissal of the caretaker of the basin.

Mr. OLIVER. I do not know that this is a matter that we are entitled to hold Parliament in session for the purpose of discussing, but if it is any interest to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) I will tell what I know about it. As the Minister of the Interior has said, a commission of inquiry was held with regard to certain matters at Banff. After the commission reported. I was requested by the Minister to look over the report with him and to discuss the statements contained in it, with a view to his ascertaining my knowledge of the circumstances and of the persons concerned. I went to the department to discuss that report with the Minister. I wish, however, to point out that I did not go to the department to discuss Mr. Walker, not did the Minister ask me to go there to discuss Mr. Walker, because the consultation was in regard to matters of more importance. I understood that the report reflected on Mr. Walker, and as Mr. Walker was no friend of mine, I did not ask that he be retained in the service.

To pay Thomas Nixon as purveyor for the Indian Department in Manitoba and the North-west Territories from 10th February, 1877, to 30th June, 1879, at $500 per annum..... $1,194 93

Mr. FOSTER. What is a purveyor ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The only way I can explain this item is by reading an extract from a report I made on it to Council :

The undersigned has the honour to report that in September, 1874, Mr. Thomas Nixon was appointed agent of the North-west Mounted Police, and some months subsequently he was directed to act as paymaster and purveyor for the Manitoba and Prairie districts of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

On his appointment his salary was placed at $2,000 per annum, but no increase was given him for his extra duties in connection with the railway, the only change being that $1,000 was paid through the Public Works Department, and the other $1,000 through the Department of the Secretary of State, to which the Mounted Police were then attached.

On the 10th February, 1877, Mr. Nixon was informed that the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs desired to avail himself of his services as purveyor for the Indian Department in Manitoba and the North-west Territories, and he was advised that the question of remuneration to be granted to him would be a matter of subsequent consideration. On the 20th May, 1878, Mr. Nixon brought the question of his remuneration before the department, and the letter was marked by the then Minister, the Hon. Mr. Mills: "Stand over until certain other matters are settled." Since that date Mr. Nixon has at various times urged upon the Department of Indian Affairs his claim to additional remuneration on account of the extra services he performed as purveyor for that department.

In December, 1894, the facts of the case were submitted to the then Superintendent General of Indian Affairs, the Hon. T. Mayne Daly, who wrote to Mr. Mills with a view to ascertaining whether when he, as Superintendent General of Indian Affairs, assigned to Mr. Nixon the duties of purveyor for the Indian Department, did so with the understanding that Mr. Nixon was to receive additional remuneration for his services. Mr. Mills replied that the officer who had discharged the duties of purveyor for the Indian Department previous to Mr. Nixon's appointment had been removed for fraud, and that the then Premier suggested that Mr. Nixon, who was doing the work of purveyor for the Public Works Department satisfactorily, should be given the additional duties of purveyor for the Indian Department, and that, in view of the increased responsibility, he should be allowed an increase of salary. Mr. Mills added that the Premier and himself considered that Mr. Nixon should receive, on account of his increased duties, additional remuneration of $500 or $600 a year, which would be much less than would be paid an officer especially employed as purveyor for the Indian Department.

On the strength of this letter from Mr. Mills, Mr. Daly directed that provision be made in the Estimates for the payment of the additional remuneration which it was considered Mr. Nixon should receive. The item, however, was struck out before the Estimates reached Parliament.

Mr. Nixon continued to press his claim. The undersigned submitted to Mr. Mills all the papers of record in the department in the matter, with a view to containing a further statement from Mr. Mills as to what he, as the Minister who had employed Mr. Nixon, considered that the understanding arrived at at the time would entitle Mr. Nixon to in the way of additional remuneration. Mr. Mills, in returning the papers, repeated what he formally wrote to Mr. Daly as to the origin of Mr. Nixon's employment, and the understanding between him and the then Premier, as to the additional remuneration which, on account of the increase of work and responsibility, Mr. Nixon should receive. He added that an immense saving was affected in the purchasing of Indian supplies through the appointment of Mr. Nixon. The question of the additional remuneration to be paid to him was, Mr. Mills adds, discussed informally in Council at the time, but it was allowed to stand over, and finally was overlooked, on account of the business incident to the then approaching general elections. Mr. Mills adds :

"There is no doubt whatever that Mr. Nixon was promised an increase of salary in consequence of the additional duties imposed upon him, and in my opinion a great injustice has been done to him in allowing this matter to remain for so long a period of time without having been settled. I have a distinct recollection of my own intentions with regard to the subject, and an equally distinct recollection of the promises of the Prime Minister, who first suggested Mr. Nixon's name to me, and subsequently to Mr. Nixon on the subject."

The accountant of the Department of Indian Affairs reports that Mr. Nixon's term of service as purveyor for the Indian Department extended

from the 10th February, 1877, to the 30th June, 1879, and that the amount to be paid to him at the rate of additional remuneration which Mr. Mills stated was fixed upon, namely, $500 a year, would be $1,194.93.

Mr. SPROULE. I think I recognize in this name a very interesting old friend who came from my riding. This account is twenty-one years old; and if this Mr. Nixon is the same gentleman, I have no doubt he will go on with this account until it will be like the old chancery case of Jarndyce vs. Jarndyce—it will travel through three generations of the family if he cannot recover it; because, like the English bulldog, he will hang on to the bitter end. I have no doubt that the hon. Minister, if he knows this man, is quite willing to pay him, because he is one of the old confidential friends of the Government and has done very noble service for them in the past.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Is that the reason the salary was withheld from him for so many years?

Mr. SPROULE. In 1874, I think it was, this man, Thomas Nixon, was entrusted with an important duty by the Mowat Government. That was to go up into the township of Proton in the county of Grey and try to defeat the Conservative candidate, Mr. Lauder. This is the celebrated Proton Nixon whose history may be found among the archives of the Ontario legislature. At that time he distributed Government money very lavishly, and made a reasonable effort to defeat the Conservative candidate. The history of his doings that was brought out in the House was not by any means creditable to either him or the party that sent him there. It has been said that he did a work for which he was never suitably rewarded; but it is a long lane that knows no turning, and now he is getting his reward. Hon. gentlemen opposite evidently never forget their friends; and so they are willing to settle this old claim, although it is over twenty years old, and therefore outlawed. If he went into court with such a claim, the statute of limitations would shut it out after six years; but this claim is three times six years old.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It would be a very dishonest plea for any government to set up the statute of limitations with regard to a claim of this kind.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not know anything about the claim, but from my knowledge of the man, I would regard it as a very scaley one if he did not push for it.

Mr. DAVIN. I will not say that this is a job on the part of the Minister, but I am afraid the hon. gentleman has been grossly imposed upon.

Mr. SIFTON.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Let me remind my hon. friend that the Minister who represented his party in the late Government recommended that this claim should be paid, and a copy of his recommendation is on file in my department, signed by him. The original recommendation is among the records of the Privy Council. I looked into it carefully and found that it ought to be paid. The Minister who employed him said that he had employed him and that he was entitled to the money. I do not see that because that gentleman was kept for 20 years out of his money he should not get it. My hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) may have certain recollection of Mr. Nixon, because he was a good political fighter, and people who came into contact with him would no doubt remember him, but I do not believe that the hon. member for East Grey or anybody else can bring up anything to his discredit.

Mr. SPROULE. If he is the same Nixon who lived in Croton I could turn up his history and satisfy the hon. gentleman that there is nothing to his credit there, or else the hon. gentleman is so hardened in his political sins that nothing would make an impression upon him.

Mr. DAVIN. Seriously, I do not think this ought to pass.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Surely the hon. gentleman would not dispute a recommendation signed by the Hon. T. M. Daly?

Mr. DAVIN. I would, and one reason for so doing would be that Mr. Daly might have had a moment of weakness.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. That is encroaching on the preserves of the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster).

Mr. DAVIN. Mr. Daly has a very soft heart, and there is no evidence that between the period, when the services are said to have been performed and the recommendation of Mr. Daly, this man had made any application to be paid.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The hon. gentleman is quite wrong, he made application at various times to be paid. We have a lot of letters in the department, I venture to say that, apart from the question of time, this claim could be proved and recovered in any court in Canada.

Mr. SPROULE. The time itself makes it very suspicious, because if it were a just claim that could have been easily established, no Government would have refused to pay it. I am quite sure that Nixon himself, from what I know about him, would have never allowed an honest claim which he could establish to go without payment.

To provide for the purchase and equipment of a steamboat and one or more launches for the use of the officers of the Government of the Yukon district (revote, $5,000)..... $25,000

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. This is for the purchase of a steamboat and a couple of launches for the use of the officers of the Government upon the Yukon River and its tributaries. Hon. gentlemen will understand that until there is a regular steam service upon these rivers, it is absolutely necessary for the officers of the Government, especially the police and military, to have a steamboat to convey them from one place to another with reasonable speed. At present there is no steamboat service on the upper Yukon at all, and the only way of getting from Dawson City to Fort Selkirk and thence down to Lake Bennett and thence to the Hootalinqua is to pull a canoe up stream. The canoe has to be poled because the current is too rapid to paddle against. That is the quickest method of getting from Dawson City down to the lower portion of the country.

Mr. FOSTER. How many months of navigation will there be?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. That portion of the river is clear about the 20th May, and navigation will probably be had until the end of October. I was there last fall on the 10th of October, and it had not frozen over then. We propose utilizing the steamer for the purpose of bringing supplies to the mounted police posts, and in the meantime also the boat will be used for carrying the mails during the summer, and the small launches for the use of the police going from one place to another.

Further amount required for expenses connected with the Rocky Mountain Park of Canada..... .... $1,000

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The caretaker of the park requires a man to look after the buffalo. He has estimated $500 for that and $500 for hay. There will be about 18 buffaloes to start with.

To provide for the payment of retiring gratuities to employees of the outside service of the Department of the Interior $6,500

Mr. FOSTER. Will the hon. Minister please explain that?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There is a gratuity of $3,200 to Mr. John Dike, late commercial agent at Liverpool, and one of $2,151 to Mr. Thomas Graham, late imigration agent at Glasgow. Both of these gentlemen have been a long time in the service. There is an additional gratuity of $500, making altogether $1,000, this portion of which was omitted by mistake from last year's Estimates, to Mr. P. M. Barker, late inspector of land titles offices in the North-west Territories.

Mr. FOSTER. On what scale are the gratuities based?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Mr. Dike and Mr. Graham were granted a year's salary each, and Mr. Barker, I think, nine months' salary.

To assist in defraying the cost of the publication of documents issued by the Canadian Mining Institute..... $1,000

Mr. FOSTER. What documents are these?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is to assist the Canadian Mining Institute in publishing literature relating to mining in the Dominion. This is a representative institution, with head office at Montreal, and including in its membership people from all provinces in the Dominion. This literature is very important and very interesting. I think the distribution of documents in the case of the Royal Society might be quoted as an instance of the same kind. The papers distributed relate not to any private interest, but to mining generally throughout the Dominion.

Mr. DAVIN. I do not intend to discuss the matter, as it is too late, but this is based on a wrong principle altogether. Where is it going to lead you? I will get you a dozen such institutions as this wanting their proceedings published.

The PRIME MINISTER. Not a dozen.

Mr. DAVIN. Yes, a dozen. The principle is a bad one. If the papers are of any value, there will be no difficulty in getting them published and bought.

To provide for payment of balance of judgment and costs of litigation commenced against the Crown in 1894 and 1895 in cases of Canada Sugar Refining Co., and Toronto Street Railway Co.... $28,000

Mr. BERGERON. Have you lost all these cases?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes, but we hope to be able to retrieve ourselves by appeal.

To provide for the payment of costs in connection with the Manitoba School Case litigation $10,607 03

Mr. TAYLOR. Is this previous to 1896 too?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Yes. This is for the second appeal to the Privy Council in the case. It is understood that the costs were to be borne by the members of the then Government.

Mr. FOSTER. Where did you get that information?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. From Mr. Ewart, of Winnipeg.

Mr. FOSTER. I never heard of it.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I give the information as I got it.

An hon. MEMBER. Was it to be borne by the members of the Government generally ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. By the Catholic members I understand.

Mr. FOSTER. That would be more correct.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The cost amounted to $14,000, of which $4,000 was paid, and the balance remains unpaid.

Mr. BERGERON. Does the hon. gentleman know by whom the $4,000 was paid ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I do, but I do not think I know it for the information of the House. It was paid through a gentleman who was appointed as an agent for the Government, a solicitor, whose name I am not free to give. My hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) should not look surprised, for he must have heard the statement on every platform in the province of Quebec, that these costs were being borne by the Catholic members of the Government.

Mr. BERGERON. And they never paid it ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. No.

Mr. BERGERON. That is why I am surprised.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. They paid $4,000. I think there were two or three members of the Government who gave $500 each.

The PRIME MINISTER. Apart from any conditions or agreements that may have been made, I submit that on the ground of justice and fair-play this item should go through. It is to be remembered that the minority in Manitoba appealed to the Government for the disallowance of the Act of 1890. The Order in Council which refused to disallow the Act stated in so many words that the constitutionality of the Act should be tested, and, if the courts pronounced the Act legal and constitutional, the minority could come to the Government under section 93, subsection 3, which grants an appeal, and ask to be heard. The judgment of the court was that the Act was constitutional. The minority came before the Government and asked for interference by the Government as against the legislation of the province of Manitoba. The Government were not prepared to acquiesce or to act either one way or the other. They were not sure whether they had the power to interfere or not. They determined to go before the Supreme Court and afterwards, as it turned out, to the Privy Council, to have the question of their right to interfere decided. The minority in Manitoba were compelled to follow them there. The minority had no doubt as to their own right to appeal and were equally sure that the Government had the right to interfere. But the Government was not prepared to acquiesce in that matter, and wanted to have it decided by the courts. That was a precaution for the protection of the Government and not for the protection of the minority. The Government compelled the minority, under such circumstances, to follow them before the Supreme Court and then before the Privy Council and argue the case. Their contention was maintained by the courts. Well, under such circumstances, it seems to me by all the laws of equity and justice, that the minority should not suffer for such action, and that the Government should recoup them for the expenditure which they were obliged to make under that act.

Mr. BERGERON. I am glad to have these explanations, which are very clear. I was going to ask my hon. friend to whom is the money to be paid ?

The PRIME MINISTER. To Mr. Ewart, the counsel for the minority.

Mr. FOSTER. What are the details of the expenditure ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The larger counsel fees are paid to Mr. Christopher Robinson, the Hon. Edward Blake and Mr. Haldane. That accounts for the success of the minority.

Mr. FOSTER. If the Government is going to acknowledge the principle that this was a bill of costs that the country ought to pay, and if a part of it has been paid by private subscription, it seems to me that the Government, in order to be consistent, should pay for the whole.

The PRIME MINISTER. We will wait until we have application for that. We have none so far.

To provide for the enforcement of the Alien Labour Law..... $3,000

Mr. DAVIN. Perhaps the hon. the Solicitor General could tell us what provision is being made for enforcing the Alien Labour Law in the North-west Territories. I do not see the Minister of the Interior here.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I am not quite sure there has been any grievance pointed out in the North-west Territories. If there is, we will be glad to deal with it.

Mr. DAVIN. At Moose Jaw there is a strong sense of grievance because alien labour is coming in every day to work on the railways, they come in by the Sault. The railway men feel a grievance because, if they go down below the line, the officers pounce on them at once ; but when the Americans come in, nothing is done. We were told when this Act was passed that there was going to be an equal administration of justice.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The Minister of the Interior told the House that he was going to carry that out. It is all in the "Hansard."

Mr. DAVIN. Nothing has been done about it yet. The only way to prevent our people being badly treated across the line, is to treat the Americans when they come here, in the same way our people are treated there. If once we do that, you will see it will bring them to their senses, because all over the country artisans are swarming in.

The PRIME MINISTER. That speaks well for the country.

Mr. FOSTER. We might talk theoretically here as much as we like; but no man who has been in British Columbia since the Crow's Nest Pass Railway has commenced, will come back without knowing that the Alien Labour Law is no more in force in British Columbia along that work than if there was no such law on the Statute-book. Everybody will tell you that there are aliens all along the line on that work. I think it would be well if the enforcement of the Alien Labour Law were left to some one department, I think probably it should be the Justice Department.

Mr. OLIVER. I would like to say that so far as my information goes, and I made particular inquiries before I came down, along the line of the Crow's Nest Pass Railway in Alberta, I was informed that the enforcement of the labour law was very satisfactory, and that as a matter of fact a large number of labourers and contractors who had come over from the States to get work on the Crow's Nest Pass Railway from Lethbridge west, had been compelled to go back to the States without getting work. That being the fact, the people in that part of the country are well satisfied with the Alien Labour Law, and satisfied with the measure of its enforcement. I would like to go further, however, and say that the people of the Territories are desirous of seeing a continuation of that enforcement. They are in favour of an Alien Labour Law. Particularly the railway men feel sore if privileges are accorded to railroaders on this side of the line which are not accorded to them when they go across. There are special facilities for exchanging railroad labour that do not exist in other branches. Railroad men are to some extent a close corporation, they keep a better tally on that kind of thing than other classes of labourers do, and it would be well for the Government to keep a good tally on that particular feature of the alien labour question. Railroading is a trade to a large extent and railroaders look for the fullest protection that the law affords them, and I think that they are entitled to it.

Board of Customs laboratory, further amount required $4,000

Mr. FOSTER. Why this large increase?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. That is owing to the change in the sugar duty, and the use of the polariscope test. It will be an additional charge upon the department.

Mr. SPROULE. We have had the polariscope test for years.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Some of the instruments have to be renewed. Under the polariscope, we pay express charges on samples and despatches.

Mr. BERGERON. I wish to inquire if a lot of machinery was imported from the United States for the elevator which is being built at Coteau Landing for the Canada Atlantic Railway Company, and if it passed the custom-house at Valleyfield without having paid full duty, and if it has resulted in difficulty between the department and the importers. Is it correct that the entries were not properly made, the collector not knowing how to deal with them.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I cannot answer the hon. gentleman's question at this moment, but I shall be glad to furnish him with the information to-morrow morning.

Mr. FOSTER. I desire to inquire whether machinery has been imported for the Chicoutimi pulp factory, and whether it was allowed to run for some time without the duty being paid, the machinery having been imported from the United States.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. My recollection is that some machinery was brought in there, and put in the mill during its course of construction. My impression is that the duty was paid before the mill commenced work.

Mr. TAYLOR. I drew the attention of the Minister to the fact that he appointed a new customs officer at Gananoque early last spring and that his residence is in such a dilapidated condition that he is unable to occupy it. The building should be put into such a shape that the officer and his family can use it.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I am glad the hon. gentleman has mentioned it in the hearing of the Minister of Public Works.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The matter still belongs to the Customs Department.

Mr. TAYLOR. I should like to have the satisfaction of being able to inform the custom-house officer that the house will be put into such a state that he and his family can occupy it. At present they are out on the street.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I should communicate with the Department of Public Works.

Amount required to provide for increase of salary of $15 each to six letter carriers in the Brantford post office, from 1st January to 30th June, 1899, those salaries not to exceed $360 each a year..... $90

Mr. BERGERON. Does this include all temporary clerks ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It covers temporary clerks.

Mr. FOSTER. This is a living example of the doctrine laid down by hon. gentlemen opposite that all statutory increases were to be abolished.

Mr. BERGERON. Are all temporary employees to share in the increases ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There are 148 of these increases, and they are made to very deserving men. They all receive not more than $450 a year each.

Mr. BERGERON. Are the increases given to the hon. gentleman's political friends and are Conservatives left aside ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The recipients will be nearly all Conservatives.

Mr. DAVIN. I do not see in the Supplementary Estimates that any consideration whatever is shown to the mail clerks in Manitoba and the North-west Territories. It is still true that the cost of living in the North-west is higher than in any other part of Canada, and the remuneration of mail clerks should be considered. As consideration appears now to be given to the cases of clerks with very small salaries, I trust that next year the hon. gentleman will place the railway mail clerks of Manitoba and the North-west in a more satisfactory position.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The mail clerks of the North-west receive special allowance above their ordinary salaries for the reason mentioned by the hon. gentleman. No officers in the service appeal more strongly for special consideration than the railway mail clerks, but both in British Columbia, Manitoba and the North-west Territories they receive special allowances.

Mr. DAVIN. Not what they formerly received.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. In what way ?

Mr. DAVIN. The hon. gentleman's predecessor lowered the amount, and we were never able to bring it back to the original sum.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. They are receiving the same remuneration as when I took office.

Mr. ELLIS. I observe that compensation has been given to officers of the department in some cases. In 1889, John Campbell was employed as a mail clerk on the Short Line, and was running over the Maine Central, under instructions from the Postmaster General, when he was burnt to death. Mr. Weldon and myself united in applying to the Premier, Sir John Macdonald, and in presenting the case we received a courteous reply, but nothing was done. In 1890, we again made representations, I think Sir Mackenzie Bowell being then acting leader in this House. He promised to look into the matter. The case went to the Post Office Department, and the secretary said that to make an allowance in such a case would form a precedent which it was not desirable to establish. I observe that since then the case of Mrs. Edgecombe has been decided. Campbell died in the public service, leaving a widow and children, and his friends have always felt that some compensation should be made. The late Inspector King spoke very highly as to the efficiency of this public servant, and I trust the Postmaster General will take his case into consideration, and grant some compensation, for if it was proper to make an allowance to Mrs. Edgecombe it is only fair to make compensation in the Campbell case, notwithstanding the lapse of years.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. My hon. friend (Mr. Ellis) a short time ago mentioned the matter to me and I had it examined, and yesterday the Controller brought the papers to me and I had an opportunity of looking through them carefully. If my hon. friend (Mr. Ellis) will have patience I think that next year the estimates will be more promising in this respect than they are now, or were on former occasions.

Mr. BERGERON. Surely the Estimates are not going to be larger next year ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I refer to this particular item. I believe that the case my hon. friend (Mr. Ellis) mentions has merit in it and ought to have been considered years ago. I hope to be able to report favourably upon it if we should be spared till another session.

Mr. McMULLEN. The Postmaster General was not in the House the other evening when I drew attention to the common custom in every department of paying clerks extra for extra work. For years in the Post Office Savings Bank Department a certain number of clerks are paid extra for calculating the interest quarterly. I object to that, for I do not believe that any clerk in the service should be paid extra pay for any such work. Bank clerks have to make up quarterly returns to the head office, and have to work some times until 12 o'clock at night, and I do not think they get extra pay for that. The clerks of wholesale merchants are required to work late at night for two or three weeks twice in the year at stocktaking, and they get no extra pay. I call the attention of the Postmaster General to this pernicious custom for it is high time it should be dropped both in the Post Office and other departments. Now, I want

the Solicitor General's attention to this. I see that the Clerk of the Exchequer Court gets a salary of $2,000 and he gets $300 extra for preparing the decisions of that court for the printers, and in addition to that for selling stamps in connection with his duty as clerk, he was last year paid $132 commission. The Clerk of the Supreme Court gets $2,600 salary, and under the system inaugurated by the Conservatives he gets $600 a year extra for preparing the reports for the printer, and in addition to that he got $190 for selling stamps. It is grossly unjust to allow these men a commission for selling stamps which is part of their duty. When I was in Opposition I challenged this extra pay system and I challenge it now. It is so common, that every clerk in every department is seeking to get extra pay, and last year about 730 of them drew money in this way. I hope that the Government will cut off these extras, particularly in the case of men who get high salaries like those officials in the Supreme and Exchequer Courts. There is no other class in the Dominion as well paid as the civil servants. Take the Department of Inland Revenue. The Deputy Minister gets $3,200 salary, and $800 additional as commissioner of standards, and he does not even sign a report for that. He should be willing to serve the country for $3,200 without getting extra pay. I hope that next year the Government will cut these extras off in the Estimates. I do not wish to cut any man's salary down. If in any department a man is getting a salary less than he is worth, let his salary be increased, but let him not get extra money in this irregular way.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I quite agree with what has been said by the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen). This Government has a big job on hand and we will have to give them a certain amount of time to correct all these abuses that have grown up under the old regime for 18 years. It is surprising to see hon. gentlemen opposite, and especially the member for York (Mr. Foster) criticising every little two-ha'penny item when for years these abuses were existing under his Government and he never said one word against them. I trust that the Government will correct this abuse.

Mr. ROGERS. I like to see some of these parliamentary warriors like the hon. gentlemen who have spoken express views on a question of this kind. The civil servants are well paid, and the evidence of that is that when there is a vacancy every representative in this House knows how he is worried by an army of applicants for the position. They have either very little to do or are very well paid, or they would not be so anxious about these positions. I speak for the farming class whom I represent, when I say that all these extra expenses should be cut down. There are very few young men from the country who have Government positions, but when one member of a family gets a position I know the difficulty and the labour the young men left at home on the farm have to encounter in order to pay for him and others in the civil service.

I know that if one of the sons of the family could trade positions to-day with one of these young men, he would give his hundred acres in return for a Government position. There is something wrong when that is the case. When the farmers of this country see the salaries of civil servants going up, and superannuations paid to them from time to time, they feel that great injustice is being done. The question is often asked, why the young men leave the farm; and this is one reason. I said before I came to this Parliament that it was very hard to undo what has been done in these matters; but I do hope that this Government will try to check a growing evil. I admit that not as much has been done as I would like to see done. I would have said more about it if a few more of the Patron boys were here. I feel my weakness, and I feel that I could do more if I had more backbone and a little more experience in this House. I feel that the Government are doing something along the right line; but I cannot say I am satisfied, and I hope they will try to do more to lessen the burdens on the backs of the agriculturists of this country. I do not wish to keep the junior clerks, or those on low salaries, at $350 or $400. I want to see them well paid; but it is the salaries of those who are getting the thousands that I want to see checked, because we are paying them more than we are really able to pay. We are willing to pay them what they earn. These increases, I am glad to see, have been given to the junior clerks who are getting small salaries. I hope the Government will continue in the good work they are doing.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I would say to my hon. friends that the special allowance made to those clerks in the service who compute the interest in the savings banks are not made for the first time by the present Government. This system of allowances I found in existence when I took office. However, I think it right that the matter should be looked into, and I promise my hon. friends to look into it; and if I find any abuses, it will be my duty to give effect to the suggestions and remove those officials.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Reference was made to certain officials of the Supreme and Exchequer Courts who receive moneys in excess of their salaries. I think the statement was made without a full knowledge of the facts. The two gentlemen are paid these extra moneys, not for the services they render as registrars of the courts,

but because they make reports of cases that are to be published. This is no part of their work as registrars, and I may say that the return we receive from the sale of those reports is more than sufficient to compensate us for the outlay. The two officers to whom special reference has been made are men in every possible way qualified for their positions, and they earn every dollar they receive.

Mr. McMULLEN. What about the commissions on the sale of stamps?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. In all the courts those who sell stamps are remunerated in that form. This is a system that has existed to my knowledge since I have been connected with public affairs. I know that it has existed in my own province from time immemorial.

Mr. McMULLEN. I want to say, in reply to my hon. friend, that we have found that a great many things have been in existence for years, but that is no reason why they should be continud. We are here to reform wrongs, and this is one of the wrongs. I do not care if all the clerks in all the courts of this country have received commissions on stamps in the past, I contend that it should be stopped. They should be called on to sell stamps, and give the country the entire revenue. The hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) kind of belittles what I say.

Mr. FOSTER. Not at all. I am going to support you against the Solicitor General.

Mr. McMULLEN. If you had supported my demands in past years, it would have been better. I called the hon. gentleman's attention to these abuses when he was in power, but he turned a deaf ear. I am glad to be able to say that I am calling the attention of a Cabinet to these abuses that I have some confidence in, and I believe they will right these abuses. I do not care how long this system of commissions on stamps has existed in the past; I contend that when these men get good salaries, they should not be paid for selling these stamps. I remember that in 1895 a man who got a salary of $1,025 was paid $60 extra for winding a clock, and my hon. friend from York raised no objection to it.

Mr. FOSTER. What kind of a clock was that?

Mr. BERGERON. Was it his grandfather's clock?

Mr. McMULLEN. I hope that next year these extra payments will be stopped in the Supreme Court and the Exchequer Court. I contend that these men get good salaries for their services, and if they do prepare these reports, that is part of their duty.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. No, it is not.

Mr. McMULLEN. Well, it ought to be. When they are not occupied as clerks, what are they doing the rest of the time? I contend that they should put these records in shape for the printers without a cent of extra pay. There is no necessity of giving them extra pay. Remove these clerks to-morrow, and you will find men in this county who will undertake to fill their positions, and do it well for the salaries they are getting. That was an abuse that was introduced and sanctioned by the hon. member for York, and I dare say he would condone it.

Mr. FOSTER. The present Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright)—we will not speak of those who have passed away—introduced that. I suggest this about the clock. I am at one with my hon. friend, and I will not vote for any $60 for winding a clock. The clock should be wound by the Solicitor General—he is tall enough and strong enough, and has not much to do.

Mr. McMULLEN. I want to say to my hon. friend that it is such abuses as that which he inaugurated and perpetuated that caused the people of this country to wind him up, and I tell you that the present Government need to put their House in order. I have said before that an allowance for extra services should not be granted. These clerks should perform those extra duties without extra pay. There is not a line of business in which men are engaged, where they are allowed extra pay for anything of that kind. The Postmaster General has handled his department admirably and merits the thanks of the country, and I hope that he will not let this abuse escape the fate of the many others he has corrected. While I hold a seat in this House, I shall endeavour to point out those wrongs and urge their removal, I do not care who is in power.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman will point out the wrong and will rest satisfied with pointing them out. What a nice little comedy this was. He was very profuse in his eulogiums on the Postmaster General, but before starting this subject, he had to come down and whisper in the ear of the Postmaster General and get his permission to attack these items.

Mr. BERGERON. Has my hon. friend received a petition from the people of the town of Beauharnois asking him to change the hour for making up the mails to catch the Montreal train in the morning?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It may have been received by the department, but personally I have no knowledge of it.

Mr. BERGERON. I know that such a petition has been sent, and since the hon. gentleman has not seen it, I shall explain to him what is required. The mails travel between Montreal and Beauharnois by the St. Law-

rence and Adirondack Railway. They used to go down by the nine o'clock train to Montreal, but that train has changed its hour and now passes at 10.30, so that the mails are not distributed in Montreal before noon. But there is a local train which does not change its hours of leaving, and which passes Beauharnois at 7.46 a.m. The people of Beauharnois ask that the postmaster be instructed to make up the mails to catch this train, and I would urge my hon. friend to give their petition his most favourable consideration. There is no politics in it, because the thing is asked for by everybody, both Liberals and Conservatives.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I shall look into it.

Mr. BRITTON. With reference to temporary clerks, there are in the service a goodly number of persons who hold office temporarily. I happen to know some who were appointed four and five years ago and are still temporary clerks. They have passed the civil service examination and expected to be put on the permanent staff, but they are still temporary and their position is uncertain. I would ask the hon. Postmaster General to look into their case, and see if he cannot, in the case of those who are suitable in every way, make their position permanent so that they will understand where they are.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I found in the office a large number of temporary clerks in excess numerically of any provision in the statute. The number went up among the hundreds, their names do not appear on any civil service list at all, and there was no provision in the estimates or in any Order in Council for permanent officers which they could fill. I do not know that Parliament will be prepared to create all the clerkships necessary, in order to provide positions for the temporary clerks now in the service. Meritorious men gradually find their way into the permanent list, but I cannot give any assurance in the matter.

Mr. BERGERON. Is it true that a gentleman by the name of Joseph A. Dauphinet, president of the Liberal Club at Sorel, has been appointed postmaster there in place of Mr. Duplessis ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think so.

Mr. BERGERON. In that change was any compensation given to Duplessis. The officer was very well conducted, although he is a very old gentleman. Some of his family helped him.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The late Government had been considering the question of retiring Mr. Duplessis, but left the task unfinished when they went out of office, and the matter devolved on me. My recollection is, if I am not confounding this case with another, that the officer became too old and infirm to give any attention to the work at all, and it was left in the hands of some very young member of his family. I recognized the intentions of the late Administration and gave effect to them after very careful consideration. The law does not provide any system of compensation to postmasters who are not on the civil service list, and this man was not.

Mr. BELL (Addington). Before this resolution is adopted, let me say that with all his faults, I find in the Postmaster General a great deal to admire. I wish to draw his attention to the position of the mail service at Desmond, and have no doubt that he will see that the grievance I am about to mention is removed. We are not getting the service that the Postmaster General desires, no doubt, we should have. We are connected with the service from Camden east to Centreville—a daily mail service—and all outgoing mail matter must lay over one night at Centreville. I call his attention to the fact that he could connect that service with the Bay of Quinté Railway, a shorter distance and at less expense, and we then could have direct connection with the daily mail. The present system is a great inconvenience. If a letter is mailed to me from home on Monday, I do not receive it until Wednesday. If the hon. gentleman will give some attention to the matter, he could improve the service without any increase in the expense.

Legislation—House of Commons—	
To provide for the payment to Sir A. P. Caron of the amount deducted from his sessional allowance owing to his absence from the House during the session of 1898, caused by injuries....	$ 150
To provide for the payment of the sessional indemnity of Thomas Beattie, who was absent owing to illness.....	1,000
Additional amount required for sessional clerks and translators	488
Additional for committees	400
Sessional messengers, pages, charwomen, &c.....	693
	$2,731

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There are here a couple of items which I regret to be obliged to ask the House to drop—those relating to the indemnity of two of our members. I placed the items in the Estimates with the idea that there were precedents for it and that it was the usual practice. That, however, is denied. It is stated that this practice is the exception and not the rule. I believe the fifteen days' allowance will cover one of these, though it may not fully cover the other. I think it better to withdraw these items than to follow a bad precedent.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend refers to cases of sickness and not of death.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. I must agree with my hon. friend. I think it is unusual, and it ought to remain unusual, because if every case of sickness is to bring full indemnity, it is liable to grow to become a great abuse. Still, I think that it is a pity, these items having been placed in the Estimate, that they should be dropped.

The PRIME MINISTER. In the case of Sir Adolphe Caron, it is beyond doubt that the fifteen days' allowance will be enough to cover his absence by reason of his unfortunate illness. And, in the case of Mr. Beattie, this fifteen days, which practically covers three weeks, will be about all that is necessary.

Mr. TAYLOR. No. It was early in the session that Major Beattie was going home and was taken sick on the train. Had he remained in Ottawa and been taken sick here, he would have drawn his indemnity. He has been absent a month or six weeks.

The PRIME MINISTER. If he had been away a month, that would leave him the loss of a week only.

Mr. TAYLOR. I wish to refer to two other cases concerning which I have had some conversation with the chief whip on the Government side, two cases that should have been attended to a session or two ago. I refer to Mr. Livingston and Mr. Corby. Mr. Livingston met with an accident by which he had his leg broken and was prevented from being here except for two or three days. Mr. Corby, after being here a few days was ordered south for his health. These are exceptional cases and provision ought have been made for them as a matter of justice. I know other cases not nearly so exceptional that have been received with favour by the Government and members have been paid for the whole session, though not present.

Resolutions to be reported.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson) moved:

That the resolution of this House agreeing to the amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 71) further to amend the Weights and Measures Act, be rescinded, and that the said amendments be further considered at the next sitting of the House

He said: this Bill coming from the Senate had two amendments. The first was making the weight of lime at 80 pounds; the second was this:

No weighing machine used for weighing or determining the weights of any of the articles mentioned in section 16 of the Weights and Measures Act shall be of less certified capacity than one Winchester bushel.

The word "Winchester" is inserted. That is not a legal measure here, we do not employ that term. I move to reconsider with a view to moving this resolution:

That the first amendment be agreed to, and that the second amendment be amended by striking out the word "Winchester" therein.

Mr. WALLACE. What is the difference between a Winchester bushel and the simple term bushel?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The Winchester bushel is not in use in Canada, we use the Imperial bushel. The Winchester bushel is used in the United States. The articles mentioned in the Bill are all of the weights of the Imperial bushel, the regular standard bushel that is in use in Canada.

Mr. BELL (Addington). What is the capacity of an Imperial bushel and a Winchester bushel?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I think they are in the proportion of about five to six.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I do not understand exactly the wording of this amendment that has been adopted by the Senate, but it seems to me that it is going to play a good deal of trouble with the grain trade. As I understand the amendment, no measure shall be less than a bushel. But how are you going to do with a half bushel, or a peck, or a gallon that is used in the grain trade? It seems to me that this amendment has been passed by the Senate without understanding the question, and I think that the Government should consider that before they adopt the amendment at all. I think the Bill should be withdrawn and considered next session. It seems to me, from a hasty reading of it, that it will seriously affect the grain trade. The member for West York (Mr. Wallace) will know the effect it will have on handling the grain trade throughout the country by dealers, and elevator men, and farmers.

Mr. COCHRANE. It will affect the elevator men more than the farmers.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. What the hon. gentleman says will have no weight against the present motion in your hands, because that is rescinding what was done, then it will be for consideration to-morrow.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I might be able to explain this amendment. I think my hon. friend from Kent (Mr. Campbell) somewhat misapprehends the point at issue. The amendment of the Senate is that no weighing machine used for weighing or determining the weight of any of the articles mentioned in section 16 of the Weights and Measures Act, shall be of less certified capacity than one Winchester bushel. It does not affect the measure of a bushel at all, it is that the weighing machine shall be of capacity to weigh a bushel. It does not affect the standard weight, it is simply to define that any weighing machine which shall be used to test the weight of a bushel, shall be of a

capacity to weigh a bushel. But unfortunately the word "Winchester" has been put in, and they might in that case be using a machine which would be of a capacity to weigh a Winchester bushel, when it could not weigh an Imperial bushel.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Does not that mean that the machine while having the capacity for weighing a bushel, could be used for half a bushel or a peck ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Certainly. It is not intended that the weight shall be made up or tested by weighing only parts of a bushel. But that it should be sufficient to weigh a whole bushel. That is, I think, the meaning of the Senate amendment. I am not discussing the advisability of that amendment, or how the House should deal with it.

Mr. BELL (Addington). If a machine can weigh a bushel, it can weigh a peck. If a weighing machine can weigh a Winchester bushel, can it not also weigh an Imperial bushel ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Not necessarily.

Mr. SPROULE. The amendment is made for the purpose of meeting a long felt want amongst the farmers. Wheat to-day is bought by standard and that standard is 1-16 of a bushel, which is a small brass pail, and the wheat is put into that and weighed. Now, wheat is bought on the market at, say 80 cents standard, that is wheat weighing 60 pounds to the bushel. Suppose it is sent down to the mill of my hon. friend from Kent (Mr. Campbell). The ticket comes back, your wheat is below standard —that is, below the 60 pounds to the bushel —we will only allow you 79 cents or 78 cents or 70 cents. The miller always has it in his own hand to send back what the standard is. Therefore, he has an advantage over the farmer, I know from experience, because I have seen it frequently, and no later than last fall, out of the same bin, I sent some wheat to two men, a portion to one and a portion to the other. It was bought at 82 cents standard, and one reported it back as not up to standard : only 58 pounds to the bushel. Therefore, I was paid 80 cents for it instead of 82 cents, while the other man bought at 82 cents standard, and paid me 1 cent more. He stated it was only half a pound less than the standard, while the first one stated it was two pounds less. It is unfair to the farmers, it is not a fair test of a bushel of wheat. If you test it at all, test the full bushel. To satisfy myself I took out of that same grain that was sent to the mill, a full bushel, and it weighed 61½ pounds, yet it was reported back as weighing only 59½ by one, and 58 pounds by the other. I am glad to see the amendment is made because it is in the right direction and will place the farmers in a better position than they are to-day in selling their wheat.

Mr. TAYLOR. I think the Minister should hold this Bill over until he has consulted the grain buyers. If this Bill passed, it would render useless hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of machines now used by grain buyers throughout the country.

An hon. MEMBER. So much the better.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. gentleman is speaking about something of which he knows nothing.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. These amendments are made by the Senate. If we adopt them, we should not adopt the Winchester bushel.

Mr. TAYLOR. The law now recognizes a weighing machine for weighing two quarts. It is undoubtedly a fact that more grain can be placed in a two-quart measure than can be run into one of these machines. This Bill will not benefit any one, but it will render useless all these weighing machines.

Mr. SPROULE. They are a nuisance.

Mr. TAYLOR. There are thousands of them in use in the country to-day. I know all about this business because I have been buying grain for twenty years.

Mr. COCHRANE. Some of us have been selling it for twenty years.

Mr. TAYLOR. The Minister should consult the grain men and the farmers.

Motion agreed to.

SECOND AND THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 171) to amend the Customs Tariff of 1897.—(Mr. Fielding.)

Bill (No. 172) to amend the Inland Revenue Act.—(Mr. Fielding.)

The PRIME MINISTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 12.25 a.m. (Saturday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

SATURDAY, 11th June, 1898.

PRAYERS.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

NORTH-WEST CENTRAL RAILWAY COMPANY.

The House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 141)—from the Senate—respecting the Great North-west Central Railway Company.—(Mr. Morrison.)

(In the Committee.)

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). It has been agreed between the various parties interested in the Bill that the suggestion which I made last evening should be carried out, provided that the power to issue new bonds be exercised only upon condition that the bonds should be issued for an additional ten miles, and the additional ten miles should be built and equipped so as to make the building of the ten miles a condition of the issuing of the bonds. I have drawn up the amendments, and they have been agreed to by the parties, and are as follows. Section 5 will be amended so as to read :

The proceeds of the new bonds shall be first applied in the construction, equipment and completion of the extension of the said railway, from its present northwestern terminus, a distance of not less than ten miles, and second,

At the end of that will be added subsection 7, as follows :—

It is hereby declared that if the said westerly extension of ten miles provided for in the first subsection of this section is not constructed, equipped and put into operation on or before the 31st December, 1898, all issues of new bonds made under this Act shall be null and void.

Section 6 will be amended so as to read in the proviso :

Provided that the company shall complete and put in operation 20 miles of its railway in addition to the ten miles required by section 5 on or before the first day of August, 1899.

A further provision is that the proviso which was added in the Railway Committee to section 4 shall be changed by striking out the word "or" after the words "High Court of Justice for Ontario," and putting in the word "and" so as to make the section read as follows :—

But such new bonds shall not be issued or disposed of until the question of the ownership of the shares claimed by Alphonse Charlebois in the capital stock of the company has been settled by a judge of the High Court of Justice for Ontario and the said court has sanctioned or ordered that such bonds may be issued, and the price or terms upon which such sale or disposition shall take place.

Mr. SPROULE. I move, Mr. Chairman, that these amendments, as read by me, be placed in the Bill.

Motion agreed to.

Bill reported as amended, and read the third time and passed.

NORTH SHORE ELECTRIC RAILWAY COMPANY.

The House proceeded to consider amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 97) to incorporate the North Shore Electric Railway Company.

Mr. SAVARD moved the following amendment :—

Clause 4. After the word "from" in the second line, strike out the words "Shawenegan to," and add at the end of the said clause 4 the following words :—"but such line shall not run within four miles at any point of the Great Northern Railway."

Amendment agreed to, and Senate amendments concurred in.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 173) further to amend the Act respecting the Senate and House of Commons.

IRRIGATION IN THE NORTH-WEST.

The House proceeded to consider amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 146) to amend and consolidate the North-west Irrigation Acts of 1894 and 1895.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton) moved :

Page 9, line 36, after the word "work," to insert "and the minimum rates to be charged by the licensee," be not concurred in, because it is impracticable to fix the maximum rate before completing the work, and before it is ascertained what the cost of constructing the same will be, and that the other amendments made by the Senate in the said Bill be concurred in.

He said : These works are not to be constructed with public money. The capital will be private money, the people will go into these enterprises in most cases without knowing absolutely what the work is going to cost. I think we must go very much further in our experience in these matters before we can adopt such a course as is here proposed. No Minister would know what the work would cost to construct or to maintain. If there was danger of the rates being fixed at such a scale as would prevent the work from paying, nobody would put his money into these works and the Act would be a dead letter, for no works would be constructed. When the attention of the Senate is called to these facts, I think that they will not insist upon their amendment.

Mr. SPROULE. It does not seem to me that there should be any difficulty in fixing a maximum rate of charges. The con-

struction of these irrigation drains will usually be by contract, and surely the contractor will take the trouble to have an estimate made by an engineer of the cost, and that would be stated in the contract. As for the cost of maintenance, I think that the experience gained in the localities where these works have been in operation for a length of time ought to enable any one to estimate fairly well the cost of maintenance. With this data it would be easy to fix the maximum rate. We should avoid putting it into the power of any person or corporation to charge a monopoly price for the use of water from these drains for irrigation purposes. This is the only means the farmers there have of carrying on farming operations in these districts, and there should be nothing to discourage them in this respect.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. My hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) is mistaken in supposing that private companies will have control of the water. That will be in control of the department. If my hon. friend has ever built a house he will know that it is only rarely the cost of it can be known before it is started—and houses have been built for a good many years. It is almost impossible to tell what these works will cost, even when we have an estimate. Any one will understand this who has ever had to do with the construction of public works. In the case of irrigation in the North-west Territories, we have practically no experience either as to construction or as to maintenance, and it is only by experience that we can learn. We want to make this Act as flexible as possible, so as to induce people to invest their money in irrigation works. Very little has been invested so far, but we are surveying the land at Government expense so as to induce capital to undertake these enterprises.

Mr. SPROULE. Since these drains have been in operation in the North-west Territories, there have been serious complaints regarding the ability of the people to get the use of the water in the streams that nature had provided, but which was controlled by man's device. They found it impossible to get the use of the water to irrigate their lands. I have had consultation with some who have had experience, and they strongly advise not to put it in the power of any private corporation to control the irrigation of any locality, because as soon as they do that, the people would assuredly suffer, the cost of the supply would be put at the highest possible figure, and one that would make it impossible for many to cultivate their lands at a profit.

Mr. OLIVER. I do not altogether agree that the cost of the work is the proper basis upon which to fix the rates. The value of irrigation depends on the profits that can be made out of the crop raised, and if water cannot be got at a figure that will enable crops to be raised at a profit, then the irrigation has no value, and there is no object in having a company organized to construct the work. I think the proper basis of the calculation of the rates is the amount that the crop can afford to pay for the use of the water, and not the cost of the work. Those who wish to go into irrigation work should go into it on the principle, that if they cannot supply the water at certain rates, they should not put their money into the work. The Government should not give a company control of the water supply free on that condition, because while one company may undertake a certain work and, by mismanagement, may make it necessary to levy a higher rate than the crop will stand in order to give them interest on their money, another company, better managed, might if they had the privilege use that same water in such a way as to give it to the people at a rate which would enable them to grow crops at a profit. While I do not wish to delay the Bill, I think it is only right, seeing that I represent one of the only two districts under Dominion control in which irrigation is likely to be used extensively, that I should make this statement.

Mr. DAVIN. What harm will result from allowing the amendment of the Senate to stand ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I could not carry it out. The amendment is that I should fix the maximum rate, and I would be in a helpless position when I came to do so before these proceedings are taken. I would not have any basis upon which to fix the rate. If I took the basis of the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver), and undertook to decide it upon the basis of the value of the crops that are going to be grown on the land, I would like any hon. member to tell me how I could figure it out. It cannot be done. When the works are constructed, we can see what benefit they are going to be, and we will have some basis upon which to fix the rate.

Mr. DAVIN. Suppose the case of a man getting control of the source of irrigation, and, after he has finished his work, he wants to charge more than the farmer could pay and make a profit, and the farmer won't use the water ; how are we going to deal with such a case as that ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. If the Senate had said that no rate should be charged except such as should be approved by the department, I would have agreed to to that, because that is practicable. But if the hon. gentleman wants to introduce an amendment to the Act next year to that effect, I will agree to it.

Mr. POUPORE. That would be the proper thing.

Mr. SPROULE. The member for Alberta says that it should be known how much the

cost will be to the farmer before the work is commenced, but the farmer has no data for judging of the cost, he does not know whether it would be a paying investment if he used it.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The hon. gentleman's views can be met without any amendment to the legislation at all. The farmer does not need to take the water unless he wants to. He does not need to be brought into connection with the irrigation system at all if he does not want to. The result of this amendment will be this, that the Minister would either have to stop the work altogether, or he would have to put this maximum rate up so high that he would be sure that he would not prevent capital from going into the construction of the work. The effect would be injurious rather than beneficial. I would agree to the proposition that the Commissioner or the Minister should fix maximum rates, and that an appeal should be allowed to a tribunal for the purpose of regulating the rates. I have no objection to such an amendment if any hon. member wishes to bring it in next year.

Mr. SPROULE. Do you propose to amend it now in that direction so as to enable the Governor in Council to have control over the rates ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I could do so, but it is too late to do it this year.

Mr. OLIVER. The provision giving the Governor the power to regulate the rates is contained in the Bill as it stands ; the only question is as to whether the rates should be regulated on the basis of the value of the work.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We cannot settle that now, and the Senate do not undertake to settle it. The Senate simply says that the Minister should say what the higher rates shall be. My hon. friend's argument shows the difficulty of doing that. He says the rates ought to be based on one thing. I suggest the rates ought to be based on another ; so that if provision is made for regulating the rates, it ought to be worked out carefully on the basis provided, and that cannot be done now.

Mr. OLIVER. I merely wish to put the suggestion formally before the House, to be worked out in the future. By paragraph 6 of section 51 it is provided that the Minister may regulate from time to time what rates may be charged by the licensees and the proportion of the tariff of rates. There is no question about the Government having the right to regulate the rates, the question is as to the basis.

Senate amendments, as amended, concurred in.

THE ELECTORAL FRANCHISE.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick) moved :

That this House do not insist upon their objections to the 7th, 8th, 9th and 10th amendments of the Senate to Bill (No. 16) repealing the Electoral Franchise Act, and to further amend the Dominion Elections Act, without assenting to the reasons given by the Senate.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). The English of it is that we accept the amendments so far as they relate to Prince Edward Island. When these amendments came down first I was doubtful whether they should be accepted or not. and the reason I was doubtful, I may just as well explain to the House. The effect of the amendment is to place an inordinate power in the hands of the Minister for the time being. There are 400 or 500 voters on the Prince Edward Island Railway, and the effect of the amendment is to disclose to the public how each of those men vote. The effect of the amendment, therefore, is to give an excessive and improper power to the Minister of the day. On that ground, I opposed it, but having made my objection, and as it did not carry the weight I expected, I will not persist in my objection any longer.

Amendment concurred in.

SUPPLY.

The House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). Referring to the inquiry made by the member for York (Mr. Foster) regarding the payment of duties on machinery for the Chicoutimi pulp works, I beg to inform him that permission was given to warehouse the machinery during construction of the building and pending valuation. The valuation has been made and the duty paid.

Mr. FOSTER. What I want to know is, whether the machinery was in use for any time, and if so, how long, before the duty was paid.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I cannot tell the time.

Mr. FOSTER. My information is that the machinery was in use for months before the duty was paid.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. We had control of the machinery.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir Richard Cartwright). Hon. gentlemen opposite did the same in regard to machinery used in the beet sugar manufactories.

Mr. FOSTER. I want the exact date at which the duty was paid, before concurrence is taken.

Militia—Yukon Contingent $147,000

Mr. FOSTER. I should like to obtain full information from the Minister both in regard to the transportation and supplies. I expected the hon. gentleman would have have had a statement prepared.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). A misunderstanding arose as to the information asked for. The member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) asked for certain information as to the contracts entered into for carrying the supplies. I had an abstract prepared and handed to the hon. member, by whom it was shown to fellow-members. As to the supplies, we have already had considerable discussion as to why they were not put up to public tender. I explained that a few firms had made offers, and we had finally purchased the goods from H. N. Bate & Co., of Ottawa, and the Hudson Bay Company. The chief point at issue between the member for York and myself with respect to the supplies was that I should have asked for tenders by public advertisement. My answer to that was a statement prepared by the Quartermaster General, which I read to the House, in which he pointed out that there was urgency, and that it was necessary for the purpose of securing more careful packing and high quality that as far as possible the supplies should be put up under the eye of the officers of the department. It seemed to be conceded by the hon. gentleman that perhaps, so far as the first portion of the supplies was concerned, that argument had some force.

Mr. FOSTER. I did not admit it.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. So far as regards the second portion of the supplies, about two-thirds of the whole, the hon. gentleman thought there were no good reasons why tenders should not have been asked. My reply was that the urgency was equally great. It was found necessary after the defeat of the Government's Yukon Railway Bill that the second lot should leave this side for the Pacific early in May, because it was found that the only safe means of getting our supplies up to Port Selkirk was by way of the Yukon River. So there was really less time for preparation of the second portion than for the first.

Mr. FOSTER. When does the first boat go ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. It has gone already. It sailed yesterday or the day before. The date given when supplies should reach the Pacific Coast was 20th May, and they had therefore to leave here during the first week in May. I have here a statement of the firms from whom the goods were purchased, and the prices. It is as follows :—

Nature of Supplies.	Prices. 1st Order.	Prices. 2nd Order.	Total cost.	Successful Tenderers.	Other firms tendering or asked to tender.
Provisions and Groceries.	$ c.	$ c.	$		
Bacon	10 50	11 70	9,250	Hudson Bay Co...	Bate & Co.
Beans	3¼	3¼	400		Strachan.
Butter	25	25	3,200		
Tinned meats, lbs	11 90	12 95	12,650		Hudson Bay Co.
Flour, brl	5 65	6 10	4,250		Ogilvie Milling Co.
Biscuit	5½	5½	3,000	Bate & Sons	Bovril Co.
Evaporated vegetables, fruits and groceries			14,000		Canadian Food Supply Co.
					R. E. Jamieson.
					Harris Bros. & Co.
Compressed beef and vegetables			1,550	Bovril, Ltd.....	
Evaporated vegetables	17	17	700	Kerr Vegetable Supply Co..	
Lime juice	95	95	250	Simpson Bros. & Co.	

This last order was given to Bate & Co., including the tinned meats.

Mr. EARLE. In regard to the item of $14.000, particulars should be given, for it might consist of small lines of goods sold at very high prices.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. As regards this item of $14.000, nearly the whole of it is for articles that will be sold to the men as they may require them, and the value will be deducted from their pay. That is customary at all our depots to a certain extent.

Mr. EARLE. That hardly covers the point. Unless all the prices are known, it is impossible to make a proper comparison.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The comparison was made in the department. The information we had was from Mr. White, of the North-west Mounted Police, and the prices quoted were compared with the prices obtaining on the coast. I made that statement of facts to the hon. gentleman and I am not able to add anything to it. We received several prices from the district commanding officer, but I found after discussing the matter with Col. Lake that our principal information was received here from prices which were being paid here. I think the hon. gentleman should take my word for that, and I scarcely see why such very severe criticisms should be made.

Mr. EARLE. I would simply say that this is a matter of very great interest to our people on the Pacific Coast. They feel that they ought at least to have an equal interest in supplying these goods as have the merchants in the east, and what I would like is something to satisfy them that they have not been overlooked in the matter. It is evident that they have not had an equal show to tender for these supplies; and in fact they were not asked to tender at all. We have no information as to the prices that have been quoted to the department by the militia officer on the Pacific Coast, and I feel myself that had the merchants of British Columbia an opportunity of tendering on open tender for that quantity of goods, the order could have been filled on the Pacific Coast certainly at these prices and I think at lower prices.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I have told my hon. friend (Mr. Earle) that we decided at the outset not to ask for public tenders and therefore, right or wrong, that phase of the case is excluded. The question remains as to whether we should buy the goods through Mr. Perry on the coast as has been done for the North-west Mounted Police, or buy them here; and my officers after considering the matter carefully decided that it was desirable we should buy them here. That is all I can say to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Earle) with reference to that point. His friends on the coast have certainly received a very large share of the patronage of this Government; ten times I suppose the amount that the merchants in the east have received. Had there been an opportunity of publishing advertisements for tenders, of course the friends of the hon. gentleman would have had the same opportunities as the others, but we did not think we had time to do that. I wish to make no reflection on the merchants of the coast or anywhere else, but what I said the other day is true, that it so happened that the goods were purchased at prices below those which we would probably have to pay if we advertised, because goods have increased in price since that time. That may be an accident, but it is nevertheless a fact and the country gets the benefit of it.

Mr. SPROULE. I want to say a word with regard to the principle the Minister has laid down.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Oh, never mind that.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. member for Kent (Mr. Campbell) is getting uneasy again; he will want another dose of salts.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I won't go to you for it.

Mr. SPROULE. This information should have been given to us at an earlier date so as to enable us to ascertain how far we are justified in passing this item. The Minister tells us that he sent a memorandum to the member for Pictou (Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper) and he supposed it was shown to the parties interested. Now, every member of this House wants this information just as well as the member for Pictou or half a dozen others, and it should have been given to the whole House and not to a few members. This is a large item and it can only be voted on intelligently when we know the details of how the expenditure was made. Not one Minister but several Ministers during this session have deferred information until the very moment the item was before us and when it was impossible to understand it, and I say that such a course is treating the House with scant courtesy. This deferring of information to the last moment is one reason of the delay in passing the Estimates this session, and the Ministers are responsible for it. When they bring down Estimates at another session, if ever they do have an opportunity of bringing down Estimates again, they should recollect that they must give the House the information it in entitled to at the earliest possible date.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not mean to be unduly insistent, but I think we will save time if this item is allowed to stand until the Minister brings down the information. This is an item of $30,000, and for my part I do not feel inclined to let it go on the scrappy information given us. The Minister has got his department equipped with officers under his control and what is the reason he cannot get a detailed statement made.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). What do you want?

Mr. FOSTER. I want the particulars, I want to know the firms he asked to send in tenders for groceries.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I told you that.

Mr. FOSTER. No, the Minister has not given us the detailed information as to what were the prices of these different firms. We asked the Minister for this information three weeks ago and now he wants to give it at the last moment by word of mouth. We

want to have something that we can look at and see how the prices compare. The Minister can get that done in his department in twenty-five minutes, and it is totally inexcusable that he should ask the House to vote this without a word of information.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I can scarcely understand why the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) should make myself, in connection with this transaction, the object of his special criticism.

Mr. FOSTER. It is not that.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. An item of half a million dollars passed the other day for the Yukon district and the hon. gentleman had not a word to say about it. I do not know if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) desires to press me unduly, or that he has any suspicion of wrongdoing in this matter but I must say the hon. gentleman's course is an unsual one.

Mr. FOSTER. Not at all.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) knows that the two firms with whom we are dealing, the Hudson Bay Company and H. N. Bate & Co., are two of the most reputable firms in this country, firms who would not charge improper prices and who would not enter into improper relations with any Government or any member of a Government. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) suspects anything wrong let him say so, but if he should accept the explanation which I gave I will say this, if this item is allowed to pass I will give in detail the price paid for everey single article of grocery at three o'clock this afternoon.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden) better bring it at three o'clock and we will pass the item.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Oh, pass the item.

Mr. FOSTER. No.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I think there is a great want of courtesy in treating me in that way. I have been in this House for more years than the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) and I know the custom has been that when a Minister of the Crown makes a statement that he will bring down papers before a certain hour, that statement has usually been accepted. These goods have been purchased and they have to be paid for. I will bring down the particulars this afternoon if my officers can do it, and I think they can. I will bring down the price of salt and pepper and every item. I did not direct the making out of the memorandum I have read, my officers did it and they no doubt thought it was all the information required. I do think that after the statement I have made the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) should allow the item to pass.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend (Mr. Borden) was not on good ground when he takes the inference that because information on an important vote is insisted on there is a suspicion that he is dishonest. My hon. friend (Mr. Borden) knows his own honesty and if he has confidence in it he ought not to take that line of argument. This House has a perfect right to know even the price of salt. My hon. friend (Mr. Borden) says he has made a saving to the country; he has done it by private contract, and it is not a picayune thing for a member of Parliament to insist that information should be given. Who said the Minister did not deal with reputable firms? But is the Minister going to make that an excuse for bringing information down? Three weeks ago this item was postponed for information, but the Minister to-day has not given us any more information than he gave then.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I do not believe that in my whole experience in this House I have ever seen the matter pressed as this has been against the Minister. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden) has a right to infer that there is some personal reason for this course.

Mr. FOSTER. Let me set that at rest at once. I say there is no personal consideration at all.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Why do you not accept what never has been refused before at the request of a Minister?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. My hon. friend (Mr. Borden) explicitly gave the reasons why he acted as he did, and he gave the names of every article and the price.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Why, the other night the Minister read a long memorandum and the House asked him to dispense with the reading of it. There could be no suggestion that he was refusing information. He had the documents there and was willing and anxious to give the facts. He made the most frank and explicit explanation of the whole matter. I think this is not fair treatment of the Minister; because, as every hon. member of the House knows, it has been usual when good general information has been given, whether satisfactory or not, for the items to be passed. Further the hon. Minister said that if any member of the House wished more definite information he would bring down in detail the facts regarding every purchase. I do not see on what ground there can be any dissatisfaction.

Mr. FOSTER. I will tell you what I will agree to, we will allow this to pass on the condition we have full information on concurrence and be allowed to discuss it the same as in committee.

Mr. SPROULE. Before we leave this, I desire to say a word in answer to the Minister. The hon. gentleman said that he never saw an item passed in this way in this House before. We have been passing items of this nature the whole session and asking for information, and we have been refused it. The Minister says that we have passed hundreds of thousands of dollars on the same principle. So we have. But we have entered our protest on every occasion against doing so; we have asked for the information and have been refused. And it is because we have been so systematically refused that we say that the principle was a bad one and one which should not be followed. The Minister suggests that we should have a discussion now, and he will bring down the information afterwards. Did he think for a moment how absurd that must seem? How can we intelligently discuss the question without the information? First, he says, commit the country to the expenditure and discuss the matter afterwards.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Will my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) allow me. Surely he will admit that when detailed information is wanted it is generally got through the Public Accounts Committee. It is not usual to bring down invoices and every detail here.

Mr. SPROULE. Such information has been brought before the House, having been asked for especially where, in a large item like this, no contract has been given, the thing having been done by private bargain, under circumstances which justify, to my mind, suspicion that something is wrong.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. What does the hon. gentleman mean by that—"circumstances that justify suspicion"—what does he mean?

Mr. SPROULE. I mean what I say. When the Minister gives a contract by private bargain and at prices above the normal prices, as we are told——

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. That is not correct, Mr. Speaker: the prices were not above the normal prices, and when the hon. gentleman states so, he states something which is not true.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPROULE. I ask your ruling on that word, Mr. Speaker.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Then I will say that the hon. gentleman is stating that which is not correct. I have over and over again said that the prices are not above the normal, and I proved it by quoting prices in this House.

Mr. SPROULE. Do I understand that the Minister has withdrawn the objectionable language? It is quite true that the Minister quoted a price list, but men just as reputable as he, and just as intelligent as he, men engaged in that business and therefore acquainted with the prices, have also quoted figures to show that the prices he gave were high and that the goods could be purchased for less. Does not that justify suspicion? And when you have the additional fact that these contracts have been given without tender, without advertisement or invitation to those engaged in the trade, you have still more to justify suspicion. I repeat "surrounded by circumstances sufficient to justify suspicion," and I do not withdraw a word of it. It is important that we should have the information which I asked for weeks ago, but which the Minister promised to give us but did not give us.

Mr. HUGHES. In view of the fact that abnormally large estimates were brought down this session, some couple of months ago, I suggested that we should avoid a great deal of discussion in order that we might get to these estimates and criticise them properly. My suggestions were not acted upon, and we had hundreds of thousands of dollars voted for transport to the Yukon voted without any discussion, the items being rushed through at the close of the session. I have entered my protest against that kind of thing already this session. These are the matters that we should discuss. We have been hanging around here for a great part of the winter, all the spring and now well into summer, and yet we have had no opportunity to discuss these matters properly. There was one point I particularly wished to discuss, and that was the item of $800 a ton for transport into the Yukon country. I am glad that the leader of the Opposition has accepted the proposal of the Minister, and I hope the Minister will bring down full information on the subject.

Mr. FOSTER. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden) has any information at hand and will send it over, it will be gratefully received. The correspondence brought down with reference to transport is not clear; it does not appear on what ground an additional $200 or $250 is being paid to transport to the Grand Trunk.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The hon. gentleman will understand that we purchased the goods delivered at Vancouver and Seattle, with the exception of some 40 or 45 tons which we sent through ourselves. The price paid is $20 per ton.

Mr. FOSTER. Or is it not $25 a ton?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The original price named was $25 a ton. But I pointed out to the Grand Trunk people that the Canadian Pacific rate was $20, and I thought they should have reduced theirs to the same, and they agreed to do it.

Mr. FOSTER. It appears that the hon. Minister asked the Grand Trunk and the Canadian Pacific for transport, and the Canadian Pacific gave a price of $20 per ton, while the Grand Trunk, in the first place, put in a schedule of prices very much higher than $20 per ton. Then after having a Sunday conference with the hon. Minister in Montreal they sent a tender reducing it to $25 a ton, which price, so far as these papers show, they never reduced. But on the last day, when the Canadian Pacific Railway telegraphed to know—that was on the 12th April—if their tender was accepted, the reply was sent that the Minister had not yet decided. And yet, I find the contract was awarded to the Grand Trunk on that very same day. When my hon. friend had asked for tenders and received them, the tender of the Canadian Pacific being the lowest, why was not that accepted? Why did the Minister tell the Grand Trunk in the first place that their schedule of prices was too high, and when they offered a rate of $25 tell them that they were still $5 above the Canadian Pacific and get them to reduce it? Does the hon. gentleman think that is a fair way of awarding contracts after asking for tenders?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Our object in corresponding with them was simply to get transportation from the Pacific to a point in the Yukon. The hon. gentleman will also remember—a fact that I have stated several times—the goods purchased on this side were purchased delivered at Vancouver or Seattle, and we had no particular interest in the rate of freight charged—that was a matter for the contractors. But it happened that the transportation company on the Pacific with which we finally made our arrangement had connection with the Grand Trunk and Northern Pacific, and so far as we were concerned, we felt under obligations to give the Grand Trunk the only traffic we had the 40 or 45 tons. The hon. gentleman knows there are different classes of freight, and we found out the rate was $5 in excess. Still, it did not amount to much on only 45 tons. I asked the Grand Trunk to make their rate the same as Canadian Pacific, and they said they thought their rate was the same, but the Canadian Pacific had gone $5 below them and they were prepared to meet the Canadian Pacific. But so far as either road was concerned, we had no traffic of any consequence for the reason I have pointed out—that the greater part of the goods were delivered on the Pacific Coast.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend thinks that is a satisfactory statement now. He thinks that is the way to carry out a system of tender and contract—to ask two companies to tender, and when one tenders too high, to have a personal interview and get them to accept a lower rate—then tell them the tender of the other company, and show them that they are still too high and must come down. If the hon. Minister is willing to let it go at that, I am.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. In addition to that there is the fact that a portion of the freight was to be taken at Seattle, and I supposed the most direct way to get the goods to Seattle was over the Grand Trunk and Northern Pacific and that that portion of the freight taken on at Seattle was shipped in that way.

Mr. FOSTER. The company which takes the freight, in the end calls at Vancouver.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. It does now. But the company insisted that one hundred tons of the freight should be taken on at Seattle.

Mr. FOSTER. Then why was not the Canadian Pacific asked to tender for the goods taken to Seattle? If you bound yourself to send that freight by an American port rather than a Canadian port, why not ask for the rate to Seattle?

Mr. EARLE. Any one in the freight business knows that Seattle is a common point.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. At the option of the ship.

Mr. EARLE. I have a letter here from a gentleman engaged for many years in shipping by large steamers. He, in quoting the prices to the Government for freight from the Pacific coast to Dawson, $275 a ton, dead weight, and ship's option, he claims, is about three times the rate that he quoted. Two thousand pounds of goods they call a ton, then take the ordinary goods by measurement, and they will measure three tons to one by weight, or somewhere in the neighbourhood, which would make their rates very much higher than the price he quoted. Here is what that gentleman says, and I presume this is information he gave to the hon. gentleman's officers:

> We did receive an inquiry from the Government through Colonel Peters for a tender to carry some 200 tons of supplies for Dawson via the Yukon. We were then in a perfect position to handle the business, and we made a quotation of $275 per ton weight through to Dawson City, particularly pointing out at the time that in offering this as a weight proposition, we were giving an extremely good quotation, because, as these supplies would run as high as three tons measurement to one ton weight, which, at the market quotation of $200 per ton weight or measurement (ship's option), meant that we were quoting $275 against $600.

Of course the ship has the option in all cases, unless special arrangements are made, as in the case of dry goods, for example, they take the option of measurement, in all other cases they take it by weight. This gentleman says further:

> Further, in case of the officials not being fully cognizant of the trend of these quotations, we made an alternative offer of $200 per ton, weight

or measurement (ship's option). Our offer was not taken up.

Another gentleman writes who had not been applied to, and I think he was in a good position to have forwarded these goods by the 10th of June. The first steamer was advertised to leave on the 9th of June for the Yukon. It is something that I have gone into particularly, because I am a member of the Canadian Pacific Navigation Company who are building a steamer at St. Michael's for the Yukon trade. We had the matter investigated carefully last year, both as to the time of opening of the Yukon and character of the river, and we know pretty well who are building steamers, and what companies are in a position to carry freight. When I left the Pacific Coast I never heard of a transportation company of the name given here. I have information since that these boats do not belong to this company calling themselves a transportation company, they belong to another company. There are a great many little companies formed who call themselves transportation companies, but which are adventurers and speculators, and these people were not in a position at the time these negotiations were made to handle the goods in any shape or form. They had no steamers, while other people had steamers and were actually engaged in transportation on that line, and were building steamers for the Yukon River. In fact, there were two or three built in Toronto by Mr. Bertram, a member of this House, and he has told me that these vessels had been shipped some time ago, and would be ready to go up as soon as it was possible to put them on the river. Another gentleman writes:

> The Dominion Government did not make any inquiry from me with regard to carrying 250 tons of supplies for the North-west Mounted Police into the Yukon. I should have been very glad to carry this amount and to have delivered it at Fort Selkirk for $300 a ton, I am despatching, the ocean steamer "Tordenskjold," with two of my river boats, on the 9th of June.

His boats have all sailed, and I have been informed, I do not say it is information I can vouch for, that the Boston Alaska Company was not in a position to get out these goods at the time they intended. This gentleman continues:

> The river boats will proceed to Dawson, Fort Selkirk and Teslin Lake, and will thereafter run upon the station between Teslin Lake and Dawson City.
>
> Yours truly,
>
> (Sgd. H. MAITLAND KERSEY.

He represents the Canadian Development Company. Anybody on the coast, the officer of the department, or Major Peters, must have known that it was possible to get a Canadian company to carry these goods as low as an American company. There are a number of them on the river, they are in an equally good position to do the work, and as to giving a guarantee to get to Selkirk. But there is no steamboat company which would give a guarantee to get to Selkirk, neither has this company given such a guarantee. This is a contract which means nothing. If a boy of mine 10 years of age drew up a contract like that, I should feel very much like spanking him. It means simply nothing. If it were read to the House any man who is accustomed to documents of that kind could see that it means nothing. There is no assurance that the contract will be carried out, and there is no penalty attached to a failure. Speaking of the purchase of goods, I do feel a little warmly upon that subject. The hon. gentleman speaks of the merchants of the Pacific Coast having had a large share of the trade. I claim that they are entitled to the bulk of it, and if they got it all, it would not be too much to expect. We were the first to take steps to divert the trade of the Yukon to Canada. When the excitement broke out last fall there was not a dollar's worth of trade being done in the Dominion of Canada with the Yukon, it was all being done in Seattle and the United States coast cities. We went to work as individuals and spent at least $75,000 on the Pacific Coast in advertising, and trying to divert trade to our ports and to Canada, because as soon as our trade was opened up we felt that all Canada was going to get a share of it. The mills from one end of Canada to the other started up in making goods specially adapted to that trade, even down as far as New Brunswick, where mills began making a special kind of cloth. We were the natural distributors for the eastern people. They talk of the trade being all for our benefit. It is a perfect myth. There were the shoe manufacturers, the makers of rubber boots, snowshoes, and everything else in that line, who immediately felt the benefit, and it was all brought about by the efforts of the merchants on the Pacific Coast, by their pluck and perseverance. We sent agents all through the country, as well as to Great Britain and Australia, we sent out circulars, and folders, and maps, much in excess of anything ever done by this Government, not excepting the celebrated book published by Hunter, Rose & Co. By these means we diverted a great portion of the trade to the coast, as is well known. The immigration that was taking place came almost exclusively from the United States, and you will understand the difficulty there was in getting them to call for supplies on our coast. We had to fight the Pacific Coast Steamship Company (who were offering to tender for the transportation of those goods that are going out now). They were our greatest enemies. They had their emissaries in Washington trying to induce the Government to enforce such customs laws as would prevent us landing goods at Skagway or Dyea. Our people carried on this fight without any

assistance from Canada, and we succeeded in diverting trade to our cities, to a great extent. Of course eastern Canada is getting their share of it. I think it is most unfortunate that our people, at any rate, did not have an opportunity to share in any benefits that were derived from the trade of the Yukon country. Now, we have competition from the east in every line, but in business of this kind we are in a good position to compete, and I think in all fairness we should have an opportunity. In this case the Minister has given these orders to two reputable houses, as he says. But there are many other houses just as reputable as Messrs. Bate & Co., and the Hudson Bay Co.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. We could not accommodate all of them.

Mr. EARLE. You could have divided it up, or have given them a show. I am speaking for British Columbia, and I feel that we were entitled to a show above all others in this country. We have spent money, we are still spending it, and I do not think that Messrs. Bate & Co. ever contributed one dollar to assist in diverting trade to the Canadian cities on the coast, and if we do not get that trade, it will go to the American cities. In asking for information in regard to this matter, I do not attribute any unfair motives to the Minister, but I must say that his action looks something like favouritism, and there is a possibility of things being not quite square. With regard to the transportation of these goods, that seems to have been done on the principle that there was to be no competition. Take the case cited by the hon. member for York in regard to freight. If a private individual conducted tenders in that way, it would not be possible for him to get anybody to tender a second time. Here is a company who tendered the first time at a much lower price than has been awarded in the contract. It is a most unfair thing, in respect to tenders, to hawk the lowest tender around trying to get some of your friends to do it at the same price. That is a most dishonourable thing, and a man who would do it in his private business, would be looked upon as dishonourable, and no respectable contractor would think of sending him a tender the second time. Now I sincerely hope that the Minister, when he gets this information in the afternoon, will give us something that is really information, because what we have now only gives the prices of a few goods, it does not even say where they are delivered. The other day I made some remarks about the flour furnished in this contract. I find the flour furnished is not of the first grade, it is second grade, as I suspected the other day from the price. I would like very much to see what this large amount of $14,000 is composed of. I presume these are prices delivered on the coast.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. All prices delivered on the coast. The freight was negotiated by the contractors themselves.

Mr. EARLE. Then these negotiations seem all to have gone through the department.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. As I explained to the member for York, they refer simply to the small quantity of stuff that was sent by the Government from the east, stuff that was in stock. Everything included in that list means delivered on the other side.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the hon. gentleman agree with the view of the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Earle) ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. That was a matter under discussion, and I had to defer to men who possessed large experience. I took the agreement to Mr. White, of the North-west Mounted Police, and asked him what he thought of it. He showed me agreements or terms which he had made with the North-American Transportation Company corresponding to the arrangement made with this company, and I was informed that that was the usual arrangement. Further, I was told that the difference in this class of goods would not be very great. In the case of bulky goods, no doubt it would increase the price, but not in the case of heavy goods. If there is any addition to the number of tons, if it should turn out to be more than 250 tons to be paid for, the difference would be very slight indeed. We have sent officers to watch the weighing of the freight and to carefully guard the Government's interest and see that we receive fair play. We have in addition the bulk of the goods when on the cars. We took pains to consult the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway, which latter corporation recommended the company with whom we have made the bargain—the Hudson Bay Company and the North American Trading Company were also asked to tender. I believe the company with which we made the bargain is a sound one.

Mr. CLARKE. Who constitute the company ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Their headquarters are at Boston. Mr. McNaught is the president or vice-president, and Mr. Grosse is the agent who came here.

Mr. EARLE. Mr. McNaught was at one time. I do not know whether he is to-day, a very prominent official in the Northern Pacific Railway Company.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. We have the assurance of Dunn &

Co., of Boston, that the company is reliable and able to carry out the contract. It is true that Mr. Kersey has offered recently to carry freight to Fort Selkirk, but it is not correct that he had no opportunity to make an offer at an earlier period. His agent was constantly in communication with my department in regard to carrying freight.

Mr. EARLE. That has not been shown by the papers.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. He knew we were going to send goods to the Yukon. We endeavoured to make an arrangement with the North American Company, but we were unable to do so, and so we entered into an arrangement with the present company, which I have every confidence will be satisfactory.

To pay the Halifax Banking Company, assignee of the Nova Scotia Central Railway Company, balance of amount earned and unpaid of sum voted by 56 Vic., chap. 2, in aid of the construction of this road, payment having been delayed owing to a dispute as to who should receive the money..... $4,500

Mr. MILLS. Last session I asked whether there was still a balance on subsidy due to the Nova Scotia Central Railway Company, and I think the Minister of Railways replied that there was a balance of $4,500 still remaining due; that as it had been earned, it would not lapse, and that so far as he knew then, he was prepared to adhere to the opinion given by the late Sir John Thompson. If that answer is correct, I should like to know why this item appears in the estimate.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). I have some knowledge of this subject, but I am not sure that it will prove sufficient to satisfy the hon. gentleman. This is a case in which a balance of subsidy was due to the Nova Scotia Central Railway Company, amounting to $4,500. There arose a question some years ago as to the person who was entitled to receive this subsidy, the company having got into difficulties. In 1893, a balance of $4,500 was revoted, and as revoted it was decided that it should be paid, not to the company, but to the persons entitled to receive it. There are several interests in this matter. In the first place, there is the company; in the second place, there is the Halifax Banking Company, which was interested: in the third place, there is F. B. Wade, who afterwards became the receiver and liquidator of the company, and in the fourth place, there were a number of unsatisfied creditors. The late Minister of Justice, Sir John Thompson, after going over the matter very thoroughly, gave an opinion that the Halifax Banking Company was entitled to receive this subsidy, but he thought it might properly be held for an accounting in the Supreme Court as between the company, the bank and all parties interested. The Halifax Banking Company claimed, by reason of a power of attorney. James Eisenhauer and F. B. Wade financed the road. They provided certain moneys, and obtained those moneys on their credit at the Halifax Bank, and among the bank's securities was a power of attorney from the company to draw the Dominion subsidy, and it did draw the subsidy until towards the end. Sir John Thompson decided that the party entitled to the money was the Halifax Banking Company, adding that it would be well to reserve payment a sufficient time for an accounting between the company and the bank. It does not appear that any accounting has taken place between the company and the bank. There has been an accounting as between Mr. Wade, as receiver of the company, and the company itself, as I am informed, although I do not find any reference to an accounting. All the equties are in favour of the Halifax Bank. If the amount were a large one, $40,000 or $50,000 instead of $4,500, it might be worth while to go behind the claim of the bank and consider the claims of other creditors, but the present amount of $4,500 would be wholly expended in endeavouring to find out who was the proper party and entitled to the money. The bank advanced money on the power of attorney. The company attempted to revoke that power of attorney; but in view of all the circumstances, they were not allowed to revoke it. In view of those facts, and that the claim is an old one and should be adjusted, and taking a broad and equitable view of the whole transaction as to the payment of the money, I think the banking company are entitled to it. That was the view taken by the Minister of Railways; but the Auditor General held that further parliamentary authority should be obtained, and therefore this item is put in the Estimates for the payment of the money to the Halifax Banking Company. As regards the railway company itself, it never was a very substantial company, it was largely a paper company, At the early stages there was some financial strength, but for a very long time the company was not in a sound condition. The road has been taken over by the bank and is owned by it, although it now runs under the name of the Central Railway. As to the company, it cannot establish any claim to the money. As regards the creditors, the amount is so insignificant that any attempt to divide it among them would mean the waste of the money in legal expenses. The Halifax Bank is entitled equitably, and I hope it will be found legally, to this money. Mr. Wade at one time filed a personal claim against the company for $20,000. Taking all the circumstances into account, Parliament could not do better than pay the amount to the Halifax Banking Company. We can go into concurrence and then my hon. friend will have an opportunity of discussing it.

Mr. MILLS. I am not here to talk. I want to convince the hon. gentleman that he is wrong.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Though the item should pass, yet if my hon. friend (Mr. Mills) can convince me it ought not to be paid, then it will not be paid.

Mr. MILLS. I can say what I have to say in a very few minutes. I agree with the facts substantially as they were stated by the Finance Minister. A vote was passed in this House for this money to be paid to the Nova Scotia Central Railway at first, and the company in order to finance their road entered into an arrangement with Wade & Eisenhauer, and Mr. Eisenhauer was the man to whom the Halifax Banking Company really looked for the payment of the advances made by them, and the mortgage that was placed upon the road at that time specially provides that these subsidies are excepted. Mr. Wade was put in as receiver under that mortgage, and there has been an accounting so far as that mortgage is concerned, but there has been no accounting as was stated by the Minister of Finance, as between Mr. Wade or Mr. Wade and Eisenhauer.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Mr. Wade acted in the capacity of receiver and I believe there was an accounting in that capacity.

Mr. MILLS. I think, perhaps, there was. There must of necessity in the ordinary legal course have been an accounting before the road could be taken over. The accounting referred to in the decision of Sir John Thompson is between Wade & Eisenhauer and the Halifax Banking Company on the one hand, and the railway company on the other. Every effort has been made to get that accounting. Mr. Wade has that entirely in his possession and he has defied the company with reference to that. It is true the company have not been very substantial.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That would not be a good reason for longer withholding the money from the Banking Company which is not in fault.

Mr. MILLS. I am stating that the Banking Company is not in fault, and I know that the Banking Company would be willing to settle this matter if they could get Mr. Wade to do so. It is not the Halifax Banking Company that is making this objection but it is Mr. Wade.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Not at all.

Mr. MILLS. They may be used by Mr. Wade.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We have correspondence from the Halifax Banking Company demanding the money, but what their relations are with Mr. Wade I do not know.

Mr. MILLS. The Halifax Banking Company was on the eve of settling this but Mr. Wade said: No; the Liberals are in power and I have influence with the Liberal Government and I can get this for the Halifax Banking Company in spite of anything that may be alleged against it. That is the contention. Let us come out and speak plainly with reference to this. Every one knows that is the understanling.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not know it.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Wade says he has a pull on the Government with reference to this, notwithstanding the opinion given by Sir John Thompson, and he says he is going to exercise that pull and to endeavour to blot out the opinion of Sir John Thompson with reference to this matter. I do not wish to beat about the bush and these are the plain facts. The resolution that was put upon the Statute-book first, voted a subsidy to the Nova Scotia Central Railway. When this balance of subsidy was about lapsing, in this Parliament in 1893—and the discussion on it is spread on the pages of "Hansard"—the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) at that time advocated the contention of Mr. Wade, and he had the motion amended in this way. That instead of having it paid directly to the Nova Scotia Central Railway, it would read:

> To the Nova Scotia Central Railway Company, or to such person or persons or company as in the opinion of the Minister or acting Minister of Justice are entitled to the sum.

Sir Louis Davies had that amendment put in in 1893, and why are you going back on that amendment now? I am suggesting that that very same thing be done now.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Is it to stand there for ever?

Mr. FOSTER. No, the Minister of Justice would decide that.

Mr. MILLS. The reason why an action for accounting has not been made before was because I could not find Mr. Stearns, the president. He gave this to me to look after for him when he was living in Middleton, but he got sick and went away and I could not find his address. Since I came to this session he has written me and I have his address now; it is Bridgeport, Conn., and he has instructed me to go on with reference to this accounting. The reason Mr. Stearns' address could not be found was because all correspondence was kept from him for something like nine months or a year, he being so very ill. I had forgotten the length of time exactly, but it was long enough to keep me from

bringing Mr. Wade or the Halifax Banking Company to an accounting. All we want is an accounting. We contend that Mr. Wade has been paid time and again over and above everything, and if Mr. Eisenhauer were alive he would tell you so because he explained personally to me that Mr. Wade had gobbled up the whole thing and Mr. Wade was the man who got Mr. Eisenhauer into the trap. All that I ask is—and it is a reasonable request and it is only what the late Government did at the instance of the present Minister of Marine—all that I ask is that the matter should be left as it is and the opinion of Sir John Thompson adhered to. I will guarantee that we will have that matter before the courts inside of three months and have it settled if Sir John Thompson's opinion is adhered to. It is absurd that we in this Parliament should be asked to legislate on what the courts are instituted to determine, and Sir John Thompson acted extremely fairly with reference to that matter.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The suggestion of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mills) does not appear to me to be unreasonable, and we can insert in the item, "subject to its being settled within three months."

Mr. MILLS. I cannot say that it will be settled, but I will guarantee that within three months an action will be entered for an accounting.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. They were entitled under that opinion of Sir John Thompson to demand an accounting. They have not done so, and my hon. friend tells us that the president of the company went away and could not be found; which is a good reason to show that the company had not a substantial interest in it.

Mr. MILLS. That is a very unfair argument.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not think so. It never could have been Sir John Thompson's opinion that this thing was to be hung up for years and the proper persons kept out of the money, because the president of the company could not be found. There are people all over Nova Scotia who are clamouring for this money, and the bank claims and the Wade claims ought to be settled and wiped out of the business of Canada. I agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Blair) that we might put in a qualification that this be subject to an accounting within three or four months or any reasonable length of time.

Mr. MILLS. Very well, I am willing to say six months.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The bank is not going to suffer by that.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not see that the bank or anybody else suffers. If it gets any money over what it is entitled to it can be recovered.

Mr. MILLS. But is not this a bad precedent?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No. We are simply paying this money to the corporation that has authority from the original contractor to receive the money under a power of attorney, and that was the opinion of the late Sir John Thompson.

Mr. MILLS. Not exactly.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We are simply giving the money to the corporation which had authority from the contracting company to receive it and which is bound to account to the contracting company if it gets one dollar more than is due.

Mr. FOSTER. Let us put in the provision with reference to giving six months for the accounting before the Supreme Court.

Mr. KAULBACH. I regret I can not concur with the views expressed by the hon. Minister of Finance. The appropriation as respects the Nova Scotia Central Railway as shown in this item of the Estimates, reads as follows:—

> To pay the Halifax Banking Company, assignee of the Nova Scotia Central Railway Company, balance of amount earned and unpaid of sum voted by 56 Vic., chap. 2, in aid of the construction of this road, payment having been delayed owing to a dispute as to who should receive the money, $4,500.

Now, I beg to inform the hon. Minister of Railways, and the Government, that in my opinion, and I consider I am right, the Halifax Banking Company is not entitled to this money equitably, the only parties entitled to it are the employees of the company—the contractors and the labourers who gave their honest toil or labour on the road, and they having done so, are entitled to their honest pay.

I have always held, and I contend I am right, that in the construction of railways, as well as any other works subsidized by Government, there should be protection given to the labourer who gives his honest toil or labour on the works. If a contractor agrees to construct, and he sublets the work. I say, in justice to the employee so engaged, they should have a right to a lien on the work and a claim on the Government, without any prejudice or any intervention of the contractor or company, or sub-contractor until their labour is paid, but not to exceed in the aggregate the amount of subsidy originally granted, less the material employed in such construction.

I ask, by what right is the Halifax Banking Company entitled to this money? This bank, as security for the money they ad-

vanced took a first lien upon the railway known as the "Nova Scotia Central," together with all the equipments of said road. and I contend the company now, at this late hour, have no claim upon this money, they having been preferred in the first instance having as security the railway as well as the unpaid labour of the men, and certainly and I will go so far as to say legally I feel the bank is not entitled to this money, as it would be giving the Banking Company the pay a second time. All I can do is to make my honest protest against this money being appropriated in this way, and to say that as the friend of the poor workingman, the right thing for the Government to do is to pay the money to the employees pro rata and not to the bank.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Kaulbach) would propose any method whereby the creditors might get the money, I could see more force in his remarks. But when he simply proposes that we shall do nothing, he does not help the creditors. I do not agree that the Halifax Banking Company has not paid this money. They advanced the money, and will be out of pocket even if they receive this amount. It is no answer to say that they have the property, for in this they have not a property that is a source of revenue, but it is a source of loss. Therefore, the fact of their holding the property should not be used to their disadvantage. If my hon. friend is going to pay any of the persons who have claims, he must pay them all; and the moment he attempts that, this $4,500 is dissipated into a few shillings apiece.

Mr. KAULBACH. I propose that in these payments the employees should have priority.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Employees of what?

Mr. KAULBACH. The men who constructed the road, without whose labour there would have been no road. The Banking Company having taken possession and sold out the property, they have acquired the results of the labour of these people, and now they want the money as well.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My recollection is that in the later stages of this business, whatever may have happened before, the labour was all paid for. Ever since Messrs. Wade & Eisenhauer and the Halifax Banking Company provided the money, this has been done. I do not think there is a penny due for labour within the last ten years of this concern's history.

Mr. KAULBACH. But the labour has not been paid for that constructed the road, and there never would have been a railway but for the labour of these people.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Is my hon. friend (Mr. Kaulbach) referring to the labourers at the time previous to the Halifax Bank's time? If so, all that is dead and gone. There was a settlement and moneys were paid. Ever since Mr. Wade and Mr. Eisenhauer and the Halifax Banking Company advanced money, there has been no such claim left unpaid.

Mr. KAULBACH. I am sure the hon. gentleman is mistaken.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I can tell my hon. friend that both in my capacity as a Minister here and in my capacity as a Minister in Nova Scotia, I have had these things before me, and I have no recollection of any claim being put in for labour employed in the course of construction.

Mr. KAULBACH. I am sure that Mr. Eisenhauer and Mr. Wade and all the parties interested in the road know that my statement is a correct one. Why, the name of the claimants for the payment of these bills is legion.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. Borden). What good would this $4,500 do them?

Mr. KAULBACH. It would show that the Government, on their part are willing that these parties should receive their pay. There is no justice in paying banking corporations who have already received the proceeds of the people's labour, while these labourers themselves have received nothing.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I hope my hon. friend (Mr. Kaulbach) will not allow that statement to go on record. I state, and I think I know the facts, that there are not any unpaid bills for labour since the money was advanced by Messrs. Wade & Eisenhauer and the Halifax Banking Company, but that every dollar of labour that went into the road since then was paid for. There was some question of supplies toward the end of construction, and after the road was finished there were claims arising out of its operation; but that did not touch the subsidy. I think my hon. friend is mistaken when he says that there are labourers' claims now.

Mr. KAULBACH. I am strongly impressed with the view I have placed on record here.

Mr. FOSTER. I think perhaps we had better get out of the committee and get clear of the matter in the meantime. Then it can be taken up on concurrence, and I think we can engage that there shall not be very much discussion.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I am willing to say that the amount will be withheld, if my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) desires it, for the term of six months, in order to afford the parties interested an opportunity to have their account considered and to have it determined whether the money should be paid

to the Nova Scotia Central Railway Company or to the Halifax Bank.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. And in that case if it is not payable to the Halifax Bank under the accounting, we will not pay it at all.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I will do that—if the result of the accounting is that the amount is not properly coming to the Halifax Bank, it will not be paid at all.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. That is the best way.

Mr. MILLS. What I propose, and it is only agreeing to what the late Government agreed to at the suggestion of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries——

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. This amounts to the same thing.

Mr. MILLS. No, my proposition is—I cannot on the spur of the moment give the wording of the resolution, but I think an item might be framed so as to carry out the idea—that the opinion of the late Minister of Justice in this matter should be acted upon, and let it stand, say for four months, and then if the accounting has not taken place, let the money be paid over to the Halifax Bank.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. Minister (Mr. Blair) gives you a formal offer to that effect.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mills) has one thing in mind and I have another. Mine is a totally distinct proposition. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Mills) desires me to engage that the view suggested by the late Sir John Thompson should be accepted, that in a certain eventuality the amounts to be paid to these solicitors, that is for certain purposes, should be dealt with. I do not wish to be drawn into any controversy as between the solicitors or to determine whether they are entitled to the money or not. I simply want to agree, if my hon. friend will accept it, that the amount shall remain in the treasury, in the meantime until an accounting takes place in a reasonable time. Then if the Banking Company is not entitled to be paid, it shall not be paid.

Mr. MILLS. That seems fair as far as it goes. Then I shall have to explain the reasons why I would like to have the other part of Sir John Thompson's opinion agreed to.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. You will be in no worse position than if there was no vote. The money will remain in the treasury.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. He may satisfy us that we should ask for the vote to be paid in the direction he suggests.

Mr. MILLS. This was done by the late Government at the suggestion of the other side. I cannot see why it cannot be carried out.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I foresee no end of trouble in it.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The Minister's statement is a fair one and ought to be accepted.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The hon. gentleman from Annapolis (Mr. Mills) discussed the matter in this House in 1893. His statement is on record, he went over the whole case then, and he could not make a clearer or fuller statement than he made at that time.

Mr. KAULBACH. Would it not be well, in order to relieve the Government of the onus and also keep the matter out of the courts and prevent the lawyers from getting this amount to themselves and the poor unforunate claimants getting nothing, to appoint a party who could have sufficient intelligence to weigh these matters as well as a lawyer, or that each party could have their lawyers and have a third party to make up an agreement.

Mr. FOSTER. If my hon. friend would allow me—suppose you just leave it to be paid on the report of the Minister of Justice. He is a third man and also, in a sense, a representative of both.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No more than I am.

Mr. FOSTER. In one way. But if we constitute him, as it were, the arbitrator and then pay upon his advisement——

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is not a matter of arbitration; it is a matter for the courts. These parties have had four years to have this accounting, and they have not done it. Now the Minister says he will give them further time—that is equivalent to an engagement by an Act of Parliament—and that the money shall not be paid before six months, and if, in the meantime, they get an accounting showing that the Halifax Banking Company has no right to the money, the money will not be paid at all, and then we shall come back to Parliament to deal with the matter further.

Mr. KAULBACH. I do not think that the hon. gentleman can say that accounts have not been submitted; some have been put in, but they have not been recognized.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, what I said was that no accounts for labour at the latter stage of the affair were due, but that there were some supply accounts arising in the later years.

Mr. MILLS. I do not wish to prolong the discussion, but if I had time, I think I could give very substantial reasons why the course proposed by the late Sir John Thompson should be carried out, and I think it is very unfair that the matter should be dealt with as suggested and not in accordance with Sir John Thompson's decision. It is taking upon ourselves the adjudication of a matter that should be adjudicated before the courts.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, we are not adjudicating anything.

Mr. MILLS. Then what is the proposition ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. What I understand was asked to be agreed to is this : Sir John Thompson decided that this was due to the Halifax Banking Company, but the railway company claimed that they had settled with the Halifax Banking Company. Therefore, this will be held open long enough to secure an accounting. Years have passed and no accounting has been given although my hon. friend (Mr. Mills) says he could get an accounting at once.

Mr. MILLS. No, what I said was that I am prepared to enforce an accounting. That accounting is all in the hands of the other side. Mr. Wade has it in his own hands entirely.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Mills) said that he was prepared to get an accounting in three months. We are ready to allow him six months, and then if the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia determines that the Halifax Banking Company is not entitled to the money, the money will not be paid.

Mr. KAULBACH. I ask that instead of this, the item be allowed to stand over until next session.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Carried.

Mr. FOSTER. On the understanding stated by the Minister of Finance.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals authorized it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

The committee rose, and reported.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I ought to have said that I asked the Chairman to substitute the "Attorney of the Halifax Banking Company" instead of the "Assignee of the Halifax Banking Company."

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to. and the House adjourned at 1.45 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Second Sitting.

SATURDAY, 11th June, 1898.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

PROROGATION.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have received the following communication from the secretary of His Excellency the Governor General :—

His Excellency will proceed to the Senate Chamber to prorogue the session of the Dominion Parliament on Monday, the 13th instant, at 3 o'clock p.m.

NOVA SCOTIA SOUTHERN RAILWAY.

Mr. KAULBACH. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I do not see the Minister of Railways and Canals in his seat, but I have written a letter to him asking for a renewal of the subsidy for the railway known as the Nova Scotia Southern Railway, also for a grant this year for the extension of that road from New Germany to Halifax. The proposed branch is from Shelburne to New Germany, and thence to Halifax direct, touching at several points on the line.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). It is not the policy of the Government to bring down any railway subsidies this session. This is one of many cases that have been presented to the Minister of Railways and Canals. I can assure the hon. gentleman of my earnest desire that his wishes should be carried out, but it is not a matter in which the Government are in a position to make any announcement at present.

SUPPLY—CONCURRENCE.

The House proceeded to consider resolutions adopted in Committee of Supply 20th April last.

Civil Government—
Department of Customs..... $38,750

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Mr. Paterson). I move that that be reduced by $1,750.

Mr. CLARKE. I would like to draw the attention of the Minister of Customs to a statement which appeared in the Toronto "News" yesterday respecting important changes which are to be made in the staff of the customs-house at Toronto. I will read the paragraph, and I would be obliged to the hon. gentleman if he would inform me as to the nature of the changes :

In political circles there are rumours of many changes to be made in the staff at the Toronto customs-house. The changes, it is expected, will take place at the beginning of the fiscal year, and will take the form of superannuations, four or five of the old officers who have served the allotted term in the employ of the Government and who are now at an age where it is necessary to dispense with their services, will be placed on the list of pensioners.

Workers of the Government who have been waiting patiently for their reward, are hustling around among their friends to receive the appointments.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I am at a loss to know how a report like that could have originated. We have not contemplated definitely any changes there except, perhaps, in the case of a very few officers who may be entitled, in our judgment, to an advanced salary or something of that kind.

Mr. CLARKE. Would the Minister give me the names of the officers whom he intends to superannuate ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. We do not intend to superannuate any.

Resolutions read the second time and concurred in.

River Ottawa—Improvement of steamboat channel, &c..... $7,200

Mr. POUPORE. I ask the Minister of Public Works in regard to repairs necessary to Portage du Fort bridge. This matter was brought to the attention of the Minister some time ago. The answer of the Minister was that the Government had transferred to the municipalities concerned the bridge in question. The position of the matter is this. It is true that such action was taken by the Government some years ago whereby they endeavoured to place the responsibility on the municipalities which the bridge connects, the one in Ontario and the other in Quebec. The municipalities never accepted the transfer of the responsibility from the Government, for the reason that they were unable to maintain so expensive a structure. The municipality in Quebec with which that bridge connects is Portage du Fort, a village of small proportions. In order to reach the main bridge it is necessary to have an approach bridge. Portage du Fort issued bonds to raise sufficient money with which to construct such approach bridge. This is a very heavy load for that municipality to bear, without being called upon to contribute anything to the main structure across the Ottawa River. The Government, after having taken the action to which I have referred, seeing the injustice done to the municipality, afterwards did work on that structure from time to time as it became necessary. They saw it was necessary again to come to the rescue of the structure, otherwise it would fall into the river. In 1870, the Dominion Government constructed a bridge on condition that the local legislatures of Ontario and Quebec would between them contribute half the cost. Since that date the bridge has been repaired on several occasions, and these two provincial governments have contributed in the same proportion towards the repairs, the Federal Government always contributing half the cost. During the last session of the Ontario legislature a sum of $2,000 was voted for repairs to the bridge, and we obtained a similar sum from the Quebec legislature, the condition being that the Government of Canada would contribute as before. I, together with a deputation, waited on the Minister of Public Works and asked him to place a sum in the Estimates to make the necessary repairs. This is the first interprovincial bridge between Ontario and Quebec for a distance of 120 miles, and it is therefore a work not only of importance to the province, but to the Dominion. I cannot understand why the Minister of Public Works has persistently refused to put a sum in the Estimates to keep that structure in use. The deplorable fact is that the provincial governments of Ontario and Quebec have granted each $1,000, in the expectation that the Federal Government would contribute $4,000. All I ask, the Minister, and I am not alone in making this request, for it is also made to the Minister by the hon. member for North Renfrew and others, is that some grant be made in order to enable repairs to be proceeded with. All I ask the Minister of Public Works to do is to put in the estimates $2,000. If we can get that in addition to what has been voted by the local governments, we can keep that bridge alive for the next few years. We think it is reasonable that the Federal Government should do this in view of the fact that the Federal Government has gone to work and on two different occasions spent considerable sums of money on that bridge. If the Federal Government had done this in the past there is no reason why it should not continue in the same line, more especially as the amount we ask is so small. Before concurrence in this item I again appeal to the Minister of Public Works to consider the situation. It is not a political matter ; it is in the interests of the whole community regardless of politics, and I will ask the Minister (Mr. Tarte) to lend a little of his good will in the matter. Indeed, I know he is inclined to be generous ; I may say that he has treated me very fairly in some matters, and I would ask him to come to our rescue in this matter which affects the provinces both of Quebec and Ontario.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. About thirty years ago that bridge was constructed by the Dominion Government with the aid of the two local governments, and ten years ago the bridge was transferred to the municipal authorities. A proclamation was issued to that effect, but whether it

was necessary or not for the municipal authorities to accept that bridge I am not prepared to say. I remind my friend that this proclamation was issued with the authority of the Department of Justice. It is perfectly true that since that transfer has been made the Federal Government, through political pressure I have no doubt, has spent money on that bridge, but that does not prove that the bridge has to be always kept up by Federal authorities. It is purely a provincial and municipal bridge and for the life of me I cannot understand how two provincial governments like Ontario and Quebec cannot take care of their own bridges.

Mr. POUPORE. Will the Minister (Mr. Tarte) excuse me a moment. One reason why I and others think the Federal Government should come to the assistance of the municipal authorities and the local governments, is because the Federal Government controls the Ottawa River entirely, and derives revenue from it to a great extent, and the construction of that bridge was made more expensive because of the improvements made in the river by the Federal authorities, The revenue of the Dominion Government is greater because of these improvements.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir Louis Davies). And the recent decision of the Privy Council has to be considered by the Government in connection with that matter.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend (Mr. Poupore) knows all about it as well as I do. He is now trying to make a little bit of politics.

Mr. POUPORE. I beg your pardon ; I certainly am not.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Well, it is his right to do so, but at the same time I am sure the House will agree with me that we cannot stand by the principle that the Federal Government will take care of all these bridges.

Mr. POUPORE. But this is not an ordinary case——

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Poupore) has already spoken.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In the case not only of an interprovincial bridge, but of an international bridge further east, the Government did not contribute a cent, and the cost had to be borne by the province of New Brunswick, which was the province interested in the matter.

Mr. MACKIE. This is one of two bridges of interprovincial importance which the Government built, between the province of Quebec and Ontario. The Minister of Public Works claims that they were handed over to the municipalities, but the municipalities claim that they never took possession of them. We claim that the Dominion Government should look after this bridge, and I believe they have a right to do so. It will not take much money now to repair the bridge, but if it is allowed to go on as it is, it will take a great deal more money, and I believe the Minister of Public Works should see to the matter at once.

Mr. FOSTER. Surely the Minister of Public Works will answer that appeal.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think I have answered that fairly already.

Bridge across the Sackatchewan at Edmonton ..... $ 25,000

Mr. DAVIN. Before this is concurred in, I wish to call attention to some telegrams with reference to this bridge. Tenders were to be sent to the department by August 6th, 1897. The specifications called for the work to be completed by the 15th November, 1897, under a penalty of $50 per day. On August 2nd, 1897, Messrs. Alford and Pringle wired the chief engineer, Mr. Louis Coste, as follows :—

Kindly wire, at our expense, if specifications piers Edmonton bridge, stating Nov. 15th, 1897, for completion are correct, and if correct will Government insist on so early a date for completion. Know locality, want to tender, but impossible to complete work in time specified.

ALFORD & PRINGLE.

The answer from Mr. Louis Coste was to the effect that the specifications would be adhered to, and that the time limit was sufficient to do the work in. Under the circumstances, Alford & Pringle declined to tender, but if more time had been allowed, 25 per cent could have been saved on the cost. A calculation of the cost of the work, as it is going on now, is placed before me by a competent person, and is as follows :—

Estimated cost of bulk sum in tender for Edmonton Bridge, if tenders had been invited in usual way :—

Clearing foundations	$ 100
4,200 feet pine, 12x12, at 22 cents.....	924
720 feet pine, 8x10, at 15 cents.....	108
3,500 lbs. iron bolts, at 6 cents.....	210
Lumber for scaffolding.....	450
184 yards of concrete in foundation at $10	1,840
1,216 yards ashlar masonry at $25.....	30,400
Rip-rap, 1,000 yards at $1.50.....	1,500
Total	$35,532

It will be seen that really $25 a yard is being paid for the concrete, although the specifications call for ashlar.

To provide for the amount required for surveys, examination of survey returns, printing of plans, &c..... $150,000

Mr. DAVIN. Before this is concurred in, I wish to read two sentences from a return :

Statement showing approximately the area reserved and settled on in the province of Manitoba and the North-west Territories respectively.

Manitoba.

	Acres.
Area reserved for railways.....	12,400,640
Area reserved for Government.....	3,354,288
Area settled on.....	7,614,068
Area reserved for settlement, sale, or otherwise	15,001,610

North-west Territories.

Area reserved for railways.....	55,234,380
Area reserved for Government.....	22,111,348
Area settled on.....	4,218,100
Area reserved for settlement, sale or otherwise	258,211,672
Civil Government— Department of Public Works	$772

Mr. WALLACE. I would like to make a few remarks on a matter that was brought up the other day. A question was asked the Minister of Public Works whether a Mr. J. B. Charleson, who was in his service, was in some way connected with the employment of men to work on the Crow's Nest Pass Railway. We understood the Minister of Public Works to say that it was a son of this man engaged by the Minister, and that so far as he knew, there was no connection between the employee in the Public Works Department and those who were engaged to employ and send men out to work on that railway. Now, I have the report of the commission who investigated these matters, and I find a complete denial of the statement made by the Minister of Public Works. This Charleson family, as I understand it, came up to Ottawa after the change of Government, and I presume on account of their valuable services, they came to get their reward, and they received their reward. This Mr. J. B. Charleson was engaged in the Public Works Department, and either the son or himself were provided with, or provided themselves with, in some way or other, a hardware store in Ottawa, and I presume they are furnishing a large portion of the hardware required by the Government; so that they are pretty well provided for. But not being satisfied with this, Mr. J. B. Charleson, while in the employ of the Government of Canada, undertook to engage men for the Crow's Nest Pass Railway. The result was that these men came in here. I presume a lot of them worked on the Western Block, or worked in various ways for the Government. They were asked to go out to the Crow's Nest Pass, and Mr. Charleson, a Government officer, engaged them. They supposed, not knowing all the intricacies of the business of the Government, that the Government were building the road; they knew, at least, that Mr. Charleson, an officer of the Government, was engaging them, and that presumably they would have, not as good a time perhaps as when working on the Western Block, but at any rate they would be under Government control, and the Government would see that the subjects of the country were not improperly treated. That was a very fair inference to make. But they were soon undeceived when they went out there. I have a letter from Nova Scotia, which I received last night, relating to the death of these two young men. It is a very distressing story, but I will not read it now. I will read that portion of the report referring to Mr. J. B. Charleson's connection with this matter:

Besides those hired for the company, Mr. Haney, upon requisitions, would help in procuring men for contractors. To that effect he appointed several agents; Mr. J. B. Charleson, at Ottawa; Mr. William McCreary, and later Mr. Calder, at Winnipeg; and Mr. Guertin, at Montreal. Mr. J. B. Charleson was appointed sole agent from Fort William east to Montreal. A first form of contract (form 277) was furnished.

Telegrams were sent by Mr. Haney to Mr. J. B. Charleson on the 17th of July, 1897, instructing him to hire 500 axemen at $1.50 a day, with the understanding that they should be charged $4 a week for board, and 6 cooks at $40 to $50 a month.

It having been found that men could not be hired under conditions first fixed by Mr. Haney, subsequent telegrams were exchanged between Mr. Haney and Mr. J. B. Charleson, when finally, on the 20th July Mr. Haney gave orders to the latter to hire 100 good axemen at $20 to $26 per month and board, with 6 cooks at prices fixed in the previous telegram, to wit, from $40 to $50. One Hermenegilde Magloire Roy was then charged by Mr. Charleson to hire these first 100 men, and the result was that on the 24th July Roy started with 115 men, which, by his deposition (No. 33), he acknowledged having hired at $20 to $26 per month and board, and food to be furnished them on the journey. With the exception of a few, all the contracts which Roy had signed were blank as to wages, and the reason given for this was that the rate being fixed from $20 to $26, it was left to Mr. Haney to fix the amount according to the ability of the man.

Still, there were some contracts specifically fixing the wages at $26, as Roy considered the men hired thereunder as particularly good axemen, who, besides, refused to sign unless the amount of their wages which they were to receive would be specially settled. The length of service and character of the work generally also were not specified, but they were all told verbally that they were to work as axemen, and be paid as such. Roy states that having specially asked Mr. J. B. Charleson as to the fare, he answered that it would be all right, understanding this to mean that it would be free, and that that is what he represented to the 115 men he engaged. He also understood and represented to the men that they would be fed on the road, that their time would commence from the day they arrived at Macleod, and that they would be furnished with blankets. On leaving, Mr. Charleson gave him tickets for the men, and also handed him $40 to buy them food for the trip. Having reached Macleod on the 28th July, at 8 p.m., Roy reported to Mr. Harwood, the accountant of the company, and there tried to obtain blankets for the men, but failed. At Macleod, those men were kept nine days idle, and on the 6th of August they were ordered to leave for

Crow's Nest Lake, a distance of 70 miles. During the nine days kept idle at Macleod the men were under tents and without blankets, the company stating they had none in stock, and the men complained of suffering from the cold during the nights. On or about the 23rd of August these men, hearing that the company intended to deduct their fare from Ottawa to Macleod,——

Which was in direct contradiction of the understanding that they were to be transported there free, and that their wages would commence from the time that they arrived.

——and transportation from Macleod to the works, took advantage of the presence of Mr. Haney at Crow's Nest Lake, to send a deputation of two (one Frenchman and one Englishman) in order to inquire about the same, and as to whether they would be paid for the nine days passed at Macleod. But, according to the report of these two men, no satisfaction could be had. and one of them, Laferrière, with one Dupont, was, the day after, discharged. In his testimony, Mr. Haney said they had been reported to him by T. Nash, under whose charge the men were, as being ringleaders, and that this was the reason for his discharging them.

This charging of fare under the circumstances, and after the representations made by Roy to those 115 men, the non-payment of wages from the time they reached Macleod to the time they began work at Crow's Nest Lake, and the charges for transportation, were the first principal causes of discontent.

Other reasons were, that having been hired as axemen, they had to work with pick and shovel for weeks; and having been engaged by the month at $20 to $26 and board, they were deducted for Sundays and for days they could not work owing to bad weather——

Then there was a new arrangement, contrary to that arrangement, and the conditions under which they left Ottawa, some of those conditions being written conditions, and some of them verbal, having, as they said, the fullest confidence that Mr. Charleson would act fairly with them and carry out every understanding that was made.

——or other circumstances over which they had no control, and that on these days they were charged for their board. This seems to have discouraged them, and as a result some left and returned to Macleod to get information and to discuss matters with the head officials, as they could not obtain satisfactory explanations from those immediately over them, such as the walking-bosses, timekeepers and district superintendents, and others left with the determination of not returning to work.

In the meantime, one Noé Landry, hotel-keeper at Hull, had been asked by Mr. J. B. Charleson to hire other men,——

You see Mr. Charleson was the controller, the manager of the men to be supplied from Fort William eastward, from all the older provinces, including the maritime provinces.

——and, in fact, from the end of August to the end of September, Landry did send some 200 or 300 men engaged under the same form of contract, but more particularly, Landry says that he insisted that the men should be hired by the month, and that the month should consist of 26 days, and, he adds, that he specially asked Mr. J. B. Charleson whether those men would have to pay their transportation to Macleod, or to the place of work, to which he was answered, no; that the company would transport them free, that this is what he represented to all those men whom he hired until the end of September.

We see the conditions which prevail. Mr. Charleson told Landry to hire the men under those conditions by the month, that their fares out would be paid and not charged against them and that they would be paid from the time they arrived at Macleod and were ready to proceed to work. Those conditions were not carried out. The report of the commissioners says:

The form which was produced to him, and which he had signed by and for the men is form 277, the blanks being generally filled at the rate of $20 to $26 per month, and it being called "26 working days, with board."

Afterwards, the second form of contract was furnished to him, and Landry adds that under both forms he always answered to those who inquired, that it might be, that after having worked at least six months, the company would make a reduction on the rate to return home, but he affirms that he never said this would be obligatory on the part of the company. The first form which is attached to Landry's deposition hired the men for the company only, giving to the company the right to end the engagement at any time without notice, and submitting the employee to give fifteen days' notice of his intention to quit the company's service. The second form specifies that although the men are engaged for the company, and to work for the company, they would be obliged to work for any contractor with whom the company would secure them work for a period of at least six months, or such longer period as the company or contractor might require their services.

From that date, the latter part of September, the men seem to have been engaged at $1.50 per day, Sunday excluded, and that they would have to pay $4 a week board

Landry swears that under the last form he represented to all whom he hired, that they would have to pay their passage to Macleod at the rate of one cent a mile, and that he never said to any one of them that after three months' work or more they would be reimbursed the same, or that they would get a reduced rate, or a free pass home, and he adds that he represented to all that it was more prudent to bring their blankets, not knowing whether they would be supplied free or sold by the company.

Landry is generally contradicted by the men we have heard engaged under the last form of contract, and they themselves do not each give the same version, some pretending that after three months the fare paid up to Macleod would be reimbursed, some admitting that there was no reimbursement to be made, some saying that after six months they would be entitled to return either at the reduced rate of one cent a mile, or free. It is difficult to form an opinion as to who is speaking the truth, but it seems that even under the last form of contract some verbal representations were made in such a way as to induce the men to start at all hazards, leaving them to understand that the company, as well for their trip to go up as for their return, would deal with them liberally. In the meantime, men were engaged at North Bay, Renfrew, Pembroke, and

in the surroundings and sent on the works, by Mr. W. G. Charleson.

This is the son, and the first time he appears on the scene.

Several of those (about 17 or 18) were heard, and their pretensions also vary as to the fare going up and coming back, some saying that, having paid $2 to the employment agent, they understood this was all they had to pay in order to be transported to Macleod, others admitting that nothing was said, but that having to work for the company and travel on their own line, they expected and understood that no fare was to be charged ; others, and this is the majority, declaring that they were specially told that after three months' work the fare up to Macleod would be reimbursed to them, although first deducted from their wages, and that after six months they would be returned free, or at a reduction of one cent a mile. Mr. W. G. Charleson, being examined on these points, denies having affirmed any such thing, but adds that representations having been made to him that such were the conditions stated to other men engaged by other sub-agents or contractors, he answered that what was done for others would be done for them by the company, or that the company, at all events, would deal with them squarely.

We have had no complaint on that score from any men engaged at Winnipeg, with the exception of one man, named James Horner, whose contract mentions that he is entitled to free transportation, whilst he was charged therefor.

Men were sent also by Mr. McCreary, the commissioner of immigration at Winnipeg, and it is right to say that none of them complained of misrepresentations.

Then the whole of the misrepresentations came from a Government officer employed by the Government and in the pay of the Government and doing Government work presumably, although at the same time he was violating a wholesome rule of the department that all men who receive salaries over $1,000 are not permitted to engage in any other employment without the express permission of the Minister who presides over the department. The report says further :

The first batch sent from Ottawa under Roy, having begun the wagon road at Crow's Nest Lake, continued their work west. They were soon joined by a number of other men hired either by Noé Landry or W. G. Charleson. It having been circulated that fare to Macleod, and from Macleod to the works, would be charged, and that they would not be paid for the time lost at Macleod, and during the journey to the work, six of them left immediately, and eighteen, headed by one Zephérin St. Amand, at the end of September, when it was found that the rumour proved to be true, and besides that their wages were deducted for the days during which they were laid off through bad weather or uncontrollable circumstances. They were then at Wardner, distant about 125 miles from Macleod. Food was refused to all of them leaving ; also, to the last gang at headquarters, after a 35-mile walk without eating, and although they offered to pay for the same. This seems to have been in obedience to general orders given at company's camps. Liver and beef heart, though, could be had from a butcher 12 miles further on, which gave them three meals without bread, and sustained them to reach Crow's Nest Lake, where they could get all they wanted to help them to continue their journey to Macleod.

A few days after these men left, through some accident, the food began to fall short in the same camp, under Mr. P. Nash, and, according to the men, this had been noticed for two or three days before the Friday noon, when, at breakfast and at dinner, they saw they were fed upon what they considered was not sufficient to sustain them while working. It is averred, further, that their foremen, Brown and Patton, acknowledged that they could not work upon the food given them ; whilst, on the other side, Coleman Godfrey, then foreman, and Mr. Charleson, then timekeeper, when examined, declared that, although acknowledging a certain deficiency in food, they believe there was enough in quality and quantity to permit the men to work. Besides, the men affirm that the cook told them that there would not be enough food to feed them any longer, upon which they refused to go to work, and matters stood in that condition until the return of Mr. P. Nash, who had gone for provisions, and who came back on the Saturday night. Having, apparently, taken information from the walking-bosses and timekeeper as to what had happened, he, on the Sunday morning, discharged 54 of these men. They were at that time at about 130 miles from Macleod. It is affirmed by the witnesses heard as to this fact that Nash not only at first refused them food to keep them on the way, but also sent somebody ahead of them, or went himself, to give orders at the company's camps not to feed them on their way. There is no positive proof to that effect, except that at first Nash did give orders to his cook not to given them any provisions, and that it was only upon their threats that they were permitted to take what they could lay their hands on in the kitchen, and which was sufficient to feed them for three meals. It is further declared that Nash, in the meantime, threatened to blow the brains out of those who would dare to enter the kitchen.

It is hard to believe that such barbarous treatment was accorded to men in our country, men who while not in Government employ understood they were engaged by one of the Ministers of Public Works, and they relied on the fairness of the Government to deal properly with every man they engaged. This is a brutal and totally disreputable state of affairs, and the Government is involved in it through the conduct of its own officials. These men started out there under agreement, not one condition of which has been lived up to by those who engaged them. The Government officer knew many of the men, of course he was their superior officer and had been connected with works going on at Ottawa. They knew he was employed by the Government. Every condition of the engagement was totally disregarded, and when these men refused to work under conditions to which they never agreed, they were not treated like human beings, they were not treated as well as ordinary men treat beasts, for they were refused food although they had to walk 133 miles and had to endure the distressing conditions.

On the road, the 54 men were really refused provisions, and whilst Nash himself denies having given a special order to that effect, Inspec-

tor Saunders declares that Nash admitted to him that he had given orders to the camps not to supply them with food, as he wished to teach the other men a lesson.

These men who had worked faithfully for the company started to go back, and the first thing is that they were starved on the way, the contractors not caring whether or not they reached their destination at Macleod.

These men, leaving by detachments, assert that they suffered a great deal of hardship on their way, many of them going towards Macleod, destitute, without food, sleeping in the open, suffering from cold, and having before them a long distance to walk.

Nash's own denial is not worth a cent in the face of the fact that Inspector Saunders, of the North-west Mounted Police, a man of reputation and position, declares that orders were issued by Nash not to supply food to these men in order to teach them a lesson.

A few, taking other directions,——

And I presume never reaching their destination, if the truth were told.

——and more particularly the three Welshmen whom we examined at Coal Creek Mines, who, after leaving on the Sunday morning, walked until the Tuesday night, sleeping also in the open, and having their first meal only at the mines on that day.

Here they were without a bite to eat and without protection at night, walking through this inhospitable country. These are the men that the Government agents sent out there under promises that were never fulfilled.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Not the Government agents.

Mr. WALLACE. The Government officer, J. B. Charleson, an official of the Department of Public Works, who engaged every one of them, and yet the Minister of Public Works said he knew nothing about this. Well, if the Minister of Public Works tells us, as he tells us frequently when we make inquiries, that he leaves it to his officers, and that if they do wrong he is not responsible; he is not an architect; he is not an engineer, or an engager of men; if he makes that excuse in this case it will not do. The country will hold him responsible for this. It will not do any longer for the Minister (Mr. Tarte) to declare his own incompetency, the public will not accept his excuse about it in this matter.

At about that time, three men, Stephen Leclair and two others (deposition 163), who were working at four miles from the camp, received a letter from Nash informing them they were discharged. It was on a Sunday. They immediately went to the camp, which they reached during the night, and were refused admittance, and would have slept in the open if they had not been received in the prospector's shanty in the neighbourhood. The reason given for discharging them was, that having worked for Keith & Fitzgerald, they should have remained with them.

They never were asked to work for Keith & Fitzgerald, they were employed by the company. It is true that a second agreement was made saying they would have to be transferred to another company, but these men, some of them illiterate, no doubt, went out there believing they would be fairly treated, and this is the way they were treated.

These men represent they were not obliged to do so, as their contract was with the company.

I have no doubt their contract was not with the company.

The work on the wagon or tote road was continued under Nash during about one month and eight days, and then his men were put under the guidance of Brown. It is averred by some of those who continued that work that they suffered a great deal from cold under tents, having generally no stoves until the beginning of January, and from being fed at times with frozen provisions, and this lasting two or three weeks.

Imagine for a moment, Mr. Speaker, that these things were going on. The Minister (Mr. Tarte) stated the other day, and I presume he will state now, that he did not know. The daily papers of that time were full of items about it, and especially the Ottawa "Free Press," which came under his observation every day. Mr. Charleson was here in his employ, under his observation daily, and the Minister could not help but know that Charleson was engaging these men at that time, and sending them out to the Crow's Nest Pass, even at the very time these terrible stories were coming in. There were no stoves until the beginning of January, when the cold of that place and the enormous snow fall make it uncomfortable to live even if they had stoves.

Mr. Haney says that at least two pairs of blankets are necessary for protection against cold in ordinary circumstances. Men he had with more than one pair was a very rare exception. Tents had to be removed from point to point periodically as the works progressed, and it happened that men, after quitting their work at 6 o'clock would have to pitch their own tent on the frozen earth, often covered with snow and ice. The tents not being provided with stoves, the men's suffering was intensified by their clothes being wet after working amidst snow, and snow droppings from the trees, and having no means of having them dried. A common result of this was suffering from rheumatism and colds.

A more unhappy state of affairs could never be pictured than we have in this report of the commission.

Under the first form of contract (277), the men were engaged for the company, and either on reaching Macleod, or after having worked a certain time for the company, hundreds of them were sent back to work under contractors or sub-contractors.

In violation of their agreement, because the commissioners say that contract 277 was with the company only.

The first batch so hired by Noé Landry, numbering about 50, were sent to Macleod under the direction of one McNab. They left on the 27th August. Although destined from the very beginning to contractors, Keith & Co., McNab was made aware of it only on the day after they had reached, and the men themselves only nine or ten miles after they left Macleod.

They were then told they were not to work for the company but for Keith & Co., about whom they knew nothing.

The camp of Keith & Co. then was at 50 miles from Macleod. Before beginning the work, Antoine Proulx and one Joel Galarneau were sent to inquire from Keith as to the conditions under which they would work for them, representing that they had been hired for the company, and for the company at $20 to $25 per month and board, and free transportation to work, to which Keith answered that this was an old story, and that they would be paid $1.50 per day, being charged $4 per week for board. Upon their refusing to work Keith begged them to wait until he would inquire about the conditions from Mr. Haney. Upon this they consented to remain and worked at clearing right of way until the 13th of October. They then asked for a settlement of accounts, and for money, and all were told at night that they were indebted to the contractors, Proulx himself owing $8.

Here are men who have gone 2,000 miles away; skilled axemen who worked faithfully for several months, and at the end of that time one of them was told he was $8 in debt.

On the 13th Dupuis, Leclair and Legault left, as they could not get shoes and mittens, but they were immediately arrested.

This was adding insult to injury. Not one condition of their engagement was observed. They were told they were to work for Keith & Co., and that they would be fairly treated and they worked for several months and yet one of them was $8 in debt, and some of them were arrested.

On the 14th instant nine others, headed by Antoine Proulx, also left to go to Macleod, some having no shoes.

This was the 14th of October, and I can tell the Minister that on the 14th of October in these mountains the winter has set in and there is generally an enormous snowfall. I have been there myself in the month of October, and I know about this, and I ask the Minister to picture these men tramping around without shoes.

That means that in the case of one of these men the contractor owed him $37.75, but they made him out $8 in debt when he refused to work any longer, and they put some of them in jail, and when the verdict came out and he got justice, there was a judgment in his favour for $37.75.

On the 15th they too were arrested, and were added to the four others in jail. This last arrest took place on a Saturday, but on the Monday night all were liberated, and made their way to Macleod, sleeping in the open in the prairie. Having sued Keith for wages before the Mounted Police officers at Macleod, they obtained judgment, and Proulx more particularly for the amount of $37.75, the others for more or less. The night following, having no money, the greater part of them slept again in the open. Other discontented labourers had reached Macleod in the meantime, and all had taken or took action against Keith and others. Judgment having been rendered in their favour, an appeal was taken by Keith,——

Of course these men were not in a position to appeal. They had not $1; they had not a bed to lie on, not a shelter was over them, and yet the appeal was taken.

——and it was agreed that the case of Antoine Proulx, which had been made the test case before the magistrate, should be made the test case in appeal. Afterwards that appeal was sustained.

But what did these men suffer in the meantime. Lured away from their homes by a Government official, an official of the department of the Minister of Public Works, the business man of the Government, employed, lured away, by his departmental officer, a man he has entrusted apparently with the control of every working man of the Public Works Department.

Whilst waiting for the result of the appeal, twelve of the men obtained work with Buchanan at $1 per day and board, but after working three days, they were told by Buchanan that he had received a letter from the company, ordering him to discharge them unless they signed a written agreement to pay their fare.

Mr. Speaker, what do you think of that?

This they refused to do and were discharged.

They got work with Buchanan, and they had to be discharged at the instigation of these men, I suppose, to teach a lesson.

Subsequently, some of them obtained work under assumed names. Others, through the intervention of Inspector Saunders, met Mr. Turnbull, the assistant superintendent, and got work at $1.50, paying $4 a week board. After six days, they returned to Macleod to inquire as to their cases in appeal, and on seeing new difficulties to which they were exposed, and an offer being made that if they would sign a complete discharge of the company's liability to them the company would give them a free pass home and $5 in cash, they decided to accept this with others, numbering in all eighty-two (82).

These men who were helpless, they had neither money nor provisions. They had a verdict against the contractors; contractors who were backed up by the other contractors, and backed up by a Government official who never came to the rescue of these men when he saw these reports published, and I say the Minister of Public Works himself could not help seeing these reports. An offer was made to give them a free pass back and $5 cash, and of course they were obliged to take it, for it is absurd to suppose they could refuse when they were subjected to such injustice and inhumanity.

The company has appointed officials to receive the men and look after them on their reaching Macleod, so they came by batches. It happened that for one reason or another, due notice was not received, and that men arriving that way did not know where to go, or what to do, and were left at Macleod station without any direction, for one night or so. Others complained that they were lodged for nights in places which were not fit, as, for instance, in an old house near the station, which they say was filthy, cold, and not properly sheltered, they being there without any blankets or any other covering whatsoever. In some instances tents were provided for them, but not in sufficient quantity, and a portion of the men had to sleep in the open and on the bare ground. Numbers were kept in box cars, in all cases also filthy and cold, during several days and nights sleeping on the floor. All alleged more or less suffering. This applies more particularly to the men who were sent in August and September. After having passed some days either in the old house or in box cars, some hundreds of them were afterwards brought to work on the track between Lethbridge and Pincher Creek.

I would like to call attention to this particular car, which was denominated by them as a Jumbo car.

It is complained that they were kept in a boarding car which has been denominated by them as the "Jumbo car" number three. It is alleged that during two months from 90 to 115 slept in that car. The size of the sleeping accommodation is given as follows :—Bunks, 4 ft. 6 in. in width ; height between top and bottom of each bunk about 2 ft. 3 in. from board to board ; passage, 3 ft. 11 in in width ; each bunk being under 6 feet in length and the whole car about 70 feet long. Two men were obliged to sleep in each bunk, and there being three tiers on each side, this forced six men to face six others when rising and retiring. It is mentioned that it was not sufficiently heated, that it was filthy, the atmosphere intolerable and unhealthy, that there was no washing or lavatory facilities in the car (only one small basin and an ordinary pail for water) and that there was not sufficient drinking water provided. Windows on each side exist for every tier of bunks for purposes of ventilation.

Statements are made that in the moving of men to the works or in changing from section to section, at times, no proper or reasonable facilities were provided, and therefore they had to sleep either in the open or on the prairie, or in hay lofts and stables ; and there was a lack of proper provisions, and that they had to walk long distances without taking sufficient meals, and at proper hours. Joseph Tobin and 133 others who left Macleod one morning, without breakfast, having been told that there was food in the wagons, walked 14 miles to Buchanan's camp and there found only a barrel of biscuits. The 133 made the best of it, and starting again, they had nothing to eat until the night of the following day at Crow's Nest Lake. The next day they walked 20 miles to Michel Prairie before having their second meal. There was no provision made for their sleeping on the journey. The last day, they reached Mann's camp, 100 miles from Macleod, where they were put into a green camp, with cone stove which, on being lit, thawed out the ice and snow, and the following morning some of the men could not move through suffering from rheumatism. In this, the witness Tobin is corroborated by several.

At the beginning of October, a gang of men first apparently assigned to Keith & Company, were afterwards directed to Smith & Mackenzie, at Pincher Creek, for the transport to which place they had to pay $2. After three weeks, the work ended there, and they were kept idle for six days. Afterwards they were directed to Wardner, which took them seven days, making in all thirteen days, for which they were refused wages. (See deposition 103 of Noel Gingras and three others.)

We note some special facts, such as, for instance, the fainting of men on the works, the refusal on the part of teamsters, whose wagons were hardly loaded, to give a ride to wounded men, such as young Joseph Bourgignon and Théodore Lambert ; some threats of Noble, one of the foremen, to kick them ; the alleged bad treatment by the same foreman of men who had had difficulties with the company, and who were discharged one day after they had returned to work ; the refusal of food generally to all men discharged or quitting work, and the hardship experienced on account of this, caused one Weir, for instance, to faint, and others to feel very weak ; three men having to subsist for a whole day on one onion (see deposition 139) ; a pinch of salt refused to men leaving camp, which they asked for in order to salt fish they might catch with a fish hook given to them by another of the men. All this when they were at distances varying from 70 to 150 miles from, and having to walk to Macleod, often having no money, and even with money not being able to obtain food, and having sometimes to rely on remnants thrown away on the road.

Losses have been sustained through the fact that having generally brought their clothes and effects in trunks, the men were forbidden to carry them with them on the works, and had to leave the trunks at Macleod, and put whatever they could into bags, with the result that in many cases, whatever had remained in the trunks, and the trunks themselves disappeared, and could not be found again. On this account the immigrants, and more especially the Welshmen, suffered more than the rest, as, coming from greater distances, they were better supplied, though one Jean Baptiste St. Amour, of Montreal, lost in this manner, over $80 worth of goods. The preventing of the men taking with them all their clothing which had been thought necessary, did not permit them, when on the works in the mountains, to effect a change of clothing, which was naturally necessary to men working in the bush and getting drenched.

In several instances, some of the contractor's camps were not kept in a proper condition, and the men, although habitually clean, were compelled to associate in the sleeping bunks with men who were habitually unclean, and thereby became affected with lice. It was impossible for them to take precautions to avoid such a result. According to the evidence, and from what we have seen ourselves, we must say that the generality of camps are well kept, but there are too many exceptions, some not being sufficiently sheltered so that the rain, snow and cold would be a cause of suffering to the men who had to remain therein. Others have not sufficient, or to speak better, have no light at all and men even during daylight, have either to use candles, for which they have to pay, or keep their doors open, if they want light either to mend their clothes or for any other purpose, without speaking of the inconvenience of being in the dark during daytime ; whilst on the other hand some camps, even when offering all other conveniences, are not properly attended to, inasmuch as they are left entirely to the men themselves to be cleaned and kept,

and it may be more properly said here than anywhere else, that "whatever is the concern of all is the concern of none." It appears that before our arrival on the line there were more camps in that condition than when we passed, some having been repaired a week or two before.

In one instance there was an entire abandonment by contractors Doidge & Company of their men in the camp, under the pretext that they were going to Macleod to settle certain difficulties, and to bring money to pay their wages. Yet they never returned, and the men were kept on the work uncertain as to what would become of them, and what they had to do. This was at Coal Creek 110 miles west of Macleod. Edwin Doidge was in charge for the concern, being examined (see deposition 126) admits the facts and says that he abandoned the camps on the 14th of December, about twenty men, being still there, about as many having left the day previous, and that $300 would pay the amount of refused cheques to labourers. We met one of these men who had been settled with Doidge & Company (deposition 54) with a cheque from them, amounting to $65 payable at the Union Bank, Macleod, but which had been refused and returned to him. This man although in possession of still another cheque for $70 from another concern not connected with the railway, but whose cheques were considered as good as cash, had been refused board along the line, and, being without money he, with a companion, only had one meal in two days, and a piece of bread. The reason for the camps not furnishing food was stated to be that it was the rule on the road.

At Wardner several labourers employed by Smith & Mackenzie complained of not having been settled with for their wages for the last two months, December and January, although a settlement had been promised to them every day.

At seven miles from Fort Steele, 25 men from Major Bowles's camp gave their evidence, stating that Major Bowles had left camp on the 7th December, and that as they were, they had barely enough to eat, and could not get provisions. The tents had become filthy, offering no more convenient shelter and no settlement of their wages had taken place since, and they were left in the dark as to what would happen to them.

At some camps, men were entirely forbidden, on pain of instant dismissal, to say a word during the work, and on the remark of one of them as to whether they were prisoners, the foreman answered that they were very nearly so.

There are several complaints of coarse language being used towards the men by the foremen, walking bosses, and timekeepers, without any apparent reason, and there is a hint on the part of a French Canadian (Joseph Mallette) that they were so treated on account of their nationality. It is complained that sick men did not receive reasonable care from their foremen, walking boss or those immediately over them, and were refused meals, although they were paying for their board, and some of them were charged 35 cents per meal, the contractors assuming that in reality they were not sick, and even some were discharged under the same pretext.

In settling their accounts, and more particularly those who were engaged until the latter part of September, the men seem to have been left entirely in the dark. Being entitled to be paid by the month at the rate of $20 to $26 and board, they believed that they would get that amount at the end of each month, according to what they would be rated at from $20 to $26, without deduction for lost time through bad weather, and other causes not controllable by them. On the first pay they found that this was not so, and that they had to lose as many days as they were kept forcibly idle. After the first month, which would be at the beginning of September, an order came from Mr. Haney to Mr. Charleson, the bookkeeper and assistant storekeeper of the company at headquarters (see his deposition No. 78) by which men were to be paid at the rate of 24-30 or 24-31 of $26, according to the number of days in the month, and this, notwithstanding the fact that some contracts specified 26 working days per month. This rule would explain what several of the men declare in their depositions, that in order to be paid at the rate of $20 to $26 per month, they had to work every day in the month Sundays included. By referring to the accounts, it appears to be so.

Before going further, the case of Frank Beaulieu and Auguste Rivard (deposition 77) who formed part of Proulx's gang should be noticed. They, like the fifty others, having hired by the company, learned after they had left Macleod, that they had to work under Keith & Company, contractors. They protested and accepted work only with the understanding that if they were not satisfied they might leave whenever they liked. They speak like several other witnesses, of the hardship on the trip to Pincher Creek, sleeping in the open, without blankets and being fed on biscuit and cheese, and one day eating nothing from breakfast time to half-past six in the evening. They had been engaged as bushmen, but were put to work with pick and shovel. Afterwards thirteen of them were sent to work under sub-contractor Fitzgerald. Having notified Fitzgerald after one half day that they would not work for him, on account of what they heard about being charged the fare to Macleod, he promised to give them employment as drillers, but when they saw that he did not keep his promise, and after some difficulty with the foreman, Patrick Tierney, seven of them left after eight days, and were arrested. Five of them were sent to jail for thirty days, two having returned to work.

It is the above and similar complaints which brought from eighty to one hundred men at about the middle of October to Macleod. The majority took legal action against the company or the contractors, others would not work, or could not obtain any more work. They were all in a perfect state of destitution, many of them had to sleep in the open, several were kept in a house hired by Zéphérin St. Amand, but all, or nearly all, had to live upon public charity, and suffered in many instances, through hunger, cold and lack of proper clothing. Discouraged and disheartened, they at the end consented to a compromise proposed to them by which they accepted a free pass to return home and $5 each to buy provisions on the journey, a full discharge for any claim against the company being at that time signed by eighty-two of them.

Now, all these facts, I think it is the duty of the House to observe. We have the right to hold the Minister of Public Works directly responsible in this matter. Permit me to read a letter I have received, dated New Glasgow, N.S., from Rev. A. W. Nicholson, a Presbyterian minister:

New Glasgow, N.S., June 10, 1898.

N. Clarke Wallace, M.P.

Sir,—A short time ago, a case was brought up in the House of Commons, about two young men

from this county, who went out to work on the Crow's Nest Pass Railway, took ill with diphtheria, and died, both of them, one shortly after the other. Stories, some of them considered authentic enough, have reached here, telling of shameful neglect and gross indifference on the part of the railway authorities in the section in which they died, and revealing a state of matters shocking to any one possessed of refined and cultivated feelings, and unworthy of a country like Canada that professes to be civilized and Christianized. Several individuals, the physician who attended them, and the clergyman who administered to them during their last moments, have been written to, and facts obtained from them. We have learned enough that some parties are to blame, and that there was neglect and indifference shown. To think that two young men, sons of respectable and worthy parents, should be treated in their last hours like lepers, and buried little better than dogs, is something we cannot get over hurriedly.

The names of these two young men were Edward McC. Fraser and Charles McDonald. The former's people are respectable and well-to-do. His father, a worthy, upright citizen and an elder in the Presbyterian church, died not very long ago, his death being caused by worry, anxiety and distress on account of the death of his son under such sad circumstances, so far away from home. Now, sir, we will take this opportunity of asking you to lend your aid and influence to the members from this county (Pictou) and the other members who have brought up this question in Parliament. Leave no stone unturned to find out all that can be found out about these young men. We want to know, and we ask you, as a favour, to help us. We are deeply interested in this, and we will be only doing our duty when we have striven to find out everything that can be ascertained.

A. W. NICHOLSON.

That is the substance of the letter. I call this letter to the attention of the Minister of Public Works and the Government, and I ask them as a duty they owe to the country to ascertain the facts concerning these young men, so as to be able to give a satisfactory explanation, and, if wrong has been done, to see to it that the guilty parties shall be punished. And wrong has been done. Can the case of these young men be called anything else than murder? Far from home, they were neglected by those who should have cared for them, treated as lepers and buried almost like dogs. Why, Mr. Speaker, it makes one's blood run cold to think of the treatment meted out to these men. And I reiterate that the chief agent of the Minister of Public Works, his confidential man, the man who has charge of all the workingmen employed by the department about Ottawa, occupied himself in sending men out to this work. This same gentleman has a store on Rideau street to supply the Government with all the hardware they require, and, I apprehend that it will be a nice bill we shall have to examine when these accounts are looked over. It will not do for the Minister of Public Works to rise and say that he knows nothing about this Crow's Nest Pass affair. We will not excuse him on any such answer, but we will hold him responsible for the most flagrant acts of inhumanity and brutality that are recorded in the history of this country.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). Of course, there is no excuse whatever for the treatment that Canadian workingmen have received at the hands of the sub-contractors on the Crow's Nest Pass Railway. When the subsidy to the Canadian Pacific Railway was unanimously voted last year——

Mr. WALLACE. Not unanimously.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It was voted very nearly unanimously.

Mr. WALLACE. It was protested against.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Would the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) permit me, I did not interrupt him once.

Mr. WALLACE. I want to correct the statement of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Tarte).

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. When the subsidy was voted almost unanimously last year, it was made a condition that the work should be carried on by Canadian labour. Surely, at that time nobody believed that our workingmen would be treated as they have been treated on that work. I do not think that the Government can be held responsible, for any lack of attention in this matter, that it can be accused of not having done its duty. As soon as we learned that complaints were made, we appointed three commissioners to investigate. I may say that Judge Dugas was appointed on that commission at my own instigation. I knew that he had a great deal of knowledge of men, and that his experience on the bench for many years would enable him to conduct the inquiry with great satisfaction to us. Well, Sir, the accusation is brought against me by my hon. friend (Mr. Wallace), who has just taken his seat that I am responsible for the action of Mr. Charleson in this matter. I am very sorry now that Mr. Charleson has in any way been mixed up with the hiring of men in the city of Ottawa for this work. Mr. Charleson and Mr. Haney are old friends, and, if the information which is conveyed to me is correct, Mr. Haney asked Mr. Charleson to find men for him. I must say at once that Mr. Charleson never asked any authorization from me nor did I give him any authorization. When I saw items in the newspapers to the effect that Mr. Charleson was hiring men for the Crow's Nest Pass Railway, I asked him in what capacity he was acting, and he said: A few friends asked me, purely as a matter of friendship, to help them to place men with Mr. Haney, and I am doing so without receiving any remuneration. Mr. Charleson told me, at the same time, that he was doing this work after office hours. As a

matter of fact, he was doing just what any of us might have been doing at the time. I remember very well having written letters to Mr. Haney, just as any one would do, asking him to take some men, that I would be glad if he would give them employment.

I understood at the time that Mr. Charleson was acting in the way I am now pointing out. The hon. gentleman does not insinuate, of course, that the two poor young men who died out there had been engaged by Mr. Charleson, they were not engaged by him. I do not know who sent them out there. We all regret what has taken place, and the hon. gentleman echoes the opinions of members on both sides of the House when he says that some action must be taken against the parties responsible for what has taken place. Canadian labourers have been treated as navvies, as Italians are treated when working on railways; they have been treated as many railway contractors treat foreigners engaged to work on railways. Well, we cannot stand that sort of treatment. The Government has done its duty; we have appointed a commission whose report has been read to-day. The parties responsible for the ill-treatment that honest labouring men received, should be punished if there is any law by which that can be done. I can say no more than that. This is not the time to make long speeches, there is no cause for it. Action is better than any number of speeches. As for Mr. Charleson, he is not in town now; as soon as he comes back I will ask him to give an account of what he has done, and if he is not in a position to give me a satisfactory explanation, he will have to take the consequences of what he has done. But I do not believe it is right, before those explanations are asked from, and given by, Mr. Charleson, that he should be accused of having done anything wrong. Suppose he did send some men there, no one man could foresee that men engaged under certain conditions would be treated like dogs. I have myself sent men out there.

Mr. LISTER. I sent two.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have sent men there believing that they would receive fair treatment. However, what has taken place is a lesson that will not be lost sight of, I am sure, when new contracts are awarded. Stringent conditions will have to be imposed, we will have to see that labouring men are treated as they have a right to be, that is, fairly and honestly.

Mr. DAVIN. I wish to protest against the position taken, not for the first time, by the Minister of Public Works in trying to shield himself behind the action of one of his subordinates. It is simply incredible that the Minister of Public Works did not know the position that Mr. Charleson occupied in respect to the hiring business. But it is not merely the Department of Public Works that is responsible, the Department of Justice is responsible. When my colleague from Alberta (Mr. Oliver) tried to get the machinery of justice to work in order to bring the responsibility home to those who did these two young men to death, what were the answers that he got from the Department of Justice? He first applied to the Minister of Justice, he is then referred to the Deputy Minister of Justice, who sends back word that he had no jurisdiction in the matter, that he had no control over the coroner.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Fitzpatrick). Is that true or not true in law, that he had no control over the coroner?

Mr. DAVIN. He had power to authorize the coroner, Dr. Mead, to withdraw and get another coroner to take his place.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. That is true, he could not have interfered.

Mr. DAVIN. But the Prime Minister tells me that the Minister of Justice is not merely Minister of Justice for the Dominion, but he is Attorney General over the North-west Territories. That is what I was told by the Prime Minister in discussing the case of the Queen against Skelton.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Did this give him control over the coroner?

Mr. DAVIN. I want to ask the hon. gentleman whether the Attorney General in Quebec, or in Ontario, in the presence of a state of things such as was going on in the North-west Territories, it being brought to his attention that an application was being made to a judge to prevent a coroner going on with an inquiry, does he mean to say that the Attorney General for the province could not interfere?

Mr. LISTER. That is a different question.

Mr. DAVIN. It is not different. I will read the very words of the Prime Minister, in the discussion of the case of the Queen vs. Skelton:

I must say to my hon. friend that he stated, and stated correctly, that on the 16th of May when the case was called to be proceeded with, the agent of the Minister of Justice, who is the Attorney General, stated that he had received a letter of instructions from the Attorney General not to go on with the case but to suspend it to another term. * * * He says that the Minister of Justice was not within his duty. * * * I have only this answer to make to my hon. friend, and he will see that he has been labouring under serious misapprehension. The Minister of Justice is the Attorney General for the North-west Territories. He is the prosecutor for Her Majesty. The Minister of Justice is the Attorney General for Canada. He has jurisdiction in all the courts of Canada, he is the prosecutor wherever Her Majesty brings suits, and he was prosecuting that indictment against James Skelton.

If so, he was the prosecutor behind the coroner, and could interfere, and when application was made to Mr. Justice Rouleau for an injunction to prevent that coroner going on with the inquiry, the Attorney General for the North-west Territories could have interfered. It brings home straight to the Department of Justice the responsibility for not having had due inquiry into the death of these two young men.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The hon. gentleman must know better than to make such a statement as that.

Mr. DAVIN. I say that responsibility is brought straight home to the Department of Justice. The Minister of Justice is the Attorney General for the North-west Territories, he has jurisdiction in all the courts. If the Minister of Justice was the Attorney General in the court of Battleford against Skelton, so was he in this case. This is what the Prime Minister says:

> If the Minister of Justice was the Attorney General prosecuting that indictment in the court at Battleford against Skelton, the case was in his hands, and he was simply within his rights when he gave instructions to his agent to postpone the case. If that case had been brought in Manitoba, or Quebec, or Ontario, where the Attorney General for the province, the prosecutor is then the Attorney General for such province, and the Minister of Justice could not have interfered in the case.

I say here that the Department of Justice was, on the showing of the Prime Minister himself, in a position to prevent such a state of things as we are now confronted with, namely, that Mr. Justice Rouleau was allowed to make that injunction preventing the coroner going on with this inquiry. The people there who wanted justice to be done, were told that nothing could be done by the Attorney General, by the man who was in the position of the Attorney General of a province. I say this brings home to the Government of Canada a much more serious matter than even the conduct of Mr. Charleson.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I have listened with a great deal of attention and with a great deal of interest to what fell from the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace). He has stated facts upon which one can place some reliance, and I think he aroused a degree of generous interest and sympathy in this House of which the occasion is deserving. But as for the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), I can scarcely credit that a gentleman occupying his position in the House should stand up and take the responsibility of the statements that he has made. He undertakes to say that the Department of Justice is responsible for the death of these young men.

Mr. DAVIN. That is not what I said. I said the department was responsible for not bringing home the guilt to the guilty parties.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I am surprised that the hon. gentleman does not remember even for two minutes what he says. These were his words: "The Department of Justice was responsible for the death of these young men."

Mr. DAVIN. That is not what I said; there is no use in the hon. gentleman replying to that. If it should turn out that I said so, it would be a lapsus linguæ. What I meant to say was that the Department of Justice was responsible for the position of things, in not bringing justice home to the responsible parties.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. Let me deal with that. The young men died after having been in the service of the Canadian Pacific Railway. We were not responsible for their employment, nor should we be responsible for the treatment they received from the time they left the Crow's Nest Pass until they reached Pincher Creek, where they died. The first information the Department of Justice had concerning this matter was information conveyed to them when a notice of application for an injunction on the coroner was sent to the Department of Justice, the coroner sent that notice asking the Department of Justice to say whether we would interfere to defend him on the basis of that injunction. I am surprised that my hon. friend could have any doubt about that. He is a lawyer from the North-west Territories himself. The coroner is not an official of the Department of Justice, he is not an official of the Federal Government, he is not under our control, he is an official of the North-west Territories, he is appointed by them and entirely under their control. The injunction, therefore, was applied for against an official of the North-west Territories. When that application was made it came before the court, who dealt with it. The court maintained the injunction on the ground that the coroner, being a party interested, being a witness and having attended the deceased, should not act as coroner. Under these circumstances nothing remained to be done. That is the extent to which the Department of Justice is concerned with this matter. Our responsibility commenced when the death of the young men came to our knowledge. What did we do? We found a commission had been appointed to investigate the whole trouble on the Crow's Nest Pass road. It was appointed by the Government. We knew that they, being on the ground, would naturally take cognizance of the occurrence, and as a matter of fact, they did make an investigation, partial I am free to admit, into the death of these young men. What could we do until the report of the commission came here? The course taken by the Department of Justice

may be stated. That report was made; we applied for a copy of it to the Department of the Interior. We are examining that report to ascertain whether we have therein the material necessary to enable us to take such proceedings as may vindicate justice in respect to the death of these men. Yesterday in the Senate it was declared by the head of the Department of Justice that if the information contained in this report was not sufficient to enable the Government to take proceedings, then another and a further investigation would be made in order to put the Government in possession of all the facts, because it is our firm intention to investigate the matter to the bottom, to ascertain the true facts connected with it. And the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) was so persistent in bringing forward this matter and calling attention to it that his efforts will be rewarded so far as the Department of Justice is concerned, because we shall make such an investigation as will enable us, if criminal acts have been done, to punish the criminals. To what extent is the Government responsible for what has taken place? To what extent is the Government, having contributed a certain amount of money to aid in the construction of this road and provided that Canadian labour should be employed, liable for the fact that those labourers, who proceeded to the scene of operations in order to earn a livelihood, have been treated in a manner most brutal and in a manner that we cannot allow to pass unnoticed? The Government has ascertained the facts, it has reported them to the House. What more can be expected from the Government? Having ascertained the facts and reported them to the House, it is our duty now, on those facts, to take such proceedings, civil or criminal, as may be justified under the circumstances. Beyond that, we could not go. This is not the first time in our history that such abuses have been committed by great corporations, benefited by contributions from the public chest, but they have been allowed to pass unnoticed. I venture the statement that those who are acquainted with the facts connected with the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, when hon. gentlemen were in power and had the control of public affairs, will be aware that similar outrages were committed, but the then Government never dared to investigate them. We have dared to investigate, and we mean to punish the criminals and mete out justice to them.

Mr. DAVIN. Who appoints the coroners in the North-west?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. The local government.

Mr. DAVIN. They are appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am exceedingly glad to hear the remarks made by the hon. Solicitor General. I hope, in respect to the treatment given these men, that we shall never hear again of such barbaric acts being committed, and that the Government on the facts presented in the report submitted, will see that punishment is meted out to those individuals such as they justly deserve. On a former occasion I stated I could hardly conceive that the Canadian Pacific Railway officials at Montreal were fully cognizant of the ill-treatment to which these men were subjected. I hope such is not the case. If they were, they have a serious charge to answer, and they should be called upon to answer it; and I earnestly trust that before the entire money voted by the Government towards the construction of the road is paid, at least those men who have been inhumanly treated should be generously dealt with, while at the same time punishment should be meted out to those men who perpetrated the acts of inhumanity. I believe those men were sub-contractors connected with the Crow's Nest Pass road. Of course, I do not know who they were. I believe Mr. Haney, who was placed in charge of the Canadian Pacific Railway construction, had authority to let out and did let out the works on considerable mileage to sub-contractors, and I believe when we come to thoroughly investigate the matter, it will be found that some of the sub-contractors were guilty of these inhuman acts, and not the regular officials of the road. I believe that is true; I have a hint that it is true. I hope the Canadian Pacific Railway Company itself will make a thorough investigation in the interest of justice and to clear their skirts of such disgraceful, inhuman acts, and not allow the matter to remain in its present shape; and further, that the Government will, in accordance with sentiments expressed by the Solicitor General, declare that the parties guilty shall be properly punished.

Mr. SPROULE. It has unfortunately happened that too frequently railway contractors treat their men in a most inhuman manner. We had some experience of that during the building of the Canadian Pacific road around Lake Superior. I remember what took place under D. F. Burke, a contractor who was around the corridors a few days ago. He employed Italians and let them go at the beginning of winter, without food or shelter, and after the season's work. They had not enough money coming to them according to his book-keeping to pay their way out of the place. They came to the Sault, and by the last boat were brought down as an act of charity to Collingwood. At the end of the season's operations these men had not enough money to bring them down to Wiarton, and they were brought down by charity. I thought then the contractor should have been punished, but unfortunately the matter was not brought to public notice. I regret that from time to time similar occurrences have taken place

elsewhere. The recital of such inhuman conduct as is shown in the report read is enough to make the blood boil, for it clearly shows inhumanity and barbarity. The report was in the possession of the Government some time ago, and the only complaint that can fairly be made against the Government in this connection is that they have been supine and have let the time go by to bring the guilty parties to trial and punishment. Had this matter not been brought so prominently and forcibly before the House, I am afraid much more time would have elapsed before taking action than is likely to result at the present time. A Government official is really an aider and abettor in these crimes, and I hope that official will receive the punishment to which he is entitled. These railway contractors are getting rich, while at the same time they are dishonestly treating and cruelly treating their men. Many of the employers are treating their employees more as beasts than as human beings. Inhumanity, barbarity and brutality are the only words in the English language which adequately express the conduct of these contractors, and condign punishment ought to be meted out at a very early date. The facts are now brought very clearly to the attention of the Government, and they should not allow one hour to pass before bringing these men to justice. With respect to the men who are dead, I can only say that from my understanding of these inquiries it is the right of the Attorney General, or whoever may represent him, if a miscarriage of justice occurs through the coroner, to have another inquiry held. A post-mortem examination is needed to obtain all possible evidence as to the cause of death.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. How can the hon. gentleman contend that at a coroner's inquest, in case of death by diphtheria, a post-mortem could take place after the coroner had been stayed by injunction? It could not be done.

Mr. SPROULE. The treatment meted out may have been calculated to bring on this disease, and this demands a most searching investigation; and if through any technicality the coroner was unable to do his duty, it is the right of the Attorney General to institute another inquiry through another coroner to bring out all the facts, and enable him to see where the blame lies and punish the guilty parties.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). Let us deal with this matter fairly and honestly. I am sure the gentleman who acted as a coroner, when acting within his legal authority, is in a position where he cannot be interfered with by the Attorney General of Canada.

Mr. DAVIN. But he is the Attorney General of the North-west Territories.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). Why blame anybody but the Attorney General of the North-west Territories?

Mr. DAVIN. The Attorney General of the North-west Territories is the Minister of Justice.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). I understand the North-west Territories have law in that regard just the same as the provinces, and when there is an appointing authority, that authority has power to punish any dereliction of duty on the part of the appointee.

Mr. DAVIN. You know nothing about it.

Mr. FOSTER. They will never make a judge of you.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). I am not fit to be a judge if my statement is not correct, that the power appointing an authority has the power to discipline that authority. If any lawyer from the North-west Territories disputes that statement, then I say it is no wonder he has not much practice.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). Does the hon. gentleman from West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) mean to say that the coroner appointed in the Territories must be taken to account by the Attorney General of Canada, if he contravenes the law?

Mr. DAVIN. I mean to say that the Attorney General of Canada has authority over him.

Mr. FRASER (Guysborough). I did not ask that. Of course, if the authorities in the Territories do not do their duty, then there is an appeal to the superior authority of the Attorney General of Canada. We are all agreed as to the wrong committed, but do not let us throw on the Government or on the Opposition for that matter, the blame when it does not rightly lie on them. The Solicitor General has said that the Government, in so far as they have any power, will see that justice is done to the end. I thank the Solicitor General for that. I believe that any member of the Opposition who says that is not a sufficient guarantee or tries to make political capital out of it, is not a friend of the two unfortunate men who died. The Government have said they will probe the whole matter to the bottom, and surely all should be satisfied with that. What more can they do? The Solicitor General or the Minister of Justice must follow the law, and he has no power to act arbitrarily or outside of the law. For the sake of the two young men who died, and for the sake of the reputation of Canada, I am glad that the Solicitor General has made the statement he did, but in the name of common humanity and in the name of bringing to justice any corporation or any individual who has done wrong, let us agree, without making party capital out of it, that justice should be done.

Mr. DAVIN. Do I understand the Solicitor General to say that Coroner Mead was appointed by what is called the local government—Mr. Haultain and Mr. Ross ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. I say now, as I said a moment ago, and without looking into the matter, I do not wish to be inconsistent in my statement, that the coroner is an official of the local authorities in the North-west Territories.

Mr. DAVIN. Then, the hon. and learned gentleman is profoundly ignorant on the subject.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL. That expression of opinion from the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) is, I believe, a commendation to me.

Mr. CLARKE. I entirely agree with the remarks that have fallen from my hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Fraser), that the inquiry into the circumstances of the death of these two young Nova Scotians and the punishment of those, if any, who are responsible for the death should not be made a party question. As a matter of fact, it cannot be made a party political question unless it can be shown that the Government of the day are derelict in their duty in bringing the perpetrators of this outrage to justice.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CLARKE. It is very difficult for laymen to brush aside the uncertainties of the law, and to know just what the powers and responsibilities of the officers of Government are, but I most respectfully draw the attention of the House to the fact that these young Nova Scotians have been dead four or five months, and that such a long time has been permitted to elapse that the condition of their bodies is now such that a post-mortem examination will not give the evidence that a post-mortem examination held immediately after their death would have given. I call attention to the fact that those who were on the ground at the time these sad circumstances were permitted to take place, are scattered far and wide, and it will be impossible, or next to impossible, to get the evidence by which responsibility can be fixed on those who are responsible for this sad and foul blot on the fair name of our country. I repeat that the people of Canada will hold the Government responsible if they have not resorted to every legal expedient within their power to obtain all possible information as to the condition under which these men were working, and as to the sad iniquity committed. We learned the other night from the statement made by the Minister of the Interior that the inquiry into the methods adopted in the construction of the Crow's Nest Pass Railway was instituted because of information which the Government had obtained from time to time through the agents who were appointed to enforce the Alien Labour Law, and since these agents have reported, I want to know what steps the Government of Canada have taken to prevent those who are still engaged in the construction of that road from being treated as the former unfortunate employees were. Without prejudging the case, we will await the action which the Government will take in this matter, and if the Government do not mete out, as far as it is possible to mete it out, not cold justice, but ample justice, to those who have brought such disgrace upon Canada by their inhuman treatment of these workmen, the people of the Dominion will know where to fix the responsibility, and they will not allow legal quibbles to stand in the way of justice being done.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I very much fear that the hope expressed by the hon. gentleman from Toronto (Mr. Clarke), that no attempt shall be made to make political capital out of this unfortunate incident, is not to be gratified. Judging from the language we have heard to-day from some hon. gentlemen opposite, it is quite evident that they will endeavour to make out of the sad death of these poor men all the capital they can against the Government. I regret to say that they are not above parading the corpses of these two young men in order to attempt to make an impression against the Government. Nothing could be more unfair and unjust than some of the charges made to-day against the Minister of Public Works, because one of his officers, as it is alleged, happened to be concerned in the hiring of these workmen. Even if one of the officers of the Public Works Department had been mixed up in the hiring of these men to work on the Crow's Nest Pass Railway, that would be at best a breach of the discipline of the department which would be altogether unnoticed, were it not for the fact that the men sent to that work were ill-treated. Had they met with ordinary fair treatment, not a word would be said to-day against Mr. Charleson or the Minister of Public Works, but because it so happened that the men were inhumanly treated, an attempt was made to fasten the guilt on the Minister of Public Works, who had no more to do with the matter than any man in this House. If Mr. Charleson has been guilty of a breach of discipline, he must first be given an opportunity of defending himself, and then have such treatment meted out to him as his case demands, but whether Mr. Charleson has been guilty or not, what reason can there be for making the Minister of Public Works responsible for his actions.

With regard to what took place afterwards the first notice which the Department of Justice had was a telegram from Mr. Oliver, informing the department that the coroner

had been stopped proceeding with the inquest, by an injunction. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to contend that the department was bound to interfere between the coroner and the judge of the North-west Territories? It seems to me that the only thing that the Government could do was to await the result of the judicial action taken before the judge. Of course it is not the fault of the Government if the judge kept the injunction before him some six weeks before giving a decision, and the department could not presume that he would have kept the matter under deliberation so long. Afterwards a full report was made to the Department of Justice by Mr. Coneybeare, the Government agent at Lethbridge, stating that there was reason to believe that gross maltreatment had been given these two men. What was there to be done under the circumstances? Only one thing, and that was to have an inquiry made. Why, at that very moment there were commissioners holding investigations into all the facts. Months before that, upon the first report that the men had not been fairly treated, the Government thought it advisable to issue a commission to inquire into the facts. We have the report of that commission, and so far as I understand them, hon. gentlemen opposite say that it is a fair, honest and pretty full report. We have in the proceedings of that commission the evidence as to who are responsible for the death of these young men, if their death was due to the action of man, or we have not. If we have, there is sufficient proof on which to administer justice. If we have not, then we have the word of the Department of Justice, given here by the Solicitor General, that no effort shall be spared in order to have full justice done. Under the circumstances, I am at a loss to understand in what respect the Government is blameable. I am at a loss to know what more shall be done than has been done. The Government, far from being derelict in their duty, have shown more diligence in this respect than any previous Government ever did. There have been other public works constructed, as was stated by the Solicitor General a moment ago, and other complaints of ill-treatment to the men employed on these works, and this is the first time that any Government has been so solicitous for the welfare of the labourers on public works as to issue a commission to inquire into their treatment.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the hon. Minister of Public Works say what position Mr. Charleson has in his department?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. He is general inspector. He attends to the pay lists, he sees that the men are located where they should be; he acts as a general agent.

Mr. FOSTER. As a purchasing agent?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, he purchases very little. He only checks the lists of purchases.

Miscellaneous printing $257,000

Mr. WALLACE. I intended to refer to the post office at Digby at some length, but as the hon. Postmaster General is not in his place, I shall be very brief. I intend merely to say that the post office has been removed from the centre of business where it had been some twenty or more years, to a place which is not suitable, and the people have petitioned unanimously to have it restored to the same locality.

There was a matter brought up some short time ago with reference E. J. Welsh, engineer, and the Prime Minister asked that it might be laid over for a moment and be brought up again under the item of miscellaneous matters. The hon. member for Pictou introduced the subject to the attention of the House, and the Prime Minister said it would receive the attention of the Government. The Government has given some attention to it but has not come to any decision and has accomplished nothing. Mr. Welsh was a civil engineer in the employ of the Government, surveying for intercolonial extensions in Nova Scotia and other provinces, and when the government of the Leeward Islands asked the Canadian Government to recommend a competent engineer to take charge of their public works, the then acting Minister of Railways and Canals—I think it was the late Sir John Macdonald—on the recommendation of Mr. Schreiber, the chief engineer of Railways and Canals, sent down Mr. Welsh, under an agreement made by the Canadian Government with the Government of the Leeward Islands. This was about eight years ago Mr. Welsh worked there five years, and the Government of the Leeward Islands were in arrears a large amount of his salary, more than a year and a half, when they gave him notice of the termination of his contract. They gave him notice that the contract was terminated. He asked them for a settlement, but that settlement was delayed and he had to remain there. It may be said that he should have come home. But with what was to him a very large sum of money due him—pay for a year and a half, amounting to about $5,000 in round numbers—he could not very well come away and leave the matter uncertain as to whether he should get his money or not. He stayed there for three months or more before he could get a settlement and secure his money. He now claims that while he was given notice of the termination of his contract, he was obliged by the action of the people there to remain, and that he is entitled to be paid for the time he was obliged to remain. Mr. Welsh himself is helpless to enforce the bargain against the Government of the Leeward Islands, but this Government are in a position to press the

matter. The previous Government sent Mr. Welsh out, and the present Government inheriting the——

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Sins.

Mr. WALLACE—the sins of their predecessors—and improving on those sins in many cases—should urge this case to a settlement. The Government of this country undertook to procure a man for this service at the request of the Government of the Leeward Islands. The matter has been referred to the Colonial Secretary, and he has perfunctorily disposed of the case. But this is the case of a Canadian citizen going to serve another Government under contract made by the Canadian Government, and I think it is the duty of the Government to look after the interests of this citizen as if they were directly interested—as indeed they are, the bargain having been made with them. Now, this Government has had some correspondence, both with the Leeward Islands and the Colonial Secretary, but Mr. Welsh gets no redress and gets none of the money properly due him. I think Mr. Welsh has the right to expect the Government to make proper representations to the Colonial Department. I believe such representations have been made, but the matter has been allowed to drop and lapse. It has not been followed up.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. What would my hon. friend (Mr. Wallace) expect us to do besides making representations to the Colonial Office ?

Mr. WALLACE. The Colonial Office has simply thrown the case aside. I think the Candian Government should say : This man was sent to the Leeward Islands under the instructions of the Canadian Government at the request of the Government of the Leeward Islands, and we demand, and fairly demand, that they receive legitimate treatment and be paid the balance of the salary to which he is fairly entitled. This Canadian citizen was sent 2,000 miles away under an agreement by which his expenses were to be paid going and returning, and he was even to be paid for the time returning ; but they did not pay his wages and he had to remain there until he got a settlement. This Government could make representations both to the Government of the Leeward Islands and to the Colonial Office, for the Government of the Leeward Islands communicated directly with the Government of Canada when they desired a man of Mr. Welsh's qualifications. This is a case where only the Government can act. It may be said that Mr. Welsh could go down and sue the Government of the Leeward Islands, but practically that is out of the question. If he sued the Government there and had a jury of the ebony-coloured gentlemen down there who understood that this man was trying to get from their country, it is not possible that he would receive fair treatment. Besides he could not be expected to undergo the expense necessary for the proceeding. The Government here should represent the case of Mr. Welsh just as strongly as if they had to pay the money out of their own pocket, for they sent Mr. Welsh there and made the bargain under which his services were to be given. Under these circumstances, I think they should make the strongest possible representations both to the Colonial Secretary and also to the Government of the Leeward Islands to accord justice to Mr. Welsh.

Civil Government—
Customs Department $1,750

Mr. FOSTER. May I ask the Minister of Customs if he has that information from his department with reference to the Chicoutimi mill machinery ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Nothing further than what I have given the hon. gentleman. The machinery was brought in and warehoused while the mill was in the course of construction. The full amount of the duty has been paid.

Mr. FOSTER. Can the hon. gentleman tell me what was the date of the payment of the duty.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. On May 14th, $2,813.20 was paid. This machinery did not all come in at the same time. While it was coming in, it was warehoused pending appraisement, to be settled when it all came in.

Mr. FOSTER. Was May 14th the final payment ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I think so. It came in at different dates, some of it as late as March. Instruction was sent that it was to be warehoused and that the duty was to be paid pending appraisement.

Mr. WALLACE. What was the object in taking that unusual course ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I do not know that it was particularly unusual. The mill was not up, the machinery kept coming along, and was warehoused.

Mr. WALLACE. Is the mill running now ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I do not know.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend has all that information in his pocket, and he might as well give it to us. He knows the payment I do not want, but he does not know the payment I do want. If he can tell from his department when the last payment was made, he knows when all the payments were made.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The hon. gentleman asked me, when I gave the other information, when the whole duties were collected. He wanted to know whether the duties had been paid before the machinery

started running. I asked that of my deputy, and he said that we were not in possession of any information that the mill had been running prior to that date.

Mr. FOSTER. Will he try that department again, and get the date on which it was bonded, and the dates at which the different payments were made?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Will the hon. gentleman be frank with me and tell me whether he thinks anything has been irregular? It has been done under warehousing conditions, where they are under a penalty of double duty. The machinery is under your control the whole time. The fact of the machinery being warehoused makes them liable to double duty.

Mr. FOSTER. Will my hon. friend get me that information?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I am giving it to you now.

Mr. FOSTER. I want the dates at which the machinery was bonded and the dates when payments were made.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I think I can get that.

Mr. WALLACE. The Minister knows that is quite contrary to the law, unless he sends an officer that has the goods under his charge all the time. But the duty must be paid when the goods come into the country, and he knows that is law.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I do not know anything of the kind. I do not think the hon. gentleman can inform me as to what the law is.

Mr. WALLACE. The law is explicit that the duty has not been paid.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I said it was warehoused, warehoused in the usual way.

Mr. WALLACE. Warehoused means to put it in a bonded warehouse, there is no other way to warehouse. The Minister did not put it in a bonded warehouse because, we are told, that it was put in the factory.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. And the factory was constituted a bonded warehouse.

WAYS AND MEANS.

The House again resolved itself into Committee of Ways and Means.

(In the Committee.)

1. Resolved, That towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty, on account of certain expenses of the public service for the financial year ending the 30th June, 1898, the sum of $1,425,412.91 be granted out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada.

2. Resolved, That towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty, on account of certain expenses of the public service for the financial year ending the 30th June, 1899, the sum of $28,677,283.08 be granted out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada.

Resolutions to be reported.

SUPPLY BILL.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 174) for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money required for defraying certain expenses of the public service for the financial year ending respectively 30th June, 1898, and 30th June, 1899, and for other purposes relating to the public service.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

JUDGES OF PROVINCIAL COURTS.

The House proceeded to consider amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 150) further to amend the Act respecting the Judges of Provincial Courts.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The Senate has made only one important amendment, and two or three minor amendments to this Bill. They have amended the clause with respect to the superannuation of judges at 75 years of age so as to read that superannuation shall take place and apply only to judges hereafter to be appointed.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the hon. gentleman not accept that?

The PRIME MINISTER. There is a good deal of point in it, but I propose to consider the whole matter at a future session. I move that all the words in this amendment be struck out and the remaining amendments be concurred in. This will have the effect of postponing the whole question of the superannuation of the judges to a future date. The Government propose to deal with the whole question at a future session.

Mr. FOSTER. Then if new judges are appointed, all of the Act will go into operation with the exception of the section providing for the retirement of judges at 75 years?

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes.

Motion agreed to.

THE FRANCHISE ACT.

Mr. FOSTER. Referring to the Franchise Act, I desire to suggest that a number of copies be printed and distributed to the members of the House. Many members are away or going away, and the revision of the lists is going on, and if in connection with the Act there should be printed the schedule, it would be found very useful indeed, and not very costly. The Solicitor General agreed that it would be a good thing

to have copies printed. Some half dozen copies might be sent to each member.

The PRIME MINISTER (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). It is a good suggestion.

Mr. FOSTER. Then it will not need a motion ?

The PRIME MINISTER. No, it is not needed.

The PRIME MINISTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 6.30 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 13th June, 1898.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

STATUS OF CORONER IN NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES.

Mr. DAVIN. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to make one or two remarks in order to put the House in possession of the facts as regards the position we are in in the North-west Territories.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman, I fear, is going to do more than put a question.

Mr. DAVIN. I will put myself in order. The North-west Territories are placed by Imperial statute, 34-35 Victoria, under the Parliament of Canada. I must say that, with some qualifications, the North-west Territories are to this moment under the legislative control of this Parliament. Even as regards the powers we give by legislation in this House, there is a saving clause ; and at any moment this Parliament could resume its plenary authority over those territories, but I may call attention to the 13th section, chapter 50, of the Revised Statutes, which defines the position of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council at that time :

> The Lieutenant-Governor in Council shall have such powers to make ordinances for the government of the North-west Territories as the Governor in Council from time to time confers upon him, but such powers shall not, at any time, be in excess of those conferred by the 92nd and 93rd sections of the British North America Act, 1867, upon the legislatures of the several provinces of Canada.

There was a slight amendment in 1888, but of no importance. There was no amendment in 1889 and none in 1890. I should probably have said that the fourth section of chapter 50 of the Revised Statutes reads as follows :—

> There shall be for the territories an officer called the Lieutenant-Governor, appointed by the Governor in Council, by instrument, under the Great Seal of Canada, who shall hold office during pleasure.
>
> The Lieutenant-Governor shall administer the government, under instructions from time to time given him by the Governor in Council or by the Secretary of State of Canada.

The North-west Territories—where we have, for all practical purposes, responsible government—apart from the powers given to the legislative assembly, to which I shall call attention, are as completely under the control of the Dominion Government as the Yukon district will be after the Act that we passed this session is assented to. In 1891 a very important Act was passed, to which I wish to call the attention of the House for a minute. That Act enlarged the powers of what might be called the territorial parliament, and by one section, which is the one we are interested in at present, it enacted : The administration of justice in the territories, including the constitution, organization and maintenance of the territorial courts of civil jurisdiction, including the procedure therein, but not including the power of appointing any judicial officers. This is subsection 10 of section 13, as amended by section 6 of the Act of 1891 : the difference observed between it and the provincial powers in the British North America Act will be familiar to the hon. gentlemen. Here is the way the powers are given to the province in subsection 14 of section 92 of the British North America Act :

> The administration of justice in the province, including the constitution, maintenance and organization of provincial courts, both of civil and of criminal jurisdiction, and including procedure in civil matters in those courts.

Now, the next amendment that was made of any importance was in 1894, when some powers were added, but nothing bearing on the subject which we have to deal with today. Then comes the Act of 1897, which changed the name of the executive committee of 1894 to that of the executive council. In the Act of 1894, I forgot to say, it is provided that the Lieutenant-Governor shall consult with his executive committee as to the expenditure of all funds, not only strictly local funds, but the funds voted by this Parliament. Up to the passing of the Act of 1897, the clerk of the assembly was a Dominion officer. I now return to the section of the North-west Territories Act which, passing away from provisions as to the administration of justice in civil matters in the territories, deals with criminal matters, and then comes to coroners and inquests ; and I will ask the attention of the House to these sections—section 82 to 87 of the Revised Statutes, chapter 50 :

> 82. The Indian Commissioner for the territories, the judges of the Supreme Court, the Commissioner and Assistant Commissioner of the North-west Mounted Police, and such other persons as the Lieutenant-Governor——

Mark this: the Lieutenant-Governor, not as advised by his executive council, but the Lieutenant-Governor as the agent of this Government.

——from time to time appoints, shall be coroners in and for the territories.

83. Except as hereinafter provided, no inquest shall be held upon the body of any deceased persons by any coroner, unless it has been made to appear that there is reason to believe that the deceased died from violence or unfair means, or by culpable or negligent conduct either of himself or of others, under such circumstances as require investigation, and not through mere accident or mischance.

84. Upon the death of any prisoner, the jailer or officer in charge of the jail where the prisoner dies, shall immediately give notice to the nearest resident coroner, and such coroner shall proceed forthwith to hold an inquest upon the body.

85. It shall not be necessary in any case that a coroner's jury shall exceed six persons, but in every case of an inquest, six jurors must agree in order to render the verdict valid.

86. Coroners shall have the same power to summon witnesses and to punish them for disobeying a summons to appear or for refusing to be sworn or to give evidence, as are enjoyed by justices of the peace.

87. The fees of coroners, jurors and witnesses attending in criminal trials and inquests may be fixed from time to time by the Governor in Council, and paid in such manner as he directs.

That is, the Governor General, as will be seen by the interpreting clause. These provisions have never been repealed.

You will observe the distinction between Lieutenant-Governor in Council and Lieutenant-Governor when used alone, as it is in section 82 of the North-west Territories Act. The coroner is, therefore, appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor, not as advised by any one, but as a Dominion officer. I thought it was necessary that I should make this clear, because it is perfectly plain, from the debates in this House, that in certain quarters, which ought to be properly informed, they really do not know what is the state of the law in this country as regards the North-west Territories, and the very department that should know what is the actual position of the coroner, actually stated, by its mouthpiece in this House, that the coroner in the North-west Territories is a local officer, whereas he is a Dominion officer.

Motion to adjourn negatived.

SUPPLY BILL.

Bill (No. 174) an Act granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money required for defraying certain expenses of the public service for the financial years ending respectively the 30th June, 1898, and the 30th June, 1899, and for other purposes relating to the public service (Mr. Fielding) read the second time and considered in committee.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding) moved that the said Bill be read the third time.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved the third reading of the Bill.

Mr. FOSTER. On the motion for the Supply Bill, I ask the House for a few moments of its time—which is not so valuable as it was at an earlier stage of the session—in order to make some comments on this Bill or upon certain features of the financial administration of the Government as illustrated in the Supply Bill. In the first place, it may be noted that this is the largest Supply Bill that ever was presented to this Parliament for its assent: and it cannot be considered remarkable, therefore, that it should call for some comments. The comments I intend to make upon the Bill shall be directed to two particulars, two prominent features: First, the utter repudiation of pre-election pledges with reference to the management of the finances of the country apparent in the administration of the present Government, and illustrated in this Supply Bill; second, the startling disregard of old and salutary methods of administration shown by the Government, of which notable examples are to be found in the present Supply Bill.

First, then, with regard to the pledges of economy. It is an old saying that we are to teach line upon line and precept upon precept. The oldest and greatest truths are those which are most frequently repeated. So, I hope I shall not jar the sensitive nerves of hon. gentlemen opposite if I ask them for another time—and not for the last time—to listen to pledges which they have already made. An influential member of the Liberal Opposition, not a member of the present Government—though probably this statement will be a reminder of disappointment to the hon. gentleman—the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) reiterated a statement with reference to the attitude of his party on the expenditures of the country. I choose one sample of his statements previous to the last election. In 1895, the hon. member for North Norfolk declared:

The Liberal party, if in power, could at once reduce the public expenditure and effect other savings to the extent of $5,000,000 per annum, without impairing the efficiency of the service.

This represented one wing, and a large wing, of the Liberal party at that time. The election documents in the province of Prince Edward Island for which, of course, I hold my hon. friend the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) largely responsible, contained the following:—

The Liberal party says that several millions may be lopped off the present expenditure, without injury to the public service. Hon. David Mills estimates the probable saving at $4,000,000.

The present Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright), at one time Finance Minister of this Diminion, and the

principal financial critic of the late Government, declared in this House in 1896:

> For my own part, I do not hesitate to tell him——

That is the Finance Minister——

> ——that I consider a yearly expenditure of $40,000,000, or $38,300,000, altogether too large for the present resources of Canada. I say it is a disgrace and a shame to the Government that have been entrusted with our affairs that they come down to us and ask for an expenditure of $38,300,000 a year for federal purposes. Sir, the thing is utterly unjustifiable. Sir, there is very little use for hon. gentlemen whining over this matter. They ought to try and meet it, and the way to meet it is to reduce our present establishment, to reduce your present extravagant mode of government, and to reduce your extravagant ideas. I have said before, and I repeat it, that $38,000,000 is, in my judgment, a monstrous sum for this people to be called on to provide for.

The right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), who leads the present Government declared in Toronto, shortly before the last general election:

> Has the expenditure gone down? No. It has gone up. It went up by one, two, three, five, ten millions, and more, until it is now thirty-eight millions and the Conservatives do not shrink from it, but swallow it all. If we get into power we will follow the example of Mr. Mackenzie, and I say that, although we may not be able to bring back the expenditures to what they were under him, we can reduce the amount two, yes, three millions of dollars per year.

But, Sir, coming back to the basis of all these statements, the convention of 1893, we find the party then assembled declaring:

> We cannot but view with alarm the large increase of the public debt and of the controllable annual expenditure of the Dominion, and the consequent undue taxation of the people under the Governments that have been continuously in power since 1878, and we demand a strict economy in the administration of the Government of the country.

These, Mr. Speaker, are samples of the pledges, all in the same direction, which were made during seventeen years, and more especially within the last five years before the elections of 1896, and made by the Liberal party then in Opposition, now in power.

We have seen, then, what their pledges were. Let us ask, now, what has been the practical performance of these pledges. Well, Sir, as to the debt of the country. The net debt on the 30th June, 1896, was $258,497,432. On the 30th June, 1897, it was $261,538,596, an increase of $3,041,163. On the 30th June, 1898, it will be, according to the estimate of the Finance Minister at the time of his late Budget speech, $266,038,596, or an increase of $4,500,000 over 1897, making an increase in the two years of $7,541,163, or an average of $3,770,581 per year. Now, the net debt of the Dominion in 1890, when the late Government was in power, was $237,533,211, and in 1896, when they went out of power, it was $258,497,432, being an increase in those years of $20,964,221. Taking off $2,394,000 from that, which was transferred and charged in 1895, although incurred in 1884 (being for the North Shore Railway bonds), we have an increase of $18,570,000, which is an average increase for these years of $2,652,900. For that the Liberal-Conservative Government and party were denounced, and on the basis of that increase it was declared that the party then in Opposition, if it came into power, would greatly improve that deplorable state of things, as stated in its platform of 1893. They have done that, Sir, by making an increase in debt to date of $3,770,581 per year against an average of $2,652,900 for the six years preceding. But, Sir, this would not be so bad if there was a prospect of an early stoppage of this increase; but every hon. gentleman present knows that with the schemes now under way and the schemes that are on the way, there is no possibility of any decrease, but all of us who are practical look for a steady and large increase of the public debt under the present Government.

There is the practical performance; I have read you the solemn pledge. It is for you and the country to judge how the performance approaches the pledge. Next, Sir, with reference to taxation. It was declared that the taxation was altogther burdensome and too great, and that if the Liberal party came into power the taxation would be rendered less burdensome, and the amount taken from the people would be less. Let us see how that pledge has been carried out, as shown by the following table of customs actually paid in according to the Public Accounts:

1891-92	$ 20,501,059
1892-93	20,954,003
1893-94	19,198,114
1894-95	17,640,466
1895-96	19,833,279
Total, 5 years	$ 98,126,921
Average per year	19,623,384

Now, Sir, in 1896-97 the customs receipts were $19,478,247, not much difference between that and the preceding year; but in 1897-98 the customs taxation, by the statement of the Minister of Finance made in his Budget speech, will amount to $21,000,000, or an increase of $1,400,000 in the sum of the customs taxation in 1897-98 over the average of 1891-92 to 1895-96. The other form of taxation is the excise taxation, shown as follows:—

1891-92	$ 7,945,097
1892-93	8,367,363
1893-94	8,381,088
1894-95	7,805,732
1895-96	7,926,005
Total	$ 40,425,285
Average	8,085,057

In 1896-97 the excise produced $9,170,378, and for 1897-98, when we come back to a more normal condition, the Minister of Finance estimates the duty at 8 million dollars. So we find that the excise taxation has increased as well as the customs taxation under the present regime as compared with that of the Liberal-Conservative Government. Taking the total taxation shown by these two, we find that, whereas the average in the five preceding years was $27,710,000, in 1896-97 it was nearly $1,000,000 greater, or $28,648,625 and in 1897-98 it is to be $1,300,000 greater, or $29,000,000, as estimated by the Finance Minister; and in 1898-99 he estimates the total taxation at $29,500,000. So that in 1898-99 the total taxation by customs and excise will be $29,500,000, or nearly $2,000,000 greater in amount than the total customs and excise taxation in the average of the years between 1891-92 and 1895-96. Taking the total revenues of the Dominion, the total amount of money that is taken from the people to be spent, the average of the five years preceding 1896-97 was $36,412,378; but in 1896-97 that increased by $1,400,000 to $37,829,000; and in 1897-98 it increased to $39,300,000, or $2,900,000 more than the average from 1891-92 to 1895-96; and in 1898-99 the Minister of Finance estimates it to be $40,500,000, or as nearly as possible, $4,000,000 greater than the average from 1891-92 to 1895-96. How exactly the prophecy—no, the solemn pledge and undertaking of the right hon. gentleman who leads the Government, has been reversed. He pledged himself that if they came into power it would be possible to reduce the total taxation by one, two, three, and the Hon. David Mills said, four million dollars, so that when 1898-99 had passed there should be a decrease of $4,000,000; but by that time it will have actually increased by $4,000,000. There you have the pledge, here you have performance: and the House and the country can see how the pledge and the performance tally with each other. But hon. gentlemen will say they have reduced the rate of taxation. How much? The rate of taxation on dutiable goods in 1893 was 30·28 per cent; in 1894, 30·87 per cent; in 1895, 30·87 per cent; in 1896, 30·07 per cent; 1897, 30·04 per cent. That is the reduction in the rate of taxation on dutiable goods, was exactly 300ths of 1 per cent in the year 1897, as compared with the year 1896. Hon. gentlemen say: But the reduced tariff was only a short time in force in 1897; for a period of about two months. Very well, that is a fair argument. Then, in order to meet the case as regards the tariff going fully into effect, if you take the comparison between the first six months of 1897-98 and of 1896-97, you find that the rate of taxation on dutiable goods was reduced by exactly 45·100ths of 1 per cent. But the statement is also made that the added 12½ per cent reduction is yet to come. Let the 12½ per cent reduction come, as it will after the 1st of July, and I venture to say that the percentage of reduction upon dutiable goods under the hon. gentleman's tariff will not at most be over 1 or 1½ per cent, if it be that. The burden is increased, the sum taken from the people is increased, the total amount is greater by millions, but the rate of taxation is inappreciably reduced.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Do you take into account the percentages on the total imports?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, I gave that in reply to the hon. gentleman's Budget speech, where you will find it. However, that does not help the matter any. Now, Sir, the hon. gentlemen have made changes in the rate of taxation. They have largely increased the duty upon tobaccos which are very extensively used by the poorer classes of people in this country. They have appreciably raised the price of tobaccos from the large increase of duty which they placed upon them, and they have done that without the satisfaction of gathering into the treasury any proportional amount of revenue, simply because in putting these increased duties upon tobacco, they have put the duties beyond the rate of profitable collection of the revenue and customs duties. They have thereby given an impulse to smuggling, and the revenue has not gained, whilst the people have to pay the increased cost of an article of prime necessity and most widely used by the people. They have added so far as taxation is concerned, this present year, a sum variously estimated at from $300,000 to $500,000 of extra taxation put upon the article of sugar, and which has gone into force with the last tariff enactment of my hon. friend. So, also, duties have in some cases been lowered to the detriment of the industries, to the wiping out almost entirely of the binder twine industry of this country without a corresponding advantage to the consumer, and to the detriment of other industries in this country, notably the shirt, collar and cuff industry, which is now struggling with the competition made unfair to it by the absurd arrangement of the tariff upon their raw material and their manufactured goods, so that a reduction of wages ensues, and upon the labouring poor of the country fall the stress and the burden.

But, Sir, whilst this increased taxation has been put upon sugar and tobacco, what else has happened? The hard-working, wage-earning class of the country has had ½ per cent taken off the interest on their deposit in the Government savings banks, and the Government have been able to save a quarter million of dollars and after 1st July will have saved a half million of dollars because of the lowering of the rate on the deposits. One-half of that lowering to 3 per cent, I think, in the main could not be found fault with; the lowering of the other half, to 2½ per cent, is a hardship and should not

be done, unless it were offset by the application of it to decrease the burdens of the people. But the half million saved in the two years by the two reductions in the interest on savings bank deposits of the country has been accompanied by the increase upon the duties on sugar, which the poor people consume, and the increase on which was placed upon it during this present year. So that, while taking out of the wage-earning class 1 per cent on the interest on deposits paid them on the one hand, the country obtains no surcease of taxation, for on the sugar largely used by these same classes about an equal amount of taxation is placed.

The next subject is with respect to the pledge made in regard to the expenditures of the country. That pledge was, as I have read it, that the expenditure of the country was to be decreased by one, two, three, and probably four millions. How has it turned out? The average expenditure on Consolidated Fund from 1887 to 1895-96, inclusive, was $36,910,000. In 1895-96, the last year of the Liberal-Conservative Government, the expenditure was $36,949,142. In 1896-97, the first full year of the Liberal Government, the expenditure increased to $38,349,759, or $1,400,000 over and above the average expenditure from 1887 to 1896, inclusive. In 1897-98, the expenditure on Consolidated Fund is to amount to $38,750,000, or an increase of $1,800,000 over the average expenditure from 1887 to 1896. Take capital account, and I mean by that the capital sum as voted in the Estimates. The average capital expenditure from 1887 to 1895-96 by the Liberal-Conservative Government was $3,550,480; in 1895-96 it was $3,781,311, that year having $1,000,000 of militia estimates charged to capital, which was an unusual expenditure. In 1896-97 the expenditure on capital was $3,523,160, and in 1897-98 it is to be $7,506,185, or $4,000,000 over the average expenditure from 1887 to 1895-96. Adding revenue and capital, they show a total average expenditure, 1887—1896, on Consolidated Fund and capital account, as voted in the Estimates, of $40,460,480; but in 1896-97 the total expenditure by this Government was $41,872,919, or $1,400,000 greater, and in 1897-98 it is to be $46,256,185, or nearly $6,000,000 greater than the average expenditure from 1887 to 1895-96 by the Liberal-Conservative Government. This does not, however, show the total expenditure. You must add to these sums the railway subsidies, general and special: the immense vote to the Canadian Pacific Railway Crow's Nest Pass Railway, $3,630,000, which will mature during the present and next year. You have to take into account the payment to Manitoba of $475,000, or thereabouts, for her public buildings. You must take into account also the loan which was put through on almost the last day of the session, of $2,000,000 to the harbour of Montreal, which, though it is a loan, adds to the liability of the country and is so counted in by the financiers of the world's market when loans have to be asked for. And to this generous sum there are other expenditures which are looming up not far in the distance. The first raid on the Treasury of the Dominion by the provinces has come. It will be followed by others. It has been successful, not quite so successful as the hon. Minister expected, thanks to the good sense and wisdom of the other House, but still it has been material and it has succeeded; after years will show its development and the success of the provinces in each instance. They are preparing, and they are preparing on the basis of pledges made at the election of 1896, which must be implemented, if the hon. gentlemen expect to face those by whose votes and influence they got into power in 1896, and by whose votes and influence they can alone hope to remain in power after their present term is over. But when we come to the estimated expenditures, we find the extravagance of the Government especially manifested, and the utter disregard and practically absolute repudiation of the pledges they made in every part of this country with respect to expenditure. On Consolidated Fund account the actual estimates for 1898-99, now before the House, are $41,073,774, but every one knows that next year we shall see in the supplementaries for 1898-99 an addition for that year probably equal to the supplementaries brought down for the current year, and then the Estimates for 1898-99 will be $42,373,774. The Estimates already down on capital account reached $6,851,282. Adding to that an equal amount to the capital estimate brought down in the supplementaries for the current year it would make a total sum of $7,000,000. So that, totalling up, we find the actual estimate brought down is $47,925,056, or an increase of $6,200,000 on these accounts over the Estimates of 1895-96; and if we take the estimated supplementaries to be brought down, we get a total estimate of $49,373,774 on Consolidated Fund and capital account, as compared with $41,768,573 on those two accounts in 1895-96, an increase of $7,600,000 in round numbers. This statement, Mr. Speaker, furnishes food for thought in two directions. In the first and primary direction, as to what hon. gentlemen think when their pledges are carried out by such performances, and the two are brought before an electorate that has been grossly deceived; in the other respect, as to what will be the financial condition of the country if this galloping increase in the expenditures goes on and still on. Is there any hope that it will be decreased or delayed in its progress? No, and for the same reason that I have already given. Schemes are already in hand and schemes are on the way to be put in hand, with the increased pressure by those behind upon men who made the great and cardinal mistake of failing to take the necessary action in their first year, when they were laying down their principles and policy and were in a

position to have fulfilled their pledges, and stayed the tide, and stayed it effectively and thoroughly, if they had had the moral force to keep to their pledges and do what they believed to be right. These, then, are the performances of hon. gentlemen opposite on the line of their financial administration. So much with regard to that matter.

But, Sir, with reference to my other point of criticism as to the startling disregard of old and salutary methods of administration I have something to say. One of the first things that strikes one is the expenditure of the public money without the authorization of Parliament. I am not going to take the time of the House to marshal all the instances of that, but I will name two or three cases as illustrative. There is one well-founded and acknowledged rule that in the expenditure of public moneys the executive or Government of the country must not spend or must not undertake to spend what Parliament has not authorized it to spend, or what it has not authorized it to undertake to spend. No gentleman on the other side will for a moment contradict that well-established and well-understood rule. The Liberal Government, of all others under its present management ought to have stood firmly by that rule. They denounced every infraction or every alleged infraction of it for the whole term of their Opposition existence, and they pledged their good faith and their word as public men and as a party that they would stand by that rule when they came into office. They have not done so, and what are the results. In the first place, I take the illustration of the Governor General's warrants issued in 1896. The law is plain on the Statute-book. The discussion had upon that matter in this House was one-sided and entirely in one direction. It was not, even by the Minister of Trade and Commerce himself, denied that the law was in its intent in a certain direction, and the late lamented Mr. McCarthy, then member for North Simcoe, made the same admission, if I mistake not, in his speech. But, $2,000,000 of Governor General warrants were asked for and were granted and were partly expended, although each of those votes had been expressly refused by the preceding Parliament, when it was proposed to it, and though it was possible to have had Parliament together and to have had a vote of credit from Parliament, and thus to have kept the salutary and secure rule of administration.

The Baie des Chaleurs Railway, as foreign to our Government railway system as is the railway in Russian Siberia, without warrant or authority of Parliament was taken in hand by the Minister of Railways and administered for four or five months at a loss and with the result of his having to ask Parliament for $18,000 or $20,000 to recoup the treasury. That was done, as I have said, without authorization of Parliament or any warrant at all except the mere personal will of the Minister or of the Government. Those are two examples of many that might be cited to illustrate this fact. Again, contracts are given and entered into without the authorization of Parliament; contracts which call for large expenditures of the people's money, or of the people's domain, which is equivalent to the people's money.

As an example of that let me take the Drummond County Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway arrangement, which, without any previous authorization of Parliament, without even the matter having been discussed in this Parliament, was undertaken by the Minister of Railways, on his own personal initiative, carried through, and a binding contract entered into with those two companies which had the effect of adding a capital obligation equivalent to $7,000,000 at 3 per cent in the yearly expenditure which it called for, for a hundred years, or in perpetuity. Thanks to the wisdom and caution of another body, a part of this Parliament, that deal was not allowed to go through and, as a result, a second arrangement has taken place which on the Drummond purchase alone saves to the people of this country $600,000 of hard cash, and which, in the two arrangements taken together is calculated to save to this country nearly $1,000,000. That deal was entered into without authority of Parliament, without previous discussion in Parliament, and, thanks to the action of the Senate, and the consequent rearrangement which has resulted, there is a saving to the people of the country of $1,000,000.

Take the Yukon deal of this year. With Parliament within seven days of assembling the Government privately and secretly, and without competition, made a private arrangement with two contractors to give them a monopoly of railway carriage into that country for a number of years and to give them nearly 5,000,000 acres of surveyed and choice gold lands as a subsidy therefor. Parliament did discuss that and, fortunately, Parliament, taking both its branches into account, was able to discount this deal and to save that enormous part of the public domain for the future use and I believe for the future good of the country. These are examples of that vice of administration by the present Government.

The next illustration is that of the principle of doing public work by private bargain without that competition which is the only security, although not even an absolute security against corruption, and which is the best security the country can have as to the regulation of prices and the consequent wise expenditure of public money. And, Sir, concrete examples of this course have been furnished as we have gone through the Estimates, and the statement has been made over and over again, unrepudiated until this hour by any member of the Government, from the leader down, that whenever the Minister of Public Works chooses and whenever the

Government thinks fit to allow him, in some matters without consultation with the Government, in some greater matters after consultation with his colleagues, but whenever it shall suit, the principle of public tender and contract based thereon shall be utterly and absolutely repudiated. What are the examples? The Minister of Public Works in the matter of the erection of a stone fence to cost on the whole about $14,000, new work entirely, as plain a piece of work for contract and tender as could possibly be, with its supervision under the eyes of its officer, right here in Ottawa, instead of letting it by tender, carved it up into portions of less than $5,000, and had it done by day's work, giving it to whomsoever he pleased. In the matter of the dredging to be done at Coteau Landing, involving $20,000 expenditure, the Minister of Public Works did not even cut it into less than in $5,000 sections, but gave the contract privately without competition, without the knowledge of the public, to a man whose work was not dredging, whose whole business is entirely foreign to it, but who has the advantage in this respect of being a relative of the Minister himself.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. He is not, but say it.

Mr. FOSTER. By marriage.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That is not relationship.

Mr. FOSTER. That is a sort of relationship. Anyway it causes a fellow feeling wondrous kind to spring up between the father of the son and the family of the son's wife. The contract was given to this man who had not a dredge of his own, and actually farmed out by him to others, he getting a percentage, how much I cannot tell, but no doubt a very respectable sum. When called to book for this, my hon. friend could only reply that this was the only way in which he could obtain a share of the patronage for his political friends, because unfortunately it was the Liberal-Conservatives who owned most of the dredges. The only way therefore in which he could benefit his friends was by giving the contract to them and letting them farm it out.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. At 8 cents a yard.

Mr. FOSTER. That does not make a bit of difference.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It makes a great deal.

Mr. FOSTER. What more? You find the Minister of Trade and Commerce, who is called the big policeman of the Government from the province of Ontario, has himself been guilty of loitering in forbidden places, because he came down, the last day but one of the working session, with an agreement made for two or three years with a firm at £8,000 sterling per year, to carry on a steamship line between ports in this country and Manchester, and has not to this day deigned to lay the draft contract on the Table of the House, or give the House any information as to details of the negotiations, other than the explanation he made at the time of asking the House to pass the vote; but that is merely an example among a large number. How are the prices to be settled if no competition is invited? and in that case there was not even the plea of urgency. Public competition was entirely set aside, and the hon. gentleman himself repudiated in that transaction, in this high-handed open way, the principle of letting these great contracts by tenders and basing the contracts on the tenders received from the public.

We have the Minister of Agriculture pleading urgency for going about among private parties by letter or messenger and asking them how much they would charge to carry freight between Prince Edward Island and the old country, and then asking us for a sum of money to enable him to make a private bargain. The only plea he gave for not advertising for tenders was the plea of urgency, although he had a whole year to make up his mind and four months to prepare and bring down his estimates.

What more do we find? We find that the Minister of Railways and the Minister of Interior in this Yukon arrangement with Mann & Mackenzie, repudiated the principle of open competition and contract made upon tender.

Then we have the Minister of Militia, without any plea for urgency, which any reasonable man will admit, giving $33,000 worth of miscellaneous supplies to his friends by private bargain, without even inviting competition among them, so as to give some security at least that the prices would be on a par with the market prices. We find him doing this in two sections—placing one order at a certain time and one about twenty days later, and showing by the fragmentary papers he has brought down that the prices of his second order are largely higher than the prices of his first, which proves conclusively that if he had put up the whole supplies for tender, he would have had them much cheaper by many thousand dollars according to his own showing. He had time to write to distant parts such as Halifax and Kentville and other cities of the Dominion, yet he came with the plea of urgency. And to show the bad faith of such a plea, let me point out that the vessel only started with these supplies from the Pacific Coast on the 10th of June of this year, and this action he contemplated as early as February, 1898. So much as instances of the repudiation by the present Government of the principle of inviting tenders and open competition are given and based upon those tenders.

What more has been done? The spoils system has been introduced into the civil service of the country and its permanency so far as future appointees are concerned, has been completely done away with. Hereafter all such appointees of the Government may at any hour be dismissed at the will of the Minister, from whatever kind of pressure, and have paid back their own money, which is on deposit, at interest, without any reference to Parliament, the high court of this country, for whose benefit this civil service is supposed to exist and not for the benefit of a party or individual Ministers.

What more has been done? These hon. gentlemen have been willing to avail themselves of every piece of legislation which was in force under the late Government, and which they denounced when in Opposition. This is shown in reference to the superannuation system. Does the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) believe that anything is being accomplished in easing the burden of superannuation in this country?

Mr. McMULLEN. You will not give me much opportunity of saying anything about it this session.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. This makes one hour the hon. gentleman has been talking.

Mr. FOSTER. Time is not so precious as it used to be. What has been done with reference to superannuation, of which my Patron friends and the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) and the Postmaster General no doubt will make a fruitful theme of discussion during recess. Not one penny of the burden of superannuation, as respects any employee at present in the Government, has been removed from this country.

Mr. McMULLEN. On the urgent plea of hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. FOSTER. I am glad my hon. friend agrees with me. When he gives an excuse for it, he agrees with the fact. I agree in the action that has taken place. It is hon. gentlemen opposite who have to look their inconsistency in the face. My action and that of my hon. friends on this side is thoroughly consistent.

Mr. McMULLEN. The action taken has been entirely in the line of the Bill introduced a year ago.

Mr. FOSTER. On the other hand with reference to future appointments in the service, I am here to state that not one dollar lightening of the burden of that future service has been secured by the legislation passed this session. Why? Because all new appointments for the last four years have been made on the basis of a superannuation abatement, which made their superannuation allowance self-sustaining and without any burden upon the country at all. That is the fact with reference to the result of superannuation legislation. With reference to the practice of superannuations, here is a table brought down by hon. gentlemen themselves, which I shall read:

SUPERANNUATIONS and Dismissals during the year 1897, ending 31st December.

RECAPITULATION.

Number.	Departments.	Superannuation Allowance.	Gratuity.	Totals.
		$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
3	Agriculture..	1,532 66	.....	1,532 66
35	Customs	6,964 80	1,011 45	7,976 25
2	House of Commons	1,838 66	.....	1,838 66
8	Indian Affairs	3,744 40	.....	3,744 40
19	Inland Revenue..	7,236 61	1,256 90	8,493 51
2	Interior	2,375 33	.....	2,375 33
3	Justice.....	1,228 00	.....	1,228 00
6	Marine & Fisheries	872 00	.....	872 00
3	Militia and Defence	3,684 00	.....	3,684 00
2	N.W.M. Police....	260 00	750 00	1,010 00
62	Post Office..	23,413 93	7,656 32	31,070 25
3	Privy Council.....	1,260 00	931 25	2,191 25
8	Public Works.....	1,826 84	433 51	2,260 35
16	Railways & Canals.	7,407 00	.....	7,407 00
1	Secretary of State..	.....	816 66	816 66
1	Senate.....	595 00	.....	595 00
174	.. .. Totals	64,239 23	12,856 09	77,095 32

And it is very well for the Government that denounced the system of superannuation and its intolerable burdens for seventeen years, and, when it came into power, has not lightened those burdens by one single dollar, but has availed itself of the old machinery, the law as it was on the Statute-book, to the extraordinary extent that I have named, in the first full year of its administration.

Mr. McMULLEN. Would the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) tell the House how many of those offices were abolished, and how many were left unfilled. Let me tell the hon. gentleman——

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I have the floor. If hon. gentlemen opposite wish to take that point, I desire to say that I have not stated it, because, if I had, it would have applied to the late Conservative Administration as well as to this. When superannuations are made, there is a certain amount of saving by reason of offices abolished and not filled either by new appointments or promotions.

Mr. McMULLEN. A small percentage.

Mr. FOSTER. No, the percentage may be a large one. I am stating the facts as they appear, and as they are, with reference to the practical administration of the superan-

nuation system by hon. gentlemen opposite, who have long denounced it.

And now, Mr. Speaker, I have finished the very short and imperfect review I have attempted of these points in connection with the present Supply Bill. I think there is food for thought for the country and for the supporters of hon. gentlemen opposite. I offer this contribution to the discussion with the greatest good-will to my hon. friends opposite, hoping, but hoping without much prospect of fulfilment, that these warnings may be heeded, and that while there is yet time, they may flee from the wrath to come.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Mr. Fielding). If agreeable, I should like to make some observations upon what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) has said, but I think the business of the House would be facilitated by reading the Supply for the third time, with the understanding that I shall have an opportunity to reply on the motion to adjourn the House.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the third time and passed.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I propose to avail myself of the understanding come to a moment ago, and move the adjournment of the House, so that I may have an opportunity of replying to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster). But first I must express my regret that at such a very late time of the session my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) has found it necessary to commit what I cannot help regarding as something like a breach of faith. I spoke to him this morning, and said I should be pleased if he could inform me if there was to be a debate on the final stage of the Supply Bill. He said that he did not intend to speak more than ten minutes. I said that if that were the case, it would be unnecessary to make any arrangement; otherwise, with the short time at our disposal, we ought to come to some understanding as to the division of the time. The hon. gentleman has occupied an hour and five minutes of the time, and now we have only a few minutes left. I think it a pity that my hon. friend was not able to keep to his engagement a little more faithfully at the close of the session——

Mr. FOSTER. I am sure my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) will allow me a word. There is no use in going into heroics——

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I did not know there was anything heroic in what I said——

Mr. FOSTER. I simply availed myself of my right to——

Mr. LISTER. In violation of your promise.

Mr. FOSTER. It was not in violation of a promise. Mr. Speaker, I do not like that kind of language used across the floor of the House. The hon. member (Mr. Lister) in this his farewell session, simply sits there and calls me a——

Mr. LISTER. What right have you to say that this is my last session?

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, am I to have protection? Am I to have protection from this bully?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) be called upon to withdraw that remark.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think that both remarks should be withdrawn.

Mr. FOSTER. Very well; let us withdraw them mutually.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member who has the floor will withdraw his observation.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) has not the floor.

Mr. SPEAKER. I understood he had the floor on a point of personal explanation or point of order.

Mr. LISTER. As you have decided, Mr. Speaker, that what I said is out of order, I withdraw it on that account.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman has information that he had not before.

Mr. LISTER. I said it was a violation of promise.

Mr. FOSTER. I took advantage of the last reading of the Supply Bill to make some observations, as I have a perfect right to do. I do not see how I could well make them before the Supply Bill was at that stage. It is not an unusual course. On one or two occasions I have done it before. The Finance Minister or the members of the Government must simply be ready for criticism at any time, and ready with their reply, if they wish to make one. The Finance Minister asked me if I were going to speak on the Supply Bill, and I told him that I was. He asked me how long I should speak, and I said I did not think it would be more than ten minutes. It was more than ten minutes. If I have done wrong in that, I must apologize. After all it is not always that one speaking in this House keeps his remarks within the time he expects.

Mr. McMULLEN. I want to say one word. I expected to say something on the Supply Bill, and the hon. Finance Minister asked me to give way and not try to catch the Speaker's eye; that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) was going to speak, but he would not occupy more than ten minutes. Had I been disposed to be as selfish as the hon. gentleman I should have taken up the time as well as he.

Mr. FOSTER. I have no objection to the House going on until three o'clock to allow hon. gentlemen all the time they require.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) knows that the House cannot go on until three o'clock, because there is a standing order of the House that it must adjourn at one o'clock. It was my hon. friend (Mr. Foster's) right to say, when I asked him the question, that he did not wish to express any opinion, that he intended to be free to take any course he pleased. Had he done so, I should have had no reason to complain. But he said he was going to speak ten minutes, and he knew that my desire was to make an arrangement——

Mr. FOSTER. I entirely repudiate that assignment of motive. I did not know that that was the hon. gentleman's intentions, nor did he say so. If I considered the idea with which he spoke to me, I thought he wished to know whether I was going to speak, in case that he might wish to reply.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have stated the facts as they occurred. The hon. gentleman assured me that he would only take ten minutes.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman will not say that he informed me in so many words that he wished to make an arrangement.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman said he would speak ten minutes, and I said: It is unnecessary, then, to talk about an arrangement.

Mr. FOSTER. I did not hear the hon. gentleman.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I regret, Mr. Speaker, that the time has been occupied, because it is utterly impossible to follow the hon. gentleman in all that he has said. What I shall be able to say will necessarily be hurried and incomplete. I should have imagined that, with his former experience, my hon. friend would not have attempted to play the part of an alarmist with reference to the financial policy of the Government. He indulged in one of these alarmist speeches during the first session he was in Opposition, but experience has shown that his alarm was unnecessary; in the light of the public accounts, all his predictions of financial disaster were shown to be unwarranted. We hope and believe that it will be the same in the future. The hon. gentleman is right in saying that these Estimates are somewhat large. But the items in the Estimates are to be justified on examination, and the hon. gentleman has not dealt with them in such a way as to establish any case to the contrary. He has manifested a disposition, manifested also in the Conservative press, to confuse estimates and expenditure, comparing the Estimates of one year with the expenditure of another, as if the two represented expenditure in the same way. It is important that we should observe the distinction. Persons who are familiar with our financial affairs, of course, know that the Estimates and expenditures are two different things. But the country at large does not so well understand it and there is a constant disposition in the Conservative press to confuse the two. For the purpose of avoiding confusion, it is well that I should point out the difference. I have here the Estimates and expenditures for several years as an illustration:

Year.	Amount authorized.	Amount expended.	Amount authorized but not expended.
1894-95.	$39,252,799.31	$38,132,005.05	$1,120,794.26
1895-96.	37,814,729.33	36,949,142.03	865,587.30
1896-97.	40,264,231.77	38,349,759.84	1,914,471.93

I mention these figures in order that not the House alone, but those outside who follow the proceedings, may understand that though the Estimates appear very large, it does not follow of necessity that these sums of money are expended; on the contrary, owing to various circumstances the Estimates of the year cannot be fully expended. As I have pointed out, in the year 1896-97 the difference between the Estimates and the expenditure was not less than $1,914,471. therefore in comparing the large estimate for the present year it is impossible that a fair comparison can be made with the expenses of former years without making allowance for the saving which always takes place. Now there is a disposition on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite to treat their expenditure for the year 1895-96 as an expenditure on which a fair comparison can be made. The expenditure of that year, the last year of the Conservative Government, was $36,949,142.03; and hon. gentlemen are constantly putting that sum before us as the measure of Conservative expenditure and the standard of comparison. I want to point out that that standard is a very unfair one, that the expenses of the year 1895-96 were entirely exceptional, and that no just comparison can be made by taking that year as a standard. If we turn to the expenditure of several years previous we find there was a constant increase from year to year. I have the figures of the annual expenditure chargable to income, beginning with 1889-90:

		Increase.
1889-90.....	$35,994,031 47	.....
1890-91.....	36,343,567 96	$349,536 49
1891-92.....	36,765,894 18	422,326 22
1892-93.....	36,814,052 90	48,158 72
1893-94.....	37,585,025 52	770,972 62
1894-95.....	38,132,005 05	546,979 53

An average increase in six years of $427,594 76

Thus we see that from year to year the expenditure of the hon. gentlemen was going on by leaps and bounds. In one year it was slightly checked, in 1892-93, when the increase was only $48,000, but in the following year the increase was $770,000, and in the following year again it was $554,000, which

was the increase at the close of the year 1895. Now, with this increase going on from year to year, how did it come about that in 1895-96 the hon. gentlemen were suddenly able to make a reduction of their expenditure? They did in that year show a reduced expenditure to the extent of $1,182,863 as compared with the expenditure of the former year. Does anybody believe that that change was brought about by any real economy? Does anybody suppose that those hon. gentlemen were actually reducing their expenditure and trying to save money? On the contrary, this was accomplished by a mere manipulation of accounts. In the first place, it was accomplished by cutting down expenses for the moment, when the hon. gentlemen must have known that the reduction could not be maintained. In the second place, the reduction was accomplished by throwing over to the next year expenditures which properly belonged to that year, and obliging us to pay them in the following year. From the time this Government came into power down to the present moment they have been often engaged in examining and paying the bills of the hon. gentlemen which were left for us to pay. In the first year of our coming into power we had to provide for a large sum which was incurred for expenses of 1895-96 by themselves, and which should have been paid in that year, but were actually paid in the subsequent year. It was by these means that the hon. gentlemen were able to show an apparent reduction of expenses in 1895-96, which reduction was entirely visionary, which had no substantial reality, and which could not possibly allow the figures of that year to be taken as a fair standard for comparison in future years. But the hon. gentleman himself knew that he could not continue that reduction. While he had shown that his expenditure for 1895-96 was a fraction under $37,000,000, he brought down in his first main Estimates for 1896-97 an amount of $38,306,586; clearly showing that at the very initiation of his financial work in 1896-97 the record which he presented for 1895-96 was a deceptive record, and one that he could not possibly continue. So he increased his main Estimates of that year to a figure which was enormously in excess of his total expenditure the previous year. But that was not the whole story. The hon. gentleman then had Supplementary Estimates. We found when we came into office records of the Supplementary Estimates prepared by the hon. gentleman to the enormous sum of $3,621,689.50 on consolidated account.

Mr. FOSTER. With the hon. gentleman's permission I will take the opportunity of stating that no Supplementary Estimates were brought down, that no Supplementary Estimates were agreed upon to a single dollar.

Mr. FIELDING.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I was perfectly aware that my hon. friend would say that. I repeat that he brought down his main Estimates amounting to $38,308,548, which in themselves were largely in excess of his expenditure the previous year. Then he had Supplementary Estimates of $3,621,689.50, making his proposed expenditure for that year chargeable only to income, irrespective of capital account, $41,930,237.63. In addition to that, his capital account estimates, main and supplementary, were large, but I do not need to dwell on these. Now, the hon. gentleman wishes us to understand that these Estimates had no existence. He stated that before. I say that the hon. gentleman cannot escape the consequence of these Estimates, because he used them to his political advantage. These Estimates were printed for nearly every item, they were distributed among certain favoured friends, they were placed in the hands of candidates throughout the different parts of the Dominion who were permitted to go on the stump and say that this, that and the other public work was provided for in the Estimates. When the other night the Minister of Public Works was accused of neglecting a certain public work by an opposition member, and the latter was asked why he did not look after it before the change of Government, the reply was: I did not neglect it, I did look after it, for it was in the Estimates for the last year. I asked the hon. gentleman: Then there were such Estimates? Yes, he says, that item was provided in them. And the hon. gentleman was right; the item to which he referred was in the Supplementary Estimates.

Mr. FOSTER. I wish just to enter a denial, and if my hon. friend goes on after I deny, I would like to see my denial there in the midst of his speech. The Estimates, those which he calls Estimates, were not Estimates at all; they were simply the demands of the different departments which, as he knows, are submitted to Council, and those of them that are approved of become the Estimates. These were not only not Estimates, but they were never submitted to Council.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman may take whichever horn of the dilemma he pleases. Either these were Estimates submitted to Council and having the assent of the Ministers, or they grossly deceived the people in regard to them. They sent these Estimates to their friends, they were shown around the country. The hon. gentleman knows that there are on record telegrams and letters referring to those items. Whenever in any portion of the Dominion a public work was required, and a candidate thought he could make favour by it, he went to the people and said: I have arranged all that, the money is

provided for in the Estimates. Again and again letters were written and telegrams were sent on the part of the Ministers saying: We have arranged to do this work, but the Grits would not allow us to get our Estimates through. The Estimates were printed, I have a copy of them here.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). They were printed in regular form.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend takes occasion to say that they are printed in regular form.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Certainly they were.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not care whether they were printed in regular or irregular form, all I have to say is that they are not Estimates, and never were; they were merely the demands of departments that were going to be submitted to Council, but which were not passed by Council, and many of them were not submitted.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman cannot escape there. Either they were Estimates and the Government meant to spend that money in good faith, or they were documents deliberately prepared to deceive and trick the electors of Canada. Of the two offences I should think the hon. gentleman would rather plead guilty to extravagance than that he had deliberately placed in these documents figures and appropriations intended to deceive the electors of Canada.

Mr. FOSTER. I have to take neither horn of the dilemma, because the facts are not as represented by the hon. gentleman.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I undertake to say that there are very few people who remember the declarations that were made by the candidates of the Conservative party that these Estimates had been prepared, who will not be able to draw conclusions in accordance with my statements. Take the little incident that occurred the other night when my hon. friend from Annapolis (Mr. Mills) complained that there was no appropriation made for a work in his county, and said it had been provided for in the late Government's Estimates. I say that these Estimates were hawked around the Dominion of Canada by the hon. gentleman and his friends in order to get votes, and constituencies were carried on the strength of them. So I think we cannot allow my hon. friend to escape the consequences of these Estimates. Now let us see what our appropriations are for the coming year. Let me say, however, that while our Estimates are large, we have certain large and exceptional expenses to meet. Let us see what they are. The following are the details of these unusual items:

Estimates for items which were not included in former estimates.

1897-98.

Rental to Grand Trunk Railway and Drummond County Railway, from Chaudière to Montreal	$ 157,500 00
Salary and expenses of inspecting engineer	2,000 00
	$ 159,500 00
To provide for supplies, transport and expenses of militia force sent to the Yukon District	100,000 00
Sum required to provide for the salaries and expenses connected with the administration of the Yukon Provisional District	50,000 00
Amount required to maintain a force of mounted police in the Yukon Provisional District	500,000 00
Towards defraying expenses of an exploratory survey to ascertain the most practical route for an all-Canadian railway from some point of an existing railway into the Klondike district	5,000 00
Total for 1897-98	$814,500 00

These figures show that in the current year, now drawing to a close, we have had to provide $814,500 for services that had no existence in previous years. Let us turn now to the Estimates of the coming year:

1898-99.

For an exploratory survey and report as to a railway route between the Stikine River and an ocean port in British Columbia	$ 35,000 00
To defray expenses of an exploratory survey to ascertain the most practicable route for an all-Canadian railway from some point on an existing railway into the Klondike district	40,000 00
	75,000 00
Sum required for the salaries and expenses connected with the administration of the Yukon Provisional District	50,200 00
Services of North-west mounted police in the Yukon Provisional District	346,250 00
	396,450 00
Further customs services in British Columbia and Yukon District	12,000 00
Salaries and travelling expenses of judge in the Yukon District	1,126 08
For the Yukon contingent, transport, supplies and fourteen months' pay	140,000 00
Stikine River, from Fort Wrangel to Glenora, Teslin Lake and Rivers Lewes, Hootalinqua and Yukon—Examination and improvements	16,000 00
Trail from Edmonton towards Yukon District	15,000 00
To meet the extra expenditure in field work connected with sending two parties to the Yukon District	5,000 00

To provide for the purchase and equipment of a steamboat and one or more launches for the use of the officers of the Government of the Yukon District	$ 25,000 00
	214,126 03
Total for Yukon	$685,576 03
Rental Grand Trunk Railway and Drummond County Railway, for railways from Chaudière to Montreal, to be operated as part of the Intercolonial Railway	210,000 00
Operating expenses of this line	550,000 00
	760,000 00
Expenses of taking the plebiscite	250,000 00
New steamer for Prince Edward Island service	180,000 00
Manitoba arrears	236,575 47
Grand total	$2,112,151 50

Here then we have in our Estimates for next year more than two million dollars for services that did not appear in the Estimates of the late Government. I wish now to invite the attention of the House to some comparisons of our Estimates with those of the late Government:

COMPARISONS WITH 1897-98.

Liberal estimates, session 1897		$39,282,147 79
Liberal estimates, supplementary, session 1898		1,287,344 81
		$40,569,492 60
Deduct for new services, Yukon District	$655,000	
Intercolonial Railway extension to Montreal	159,500	
		814,500 00
Balance, representing our estimates for the ordinary services		$39,754,992 60
Against Conservative estimates, 1896-97		$41,930,237 63
Balance in favour of our estimates for 1897-98		$2,175,245 03

This is further increased by allowance for the late Government's final supplementaries, necessary in session of 1897, making probably two and a half millions difference in our favour.

COMPARISONS WITH 1898-99.

Main Estimates	$39,125,879 57
Supplementary	1,861,933 90
Second Supplementary	20,000 00
Manitoba arrears	231,575 47
	$41,239,388 94
Deduct for new services as above	2,112,151 50
Balance, representing our estimates for ordinary services	$39,127,237 44
Against Conservative estimates for similar services, 1896-97	41,930,237 63
Balance in favour of our estimates	$ 2,803,000 19

As regards the expenditure on the civil service, I desire to point out that a large number of superannuations have taken place, and in some cases new officers have been appointed, while in others the offices have been abolished. No doubt as time rolls on we shall be able to do more in that direction. There is no part of the public expenditure in which the people expect greater saving to be made than in the civil service. I believe there are too many officers, and that hon. gentlemen opposite, when in power, yielded too readily to pressure put on them to make appointments. It is much more easily to appoint officers than to remove them, and that has been the experience of the head of every department. My colleagues will be ready to tell the House the difficulties they have met with in attempting to rid the service of some men who are useless, but who have been retained in the service by an influence stronger almost than vested right. The superfluous officers have political friends and relatives on both sides of politics who will tell you that if you remove that man you are going to subject his family to destitution. I suppose these Ministers are only human, and in many cases when they desired to get rid of officials they were obliged to retain them because of the hardship that would be inflicted on the officials and their families. I believe, Sir, that as the days and years go on we shall be able to overcome that, and we shall be able to meet the expectations of the people for a reduction in the expenses of the civil service. We are expending more money on agriculture, but who will complain of that? Surely if there be any class of people in the whole Dominion who ought to receive encouragement from the Government it is the farmers of Canada. My hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) has asked for liberal expenditures in his department, and we have without distinction of party granted him the money. We are spending more money on immigration, and why not? The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) spent a great deal of money on immigration, but he and his Government sent the people out of the country, whereas we are spending money to bring the people here and to keep them here. The exodus if not absolutely stopped—I suppose it will never stop altogether—the exodus has been stemmed and Canadians are having hope and faith in their country now and are staying at home. My hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) is bringing thousands of immigrants into the country to swell the population. We must take each of these items of expenditure in detail and if we do we will see that they are all expenditures for the advancement and prosperity of Canada.

We have been spending a large amount of money on militia, for we do not keep up an expensive staff as the Conservative Government did, and forget to drill the men. We spent money to open up the Yukon district, and who will blame us for that? We

are spending more money on the Intercolonial Railway, and who will blame us for that? We are giving to the people of Prince Edward Island an improvement in their service between the island and the mainland, which was one of the terms of their entering into confederation, and which up to the present has never been fully carried out. We are appropriating money for the plebiscite. Let the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) take these items in detail and if they are wrong let him challenge the vote of the House on them. Why does not the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) do that? Oh, no. He won't do that. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) had the audacity at an earlier stage of the session—is the word audacity parliamentary, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. FOSTER. I won't challenge it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. He had the audacity to talk of the Crow's Nest Pass "deal." The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) not only voted for the Crow's Nest Pass "deal," but day after day through the session he manifested more interest in it than the man who introduced the Bill. Day after day when the Bill was not gone on with as fast as he wanted, he would rise in his place and say, what are you going to do with this Bill? The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) was more interested in the Crow's Nest Pass Bill than any other man in this House. He voted for it, he hustled it along, and now he comes back a year afterwards to talk about the Crow's Nest Pass "deal." If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) objects to these things, why does he not take them up item after item and vote against them? We have voted, he says, many millions of dollars. Let him go to the records of the House and he will find that there are not more than two or three paltry items of four and five thousand dollars each with reference to which he has had the courage to divide the House. If these expenditures are lavish, why does not the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) accept his responsibility to Parliament and to the country, and challenge a division on them.

Mr. FOSTER. After you had decimated the House.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) knows that we brought down our estimates at a reasonably early period.

Mr. FOSTER. When did you go into them?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We went into Committee of Supply at a reasonably early period, and we have spent twenty-seven days in Supply, which is quite long enough. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) instead of wasting his time with some trumpery matters had brought his mind to bear on this question of the estimates and challenged what he thought was wrong, he would be in a better position to make his complaint in the House now. But the hon. gentleman and his friends did not do that. They preferred to let the estimates go, knowing that they could not challenge them item by item. They preferred to do that, and then to send out to their press paragraphs containing statements like this, which I take from the chief Conservative organ, the Toronto "Mail and Empire," of Friday last:

HOW WE STAND.

The expenditures proposed so far by the Government for the coming year are as follows:—

Regular Estimates	$ 44,912,571
Supplementaries	3,058,376
Further Supplementaries	68,500
Judicial salaries, additional	27,000
Payable to Manitoba—	
For schools	300,000
On account of Parliament buildings	475,000
	$ 48,841,447

Then says the veracious writer:

This is exactly twelve millions more than was spent in the year when Sir Richard stood on Parliament hill and viewed the annual outlays with alarm.

The figures for that year, 1895-96, was $36,949,000.

The chief organ of the Conservative party is willing to have that false statement go before the country, that for the services which the Conservatives in 1895-96 expended $36,949,000 we propose to spend $48,831,000. They take the capital services and the income services; they take them in the first estimates and they take them in the second estimate; they take the proposed payment of $300,000 of Manitoba, and they add it, when even if it had to be paid it would not add one cent to the charges on Canada as it is merely a matter of bookkeeping. They take the item on account of Manitoba Parliament Buildings, one-half of which does not enter into the year's expenditure at all but is credited back to Manitoba. They take all these items, income charges and capital charges; they dump them all into one account and they say that over $48,000,000 are being expended by this Government upon services which in the time of the Conservative Government only cost $36,949,000. The author of that statement knew it was an infamous comparison to make when he undertook to roll up capital expenditures and income expenditures and everything of the kind, and compare them with the expenditures of the Conservative Government chargeable to income only. That is on a par with what hon. gentlemen opposite have been doing right along. "But," says the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster), "some Liberals thought they could carry on the business of the country at an expenditure of less money." Undoubtedly many Liberals thought that the expenditure in the past was extravagant, and they were right, but they did not realize as fully as they do now the difficulty in cutting down

that expenditure. I have no doubt that some of the reductions which they desired will in a short time be carried out. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) says we should be consistent, but there is a true and false consistency. I think it was Emerson who said: Consistency is the bugaboo of little minds. It is much easier to be consistent at times than it is to be right, and the highest consistency is in being consistent with the obligations which the Government has cast upon it. New occasions teach new duties. We recognize that and we are endeavouring to respond to these new duties and to make the new expenditures which have been demanded of us. I believe that the people of Canada will understand that. I believe that the people of Canada are not going to be alarmed because this Government meets its new obligations in a generous spirit. What the people of Canada would be alarmed about would be, if they had any reason to believe that the money placed at our service was to be jobbed away as the public money was jobbed away by the Conservative Government. I have no fear that this Government will be condemned because it is liberal in its expenditure of public money for useful public purposes. It is true that we might have saved money and not opened up the Yukon country. It is true that we might have saved money by not completing our canal system, but the country did not want that sort of economy. I believe the country will ask the question: Is the Government doing what is necessary to meet the new condition of things, and if we can show that these moneys have been expended faithfully and honestly, for the proper development of the country, the people of the country will not blame us for it. I believe that no Government in the history of Canada ever had to deal with so many new and difficult questions in the same space of time as this Government has had to deal with during the twenty-three months it has been in office. Hon. gentlemen opposite knew that very well, and they indulged in fond anticipation that these difficulties would be too great for the Government to surmount. They thought, Sir, that one session of Parliament would put an end to this Government. I believe that one distinguished member of the Opposition was good enough to give us a single session. Well, Sir, we have been here for the second and third session; we have met the attacks of hon. gentlemen opposite, we have had them fishing into the public accounts day after day and week after week, with what result? On one subject they did endeavour to cast the suspicion of corruption upon a transaction with which this Government was connected. But this Government did not let them escape on that. They would have been glad had they been allowed to escape, but this Government insisted that there should be a strict investigation, and the result of that investigation into the Drummond County transaction was that members on that side of the House had to stand up and declare, not only that there was no corruption but that they had never charged corruption. And hon. gentlemen opposite, instead of pressing the matter to a conclusion this session, were ready to ask that it should not be gone on with.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend is not quite fair. He should put in the words there "this session."

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Very well, "this session." My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) thinks that by putting it off this session the public will forget the great outcry that was made by him and his friends as to alleged corruption last year. My hon. friend thinks that the public will forget that it has been proven beyond a doubt that there was not a shade of wrongdoing in connection with the Drummond County Railway. The Government have expended large sums of money, but they have expended them for useful purposes, for purposes which the country does appreciate and will continue to appreciate. Some large sums of money have been expended in opening up the Yukon, and though for the moment the work of the Government has been checked by the foolish policy of hon. gentlemen opposite, yet that opposition would be overcome and the progress of Canada will continue in the meantime. In the North-west and British Columbia we have secured the building of the Crow's Nest Pass Railway which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) voted for and afterwards attempted to condemn. We have in that matter given hope and encouragement to the people in the mining districts of British Columbia, and our action will be a great factor in the development of that province. Coming east we have released the people of the prairie province from the excessive transportation charges which the Conservative Government fastened upon them. We have opened up the trade of British Columbia and the Yukon, as never before, to the merchants of Ontario and Quebec. We have developed the canal system to such an extent that before many months are over, our people will have advantage of the increased, trade through the completion of these works to which they have been so long looking. We have extended the Intercolonial Railway into Montreal, into which it should have been extended long ago. We are giving assistance to the great port of Montreal to provide for the large stream of traffic that flows into that port. We have helped the good old harbour of Quebec, which I believe has now a brighter future. We have gone to the maritime provinces, and in order that the trade of Canada, as far as possible, should be carried through the national channels of Canada, we are equipping the Intercolonial Railway, in Halifax and St. John with elevators to receive the grain of Canada and send it across the ocean.

The record of this Government has been one of progress. The one question overshadowing others, which hon. gentlemen opposite fondly hoped would bring this Government down, the great Manitoba school question, my right hon. friend beside me has brought to a settlement, which is bound to bring peace and prosperity to the western country and the whole Dominion. True, we have the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron), and one or two others, conducting a sort of guerilla warfare on the subject, but they show how little faith they have in their own party when they do not venture to move a resolution and challenge a division of the House. They will, no doubt, go on from day to day telling the Roman Catholic population of the province of Quebec and of Manitoba what wonderful things they would do for them, if they had the chance. But all who are concerned will not fail to observe that although these hon. gentlemen are quite ready to make speeches, not one of them will come down with a declaration of Conservative policy and take a division on the subject.

If that is the record of the Government at home, what is it abroad? In our dealings with other nations, this Government has a record of which it may well be proud. The treaties which hon. gentlemen opposite in vain struggled for years to have removed have now been taken away. By the action of my right hon. friend, the British Government were able to denounce the treaties and did denounce them. In our dealings with the United States, we find a better condition of affairs than ever existed before, and the way is opening now to a fair and liberal treaty of reciprocity. Whether at home or abroad, Canada, under the administration of this Government has had progress and prosperity, and if hon. gentlemen opposite will only bear with us in patience we feel satisfied that for many years to come we shall have the same good story to tell them.

I move that the House do now adjourn.

Motion agreed to, and at 1 p.m. the House adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 13th June, 1898.

Second Sitting.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

PROROGATION.

A Message from His Excellency the Governor General by the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod:

Mr. SPEAKER:

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

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, with the House, went up to the Senate Chamber.

IN THE SENATE CHAMBER.

His Excellency was pleased to give, in Her Majesty's name, the Royal Assent to the following Bills:—

An Act respecting the Lake Erie and Detroit River Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Board of Trade of the City of Toronto.

An Act to amend the Mounted Police Pension Act, 1889.

An Act further to amend the Act respecting Government Harbours, Piers and Breakwaters.

An Act further to amend the Petroleum Inspection Act.

An Act further to amend the Inland Revenue Act.

An Act further to amend the Act respecting Certificates to Masters and Mates of Ships.

An Act respecting the Dominion Building and Loan Association.

An Act to incorporate the Prudential Life Assurance Company of Canada.

An Act for the relief of Robert Augustus Baldwin Hart.

An Act respecting the Hudson's Bay and Pacific Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Ontario and Rainy River Railway Company.

An Act for the relief of Edwin Heyward.

An Act to amend the Charter of the Union Bank of Canada.

An Act respecting the Manufacturers' Guarantee and Accident Insurance Company, and to change its name to "The Dominion of Canada Guarantee and Accident Insurance Company."

An Act to incorporate the Victoria-Montreal Fire Insurance Company.

An Act respecting the Columbia and Western Railway Company.

An Act respecting the British Columbia Southern Railway Company.

An Act to confirm an agreement between the St. Stephen and Milltown Railway Company and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Queenston Heights Bridge Company.

An Act respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Federal Life Assurance Company of Ontario, and to change its name to the Federal Life Assurance Company of Canada.

An Act respecting the Inspection of Steamboats and the Examination and Licensing of Engineers employed on them.

An Act respecting the Edmonton District Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Cowichan Valley Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Brandon and Southwestern Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Miles Cañon and Lewes River Tramway Company.

An Act respecting the Hamilton and Lake Erie Power Company.

An Act to incorporate the Klondike and Peace River Gold Mining, Land and Transportation Company (Limited).

An Act to incorporate the Nickel Steel Company of Canada.

An Act incorporating the Central Canada Loan and Savings Company.

An Act to incorporate the Montreal and James Bay Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Brockville and St. Lawrence Bridge Company.

An Act respecting the Lake Manitoba Railway and Canal Company.

An Act to incorporate the Miles Cañon and White Horse Tramway Company.

An Act respecting the Ottawa and New York Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the London and Lake Huron Railway Company.

An Act for better securing the Safety of certain Fishermen.

An Act respecting the Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Railway and Navigation Company.

An Act respecting the Canada Atlantic Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Timagami Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Canada Atlantic Transit Company.

An Act to incorporate the Atlas Loan Company.

An Act further to amend the Act respecting the Department of the Geological Survey.

An Act respecting the Montfort Colonization Railway Company, and to change its name to the Montfort and Gatineau Colonization Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Canadian Mining Institute.

An Act respecting the Nakusp and Slocan Railway Company.

An Act further to amend the Companies Act.

An Act respecting the Kingston and Pembroke Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Windsor and Detroit Union Bridge Company.

An Act respecting the Saint John Bridge and Railway Extension Company.

An Act to incorporate the Montmorency Cotton Mills Company.

An Act further to amend the Fisheries Act.

An Act respecting the Harbour of the City of Saint John, in the province of New Brunswick.

An Act further to amend the Adulteration Act.

An Act further to amend the Act respecting the Protection of Navigable Waters.

An Act to incorporate the British American Light and Power Company.

An Act respecting the Montreal Island Belt Line Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Klondike and Dawson City Bank.

An Act for the relief of James Pearson.

An Act to incorporate the Toronto and Hudson's Bay Railway Company.

An Act further to amend the General Inspection Act.

An Act further to amend the Militia Act.

An Act to make further provision respecting Grants of Land to members of the Militia Force on Active Service in the North-west.

An Act to amend "The Canada Evidence Act, 1893."

An Act to incorporate the Tobique Manufacturing Company (Limited).

An Act to authorize the Canada Eastern Railway Company to convey its railway to the Alexander Gibson Railway and Manufacturing Company.

An Act to incorporate the Subsidiary High Court of the Ancient Order of Foresters in the Dominion of Canada.

An Act to provide for the government of the Yukon District.

An Act further to amend the Land Titles Act, 1894.

An Act further to amend the Indian Act.

An Act further to amend the Acts respecting the North-west Territories.

An Act to incorporate the Lake Bennett and Klondike Railway and Tramway Company.

An Act further to amend the Dominion Lands Act.

An Act further to amend the Post Office Act.

An Act respecting the identification of Criminals.

An Act to amend Chapter 11 of the Statutes of 1897, intituled: "An Act to restrict the importation and employment of Aliens."

An Act to authorize the Quebec Harbour Commissioners to borrow money.

An Act to authorize certain contracts with Steamship Companies for Cold Storage accommodation.

An Act respecting the Saskatchewan Railway and Mining Company.

An Act respecting the International Radial Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Transport Contract between Her Majesty and the Winnipeg Great Northern Railway Company.

An Act to amend the Act to provide for Bounties on Iron and Steel made in Canada.

An Act to provide for the abolition of the Civil Service Superannuation Act and for the retirement of members of the Civil Service.

An Act respecting the repayment of the moneys advanced to the Saint John Bridge and Railway Extension Company.

An Act to confirm a certain award in favour of the Dominion Atlantic Railway Company.

An Act further to protect the Customs and Fisheries.

An Act further to amend the Customs Act.

An Act to incorporate the Dawson City Electric Company, Limited.

An Act to incorporate the Dawson City Electric Lighting and Tramway Company, Limited.

An Act to grant further aid to the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal.

An Act incorporating the Western Alberta Railway Company.

An Act to amend the Companies Act.

An Act further to amend the Act respecting Public Officers.

An Act further to amend the Railway Act.

An Act to incorporate the Northern Commercial Telegraph Company, Limited.

An Act to incorporate the Lake Champlain and Saint Lawrence Ship Canal Company.

An Act in further amendment of the Post Office Act.

An Act respecting the Manitoba Debt Account.

An Act respecting the payment of grants in aid of the construction of Public Works.

An Act respecting the north-western, northern and north-eastern boundaries of the province of Quebec.

An Act respecting the Prohibition of the Importation, Manufacture and Sale of Intoxicating Liquors.

An Act to incorporate the Ottawa Interprovincial Bridge Company.

An Act respecting the Montreal and Southern Counties Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Montreal and Province Line Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Company.

An Act further to amend the Act respecting the Senate and House of Commons.

An Act further to amend the Weights and Measures Act.

An Act to repeal the Electoral Franchise Act, and to further amend the Dominion Elections Act.

An Act to amend and consolidate the North-west Irrigation Acts of 1894 and 1895.

An Act respecting the Great North-west Central Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Three Rivers and North Shore Electric Railway Company.

An Act to amend the Customs Tariff, 1897.

An Act further to amend the Inland Revenue Act.

After which His Excellency the Governor General was pleased to close the Third Session of the Eighth Parliament of the Dominion with the following

SPEECH :

Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate :

Gentlemen of the House of Commons :

I am glad to be able to relieve you from further attendance in Parliament.

Whilst all the measures which public interest seemed to demand, and to which I invited your consideration at the opening of this session, have not received the concurrence of both Houses of Parliament, I congratulate you on the very important legislation which has been the outcome of your deliberations, particularly the Plebiscite Act and the new Franchise Act, which, it is confidently expected, will work satisfactorily in all parts of the Dominion.

I rejoice that during my term of office, it has been my good fortune to witness the improved relations that have grown up between Canada and the neighbouring Republic, and I look forward with much satisfaction to the great benefits that will flow from a settlement of the many questions that have caused irritation in the past.

Gentlemen of the House of Commons :

I thank you for the liberal provision which you have made for the public service.

Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate :

Gentlemen of the House of Commons :

I now wish to express the earnest hope that the work of the session may materially advance the prosperity of the country.

I cannot be unmindful of the fact that this is the last occasion on which it will be my privilege to address you from this seat, as the Representative of the Sovereign.

In bidding you a cordial farewell, I have to return my warm acknowledgments of the parting Address, full of loyalty to the Queen and of kindly good-will to myself, which I am officially informed has been unanimously passed by both Houses of Parliament, and which will always constitute a valued token and memorial of my stay amongst you ; and in conclusion I desire to express my most hearty good wishes for your personal happiness and for the welfare of the great interests entrusted to you.

OTTAWA : Printed by S. E. DAWSON, Printer to the Queen's most Excellent Majesty, 1898.

INDEX.

THIRD SESSION—EIGHTH PARLIAMENT, 1898.

Abbreviations of well known words and Parliamentary expressions are used in the following :—1°, 2°, 3°, First Reading, Second Reading, Third Reading ; 3 m. h., 6 m. h., 6 w. h., Three Months' Hoist, Six Months' Hoist, Six Weeks' Hoist; *, without remarks or debate; Accts., Accounts; Adjn., Adjourn; Adjd., Adjourned ; Amt., Amendment ; Amts., Amendments ; Amalg., Amalgamation ; Ans., Answer ; Ass., Assurance ; B., Bill ; B. C., British Columbia ; Can., Canada or Canadian ; C. P. R., Canadian Pacific Railway; Com., Committee; Co., Company; Conc., Concur, Concurred, Concurrence ; Consd., Consider ; Consdn., Consideration ; Cor., Correspondence; Deb., Debate ; Dept., Department ; Depts., Departments ; Div., Division ; Dom., Dominion; Govt., Government ; His Ex., His Excellency the Governor General ; Hse., House ; H. of C.; House of Commons ; Incorp., Incorporation ; Ins., Insurance; I.C.R., Intercolonial Railway ; Man., Manitoba ; Mess., Message ; M., Motion ; m., moved ; Neg., Negatived ; N.B., New Brunswick ; N.W.T., North-west Territories ; N.S., Nova Scotia ; O.C., Order in Council ; Ont., Ontario ; P.E.I., Prince Edward Island ; P.O., Post Office ; Par., Paragraph ; Prop., Proposed ; Q., Quebec ; Ques., Question ; Recom., Recommit ; Ref., Refer, Referred, Reference ; Rep., Report, Reported ; Reps., Reports ; Res., Resolution ; Ret., Return ; Ry., Railway ; Rys., Railways ; Sel., Select ; Sen., Senate ; Sp., Special ; Stmnt., Statement ; Sup., Supply ; Suppl., Supplement, Supplementary ; Wthdn., Withdrawn ; Wthdrl., Withdrawal ; Y. N., Yeas and Nays ; Names in Italic and parentheses are those of the mover.

Angers, Mr. L. C. A., *Charlevoix.*

Chicoutimi, Saguenay and Gaspé Judges, increase of salaries (remarks) 7385 (ii).

Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries B. 14 (Mr. *Richardson*) in Com., 4656 (ii).

Insolvency B. 84 (Mr. *Fortin*) on M. for 1°, 2032.

Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 150 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 6175 ; on M. for 2°, 6771 ; on M. for 3°, 7046 (ii).

Bain, Mr. T. W., *North Wentworth.*

Agriculture and Colonization Com., 1st Rep. conc., 1174 (i).

Butter Industry of Can., Encouragement of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Reid*) 2382 (i).

Preferential Trade with G. B., on amt. (Mr. *McNeill*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 5850 (amt.) 5853 (ii).

Prudential Life Insurance Co. of Can. incorp. (B. 53) 1°*, 1272 (i).

San Jose Scale, Prohibition of Nursery Stock B. 82 (Mr. *Fisher*) on M. for 1°, 1916 (i).

SUPPLY :

Public Works: Buildings (N.S.), 5075 (i).

Beattie, Mr. T., *London.*

Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries B. 14 (Mr. *Richardson*) in Com., 3710 (i), 4665 (ii).

Lord's Day, Better Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 1980 (i).

Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors—Plebiscite B. 121 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4757 (ii).

Ry. Passenger Tickets (B. 36) 1°*, 903 (i).

Stimulants in the Chamber during Debate, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Talbot*) 3639 (i).

——— Order (Ques. of) 3611 (i).

Beausoleil, Mr. C., *Berthier.*

Berthier, Public Buildings, Purchase of Site (Ques.) 3662 (i).

——— Post Office, site, &c. (Ques.) 6008 (ii).

Insolvency B. 84 (Mr. *Fortin*) on M. for 1°, 2026.

Belcourt, Mr. N. A., *Ottawa.*

Alaska and North Western Ry. Co.'s Pet., prop. Res., 2142 (i).

——— Incorp. (B. 108) 1°*, 2844 (i).

Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries B. 14 (Mr. *Richardson*) on M. for Com., 3689 (i).

Dismissals and Appnmts., from 1878 to 1879 (M. for Ret.) 3665 (i) 4246 (ii).

Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4057, 4373 (ii).

Govt. Officials, dismissed from 1878 to 1879, names, &c. (M. for Ret.) 4246 (ii).

Great North-west Central Ry. Co.'s B. 141 (Mr. *Morrison*) in Com., 7735 (ii).

Heyward, Edwin, Relief (B. 112) 1°*, 3309 (i).

Militia Clothing in Can., W. L. McKing's Rep. (M. for Copy*) 3669 (i).

Montreal Island Belt Line Ry. Co. (B. 105) Sen. Amts., 5905 (ii).

Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Co., Construction, &c., on M. (Mr. *Poupore*) to Com of Sup., 6486 (ii).

——— (M. for Sel. Com.) 3664 (i).

National Museum, Erection at Ottawa (remarks 5323 (ii).

Ontario and Quebec Bridge Co.'s incorp. (B. 25) 1°*, 744 (i).

Ottawa and New York Ry. Co. (B. 80) 1°*, 1839.

Personal Explanation, par. in *Gazette re* Alaska and N. W. Ry. Co.'s B. 6242 (ii).

Belcourt, Mr. N. A.—*Continued.*
Private Bills Legislation, M. to Proceed with, 7466 (ii).
Privilege (Ques. of) par in *La Patrie re* Man. Schools (Mr. *Bergeron*) 7719 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Civil Government: Geological Survey, 7478 (ii).
Union Bank of Can. Amt. (B. 24) 1°*, 743 (i).

Bell, Mr. A. C., *Pictou.*
Bruneau, Mr., M.P. for Richelieu, Resignation, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Marcotte*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 2218 (i).
Butter Industry of Can., Encouragement of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Reid*) 2503 (i).
Canadian Yukon Ry. B. 6 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 2°, 1188 (i).
——— Telegram to High Commissioner *re* Mr. Hamilton Smith's Proposals, 1010 (i).
Civil Service Superannuation Abolition B. 76 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 6797, 6798; on M. for 3°, (Amt.) 6932 (ii).
Crow's Nest Pass Ry., Death of Employees (M. for cor.*) 3668 (i).
——— (M. for Ret.) 3666 (i).
——— Treatment of Workmen on M. for Com. of Sup., 6593 (ii).
Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4274 (ii).
——— on Amt. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to M. for 3°, 5685 (ii).
I.C.R. Eastern Extension, Dining Car (Ques.) 2345 (i).
——— Reduction in number of Brakesmen (Ques.) 478 (i).
——— Westville, N.S., Station Improvements, &c. (Ques.) 2342 (i).
King's Head Light, N.S. (Ques.) 1932 (i).
Returns (inquiry) 4605, 5394 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Civil Government: Customs (contingencies) 4589.
Miscellaneous (Crow's Nest Pass Commission) 7263.
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers (N.S.) 5612.

Bell, Mr. J. W., *Addington.*
Crow's Nest Pass Ry. Commission, Printing of Rep. (Ques.) 6466 (ii).
Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 2987 (i).
SUPPLY:
Post Office: Outside Service (letter carriers) 7782.
Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 71 (Sir *Henri Joly*) Sen. Amts., 7784 (ii).

Bennett, Mr. W. H., *East Simcoe.*
Address, on The, 308 (i).
Alien Labour Law, Appnmt. of Agent at Georgian Bay (remarks) 4523, 6240 (ii).
——— Enforcement (Ques.) 5392 (ii).
——— Enforcement at Toronto (remarks) 5012 (ii).
Appnmts. by late Govt., on Amt. (Mr. *Montague*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 4838 (ii).

Bennett, Mr. W. H.—*Continued.*
Baxter, Wm., Lighthouse-keeper, Emplymt. (Ques.) 3657 (i).
Bruneau, Mr., M.P. for Richelieu, Resignation, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Marcotte*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 2160 (i).
Budget, The, 3477 (i).
Canadian Yukon Ry. B. 6 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 1857 (i).
Certificates to Masters and Mates Act Amt. B. 37 (Sir *Louis Davies*) in Com., 1862 (i).
Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 2321; in Com., 2941, 2969, 2978 (i), 4068, 4083, 4093, 4141, 4152, 4254, 4453, 4468, 4492, 5262; on M. for 3°, 5704 (ii).
Gascoigne, Maj. Gen., Militia Commission (Ques.) 3825 (i).
Govt. Harbours, Piers and Breakwaters Act Amt. B. 38 (Sir Louis Davies) in Com., 1867 (i).
Gravenhurst, Ont., Appnmt. of Postmaster (Ques.) 5320 (ii).
Midland, Ont., Appnmt. of Harbour Master (Ques.) 3662 (i).
Ont. Lumber Cut, on M. (Mr. *Britton*) to adjn., 1843 (i).
Ontario Voters' Lists, Revising Officers, cost of printing &c. (Ques.) 2845 (i).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 110 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for Com., 5734 (ii).
——— Savings Banks, Reduction of Interest, on Amt. (Mr. *Davin*) to M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 3720 (i).
Rainy River Judicial District, Appnmt. of Judge (remarks) 5011 (ii).
Rockliffe Rifle Range, Land Valuator (Ques.) 3408, 3660 (i).
Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 39 (Sir *Louis Davies*) in Com., 1878 (i).
Stimulants in Chamber during debate, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Talbot*) 3642 (i).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Year Book) 5038 (ii).
Canals: Trent (construction) 6539 (ii).
Civil Government: Customs Dept. (contingencies) 4588 (ii); Gov. Gen. Sec's Office, 3836 (i); Marine and Fisheries (contingencies) 4596; Post Office, 4864; Public Works (contingencies) 4591; Trade and Commerce (contingencies) 4599 (ii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service: (construction) 4999; (salaries) 4991 (ii).
Post Office: Outside Service (miscellaneous expenses) 6716 (ii).
Public Works: Buildings (N.S.) 5076; (Ques.) 5093; Harbours and Rivers (dredging) 6073; Ont., 6087; (Kaministiquia) 5068 (ii).
Ways and Means:—The Tariff.
In Com. (preferential clause) 3763, 3792 (i).
Waverley, Ont., Dismissal of Postmaster (Ques.) 598 (i).
White, Mr., ex-Dep. Postmaster Gen., Superannuation (Ques.) 474 (i).

Bennett, Mr. W. H.—*Continued.*
Williams, W. W., Postmaster at Seeley's Bay, Dismissal on M. (Mr. *Taylor*) to adjn., 3422 (i).
Wyebridge, Wyevale Postal Service (Ques.) 598 (i).

Bergeron, Mr. J. G. H., *Beauharnois.*
Abenakis Indians, St. Francis Agency (Ques.) 3408 (i).
Address, on The, 430 (i),
Alaska and North-western Ry. Co.'s Pet., on prop. Res. (Mr. Belcourt) 2142 (i).
Aud. Gen's Rep., French translation (remarks) 3827 (i).
Bagot, Electoral District, Issue of Writ (M. to adjn.) 5234, 5255 (ii).
——— (notification) 3825 (i).
——— (Ques.) 4772 (ii).
Berthier Channel, Deepening (Ques.) 3085 (i).
Beauharnois Canal, Dismissal of Touissant Boyer (Ques.) 3662 (i).
Bruneau, Mr., M.P. for Richelieu, Resignation, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Marcotte*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 2188 (i).
Canadian Yukon Railway B. 6 (Mr. *Blair*) on amt. (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) to M. for 2°, 1440 (i).
Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries B. 14 (Mr. *Richardson*) on M. for Com., 3701 (i).
Dep. Min. of Interior, present occupant (Ques.) 3408 (i).
Drummond County Ry. Investigation, Rep. of Commission on M. (Mr. *Lister*) 7113 (ii).
Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 2971 (i).
French Line of Steamers, Negotiations, &c. (remarks) 6465 (ii).
Gaspé Line of Steamers, Subsidy, &c. (Ques.) 7120, 7685 (ii).
Gatien, Louis, Postmaster at Marieville, Dismissal by Govt. (Ques.) 7685 (ii).
Homestead Land Laws in the Yukon (Ques.) 1338, 1784 (i).
Judges of the Provincial Court Act Amt. B. 150 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 6131, 6166, 6183, 7137; on M. for 2°, 6778; in Com., 6795.
Judges of the Province of Quebec, Reps. from Montreal Bar (M. for Ret.*) 505 (i).
Lachine Canal, Dismissal of François Corbeil (M. for Ret.*) 2840.
——— (Ques.) 2343 (i).
Lavoie, Dr., Appnmt. by Govt. (Ques.) 7119 (ii).
Legris, Narcisse, Postmaster at St. Eulalie, Letter in *La Patrie* (Ques.) 7688 (ii).
London and Lake Huron Ry. Co.'s B. 67 (Mr. *Lister*) in Com., 4073 (ii).
Man. Schools Fund B. 168 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7436 (ii).
Man. Schools Question, Address to the Holy Father, on M. for Com. of Sup., 5344, 5363, 5411 (ii).
——— document presented at Rome (Ques.) 3165.
Military Camp at Beauharnois (remarks) 6638 (ii).

Bergeron, Mr. J. G. H.—*Continued.*
Mint, Govt. Establishment (Ques.) 1340 (i).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners' Loan B. 163 (Mr. *Fielding*) on prop. Res., 6867, 6911; on M. for Com., 7171 (ii).
Ogilvie's Klondike Rep., French translation (Ques.) 2529.
——— (remarks) 1577 (i).
Ontario and Rainy River Co.'s B. 32 (Mr. *Tisdale*) in Com., 2627 (i).
Parliament Buildings, Asphalt Sidewalks, &c., contractor (Ques.) 487 (i).
Post Office Act Amt. (Special Delivery) B. 167 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 1°, 7409 (ii).
Privilege (Ques. of) par. in *La Patrie re* Man. Schools, 7697, 7715 (ii).
Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors—Plebiscite B. 121 (Mr. *Fisher*) on M. for 1°, 3933; on M. for 2°, 4718 (ii).
Returns (inquiry) 3713 (i), 4348 (ii).
Ry. Employees Safety B. 4 (Mr. *Casey*) in Com., 3680 (i).
Reid, Wm., Bridge-keeper, Beauharnois Canal, Dismissal (Ques.) 3937 (ii).
St. Anicet Wharf, Cost when built (Ques.) 2818 (i).
——— Cor. between L. H. Masson and Public Works (M. for copy*) 2841 (i).
St. Cyprien Postmaster, charges against (Ques.) 6007 (ii).
St. Lawrence River, Placing of Buoys (remarks) 3318 (i).
St. Michel de Napierville post-office, cor *re* (Ques.) 1471 (i).
Soulanges Canal, expenditure on construction (Ques.) 5133 (ii).
——— Tenders for Cement, &c. (Ques.) 4176 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Canals: Beauharnois (contingencies) 7189; Chambly, 7651; Soulanges (construction) 6446, 6530 (ii).
Civil Government: Agriculture (salaries) 4845. Public Works (books, &c.) 6984 (ii).
Customs: (Laboratory) 7774 (ii).
Fisheries: (protection service) 5273, 5301 (ii).
Legislation: House of Commons (debates) 7014; (stationery, &c.) 7035 (ii).
Miscellaneous: (litigation costs) 7770; Man. School case (litigation) 7771; (Parliamentary Companion) 6796 (ii).
Penitentiaries: (St. Vincent de Paul) 6640.
Post Office: Outside Service (letter carriers) 7775; (miscellaneous expenses) 6703 (ii).
Public Works: Buildings (general) 5494; (B.C.) 5494; Ont. (Major's Hill Park) 5455; Que., 7217; (repairs, &c.) 7218. Harbours and Rivers (dredging) 6079; N.S. (New Harbour) 7609; (Ont.) 6087, 6094; (Que.) 5648, 7226. Roads and Bridges (Dom.) 6100. Telegraph Lines (St. Lawrence shores) 6101 (ii).
Railways: I.C.R. (general expenses for investigations) 7203; (increased accommodation at St. John) 7647; (iron bridges) 6401; (rolling stock) 7644 (ii).

Bertram, Mr. G. H., *Toronto Centre.*

Address, The, in Ans. to His Ex.'s Speech (moved) 7 (i).

Anglo-American Commission and Govtl. Action (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 7689 (ii).

Canadian Yukon Railway B. 6 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 2°, 735 (i).

Lord's Day, Better Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) that Com. rise, 2405 (i).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 110 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 3°, 6125 (ii).

Ry. Rate War and Man. Settlers on M. (Mr. *Maclean*) to adjn., 1480 (i).

Sons of England Benefit Society (B. 122) M. for Com., 6048, 6060 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Miscellaneous (Crow's Nest Pass Commission) 7268 (ii).

Public Works: Harbours and Rivers (dredging) 6076 (ii).

Trade Mark and Design Act Amt. (B. 61) 1*, 1387; 2°, 2842 (i).

Bethune, Mr. J. L., *Victoria, N.S.*

Aspy Bay, Harbour of Refuge, Construction (Ques.) 2819 (ii).

Baddeck Drill Shed, Land Title (Ques.) 1467 (i).

Lobster Packing, Size of Catch, &c. (Ques.) 1340.

Storm Signals, C.B., &c., Number of (Ques.) 7118.

Telegraph Lines, N.S., Govt. rates, &c. (Ques.) 6006 (ii).

Blair, Hon. A. G. (Minister of Railways and Canals) *Sunbury and Queen's.*

Alien Labour Law, Enforcement (remarks) 5791.

Boyer, Touissant, Lockmaster Beauharnois Canal, Dismissal (Ans.) 3662 (i).

Bruneau, Mr., M.P. for Richelieu, Resignation, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Marcotte*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections. 2188 (i).

Can. Pac. Ry. Co.'s B. 46 (Mr. *Morrison*) in Com., 3665 (i).

Canadian Yukon Railway (B. 6) 1° *m.*, 186; 2° *m.*, 521; agreed to (Y. 111, N. 72) 1733; land subsidy, prop. Res. 515; in Com. on Res., 1772; in Com. on B., 1851 (i).

——— exclusion of Foreign Labour (Ans.) 827 (i).

——— Govt. Amts. (remarks) 744 (i).

——— plans, papers &c., 402 (i).

Canals, Date of Opening (Ans.) 3318 (i).

——— (remarks) 2700 (i).

Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries B. 14 (Mr. *Richardson*) in Com., 4643, 4666 (ii).

Cornwall Canal, Construction, Amount Paid, &c. (Ans.) 5391 (ii).

Crow's Nest Pass Ry., Agreement with C.P.R. Co. (Ans.) 2036 (i).

——— Amounts Paid to C.P.R. Co. (Ans.) 3405 (i).

——— Construction, &c., 6240 (ii).

Dawson City Electric Lighting and Tramway Co.'s incorp. B. 118 (Mr. *Morrison*) in Com., 6944 (ii).

Blair, Hon. A. G.—*Continued.*

Dawson City Electric Co.'s B. 123 (Mr. *Morrison*) in Com., 7158.

Drummond Co. Ry. and G.T.R., new arrangements (remarks) 2699 (i).

——— second agreement (Ans.) 3317 (i).

——— through traffic (Ans.) 472 (i).

Floods on Grand River, on M. (Mr. *Montague*) to adjn., 2527 (i).

Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 2985 (i), 4078, 4091, 4122, 4128, 4256, 4470; Sen. Amts., 7532 (ii).

Galbraith, Thos. J., canal officer, Port Colborne, Resignation (Ans.) 516 (i).

Grain Transportation in Man. and N. W. T. by C. P. R. and Elevator Co. (Ans.) 483 (i).

Grand Narrows, C.B., Dismissal of Govt. blacksmith (Ans.) 3661 (i).

G. T. Ry. and C. P. Ry., connection at North Bay (remarks) 4353 (ii).

G. T. R. and O. A. & P. S. Ry., connection at Scotia Junction (Ans.) 454 (i).

——— Regulations on (Mr. *Wallace*) M. to adjn. (remarks) 6014, 6026 (ii).

G. N. W. Central Ry. Co.'s B. 141 (Mr. *Morrison*) on M. for 2°, 5965.

——— Ques. of Procedure (remarks) 6004 (ii).

"Hard-pan" Claims, Cape Breton Ry. (Ans.) 5131 (ii).

I.C.R. Agreement with A. H. Harris (Ans.) 3166 (ii).

——— (remarks) 5393 (ii).

——— Archibald, Mr., Chief Engineer, dismissal on M. for Ret., 1835 (i).

——— Brakesmen, Reduction in Number (Ans.) 475 (i).

——— Carriage of coal (Ans.) 4448 (ii).

——— Coloured Employees, on M. (Mr. *Campbell*) to Adjn., 3168 (i).

——— Dismissal (remarks) 2852; (Ans.) 3405 (i).

——— Construction of Gates, Tenders (Ans.) 2819.

——— Dining Cars, Number, &c. (Ans.) 2812 (i).

——— Diversion of Route through Springhill (Ans.) 1929 (i).

——— Eastern Extension, Dining Car (Ans.) 2345 (i).

——— Employees, Reductions in Passenger and Freight Depts. (Ans.) 602 (i).

——— Expenditure for Fuel (Ans.) 3089 (i).

——— Extension to Montreal, Agreement with G. T. Ry. on M. for Ret., 3821 (i).

——— contracts, &c. (copies laid on table) 382 1(i).

——— passengers from Lévis, number of (Ans.) 3406 (i).

——— Govt. Lands, Trois Pistoles, Occupation, &c. (Ans.) 4179 (ii)

——— Killam's Claims, Destruction of Cattle, on inquiry for Ret., 4683 (ii).

——— Lowering Schedule Rates (remarks) 1481.

——— Madame Charon's Horse (Ans.) 3659 (i).

Blair, Hon. A. G.—*Continued.*
I.C.R. Moncton Ry. Station, construction (Ans.) 477 (i).
——— plumbing and heating contract (Ans.) 2346 (i).
——— Murray, J. H., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 5318 (ii).
——— News Stand at Lévis, lease (Ans.) 1338 (i).
——— Patent Locomotive cylinder (Ans.) 1335.
——— Powlie, A., Car Inspector at Springhill, Dismissal (Ans.) 1933 (i).
——— Purchase of Locomotives in U. S., &c. (Ans.) 477 (i).
——— Riviere du Loup, cost of inquiry (Ans.) 2820 (i).
——— Rory McNeil, Dismissal of (Ans.) 603 (i).
——— Ste. Michel, Station, Cost, &c. (Ans.) 3312.
——— Stewart, A., Tank Man at Springhill, Dismissal (Ans.) 1933, 2342 (i).
——— Train Service, Issue of Time-tables (remarks) 6242 (ii).
——— Westville, N.S., Station Improvements (Ans.) 2342 (i).
Killam, A. E., Position on I.C.R. (Ans.) 827 (i).
Kettle River Valley Ry. Co.'s B. 26 (Mr. *Bostock*) in Com., 2957, 3023, 3079 (i).
King, W. C., Station Agent, Antigonish, Dismissal (Ans.) 7120 (ii).
Kingston and Pembroke Ry. Co.'s B. 69 (Mr. *Britton*) in Com., 4807 (ii).
——— Locomotive Works, on M. (Mr. *Taylor*) to Adjn. House, 612 (i).
——— Telegrams *re* Order for Locomotives (Ans.) 454 (i).
Klondike, Edmonton and Prince Albert routes 453 (i).
Lachine Canal, Dismissals, on M. (Mr. *Monk*) 4622 (ii).
——— of Francis Corbeil (Ans.) 2343 (i).
——— Storekeeper, applicants for position (Ans.) 456 (i).
Lake Bennett and Klondike Ry. and Tramway Co.'s incorp. B. 31 (Mr. *Haggart*) on M. to Conc. in Sen. Amts., 5905, 6266 (ii).
——— Temiscamingue Ry. and Ry. Act (Ans.) 2349 (i).
Laurentian Ry., Telegraph Regulations, &c. (Ans.) 4923 (ii).
Lafaivre, Xavier, lockmaster, Lachine Canal, Dismissal (Ans.) 3937 (ii).
Linloff, Edward, Appmnt. by Govt. (Ans.) 5319 (ii).
London and Lake Huron Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 67 (Mr. *Lister*) in Com., 4073 (ii).
Long Lake, Qu'Appelle and Saskatchewan Ry. Co., on M. (Mr. *Davis*) to adjn., 4254 (ii).
McKay, Kenneth, lockmaster, St. Peter's Canal, Dismissal (Ans.) 1070 (i).
Matheson, John D., Appmnt. by Govt. (Ans.) 7121 (ii).

Blair, Hon. A. G.—*Continued.*
Mercier, Wilfrid, Commissioner, amounts paid, &c. (Ans.) 4345 (ii).
Montreal and Lake Ontario, completion of fourteen foot navigation (Ans.) 6010 (ii).
Nickel Steel Co.'s incorp. B. 96 (Mr. *Wood*, Hamilton) on M. (Mr. *LaRivière*) to ref. to Com. on Rys., &c., 3644 (i).
Ontario and Rainy River Ry. Co.'s B. 32 (Mr. *Tisdale*) on M. (Mr. *Maclean*) to ref. back to Com., 2676 (remarks) 2123 (i).
Otonabee River Floods, Investigation as to cause (Ans.) 484 (i).
P. E. I. Ry., Curve at North Wiltshire (Ans.) 2345 (i).
Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors—Plebiscite B. 121 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4729 (ii).
Public Officers' Act Amt. B. 170 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 7581 (ii).
——— Works Aid (B. 161) 1°, 6892; 2°, *m.*, 7411, 7570; in Com, amt., 7570 (ii).
Ry. Act Amt. (B. 145) 1°, 5662 (ii).
Rys. and Canals, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 1341 (i).
——— Appnmts. (Ans.) 1784 (i).
——— Commission, Board of (Mr. *Jameson*) 1815.
——— Committee of the Privy Council, Constitution (Ans.) 1472 (i).
——— Employees Safety B. 4 (Mr. *Casey*) in Com., 2055, 3673, (i) 4210, 4671 (ii); on M. to ref. back to Com., 5147; in Com., 5162, 5174 (ii).
——— Freight Rates B. 7 (Mr. *Reid*) on M. for 2°, 2912 (i).
——— Rates to Stickine River (Ans.) 1070 (i).
——— Rate War, on M. (Mr. *Maclean*) to adjn., 1476 (i).
——— (Mr. *Sproule*) to adjn., 1183 (i).
——— Regulations, Enforcement, &c. (Ans.) 7118.
——— Transportation, on M. (Mr. *Maclean*) to adjn., 1764 (i).
Reid, Wm., Bridge Keeper, Beauharnois Canal, Dismissal (Ans.) 3937 (ii).
Returns, on Inquiry for, 4774 (ii).
Roche Fendue and Calumet Dams, on M. (Mr. *Poupore*) for Cor., 4161, 4619 (ii).
St. Anne's Lock, Commissioner, amount paid (Ans.) 4345 (ii).
St. Peter's Canal, Repairs to entrance (Ans.) 1339 (i).
St. Pierre River Works, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 476.
Soulanges Canal, Expenditure on Construction (Ans.) 5133 (ii).
——— Tenders for cement, &c. (Ans.) 4176 (ii).
Southport to Murray Harbour, P.E.I. Ry. Extension (Ans.) 972 (i).
Stellarton, Car Inspector Sutherland, Dismissal, on M. for Cor., 1833 (i).
SUPPLY:
Canals: Beauharnois (contingencies) 7189; Chambly, 6553, 7651; Cornwall, 6532, 6554; Farran's Point, 6532; Galops, 7650 (construction) 6538; Grenville (enlargement) 6552; Lachine (enlarge-

Blair, Hon. A. G.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
ment) 6551; Murray (repairs) 6558; North Channel (construction) 6535; Rideau, 7182; Sault Ste. Marie (construction) 6550; (contractors claims) 7105; Soulanges (construction) 6446, 6510, 6516; Trent (construction) 6540, 6553; Welland, 7652, Williamsburg (gratuities) 7192 (repairs) 6554 (ii).
Civil Government: Railways and Canals, 4558; (contingencies) 4597 (ii).
Public Works: Buildings (N.B.) 5092; Harbours and Rivers (N.B.) 7634 (ii).
Railways: C.P.R., 6391; Crow's Nest Pass (salaries, &c.) 7110, 7182; I.C.R., 6427; (accommodation at Moncton) 6388, 7084; (Halifax) 6382; (Mulgrave) 6428; (St. John) 7646; (general) 6433; (claims for damages) 7183, 7373; (culverts, &c.) 7085; (Dalhousie wharf) 7084; (expenses of commissions) 7194; (Indiantown branch, land damages) 7078; (iron bridges) 6388, 6564; (Montreal extension) 6564; (North Sydney) 6386; (original construction) 6385; (Oxford and New Glasgow) 6385; (rolling stock) 7643; (miscellaneous) 6562; P.E.I. Ry. (rolling stock) 6434; (subsidies to N.S. Central Ry. Co.) 7809; (subsidies unpaid) 7653 (ii).
Toronto and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 77 (Mr. *Clarke*) on M. for Com., 4569; Sen. Amts., 5906 (ii).
Trent Valley Canal, Promised aid by Govt. (Ans.) 2817 (i).
United Counties Ry., Payments to (Ans.) 3658 (i).
U.S. SS. "Yantic", Passage up St. Lawrence (Ans.) 830 (i).
Wellington Bridge, Montreal, Accident (Ans.) 4775 (ii).
——— (remarks) 4604 (ii).
Winnipeg Great Northern Ry. Co.'s Transportation (B. 148) 1°*, 5867; 2°, *m.*, 6232; in Com., 6232 (ii).
Woods, H. W., Postmaster, Welsford, N. B., Dismissals (Ans.) 7120 (ii).

Borden, Hon. F. W. (Minister of Militia), *King's, N.S.*
Aldershot, N.S., Military Camp, Supplies, on M. for Ret., 1786 (i).
Baddeck Drill Shed, Land Title (Ans.) 1468 (i).
Brigade Military Camp, Third District (Ans.) 5786 (ii).
Côte Leisse, Rifle Ranges, Farmers' Grievances (remarks) 6323 (ii).
Côte St. Luc Rifle Range, Accidental Shooting (remarks) 6030 (ii).
Domville, Lt. Col., M.P., Charges against (remarks) 5393, 6031 (ii).
Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 2990 (i).
Gananoque Drill Shed, on M. for Ret. (remarks) 3826 (i).
——— on M. (Mr. *Taylor*) to adjn., 5108, 5111 (ii).
——— letter from Lt. Gov. Patterson laid on Table, 5316 (ii).
——— site (Ans.) 457 (i).

Borden, Hon. F. W.—*Continued.*
Gascoigne, Maj. Gen., Militia Commission (Ans.) 3825 (i).
Illinois National Guards, Permission to enter Can. (Ans.) 599 (i).
Imperial Army, Soldiers at Toronto (remarks) 4523 (ii).
Infantry Schools, Fredericton and London, cost of lighting, &c. (Ans.) 7121 (ii).
Militia Act Amt. (B. 140) 1°*, 5331; in Com., 5965 (ii).
Militia Annual Camp Drill (remarks) 5324 (ii).
——— Deptl. Rep. (presented) 2425.
——— Force, Permanent, inspection by Maj. Gen. Gascoigne (Ans.) 1782 (i).
——— General Orders, qualification of Officers, &c. (Ans.) 1782 (i), 7124 (ii).
——— Harness and Saddlery contracts (Ans.) 1471 (i).
——— Promotions (Ans.) 2433 (i).
——— Camp at Beauharnois (remarks) 6638 (ii).
Mounted Police Medals (Ans.) 451 (i).
North-west Mounted Police, contract for transportation of supplies (remarks) 5499 (ii).
——— Yukon Force, contract for supplies (remarks) 5116 (ii).
Officer commanding Militia, Increased Allowance, in com. on Res., 4930, 4937 (ii).
Oliver Militia Equipments, adoption by Govt. (Ans.) 4347 (ii).
Permanent Force, subaltern officers, &c., appnmt. by Govt. (Ans.) 7122 (ii).
——— Qualifications for Commissions (Ans.) 6010.
Peterborough Drill Shed, tenders, &c. (Ans.) 5132.
Ry. Regulations, enforcement, &c. (remarks) 7119.
Repatriation of 100th Regiment (remarks) 6613(ii).
Rifle Range, Target Practice, (Ans.) 6612 (ii).
Rockliffe Rifle Range, land valuator (Ans.) 3661(i).
Rogers, Lt. Col. R. Z., retirement, &c. (Ans.) 5787 (ii).
Royal Canadian Regiment (remarks) 5232 (ii).
Royal Military College, amalgamation of classes (Ans.) 973 (i).
——— Employees, Suppl. Ret. (remarks) 6035 (ii).
St. Helen's Island, allotment for Military purposes (Ans.) 456 (i).
St. Luc Rifle Ranges, action of Govt. *re* accidents (remarks) 5569 (ii).
San José Scale, Prohibition of Nursery Stock B. 82 (Mr. *Fisher*) on M. for 1°, 1914 (i).
SUPPLY:
Civil Government: Militia and Defence (accountant) 3899: (salaries) 6564, 6985 (ii).
Militia: (arms and accoutrements) 7523; (Dom. Artillery Association) 7521: (Dom. Cartridge Factory) 6570, 7075; (Dom. Rifle Association) 7521; (Fredericton School) 7057; (gratuities) 6573, 7517; (medals, &c.) 7515; (messenger) 7482; (permanent force) 7056; (Rifle Associations) 6570; (salaries) 6564; (unforeseen expenses) 6570; (Yukon force) 7059; (contract for supplies) 7793; (ii).

Borden, Hon. F. W.—*Continued.*
SUPALY—*Continued.*
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, N S. 5622; (New Harbour) 7594 (ii).
Railways: Subsidy to Nova Scotia Central Ry. Co., 7814 (ii).
Sutton, Lt., instruction *re* Military course in England (Ans.) 1782 (i).
Volunteers of 1866, granting of medals (remarks) 6613 (ii).
Yukon Military Contingent, expenditure &c. (remarks) 1577, (i); 4795, (ii).
——— H. N. Bate's contract (Ans.) 6009 (ii).
——— Contract for transportation of Supplies (remarks) 4602 (ii).

Borden, Mr. R. L., *Halifax.*
Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Peterson and Tate's contract (Ques.) 829 (i).
Bruneau, Mr., M.P. for Richelieu, Resignation, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Marcotte*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 2178 (i).
Canadian Yukon Ry. B. 6 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 2°, 1251; (amt.) 1271; Neg. (Y. 65; N. 119) 1732 (i).
——— Telegram to High Commissioner *re* Hamilton Smith's Proposal, 1002 (i).
Cape Negro Island Light, Appnmt. of Keeper (M. for Ret.*) 1839 (i).
——— (Ques.) 1929 (i).
Civil Service Superannuation Abolition B. 76 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 6371, 6380 (ii).
Dart, Lyman, Commutation of Sentence, Pets. &c. (M. for copy*) 5669 (i).
——— in Com of Sup., 6641, 6647, 6656 (ii).
Drummond Co. Ry. Investigation, Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. *Lister*) 7114 (ii).
——— 2nd Rep. of Com. (remarks) 6580 (ii).
Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4383, 4419, 4476; Sen. amts., 7527 (ii).
Fishermen's Safety B. 111 (Sir *Louis Davies*) in Com. 4788 (ii).
General Inspection Act Amt. B. 128 (Sir *Henry Joly*) in Com., 5967 (ii).
Honey Locust Plant and San José Scale Act, on M. (Mr. *Maclaren*) for Com. of Sup., 6970 (ii).
I.C.R., Dismissal of Chief Engineer Archibald (M. for Ret.) 1834 (ii).
——— reinstatement of employees (M. for Ret.) 3665 (ii).
Identification of Criminals B. 156 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 6964 (ii).
Judges of the Provincial Courts B. 150 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 6793 (ii).
——— in Com. on Res., 7127 (ii).
Land Titles Act Amt. B. 132 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 5959 (ii).
Manitoba and North Western Ry. Co. on M. for Com. of Sup., 7473 (ii).
Man. School Fund B. 168 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7426 (ii).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Continued.*
P. E. I., Suits by non-residents (remarks) 7410.
Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 39 (Sir *Louis Davies*) in Com., 2094, 2112 (i).
SUPPLY:
Administration of Justice: Supreme Court (purchase of books) 6638 (ii).
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (distribution of literature) 5991 (ii).
Indians: N. B. (medical attendance) 7298 (ii).
Inspection of Staples (grain standards) 6698 (ii).
Miscellaneous (pilotage investigations) 7103.
Penitentiaries (expenses of commissions) 7349; (St. Vincent de Paul) 6641 (ii).
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, N.S. (New Harbour) 7598 (ii).
Railways: I.C.R. (claims for damages by fire) 7375; (increased accommodetion at Halifax 6382; (iron bridges) 6393 (ii).
U.S. SS. "Yantic," passage up St. Lawrence (Ques.) 830 (i).
West Indian Trade, extension of (Ques.) 1339 (i).

Bostock, Mr. H., *Yale and Cariboo.*
Cameron *vs.* Queen, Papers, &c. (M. for copy) 1827 (i).
Canadian Yukon Ry. Co.'s B. 6 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 2°, 940 (i).
Columbia and Western Ry. Co.'s (B. 34) 1°*, 903.
Indictment for Libel, depositions and papers (M. for copies) 1827 (i).
Kettle River Valley Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 26) 1°*, 744 (i); in Com., 3042, 3054 (i).
Lord's Day Better Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., on amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) that Com. rise, 2408 (i).
Miles Cañon and White Horse Tramway Co.'s incorp. (B. 35) 1°*, 903 (i).
Nakusp and Slocan Ry. B. 52 (Mr. *McPherson*) in Com., 3868 (i).
San José Scale, Prohibition of Nursery Stock B. 82 (Mr. *Fisher*) on M. for 1°, 1917 (i).

Bourassa, Mr. J. H. N., *Labelle.*
Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 2703 (i).
Insolvency B. 84 (Mr. *Fortin*) on M. for 1°, 2020.
Man. School Fund B. 168 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7451 (ii).
——— School Ques., Address to the Holy Father, on M. for Com. of Sup., 5425 (ii).
Montfort Colonization Ry. Co.'s (B. 68) 1°*, 1736.

Britton, Mr. B. M., *Kingston.*
Alien Workmen, importation to Toronto, on M. (Mr. *Clarke*) to adjn., 4039 (ii).
Canada Evidence Act Amt. B. 143 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 6235 (ii).
Canadian Yukon Ry. B. 6 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 1858 (i).
——— Order (Ques. of) 1505 (i).
Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries B. 14 (Mr. *Richardson*) on M. for Com., 2858 (i); in Com., 4642 (ii).

Britton, Mr. B. M.—*Continued.*
Criminal Code (Abduction and Seduction) B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 2908 (i).
——— (1892) Act Amt. (B. 12) 1°, 270 (i); 2°, 2842; M. for Com., 2885; on amt. (Mr. *Cameron*) 6 m. h., 2900 (i).
Customs Act Amt. B. 152 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com., 6950 (ii).
Dart, Lyman A., Commutation of Sentence, in Com. of Sup., 6670 (ii).
Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on amt. (Mr. *Powell*) to M. for 2°, 2744 (i); in Com., 4095, 4504 (ii).
Govt. Harbours, Piers and Breakwaters Act Amt. B. 38 (Sir *Louis Davies*) in Com., 1866 (i).
Judges of the Provincial Courts B. 150 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 6782; in Com., 6786.
Kingston and Pembroke Ry. Co.'s B. 69, 1°*, 1736 (i); in Com., 4806 (ii).
——— Locomotive Works, on M. (Mr. *Taylor*) to adjn., 610 (i).
Lord's Day, Better Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 1970 (i).
Naval Militia Corps, establishment (Ques.) 3085.
Ontario Lumber Cut, (M. to adjn.) 1840 (i).
Ontario and Rainy River Ry. Co.'s B. 32 (Mr. *Tisdale*) on M. (Mr. *Maclean*) to refer back to Com., 2695 (i).
Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors—Plebiscite B. 121 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4738, 4762 (ii).
Ry. Employees Safety B. 4 (Mr. *Casey*) in Com., 4220, 5163 (ii).
Reciprocity in Wrecking, Can. and U. S. (remarks) 6612 (ii).
Cañon Ry. Co.'s (B. 27) 1°*, 744 (i).
Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 39 (Sir *Louis Davies*) in Com., 1870, 1903, 2084, 2087, 2094, 2097, 2532 (i).
Statutes, Revision and Consolidation (Ques.) 2343.
SUPPLY:
Administration of Justice: (Judge's salaries) 6989, 7487 (ii).
Arts, Agriculture, &c: (Year-book) 5027 (ii).
Canals: Rideau, 7182; Trent (construction) 6544; Williamsburg (gratuities) 7194 (ii).
Civil Government: Customs (clerical assistance) 7477, Post Office, 4861, 4871 (ii).
Fisheries: Behring's Sea (claims commission) 7287 (ii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service: (maintenance) 4998.
Miscellaneous: Privy Council (records) 7282 (ii).
Ocean and River Service: (life saving stations) 4954; (winter mail service) 4976 (ii).
Penitentiaries: (expenses of commissions) 7345; (Kingston) 6686, 7490 (ii).
Post Office: Outside service (letter carriers) 7781.

Broder, Mr. A., *Dundas.*
Butter Industry of Can., Encouragement of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Reid*) 2379 (i).
Cornwall Canal Construction, amount paid, &c. (Ques.) 5391 (ii).

Broder, Mr. A.—*Continued.*
Galops Canal, Purchase of Land, names and amounts paid (M. for Ret.*) 3668 (i).
Insurance Companies, changes of law governing (M.) 5136 (ii).
Post Office Savings Banks, Reduction of Interest on amt. (Mr. *Davin*) to M. for Com. of Ways and Means, 3748 (i).
SUPPLY:
Canals: Williamsburg (gratuities) 7192.
Yukon Military Contingent, supplies, &c., H. N. Bate's contract (Ques.) 6009 (ii).

Burnett, Mr. L. *South Ontario.*
Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 2947, 2953 (i).

Calvert, Mr. W. S., *West Middlesex.*
Civil Service. Attachment of Salaries B. 14 (Mr. *Richardson*) on M. for Com., 3706 (i).
London Election Trial, 1897, Mr. H. H. Robertson's accounts (M. for Ret.*) 3669 (i).
Returns (inquiry) 4774 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Penitentiaries: Dorchester, 6676 (ii).

Cameron, Mr. M. C., *West Huron.*
Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries B. 14 (Mr. *Richardson*) on M. for Com., 2873 (i).
Criminal Code (1892) Act Amt. B. 12 (Mr. *Britton*) on M. for Com., 2892; (Amt.) 6. m. h., 2897, 2910 (i).

Campbell, Mr. A., *Kent.*
Butter Industry of Can., Encouragement of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Reid*) 2370, 2482 (i).
Canadian Yukon Ry. B. 6 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 2°, 1246 (i).
Customs Act Amt. B. 152 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com., 6958 (ii).
Drainage Across Rys. Provision (B. 18) 1°, 405 2° *m.*, 2058; ref. to sel. com., 2059 (i).
Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 2952 (i).
Honey Locust Plant and San José Scale Act, on M. (Mr. *Maclaren*) to Com. of Sup., 6971 (ii).
I.C.R., coloured employees, (M. to adjn.) 3167 (i).
Judges of the Provincial Courts B. 150 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 6794 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Immigration: (agents' salaries), 6834 (i).
Miscellaneous: (prohibition expenses), 7094 (ii).
Quarantine: (cattle slaughtered) 7007 (ii).
Post Office: Outside Service (letter carries), 7777.
Railways: I.C.R. (iron bridges) 6407; (rolling stock) 7644 (ii).
Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 71 (Sir *Henri Joli*) Sen. Amts., 7784 (ii).

Cargill, Mr. H., *East Bruce.*
SUPPLY:
Public Works: Buildings (Dom.) 5607 (ii).

Caron, Hon. Sir A., K.C.M.G., *Three Rivers.*
Bruneau, Mr., M.P. for Richelieu, Resignation, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Marcotte*) to ref. to Com. on Priv. and Elections, 2195 (i).
Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries B. 14 (Mr. *Richarson*) in Com , 4668 (ii).
Dupont, Mr., late M. P., decease (remarks) 1774.
Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 3947, 4469 (ii).
Gascoigne, Maj. Gen., Resignation (remarks) 4167 (ii).
Jubilee Stamps, receipts from sales (Ques.) 3939.
Kettle River Valley Ry. Co's B. 26 (Mr. *Bostock*) in Com., 3068; on consdn. of Amts., 3366 (i).
Klondike and Peace River Transportation Co.'s B. 91 (Mr. *Davis*) in Com., 4169 (ii).
Man. Schools Ques., Address to the Holy Father, on M. for Com. of Sup., 5432 (ii).
Officer Commanding Militia, Increased Allowance, in Com. on Res., 4935 (ii).
Oliver Equipments, Militia, adoption by Govt. (Ques.) 4347 (ii).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 110 (Mr. *Mulock*) on. M. for 1°, 2919 (i); on M. for 2°, 5553 (ii); on M. for Com., 5719; in Com., 5750 (ii).
——— Free Postage for Newspapers (remarks) 4041 (ii).
Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquor—Plebiscite B. 121 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4748 (ii).
Ry. Employees Safety B. 4 (Mr. *Casey*) in Com., 4670 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Arts. Agriculture, &c. (Paris Exhibition) 5042 (ii).
Civil Government: Interior, 4528; Militia and Defence (accountant) 3900, 3922 (i).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (salaries, &c.) 4993.
Williams, W. W., Seeley's Bay Postmaster, Dismissal, on M. (Mr. *Taylor*) to adjn., 3413 (i).

Carscallen, Mr. A. W., *North Hastings.*
Certificates to Masters and Mates Act Amt. B. 37 (Sir *Louis Davies*) in Com., 1860 (i).

Cartwright, Hon. Sir Richard, G.C.M.G. (Minister of Trade and Commerce) *South Oxford.*
Address, on The, 151 (i).
Adjnmt. for Easter (remarks) 2848 (i).
——— (M.) 3095 (i).
Alien Labour Law, copy of instructions from Dept. of Justice (remarks) 5519 (ii).
Appnmts. by late Govt. (remarks) 4927 (ii).
Atlantic Fast SS. Service, negotiations, &c. (Ans) 600 (i).
——— (remarks) 6609 (ii).
——— Peterson and Tate's contract (Ans.) 829.
——— prop. Res., 5215 (ii).
——— (remarks) 7385 (ii).

Cartwright, Hon. Sir R.—*Continued.*
Auditor General, Powers and Duties on amt. (Mr. *Foster*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 6205 (ii).
——— Rep., French Translation (remarks) 3827.
Budget, The, 3242 (i).
——— M. for precedence on Wednesdays, 3094 (i).
Business of the House, Easter adjnmt. (remarks) 2929 (i).
——— (M.) 6109 (ii).
——— (remarks) 5885 (ii).
Canadian and English Mails, Beaver Line Steamers (Ans.) 2845 (i).
Canadian Yukon Ry. B. 6 (Mr. *Blair*) on amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to M. for 2°, 1712 (i).
Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries B. 14 (Mr. *Richardson*) on M. for Com., 3700; in Com., 3711 (i).
——— Superannuation Abolition B. 76 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 6374 (ii).
Crow's Nest Pass Ry., Treatment of Workmen on M. for Com. of Sup., 6593 (ii).
Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 3010 (i).
Gaspé, Line of Steamers, Subsidy, &c. (Ans.) 7686 (ii).
Gladstone, Rt. Hon. W. E., Decease of (remarks) 5868 (ii).
Grain Transit, Man. and N. W. Regulation B. 19 (Mr. *Douglas*) on M. for 2°, 2080 (i).
Hawaiian Vessels, Navigating Canadian waters (Ans.) 603 (i).
Insolvency B., Govt. legislation (Ans.) 3826 (i).
——— Govt. measure (Ans.) 2848 (i).
——— Govt. policy, on M. to adjn., 2927 (i).
L'Ancienne Lorette, Postmaster Alain, Dismissal, on M. for Ret., 2821 (i).
Man. Schools, documents, &c., on M. for Cor., 3664 (i).
——— Pet. presented at Rome (Ans.) 3165 (i).
Mistassini and St. Methode Public Works, on M. for Ret., 2823 (i).
Montague, P.E.I., Sub-collector of Customs, Dismissal, on M. for Cor., 2822 (i).
Montreal Harbour, Commissioners Loan B. 163, on prop. Res., 6440, 6880, 6908 (ii).
Pacific Cable between Vancouver and Australia, on M. (Mr. *Casey*) for Com. of Sup., 6197 (ii).
——— *re* Conference (remarks) 7385 (ii).
Post Office Savings Banks, reduction of interest, on Amt. (Mr. *Davin*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 3715, 3736 (i).
Preferential Trade with G.B., on Amt. (Mr. *McNeill*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 5861 (ii).
Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors-Plebiscite B. 121 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4735 (ii).
Queen's Printer, Qualifications (Ans.) 3165 (i).
Smelting Silver Lead in B.C., regulations, &c. (Ans.) 6012 (ii).
Sons of England Benefit Society Co.'s incorp. B. 127 (Mr. *Bertram*) on M. for Com., 6057 (ii).

Cartwright, Hon. Sir R.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY:
Civil Government: Agriculture (salaries) 4849; Gov. Gen.'s Sec.'s Office, 3831, 3859; High Commissioner's Office (contingencies) 4561, 4577; Interior, 4535; Justice (penitentiary branch) 3899; Militia and Defence (accountant) 3921; Privy Council Office, 3894; (contingencies) 4582; Public Works, 4558; Trade and Commerce, 4560; (contingencies) 4598; (salaries) 7483 (ii).
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, N.S. (New Harbour) 7592, 7606; Que. (River St. Lawrence) 5057 (ii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Baddeck, &c., East Bay and Irish Cove) 7723; (Can. and South Africa) 7720; (Gaspé Basin and Dalhousie) 6687; (Halifax and St. John) 6686; (Montreal, St. John and Manchester) 7659; (Quebec and Gaspé Basin) 6688; (St. John, Halifax, &c.) 7282; (Victoria and San Francisco) 6687 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Crow's Nest Pass Commission) 7266.
Trade and Commerce (Chinese Immigration Act, &c.) 6690 (ii).
Trade and Commerce, Deptl. Rep. (presented 935 (i).
Trade with W. Indies, on Adjnmt. (remarks) 2844 (i).
Veterinary Inspectors, Appnmts. on M. for Ret., 2821 (i).
Ways and Means, on M. (Sir *C. H. Tupper*) to adjn. Deb., 3170 (i).
——— on M. (Mr. *Davin*) to adjn. Deb., 3593 (i).
——— In Com. (preferential clause) 3770 (i).
Woods, J. P., ex-Judge, retiring allowance (Ans.) 825 (i).
Yukon District, Customs Regulations, on M. for Ret., 2822 (i).
Yukon Ry., action of U.S. Senate, on M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to adjn., 1326 (i).
——— Land subsidy (remarks) *re* exchange (Ans.) 2037 (i).

Casey, Mr. G. E., *West Elgin.*
Alberta and Yukon Ry. Nav. and Mining Co.'s incorp. (B. 124) 1°, 4348 (i); in Com., 7163 (ii).
Atlas Loan Co.'s (B. 55) 1°*, 1379 (i).
Bruneau, Mr., M. P. for Richelieu, Resignation, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Marcotte*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 2157 (i).
Business of the Hse., Morning Sittings and Committees (remarks) 6110, 6227 (ii).
Canadian Yukon Ry. B. 6 (Mr. *Blair*) on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to M. for 2°, 1725 (i).
Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries B. 14 (Mr. *Richardson*) on M. for Com., 2868; in Com., 4645 (ii).
Dawson City Electric Lighting and Tramway Co.'s incorp. B. 118 (Mr. *Morrison*) in Com., 6941 (ii).
Drainage Across Ry. Lands (B. 5) 1°, 185; 2° *m.*, 2055; ref. to Sel. Com., 2056 (i).
Federal Life Assurance Co.'s (B. 29) 1°*, 902 (i).
Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 2720 (i).

Casey, Mr. G. E.—*Continued.*
Govt Business, Precedence on Thursdays on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 2522 (i).
G. T. R. Regulations, on M. (Mr. *Wallace*) to adjn., 6018 (ii).
Kettle River Valley Ry. Co.'s B. 26 (Mr. *Bostock*) in Com., 2958 (i).
Lake Erie and Detroit River Ry. Co.'s B. 30 (Mr. *McGregor*) 1°*, 902 (i).
Man. Schools Ques., Address to the Holy Father, on M. to Com. of Sup., 5418 (ii).
N. W. Mounted Police, distribution in N.W.T. (M. for Ret.*) 3670 (i).
Ontario and Rainy River Ry. Co.'s B. 32 (Mr. *Tisdale*) on M. for Com., 2394; in Com., 2626.
Order (Ques. of) Chairman's ruling, 71 (i).
Pacific Cable between Vancouver and Australia, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6186 (ii).
——— Imp. Govt.'s Rep. (M. for copy*) 3668 (ii).
——— (M.) to print papers, 6226 (ii).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 110 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 1°, 2924 (i).
Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors—Plebiscite B. 121 (Mr. *Fisher*) on M. for 2°, 4714 (ii).
Ry. Employees Safety (B. 4) 1°, 185; 2° *m.*, 2054; in Com., 3675, 4209, 4213, 4638, 4669, 4676; ref. back to Com., 5148; in Com., 5148; (amt.) neg. (Y. 21, N. 80) 5174 (ii).
Ry. Regulations, Enforcement, &c. (Ques.) 7118.
Returns (inquiry) 5232 (ii).
San José Scale Pest, Prohibition of U. S. Nursery Stock, on M. (Mr. *Charlton*) to adjn., 2249.
SUPPLY:
Legislation: House of Commons (debates) 7031.
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions: (Montreal, St. John and Manchester) 7673 (ii).
Railways: Crows Nest Pass (salaries, &c.) 7111.

Casgrain, Mr. T. C., *Montmorency.*
Bruneau, Mr., M.P. for Richelieu, Resignation, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Marcotte*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 2234 (i).
Canadian Defences, Improvements (M. for cor.*) 2839 (i).
Canadian Yukon Ry. Co.'s B. 6 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 2°, 758 (i).
Chambord, Chicoutimi, Customs House, establishment (Ques.) 1469 (i).
Coulombe *vs.* Queen, appeal before Court of Queens Bench (M. for cor.*) 3668 (i).
——— (Ques.) 1068 (i).
Drummond County Ry., Com. of Investigation, on prop. Res. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 513 (i).
Fisheries of Can. appeal from Supreme Court (Ques.) 3825 (i).
Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) French translation and printing (remarks) 2434 (i).
French Translation and Printing (remarks) 3091.
Frigon, A., Indemnity for injury (M. for Rep.*) 3668 (i).

Casgrain, Mr. T. C.—*Continued.*
Godbout, A., Dismissal (M. for Ret.) 3664 (i).
I. C. R. Employees, reduction in passenger and freight depts. (Ques.) 602 (i).
——— news stand at Lévis Station, lease (Ques.) 1338 (i).
——— St. Michel Station (Ques.) 3312 (i).
——— ties and lumber supplies, tenders (M. for Ret.*) 2840 (i).
Judges of the Provincial Courts B. 150 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 6755; in Com., 6784 (ii).
La Canadienne, SS., chartered by Govt. (Ques.) 5318 (ii).
L'Ancienne Lorette, Postmaster Alain, Dismissal (M. for Ret.) 2821 (i).
Lord's Day, Better Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., on Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) that Com. rise, 2407 (i).
Mistassini Wharf and St. Methode, construction, &c. (M. for copy of instruction*) 3668 (i).
——— (M. for Ret.) 2822 (i).
Ogilvie's Rep., and Hansard translation (remarks) 1576 (i).
Rivière la Pipe Wharf, purchase of timber (Ques.) 1468 (i).
Roberval Pier, Payments to men, &c. (M. for Ret.*) 2840 (i).
Russell, Chas., English Solicitor, Amounts paid (M. for Ret.*) 2839 (i).
St. Anne de Beaupre Postmaster, Dismissal (Ques.) 1072 (i).
St. Michel, Govt. Wharf, repairs (Ques.) 3312 (i).
——— Mail Service (Ques.) 3313 (i).
Telegraph Lines, North Shore St. Lawrence (Ques.) 1336 (i).
——— tenders, &c., for contract (Ques.) 7123 (ii).

Charlton, Mr. J., *North Norfolk.*
Alien Labour Law, Enforcement (remarks) 5797.
Bagot Electoral District, vacancy, issue of writ, on M. (Mr. *Bergeron*) to adjn., 5250 (ii).
Canadian Yukon Ry. B. 6 (Mr. *Blair*) on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to M. for 2°, 1628 (i).
Criminal Code (1892) Seduction and Abduction (B. 3) 1°*, 185; 2° *m.*, 2907 (i); on M. for 2°, 4221 (ii).
Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 3949, 4277 (ii).
Honey Locust Plant and San José Scale Act, on M. (Mr. *Maclaren*) for Com. of Sup., 6967.
Lake Champlain and River St. Lawrence Ship Canal incorp. B. 99 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) in Com., 6331, 6934 (ii).
Land Grants to Ry. Corporations in Man. and N.W.T. (Ques.) 482 (i).
Lord's Day, Better Observance (B. 2) 1°, 184; 2° *m.*, 1950, 1975; in Com., 1977, 1984, 1989, 2042, on Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) that Com. rise, 2045, 2411 (i).
——— (M. to restore to order paper) 2426 (i).

Charlton, Mr. J.—*Continued.*
Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Co., construction, &c., on M. (Mr. *Poupore*) to Com. of Sup., 6498 (ii).
San José Scale, Prohibition of Nursery Stock B. 82 (Mr. *Fisher*) on M. for 1°, 1909, 1926 (i).
——— (M. to adjn.) 2241 (i).
Spanish Ambassador, late, presence in Can. (remarks) 5788 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Paris Exhibition) 5047; (Year-book) 5028 (ii).
Public Works: Buildings (N.S.) 5075; Harbours and Rivers (Ont.) 5923 (ii).

Chauvin, Mr. L. A., *Terrebonne.*
Bagot Electoral District, vacancy, issue of writ on M. (Mr. *Bergeron*) to adjn., 5236 (ii).
Drainage across Ry. Lands B. 5 (Mr. *Casey*) on M. to ref. to Sel. Com., 2057 (i).
Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on Amt. (Mr. *Powell*) to M. for 2°, 2785 (i).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners, Loan B. 163 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for Com., 7171 (ii).
St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, revolt of convicts (Ques.) 1069 (i).
Terrebonne, Excise division, Prevost's rep. into conduct of Collector (M. for copy*) 1837 (i).
Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 60 (Mr. *Fortin*) on M. for 1°, 1384 (i).

Choquette, Mr. P. A., *Montmagny.*
Budget and Hansard translation (remarks) 1576 (i).
Can. Atlantic Transit Co.'s incorp. B. 92 (Mr. *Belcourt*) 1°*, 2429 (i).
Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries B. 14 (Mr. *Richardson*) on M. for Com., 2882 (i).
Debates, Official Rep., 2nd Rep. (presented) 3822 (i).
——— conc. (M.) 4246 (ii).
Govt. Tolls on Wharfs (remarks) 4351 (ii).
Great North-west Central Ry. Co.'s B. 141 (Mr. *Morrison*) Sen. Amts., 7461 (ii).
Train Service, issue of Timetables (remarks) 6242 (ii).
Kettle River Valley Ry. Co's B. 26 (Mr. *Bostock*) in Com., 2962 (i).
Lord's Day, Better Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com. (Amt.) 2046 (i).
SUPPLY:
Canals: Murray (repairs) 6562.

Christie, Mr. T., *Argenteuil.*
Lord's Day, Better Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 1980 (i).

Clancy, Mr. J., *Bothwell.*
Agricultural Implements, free entry on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 3204 (i).
Alien Labour Law, Appnmt. of Agent at Wallaceburg (remarks) 6612 (ii).
——— Enforcement &c. (remarks) 7126 (ii).

Clancy, Mr. J.—*Continued.*

Alien Workmen, importation to Toronto on M. (Mr. *Clarke*) to adjn., 4035 (ii).

Budget, The, 3574 (i).

Butter Industry in Can., Encouragement of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Reid*) 2506 (i).

Canadian Yukon Ry. B. 6 (Mr. *Blair*) on Amt. (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) to M. for 2°, 1562 (i).

——— Telegram to High Commissioner, *re* Hamilton Smith's Proposals, 1026 (i).

Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries B. 14 (Mr. *Richardson*) on M. for Com., 3700; in Com., 3712 (ii).

Civil Service, Superannuation Abolition B. 76 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 6379 (ii).

Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 2708; in Com., 2971, 2981 (i), 3942, 4115, 4338, 4486, 4503 (ii).

Honey Locust Plant and San José Scale Act, on M. (Mr. *Maclaren*) to Com. of Sup., 6972 (ii).

Judges of the Provincial Courts (Pension) B. in Com. on Res., 7135 (ii).

Lord's Day, Better Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 1973 (i).

Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors—Plebiscite B. 121 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4749 (ii).

Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 39 (Sir *Louis Davies*) in Com., 2095, 2104 (i).

SUPPLY:

Adulteration of Food (expenses, &c.) 6000 (ii).

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (archives) 5024; (cold storage) 5997; (creameries, N.W.T.) 5994; (experimental farm) 5978; (Year-book) 5027 (ii).

Civil Government: Agriculture (salaries) 4854; Aud. Gen.'s Office (contingencies) 4587; Finance (contingencies, charwomen) 4599; Gov. Gen. Sec.'s Office, 3835: Indian Affairs (contingencies) 4586; Inland Revenue (contingencies) 4590; Justice (contingencies) 4583: Marine and Fisheries (contingencies) 4596; Public Works (contingencies) 4592; Sundry Depts. (private sec.'s salaries) 7486 (ii).

Culling Timber (contingencies) 6000 (ii).

Fisheries (protection service) 5297 (ii).

Indian Affairs: N.B. (medical attendance) 7299; N.S. (erection of fence) 7298; Que. (Oka Indians) 7291 (ii).

Legislation: House of Commons (debates) 7028; (sessional clerks) 7013 (ii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (salaries) 4990 (ii).

Militia (Yukon Force) 7071, 7354 (ii).

Penitentiaries (expenses of commission) 7340 (ii).

Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, Man., 5929; Ont., 5922, 7642; (Toronto Harbour) 5891, 5906; Public Buildings: Ont. (Arnprior P.O.) 5449; (Major's Hill Park) 5461; (Summer House, Ottawa) 7221; Harbours and Rivers (general vote) 6071: N.S. (New Harbour) 7614 (ii).

Railways (general expenses for investigations) 7212; I C.R. (claims for damages) 7183; Indiantown Branch (land damages) 7082 (ii).

Toronto Harbour Improvements, amounts paid W. E. Phin (Ques.) 1337 (i).

Clancy, Mr. J.—*Continued.*

Ways and Means—The Tariff:

In Com. (preferential clause) 3759, 3791: (tobacco) 3812 (i)

Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 71 (Sir *Henri Joly*) in Com., 2135, 3103 (i); 6582 (ii).

Clarke, Mr. E. F., *Toronto.*

Address, on The, 377 (i).

Alien Labour Law, appnmt. of Officers in Ont. (Ques.) 5317 (ii).

——— appnmt. of Agent at Toronto (remarks) 4254, 4349 (ii).

——— enforcement at Toronto (remarks) 5011, 5445, 5799 (ii).

Alien Workmen, Importation to Toronto, M. to adjn., 4029 (ii).

Bell Telephone Co.'s Rates (remarks) 7126 (ii).

Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Co.'s (B. 51) 1°*, 1068 (i).

Civil Service Superannuation Abolition B. 76 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 6339; in Com., 6371, 6797 (ii).

Crow's Nest Pass Ry., Investigation, on conc., 7848 (ii).

Dom. Loan (1897) Amount applied for by banks (Ques.) 4177 (ii).

Dredging in Toronto Harbour, expenditure (Ques.) 482 (i).

Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4500, 5262; on M. for 3°, 5698 (ii).

Govt. Contracts, prohibition of sweating (Ques.) 599 (i).

Great North-west Central Ry. Co.'s B. 141 (Mr. *Morrison*) in Com., 7741 (ii).

Illinois National Guards, permission to enter Can. (Ques.) 599 (i).

Judges of the Provincial Courts (Pension) B. in Com. on Res., 7135 (ii).

Lord's Day, Better Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 2048, on Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) that Com. rise, 2407 (i).

Man. School Fund B. 168 (Mr. *Fielding*) prop. Res., 7423 (ii).

Manufacturers Guarantee and Accident Insurance Co., change of name (B. 57) 1°*, 1380 (i).

North-west Mounted Police, Supplies, transportation, &c. (Ques.) 5520 (ii).

P.E.I. Legislation, Disallowance of Act (remarks) 7553 (ii).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 110 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 1°, 2919 (i); on M. for 2°, 5540; in Com., 5748, 5768 (ii).

——— Amt. (Special Delivery) B. 167 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 1°, 7409 (ii).

Post Office Savings Banks Deposits, reduction of interest, on amt. (Mr. *Davin*) to M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 3751 (i).

Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors—Plebiscite B. 121 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4733, 4756 (ii).

Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Ry. Co. on M. (Mr. *Davis*) to adjn., 4253 (ii).

Clarke, Mr. E. F.—*Continued.*
Queenston Heights Bridge Co.'s (B. 58) 1°*, 1380.
Royal Canadian Regiment (remarks) 5232 (ii).
Ry. Employes Safety B. 4 (Mr. *Casey*) in Com., 4674 (ii).
Sheridan, John, Inspector Live Stock, Appnmt. by Govt. (Ques.) 6010 (ii).
Sons of England Benefit Society Co.'s incorp. B. 122 (Mr. *Bertram*) on M. for Com., 6059 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Paris Exhibition) 5046.
Civil Government: Customs (conc.) 7818; Gov. Gen. Sec's Office, 3839; Post Office, 4874, 4877; (contingencies) 4915; sundry Depts. (private sec's salaries) 7486 (ii).
Immigration (agents' salaries) 7746 (ii).
Militia (gratuities) 7521; (medals) 7516; (permanent force) 7156; (Yukon Force) 7059 (ii).
Miscellaneous: Alien Labour Law (Man. and N.W.T.) 7275; (Crow's Nest Pass commission) 7256, 7273; (pilotage investigations) 7104 (ii); Yukon Provisional District (administration of Govt.) 7330 (ii).
Ocean and River Service (cattle inspection) 7732; (maintenance, &c.) 4948; (winter mail service) 4970 (ii).
Penitentiaries: Kingston, 7488, 7789 (ii).
Post Office (temporary clerks) 7040 (ii).
Public Works: Buildings, N.S., 7214; Ont., 7217; (Major's Hill Park) 5462; (repairs, &c.) 5448; Que., 7587 (ii); Harbours and Rivers, N.S., 7589; (New Harbour) 7594; Ont., 7641; (dredging) 7227, 7231; Que., 5655, 7639 (ii).
Railways: Crow's Nest Pass (salaries) 7112, 7182; (general expenses for investigation) 7210; I.C.R. Indiantown Branch (land damages) 7078, 7081
Scientific Institutions: (meteorological service) 7285; (Toronto Observatory) 5002, 7733 (ii).
Toronto Harbour Dredging, expenditure (Ques.) 482 (i).
——— contract (Ques.) 4771 (ii).
——— liability incurred (Ques.) 971 (i).
Toronto and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 77) 1°*, 1839 (i); Sen. Amts. (M.) to conc., 6268.
Ways and Means—The Tariff:
In Com. (preferential clause) 3773 (i).
Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 71 (Sir *Henri Joly*) in Com., 2127 (i).

Cochrane, Mr. E., *East Northumberland.*
Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4023 (ii).
Govt. Harbours, Piers and Breakwaters Act Amt. B. 38 (Sir *Louis Davies*) in Com., 1864.
SUPPLY:
Canals: Murray (repairs) 6554; Trent (construction) 6548, 6553 (ii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Montreal) St. John and Manchester) 7679 (ii).
Militia (Yukon Force) 7068 (ii).
Ocean and River Service (P.E.I. and Mainland) 7731 (ii).
Penitentiaries: Kingston, 7489 (ii).
Public Works: Buildings (Major's Hill Park) 5586; (Woodstock P.O.) 5467 (ii); Harbours and Rivers, N.S. (New Harbour) 7615 (ii).

Cochrane, Mr. E.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
Railways: I.C.R. (iron bridges) 6403 (ii).
Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 71 (Sir *Henri Joly*) Sen. Amts., 7784 (ii).

Copp, Mr. A. J. S., *Digby.*
Deputy Minister of Justice, Appnmt. (Ques.) 3166 (i).
Lobster Fishing in Bay of Fundy (Ques.) 479 (i).
Printing Bureau Employees, Names, Salaries, &c. (M. for Ret.*) 3669 (i).
——— H. T. Smith's position and duties (Ques.) 2350 (i).
——— superintendent's status (Ques.) 2431 (i).
Queen's Printer, qualification (Ques.) 3165 (i).
SUPPLY:
Public Works: Buildings (N.B.) 5092 (ii).

Corby, Mr. H., *West Hastings.*
Belleville P. O., Dismissals, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6208 (ii).
——— (Remarks) 6112 (ii).
G. T. Ry. Regulations, on M. (Mr. *Wallace*) to adjn., 6021 (ii).
Trent Valley Canal, Promised Aid by Govt. (Ques.) 2817 (i).

Costigan, Hon. J., *Victoria, N.B.*
Civil Service, Superannuation Abolition B. 76 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 6375 (ii).
Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4265 (ii).
General Inspection Act Amt. B. 128 (Sir *Henri Joly*) in Com., 5968 (ii).
Gladstone, Rt. Hon. W. E., Decease of, Res. of condolence, on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 6120 (ii).
Judges of the Provincial Courts B., in Com. on Res., 7141 (ii).
Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. B. 136 (Sir *Louis Davies*) in Com., 5325 (ii).
Nickel Steel Co.'s incorp. B. 96 (Mr. *Wood, Hamilton*) on M. (Mr. *LaRivière*) to ref. to Com., 3647 (ii).
Privilege (Ques. of) par. in *La Patrie re* Man. Schools (Mr. *Bergeron*) 7714 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Civil Government: Inland Revenue Dept. (contingencies) 6978 (ii).
Legislation: House of Commons (sessional clerks) 6993 (ii).
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers N.B., 7634; N. S. (New Harbour) 7617 (ii).
Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 71 (Sir *Henri Joly*) in Com., 2118 (i).

Cowan, Mr. M. K., *South Essex.*
Alien Workmen, Importation to Toronto, on M. (Mr. *Clarke*) to adjn., 4034 (ii).

Craig, Mr. T. D., *East Durham.*
Address, on The, 328 (i).
Agricultural Implements, Free Entry, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 3183 (i).
Budget, The, 3428 (i).
Butter Industry of Can., Encouragement of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Reid*) 2365 (i).
Canadian Yukon Ry. B. 6 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 2°, 1086 (i).
Criminal Code, Seduction and Abduction Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 2908 (i).
Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 2309 (i).
Insolvency B. 84 (Mr. *Fortin*) on M. for 1°, 2033.
Lord's Day, Better Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 1958; in Com., 1998; on Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) that Com. rise, 2421 (i).
Privilege (Ques. of) par. in Montreal *Witness*, 3503.
Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors-Plebiscite B. 121 (Mr. *Fisher*) on M. for 1°, 3931; in Com., 4753; on M. for 3°, 6039 (ii).
——— Letter of Min. of Jus. (remarks) 5321 (ii).
——— (M. to adjn.) 3314 (i).
——— (Ques.) 2441 (i).
Ry. Employees Safety B. 4 (Mr. *Casey*) in Com., 5161 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Civil Government: Gov. Gen. Sec.'s Office, 3837.
Ways and Means—The Tariff.
In Com. (preferential clause) 3762 (i).
Yukon Territory, Liquor Permits (Ques.) 1781, 2434 (i).

Davies, Hon. Sir Louis (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) *Queen's, P.E.I.*
Address, on The, 385 (i).
Alien Labour Law, Enforcement (Ans.) 3085 (i).
——— B.C. Govt. action (Ans.) 3663 (i).
Appnmts. by late Govt., on Amt. (Mr. *Montague*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 4825 (ii).
——— (remarks) 4926 (ii).
Arichat Harbour, Buoys, &c. (Ans.) 5320 (ii).
Aspy Bay, Harbour of Refuge, Construction (Ans.) 2820 (i).
Baxter, Wm., Services as Lighthouse-keeper (Ans.) 3657 (i).
Bear River Bridge, Report as to Piers (Ans.) 975.
——— Shipping-master, Dismissal (Ans.) 1072 (i).
Behring Sea, British Vessels seized by Russia (Ans.) 1072 (i).
Belœil, Caretaker of Booms, Resignation (Ans.) 2847 (i).
——— Land Damages (Ans.) 2847 (i).
Berthier Channel, Deepening (Ans.) 3085 (i).
Binder Twine, Kingston Penitentiary, Sale of (Ans.) 3659 (i).
Bounty to Fishermen, Application to Gabarous (Ans.) 674 (i).
Bruneau, Mr., M.P., for Richelieu, Resignation, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Marcotte*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 2710 (i).

Davies, Hon. Sir Louis—*Continued.*
Business of the Hse. (remarks) 3821 (i).
Can. Yukon Ry., Telegram to High Commissioner, on Explanation (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 985 (i).
Cape Breton, Marine Dept., Changes (Ans.) 673.
Cape Negro Island Light, Appnmt. of Keeper (Ans.) 1929 (i).
Certificates to Masters and Mates Act Amt. (B. 37) 1°, 936; in Com., 1860 (i).
Chicoutimi Co. Telegraph Line (Ans.) 2815 (i).
Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries B. 14 (Mr. *Richardson*) on M. for Com., 2879 (i).
Coasting Trade of Can. Act Amt. B. 106 (Sir *C. H. Tupper*) on M. for 1°, 2809 (i).
Criminal Code, Amt. Seduction and Abduction B. 12 (Mr. *Britton*) on Amt. (Mr. *Cameron*) to M. for Com., 2897 (i).
——— B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 2905.
Crow's Nest Pass Ry., Death of Employees, on M. (Mr. *Bell*) for Ret., 3666 (i).
Dart, Lyman, Commutation of Sentence, in Com. of Sup., 6643, 6660, 6671 (ii).
Dawson City Electric Lighting and Tramway Co's incorp. B. 118 (Mr. *Morrison*) in Com. 6939 (ii).
Dawson City Electric Co.'s B. 123 (Mr. *Morrison*) in Com., 7162 (ii).
Dom. Lands, Tenby, Man., sub-agent, Appnmt. (Ans.) 3087 (i).
Drummond County Ry. Com. of Investigation, on prop. Res. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 510 (i).
Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 2972, 2993 (i), 4082, 4109, 4388, 4409, 4477, 4508; Sen. Amts., 7528, 7566, 7792 (ii).
Fishermen's Safety (B. 111), in Com., 4781 (ii).
Fisheries Act Amt. (B. 127), 1°, 4522; in Com., 4946 (ii).
Fisheries Act, Amt. (Saw-dust in Rivers), (B. 166) 1°, 7115; 2°, *n.*, 7470 (ii).
Fishery Overseer Boddy, Appnmt. (Ans.) 3658 (ii).
Fishing Licenses, amount paid by Lake Erie Fishermen, &c. (Ans.) 601 (i).
French Translation and Printing (remarks) 3091 (i).
Govt. Harbours, Piers and Breakwaters Act Amt. (B. 38), 1°, 936; in Com., 1863 (i).
——— (B. 135), 1°, 4922; in Com., 5325 (ii).
Hicks, Wm., Fishery Overseer, Appnmt. (Ans.) 3668 (i).
Hudson Bay Expedition, James Fisher's Rep. (Ans.) 2350 (i).
——— Report of Commissioner, (Ans.) 604, 975 (i).
——— Report as to navigability (Ans.) 975 (i).
Joint Commission, U. S. and Can., proposed conference (remarks) 6609 (ii).
Judges of the Provincial Courts B. 150 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 6752; in Com., on Res., 7132 (ii).
King's Head Light, (Ans.) 1929, 1932 (i).
Klondike and Peace River Transportation B. 91 (Mr. *Davis*) in Com., 4169 (i).

Davies, Hon. Sir Louis—*Continued.*

La Canadienne, SS. Charter by Govt. (Ans.) 5318 (ii).

L'Ardoise, St. Peters Canal, &c., Outports, medical aid to sick seamen (Ans.) 1339 (i).

Lavoie, Dr., Appnmt. by Govt. (Ans.) 7112 (ii).

Lighthouses between Vancouver and Stikine River (Ans.) 976 (i).

——— Supplies, Montreal West, Contract (Ans.) 2846 (i).

Lobster Packing, Size of Catch, &c. (Ans.) 1340 (i).

Logs, &c., Export Duty authorized (Ans.) 3085 (i).

Mackay's Point Wharf, Judique, N. S., tenders for buildings, &c. (Ans.) 2816 (i).

McNabb, Campbell, Claim against Govt. (remarks) 5447 (ii).

Man. Debt Account B. 169 (Mr. *Fielding*) prop. Res. 7397; in Com., 7402 (ii).

Marine and Fisheries, Deptl. Rep. Marine Branch (presented) 5 (i).

Midland, Ont., Harbour-master, Appnmt. (Ans.) 3662 (i).

Naval Militia Corps, Establishment (Ans.) 3085.

Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. (B. 136) 1°, 4923; in Com., 5328 (ii).

Neufrage Pond, P.E.I., Survey (Ans.) 3166 (i).

Nickel Steel Co.'s incorp. B. 96 (Mr. *Wood, Hamilton*) on M. (Mr. *LaRivière*) to ref. to Com. on Rys., 3646 (i).

N.W.M.P. Supplies, Transportation, &c. (Ans.) 5520 (ii).

——— wthdrl. from Moosimin (Ans.) 3084 (i).

Oyster Fisheries, P.E.I., Leases, &c. (Ans.) 1776.

Parliament Grounds, Dismissal of late Supt. Robertson (Ans.) 2819 (i).

Parry Sound, Harbour-master (Ans.) 5135 (ii).

Perry, Mr. S. F., late M.P., Decease of (remarks) 938 (i).

Pictou Postmaster (Ans.) 2819 (i).

Piers and Wharfs in P.E.I. Govt. control (Ans.) 3088 (i).

Pilotage Investigation at St. John, N.B. (Ans.) 825 (i).

Point Jérôme, N.S., Appnmt. of Light-keeper (Ans.) 5321 (ii).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 110 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 5772 (ii).

Pound Net Licenses, North Shore of Lake Superior (Ans.) 3657 (i).

P.E.I., suits by Non-residents (remarks) 7410 (ii).

Private Bills, allowed to stand (remarks) 5540 (ii).

Privilege, Ques. of (Sir *Charles Tupper*) Members of Parliament and Representatives of the press (remarks) 5127 (ii).

Procedure, on third reading of B., Mr. Speaker's ruling, 2656 (i).

Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors—Plebiscite B. 121 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4731 (ii).

Racine Fishery and Riparian Owner, License for erection (Ans.) 4772 (ii).

Davies, Hon. Sir Louis—*Continued.*

Reciprocity in Wrecking, Can. and U.S. (remarks) 6612 (ii).

Returns, on Inquiry for, 5519, 5569 (ii); (remarks) 2820 (i).

Royal Military College, on inquiry for Ret., 5571.

St. Anicette Wharf, cost of (Ans.) 2818 (i).

St. Lawrence Channel, placing of buoys, Contract Ans.) 4180 (i).

——— (remarks) 3318 (i).

Stationary Engineers, Examination, on prop. introd. of B. (remarks) 2800 (i).

Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. (B. 39) in Com., 1869, 1903, 1937, 2084, 2113, 2531 (i); Sen. Amts., 4525 (ii).

Steamboat Inspection, remission of penalties (Ans.) 2344 (i).

Storm Signals, Cape Breton, number, &c. (Ans.) 7118 (ii).

Summerside Breakwater, Tenders for construction (Ans.) 2816 (i).

SUPPLY:

Civil Government: Auditor General's Office (contingencies) 4587; Finance Dept. (charwomen) 4600; Gov. Gen. Sec.'s Office, 3842; Indians, 4553; Inland Revenue (contingencies) 4591; Interior, 4541; Marine and Fisheries, 4558; (contingencies) 4596; (extra clerks) 7481 (ii).

Fisheries (Behring Sea Claims, commissioners) 7286; (litigation expenses) 7285; (protection service) 5269, 7285; (salaries, overseers, &c.) 5004 (ii).

Indians: Man. and N.W.T., 7767 (ii).

Legislation: House of Commons (sessional clerks) 6991, 7012 (ii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (construction) 4999; (maintenance) 4938; (repairs to wharfs) 5000; (salaries) 4985 (ii).

Marine (hospitals) 5003 (ii).

Miscellaneous (Alien Labour Law, enforcement) 7773; (Boundary, Can. and U.S.) 6860; (Crow's Nest Pass Commission) 7266; (Hudson Bay Expedition) 7094; (Pilotage Investigations) 7102; (Prescott and Russell Fire Relief Fund) 7091; (Wharfinger, Sault Ste. Marie, salary) 7098 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (Biological Station) 7733; (cattle inspection) 7732; (life saving stations) 4953; (maintenance) 4947; (obstructions) 4964; (P.E.I. and mainland) 7730; (registry of shipping) 4954; (repairs to "Stanley") 7283; (tidal service, &c.) 4957, 4961, 7732; (winter mail service) 4964, 7284 (ii).

Public Works: Buildings (Major's Hill Park) 5582; Harbours and Rivers, N.S. (New Harbour) 7611; Ont., conc., 7821; P.E.I., 5631, 7537; Que., 5658; Miscellaneous (professional services) 7243.

Railways: (Subsidy to N. S. C. Ry. Co.) 7315 (ii).

Scientific Institutions (hydrographic service) 5000; (meteorological service) 5002, 7235; (Toronto observatory) 5002, 7284 (ii).

Steamboat Inspection: 5003 (ii).

Trade and Commerce (Chinese Immigration Act, &c.) 6693 (ii).

Unprovided Items (per Aud. Gen. Rep.) 7351 (ii).

Yukon Provisional District (Administration of Govt.) 7332 (ii).

Davies, Hon. Sir Louis—*Continued.*
Telegraph Operator Ross, North Margaree, Dismissal (Ans.) 2815 (i).
Thessalon Point Lighthouse, Cost, &c. (Ans.) 1932 (i).
Tolls on Govt. wharfs (remarks) 4352 (ii).
U. S. SS. *Frederick J. Gerring*, Supreme Court Judgment, on M. for Ret., 2823 (i).
——— *Yantie*, passage up St. Lawrence (Ans.) 830 (i).
——— collision with *La Canadienne*, &c. (Ans.) 4451 (ii).
Winter Communication, P.E.I. and mainland (Ans.) 1779 (i).
Yukon District, Liquor Permits (Ans.) 3088 (ii).
Yukon Ry., Action of U. S. Senate, on M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to Adjn. Hse., 1289, 1312 (i).

Davin, Mr. N. F., *West Assiniboia, N.W.T.*
Address, on The, 272 (i).
Agricultural Implements and Free List, prop. Res., 2825 (i).
——— Free Entry, 3170, 3196 (i).
Alien Labour Law, B. C. Govt. action (Ques.) 3662 (i).
——— prosecutions under (Ques.) 474 (i).
Appnmts. in N. W. T. (Ques.) 977 (i).
Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Agreements, &c., on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 5231 (ii).
——— Telegram from London *re* Contract (Ques.) 7356 (ii).
Bagot Electoral District, Vacancy, issue of Writ, on M. (Mr. *Bergeron*) to Adjn., 5249 (ii).
Banff Baths, Caretaker, Dismissal of (Ques.) 451.
——— (M. for Ret.*) 2841 (i).
Business of The House, on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) to take in Mondays, 5012 (ii).
Budget, The, 3594 (i).
Butter Industry in Can., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Reid*) 2357, 2498 (i).
Canada Evidence Act Amt. B. 143 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 6237 (ii).
Canada Yukon Ry. B. 6 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 2°, 1214; in Com. (Land Subsidy) 1859 (i).
Cattle Shipments from Canada to United Kingdom, on M. (Mr. *Hughes*) to adjn., 2441 (i).
Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries B. 14 (Mr. *Richardson*) on M. for Com., 3698, 4639 (ii).
——— Superannuation Abolition B. 76 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 6352; in Com., 6371 (ii).
Creameries in N.W.T., number, patrons, &c. (M. for Ret.), 487, 503 (i).
Criminal Code Act Amt. (B. 65) 1°, 1573 (i).
Crow's Nest Pass Ry., Investigation, on conc., 7840 (ii).
——— Treatment of Labourers, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6614 (ii).
Dairying in N.W.T., subsidy, prop. Res. 504 (i).
Daunais, C. M., Emplymnt. by Govt. (Ques.) 1928 (i).

Davin, Mr. N. F.—*Continued.*
Deaf Mutes in N.W.T., Provision by N. W. Govt. (Ques.) 1930 (i).
Deptl. Buildings, Fire at West Block (Ques.) 2347 (i).
Dom. Land Act Amt. B. 130 (Mr. *Sifton*) on M. for 1°, 4681; in Com., 5937 (ii).
Dredging Licenses, Regulations respecting (remarks) 746 (i).
Drolet, Chevalier, Mining leases granted (M. for copies) 2839 (i).
——— (Ques.) 671 (i), 4924 (ii).
Edmonton Bridge, Contract for Construction (Ques.) 1341 (i).
——— Freight rates, &c. (Ques.) 6010 (ii).
——— (M. for Ret.*) 1838 (i).
——— penalties imposed on contractors (Ques.) 5316 (ii).
——— Return *re* (Ques.) 2528 (i).
——— (remarks) 3827 (i).
Edwards, Dr. O. C., Indian Medical Officer, Appnmt. by Govt., 4607 (ii).
Franchise Act Repeal B. 6 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on Amt. (Mr. *Powell*) to M. for 2°, 2768; in Com., 2996 (i), 4016, 4282, 4354, 4483, 4492; on Amt. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to M. for 3°, 5688, 5707; Sen. Amts., 7564 (ii).
Galician Settlers in N.W.T., Rep. *re* Destitution (remarks) 101 (i), 6032 (ii).
General Inspection Act. Amt. B. 128 (Sir *Henry Joly*) in Com., 5970 (ii).
Gisborne, Mr., Govt. inspector of Tel. Lines, N.W.T., Dismissal (Ques.) 5317 (ii).
Grain Liens, Man., and N. W. T. legislation *re* (Ques.) 1930 (i).
Grain Standards, Inspection System (Ques.) 1780 (i).
G. T. R. Regulations, on M. (Mr. *Wallace*) to Adjn., 6022 (ii).
Great North-west Central Ry. Co.'s B. 141 (Mr. *Morrison*) in Com., 7741 (ii).
Immigration Literature, Correction (remarks) 6581 (ii).
Indian Act Amt. B. 144 (Mr. *Sifton*) on M. for 2°, 5960; in Com., 5964 (ii).
Indian Dept., Law clerk, Appnmt. (remarks) 7654, 7658 (ii).
——— Lands, Qu'Appelle Valley, rights of settlers (M. to adjn. Hse.) 516 (i).
——— Reserves, Assiniboia, distribution of seed (M. for Ret.*) 4678 (ii).
——— Reserves, crops grown on (M. for Ret.*) 1837 (i).
——— Reserves, N.W.T. (Ques.) 452 (i).
——— Reserves, Qu'Appelle District (Ques.) 451.
——— Supplies, Purchase of, Man. and N.W.T. (Ques.) 452 (ii).
Interior Dept., Dismissal of Employees in N.W.T. (Ques.) 829 (i).
Japanese Immigration, Imposition of poll tax (remarks) 2441 (i).

Davin, Mr. N. F.—*Continued.*
Jones, Charles A., Appnmt. by Govt. (Ques.) 4607 (ii).
Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 150 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., on Res., 6130; on M. for 2°, 6732 (ii).
Kettle River Valley Ry. Co.'s B. 26 (Mr. *Bostock*) in Com., 2957, 3040 (i).
Klondike, Edmonton and Prince Albert routes (Ques.) 453 (i).
Lands Titles Act Amt. B. 132 (Mr. *Sifton*) on M. for 2°, 5951 (ii).
——— Reserved for settlement in Man. and N.W.T. (M. for Ret.*) 1837 (i).
——— (Ques.) 971 (i).
——— Surveys in N.W.T. (Ques.) 450 (i).
Lieut. Gov. of N.W.T., rumoured Appnmt. of Member for North Wellington (Ques.) 101 (i).
McCarthy, Dalton, M.P., Candidature for Brandon (Ques.) 4610 (ii).
Militia Act Amt. B. 140 (Mr. *Borden, Kings*) in Com., 5965 (ii).
Noel, L. P. O., Dismissal, N.W.T., 6319 (ii).
N. W. T. Irrigation Act Amt. B. 146 (Mr. *Sifton*) on M. for 1°, 5663; in Com., 6123, Sen. Amts., 7790 (ii).
N. W. M. P. Act (1889) Amt. (B. 15) 1°*, 307; 2° *m.*, 4239 (ii).
——— (Pension) Act Amt. B. 13 (Mr. *Davis*) 1°, 271 (i).
——— (Land Grants) Further Provision B. 123 (Mr. *Sifton*) on M. for 2°, 5960 (ii).
——— contract for transporting supplies to the Yukon (remarks) 5116, 5597 (ii).
——— medals (Ques.) 451 (i).
——— number in Territories (Ques.) 452 (i).
——— Dismissal of Dr. Bain (Ques.) 2349 (i).
——— Pensions, on M. for Com. of Sup., 5019 (ii).
——— Tenders for Drugs (M. for copy*) 4246 (ii).
——— Tenders for Drugs (Ques.) 2349 (i).
——— wthdrl. from Alberta District (remarks) 404 (i).
N.W. Territory Act Amt. B. 131 (Mr. *Sifton*) on M. for 1°, 4600, 4682; in Com., 5945 (ii).
——— Dismissals, &c. (inquiry for Ret.) 6317 (ii).
——— Govt. Officials, dismissed since 1896, names, &c. (M. for Ret.*) 4246 (ii).
——— and Immigration hand-book (M. to adjn.) 5932 (ii).
——— Seed Grain, amount due Settlers (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 5569 (ii).
——— (Ques.) 5135 (ii)
——— Status of Coroners (remarks) 7855 (ii).
Order (Ques. of) Ways and Means, 3525 (i).
Ontario and Rainy River Co.'s B. 32 (Mr. *Tisdale*) on M. for Com., 2617; on M. (Mr. *Maclean*) to ref. back to Com., 2693 (i).
Parliament Buildings, Contract for asphalting walks (Ques.) 1783 (i).
Perjury, Convictions at Battleford (Ques.) 1780(i).

Davin, Mr. N. F.—*Continued.*
Personal explanation (Mr. *Oliver*) remarks, 2930.
——— par. in Manitoba *Free Press re* agricultural implements, 4349 (ii).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 110 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for Com., 5739; in Com., 5944 (ii).
P. O. Savings Banks, rate of interest, &c. (Ques.) 5318 (i).
——— reduction of interest, on Amt. to Com. on Ways and Means, 3714 (ii).
——— wthdrls. (Ques.) 6465 (ii).
Prince Albert Mail Service delay, on M. (Mr. *Davis*) to adjn., 2518 (i).
Privilege (Ques. of) Members of Parlt. and Press representatives, on M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to adjn., 5123 (ii).
Procedure, on third reading of B., Mr. Speaker's ruling, 2660 (i).
Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors-Plebiscite B. 121 (Mr. *Fisher*) on M. for 1°, 3930; on M. for 2°, 4721; in Com., 4728 (ii).
Ry. Commissioners, Board of legislation, prop. Res. (Mr. *Jameson*) 1822 (i).
Ry. Employees Safety B. 4 (Mr. *Casey*) in Com., 3676, 4209; on M. to ref. back to Com., 5146 (ii).
Ry. Policy of the Govt., on M. to adjn. (remarks) 2701 (i).
——— Rate War and Man. Settlers, on M. (Mr. *Maclean*) to adjn., 1477 (i).
——— Transportation, on M. (Mr. *Maclean*) to adjn., 1758 (i).
Rankin, Immigration Agent in Kansas (Ques.) 1779 (i).
Reciprocity with the U.S. (Ques.) 452 (i).
Regina District, Registry Office (Ques.) 5319 (ii).
——— Industrial School, Emplymt. of Dr. Willoughby (Ques.) 828 (i).
——— Registry and Land Office, Regina (Ques.) 1931 (i).
Returns (inquiry) 4773, 5519, 6115 (ii).
Rouleau Post Office, Abolition of (remarks) 5018.
Saskatchewan District Timber Berths held by Moore & McDowall Co. (Ques.) 481 (i).
Skelton *vs.* The Queen, Affidavits, &c. (remarks) 6112, 6240, 6317 (ii).
——— application for new trial (Ques.) 5319 (ii).
Skelton *vs.* Queen, conviction at Battleford (Ques.) 1780 (i).
——— Personal explanation, 6890 (ii).
——— Postmaster at Battleford, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6803 (ii).
——— Proceedings against (remarks) 5117, 5258.
——— (remarks) 5931 (ii).
Spencer, Wm., late of N.W.M.P., Discharge (M. for Ret.*) 2840 (i).
——— Pension remarks) 6325 (ii).
Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 39 (Sir *Louis Davies*) in Com., 2108 (i).
Stimulants in the Chamber during Debate, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Talbot*) 3639 (ii).

Davin, Mr. N. F.—*Continued.*

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (archives) 5022; (creameries, N.W.T.), 5936; (criminal statistics) 5025; (distribution of literature) 5991; (Paris exhibition) 5041; (patent record) 5023; (year-book) 5039 (ii).

Canals: Soulanges (construction) 6524 (ii).

Civil Government: Agriculture (contingencies) 5021; (salaries) 4851; Auditor Gen. Office, 4549; (contingencies) 4586; Gov. Gen. Sec's Office, 3837, 3847, 3887; Indians (contingencies) 4585; Justice (contingencies) 4583; Marine (contingencies) 4596; Militia (accountant) 3916; Privy Council (contingencies) 4582; Public Works (conc.) 7839; (contingencies) 4594; Railways and Canals (contingencies) 4597; Trade and Commerce (contingencies) 4598 (ii).

Dominion Lands (commissioner's salary) 6858; (surveys, &c.) 7307, 7822 (ii).

Government of N.W.T. (insane asylums) 7305; (schools) 6857 (ii).

Immigration (agent's salaries) 6819, 7748 (ii).

Indians (B.C.) 7763; Man. and N.W.T., 6854, 7301, 7767; (surveys) 6848 (ii).

Inspection of Staples (grain standards) 6695 (ii).

Legislation: Library of Parlt. (American History) 5999 (ii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Montreal, St. John and Manchester) 7667 (ii).

Miscellaneous (Alien Labour Law enforcement) 7772; (Canadian Mining Institute) 7770 (ii).

Penitentiaries (expenses of commissions) 7341 (ii).

Post Office: Outside Service (letter carriers) 7775; (miscellaneous expenses) 6704 (ii).

Public Works: Buildings (N. W. T.) 5489; Ont. (Major's Hill Park) 5460, 5573, 5598; (Ottawa grounds) 5473 (ii); Harbours and Rivers (Man.) 5928; Roads and Bridges (Edmonton bridge) 6245, 6268, 6311; (conc.) 7822 (ii); Telegraph lines (N. W. T.) 6316 (ii).

Yukon Provisional District (maintenance of force) 7355; (service of N.W.M.P.) 6858 (ii).

Tennant, John F., Dismissal by Govt. on M. (Mr. *Quinn*) for Ret., 5183 (ii).

Territorial Exhibition, N.W.T., Miss Cumming's claims (Ques.) 1780 (i).

——— outstanding indebtedness (Ques.) 486 (i).

——— payment for prizes (Ques.) 976 (i).

——— P. Lamont's account (Ques.) 2431 (i).

Ways and Means—The Tariff: M. to adjn. deb., 3593 (ii).

In Com. (preferential clause) 3756, 3786 (ii).

Winnipeg Great Northern Ry. Co.'s Transport Contract B. 148 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 6233 (ii).

Yukon Provisional District Administration B. 145 (Mr. *Sifton*) on M. for 2°, 6927 (ii).

——— Customs Officials, par. in Ottawa *Citizen* (remarks) 4451 (ii).

——— Liquor Permits M. on Order Paper (remarks) 3092 (ii); (Ques.) 2433, 3088; (remarks) 2269, 3092 (i).

——— Municipal Regulations (remarks) 1747 (i).

——— Provisions, purchase of by Govt. for N.W.M.P.. (Ques.) 1931; contract for carrying (remarks) 4602 (ii).

Davin, Mr. N. F.—*Continued.*

Yukon Timber Limits granted H. Domville (Ques.) 474 (i).

Yukon Ry. Co.'s Land Subsidy, Sir Richard Cartwright's remarks (Ques.) 2037 (i).

——— Action of U. S. Senate on M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to adjn. 1295 (i).

Yukon Route through the N.W.T., on M. (Mr. *Davis*) for plans, &c., 5139 (ii).

Davis, Mr. T. O., *Saskatchewan.*

Battleford and Indian Agency, Death of cattle (Ques.) 1574, 2844 (i).

Board of Ry. Commissioners, legislation on prop. Res. (Mr. *Jameson*) 1794 (i).

Canadian Yukon Ry. B. 6 (Mr. *Blair*) on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to M. for 2°, 1728 (i).

Donaldson, S. J., Immigration Agent, N.W.T., amounts paid (Ques.) 4176 (ii).

Duck Lake Indian Industrial School, maintenance, &c. (Ques.) 2356 (i).

Grain Transit, Man. and N.W.T. Regulation B. 19 (Mr. *Douglas*) on M. to refer to Ry. Com., 2082 (i).

Great North-west Central Ry. Co's B. 141 (Mr. *Morrison*) in Com., 7736; Sen. Amts., 7459.

Hudson Bay and Pacific Ry. Co's (B. 22) 1°*, 743 (i).

Hudson Straits, Navigability, Commander Wakeham's Rep. (Ques.) 1934 (i).

Indian Title in Athabasca, Mackenzie and Yukon (Ques.) 824 (i).

Industrial School, Battleford (Ques.) 1574 (i).

Judiciary in the N. W. T., additional judge (Ques.) 1775 (i).

Klondike and Peace River Gold Mining Land and Transportion Co's incorp. (B. 91) 1°*, 2429.

Land Titles Act (1894) Amt. (B. 28) 1°*, 744 (i).

Man. and North-west Ry. Co., on M. for Com. of Sup., 7470 (ii).

Mounted Police and Edmonton Route to Klondike (Ques.) 1574 (i).

N. W. Mounted Police Pensions Act Amt. B. 15 (Mr. *Davin*) on M. for 2°, 4242 (ii).

N.W.T., Thomas McKay, amount of timber dues (Ques.) 4176 (ii).

Ontario and Rainy River Ry. Co's B. 32 (Mr. *Tisdale*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 2394; in Com., 2621.

——— Remarks, 2123 (i).

Prince Albert Mail Service, delay in transmission (M. to adjn.), 2517 (i).

Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Ry. (M. to adjn.), 4248 (ii).

Rebellion Claims, N.W.T., Appnmt. of Commissioner, &c. (Ques.) 5321 (ii).

——— Losses (1885) documents in possession of Govt. (M. for copy*) 4246 (ii).

Returns (inquiry) 4774 (ii).

Saskatchewan District, Appnmt. of Judge (remarks) 7042 (ii).

Davis, Mr. T. O.—*Continued.*
Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 39 (Sir *Louis Davies*) in Com., 2098 (i).
SUPPLY:
Immigration (agents' salaries) 6842 (ii).
Indian Affairs (surveys) 6849: (Man. and N.W.T. 6855 (ii).
Public Works: Buildings (summer house, Ottawa) 7220 (ii).
Yukon Route through N.W.T. (M. for Reps.), &c., 5136 (ii).

Dechene, Mr. A. M., *L'Islet.*
I. C. R., Construction of gates, tenders, &c. (Ques.) 2819 (i).
——— Rivière du Loup, roadmaster, cost of inquiry (Ques.) 2820 (i).

Dobell, Hon. R. R., *West Quebec.*
Atlantic S.S. Fast Service, agreements, &c., on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 5229 (ii).
Budget, The (remarks) 3297 (i).
Canadian Yukon Ry. Co's B. 6 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 2°, 954 (i).
Debts due Dom. on loans to Public Works, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6239 (ii).
Montreal Harbour Commissioner's Loan B. 163 on prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 6919 (ii).
Preferential Trade with G. B., on Amt. (Mr. *McNeill*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 5861 (ii).
Quebec Harbour Commissioner's Loan (B. 142) 1°*, 5568; 2° *m.*, 6229; in Com., 6231; 3° *m.*, 6444 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Public Works: Roads and bridges, N. W. T. (Edmonton Bridge) 6314 (ii).
Trade and Commerce; (Chinese Immigration Act) 6691 (ii).

Domville, Mr. James, *King's, N.B.*
British Joint Stock Co. in the Yukon (Ques.) 1471 (i).
Hawaiian Vessels navigating in Can. waters (Ques.) 603 (i).
Personal Explanation, Alleged whisky transportation into Yukon, 2039 (i).
St. John Bridge B. 78 (Mr. *Ellis*) on M. for 2°, 1950 (i).
Yukon Provisional District Overland Transportation Co.'s incorp. (B. 107) 1°*, 2844 (i).
——— Timber berths, names of tenderers (Ques.) 485 (i).
——— sales, &c. (Ques.) 1784 (i).
——— Mining regulations (Ques.) 2036 (i).

Douglas, Mr. J. M., *East Assiniboia.*
Colonization Co.; Grants of land, Conditions (Ques.) 479 (i).
Deaf and Dumb mutes, N.W.T. (Ques.) 4345 (ii).
Grain Trade at Fort William (Ques.) 475 (i).
——— Transit, Man. and N.W.T., Regulation (B 19) 1°, 450; 2° m., 2059 (i).
Mounted Police, wthdrl. from Moosimin (Ques.) 3084 (ii).

Dugas, Mr. L. E., *Montcalm.*
Kildare Postmaster, Dismissal (Ques.) 1575 (i).
Lavaltrie Mail Service, Contract (Ques.) 473 (i).
Nulty, Thos., Pets. *re* Commutation of death sentence (Ques.) 4770 (ii).
St. Felix de Valois, Postmaster, complaints against (Ques.) 4610 (ii).
St. Jacques L'Achigan Postmaster (Ques.) 1783.
St. Jacques Model Farm, Establishment by Govt. (Ques.) 7121 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff:
In Com. (tobacco) 3813 (ii).

Dupont, Mr. F., *Bagot.*
Address, on The, 392 (i).

Dyment, Mr. A. E., *Algoma.*
Ontario and Rainy River Ry. Co.'s B. 32 (Mr. *Tisdale*) on M. (Mr. *Maclean*) to ref. back to Com., 2690 (i).
SUPPLY:
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, Que. (dredging) 7249; Buildings, Ont. (Ottawa grounds) 5476 (ii).

Earle, Mr. T., *Victoria, B.C.*
Silver Lead Smelting in B.C., Regulations, &c (Ques.) 6012 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Indians (B.C.) 7764 (ii).
Militia (medals) 7517; Yukon force, 7067, (contract for supplies) 7793, 7802 (ii).
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers (B.C.) 7242: (general vote) 6066 (ii).
Quarantine (general vote) 7514 (ii).

Edwards, Mr. W. C., *Russell.*
Bagot, Electoral District, Vacancy, issue of writ on M. (Mr. *Bergeron*) to adjn., 5236 (ii).
Canadian Yukon Ry. B. 6 (Mr. *Blair*) on Amt. (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) to M. for 2°, 1557 (i).
Montreal Harbour Commissioner's, Loan B, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 6887 (ii).

Ellis, Mr. J. V., *St. John City, N.B.*
Certificates to Masters and Mates B. 37 (Sir *Louis Davies*) in Com., 1863 (i).
Civil Service, Superannuation Abolition B. 76 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 6370 (ii).
Fishermen's Safety B. 111 (Sir *Louis Davies*) in Com., 4785 (ii).
Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4077, 4474 (ii).
French Translation and Printing (remarks) 3091 (ii).
Hansard, cost from 1890 to 1897 (M. for Ret.*) 505 (i).
Harbour of St. John Amalgamation (B. 101) 1°*, 2430 (i).
Man. Debt Account B. 169 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7407 (ii).
Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. B. 136 (Sir *Louis Davies*) in Com., 5327 (ii).

Ellis, Mr. J. V.—*Continued.*
Pilotage Investigations at St. John N.B. (Ques.) 825 (i).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 110 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 1°, 2918; in Com., 5755, 5764 (ii).
Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors-Plebiscite B. 121 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4764 (ii).
Ry. Employees Safety B. 4 (Mr. *Casey*) in Com., 3675 (i), 4209, 4216, 4677 (ii).
St. John Bridge and Ry. Extension Co.'s (B. 78) 1°*, 1839, 2° *m.*, 1950 (i).
San José Scale, Prohibition of Nursery Stock B. 82 (Mr. *Fisher*) on M. for 1°, 1919 (i).
——— on M. (Mr. *Charlton*) to adjn. 2262 (i).
Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 39 (Sir *Louis Davies*) in Com., 2097 (i).
SUPPLY:
Civil Government: Marine and Fisheries (extra clerks) 7481 (ii); Public Works (contingencies) 4593 (ii).
Legislation: House of Commons (debates) 7014 (ii) (sessional clerks) 6994; (stationery, &c.) 7036 (ii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Halifax and St. John) 6686 (ii).
Post Office: Outside service (letter carriers) 7775; Mail Clerks (salaries) 7051 (ii).
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers (N. B.) 7633 (ii).
Railways and Canals: I.C.R. (claims for damages) 7377; (rolling stock) 7645 (ii).
Votes and Proceedings, Record of Vote of third reading of Bill (remarks) 2850 (ii).

Erb, Mr. D. H., *South Perth.*
Butter Industry in Can., Encouragement of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Reid*) 2490 (i).
Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 2993 (i).
Honey Locust Plant and San José Scale B., on M. (Mr. *Maclaren*) for Com. of Sup., 6970 (ii).
Judges of the Provincial Courts B. in Com. on Res., 7139; on M. for 3°, 7142 (ii).
Lord's Day, Better Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., on Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) that Com. rise, 2420 (i).
San José Scale, Prohibition of Nursery Stock B. 82 (Mr. *Fisher*) on M. for 1°, 1916 (i).
SUPPLY:
Justice: Administration of (salaries) 7487 (ii).
Woods, J. P., ex-Judge, retiring allowance (Ques.) 825 (i).

Ethier, Mr. J. A. C., *Two Mountains.*
Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 60 (Mr. *Fortin*) on M. for 1°, 1382 (i).

Featherston, Mr. J., *Peel.*
Butter Industry in Can., Encouragement of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Reid*) 2461 (i).

Fielding, Hon. W. S. (Minister of Finance) *Shelburne and Queen's, N.S.*
Agricultural Implements, Free Entry, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 3204 (i).

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Continued.*
Alien Labour Act Amt. (B. 155) 1°*, 6577; in Com., 6965 (ii).
Auditor General's Rep. (presented) 307 (i).
Binder Twine, re-imposition of duty (Ans.) 455.
Bounties on Iron and Steel B. 159 (Mr. *Paterson*) on prop. Res., 6724 (ii).
Bruneau, Mr., M.P. for Richelieu, Resignation, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Marcotte*) to ref. to Com. on Priv. and Elections, 2215 (i).
Budget, The, Date of delivery (remarks) 2849.
——— Financial Statement, 3104 (i).
Cape Breton Co., Dismissals (remarks) 6034 (ii).
Companies Act Amt. (B. 138) 1°*, 5259; 2° m., 5331 (ii).
——— (B. 165) 1°*, 7086; 2° m., 7470; in Com., 7470 (ii).
Dom. Loan (1897) Amount applied for by Banks, (Ans.) 4177 (ii).
Estimates, The (Ans.) 1935 (i).
——— Year ending 1899 (presented) 2698 (i).
——— Suppl. (presented) 5663, 6439, 7378 (ii).
Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on Amt. (Mr. *Powell*) to M. for 2°, 2787; on Amt. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to M. for 3°, 5681; in Com., 3964, 4270; on Sen. Amts., 7554 (ii).
Georgian Bay Timber Districts, Output of logs to Michigan (Ans.) 827 (i).
Identification of Criminals B. 156 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1°*, 6577 (ii).
Insurance Companies, Changes in the law governing, on M. (Mr. *Broder*) 5136 (ii).
Interest paid Ont. and Que. during 1897 (Ans.) 455 (i).
Klondike and Dawson City Co.'s incorp. B. 17 (Mr. *Morrison*) in Com., 5118 (ii).
Loan Companies (B. 164) 1°*, 7086 (ii).
Man. Debt Account (B. 169) prop. Res., 6861; M. for Com., 7386, 7390; in Com., 7402; 1°* of B., 7467; 2° of Res., 7466 (ii).
Man. and North Western Ry. Co.'s on M. for Com., 7474 (ii).
Man. Public Buildings (remarks) 3826 (i).
Man. School Fund (B. 168) prop. Res., 4029, 7411; in Com., 7423, 7453; 1°* of B., 7466; 2° *m.*, 7571, 7575; agreed to (Y. 61, N. 32) 7578 (ii).
Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 2698 (i), 5663, 6439, 7378 (ii).
Military College Employees, Suppl. Ret. (remarks) 6035 (ii).
Mint, Govt., establishment (Ans.) 1341 (i).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners' Loan (B. 163) prop. Res., 6862; 1°*, 7011; M. for Com., 7142, 7153 (ii).
Nova Scotia Southern Ry. Co. Subsidy (remarks) 7818 (ii).
Officer Commanding Militia, Increase of Salary (M. for Com. on Res.) 4522 (ii).
Order, Ques. of (Mr. *Montague*) in Com. of Sup., P. O. Dept., 4892 (ii).

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Continued.*
Petroleum, reduction of duty, legislation *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Moore*) 1949 (i).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 110 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 5769 (ii).
——— Savings Bank, rate of interest, &c. (Ans.) 5318 (ii).
——— reduction of interest, on M. (Mr. *Davin*) to Com. on Ways and Means, 3725 (i).
——— wthdrls. (Ans.) 6465 (ii).
Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors-Plebiscite B. 121 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4762 (ii).
Public Accounts, Annual Rep. (presented) 267 (i).
——— Com. Meetings (remarks) 2528 (i).
Public Officers (B. 170) 1°*, 7523 (ii).
Rubber Goods, Tariff respecting, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6638 (ii).
St. John Bridge and Ry. Extension Co.'s (B. 157) prop. Res., 6111, 6233; in Com. on Res., 6234; 1°* of B., 6582 (ii).
Senate and House of Commons Act Amt. (B. 173) prop. Res., 7655; 1°* of B., 7657 (ii).
Sessional Indemnity to Members, prop. Res., 7382.
Shirt and Collar industry, on M. (Mr. *Monk*) to Com. of Sup., 6587 (ii).
Sons of England Benefit Society incorp. B. 122 (Mr. *Bertram*) to M. for Com., 6048 (ii).
Spades and Shovels combine monopoly, on M. (Mr. *Richardson*) to adjn., 1936 (i).
Steamship Co.'s Cold Storage authorization (B. 149) 1°, 5930 (ii).
Stimulants in Chamber during Debate, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Talbot*) 3642 (i).

SUPPLY:

Charges of Management: 3828; (printing Dom. notes) 3829 (i), 6976 (ii).

Civil Government: Aud. Gen.'s Office, 4546, 7475; (contingencies) 4587; Finance, 4554; (cleaning deptl. buildings) 4600; (contingencies) 4588; Gov. Gen.'s Sec.'s Office, 3830; (contingencies) 6978; High Commissioner's Office, 4560; (contingencies) 4561; Interior, 4528; (contingencies) 4582; Marine and Fisheries (clerical assistance) 6984; Post Office, 4863; (savings bank branch) 4581; (printing and stationery) 4527; Privy Council Office (private secretary) 6978; Queen's Printer (salaries) 7483; Sec. of State, 4526; Sundry Depts. (private secretaries' salaries) 7484 (ii).

Customs: Outside service, 7364; (salaries, &c.) 6001.

Immigration (agents' salaries) 6819, 6839 (ii).

Legislation: House of Commons (sessional indemnities of absent members) 7782; Library of Parlt. (American History) 5999; Senate (unforeseen expenses) 6994 (ii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Baddeck, East Bay and Irish Cove) 7724; (Montreal, St. John and Manchester) 7667; (St. John, &c., and Yarmouth) 6688 (ii).

Miscellaneous (arbitration, Dom. and Provs.) 6861; (Can. Mining Institute) 7770; (Deep Waterways Commission) 7282; (parliamentary companion) 6975; (printing) 7851; (Prescott and Russell Fire relief Fund) 7089; (prohibition expenses) 7094 (ii).

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers N.S., 5617; (New Harbour) 7591, 7599; Ont. (conc.) 7821; Que. (dredging) 7240 (ii).
Railways: I.C.R. (claims for damages by fire) 7374; (iron bridges) 6408; (subsidy to N.S. Central Ry. Co.) 7807 (ii).
Unprovided Items: Per Aud. Gen.'s Rep., 7351 (ii).
Supply (Res. for Com.), 449 (i).
——— (B 174) 1°*, 7854; on M. for 2°, 7871 (ii).
Tanner, J. E., Detention by Spanish Govt. at Porto Rico (Ans.) 6011 (ii).
Ways and Means—(Res. for Com.) 449 (i).
——— The Budget (Financial Stmnt.) 3104 (i).
——— Personal explanation (Sir *Charles Tupper*) *re* Speech at Sheffield, 3452 (i).
———on M. (Mr. *Davin*) to adjn. deb., 3593 (i).
——— The Tariff, Res. in Com., 7582.
In Com. (preferential clause) 3756, 3781; (British preferential tariff) 3804; (sugar) 3805; in Com., 7853 (ii).
West Indian Trade, extension (Ans.) 1339 (i).
Yukon Provisional District, Banking Business in (Ans.) 1071, 1467, 3312 (i).

Fisher, Hon. S. A., *Minister of Agriculture, Brome.*
Agriculture, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 1473 (i).
Appnmts. by late Govt. on Amt. (Mr. *Montague*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 4817 (ii).
Ashcroft (B.C.) Mail contract (Ans.) 3090 (i).
——— Post Office, position of Postmaster (Ans.) 3090 (i).
Butter Industry of Can., Encouragement of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Reid*) 2357, 2450 (i).
Butter and Cheese Speculation B. 83 (Mr. *Parmelee*) on 2°, 2843 (i).
Canadian Yukon Ry. Co.'s B. 6 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 2°, 700 (i).
——— Tel. to High Commissioner *re* Hamilton Smith's Proposals, 992 (i).
Cattle exported from Canadian Ports (Ans.) 475.
——— from Can. to United Kingdom on M. (Mr. *Hughes*) to adjn., 2436 (i).
——— Shipments to Belfast (Ans.) 484 (i).
——— Trade, Opening Belfast Ports (remarks) 2851 (i).
Chapleau Postmaster, Dismissal of Patrick Lynch (Ans.) 3088 (i).
Cheese Factories in the Prov. of Que. (remarks) 1578 (i).
Cold Storage for P.E.I., Provision (Ans.) 828 (i).
——— S.S. Accommodation (B. 149) in Com., 6727 (ii).
Copyright International, Action of British Govt. on M. for Com. of Sup., 6631 (ii).
Creameries in N.W.T., number, patrons, &c., on M. (Mr. *Davin*) for stmnt., 495 (i).
Experimental Farms, distribution of bulletins (remarks) 2454 (i).
——— Rep. (presented) 7378 (ii).

Fisher, Hon. S. A.—*Continued.*
Govt. Creameries (Ans.), 3086 (i).
Honey Locust Plant and San José Scale Act, on M. (Mr. *Maclaren*) to Com. of Sup., 6973 (ii).
Lord's Day, Better Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 1972; in Com., 1977, 1981, 2044 (i).
Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors-Plebiscite (B. 121) 1°, 3925; 2° m., 4684; in Com., 4740, 4768; 3° *m.*, 6035-36 (ii).
Printing and Stationery, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 7009 (ii).
Rockliffe Rifle Range, Land Valuator (Ans.) 3408 (i).
St. Tite Postmaster, Dismissal (Ans.) 3090 (i).
San José Scale, Prohibition of Nursery Stock (B. 82) 1°, 1904, 1921, 1925 (i).
——— on M. (Mr. *Charlton*) to adjn., 2252 (i).
Sheridan, John, Inspector of Live Stock, Apnmt. by Govt. (Ans.) 6010 (ii).
Statistical Branch, Agricultural Dept. (Ans.) 2814.
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (archives) 5022; (cold storage) 5997; (creameries, N.W.T.) 5994; (experimental farm) 5972; (criminal statistics) 5025; (dairy station, N.S.) 7513; (N.W.T. exhibition accounts) 6995; (Paris Exhibition) 5039; (patent record) 5023, 7512; (year-book) 5025 (ii).
Civil Government: Agriculture (contingencies) 5020; (salaries) 4845, 4855 (ii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Montreal, St. John and Manchester) 7675 (ii).
Quarantine: 7514; (cattle) 5998; (cattle slaughtered) 7004; (gratuities) 6995; ("Scientific Dairying") 7001; (Trans-Mississippi Exhibition) 7003 (ii).
Sydney and N. Sydney, Quarantine Officer Physician (Ans.) 1781 (i).
Territorial Exhibition, Miss Cummings' claims (Ans.) 1780 (i).
——— N.W.T., outstanding indebtedness (Ans.) 486 (i).
——— payment of prizes (Ans.) 976 (i).
——— P. Lamont's account (Ans.) 2431 (i).
Trade Mark and Designs Act Amt. B. 61 (Mr. *Bertram*) on M. for 2°, 2842 (i).
Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 71 (Sir *Henri Joly*) in Com., 3102 (i); Sen. Amts., 7784.
Yukon Ry., Action of U. S. Senate, on M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to adjn., 1314.

Fitzpatrick, Hon. C. (Solicitor General) *Quebec County.*
Alien Labour Law, Appnmt. of Agent at Georgian Bay (remarks) 4523 (ii).
——— Toronto, 4254, 4286, 4292, 4350 (ii).
——— prosecutions under (Ans.) 474 (i).
Canada Evidence Act Amt. (B. 143) 1°*, 5786; 2° m., 6234 (ii).
Canadian Yukon Ry. Co's B. 6 (Mr. *Blair*) on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to M. for 2°, 1342.
Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries B. 14 (Mr. *Richardson*) on M. for Com., 2869 (i).

Fitzpatrick, Hon. C.—*Continued.*
Civil Service, List (presented) 184 (i).
Copyright in Canada, Powers of Parlt. (Ans.) 473.
Crow's Nest Pass Ry., Investigation, on conc., 7840 (ii).
——— Treatment of Labourers, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6623 (ii).
Dom. Atlantic Ry. Co's Award, prop. Res., 6722.
——— (B. 162) 1°* of B., 6962 (ii).
Fisheries of Can., Appeal from Supreme Court to Imp. Privy Council (Ans.) 3825 (i).
Franchise Act Repeal (B. 16) 1°, 308; 2° m., 2270; in Com., 2946, 2971, 2984 (i), 3942, 4044, 4067, 4075, 4083, 4097, 4254, 4366, 4454, 4484, 4523; M. to refer back to Com., 5259; 3° m., 5664; on Amt. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to M. for 3°, 5688; on M. for 3°, 5700; Sen. Amts., 7467, 7527, 7543 (ii).
——— French Schedules, Translation and Printing (remarks) 2434 (i).
Identification of Criminals (B. 156) 2° m., 6962; in Com., 6963 (ii).
Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. (B. 150) prop. Res., 5867; in Com. on Res., 6124, 6185; 1° of B., 6185; 2° m., 6732, 6738; in Com., 6784; 3° m., 7127 (ii).
——— (Pension) B., prop. Res., 7087; in Com. on Res., 7127 (ii).
Judiciary in N.W.T., additional judge (Ans.) 1775 (i).
Justice Dept., Agent at Charlottetown, P.E.I. (Ans.) 1075 (i).
——— Dep. Min., Appnmt., &c. (Ans.) 3166 (i).
Kingston Penitentiary, Medical officer (Ans.) 2846 (i).
Legal Agents of Govt. in G. B., amounts paid, &c. (Ans.) 5135 (ii).
Lord's Day, Better Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 1987; on Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) that Com. rise, 2422 (i).
Noble, Mr., Payments to, by Govt. (Ans.) 5133.
Ontario Court of Appeal, extra judge (Ans.) 1071 (i).
Ont. Voters' List, Cost of printing, &c. (Ans.) 2845 (i).
Penitentiary Commissioner's account, stmnt. (presented) 7383 (ii).
Procedure on 3° of B., Mr. Speaker's ruling, 2659.
Queen *vs.* Cameron, Indictment for libel, deposition, &c., on M. for papers, 1831 (i).
——— *vs.* Colombe, Whisky smuggling (Ans.) 1069 (i).
——— *vs.* Skelton, perjury convictions at Battleford (Ans.) 1780 (i).
——— proceedings against (remarks) 5117, 5258.
Penitentiaries Rep. (presented) 7009 (ii).
Ry. Employees Safety B. 4 (Mr. *Casey*) in Com., 4213, 5152 (ii).
St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, Claims of Commissioners (Ans.) 3938 (ii).
——— Revolt of convicts (Ans.) 1069 (i).

Fitzpatrick, Hon. C.—*Continued.*
Spinks, Judge, Investigation *re* conduct (remarks) 5268 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Administration of Justice (judges salaries) 7487; Exchequer Court (Reps.) 6639; Supreme Court (judges salaries) 6986; (purchase of books) 6638.
Civil Government: Gov. Gen.'s Sec.'s Office, 3876; Justice. 3894 (i); (contingencies) 4583, 6983; Penitentiary Branch, 3899 (ii).
Dominion Police: 7488 (ii).
Miscellaneous (alien labour law enforcement) 7772: (Chief Justice's expenses to England) 7089; (German Treaties, &c.) 7088; (law books, &c.) 7088; (Law library, Eng.) 7088; litigation costs) 7770: (Man. School case litigation) 7770; (Quebec Land slide claims) 7087 (ii).
Penitentiaries (expenses of commissions) 7339; Kingston, 6686, 7488: St. Vincent de Paul, 6640.
Post Office: Outside service (letter carriers) 7778.
Weatherbee, Mr. Justice, Absence from Prov., 3167 (i).

Flint, Mr. T. B., *Yarmouth, N.S.*
Bruneau, Mr., M.P. for Richelieu, Resignation, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Marcotte*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 2193 (i).
Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries B. 14 (Mr. *Richardson*) on M. for Com., 3689 (i).
Criminal Code Act Amt. (B. 134) 1°, 4769 (ii).
Fishermen's Safety B. 111 (Sir *Louis Davies*) in Com., 4784 (ii).
Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 2334 (i); in Com., 4021 (ii).
Govt. Harbours, Piers and Breakwaters Act Amt. B. 38 (Sir *Louis Davies*) in Com., 1867 (i).
Insolvency B. and Govt. Policy, on M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to adjn., 2928 (i).
Lord's Day, Better Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 1984 (i).
N. W. M. P. Act Amt. B. 15 (Mr. *Davin*) on M. for 2°, 4241 (ii).
Privilege (Ques. of) Press Representatives and Members of Parlt., on M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to adjn., 5130 (ii).
Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors-Plebiscite B. 121 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4761; on M. for 3°, 6043 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, Ont. (Toronto Harbour) 5915: Roads and Bridges (Edmonton Bridge, N.W.T.) 6293 (ii).
Tennant, John F., Dismissal by Govt., on M. (Mr. *Quinn*) for Ret., 5205 (ii).

Fortin, Mr. T., *Laval.*
Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries B. 14 (Mr. *Richardson*) on M. for Com., 2854 (i); in Com., 4646 (ii).
Insolvency (B. 84) 1°, 2004 (i).
St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary Rep. (M. to print) 6607 (ii).

Fortin, Mr. T.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY:
Penitentiaries (expenses of commissions) 7345; (Kingston) 7501 (ii).
Weights and Measures Act Amt. (B. 60) 1° m., 1380; 2° m., 2842 (i).
——— B. 71 (Sir *Henri Joly*) in Com., 3097 (i); 6582 (ii).

Foster, Hon. G. E., *York, N.B.*
Address, on the, 103 (i).
——— to His Ex. on departure from Can. (seconded) 7380 (ii).
Adulteration of Food Act Amt. B. 72 (Sir *Henry Joly*) Remarks, 2137 (i).
Alberta and Yukon Ry. Nav. and Mining Co.'s incorp. B. 124 (Mr. *Casey*) in Com., 7163 (ii).
Anglo-American Commission and Govtl. Action, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 7694 (ii).
Appnmts. by late Govt. (remarks) 4927 (ii).
Atlantic Fast SS. Service (remarks) 6609 (ii).
——— Contract, &c. (remarks) 7385 (ii).
Auditor General, Powers and Duties, Amt. to Com. of Sup., 5202 (ii).
Bagot Electoral District, issue of writ (remarks) 4350, 4449, 4602 (ii).
——— Vacancy, issue of writ on M. (Mr. *Bergeron*) to adjn., 5243 (ii).
Banking Business in Yukon District (Ques.) 1071, 1467 (i).
Belleville Post Office, Dismissals on M. for Com. of Sup., 6221 (ii).
Bonding, &c., Arrangement with U.S. on Pacific Coast (M. for cor.) 1786 (i).
Bounties on Iron and Steel B. 159 (Mr. *Paterson*) on prop. Res., 6723 (ii).
Bruneau, Mr., M.P., for Richelieu, Resignation, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Marcotte*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 2205 (i).
Budget, The (date of delivery) remarks, 2848 (i).
——— (reply) 3208 (i).
Business of the Hse. (remarks) 3821 (i); 7525 (ii).
——— Morning Sittings and Committees (remarks) 6109 (ii).
——— on M. (Mr. *Sutherland*) for Ry. Com. to sit during session of the Hse., 6227, 6318 (ii).
Can. Yukon Ry. B. 6 (Mr. *Blair*) on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to M. for 2°, 1580; in Com., 1858 (i).
——— ref. in Speech from Throne (remarks) 7, (i).
——— Telegram to High Commissioner on explanation (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 983 (i).
Canada Evidence Act Amt. B. 143 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 6234 (ii).
Civil Service, Superannuation Abolition B. 76 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 6334, 6355; in Com., 6367, 6797; on Amt. (Mr. *Bell, Pictou*) to M. for 3°, 6933 (ii).
——— (remarks) 2141 (i).
Colonial Premiers, London Conference (M. for cor.) 1785 (i).

Foster, Hon. G. E.—*Continued.*
Commissioners to inquire into conduct of Govt. Employees (M. for Ret.*) 1837 (i).
Connor, John, Gold Dredging leases in N.W.T. (Ques.) 1074 (i).
Crow's Nest Pass Ry., Amounts paid C.P.R. (Ques.) 3405 (i).
——— Construction by Co. (remarks) 6241 (ii).
——— J. B. Charleson's connection, &c. (remarks) 7685 (ii).
——— Treatment of Workmen, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6593 (i).
Customs Act Amt. B. 152 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com., 6947 (ii).
Dawson City Electric Lighting and Tramway Co.'s incorp. B. 118 (Mr. *Morrison*) in Com., 6939 (ii).
Dawson City Electric Co.'s B. 123 (Mr. *Morrison*) in Com., 7162 (ii).
Domville, Lt. Col., M.P., charges against (remarks) 5393, 6031 (ii).
Drolet, Chevalier, mining concessions, &c. (Ques.) 1073 (i).
Drummond Co. Ry., Com. of investigation on prop. Res. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 508 (i).
——— Rep. of Com. on M. (Mr. *Lister*) to conc., 7115, 7524 (ii).
——— Rumoured new arrangements (remarks) 2699 (i).
——— 2nd agreement with G.T.R. (Ques.) 3317.
——— 2nd Rep. (remarks) 6586 (ii).
——— Through traffic (Ques.) 472 (i).
Estimates and Budget Speech (Ques.) 1935 (i).
Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 3979, 3996, 4097, 4136, 4255, 4296, 4403, 4476, 5260; on Amt. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to M. for 3°, 5691, 5693; Sen. Amts., 7468 (ii).
——— Distribution of printed copies (remarks) 7854 (ii).
Gananoque Drill Shed, site (remarks) 459 (i), 5316 (ii).
Geological Survey Act Amt. B. 114 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 4776 (ii).
Golden, B.C., and St. Eugene Mail Carrier (M. for cor.) 2824 (i).
——— (Ques.) 2816 (i).
Govt. Business, Precedence on Thursdays on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 2524 (i).
Great North-west Central Ry. Co.'s B. 141 (Mr. *Morrison*) in Com., 7736, 7742; Sen. Amts., 7464 (ii).
Imports, Dutiable value and amount collected (Ques.) 600 (i).
Inland Revenue Act Amt. B. 75 (Sir *Henri Joly*) in Com., 2139 (i).
I.C.R. Rys., Agreement with Mr. Harris (remarks) 5392 (ii).
——— Coloured Porters, Dismissals (Ques.) 3405.
——— (remarks) 2852 (i).
——— Extension to Montreal, passengers carried from Lévis (Ques.) 3406 (i).

Foster, Hon. G. E.—*Continued.*
I.C.R., Schedule rates, lowering of (remarks) 4811.
——— Tariffs, &c., since appnmt. of Mr. Harris (M. for copy*) 3669 (i).
——— Tenders for ties from 1896, prices, &c. (M. for Ret.*) 3669 (i).
——— Train service, Issue of New Time-table (remarks) 6242 (ii).
Joint Commission, U.S. and Can. prop. conference (remarks) 6609 (ii).
Jubilee stamps, amount received from sale (Ques.) 3405 (i), 3938 (ii).
Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 150 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 6128; on M. for 2° of B., 6734; Sen. Amts., 7854 (ii).
Kingston Locomotive Works, on M. (Mr. *Taylor*) to adjn., 612 (i).
King, W. A., station agent, Antigonish, Dismissal (Ques.) 7120 (ii).
Klondike and Dawson City Bank Co.'s incorp. B. 117 (Mr. *Morrison*) in Com., 5118, 5125 (ii).
Klondike and Peace River Transportation Co.'s incorp. B. 91 (Mr. *Davis*) in Com., 4168 (ii).
Lake Champlain and River St. Lawrence Ship Canal Co.'s incorp. B. 99 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) in Com., 6328 (ii).
Lt. Gov. of N.W.T. (Ques.) 1073 (i).
——— Confirmation of appnmt. (remarks) 6466.
Lord's Day, Better Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 2047, 2050; on M. to restore to order paper, 2428 (i).
McCallum, John, Appnmt. and Dismissal by Govt. (Ques.) 7686 (ii).
Maj. Gen. Commanding—Order (Ques. of) *re* Letter read by Prime Minister, 6464 (ii).
Man. Debt Account B. 169 (Mr. *Fielding*) prop. Res., 7387 (ii).
——— School Fund B. 168 (Mr. *Fielding*) prop. Res., 7413; on M. for 2°, 7571 (ii).
Mann and Mackenzie, Sleigh road contract, Construction (Ques.) 1928 (i).
——— Teslin Lake Wagon route and Govt. Policy (remarks) 2700 (i).
See "Yukon."
Mohawk Indians, Wthdrl. of grant for medical services (Ques.) 2817 (i).
Montmorency Cotton Mills, incorp. B. 102 (Mr. *Penny*) in Com., 4174 (ii).
Montreal Harbour Commissioner's Loan B. 163 (Mr. *Fielding*) on prop. Res., 6864, 6874; in Com. on Res., 6929; on M. for Com., 7142 (ii).
Nanaimo, Member elect, resignation (remarks) 4605 (ii).
Nickel Steel Co.'s incorp. B. 96 (Mr. *Wood, Hamilton*) on M. (Mr. *LaRivière*) to refer to Com. on Rys., 3650 (i).
Norwood, H. H., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 7120 (ii).
Officer Commanding Militia, Increased allowance, in Com. on Res., 4945 (ii).

Foster, Hon. G. E.—*Continued.*

Ogilvie, Mr.. services since Jan., 1898 (Ques.) 3406 (i).

——— Official Rep. on Klondike, translation (remarks) 604 (i).

——— Mr. Rose's contract for printing (M. for cor.*) 3670 (i).

Ont. and Rainy River Ry. Co.'s B. 32 (Mr. *Tisdale*) in Com., 2627 (i).

Order (Ques. of) Montreal Harbour Loan B., 6926 (ii).

Palmer's Point Lighthouse-keeper (M. for cor.*) 504 (i).

Postal rate between G. B. and Can., copy of Instructions to Postmasters (inquiry for Ret.) 6322 (ii).

Post Office Act Amt. B 110 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 1°, 2920 (i): on M. for Com., 5710, 5722, 5738; in Com., 5750, 5880 (ii).

——— Special Delivery B. 167 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 1°, 7409 (ii).

——— Savings Banks, Reduction of Interest, on Amt. (Mr. *Davin*) to M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 3721 (i).

Preferential Clause, Admission of Foreign countries to commercial privileges (M. for cor.*) 1837.

Printing Com., Rep., M. to print evidence on Pub. Accounts, 6317 (ii).

Private Bills legislation, Order of procedure (remarks) 7586 (ii).

Privilege (Ques. of), Par. in *La Patrie re* Man. Schools (Mr. *Bergeron*) 7711 (ii).

Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors—Plebiscite B. 121 (Mr. *Fisher*) on M. for 1°, 3928; on M. for 2°, 4692; in Com., 4742; on M. for 3°, 6035.

Public Accounts Com., organization (remarks) 2517, 2528 (i).

——— 5th and 6th Reps., M. to print evidence 6640 (ii).

——— M. to print papers, 6465 (ii).

Public Officers Act Amt. B. 170 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 7580 (ii).

Public Works Aid B. 161 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 1°, 6893; on M. for 2°, 7411, 7570 (ii).

Pulp Mill Machinery, duty, &c. (Ques.) 3165 (i).

Quebec Bridge, prop. subsidy (remarks) 7385 (ii).

Quebec Harbour Commissioner's Loan B. 142 (Mr. *Dobell*) on M. for 2°, 6229; in Com., 6231; on M. for 3°, 6444 (ii).

Racine Fishery and Riparian Owner, License for erection (Ques.) 4772 (ii).

Reciprocal clause of tariff, 1897, amounts, refunds, &c., paid (Ques.) 4175 (ii).

Returns (inquiry) 4774, 6028, 6114, 6446 (ii).

St. John Bridge and Ry. Extension Co.'s Loan B. 157 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 6233 (ii).

San José Scale Pest, Prohibition of U. S. nursery stock on M. (Mr. *Charlton*) to adjn., 2266 (i).

Senate and House of Commons Act Amt. B. 173 (Mr. *Fielding*) prop. Res., 7655 (ii).

Foster, Hon. G. E.—*Continued.*

Shirt and Collar Industry on M. (Mr. *Monk*) to Com. of Sup., 6590 (ii).

Spencer, W. J., Pension to (remarks) 6326 (ii).

Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 39 (Sir *Louis Davies*) in Com., 2090, 2095 (i).

Steamship Service (winter), St. John, &c., to G. B. (M. for cor.*) 504 (i).

Stimulants in the Chamber during debate on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Talbot*) 3641 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Administration of Justice: Exchequer Court (reports) 6639: Supreme Court (judges' salaries) 6986; (purchase of law books) 6638 (ii).

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Paris Exhibition) 5043, 5047: (patent record) 7512 (ii).

Canals: Galops, 7650; Murray (repairs) 6556; Soulanges (construction) 6454, 6510 (ii).

Charges of Management: 3828; (printing notes) 3829 (i); 6976 (ii).

Civil Government: Agriculture (contingencies) 5020; Aud. Gen's Office, 4546; Customs, 4555 (clerical assistance) 7475; conc., 7852; Finance, 4554; Geological Survey, 4559 (salaries) 7477; Gov. Gen's Sec's. Office, 3830, 3861 (contingencies) 4581, 6978: High Commissioner's Office, 4560; (contingencies) 4561, 4580; Indian Affairs, 4553; Inland Revenue, 4556; Interior, 4532, 4551; Justice, 3895 (i), (contingencies) 4582, 6983; Penitentiary Branch, 3899 (i); Marine and Fisheries, 4558 (extra clerks) 7481; Militia and Defence (accountant) 3899, 3905 (i), (messenger) 7482; (salaries) 6564: N. W. Mounted Police, 4545: Post Office (statutory increases) 7482; (printing and stationery) 4527; Queen's Printer (salaries) 7483 (ii); Privy Council Office, 3894 (i), 7483; (contingencies) 4582; Private Secretaries, 6978: Public Works, 4558 (books, &c.) 6934; Railways and Canals, 4558; Sec. of State, 5426; Sundry Depts., Private Secretaries (salaries) 7484; Trade and Commerce, 4560 (salaries) 7453 (ii).

Customs: Chicoutimi Pulp Works (machinery, duty paid) 7792; (laboratory) 7773 (ii).

Dom. Lands (surveys, &c.) 7311 (ii).

Dom. Police: 7488 (ii).

Fisheries (Behring Sea claims commission) 7286; (litigation expenses) 7285; (protection service) 5298, 7285 (ii).

Immigration (agents' salaries), 7287, 7745 (ii).

Indians: B. C., 7712; N. B. (medical attendance) 7300; Ont. and Que. (industrial schools) 7754; (Oka Indians) 7291 (ii).

Inspection of Staples (grain standards) 6695 (ii).

Legislation: House of Commons (debates) 7014; (sessional clerks) 7012; (sessional indemnity of absent members) 7752; (stationery) 7035; Senate (unforeseen expenses) 6994 (ii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (salaries) 4981, 4987.

Mail Subsidies and S.S. Subventions (Baddeck, East Bay and Irish Cove) 7723; (Can. and South Africa) 7721; (Gaspe Basin and Dalhousie) 6687; (Gaspe Basin and Que.) 6688; (Montreal, St. John and Manchester) 7660; (St. John, &c., and Yarmouth) 6688; (Victoria and San Francisco) 6687 (ii).

Militia (Dom. cartridge factory) 7075; (gratuities, &c.) 7517; (medals) 7517; (Yukon Force, contract for supplies, &c.) 7059, 7072, 7793 (ii).

Foster, Hon. G. E.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
Miscellaneous: Alien Labour Law (enforcement) 7773; Man. and N.W.T., 7276; (Chief Justice's expenses to Eng.) 7089; (Crow's Nest Pass commission) 7263; (deep water ways commission) 7282; (German treaties) 7088; (gratuities outside service) 7769; (Hudson Bay expedition) 7094; (law books) 7088; (law library, Eng.) 7088; Man. School Ques. (litigation) 7770; (parliamentary guide) 6975; (pilotage investigation) 7102; (Prescott and Russell Fire relief fund) 7089; (professional services) 7243; (prohibition expenses) 7094; (Quebec land slide claims) 7087 (ii).
Ocean and River Service (biological station) 7733; (life saving stations) 4953; (P.E.I. and mainland) 7730; (repairs to "Stanley") 7284; (winter mail service) 4972, 4979 (ii).
Penitentiaries (expenses of commissions) 7340; St. Vincent de Paul, 6629 (ii).
Post Office: Outside service (letter carriers) 7775; (salaries) 6698 (ii).
Public Works: Buildings, Man., 5485; N.B., 5092, 7586; N S., 5071, 7214, 7586; Ont., 7217; Arnprior P. O.) 5450; (deptl. block, Ottawa) 5069; (Major's Hill Park) 5453, 5572, 5577, 5591; (Ottawa Grounds, &c.) 5472, 5479, 7587; (summer house) 7218; (Rideau Hall) 5599; (repairs) 5448; (telephone service) 5605; (Woodstock P. O.) 5464; Que., 5093, 7217, 7587; (slides and booms) 7643; Harbours and Rivers, B.C., 6024, 7242; (dredging) 6072, 6081; (general service) 6099; (general vote) 6067; N.B., 7589. (New Harbour) 7590; Ont., 5886, 5889, 7242, 7641; (Kaministiquia) 5067; (Toronto Harbour) 5902; Que., 7638; (dredging) 7227; (St. Lawrence ship channel) 5051; Miscellaneous (Hon. Mr. Mackenzie's monument) 6105; (over expenditures) 6244; Roads and Bridges (Edmonton Bridge) 6280, 6301; Telegraph Lines (B.C.) 6102; (St. Lawrence shore) 6101 (ii).
Quarantine (Trans-Mississippi Exhibition) 7003.
Railways: C. P. R., 6381; Crow's Nest Pass, (salaries) 7110, 7181; (general expenses for investigations) 7198; I. C. R., (accommodation at Moncton) 6388; (accommodation at St. John) 7645; (claims for damages) 7186; (culverts, &c.) 7085; Indiantown branch (land damages) 7078; (iron bridges) 6394, 6564; (North Sydney) 6387; (original construction) 6386; (rolling stock) 7643; Miscellaneous (survey, Klondike district) 6563; Subsidies unpaid, 7653; subsidy to N.S. Central Ry. Co., 7810 (ii).
Scientific Institutions (Toronto observatory) 7284.
Steamboat Inspection: 5003 (ii).
Trade and Commerce (Chinese Immigration Act &c.) 6690 (ii).
Yukon Provisional District (administration of Govt.) 7335; (maintenance of force) 7338; (steamers) 7769 (ii).
Supply B. 174 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 2°, 7858.
Walsh, Administrator in Yukon, instructions and commissions (remarks) 1080, 1387 (i).
——— Appnmt. to Force (Ques.) 480 (i).
——— Commisions and instructions (Ques.) 1777.
Ways and Means:—The Tariff:
In Com.: (preferential clause) 3767, 3794; (sugar) 3805; (tobacco) 3833 (i).

Foster, Hon. G. E.—*Continued.*
Western Deptl. Block, Repairs, &c. (Ques.) 2528, 3319 (i).
West Prince, P. E. I., Vacancy, issue of writ (Ques.) 2241 (i).
Wood, H. W., Postmaster Welsford, N. B., Dismissal (Ques.) 7120 (ii).
Yukon Provisional District Administration B. 154 (Mr. *Sifton*) on M. for 2°, 6728 (ii).
——— Contingent, &c. (remarks) 4774, 4795 (ii).
———Dredging Leases Issued; Inquiry for Ret., 5322 (ii).
——— (M. for cor.*) 504 (i).
——— (M. for Ret.*) 1838 (i).
——— (Ques.) 1074, 1934, 3317 (i).
——— (remarks) 6895 (ii).
——— Liquor Permits (Ques.) 473, 2813 (i).
——— (remarks) 745 (i).
——— Mann and Mackenzie's Sleigh road (Ques.) 1777 (i).
——— Military Force, cost, &c. (remarks) 4604 (ii).
——— Mounted Police, contract for transportation of supplies, 5499 (i).
——— Placer Mining and Timber Licenses (Ques.) 460 (i).
——— Routes and Passes, explorations (Ques.) 482 (i).
——— Stikine-Teslin winter road (remarks) 1187.
——— Timber Berths, &c. (M. for cor.*) 504 (i).
——— Troops for (remarks) 1577 (i).
——— U. S. Relief Expedition (Ques.) 102 (i).
——— U. S. Senate, Action of, on M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to adjn., 1284 (i).

Fraser, Mr. D. C., *Guysboro' N.S.*
Alien Labour Law, Enforcement (remarks) 5803.
Anglo-American Commission and Govtl. action on M. for Com. of Sup., (remarks) 7697 (ii).
Anglo-French Telegraph Co. (M. to present Pets, &c.) 5143 (ii).
Canada Eastern Ry. Co.'s B. 94 (Mr. *Tucker*) 1°*, 2430 (i).
Canadian Yukon Ry. Co.'s B. 6 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 2°, 855 (i).
——— Telegram to High Commissioner *re* Hamilton Smith's Proposals, 1008 (i).
Crow's Nest Pass Ry. Investigation, Treatment of Workmen, 6598, 7845 (ii).
Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 5263; Sen. Amts., 7539 (ii).
I.C.R., Coloured Employees on M. (Mr. *Campbell*) to adjn., 3169 (i).
Lord's Day, Better Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com. on Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) that Com. rise, 2423 (i).
Nickel Steel Co.'s incorp. B. 96 (Mr. *Wood, Hamilton*) on M. (Mr. *LaRiviere*) to ref. to Com. on Rys., 3652 (i).
Ottawa, Montreal and James Bay Ry. Co incorp. (B. 50) 1°*, 1068 (i).

Fraser, Mr. D. C.—*Continued.*
Pacific and Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 40) 1°*, 970 (i).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 110 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 5773 (i).
Prince Albert Mail Service, Delay in Transport on M. (Mr. *Davis*) to adjn., 2521 (i).
Stimulants in the Chamber during debate, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Talbot*) 3641 (i).
SUPPLY:
Post Office: Mail Clerks (salaries) 7053 (ii).
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, N.S. (New Harbour) 7622 (ii).

Frost, Mr. F. T., *Leeds and Grenville.*
Budget, on The, 3517 (i).
Butter Industry of Can. Encouragement of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Reid*) 2373 (i).
SUPPLY:
Canals: Murray (repairs) 6559 (ii).

Ganong, Mr. G. W., *Charlotte, N.B.*
Campobello Island, Telephone communication, cost, &c. (Ques.) 4177 (ii).
Canadian Yukon Ry. B. 6 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 2°, 1132 (i).
Deer Island Telegraph Cable, &c., Surveys, &c. (Ques.) 4177 (ii).
Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 3°, 5708 (ii).
Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. B. 136 (Sir *Louis Davies*) in Com., 5330 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Fisheries: Protection service, 5311; (salaries, overseers, &c.) 5008 (ii).
Public Works: Buildings, Ont. (Ottawa grounds, &c.) 5476; Harbours and Rivers, N.B., 5643; Telegraph Lines, B.C., 6102 (ii).

Gauthier, Mr. J., *L'Assomption.*
Laurentian Ry., Telegraph Regulations, &c. (Ques.) 4923 (ii).

Gauvreau, Mr. C. A., *Temiscouata.*
Address, The, in Ans. to His Ex.'s Speech (seconded) 18 (i).
Hebert, I. A., Postmaster at Princeville, and sale of intoxicating liquors (Ques.) 7689 (ii).
I.C.R., Govt. Lands, Trois Pistoles, occupation, &c. (Ques.) 4175 (ii).
—— Madame Charon's Horse (Ques.) 3659 (i).
Personal Explanation, Temiscouata Election (remarks) 5447 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers (Que.) 7640.

Gibson, Mr. W., *Lincoln and Niagara.*
Canadian Yukon Ry., Tel. to High Commissioner *re* Hamilton Smith's proposals, 1004 (i).
Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries B. 14 (Mr. *Richardson*) on M. for Com., 2866 (i).
—— Superannuation Abolition B. 76 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 6798 (ii).
Dundas, Mr., Dismissal by Govt. (remarks) 6578.

Gibson, Mr. W.—*Continued.*
Gladstone, Rt. Hon. W. E., reported decease (Ques.) 4347 (i).
Great Commonwealth Development and Mining Co.'s (B. 95) 1°*, 2430 (i).
Man. School Ques., Address to the Holy Father, on M. for Com. of Sup., 5423 (ii).
Members Sessional Trunks, &c., Contracts, &c., on M. for Com. of Sup., 7047 (ii).
Pacific and Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 40 (Mr. *Fraser, Guysboro'*) M. to withdraw B., 3713 (i).
Prince Albert Mail Service, delay in transmission, on M. (Mr. *Davis*) to adjn., 2519 (i).
Printing of Parlt., 1st Rep., conc. (M.) 3713 (i).
St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary Commissioner's Rep., on M. (Mr. *Fortin*) to print, 6608 (ii).
San José Scale, Prohibition of Nursery Stock B. 82 (Mr. *Fisher*) on M. for 1°, 1913 (i).
SUPPLY:
Canals: Soulanges (construction) 6521 (ii).
Civil Government: Post Office, 4867, 4872 (ii).
Militia (gratuities) 6575 (ii).
Railways: I.C.R. (culverts, &c.) 7086 (ii).
Windsor and Detroit Union Bridge Co.'s incorp. (B. 79) 1°*, 1839 (i).

Gillies, Mr. J. A., *Richmond, N.S.*
Appnmts. to office (remarks) 1186 (i).
—— New Senators, ref. to telegraphic despatch (remarks) 2606 (i).
Arichat Harbour, Buoys, &c. (Ques.) 5320 (ii).
Chapel Cove Breakwater, Govt. aid (Ques.) 4345.
Cheticamp Customs Collector, Name, &c. (Ques.) 4180 (ii).
Ferguson, Roderick, L'Ardoise Postmaster, Dismissal (M. for cor.) 3666 (i).
Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on Amt. (Mr. *Powell*) to M. for 2°, 2760 (i); in Com., 3960, 4438, 4488 (ii).
Govt. Harbours, Piers and Breakwaters Act Amt. B. 38 (Sir *Louis Davies*) in Com., 1864 (i).
Hubert, Miss A., Pets. (remarks) 7525 (ii).
I.C.R., Purchase of Locomotives in U.S. (Ques.) 476 (i).
Lachine Canal, Dismissals (M. for Ret.) 4621 (ii).
L'Ardoise Breakwater, repairs, &c. (Ques.) 972.
—— St. Peter's, &c., outport, medical aid to sick seamen (Ques.) 1339 (i).
Linloff, Ed., Appnmt. by Govt. (Ques.) 5319 (ii).
Lower L'Ardoise Postmaster (Ques.) 1069, 1334.
McKay, Kenneth, lockman, St. Peter's Canal, Dismissal (Ques.) 1070 (i).
Mackay's Point Wharf, Tenders for building, &c. (Ques.) 2815 (i).
Mail Contracts, N.S., Cancellation since 1896 (Ques.) 4609 (ii).
Margaree Customs Collector, Dismissal (Ques.) 4181 (ii).
Matheson, John D., Appnmt. by Govt. (Ques.) 7121 (ii).
Militia Point Mail Carrier, amount paid (Ques.) 3310 (i).

Gillies. Mr. J. A.—*Continued.*
Militia Point Postmaster, Appnmt. (Ques,) 3310.
Point Jerome Lightkeeper, Appnmt. of J. E. McNeil (Ques.) 5320 (ii).
Port Mulgrave and St. Peter's Mail route (remarks) 6323 (ii).
Postal Rates Empire, Authority for reduction (Ques.) 4345 (ii).
Postmaster General's Rep, (Ques.) 2527 (i).
Postmasters, Dismissals since 1896 (Ques.) 4609.
Post Office Act Amt. B. 110 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 5765 (ii).
Returns (inquiry) 5519, 5932 (ii).
St. Peter's Canal, repairs to entrance, (Ques.) 1339 (i).
SUPPLY:
Administration of Justice: Supreme Court (judges salaries) 6986 (ii).
Civil Government: Post Office, 4876, 4884 (ii).
Fisheries (protection service) 5286, 5307 (ii).
Indians: N.S., 7293; (erection of fence) 7297 (ii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Baddeck, East Bay and Irish Cove) 7724 (ii).
Miscellaneous (wharfinger, Sault Ste. Marie, salary) 7098 (ii).
Penitentiaries: St. Vincent de Paul, 6640 (ii).
Post Office: Outside service (miscellaneous expenses) 6707 (ii).
Public Works: Buildings, Ont. (Major's Hill Park) 5462; Harbours and Rivers (dredging) 6081; Mar. Provs., 6085; (general vote) 6067; Que., (St. Lawrence River) 5062 (ii).
Railways: General expenses for investigations, 7207; I.C.R., (North Sydney) 6686 (ii).
Trade and Commerce (Chinese Immigration Act, &c.) 6694 (ii).
Telegraph Operator Ross, North-east Margaree, Dismissal (Ques.) 2815 (i).

Gilmour, Mr. J., *East Middlesex.*
Honey Locust Plant and San José Scale Act, on M. (Mr. *Maclaren*) to Com. of Sup., 6973 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Public Works: Buildings, Ont. (Woodstock, P.O.) 5469 (ii).

Guay, Mr. P. M., *Lévis.*
Montreal and Southern Counties Ry. Co.'s (B. 81) 1°*, 1840 (i).

Guillet,, Mr. G., *West Northumberland, O.*
Brigade Camp, 3rd Military District (Ques.) 5786.
Cobourg Postmaster, attendance at reform convention (Ques.) 602 (i).
Rogers, Lt.-Col. R. Z., retirement, &c. (Ques.) 5787 (ii).
Tennant, John F., Dismissal by Govt. on M. (Mr. *Quinn*) for Ret., 5194 (ii).
Whisky for the Klondike, the *Manaunses* cargo (remarks) 1188 (i).

Guite, Mr. J. F., *Bonaventure.*
SUPPLY:
Post Office: Outside service (miscellaneous expenses) 6713 (ii).

Haggart, Hon. J. G., *South Lanark.*
Appnmts. by late Govt. on Amt. (Mr. *Montague*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 4832 (ii).
Canadian Yukon Ry. B. 6 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 1°, 212; on M. for 2°, 674; in Com., 1855 (i).
——— Kaslo-Slocan Ry. plans, Request for papers (remarks) 402 (i).
Customs Act Amt. B. 152 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com., 6950 (ii).
Dawson City Electric Lighting and Tramway Co.'s incorp. B. 118 (Mr. *Morrison*) in Com., 6945 (ii).
Dawson City Electric Co.'s B. 123 (Mr. *Morrison*) in Com., 7163 (ii).
Drummond County Ry. Com. of Investigation on prop. Res. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 511 (i).
Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4057, 4289, 4384, 4457, 4480 (ii).
Geological Survey Act Amt. B. 114 (Mr. *Sifton*) on 1°, 3404 (i).
G. T. Ry. Regulations on M. (Mr. *Wallace*) to adjn., 6024 (ii).
Identification of Criminals B. 156 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 6964 (ii).
Judges of the Provincial Courts (Pension) B. in Com. on Res., 7137 (ii).
Kingston and Pembroke Ry. Co.'s B. 69 (Mr. *Britton*) in Com., 4806 (ii).
Lake Bennett and Klondike Ry. and Tramway Co.'s incorp. (B. 31) 1°, 903 (i); Sen. Amts., 5905, 6266 (ii).
Lake Champlain and St. Lawrence River Canal Co.'s incorp. B. 99 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) in Com., 6330 (ii).
Man. Debt Account B. 169 (Mr. *Fielding*) prop. Res., 7394; in Com., 7404, 7467 (ii).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners' Loan B. 163 (Mr. *Fielding*) prop. Res., 6915; in Com. on Res., 6931 (ii).
Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Co., Construction, &c., on M. (Mr. *Pouporé*) to Com. of Sup., 6502 (ii).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 110 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 5883 (ii).
Procedure on 3° of B., Mr. Speaker's ruling, 2658.
Public Works Aid B. 161 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 1°, 6893; on M. for 2°, 7570 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (archives) 5022; (Paris exhibition) 5049 (ii).
Canals: Chambly, 6553; Cornwall, 6532, 6554; Grenville (enlargement) 6552; Farran's Point, 6532; Lachine (enlargement) 6551; Murray (repairs) 6557; North Channel (construction) 6535; Rideau, 7183; Sault Ste. Marie (contractors' claims) 7106; Soulanges (construction) 6446, 6526; Trent (construction) 6543; Williamsburg (repairs) 6554 (ii).
Charges of Management (printing notes) 6977 (ii).
Civil Government: Agriculture (contingencies) 3021 (i); Aud. Gen.'s Office, 4547, 7475 (ii).
Customs: Outside service, 7357 (ii).
Dom. Lands (surveys, &c.) 7307, 7316 (ii).

Haggart, Hon. J. G.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
Fisheries (litigation expenses) 7285 (ii).
Penitentiaries (expenses of commissions) 7342 (ii).
Public Works: Buildings, Ont. (Major's Hill Park) 5456, 5574; Harbours and Rivers (Man.) 5928, (Ont.) 5887, 5922; (Toronto Harbour) 5914; Que. (dredging) 7237; Roads and Bridges (Edmonton Bridge, N.W.T.) 6251, 6260 (ii).
Railways: I.C.R., 6427; (accommodation at Mulgrave) 6432; (claims for damage by fire) 7184, 7373; (increased accommodation) 6433; (increased accommodation, Halifax) 6385; (iron bridges) 6388; (Montreal extension) 6564; (North Sydney) 6386: P.E.I. (rolling stock) 6434; (general expenses for investigations) 7197; Miscellaneous (surveys, Klondike district) 6563 (ii).
Minor Revenues (printing law stamps) 7251 (ii).
Unprovided Items: Aud. Gen.'s Rep., 7352 (ii).
Yukon Provisional District: Maintenance of Force, 7354 (ii).
Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 71 (Sir *Henri Joly*) in Com., 2120 (i).

Hale, Mr. F. H., *Carleton, N.B.*
Customs Collector at Centreville, N.B., Investigation *re* (Ques.) 830 (i).

Haley, Mr. A., *Hants, N.S.*
SUPPLY:
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, N.S., 5620.

Henderson, Mr. D., *Halton.*
Butter Industry of Can., on prop. Res, (Mr. *Reid*) 2371 (i).
Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on Amt. (Mr. *Powell*) to M. for 2°, 2757 (i); in Com., 4512 (ii).
Great North-west Central Ry. Co.'s B. 141 (Mr. *Morrison*) in Com., 7741; Sen. Amts., 7464 (ii).
Halstead, Mr. Freeman, sentenced at Porto Rico, par. in Toronto *World* (remarks) 6028 (ii).
Interest paid Ont. and Que., 1897 (Ques.) 455 (i).
Lord's Day, Better Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 1977, 2045; M. (Mr. *Charlton*) to restore to order paper, 2428 (i).
Man. School Fund B. 168 (Mr. *Fielding*) prop. Res., 7421 (ii).
Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors-Plebiscite B. 121 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4740 (ii).
Public Officer Act Amt. B. 170 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 7582 (ii).
San José Scale, Prohibition of Nursery Stock B. 82 (Mr. *Fisher*) on M. for 1°, 1913 (i).
——— on M. (Mr. *Charlton*) to adjn., 2252 (i).
Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 39 (Sir *Louis Davies*) in Com., 1877 (i).
SUPPLY:
Civil Government: Post Office, 4876 (ii).
Dom. Lands (surveys, &c.) 7322 (ii).
Fisheries (overseers' salaries, &c.) 5010 (ii).
Immigration (agents' salaries) 7291 (ii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (salaries) 4994 (ii).

Henderson, Mr. D.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
Public Works (Buildings, Ont.) 5482: (Ottawa grounds, &c.) 5470: (summer house, Ottawa) 7220; (Woodstock P. O.) 5464; Harbours and Rivers, N.S. (New Harbour) 7602; Ont. (dredging) 6098 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff:
In Com. (preferential clause) 3765, 3782 (i).
Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 71 (Sir *Henri Joly*) in Com., 2128 (i).

Heyd, Mr. C. B., *North Brant.*
Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 2587; in Com., 2954 (i) 3943 (ii).
Mount Elgin Institute, Establishment (Ques.) 672 (i).
Sons of England Benefit Society incorp. B. 122 (Mr. *Bertram*) on M. for Com., 6052 (ii).
Statistical Branch, Agriculture Dept. (Ques.) 2814 (i).
Volunteers of 1866, Granting of Medals (remarks) 6613 (ii).
Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 71 (Sir *Henri Joly*) in Com., 2125 (i).

Hughes, Mr. S., *North Victoria.*
Anglo-American Commission and Govtl. action, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 7696 (ii).
Belleville Post Office, Dismissals, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6219 (ii).
Canadian Yukon Ry. B. 6 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 2°, 746 (i).
Cattle Export Trade, Montreal, G.B. and Ireland (remarks) 2270 (i).
——— (M. to adjn.) 2435 (i).
——— to Belfast (Ques.) 484 (i).
Customs Dept., Appnmt. of Irish Roman Catholics (Ques.) 4608 (ii).
Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on Amt. (Mr. *Powell*) to M. for 2°, 2748; in Com., 3003 (i); on M. for 3°, 5699 (ii).
G.T.R. Regulations, on M. (Mr. *Wallace*) to adjn. (remarks) 6017 (ii).
Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 150 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 6127 (ii).
Kettle River Valley Ry. Co.'s B. 26 (Mr. *Bostock*) in Com., 2958; on consdn. of Amts., 3365 (i).
Lord's Day, Better Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 1968; in Com. (Amt.) 1980 (i).
Militia Annual Camp Drill (remarks) 5324 (ii).
——— Corps, issue of Lee-Enfield Rifles (M. for copy*) 3670 (i).
——— Inspection, recommendation, &c. (M. for Rep.*) 3670 (i).
Miners Free Licenses, Issue of (remarks) 4773 (ii).
Motion, Notice of (remarks) 6027 (ii).
Noble, Mr., payments to by Govt. (Ques.) 5133.
N.W.M.P., reported loss of men in Yukon (remarks) 7659 (ii).
Officer commanding Militia, Increased Allowance, in Com. on Res., 4936, 4944 (ii).

Hughes, Mr. S.—*Continued.*
Ontario and Rainy River Co.'s B. 32 (Mr. *Tisdale*) in Com., 2633 (i).
Order (Ques. of) P.O. Dept. (Mr. *Montague*) in Com. of Sup., 4892 (ii).
Payments to Militia on active service (M. for Rep.*) 3670 (ii).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 110 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 1°, 2922 (i); in Com., 5762, 5944 (ii).
Repatriation of 100th Regiment (remarks) 6613.
San José Scale, Prohibition of Nursery Stock B. 82 (Mr. *Fisher*) on M. for 1°, 1916 (i).
——— on M. (Mr. *Charlton*) to adjn., 2249 (i).
Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 39 (Sir *Louis Davies*) in Com., 1880 (i).
SUPPLY:
Canals: Murray (repairs) 6557; Sault Ste. Marie (construction) 6551; Trent (construction) 6540, 6553 (ii).
Civil Government: Militia (accountant) 3909 (i); (salaries) 6567; Post Office, 4859, 4875, 4888 (ii).
Fisheries: Protection service, 5315 (ii).
Legislation: House of Commons (expenses at election trials) 7505 (ii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Montreal, St. John and Manchester) 7676 (ii).
Militia (Dom. Artillery association) 7522; (Dom. cartridge factory) 6571; (Dom. Rifle association) 6570, 7521; (gratuities, &c.) 6573, 7519; (medals, &c.) 7515; (unforeseen expenses) 6570; Yukon contingent (contract for supplies, &c.) 7800 (ii).
Miscellaneous (pilotage investigations) 7104; (Prescott and Russell Fire relief fund) 7090 (ii).
Penitentiaries (expenses of commissions) 7351 (ii).
Post Office (temporary clerks) 7041 (ii).
Public Works: Buildings (N.B.) 5093, (N.S.) 5084, (Que.) 5093; Harbours and Rivers, B.C., 6065, (dredging) 6073; Ont. (dredging) 6091; Mar. Provs. (dredging) 7243; Miscellaneous (clerical assistance) 6104; (Hon. Mr. Mackenzie's monument) 6108; (National Art Gallery) 6104; Roads and Bridges, 6100; Slides and Booms, 6099; Telegraph Lines, (B.C.) 6102; (St. Lawrence Shores) 6101 (ii).
Railways: Crow's Nest Pass (salaries, &c.) 7110; I.C.R. (North Sydney) 6388 (ii).
Yukon Provisional District: maintenance of force, 7356 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff:
In Com.: (preferential clause) 3771, 3795; (sugar) 3808 (i).
Yukon Military Contingent, expenditure, &c. (remarks) 4797 (ii).

Hurley, Mr. J. M., *East Hastings.*
North American Telegraph Co.'s (B. 120) 1°*, 3713 (i).

Hutchison, Mr. W., *Ottawa.*
Ottawa Interprovincial Bridge Co.'s incorp. (B. 125) 1°*, 4448 (ii).

Ingram, Mr. A. B., *East Elgin.*
Address, on The, 385 (i).
Belleville Post Office, Dismissals on M. for Com. of Sup., 6217 (ii).

Ingram, Mr. A. B.—*Continued.*
Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries B. 14 (Mr. *Richardson*) on M. for Com., 3705 (i); in Com., 4640, 4653, 4665 (ii).
County Court Judges, Age limit, cor., &c. (Ques.) 7124 (ii).
Fishing Licenses, amount paid by Lake Erie fishermen (Ques.) 601 (i).
Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 3010 (i); 4417, 4442, 4456, 4477, 4487, 5261; on M. for 3°, 5700 (ii).
Judges of the Provincial Courts B. 150 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 6791 (ii).
——— (Pension) B. in Com., on Res., 7127, 7134.
Kingston Locomotive Works on M. (Mr. *Taylor*) to adjn. (remarks) 611 (i).
Penitentiary Commissioners' Accounts (remarks) 7383 (i).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 110 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 1°, 2923 (i).
Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors-Plebiscite B. 121 (Mr. *Fisher*) on M. for 1°, 3935; in Com., 4734, 4747 (ii).
Ry. Employees Safety B. 4 (Mr. *Casey*) in Com., 3675 (i); 4674 (ii).
St. Thomas Mail Service, Tenders and Contracts (Ques.) 453 (i).
SUPPLY:
Civil Government: Agriculture (salaries) 4850; Gov. Gen. Sec.'s Office, 3833, 3893 (i); Post Office, 4857, 4872, 4882, 4895, 4914; (contingencies) 4919; Trade and Commerce (contingencies) 4599 (ii).
Fisheries (protection service) 5289 (ii).
Immigration (agents salaries) 6832 (ii).
Legislation: House of Commons (sessional clerks) 6994; (stationery, &c.) 7036 (ii).
Miscellaneous: Alien Labour Law (Man. and N. W. T.) 7279; Crow's Nest Pass Commission, 7258; (pilotage investigations) 7104 (ii).
Ocean and River Service (life saving stations) 4952.
Penitentiaries (expenses of commissions) 7345 (ii).
Post Office (temporary clerks) 7039 (ii).
Public Works: Buildings, Dom., 5607; (heating, &c., generally) 5494, 5607, 5608: Ont. (summer house, Ottawa) 7225; (Major's Hill Park) 5576; (Telephone service) 5606; Harbours and Rivers, Ont. (dredging) 6087 (ii).
Quarantine (cattle slaughtered) 7005 (ii).
Railways: I.C.R. (claims for damages) 7188, 7377; (general expenses for investigations) 7194, 7201; (iron bridges) 6405, 6425; (land damages) 7083.
Trade and Commerce (Chinese Immigration Act &c.) 6692 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff:
In Com.: (tobacco) 3817 (i).
Yukon Ry., Rothschild's Agents (Ques.) 486 (i).

Ives, Hon. W. B., *Sherbrooke.*
Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Negotiations (Ques.) 600 (i).
Canadian and English Mails, Beaver Line steamers (Ques.) 2844 (i).
Canadian Yukon Ry. B. 6 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 2°, 947 (i).

Ives, Hon. W. B.—*Continued.*
Canadian cablegram to Lord Strathcona (remarks) 1078 (i).
——— Telegram to High Commissioner, *re* Hamilton Smith's proposals, on explanation (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 989 (i).
Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors-Plebiscite B. 121 (Mr. *Fisher*) on M. for 1°, 3934 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Civil Government: Gov. Gen.'s Sec.'s Office, 3871.
Ways and Means—The Tariff:
In Com.: (preferential clause) 3757 (i).

Jameson, Mr. R. W., *Winnipeg.*
C. P. R. Lands exempt from Taxation (Ques.) 1340 (i).
Lake Man. Ry. and Canal Co.'s (B. 66) Sen. Amts., 4807 (ii).
Ontario and Rainy River Ry. Co.'s B. 32 (Mr. *Tisdale*) in Com., 2628 (i).
Ry. Commissioners, Board of, legislation, prop. Res., 1787 (i).
——— Com. of the Privy Council, constitution (Ques.) 1472 (i).
——— Transportation, on M. (Mr. *Maclean*) to adjn., 1756 (i).
SUPPLY:
Miscellaneous (Crow's Nest Pass commission) 7269.

Joly de Lotbinière, Hon. Sir H., K.C.M.G. (*Controller of Inland Revenue*) *Portneuf.*
Adulteration Act Amt. (B. 72) 1°, 1743 (i); in Com., 4777 (ii).
Allaire, J. P. O., Claim against Govt. (Ans.) 3661.
Customs Act Amt. B. 152 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com. 6950 (ii).
Gas Inspection Act Amt. (B. 73) 1°, 1744; in Com., 2138 (i).
General Inspection Act Amt. (B. 128) 1°*, 4522; in Com., 5966 (ii).
Grain Standards Inspection System (Ans.) 1780.
——— Trade at Fort William (Ans.) 475 (i).
Inland Revenue Act Amt. (B. 75) 1°, 1744; in Com., 2139 (i).
——— (B. 172) 1°*, 7585 (ii).
——— Deptl. Rep. (presented) 194 (i).
Inspection of Ashes, Govt. (Ans.) 3660 (i).
McNaughton, Wm., Emplymnt. in Inland Rev. Dept., N.S. (Ans.) 1931 (i).
Napanee Customs Collector, amount paid, &c. (Ans.) 6008 (ii).
Petroleum Inspection Act Amt. (B. 74) 1°, 1744; in Com., 2138 (i).
SUPPLY:
Adulteration of Food (expenses, &c.) 6000 (ii).
Civil Government: Inland Revenue, 4556; (contingencies) 4590, 6983 (ii).
Culling Timber (contingencies) 6000: (salaries, &c.) 7250 (ii).
Excise: 6000; (contingencies, &c.) 7243 (ii).
Inspection of Staples (grain standards) 6695 (ii).
Minor Revenues (printing law stamps) 7251 (ii).

Joly de Lotbinière, Hon. Sir H.—*Con.*
Ways and Means—The Tariff:
In Com.: (tobacco) 3812 (i).
Weights and Measures Act Amt. (Potatoes) B. 60 (Mr. *Fortin*) on M. for 1°, 1384 (i).
——— (B. 71) 1°, 1737; in Com., 2115, 2137, 3097 (i); 6582 (ii).
Yukon Provisional District Administration B. 154 (Mr. *Sifton*) 1°*, 6439 (ii).

Kaulbach, Mr. C. E., *Lunenburg.*
Canadian Yukon Ry. B. 6 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 3°, 1937 (i).
Fishermen's Safety B. 111 (Sir *Louis Davies*) in Com., 4778 (ii).
Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for Com., 2930 (i): in Com., 4045, 4418 (ii).
Georgian Bay Timber District, output of logs to Michigan (Ques.) 826 (i).
Nova Scotia Southern Ry. Subsidy (remarks) 7818 (ii).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 110 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 5777 (ii).
Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors-Plebiscite B. 121 (Mr *Fisher*) on M. for 3°, 6045 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (experimental farms) 5982.
Fisheries (protection service) 5294 (ii).
Indians (N. S.) 7294 (ii).
Ocean and River Service (maintenance, &c.) 4950.
Public Works: Buildings, Dom. (heating, &c.) 5611 (ii); Harbours and Rivers, Mar. Provs. (dredging, &c.) 6083 (ii); N.S., 5614, 7630; Ont. (Toronto Harbour) 5895 (ii).
Railways: Subsidies to N. S. Central Ry. Co., 7812.
Transport of Merchandise in U. S. Vessels (remarks) 1076 (i).

Kloepfer, Mr. C., *South Wellington.*
Budget, The, 3499 (i).

Landerkin, Mr. G., *South Grey.*
Bagot, Electoral District, Vacancy, issue of writ, on M. (Mr. *Bergeron*) to adjn., 5238 (ii).
Belleville Post Office, Dismissals, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6224 (ii).
Dundas, Mr., Dismissal by Govt. (remarks) 6578.
Private Bills, Extension of Time (M.) 1839 (i).
Saskatchewan Ry. and Mining Co.'s Pet., ref. to Standing Orders Com. (M.) 3924 (i).
——— (B. 126) 1°*, 4522 (ii).
Standing Orders Com., suspension of Rule (M.) 5013 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Legislation: House of Commons (debates) 7019 (ii).
Supreme Grand Lodge of the Sons of Eng. Benefit Society's B. 122 (Mr. *Bertram*) 1°*, 4029 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff:
In Com.: (tobacco) 3815 (i).

Lang, Mr. J., *East Peterborough.*
Lakefield and Apsley Mail Route, tenders, &c. (Ques.) 4930 (ii).

Lang, Mr. J.—*Continued.*
Otonabee River Floods, Investigation as to cause (Ques.) 483 (i).
Peterborough Drill Shed, tenders, &c. (Ques.) 5132 (ii).

LaRivière, Mr. A. A. C., *Provencher.*
Allaire, J. P. O., Claim against Govt. (Ques.) 3661 (i).
Business of the Hse., Morning Sittings, 6228 (ii).
Debates, Official, 2nd Rep. of Com. on M. to conc., 4247 (ii).
French translation and printing (remarks) 3091.
Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4084, 4093, 4115, 4295, 4467, 4494, 5262; on M. for 3°, 5689, 5705 (ii).
Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 150 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 6163 (ii).
Kettle River Valley Ry. Co.'s B. 26 (Mr. *Bostock*) in Com., 2957, 3012, 3082 (i).
Manitoba Public Buildings, Ret. *re* (remarks) 3826.
——— Debt Account B. 169 (Mr. *Fielding*) prop. Res., 7401; in Com., 7404.
——— School Fund B. 168 (Mr. *Fielding*) prop. Res., 7414; in Com. on Res., 7425, 7465; on M. for 2°, 7577 (ii).
Man. Claims against Dom. (inquiry for Ret.) 1030 (i).
——— (remarks) 2525 (i).
———Schools Ques., Address to the Holy Father on M. for Com. of Sup., 5436 (ii).
——— University Land Grant, &c., Inquiry for Ret., 5571 (ii).
——— (M. for O.C., &c.*), 3670 (i).
——— (Ques.) 7124 (ii).
Montmorency Cotton Mills incorp. B. 102 (Mr. *Penny*) on M. for 2°, 3084 (i).
Nickel Steel Co.'s incorp. B. 96 (Mr. *Wood, Hamilton*) on M. for Com., 3643; (M. to ref. to Com. on Rys., &c.) 3644 (i).
North-west Settlers, Amount due Govt. by Settlers (remarks) 5570 (ii).
Ontario and Rainy River Ry. Co.'s B. 32 (Mr. *Tisdale*) on M. for Com., 2606, 2625 (i).
Prince Albert Mail Service, delay in transmission on M. (Mr. *Davis*) to adjn., 2521 (i).
Provencher Postmaster, Appnmt. by Govt. (Ques.) 6006 (ii).
St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary Commissioner's Rep. on M. (Mr. *Fortin*) to print (objection), 6607 (ii).
School Lands in Man., Sales (Ques.) 2432 (i).
Standing Orders Com., on M. (Mr. *Landerkin*) to suspend Rule 49, 5014 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Charges of Management: (printing notes) 6977 (ii).
Civil Government: Inland Revenue (contingencies) 6982; Post Office, 4865 (ii).
Legislation: House of Commons (debates) 7015; (sessional clerks) 7012 (ii).

LaRivière, Mr. A. A. C.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY:
Militia: (medals) 7515 (ii).
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, Man., 5928; (dredging) 6099; Ont. (Kaministiquia), 5068; Roads and Bridges (Edmonton Bridge, N.W.T.), 6288 (ii).
Quarantine: (cattle) 5998 (ii).
University of Man. and Govt. Grant of Land (M. for O.C., &c.*) 3670 (i).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid (President of the Council), *East Quebec.*
Address, on the, 81 (i).
——— Precedence of Deb. (M.) 160 (i).
——— Reply to, Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 936 (i).
——— to His Ex. on departure from Can. (M.) 7379 (ii).
——— (Jubilee) to Her Majesty, Reply, Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 1465 (i).
Adjournment for Ash Wednesday (M.) 903 (i).
——— Queen's Birthday (M.) 5930 (ii).
Administration of Oaths of Office B. 1, 1°*, 3 (i).
Alaskan Boundary Dispute, Telegram to N. Y. Press (remarks) 1735 (i).
Alberta and Yukon Ry. Nav. and Mining Co.'s incorp. B. 124 (Mr. *Casey*) in Com., 7166 (ii).
Alien Labour Law, Appnmt. of agent at Georgian Bay (remarks) 6240 (ii).
——— Hamilton (Ans.) 6612 (ii).
——— Ont. (Ans.) 5317 (ii).
——— Parry Sound (remarks) 6613 (ii).
——— Wallaceburg (remarks) 6613 (ii).
——— Enforcement (Ans.) 5392 (ii).
——— at Toronto (remarks) 5012, 5117, 5792, 7126 (ii).
——— Instructions to Agents (remarks) 6581 (ii).
Alien Workmen, Importation to Toronto, on M. (Mr. *Clarke*) to adjn., 4039 (ii).
American Canned Meats, contract with Canadian Govt. (remarks) 3141 (i); 5018 (ii).
Anglo-American Commission and Govtl. action, on M. for Com. of Sup., (remarks) 7692 (ii).
Appnmts. by late Govt., and Colonial Office, cor. &c. (Ans.) 7689.
——— on Amt. (Mr. *Montague*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 4836 (ii).
——— (remarks) 1187 (i); 4926 (ii).
Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Agreements, &c., on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 5225 (ii).
——— (remarks) 3208, 3313 (i).
——— Telegram (Mr. *Davin*) from London (Ans.) 7357 (ii).
Atlantic Fisheries, U. S. Legislation *re* Papers (presented) 1273 (i).
Bagot Electoral District, Vacancy, issue of writ on M. (Mr. *Bergeron*) to adjn., 5247 (ii).
——— (Ans.) 4772 (ii).
——— (remarks) 4350, 4449, 4602, 4928 (ii).
Banff Baths, Caretaker's dismissal, (Ans.) 451 (i).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid—*Continued.*
Bell Telephone Co.'s Pet. (Ans.) 6031 (i).
——— Rates (remarks) 7126 (ii).
Belleville Post Office, Dismissals (remarks) 6112.
Bonding, &c., Arrangement with U.S. on Pacific Coast, on M. for cor., 1786 (i).
B. C. Coast Surveys, Rep. of Mr. Coste (remarks) 5323 (ii).
Bruneau, Mr., M.P. for Richelieu, Resignation, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Marcotte*) (remarks) 2038, 2083, 2143 (i).
Business of the House, Govt. precedence on Mondays (M.) 5012 (ii).
——— Morning Sittings and Coms. (remarks) 6110, 6227 (M.) 6229 (ii).
——— Precedence (M.) 1840 (i).
——— (remarks) 5115, 5787, 5937, 7525 (ii).
Canadian Yukon Ry. Co.'s B. 6 (Mr. *Blair*) Govt. Amts. (remarks) 745 (i).
——— precedence of deb. (M.) 252 (i).
——— Contract (Ans.) 102 (i).
——— Hamilton Smith's communication (remarks) 674, 831, (presented) 903 (i).
——— Kaslo-Slocan Ry. Plans, Papers *re* (remarks) 402 (i).
——— Ref. in Speech from Throne (remarks) 7 (i).
——— Tel. to High Commissioner (explanation) 980 (i).
——— (remarks) 939 (i).
Chicoutimi and Saguenay and Gaspé Judge, Increase of salaries (remarks) 7385 (ii).
Chignecto Ship Ry., par. in Montreal *Gazette* (remarks) 5664 (ii).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 17 (Mr. *McMullen*) on M. for 2°, 4231 (ii).
——— Examiner's Rep. (presented) 4248 (ii).
——— Superannuation Abolition B. 76 (Mr. *Mulock*) Remarks, 2141 (i).
Colonial Premiers, London Conference, on M. for cor., 1785 (i).
Colonization Companies, Grants of land, conditions (Ans.) 479 (i).
Copyright, International, Action of British Govt. on M. for Com. of Sup., 6635, 6802 (ii).
County Court Judges, Age limit, cor., &c. (Ans.) 7124 (ii).
Crow's Nest Pass Ry., Commissioner's Rep. (remarks) 6031 (ii).
——— printing of Rep. (remarks) 6466 (ii).
——— Investigation on conc., 7848 (ii).
——— Treatment of Labourers, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6626 (ii).
——— Member called to order, 6618 (ii).
Dart, Lyman, Remission of sentence in Com, of Sup., 6653 (ii).
Dawson City Electric Lighting and Tramway Co.'s incorp. B. 118 (Mr. *Morrison*) in Com., 6939 (ii).
Debates, Official, Omission of Ques. from Rep., on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *McDougall*) 3427 (i).
——— Rep. Sel. Com. (M.) 449 (i).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid—*Continued.*
Dredging for Gold in Peace River, Permit to Dr. Roughsedge (Ans.) 478 (i).
——— Licenses, Regulation respecting (remarks) 746 (i).
Drummond Co. Ry., Com. of Investigation, prop. Res. 506 (i).
——— Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. *Lister*) to con., 7114 (ii).
——— (M. wthdn.) 7523-4 (ii).
Duck Lake Indian Industrial School, Maintenance, &c. (Ans.) 2356 (i).
Dupont, Mr. late M.P., Decease of (remarks) 1773 (i).
Elevators Monopoly, Man. and N. W. Ter. (Ans.) 598 (i).
Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 2279 (i); in Com., 3967, 3979, 4008, 4069, 4098, 4308, 4406; on Amt. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to M. for 3°, 5671; on M. for 3°, 5700, 5702; Sen. Amts., 7468 (ii).
——— Distribution of printed copies (remarks) 7853 (ii).
French Language in N.W.T., articles in *L'Ouest Canadien* (remarks) 2531 (i).
French Line of Steamers, Negotiations, &c. (remarks) 6466 (ii).
Gananoque Drill Shed, inquiry for Ret. (remarks) 3318 (i).
Gascoigne, Maj. Gen., Resignation (remarks) 4167 (ii).
——— letter read, 6320 (ii).
——— Order, Ques. of (Mr. *Foster*) 6442, 6464 (ii).
Galician Immigrants, *re* par. in *'Nor-Wester*, Govt. treatment (remarks) 6033 (ii).
Gaspé Line of Steamers, subsidy, &c. (Ans.) 7121.
Gladstone, Rt. Hon. W. E., Rep. of decease (Ans.) 4347 (ii).
——— Decease, Res. of Condolence (M.) 6115 (ii).
Govt. Business, Change of procedure on order paper (M.) 3502 (i).
——— Precedence on Thursday (M.) 2521 (i).
——— Two Sittings of the Hse. (remarks) 6013.
——— (M.) 6862 (ii).
Gov. Gen. and Ministerial responsibility, on M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to adjn., 260 (i).
G. T. Ry. Regulation, on M. (Mr. *Wallace*) to adjn., 6023 (ii).
Great North-west Central Ry. Co.'s B. 141 (Mr. *Morrison*) in Com., 7741 (ii).
——— Ques. of Procedure (remarks) 6003 (ii).
Halstead, Mr. Freeman, sentenced at Porto Rico, par. in Toronto *World* (remarks) 6029 (ii).
Hubert, Miss A., Pets. (remarks) 7525 (ii).
Indian Dept., Appnmt. of Law clerk (remarks) 7659 (ii).
Indian Reserves in N.W.T. (Ans.) 452 (i).
——— Qu'Appelle District (Ans.) 451 (i).
——— Supplies, Man. and N.W.T., Purchase (Ans.) 452 (i).
Insolvency B. 84 (Mr. *Fortin*) on M. for 1°, 2029.

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid—*Continued.*
Internal Economy Commission, Mess. of His Ex. (presented) 405 (i).
Japanese Immigration, Imposition of poll-tax (Ans.) 2441 (i).
Joint Commission, U.S. and Can. prop. Conference (remarks) 6611 (ii).
Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 150 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 6132; on M. for 2°, 6761; on M. for 3°, prop. Amt., 7043; Sen. Amts., 7854 (ii).
——— Pension B., in Com. on Res., 7128 (ii).
Kingston Locomotive Works, &c., on M. (Mr. *Taylor*) to adjn. (remarks) 605 (i).
Lake Champlain and St. Lawrence River Ship Canal, incorp. B. 99 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) in Com., 6329, 6928 (ii).
——— (remarks) 6647 (ii).
Land Grants to Ry. Corporations in Man. and N. W. Ters. (Ans.) 482 (i).
——— Surveys in N.W.T. (Ans.) 450 (i).
Library Committee, Joint (M.) 671 (i).
Lt. Gov. N.W.T., Confirmation of Appnmt. (remarks) 6466 (ii).
——— rumoured Appnmt. of member for N. Wellington (Ans.) 101 (i).
——— (remarks) 2699 (i).
——— (Ans.) 1073, 2529 (i).
Lobster Fishery in Bay of Fundy (Ans.) 479 (i).
Lord's Day, Better Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 1964; in Com., 1998, 2047 (i).
London and Lake Huron Ry. Co.'s B. 158 (Mr. *Lister*) on M. to supend Rule, 6607 (ii).
Macdonald Elections, cost of Prosecutions (Ans.) 2349 (i).
McCarthy, Mr., late M.P., Decease of (remarks) 5389 (ii).
Man. Debt Account B. 169 (Mr. *Fielding*) prop. Res., 6722 (ii).
——— School Fund B. 168 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7442, 7465 (ii).
——— Ques., Address to the Holy Father, on M. for Com. of Sup., 5344, 5405 (ii).
Man. Schools, Cor. between Charles Russell and Cardinal Rampolla (Ans.) 4926, 7125 (ii).
Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 405, 936, 1465 (i).
Montreal Circuit Court, extra Judge (Ans.) 598.
Montreal Harbour Commissioners, Loan B. 163 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for Com., 7177 (ii).
Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Co., Construction, &c., on M. (Mr. *Poupore*) to Com. of Sup., 6507 (ii).
Motions, Notice of (Mr. *Hughes*) Remarks, 6027.
Nanaimo, Resignation of member, 4606 (ii).
Newfoundland and Can., Negotiations between (Ans.) 5391 (ii).
——— (remarks) 4928 (ii).
North Simcoe and West Huron, vacancy (remarks) 7042 (ii).
N.W. Mounted Police Pension Act Amt. B. 13 (Mr. *Davis*) in Com., 2058 (i).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid—*Continued.*
N.W. Mounted Police, B. 15 (Mr. *Davin*) on M. for 2°, 4245 (ii).
——— Contract for Supplies, &c. (Ans.) 4041 (ii).
——— Dismissal of Dr. Bain (Ans.) 2349 (i).
——— (remarks) 5116 (ii).
——— Edmonton route to Yukon (Ans.) 1574 (i).
——— on M. for Com. of Sup., 5020 (ii).
——— number in Ters. (Ans.) 452 (i).
——— Tender for Drugs (Ans.) 2349 (i).
——— wthdrl. from Alberta District (remarks) 404 (i).
——— Yukon Detachment (remarks) 4453 (ii).
Nulty, Thos., Death Sentence, Commutation (Ans.) 824 (i), 4771 (ii).
Officer Commanding Militia, Increased allowance, in Com. on Res., 4934 (ii).
Ogilvie's Lecture on the Klondike (remarks) 307.
——— Official Rep. on Klondike, Translation (Ans.) 604, 2529 (i).
Pacific Cable (remarks) 7126 (ii).
Perry, Mr. S. F., late M.P., Decease (remarks) 937 (i).
Preferential Duties on adjnmt. (remarks) 506 (i).
——— trade with G.B. (remarks) 4168, 4452, 4604, 4775, 4928 (ii).
Prendergast, Judge, Commission of inquiry (Ans.) 1076 (i).
P.E.I. Legislation, Disallowance of Act (remarks) 7553 (ii).
Prince, West P.E.I., issue of writ, &c. (Ans.) 1481 (i).
Printing Bureau, H. T. Smith's position (Ans.) 2350 (i).
——— Superintendent's status (Ans.) 2431 (i).
——— Committee, Joint (M.) 597 (i).
Private Bills, Legislation, Order of Procedure (remarks) 7586 (ii).
Priv. (Ques. of), Representative of the Press and Members of Parlt. on M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to adjn., 5122 (ii).
——— par. in *La Patrie re* Man. Schools (Mr. *Bergeron*) 7717 (ii).
Procedure on 3° of B., Mr. Speaker's ruling, 2655.
Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors—Plebiscite B. 121 (Mr. *Fisher*) on M. for 1°, 3930; on M. for 2°, 4704; on M. for 3°, 6038 (ii).
——— (Ans.) 2441 (i).
——— on M. (Mr. *Craig*) to adjn., 3316 (i).
——— Cor. of Min. of Jus. *re* publication in newspaper, 5321 (ii).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 110 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for Com., 5710, 5738 (ii).
Public Accounts Com., on M. (Mr. *Foster*) to print 5th and 6th Reps., 6440 (ii).
——— organization (remarks) 2517 (i).
Public Works Aid B. 161 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 1°, 6894; on M. for 2°, 7411 (ii).
Quebec Bridge, prop. subsidy (remarks) 7386 (ii).
Questions by members, order of Procedure, 7118.

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid—*Continued.*
Ry. Employees Safety B. 4 (Mr. *Casey*) in Com., 4639, 4675; M. to ref. to Com., 5144, 5147; in Com., 5151, 5160 (ii).
——— Rate War and Man. Settlers, on M. (Mr. *Maclean*) to adjn., 1477 (i).
Rainy River Judicial District, Appnmt. of Judge (remarks) 5011 (ii).
Reciprocity with the U.S. (Ans.) 452 (i).
Returns, on inquiries for, 5117, 5232, 5931 (ii).
St. Jacques Model Farm, Establishment by Govt. (Ans.) 7121 (ii).
St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, Commissioner's Rep. on M. (Mr. *Fortin*) to print, 6608 (ii).
Saskatchewan District, Appnmt. of Judge (remarks) 7042 (ii).
——— Timber Limits held by Moore & McDowell (Ans.) 481 (i).
San José Scale, Prohibition of Nursery Stock B. 82 (Mr. *Fisher*) on M. for 1°, 1927 (i).
Sec. of State, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 2425 (i).
Select Standing Coms. (M.) 5 (i).
——— Com. to prepare Lists (M.) 450 (i).
——— Lists (presented) 591 (i).
——— Standing orders, on M. (Mr. *Landerkin*) to suspend Rule 49, 5014 (ii).
Skelton vs. Queen, Affidavits, &c. (remarks) 6112, 6322, 6317 (ii).
——— application for a new trial (Ans.) 5319 (ii).
——— Personal Explanation (Mr. *Davin*) 6891 (ii).
———Postmaster at Battleford, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6816 (ii).
——— (remarks) 5931 (ii).
Spanish Ambassador, late, Presence in Can. (remarks) 5789 (ii).
Speech from the Throne, consdn. (M.) 4 (i).
Spencer, W. J., Pension to (remarks) 6325 (ii).
Statutes, Revision and Consolidation (Ans.) 2343 (i).
Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 39 (Sir *Louis Davies*) in Com., 2096 (i).
SS. Service, Can. and France, Establishment (Ans.) 456 (i).
Superior Court, Magdalen Islands, (Ans.) 598 (i).
SUPPLY.
Civil Government: Agriculture (salaries) 4850; N. W. M. P., 4545; Post Office, 4861; Privy Council, 7483 (ii).
Indians: Ont. and Que. (industrial schools) 7757.
Legislation: House of Commons (debates) 7025: (sessional indemnities to absent members) 7783.
Miscellaneous (Crow's Nest Pass Commission) 7262; (Hudson Bay Expedition) 7097; Man. School Case litigation) 7771; (Prescott and Russell Fire relief fund) 7090; Privy Council (records) 7281 (ii).
Penitentiaries (commission's expenses) 7350 (ii).
Unprovided Items: per Auditor Gen.'s Rep., 7352.
Yukon Provisional District: Maintenance of Force, 7339, 7353 (ii).
Treasury Board Recommendations, non-production of Returns (remarks) 1078 (i).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid—*Continued.*
U.S. Customs Regulations at Skagway and Dyea (Ans.) 101 (i).
——— on the Stikine (remarks) 621 (i).
——— on the Yukon (Ans.) 454 (i).
——— (remarks) 6 (i).
——— Occupation of Dyea and Skagway (remarks) 619 (i).
——— Transport of Merchandise in U. S. vessels (remarks) 1076 (i).
——— War Ships in Canadian Canals (remarks) 4350 (ii).
——— in Canadian Waters, Right to exclude (Ans.) 825 (i).
Victoriaville Public Building, Erection, &c., (Ans.) 7120 (ii).
Walsh, E. J., Claims against the Govt. (remarks) 6325 (ii).
Walsh, Administrator of Yukon, Appnmts. to Force (Ans.) 480 (i).
——— Appnmts., &c. (Ans.) 479 (i).
——— Instructions *re* Immigration (Ans.) 601 (i).
———Instructions *re* non-production of (remarks) 1387 (i).
——— Instructions and Commission (presented) 1174 (i).
Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 71 (Sir *Henri Joly*) in Com., 2117 (i).
West Prince (P.E.I.) Vacancy, issue of writ (Ans.) 2241 (i).
Whisky for the Yukon, *re Mananunses* cargo (remarks) 1188 (i).
Williams, W. W., Seeley's Bay Postmaster, Dismissal, on M. (Mr. *Taylor*) to adjn., 3412 (i).
Yukon Provisional District, Action of U.S. Senate, on M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to adjn., 1276 (i).
——— Customs Officials, par. in Ottawa *Citizen*, 4452 (ii).
——— Liquor Permits, Govt. right to grant (Ans.) 473 (i).
——— (remarks) 746, 2269 (i).
——— Placer Mining and Timber licenses (Ans.) 460 (i.)
——— Purchase of provisions, for N.W.M.P., &c. (Ans.) 1931 (i).
——— Rothschilds' Agents (Ans.) 486 (i).
——— Routes and Passes, explorations (Ans.) 482.
——— Teslin Lake Wagon route, and Govt. Policy (remarks) 2700 (i).
——— (remarks) 1188 (i).
——— Timber Berths, Names of Tenderers (Ans.) 485 (i).
——— limits granted to H. Domville (Ans.) 474.
——— Troops for (remarks) 1577 (i).
——— Wagon Road (remarks) 1185 (i).

Lavergne, Mr., *Drummond and Arthabaska.*
Victoriaville, Public Building, Erection, &c. (Ques.) 7120 (ii).

Legris, Mr. J. H., *Maskinongé.*
Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on Amt. (Mr. *Powell*) to M. for 2°, 2782 (i).
Man. School Fund B. 168 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7451 (ii).

Lemieux, Mr. R., *Gaspé.*
Budget, The, 3569 (i).
Canadian Yukon Ry. B. 6 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 2°, 1229 (i).
Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries B. 14 (Mr. *Richardson*) on M. for Com., 2883 (i).
Magdalen Islands Mail Service (Ques.) 1575 (i).
Montreal Circuit Court, extra Judge (Ques.) 598.
Nulty's Death Sentence, Petitions for commutation (Ques.) 824 (i).
St. Helen's Island, allotment for Military Purposes (Ques.) 456 (i).
SS. Service, Can. and France, establishment (Ques.) 456 (i).
Superior Court, Magdalen Islands (Ques.) 597 (i).
SUPPLY:
Fisheries (salaries, &c., overseers) 5006 (ii).
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, Mar. Provs. (dredging) 6083 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Hon. Mr. Mackenzie's monument) 6106 (ii).
U.S. SS. *Yantic* and *La Canadienne*, Collision, &c. (Ques.) 4451 (ii).

Lister, Mr. J. F., *West Lambton.*
Chignecto Ship Ry., par in Montreal *Gazette* (remarks) 5663 (ii).
Drummond County Ry. Investigation, Rep. of Com. (M.) 7113 (ii).
——— 1st Rep. of Com. (presented) 1272 (i).
——— 2nd Rep. of Com. (presented) 6580 (ii).
——— (M.) to print Evidence and Rep., 6580 (ii).
Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 3948 (ii).
London and Lake Huron Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 67) 1°, 1736 (i); in Com., 4072 (ii).
——— (B. 158) M. to suspend Rule, 1*, 6607 (ii).
Privilege (Ques. of) Press Representatives and Members of Parlt., on M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to adjn., 5124 (ii).
Safety of Ry. Employees B. 4 (Mr. *Casey*) in Com., 4209, 4212 (ii).

Logan, Mr. H. J., *Cumberland.*
Canada Atlantic Ry. Co.'s (B. 93) 1°*, 2430 (i).
Missaquash Commissioners, Confirmation of Acts (B. 103) 1°, 2430 (i).

Macdonald, Mr. A. C., *King's, P.E.I.*
Butter Industry in Can., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Reid*) 2458 (i).
Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 2974 (i).
Govt. Harbours, Piers and Breakwaters Act Amt. B. 38 (Sir *Louis Davies*) in Com., 1865 (i).

Macdonald, Mr. A. C.—*Continued.*
Lambert, Martin, Montague, P.E.I., Dismissal (Ques.) 5787 (ii).
Macdonald, A., Postmaster at Peake's Station, Dismissal (Ques.) 4344 (ii).
Montague, P.E.I., Sub-collector of Customs, Dismissal (M. for cor.) 2822 (i).
Neufrage Pond, Survey (Ques.) 3166 (i).
Prince Edward, Dredge, Number of caretakers and employees (M. for Ret.*) 2841 (i).
——— (Ques.) 2345 (i).
P.E.I. Ry. Curve at North Wiltshire (Ques.) 2345.
Returns (inquiry) 7526 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Fisheries (salaries, overseers, &c.) 5004 (ii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service: Salaries, 4996 (ii).
Miscellaneous: Wharfinger, Sault Ste. Marie, salary, 7102 (ii).
Ocean and River Service (P.E.I. and Mainland) 7731; (Winter Mail Service) 4980 (ii).
Public Works: Buildings, Dom. (heating, &c.) 5609; Harbours and Rivers, N.S. (New Harbour) 7598; P.E.I., 5630, 7638 (ii).
Weights and Measures Act. Amt. B. 71 (Sir *Henri Joly*) in Com., 2124 (i).
West Prince, P.E.I., Vacancy in Electoral District, Notification, 1079 (i).

Macdonald, Mr. P., *East Huron.*
Budget, The, 3392 (i).
Canadian Yukon Ry. Co.'s B. 6 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 2°, 1055 (i).
Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 2301; in Com., 2978-2982 (i).

Mackie, Mr. T., *North Renfrew.*
Roche Fendue and Calumet Dams, on M. (Mr. *Poupore*) for cor., 4621 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, Ont. conc., 7821 (ii).

Maclaren, Mr. A. F., *North Perth.*
Alien Labour Workmen, Importation to Toronto, on M. (Mr. *Clark*) to adjn., 4034 (ii).
Robert, H. A., Post Office clock, Stratford, caretaker, dismissal (Ques.) 4344 (ii).
Honey Locust Plant and San José Scale Act, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6965 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Public Works: Buildings, Ont. (Woodstock, P.O.) 5469 (ii).

Maclean, Mr. W. F., *East York.*
Address, on The, Member's Stmnt. challenged, 93 (i).
Board of Trade at Toronto (B. 43) 1°*, 970 (i).
Butter Industry in Canada, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Reid*) 2469 (i).
Canadian Yukon Ry. Co.'s B. 6 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 2°, 844 (i).
——— Telegram to High Commissioner on Explanation (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 985 (i).

Maclean, Mr. W. F.—*Continued.*
Canals, Date of opening (Ques.) 3317 (i).
Cattle exported from Canadian Ports (Ques.) 475.
Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries B. 14 (Mr. *Richardson*) on M. for Com., 2861 (i).
Dom. Building and Loan Association (B. 41) 1°*, 970 (i).
Dredging for Gold in Peace River, &c., permit to Dr. Roughsedge (Ques.) 478 ii).
Foreign Immigrants, settled in Can. (Ques.) 6109 (ii).
Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on Amt. (Mr. *Powell*) to M. for 2°, 2751 ; in Com., 3949 ; on M. for 3°, 5702 (ii).
Free Miners Certificates, Number issued (Ques.) 3311 (i).
Galician Immigrants, settled in Can. (Ques.) 6109 (ii).
Govt. Business, precedence on Thursdays, on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 2523 (i).
G.T.R. and C.P.R., connection at North Bay (remarks) 4353 (ii).
G. T. R. and O. A. & P. S. Ry. connection at Scotia Junction (Ques.) 454 (i).
Insolvency Bill, Govt. legislation (Ques.) 3826 (i).
——— Govt. measure (Ques.) 2848 (i).
Kettle River Valley Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 26 (Mr. *Bostock*) consdn. of amts., 3360 (i).
Lighthouse Supplies, Montreal west, Contract (Ques.) 2846 (i).
Lord's Day, Better Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 1962 ; in Com., 1979 ; (Amt.) that Com. rise, 2045 ; on M. for 3° (Amt.) to re-commit, 2400, in Com., 2401 ; (Amt.) that Com. rise, 2402, 2417 (i).
——— on M. to restore to order paper, 2427 (i).
Man. Debt Account B. 169 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res , 7406 (ii).
——— School Fund B. 168 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7424 (ii).
Miners' Free Licenses, Issue of Certificates (Ques.) 5133 (ii).
Montreal & Lake Ontario, Completion of fourteen foot Navigation (Ques.) 6009 (ii).
Ontario and Rainy River Ry. Co.'s B. 32 (Mr. *Tisdale*) on M. for Com., 2386, 2616, 2647 ; in Com., 2619 (i).
——— M. to ref. back to Com., 2661 (i).
Ontario Court of Appeal, Extra judge (Ques.) 1071.
Prince Albert Mail Service, Delay in Transport, on M. (Mr. *Davis*) to adjn., 2519 (i).
Privilege (Ques. of) Press Representatives and Members of Parlt. on M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to adjn., 5130 (ii).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 110 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 5749, 5759 (ii).
——— Savings Banks, reduction of interest on amt. (Mr. *Davin*) to M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 3719 (i).
Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors—Plebiscite B. 121 (Mr. *Fisher*) on M. for 1°, 3933 (ii).

Maclean, Mr. W. F.—*Continued.*
Ry. Employees Safety B. 4 (Mr. *Casey*) on M. to ref. back to Com., 5144 ; in Com., 5150 (ii).
——— Commissioners, Board of, legislation, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Jameson*) 1805, 1821 (i).
——— Rates to Stickine (Ques.) 1070 (i).
——— rates, War, and Man. Settlers (M. to adjn.) 1473 (i).
——— Transportation (M. to adjn.) 1749 (i).
San José Scale, Prohibition of Nursery Stock B. 82 (Mr. *Fisher*) on M. for 1°, 1968 (i).
——— on M. (Mr. *Charlton*) to adjn., 2250 (i).
Spanish Ambassador, late, presence in Canada, 5789 (ii).
SUPPLY :
Civil Government: Gov. Gen. Sec's Office, 3839 (i).
Trade with West Indies, on Adjnmt. (remarks) 2843 (i).
Walsh, Major, Appnmt. as Administrator of Yukon District (Ques.) 479 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff :
In Com.: (preferential clause) 3758 (i).
Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 71 (Sir *Henri Joly*) in Com., 3191 (i).
Yukon Provisional District, Banking Business (Ques.) 3311 (i).
——— geological survey of (Ques.)

Macpherson, Mr. T. H., *Hamilton.*
Alien Labour Law, Appnmt. of Agent at Hamilton (Ques.) 6611 (ii).
Edmonton and Peace River Ry. and Nav. Co.'s incorp. (B. 98) 1°*, 2430 (i).
Hamilton and Lake Erie Power Co.'s (B. 100) 1°*. 2430 (i) ; Sen. Amts., 4606 (ii).
International Radial Ry. Co. Revival Act Amt. (B. 137) 1°*, 5215 (ii).
Nakusp and Slocan Ry. Co.'s (B. 52) 1°*, 1174 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff :
In Com. (preferential clause) 3766 (i).

McAlister, Mr. J., *Restigouche.*
Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 3966. 4486 (ii).
Govt. Harbours, Piers and Breakwaters Act Amt. B. 38 (Sir *Louis Davies*) in Com., 1865 (i).
I. C. R. Train Service, issue of new time tables, 6243 (ii).
Oak Bay Mills Post Office, Closing (Ques.) 3824.
——— imperfect Return (remarks) 5324 (ii).
——— Return (inquiry) 3941 (ii).
Ogilvie's Reports, sent from Yukon, dates (Ques.) 974 (i).
Ry. Employees Safety B. (Mr. *Casey*) in Com., 3682 (i).
Restigouche Indians, Agent, Dismissal of J. A. Venner (M. for Ret.*) 2839 (i).
——— (Ques.) 4611 (ii).
——— (remarks) 1786 (i).
Returns (inquiry) 4928 (ii).

McAlister, Mr. J.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY:
Civil Government: Geological Survey (salaries) 7478 (ii).
Fisheries (protection service) 5564; (salaries, overseers') 507 (ii).
Indians: N.B., 7294 (ii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (construction) 4999.
Post Office: Outside Service (miscellaneous expenses) 6712 (ii).
Public Works: Buildings, N.S., 5087; Harbours and Rivers, N.S. (New Harbour) 7590; Ont., 7642; (dredging) 6093; Que., 7638 (ii).
Railways: I. C. R. (increased accommodation at St. John) 7649; (rolling stock) 7644 (ii).

McCarthy, Mr. D., *North Simcoe.*
Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4465 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Civil Government: High Commissioner's Office (contingencies) 4579 (ii).
Toronto and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 77 (Mr. *Clarke*) on M. for Com., 4570 (ii).

McCleary, Mr. W., *Welland.*
Alien Labour Law, Appnmt. of Agent at Fort Erie (Ques.) 4178 (ii).
——— Enforcement of (remarks) 5789, 5807 (ii).
——— Workmen, Importation to Toronto, on M. (Mr. *Clarke*) to adjn., 4036 (ii).
Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on Amt. (Mr. *Powell*) to M. for 2°, 2753 (i).
Horses for feeding, Licenses by farmers (Ques.) 2343 (i).
Johnson, Mr. J. T., Customs Collector at Fort Erie, Dismissal (Ques.) 4178 (ii).
Lord's Day, Better Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 2041 (i).
Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors-Plebiscite B. 121 (Mr. *Fisher* in Com., 4740 (ii).
Queen Victoria Park, Niagara Falls (Ques.) 2847.
San José Scale, Prohibition of Nursery Stock B. 82 (Mr. *Fisher*) on M. for 1°, 1913 (i).
——— on M. (Mr. *Charlton*) to adjn., 2247 (i).
SUPPLY:
Canals: Soulanges (construction) 6459; Welland, 7652 (ii).
Public Works: Buildings, Ont., 5463; Harbours and Rivers, Ont., 5463, 7642; (Toronto Harbour) 5899 (ii).
Railways (General expenses for Investigations) 7206 (ii).

McClure, Mr. F., *Colchester.*
Canadian Yukon Ry. Co.'s B. 6 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 2°, 832 (i).
Canada Temperance Act Amt. (B. 49) 1°*, 970 (i).
Dart, Lyman, Remission of Sentence, in Com. of Sup., 6666 (ii).
Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 2571 (i); in Com., 3962, 4398 (ii).
Lord's Day, Better Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 1986; on M. (Mr. *Maclean*) that Com. rise, 2425 (i).

McClure, Mr. F.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY:
Indians (surveys) 6851 (ii).
Railways: I.C.R. (claims for damages by fire) 7376.

McCormick, Mr. G., *Muskoka and Parry Sound.*
Alien Labour Law, Appnmt. of Agent at Parry Sound (remarks) 6613 (ii).
——— Enforcement, &c. (remarks) 7126 (ii).
Parry Sound Harbour-master (Ques.) 5135 (ii).
Walton, T. M., Indian Agent at Parry Sound, Dismissal, &c. (M. for cor.*) 3670 (i).

McDougall, Mr. H. F., *Cape Breton.*
Bounties on Iron and Steel B 159 (Mr. *Paterson*) on prop. Res., 6724 (ii).
Bounty to Fishermen, Applications at Gabarus (Ques.) 674 (i).
Business of the Hse. (remarks) 5787 (ii).
Canadian Yukon Ry. Co.'s B. 6 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 2°, 961, 1030 (i).
Cape Breton County, Marine Dept. changes (Ques.) 673 (i).
——— Dismissals (remarks) 6033 (ii).
Certificates to Masters and Mates Act Amt. B. 37 (Sir *Louis Davies*) in Com., 1861 (i).
Civil Service, Superannuation Abolition B. 76 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 6800 (ii).
Debates, Official, omission of Question from Rep. on Ques. of Privilege, 3425 (i).
Dismissals in Cape Breton, inquiry for Ret., 6321, 6519, 6569 (ii).
Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4026, 4042, 4080, 4103, 4270, 4293, 4333, 4401, 4416, 4454, 4487 (ii).
Fishermen's Safety B. 111 (Sir *Louis Davies*) in Com., 4780 (ii).
Gabarus Breakwater, Grant, &c. (Ques.) 4179 (ii).
Grand Narrows, C.B., Dismissal of Govt. blacksmith (Ques.) 3661 (i).
——— Preventive officer, duties and salary (Ques.) 1781 (i).
McNeill, Rory, section foreman I. C. R., Dismissal (Ques.) 603 (i).
Man. School Ques., Address to the Holy Father, on M. for Com. of Sup., 5331 (ii).
——— cor. between Mr. Charles Russell and Cardinal Rampolla (Ques.) 4924, 7124 (ii).
——— documents and cor. with Rome (M. for cor.) 3663 (i).
Members' sessional trunks, Contract, &c., on M. (Mr. *Gibson*) to Com. of Sup., 7049 (ii).
Military College Employees, Suppl. Ret. (remarks) 6035 (ii).
Ottawa and Truro Mail Service (Ques.) 1575 (i).
Port Morien, Breakwater, Grant by Govt. (Ques.) 4179 (ii).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 110 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for Com., 5716 (ii).
——— Savings Banks, Reduction of Interest on Amt. (Mr. *Davin*) to M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 3724 (i).

McDougall, Mr. H. F.—*Continued.*
Returns (inquiry) 5930 (ii).
Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 39 (Sir *Louis Davies*) in Com., 2086 (i).
Stimulants in Chamber during debate, on Ques. of Privilege (Mr. *Talbot*) 3640 (i).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (creameries, N.W.T) 5994; (Farm Bulletins, distribution) 5994; (Patent Record) 5024; (Year-book) 5038 (ii).
Canals: Soulanges (construction) 6449 (ii).
Civil Government: Inland Revenue (contingencies) 4591; Post Office, 4859, 4883; (contingencies) 4915; Public Works (contingencies) 4593; Railways and Canals (contingencies) 4597; Trade and Commerce (contingencies) 4598 (ii).
Dom. Lands: Surveys, &c. 7321 (ii).
Excise (preventive service) 7248 (ii).
Fisheries (protection service) 5277 (ii).
Indians: N.B. (erection of fence, &c) 7294; (surveys) 6851 (ii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (salaries) 4987 (ii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Halifax, St. John, &c.) 7282 (ii).
Militia (Fredericton school) 7057 (ii).
Miscellaneous (pilotage investigations) 7104 (ii).
Ocean and River Service (life saving station) 4954; (maintenance) 4951; (registry of shipping) 4954; (tidal surveys) 4963; (winter mail service) 4966, 4975 (ii).
Post Office: Mail Clerks (salaries) 7051 (ii).
Public Works: Buildings, Dom. (heating, &c.) 5608; Man., 5488; N.S., 5074; Ont. (deptl. block, Ottawa 5070; (summer house) 7220; Harbours and Rivers (general vote) 6071; Mar. Provs. (dredging) 6082; N.S, 5612; Que. (St. Lawrence Ship Channel) 5053, 5059; Toronto Harbour) 5908 (ii).
Quarantine (cattle slaughtered) 7004; (gratuities) 6995 (ii).
Railways: I.C.R. (accommodation at Mulgrave) 6428; (claims for damages) 7183; (dismissal of Rory McNeil) 6415; (increased accommodation) 6433; (iron bridges) 6405; (general expenses of investigations) 7195 (ii).
Sydney and North Sydney quarantine, Physicians (Ques.) 1781 (i).
Yukon Military Contingent, Expenditure, &c. (remarks) 4797 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff:
In Com. (preferential clause) 3772, 3780; (tobacco) 3814 (i).
Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 71 (Sir *Henri Joly*) on M. for 1°, 1741; in Com., 2120, 2133 (i).

McGregor, Mr. W., *North Essex.*
Alien Workmen, importation to Toronto, on M. (Mr. *Clarke*) to adjn., 4035 (ii).
Customs Act Amt. B. 152 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com., 6959 (ii).
San José Scale, Prohibition of Nursery Stock, on M. (Mr. *Charlton*) to adjn., 2264 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Ocean and River Service (winter mail service) 4973.
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers (dredging) 6078; Mar. Provs. (dredging) 6083 (ii).

McHugh, Mr. G., *South Victoria, O.*
Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries B. 14 (Mr. *Richardson*) on M. for Com., 2878 (i).
Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 2948 (i), 4460 (ii).
Ry. Employees Safety B. 4 (Mr. *Casey*) in Com., 4676 (ii).
Tamagamingue Ry. Co's incorp. (B. 62) 1°*, 1465.

McInerney, Mr. G. V. (*Kent, N.B.*)
Bruneau, Mr., M.P., for Richelieu, Resignation, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Marcotte*) ref. to Com. on Priv. and Elections, 2167 (i).
Canadian Yukon Ry. Co.'s B. 6 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 2°, 794 (i).
Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries B. 14 (Mr. *Richardson*) on M. for Com., 3699 (ii).
Elgin, N.B., Postmaster, Dismissal, (M. for cor.*) 1837 (i).
European and North American Ry., Settlement between Govt. and E. B. Chandler (M. for Ret.*) 2841 (i).
Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 3990, 4074, 4084, 4100, 4133, 4254, 4266, 4374, 4377, 4473, 4525 (ii).
Hillsborough Customs Collector, Dismissal (M. for cor.*) 1838 (i).
I.C.R., Carriage of Coal (Ques.) 4448 (ii).
——— Killam's claim, cattle destroyed, inquiry for Ret. 4683 (ii).
——— position on I. C. R. (Ques.) 827 (i).
McNaughton, Wm., Emplymt. in the Inland Rev., N.S. (Ques.) 1931 (i).
Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. B. 136 (Sir *Louis Davies*) in Com., 5330 (ii).
Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors-Plebiscite B. 121 (Mr. *Fisher*) on M. for 1°, 3929 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Civil Government: Militia (accountant) 3908 (i).
Fisheries (protection service) 5273 (ii).
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers (N.B.) 5642.
Yukon Ry., Action of U. S. Senate, on M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to adjn., 1298 (i).

McInnes, Mr. W. W. B., *Vancouver, B.C.*
Beaumont, Wm., Claims for salary as Postmaster (Ques.) 4611 (ii).
Boundary between Can. and Alaska (Ques.) 1076.
Canadian Yukon Ry. B. 6 (Mr. *Blair*) on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to M. for 2°, 1722, 1723.
Cowichan Valley Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 48) 1°*, 970 (i).
Crow's Nest Pass Ry., Agreement with C. P. R. (Ques.) 2036 (i).
Dawson City Electric Co.'s B. 123 (Mr. *Morrison*) 1°*, 4247 (ii).
Dom. Govt. Creameries (Ques.) 3085 (i).
Immigration into Yukon, Maj. Walsh's instructions (Ques.) 601 (i).
Japanese Immigration Restriction (B. 70) 1°, 1736 (i).
——— (remarks) 2528 (i).

McInnes, Mr. W. W. B.—*Continued.*
Kettle River Valley Ry. Co.'s B. 26 (Mr. *Bostock*) in Com., 2958, 2963, 3012 (i).
"Mudlark," Dredge, Increase in working hours (Ques.) 3825 (i).
Rothwell's Rep. *re* Claims of settlers (remarks) 2851 (i).
U. S. Customs Regulations in the Yukon (Ques.) 453 (i).
——— Relief Expedition to Yukon, Military Escort (Ques.) 970 (i).
Vancouver Island Ry. belt, Settler's claims, Rep. of Mr. Rothwell (remarks) 4452 (ii).
Victoria, Vancouver and Eastern Ry. Co.'s B. 64 (Mr. *Maxwell*) 1°*, 1573 (i).
Yukon Mines, Telegraph connection (Ques.) 1472.

McIsaac, Mr. C. F. (*Antigonish, N.S.*)
Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on Amt. (Mr. *Powell*) to M. for 2°, 2795 (i).
SUPPLY :
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, N.S., 7633 (ii).

McLellan, Mr. B. D., *West Prince, P.E.I.*
SUPPLY :
Railways and Canals: P.E.I. Ry. (rolling stock) 6437 (ii).

McLennan, Mr. R. R., *Glengarry.*
Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries B. 14 (Mr. *Richardson*) in Com., 4666 (ii).
SUPPLY :
Canals: Farran's Point, 6533; North Channel (construction) 6536 (ii).
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, Ont. (dredging) 6087; Roads and Bridges (Edmonton Bridge, N.W.T.) 6286, 6290 (ii).

McLennan, Mr. A., *Inverness, N.S.*
Butter Industry in Canada, prop. Res. (Mr. *Reid*) 2496 (i).
Cape Breton Ry., Hard-pan Claims (Ques.) 5134.
Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 3986, 4413, 4492 (ii).
Grand Etang, Dredging, &c. (Ques.) 5317 (ii).
Privilege (Ques. of) Ref. to Mr. Mills's speech in *Hansard*, 4603 (ii).
SUPPLY :
Arts, Agriculture &c. (creameries, N.W.T.) 5994; (dairy stations, N.S.) 7513 (ii).
Fisheries (protection service) 5295 (ii).
Militia (Dom. Artillery associations) 7522 (ii).
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, Mar. Provs. (dredging) 6082; N.S., 5617, 5623 (ii).
Railways: I.C.R. (accommodation at Mulgrave) 6430; (dismissal of Rory McNeill) 6417 (ii).
Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 71 (Sir *Henri Joly*) on M. for 1°, 1741 (i).

McMillan, Mr. J., *South Huron.*
Belleville Post Office, Dismissals, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6225 (ii).
Budget, on The, 3489 (i).
Butter Industry of Can. on prop. Res. (Mr. *Reid*) 2377, 2501, 2511 (i).

McMillan, Mr. J.—*Continued.*
Canadian Yukon Ry. B. 6 (Mr. *Blair*) on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to M. for 2°, 1672 (i).
Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries B. 14 (Mr. *Richardson*) on M. for Com., 3702 (i).
Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 2947, 2975 (i).
Honey Locust Plant and San José Scale Act on M. (Mr. *Maclaren*) to Com. of Sup., 6972 (ii).
Man. School Ques., Address to the Holy Father, on M. for Com. of Sup., 5423 (ii).
Personal explanation *re* Mr. Taylor's speech on Experimental Farms, 6113 (ii).
Ry. Commissioners, Appnmt. (Ques.) 1784 (i).
——— legislation on prop. Res. (Mr. *Jameson*) 1823 (i).
San José Scale, Prohibition of Nursery Stock B. 82 (Mr. *Fisher*) on M. for 1°, 1915 (i).
——— on M. (Mr. *Charlton*) to adjn., 2265 (i).
SUPPLY :
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Paris Exhibition) 5048 (ii).
Public Works: Buildings, N.S., 5082 (ii).
Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 71 (Sir *Henri Joly*) in Com., 2131 (i).

McMullen, Mr. J., *North Wellington.*
Address, on The, 422 (i).
Aliens Act Amt. (B. 63) 1°, 1466 (i).
Bagot Electoral District, Vacancy, issue of writ on M. (Mr. *Bergeron*) to adjn., 5254 (ii).
Belleville Post Office, Dismissals, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6221 (ii).
Budget, on The, 3458 (ii).
Butter Industry of Can. Encouragement of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Reid*) 2363 (i).
Canadian Yukon Ry. B. 6 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 1°, 219 (i).
——— Telegram to High Commissioner *re* Hamilton Smith's proposals, 1015 (i).
Civil Service Act Amt. (B. 17) 1°*, 405 (i); 2° m., 4222, 4237 (ii).
——— Board of Supervisors, Authorization, (B. 10) 1°, 270 (i).
——— Attachment of Salaries B. 14 (Mr. *Richardson*) on M. for Com., 3692 (ii).
——— Superannuation Abolition B. 76 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 6348; in Com., 6367, 6797 (ii).
Crow's Nest Pass Ry. Investigation on conc. 7843 (ii).
Debts due the Dom. on Loans to Public Works on M. for Com. of Sup., 6238 (ii).
Dep. Minister and Clerks, amounts paid for extra services from 1890 to 1897 (M. for Ret.*) 3667 (ii).
Experimental Farm, Distribution of Bulletins (remarks) 2454 (i).
Extra Clerks and Civil Service, Salaries and amounts paid from 1895 to 1897 (M. for Ret.*) 3667 (i).
——— inside and outside service (M. for Ret.*) 3667 (i).

McMullen, Mr. J.—*Continued.*

Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 2314 (i).

Govt. Business, Change of Procedure, on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 3502 (i).

——— Precedence on Thursdays on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 2523 (i).

G. T. Ry. Regulations on M. (Mr. *Wallace*) to adjn., 6022 (ii).

I. C. R. Dining cars, number, &c. (Ques.) 2812 (i)

Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 150 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 6152, 6184 (ii).

Lord's Day, Better Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 1960 (i); in Com., 1985; on Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) that Com. rise, 2404 (i).

Man. Debt Account B. 169 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7406 (ii).

N. W. Mounted Police, Contract for transporting supplies to Yukon (remarks) 5510 (ii).

Order (Ques. of) in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Montague*) P.O. Dept., 4892 (ii).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 110 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for Com., 5731; in Com., 5779 (ii).

Preferential Trade with G. B. on Amt. (Mr. *McNeil*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 5839 (ii).

Public Accounts Committee, Meetings (remarks) 3503 (i).

St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, Commissioner's Rep. (Ques.) 3940 (ii).

San José Scale Pest, Prohibition of Nursery Stock on M. (Mr. *Charlton*) to adjn., 2249 (i).

Sons of England Benefit Society incorp. B. 122 (Mr. *Bertram*) on M. for Com., 6061 (ii).

Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 39 (Sir *Louis Davies*) in Com., 2093 (i).

Stimulants in the Chamber during debate on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Talbot*) 3640 (i).

SUPPLY:

Administration of Justice: Supreme Court (judges' salary) 6990 (ii).

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (N. W. Ter. exhibition account) 6995; (year book) 5027 (ii).

Canals: Sault Ste. Marie (contractors' claims) 7105; Soulanges (construction) 6529 (ii).

Civil Government: Agriculture (salaries) 4848; Gov. Gen.'s Sec.'s Office, 3854; Interior, 4544; Post Office, 4891; Sundry Depts. (Priv. Secs.) 7484 (ii).

Govt. of North-west Ters.: Insane Asylums, 7306.

Legislation: House of Commons (debates) 7030 (sessional clerks) 6991; (stationery, &c.) 7037; Senate (unforeseen expenses) 6994 (ii).

Minor Revenues (printing law stamps) 7251 (ii).

Miscellaneous: Crows Nest Pass Commission, 7260.

Penitentiaries (expenses of commission) 7350 (ii).

Post Office: Outside Service (letter carriers) 7776.

Public Works: Buildings, N.S., 5074; N.W.T., 5490: Ont. (Major's Hill Park) 5457; (Woodstock P.O.) 5468; Roads and Bridges (Edmonton Bridge, N.W.T.) 6299 (ii).

Quarantine (gratuities) 6997; ("Scientific Dairying") 6999 (ii).

McMullen, Mr. J.—*Continued.*

SUPPLY—*Continued.*

Railways: I.C.R. (accommodation at Halifax) 6383; (iron bridges) 6389; (original construction) 6386 (ii).

Unprovided Items: per Aud. Gen 's Rep., 7351 (ii).

Tennant, John F., Dismissal by Govt. on M. (Mr. *Quinn*) for Ret., 5196 (ii).

Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 71 (Sir *Henri Joly*) in Com., 2118 (i).

Williams, W. W., Seeley's Bay Postmaster, Dismissal on M. (Mr. *Taylor*) to adjn., 3414 (i).

McNeill, Mr. A., *North Bruce.*

Address, on The, 410 (i).

Bruneau, Mr., M.P. for Richelieu, Resignation, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Marcotte*) to ref. to Com. on Priv. and Elections, 2228 (i).

Butter Industry in Can., Encouragement of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Reid*) 2460 (i).

Civil Service; Attachment of Salaries B. 14 Mr. *Richardson*) on M. for Com., 2885 (i).

——— Superannuation Abolition B. 76 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 6343, 6347 (ii).

Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 2567, on Amt. (Mr. *Powell*) to M. for 2°, 2794 (i); in Com. 3957, 4283, 4375, 4396; Sen. Amts., 7534 (ii).

G. T. Ry. Regulations on M. (Mr. *Wallace*) to adjn., 6020 (ii).

Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 150 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 6173; on M. for 2°, of B., 6767; in Com., 6791 (ii).

——— (Pension) B. in Com. on Res., 7131 (ii).

Man. Debt Account B. 159 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7408 (ii).

Man. Schools Ques., Address to the Holy Father, on M. for Com. of Sup., 5421 (ii).

Pacific Cable between Vancouver and Australia, on M. (Mr. *Casey*) for Com. of Sup., 6199 (ii).

——— (remarks) 7125, 7384 (ii).

Personal Explanation, Misquotation of quotation (remarks) 518 (i).

Preferential Trade with G.B., Amt. to Com. of Sup., 5808 (ii).

——— (remarks) 4168, 4452, 4604, 4775, 4928 (ii).

Privilege (Ques. of) Press Representatives and Members of Parlt., on M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to adjn., 5131 (ii).

Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors-Plebiscite B. 121 (Mr. *Fisher*) on M. for 1°, 3932; in Com., 4751 (ii).

Ry. Employees Safety B. 4 (Mr. *Casey*) in Com., 4220 (ii).

——— Transportation on M. (Mr. *Maclean*) to adjn., 1770 (i).

San José Scale, Prohibition of Nursery Stock B. 82 (Mr. *Fisher*) on M. for 1°, 1924 (i).

——— on M. (Mr. *Charlton*) to adjn., 2251 (i).

Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 39 (Sir *Louis Davies*) in Com., 2104 (i).

McNeill, Mr. A.—*Continued.*

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Paris exhibition) 5046; (year book) 5027, 5099 (ii).

Civil Government: Agriculture (salaries) 4848; Aud. Gen.'s Office, 4549: Gov. Gen.'s Sec.'s Office, 3833, 3841, 3869 (i); Interior, 4528, 4538 (ii).

Legislation: House of Commons (debates) 7033; (stationery, &c.) 7037 (ii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (salaries) 4987 (ii).

Public Works: Buildings, Ont. (Major's Hill Park) 5458, 5573; Harbours and Rivers, Ont. (dredging) 6092 (ii).

Ways and Means—The Tariff:

In Com. (preferential clause) 3797 (i).

Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 71 (Sir *Henri Joly*) in Com., 2120 (i).

Marcotte, Mr. F. A., *Champlain.*

Bagot Electoral District, Vacancy, issue of writ, on M. (Mr. *Bergeron*) to adjn., 5243 (ii).

Bruneau, Mr., M.P. for Richelieu, Resignation, prop. Res., 2037 (i).

——— M. to refer to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 2142 (i).

Canadian Yukon Ry. B. 6 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 2°, 1208 (i).

Chambord Junction Custom-house, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 4179 (ii).

Cheese Factories in Prov. of Que. (remarks) 1578.

Chicoutimi County Telegraph Line (Ques.) 2814.

——— Wharf, Govt. Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 4180 (ii).

Dagneau, Mr., Dismissal (Ques.) 4609 (ii).

Houde, Charles E., Dismissal by Govt. (Ques.) 7686 (ii).

I.C.R., Expenditure for fuel (Ques.) 3089 (ii).

Man. School Fund B. 168 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7432 (ii).

Ogilvie's Official Rep. on Klondike, translation (Ques.) 604 (i).

Personal Explanation, par. in *La Patrie*, on M. for Com. of Sup., 7657 (ii).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 110 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 5769, 5779 (ii).

Rivière Ste. Anne de la Pérade, Repairs to work, &c. (Ques.) 1785 (i), 3941 (ii).

——— Postmaster, Dismissal (M. for O.C.*) 4678 (ii).

——— (Ques.) 3313 (i).

St. Lawrence Channel, Placing of buoys, Contract, &c. (Ques.) 4180 (ii).

——— River, Inundations (Ques.) 3660 (i).

St. Tite Postmaster, Dismissal (Ques.) 3090 (i).

SUPPLY:

Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, Ont. (dredging) 6093; Que., 5649, 7640; Miscellaneous (Hon. Mr. Mackenzie's monument) 6108; Slides and Booms, 6100 (ii).

Tarte, Hon. Mr., and the Senate, par. in *Le Soleil* (remarks) 3319 (i).

United Counties Ry., Payments to (Ques.) 3658.

Martin, Mr. A., *Queen's, P.E.I.*

Belle River Breakwater, Govt. control (Ques.) 1785, 2036 (i).

——— (remarks) 2040 (i).

China Point Wharf, Condition (Ques.) 671 (i).

Cold Storage, P.E.I., Provision (Ques.) 828 (i).

Double Hill, P.E.I., Post Office, closing (Ques.) 1931 (i).

Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on Amt. (Mr. *Powell*) to M. for 2°, 2741 (i); in Com., 3943 (ii); Sen. Amts., 7560 (ii).

Importation of Horses from U.S. to N.W.T. (Ques.) 3942 (ii).

Justice Dept., Agent at Charlottetown 1075 (i).

Piers and Wharfs in P.E.I., Govt. control (Ques.) 3088 (i).

——— Private, Expenditure, &c., by Govt. (M. for Ret.*) 3670 (i).

——— (remarks) 7241 (ii).

P.E.I. and Can. Govt. local delegation *re* Outstanding Disputes (M. for O. C.'s*) 3669 (i).

——— Ry. branches (M. for cor.) 4622 (ii).

——— St. Mary's Road Post Office, closing, &c. (M. for cor.*) 4246 (ii).

Red Point Wharf, repairs, &c. (Ques.) 1074 (i).

Returns (inquiry) Expenditure on Private Wharfs and Piers, 6581 (ii).

——— (inquiry) 3427 (i), 5018, 5117, 7526, 7655 (ii).

Shipping Accommodation, Murray River (Ques.. 3823 (i).

Southport to Murray Harbour, P.E.I. Ry. Extension (Ques.) 972 (i).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (cold storage) 5997 (ii).

Fisheries: Protection Service, 5288; (salaries, overseers, &c.) 5007 (ii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Montreal, St. John and Manchester) 7681 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (P.E.I. and Mainland) 7732; (winter mail service) 4970, 7284 (ii).

Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, P.E.I., 7636.

Railways: P.E.I. Ry. (rolling stock) 6434 (ii).

Tignish Breakwater, Tenders, &c., for construction (Ques.) 1074 (i).

West Point Pier, Tenders for construction (Ques.) 1075 (i).

Winter Communication, P.E.I. and Mainland (Ques.) 1778 (i).

Wood Island Breakwater, Dredging, &c. (Ques.) 2350 (i).

Yukon Ry., Exclusion of Foreign labour (Ques.) 827 (i).

Maxwell, Mr. G. R., *Burrard, B.C.*

Canadian Yukon Ry. B. 6 (Mr. *Blair*) on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to M. for 2°, 1527 (i).

Chinese Immigration Act Amt. (B. 20) 1°, 597 (i).

Dredging Leases issued to J. A. Mercier, miles of River (Ques.) 1934 (i).

Lighthouses between Vancouver and Stikine River (Ques.) 976 (i).

Maxwell, Mr. G.—*Continued.*
N. W. Mounted Police, Contract for transporting supplies to the Yukon (remarks) 5517 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, N.S., 5616; Ont. (Toronto Harbour) 5912 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff:
In Com. (preferential clause) 3796 (i).

Mills, Mr. J. B., *Annapolis, N.S.*
Bear River Bridge, Rep. as to condition of Pier (Ques.) 975 (i).
——— removal (M. for Ret.*) 2840 (i).
——— Shipping Master, Dismissal (M. for Ret.*) 2840 (ii).
——— (Ques.) 1071 (i).
Bruneau, Mr., M.P., for Richelieu, Resignation, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Marcotte*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 2184 (i).
Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 2533; on Amt. (Mr. *Powell*) to M. for 2°, 2792; on M. for Com., 2933 (i); in Com., 3983, 4065, 4255, 4260, 4313, 4411, 4454; on Amt. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to M. for 3°, 5690; Sen. Amts., 7551, 7554 (ii).
——— (Personal Explanation) 4520 (ii).
Imports from U.S. and G.B. (Ques.) 3663 (i).
Lafrance Fire Engine, duty, &c., charged (Ques.) 6011 (ii).
Middletown Post Office District, Pets. *re* (Ques.) 7687 (ii).
Ogilvie's Official Guide to Klondike, Distribution, &c. (Ques.) 4611, 4771 (ii).
Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors-Plebiscite B. 121 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4757, 4767 (ii).
Returns (inquiry) 4605, 5321 (ii).
Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 39 (Sir *Louis Davies*) in Com., 1885 (i).
SUPPLY:
Excise (contingencies, &c.) 7244 (ii).
Indians: N.S. (erection of fence) 7295 (ii).
Militia (gratuities, &c.) 7519; (Yukon Force) 7059.
Post Office: Mail Clerks (salaries) 7055 (ii).
Public Works: Buildings (N.S.) 7216; Harbours and Rivers, N.S. (New Harbour) 7619 (ii).
Railways (accommodation at St. John) 7649; (subsidy to N.S. Central Ry. Co.) 7807 (ii).

Monk, Mr. F. D., *Jacques Cartier.*
Bagot, Electoral District, Vacancy, issue of writ, on M. (Mr. *Bergeron*) to adjn., 5242 (ii).
Beloeil, Caretaker of Booms, Resignation (Ques.) 2847 (i).
——— land damages (Ques.) 2847 (i).
Bruneau, Mr., M.P. for Richelieu, Resignation, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Marcotte*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 2197 (i).
Canadian Yukon Ry. Co.'s B. 6 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 2°, 909 (i).
Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries B. 14 (Mr. *Richardson*) on M. for Com., 2864 (i).
——— Superannuation Abolition B. 76 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 6373 (ii).

Monk, Mr. F. D.—*Continued.*
Commission *re* Civil Service Employees in Prov. of Que., Names, &c. (M. for Ret.*) 504 (i).
Côte de Liesse Rifle Ranges and Farmers Grievances (remarks) 6322 (ii).
Cote St. Luc Rifle Ranges, Accidental Shooting, &c. (M. for Cor.*) 4678 (ii).
——— (remarks) 5569, 6029 (ii).
Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 3967, 4050, 4151, 4463, 4500 (ii).
French Language in N.W.T., article in *L'Ouest Canadien* (remarks) 2529 (i).
Insolvency B. 84 (Mr. *Fortin*) on M. for 1°, 2023.
Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 150 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 6130, 6142, 6171 (ii).
Lake Champlain and St. Lawrence River Ship Canal Co.'s incorp. B. 99 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) in Com., 6332 (ii).
——— (remarks) 6647 (ii).
Lefaivre, Xavier, Lockmaster Lachine Canal, Dismissal (Ques.) 3937 (ii).
Lord's Day, Better Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 2046 (i).
Militia Clothing, contract since Sept., 1896, &c. (M. for Ret.*) 1838 (i).
——— Force, Permanent, Inspection by Gascoigne (Ques.) 1782 (i).
——— General Orders (Ques.) 1782 (i).
——— Harness and Saddlery, Contract, &c. (Ques.) 1470 (i).
——— (M. for Ret.*) 1839 (i).
——— Promotions (Ques.) 2433 (i).
Montreal Drill Shed, repairs executed (M. for Ret.*) 1838 (i).
Ogilvie's Official Guide to Klondike, French translation (remarks) 1078 (i).
Point Claire Wharf, construction (M. for cor.*) 505 (i).
——— (Ques.) 476 (i).
——— Ret. *re* (inquiry) 3941 (ii).
Richelieu River Works, estimated cost, &c. 484 (i).
Rifle Range, Ottawa, Target practice (Ques.) 6612 (i).
Ste. Anne Lock, Investigation, &c. (M. for Ret.*) 3667 (i).
——— (Ques.) 4345 (ii).
St. Geneviève Floods (M. for cor.*) 505 (i).
——— (Ques.) 476 (i).
St. Hyacinthe Customs Office, Dues and Officials (Ques.) 600 (i).
St. Pierre River, dredging, &c. (M. for cor.*) 4678 (ii).
——— Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 476 (i).
St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, Claims of commissioner (Ques.) 3938 (ii).
Shirt and Collar Industry, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6583 (ii).

Monk, Mr. F. D.—*Continued.*

SUPPLY:

Civil Government: Gov Gen.'s Sec.'s Office, 3879; Militia (accountant) 3900, 3908 (i).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (construction) 5000.

Public Works: Buildings, B.C., 5444; Dom., 5606; (generally) 5495; Ont., 5484; (Major's Hill Park) 5457; (Ottawa Grounds, &c.) 5475; (Rideau Hall) 5599: Telephone Service, 5606; Harbours and Rivers (dredging) 6074; Ont. (dredging) 6090; Ques., 5651 (ii).

Scientific Institutions (Toronto observatory) 5002.

Sutton, Lt., Instructions *re* Military course in Eng. (Ques.) 1782 (i).

Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 60 (Mr. *Fortin*) on M. for 1°, 1386 (i).

——— B. 71 (Sir *Henri Joly*) in Com., 2113 (i).

Yukon Provisional District, Govt. claims (Ques.) 5133 (ii).

——— placer Mining, claims entered, &c. (Ques.) 6006 (ii).

Montague, Hon. W. H., *Haldimand.*

Agricultural Implements. M. allowed to stand, 1949 (i).

Alien Labour Law, Copy of Instructions from Dept. of Justice (remarks) 5518 (ii).

——— instructions to Agents (remarks) 6581 (ii).

Appmnts. by late Govt., on M. for Com. of Sup., 4797, 4809 (ii).

Butter Industry in Can., Encouragement of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Reid*) 2361 (i).

Canadian Yukon Ry. B. 6 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 1°, 240 (i).

Cattle Shipments, Can. to United Kingdom, on M. (Mr. *Hughes*) to adjn., 2437 (ii).

Civil Service, Superannuation Abolition B. 76 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com. 6797 (ii).

Dawson City, Electric Lighting and Tramway Co.'s incorp. B. 118 (Mr. *Morrison*) in Com., 6940 (ii).

Dawson City Electric Co's. B. 123 in Com., 7161 (ii).

Drummond County Ry., Com. of Investigation on prop. Res. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 508 (i).

——— Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. *Lister*) 7114 (ii).

Dundas, Mr., Dismissal by Govt. (remarks) 6579.

Experimental Farms, Distribution of Bulletins (remarks) 2454 (i).

Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4258, 4294, 4387, 4446, 4456, 4495, 4524.

Galbraith, Thos. J., Canal Officer, Port Colborne, Resignation (Ques.) 516 (i).

Grand River Floods (M. to adjn.) 2526 (i).

G. T. Ry. Regulations, on M. (Mr. *Wallace*) to adjn., 6026 (ii).

Imperial Army Soldiers at Toronto (remarks) 4523 (ii).

Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 150 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 6744 (ii).

——— (Pension) B. in Com. on Res., 7128, 7140.

Montague, Hon. W. H.—*Continued.*

Lord's Day, Better Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 1989, 2042; on Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) that Com. rise, 2409 (i).

Militia Annual Camp Drill (remarks) 5324 (ii).

N.W. Mounted Police, Contract for transporting supplies to the Yukon (remarks) 5512 (ii).

Prince Albert Mail Service, Delay in transmission, on M. (Mr. *Davis*) to adjn., 2520 (i).

Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors-Plebiscite B. 121 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4728 (ii).

Quartz Mining in Yukon, Regulations (Ques.) 1341 (i).

——— (Remarks) 2000 (i).

Ry. Employees Safety B. 4 (Mr. *Casey*) in Com. 2055 (i).

Returns (inquiry) Alien Labour Instructions, 6114.

San José Scale, Prohibition of Nursery Stock B. 82 (Mr. *Fisher*) on M. for 1°, 1919 (i).

Sons of England Benefit Society's incorp. B. 122 (Mr. *Bertram*) on M. for Com., 6049 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Administration of Justice: Supreme Court (Judge's salary) 6989 (ii).

Arts. Agriculture, &c.: N.W.T. Exhibition accounts, 6995; (creameries, N.W.T.) 5992; Experimental Farms, 5974 (ii).

Canals: Farran's Point, 6533; Grenville (enlargement) 6552; North Channel (construction) 6535; Rideau, 7183; Soulanges (construction) 6448 (ii).

Civil Government: High Commissioner's Office, 4561; (contingencies) 4561; Inland Revenue, 4556; Interior, 4529; Post Office, 4860; (contingencies) 4917; (Order, Ques. of) 4891; (printing and stationery) 4527 (ii).

Dom. Lands: Commissioner's salary, &c., 6858; surveys, &c, 7309 (ii).

Excise: 6000 (ii).

Indians: N.B. (medical attendance) 7299; N.S. (erection of fence, &c.) 7295; (surveys) 6852 (ii).

Legislation: House of Commons (debates) 7029; (sessional clerks) 5999, 6991, 7011; Library of Parlt. (American History) 5999 (ii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Gaspé Basin and Que.) 6 88; (Victoria and San Francisco) 6687.

Militia (Dom. Cartridge factory) 6570; (gratuities) 6574; (permant. force, &c.) 7056; Yukon Force) 7063 (ii).

Miscellaneous: Crow's Nest Pass Commission, 7267; Privy Council (records) 7281 (ii).

Ocean and River Service: (winter mail service) 4967 (ii).

Post Office: Outside Service (salaries) 6760; temporary clerks) 7038 (ii).

Public Works: Buildings (B.C.) 5493; (Experimental Farms) 5495; (generally) 5495; Man., 5487; N.S., 7215; Ont., 7218; (Major's Hill Park) 5459; (Ottawa grounds, &c.) 5471; Harbours and Rivers (dredging) 6074; B.C. (dredging) 6099; Ont. (dredging) 6087; Que. (dredging) 7227 (ii).

Quarantine (cattle slaughtered) 7003; "Scientific Dairying") 7001; (Trans-Mississippi Exhibition) 7003 (ii).

Montague, Hon. W. H.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
Railways: C.P.R., 6382; I.C.R. (accommodation at Mulgrave) 6433; (claims for damages) 7185; (increased accommodation) 6434; Indiantown Branch) (land damages) 7081; (iron bridges) 6397; (general expenses for investigation) 7197; Miscellaneous (survey Klondike district) 6563 (ii).
Trade and Commerce (Chinese Immigration Act, &c.) 6691 (ii).
Yukon Provisional District: Administration of Govt., 7323 (ii).
Veterinary Inspectors, Appnmt. (M. for Ret.) 2821 (i).
Welland Canal and Feeders, Employees dismissed, Names, &c. (M. for Ret.*) 2839 (i).
West Prince, P.E.I., Vacancy, Ret. Officer, Appnmt. (Ques.) 2040 (i).
Williams, W. W., Seeley's Bay Postmaster, Dismissal on M. (Mr. *Taylor*) to adjn., 3414 (i).
Yukon Ry., Action of U.S. Senate on M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to adjn., 1305 (i).

Moore, Mr. A. A., *Stanstead.*
Bagot, Electoral District, Vacancy, issue of writ, on M. (Mr. *Bergeron*) to adjn., 5255 (ii).
Butter Industry of Can., Encouragement of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Reid*) 2355 (i).
Can. Yukon Ry. B. 6 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 2°, 1080 (i).
Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 2601 (i).
——— (personal explanation) 2776 (i).
Petroleum, Reduction of Duty, legislation *re* prop. Res., 1945 (i).
Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors-Plebiscite B. 121 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4763 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (year book) 5034 (ii).
Fisheries (protection service) 5296 (ii).

Morin, Mr. J. B., *Dorchester.*
Canadian Yukon Ry. B. 6 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 2°, 1161 (i).

Morrison, Mr. A., *New Westminster.*
Anglo-French Telegraph Co.'s incorp. (B. 139) 1°*, 5315 (ii).
Brandon and South-western Ry. Co.'s (B. 47) 1°*, 970 (i).
British Columbia Southern Ry. Co.'s (B. 45) 1°*, 970 (i).
C.P.R. Co.'s (B. 46) 1°*, 970 (i).
Canadian Yukon Ry. B. 6 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 1°, 235; on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to M. for 2°, 1448, 1481 (i).
Dawson City, Electric Lighting and Tramway Co.'s incorp. (B. 118) 1°*, 3502 (i); M. to dschg. B., 4805; in Com., 6940 (ii).
Dawson City Electric Co.'s (B. 123) in Com., 7159.
Dawson City and Victoria Tel. Co.'s incorp. (B. 119) 1°*, 3503 (i).

Morrison, Mr. A.—*Continued.*
Great North-west Central Ry. Co.'s (B. 141) 1°*, 5518; in Com., 7734; Sen. Amts. conc., 7456.
Kettle River Valley Ry. Co.'s B. 26 (Mr. *Bostock*) in Com., 2960, 3035 (i).
Klondike and Dawson City Bank, incorp. (B. 117) 1°*, 3502; in Com., 5118 (ii).
Lewes River Tramway Co.'s incorp. (B. 23) 1°*, 743 (i); Sen. Amts., 4606 (ii).
N.W. Mounted Police, Contract for transporting supplies to Yukon (remarks) 5501 (ii).
Personal Explanation *re* Ogilvie's Rep., 2849 (i).
SUPPLY:
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, N.S. (New Harbour) 7596 (ii).

Mulock, Hon. W. (Postmaster General) *North York, O.*
Agnes Postmaster and Removal of Office, on M. for Cor., 1787 (i).
Alien Labour Law, Enforcement at Toronto (remarks) 5445 (ii).
——— Workmen, Importation to Toronto, on M. (Mr. *Clarke*) to adjn., 4033 (ii).
Ashcroft Post Office, present Occupant (Ans.) 1470 (i).
Beatonville Postmaster, Dismissal (Ans.) 3824 (i).
Beaumont, Wm., claims for salary as Postmaster (Ans.) 4611 (ii).
Belleville Post Office, Dismissals, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6214 (ii).
Berne Convention Papers, laid on Table, 6446 (ii).
Berney, Mr., Dismissal by Govt. (Ans.) 7687 (ii).
Civil Service, Superannuation Abolition (B. 76) 1°, 1744; 2° m., 6334; in Com., 6367, 6796; 3° m., 6932 (ii).
Cobourg Postmaster, attendance at Reform Convention (Ans.) 602 (i).
Craigville and Stroud Mills Service, tenders (Ans.) 487 (i).
Dep. Postmaster Gen., present occupant of Office (Ans.) 3407 (ii).
Double Hill, P.E.I., Post Office, closing (Ans.) 1931 (i).
Dundas, Mr., Dismissal by Govt. (remarks) 6579.
Elkhorn, Man., Postmaster, Appnmt. of (Ans.) 4771 (ii).
Empire Postal Rates, Authority for Reduction (Ans.) 4345 (ii).
Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 2959 (ii).
Gatien, Louis, Dismissal by Govt. (Ans.) 7685 (ii).
Golden, B.C., and St. Eugene Mail Carrier (Ans.) 2816 (i).
——— on M. for Cor., 2825 (i).
Govt. Contracts, Prohibition of Sweating (Ans.) 599 (i).
Gravenhurst P. O., Appnmt. of Postmaster (Ans.) 5320 (ii).
Hebert, I. A., Postmaster at Princeville and Sale of intoxicating Liquors (Ans.) 7689 (ii).

Mulock, Hon. W.—*Continued.*
Houde, Charles E., Dismissal by Govt. (Ans.) 7686 (ii).
Isaac's Harbour, Postmaster Griffin, Dismissal, on M. for Ret., 1834 (i).
Jubilee Stamps, receipts from Sales (Ans.) 3405 (i), 3938 (ii).
Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 150 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on Ques. of Order (Sir *C. H. Tupper*) 6155 (ii).
Kildare Postmaster, Dismissal (Ans.) 1575 (i).
Kootenay District, Postal, &c., facilities, telegrams (remarks) 1747 (i).
Lakefield and Apsley Mail Route (Ans.) 4930 (ii).
Lavaltrie Mail Service, contract (Ans.) 1473 (i).
Leeds County Postal Service, Pets., &c. (Ans.) 4181 (ii).
Legris, Narcisse, Postmaster, St. Eulalie, and letter in *La Patrie* (Ans.) 7688 (ii).
Loch Levens, C.B., Postmaster (Ans.) 1777 (i).
Lower L'Ardoise Postmaster, Dismissal (Ans.) 1335 (i).
McCallum, John, Appnmt. and Dismissal by Govt. (Ans.) 7686 (ii).
McLeod, M. G., Postal Mail Clerk, Dismissal, on M. for O. C., 4181 (i).
Magdalen Islands Mail Service (Ans.) 1575 (i).
Mail Contracts, N.S., cancelled since 1896 (Ans.) 4610 (ii).
Middleton, N.S., Post Office District, Pet. *re* (Ans.) 7688 (ii).
Militia Point Mail Carrier, amount paid (Ans.) 3310 (i).
——— Postmaster, Appnmt. (Ans.) 3310 (i).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners, Loan B. 163 (Mr. *Fielding*) on prop. Res., 6924 (ii).
Oak Bay Mills Post Office, Closing (Ans.) 3824.
——— imperfect Ret. (remarks) 5325 (ii).
Ottawa and Truro Mail Service, N.S. (Ans.) 1575.
Peakes Station, P.E.I., Dismissal of Postmaster (Ans.) 4344 (i).
Port Mulgrave and St. Peters, Mail route (remarks) 6323 (ii).
Postal Mail Service, N.S., Removal from former residence (Ans.) 3407 (i).
Postmasters, Dismissals since 1896 (Ans.) 460 (ii).
Postmaster Gen.'s Rep. (Ans.) 2528 (i).
Postal Rates to G.B., Instructions to Postmasters on inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Foster*) 6114, 6322 (ii).
Post Office Act Amt. (B. 110) 1°, 2913 (i); 2° m., 5520; M. for Com., 5710, 5744; in Com., 5748, 5870, 5885; 3° m. 6121; M. to ref. back to Com., 5943; in Com., 5944 (ii).
——— (Special Delivery) B. 167, 1°, 7408; 2° m., 7579 (ii).
Post Offices closed since 1st July, 1896 (Ans.) 3936 (ii).
Post Office Act Amt., Free postage for newspapers (Ans.) 4041 (ii).
Prince Albert Mail Service, Delay in transport on M. (Mr. *Davis*) to adjn., 2520 (i).

Mulock, Hon. W.—*Continued.*
Provencher Postmasters, Appnmt. by Govt. (Ans.) 6006 (ii).
Public Officers Act Amt. B. 170 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 7580 (ii).
Returns on inquiry for, 4928, 5018, 7526 (ii).
Rouleau Post Office, abolition of (Ans.) 5018 (ii).
St. Anne de Beaupre, Dismissal of Postmaster (Ans.) 1072 (i).
Ste. Anne de la Pérade, Dismissal of Postmaster (Ans.) 3313 (i).
St. Cyprien Postmaster, Charges against (Ans.) 6007 (ii).
St. Felix de Valois Postmaster, Charges against (Ans.) 4610 (ii).
St. Jacques L'Achigan, Postmaster (Ans.) 1783.
St. Michel Mail Service (Ans.) 3313 (i).
St. Michel de Napierville Post Office, cor. *re* (Ans.) 1472 (i).
St. Thomas Mail Service, Tenders and Contracts (Ans.) 453 (i).
Seeley's Bay Postmaster, Dismissal of W. W. Williams (Ans.) 3407 (i).
——— on M. (Mr. *Taylor*) to adjn., 3410, 3418 (i).
SUPPLY:
Civil Government: Post Office, 4857: (clerical assistance) 7038; (contingencies) 4915: (statutory increases) 7482; Sundry Depts., (Priv. Sec.'s salaries) 7486 (ii).
Post Office: Mail Clerks (salaries) 7051; Outside service (letter carriers) 7775; (miscellaneous expenses) 6703; (salaries) 6698; (temporary clerks) 7038 (ii).
Waverley Postmaster, Removal (Ans.) 599 (i).
White, Mr., Dep. P.M.G., Superannuation (Ans.) 475 (i).
Williams, W. W., Dismissal on M. (Mr. *Taylor*) to adjn., 3410, 3418 (i).
Wyebridge-Wyevale Postal Service (Ans.) 598.

Oliver, Mr. F., *Alberta.*
Butter Industry in Canada, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Reid*) 2472 (i).
Canadian Yukon Ry. B. 6 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 2°, 1098; on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to M. for 2°, 1495 (i).
Crows' Nest Pass Ry., Treatment of Workmen on M. for Com. of Sup., 6600 (ii).
Edmonton District Ry. Co.'s (B. 54) 1°*, 1379 (i).
Kettle River Valley Ry. Co.'s B. 26 (Mr. *Bostock*) in Com., 3075; on consdn. of Amt., 3368, 3546.
Lake Manitoba Ry. and Canal Co.'s B. 66 (Mr. *Jameson*) on Sen. Amts., 4807 (ii).
North-west Irrigation Act Amt. B. 146 (Mr. *Sifton*) on Sen. Amts., 7789 (ii).
N.W.M.P., Yukon Detachment (remarks) 4453.
Ont. and Rainy River Ry. Co.'s B. 32 (Mr. *Tisdale*) on M. for 2°, 2609; in Com., 2634 (i).
Personal Explanation *re* Liberal promises to N.W. farmers, 2929 (i).
Senate and House of Commons Act Amt. B. 173 (Mr. *Fielding*) prop. Res. 7685 (ii).

Oliver, Mr. F.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY:
Immigration (agent's salaries) 6839 (ii).
Indians: B. C., 7765 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Alien Labour Law Enforcement) 7773; (Crow's Nest Pass commission) 7263 (ii).
Public Works: Roads and Bridges, (Edmonton Bridge, N.W.T.) 6259, 6297 (ii).

Osler, Mr. E. B., *West Toronto.*
Address, on The, 386 (i).
Canadian Yukon Ry. Co.'s B. 6 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 2°, 724 (i).
Chignecto Ship Ry., par. in Montreal *Gazette* (remarks) 5664 (ii).
Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 3°, 5705 (ii).
Long Lake Ry., M. to adjn. 4449 (ii).
Lord's Day, Better Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) on Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) that Com. rise, 2419 (i).
Preferential Trade with G. B., on Amt. (Mr. *McNeill*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 5846 (ii).
Rubber Goods, Duty &c., on M. for Com. of Sup., 6637 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Canals: Trent (construction) 6538 (ii).
Immigration (agent's salaries) 6820, 6837 (ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff:
In Com. (preferential clause) 3796 (i).

Parmalee, Mr. C. H., *Shefford.*
Butter and Cheese, Improper Speculation in Sale, Prohibition (B. 83) 1°, 2001; 2° m., 2843 (i).

Paterson, Hon. W., (Controller of Customs), *North Grey.*
Alien Labour Law, Appnmt. of Agent at Ft. Erie (Ans.) 4178 (ii).
Appnmts. by late Govt. on Amt. (Mr. *Montague*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 4841 (ii).
Bath (Ont.) Customs Officer, Appnmt. by Govt. (Ans.) 6007 (ii).
Bounties on Iron and Steel, prop. Res., 6334 (ii).
Budget, on The, 3220 (i).
Canadian Yukon Ry. Co.'s B. 6 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 2°, 887 (i).
Chambord Customs House, Cost, Establishment, &c. (Ans.) 1469 (i) 4179 (ii).
Cheticamp Customs Collectors, name, &c., (Ans.) 4181 (ii).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 17 (Mr. *McMullen*) on M. for 2°, 4231 (ii).
Coasting Trade of Can. Act Amt. B. 106 (Sir *C. H. Tupper*) on M. for 1°, 2811 (i).
Corn importations, 1897 to April, 1898, (Ans.) 3659 (i).
——— foreign imports into Man. (Ans.) 3660 (i).
Customs Act Amt. (B. 152) 1°, 6318; in Com., 6946 (ii).
——— B. 174 (Mr. *Fielding*) 1°*, 7585 (ii).
——— Ass't Inspector at Quebec (Ans.) 2817 (i).
——— Collector at Centreville, N. B., investigation *re* (Ans.) 831 (i).

Paterson, Hon. W.—*Continued.*
Customs, Collections in the Yukon (Ans.) 826 (i).
——— Dept., Appnmt. of Irish Roman Catholics, 4608 (ii).
——— Dept., Changes in Officials, Ret. laid on Table, 6895 (ii).
Customs and Fisheries Further Protection (B. 153) 1°, 6319; 2° *m.*, 6961 (ii).
——— Inspector, Ass't. in Prov. of Quebec (Ans.) 3313 (i).
Dismissals in Cape Breton Co., on Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *McDougall*) 6321 (ii).
Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4322, 4386, 4424, 4468, 5264 (ii).
Grand Narrows, Preventive Officer, duties and salary (Ans.) 1781 (i).
Hagarsville, Collector of Customs, defalcations (Ans.) 974 (i).
Horses for Feeding, &c., Importation, Licenses by Farmers (Ans.) 2343 (i).
——— from U.S. into N.W.T., &c. (Ans.) 3942.
Imports from G.B. and U.S. (Ans.) 3663, 3936.
——— Dutiable value and amount collected (Ans.) 601 (i).
Iron and Steel Bounties (B. 159) prop. Res., 6723; 1°* of B., 6727 (ii).
Johnson, J. T., Customs Officer at Ft. Erie, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 4178 (ii).
Kootenay District, Postal, &c., facilities (remarks) 1747 (i).
Lafrance Fire Engine, Duty, &c., charged by Govt. (Ans.) 6011 (ii).
Margaree Customs Collector, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 4181 (ii).
Pulp Mill Machinery, entry in bond (Ans.) 3165.
Reciprocal clause, Tariff, 1897, Amounts paid, refund, &c., to Customs (Ans.) 4175 (ii).
Returns *re* Dismissals (remarks) 5519 (ii).
St. Hyacinthe Customs Office, dues and officials (Ans.) 600 (i).
Shannon, Thos., Customs Collector at Killarney, Man., Dismissal (Ans.) 4770 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Civil Government: Customs, 4556; conc., 7852 7818; (clerical assistance) 7475; (contingencies) 4588 (ii).
Customs (laboratory) 7774; (machinery, Chicoutimi Pulp Works) 7792; (outside service) 7356 (ii).
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, Ont. (Toronto Harbour) 5903, 5907; Que. (dredging) 7238 (ii).
Railways: I.C.R. (iron bridges) 6409 (ii).
Tennant, J. F., Dismissal of, on M. (Mr. *Quinn*) for cor., 4203 (ii).
——— on M. (Mr. *Quinn*) for Ret., 5176 (ii).
Trade and Navigation Rets. (presented) 184 (i).
U. S. Customs Regulations at Fort Wrangel (remarks) 1186 (i).
——— at Skagway and Dyea (explanation) 264 (i).
——— SS. "Yantic," passage up St. Lawrence (Ans.) 1336 (i).
Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 71 (Sir *Henri Joly*) on Sen. Amts., 7783 (ii).

Penny, Mr. E. G., *Montreal.*
Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries B. 14 (Mr. *Richardson*) on M. for Com., 2862 (i).
Criminal Code (1892) Cruelty to Animals (B. 11) 1°*, 271 (i).
General Inspection Act Amt. (B. 85) 1°, 2035 (i); wthdrl. of B. (M.) 2606 (i).
Holidays Act Amt. (B. 9) 1°, 270 (i).
Insolvency B. 84 (Mr. *Fortin*) on M. for 1°, 2026.
Montmorency Cotton Mills Co.'s incorp. (B. 102) 1°*, 2430 (i).
Montreal Harbour Commissioner's Loan B. 163 (Mr. *Fielding*) prop. Res., 6916; on M. for Com., 7175 (ii).
Montreal and Province Line Ry. Co.'s (B. 56) 1°*, 1380 (i).
Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 60 (Mr. *Fortin*) on M. for 1°, 1384 (i).

Pope, Mr. R. H., *Compton.*
Address, on The, 365 (i).
Agnes Postmaster and removal of office (M. for cor.) 1787 (i).
Butter Industry of Canada, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Reid*) 2384, 2443 (i).
Canadian Yukon Ry. B. 6 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 1859 (i).
——— Telegram to High Commissioner *re* Hamilton Smith's Proposals, 1018 (i).
Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 2989 (i).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 110 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 5779 (ii).
Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors-Plebiscite B. 121 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com,. 4736 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Paris exhibition) 5049 (ii).
Civil Government: Indians (contingencies) 4586; Inland Revenue (contingencies) 4590; Marine and Fisheries (contingencies) 4596; Post Office, 4897; Public Works (contingencies) 4594 (ii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Montreal, St. John and Manchester) 7674 (ii).
Militia (gratuities) 7517 (ii).
Penitentiaries: Kingston, 7489 (ii).
Public Works: Buildings (experimental farm) 5495; Ont., 5464; (Arnprior P.O.) 5453; (Deptl. Block, Ottawa) 5070; (Major's Hill Park) 5453, 5462; N.S., 5084, 5087; N.W.T., 5492; Harbours and Rivers, N.S. (New Harbour) 7612; Que., 7639 (ii).
Yukon Ry., Action of U. S. Senate, on M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to adjn., 1319 (i).

Poupore, Mr. W. J., *Pontiac.*
Chapleau Postmaster, Dismissal of Patrick Lynch (Ques.) 3088 (i).
Des Joachims and Mackie's Station Mail service (Ques.) 5135 (ii).
Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 2726 (i).
Lake Temiscamingue Ry. and Ry. Act (Ques.) 2349 (i).

Poupore, Mr. W. J.—*Continued.*
Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal, Construction, &c., on M. for Com. of Sup., 6466.
Roche Fendue and Calumet Dams (M. for cor.) 4612 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Canals: Soulanges (construction) 6520 (ii).
Culling Timber (salaries, &c.) 7250 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Crow's Nest Pass commission) 7274.
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, Ont., conc.,

Powell, Mr. H. A., *Westmoreland.*
Bruneau, Mr., M.P. for Richelieu, Resignation, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Marcotte*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 2233 (i).
Canadian Yukon Ry. Co.'s B. 6 (Mr. *Blair*) on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to M. for 2°, 1540.
——— Telegram to High Commissioner, *re* Hamilton Smith's Proposals, 1006 (i).
Dart, Lyman, Remission of Sentence, in Com. of Sup., 6673 (ii).
Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 2737; Amt., 2740; in Com., 2983; on Amt. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to M. for 3°, 5691 (ii).
I.C.R., A. Stewart's Dismissal (Ques.) 1933, 2342.
——— Diversion of route through Springhill (Ques.) 1929 (i).
——— Expenditure for Improvements, &c. out of income (M. for Ret.*) 3667 (i).
——— Moncton Ry. station, Construction (Ques.) 477 (i).
——— plumbing and heating contracts (Ques.) 2346 (i).
——— Powlie, A., Car Inspector, Springhill, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 1932 (i).
Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 150 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 6796 (ii).
Lord's Day, Better Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 2052 (i).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 110 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 5760 (ii).
Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquours-Plebiscite B. 121 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4764 (ii).
Ry. Employees Safety B. 4 (Mr. *Casey*) in Com., 5152 (ii).
Simonds, R. H., I.C.R. employee, dismissal (M. for Ret.*) 2840 (i).
Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 39 (Sir *Louis Davies*) in Com., 1885, 2105, 2113 (i).
Summerside Harbour Breakwater, Tenders for construction (Ques.) 2816 (i).
SUPPLY:
Fisheries (protection service) 5309 (ii).
Legislation: House of Commons (sessional clerks) 6990 (ii).
Ocean and River Service (obstructions in navigable rivers) 4964; (winter mail service) 4966, 4968 (ii).
Public Works: Buildings, N.S., 5087; Harbours and Rivers, N.B., 5641; N.S., 5617; P.E.I., 5632 (ii).
Quarantine (cattle slaughtered) 7008 (ii).
Railways: I.C.R. (accommodation at Moncton) 7084; (culverts) 7085; (iron bridges) 6390 (ii).

Powell, Mr. H. A.—*Continued.*
Ways and Means—The Tariff:
In Com. (preferential clause) 3775 (i).

Préfontaine, Mr. R., *Maissonneuve.*
Inspection of Ashes, Govt. (Ques.) 3660 (i).
Lake Champlain and St. Lawrence River Ship Canal Co.'s incorp. (B. 99) 1°*, 2430 (i); M. for Com., 6328 (ii).
Montreal Harbour Commissioner's Loan B. 163 (Mr. *Fielding*) prop. Res., 6895 (ii).
North Shore Electric Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 97) 1°*, 2430 (i).

Prior, Hon. E. G., *Victoria, B.C.*
Ashcroft Mail Service, Contract (Ques.) 3090 (i).
——— Postmaster, present occupant (Ques.) 1470.
——— Post Office, position of Postmaster (Ques.) 3090 (i).
Miners' Licenses, issued at Ashcroft, B.C. (Ques.) 2847 (i).
Royal Military College, amalgamation of Classes (Ques.) 973 (i).
U.S. Occupation of Dyea and Skagway (remarks) 619 (i).

Quinn, Mr. M. J. F., *Montreal (Ste. Anne's).*
Adulteration Act Amt. B. 72 (Sir *Henri Joli*) in Com., 4777 (ii).
American canned meats, Contracts with Can. Govt. (remarks) 3940, 5017 (ii).
Belleville Post Office, Dismissals, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6223 (ii).
Bruneau, Mr., M.P., for Richelieu, Resignation, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Marcotte*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 2179 (i).
Canadian Yukon Ry. Co.'s B. 6 (Mr. *Blair*) on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to M. for 2°, 1503; in Com., 1854 (i).
——— Telegram to High Commissioner *re* Hamilton Smith's Proposals, 1028 (i).
Cattle Trade, opening Belfast Port (remarks) 2851.
Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries B. 14 (Mr. *Richardson*) on M. for Com., 3693; in Com., 4648 (ii).
Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 2986 (i), 3948, 4286, 4462, 4501 (ii).
Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 150 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 6145, 6180.
Lachine Canal Storekeeper, Applicants for position (Ques.) 456 (i).
Man. School Fund B. 168 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7428, 7465 (ii).
Montreal Custom House, Dismissals, 1896 to 1898, names, &c. (M. for Ret.*) 3669 (i).
Navigation, Opening of Canals (remarks) 2700 (i).
Order (Ques. of) in Com. on B. 150 (Sir *C. H. Tupper*) 6156 (ii).
Post Office Act Amt. (Special Delivery) B. 167 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 7580 (ii).
Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors-Plebiscite B. 121 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4739 (ii).

Quinn, Mr. M. J. F.—*Continued.*
Ry. Employees Safety B. 4 (Mr. *Casey*) in Com., 3681 (i).
Returns (inquiry) 5519 (ii).
Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 39 (Sir *Louis Davies*) in Com., 1890 (i).
SUPPLY:
Civil Government (Gov. Gen. Sec.'s Office) 3873; Militia and Defence (accountant) 3907 (i).
Militia (Dom. Artillery Association) 7522 (ii).
Penitentiaries: Kingston, 7490 (ii).
Public Works: Buildings, Ont., 5464: (Major's Hill Park) 5453; (repairs) 5448; (Woodstock, P.O.) 5465; Harbours and Rivers, Mar. Provs. (dredging) 6084: Ont. (dredging) 6095: N.S. (New Harbour) 7603 (ii).
Tennant, J. F., Customs Collector at Gretna, Man., Dismissal (M. for cor.) 4182 (ii).
——— (M. for Ret.) 3670 (i), 5206 (ii).
Victoria Fire Ins. Co.'s incorp. (B. 59) 1°*, 1380.
Wellington Bridge, Montreal, accident, Mr. Mattison's services, &c. (remarks) 4775 (ii).
——— (remarks) 4604 (ii).
Yukon Ry., Action of U.S. Senate, on M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to adjn., 1331 (i).

Reid, Mr. J. D., *North Grenville.*
Butter Industry of Canada (prop. Res.) 2350, 2482 (i).
Freight Rates on Rys., Regulation (B. 7) 1*, 271; 2°, m., 2910 (i).

Richardson, Mr. R. L., *Lisgar.*
Agricultural Implements, Free Entry, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 3188 (i).
Board of Ry. Commissioners, legislation, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Jameson*) 1812, 1825 (i).
Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries (B. 14) 1°*, 271; M. for Com., 2852, 3700 (i), 4639; in Com., 3706 (i), 4640, 4653 (ii).
Crow's Nest Pass Ry., Construction by Co. (remarks) 6240 (ii).
——— Treatment of Labourers, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6622 (ii).
Grain Transit, Man. and N.W.T., Regulation B. 19 (Mr. *Douglas*) on M. for 2°, 2064 (i).
Grain Transport by C. P. R. and Elevator Co. of Man. and N.W.T. (Ques.) 483 (i).
Great North-west Central Ry. Co.'s B. 141 (Mr. *Morrison*) in Com., 7734; Sen. Amts. 7460 (ii).
Lord's Day, Better Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 1970; in Com., 1981 (i).
Ont. and Rainy River Ry. Co.'s B. 32 (Mr. *Tisdale*) on M. (Mr. *Maclean*) to ref. back to Com., 2670 (i).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 110 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 5763 (ii).
Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors-Plebiscite B. 121 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4759 (ii).
Ry. Act (Grain Shipments) Amt. (B. 21) 1°, 671.
Spades and Shovels, Combine monopoly M. to Adjn., 1935 (i).

Richardson, Mr. R. L.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY:
Immigration (agents' salaries) 6838 (ii).
Legislation: House of Commons (debates) 7033 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Crow's Nest Pass Commission) 7271.
Penitentiaries: St. Vincent de Paul, 6640 (ii).
Tennant, J. F., Customs Collector at Gretna, Man., on M. (Mr. *Quinn*) for cor., &c., 4198 (ii).
——— on M. (Mr. *Quinn*) for Ret., 5191 ii).
Wheat graded and put in Elevators at Fort William (M. for Ret.*) 2839 (i).
Yukon Provisional District, Liquor permits (Ques.) 1472 (i).

Robertson, Mr. J. Ross, *East Toronto.*
Bell Telephone Co.'s Pet. (Ques.) 6031 (ii).
Canadian Yukon Ry. Co.'s B. 6 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 1°, 248; on M. for 2°, 1126 (i).
Copyright, International Action by British Govt., on M. for Com. of Sup., 6627, 6801 (ii).
Crow's Nest Pass Ry., Commissioner's Rep. (remarks) 6030 (ii).
Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on Amt. (Mr. *Powell*) to M. for 2°, 2768 (i); on M. for 3°, 5701 (ii).
Infantry Schools, Fredericton and London, Cost of Lighting, &c. (Ques.) 7121 (ii).
Kettle River Valley Ry. Co.'s B. 26 (Mr. *Bostock*) in Com., 3037; on consdn. of Amts., 3551 (i).
Permanent Force, Subaltern Officers, &c., Appnmt. by Govt. (Ques.) 7122 (ii).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 110 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 5548; in Com., 5755; on M. for 3°, 6122.
——— Free Postage for Newspapers (remarks) 4041 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (patent record) 5023 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Crow's Nest Pass Commission) 7251, 7273; Privy Council (records) 7279.
Public Works: Buildings, Ont., 7217; (repairs, &c.) 5449; Miscellaneous (monument for Hon. Mr. Mackenzie) 6105; (National Art Gallery) 6103; Telegraph Lines (St. Lawrence Shore) 6101 (ii)
Scientific Institutions (Toronto observatory) 5002.
Yukon Provisional District: Administration of Govt., 7328 (ii).

Roche, Mr. W. J., *Marquette.*
Agricultural Implements, Free Entry, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 3180 (i).
Budget, on The, 3626 (i).
Canadian Yukon Ry. Co.'s B. 6 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 2°, 1106 (i).
Corn, Foreign, Imports into Man. (Ques.) 3660.
Coté, Thos., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 4176 (ii).
Dom. Elections, 1896, cost, &c., *re* prosecutions in Man. (M. for Ret.*) 2841 (i).
Dom. Lands, Tenby, Man., sub-agent, Appnmt. (Ques.) 3087 (i).
Elkhorn, Man., Postmaster, Appnmt., &c. (Ques.) 4771 (ii).
Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 2580 (i); in Com., 4144 (ii).

Roche, Mr. W. J.—*Continued.*
Hudson Bay Expedition, James Fisher's Rep. (Ques.) 603, 2349 (i).
Immigration of Women servants (Ques.) 3309 (i).
Kingston Penitentiary, Medical Officer (Ques.) 2846 (i).
Macdonald Election, Cost of Prosecutions (Ques.) 2349 (i).
Shannon, Thos., sub-collector of Customs at Kilarney, Dismissal (Ques.) 4770 (ii).
Tennant, J. F., Customs Collector at Gretna, on M. (Mr. *Quinn*) for Ret., 5189 (ii).
Weatherbee, Mr. Justice, Absence from Prov. (Ques.) 3166 (i).

Roddick, Mr. T. G., *Montreal (St. Antoine).*
Appnmts. by late Govt. and Colonial Office Cor., &c. (Ques.) 7689 (ii).
Newfoundland and Canada, Negotiations between (remarks) 4928 (ii).
——— (Ques.) 5391 (ii).

Rogers, Mr. D. D., *Frontenac.*
Address, on The, 374 (i).
Butter industry in Canada, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Reid*) 2480 (i).
Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries B. 14 (Mr. *Richardson*) on M. for Com., 3696 (i).
——— Abolition B. 76 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 6378, 6797 (ii).
Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 2729 (i).
P. O. Savings Banks deposits, reduction of interest, on Amt. (Mr. *Davin*) to M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 3746 (i).
SUPPLY:
Canals: Trent (construction) 6545 (ii).
Civil Government: Post Office, 4895 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Crow's Nest Pass Commission) 7271.
Post Office: Outside service (letter carriers) 7777.
Public Works: Buildings, Ont. (Rideau Hall) 5602.

Rosamond, Mr. B., *North Lanark.*
British American Light and Power Co.'s incorp. (B. 109) 1°*, 2844 (i).
Pacific and Yukon Ry., Nav., Trading and Mining Co.'s (B. 151) 1°*, 6227 (ii).

Russell, Mr. B., *Halifax.*
Atlantic Fisheries, U.S. Legislation *re* (remarks) 1272 (i).
Bear River Bridge, Removal (Ques.) 1337 (i).
Bruneau, Mr. M.P. for Richelieu, Resignation, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Marcotte*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 2200 (i).
Canadian Yukon Ry. Co.'s B. 6 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 2°, 774 (i).
Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries B. 14 (Mr. *Richardson*) on M. for Com., 3702 (i).
Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 3962, 3976, 4046, 4062, 4434 (ii).

Russell, Mr. B.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY:
Civil Government: Public Works (contingencies) 4594 (ii).
Tanner, J. E., Forcible detention by Spanish Govt. at Porto Rico (Ques.) 6011 (ii).

Rutherford, Mr. J. G., *Macdonald.*
Board of Ry. Commissioners, legislation, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Jameson*) 1795 (i).
Canadian Yukon Ry. Co.'s B. 6 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 2°, 1116 (i).
Elevator Monopolies, Man. and N.W.T. (Ques.) 598 (i).
Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 2593 (i); in Com., 4150 (ii).
Grain Transit, Man. and N.W.T. Regulation B. 19 (Mr. *Douglas*) on M. to ref. to Ry. Com., 2081 (i).
Hudson Bay Expedition, Rep. as to Navigability (Ques.) 975 (i).
Lake Man. Ry. and Canal Co.'s B. 66 (Mr. *Jameson*) 1°*, 1736 (i).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 110 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 5776 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Immigration (agents' salaries) 6844 (ii).
Public Works: Buildings, Man., 5487; Harbours and Rivers, Man., 5929 (ii).
Miscellaneous: (Crow's Nest Pass commission) 7261 (ii).
Yukon Ry. Action of U.S. Sen. on M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to adjn., 1302 (i).

Savard, Mr. P. V., *Chicoutimi and Saguenay.*
Judges of the Provincial Court Act Amt. B. 150 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 6775 (ii).
North Shore Electric Ry. Co. incorp B. 97 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) Sen. Amts., 7788 (ii).

Scriver, Mr. J., *Huntingdon.*
Nickel Steel Co.'s B. 96 (Mr. *Wood, Hamilton*) on M. (Mr. *LaRivière*) to ref. to Com. on Rys., &c., 3644 (i).
Private Bills Pet., Extension of time (M.) 935, 970 (i).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (patent record) 7513 (ii).
Canals: Beauharnois (contingencies) 7191 (ii).

Semple, Mr. A., *Centre Wellington.*
Butter Industry in Can. on prop. Res. (Mr. *Reid*) 2475 (i).
Can. Yukon Ry. B. 6 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 2°, 1242 (i).
Manitoba Debt Account B. 169 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7408 (ii).
San José Scale, Prohibition of U.S. Nursery Stock on M. (Mr. *Charlton*) to Adjn., 2250.
Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 71 (Sir *Henri Joly*) in Com., 2126 (i).

Sifton, Hon. C., (Minister of Interior), *Brandon.*
Abenakis Indians, St. Francis Agency (Ans.) 3408 (i).
Appnmts in N. W. Ters. (Ans.) 977 (i).
Battleford Indian Agency, death of cattle (Ans.) 1574, 2844 (i).
Boundaries of the Prov. of Que. (B. 160) 1°, 6746; 2°, and in Com., 7410 (i).
Boundary between Can. and Alaska (Ans.) 1076.
British Joint Stock Co. in Yukon (Ans.) 1471 (i).
C. P. R., Lands exempt from taxation (Ans.) 1340 (i).
Canadian Yukon Ry. B. 6 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 2°, 571, 621; on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to M. for 2°, 1727, in Com., 1856 (i).
——— Hamilton Smith's Proposals (Ans.) 979 (i).
——— Telegram to High Commissioner, 999 (i).
Coasting Trade of Can. Act Amt. B. 106 (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) on M. for 1°, 2508 (i).
Crow's Nest Pass Ry., Treatment of Workmen, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6604 (ii).
Daunais, C. N., Emplmnt. by Govt. (Ans.) 1928.
Deaf Mutes in N. W. T., Provision by N. W. Govt. (Ans.) 1930 (i), 4345 (ii).
Dep. Min. of Int., present occupant (Ans.) 3408.
Des Joachims and Mackie Station Mail Service (Ans.) 5135 (ii).
Dom. Lands Act Amt. (B. 130) 1°, 4679; in Com., 5937 (ii).
Donaldson, S. J., Immigration Agent, N. W. T., amounts paid (Ans.) 4176 (ii).
Dismissals in N. W. T., on inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Davin*) 6115 (ii).
Dredging Leases issued to J. A. Mercier (Ans.) 1934 (i), 6317 (ii).
——— Miles of River (Ans.) 1935 (i).
——— Drolet, Chevalier, Mining Leases, &c. (Ans.) 671, 1073 (i), 4924 (ii).
——— (explanation) 831 (i).
Edwards, Dr. O. C., Indian Medical Officer, Appnmt. by Govt. (Ans.) 4607 (ii).
Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4127, 4139; on Amt. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to M. for 3°, 5674 (ii).
Free Miners Certificates, number issued, &c. (Ans.) 3311 (ii), 4773, 5133 (i).
Galician Settlers in N. W. T., Rep. *re* destitution (remarks) 101 (i).
Geological Survey Act Amt. (B. 114) 1°, 3404 (i); in Com., 4776 (ii).
Govt. cattle and Battleford Agency (Ans.) 1574, 2844 (i).
Grain liens, Man. and N. W. T., legislation *re* (Ans.) 1930 (i).
Great North-west Central Ry. Co.'s B. 141 (Mr. *Morrison*) in Com., 7737, 7742, 7787 (ii).
Immigration Literature, correction of statement (remarks) 6581 (ii).
Immigration foreign, settled in Can. (Ans.) 6109.
——— women domestics (Ans.) 3309 (i).

Sifton, Hon. C.—*Continued.*
Indian Act Amt. (B. 144) 1°, 5661; 2°, m., 5960; in Com., 5963 (ii).
Indian Dept., Annual Rep. (presented) 1473 (i).
——— Law Clerk, Appnmt., 7654, 7658 (ii).
——— Lands, Qu'Appelle Valley, rights of settlers, on M. (Mr. *Davin*) to adjn. 518 (i).
——— Reserve crops in N. W. T. (remarks) 5571.
——— Titles in Athabasca, Mackenzie and Yukon (Ans.) 824 (i).
Industrial School, Battleford (Ans.) 1574 (i).
Interior Dept., Annual Rep. (presented) 3940 (ii).
——— Dismissals in N.W.T. (Ans.) 829 (i).
Jones, Charles A., Immigration Agent, Appnmt. by Govt., 4607 (ii).
Lands Reserved for settlement in Man. and N.W.T. (Ans.) 971 (i).
Land Titles Act Amt. (B. 132) 1°, 4683; 2° m., and in Com., 5957 (ii).
Lord's Day, Better Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 1967 (i).
McCarthy, Dalton, M.P., Candidature for Brandon (Ans.) 4610 (ii).
McKay, Thos., amounts due for timber dues (Ans.) 4176 (ii).
Man. Claims, on inquiry for Ret., 1030 (i).
Man. School Fund B. 168 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7425 (ii).
——— University and Driving Park Grant, &c. (Ans.) 7124 (ii).
Militia Bounty (land) N.W.T. Extension B. 133, 1°, 4683; 2° m., 5960 (ii).
Miners Licenses issued at Ashcroft, B.C. (Ans.) 2847 (i).
——— White and Chilkoot Passes (remarks) 4602.
Mining and Dredging leases, on inquiry for Ret., 5322 (ii).
——— issued (Ans.) 3317 (i).
Mohawk Indians, wthdrl. of grant for medical services (Ans.) 2817 (i).
Mount Elgin Institute, Establishment (Ans.) 672.
Noble, Mr., Payments to, by Govt. (Ans.) 5133.
N.W. Ter. Act Amt. (B. 131) 1°, 4681; 2° m., 5945; in Com., 5946; 3° m., 6064 (ii).
——— Irrigation Act Amt. (B. 146) 1°, 5662; in Com., 6124; Sen. Amts., 7788 (ii).
N. W. Mounted Police, Contract for transporting Supplies to Yukon, 5500 (ii).
——— Reported loss of men (remarks) 7659 (ii).
N. W. Settlers, amount due Govt. for seed grain (remarks) 5135, 5570 (ii).
N.W.T., Dismissals, on inquiry for Ret., 6115, 6317 (ii).
——— Immigration Hand-book, on M. (Mr. *Davin*) to adjn., 5936 (ii).
Norwood, H. H., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 7120.
Ogilvie, Mr., Services since 1898 (Ans.) 3406 (i).
——— Official Klondike Guide, number distributed (Ans.) 4612, 4772 (i).
——— Translation (remarks) 604 (i).
——— Rep. sent from Yukon, dates (Ans.) 974 (i).

Sifton, Hon. C.—*Continued.*
Orton, Dr., Indian Medical Supt., Dismissal (remarks) 5394 (ii).
Priv. (Ques. of) Press Representatives and Members of Parlt., on M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to Adjn., 5128 (ii).
Queen Victoria Park, Niagara Falls (Ans.) 2848.
Rankin, Immigration Agent in Kansas (Ans.) 1779 (i).
Rebellion Claims Commission, N.W.T., Appnmt. by Govt. (Ans.) 5321 (ii).
Regina Industrial School, Emplymt. of Dr. Willoughby (Ans.) 828 (i).
Registry and Land Office, Regina (Ans.) 1931 (i).
Restigouche Indian Agent, Dismissal of V. J. A. Venner (Ans.) 4611 (ii).
Rothwell's Rep., *re* claims of settlers (remarks) 2852 (i).
School Lands, sales in Man. (Ans.) 2432 (i).
Seed Grain, amount due Govt. by Settlers (Ans.) 5135, 5570 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Civil Government (Geological survey) 4559; (salaries) 7477; Indians, 4553; (contingencies) 4585: Interior, 4527, 4551 (ii).
Dom. Lands (commissioners' salary) 6858; (surveys, &c.) 6860, 7307 (ii).
Geological Survey (Yukon District survey) 7754.
Govt. of N. W. T. (Insane asylums) 7305; (schools, &c.) 6857 (ii).
Immigration (agents' salaries) 6821, 6827, 7277, 7288, 7744 (ii).
Indians (Oka Indians) 7291; B.C., 7761; (General Inspector's salaries) 7303; (Man. and N.W.T.) 6854, 7301, 7765; N.B., 7294; (medical attendance) 7298; N.S., 7293: (erection of fence) 7294; Ont. and Que. (industrial schools) 7755; (surveys) 6849 (ii).
Militia (Yukon Force) 7060 (ii).
Miscellaneous: Man. and N.W.T. (Alien Labour Law) 7275; (Boundary U.S. and Can.) 6860; (fencing N.W.T. Park) 7251; Interior, Outside service (gratuities) 7769; (Rocky Mountain Park) 7769 (ii).
Mounted Police: 6856 (ii).
Yukon Provisional District: Administration of Govt., 7325; (service of N.W.M.P.) 6858; (steamers) 7769 (ii).
Telegraph Lines, north shore of St. Lawrence, tenders for contract (Ans.) 7123 (ii).
U.S. Customs in Alaska and boundary Line (remarks) 407 (i).
——— Occupation of Dyea and Skagway (Ans.) 829 (i).
——— Relief Expedition to the Yukon (remarks) 102 (i).
——— military escort (Ans.) 971 (i).
Vancouver Island Ry. Belt, Settlers' claims, &c. (remarks) 4452 (ii).
Walsh, Administrator in the Yukon, Instructions (Ans.) 1777 (i).
——— (presented) 1341 (i).
Yukon Provisional District Administration (B. 154) 2° m., 6727; in Com., 6731 (ii).

Sifton, Hon. C.—*Continued.*
Yukon Dredging Leases, Advertisement from Chicago *Record* (remarks) 409 (i).
——— Geological Survey (Ans.) 3312 (i).
——— Gold Dredging (Ans.) 1074 (i).
——— Homestead Land Laws (Ans.) 1338, 1784.
——— Govt. Claims (Ans.) 5134 (ii).
——— Liquor Permits (Ans.) 1472, 2433, 2813, 2446, 1781 (i).
——— Mining Leases, &c. (Ans.) 2036 (i).
——— (remarks) 6895 (ii).
——— Mann and Mackenzie's contract, Omissions (remarks) 1079 (ii).
——— sleigh Route (Ans.) 1777, 1928 (i).
——— Municipal Regulations (remarks) 1748 (i).
——— Placer Mining, Claims entered, &c., (Ans.) 6006 (ii).
——— Quartz Mining, regulations (Ans.) 1342 (i); (remarks) 2000 (ii).
——— River Routes, Mr. Jenning's Rep. (presented) 409 (i).
——— Timber Sales, &c. (Ans.) 1784 (i).
——— Transport of Supplies (remarks) 6581 (ii).
——— accounts ordered by Public Accts. Com. (remarks) 4350.
——— Wagon Road (remarks) 1341 (i).

Snetsinger, Mr. J. G., *Cornwall and Stormont.*
Butter Industry in Can., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Reid*) 2477 (i).
SUPPLY:
Canals: Galops, 7650 (ii).

Somerville, Mr. J., *North Wentworth and Brant.*
Butter Industry in Can. on prop. Res. (Mr. *Reid*) 2500 (i).
Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries B. 14 (Mr. *Richardson*) on M. for Com., 2862 (i).
Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4325 (ii).
Hagarsville Collector of Customs, Defalcation (Ques.) 974 (i).
Lord's Day, Better Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) on Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) that Com. rise, 2402, 2418 (i).
——— M. to restore to order paper, 2427 (i).
Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors-Plebiscite B. 121 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4737 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Legislation: House of Commons (debates) 7030 (ii).

Speaker, Mr. (SIR JAMES D. EDGAR) *West Ontario.*
Address, Reply to, Mess. from His Ex. (read) 936.
——— Jubilee to the Queen, Reply, Mess. from His Ex. (read) 1466 (i).
Agricultural Implements, Ques. of Order (Mr. *Davin*) ruling, 3205 (i).
Alien Workmen, on M. (Mr. *Clarke*) to adjn., 4030 (ii).
Appnmts. in the N.W.T., Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) ruled in order, 977 (i).
——— to Office (remarks) 1187 (i).

Speaker, Mr.—*Continued.*
Bagot Electoral District, issue of writ (notification) 3924 (i).
——— (remarks) 3826 (i).
Bills not printed in French (remarks) 3084 (i).
——— presentation, remarks as to seconders, 671.
——— Royal Assent, 2089 (i).
Bounties on Iron and Steel B. 159 (Mr. *Paterson*) members remarks checked, 6726 (ii).
Bruneau, Mr., M.P., for Richelieu, Resignation, member called to order, 2165 (i).
——— (Personal Explanation) 1772 (i).
Canadian Yukon Ry. B. 6 (Mr. *Blair*) Amt. (Mr. *McInnes*) declared out of order, 1725 (i).
Controverted Elections, Judges' Rep. (read) 1 (i).
Criminal Code Act Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2° (ruling) 4221 (ii).
Dawson City, Electric Lighting, &c., Co.'s B. ref. to Miscellaneous Private Bills Com., 3868.
Dawson City Electric Co.'s B. 123, ref. to Sel. Com. on Rys., 4387 (ii).
Debates, Official, 2nd Rep. (ruling) 3823 (i).
——— Omission of Ques. from Rep., on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *McDougall*) 3427 (i).
——— Ret. *re* (presented) 3924 (i).
——— French translation and printing (remarks) 3092 (i).
Gananoque Drill Shed (remarks) 5316 (ii).
General Inspection Act, wthdrl. of B. (remarks) 2606 (i).
Georgian Bay Timber on prop. Ques. of Mr. *Kaulbach* (ruling) 826 (i).
Gov. Gen. and Ministerial Responsibilities on M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to adjn. (remarks) 267 (i).
Inspection of Ashes (remarks) 3660 (i).
Jubilee Stamps, Irregularity of deb. (remarks) 3939 (ii).
Kingston Locomotive Works, &c., on M. (Mr. *Taylor*) to adjn., 605 (i).
Lalonde, Messenger, House of Commons, charge of canvassing in Russell (remarks) 909 (i).
Library of Parlt., Joint Rep. (presented) 5 (i).
McCarthy, Dalton, Candidature for Brandon, relevancy of Ques., 4610 (ii).
Maj. Gen. Commanding, Order, Ques. of (Mr. *Foster*) *re* Letter read by Prime Minister (ruling) 6441, 6463 (ii).
Members asking questions (remarks) 2433 (i).
Members called to Order, 271, 613 (i).
——— New, Certificates of Ret. (notification) 2 (i); 4347 (ii).
——— New (notification) 3, 270 (i).
——— interrupting Speaker (remarks) 987 (i).
——— remarks checked, 1051, 2922 (i); 5013, 5324, 6320, 6326 (ii).
Mess. from His Ex. (read) 405, 936, 1466, 2698 (i); 5663, 6439, 7378 (ii).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners, Loan B. on prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) Order, Ques. of (ruling) 6927.
Nickel Steel incorp. B. 96 on M. (Mr. *LaRiviere*) to ref. to Ry. Com., 3648 (i).

Speaker, Mr.—*Continued.*
North-west Central Ry. Co.'s B. 140, Ques. of Procedure (remarks) 6002 (ii).
Ontario Lumber Cut, on M. (Mr. *Britton*) to adjn. (remarks) 1843 (i).
Ont. and Rainy River Co.'s B. on M. for Com., (ruling) 2614 (i).
Order, Ques. of (Mr. *Domville*) 1702 (i).
——— (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) in Com. on B. 150 (ruling) 6155 (ii).
——— (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) *re* Crow's Nest Pass Labourers (ruling) 6618 (ii).
——— Unparliamentary Language, 1679 (i).
——— W. W. Williams, Dismissal (remarks) 3424.
Parliament, Opening, Mess. by Black Rod, 1 (i).
Personal Explanation (Mr. *McNeill*) (remarks) 520 (i).
——— (Mr. *McMillan*) (ruling) 6113 (ii).
Prince Albert Mail Service, delay in transmission on M. (Mr. *Davis*) to adjn., Irregularity in deb., 2520 (i).
Privilege (Ques. of) Press Representative and Members of Parlt. (Sir *Charles Tupper*). Members remarks checked. 5125 (ii).
——— (remarks) 5132 (ii).
Procedure, Ques. of, 3° of B. (remarks) 2647 (i).
——— stmnt. read, 3095 (i).
Prorogation, Com. from Gov. Gen.'s Sec. (notification) 7818 (ii).
——— Mess. from His Ex., 7886 (ii).
Questions asked by members, Answers must bear on subject matter (ruling) 459 (i).
——— put by members, order of procedure, 7118.
——— Ruled out of order, 602 (i).
Speech from the Throne (rep.) 3 (i).
Stationary Engineers, Examination B. on prop. introduction (remarks) 2800 (i).
Stimulants in the Chamber during debate (remarks) 3638 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Legislation: House of Commons (Debates) 7034; (sessional clerks) 5999, 7011; (stationery, &c.) 7035 (ii).
Suspension of Rule 49 on M. (Mr. *Landerkin*) (ruling) 5016 (ii).
Tarte, Hon. Mr., and the Senate (remarks) 3319.
Vacancies (notification) 2 (i).
Votes and Proceedings, Record of vote on 3° of B. (remarks) 2850 (i).
Warrants for writs of elections, 2 (i).
West Huron and North Simcoe, Vacancy (remarks) 7043 (ii).
——— issue of Warrant, 7087 (ii).
West Prince, P.E.I., vacancy (remarks) 1079 (i).
——— issue of Writ, 1173 (i).
Winter Communication, P.E.I. and Mainland (remarks) 1779 (i).
Yukon Provisional District, Accounts asked for by Pub. Accts. Com. (remarks) 4354 (ii).
——— Liquor Permits, members remarks checked on M. to Adjn., 3093 (i).

Speaker, Deputy (Mr. L. P. BRODEUR) *Rouville.*
Alberta and Yukon Ry. Navigation Mining Co.'s B. in Com. (ruling) 7166 (ii).
Cattle Export Trade, Montreal, G.B. and Ireland, members remarks ruled out of order, 2270 (i).
Lord's Day, Better Observance B., section before Chair (remarks) 2041 (i).
Members called to order, 437, 1961 (i), 4158, 4207, 7604 (ruling) 7606 (ii).
——— remarks checked, 4444, 4446, 5145, 6153, 6221, 6578 (ii).
——— requested to wthdrw. remarks, 6871 (ii).
N.W. Mounted Police Act Amt. B. on M. for 2° (ruling) 4242 (ii).
Order, Ques. of (Mr. *Britton*) 1505 (i).
——— (Mr. *Montague*) in Com. of Sup., 4891 (ii).
——— (ruling) 3526, 3531 (i).
——— Ways and Means, stimulants in the Hse., 3611 (ii).
Post Office Act Amt. B. on M. for Com., Members remarks checked, 5720 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Civil Government: Post Office (members' remarks checked) 4867; (unparliamentary language) member called to Order, 2507 (i).
Ways and Means—On M. (Mr. *Davin*) to adjn. deb. (ruling) 3595, 3606 (i).

Sproule, Mr. T. S., *East Grey.*
Address, on The, 337 (i).
Agricultural Implements, Free Entry on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 3200 (i).
Alien Labour, Enforcement (remarks) 5795 (ii).
——— Workmen, importation to Toronto on M. (Mr. *Clarke*) to adjn., 4040 (ii).
Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Agreements, &c., on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 5230 (ii).
Bagot Electoral District, Vacancy, issue of Writ on M. (Mr. *Bergeron*) to Adjn., 5240 (ii).
Boundaries of the Prov. of Que., B. 160 (Mr. *Sifton*) on M. for 1°, 6747 (ii).
Bruneau, Mr., M.P., for Richelieu, Resignation, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Marcotte*) to ref. to Com. on Priv. and Elections, 2223 (i).
Business of the Hse., Morning Sittings, 6228 (ii).
Butter Industry of Can., Encouragement of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Reid*) 2367, 2479, 2511 (i).
Budget, The, 3533, 3554 (i).
Canadian Yukon Ry. B. 6 (Mr. *Blair*) on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to M. for 2°, 1657 (i).
——— Hamilton Smith's Proposals (Ques.) 979 (i).
Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries B. 14 (Mr. *Richardson*) on M. for Com., 2872 (i); in Com., 4665 (ii).
——— Act Amt. B. 17 (Mr. *McMullen*) on M. for 2°, 4233 (ii).
——— Superannuation Abolition B. 76 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 2°, 6346; in Com., 6797 (ii).
Combination in Restraint of Trade, Prevention Act Amt. (B. 88) 1°, 2241 (i).

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Continued.*
Crow's Nest Pass Ry., Investigation on conc., 7845 (ii).
Dawson City Electric Lighting and Tramway Co.'s incorp. B. 118 (Mr. *Morrison*) in Com., 6842 (ii).
Dawson City Electric Co.'s B. 123 (Mr. *Morrison*) in Com., 7160 (ii).
Detective Corporations and Mercantile Agencies (B. 90) 1°*, 2241 (i).
Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 2296 (i); in Com., 4118, 4375, 4455; on M. for 3°, 5703; Sen. Amts., 7543 (ii).
Grand Trunk Ry. Regulations, on M. (Mr. *Wallace*) to adjn., 6025 (ii).
Govt. Business, Precedence on Thursdays on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 2525 (i).
Great North-west Central Ry. Co.'s B. 141 (Mr. *Morrison*) on Sen. Amts., 7463 (ii).
Insolvency B. 84 (Mr. *Fortin*) on M. for 1°, 2035.
Judges of the Provincial Courts Act. Amt. B. 150 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com on Res., 6128, 6159 (ii).
——— (Pension) B. in Com. on Res. 7140 (ii).
Kettle River Valley Ry. Co.'s B. 26 (Mr. *Bostock*) in Com., 2961, 3071 (i).
Kingston and Pembroke Ry. Co.'s B. 69 (Mr. *Britton*) in Com., 4805 (ii).
Klondike and Peace River, &c., B. 91 (Mr. *Davis*) in Com., 4170 (ii).
Lake Champlain and St. Lawrence River Ship Canal Co.'s incorp. B. 99 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) in Com., 6333 (i).
Lord's Day, Better Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 1969 (i).
Maj. Gen. Commanding, Order, Ques. of, *re* Letter read by Prime Minister, 6443 (ii).
Manitoba Debt Account B. 169 (Mr. *Fielding*) prop. Res., 7396; in Com., 7402, 7467 (ii).
——— School Fund B. 168 (Mr. *Fielding*) prop. Res., 7419; in Com., 7424 (ii).
——— School Ques., Address to the Holy Father on M. for Com. of Sup., 5416 (ii).
Members' Sessional Trunks, Contract, &c., on M. for Com. of Sup., 7050 (ii).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners, Loan B. 163 (Mr. *Fielding*) on prop. Res., 6917; on M. for Com., 7173: in Com., 7180 (ii).
North-west Irrigation Act Amt. B. 146 (Mr. *Sifton*) on Sen. Amts., 7788 (ii).
N. W. Mounted Police, Contract for transportation of supplies to Yukon (remarks) 5517 (ii).
Officer Commanding Militia, Increased allowance in Com. on Res., 4930, 4946 (ii).
Ontario Lumber Cut, on M. (Mr. *Britton*) to adjn., 1847 (i).
Ontario and Rainy River Ry. Co.'s B. 32 (Mr. *Tisdale*) 1°*, 903 (i); on M. for Com., 2397, 2560 (i).
——— (remarks) 2123 (i).

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Continued.*
Order (Ques. of) *re* Montreal Loan B., 6925 (ii).
——— (Mr. *Montague*) in Com. of Sup., P. O. Dept., 4893 (ii).
Orton, Dr., Dismissal as Indian Agent in Man., (M. for cor.*) 3669 (i).
——— (remarks) 5393 (ii).
Pacific and Yukon Ry. Navigation and Mining Co.'s B. 33 (Mr. *Tisdale*) 1°*, 903 (i).
Personal Explanation *re* par. in Ottawa *Citizen re* Man. School Question, 5496 (ii).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 110 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 3°, 6123 (ii).
——— Savings Bank, reduction of interest on Amt. (Mr. *Davin*) to M. for Com. of Ways and Means, 3740 (i).
Preferential Trade with G. B., on Amt. (Mr. *McNeill*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 5853 (ii).
Prince Albert Mail Service, Delay in Transport, on M. (Mr. *Davis*) to Adjn., 2520 (i).
Private Legislation, on M. (Mr. *Belcourt*) to proceed (objection) 7466 (ii).
Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. *Bergeron*) *re* par. in *La Patrie*) *re* Man. Schools, 7720 (ii).
Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors—Plebiscite B. 121 (Mr. *Fisher*) on M. for 2°, 4712 (ii).
Ry. Commissioners, Board of, Legislation, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Jameson*) 1814 (i).
——— Employees Safety B. 4 (Mr. *Casey*) in Com., 4208 (ii).
——— Rate War (M. to adjn.) 1175 (i).
——— Man., Settlers, on M. (Mr. *Maclean*) to adjn., 1478 (i).
——— Transportation, on M. (Mr. *Maclean*) to adjn., 1752 (i).
St. John Bridge Co.'s B. 78 (Mr. *Ellis*) on 2°, 1950 (i).
San José Scale, Prohibition of Nursery Stock B. 82 (Mr. *Fisher*) on M. for 1°, 1907, 1912 (i).
——— on M. (Mr. *Charlton*) to adjn., 2251 (i).

SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Paris exhibition) 5041; (patent record) 5023; (year book) 5025 (ii).
Canals: Grenville (enlargement) 6552; Sault Ste. Marie (construction) 6550; Soulanges (construction) 6448, 6528; Trent (construction) 6547 (ii).
Civil Government: Agriculture (salaries) 4850; Gov. Gen. Sec.'s Office, 3834; Militia and Defence (accountant) 3904 (i); Post Office, 4857, 4878; (contingencies) 4918 (ii).
Customs (laboratory) 7774; (outside service) 7362.
Dominion Lands (commissioner's salary, &c.) 6858; (surveys) 6860, 7308 (ii).
Fisheries (protection service) 5268 (ii).
Government of N.W.T.: Insane Asylums, 7306; (schools, &c.) 6857 (ii).
Immigration (agents' salaries) 6821 (ii).
Indians: Man. and N.W.T., 6856, 7767; N.S. (erection of fence, &c.) 7296; (surveys) 6853 (ii).
Legislation: House of Commons (debates) 7031; (stationery, &c.) 7038 (ii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (repairs to wharfs) 5000; (salaries) 4988 (ii).

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and South Africa) 7722; (Montreal, St. John and Manchester) 7660 (ii).
Marine Hospitals, 5003 (ii).
Miscellaneous: Man. and N.W.T. (alien labour law) 7277; (arbitration accounts, Can. and Provs.) 6861; (Boundary Can. and U.S.) 6860; (Hudson Bay Expedition) 7098 (ii).
Militia (gratuities, &c.) 7518; (Yukon Contingent) 7796 (ii).
Mounted Police, 6856 (ii).
Ocean and River Service (winter mail service) 4971 (ii).
Penitentiaries (commissioners expenses) 7339,7348; Kingston, 7489 (ii).
Public Works: Buildings, B. C., 7581; N. W. T., 7589; Ont., 5470, 5482: (Ottawa grounds, &c.) 5471; (Woodstock P O.) 5468; Harbours and Rivers (general vote) 6072; B.C., 7242; N.S. (New Harbour) 7590, 7600; Ont., 5886; (dredging) 6091; (Toronto Harbour) 5893, 5909: Que. (St. Lawrence Ship channel) 5054; Miscellaneous (clerical assistance) 6104; (National Art Gallery) 6103; (Hon. Mr Mackenzie's monument) 6105; Roads and Bridges, 6100; Que., 7587 (ii).
Quarantine (cattle slaughtered) 7004; ("Scientific Dairying") 6997 (ii).
Railways: Crow's Nest Pass (salaries, &c.) 7110; I.C.R. (claims for damages by fire) 7373; (accommodation at St. John) 7649; P.E.I. Ry. (rolling stock) 6437 (ii).
Scientific Institutions (hydrographic service) 5001; (meteorological service) 5001 (ii).
Unprovided Items: per Aud Gen.'s Rep., 7351 (ii).
Yukon Provisional District: Maintenance of Force, 7365 (ii).
Thessalon Point Lighthouse, total cost (Ques.) 1932 (i).
Toronto and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 77 (Mr. *Clarke*) on M. for Com., 4562; on M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 6268 (ii).
Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 60 (Mr. *Fortin*) on M. for 1°, 1386 (i).
——— Amt. B. 71 (Sir *Henri Joly*) in Com., 2115, 3101 (i); Sen. Amts., 7785 (ii).
West Huron and North Simcoe, Vacancy (remarks) 7042 (ii).
Williams, W. W., Seeley's Bay Postmaster, Dismissal, on M. (Mr. *Taylor*) to Adjn., 3416 (i).
Yukon Military Contingent, Expenditure, &c. (remarks) 4797 (ii).

Stenson, Mr. M. T., *Richmond and Wolfe.*
Butter Industry in Can., Encouragement of, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Reid*) 2466 (i).
Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 2732 (i).

Sutherland, Mr. J., *North Oxford.*
Ancient Order of Foresters, Subsidiary Court incorp. B. 113 (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1°, 3164 (ii).
Anglo-French Telegraph Co. on M. (Mr. *Fraser*) to present Pet., 5143 (ii).

Sutherland, Mr. J.—*Continued.*
Business of the Hse.—Morning Sittings and Committees (remarks) 6110 (i).
——— Sittings of Committees (M.) 6227, 6318 (ii).
Butter Industry in Can., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Reid*) 2486 (i).
Canadian Mining Institute incorp. B. 116 (Mr. *Haley*) 1°*. 3502 (i).
Canadian Ry. Accident Ins. Co.'s B. 42 (Mr. *Belcourt*) 1°*, 970 (i).
Dawson City, Electric Lighting and Tramway Co.'s incorp. B. 118 (Mr. *Morrison*) in Com., 6939 (ii).
Dawson City Electric Co.'s B. 123 (Mr. *Morrison*) in Com., 7159 (ii).
Experimental Farms, distribution of Bulletins (remarks) 2486 (i).
Great Commonwealth Mining and Development B. 95 (Mr. *Gibson*) M. to wthdrw. B., 6227 (ii).
Great North-west Central Ry. Co.'s B. 141 (Mr. *Morrison*) in Com., 7743 (i).
Honey Locust Plant and San José Scale on M. (Mr. *Maclaren*) for Com. of Sup., 6967 (ii).
Klondike and Peace River, &c., Transportation Co.'s B. 91 (Mr. *Davis*) in Com., 4173 (ii).
Lake Champlain and St. Lawrence River Ship Canal Co.'s incorp. B. 99 (Mr. *Préfontaine*) in Com., 6329, 6937 (ii).
Montreal Island Belt Line, Ry. Co.'s B. 105 (Mr. *Belcourt*) 1°*, 2799 (i).
Nickel Steel Co.'s incorp. B. 96 (Mr. *Wood, Hamilton*) on M. (Mr. *LaRiviere*) to ref. to Com. on Rys., 3651 (i).
North American Telegraph Co. B. 120 (Mr. *Hurley*) in Com., 5363 (ii).
Ontario and Rainy River Ry. Co.'s B. 32 (Mr. *Tisdale*) in Com., 2624, 2639; ref. to Ry. Com. (M.) 1774 (i).
Ottawa and Georgian Canal Co.'s B. 104 (Mr. *Belcourt*) 1°*, 2799 (i).
Pearson, James, Relief (B. 147) 1°*, 5867 (ii).
Private Bills Legislation (M.) 7042 (ii).
Sons of England Benefit Society incorp. B. 122 (Mr. *Bertram*) on M. for Com., 6061 (ii).
Stationary Engineers, Examination B., prop. introduction (remarks) 2799 (i); 4769 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Militia: (gratuities) 6576; (Yukon contingent, &c.) 7798 (ii).
Public Works: Buildings, Ont. (Woodstock, P.O.) 5466; Harbours and Rivers, Ont. (Toronto Harbour) 5910; Que. (dredging) 7231 (ii).

Talbot, Mr. O. E., *Bellechasse.*
Great North-west Central Ry. Co.'s B. 141 (Mr. *Morrison*) in Com., 7739; on Sen. Amts. (Amt.) 7456 (ii).
I.C.R., Train Services, issue of Time-tables, 6243.
Privilege (Ques. of) par. in *La Patrie re* Man. Schools (Mr. *Bergeron*) 7716, 7719 (ii).
——— Stimulants in the Chamber during debate (explanation) 3637 (i).

Talbot, Mr. O. E.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (experimental farms) 5988.
Legislation: House of Commons (debates) 7030 (ii).
Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 60 (Mr. *Fortin*) on M. for 1°, 1386; in Com., 2121 (i).

Tarte, Hon. Mr. J. I. (Minister of Public Works) *St. John and Iberville.*
Arnprior Post Office, Inspector, &c. (Ans.) 4177.
Bear River Bridge, N.S., Removal (Ans.) 1337 (i).
Belle River, P.E.I., Breakwater, Govt. control (Ans.) 1785, 2036, 2040 (i).
Berthier Post Office, site, &c. (Ans.) 6008 (ii).
—— Public Building, real estate, purchase by Govt. (Ans.) 3662 (i).
Budget, on The, 3564 (i).
Campobello, N.B., Telephone Communication, cost, &c. (Ans.) 4178 (ii).
Canadian Yukon Ry. Co.'s B. 6 (Mr. *Blair*) on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to M. for 2°, 1430.
Chapel Cove Breakwater, Govt. aid (Ans.) 4347.
Chicoutimi Wharf, Govt. expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 4180 (ii).
China Point, P.E.I. Wharf, condition (Ans.) 672.
Côté, Thos., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 4176 (ii).
Dagnault, R., Dismissal (Ans.) 4609 (ii).
Deer Island, N.B., Telegraph Cable, surveys, &c. (Ans.) 4177 (ii).
Deptl. Buildings, Fire at West Block (Ans.) 2348.
—— Refacing Wall (Ans.) 2528; (remarks) 3319.
Drummond County Ry., Com. of Investigation on prop. Res. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 512 (i).
Edmonton Bridge, N.W.T., contract for construction (Ans.) 1341 (i).
—— Ret. *re* (Ans.) 2528, 3827 (i).
—— Penalties imposed on Contractors (Ans.) 5317 (ii).
—— Freight Rates, &c. (Ans.) 6001 (ii).
Gananoque Customs House (Ans.) 4923 (ii).
Gabarus Breakwater, grant, &c. (Ans.) 4179 (ii).
Gisborne, Mr., Govt. Inspector Telegraph Lines, N.W.T., Dismissal (Ans.) 5317 (ii).
Grand Etang, Dredging, &c. (Ans.) 5317 (ii).
Kettle River Valley Ry. Co.'s B. 26 (Mr. *Bostock*) on consdn. of Amts., 3357 (i).
L'Ardoise Breakwater, Repairs, &c. (Ans.) 972 (i).
Montague, P.E.I., Dismissal of Caretaker (Ans.) 5787 (ii).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners' Loan B. 163 (Mr. *Fielding*) prop. Res., 6864; on M. for Com., 7154, 7167; in Com. on Res., 6928 (ii).
Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Co., construction, &c., on M. (Mr. *Pouporc*) to Com. of Sup., 6505 (ii).
Morien Port, Breakwater, Govt. grant (Ans.) 4179 (ii).
Mudlark, Dredge, Increase in working hours (Ans.) 3825 (i).
Napanee Public Building, Caretaker, &c. (Ans.) 6008 (ii).

Tarte, Hon. Mr. J. I.—*Continued.*
Noël, L. P. O., Dismissal in N.W.T., 6320 (ii).
Parlt. Buildings, contract for asphalting walks (Ans.) 487, 1783 (i).
Point Claire, construction of wharf (Ans.) 476 (i).
Prince Edward Dredge, number of employees (Ans.) 2345 (i).
Private Piers and Wharfs, Expenditure, &c. (remarks) 7241 (ii).
Privilege (Ques. of) par. in *La Patrie re* Man. Schools, 7711 (ii).
Red Point Wharf, P.E.I., repairs, &c. (Ans.) 1074 (i).
Regina District Registry Office (Ans.) 5319 (ii).
Returns, on Inq. for, 4774, 5322, 7526, 7655 (ii).
—— expenditure on private wharfs and piers (Mr. *Martin*) 6581 (ii).
Richelieu River Works, estimated cost (Ans.) 484 (i).
River St. Anne, repairs to work, &c. (Ans.) 1785 (i); 3941 (ii).
Rivière la Pipe, wharf, purchase of timber (Ans.) 1468 (i).
Robert, H. A., caretaker of Post Office clock, Stratford, dismissal (Ans.) 4344 (ii).
Ste. Geneviève Floods (Ans.) 476 (i).
St. Lawrence River inundations (Ans.) 3660 (i).
St. Michel Govt. wharf, repairs (Ans.) 3312 (i).
SUPPLY:
Canals: Chambly, 7651 (ii).
Civil Government: Public Works, 4578; conc., 7838; (books, &c.) 6984; Justice (contingencies) 4583, 4592 (ii).
Crow's Nest Pass Ry.: Investigation on conc., 7838 (ii).
Miscellaneous: Man. and N.W.T. (alien labour law) 7277; (Crow's Nest Pass Ry. Commission) 7274 (ii).
Post Office: Mail Clerks (salaries) 7050 (ii).
Public Works: Buildings, B.C., 5493, 7589; (deptl. block) 5069; Dom., 5607; (heating, &c.) 5608; (experimental farm) 5495; Generally, 5494; (Major's Hill Park) 5572, 5598; Man., 5485; N.B., 5092, 7586; N.S., 5071, 7214, 7586; N.W.T., 5489, 7589; Ont., 5463, 5970, 5482, 7217, 7587; (Major's Hill Park) 5453; (Ottawa grounds, &c.) 5470, 7587; (repairs, &c.) 5448; (Rideau Hall) 5599; (summer house) 7218; (telephone service) 5605; (Woodstock P.O.) 5464; Que., 5093, 7217, 7587; (repairs, &c.) 7218; Collection of Revenues (slides and booms) 7643; Harbours and Rivers, B.C., 6064, 7242; (dredging) 6072, 6099; (dredging generally) 6099; Ont., 5889; (dredging) 6087; (Toronto Harbour) 5891, 5905, 5922; Man., 5928; (dredging) 6099; Mar. Provs. (dredging) 6082, 7242; N.B., 5641, 7633; N.S., 5612, 7589; N.S. (New Harbour) 7590; Ont., 5886, 7242, 7641, 7820; (Kaministiquia) 5067; P.E.I., 5630, 7637; Que., 5648, 7638; (dredging) 7226; (St. Lawrence Ship Channel) 5050; (general vote) 6066; Miscellaneous (clerical assistance) 6104; (monument for Hon. Mr. Mackenzie) 6105; (National Art Gallery) 6103; (over expenditures) 6244; Roads and Bridges (Dom.) 6100; (Edmonton Bridge, N.W.T.) 6245, 6272; Slides and Booms, 6099;

Tarte, Hon. Mr. J. I.—*Continued.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
Public Works—Continued.
Telegraph Lines (B.C.) 6102; (N.W.T.) 6316; (St. Lawrence Shores) 6101 (ii).
Railways (general expenses for investigations) 7204 (ii).
Tarte, Hon. Mr., and Senate, par. in *Le Soleil* (remarks) 3320 (i).
Telegraph Lines, N.S., Govt. rates, &c. (Ans.) 6007 (ii).
——— North Shore, St. Lawrence (Ans.) 1336 (i).
Tignish Breakwater, P.E.I., tenders for construction (Ans.) 1075 (i).
Toronto Harbour Improvements, amount paid W. E. Phin (Ans.) 1337 (i).
——— dredging contract, &c. (Ans.) 482 (i) 4771.
——— liability incurred (Ans.) 972 (i).
Trout Cove, Breakwater, repairs (Ans.) 3824 (i).
West Point Pier, P.E.I., tenders for construction (Ans.) 1075 (i).
Wood Island, P.E.I., Breakwater, dredging (Ans.) 2350 (i).
Yukon Mines, telegraphic connection (Ans.) 1473.

Taylor, Mr. G., *South Leeds.*
Address, on The, 390 (i).
Agricultural Implements, Free Entry, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 3185 (i).
Alien Labour Act Amt. (B. 8) 1°, 268 (i).
Alien Labour Law, Enforcement (remarks) 5804.
——— Workmen, Importation to Toronto, on M. (Mr. *Clarke*) to Adjn., 4037 (ii).
Berney, Thos., Dismissal by Govt. (Ques.) 7687.
Binder Twine, *re* imposition of duty (Ques.) 455.
——— sale of Govt. output Kingston Penitentiary (Ques.) 3659 (i).
Budget, on The, 3505 (i).
Butter Industry of Canada, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Reid*) 2375, 2513 (i).
Canadian Yukon Ry., Telegram to High Commissioner *re* Hamilton Smith's Proposals, 1017.
Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries B. 14 (Mr. *Richardson*) on M. for Com., 2879; in Com., 3711 (i).
Civil Servants superannuated, 13th July, 1896, to 1st Feb., 1898 (M. for Ret.*) 505 (i).
Corn Importation, 1897 to April, 1898 (Ques.) 3659 (i).
Dep. P. M. G., present occupant of office (Ques.) 3407 (i).
Fishery Overseer Boddy, Appnmt. (Ques.) 3657.
Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 2973, 2979 (i); 4110, 4445 (ii).
Gananoque Customs House (Ques.) 4923 (ii).
——— Drill Shed, Inquiry for Ret., 3318 (i).
——— (M. to adjn.) 5098 (ii).
——— site (Ques.) 457 (i).
——— (remarks) 5316 (ii).
——— Ret. *re* inquiry, 3826 (i).
——— Removal, &c. (M. for Cor.*) 1837 (i).

Taylor, Mr. G.—*Continued.*
Hicks, Wm., Fishery Overseer, Appnmt. (Ques.) 3658 (i).
Insurance Companies, Changes in the law governing, &c. (prop. Res.) 5136 (ii).
Kingston Locomotive Works, Telegram *re* order for Locomotives (Ques.) 454 (i).
——— and Gananoque Drill Shed (M. to adjn.) 605 (i).
Leeds Co. Postal Mail service, Pets., &c. (Ques.) 4181 (ii).
Parliament Grounds, Dismissal of late Supt. Robertson (Ques.) 2818 (i).
Personal Explanation (Mr. *McMillan*) Speech *re* Experimental Farm, 6113 (ii).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 110 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 1°, 2923; on M. for Com., 5712 (ii).
Post Offices closed since 1st July, 1896 (Ques.) 3936 (ii).
Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors—Plebiscite B. 121 (Mr. *Fisher*) on M. for 1°, 3935; in Com., 4750 (ii).
Seeley's Bay Postmaster, Dismissal of W. W. Williams (Ques.) 3407 (i).
——— (M. to adjn.) 3409, 3416 (i).
Sons of England Benefit Society Co.'s incorp. B. 122 (Mr. *Bertram*) on M. for Com., 6058 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Experimental Farm) 5990.
Civil Government (Gov. Gen. Sec.'s Office) 3857.
Customs (laboratory) 7774 (ii).
Fisheries: (protection service) 5275 (ii).
Immigration (agent's salaries) 6834 (ii).
Indians (surveys) 6851 (ii).
Legislation: House of Commons (sessional indemnities to absent members) 7783 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Man. School Case, costs) 7770 (ii).
Post Office: Outside Service (miscellaneous expenses) 6701 (ii).
Public Works: Buildings, N.S., 5073, 7216: Ont. (Arnprior P. O.) 5451; (Major's Hill Park) 5461, 5597; (Ottawa grounds, &c.) 5474; (Rideau Hall) 5600; (summer-house, Ottawa) 7218; Ont. (dredging) 6093; Harbours and Rivers, Que. (dredging) 7237.
Ways and Means, on M. (Mr. *Davin*) to adjn. deb., 3594 (i).
——— The Tariff:
In Com. (preferential clause) 3785; (tobacco, 3815.
Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 71 (Sir *Henri Joly*) in Com., 3103 (i); Sen. Amts., 7786 (ii).
Williams, W. W., Seeley's Bay Postmaster, Dismissal (M. to adjn.) 3409, 3416 (i).

Tisdale, Hon. D., *South Norfolk.*
Civil Service, Attachment of Salaries B. 14 (Mr. *Richardson*) in Com., 4645 (ii).
Criminal Code Act Amt. B. 134 (Mr. *Flint*) on 1°, 4769 (ii).
Dawson City, Electric Co.'s B. 123 (Mr. *Morrison*) in Com., 7162 (ii).
Judges of the Provincial Courts (Pension) B. in Com. on Res., 7130 (ii).

Tisdale, Hon. D.—*Continued.*
Kingston and Pembroke Ry. Co.'s B. 69 (Mr. *Britton*) in Com., 4806 (ii).
Officer Commanding Militia, increased allowance in Com. on Res., 4934, 4941 (ii).
Ry. Employees Safety B. 4 (Mr. *Casey*) in Com., 4638, 4676 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Civil Government (Gov. Gen. Sec.'s Office) 3853 (i).
Militia (Dom. cartridge factory) 7075; (Yukon Force) 7060 (ii).
Yukon Military Contingent, expenditure, &c. (remarks) 4796 (ii).

Tupper, Hon. Sir C., Bart., *Cape Breton.*
Address, on The, 23 (i).
Adjnmt. for Easter (remarks) 2848 (i).
Alaskan Boundary Dispute, Telegram to New York press (remarks) 1735 (i).
Alien Labour Law, Enforcement (remarks) 5794.
Anglo-French Telegraph Co. on M. (Mr. *Fraser*) to present Pet., 5143 (ii).
Appnmts. by late Govt. on Amt. (Mr. *Montague*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 4819 (ii).
——— (remarks) 4926 (ii).
Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Contracts and Agreements, &c., on prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 5220 (ii).
——— (remarks) 3208 (i).
Auditor General, Powers and Duties, on Amt. (Mr. *Foster*) to Com. of Sup., 6203 (ii).
Bagot Electoral District, Vacancy, issue of Writ on M. (Mr. *Bergeron*) to adjn., 5237 (ii).
——— (remarks) 4927, 5233 (ii).
Beatonville Postmaster, Dismissal (Ques.) 3824 (i).
B.C. Coast surveys, Rep. of Mr. Coste (remarks) 5323 (ii).
Budget, on The, 3262 (i).
Business of the Hse., Govt. precedence on Mondays on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 5012 (ii).
——— on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1840 (i).
——— (remarks) 5115, 5787, 5885, 6029 (ii).
——— unopposed Motions for Rets. (remarks) 2820 (i).
[*See* "Govt. Business."]
Canadian, Yukon Ry. Co.'s B. 6 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 2°, 538; on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to M. for 2°, 1678; in Com., 1852 (i).
——— Contract (Ques.) 102 (i).
——— Govt. Amts. (remarks) 744 (i).
——— Hamilton Smith's Communication (remarks) 674, 831 (i).
——— Telegram to High Commissioner on Explanation (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 980, 1078 (i).
——— (remarks) 271, 939 (i).
Chignecto Ship Ry., par. in Montreal *Gazette* (remarks) 5664 (ii).
Civil Service Superannuation Act Abolition B. 76 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 1°, 1745 (i).
Debates, Official 2nd Rep. presented (remarks) 3823 (i).

Tupper, Hon. Sir C.—*Continued.*
Debates, Omission of Ques. from Report, on Ques. of Privilege (Mr. *McDougall*) 3427 (i).
Drainage across Ry. Lands B. 5 (Mr. *Casey*) on M. for 2°, 2056 (i).
Drummond County Ry. Com. of Investigation, on prop. Res. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 507 (i).
Dupont, Mr., late M.P., Decease (remarks) 1773.
Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 2274; in Com., 2971, 2995 (i), 3964, 3968, 4058, 4069, 4122, 5261; on M. for 3°, 5665; (Amt.) 5670; neg. (Y. 48; N. 88) 5696 (ii).
Gladstone, Rt. Hon. W. E., Decease of (remarks) 5869 (ii).
——— Res. of Condolence on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 6120 (ii).
Govt. Business, Change of Procedure on Order Paper on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 3502 (i).
——— precedence on Thursdays on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 2522 (i).
Gov. Gen. and Ministerial Responsibility (M. to adjn.) 253 (i).
Insolvency Bill, Govt. Measure (M. to adjn.) 2925 (i).
Kettle River Valley Ry. Co.'s B. 26 (Mr. *Bostock*) in Com., 2958 (i).
Kingston Locomotive Works on M. (Mr. *Taylor*) to adjn., 611 (i).
Kootenay District Postal, &c., Facilities, Telegram, 1746 (i).
Lieut. Governorship of N. W. T., rumoured Appnmt. (remarks) 2699 (i).
London and Lake Huron Ry. Co.'s Incorp. B. 67 (Mr. *Lister*) in Com., 4073 (ii).
McCarthy, Mr., M.P., Decease, (remarks) 5390.
Military College Employees, Suppl. Return (remarks) 6034 (ii).
Nickel Steel Co.'s incorp. B. 96 (Mr. *Wood, Hamilton*) on M. (Mr. *LaRivière*) to ref. to Com. of Rys., 3645 (i); on M. for 3', 4071 (ii).
Officer Commanding Militia, increased allowance, in Com., on Res., 4932, 4939 (ii).
Ogilvie's Lecture on the Klondike (remarks) 307.
Ont. and Rainy River Ry. Co.'s B. 32 (Mr. *Tisdale*) on. M. for Com., 2615 (i).
Pacific Cable between Vancouver and Australia, on M. (Mr. *Casey*) for Com. of Sup., 6192 (ii).
Perry, Mr. S. F., late M.P., Decease (remarks) 938 (i).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 110 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 1°, 2916 (i); on M. for 2', 5541; on M. for Com., 5714; in Com., 5871; on M. for 3°, 6122 (ii).
——— Savings Banks, reduction of interest, on Amt. (Mr. *Davin*) to M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 3730 (i).
Preferential Duties on Adjnmt. (remarks) 505 (i).
——— Trade with G. B. on Amt. (Mr. *McNeill*) to M. for Com. of Sup., M. to adjn. deb., 5866.
Privilege (Ques. of) Press Representatives and Members of Parlt. (M. to adjn.) 5118 (ii).

Tupper, Hon. Sir C.—*Continued.*
Procedure; on 3ª of B., Mr. Speaker's ruling, 2650 (i).
Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors—Plebiscite B. 121 (Mr. *Fisher*) on M. for 3ª, 6036 (ii).
——— on M. (Mr. *Craig*) to adjn., 3317 (i).
Public Accounts Com., Meeting (remarks) 3503.
Ry. Employees Safety B. 4 (Mr. *Casey*) in Com., 5172 (ii).
——— Transportation on M. (Mr. *Maclean*) to adjn., 1756 (i).
Royal Military College, Staff and Employees, on M. for Ret., 2824 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 5571, 6034 (ii).
San José Scale, Prohibition of Nursery Stock B. 82 (Mr. *Fisher*) on M. for 1ª, 1910 (i).
Sel. Com. on Standing Orders, on M. (Mr. *Landerkin*) to suspend Rule, 5014 (ii).
Speech from the Throne, consdn. (remarks) 4 (i).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (year book) 5028 (ii).
Civil Government: Agriculture (salaries) 4846 (ii).
Treasury Board Recommendations, non-production of Ret. (remarks) 1077 (i).
Trout Cove Breakwater, Repairs (Ques.) 3824 (i).
U. S. Customs Duties in Alaska, Tel. in Montreal *Gazette* (remarks) 405 (i).
U. S. Customs Regulations at Fort Wrangel (remarks) 1186 (i).
——— Skagway and Dyea (Ques.) 161 (i).
——— Stickine (remarks) 620 (i).
——— in the Yukon (remarks) 6 (i).
Walsh, Major, Commissioner, Yukon district (M. for Ret.*) 2839 (i).
Ways and Means—Personal Explanation in ref. to speech of Min. of Finance at Sheffield, 3450
West Prince, P.E.I., Vacancy, Appnmt. of Returning Officer (Ques.) 1481 (i).
Williams, W. W., Seeley's Bay Postmaster, Dismissal on M. (Mr. *Taylor*) to Adjn., 3411 (i).
Yukon Provisional District, Action of U.S. Senate (M. to adjn.), 1274 (i).
——— Customs Regulations (M. for Ret.) 2822 (i).
——— Liquor Permits (Ques.) 2846 (i).
——— Mann and Mackenzie's contract, Omissions (remarks) 1078 (i).
——— Mounted Police, Contract for Supplies (remarks) 5116 (ii).
——— Routes, Mr. Jenning's Rep. (M. to print) 410 (i).
——— Wagon Road (remarks) 1184, 1341 (i).

Tupper, Hon. Sir C. H., K.C.M.G., *Picton.*
Address, on The, 164 (i).
Agricultural Implements, Free Entry, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 3205 (i).
——— on Ques. of Order, 3205 (i).
Aldershot Military Camp, Supplies (M. for Ret.) 1786 (i).
Atlantic and Pacific Coasting Laws of Can. (M. for Ret.*) 504 (i).

Tupper, Hon. Sir C. H.—*Continued.*
Bagot Electoral District, Vacancy, issue of Writ on M. (Mr. *Bergeron*) to Adjn., 5251 (ii).
Behring Sea, British Vessels seized by Russia (Ques.) 1072 (i).
Bounties on Iron and Steel B. 159 (Mr. *Paterson*) on prop. Res., 6725 (ii).
Bruneau, Mr., M.P. for Richelieu, Resignation, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Marcotte*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, 2038, 2147 (i).
Butter Industry in Can. on prop. Res. (Mr. *Reid*) 2491 (i).
Cameron, A. F., Customs service, Sherbrooke, N.S., Dismissal (M. for Ret.*) 2840 (i).
C.P.R. Co. B. 46 (Mr. *Morrison*) in Com., 3655 (i).
Canadian Yukon Ry. B. 6 (Mr. *Blair*) on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) on M. for 2ª, 1366, 1388.
——— Tel. to High Commissioner *re* Hamilton Smith's Proposals, 994 (i).
Certificates to Masters and Mates Act Amt. B. 37 (Sir *Louis Davies*) in Com., 1860 (i).
Coasting Laws, Atlantic and Pacific (M. for cor.*) 2839 (i).
Coasting Trade of Canada Act Amt. (B. 106) 1ª, 2800 (i).
Connors, D., Bayfield, Antigonish, Fire claims (M. for Ret.*) 1837 (i).
Copyright in Can., Powers of Parlt., &c. (Ques.) 473 (i).
——— International, Action by British Govt. on M. for Com. of Sup., 6634 (ii).
Crow's Nest Pass Ry., Treatment of Labourers on M. for Com. of Sup., 6619 (ii).
Customs Act Amt. B. 152 (Mr. *Paterson*) on M. for 1ª, 6318 (ii).
Customs, Assistant Inspector, Que. (Ques.) 2817, 3313 (i).
Dagneau, J. T., Postmaster at Robitaille, P.Q., Charges against (M. for Ret.*) 4246 (ii).
Dart, Lyman, Remission of sentence, in Com. of Sup., 6657 (ii).
Fishermen's Safety B. 111 (Sir *Louis Davies*) in Com., 4779 (ii).
——— Fisheries Act Amt. B. 127 (Sir *Louis Davies*) on M. for 1ª, 4522, in Com., 4946 (ii).
Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on Amt. (Mr. *Powell*) to M. for 2ª, 2793; in Com., 2992 (i); 4256, 4269, 4358, 4432, 4462, 5260 on Amt. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to M. for 3ª, 5678. (ii)
General Inspection Act Amt. B. 128 (Sir *Henri Joly*) in Com., 5971 (ii).
Great North-west Central Ry. Co's B. 141 (remarks) 6001; (M.) 6002 (ii).
Gov. Gen. and Ministerial Responsibility, on M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to Adjn., 261 (i).
Govt. Harbours, Piers and Breakwaters Act Amt. B. 38 (Sir *Louis Davies*) in Com., 1863 (i) 5325.
Identification of Criminals B. 156 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2ª, in Com., 6963 (ii).

Tupper, Hon. Sir C. H.—*Continued.*

I. C. R., A. H. Harriss' Appnmt., (M. for Cor.) 3667 (i).

——— (M. for O. C.'s*) 3669 (i).

——— (Ques.) 3166 (i).

——— Charles Hoar, Employee at Pictou, Dismissal (M. for Cor.*) 1838 (i).

——— Contract for Farm Gates (M. for Ret.*) 2839 (i).

——— J. H. Murray, Appnmt. by Govt. (Ques.) 5318 (ii).

——— Lumber Schedules (remarks) 2442 (i).

——— Patent Locomotive Cylinder (Ques.) 1335.

Isaac's Harbour, Postmaster Griffin, Dismissal (M. for Ret.) 1834 (i).

Joint Commission, Can. and U. S., prop. Conference (remarks) 6611 (ii).

Judges of the Provincial Courts Act. Amt. B. 150 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 6125, 6137, 6164, 6182; on M. for 2°, 6731, 6747; in Com., 6784; on M. for 3°, 7043; (Amt.) 7045 (ii).

——— Order (Ques. of) 6153 (ii).

Kettle River Valley Ry. Co's B. 26 (Mr. *Bostock*) in Com., 3063 (i).

Kings Head Light, Pictou, Request to turn on (Ques.) 1929 (i).

Land Titles Act Amt. B. 132 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 5959 (ii).

Lt.-Gov. N.W.T., Present Occupant, (Ques.) 2529 (i).

Loch Leven, C.B., Postmaster (Ques.) 1776 (i).

Lord's Day, Better Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., 1988 (i).

Macleod, Mr., Postal Mail Clerk, N.S., (M. for O. C's., &c.) 4181 (ii).

McNab, Campbell, Claim against Govt. (remarks) 5446 (ii).

Manitoba Schools Ques., Address to the Holy Father on M. for Com. of Sup., 5404 (ii).

Miners Licenses at White and Chilkoot Passes (remarks) 4601 (ii).

Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. B. 136 (Sir *Louis Davies*) in Com., 5328 (ii).

Nickel Steel incorp. B. 96 (Mr. *Wood, Hamilton*) on M. to ref. to Com. on Rys., 3649 (i).

N.W.T. Act Amt. B. 131 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 5946; on M. for 3°, 6064 (ii).

Oxford, N.S., Postmaster R. S. Thompson, Appnmt. (M. for Cor.*) 1838 (i).

Petroleum Inspection Act. Amt. B. 74 (Sir *Henri Joly*) in Com., 2138 (i).

Pictou Postmaster (Ques.) 2819 (i).

Port Mulgrave Station Agent, Dismissal (M. for Cor.) 1832 (i).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 110 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for Com., 5711, 5743; in Com., 5944 (ii).

Postal Mail Clerks, N.S., Removal from former residences, &c. (M. for Rep.*) 4246 (ii).

——— (Ques.) 3406 (i).

Pound Net Licenses, North shore of Lake Huron (Ques.) 3657 (i).

Tupper, Hon. Sir C. H.—*Continued.*

Pound Net Licenses, North of Lake Superior (M. for Cor.*) 3670 (i).

Prendergast, Judge, Commission of Inquiry (Ques.) 1076 (i).

Procedure on 3° of B., Mr. Speaker's ruling, 2651.

Public Works Dept., Temporary and Permanent clerks, Number dischgd., &c. (M. for Ret.*) 1838 (i).

Queen *vs.* Cameron, Indictment for Libel, on M. for Papers, 1828 (i).

Returns (inquiry) 4348, 6028 (ii).

Ross, David, Fishery Officer, North-east Margaree (M. for Ret.*) 1837 (i).

St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, Commissioner's Rep., on M. (Mr. *Fortin*) to print, 6608 (ii).

Spinks, Judge, Investigation *re* (remarks) 5268 (ii).

——— (M. for Reps.*) 3668 (i).

Stationery Engineers, on prop. introduction of B. (remarks) 2800 (i).

Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 39 (Sir *Louis Davies*) in Com., 1871, 1903, 2085, 2113, 2532 (i); on consdn. Sen. Amts., 4525 (ii).

Steamboat Inspection, Remission of Penalties (Ques.) 2344 (i).

Stellarton, Car Inspector Sutherland, Dismissal (M. for Cor.) 1833 (i).

——— (M. for Ret.*) 2839 (i).

SUPPLY:

Administration of Justice: Exchequer Court (travelling expenses) 6639 (ii).

Arts, Agriculture, &c.: Experimental Farm, 5983.

Civil Government: Geological Survey, 4560: Interior, 4528 (ii).

Customs (salaries, &c.) 6000 (ii).

Fisheries (protection service) 5269 (ii).

Legislation: House of Commons (sessional clerks) 7012 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (life saving station) 4953; (maintenance) 4947; (tidal survey) 4955; (winter mail service) 4964 (ii).

Penitentiaries: Dorchester, 6678; St. Vincent de Paul, 6640 (ii).

Public Works: Buildings (N.S.) 5071, 5081; Ont., 5470, 5482; (Major's Hill Park) 5456, 5572: (Ottawa Grounds, &c.) 5471, 5477; Harbours and Rivers (N.S.) 5612, 5623; (general vote) 6066, 6069; Ont., 5888; (dredging) 6097; Que. (St. Lawrence River) 5060 (ii).

Railways: I. C. R. (accommodation at Halifax) 6385; (iron bridges) 6388 (ii).

Tides and Currents, Reps. of Surveys (M. for copy) 1835 (i).

U. S. Customs, Duties in Alaska, Boundary line (remarks) 407 (i).

——— Occupation of Dyea and Skagway (Ques.) 829 (i).

——— Regulations at Skagway and Dyea (remarks) 265 (i).

——— Vessels in Canadian Waters, Right to exclude (Ques.) 824 (i).

——— SS. *Frederick J. Gerring*, Supreme Court Judgment (M. for Ret.) 2823 (i).

Tupper, Hon, Sir C. H.—*Continued.*
——— SS. *Yantic*, Clearances, Entries, &c., at Can. Ports (M. for copies) 1834 (i).
——— passage up St. Lawrence (Ques.) 1336 (i).
——— (remarks) 830 (i).
Walsh, E. J., Claim against Govt., 6324 (ii).
——— Claim against Leeward Islands (M. for Ret.*) 2841 (i).
Ways and Means, Adjnmt. of deb. (M.) 3169 (i).
Yukon Provisional District, Action of U. S. Senate on M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to Adjn., 1291.
——— Mounted Police, Contract for Transportation of Supplies (remarks) 5497, 6580, 6894 (ii).

Tyrwhitt, Mr. R., *South Simcoe.*
Craigville and Stroud Mills Mail Service, Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 487 (i).
Military College, Commissions granted to Cadets 1898-99 (M. for Cor.*) 2840 (i).
——— Staff and Employees (M. for Ret.) 2824.
Militia General Orders, Qualifications of Officers, &c. (Ques.) 7124 (ii).
Permanent Force, Qualifications for Commissions (Ques.) 6010 (ii).

Wallace, Hon. Mr. N. C, *West York.*
Alien Labour Act, Enforcement (Ques.) 3084 (i).
——— Enforcement at Toronto (remarks) 5116.
——— Workmen, Importation to Toronto on M. (Mr. *Clarke*) to Adjn., 4032 (ii).
Budget, on The, 3369 (i).
Canadian Yukon Ry. B. 6 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 1°. 220 ; on M. for 2°, 868 (i).
——— Kaslo-Slocan Ry., Plans, Papers (remarks) 403 (i).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. 17 (Mr. *McMullen*) on M. for 2°, 4234 (ii).
Crow's Nest Pass Ry., Investigation, on conc., 7823 (i).
Customs Act Amt. B. 152 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com., 6947 (ii).
——— Collections in the Yukon (Ques.) 825 (i).
Experimental Farms, Distribution of Bulletins (remarks) 2454 (i).
Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on Amt. (Mr. *Powell*) to M. for 2°, 2776 ; in Com., 2972, 2985, 3005 (i) ; 4318, 4451 (ii).
Grand Trunk Ry. Regulations (M. to adjn.), 6013 (ii).
Imports from G. B. and U. S. (Ques.) 3936 (ii).
Jubilee Stamps (remarks) 3939, 3940 (ii).
Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 150 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 6127, 6177 (ii).
Legal Agents of Govt. in G. B., Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 5135 (ii).
Liquor Permits in the Yukon (remarks) 2813 (i).
Logs, &c., Authorized Export Duty (Ques.) 3085.
Lord's Day, Better Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) in Com., on Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) that Com. rise, 2403 (i).

Wallace, Hon. Mr. N. C.—*Continued.*
McCarthy, Mr., Late M.P., Decease of (remarks) 5390 (ii).
Man. Schools Ques., Address to the Holy Father on M. for Com. of Sup., 5394 (ii).
——— Ques. of Priv. *re* par. in *La Patrie* 7717 (ii).
Mann and Mackenzie's Contract, Omissions (remarks) 1079 (i).
Miners' licenses, Issue (remarks) 4773 (ii).
Nickel Steel Co.'s incorp. B. 96 (Mr. *Wood, Hamilton*) on M. (Mr. *La Rivière*) to ref. to Com. on Rys., 3645 (ii).
Officer Commanding Militia, Increased Allowance, in Com. on Res., 4940 (ii).
Ontario and Rainy River Ry. Co.'s B. 32 (Mr. *Tisdale*) on M. (Mr. *Maclean*) to ref. back to Com., 2683 (i).
Pacific Cable between Vancouver and Australia on M. (Mr. *Casey*) for Com. of Sup., 6201 (ii).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 110 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 5756, 5768, 5773, 5876 (ii).
Post Office Savings Bank Deposits, Reduction of Interest on Amt. (Mr. *Davin*) to M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 3732 (i).
Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquor-Plebiscite B. 121 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4745 (ii).
Ry. Employees Safety B. 4 (Mr. *Casey*) in Com., 4672 (ii).
——— Rate War and Man. Settlers on M. (Mr. *Maclean*) to Adjn., 1475 (i).
——— Transportation on M. (Mr. *Maclean*) to Adjn., 1768 (i).
Returns (inquiry) 7526 (ii).
Sel. Com. on Standing Orders, on M. (Mr. *Landerkin*) to suspend Rule, 5015 (ii).
Stimulants in Chamber during debate, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Talbot*) 3641 (ii).
SUPPLY :
Administration of Justice : Supreme Court (judge's salary) 6990 (ii).
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Paris exhibition) 5045; (year book) 5035 (i).
Civil Government : Customs (contingencies) 4588; conc., 7852; Gov. Gen. Sec.'s Office, 3838; High Commissioner's Office (contingencies) 4575 ; Militia (accountant) 3911, (salaries) 6985; Post Office, 4837, 4868, 4912 ; (contingencies) 4916 ; Public Works, conc., 7823; Trade and Commerce (contingencies) 4598 (ii).
Customs : Outside Service, 7357 (ii).
Dominion Lands (surveys, &c.) 7316 (ii).
Fisheries (protection service) 5270 (ii).
Indians : B.C., 7750 ; (inspectors' salaries) 7303 (ii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and South Africa) 7723; (Montreal, St. John and Manchester) 7684 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Crow's Nest Pass Commission) 7259, 7274 ; (printing, &c., conc.) 7850 (ii).
Public Works : Buildings (deptl. block, Ottawa) 5071 ; (N.S.) 5072 ; (New Harbour) 7624 ; Ont., 5886, 5926 ; (Major's Hill Park) 5457 ; (Toronto Harbour) 5896 ; Harbours and Rivers, Que. (River St. Lawrence) 5063 (ii).
Quarantine ("Scientific Dairying") 7003 (ii).

Wallace, Hon. Mr. N. C.—*Continued.*
Tennant, John F., Dismissal by Govt., on M. (Mr. *Quinn*) for Ret., 5197 (ii).
U.S. Customs Regulations at Skagway and Dyea (remarks) 266 (i).
——— Warships in Canadian Canals (remarks) 4350 (ii).
Walsh, E. J., Claim against Govt. (remarks) 6325.
Ways and Means—The Budget, 3369 (i).
——— on M. to adjn. deb. (Mr. *Davin*) 3593 (i).
In Com.: (preferential clause) 3804; (sugar) 3809; (tobacco) 3817 (i); Res. in Com., 7583 (ii).
Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 60 (Mr. *Fortin*) on M. for 1°, 1385 (i).
——— B. 71 (Sir *Henri Joly*) in Com., 2128, 3101; Sen. Amts., 7784 (ii).
Williams, W. W., Seeley's Bay Postmaster, Dismissal on M. (Mr. *Taylor*) to Adjn., 3421 (i).
Yukon Provisional District, Accounts, &c. (remarks) 4350 (ii).
——— Military Contingent, Expenditure, &c. (remarks) 4795 (ii).
——— Mounted Police, Contract for transporting Supplies (remarks) 5509 (ii).

Wilson, Mr. U., *Lennox.*
Address, on The, 356 (i).
Anderson, T. E., Customs Collector at Napanee, Salary, &c. (Ques.) 6008 (ii).
Bath (Ont.) Customs Officer, Appnmt. by Govt. (Ques.) 6007 (ii).
Canadian Yukon Ry. B. 6 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 2°, 1235 (i).
Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 5263 (ii).
Lalonde, Messenger, Charge of canvassing in Russell Co. (remarks) 909 (i).
Napanee Customs Collector, Amount paid, &c. (Ques.) 6008 (i).
——— Public Building, Caretaker, &c. (Ques.) 6008 (ii).
Sel. Com. on Standing Orders, on M. (Mr. *Landerkin*) to suspend rule, 5016 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (patent record) 5023; (year book) 5026 (ii).
Public Works: Buildings, Ont., 5450 (ii).
Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 71 (Sir *Henri Joly*) in Com., 2117 (ii).

Wood, Hon. J. F., *Brockville.*
Adulteration Act Amt. B. 72 (Sir *Henri Joly*) on M. for 1°, 1743 (i).
Brockville and St. Lawrence Bridge Co.'s (B. 86) 1°*, 2084 (i).
Customs Act Amt. B. 152 (Mr. *Paterson*) in Com., 6947 (ii).
——— and Fisheries, Further Protection B. 153 (Mr. *Paterson*) on M. for 2°, 6962 (ii).

Wood, Hon. J. F.—*Continued.*
Franchise Act Repeal B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 2290 (i); in Com., 4044 (ii).
Grand Trunk Ry. Regulations on M. (Mr. *Wallace*) to Adjn., 6019 (ii).
Lord's Day, Better Observance B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 1967; in Com., 1977, 1985 (i).
Manitoba School Fund B. 168 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 7430 (ii).
Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Co., Construction, &c., on M. (Mr. *Poupore*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 6500 (ii).
Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors-Plebiscite B. 121 (Mr. *Fisher*) on M. for 1°, 3932 (ii).
Stationary Engineers, &c., on proposed Introduction of B. (remarks) 2799 (i).
Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 39 (Sir *Louis Davies*) in Com., 1880, 2086, 2094 (i).
SUPPLY:
Canals: Williamsburg (gratuities) 7194 (ii).
Civil Government: Gov. Gen. Sec.'s Office, 3881 (i); Inland Revenue (contingencies) 6983 (ii); Justice, 3899; Militia (accountant) 3920 (i); Post Office (clerical assistance) 7038 (ii).
Culling Timber (salaries) 7249 (ii).
Customs (outside service) 7356 (ii).
Dominion Lands (surveys, &c.) 7309 (ii).
Excise (contingencies) 7243 (ii).
Legislation: House of Commons (sessional clerks) 6992 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Man. and N. W. T.) (Alien Labour Law) 7279; Crow's Nest Pass Commission, 7265.
Penitentiaries: Expenses of Commissions, 7344.
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, N. S. (New Harbour) 7592; Ont. (Toronto Harbour) 5901; Que. (dredging) 7226 (ii).
Railways: I. C. R. (claims for damages) 7185; (General expenses for Investigations) 7194 (ii).
Winnipeg and Great Northern Ry. Co.'s Transport Contract B. 148 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 6232 (ii).

Wood, Mr. A. T., *Hamilton.*
Adjournment, Ash Wednesday, on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 903 (i).
British Yukon Mining, Trading and Transportation Co.'s, Change of name (B. 115) 1°*, 3502.
Nickel Steel Co. of Can. incorp. (B. 96) 1°*, 2430 (i); in Com., 4072 (i).
——— on M. (Mr. *LaRivière*) to ref. to Com. on Rys., 3648 (i).
Ontario and Rainy River Ry. Co.'s B. 32 (Mr. *Tisdale*) in Com., 2639 (i).
——— on M. (Mr. *Maclean*) to ref. to Com., 2688, 2694 (i).
Ry. Employees Safety B. 4 (Mr. *Casey*) in Com., 5158 (ii).
St. Stephen and Milltown Ry. Co. and C.P.R., Confirmation of Agreement (B. 44) 1°*, 970 (i).

Wood, Mr. A. T.—*Continued.*

SUPPLY :

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (year book) 5034 (ii).

Legislation : House of Commons (debates) 7031 (ii).

Public Works : Roads and Bridges (Edmonton Bridge, N.W.T.) 6282 (ii).

Ways and Means—The Tariff:

In Com. (preferential clause) 3765, 3782 (i).

Yeo, Mr. J., *East Prince, P.E.I.*

Oyster Fisheries, Leases, &c. Ques.) 1775 (i).

SUPPLY :

Fisheries (overseers' salaries) 5005 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (Winter mail service) 4978, 4981 (ii).

Railways : P. E. I. Ry. (rolling stock) 6436 (ii).

INDEX—PART II

SUBJECTS

ABENAKIS INDIANS, ST. FRANCIS AGENCY: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 3408 (i).

ADDRESS, THE, IN ANSWER TO HIS EX.'S SPEECH: consdn., M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 4 (i).

——— moved (Mr. *Bertram*) 7; seconded (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 18 (i).

Deb. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 23; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 81; (Mr. *Foster*) 103; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 151; (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 164; (Mr. *Davin*) 272; (Mr. *Bennett*) 308; (Mr. *Craig*) 328; (Mr. *Sproule*) 337; (Mr. *Wilson*) 356; (Mr. *Pope*) 365; (Mr. *Rogers*) 375; (Mr. *Clarke*) 377; (Sir *Louis Davies*) 385; (Mr. *Osler*) 386; (Mr. *Taylor*) 390; (Mr. *Dupont*) 392; (Mr. *McNeill*) 410; (Mr. *McMullen*) 422; (Mr. *Bergeron*) 430.

——— REPLY: Presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 936.

——— (JUBILEE) TO HER MAJESTY, REPLY: Presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1466 (i).

———DEPARTURE FROM CAN.: moved (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 7379; seconded (Mr. *Foster*) 7380 (ii).

ADJOURNMENTS, MS.:

ALIEN WORKMEN IMPORTED TO TORONTO: (Mr. *Clarke*) 4029 (ii).

ASH WEDNESDAY (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 903 (i).

CATTLE SHIPMENTS TO UNITED KINGDOM (Mr. *Hughes*) 2435 (i)

EASTER (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 3095; Remarks 2929; (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 2848 (i).

GANANOQUE DRILL SHED (Mr. *Taylor*) 5098 (ii).

GOVERNOR GENERAL AND MINISTERIAL RESPONSIBILITY (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 253 (i).

GRAND RIVER FLOODS (Mr. *Montague*) 2528 (i).

G. T. RY. REGULATIONS (Mr. *Wallace*) 6013 (ii).

I. C. R. COLOURED PORTERS (Mr. *Campbell*) 3167 (i).

N. W. T. AND IMMIGRATION HAND BOOKS (Mr. *Davin*) 5932 (ii).

ONTARIO LUMBER CUT (Mr. *Bennett*) 1843 (i).

PRESS REPRESENTATIVES AND MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 5118 (ii).

PRINCE ALBERT MAIL SERVICE (Mr. *Davis*) 2517 (i).

PROHIBITION PLEBISCITE (Mr. *Craig*) 3314 (i).

QU'APPELLE, LONG LAKE AND SASKATCHEWAN RY. (Mr. *Davis*) 4248 (ii).

——— (Mr. *Osler*) 4449 (ii).

QUEEN'S BIRTHDAY (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 5930 (ii).

RAILWAY TRANSPORTATION (Mr. *Maclean*) 1756 (i).

RY. RATE WAR AND MANITOBA SETTLERS (Mr. *Maclean*) 1473 (i).

SPADES AND SHOVELS COMBINE, &c. (Mr. *Richardson*) 1936 (i).

WILLIAMS, W. W., POSTMASTER AT SEELEY'S BAY, DISMISSAL (Mr. *Taylor*) 3409, 3416 (i).

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE: in Com. of Sup., 7486.

Administration of Oaths of Office B. No. 1 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1°*, 3; *pro formâ*.

Adulteration Act Amt. B. No. 72. (Sir *Henri Joli de Lotbinière*) 1°, 1743 (i.); 2°, and in Com., 4777; 3°*, 4777 (ii). (61-62 Vic., c. 24.)

ADULTERATION OF FOOD: in Com. of Sup., 6000 (ii).

ADVOCATE HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 7631 (ii).

AGRICULTURE AND STATISTICS:

AGRICULTURE AND COLONIZATION, SEL. COM., 1ST REP.: CONC., 1174 (i).

AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT: in Com. of Sup., 4845, 5020 (ii).

——— DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. *Fisher*) 1473 (i).

ARTS, AGRICULTURE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5972, 7512 (ii).

BULLETINS AND REPORTS, PRINTING AND DISTRIBUTION: in Com. of Sup., 5991 (ii).

BUTTER INDUSTRY IN CANADA, ENCOURAGEMENT OF: prop, Res. (Mr. *Reid*) 2350; Amt. (Mr. *Sutherland*) to adjn. deb., Agreed to (Y, 80, N.34) 2515.

CATTLE EXPORTED FROM CANADIAN TERRITORY: Ques. (Mr. *Maclean*) 475 (i).

——— EXPORT TRADE, MONTREAL, G. B. AND IRELAND: Remarks (Mr. *Hughes*) 2270 (i).

———INSPECTION, SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 7732 (ii).

——— QUARANTINE SLAUGHTER COMPENSATION; in Com. of Sup., 7003 (ii).

——— SHIPMENTS TO BELFAST; Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 484 (i).

——— TO THE UNITED KINGDOM: M. (Mr. *Hughes*) to Adjn., 2435 (i).

——— TRADE, OPENING BELFAST PORT; Remarks (Mr *Fisher*) 2851 (i).

CHEESE FACTORIES IN QUEBEC; Remarks (Mr. *Marcotte*) 1578 (i).

COLD STORAGE FOR P. E. I., PROVISION: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 828 (i).

——— SHIPMENT, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5997 (ii).

COPYRIGHT IN CAN., POWERS OF PARLT., &C.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 473 (i).

COPYRIGHT INTERNATIONAL, ACTION BY BRITISH GOVT.: M. for Com. of Sup., (Mr. *Ross Robertson*) 6627, 6801 (ii).

CREAMERIES, DOM. GOVT.: Ques. Mr. *McInnes*) 3085.

——— IN N. W. T., NUMBER OF PATRONS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Davin*) 487, 503 (i).

——— in Com. of Sup., 5994 (ii).

DAIRYING in N. W. T., SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 504 (i).

DAIRYING SERVICE; in Com. of Sup., 5994 (ii).

AGRICULTURE AND STATISTICS—*Con.*
EXPERIMENTAL FARMS: in Com. of Sup., 5972 (ii).
—— DISTRIBUTION OF BULLETINS: Remarks (Mr. *Montague*) 2454 (i).
—— REP.: Presented (Mr. *Fisher*) 7378 (ii).
HORSES FOR FEEDING, LICENSES BY FARMERS; Ques. (Mr. *McCleary*) 2343 (i).
LYNCH, MR., PROMOTION: in Com. of Sup., 4855 (ii).
PARIS EXHIBITION, PREPARATION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5039 (ii)
PATENTS, CANADIAN AND U. S., CLASSIFICATION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7512 (ii).
"PATENT RECORD": in Com. of Sup., 5023 (ii).
QUARANTINE, B C.: in Com. of Sup., 7514 (ii).
——CATTLE: in Com. of Sup., 5998 (ii).
—— GRATUITY TO W. McK. McLEOD: in Com. of Sup., 6995 (ii).
ST. JACQUES MODEL FARM, ESTABLISHMENT BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Dugas*) 7121 (ii).
"SCIENTIFIC DAIRYING": in Com. of Sup., 6997 (ii).
SHERIDAN, JOHN, INSPECTOR OF LIVE STOCK, APPNMT. BY GOVT., Ques. (Mr. *Clark*) 6010 (ii).
STATISTICAL BRANCH, AGRICULTURE DEPT.: Ques. (Mr. *Heyd*) 2814 (i).
—— YEAR-BOOK: in Com. of Sup., 5825 (ii).
SYDNEY, AND NORTH SYDNEY, QUARANTINE PHYSICIAN: Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 1781 (i).
VETERINARY INSPECTORS, APPNMTS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Montague*) 2821 (i).
AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENTS, FREE ENTRY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 2825, 3170, 3196; Amt. (Mr. *Fielding*) to adjn. deb. agreed to (Y. 46; N. 14) 3207 (i).
—— Motion allowed to stand, 1949 (i).
—— Personal explanation, par. in Man. *Free Press* (Mr. *Davin*) 4349 (ii).
AGNES POSTMASTER AND REMOVAL OF OFFICE: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Pope*) 1787 (i).
Alaska and North-western Ry. Co.'s B. No. 108 (Mr. *Belcourt*) 1°*, 2844; 2°*, 3084 (i).
ALASKAN BOUNDARY DISPUTE, TELEGRAM TO N. Y. PRESS: Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1735 (i).
Alberta and Yukon Ry. Nav. and Mining Co.'s incorp. B. No 124 (Mr. *Casey*) 1°, 4348; 2°*, 4606; in Com., 7163; 3°*, 7456 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 90.)
ALDERSHOT (N.S.) MILITARY CAMP SUPPLIES: M. for Ret. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 1786 (i).
ALEXANDRIA REFORMATORY: in Com. of Sup., 5482.
ALIEN LABOUR LAW, AGENT AT FORT ERIE: Ques. (Mr. *McCleary*) 4178 (ii).
—— GEORGIAN BAY: Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) 4523, 6240 (ii).
—— HAMILTON: Ques. (Mr. *MacPherson*) 6611 (ii).
—— OFFICERS IN ONTARIO: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 5317 (ii).
—— PARRY SOUND: Remarks (Mr. *McCormick*) 6613 (ii).
—— TORONTO: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 4254, 4349.
—— WALLACEBURG: Remarks (Mr. *Clancy*) 6612.
—— BRITISH COLUMBIA GOVERNMENTAL ACTIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 3662 (i).
—— ENFORCEMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 5392 (ii).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Wallace*) 3084 (i).
ALIEN LABOUR LAW: Remarks (Mr. *Clancy*) 7126 (ii).
—— Remarks (Mr. *McCleary*) 5789, 5807 (ii).
—— in Com. of Sup., 7772 (ii).
—— MAN. AND N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 7275 (ii).
—— TORONTO: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 5011, 5445.
—— (Mr. *Wallace*) 5116 (ii).
—— INSTRUCTIONS: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Montague*) 6114 (ii).
—— TO AGENTS: Remarks (Mr. *Montague*) 6581.
—— FROM JUSTICE DEPT.: Remarks (Mr. *Montague*) 5518 (ii).
—— PROSECUTIONS UNDER: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 474.
Alien Act Amt. B. 63 (Mr. *McMullen*) 1°, 1466.
Alien Labour Restriction B. No. 8 (Mr. *Taylor*) 1°, 268 (i).
Alien Labour Restriction B. No. 155 (Mr. *Fielding*) 1°*, 6577; 2°, and in Com., 6964; 3°*, 7011 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 2.)
ALIEN WORKMEN IMPORTED TO TORONTO: M. (Mr. *Clarke*) to Adjn., 4029 (ii).
ALLAIRE, J. P. O., CLAIM AGAINST GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *LaRiviere*) 3661 (i).
AMERICAN CANNED MEATS, CONTRACT WITH CANADIAN GOVT.: Remarks (Mr. *Quinn*) 5017 (ii).
AMERICAN HISTORY, BOOKS ON: in Com. of Sup., 5999 (ii).
ANDERSON, T. E., CUSTOMS COLLECTOR AT NAPANEE, SALARY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 6008 (ii).
ANGLO-AMERICAN COMMISSION AND GOVT. ACTION: Remarks (Mr. *Bertram*) 7689 (ii).
Anglo-French Telegraph Co.'s incorp. B. No. 139 (Mr. *Morrison*) 1°*, 5315; 2°*, 5827; in Com. and 3°*, 7456 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 111.)
ANGLO-FRENCH TELEGRAPH CO.'S PETS., &C.: M. (Mr. *Fraser, Guysboro'*) 5143 (ii).
ANNAPOLIS AND NEW GLASGOW, DISMISSAL OF OFFICERS: in Com. of Sup., 3828 (i).
ANSE À BEAUFILS HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 5658.
APPNMTS. BY LATE GOVT.: M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Montague*) 4797, 4809 (ii).
Deb. (Mr. *Fisher*) 4817; (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 4819; (Sir *Louis Davies*) 4825; (Mr. *Haggart*) 4832; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 4836; (Mr. *Bennett*) 4838; (Mr. *Paterson*) 4841.
Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 4926; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 4926; (Sir *Louis Davies*) 4926; (Mr. *Foster*) 4927; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 4927 (ii).
APPNMTS. AND COR., &C., COLONIAL OFFICE: Ques. (Mr. *Roddick*) 7689 (ii).
—— TO OFFICE: Remarks (Mr. *Gillies*) 1187 (i).
ARBITRATION, DOM. AND ONT. AND QUEBEC ACCOUNTS: in Com. of Sup., 6851 (ii).
ARCHIVES: in Com. of Sup., 5022 (ii).
ARICHAT HARBOUR, BUOYS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 5320 (ii).
—— in Com. of Sup., 7589 (ii).
ARMS AND ACCOUTREMENTS FOR MILITIA: in Com. of Sup., 7523 (ii).
ARMSTRONG, MR., SALARY, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4857.
ARNPRIOR P.O., INSPECTOR, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 4177 (ii).
—— in Com. of Sup., 5449 (ii).

ARROW LAKES IMPROVEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 6065.
ARTS, AGRICULTURE AND STATISTICS: in Com. of Sup., 5972, 7212 (ii).
ASHCROFT, B.C., MAIL SERVICE, CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 3090 (i).
——— MINERS' LICENSES ISSUED: Ques. (Mr. Prior) 2847 (i).
——— POST OFFICE, POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 3090 (i).
——— PRESENT OCCUPANT: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1470.
ASH WEDNESDAY, ADJNMT.: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 903 (i).
ASHES, GOVT. INSPECTION: Ques. (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 3660 (i).
ASPY BAY, HARBOUR OF REFUGE, CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Bethune*) 2819 (i).
ATLANTIC FAST SS. SERVICE, CONTRACT: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 7385 (ii).
——— NEGOTIATIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Ives*) 600 (i).
——— PETERSEN & TATE'S CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 829 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Dobell*) 3297 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 6609 (ii).
——— Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 3313 (i).
——— TEL. FROM LONDON *re* CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 7356 (ii).
ATLANTIC FISHERIES, U.S. LEGISLATION: Remarks (Mr. *Russell*) 1272 (i).
ATLANTIC AND PACIFIC COASTING LAWS OF CAN.: M. for Ret.* (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 503 (i).
Atlas Loan Co.'s B. No. 55 (Mr. *Casey*) 1°*, 1379; 2°*, 1509 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 4562 (ii). (61-62 *Vic., c.* 92.)
AUDITOR GENERAL, POWERS AND DUTIES: Amt. to Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Foster*) 6202 (ii).
——— OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 4546 (ii).
——— CONTINGENCIES.: in Com. of Sup., 4586 (ii).
——— ADDITIONAL EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 7474.
——— REP., FRENCH TRANSLATION: Remarks (Mr. *Bergeron*) 3827 (i).
BADDECK DRILL SHED, LAND TITLES: Ques. (Mr. *Bethune*) 1467 (i).
BADDECK AND IONA MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 7723 (ii).
BAGOT, ELECTORAL DISTRICT, ISSUE OF WRIT: (Mr. *Speaker*) 3924 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 4350, 4449, 4602 (ii).
BAGOT ELECTORAL DISTRICT, VACANCY, ISSUE OF WRIT: M. (Mr. *Bergeron*) to Adjn., 5234, 5255(ii).
Deb. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 5247; (Mr. *Edwards*) 5236; (Mr. *Chauvin*) 5236; (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 5237; (Mr. *Landerkin*) 5238; (Mr. *Sproule*) 5240; (Mr. *Monk*) 5242; (Mr. *Marcotte*) 5243; (Mr. *Foster*) 5243; (Mr. *Davin*) 5249; (Mr. *Charlton*) 5250; (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 5251; (Mr. *McMullen*) 5254; (Mr. *Moore*) 5255 (ii).
Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 5233; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 5233 (ii).
——— Notification (Mr. *Bergeron*) 3825 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 4772 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Speaker*) 3826 (i).
——— Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 4927 (ii).
BAIE ST. PAUL WHARF, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 7639 (ii).
BANFF, CARETAKER CAVE AND BASIN BATHS, DISMISSAL: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Davin*) 2841 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 451 (i).
BATH (ONT.) CUSTOMS OFFICER, APPNMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 6007 (ii).
BATTLEFORD AGENCY AND GOVT. CATTLE: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 1574, 2844 (i).
——— INDUSTRIAL SCHOOL: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 1574.
BAXTER, WM., LIGHTHOUSE-KEEPER: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 3657 (i).
BEAR RIVER BRIDGE, REMOVAL: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Mills*) 2840 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Russell*) 1337 (i).
——— REPORT AS TO CONDITION OF PIERS: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 975 (i).
BEAR ISLAND SHIPPING MASTER, APPNMT.: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Mills*) 4605 (ii).
——— DISMISSAL: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Mills*) 2840 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 1071 (i).
BEATTIE, JOHN, INDIAN AGENT AT HIGHGATE: in Com. of Sup., 7291 (ii).
BEATONVILLE POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 3824 (i).
BEAUHARNOIS CANALS, DISMISSALS: in Com. of Sup., 7189 (ii).
BEAUMONT, WM., CLAIMS FOR SALARY AS POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. *McInnes*) 4611 (ii).
BECK, JOHN, DISMISSAL: in Com. of Sup., 5301 (ii).
BEHRING SEA, BRITISH VESSELS SEIZED BY RUSSIA: Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 1072 (i).
——— CLAIMS COMMISSION, EXPENSES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 7286 (ii).
BELFAST PIER: in Com. of Sup., 5632 (ii).
BELGIAN AND GERMAN TREATIES, LEGAL EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 7088 (ii).
BELLE RIVER BREAKWATER (P.E.I.) GOVT. CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 1785, 2036; remarks, 2040 (i).
BELL TELEPHONE CO.'S PET.: Ques. (Mr. *Ross Robertson*) 6031 (ii).
——— RATES: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 7126.
BELLEVILLE P.O., DISMISSALS: M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Corby*) 6112, 6208 (ii).
BELOEIL LAND DAMAGES: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 2847 (i).
——— CARETAKER OF BOOMS, RESIGNATION: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 2847 (i).
BENNETT, MR., MAIL CLERK: in Com. of Sup., 4869.
BERNEY, MR., DISMISSAL: in Com. of Sup., 5275 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 7687 (ii).
BERRY, MR., DISMISSAL: in Com. of Sup., 4952 (ii).
BERTHIER CHANNEL, DEEPENING: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 3085 (i).
——— POST OFFICE, SITE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 6008 (ii).
——— PUBLIC BUILDING, PURCHASE OF SITE: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 3662 (i).
BERTILLON SYSTEM, IDENTIFICATION OF CRIMINALS: in Com. of Sup., 7488 (ii).

BILL (No. 1) Respecting the Administration of Oaths of Office.—(Sir *Wilfrid Laurier.*)
1°*, 3; *pro formâ.*

BILL (No. 2) To secure the better observance of the Lord's Day, commonly called Sunday, as a day of rest.—(Mr. *Charlton.*)
1°, 184; 2° *m.*, 1950; in Com., 1977, 2041; 3° *m.*, 2400; amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) to refer to Com., 2400; agreed to (Y. 64, N. 58) 2401; in Com., 2401; M. to restore to Order Paper, 2426 (i).

BILL (No. 3) To amend the Criminal Code, 1892, so as to make effectual provision for the punishment of Seduction and Abduction.—(Mr. *Charlton.*)
1°, 185; 2° *m.*, 2902 (i); neg., 4221 (ii).

BILL (No. 4) Further to secure the safety of Railway Employees and Passengers.—(Mr. *Casey.*)
1°, 185; 2° *m.*, 2054; in Com., 2055; ref. to Sel. Com., 2056; in Com., 3673 (i), 4208, 4638, 4670, 5144; 3°*, 5175 (ii).

BILL (No. 5) Respecting Drainage on and across the lands of Railway Companies.—(Mr. *Casey.*)
1°, 185; 2° *m.*, 2055 (i).

BILL (No. 6) To confirm an agreement between Her Majesty and William Mackenzie and Donald D. Mann, to incorporate the Canadian Yukon Rail-Company.—(Mr. *Blair.*)
1° *m.*, 186; 1°, 252; 2° *m.*, 521, 621, 674, 746, 831, 909, 940, 1030, 1080, 1188, 1214, 1342, 1388, 1481, 1579; 2° agreed to (Y. 111, N. 72) 1734; Res. prop. (Land Grants) 1772; agreed to, 1850; in Com., 1851; 3° *m.*, 1937: agreed to, 1945 (i).

BILL (No. 7) To regulate freight rates on Railways.—(Mr. *Reid.*)
1°*, 271; 2° *m.*, 2910; wthdn., 2913 (i).

BILL (No. 8) To amend the Act to restrict the importation and employment of Aliens.—(Mr. *Taylor.*)
1°, 268 (i).

BILL (No. 9) To amend the law respecting Holidays.—(Mr. *Penny.*)
1°, 270 (i).

BILL (No. 10) To authorize the appointment of a Board of Civil Service Supervisors.—(Mr. *McMullen.*)
1°, 270 (i).

BILL (No. 11) To amend the Criminal Code, 1892, with respect to Cruelty to Animals.—(Mr. *Penny.*)
1°*, 271; 2°*, 2058 (i).

BILL (No. 12) Further to amend the Criminal Code.—(Mr. *Britton.*)
1°, 270; 2° *m.*, 2842; M. for Com., 2885; Amt. (Mr. *Cameron*) 6 m. h. agreed to, 2902 (i).

BILL (No. 13) To amend the Mounted Police Pension Act.—(Mr. *Davis.*)
1°, 271; 2° and in Com., 2058; 3°*, 2058 (i). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 33.)

BILL (No. 14) Respecting the attachment of salaries out of moneys in the hands of the Government of the Dominion of Canada.—(Mr. *Richardson.*)
1°, 271; 2°*, 2058; M. for Com., 2852, 3689; in Com., 3706 (i), 4639; on Order, 5175 (ii).

BILL (No. 15) Further to amend the Mounted Police Pension Act, 1889.—(Mr. *Davin.*)
1°*, 307 (i); 2° *m.*, 4239 (ii).

BILL (No. 16) To repeal the Electoral Franchise Act and to further amend the Dominion Elections Act.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick.*)
1°, 308; 2° *m.*, 2270, 2532, 2567, 2703; agreed to (Y. 97, N. 48) 2799; M. for Com., 2930; in Com., 2941, 2969 (i), 3942, 4042, 4074, 4254, 4354, 4387, 4453, 4523, 5259; 3° *m.*, 5664; 3°, 5709; Sen. Amts., 6467, 7527, 7553, 7792; 3°, 5709 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 14.)

BILL (No. 17) To amend the Act respecting the Civil Service of Canada.—(Mr. *McMullen.*)
1°*, 405 (i); 2° *m.*, 4222 (ii).

BILL (No. 18) Further to amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. *Campbell.*)
1°, 405; 2° *m.*, 2058; ref. to Sel. Com., 2059 (i).

BILL (No. 19) To regulate the transit of grain in Manitoba and the North-west Territories.—(Mr. *Douglas.*)
1°, 450; 2° *m.*, 2059; ref. to Com. on Rys., 2083 (i).

BILL (No. 20) Further to amend the Chinese Immigration Act.—(Mr. *Maxwell.*)
1°, 597 (i).

BILL (No. 21) To amend the Railway Act with respect to the shipment of grain.—(Mr. *Richardson.*)
1°*, 671 (i).

BILL (No. 22) Respecting the Hudson's Bay and Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. *Oliver.*)
1°*, 743; 2°*, 824; in Com. and 3°*, 2122 (i). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 65.)

BILL (No. 23) To incorporate the Lewes River Tramway Company, Limited.—(Mr. *Morrison.*)
1°*, 743; 2°*, 824; in Com. and 3°*, 3656 (i); Sen. Amts., 4606 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 73.)

BILL (No. 24) To Amend the Charter of the Union Bank of Canada.—(Mr. *Belcourt.*)
1°*, 743; 2°*, 824; in Com. and 3°*, 2122 (i). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.*, 118.)

BILL (No. 25) To incorporate the Ontario and Quebec Bridge Company.—(Mr. *Belcourt.*)
1°*, 744; 2°*, 824 (i).

BILL (No. 26) To incorporate the Kettle River Valley Railway Company (as amended by Select Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines).—(Mr. *Bostock.*)
1°*, 744; 2°*, 824; in Com., 2957, 3012, 3357, 3546.

BILL (No. 27) To incorporate the Cañon Railway Company.—(Mr. *Frost.*)
1°*, 744; 2°*, 824; wthdn., 3404 (i).

BILL (No. 28) Further to amend the Land Titles Act, 1894.—(Mr. *Davis.*)
1°*, 744 (i).

BILL (No. 29) Respecting the Federal Life Assurance Company of Ontario, and to change the name to the Federal Life Assurance Company of Canada—(Mr. *MacPherson.*)
1°*, 902; 2°*, 1017; in Com., and 3°*, 2559 (i). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 103.)

BILL (No. 30) Respecting the Lake Erie and Detroit River Railway Company—(Mr. *McGregor.*)
1°*, 902; 2°*, 1018; in Com. and 3°*, 1774 (i). 61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 69.)

BILL (No. 31) To incorporate the Lake Bennett and Klondike Railway and Tramway Company. (Mr. *Haggart.*)
1°*, 903; 2°*, 1018; in Com. and 3°*, 3867 (i). Sen. Amts., 5905, 6266 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 68.)

BILL (No. 32) Respecting the Ontario and Rainy River Railway Company—(Mr. *Tisdale.*)
1°*, 903; 2°*, 1018; recom. to Com. on Rys., 1774; in Com., 2123; M. for Com., 2386, 2560, 2606; in Com., 2619; 3°, 2697 (i). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 81.)

BILL (No. 33) To incorporate the Pacific and Yukon Railway, Navigation and Mining Company.—(Mr. *Tisdale.*)
1°*, 903; 2°*, 1018; wthdn., 3404 (i).

BILL (No. 34) Respecting the Columbia and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. *Bostock.*)
1°*, 903; 2°*, 1018; in Com. and 3°*, 3554 (i). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 61.)

BILL (No. 35) To incorporate the Miles Cañon and White Horse Tramway Company.—(Mr. *Bostock.*)
1°*, 903; 2°*, 1018; in Com., 3653; 3°*, 3655 (i). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 74.)

BILL (No. 36) To amend the Act respecting the sale of Railway Passenger Tickets.—(Mr. *Beatty.*)
1°*, 903 (i).

BILL (No. 37) Further to amend the Act respecting the Certificates to Masters and Mates of Ships.—(Sir *Louis Davies.*)
1°*, 936; 2° and in Com., 1869; 3°*, 1863 (i). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 45.)

BILL (No. 38) Further to amend the Act respecting the Government Harbours, Piers and Breakwaters.—(Sir *Louis Davies.*)
1°, 936; 2° and in Com., 1863; 3°*, 1869 (i). (61-62 *Vic. c.* 42.)

BILL (No. 39) Respecting the Inspection of Steamboats and the Examination and Licensing of Engineers employed on them.—(Sir *Louis Davies.*)
1°, 937; 2° and in Com., 1869, 2084, 2531; 3°*, 2532 (i). Sen. Amts., 4525 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 46.)

BILL (No. 40) To incorporate the Pacific and Eastern Railway Company.—(Mr. *Fraser, Guysborough.*)
1°*, 970; 2°*, 1214; wthdn., 3713 (i).

BILL (No. 41) Respecting the Dominion Building and Loan Association.—(Mr. *Clarke.*)
1°*, 970; 2°*, 1214; in Com., and 3°*, 2559 (i). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 101.)

BILL (No. 42) Respecting the Canadian Railway Accident Insurance Company.—(Mr. *Belcourt.*)
1°*, 970; 2°*, 1214 (i).

BILL (No. 43) Respecting the Board of Trade of the City of Toronto.—(Mr. *Osler.*)
1°*, 970; 2°*, 1214; in Com. and 3°*, 2122 (i). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 117.)

BILL (No. 44) To confirm an agreement between the St. Stephen and Milltown Railway Company and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. *MacPherson.*)
1°*, 970; 2°*, 1214; in Com. and 3°*, 3554 (i). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 84.)

BILL (No. 45) Respecting the British Columbia Southern Railway Company.—(Mr. *Morrison.*)
1°*, 970; 2°*, 1214; in Com. and 3°*, 3554 (i). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 56.)

BILL (No. 46) Respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. *Morrison.*)
1°*, 970; 2°*, 1214; in Com. 3655; 3°*, 3656 (i). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 60.)

BILL (No. 47) Respecting the Brandon and Southwestern Railway.—(Mr. *Morrison.*)
1°*, 970; 2°*, 1214; in Com. and 3°*, 3867 (i). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 55.)

BILL (No. 48) To incorporate the Cowichan Valley Railway Company.—(Mr. *McInnes.*)
1°*, 970; 2°*, 1214; in Com. and 3°*, 3656 (i). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 62.)

BILL (No. 49) Further to amend the Canada Temperance Act.—(Mr. *McClure.*)
1°*, 970 (i).

BILL (No. 50) To incorporate the Ottawa, Montreal and James Bay Railway Company.—Mr. *Fraser, Guysborough.*)
1°*, 1068; 2°*, 1214 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 4072 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 76.)

BILL (No. 51) Respecting the Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company.—(Mr. *Clarke.*)
1°*, 1068; 2°*, 1214; in Com. and 3°*, 3656 (i). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 57.)

BILL (No. 52) Respecting the Nakusp and Slocan Railway Company.—(Mr. *MacPherson.*)
1°*, 1174; 2°*, 1334; in Com., 3868; 3°*, 3868 (i). 61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 80.)

BILL (No. 53) To incorporate the Prudential Life Assurance Company of Canada.—Mr. *Bain.*)
1°*, 1272; 2°*. 1509; in Com. and 3°*, 2559 (i). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 113.)

BILL (No. 54) Respecting the Edmonton District Railway Company.—(Mr. *Oliver.*)
1°*, 1379; 2°*, 1509; in Com. and 3°*, 3656 (i). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 63.)

BILL (No. 55) Respecting the Atlas Loan Company.—(Mr. *Casey.*)
1°*, 1379; 2°*, 1509; in Com. and 3°*, 4562 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 92.)

BILL (No. 56) Respecting the Montreal and Province Line Railway Company.—(Mr. *Penny.*)
1°*, 1380; 2°*, 1509 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 4072 (ii). 61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 77.)

BILL (No. 57) Respecting the Manufacturers' Guarantee and Accident Insurance Company, and to change its name to "The Dominion of Canada Guarantee and Accident Insurance Company."—(Mr. *Clarke.*)
1°*, 1380; 2°*, 1509; in Com. and 3°*, 2957 (i). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 102.)

BILL (No. 58) Respecting the Queenston Heights Bridge Company. (Mr. *Clarke.*)
1°*, 1380; 2°*, 1509; in Com. and 3°*, 3656 (i). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 114.)

BILL (No. 59) To incorporate the Victoria Fire Insurance Company.—(Mr. *Quinn.*)
1°*, 1380; 2°*, 1509; in Com. and 3°*, 2957 (i). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 119.)

BILL (No. 60) To amend the Weights and Measures Act.—(Mr. *Fortin.*)
1° m., 1380; 1°, 1387; 2° m., 2842 (i).

BILL (No. 61) In further amendment of the Trade Mark and Design Act.—(Mr. *Bertram.*)
1°*, 1387; 2° m., 2842 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 4208 (ii).

BILL (No. 62) To incorporate the Tamagamingue Railway Company.—(Mr. *McHugh.*)
1°*, 1465; 2°*, 1775 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 4072 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 87.)

BILL (No. 63) To amend the law relating to Aliens.—(Mr. *McMullen.*)
1°*, 1466 (i).

BILL (No. 64) Respecting the Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Railway Company.—(Mr. *Maxwell.*)
1°*, 1573; 2°*, 1775 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 4387 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 89.)

BILL (No. 65) To further amend the Criminal Code, 1892.—(Mr. *Davin.*)
1°*, 1573 (i).

BILL (No. 66) Respecting the Lake Manitoba Railway and Canal Company.—(Mr. *Jameson.*)
1°*, 1736; 2°*, 1775; in Com. and 3°*, 3656 (i); Sen. Amts., 4807 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 70.)

BILL (No. 67) To incorporate the London and Lake Huron Railway Company.—(Mr. *Lister.*)
1°*, 1736; 2°*, 1775; in Com., 4072; 3°*, 4074 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 71.)

BILL (No. 68) Respecting the Montford Colonization Railway Company, and to change its name to the Montford and Gatineau Colonization Railway Company.—(Mr. *Bourassa.*)
1°*, 1736; 2°*, 1775 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 4387 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 75.)

BILL (No. 69) Respecting the Kingston and Pembroke Railway Company,—(Mr. *Britton.*)
1°*, 1736; 2°*, 1775 (i); in Com., 4805 (ii); 3°*, 4807 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 67.)

BILL (No. 70) To amend the Chinese Immigration Act, so as to extend its application to Japanese —and to provide for a more equitable distribution of the revenue derived therefrom.—(Mr. *McInnes.*)
1°*, 1736.

BILL (No. 71) Further to amend the Weights and Measures Act.—(Sir *Henri Joly de Lotbinière.*)
1°, 1737; 2°* and in Com., 2113, 2123, 3097 (i), 6582; 3°*, 6582; Sen. Amts., 7783. (60-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 30.)

BILL (No. 72) To amend the Adulteration Act.—(Sir *Henri Joly de Lotbinière.*)
1°, 1743 (i); 2° and in Com., 4777; 3°*, 4777 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*. *c.* 24.)

BILL (No. 73) To amend the Gas Inspection Act.—(Sir *Henri Joly de Lotbinière.*)
1°, 1744; 2°* and in Com., 2138; 3°*, 2138 (i). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 26.)

BILL (No. 74) To amend the Petroleum Inspection Act.—(Sir *Henri Joly de Lotbinière.*)
1°, 1744; 2°* and in Com., 2138; 3°*, 2139 (i). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 29.)

BILL (No. 75) Further to amend the Inland Revenue Act.—(*Sir Henri Joly de Lotbinière.*)
1°, 1744; 2°*, and in Com., 2139; 3°*, 2141 (i). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 27.)

BILL (No. 76) To provide for the abolition of the Civil Service Superannuation Act and for the retirement of members of the Civil Service.—(Mr. *Mulock.*)
1°, 1744 (i); 2°, 6334; in Com., 6367, 6796; 3°, 6932 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 17.)

BILL (No. 77) To incorporate the Toronto and Hudson Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. *Clarke.*)
1°*, 1839; 2°*, 1949 (i); M. for Com., 4562; in Com. and 3°*, 4606; Sen. Amts. 5906, 6268. (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 88.)

BILL (No. 78) Respecting the Saint John Bridge and Railway Extension Company.—(Mr. *Ellis.*)
1°*, 1839; 2°, 1950 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 4072 (ii). 61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 83.)

BILL (No. 79) To incorporate the Windsor and Detroit Union Bridge Company.—(Mr. *Gibson.*)
1°*, 1839; 2°*, 1949; 3°*. (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 120.)

BILL (No. 80) Respecting the Ottawa and New York Railway Company.—(Mr. *Belcourt.*)
1°*, 1839; 2°*, 1949 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 4072 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 82.)

BILL (No. 81) Respecting the Montreal and Southern Counties Railway Company.—(Mr. *Préfontaine.*)
1°*, 1840; 2°*, 1950; in Com. and 3°*, 5827 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 78.)

BILL (No. 82) To protect Canada against the introduction of the insect pest known as the San José Scale.—(Mr. *Fisher.*)
1°, 1904; 2°, 1926; in Com. and 3°*, 1928 (i). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 23.)

BILL (No. 83) To prohibit improper speculation in the sale of butter and cheese.—(Mr. *Parmalee.*)
1°, 2001; 2°, m., 2843 (i).

BILL (No. 84) Respecting Insolvency.—(Mr. *Fortin.*)
1°, 2004 (i).

BILL (No. 85) To amend Chapter 99 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, being the General Inspection Act.—(Mr. *Penny.*)
1°, 2035; M. to withdraw B., 2606 (i).

BILL (No. 86) Respecting the Brockville and St. Lawrence Bridge Company.—(Mr. *Wood, Brockville.*)
1°*, 2084; 2°*, 2240 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 4072 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 94.)

BILL (No. 87 from the Senate) For the relief of Augustus Baldwin Hart.—(Mr. *Landerkin.*)
1°*, —— ; 2°*, 2841; in Com., and 3°*, 3554 (i). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 121.)

BILL (No. 88 from the Senate) Incorporating the Central Canada Loan and Savings Company—(Mr. *Casey.*)
1°*, 2°*, 2240; in Com., and 3°*, 4562 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 97.)

BILL (No. 89) To amend the Criminal Code, 1892, with respect to combinations in restraint of Trade.—(Mr. *Sproule.*)
1°, 2241 (i).

BILL (No. 90) Respecting Detective Corporations and Mercantile Agencies—(Mr. *Sproule.*)
1°*, 2241 (i).

BILL (No. 91) To incorporate the Klondike and Peace River Gold Mining, Land and Transportation Company (Limited).—(Mr. *Davis.*)
1°*, 2429; 2°*, 2841 (i); in Com., 4168; 3°*, 4174 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 106.)

BILL (No. 92) To incorporate the Canada Atlantic Transit Company.—(Mr. *Belcourt.*)
1°*, 2429; 2°*, 2559 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 4072 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 95.)

BILL (No. 93) Respecting the Canada Atlantic Railway Company.—(Mr. *Belcourt.*)
1°*, 2430; 2°*, 2560 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 4387 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 58.)

BILL (No. 94) To authorize the Canada Eastern Railway Company to convey its railway to the Alexander Gibson Railway and Manufacturing Company.—(Mr. *Tucker.*)
1°*, 2430; 2°*, 2560 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 4606 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 59.)

BILL (No. 95) Respecting the Great Commonwealth Development and Mining Company (Limited Liability) and to change its name to the Alberta and Yukon Railway Company.—(Mr. *Gibson.*)
1°*, 2430; 2°*, 2560 (i); wthdn. 6227 (ii).

BILL (No. 96) To incorporate the Nickel Steel Company of Canada.—(Mr. *Wood, Hamilton.*)
1°*, 2430; 2°*, 2560; M. for Com., 3554, 3643; ref. back to Com. on Ry's., 3653 (i); in Com., 4071; 3°*, 4071 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 110.)

BILL (No. 97) To incorporate the North Shore Electric Railway Company.—(Mr. *Préfontaine.*)
1°*, 2430; 2°*, 2560 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 5827; Sen. Amts. 7744, 7788 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 86.)

BILL (No. 98) To incorporate the Edmonton and Peace River and Navigation Company.—(Mr. *MacPherson.*)
1°*, 2430; 2°*, 2560 (i); wthdn. 4922 (ii).

BILL (No. 99) To incorporate the Lake Champlain and River St. Lawrence Ship Canal Company.—(Mr. *Préfontaine.*)
1°*, 2430; 2°*, 2698 (i); in Com., 6328, 6934, 7158; 3°*, 7156 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 107.)

BILL (No. 100) Respecting the Hamilton and Lake Erie Power Company.—(Mr. *MacPherson.*)
1°*, 2430; 2°*, 2560; in Com. and 3°*, 3554 (i); Sen. Amts., 4606 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 104.)

BILL (No. 101) Respecting the St. John Harbour.—(Mr. *Ellis.*)
1°, 2430; 2°*, 3084 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 5049 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 115.)

BILL (No. 102) To incorporate the Montmorency Cotton Mills Company.—(Mr. *Penny.*)
1°*, 2430; 2°*, 3084 (i); in Com., 4174; 3°*, 4174 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 108.)

BILL (No. 103) To confirm certain public Acts of the Legislatures of the Provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, so far as they relate to the Missaquash Commissioners of Sewers.—(Mr. *Logan.*)
1°, 2430 (i).

BILL (No. 104) Respecting the Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Company.—(Mr. *Belcourt.*)
1°*, 2799; 2°*, 3084 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 5363 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 109.)

BILL No. 105) Respecting the Montreal Island Belt Line Railway Company.—(Mr. *Belcourt.*)
1°*, 2799; 2°*, 3084 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 4807; Sen. Amts., 5905 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 79.)

BILL (No. 106) To amend the Act respecting the Coasting Trade of Canada.—(Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper.*)
1°, *m.*, 2800 (i).

BILL (No. 107) To incorporate the Yukon Overland Transportation Company.—(Mr. *Domville.*)
1°*, 2844; 2°*, 3084 (i).

BILL (No. 108) To incorporate the Alaska and Northwestern Railway Company.—(Mr. *Belcourt.*)
1°*, 2844; 2°*, 3084 (i).

BILL (No. 109) To incorporate the British American Light and Power Company.—(Mr. *Rosamond.*)
1°*, 2844; 2°*, 3084 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 4562 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 93.)

BILL (No. 110) Further to amend the Post Office Act.—(Mr. *Mulock.*)
1°, *m.*, 2913 (i); 2° *m.*, 5520, 5568; M. for Com., 5709; in Com., 5748, 5870, 5943; 3°, 6121 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 20.)

BILL (No. 111 from the Senate) For better securing the safety of certain fisherman.—(Sir *Louis Davies.*)
1°*———; 2°, and in Com., 4778; 3°*, 4930 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 44.)

BILL (No. 112 from the Senate) For the relief of Edwin Heyward.—(Mr. *Belcourt.*)
1°*, 3309; 2°*, 3656 (i); in Com. and 3°* on div., 4175 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 122.)

BILL (No. 113) To incorporate the Subsidiary High Court of the Ancient Order of Foresters in the Dominion of Canada.—(Mr. *Landerkin.*)
1°, 3164; 2°*, 3656 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 5569 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 91.)

BILL (No. 114) Further to amend the Act respecting the Department of the Geological Survey.—(Mr. *Sifton.*)
1°, 3404 (i); 2°, and in Com., 4776; 3°*, 4777 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 18.)

BILL (No. 115) Respecting the British Yukon Mining, Trading and Transportation Company, and to change its name to the White Pass and Yukon Company.—(Mr. *MacPherson.*)
1°*, 3502; 2°*, 3657 (i).

BILL (No. 116) To incorporate the Canadian Mining Institute.—(Mr. *Haley.*)
1°*, 3502; 2°*, 3657 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 4562 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 96.)

BILL (No. 117) To incorporate the Klondike and Dawson City Bank—(Mr. *Morrison.*)
1°* 3,502; 2°*, 3657 (i); in Com., 5117; 3°*, 5118 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 105.)

BILL (No. 118) To incorporate the Dawson City Electric Lighting and Tramway Company.—(Mr. *Morrison.*)
1°*, 3502; 2°*, 3868; ref. to Com,, 3868 (i) 4805; 6939, in Com. and 3°*, 7158 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 99.)

BILL (No. 119) To incorporate the Dawson City and Victoria Telegraph Company.—(Mr. *Morrison.*)
1°*, 3502; 2°*, 3868 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 5363 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 100.)

BILL (No. 120) Respecting the North American Telegraph Company.—(Mr. *Hurley.*)
1°*, 3713; 2°*, 3868 (i); in Com. and 3°, 5363 (ii).

BILL (No. 121) Respecting the Prohibition of the Importation, Manufacture and Sale of Intoxicating Liquors.—(Mr. *Fisher.*)
1°, *m*, 3925; 2°, 4684; in Com., 4728; 3°, 6035 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 51.)

BILL (No. 122) To incorporate the Supreme Grand Lodge of the Sons of England Benefit Society.—(Mr. *Bertram.*)
1°*, 4029; 2°*, 4175; M. for Com., 6048; in Com., 6266; 3°*, 6328 (ii)

BILL (No. 123) Respecting the Dawson City Electric Company (Limited).—(Mr. *Morrison.*)
1°*, 4247; ref. to Com. on Rys., 4387; 2°, 4606; in Com., 7158; 3°*, 7163 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 98.)

BILL (No. 124, from the Senate) Incorporating the Alberta and Yukon Railway, Navigation and Mining Company.—(Mr. *Casey.*)
1°, 4348; 2°*, 4606; in Com. 7163; 3°*, 7456 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 90.)

BILL (No. 125) To incorporate the Ottawa Interprovincial Bridge Company.—(Mr. *Belcourt.*)
1°*, 4448; 2°*, 4808; in Com. and 3°*, 6647 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 112.)

BILL (No. 126) Respecting the Saskatchewan Railway and Mining Company, and to change its name to the Saskatchewan Pacific Railway and Mining Company.—(Mr. *Landerkin.*)
1°*, 4521; 2°, 4606, in Com. and 3°*, 6647 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 85.)

BILL (No. 127) To further amend the Fisheries Act.—(Sir *Louis Davies.*)
1°, 4522; 2°, and in Com., 4946; 3°*, 4947 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 39.)

BILL (No. 128) Further to amend the General Inspection Act.—(Sir *Henri Joly de Lotbinière.*)
1°*, 4522; 2°, and in Com., 5966; 3°*, 5972 (ii). 61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 25.)

BILL (No. 129, From the Senate) "An Act to incorporate the Tobique Manufacturing Company.—(Mr. *Taylor.*)
1°*, 2°*, 5050; in Com., and 3°*, 6266 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.*, 116.)

BILL (No. 130) Further to amend the Dominion Lands Act.—(Mr. *Sifton.*)
1°, 4679; 2°, and in Com., 5937; 3°*, 6048 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 31.)

BILL (No. 131) Further to amend the Acts respecting the North-west Territories.—(Mr. *Sifton.*)
1°, 4681; 2°, and in Com., 5945; 3°, 6064 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 5.)

BILL (No. 132) Further to amend the Land Titles Act, 1894.—(Mr. *Sifton.*)
1°, 4683; 2°, and in Com., 5957; 3°*, 6048 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 32.)

BILL (No. 133) To make further provision respecting grants of land to members of the Militia Force on active service in the North-west.—(Mr. *Sifton.*)
1°, 4683; 2°, and in Com., 5960; 3°*, 6048 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 13.)

BILL (No. 134) Further to amend the Criminal Code, 1892.—(Mr. *Flint.*)
1°, 4769 (i).

BILL (No. 135) Further to amend the Act respecting Government Harbours, Piers and Breakwaters —(Sir *Louis Davies.*)
1°, 4922; 2°, in Com., and 3°, 5325 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 43.)

BILL (No. 136) Further to amend the Act respecting the Protection of Navigable Waters.—(Sir *Louis Davies.*)
1°, 4923; 2°, and in Com., 5325; 3°*, 5330 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 41.)

BILL (No. 137) To revive and amend the Acts respecting International Radial Railway Company.—(Mr. *MacPherson.*)
1°*, 5215; 2°*, 5540; in Com. and 3°*, 6647 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 66.)

BILL (No. 138, from the Senate) Further to amend the Companies Act.—(Mr. *Fielding.*)
1°*, 5259; 2°, in Com. and 3°, 5331 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 50.)

BILL (No. 139) To incorporate the Anglo-French Telegraph Company (Limited).—(Mr. *Morrison.*)
1°*, 5315; 2°*, 5827; in Com. and 3°*, 7456 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 111.)

BILL (No. 140) Further to amend the Militia Act.—(Mr. *Borden, King's.*)
1°*, 5331; 2°, and in Com., 5965; 3°*, 5966 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 19.)

BILL (No. 141, From the Senate) Respecting the Great North-west Central Railway Company.—(Mr. *Morrison.*)
1°*, 5518; M. for 2°, 5930; and ref. to Com., on Rys., 5965, 6001; in Com., 7456, 7733, 7787; 3°*, 7788 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 64.)

BILL (No. 142) To authorize the Quebec Harbour Commissioners to borrow money.—(Mr. *Dobell.*)
1°*, 5568; 2°, and in Com., 6229; 3°, 6444 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 48.)

BILL (No. 143. From the Senate) To amend the Canada Evidence Act, 1893.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick.*)
1°*, 5786; 2°, 6234; in Com. and 3°*, 6446 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 53.)

BILL (No. 144) Further to amend the Indian Act.—(Mr. *Sifton.*)
1°, 5661; 2° and in Com., 5960; 3°*, 6048 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 34.)

BILL (No. 145) Further to amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. *Blair.*)
1°, 5662; 2°*, 5966; 3°*, 6048 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 22.)

BILL (No. 146) To amend and consolidate the North-west Irrigation Acts of 1894 and 1895.—(Mr. *Sifton.*)
1°, 5662; 2° and in Com., 6123; 3°*, 6946; Sen. Amts., 7788 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 35).

BILL (No. 147, from the Senate) For the relief of James Pearson.—(Mr. *Sutherland.*)
1°*, 5867; 2°*, 5885, 5906; in Com. and 3°*, 6266 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 123.)

BILL (No. 148) Respecting the transport contract between Her Majesty and the Winnipeg Great Northern Railway Company.—(Mr. *Blair.*)
1°*, 5867; 2° and in Com., 6232; 3°*, 6446 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 10.)

BILL (No. 149) To authorize certain contracts with Steamship Companies for cold storage accommodation.—(Mr. *Fisher.*)
1°*, 5930; 2° and in Com., 6727; 3°*, 6747 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 7.)

BILL (No. 150) Further to amend the Act respecting the Judges of Provincial Courts.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick.*)
1°*, 6185; 2°, 6732, 6747; in Com., 6784, 7043; ref. back to Com., 7126; 3°, 7142; Sen. Amts., 7854 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 52.)

BILL (No. 151, from the Senate) An Act to incorporate the Pacific and Yukon Railway, Navigation, Trading and Mining Company.—(Mr. *Rosamond.*)
1°*, 6227; 2°* and ref. to Sel. Com. on Rys., 6334.

BILL (No. 152) Further to amend the Customs Act.—(Mr. *Paterson.*)
1°, 6318; 2° and in Com., 6947; 3°*, 6961 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 36.)

BILL (No. 153) Further to protect the Customs and Fisheries.—(Mr. *Paterson.*)
1°, 6319; 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 6962 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 38.)

BILL (No. 154, from the Senate) To provide for the Government of the Yukon District.—(Mr. *Sifton.*)
1°*, 6439; 2° and in Com., 6727; 3°*, 6747 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 6.)

BILL (No. 155, from the Senate) To amend Chapter 11 of the Statutes of 1897, intituled: An Act to restrict the importation and employment of Aliens.—(Mr. *Fielding.*)
1°*, 6577; 2° and in Com., 6964; 3°*, 7011 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 2.)

BILL (No. 156, from the Senate) Respecting the Identification of Criminals.—(Mr. *Fielding.*)
1°*, 6577; 2° and in Com., 6962; 3°*, 6964 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.* *c.* 54.)

BILL (No. 157) Respecting the repayment of the moneys advanced to the Saint John Bridge and Railway Extension Company.—(Mr. *Fielding.*)
1°*, 6582; 2°*, 6801; in Com. and 3°*, 7011 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 9.)

BILL (No. 158) Respecting the London and Lake Huron Railway Company.—(Mr. *Lister.*)
1°*, 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 6607 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 72.)

BILL (No. 159) To amend the Act to provide for Bounties on Iron and Steel made in Canada.—(Mr. *Paterson.*)
1°* and 2°*, 6727; in Com. and 3°*, 6747 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 11.)

BILL (No. 160) Respecting the Boundaries of the Province of Quebec.—(Mr. *Sifton.*)
1°, 6746; 2° and in Com., 7410; 3°*, 7527 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 3.)

BILL (No. 161) Respecting the payment of grants in aid of the construction of Public Works.—(Mr. *Blair.*)
1°, 6892; M. for 2°, 7411; 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 7570 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*. *c.* 12.)

BILL (No. 162) To confirm a certain award in favour of the Dominion Atlantic Railway Company.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick.*)
1°*, 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 6962 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 8.)

BILL (No. 163) To grant further aid to the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal.—(Mr. *Fielding.*)
1°* and 2°*, 7011; M. for Com., 7142, 7166; in Com., 7180; 3°*, 7241 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 47).

BILL (No. 164, from the Senate) Respecting Loan Companies.—(Mr. *Fielding.*)
1°*, 7086; 2°, dschgd., 7525 (ii).

BILL (No. 165, from the Senate) To amend the Companies Act.—(Mr. *Fielding.*)
1°*, 7086; 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 7470 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 49.)

BILL (No. 166) In further amendment of the Fisheries Act.—(Sir *Louis Davies.*)
1°, 7115; 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 7470 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 40.)

BILL (No. 167) In further amendment of the Post Office Act.—(Mr. *Mulock.*)
1°, 7408; 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 7579 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 21.)

BILL (No. 168) Respecting the Manitoba School Fund.—(Mr. *Fielding.*)
1°*, 7466; 2° and in Com., 7571; 3°*, 7655 (ii).

BILL (No. 169) Respecting the Province of Manitoba Debt Account.—(Mr. *Fielding.*)
1°, 7467; 2°, 7571; in Com. and 3°*, 7579 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 4.)

BILL (No. 170, from the Senate) Further to amend the Act respecting Public Officers.—(Mr. *Fielding.*)
1°*, 7523; 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 7580 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*. *c.* 16.)

BILL (No. 171) To amend the Customs Tariff of 1897.—(Mr. *Fielding.*)
1°*, 7585; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 7786 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 37.)

BILL (No. 172) To amend the Inland Revenue Act.—(Mr. *Fielding.*)
1°*, 7585; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 7786 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 28.)

BILL (No. 173) Further to amend the Act respecting the Senate and House of Commons.—(Mr. *Fielding.*)
1°* and 2°*, 7657; in Com. and 3°*, 7788 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 15.)

BILL (No. 174) Granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money required for defraying certain expenses of the Public Service for the financial years ending respectively the 30th June, 1898, and the 30th June, 1899, and for other purposes relating to the Public Service.—(Mr. *Fielding.*)
1°*, 7854; 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 7857 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 1.)

BILLS, FRENCH TRANSLATION: Remarks (Mr. *Speaker*) 3084 (i).

——— PRESENTATION: Remarks as to seconders (Mr. *Speaker*) 671 (i).

——— Royal Assent, 2089 (i).

BINDER TWINE *re* IMPOSITION OF DUTY: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 455 (i).

——— SALE OF GOVT. OUTPUT AT KINGSTON PENITENTIARY: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3659 (i).

BIOLOGICAL STATION, GULF OF ST. LAWRENCE: in Com. of Sup., 7733 (ii).

BIRON, MR. N., DISMISSAL: in Com. of Sup., 4994.

BOARD OF CUSTOMS LABORATORY: in Com. of Sup., 7356, 7773 (ii).

BOARD OF RAILWAY COMMISSIONERS, LEGISLATION: prop. Res. (Mr. *Jameson*) 1787 (i).
Deb. (Mr. *Davis*) 1794; (Mr. *Rutherford*, 1795; (Mr. *Maclean*) 1821; (Mr. *Richardson*) 1812, 1825: (Mr. *Sproule*) 1814; (Mr. *Blair*) 1816; (Mr. *Davin*) 1822; (Mr. *McMillan*) 1823 (i).

BOAT HARBOUR, EASTERN PASSAGE: in Com. of Sup., 5618 (ii).

BODDY, MR. A., APPNMT. AS FISHERY OVERSEER: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3657 (i).

——— in Com. of Sup., 5275 (ii).

BONDING, &C., ARRANGEMENTS WITH U. S. ON PACIFIC COAST: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Foster*) 1786 (i).

BORDEN, MR., ACCOUNTANT MILITIA DEPARTMENT: in Com. of Sup., 3899 (i), 6563 (ii).

Boundaries of Prov. of Quebec B. No. 160 (Mr. *Sifton*) 1°, 6746; 2° and in Com., 7410; 3°*. 7527 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 3.)

BOUNDARY BETWEEN CANADA AND ALASKA: in Com. of Sup., 6860 (ii).

——— Ques. (Mr. *McInnes*) 1076 (i).

Bounties on Iron and Steel B. No. 159 (Mr. *Paterson*) 1°*, 2°*, 6727; in Com., and 3°*, 6747 (ii). (62-61 *Vic.*, *c.* 11.)

BOUNTY TO FISHERMEN, APPLICATION AT GABARUS: Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 674 (i).

BOYER, TOUISSANT, LOCKMASTER BEAUHARNOIS CANAL, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 3662 (i).

BRAE BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 5633 (ii).

Brandon and South-western Ry. Co.'s B. No. 47 (Mr. *Morrison*) 1°*, 970; 2°*, 1214; in Com., and 3°*, 3867 (i). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 55.)

BRANDON ELECTORAL DISTRICT, MR. MCCARTHY'S CANDIDATURE: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 4610 (ii).

BRANTFORD POST OFFICE LETTER CARRIERS, INCREASE OF SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 7775 (ii).

BRIDGE TENDERS MURRAY CANAL, DISMISSALS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6553 (ii).

BRIGADE CAMP, THIRD MILITARY DISTRICT: Ques. (Mr. *Guillet*) 5787 (ii).

British American Light and Power Co.'s B. No. 109 (Mr. *Rosamond*) 1°*, 2844; 2°*, 3084 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 4562 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 93.)

BRITISH COLUMBIA:
ALIEN LABOUR ACT, B.C. AND GOVTL. ACTION: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 3662 (i).
ARROW LAKES IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup.. 6065 (ii).
ASHCROFT, B.C. MAIL SERVICE, CONTRACT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 3090 (i).
——— MINERS' LICENSES ISSUED: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 2847 (i).
——— POSTMASTER, PRESENT OCCUPANT: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1470, 3090 (i).
ATLANTIC AND PACIFIC COASTING LAWS OF CAN.: M. for Ret.* (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 504 (i).
BEAUMONT, WM., CLAIMS FOR SALARY AS POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. *McInnes*) 4611 (ii).
BEHRING SEA, BRITISH VESSELS SEIZED BY RUSSIA: Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 1072 (i).
BOUNDARY BETWEEN CAN. AND ALASKA: Ques. (Mr. *McInnes*) 1076 (i).
BRITISH COLUMBIA COAST SURVEYS, MR. COSTE'S REP.: Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 5323 (ii).
——— M. for Cor.* (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 2839 (i).
——— TELEGRAPH LINES: in Com. of Sup., 6102 (ii).
COLUMBIA RIVER IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 6064 (ii).
CREAMERIES, DOM. GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *McInnes*) 3085.
DREDGING LEASES ISSUED TO J. A. MERCIER: Ques. (Mr. *Maxwell*) 1934 (i).
FRASER RIVER SHIP CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 6065.
GOLDEN, B.C. AND ST. EUGENE MAIL CARRIER: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Foster*) 2824 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 2816 (i).
HARBOURS AND RIVERS, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 6064 (ii).
KASLO-SLOCAN RY., PLANS, PAPERS, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Haggart*) 402 (i).
KOOTENAY DISTRICT POSTAL, &C., FACILITIES: Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1746 (i).
LIGHTHOUSES BETWEEN VANCOUVER AND STIKINE RIVER: Ques. (Mr. *Maxwell*) 976 (i).
NANAIMO ELECTORAL DISTRICT, MEMBER ELECT, RESIGNATION: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 4605 (ii).
QUEEN VS. CAMERON, INDICTMENT FOR LIBEL, DEPOSITIONS, &C.: M. for Copies (Mr. *Bostock*) 1827 (i).
ROTHWELL'S REPORT *re* CLAIMS OF SETTLERS: Remarks (Mr. *McInnes*) 2851 (i), 4452 (ii).
SILVER AND LEAD SMELTING, REGULATIONS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Earle*) 6012 (ii).

BRITISH COLUMBIA—*Con.*

SPINKS, JUDGE, INVESTIGATION *re:* Remarks (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 5268 (ii).

—— M. for Copy of Rep.* 3668 (i).

VANCOUVER DRILL SHED: in Com. of Sup., 7589 (ii).

VANCOUVER ISLAND RY. BELT, SETTLERS' CLAIMS, REP. OF MR. ROTHWELL: Remarks (Mr. *McInnes*) 2851 (i), 4452 (ii).

YALE COUNTY COURT JUDGE, INQUIRY *re* JUDGE SPINKS: M. for Copy of Rep* (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 3668 (i).

—— Remarks (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 5268 (ii).

B. C. Southern Ry. Co.'s B. No. 45 (Mr. *Morrison*) 1°*, 970; 2°*, 1214; in Com. and 3°*, 3554 (i), (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 56).

BRITISH JOINT STOCK CO., IN THE YUKON: Ques. (Mr. *Domville*) 1471 (i).

BRITISH COLUMBIA COAST SURVEYS, REP. OF MR. COSTE: Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 5323 (ii).

—— PUBLIC BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 5493 (ii).

British Yukon Mining, Trading and Trans. Co.'s B. No. 115 (Mr. *MacPherson*) 1°*, 3502; 2°*, 3657 (i).

Brockville and St. Lawrence Bridge Co.'s B. No. 86 (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) 1°*, 2084; 2°*, 2240 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 4072 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 94.)

BRUNEAU, MR., M.P. FOR RICHELIEU, ALLEGED RESIGNATION: prop. Res. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 2037; remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 2038, 2083; (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 2038 (i).

—— REF. TO PRIV. AND ELECTIONS COM.: prop. Res. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 2142 (i).

Deb. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 2142; (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 2143; (Mr. *Casey*) 2157; (Mr. *Bennett*) 2160; (Mr. *McInerney*) 2167; (Sir *Louis Davies*) 2170; (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2178; (Mr. *Quinn*) 2179; (Mr. *Mills*) 2184; (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2188; (Mr. *Flint*) 2193; (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 2195; (Mr. *Monk*) 2197; (Mr. *Russell*) 2200; (Mr. *Foster*) 2205; (Mr. *Fielding*) 2215; (Mr. *Bell, Pictou*) 2218; (Mr. *Sproule*) 2223; (Mr. *McNeill*) 2228; (Mr. *Blair*) 2228; (Mr. *Powell*) 2233; Mr. *Casgrain*) 2234 (i). Neg. (Y. 39; N. 79) 2239 (i).

BUDGET AND HANSARD TRANSLATION: Remarks (Mr. *Choquette*) 1576 (i).

BUDGET, THE, ADJNMT. OF DEBATE: M. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 3169 (i).

—— DATE OF DELIVERY: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 2848 (i).

—— FINANCIAL STATEMENT (Mr. *Fielding*) 3104 (i).

—— REPLY (Mr. *Foster*) 3208 (i).

BUILDINGS, GENERALLY: in Com. of Sup., 5494, 5598; (N.S.) 5071 (ii).

BULLETINS AND REPORTS, PRINTING AND DISTRIBUTION: in Com. of Sup., 5991 (ii).

BURNT CHURCH WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 7636 (ii).

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE, MORNING SITTINGS (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 6227, 6229 (ii).

—— CHANGE OF PROCEDURE ON ORDER PAPER: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 3502 (i).

—— MORNING SITTINGS AND COMMITTEE: M. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 6109 (ii).

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE, MOTIONS FOR RETS.: Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 2820 (i).

—— NOTICES OF MOTIONS (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1840 (i).

—— PRECEDENCE ON MONDAYS, WEDNESDAYS AND THURSDAYS, TUESDAYS AND FRIDAYS (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1840 (i).

—— MONDAY: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 5012 (ii).

—— THURSDAYS: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 2521.

—— Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 3821 (i), 7525 (ii); (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 5787, 5937 (ii); (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 5115, 5885, 6029 (ii).

—— TWO SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 6013 (ii).

—— SITTINGS OF COMMITTEE (Mr. *Sutherland*) 6227.

Butter and Cheese, Improper Speculation in Sale, Prohibition B. No. 83 (Mr. *Parmalee*) 1°, 2001; 2° m., 2843 (i).

BUTTER INDUSTRY IN CAN., ENCOURAGEMENT: prop. Res. (Mr. *Reid*) 2350 (i).

Deb. (Mr. *Moore*) 2355; (Mr. *Davin*) 2357; (Mr. *Fisher*) 2357, 2450; (Mr. *Montague*) 2361; (Mr. *McMullen*) 2363; (Mr. *Craig*) 2365; (Mr. *Sproule*) 2367; (Mr. *Campbell*) 2370; (Mr. *Henderson*) 2371; (Mr. *Frost*) 2373; (Mr. *Taylor*) 2375; (Mr. *McMillan*) 2377; (Mr. *Broder*) 2379; (Mr. *Bain*) 2382; (Mr. *Pope*) 2384, 2443; (Mr. *Macdonald, King's*) 2458; (Mr. *McNeill*) 2460; (Mr. *Featherston*) 2461; (Mr. *Stenson*) 2466; (Mr. *Maclean*) 2469; (Mr. *Oliver*) 2472; (Mr. *Semple*) 2475; (Mr. *Snetsinger*) 2477; (Mr. *Sproule*) 2479; (Mr. *Rogers*) 2480; (Mr. *Campbell*) 2482; (Mr. *Reid*) 2482; (Mr. *Sutherland*) 2486; (Mr. *Erb*) 2490; (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 2491; (Mr. *McLennan*) 2496; (Mr. *Davin*) 2498; (Mr. *Somerville*) 2500; (Mr. *McMillan*) 2501, 2511; (Mr. *Bell, Pictou*) 2503; (Mr. *Clancy*) 2506; (Mr. *Taylor*) 2513 (i).

Amt. (Mr. *Sutherland*) to adjn. Deb., agreed to (Y. 80; N. 34) 2515 (i).

Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Co.'s B. No. 51 (Mr. *Clarke*) 1°*, 1068; 2°*, 1214; in Com., and 3°*, 3656 (i). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 57.)

CAMERON, A. F., CUSTOMS OFFICER, SHERBROOKE (N.S.): M. for Ret. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 2840.

CAMERON, MR., FISHERY OVERSEER AT ST. PETERS, DISMISSAL: in Com. of Sup., 5307 (ii).

CAMERON AND LENOIR, FISHERY OFFICERS, N.S., DISMISSAL: in Com. of Sup., 5097 (ii).

CAMPBELLTON WHARF, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 7635 (ii).

CAMPOBELLO ISLAND, TELEPHONE COMMUNICATION, COST, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 4177 (ii).

Canada Atlantic Ry. Co.'s B. No. 93 (Mr. *Belcourt*) 1°*, 2430; 2°*, 2560 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 4387 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 58.)

Canada Atlantic Transit Co.'s B. No. 92 (Mr. *Belcourt*) 1°*, 2429; 2°*, 2559 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 4072 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 95.)

CANADA AND AUSTRALIAN CABLE, AND IMPERIAL GOVT.'S REP.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3668 (i).

CANADA AND SOUTH AFRICA, MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 7720 (ii).

Canada Eastern Ry. Co.'s B. No. 94 (Mr. *Tucker*) 1°*, 2430; 2°*, 2560 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 4606 (ii). (61-62 *Vic., c.* 59.)

Canada Evidence Act Amt. B. No. 143 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1°*, 5786; 2°, 6234; in Com. and 3°*, 6446 (ii). (61-62 *Vic., c.* 53.)

CANADA SUGAR REFINING CO., LITIGATION EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 770 (ii).

Canada Temperance Act Amt. B. No. 49 (Mr. *McClure*) 1°*, 970 (i).

CANADIAN DEFENCES IMPROVEMENTS: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2839 (i).

CANADIAN AND ENGLISH MAILS, BEAVER LINE STRS.: Ques. (Mr. *Ives*) 2844 (i).

CANADIAN INTERNATIONAL DEEP WATERWAY COMMISSION: in Com. of Sup., 7282 (ii).

CANADIAN LAW LIBRARY, LONDON: in Com. of Sup., 7086 (ii).

Canadian Mining Institute B. No. 116 (Mr. *Haley*) 1°*, 3502; 2°*, 3657 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 4562 (ii). (61-62 *Vic., c.* 96.)

CANADIAN MINING INSTITUTE, PUBLICATION OF DOCUMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 7770 (ii).

Canadian Yukon Ry. B. No. 6 (Mr. *Blair*) 1°, m., 186; 1°, 252; 2°, m., 521, 621, 674, 746, 831, 909, 940, 1030, 1080, 1188, 1214, 1342, 1388, 1481, 1579; 2° agreed to (Y. 111, N. 72) 1734; Res. prop., 1772; agreed to, 1850; in Com., 1851; 3° m., 1937; agreed to, 1945 (i).

On M. for 1°:

Deb. (Mr. *Blair*) 186; (Mr. *Haggart*) 212; Mr. *McMullen*) 219; (Mr. *Wallace*) 220; (Mr. *Morrison*) 235; (Mr. *Montague*) 240; (Mr. *Ross Robertson*) 248.

On M. for 2°:

Deb. (Mr. *Blair*) 521; (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 538, 1678; (Mr. *Sifton*) 571, 621, 1727; (Mr. *Haggart*) 674; (Mr. *Fisher*) 700; (Mr. *Osler*) 724; (Mr. *Bertram*) 735; (Mr. *Hughes*) 746; (Mr. *Casgrain*) 758; (Mr. *Russell*) 774; (Mr. *McInerney*) 794; (Mr. *McClure*) 832; (Mr. *Maclean*) 844; (Mr. *Fraser, Guysboro'*) 855; (Mr. *Wallace*) 868; (Mr. *Paterson*) 887; (Mr. *Bostock*) 940; (Mr. *Ives*) 947; (Mr. *Dobell*) 954; (Mr. *McDougall*) 961, 1030; (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 1055; (Mr. *Moore*) 1080; (Mr. *Craig*) 1086; (Mr. *Oliver*) 1098, 1495; (Mr. *Roche*) 1106; (Mr. *Rutherford*) 1116; (Mr. *Ross Robertson*) 1126; (Mr. *Ganong*) 1132; (Mr. *Morin*) 1161; (Mr. *Bell, Pictou*) 1188; (Mr. *Marcotte*) 1208; (Mr. *Davin*) 1214; (Mr. *Lemieux*) 1229 (Mr. *Wilson*) 1235; (Mr. *Semple*) 1242; (Mr. *Campbell*) 1246; (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) amt., 1271; (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1342; (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 1388; (Mr. *Tarte*) 1430; (Mr. *Bergeron*) 1440; (Mr. *Morrison*) 1448, 1481; (Mr. *Quinn*) 1503; (Mr. *Britton*) 1505; (Mr. *Maxwell*) 1527; (Mr. *Powell*) 1540; (Mr. *Edwards*) 1557; (Mr. *Clancy*) 1562; (Mr. *Foster*) 1580; (Mr. *Charlton*) 1628; (Mr. *Sproule*) 1657; (Mr. *McMillan*) 1672; Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1712; (Mr. *McInnes*) 1722; (Mr. *Casey*) 1725; (Mr. *Davis*) 1728; amt. (Mr. *Borden*) neg. (Y. 65, N. 119) 1732; 2° agreed to (Y. 111; N. 72) 1733 (i).

Canadian Yukon Ry. B. No. 6—*Con.*

In Com.:

Deb. (Mr. *Blair*) 1851; (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1852; (Mr. *Quinn*) 1854; (Mr. *Haggart*) 1855; (Mr. *Sifton*) 1856; (Mr. *Bennett*) 1857; (Mr. *Britton*) 1858; (Mr. *Foster*) 1858; (Mr. *Davin*) 1859 (i).

CANADA YUKON RY. AND HAMILTON SMITH'S PROPOSALS; TELEGRAM TO HIGH COMMISSIONER: Explanation (Sir *Wifrid Laurier*) 980 (i).

Deb. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 980, 1078; (Mr. *Foster*) 983; (Mr. *McLean*) 985; (Sir *Louis Davies*) 985; (Mr. *Ives*) 989, 1078; (Mr. *Fisher*) 992; (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 994; (Mr. *Sifton*) 999; (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1002; (Mr. *Gibson*) 1004; (Mr. *Powell*) 1006; (Mr. *Fraser, Guysboro'*) 1008; (Mr. *Bell, Pictou*) 1010; (Mr. *McMullen*) 1015; (Mr. *Taylor*) 1018; (Mr. *Clancy*) 1026; (Mr. *Pope*) 1018; (Mr. *Quinn*) 1028 (i).

—— ACTION OF THE U.S. SENATE: M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to Adjn., 1274 (i).

Deb. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1276; (Mr. *Foster*) 1284; (Sir *Louis Davies*) 1289, 1312; (Mr. *Davin*) 1295; (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 1291; (Mr. *McInerney*) 1298; (Mr. *Rutherford*) 1302; (Mr. *Montague*) 1305; (Mr. *Fisher*) 1314; (Mr. *Pope*) 1319; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1326; (Mr. *Quinn*) 1331(i).

(Land Subsidy)

Deb. (Mr. *Blair*) 1851; (Mr. *Haggart*) 1855; Mr. *Bennett*) 1857; (Mr. *Foster*) 1858; (Mr. *Britton*) 1858; (Mr. *Davin*) 1859; (Mr. *Pope*) 1859.

—— GOVT. AMENDMENTS: Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 744 (i).

—— LAND SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Blair*) 515 (i).

—— remarks *re* Exchange (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 3037 (i).

—— EXCLUSION OF FOREIGN LABOUR: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 827 (i).

—— HAMILTON SMITH'S PROPOSALS: presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 903 (i).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 979 (i).

—— remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 674, 831 (i).

—— PLANS, PAPERS, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Haggart*) 402 (i).

—— TELEGRAM TO HIGH COMMISSIONER: Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 939 (i).

Canadian Ry. Accident Ins. Co. B. No. 42 (Mr. *Belcourt*). 1°*, 970; 2°*, 1214 (i).

CANALS:

BEAUHARNOIS CANAL, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 7189 (ii).

BERTHIER CHANNEL, DEEPENING: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 3085 (i).

BOYER, TOUISSANT, LOCKMASTER, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 3662 (ii).

BRIDGE TENDERS, MURRAY CANAL, DISMISSAL, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6563 (ii).

CANALS: in Com of Sup., 6446 (ii).

—— DATE OF OPENING: Ques. (Mr. *Maclean*) 3317 (i).

CHAMBLY CANAL; in Com. of Sup., 6553 (ii).

—— ST. JOHN, P.Q.: in Com. of Sup., 7651 (ii).

CORBEIL, FRANÇOIS, EMPLOYEE, LACHINE CANAL, DISMISSAL: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 4348.

—— Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2343 (i).

CANALS—*Con.*

CORNWALL CANAL, CONSTRUCTION, AMOUNT PAID: Ques. (Mr. *Broder*) 5391 (ii).

—— ENLARGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 6532 (ii).

—— REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6354 (ii).

DANIS, MR., DISMISSAL FROM BEAUHARNOIS CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 7203 (ii).

FARRAN'S POINT, ENLARGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 6532 (ii).

GALBRAITH, THOS. J., PORT COLBORNE, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Montague*) 516 (i).

GALOPS CANAL, CLAIMS FOR EXPROPRIATION OF LAND: in Com. of Sup., 7650 (ii).

—— PURCHASE OF LAND, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Broder*) 3668 (i).

—— STRAIGHTENING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6538.

GRENVILLE CANAL, ENLARGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 6552 (ii).

HOGAN & ONDERDONK, CONTRACTORS, SOULANGES CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 6510 (ii).

LACHINE CANAL, CORBEIL, FRANÇOIS, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2343 (i), 4348 (ii).

—— ENLARGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 6551 (ii).

—— LEFAIVRE, XAVIER, LOCKMASTER, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 3937 (i).

—— ST. PIERRE RIVER, DEEPENING: in Com. of Sup., 6551 (ii).

—— STOREKEEPER, APPLICANTS FOR POSITION: Ques. (Mr. *Quinn*) 456 (i).

—— WHARFINGER, DISMISSAL OF F. CORBEIL: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2840 (i).

MCKAY, KENNETH, LOCKMAN, ST. PETER'S CANAL, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 1069 (i).

MONTREAL AND LAKE ONT. NAVIGATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr *Maclean*) 6009 (ii).

MONTREAL, OTTAWA AND GEORGIAN BAY CANAL CONSTRUCTION: M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Poupore*) 6466 (ii).

MURRAY CANAL, BRIDGE TENDERS, DISMISSALS: in Com. of Sup., 6554 (ii).

—— FLOATING WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 6554 (ii).

NAVIGATION, OPENING OF CANALS: Remarks (Mr. *Quinn*) 2700 (i).

REID, WM., BRIDGE TENDER, BEAUHARNOIS CANAL, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2937 (i).

RIDEAU CANAL, LAND DAMAGES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7182 (ii).

ST. FRANCIS LAKES, REMOVAL OF BOULDERS: in Com. of Sup., 6538 (ii).

SAULT STE. MARIE CANAL, CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 6550 (ii).

—— CONTRACTOR'S CLAIMS: in Com. of Sup., 7105.

SOULANGES CANAL, CEMENT, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6457, 6510 (ii).

—— CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 6446 (ii).

—— CONTRACTORS' CLAIMS: in Com. of Sup., 6447, 6510 (ii).

—— EXPENDITURE ON CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 5133 (ii).

—— TENDERS FOR CEMENT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 4176 (ii).

TRENT CANAL, CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 6538.

—— GOVT. AID: Ques. (Mr. *Corby*) 2817 (i).

—— REMOVAL OF ROCK: in Com. of Sup., 6553 (ii).

WELLAND CANAL, DISMISSALS: in Com. of Sup., 7206.

—— EMPLOYEES DISMISSED, NAMES: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Montague*) 2839 (i).

WELLINGTON BRIDGE, MONTREAL, ACCIDENT: Remarks (Mr. *Quinn*) 4604 (ii).

CANALS—*Con.*

WELLINGTON BRIDGE, MR. MATTISON'S SERVICES: Remarks (Mr. *Quinn*) 4775 (ii).

WILLIAMSBURG CANAL, GRATUITY TO GEORGE REID: in Com. of Sup., 7192 (ii).

—— REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6554 (ii).

"YANTIC," U. S. SS., PASSAGE UP ST. LAWRENCE: Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 830 (i).

—— Ques. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1336 (i).

—— IN CANADIAN CANALS: Remarks (Mr. *Wallace*) 4350 (ii).

Cañon Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 27 (Mr. *Frost*) 1°*, 744; 2°*, 824; wthdn., 3404 (i).

CANNED GOODS FOR YUKON, PAR. IN *National Provisioner*: Remarks (Mr. *Quinn*) 3940 (ii).

CAPE BRETON COUNTY, MARINE DEPT., CHANGES Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 673 (i).

—— DISMISSALS: Remarks (Mr. *McDougall*) 6033, 6034 (ii).

CAPE BRETON RY., "HARD PAN" CLAIMS: Ques. (Mr. *McLennan, Inverness*) 5134 (ii).

CAPE NEGRO ISLAND LIGHT, APPNMT. OF KEEPER: Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1929 (i).

—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1839 (i).

CASSELMAN, MR., LOCKMASTER AT MORRISBURG, DISMISSAL: in Com. of Sup., 7192 (ii).

CATTLE EXPORTED FROM CANADIAN TERRITORY: Ques. (Mr. *Maclean*) 475 (i).

—— EXPORT TRADE, MONTREAL, G. B. AND IRELAND: Remarks (Mr. *Hughes*) 2270 (i).

—— INSPECTION, SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7732 (ii).

—— SHIPMENTS TO BELFAST: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 484 (i).

—— SHIPMENTS TO G. B. OR UNITED KINGDOM: M. (Mr. *Hughes*) to Adjn., 2435 (i).

—— QUARANTINE: in Com. of Sup., 5998 (ii).

—— QUARANTINE, SLAUGHTER, COMPENSATION: in Com. of Sup., 7003 (ii).

—— TRADE, OPENING BELFAST PORT: Remarks (Mr. *Fisher*) 2851 (i).

CEMENT USED IN SOULANGES CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 6457, 6510 (ii).

CENTRAL RAILWAY, N.B., UNPAID ACCOUNTS: in Com. of Sup., 7653 (ii).

Central Canada Loan and Savings Co.'s B. No. 88 (Mr. *Casey*) 1°*, 2°*, 2240; in Com. and 3°*, 4567 (ii). (61-62 *Vic., c.* 97.)

CHAMBLY CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 6553, 7651 (ii).

CHAMBORD JUNCTION, CUSTOM-HOUSE, COST: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 4179 (ii).

—— ESTABLISHMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1469.

CHAPEL COVE, N.S., BREAKWATER, GOVT. AID: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 4345 (ii).

CHARGES OF MANAGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 3828 (i), 6976 (ii).

CHARLOTTE COUNTY, FISHERY OVERSEERS, DISMISSALS: in Com. of Sup., 5311 (ii).

—— TELEGRAPH LINES: in Com. of Sup., 6102 (ii).

CHEESE FACTORIES IN QUEBEC: Remarks (Mr. *Marcotte*) 1578 (i).

CHETICAMP CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, NAME, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 4180 (ii).
CHICOUTIMI WHARF, GOVT. EXPENDITURE: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 4180 (ii).
—— TELEGRAPH LINES: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 2814.
CHIEF JUSTICE STRONG'S EXPENSES TO ENGLAND: in Com. of Sup. 7089 (ii).
CHIGNECTO SHIP RAILWAY, PAR. IN MONTREAL *Gazette*: Remarks (Mr. *Lister*) 5663 (ii).
CHINA POINT WHARF, P.E.I., CONDITION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 671 (i).
—— PIER, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7636 (ii).
Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. No. 20 (Mr. *Maxwell*) 1°, 597 (i).
—— **B. No. 70** (Mr. *McInnes*) 1°, 1736 (i).
CHINESE IMMIGRATION ACT, ADMINISTRATION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6690 (ii).
Civil Service Supervisors Authorization B. No. 10 (Mr. *McMullen*) 1°, 270 (i).
Civil Service Act Amt. B. No. 17 (Mr. *McMullen*) 1°*, 405 (i) 2° m., 4222 (ii).
Civil Service Superannuation B. No. 76 (Mr. *Mulock*) 1°, 1744 (i); 2°, 6334; in Com., 6367, 6796; 3°, 6932 (ii). (61-62 *Vic. c.* 17.)
2° m., 6334 (ii).
Deb. (Mr. *Foster*) 6334, 6355; (Mr. *Clarke*) 6339; (Mr. *McNeill*) 6343, 6347; (Mr. *Sproule*) 6346; (Mr. *McMullen*) 6348; (Mr. *Davin*) 6352 (ii).
In Com.
Deb. (Mr. *Foster*) 6367, 6797; (Mr. *Clarke*) 6371, 6797; (Mr. *McMullen*) 6367, 6797; (Mr. *Davin*) 6371; (Mr. *Ellis*) 6370; (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 6361, 6380; (Mr. *Monk*) 6373; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 6374; (Mr. *Costigan*) 6375; (Mr. *Rogers*) 6378; (Mr. *Clancy*) 6379; (Mr. *Mulock*) 6796; (Mr. *Bell, Pictou*) 6797; (Mr. *Montague*) 6797; (Mr. *Rogers*) 6797; (Mr. *Sproule*) 6797; (Mr. *Gibson*) 6797; (Mr. *McDougall*) 6800 (ii).
3° m.
Deb. (Mr. *Foster*) 6933 (ii).
CIVIL SERVICE EMPLOYEES IN PROV. OF QUEBEC, NAMES, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Monk*) 504 (i).
—— SUPERANNUATED 1896-98: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Taylor*) 505 (i).
CLEANING, &c., DEPTL. BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 4599 (ii).
CLERKS, EXTRA, IN CIVIL SERVICE, AMOUNTS PAID, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *McMullen*) 3667 (i).
CLERICAL ASSISTANCE: in Com. of Sup., 6104 (ii).
—— CUSTOMS DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 7475 (ii).
COASTING LAWS, ATLANTIC AND PACIFIC: M. for Cor.* (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 2839 (i).
Coasting Trade of Canada Act Amt. B. No. 106 (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 1° m., 2800 (i).
COBOURG POSTMASTER, ATTENDANCE AT REFORM CONVENTION: Ques. (Mr. *Guillet*) 602 (i).
Cold Storage and Steamship Companies B. No. 149 (Mr. *Fisher*) 1°*, 5930; 2° and in Com., 6727; 3°*, 6747 (ii). (61-62 *Vic., c.* 7.)
COLD STORAGE FOR P.E.I., PROVISION: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 828 (i).
—— SHIPMENTS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5997 (ii).
COLLECTION OF REVENUES: *See* "SUPPLY," &c.
COLLINGWOOD HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 5886 (ii).
COLMER, MR., INCREASE OF SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 4561 (ii).
COLONIAL PREMIERS, LONDON CONFERENCE: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Foster*) 1785 (i)
COLONIZATION COMPANIES, GRANTS OF LANDS, CONDITIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Douglas*) 479 (i).
Columbia and Western Ry. Co.'s B. No. 34 (Mr. *Bostock*) 1°*, 903; 2°*, 1018; in Com. and 3°*, 3554 (i). (61-62 *Vic., c.* 61.)
COLUMBIA RIVER (B.C.) IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 6064 (ii).
Combinations in Restraint of Trade B. No. 89 (Mr. *Sproule*) 1°, 2241 (i).
COMMERCIAL AGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 4575, 6690.
COMMITTEES MEETING DURING SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE (Mr. *Sutherland*) 6318 (ii).
COMMITTEES:
DEBATES, OFFICIAL, SEL. COM.: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 449 (i).
—— 2ND REP. OF COM.: Presented (Mr. *Choquette*) 3822; conc., 4246 (ii).
LIBRARY COM., JOINT: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 671.
PRINTING COM., JOINT: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 597.
PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COM., MEETING: Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 3503 (i).
—— 5TH and 6TH REPS.: M. (Mr. *Foster*) to print Evidence, 6440, 6465 (ii).
SELECT STANDING COMS., COM. TO PREPARE LISTS: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 5, 450 (i).
—— Lists presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 591 (i).
Companies Act Amt. B. No. 138 (Mr. *Fielding*) 1°*, 5259; 2°, in Com., and 3°, 5331 (ii). (61-62 *Vic., c.* 50.)
—— **B. No. 165** (Mr. *Fielding*) 1°*, 7086; 2°, in Com., and 3°*, 7470 (ii). (61-62 *Vic., c.* 49.)
CONNORS, D., ANTIGONISH, FIRE CLAIMS: M. for Ret.* (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 1837 (i).
CONNOR, JOHN, GOLD DREDGING LEASES, N. W. T.: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 1074 (i).
CONTINGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 4581-4600 (ii).
CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS, JUDGES' REPS.: Read (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).
COPYRIGHT IN CANADA, POWERS OF PARLT., &c.: Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 473 (i).
—— ACTION BY BRITISH GOVERNMENT: M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Ross Robertson*) 6627, 6801 (ii).
CORBEIL, FRANÇOIS, LACHINE CANAL, DISMISSAL: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 4348 (ii).
CORN, FOREIGN IMPORTS INTO MAN.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 3660 (i).
—— IMPORTATIONS SINCE 1897-8: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3659 (i).
CORNWALL CANAL, CONSTRUCTION, AMOUNT PAID: Ques. (Mr. *Broder*) 5391 (ii).
—— ENLARGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 6532 (ii).
—— REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6554 (ii).
CORONERS, N.W.T., STATUS: Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 7855 (ii).
COTEAU LANDING, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 7226.

COTÉ, THOMAS, EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 4176 (ii).

COTE DE LEISSE RIFLE RANGES AND FARMERS' GRIEVANCES: Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 6322 (ii).

COTE ST. LUC RIFLE RANGES, ACCIDENTAL SHOOTING OF FARMER: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Monk*) 4678 (ii).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 6029 (ii).

COULOMBE VS. QUEEN, APPEAL QUEEN'S BENCH: M. for Copy* (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3668 (i).

COUNTY COURT JUDGES, AGE LIMIT, COR., &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 7124 (ii).

COURT OF APPEAL, ONT., EXTRA JUDGE: Ques. (Mr. *Maclean*) 1071 (i).

COW BAY BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 7590 (ii).

Cowichan Valley Ry. Co.'s B. No. 48 (Mr. *McInnes*) 1°*, 970; 2°*, 1214; in Com. and 3°*, 3656 (i). (61-62 *Vic., c.* 62.)

C. P. R. and St. Stephen and Milltown Ry. Co.'s B. No. 44 (Mr. *MacPherson*) 1°*, 970; 2°*, 1214; in Com., and 3°*, 3554 (i). (61-62 *Vic., c.* 84.)

Canadian Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. No. 46 (Mr. *Morrison*) 1°*, 970; 2°*, 1214; in Com., 3655; 3°*, 3656 (i). (61-62 *Vic., c.* 60.)

C.P.R. BALANCE OF AWARDS: in Com. of Sup., 6381.

——— LAND DAMAGES: in Com. of Sup., 6382 (ii).

——— LANDS EXEMPT FROM TAXATION: Ques. (Mr. *Jameson*) 1340 (i).

CRAIGVILLE AND STROUD'S MILLS MAIL SERVICE, TENDERS: Ques. (Mr. *Tyrwhitt*) 487 (i).

CREAMERIES, DOM. GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *McInnes*) 3085.

CREAMERIES IN N.W.T., ESTABLISHMENT, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5994 (ii).

——— NUMBER OF PATRONS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Davin*) 487, 503 (i).

CRIBBONS POINT, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5614 (ii).

Criminal Code (1892) Act Amt. B. No. 3 (Mr. *Charlton*) 1°, 185; 2° m., 2902 (i) neg., 4221.

——— **B. No. 11** (Mr. *Penny*) 1°*, 271; 2°*, 2058 (i).

——— **B. No. 12** (Mr. *Britton*) 1°, 270; 2° m., 2842; M. for Com., 2885; Amt. (Mr. *Cameron*) 6 m. h., agreed to, 2902 (i).

——— **B. No. 65** (Mr. *Davin*) 1°, 1573 (i).

——— **B. No. 134** (Mr. *Flint*) 1°, 4769 (i).

Criminals Identification B. No. 156 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1°*, 6577; 2° and in Com., 6962; 3°*, 6964 (ii). (61-62 *Vic., c.* 54.)

CRIMINAL STATISTICS: in Com. of Sup., 5025 (ii).

CROW'S NEST PASS RY., AGREEMENT WITH C.P.R.: Ques. (Mr. *McInnes*) 2036 (i).

——— AMOUNTS PAID C.P.R.: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 3405 (i).

——— COMMISSIONER'S REP.: Remarks (Mr. *Ross Robertson*) 6030 (ii).

——— PRINTING OF REP.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell, Pictou*) 6466 (ii).

——— remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 6466 (ii).

——— COMMISSION, EXPENSES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 7251 (ii).

CROW NEST PASS RY., CONSTRUCTION BY COMPANY: Remarks (Mr. *Richardson*) 6240 (ii).

——— DEATH OF EMPLOYEES: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Bell, Pictou*) 4605, 5394 (ii).

——— M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Bell, Pictou*) 3668 (i).

——— M. for Ret. (Mr. *Bell, Pictou*) 3666 (i).

——— EMPLOYEES: on conc., 7823 (ii).

——— ENGINEER'S SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 7110, 7181 (ii).

——— J. B. CHARLESON'S CONNECTION: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 7685 (ii).

——— TREATMENT OF WORKMEN: M. for Com. of Sup., (Mr. *Bell, Pictou*) 6593 (ii).

Deb. (Mr. *Foster*) 6593; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 6593; (Mr. *Fraser, Guysboro'*) 6598; (Mr. *Oliver*) 6600; (Mr. *Sifton*) 6614; (Mr. *Davin*) 6614; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 6618, 6626; (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 6619; (Mr. *Richardson*) 6622; (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 6623 (ii).

CROW'S NEST PASS RY. INVESTIGATION: on conc. (Mr. *Wallace*) 7823 (ii).

Deb. (Mr. *Davin*) 7840; (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 7840; (Mr. *McMullen*) 7843; (Mr. *Sproule*) 7845; (Mr. *Fraser Guysboro'*) 7845; (Mr. *Clarke*) 7847; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 7848 (ii).

CULLING TIMBER: in Com. of Sup., 6000, 7249 (ii).

CUSTOMS:

ANDERSON, T. E., CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, NAPANEE, SALARY: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 6008 (ii).

BATH (ONT.) CUSTOMS OFFICER, APPNMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 6007 (ii).

BONDING ARRANGEMENTS WITH U.S. ON PACIFIC COAST: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Foster*) 1786 (i).

CHAMBORD, CHICOUTIMI, CUSTOM HOUSE, COST, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 4179 (ii).

——— CUSTOM HOUSE, ESTABLISHMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1469 (i).

CAMERON, A. F., CUSTOMS SERVICE, SHERBROOKE (N.S.): M. for Ret.* (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 2840.

CHETICAMP, CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, NAMES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 4180 (ii).

CORN, FOREIGN IMPORTS INTO MAN.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 3660 (i).

——— IMPORTATIONS FROM 1897 TO 1898: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3659 (i).

CUSTOMS: in Com. of Sup., 4555, 4588, 6000, 7355, 7357, 7475; conc., 7818, 7852 (ii).

——— ASSISTANT INSPECTOR, PROV. OF QUE.: Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 2817, 3313 (i).

——— APPNMT. OF IRISH ROMAN CATHOLICS: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 4608 (ii).

——— CHANGES IN OFFICIALS: Ret. laid on Table (Mr. *Paterson*) 6895 (ii).

COLLECTOR AT CENTREVILLE, N.B., INVESTIGATION: Ques. (Mr. *Hale*) 830 (i).

——— COLLECTIONS IN THE YUKON: Ques. (Mr. *Wallace*) 825 (i).

GANANOQUE CUSTOM HOUSE: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 4923.

GRAND NARROWS, C.B., PREVENTIVE OFFICER, DUTIES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 1781 (i).

HAGARSVILLE CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, DEFALCATION: Ques. (Mr *Somerville*) 974 (i).

HILLSBORO' CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, DISMISSAL: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *McInerney*) 1838 (i).

IMPORTS, DUTIABLE VALUE AND AMOUNT COLLECTED: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 600 (i).

CUSTOMS,—*Con.*

JOHNSTON, J. T., CUSTOMS OFFICER, FORT ERIE, DISMISSAL; Ques. (Mr. *McCleary*) 4178 (ii).

LAFRANCE FIRE ENGINE, DUTY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 6011 (ii).

LOGS, &C., EXPORT DUTY; Ques. (Mr. *Wallace*) 3085.

MARGAREE CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 4161 (ii).

MONTAGUE (P.E.I.) CUSTOMS SUB-COLLECTOR, DISMISSAL: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Macdonald*) 2832 (i).

MONTREAL CUSTOMS HOUSE, DISMISSALS, 1896 TO 1898, NAMES, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Quinn*) 3669.

NAPANEE CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, AMOUNT PAID, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 6006 (ii).

N.W.T., HORSES IMPORTED FROM U.S.: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 3942 (ii).

PETROLEUM REDUCTION OF DUTY, LEGISLATION *re*: prop. Res. (Mr. *Moore*) 1945 (i).

PULP MILL MACHINERY, ENTRY IN BOND: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 3165 (i).

RECIPROCITY WITH U S.: Ques. (Mr *Davin*) 452 (i).

ST. HYACINTHE CUSTOMS OFFICE, DUES AND OFFICIALS: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 600 (i).

TENNANT, J. F., CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, MAN., DISMISSAL: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Quinn*) 3670 (i) 4182 (ii).

U.S. AND GREAT BRITAIN, IMPORTS: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 3663 (i).

"YANTIC," SS., CLEARANCE, ENTRIES, &C., AT CANADIAN PORTS: M. for Ret. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 1834 (i).

Customs Act Amt. B. No. 152 (Mr. *Paterson*). 1°, 6318; 2°, and in Com., 6946; 3°*, 6961 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 36.)

—— **B. No. 171** (Mr. *Fielding*). 1°*, 7585; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 7786 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 37.)

Customs and Fisheries Protection B. No. 153 (Mr. *Paterson*). 1°, 6319; 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 6962 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 38.)

DAGNEAU, J. T., POSTMASTER AT ROBITAILLE, CHARGES AGAINST: M. for Ret.* (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 4246 (ii).

DAGNAULT, Mr. R., DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 4609 (ii).

DAIRYING IN N.W.T., SUBSIDY; prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 504 (i).

DAIRYING SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 5994 (ii).

DALHOUSIE WHARF EXTENSION, IMPROVEMENTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 7084 (ii).

DANIS, MR., DISMISSAL FROM BEAUHARNOIS CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 7203 (ii).

DAUNAIS, C. M., EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1928 (i).

DART, LYMAN A., COMMUTATION OF DEATH SENTENCE, PETS. *re* &C: M. for copies* (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 3669 (i).

—— in Com. of Sup., 6641, 6653 (ii).

Dawson City and Victoria Telegraph Co.'s B. No. 119 (Mr. *Morrison*) 1°*, 3502; 2°*, 3868 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 5363 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 100.)

Dawson City Electric Lighting and Tramway Co.'s B. No. 118 (Mr. *Morrison*) 1°*, 3502; 2°*, 3868; ref. to Com., 3868 (i); 4805, 6939; in Com. and 3°*, 7158 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 99.)

Dawson City Electric Co.'s B. No. 123 (Mr. *Morrison*) 1°*, 4247; ref. to Com. on Rys., 4387; 2°, 4606; in Com., 7158; 3°*, 7163 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 98.)

DEAF AND DUMB MUTES, N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. *Douglas*) 4345 (ii).

—— PROVISION BY N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1930 (i).

DEBATES, OFFICIAL, 2ND REP. OF COM.: conc., 4246.

—— OMISSION OF QUESTION FROM REP.: Ques. of Privilege (Mr. *McDougall*) 3427 (i).

—— OFFICIAL REPORTING AND PUBLISHING: Return presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 3924 (i).

—— PUBLISHING: in Com. of Sup., 7011 (ii).

DEER ISLAND TELEGRAPH CABLE, SURVEYS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 4177 (ii).

DEPTL. BUILDINGS, FIRE AT WEST BLOCK: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 2347 (i).

—— REMOVAL OF FACING WALL: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 2528 (i).

DEPUTY MINISTERS, RECOMMENDATIONS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4899 (ii).

DES JOACHIMS AND MACKIE'S STATION MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Poupore*) 5135 (ii).

Detective Corporations and Mercantile Agencies B. No. 90 (Mr. *Sproule*) 1°*, 2241.

DISMISSALS:

ANDERSON, T. E., CUSTOMS COLLECTOR AT NAPANEE, SALARY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 6008 (ii).

ANNAPOLIS AND NEW GLASGOW: in Com. of Sup., 5836 (i).

BANFF, CAVE AND BASIN BATHS, CARETAKER: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Davin*) 2841 (i).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 451 (i).

BEAR RIVER SHIPPING MASTER: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Mills*) 2840 (i).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 1071 (i).

BEATTIE, JOHN, INDIAN AGENT AT HIGHGATE: in Com. of Sup., 7291 (ii).

BEATONVILLE POSTMASTER: Ques, (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 3824 (i).

BEAUHARNOIS CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 7189, 7203 (ii)

—— BOYER, TOUISSANT, LOCKMASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 3662 (i).

—— REID, WM., BRIDGE KEEPER: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 3937 (ii).

BECK, JOHN: in Com. of Sup., 5301 (ii).

BELLEVILLE P. O.: Remarks (Mr. *Corby*) 6112 (ii).

—— on M. for Com. of Sup., 6208 (ii).

BENNETT, MR., MAIL CLERK: in Com. of Sup., 4869.

BERNEY, MR.: in Com. of Sup., 5275 (ii).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 7687 (ii).

BERRY, MR.: in Com. of Sup., 4952 (ii).

BIRON, MR. N: in Com. of Sup, 4994 (ii).

BRIDGE TENDERS, MURRAY CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 6553 (ii).

BODDY, MR.: in Com. of Sup., 5275 (ii).

CAMERON, A. F., CUSTOMS OFFICER; M. for Ret.* (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 2840 (i).

CAMERON, MR., FISHERY OVERSEER AT ST. PETER'S: in Com. of Sup., 5307 (ii).

CAMERON AND LENOIR, FISHERY OFFICERS, N. S.: in Com. of Sup., 5307, 7096 (ii).

CAPE BRETON COUNTY: Remarks (Mr. *McDougall*) 6033 (ii).

—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *McDougall*) 6321 (ii).

DISMISSALS--*Con.*

CASSELMAN, MR., LOCKMASTER, MORRISBURG: in Com. of Sup., 7192 (ii).

CHAPLEAU POSTMASTER, PATRICK LYNCH: Ques. (Mr. *Poupore*) 3088 (i).

DAGNAULT, MR. R.: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 4609 (ii).

DAGNEAU, J. T., POSTMASTER AT ROBITAILLE, P. Q., CHARGES AGAINST: M. for Ret.* (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 4246 (ii).

DANIS, MR., BEAUHARNOIS CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 7203 (ii).

DISMISSALS AND APPNMTS. FROM 1878 TO 1879: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Belcourt*) 3665 (i).

——— ON INDIAN RESERVES, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 7302 (ii).

——— BY GOVT.: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *McDougall*) 5519, 5569 (ii).

DOBBINS, MR.: in Com. of Sup., 6858 (ii).

DUNDAS, MR.: Remarks (Mr. *Montague*) 6579 (ii).

DUNLOP, JAMES: in Com. of Sup., 5278 (ii).

ELGIN, N.B., POSTMASTER: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *McInerney*) 1837 (i).

FERGUSON, RODERICK, POSTMASTER AT LOWER L'ARDOISE: in Com. of Sup., 6707 (ii).

——— M. for Cor. (Mr. *Gillies*) 3666 (i).

FISHER, MR., MAIL CLERK: in Com. of Sup., 4872 (ii).

FORREST, MR., DIRECTOR NAPPAN EXPERIMENTAL FARM, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 5983 (ii).

GALBRAITH, THOS. J., CANAL OFFICER AT PORT COLBORNE: Ques. (Mr. *Montague*) 516 (i).

GATIEN, LOUIS, POSTMASTER AT MARIEVILLE: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 7685 (ii).

GISBORNE, MR.: in Com. of Sup., 6316 (ii).

GODBOUT, ALBERT: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3664.

GOFFETT, MR., POSTMASTER AT ORILLIA: in Com. of Sup., 6718 (ii).

GOVT. OFFICIALS DISMISSED, 1878 TO 1879, NAMES, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Belcourt*) 4246 (ii).

GRAND NARROWS, C.B., GOVT. BLACKSMITH: Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 3561 (i).

GRAVENHURST P. O., CHARGES AGAINST POSTMASTER: in Com. of Sup., 6716 (ii).

HAGARSVILLE COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS: Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 974 (i)

HICKS, MR., DISMISSAL: in Com. of Sup., 5275 (ii).

HILLSBORO, CUSTOMS COLLECTOR: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *McInerney*) 1838 (i).

HOUDE, CHARLES E., DISMISSAL BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 7686 (ii).

I. C. R., COLOURED PORTERS: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 3405 (i).

——— Remarks, 2852 (i).

——— CAPE BRETON: in Com. of Sup, 6414 (ii).

——— HOAR, CHAS.: M. for Cor.* (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 1838 (i).

——— ISAAC'S HARBOUR POSTMASTER GRIFFIN: M. for Ret. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 1834 (i).

——— MCNEILL, RORY, SECTION FOREMAN: in Com. of Sup., 6416 (ii).

——— Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 603 (i).

——— POWLIE, A., CAR INSPECTOR, SPRINGHILL: Ques. (Mr. *Powell*) 1932 (i).

——— STEWART, A.: Ques. (Mr. *Powell*) 2342 (i).

JOHNSON, J. T., CUSTOMS OFFICER AT FORT ERIE: (Mr. *McCleary*) 4178 (ii).

KELLY, MR: in Com. of Sup., 5274 (ii).

KILDARE POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Dugas*) 1575 (i).

KING, W. A., STATION AGENT, ANTIGONISH: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 7120 (ii).

DISMISSALS—*Con.*

LACHINE CANAL: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Gillies*) 4621 (ii).

——— FRANCOIS CORBEIL: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2343 (i).

——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2840 (i).

——— LEFAIVRE, XAVIER, LOCKMASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 3937 (i).

LAMBERT, MARTIN, MONTAGUE, P.E.I.: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, King's*) 5787 (ii).

——— in Com. of Sup., 5609 (ii).

L'ANCIENNE-LORETTE, POSTMASTER ALAIN: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2821 (i).

LOWER L'ARDOISE POSTMASTER: in Com. of Sup., 6707 (ii).

MARGAREE CUSTOMS COLLECTOR. DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 4181 (ii).

——— in Com. of Sup., 5271 (ii).

——— TELEGRAPH OPERATOR ROSS: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 2815 (i).

MARCHILDON, THOS., DISMISSAL: in Com. of Sup., 4991 (ii).

MATHESON, JOHN D., DISMISSAL FROM ST. PETER'S CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 7207 (i).

MILITARY COLLEGE EMPLOYEES, SUPPL. RETURN: Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 6034 (ii).

MACDONALD, A., POSTMASTER AT PEAKE'S STATION: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, P.E.I.*) 4344 (ii).

MCCALLUM, JOHN, APPNMT. AND DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 7686 (ii).

MCKAY, KENNETH, LOCKMAN, ST. PETER'S CANAL: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 1070 (i).

MCLEOD, M. G., POSTAL MAIL CLERK, N.S.: M. for O.C.'s, &c. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 4181 (ii).

MCNEILL, MR., CARETAKER: in Com. of Sup., 5609.

MCEACHREN, MR., NORTH SYDNEY: in Com. of Sup., 5608 (ii).

MUNROE, MR., FISHERY INSPECTOR: in Com. of Sup., 5310 (ii).

MONTAGUE, P.E.I., SUB-COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Macdonald, King's*) 2822 (i).

MONTREAL CUSTOMS HOUSE, DISMISSALS, 1896 to 1898, NAMES, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Quinn*) 3569 (i).

MOUNTED POLICE, DR. BAIN: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 2349 (i).

MURRAY CANAL BRIDGE TENDERS: in Com. of Sup., 6554 (ii).

NOEL, L. P. O., N.W.T.: Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 6319.

N. W. T. GOVT. OFFICIALS DISMISSED SINCE 1896, NAMES, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Davin*) 4246 (ii).

NORWOOD, H. H., EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 7120 (ii).

ORTON, DR. GEO., INDIAN AGENT IN MAN.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Sproule*) 3669 (i).

——— Remarks, 5393 (ii).

PALMER, BENJAMIN, DISMISSAL: in Com. of Sup., 4981 (ii).

PARLIAMENT GROUNDS, DISMISSAL OF LATE SUPT. ROBERTSON: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 2818 (i).

PICKETT, GEO. B.: in Com. of Sup., 4998 (ii).

PORT MULGRAVE STATION AGENT: M. for Cor. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 1832 (i).

POSTAL MAIL CLERKS, N.S., REMOVAL, &C.: Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 3406 (i).

POSTMASTERS DISMISSED SINCE 1896: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 4609 (ii).

REID, WM., BRIDGE TENDER, BEAUHARNOIS CANAL: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 3937 (ii).

RESTIGOUCHE INDIAN AGENT, J. A. VENNER: Ques. (Mr. *McAlister*) 4611 (i).

DISMISSALS—*Con.*

——— Remarks, 1786 (i).

——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. *McAlister*) 2839 (i).

RETURNS *re* DISMISSALS: Remarks (Mr. *Quinn*) 5519.

ROBERT, H. A., STRATFORD P. O.: Ques. (Mr. *MacLaren*) 4344 (ii).

ROSS, DAVID, in Com. of Sup., 5270 (ii).

STE. ANNE DE BEAUPRÉ POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1072 (i).

STE. ANNE DE LA PARADE POSTMASTER: M. for O. Cs.* (Mr. *Marcotte*) 4678 (ii).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 3313 (i).

ST. CYPRIEN POSTMASTER, CHARGES AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 6007 (ii).

ST. PETER'S CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 7207 (ii).

ST. TITE POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 3090 (i).

SASKATCHEWAN INDIAN AGENTS: in Com. of Sup., 6854 (ii).

SHANNON, THOS., CUSTOMS OFFICER, KILLARNEY: in COM. of Sup., 7365 (ii).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 4770 (ii).

SIMOND, R. H., I.C.R. EMPLOYEE: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Powell*) 2840 (i).

STELLARTON CAR INSPECTOR SUTHERLAND: M. for Cor. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 1833, 2839 (i).

TENNANT, J. F., CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, MAN.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Quinn*) 3670 (i), 4182, 5206 (ii).

VERGE, J. ALBERT, FISHERY OVERSEER: in Com. of Sup., 5304 (ii).

WALTON, T. M., INDIAN AGENT AT PARRY ISLAND: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *McCormack*) 3670 (i).

WAVERLEY POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 598 (i).

——— in Com. of Sup., 7206 (ii).

WELLAND CANAL EMPLOYEES, NAMES, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Montague*) 2839 (i).

WILLIAMS, W. W., POSTMASTER AT SEELEY'S BAY: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3407, 3409, 3416 (i).

——— in Com. of Sup., 6701 (ii).

——— Ques. of Order: Remarks (Mr. *Speaker*) 3424.

WINSTANELY, MR., MAIL CLERK: in Com. of Sup., 4866 (ii).

WOOD, H. W., POSTMASTER AT WELSFORD, N.B.: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 7120 (ii).

WOOD, MR. W. F., INDIAN AGENT: in Com. of Sup., 7303 (ii).

DIVISIONS:

AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENTS AND THE TARIFF: on prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) Amt. (Mr. *Fielding*) to adjn Deb., agreed to (Y. 46, N. 14) 3207 (i).

AUDITOR GENERAL, POWERS AND DUTIES: on M. for Com. of Sup., Amt. (Mr. *Foster*) neg. (Y. 32, N. 49) 6207 (ii).

BRUNEAU, MR., M.P. FOR RICHELIEU, RESIGNATION: on prop. Res. (Mr. *Marcotte*) to ref. to Com. on Privs. and Elections, neg. (Y. 39, N. 79) 2239 (i).

BUTTER INDUSTRY OF CAN., ENCOURAGEMENT OF: on prop. Res. (Mr. *Reid*), Amt. (Mr. *Sutherland*) to adjn. Deb., agreed to (Y. 80, N. 34) 2515 (i).

CANADIAN YUKON RY. CO.'S B. 6 (Mr. *Blair*), Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to M. for 2°, neg. (Y. 65, N. 119) 1732 (i); M. (Mr. *Blair*) for 2°, agreed to (Y. 111, N. 72) 1733 (i).

FRANCHISE ACT REPEAL B. 16: Amt. (Mr. *Powell*) neg. (Y. 48, N. 97) 2797 (i).

KETTLE RIVER VALLEY RY. CO.'S B. 26 (Mr. *Bostock*) on Sen. Amts., neg. (Y. 44, N. 64) 3553 (i).

DIVISIONS—*Con.*

LORD'S DAY, BETTER OBSERVANCE B. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 3°, Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) to recom., agreed to (Y. 64, N. 58) 2400; M. (Mr. *Charlton*) to restore to Order Paper, neg. (Y. 52, N. 93) 2428 (i).

ONTARIO AND RAINY RIVER RY. CO.'S B. 32 (Mr. *Tisdale*) Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) neg. (Y. 16, N. 65) 2697.

POST OFFICE SAVINGS BANKS DEPOSITS, REDUCTION OF INTEREST: Amt. (Mr. *Davin*) neg. (Y. 40, N. 76) 3754 (i).

PROCEDURE, QUES. OF, ON 3° OF BILL AFTER REPORTED FROM COM., DIVISION DEMANDED BY MEMBER: agreed to (Y. 56, N. 35) 2649 (i).

RY. EMPLOYEES SAFETY B. 4 (Mr. *Casey*) Amt. (Mr. *Casey*) to recom., neg. (Y. 21, N. 80) 5174 (ii).

SONS OF ENGLAND BENEFIT SOCIETY'S CO.'S INCORP. B. 122 (Mr. *Bertram*) M. for Com. agreed to (Y. 85, N. 14) 6063 (ii).

Divorce (Augustus Baldwin Hart) B. No. 87 (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1°*, 2°*, 2841; in Com., and 3°*, 3554 (i). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 121.)

Divorce (Edwin Heyward) B. No. 112 (Mr. *Belcourt*) 1°*, 3309; 2°*, 3654 (i); in Com. and 3° on div., 4175 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 122.)

Divorce (James Pearson) B. No. 147 (Mr. *Sutherland*) 1°*, 5867; 2°*, 5885, 5906; in Com. and 3°*, 6266 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 123.)

DOBBIN, MR., DISMISSAL BY GOVT.: in Com. of Sup., 6858 (ii).

DOM. ARTILLERY ASSOCIATION GRANT: in Com. of Sup., 7521 (ii).

Dom. Atlantic Ry. Co.'s B. No. 162 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1°*, 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 6962 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 8.)

Dom. Building and Loan Association Co.'s B. No. 41 (Mr. *Clarke*) 1°*, 970; 2°*, 1214; in Com. and 3°*, 2559 (i). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 101.)

DOM. CARTRIDGE FACTORY: in Com. of Sup., 6570, 7075 (ii).

DOM. GENERAL ELECTIONS (1896) COST, &C., OF PROSECUTIONS IN MAN.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Roche*) 2841 (i).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. No. 130 (Mr. *Sifton*) 1°, 4679; 2°, and in Com., 5937; 3°*, 6048 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 31).

DOM. LANDS: in Com. of Sup., 6858, 7307 (ii).

DOM. LANDS, TENBY, MAN., APPNMT. OF SUB-AGENT: Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 3087 (i).

DOMINION LOAN (1897) APPLICATION BY BANKS: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 4177 (ii).

DOMINION NOTES, PRINTING AND ENGRAVING: in Com. of Sup., 3829 (i).

DOMINION POLICE: in Com. of Sup., 7488 (ii).

DOMVILLE, LT. COL., M.P., CHARGES AGAINST: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 5393 (ii).

DONALDSON, S. J., IMMIGRATION AGENT, N.W.T., AMOUNTS PAID: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 4176 (ii).

DORCHESTER PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 6676.

DOUBLE HILL (P.E.I.), P. O., CLOSING: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 1931 (i).

DOUCET'S LANDING, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 7639 (ii).

Drainage across Railway Co.'s Lands B. No. 5 (Mr. *Casey*) 1°, 185; 2° m., 2055 (i).

DREDGES, BUILDING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5050, 6072, 6081, 7226 (ii).

DREDGING, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 6099 (ii).

—— GENERAL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 6099 (ii).

—— MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 6099 (ii).

—— MARITIME PROVINCES: in Com. of Sup., 6082.

—— ONT. AND QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 6087 (ii)

—— TORONTO HARBOUR EXPENDITURE: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 482 (i).

—— IMPROVEMENTS, AMOUNTS PAID W. E. PHIN: Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 1337 (i).

—— CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 4771 (ii).

—— LIABILITY INCURRED: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 971.

DREDGING GOLD LEASES, APPLICATIONS, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Foster*) 1838 (i).

—— GOLD PERMITS IN PEACE RIVER: Ques. (Mr. *Maclean*) 478 (i).

—— GOLD LEASES, ISSUED TO J. A. MERCIER: Ques. (Mr. *Maxwell*) 1934 (i).

—— MILES OF RIVER LEASED: Ques. (Mr *Foster*) 1934 (i).

—— AND MINING LICENSES: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Foster*) 5774 (ii).

—— REGULATIONS RESPECTING: Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 746 (i).

DROLET, CHEVALIER, MINING CONCESSIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 671 (i) 4924 (ii).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 1073 (i).

—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Davin*) 2839 (i).

—— Explanation (Mr. *Sifton*) 831 (i).

DRUMMOND COUNTY RY., COMMITTEE OF INVESTIGATION: prop. Res. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 506 (i).

—— 1ST REP. OF COM.: Presented (Mr. *Lister*) 1272.

—— 2ND REP. OF COM.: Presented (Mr. *Lister*) 6580; conc., 7113 (ii).

—— M. TO PRINT EVIDENCE AND REPORT: (Mr. *Lister*) 6580 (ii).

—— M. TO WTHDRW.: (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 7523-4.

—— G. T. R. AGREEMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 3317 (i).

—— RUMOURED NEW ARRANGEMENTS: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 2699 (i).

—— THROUGH TRAFFIC: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 472 (i).

—— *See* "I.C.R. Extension to Montreal."

DUNDAS, MR., DISMISSAL BY GOVT: Remarks (Mr. *Landerkin*) 6578 (ii).

DUNLOP, JAMES: in Com. of Sup., 5278 (ii).

DUPONT, MR., LATE M.P., DECEASED: Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1773 (i.)

EAST RAGGED ISLAND WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 5618.

ECLIPSE FILES: in Com. of Sup., 4584 (ii).

Edmonton and Peace River Ry. and Nav. Co.'s B. No. 98 (Mr. *MacPherson*) 1°*, 2430; 2°*, 2560 (i); wthdn., 4922 (ii).

Edmonton District Ry. Co.'s B. No. 54 (Mr. *Oliver*) 1°*, 1379; 2°*, 1509; in Com. and 3°*, 3656 (i). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 63.)

EDMONTON BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 6245, 6268; conc., 7822 (ii).

—— CONTRACT FOR CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1341 (i).

—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Davin*) 1838 (i).

—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Davin*) 4773 (ii).

—— FREIGHT RATES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 6010.

—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Davin*) 3827 (i).

—— remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 2528 (i).

—— PENALTIES TO CONTRACTORS: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 5316 (ii).

EDWARDS, DR. O. C., INDIAN MEDICAL OFFICER, APPNMT. BY GOVT.: Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 4607.

ELEVATOR MONOPOLY, MAN. AND N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. *Rutherford*) 598 (i).

ELGIN, EAST AND WEST, INVESTIGATION INTO CHARGES AGAINST FISHERY OVERSEERS: in Com. of Sup., 5289 (ii).

ELGIN, N.B., POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL: M. for Cor. (Mr. *McInerney*) 1837 (i).

ELKHORN (MAN.), POSTMASTER, APPNMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 4771 (ii).

ENGINEERS, &C., PUBLIC BUILDINGS, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 5607 (ii).

ESTIMATES, THE, 1898-99: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 2698 (i).

—— Suppl., 5663, 7378 (ii).

—— AND BUDGET SPEECH: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 1935.

EUROPEAN AND AMERICAN RY., SETTLEMENT BETWEEN GOVT. AND E. B. CHANDLER: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *McInerney*) 2841 (i).

EXCHEQUER COURT, TRAVELLING EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 6639 (ii).

EXCISE: in Com. of Sup., 6000 (ii).

—— PREVENTIVE SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 7243.

EXPERIMENTAL FARMS: in Com. of Sup., 5972 (ii).

—— LABORATORY: in Com. of Sup., 5495 (ii).

—— DISTRIBUTION OF BULLETINS: Remarks (Mr. *Montague*) 2454 (i).

EXTRA ALLOWANCE TO CIVIL SERVICE CLERKS: in Com. of Sup., 7484 (ii).

FARM BULLETINS AND REPORTS: in Com. of Sup., 5991 (ii).

FARRANS POINT CANAL, ENLARGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 6532 (ii).

FASCINE FISHERY, CHARLEVOIX COUNTY: in Com. of Sup., 5298 (ii).

Federal Life Assurance Co. of Ont., Change of Name B. No. 29 (Mr. *MacPherson*) 1°*, 902; 2°*, 1017; in Com. and 3°*, 2559 (i). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 103.)

FENCE ON INDIAN RESERVE, ANTIGONISH COUNTY: in Com. of Sup., 7294 (ii).

FERGUSON, RODERICK, POSTMASTER LOWER ARDOISE, DISMISSAL: in Com. of Sup., 6707 (ii).

FINANCE:

ARBITRATION, DOMINION AND ONTARIO AND QUEBEC ACCOUNTS: in Com. of Sup., 6851 (ii).

AUDITOR GENERAL, POWERS AND DUTIES: Amt. to Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Foster*) 6202 (ii).

—— REP.: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 307 (i).

FINANCE—*Con.*

BELGIAN AND GERMAN TREATIES, LEGAL EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 7088 (ii).

BINDER TWINE *re* IMPOSITION OF DUTY: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 455 (i).

CHARGES OF MANAGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 3828 (i) 6976 (ii).

DOMINION LOAN (1897) APPLICATION BY BANKS: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 4177 (ii).

DOMINION NOTES, PRINTING AND ENGRAVING: in Com. of Sup., 3829 (i) 6976 (ii).

FINANCE DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 4554 (ii).

—— CONTINGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 4587 (ii).

IMPORTS FROM GREAT BRITAIN AND U.S.: Ques. (Mr. *Wallace*) 3936 (ii).

INDIA RUBBER BOOTS AND SHOES: in Com. of Sup., 7583 (ii).

INSURANCE COMPANIES, CHANGES OF LAW GOVERNING: M. (Mr. *Broder*) 5136 (ii).

INTEREST PAID ONTARIO AND QUEBEC, 1897: Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 455 (i).

LIQUOR TRAFFIC COMMISSION, AMOUNT DUE "HANSARD" REPORTERS: in Com. of Sup., 7093 (ii).

LOANS TO PUBLIC WORKS, DUE THE DOMINION: M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Dobell*) 6239 (ii).

MINT, GOVERNMENT ESTABLISHMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron* 1349 (i),

"PARLIAMENTARY COMPANION," PURCHASE OF COPIES BY GOVT.: in Com. of Sup., 6975 (ii).

P. E. I. AND CANADIAN GOVT., OUTSTANDING DISPUTES: M. for O. C's.* (Mr. *Martin*) 3669 (i).

RECIPROCAL TARIFF CLAUSE, AMOUNTS, REFUNDS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 4175 (ii).

RUBBER GOODS, TARIFF RESPECTING: M. for Com., of Sup. (Mr. *Osler*) 6637 (ii).

SAVINGS BANKS: in Com. of Sup., 3828 (i).

—— P. O. DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 4581 (ii).

SHIRT AND COLLAR INDUSTRY: M. for Com. of Sup., (Mr. *Monk*) 6583 (ii).

SUGAR: in Com. of Ways and Means, 7585 (ii).

SUPPLY: Res. for Com. (Mr. *Fielding*) 449 (i).

—— *See* general heading.

TREASURY BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS, NON-PRODUCTION OF RETURN: Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1077 (i).

WAYS AND MEANS: Res. for Com. (Mr. *Fielding*) 449 (i).

(*See* "Customs," "Trade and Commerce," &c.)

FISHER, MR., MAIL CLERK: in Com. of Sup., 4872.

FISHERIES:

APPEAL TO PRIVY COUNCIL, LEGAL EXPENSES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7285 (ii).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3825 (i).

ATLANTIC FISHERIES, U.S. LEGISLATION: Remarks (Mr. *Russell*) 1272 (i).

BIOLOGICAL STATION, GULF OF ST. LAWRENCE: in Com. of Sup., 7733 (ii).

BODDY, A., APPNMT. AS FISHERY OVERSEER: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3657 (i).

BOUNTY TO FISHERMEN, APPLICATION AT GABARUS: Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 674 (i).

DISMISSALS. *See* general heading.

FISHERIES: in Com. of Sup., 5003, 7285 (ii).

FISHING LICENSES, AMOUNT PAID BY LAKE ERIE FISHERMEN: Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 601 (i).

HICKS, WM., APPNMT. AS FISHERY OVERSEER: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3658 (i).

FISHERIES—*Con.*

LOBSTER FISHERY IN BAY OF FUNDY: Ques. (Mr. *Copp*) 479 (i).

—— PACKING, SIZE OF CATCH: Ques. (Mr. *Bethune*) 1340 (i).

METEOROLOGICAL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 7285 (ii).

NOBLE BROTHERS, ACTION BY GOVT.: in Com. of Sup., 5268 (ii).

—— PAYMENTS TO, BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 5133 (ii).

OVERSEERS IN C.B., DISMISSALS: in Com. of Sup., 5277 (ii).

OVERSEERS, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 5004 (ii).

OYSTER FISHERIES, LEASES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Yeo*) 1775 (i).

PROTECTION SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 4948, 5268 (ii).

ROSS, DAVID, FISHERY OVERSEER, MARGAREE: M. for Ret.* (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 1837 (i).

[*See* "MARINE."]

Fishermen's Safety B. No. 111 (Sir *Louis Davies*) 1°, 2° and in Com., 4778; 3°*, 4930 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 44.)

Fisheries Act Amt. B. No. 127 (Sir *Louis Davies*) 1°, 4522; 2° and in Com., 4946; 3°*, 4947 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 39.)

—— **No. 166** (Sir *Louis Davies*) 1°, 7115; 2° in Com. and 3°*, 7470 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 40.)

FORREST, MR., DIRECTOR NAPPAN EXPERIMENTAL FARM (N.S.), DISMISSAL: in Com. of Sup., 5983.

Foresters, Ancient Order of, B. No. 113 (Mr. *Landerkin*). 1°, 3164; 2°*, 3656 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 5569 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 91.)

Franchise Act Repeal B. No. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*). 1°, 308; 2° m., 2270, 2532, 2567, 2703; agreed to (Y. 97, N. 48) 2799; M. for Com., 2930; in Com., 2941, 2969 (i), 3942, 4042, 4074, 4254, 4354, 4387, 4453, 4523, 5259; 3° m., 5664; 3°, 5709; Sen. Amts., 6467, 7527, 7553, 7792; 3°, 5709 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 14.)

Deb. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 2270; (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 2274; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 2279; (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*), 2290; (Mr. *Sproule*) 2296; (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*), 2301; (Mr. *Craig*) 2309; (Mr. *McMullen*) 2314; (Mr. *Bennett*) 2321; (Mr. *Flint*) 2334; (Mr. *Mills*) 2533; (Mr. *McNeill*) 2567; (Mr. *McClure*) 2571; (Mr. *Roche*) 2580; (Mr. *Heyd*) 2587; (Mr. *Rutherford*) 2593; (Mr. *Moore*) 2601; (Mr. *Bourassa*) 2703; (Mr. *Clancy*) 2708; (Mr. *Casey*) 2720; (Mr. *Poupore*) 2726; (Mr. *Rogers*) 2729; (Mr. *Stenson*) 2732; (Mr. *Powell*) 2737 (i).

Amt. (Mr. *Powell*) 2740:

Deb. (Mr. *Martin*) 2741; (Mr. *Britton*) 2744; (Mr. *Hughes*) 2748; (Mr. *Maclean*) 2751; (Mr. *McCleary*) 2753; (Mr. *Henderson*) 2757; (Mr. *Gillies*) 2760; (Mr. *Ross Robertson*) 2768; (Mr. *Davin*) 2768; (Mr. *Wallace*) 2776; (Mr. *Legris*) 2782; (Mr. *Chauvin*) 2785; (Mr. *Fielding*) 2787; (Mr. *Mills*) 2792; (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 2793; (Mr. *McNeill*) 2794; (Mr. *McIsaac*) 2795; Amt. Neg. (Y. 48, N. 97) 2797 (i).

In Com.:

Deb. (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 2930 (i), 4045, 4418 (ii); (Mr. *Mills*) 2933 (i), 3983, 4065, 4255, 4260, 4313, 4411, 4454 (ii); (Mr. *Bennett*) 2941, 2969, 2978 (i), 4068, 4083, 4093, 4141, 4152, 4254, 4453, 4468, 4492, 5262; (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 2946, 2971, 2984 (i), 3942, 4067, 4075, 4083, 4097, 4254, 4366, 4454, 4484, 4523; (Mr. *McMillan*) 2947, 2975; (Mr. *McHugh*) 2948 (i), 4460 (ii); (Mr. *Burnett*) 2947, 2953;

Franchise Act Repeal B. No. 16—*Con.*
In Com.—*Con.*
(Mr. *Campbell*) 2952; (Mr. *Heyd*) 2954; (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2971; (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 2971, 2995 (i), 3964, 3968, 4058, 4069, 4122, 5261 (ii); (Mr. *Clancy*) 2971, 2981 (i), 3942, 4115, 4338, 4486, 4503 (ii); (Sir *Louis Davies*) 2972, 2993 (i), 4082, 4109, 4388, 4409, 4477, 4508; (Mr. *Wallace*) 2972, 2988, 3005 (i), 4318, 4457; (Mr. *Taylor*) 2973, 2979 (i), 4110, 4445 (ii); (Mr. *Macdonald, King's*) 2974; (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 2978-2982; (Mr. *Powell*) 2983, (Mr. *Blair*) 2985 (i), 4078, 4091, 4122, 4128, 4256, 4470 (ii); (Mr. *Quinn*) 2986 (i), 3948, 4286, 4462, 4501 (ii); (Mr. *Bell, Addington*) 2987; (Mr. *Pope*) 2989; (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2990 (i) 4383, 4419, 4476 (ii); (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 2992 (i) 4256, 4269, 4358, 4432, 4462, 5260 (ii); (Mr. *Erb*) 2993; (Mr. *Davin*) 2996 (i), 4016, 4282, 4354, 4483, 4492 (ii); (Mr. *Hughes*) 3003; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 3010; (Mr. *Ingram*) 3010 (i); 4417, 4442, 4456, 4477, 4487, 5261 (ii); (Mr. *Belcourt*) 4057, 4373; (Mr. *Britton*) 4095, 4504; (Mr. *Bell, Pictou*) 4274; (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 3947, 4469; (Mr. *Charlton*) 3949, 4277; (Mr. *Clarke*) 4500, 5262; (Mr. *Corbrane*) 4023; (Mr. *Costigan*) 4265; (Mr. *Ellis*) 4077, 4474; (Mr. *Fielding*) 3964, 4270; (Mr. *Flint*) 4021; (Mr. *Foster*) 3979, 3996, 4097, 4136, 4255, 4296, 4403, 4476, 5260; (Mr. *Fraser, Guysboro'*) 5263; (Mr. *Gillies*) 3960, 4438, 4488; (Mr. *Haggart*) 4057, 4289, 4384, 4457, 4480; (Mr. *Henderson*) 5412; (Mr. *LaRivière*) 4084, 4093, 4115, 4295, 4467, 4494, 5262; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 3967, 3979, 4008, 4069, 4098, 4308, 4406; (Mr. *Lister*) 3948; (Mr. *Maclean*) 3949; (Mr. *McAlister*) 3966, 4486; (Mr. *McCarthy*) 4465; (Mr. *McClure*) 3962, 4398; (Mr. *McDougall*) 4026, 4042, 4080, 4103, 4270, 4293, 4401, 4416, 4454, 4487; (Mr *McInerney*) 3990, 4074, 4084, 4100, 4133, 4254, 4266, 4374, 4377, 4473, 4525; (Mr. *McLennan*) 3986, 4413, 4492; (Mr. *McNeill*) 3957, 4283, 4375, 4396; (Mr. *Martin*) 3943 (ii) (Mr. *Monk*) 3908 (i) 4050, 4151, 4463, 4500; (Mr. *Montague*) 4258, 4294, 4387, 4446, 4456, 4495, 4524; (Mr. *Mulock*) 3959; (Mr. *Paterson*) 4322, 4386, 4424, 4468, 5264; (Mr. *Roche*) 4144; (Mr. *Russell*) 3962, 3976, 4046, 4062, 4434; (Mr. *Rutherford*) 4150; (Mr. *Sifton*) 4127, 4139; (Mr. *Somerville*) 4325; (Mr. *Sproule*) 4118, 4375, 4455; (Mr. *Wilson*) 5263; (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) 4044 (ii).

FRANCHISE ACT REPEAL B. 16 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*), FRENCH TRANSLATION AND PRINTING OF SCHEDULES: Remarks (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2434 (i).

—— DISTRIBUTION OF PRINTED COPIES: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 7854 (ii).

FRASER RIVER (B.C.) IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 6065 (ii).

FREELAND, MR., FISHERY OVERSEER, CHARGES AGAINST: in Com. of Sup., 5290 (ii).

Freight Rates. *See* "Railways."

FRENCH LANGUAGE IN N.W.T., ARTICLE in *L'Ouest Canadien*: Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 2529 (i).

FRENCH LINE OF STEAMERS, NEGOTIATIONS: Remarks (Mr. *Bergeron*) 6465 (ii).

FRENCH TRANSLATION AND PRINTING: Remarks (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3091 (i).

FRIGON, A., INDEMNITY FOR INJURY: M. for Rep.* (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3668 (i).

GABARUS BREAKWATER, GRANTS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 4179 (ii).

GALBRAITH, THOS. J., CANAL OFFICER AT PORT COLBORNE, RESIGNATION: Ques. (Mr. *Montague*) 516.

GALICIAN IMMIGRANTS, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 6819 (ii).

—— IN CANADA: Ques. (Mr. *Maclean*) 6109 (ii).

—— PAR. IN *North-Wester, re* TREATMENT BY GOVT.: Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 6032 (ii).

—— REPORT *re* DESTITUTION: Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 101 (i).

GALOPS CANAL, CLAIMS FOR EXPROPRIATION OF LAND: in Com. of Sup., 7650 (ii).

—— PURCHASE OF LAND, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Broder*) 3668 (i).

—— STRAIGHTENING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6538.

GANANOQUE CUSTOMS HOUSE: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 4923 (ii).

GANANOQUE DRILL SHED: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3318, 3826 (i).

—— M. FOR RET.: Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) 3826 (i).

—— LETTERS OF LT.-GOV. PATERSON: LAID ON TABLE (Mr. *Borden, King's*) 5316 (ii).

—— M. (Mr. *Taylor*) to Adjn., 5098 (ii).

—— REMOVAL AND NEW SITE: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Taylor*) 1837 (i).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 457 (i).

GASCOIGNE, MAJ.-GEN., MILITIA COMMISSION: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 3825 (i).

—— RESIGNATION: Remarks (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 4167 (ii).

—— LETTER READ (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 6320 (ii).

—— Ques. of Order (Mr. *Foster*) 6464 (ii).

Gas Inspection Act Amt. B. No. 73 (Sir *Henri Joly de Lotbinière*) 1°, 1744; 2°* and in Com., 2138; 3°* 2138 (i). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 26.)

GASPÉ BASIN AND DALHOUSIE MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 6687 (ii).

—— AND QUEBEC MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 6687 (ii).

—— LINE OF STEAMERS, SUBSIDY: Ques. (Mr. (*Bergeron*) 7120 (ii).

—— STEAM COMMUNICATION WITH QUEBEC, SUBSIDY: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 7685 (ii).

GATIEN, LOUIS, DISMISSAL BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 7685 (ii).

General Inspection Act Amt. B. No. 85 (Mr. *Penny*) 1°, 2035; M. to wthdrw. B., 2606 (i).

—— **B. No. 128** (Sir *Henri Joly de Lotbinière*) 1°*, 4522; 2°, and in Com., 5966; 3°*, 5972 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 25.)

Geological Survey Dept. B. No. 114 (Mr. *Sifton*) 1°, 3404 (i); 2°, and in Com., 4776; 3°*, 4777 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 18.)

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY: in Com. of Sup., 4559, 7477 (ii).

—— YUKON DISTRICT SURVEYS: in Com. of Sup., 7754 (ii).

GEORGIAN BAY TIMBER DISTRICTS, OUTPUT OF LOGS TO MICHIGAN: Ques. (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 825 (i).

—— Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 826 (i).

GISBORNE, MR., DISMISSAL BY GOVT.: in Com. of Sup., 6316 (ii).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 5317 (ii).

GLADSTONE, RT. HON. W. E., REPORT OF DEATH: Ques. (Mr. *Gibson*) 4347 (ii).
——— DECEASE OF: Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 5868 (ii).
——— RES. OF CONDOLENCE: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 6115 (ii).
GODBOUT, ALBERT, DISMISSAL: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3664 (i).
GODERICH HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 6087 (ii).
GOLDEN, B.C., AND ST. EUGENE MAIL CARRIER: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Foster*) 2824 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 2816 (i).
GOLD PLACER MINING IN N.W.T. AND YUKON: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Foster*) 504 (i).
GOFFETT, POSTMASTER AT ORILLIA, CHARGES AGAINST: in Com. of Sup., 6718 (ii).
GOVERNOR GEN.'S SEC.'S OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 3830 (i) 4581, 6978 (ii).
GOVERNOR GEN. AND MINISTERIAL RESPONSIBILITY, on M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to Adjn., 253 (i).
GOVT. BUSINESS. *See* "Business of the House."
——— CONTRACTS, PROHIBITION OF SWEATING: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 599 (i).
——— EMPLOYEES AND COMMISSIONERS: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Foster*) 1837 (i).
Govt. Harbours, Piers and Breakwaters Act Amt. B. No. 38 (Sir *Louis Davies*). 1°, 926; 2° and in Com., 1863; 3°*, 1869 (i). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 42.)
——— **B. No. 135** (Sir *Louis Davies*). 1°, 4922; 2°, in Com. and 3°, 5325 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 43.)
GOVT. HOUSE, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 5491, 6857.
——— OFFICIALS DISMISSED FROM 1878 TO 1879, NAMES, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Belcourt*) 4246 (ii).
——— STEAMERS, MAINTENANCE AND REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 4947 (ii).
——— TOLLS ON WHARFS: Remarks (Mr. *Choquette*) 4351 (ii).
GRAIN LIENS, MAN. AND N. W. T., LEGISLATION: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1930 (i).
——— STANDARDS: in Com. of Sup., 6695 (ii).
——— INSPECTION SYSTEM: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1780.
——— TRADE AT FORT WILLIAM: Ques. (Mr. *Douglas*) 475 (i).
——— TRANSPORT BY C.P.R. AND ELEVATOR CO. OF MAN. AND N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. *Richardson*) 483 (i).
GRAND ETANG DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 6083 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *McLennan, Inverness*) 5317 (ii).
GRAND NARROWS, DISMISSAL OF GOVT. BLACKSMITH: Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 3661 (i).
——— PREVENTIVE OFFICER, DUTIES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 1781 (i).
——— I.C.R. RESTAURANT: in Com. of Sup., 6428 (ii).
GRAND RIVER FLOODS: M. (Mr. *Montague*) to Adjn., 2526 (i).
——— WHARF, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5648.
Great Commonwealth Development and Mining Co.'s B. No. 95 (Mr. *Gibson*). 1°*, 2430; 2°*, 2560 (i); wthdn., 6227 (ii).
Great North-west Central Ry. Co.'s B. No. 141 (Mr. *Morrison*). 1°*, 5518; M. for 2°, 5930; 2° and ref. to Com. on Rys., 5965, 6001; in Com., 7456, 7733, 7787; 3°*, 7788 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 64.)
G. T. R. AND C. P. R. CONNECTION AT NORTH BAY: Remarks (Mr. *Maclean*) 4353 (ii).
——— O. A. AND P. S. RY. AND C. P. R., CONNECTION AT SCOTIA JUNCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Maclean*) 454 (i).
G. T. R. REGULATIONS: M. (Mr. *Wallace*) to Adjn., 6013 (ii).
GRATUITIES TO RETIRED MILITIA OFFICERS: in Com. of Sup., 6573 (ii).
GRAVENHURST POST OFFICE (ONT.) APPNMT. OF POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 5320 (ii).
——— CHARGES AGAINST: in Com. of Sup., 6716 (ii).
GREEN HOUSE, OTTAWA GROUNDS: in Com. of Sup., 5471 (ii).
——— AMT. (Mr. *Montague*) TO REDUCE VOTE: Neg. (Y. 26; N. 31) 5481 (ii).
GRENVILLE CANAL ENLARGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 6552 (ii).

HAGARSVILLE COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS, DEFALCATION: Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 974 (i).
HALIFAX BANKING CO. AND NOVA SCOTIA CENTRAL RY. CO.: in Com. of Sup., 7807 (ii)
HALIFAX DRILL SHED: in Com. of Sup., 5071, 7586.
HALIFAX, ST. JOHN AND YARMOUTH MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 6687 (ii).
HALSTEAD, MR. FREEMAN, SENTENCED AT PORTO RICO, PAR. IN TORONTO *World*: Remarks (Mr. *Henderson*) 6028 (ii).
Hamilton and Lake Erie Power Co.'s B. No. 100 (Mr. *MacPherson*). 1°*, 2430; 2°*, 2560; in Com., and 3°*, 3554 (i); Sen. Amts., 4606 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, c. 104.)
HANSARD, COST FROM 1890 TO 1897: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Ellis*) 505 (i).
——— REPORTERS, AMOUNT DUE FROM COMMISSION ON LIQUOR TRAFFIC: in Com. of Sup., 7093 (ii).
HARBOURS AND RIVERS, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 6064.
——— GENERALLY: in Com. of Sup., 6066 (ii).
——— MAR. PROVS.: in Com. of Sup., 5642 (ii).
——— N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 5612, 7589 (ii).
——— ONT.: in Com. of Sup., 5067, 5886 (ii).
——— P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 5630 (ii).
——— QUE.: in Com. of Sup., 5050 (ii).
HARRIS, W. C., PAYMENT FOR PROFESSIONAL SERVICES: in Com. of Sup., 7243 (ii).
HAWAIIAN VESSELS, NAVIGATING CANADIAN WATERS: Ques. (Mr. *Domville*) 603 (i).
HEATING, DOM. BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 5608.
HICKS, WM., APPNMT. AS FISHERY OVERSEER: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3658 (i).
——— DISMISSAL: in Com. of Sup., 5275 (ii).
HIGH COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 4560, 4561, 4575 (ii).
HILLSBORO', CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, DISMISSAL: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *McInerney*) 1838 (i).

HOGAN AND ONDERDONK, SOULANGES CANAL CONTRACTORS: in Com. of Sup., 6510 (ii).

Holidays Act Amt. B. No. 9 (Mr. *Penny*). 1°, 270 (i).

HONEY LOCUST PLANT AND SAN JOSÉ SCALE ACT: M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *MacLaren*) 6965 (ii).

HORSES FOR FEEDING, LICENSES BY FARMERS: Ques. (Mr. *McCleary*) 2343 (i).

HOUDE, CHAS. E., DISMISSAL BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 7686 (ii).

HOUSE OF COMMONS:

ADDRESS TO HIS EX., CONSDN.: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 4 (i).
—— REPLY, MESS. FROM HIS EX.: Read (Mr. *Speaker*) 936 (i).
—— DEPARTURE OF HIS EX. FROM CANADA: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 7379 (ii).
ADJOURNMENT FOR ASH WEDNESDAY (M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 903 (i).
—— EASTER: M. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 3095 (i).
—— Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2929 (i).
—— Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 2848 (i).
—— QUEEN'S BIRTHDAY: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 5930 (ii).
BAGOT, ELECTORAL DISTRICT, ISSUE OF WRIT: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 4350, 4449, 4602 (ii).
—— (Mr. *Speaker*) 3924 (i).
—— Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 4927 (ii).
—— NOTIFICATION (Mr. *Bergeron*) 3825 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. *Speaker*) 3825 (i).
—— VACANCY: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 4772 (ii).
BILLS, FRENCH TRANSLATION: Remarks (Mr. *Speaker*) 3084 (i).
—— PRESENTATION, REMARKS AS TO SECONDERS: (Mr. *Speaker*) 671 (i).
—— Royal Assent, 2089 (i).
BRANDON ELECTORAL DISTRICT, MR. MCCARTHY'S CANDIDATURE: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 4610 (ii).
BRUNEAU, MR., M.P. FOR RICHELIEU, ALLEGED RESIGNATION: prop. Res., (Mr. *Marcotte*) 2037; Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 2038, 2083; (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 2038 (i).
BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE, MORNING SITTINGS: M. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 6109, 6237, 6329 (ii).
—— MOTIONS FOR RETURNS: Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 2820 (i).
—— PRECEDENCE: Notices of M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1840 (i).
—— MONDAYS: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 5012 (ii).
—— MONDAYS, WEDNESDAYS AND THURSDAYS, TUESDAYS AND FRIDAYS: Notices of M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1840 (i).
—— THURSDAYS: Notice of M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 2521 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 3821 (i) 5787, 5937, 5115, 5885, 6029, 7525 (ii).
—— SITTINGS OF COMMITTEES: Remarks (Mr. *Sutherland*) 6227, 6318 (ii).
—— SITTINGS OF THE HSE.: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 6862 (ii).
CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS, JUDGES' REP.; Read (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).
DEBATES, OFFICIAL: in Com. of Sup., 7011 (ii).
—— OMISSION OF QUESTION FROM *Hansard*: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *McDougall*) 3425 (i).
—— REPORTING AND PUBLISHING, COST, &C., RET,: Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 3924 (i).

HOUSE OF COMMONS—*Con.*

DISMISSALS BY GOVT.: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *McDougall*) 5519, 5569 (ii).
GLADSTONE, RT. HON. W. E., DECEASE OF: Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 5868 (ii).
—— RESOLUTION OF CONDOLENCE: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 6115 (ii).
GOVT. BUSINESS, TWO SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE; Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 6013 (ii).
—— CHANGE OF PROCEDURE ON ORDER PAPER: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 3502 (i).
Hansard, COST FROM 1890 TO 1897: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Ellis*) 505 (i).
HURON, WEST, AND SIMCOE VACANCIES: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 7042 (ii).
INTERNAL ECONOMY COMMISSION, MESSAGE FROM HIS EX.: Presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 405 (i).
MESS. FROM HIS EX.; Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 405, 936, 1466, 2698 (i), 5663, 6439, 7378 (ii).
LALONDE, MESSENGER AND PROVINCIAL ELECTION IN RUSSELL COUNTY: Remarks (Mr. *Wilson*) 909 (i).
LEGISLATION: in Com. of Sup., 5999, 6990, 7011, 7504, 7782 (ii).
LIBRARY OF PARLT., JOINT COM.: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 671 (i).
—— REP. PRESENTED (Mr. *Speaker*) 5 (i).
LORD'S DAY, BETTER OBSERVANCE B. 2, SECTION BEFORE CHAIR: Remarks (Mr. *Deputy Speaker*) 2041 (i).
MCCARTHY, MR., LATE M.P., DECEASED: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 5389 (ii).
MCLELLAN, D., MEMBER FOR WEST PRINCE, P.E I.: Introduced, 4347 (ii).
MANITOBA CLAIMS: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 1030 (i).
—— UNIVERSITY LAND GRANT: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 5571 (ii).
MEMBERS ASKING QUESTION: Remarks (Mr. *Speaker*) 2433 (i).
—— CALLED TO ORDER (Mr. *Speaker*) 437, 613 (i); 4158, 7606 (ii).
—— INTRODUCED: 3, 370 (i); 4347 (ii).
—— NEW: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).
—— REMARKS CHECKED, 4444, 4446, 5013, 5324, 6326, 6320, 6578 (ii).
—— REQUESTED TO WTHDRW. REMARKS (Mr. *Speaker*) 68, 71 (i).
—— SESSIONAL TRUNKS: M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Gibson*) 7047 (ii).
MOTION, NOTICE OF (Mr. *Hughes*): Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 6027 (ii).

NANAIMO ELECTORAL DISTRICT, REPORTED RESIGNATION OF MEMBER: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 4605 (ii).

ORDER, QUESTION OF, ON CHAIRMAN'S RULING (Mr. *Casey*) 71 (i).
—— WILLIAMS, W. W., DISMISSAL (Mr. *Speaker*) 3424 (i).

PARLIAMENT, OPENING: Mess. by Black Rod 1 (i).
—— PROROGATION, COMMUNICATION FROM GOV. GEN.'S SEC.: Read (Mr. *Speaker*) 7818 (ii).
PERRY, MR., LATE M.P., DECEASED: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 937 (i).
PRIVATE BILLS, PETS.: M. (Mr. *Scriver*) 970 (i).
—— LEGISLATION: M. to Proceed (Mr. *Belcourt*) 7466 (ii).
—— M. (Mr. *Sutherland*) 7042 (ii).
—— ORDER OF PROCEDURE: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 7586 (ii).

HOUSE OF COMMONS—*Con.*
PRIVILEGE, QUES. OF, PAR. IN MONTREAL *Witness* (Mr. *Craig*) 3503 (i).
—— PRESS REPRESENTATIVES AND MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT: M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to Adjn., 5118 (ii).
—— STIMULANTS IN CHAMBER DURING DEBATE: Explanation (Mr. *Talbot*) 3637 (i).
PROCEDURE, QUES. OF, ON 3° OF BILL: Remarks (Mr. *Speaker*) 2647; Ruling, 2659; Stmnt. read, 3095.
PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COM., ORGANIZATION: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 2517, 2528 (i).
QUESTIONS PUT BY MEMBERS: Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 459 (i).
—— RULED OUT OF ORDER (Mr. *Speaker*) 602 (i).
RETURNS, INQUIRY FOR, 5931 (ii).
—— (Mr. *Bergeron*) 3713 (i); 4348 (ii).
—— (Mr. *Davis*) 4774 (ii).
—— (Mr. *Foster*) 6028 (ii).
—— (Mr. *Gillies*) 5923 (ii).
—— (Mr. *LaRivière*) 1030 (i); 5571 (ii).
—— (Mr. *McDougall*) 5930, 5931 (ii).
—— (Mr. *Martin*) 3427 (i); 7526 (ii).
—— (Mr. *Mills*) 5321 (ii).
—— (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 4348, 6028 (ii).
—— (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 5571 (ii).
ROYAL ASSENT TO BILLS, COM. FROM GOV. GEN.'S SEC: Read (Mr. *Speaker*) 2089 (i).
SASKATCHEWAN RY. AND MINING CO.'S PET. REF. TO STANDING ORDERS: M. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 3924 (i).
SESSIONAL AND EXTRA CLERKS: in Com. of Sup., 5999, 6490, 7011 (ii).
—— INDEMNITY TO MEMBERS: Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*) 7382 (ii).
SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 6862 (ii).
SPEECH FROM THE THRONE: Rep. (Mr. *Speaker*) 3 (i).
TRUNKS FOR MEMBERS: M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Gibson*) 7047 (ii).
VACANCIES: Notifications (Mr. *Speaker*) 2, 1079 (i).
VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS, RECORD OF VOTE, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Ellis*) 2859 (i).
WEST PRINCE, P.E.I., VACANCY, APPNMT. OF RET. OFFICER: Ques. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1481; (Mr. *Montague*) 2040 (i).
—— ISSUE OF WRIT: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1173 (i).
—— Notification (Mr. *Macdonald, P.E.I.*) 1079 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 2241 (i).
WARRANTS FOR WRITS OF ELECTIONS: (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).
HUBERT, MISS, PET. *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Gillies*) 7525.
Hudson's Bay and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. No. 22 (Mr. *Oliver*). 1°*, 743; 2°*, 824; in Com. and 3°*, 2122 (i). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 65.)
HUDSON BAY EXPEDITION, COM. WAKEHAM'S REP.: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 1934 (i).
—— JAMES FISHER'S REP.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 2349.
—— PRINTING REPS.: in Com. of Sup., 7092 (ii).
—— REP. OF COMMISSIONER: Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 603 (i).
—— REP. AS TO NAVIGABILITY: Ques. (Mr. *Rutherford*) 975 (i).
HURON, WEST, AND SIMCOE VACANCIES: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 7042 (ii).
HUSSARS, 8TH, CHARGES AGAINST COLONEL: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 6031 (ii).
HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEYS: in Com. of Sup., 5000 (ii).
ILLINOIS NATIONAL GUARDS, PERMISSION TO ENTER CAN.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 599 (i).
IMMIGRATION:
CHINESE IMMIGRATION ACT, ADMINISTRATION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6690 (ii).
DONALDSON, S. J., IMMIGRATION AGENT, N.W.T. AMOUNTS PAID: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 4176 (ii).
GALICIAN SETTLERS IN CAN.: Ques. (Mr. *Maclean*) 6109 (ii).
—— N.W.T., REP. *re* DESTITUTION: Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 101 (i).
—— in Com. of Sup., 6819 (ii).
—— PAR. IN *Nor' Wester re* TREATMENT BY GOVT.: Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 6032 (ii).
IMMIGRATION: in Com. of Sup., 6819, 7287 (ii).
IMMIGRATION AGENTS SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6819, 7287, 7744 (ii).
—— BUILDINGS, DOM., REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 5611 (ii).
IMMIGRANTS, FOREIGN, SETTLED IN CAN.: Ques. (Mr. *Maclean*) 6109 (ii).
IMMIGRATION LITERATURE: Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 6581 (ii).
—— WOMEN DOMESTICS: Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 3369 (i).
—— JAPANESE, IMPOSITION OF POLL TAX: Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 2441; (Mr. *McInnes*) 2528 (i).
JONES, CHARLES A., APPMNT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 4607 (ii).
N.W.T. AND HAND BOOK: M. (Mr. *Davin*) to Adjn., 5932 (ii).
RANKIN, MR., IMMIGRATION AGENT IN KANSAS: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1779 (i).
[*See* "AGRICULTURE, SUPPLY," &C.]
IMPERIAL ARMY SOLDIERS AT TORONTO: Remarks (Mr. *Montague*) 4523 (ii).
IMPORTS, DUTIABLE, AND AMOUNT COLLECTED: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 600 (i).
—— FROM G. B. AND U. S.: Ques. (Mr. *Wallace*) 3936 (ii).
INDIANS:
ABENAKIS INDIANS, ST. FRANCIS AGENCY: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 3408 (i).
BATTLEFORD INDIAN AGENCY, DEATH OF CATTLE: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 2844 (i).
—— INDUSTRIAL SCHOOL: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 1574 (i).
DISTRIBUTION OF SEED, ASSINIBOIA RESERVE: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Davin*) 4678 (ii).
EDWARDS, DR. O. C., INDIAN MEDICAL OFFICER, APPNMT. BY GOVT.: Remarks (Mr. *Davis*) 4607.
ERECTION OF FENCE ON INDIAN RESERVE, ANTIGONISH COUNTY: in Com. of Sup., 7294 (ii).
INDIAN AFFAIRS, MAN. AND N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 6854 (ii).
INDIAN DEPT., LAW CLERK, APPNMT.: Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 7654, 7658 (ii).
INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 4553, 4585, 6848, 7291 (ii).
INDIAN INDUSTRIAL SCHOOL, DUCK LAKE, N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 2346 (i).
—— INSPECTORS, TRAVELLING EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 7303 (ii).
—— LANDS, QU'APPELLE VALLEY, RIGHTS OF SETTLERS: Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 516 (i).
—— RESERVES IN QU'APPELLE DISTRICT: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 451 (i).
—— RESERVES CROPS IN N.W.T.: Remarks (Mr. *Sifton*) 5571 (ii).

INDIANS—*Con.*
INDIAN RESERVE: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 452, 451 (i).
——— SUPPLIES, MAN. AND N. W. T., PURCHASE: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 452 (i).
——— TITLES IN ATHABASCA, MACKENZIE AND YUKON: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 824 (i).
MEDICAL ATTENDANCE, N.B. INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 7298 (ii).
——— N.S. INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 7293 (ii).
MOHAWK INDIANS, WTHDRL. OF GRANT OF MEDICAL SERVICES: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 2817 (i).
MOUNT ELGIN INDIAN SCHOOL: in Com. of Sup., 7754.
——— Ques. (Mr. *Heyd*) 672 (i).
NIXON, THOS., INDIAN PURVEYOR, CLAIMS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7765 (ii).
N.W.T. INDIAN RESERVES, CROPS SEEDED, NUMBER OF ACRES, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Davin*) 1837 (i).
ORTON, DR. GEO., INDIAN AGENT IN MAN., DISMISSAL: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Sproule*) 3669 (i), 5393 (ii).
REGINA INDUSTRIAL SCHOOL, EMPLYMT. OF DR. WILLOUGHBY: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 828 (i).
ST. SULPICE SEMINARY: in Com. of Sup., 7291 (ii).
SURVEY OF INDIAN RESERVES: in Com. of Sup., 6848.
TYANDENAGA INDIANS, MEDICAL ATTENDANCE: in Com. of Sup., 7754 (ii).
VENNER, J. A., RESTIGOUCHE INDIAN AGENT: Remarks (Mr. *McAlister*) 1786 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. *McAlister*) 2839 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *McAlister*) 4611 (ii).
WALTON, T. M., INDIAN AGENT AT PARRY ISLAND, DISMISSAL: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *McCormack*) 3670.
WOOD, W. F., DISMISSAL: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Wallace*) 7526 (ii).
——— in Com. of Sup., 7760 (ii).

Indian Act Amt. B. No. 144 (Mr. *Sifton*) 1°, 5661; 2°, and in Com., 5960; 3°*, 6048 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 34.)

INDIANTOWN BRANCH, I.C.R., CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES: in Com. of Sup., 7078 (ii).

INDIA RUBBER BOOTS AND SHOES: in Com. of Ways and Means, 7583 (ii).

INFANTRY SCHOOLS, FREDERICTON AND LONDON, COST OF LIGHTING: Ques. (Mr. *Ross Robertson*) 7121.

INGONISH WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 7589 (ii).

INLAND REVENUE:
ASHES, GOVT. INSPECTION: Ques. (Mr. *Préfontaine*) 3660 (i).
ELEVATOR MONOPOLY, MAN. AND N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. *Rutherford*) 598 (i).
GRAIN LIENS, MAN. AND N.W.T., LEGISLATION: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1930 (i).
——— STANDARDS, INSPECTION SYSTEM: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1780 (i).
——— TRADE AT FORT WILLIAM; Ques. (Mr. *Douglas*) 475 (i).
INLAND REVENUE DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 4556, 4589, 6978 (ii).
——— REP.: Presented (Sir *Henri Joly de Lotbinière*) 194 (i).
MCNAUGHTON, WM., EMPLYMT. IN INLAND REVENUE, N.S.: Ques. (Mr. *McInerney*) 1931 (i).
TERREBONNE EXCISE DIVISION, PREVOST'S REP., AGAINST COLLECTOR: M. for Copy*, (Mr. *Chauvin*) 1837 (i).
WHEAT GRADED IN ELEVATORS AT FORT WILLIAM: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Richardson*) 2839 (i).

Inland Revenue Act Amt. B. No. 75 (Sir *Henri Joly de Lotbinière*) 1°, 1744; 2°, and in Com., 2139; 3°*, 2141 (i). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 27.)
——— **B. No. 172** (Mr. *Fielding*) 1°*, 7585; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 7786 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 28.)
INSANE ASYLUMS, MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 7305 (ii).
Insolvency B. No. 84 (Mr. *Fortin*) 1°, 2004 (i).
INSOLVENCY BILL, GOVT. LEGISLATION *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Maclean*) 3826 (i).
——— GOVT. MEASURE: Ques. (Mr. *Maclean*) 2848 (i).
——— Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 2925 (i).
INSPECTION OF STAPLES, GRAIN STANDARDS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6695 (ii).
INSURANCE COMPANIES, CHANGES OF LAW GOVERNING, M. (Mr. *Broder*) 5136 (ii).
INTEREST PAID ONT. AND QUE. DURING 1897: Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 455 (i).
INTERIOR:
ALASKAN BOUNDARY DISPUTE, TELEGRAM TO N. Y. PRESS: Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1735 (i).
ASHCROFT, B.C., MINERS' LICENSES ISSUED: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 2847 (i).
BANFF BATHS CARETAKER, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 451 (i).
——— M. for Ret. (Mr. *Davin*) 2841 (i).
BATTLEFORD AGENCY AND GOVT. CATTLE: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 1574 (i).
BOUNDARY BETWEEN CANADA AND ALASKA: Ques. (Mr. *McInnes*) 1076 (i).
C. P. R. LANDS EXEMPT FROM TAXATION: Ques. (Mr. *Jameson*) 1340 (i).
COLONIZATION COMPANIES, GRANTS OF LANDS, CONDITIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Douglas*) 479 (i).
CONNOR, JOHN, GOLD DREDGING LEASES, N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 1074 (i)
DEAF AND DUMB MUTES, N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. *Douglas*) 4345 (ii).
DOMINION LANDS, TENBY, MAN., APPNMT. OF SUB-AGENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 3087 (i).
DREDGING, GOLD LEASES, APPLICATIONS, NAMES, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Foster*) 1838 (i).
DREDGING FOR GOLD IN PEACE RIVER, PERMITS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Maclean*) 478 (i).
DREDGING LEASES ISSUED TO J. A. MERCIER: Ques. (Mr. *Maxwell*) 1934 (i).
——— MILES OF RIVER; Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 1934 (i).
——— REGULATIONS RESPECTING: Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 746 (i).
DROLET, CHEVALIER, DREDGING LEASES: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 671 (i).
——— MINING LEASES: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 4924 (ii).
——— (Mr. *Foster*) 1073 (i).
——— Explanation (Mr. *Sifton*) 831 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Davin*) 2839 (i).
[*See* "YUKON," &c.]
GEORGIAN BAY TIMBER DISTRICT, OUTPUT OF LOGS TO MICHIGAN: Ques. (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 2825 (i).
——— RULING (Mr. *Speaker*) 826 (i).
INTERIOR: in Com. of Sup., 4527, 4551, 7769 (ii).
——— DEPT., DISMISSAL OF EMPLOYEES IN N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 828 (i).
——— DEP. MINISTER, PRESENT OCCUPANT: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 3408 (i).
——— REP.: Presented (Mr. *Sifton*) 3940 (ii).
LAND GRANTS TO MANITOBA AND N.W.T. RY. CORPORATIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 482 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Davin*) 1837 (i).

INTERIOR—*Con.*

—— Reserved for Settlement in Man. and N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 971 (i).

—— Surveys, N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 450 (i).

Manitoba University and Land Grant of Driving Park: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 7124 (ii).

—— M. for O. C.'s* (Mr. *LaRivière*) 3670 (i).

Mercier, J. A., Dredging Leases Issued, Number: Ques. (Mr. *Maxwell*) 1934 (i).

Miners' Free Certificates, Number Issued: Ques. (Mr. *Maclean*) 3311 (i); 5133 (ii).

—— Remarks (Mr. *Hughes*) 4773 (ii).

Mining and Dredging Leases Issued: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 3317 (i); 5322 (ii).

Miners' Licenses, White and Chilkoot Passes: Remarks (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 4701 (ii).

North-west Mounted Police, Number in Territories: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 452 (i).

North-west Territories, Govt. Officials Dismissed since 1896, Names, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Davin*) 4246 (ii).

—— McKay, Thomas, Amount of Timber Dues: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 4176 (ii).

Ontario Lumber Cut: M. (Mr. *Bennett*) to Adjn., 1843 (i).

Regina District Registry Office: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1931 (i); 5319 (ii).

Rothwell's Report *re* Claims of Settlers: Remarks (Mr. *McInnes*) 2851 (i).

Saskatchewan District, Timber Berths held by Moore, McDowell & Co.: Ques (Mr. *Davin*) 481 (i).

School Lands in Man., Sales, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 2432 (i).

Seed Grain, N.W.T., Amount due Settlers: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 5135 (ii).

—— Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 5569 (ii).

Smelting Silver Lead in B.C., Regulations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Earle*) 6012 (ii).

Territorial Exhibition, N.W.T., P. Lamont's Accounts: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 2431 (ii).

—— Miss Cummings' Claims: Ques (Mr. *Davin*) 1789 (i).

—— Outstanding Indebtedness: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 486 (i).

—— Payment for Prizes: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 976.

Timber Berths held by Moore, McDowell & Co.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 481 (i).

Timber Berths in N.W.T. and Yukon: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Foster*) 504 (i).

Timber Dues in N.W.T., Amount due Thos. McKay: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 4176 (ii).

University of Manitoba and Govt. Land Grant: M. for O. C.'s* (Mr. *LaRivière* 3670 (i).

[*See* Manitoba, &c.]

Vancouver Island Railway Belt, Settlers' Claims, Rep. of Mr. Rothwell; Remarks (Mr. *McInnes*) 4453 (ii).

Whisky for the Klondike, SS. "Manaunse's" Cargo: Remarks (Mr. *Guillet*) 1188 (i).

Yukon Route through N.W.T., Plans, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Davin*) 5139 (ii).

[See Yukon, &c.]

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Archibald, Chief Engineer, Dismissal: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1834 (i).

Bain, N., Thompson, R. S., Hoar, Chas., Sutherland, Wm.: Inquiry for Ret. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 4348 (ii).

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—*Con.*

Cape Breton Dismissals: in Com. of Sup., 6414 (ii).

Coal Carried, Amount, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *McInerney*) 4448 (ii).

Coloured Porters, Dismissal by Govt.: M. (Mr. *Campbell*) to Adjn., 3167 (i).

—— Ques. (Mr *Foster*) 3405 (ii).

—— Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 2852 (i).

Dining Cars, Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 2812 (i).

—— on Eastern Extension: Ques. (Mr. *Bell, Pictou*) 2345 (i).

Dismissals. *See* general heading.

Diversion of Route of I.C.R. through Springhill: Ques. (Mr. *Powell*) 1929 (i).

Employees Reinstatement: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 3665 (i).

—— Reduction in Number of Brakesmen: Ques. (Mr. *Bell, Pictou*) 478 (i).

—— Reduction in Passenger and Freight Depts.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 602 (i).

Expenditure for Improvements: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Powell*) 3667 (i).

Farm Gates, Contract, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 2839 (i).

—— Tenders for Construction: Ques. (Mr. *Dechene*) 2819 (i).

Fencing, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6432 (ii).

Fuel Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 3089 (i).

Halifax Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 6382 (ii).

Harris, Mr., Agreement with Govt.: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 5392 (ii).

—— Appnmt. by Govt.: M. for Cor. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 3667 (i).

—— M. for O.C., &c. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 3669.

—— Position, &c.: Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 3166 (i).

—— Tariffs issued since Appnmt.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Foster*) 3669 (i).

Hoar, Chas., Dismissal by Govt: M. for Cor.* (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 1838 (i).

—— Inquiry for Ret. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 4348

Indiantown Branch, Claims for Damages: in Com. of Sup., 7078 (ii).

Investigations, Expenses, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7194 (ii).

Iron Bridges: in Com. of Sup., 6388, 6564 (ii).

Killam's Claims: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *McInerney*) 4683 (ii).

—— Position on I.C.R., 827 (i).

Kirk Estate, Damages by Fire: in Com. of Sup., 7183, 7373 (ii).

Land Damages, Claims, &c.; in Com. of Sup., 7078.

Lowering of Schedule Rates: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 1481 (i).

Lumber Schedules: Remarks (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 2442 (i).

McNeill, Roby, Railway Employee, Dismissal: in Com. of Sup., 6416 (ii).

—— Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 603 (i).

Madame Charon's Horse, Claim, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 3659 (i).

Moncton Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 6368 (ii).

—— Station, Construction: Ques. (Mr. *Powell*) 477 (i).

—— Plumbing and Heating Contracts: Ques. (Mr. *Powell*) 2346 (i).

Montreal Extension, Rental, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6553, 6564 (ii).

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—*Con.*
MONTREAL AGREEMENTS WITH G.T.R. Co.: M. for Ret., 3821 (i).
—— CONTRACT, &c.: Copies Laid on Table, 3821 (i).
PASSENGERS CARRIED FROM LÉVIS: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 3406 (i).
MULGRAVE ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 6428.
MURRAY, J. H., APPNMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 5318 (ii).
NEWS STAND AT LÉVIS STATION, LEASE: Ques. (Mr *Casgrain*) 1338 (i).
NEW TIME TABLE: Remarks (Mr. *Choquette*) 6242 (ii)
ORIGINAL CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 6386 (ii).
PATENT LOCOMOTIVE CYLINDER: Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 1335 (i).
PAYMENTS TO A. KIRK, DAMAGES BY FIRE: in Com. of Sup., 7183, 7373 (ii).
POWLIE, A., CAR INSPECTOR, SPRINGHILL, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Powell*) 1932 (i).
PURCHASE OF LOCOMOTIVES IN U.S, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 476 (i).
REPLACING WOODEN TRESTLES WITH MASONRY: in Com. of Sup., 7085 (ii).
RIVIÈRE DU LOUP, ROADMASTER, COST OF INQUIRY AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Dechene*) 2820 (i).
ROLLING STOCK: in Com. of Sup., 7643 (ii).
ST. MICHEL STATION, COST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3312 (i).
SIMONDS, R. H., DISMISSAL: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Powell*) 2840 (i).
SNOW FENCES (N.S.): in Com. of Sup., 6427 (ii).
STATION ACCOMMODATION GENERALLY: in Com. of Sup., 6433 (ii).
STEWART, A., TANKMAN, SPRINGHILL, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Powell*) 1933, 2342 (i).
SUTHERLAND, WM.: Inquiry for Ret. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 2839 (i), 4348 (ii).
TARIFFS, &c., IN FORCE SINCE MR. HARRIS' APPNMT.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Foster*) 3669 (i).
THOMPSON, R. S., HOAR, CHAS., SUTHERLAND, WM., AND N. BAIN: Inquiry for Ret. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 4242 (ii).
TIES AND LUMBER SUPPLIES, TENDERS: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2840 (i).
—— TENDERS FROM 1896, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Foster*) 3669 (i).
TROIS PISTOLES, GOVT. LANDS, OCCUPATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 4175 (ii).
WESTVILLE, N.S., STATION IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Bell, Pictou*) 2342 (i).
INTERNAL ECONOMY COMMISSION, Mess.: presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 405 (i).
International Radial Ry. Co.'s B. No. 137 (Mr. *MacPherson*). 1°*, 5215; 2°*, 5540; in Com., and 3°*, 6647 (ii). (61-62 *Vic., c.* 66.)
INTERNATIONAL CUSTOMS BUREAU: in Com. of Sup., 6690 (ii).
INVESTIGATION ON GOVT. RYS., EXPENSES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7194 (ii).
IONA WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 7589 (ii).
ISAAC'S HARBOUR, POSTMASTER GRIFFIN, DISMISSAL: M. for Ret. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 1834 (i).
ISLE PERRAULT WHARF, ADDITION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5659 (ii).
JAPANESE IMMIGRATION, IMPOSITION OF TOLL TAX: Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 2441 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. *McInnes*) 2528 (i).
JOHNSTON, J. T., FT. ERIE CUSTOMS OFFICER, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *McCleary*) 4178 (ii).
JONES, MR. C. A., IMMIGRATION AGENT, APPMNT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 4607 (ii).
JUBILEE STAMPS: in Com. of Sup., 4916 (ii).
—— RECEIPTS FROM SALES: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 3405, 3938 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Foster*) 7526 (ii).
Judges of the Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. No. 150 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) Res. prop., 5867; 1°*, 6185; 2°, 6732; 6747; in Com., 6784, 7043; ref. back to Com., 7126; 3°, 7142; Sen. Amts., 7854 (ii). (61-62 *Vic., c.* 52.)
Deb. in Com. on Res. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 6124. 6185; (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 6125, 6137, 6164, 6182; (Mr. *Hughes*) 6127: (Mr. *Wallace*) 6127, 6167; (Mr. *Foster*) 6128: (Mr. *Sproule*) 6128, 6159; Mr. *Monk*) 6130, 6142, 6171; (Mr. *Davin*) 6130; (Mr. *Bergeron*) 6131, 6165, 6183; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 6132; (Mr. *McMullen*) 6152, 6184; (Mr. *Quinn*) 6145, 6180: (Mr. *La Rivière*) 6163; (Mr. *McNeill*) 6173; (Mr. *Angers*) 6175 (ii).
1°, 6185; 2 *m.* (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 6732, 6738 (ii).
Deb. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 6731; (Mr. *Davin*) 6732; (Mr. *Foster*) 6734; (Mr. *Montague*) 6741; (Mr. *Britton*) 6782; (Sir *Louis Davies*) 6752; (Mr. *Casgrain*) 6755; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 6761; (Mr. *McNeill*) 6767; (Mr. *Angers*) 6771; (Mr. *Sword*) 6775; (Mr. *Bergeron*) 6778 (ii).
Deb in Com. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 6784: (Mr. *McNeill*) 6791; (Mr. *Bergeron*) 6795; (Mr. *Britton*) 6786; (Mr. *Campbell*) 6794; (Mr. *Ingram*) 6791; (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 6793; (Mr. *Powell*) 6796; (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 6784; (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 6784.
3° *m.*, 7043; Amt. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 7043 (ii).
Deb. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 7043, 7045; (Mr. *Angers*) 7046; (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 7127 (ii).
JUDGES OF PROVINCIAL COURTS (PENSION) B. prop. Res. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 7127 (ii).
Deb. in Com. (Mr. *Ingram*) 7127, 7134: (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 7127; (Mr. *Montague*) 7128, 7140: (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 7128: (Mr. *Tisdale*) 7130: (Mr. *McNeill*) 7131: (Sir *Louis Davies*) 7132: (Mr. *Clancy*) 7135; (Mr. *Clarke*) 7135: (Mr. *Bergeron*) 7137; (Mr. *Haggart*) 7137; (Mr. *Erb*) 7139; (Mr. *Sproule*) 7140 (ii).
JUDIQUE WHARF, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 5612 (ii).
JUSTICE:
ALIEN LABOUR ACT AND BRITISH COLUMBIA GOVT. ACTION: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 3662 (i).
—— AGENT AT FORT ERIE: Ques (Mr *McCleary*) 4178 (ii).
—— GEORGIAN BAY: Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) 4523, 6240 (ii).
—— HAMILTON: Ques. (Mr. *MacPherson*) 6611 (ii).
—— PARRY SOUND: Remarks (Mr. *McCormick*) 6613 (ii).
—— TORONTO: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 4254, 4349.
—— WALLACEBURG: Remarks (Mr. *Clancy*) 6612.
—— APPNTS. OF OFFICERS IN ONTARIO: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 5317 (ii).
—— ENFORCEMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 5392 (ii).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Wallace*) 3084 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. *Clancy*) 57 9, 5807, 7126 (ii).
—— AT TORONTO: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 5011, 5445.
—— Remarks (Mr. *Wallace*) 5116 (ii).
—— INSTRUCTIONS TO AGENTS: Remarks (Mr. *Montague*) 5518, 6114, 6581 (ii).
—— PROSECUTIONS UNDER: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 474.

JUSTICE—*Con.*

——— Workmen Imported to Toronto: M. (Mr. *Clarke*) to Adjn., 4029 (ii).

Binder Twine, Sale of Govt. Output at Kingston Penitentiary: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3659 (i).

Coulombe *vs.* Queen, Appeal Queen's Bench: M. for Copy* (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1068, 3668 (i).

Chief Justice Supreme Court and Judicial Committee: in Com. of Sup 7089 (ii).

County Court Judges, Age Limit, Cor., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 7124 (ii).

——— Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 6986 (ii).

Court of Appeal, Ontario, Extra Judge: Ques (Mr. *Maclean*) 1071 (i).

Crow's Nest Pass Ry., Death of Employees: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Bell, Pictou*) 3666, 3668 (i).

——— in Com. of Sup., 7110, 7823 (ii).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Bell*) 4608, 5394 (ii).

Dart, Lyman A., Commutation of Death Sentence, Pets. &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. *Borden*) 3669 (i).

——— in Com. of Sup., 6653 (ii).

Dominion General Elections, 1896, Cost, &c., of prosecutions in Man.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Roche*) 2841 (i).

Exchequer Court Travelling Expenses, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6639 (ii).

Fisheries Case, Appeal from Supreme Court Judgment: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3825 (i).

Justice Dept.: in Com. of Sup., 3894 (i); 4582, 6638, 6983 (ii).

——— Agent at Charlottetown, P.E.I.: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 1075 (i).

——— Deputy Minister, Appnmt: Ques (Mr. *Copp*) 3166 (i).

——— Rep.: Presented (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 7009 (ii).

Judges, Increase of Salaries: Remarks (Mr. *Angers*) 7385 (ii).

——— Prov. of Quebec, Reps. from Montreal Bar: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Bergeron*) 505 (i).

Judiciary in N.W.T., Additional Judge: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1775 (i).

——— Yukon Provisional District: in Com. of Sup., 6986 (ii).

Kingston Penitentiary Medical Officer: Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 2846 (i).

Legal Agents in Great Britain, Amounts Paid: Ques. (Mr. *Wallace*) 5135 (ii).

London Election Trial, 1897, Accounts, &c., of Mr. H. H. Robertson: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Calvert*) 3669 (i).

——— in Com. of Sup., 6676 (ii).

——— Inquiry for Ret (Mr. *Calvert*) 4774 (ii).

Macdonald Elections (Man.) Cost of Prosecutions: Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 2349 (i).

Montreal Circuit Court, Extra Judge: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 598 (i).

Nulty's Death Sentence, Pets. for Commutation: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 824 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Dugas*) 4770 (ii).

North Ontario County Elections, Litigation Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 7504 (ii).

Penitentiary Commissioners' Accounts, Stmnt.: Presented (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 7383 (ii).

Penitentiaries, Expenses for Commissions: in Com. of Sup., 6639, 7349 (ii).

Perjury Convictions at Battleford: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1780 (i).

Prendergast, Judge, Commission of Inquiry: Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 1076 (i).

JUSTICE—*Con.*

Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors, Cor. of Min. of Justice *re* Inquiry for Letter Published in Newspaper (Mr. *Craig*) 5321 (ii).

Queen *vs.* Cameron Indictment for Libel, Depositions, &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. *Bostock*) 1827 (i).

Rainy River Judicial District, Appnmt. of Judge: Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) 5011 (ii).

Russell, Charles, Solicitor, Costs, &c., rendered: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2839 (i).

St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary Commissioners' Claims: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 3938 (i).

——— Inquiry for Rep.: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 3940 (i).

——— M. (Mr. *Fortin*) to print, 6607 (ii).

——— in Com. of Sup., 6639 (ii).

——— Revolt of Convicts: Ques. (Mr. *Chauvin*) 1069 (i).

Saskatchewan District. Appnmt. of Judge: Remarks (Mr. *Davis*) 7042 (ii).

Skelton *vs.* Queen, Affidavits, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 6112, 6240, 6317, 6322 (ii).

——— Application for new trial: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 5319 (ii).

——— Postmaster at Battleford: M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Davin*) 5931, 6803 (ii).

——— Personal Explanation (Mr. *Davin*) 6899 (ii).

——— Proceedings, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 5117, 5258 (ii).

Spinks, Judge, Investigation *re*: Remarks (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 3668 (i) 5268 (ii).

Statutes, Revision and Consolidation: Ques. (Mr. *Britton*) 2343 (i).

Superior Court, Magdalen Islands: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 597 (i).

Supreme Court Library: in Com. of Sup., 6638 (ii).

U.S. SS. "Frederick J. Gerring," Supreme Court Judgment: M. for Ret. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 2823 (i).

Weatherbee, Mr. Justice, Absence from Province: Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 3166 (i).

Woods, J. P., ex-Judge, Retiring Allowance: Ques. (Mr. *Erb*) 825 (i).

Yale County Court Judge, Inquiry *re* Judge Spinks: M. for Copy of Rep.* (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 3668 (i), 5268 (ii).

Kaministiquia River: in Com. of Sup., 5067 (ii).

Kaslo-Slocan Ry., Plans, Papers, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Haggart*) 402 (i).

Kelly, Mr. J., Dismissal by Govt.: in Com. of Sup., 5274 (ii).

Kentville P. O.: in Com. of Sup., 5071 (ii).

Kettle River Valley Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 26 (Mr. *Bostock*) 1°*, 744; 2°*, 824; in Com., 2957, 3012, 3357, 3546 (i).

Kildare Postmaster, Dismissal by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. *Dugas*) 1575 (i).

Killam, Mr. A. E., Position on I.C.R.: Ques. (Mr. *McInerney*) 827 (i).

King's Head Light: Ques. (Mr. *Bell, Pictou*) 1932.

——— Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 1929 (i).

Kingston and Pembroke Ry. Co.'s B. No. 69 (Mr. *Britton*) 1°*, 1736; 2°*, 1775 (i); in Com., 4805; 3°*, 4807 (ii). (61-62 *Vic. c.*, 67.)

Kingston Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 5453 (ii).

KINGSTON HARBOUR, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 7242, 7641 (ii).
——— LOCOMOTIVE WORKS AND GANANOQUE DRILL SHED: M. (Mr. *Taylor*) to Adjn., 605 (i).
——— TELEGRAMS *re* ORDER FOR LOCOMOTIVES: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 454 (i).
——— PENITENTIARY COMMISSIONERS' REP.: in Com. of Sup., 7490 (ii).
——— MEDICAL OFFICER APPMNT: Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 2846 (i).
——— MEDICAL SUPERINTENDENT, INCREASE OF SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 7488 (ii).
KING, W. A., STATION AGENT AT ANTIGONISH, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 7120 (ii).
KINROSS (P.E.I.) POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Martin*) 5018 (ii).

Klondike and Dawson City Bank B. No. 117 (Mr. *Morrison*) 1°*, 3502; 2°*, 3657 (i); in Com., 5117; 3°*, 5118 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 105).

Klondike and Peace River Gold Mining Land and Transportation Co.'s B. No. 91 (Mr. *Davis*) 1°*, 2429; 2°*, 2841 (i); in Com., 4168; 3°*, 4174 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 106.)

KLONDIKE DISTRICT, LIQUOR PERMITS: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 2433 (i).
KLONDIKE, EDMONTON AND PRINCE ALBERT ROUTES: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 453 (i).
KLONDIKE RY.: Exploratory Surveys, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6562 (ii).
See "Yukon."
KOOTENAY DISTRICT, POSTAL, &C., FACILITIES *re* TELEGRAM: Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1746.
"LA CANADIENNE," SS., CHARTERED BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 5318 (ii).
L'ANCIENNE-LORETTE POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2821 (i).
LACHINE CANAL, FRANCOIS CORBEIL, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2343 (i).
——— M. for Ret. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2840 (i).
——— DISMISSALS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Gillies*) 4621 (ii).
——— ENLARGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 6551 (ii).
——— ST. PIERRE RIVER, DEEPENING: in Com. of Sup., 6551 (ii).
——— STOREKEEPER, APPLICANTS FOR POSITION: Ques. (Mr. *Quinn*) 456 (i).
LAFRANCE FIRE ENGINE, DUTY, &C., PAID: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 6011 (ii).

Lake Bennett and Klondike Ry. and Tramway Co.'s B. No. 31 (Mr. *Haggart*). 1°*, 903; 2°*, 1018; in Com. and 3°*, 386; Sen. Amts., 2905 (i) 6266 (ii). (61-62 *Vic. c.* 68.)

Lake Champlain and River St. Lawrence Ship Canal Co.'s B. No. 99 (Mr. *Préfontaine*). 1°*, 2430; 2°*, 2698 (i); in Com., 6328, 6934, 7158; 3°*, 7456 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 107).

Lake Erie and Detroit River Ry. Co.'s B. No. 30 (Mr. *McGregor*). 1°*, 902; 2°*, 1018; in Com. and 3°*, 1774 (i). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 69).

Lake Man. Ry. and Canal Co.'s B. No. 66 (Mr. *Jameson*). 1°*, 1736; 2°*, 1775; in Com. and 3°*, 3656 (i); Sen. Amts., 4807 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 70.)

LAKEFIELD AND APSLEY MAIL ROUTE, TENDERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lang*) 4930 (ii).
LAKE MANITOBA, OUTLETS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5928 (ii).
LAKE TEMISCAMINGUE RY. AND RY. ACT: Ques. (Mr. *Poupore*) 2349 (i).
LALONDE, MESSENGER, CANVASSING IN RUSSELL CO. DURING PROVINCIAL ELECTIONS: Remarks (Mr. *Wilson*) 909 (i).
LAMBERT, MR., CARETAKER AT MONTAGUE (P.E.I.) DISMISSAL: in Com. of Sup., 5609 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, King's*) 5787 (ii).
LAND GRANTS TO MAN. AND N.W.T. RY. CORPORATIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 482 (i).
LAND RESERVED FOR SETTLEMENT IN MAN. AND N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 971 (i).
LAND SURVEYS, N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 450 (i).

Land Titles Act (1894) Amt. B. No. 28 (Mr. *Davis*). 1°*, 744 (i).

——— **B. No. 132** (Mr. *Sifton*). 1°, 4683; 2° and in Com., 5957; 3°*, 6048 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 32.)

LANGEVIN BLOCK, FIRE PROOF ATTIC, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 7587 (ii).
LAPRAIRIE ICE PIERS, DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5653 (ii).
L'ARDOISE, BREAKWATER, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5622 (ii).
——— AMOUNT VOTED: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 972 (i).
——— POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Gillies*) 3666 (i).
——— ST. PETER'S, &C., OUTPORTS, MEDICAL AID TO SICK SEAMEN: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 1339 (i).
LAURENTIAN RY., TELEGRAPH REGULATIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Gauthier*) 4923 (ii).
LAVALTRIE MAIL SERVICE, CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Dugas*) 1473 (i).
LAVOIE, DR., APPNMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 7119 (ii).
LAW STAMPS, PRINTING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 7251.
LEEDS CO. POSTAL SERVICE, PETS., &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 4181 (ii).
LEFAIVRE, XAVIER, LOCKMASTER ON LACHINE CANAL, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 3937 (ii).
LEGAL AGENTS, G.B., AMOUNTS PAID: Ques. (Mr. *Wallace*) 5135 (ii).
LEGISLATION: in Com. of Sup., 5999, 6990, 7011, 7504, 7782 (ii).
LEGRIS, NARCISSE, POSTMASTER AT ST. EULALIE, LETTER IN *La Patrie*: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 7688.
LENOIR, MR., FISHERY INSPECTOR AT ISLE MADAME (C.B.) DISMISSAL: in Com. of Sup., 5307 (ii).
LETTER CARRIERS, SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6698 (ii).

Lewes River Tramway Co.'s incorp. B. No. 23 (Mr. *Morrison*). 1°*, 743; 2°*, 824; in Com., and 3°*, 3656 (i); Sen. Amts., 4606 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 73.)

LIBRARY: in Com. of Sup., 5999 (ii).

LIFE SAVING STATIONS: in Com. of Sup., 4953 (ii).

LIEUT.-GOV. N.W.T., APPNMT. OF MEMBER FOR NORTH WELLINGTON: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 101 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 1073 (i).

——— Ques. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 2529 (i).

——— RUMOURED APPNMT. OF MEMBER FOR WEST HURON: Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 2699 (i).

——— CONFIRMATION OF APPMNT.: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 6466 (ii).

LIGHTHOUSES BETWEEN VANCOUVER AND STIKINE RIVER: Ques. (Mr. *Maxwell*) 976 (i).

LIGHTHOUSE SUPPLIES, MONTREAL WEST, CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Maclean*) 2846 (i).

LIGHTHOUSE AND COAST SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 4998, 4999 (ii).

LIGHTHOUSE-KEEPERS, SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4981 (ii).

LINLOFF, EDWARD, APPNMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 5319 (ii).

LIVERPOOL P. O.: in Com. of Sup., 5074 (ii).

LIVINGSTONE COVE: in Com. of Sup., 7633 (ii).

Loan Companies B. No. 164 (Mr. *Fielding*) 1°*, 7086; 2°, dischgd., 7525 (ii).

LOANS TO PUBLIC WORKS DUE THE DOMINION: M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Dobell*) 6239 (ii).

LOBSTER FISHERY IN BAY OF FUNDY: Ques. (Mr. *Copp*) 479 (i).

LOBSTERS, EXTENSION OF CLOSE SEASON: in Com. of Sup., 5280 (ii).

LOBSTER PACKING, SIZE OF CATCH, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bethune*) 1340 (i).

LOCH LEVEN, C.B., POSTMASTER: Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 1776 (i).

LOGS, &C., EXPORT DUTY: Ques. (Mr. *Wallace*) 3085.

London and Lake Huron Ry. Co's B. No. 67 (Mr. *Lister*). 1°*, 1736; 2°*, 1775; in Com., 4072; 3°*, 4074 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 71.)

——— **B. No. 158** (Mr. *Lister*). 1°*, 2°*, in Com. and 3°, 6607 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 72.)

LONDON ELECTIONS, &C., ACCOUNTS RENDERED MR. H. H. ROBERTSON: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Calvert*) 3669 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Calvert*) 477 *i* (ii).

——— in Com. of Sup., 6676 (ii).

LONDON CAMPING GROUND: in Com. of Sup., 7516 (ii).

Lord's Day Observance B. No. 2 (Mr. *Charlton*). 1°, 184; 2° *m.*, 1950; in Com., 1977, 2041; 3 m., 2400; Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) to ref. to Com., 2400; agreed to (Y. 64; N. 58) 2401; in Com., 2401; M. to restore to Order Paper, 2426 (i).

——— Section before Chair: Remarks (Mr. *Deputy Speaker*) 2041 (i).

L'ORIGINAL WHARF, RECONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 5922 (ii).

LOWER L'ARDCISE, POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL: in Com. of Sup., 6707 (ii).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 1069, 1334, 1335 (i).

LUNCHES FOR PRIVY COUNCIL: in Com. of Sup., 4582.

LYNCH, MR., PROMOTION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4855.

LYNCH, PATRICK, POSTMASTER AT CHAPLEAU, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Poupore*) 3088 (i).

MACDONALD, A. L., PEAKES STATION (P.E.I.), POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, King's*) 4344 (ii).

MACDONALD ELECTIONS (MAN.), COST OF PROSECUTIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 2349 (i).

MACKENZIE, LATE ALEXANDER, MONUMENT: in Com. of Sup., 6105 (ii).

MCCALLUM, JOHN, APPNMT. AND DISMISSAL BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 7686 (ii).

MCCARTHY, MR., LATE M.P., DECEASE: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 5389 (ii).

MCEACHREN, MR., NORTH SYDNEY, DISMISSAL: in Com. of Sup., 5608 (ii).

MCKAY, KENNETH, LOCKMAN, ST. PETER'S CANAL, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 1069 (i).

MACKAY'S POINT WHARF, TENDERS FOR BUILDING, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 2815 (i).

MCLELLAN, MR. B. D., MEMBER FOR WEST PRINCE, (P.E.I.), INTRODUCED, 4347 (ii).

MCLEOD, M. G., POSTAL MAIL CLERK, N.S.: M. for O.Cs. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 4181 (ii).

MCNABB, CAMPBELL, CLAIM AGAINST GOVT.: Remarks (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 5446 (ii).

MCNEILL, RORY, SECTION FOREMAN, I.C.R., DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 603 (i).

MCNEILL, MR., CARETAKER, DISMISSAL: in Com. of Sup., 5609 (ii).

MCNAUGHTON, WM., EMPLYMT. IN INLAND REVENUE, N.S.: Ques. (Mr. *McInerney*) 1931 (i).

MAGDALEN ISLANDS WINTER MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 1575 (i).

MAIL CLERKS: in Com. of Sup., 4857 (ii).

MAIL CONTRACTS, N.S., CANCELLATION SINCE 1896: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 4609 (ii).

——— SUBSIDIES AND SS. SUBVENTIONS: in Com. of Sup., 6686, 7282 (ii).

——— *See* "Post Office."

MAJOR GENERAL COMMANDING MILITIA, LETTER READ (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 6320 (ii).

——— Order, Ques. of (Mr. *Foster*) 6464 (ii).

MAJOR'S HILL PARK, STONE FENCE: in Com. of Sup., 5453, 5572, 7588 (ii).

——— GROUNDS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5606 (ii).

MANITOBA:

ALLAIRE, J. P. O., CLAIMS AGAINST GOVERNMENT: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 3661 (i).

BRANDON ELECTORAL DISTRICT, MR. MCCARTHY'S CANDIDATURE: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 4610 (ii).

C.P.R., LANDS EXEMPT FROM TAXATION: Ques. (Mr. *Jameson*) 1340 (i).

CLAIMS AGAINST THE DOMINION: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 1030, 2525 (i).

CORN, FOREIGN, IMPORTS INTO MAN.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 3660 (i).

DOMINION LANDS, TENBY, MAN., APPNMT. OF SUB-AGENT: Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 3087 (i).

ELKHORN POSTMASTER, APPNMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 4771 (ii).

GALICIAN SETTLERS IN CAN.: Ques. (Mr. *Maclean*) 6109 (ii).

MANITOBA—*Con.*

GRAIN TRANSPORT BY C.P.R. AND ELEVATOR COMPANY OF MAN. AND N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. *Richardson*) 483 (i).

HUDSON BAY EXPEDITION, REP. OF COMMISSIONER: Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 603, 2349 (i).

——— COMMANDER WAKEHAM'S REP.: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 1934 (i).

IMMIGRATION OF WOMEN DOMESTICS: Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 3309 (i).

INSANE ASYLUMS: in Com. of Sup., 7345 (ii).

LAKE MANITOBA, OUTLETS: in Com. of Sup., 5928.

MACDONALD ELECTIONS (MAN.) COST OF PROSECUTIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 2349 (i).

MANITOBA PUBLIC BUILDINGS: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 3826 (i).

——— SCHOOLS QUESTION, ADDRESS TO THE HOLY FATHER: M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 5344, 5363, 5411 (ii).

Deb. (Mr. *Wallace*) 5394: Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 5404; (Mr. *Sproule*) 5416; (Mr. *Casey*) 5418; (Mr. *McNeill*) 5431; (Mr. *Gibson*) 5423; (Mr. *McMillan*) 5423; (Mr. *Bourassa*) 5425; (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 5432; (Mr. *LaRivière*) 5436 (ii).

——— COR. BETWEEN MR. CHARLES RUSSELL AND CARDINAL RAMPOLLA: Ques (Mr. *McDougall*) 4924, 7124 (ii).

——— DOCUMENTS PRESENTED AT ROME: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 3165 (i).

——— DOCUMENTS AND COR. WITH ROME: M. for copies (Mr. *McDougall*) 3663 (i).

——— FUND: prop. Res. (Mr. *Fielding*) 4029 (ii).

——— LITIGATION EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 7770.

——— UNIVERSITY AND GOVT. LAND GRANT: M. for O.Cs. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 3670 (i).

——— INQUIRY FOR RET. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 5571 (ii).

——— DRIVING PARK GRANT: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 7124 (ii).

ORTON, DR. GEO., INDIAN AGENT IN MAN., DISMISSAL: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Sproule*) 3669 (i), 5393 (ii).

PAR. IN "LA PATRIE": Ques. of Privilege (Mr. *Bergeron*) 7697, 7715 (ii).

PAR. IN OTTAWA "CITIZEN": Personal Explanation (Mr. *Sproule*) 496 (ii).

PORTAGE LA PRAIRIE P. O.: in Com. of Sup., 5485 (ii).

PRENDERGAST, JUDGE, COMMISSION OF INQUIRY: Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 1076 (i)

PROVENCHER POSTMASTERS, APPNMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 6006 (ii).

SHANNON, THOS., KILLARNEY CUSTOMS OFFICER, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 4770 (ii).

SCHOOL LANDS IN MANITOBA, SALES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 2432 (i).

TENNANT, J. F., CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, MAN., DISMISSAL: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Quinn*) 3670 (i), 4182 (ii).

WHEAT GRADED IN ELEVATORS AT FORT WILLIAM: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Richardson*) 2839 (i).

[*See* "NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES."]

Manitoba Debt. Account B. No. 169 (Mr. *Fielding*). 1°, 7467; 2°, 7571; in Com. and 3°*, 7579 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 4.)

Manitoba School Fund B. No. 168 (Mr. *Fielding*). 1°*, 7466; 2° and in Com., 7571; 3°*, 7655 (ii).

MANN AND MACKENZIE'S CONTRACT, OMISSIONS: Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1078 (i).

MANN AND MACKENZIE'S SLEIGH ROAD, CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 1928 (i).

[*See* "YUKON," &C.]

Manufacturers Guarantee and Accident Ins. Co. Change of Name B. No. 57 (Mr. *Clarke*). 1°*, 1380; 2°*, 1599; in Com. and 3°*, 2957 (i). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 102.)

MARCHILDON, THOS., DISMISSAL, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4991 (ii).

MARGAREE CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 4181 (ii).

——— FISHERY OVERSEER, DISMISSAL: in Com. of Sup., 5271 (ii).

——— PIER, EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 5616 (ii).

——— TELEGRAPH OPERATOR ROSS, DISMISSAL AND APPNMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 2815 (i).

MARIA STREET BRIDGE, OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 6100 (ii).

MARIA (QUE.) WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 7636 (ii).

MARINE:

ARICHAT HARBOUR, BUOYS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 5320 (ii).

ASPY BAY, HARBOUR OF REFUGE, CONSTRUCTION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bethune*) 2819 (i).

ATLANTIC AND PACIFIC COASTING LAWS OF CAN.: M. for Ret.*, (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 504 (i).

BAXTER, WM., LIGHTHOUSE-KEEPER: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 3637 (i).

BEAR RIVER SHIPPING MASTER, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 1071 (i).

——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Mills*) 2840 (i) 4605 (ii).

BEHRING SEA, BRITISH VESSELS SEIZED BY RUSSIA: Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 1072 (i).

CAPE BRETON COUNTY, MARINE DEPT., CHANGES: Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 673 (i).

CAPE NEGRO ISLAND LIGHT, APPNMT. OF KEEPER: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1839, 1929 (i).

COASTING LAWS, ATLANTIC AND PACIFIC: M. for Cor *, (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 2839 (i).

DISMISSALS. *See* general heading.

FISHERY PROTECTION SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 4948 (ii).

GOVT. TOLLS ON WHARFS: Remarks (Mr. *Choquette*) 4351 (ii).

HUDSON BAY EXPEDITION, JAMES FISHER'S REP.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 2349 (i).

——— REP. OF COMMISSIONERS: Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 603 (i).

——— REP. OF COMMANDER WAKEHAM: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 1934 (i).

——— REP. ON NAVIGABILITY: Ques. (Mr. *Rutherford*) 975 (i).

——— PRINTING REPS.: in Com. of Sup., 7092 (ii).

HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEYS; in Com. of Sup., 5900 (ii).

KINGS HEAD LIGHT: Ques. (Mr. *Bell, Pictou*) 1932 (i).

——— Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 1939 (i).

"LA CANADIENNE" SS. CHARTERED BY GOVT,; Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 5318 (ii).

L'ARDOISE, ST. PETERS, &C., OUTPORTS, MEDICAL AID TO SICK SEAMEN: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 1339 (i).

LIGHTHOUSES BETWEEN VANCOUVER AND STIKINE RIVER: Ques. (Mr. *Maxwell*) 976 (i).

——— SUPPLIES, MONTREAL WEST, CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Maclean*) 2846 (i).

MARINE—*Con.*
MARINE AND FISHERIES DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 4558, 4596, 7481 (ii).
—— REP.: PRESENTED (Sir *Louis Davies*) 5 (i).
METEOROLOGICAL SURVEYS: in Com of Sup., 5001 (ii).
MARINE HOSPITALS: in Com. of Sup., 5003 (ii).
MIDLAND HARBOUR-MASTER, APPNMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 3662 (i).
"MUDLARK," DREDGE, WORKING HOURS: Ques. (Mr. *McInnes*) 3825 (i).
MURRAY RIVER, P.E.I., SHIPPING ACCOMMODATION: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 3823 (i).
PALMER'S POINT LIGHTHOUSE-KEEPER: M. for Cor.*, (Mr. *Foster*) 504 (i).
PARRY SOUND HARBOUR-MASTER; Ques. (Mr. *McCormack*) 5135 (ii).
PILOTAGE INVESTIGATION AT ST. JOHN, N.B: Ques. (Mr. *Ellis*) 825 (i).
POINT JÉRÔME LIGHT-KEEPER, APPNMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 5320 (i).
POUND NET LICENSES, LAKE SUPERIOR: M. for Cor.*, (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 3670 (i).
—— NORTH SHORE LAKE HURON: Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 3657 (i).
"PRINCE EDWARD," DREDGE, CARETAKERS AND EMPLOYEES, &C.: M. for Ret.*, (Mr. *Macdonald, King's*) 2841 (i), 7526 (ii).
—— NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, King's*) 2345 (i).
P.E.I. AND MAINLAND, WINTER COMMUNICATION; Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 1778 (i).
RACINE FISHERY AND RIPARIAN OWNER, LICENSES, &C.: Ques. (Mr *Foster*) 4772 (ii).
RECIPROCITY IN WRECKING, CAN. AND U.S.: Remarks (Mr. *Britton*) 6612 (ii).
REWARDS FOR SAVING LIFE.: in Com. of Sup., 4952 (ii).
ST. LAWRENCE CHANNEL, PLACING OF BUOYS, CONTRACTS: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 4180 (ii).
—— Remarks (Mr. *Bergeron*) 3318 (i).
"STANLEY," REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 7383.
STATIONARY ENGINEERS, EXAMINATION BILL, PROP. INTRODUCTION: Remarks (Mr. *Sutherland*) 2799.
STEAMBOAT INSPECTION, REMISSION OF PENALTIES: Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 2344 (i).
STORM SIGNALS, C.B., NUMBER, &C.; Ques. (Mr. *Bethune*) 7118 (ii).
THESSALON POINT LIGHTHOUSE, TOTAL COST: Ques, (Mr. *Sproule*) 1932 (i).
TIDES AND CURRENTS, REPS. OF SURVEYS: M. for Copies (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 1835 (i).
TRANSPORT OF MERCHANDISE IN U.S. VESSELS: Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 1076 (i).
TORONTO OBSERVATORY: in Com. of Sup, 5002 (ii).
[*See* "FISHERIES," &C.]
MARITIME PROVINCES, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 7242 (ii).
MARYSVILLE (N.B.), P. O.: in Com. of Sup., 5092 (ii).
Masters and Mates (Certificates) of Ships Act Amt. B. No. 37 (Sir *Louis Davies*) 1°, 936; 2°, and in Com., 1860; 3°*, 1863 (i). (61-62 *Vic., c.* 45.)
MATHESON, JOHN D., APPNMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 7121 (ii).
—— DISMISSAL FROM ST. PETER'S CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 7207 (ii).
MEAFORD HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 5927 (ii).
MEDALS FOR MILITIAMEN DURING FENIAN RAID: in Com. of Sup., 7515 (ii).
MEDICAL ATTENDANCE, INDIANS, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 7298 (ii).
—— INDIANS, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7293 (ii).
MEDICINE HAT COURT HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 7589.
MEMBERS ASKING QUESTIONS: Remarks (Mr. *Speaker*) 2433 (i).
—— CALLED TO ORDER (Mr. *Speaker*) 437, 613 (i), 4158, 7606 (ii).
—— INTRODUCED: 3, 270 (i), 4347 (ii).
—— NEW: 2 (i).
—— REMARKS CHECKED: 4444, 4446, 5013, 5324, 6320, 6326, 6578 (ii).
—— REQUESTED TO WTHDRW. REMARKS, 68, 71 (i).
MERCIER, J. A., DREDGING LEASES ISSUED, NUMBER: Ques. (Mr. *Maxwell*) 1934 (i).
—— WILFRID, COMMISSIONER, AMOUNT PAID: Remarks (Mr. *Blair*) 4345 (ii).
MESSAGES FROM HIS EXCELLENCY:
ESTIMATES, THE, 1897-98: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 2698 (i).
—— SUPPL., 1897-98, 5663 (ii).
—— SUPPL., 1898-99, 7378 (ii).
QUEEN'S DIAMOND JUBILEE, ADDRESS, REPLY: Presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1465 (i).
SPEECH FROM THE THRONE, REPLY: Presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 936 (i).
METHEGAN BREAKWATER, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5619.
METEOROLOGICAL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 5001, 7285 (ii).
MIDDLETON P. O. DISTRICT, PET. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 7687 (ii).
MIDLAND HARBOUR-MASTER, APPNMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 3662 (i).
Miles Cañon and White Horse Tramway Co.'s B. No. 35 (Mr. *Bostock*) 1°*, 903; 2°*, 1018; in Com., 3653; 3°*, 3655 (i). (61-62 *Vic., c.* 74.)
MILITIA:
ALDERSHOT (N.S.) MILITARY CAMP SUPPLIES: M. for Ret. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 1785 (i).
AMERICAN CANNED MEATS, CONTRACT WITH CAN. GOVT.: Remarks (Mr. *Quinn*) 5017 (ii).
—— PAR. IN *National Provisioner*: Remarks (Mr. *Quinn*) 3940 (i).
BADDECK DRILL SHED, LAND TITLE: Ques. (Mr. *Bethune*) 1467 (i).
BRIGADE CAMP, THIRD MILITARY DISTRICT: Ques. (Mr. *Guillet*) 5786 (ii).
CANADIAN DEFENCES, IMPROVEMENTS: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2839 (i).
COTÉ DE LEISSE RIFLE RANGE AND FARMERS' GRIEVANCES: Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 6322 (ii).
COTÉ ST. LUC RIFLE RANGES, ACCIDENTAL SHOOTING: Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 5569, 6029 (ii).
DOMVILLE, LT.-COL., M.P., CHARGES AGAINST: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 5393 (ii).
GANANOQUE DRILL SHED, LETTERS OF LT.-GOV. PATTERSON: laid on Table, 5316 (ii).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3318, 3826 (i).
—— M. (Mr. *Taylor*) to Adjn., 5098 (ii).
—— M. for Ret., 3826 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 457 (i).
—— REMOVAL AND NEW SITE: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Taylor*) 1837 (i).

MILITIA—*Con.*

GASCOIGNE, MAJ. GEN., COMMANDING MILITIA, COMMISSION: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 3825 (i).
—— LETTER READ BY PREMIER, 6320 (ii).
—— Order, Ques. of (Mr. *Foster*) 6464 (ii).
—— RESIGNATION: Remarks (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 4167 (ii).
HUSSARS, 8TH, CHARGES AGAINST COLONEL: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 6031 (ii).
ILLINOIS NATIONAL GUARDS, PERMISSION TO ENTER CANADA: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 509 (i).
IMPERIAL ARMY SOLDIERS AT TORONTO: Remarks (Mr. *Montague*) 4523 (ii).
INFANTRY SCHOOLS, FREDERICTON AND LONDON, COST OF LIGHTING: Ques. (Mr. *Ross Robertson*) 7121.
MILITARY COLLEGE, COMMISSIONS GRANTED TO CADETS, 1898-99: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Tyrwhitt*) 2840 (i).
—— EMPLOYEES, SUPPL. RET.: Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 6034 (ii).
MILITARY SCHOOLS, FREDERICTON: in Com. of Sup., 7057 (ii).
MILITIA AND DEFENCE DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 3899 (i); 4585, 6564, 6984, 7056, 7482, 7515 (ii).
—— REP.: Presented (Mr. *Borden, King's*) 2425 (i).
MILITIA, ACTIVE SERVICE, PAYMENTS TO: M. for Reps.* (Mr. *Hughes*) 3670 (i).
—— ANNUAL CAMP DRILL: Remarks (Mr. *Montague*) 5324 (ii).
—— ATTENDANCE AT FUNERALS: in Com. of Sup., 6571 (ii).
—— CAMP AT BEAUHARNOIS: Remarks (Mr. *Bergeron*) 6638 (ii).
—— CLOTHING, CONTRACT SINCE SEPT., 1896: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Monk*) 1838 (i).
—— IN CANADA; MR. MCKING'S REP. *re* CLOTHING: M. for Copy* (Mr. *Belcourt*) 3669 (i).
—— CORPS, ISSUE OF LEE-ENFIELD RIFLES BY MAJ. GEN. GASCOIGNE: M. for Copy* (Mr. *Hughes*) 3670 (i).
—— FORCE, PERMANENT INSPECTION BY GEN. GASCOIGNE: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1782 (i).
—— GENERAL ORDERS: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1782 (i).
—— QUALIFICATIONS OF OFFICERS: Ques. (Mr. *Tyrwhitt*) 7124 (ii).
—— GRATUITIES: in Com. of Sup., 7517 (ii).
HARNESS AND SADDLERY, CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1470 (i).
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Monk*) 1839 (i).
—— INSPECTION, RECOMMENDATION, &C.: M. for Reps.* (Mr. *Hughes*) 3670 (i).
—— NAVAL CORPS, ESTABLISHMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Britton*) 3085 (i).
—— PROMOTIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 2433 (i).
MONTENAL DRILL SHED, REPAIRS EXECUTED: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Monk*) 1838 (i).
OLIVER MILITARY EQUIPMENT, ADOPTION BY GOVT.: Ques. (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 4345 (ii).
PERMANENT FORCE, OFFICERS APPOINTED BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Ross Robertson*) 7122 (ii).
—— QUALIFICATIONS FOR COMMISSIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Tyrwhitt*) 6010 (ii).
REBELLION LOSSES (1885) DOCUMENTS IN POSSESSION OF GOVT.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Davie*) 4246 (ii).
RIFLE RANGE AT OTTAWA, TARGET PRACTICE: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 6612 (ii).
—— ROCKLIFFE, LAND VALUATOR: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 3408, 3669 (i).
ROGERS, LT.-COL. R. E., RETIREMENT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Guillet*) 5787 (ii).

MILITIA—*Con.*

ROYAL CANADIAN REGIMENT: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 5232 (ii).
—— REPATRIATION: Remarks (Mr. *Hughes*) 6613 (ii).
ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE, AMALGAMATION OF CLASSES: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 973 (i).
ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE, STAFF AND EMPLOYEES: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Tyrwhitt*) 2824 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 5571 (ii).
ST. HELEN'S ISLAND, ALLOTMENT FOR MILITARY PURPOSES: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 456 (i).
SUTTON, LT., INSTRUCTIONS *re* MILITARY COURSE IN ENGLAND: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1782 (i).
VOLUNTEERS OF 1866, MEDALS GRANTED: Remarks (Mr. *Heyd*) 6613 (ii).
YUKON, &C, MILITARY FORCE, COST, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 4694 (ii).
—— TRANSPORTATION OF SUPPLIES: in Com. of Sup., 7793 (ii).
[*See* "Yukon," &c.]

Militia Act Amt. B. No. 140 (Mr. *Borden, King's*). 1°*, 5331; 2° and in Com., 5965; 3°*, 5966 (ii). (61-62 *Vic., c.* 19.)

Militia Force, Land Grants B. No. 133 (Mr. *Sifton*). 1°, 4683; 2° and in Com., 5960; 3°*, 6048 (ii). (61-62 *Vic., c.* 13.)

MILITIA POINT, N.S., MAIL CARRIER, AMOUNT PAID: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 3310 (i).
—— APPNMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 3310 (i).
MINER'S FREE CERTIFICATES, NUMBER ISSUED: Ques. (Mr. *Maclean*) 3311 (i).
—— LICENSES ISSUED: Remarks (Mr. *Hughes*) 4773.
—— Ques. (Mr. *Maclean*) 5133 (ii).
—— WHITE AND CHILCOOT PASSES: Remarks (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 4601 (ii).
MINING AND DREDGING LEASES ISSUED: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 3317 (i).
—— inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Foster*) 5322 (ii).
[*See* "Yukon."]
MINISTERS, DEPUTIES AND CLERKS, AMOUNTS PAID FOR EXTRA SERVICE, 1890 TO 1897: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *McMullen*) 3667 (i).
MINT, ESTABLISHMENT OF: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 1340.

Missaquash Commissioners of Sewers B. No. 103 (Mr. *Logan*). 1°, 2430 (i).

MISTASSINI AND ST. METHODE, PUBLIC WORKS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2822 (i).
—— WHARF, CONSTRUCTION, &C.: M. for Copy of Instructions* (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3668 (i).
MOHAWK INDIANS, WTHDRL. OF GRANT FOR MEDICAL SERVICES: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 2817 (i).
MONCTON (N.B.) STATION ACCOMMODATION, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 7084 (ii).
MONROE, MR., FISHERY INSPECTOR, DISMISSAL: in Com. of Sup., 5310 (ii).
MONTAGUE (P.E.I.) CUSTOMS SUB-COLLECTOR, DISMISSAL: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Macdonald, King's*) 2822.
—— DISMISSAL OF CARETAKER: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, King's*) 5787 (ii).

Montford Colonization Ry. Co., Change of Name B. No. 68 (Mr. *Bourassa*). 1°*, 1736; 2°*, 1775 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 4287 (ii). (61-62 *Vic., c.* 75.)

MONTREAL CIRCUIT COURT, EXTRA JUDGE: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 598 (i).

Montmorency Cotton Mills Co.'s B. No. 102 (Mr. *Penny*). 1°*, 2430; 2°, 3084 (i); in Com., 4174; 3°, 4174 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 108.)

Montreal Harbour Commissioners Loan B. No. 163 (Mr. *Fielding*). 1°*, 2°*, 7011; M. for Com., 7142, 7166; in Com., 7180; 3°*, 7241 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 47.)

Montreal Island Belt Line Ry. Co.'s B. No. 105 (Mr. *Belcourt*). 1°*, 2799; 2°*, 3084 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 4807; Sen. Amts., 5905 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 79.)

Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. No. 104 (Mr. *Belcourt*). 1°*, 2799; 2°*, 3084 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 5363 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 109.)

Montreal and Province Line Ry. Co.'s B. No. 56 (Mr. *Penny*). 1°*, 1380; 2°*, 1509 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 4072 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 77.)

Montreal and Southern Counties Ry. Co.'s B. No. 81 (Mr. *Préfontaine*). 1°*, 1840; 2°*, 1950; in Com. and 3°*, 5827 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 78.)

MONTREAL CUSTOMS HOUSE, DISMISSALS, 1896 TO 1898, NAMES, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Quinn*) 3669.

——— DRILL SHED, REPAIRS EXECUTED: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Monk*) 1838 (i).

MONTREAL AND LAKE ONT. NAVIGATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Maclean*) 6009 (ii).

MONTREAL, OTTAWA AND GEORGIAN BAY CANAL, CONSTRUCTION: M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Poupore*) 6466 (ii).

MONTMAGNY P. O.: in Com. of Sup., 5093 (ii).

MONTREAL P. O.: in Com. of Sup., 7587 (ii).

MONTREAL, QUEBEC AND MANCHESTER MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 7659 (ii).

MONUMENT TO LATE ALEXANDER MACKENZIE: in Com. of Sup., 6105 (ii).

MORIEN, PORT, C.B., BREAKWATER, GOVT. GRANT: Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 4179 (ii).

MORDEN, WHARF, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5615 (ii).

MOTION, NOTICE OF (Mr. *Hughes*): Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 6027 (ii).

MT. ELGIN INSTITUTE, ESTABLISHMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Heyd*) 672 (i).

——— INDIAN SCHOOL: in Com. of Sup., 7754 (ii).

MOUNTED POLICE AND EDMONTON ROUTE TO YUKON: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 1574 (i).

——— TENDER FOR DRUGS: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 2349.

Mounted Police Pension Act Amt. B. No. 13 (Mr. *Davis*) 1°, 271; 2°, and in Com., 2058; 3°*, 2058 (i).

Mounted Police Pensions (1889) Act Amt. B. No. 15 (Mr. *Davin*) 1°*, 3070 (i); 2° m., 4239 (ii).

"MUDLARK," DREDGE, WORKING HOURS: Ques. (Mr. *McInnes*) 3825 (i).

MURRAY CANAL, BRIDGE TENDERS, DISMISSAL: in Com. of Sup., 6554 (ii).

MURRAY CANAL, FLOATING WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 6554 (ii).

MURRAY RIVER (P.E.I.) SHIPPING ACCOMMODATION: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 3823 (i).

Nakusp and Slocan Ry. Co.'s B. No. 52 (Mr. *MacPherson*) 1°*, 1174; 2°*, 1334; in Com., 3868; 3°*, 3868 (i). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 80.)

NANAIMO ELECTORAL DISTRICT, REPORTED RESIGNATION OF MEMBER: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 4605 (ii).

NAPANEE CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, AMOUNT PAID, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 6006 (ii).

——— PUBLIC BUILDING, CARETAKER: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 6008 (ii).

NAPPAN (N.S.) DAIRY STATION, BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 7513 (ii).

NATIONAL ART GALLERY: in Com. of Sup., 6103 (ii).

——— MUSEUM, OTTAWA: Remarks (Mr. *Belcourt*) 5323 (ii).

NAVIGABLE RIVERS, OBSTRUCTIONS: in Com. of Sup., 4964 (ii).

Navigable Waters Protection Act Amt. B. No. 136 (Sir *Louis Davies*) 1°, 4923; 2°, and in Com., 5325; 3°*, 5330 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 41.)

NAVIGATION, OPENING OF CANALS: Remarks (Mr. *Quinn*) 2700 (i).

NEUFRAGE POND, SURVEY: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, King's*) 3166 (i).

NEW BRUNSWICK:

CAMPOBELLO ISLAND, TELEPHONE COMMUNICATION, COST, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 4177 (ii).

CAMPBELLTON WHARF, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 7635 (ii).

CENTRAL RY., N.B., UNPAID ACCOUNTS: in Com. of Sup., 7653 (ii).

CHARLOTTE COUNTY, N.B., TELEGRAPH LINES: in Com. of Sup., 6102 (ii).

CUSTOMS COLLECTOR AT CENTREVILLE, N.B., INVESTIGATION: Ques. (Mr. *Hale*) 830 (i).

DEER ISLAND TELEGRAPH CABLE, SURVEYS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 4177 (ii).

DOMVILLE, LT. COL., M.P., CHARGES AGAINST: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 5393 (ii).

ELGIN, N.B., POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL: M. for Cor. (Mr. *McInerney*) 1837 (i).

EUROPEAN AND AMERICAN RY., SETTLEMENT BETWEEN GOVT. AND E. B. CHANDLER: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *McInerney*) 2841 (i).

HILLSBORO' CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, DISMISSAL; M. for Cor.* (Mr. *McInerney*) 1838 (i).

I. C. R., DIVERSION OF ROUTE THROUGH SPRINGHILL: Ques. (Mr. *Powell*) 1929 (i).

——— KILLAM'S CLAIM: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *McInerney*) 4683 (ii).

——— POSITION ON I.C.R.: Ques. (Mr. *McInerney*) 827 (i).

——— MONCTON RY. STATION ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 6368, 7084 (ii).

——— CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Powell*) 477 (i).

——— PLUMBING AND HEATING CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Powell*) 2346 (i).

——— POWLIE, A., CAR INSPECTOR, SPRINGHILL, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Powell*) 1932 (i).

——— SIMONDS, R. H., DISMISSAL: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Powell*) 2340 (i).

——— STEWART, TANK MAN, SPRINGHILL, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Powell*) 1933, 2342 (i).

NEW BRUNSWICK—*Con.*
LOBSTER FISHERY IN BAY OF FUNDY: Ques. (Mr. *Copp*) 479 (i).
PALMER'S POINT LIGHTHOUSE-KEEPER: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Foster*) 504 (i).
PILOTAGE INVESTIGATION AT ST. JOHN, N.B.: Ques. (Mr. *Ellis*) 825 (i).
ST. JOHN INCREASED ACCOMMODATION, I C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 7645 (ii).
—— MARINE CEMETERY: in Com. of Sup., 7481.
—— QUARANTINE STATION: in Com. of Sup., 7586 (ii).
STEAMSHIP SERVICE, ST. JOHN, &c., TO GREAT BRITAIN: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Foster*) 504 (i).
TOBIQUE RIVER CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 7633 (ii).
VENNER, J. A., INDIAN AGENT AT RESTIGOUCHE, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *McAlister*) 4611 (ii).
—— Remarks (Mr. *McAlister*) 1786 (i).
—— SUSPENSION: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *McAlister*) 2839 (i).
WOOD, H. W., WELSFORD POSTMASTER, N.B., DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 7120 (ii).

NEWFOUNDLAND AND CANADA, NEGOTIATIONS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Roddick*) 5391 (ii).

—— Remarks (Mr. *Roddick*) 4928 (ii).

NEWFOUNDLAND AND CAPE BRETON, MAIL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 7282 (ii).

NEW HARBOUR (N.S.) BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 7590 (ii).

NEWSPAPERS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4581, 4590 (ii).

NEWSPAPER CRITICISMS:
AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENTS, PAR. IN MAN. *Free Press:* Personal Explanation (Mr. *Davin*) 4349.
ALASKAN AND N. W. RY. CO.'S BILL, PAR. IN *Gazette:* Personal Explanation (Mr. *Belcourt*) 6242 (ii).
ALASKAN BOUNDARY DISPUTE, TELEGRAM TO N. Y. PRESS: Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1735 (i).
CANNED GOODS FOR KLONDIKE, PAR. IN *National Provisioner:* Remarks (Mr. *Quinn*) 3940 (i).
CHIGNECTO SHIP RY., PAR IN MONTREAL *Gazette:* Remarks (Mr. *Lister*) 5663 (ii).
FRENCH LANGUAGE IN N.W.T., ARTICLE IN THE *L'Ouest Canadien:* Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 2529 (i).
GALICIAN IMMIGRANTS, PAR. IN *Nor'-Wester re* TREATMENT BY GOVT.; Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 6032 (ii).
HALSTEAD, MR. FREEMAN, SENTENCED AT PORTO RICO, PAR. IN TORONTO *World:* Remarks (Mr. *Henderson*) 6023 (ii).
LEGRIS, NARCISSE, POSTMASTER AT STE. EULALIE, LETTER IN *La Patrie:* Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 7688.
MANITOBA SCHOOLS, PAR. IN OTTAWA *Citizen:* Personal Explanation (Mr. *Sproule*) 5496 (ii).
—— PAR. IN *La Patrie:* Ques. of Priv. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 7697, 7711, 7715 (ii).
PERSONAL EXPLANATION, PAR. IN *La Patrie:* on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 7657 (ii).
PRIVILEGE, QUES. OF, PAR. IN MONTREAL *Witness:* (Mr. *Craig*) 3503 (i).
TARTE, HON. MR., AND THE SENATE, PAR. IN *La Soleil:* Remarks (Mr. *Marcotte*) 3319 (i).
U. S. CUSTOMS DUTIES IN ALASKA, TELEGRAM IN MONTREAL *Gazette:* Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 405 (i).
YUKON PROVISIONAL DISTRICT, PAR. IN OTTAWA *Citizen re* CUSTOMS OFFICIALS: (Mr. *Davin*) 4451.
—— PAR. IN SASKATCHEWAN *Times re* LIQUOR PERMITS: Remarks (Mr. *Davis*) 1174 (i).

Nickel Steel Co.'s B. No. 96 (Mr. *Wood, Hamilton*). 1st*, 2430; 2nd*, 2560: M. for Com., 3554, 3643; ref. back to Com. on Rys., 3653 (i); in Com., 4071; 3rd*, 4071 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 110.)

NIXON, THOS., INDIAN PURVEYOR, CLAIMS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7765 (ii).

NOBLE BROS., ACTION BY GOVT.: in Com. of Sup., 5268 (ii).

—— PAYMENTS TO, BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 5133 (ii).

NOEL, L.P.O., N.W.T., DISMISSAL: Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 6319 (ii).

NORTH BAY WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 5927 (ii).

NORTH CHANNEL, DEEPENING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6535 (ii).

NORTH SYDNEY, EASTERN EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 6386 (ii).

North American Telegraph Co.'s B. 120 (Mr. *Hurley*). 1st*, 3713: 2nd*, 3868 (i); in Com. and 3rd, 5363 (ii).

North Shore Electric Ry. Co.'s B. No. 97 (Mr. *Préfontaine*). 1st*, 2430; 2nd*, 2560 (i); in Com. and 3rd*, 5827; Sen. Amts., 7744, 7788 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 86.)

North-West Irrigation Act Amt. B. No. 146 (Mr. *Sifton*) 1st, 5662; 2nd and in Com., 6123; 3rd*, 6946; Sen. Amts., 7788 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 35.)

North-West Territories Act Amt. B. No. 131 (Mr. *Sifton*). 1st, 4681; 2nd and in Com., 5945; 3rd, 6064 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 5.)

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES:
APPNMTS. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 977 (i).
—— Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 977 (i).
ALIEN LABOUR LAW, ENFORCEMENT IN MAN. AND N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 7275 (ii).
BANFF CAVE AND BASIN, BATHS, CARETAKER, DISMISSAL: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Davin*) 2841 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 451 (i).
BATTLEFORD INDIAN AGENCY, DEATH OF CATTLE: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 1574, 2844 (i).
—— INDUSTRIAL SCHOOL: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 1574.
COLONIZATION COMPANIES GRANTS OF LANDS, CONDITIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Douglas*) 479 (i).
CONNOR, JOHN, GOLD DREDGING LEASES, N.W.T. Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 1074 (i).
CORONERS, N.W.T., STATUS: Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 7855 (ii).
CREAMERIES IN N.W.T., NUMBER OF PATRONS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Davin*) 487, 503 (i).
—— in Com. of Sup., 5994 (ii).
CROW'S NEST PASS RY., AGREEMENT WITH C.P.R.; Ques. (Mr. *McInnes*) 2036 (i).
—— AMOUNTS PAID C.P.R.: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 3405 (i).
—— COMMISSIONER'S REP.: Remarks (Mr. *Ross Robertson*) 6030 (ii).
—— CONSTRUCTION BY COMPANY: Remarks (Mr. *Richardson*) 6240 (ii).
—— DEATH OF EMPLOYEES; M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Bell, Pictou*) 3666, 3668 (i); conc., 7823 (ii).
—— inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Bell, Picton*) 4605, 5394.
—— ENGINEER'S SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 7110, 7181 (ii).
—— EXPENSES OF COMMISSION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7251 (ii).

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES—*Con.*

DAIRYING IN N.W.T., SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Davin*) 504 (i).

DAUNAIS, C. M., EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr, *Davin*) 1928 (i).

DEAF MUTES, PROVISION BY N.W.T. GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1930 (i).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Douglas*) 4345 (ii).

DISMISSALS: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Davin*) 6115, 6317 (ii).

—— *See* general heading.

DONALDSON, S. J., IMMIGRATON AGENT, AMOUNTS PAID: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 4176 (ii).

DREDGING FOR GOLD IN PEACE RIVER, PERMITS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *McLean*) 478 (i).

—— LICENSES, REGULATIONS RESPECTING: Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 746 (i).

—— DROLET, CHEVALIER, MINING LEASES: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 4924 (ii).

EDMONTON RY. BRIDGE, CONTRACTS: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Davin*) 3827 (i) 4773 (ii).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 2528 (i).

—— CONTRACT: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Davin*) 1836 (i).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1341 (i).

—— in Com. of Sup., 6245, 6268; conc., 7822 (ii).

—— FREIGHT RATES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 6010.

—— PENALTIES TO CONTRACTORS: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 5316 (ii).

EDWARDS, DR. O. C., INDIAN MEDICAL OFFICER, APPNMT. BY GOVT.: Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 4607.

ELEVATOR MONOPOLY MAN. AND N. W. T.; Ques. (Mr. *Rutherford*) 598 (i).

FARMERS AND LIBERAL PROMISES: Personal Explanation (Mr. *Oliver*) 2929 (i).

GALICIAN SETTLERS IN N.W.T., REP. *re* DESTITUTION; Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 101 (i).

—— PAR. IN "NOR'-WESTER" *re* TREATMENT BY GOVT.: Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 6052 (ii).

GISBORNE, MR., INSPECTOR OF GOVT., TELEGRAPH LINES, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 5317 (ii).

GOLD PLACER MINING IN N.W.T. AND YUKON: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Foster*) 504 (i).

GRAIN LIENS, MAN. AND N.W.T., LEGISLATION: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1930 (i).

—— STANDARDS INSPECTION SYSTEM: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1780 (i).

—— TRADE AT FORT WILLIAM: Ques. (Mr. *Douglas*) 475 (i).

GOVT. OFFICIALS DISMISSED SINCE 1896, NAMES, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Davin*) 4246 (ii).

GREAT NORTH-WEST CENTRAL RY. CO.'S B. NO. 140: QUES. OF PROCEDURE: Remarks (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 6001; (M.) 6002 (ii).

HORSES IMPORTED FROM U.S.: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 3942 (i).

IMMIGRATION HAND-BOOK: M. (Mr. *Davin*) to Adjn., 5932 (ii).

INDIAN INDUSTRIAL SCHOOL, DUCK LAKE: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 2346 (i).

—— LANDS, QU'APPELLE VALLEY, RIGHTS OF SETTLERS: Remarks (Mr. *Davis*) 516 (i).

—— RESERVES, ASSINIBOIA, DISTRIBUTION OF SEED: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Davis*) 4678 (ii).

—— RESERVES, CROPS IN N.W.T.: Remarks (Mr. *Sifton*) 5571 (ii).

—— NUMBER OF ACRES SEEDED: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Davin*) 1837 (i).

—— RESERVES IN N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 452.

—— QU'APPELLE DISTRICT: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 451.

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES—*Con.*

INDIAN SUPPLIES, MAN. AND N.W.T., PURCHASE: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 452 (i).

—— TITLES IN ATHABASCA, MACKENZIE AND YUKON: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 824 (i).

INDIANS, MAN. AND N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 7301.

INTERIOR DEPT., DISMISSAL OF EMPLOYEES IN N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 828 (i).

JONES, CHARLES A., IMMIGRATION AGENT: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 4607 (ii).

JUDICIARY IN N.W.T., ADDITIONAL JUDGE: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 1775 (i).

KLONDIKE, EDMONTON AND PRINCE ALBERT ROUTES: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 453 (i).

LAND GRANTS TO MAN. AND N.W.T. RY. CORPORATIONS: Ques. (Mr *Charlton*) 482 (i).

LANDS RESERVED FOR SETTLEMENT IN MAN. AND N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 971 (i).

—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Davin*) 1837 (i).

LAND SURVEYS, N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 450 (i),

LIEUT.-GOVERNOR N.W.T., APPNMT. OF MEMBER FOR N. WELLINGTON: Ques, (Mr. *Davin*) 101 (i).

—— RUMOURED APPNMT.: Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 2699 (i).

—— CONFIRMATION OF APPNMT.: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 6466 (ii).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 1073 (i).

—— Ques. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 2529 (i).

MCKAY, THOS., AMOUNT OF TIMBER DUES: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 4176 (ii).

MANITOBA AND NORTH-WESTERN RY. CO.: M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Davis*) 7470 (ii).

MEDICINE HAT COURT HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 7589.

MOUNTED POLICE: in Com. of Sup., 4545, 6856 (ii).

—— CONTRACT FOR SUPPLIES: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 4041 (ii).

—— Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 5116 (ii).

—— DISTRIBUTION IN N.W.T.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Casey*) 3670 (i).

—— DISMISSAL OF DR. BAIN: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 2349 (i).

—— MEDALS: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 451 (i).

—— NUMBER IN TERRITORIES: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 452 (i).

—— PENSIONS: in Com of Sup., 6577 (ii).

—— M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Davin*) 5019 (ii).

—— REPORTED LOSS OF MEN IN YUKON; Remarks (Mr. *Hughes*) 7659 (ii).

—— SUPPLIES, TRANSPORTATION: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 5520 (ii).

—— remarks (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 5497 (ii).

—— TENDER FOR DRUGS: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Davin*) 4246 (ii).

—— WYNDEL. FROM MOOSOMIN: Ques. (Mr. *Douglas*) 3084 (i).

—— YUKON DETACHMENT: Remarks (Mr. *Oliver*) 4453 (ii).

NOEL, L. P. O., DISMISSAL: Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 6319 (ii).

PERJURY CONVICTIONS AT BATTLEFORD: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1780 (i).

PRINCE ALBERT MAIL SERVICE, DELAY IN TRANSMISSION: M. (Mr. *Davis*) to Adjn., 2617 (i).

PUBLIC BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 5499 (i).

RAILWAY RATE WAR AND MAN. SETTLERS: M. (Mr. *Maclean*) to Adjn., 1473 (i).

RANKIN, MR., IMMIGRATION AGENT IN KANSAS: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1779 (i).

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES—*Con.*

REBELLION CLAIMS, N.W.T., APPNMT. OF COMMISSIONER: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 5321 (ii).

—— CLAIMS OF (1885) DOCUMENTS IN POSSESSION OF GOVT.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Davis*) 4246 (ii).

REGINA DISTRICT, REGISTRY OFFICE: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 5319 (ii).

—— INDUSTRIAL SCHOOL, EMPLYMT. OF DR. WILLOUGHBY: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 828 (i).

ROCKY MOUNTAIN PARK, FENCING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7251, 7769 (ii).

ROULEAU P. O., ABOLITION OF: Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 5018 (ii).

SASKATCHEWAN DISTRICT, APPNMT. OF JUDGE: Remarks (Mr. *Davis*) 7042 (ii).

—— TIMBER BERTHS HELD BY MOORE, MCDOWELL & CO.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 481 (i).

SASKATOON BRIDGE: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Davis*) 4774 (ii).

SEED GRAIN, AMOUNT DUE GOVT. BY SETTLERS: Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 5135, 5569 (ii).

SKELTON *vs.* QUEEN, POSTMASTER AT BATTLEFORD: M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Davin*) 6803 (ii).

—— AFFIDAVITS *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 6112, 6240, 6317, 6322 (ii).

—— APPLICATION FOR NEW TRIAL: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 53 9 (ii).

—— PERSONAL EXPLANATION (Mr. *Davin*) 6890 (ii).

—— PROCEEDINGS, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 5117, 5258, 5931 (ii).

SPENCER, WM., EX-POLICEMAN, DISCHARGE: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Davin*) 2840 (i).

—— PENSION: Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 6325 (ii).

TELEGRAPH LINES, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 6316 (ii).

TERRITORIAL EXHIBITION, N.W.T., ACCOUNTS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6995 (ii).

—— MISS CUMMINGS' CLAIMS: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1780 (i).

—— OUTSTANDING INDEBTEDNESS: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 486 (i).

—— PAYMENT OF PRIZES: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 976.

—— P. LAMONT'S ACCOUNT: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 2431 (i).

—— TIMBER BERTHS IN N.W.T. AND YUKON: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Foster*) 504 (i).

[*See* "POST OFFICE," "PUBLIC WORKS," "YUKON," &c.]

NORWOOD, H. H., EMPLMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 7120 (ii).

NOVA SCOTIA:

ADVOCATE HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 7631 (ii).

ALDERSHOT MILITARY CAMP SUPPLIES: M. for Ret. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 1786 (i).

ARICHAT HARBOURS, BUOYS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 5320 (ii).

ASPY BAY, HARBOUR OF REFUGE, CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Bethune*) 2819 (i).

ATLANTIC FISHERIES, U. S. LEGISLATION: Remarks (Mr. *Russell*) 1272 (i).

BADDECK DRILL SHED, LAND TITLE: Ques. (Mr. *Bethune*) 1467 (i).

BEAR RIVER, BRIDGE AT MOUTH, REMOVAL: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Mills*) 2840 (i).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Russell*) 1337 (i).

—— REPORT AS TO CONDITION OF PIERS: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 975 (i).

—— SHIPPING MASTER, APPNMT.: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Mills*) 4605 (ii).

NOVA SCOTIA—*Con.*

BEAR RIVER, DISMISSAL: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Mills*) 2840 (i).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 1071 (i).

BEATONVILLE POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 3824 (i).

BOUNTY TO FISHERMEN, APPLICATION AT GABARUS: Ques. (*Mr. McDougall*) 674 (i).

BURNT CHURCH WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 7636 (ii).

CAMERON, A. F., CUSTOMS OFFICER, SHERBROOKE (N.S.): M. for Ret.* (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 2840.

CAPE BRETON COUNTY DISMISSALS: Remarks (Mr. *McDougall*) 6034, 6321 (ii).

—— MARINE DEPT., CHANGES; Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 673 (i).

—— RAILWAY, "HARD PAN" CLAIMS; Ques. (Mr. *McLennan, Inverness*) 5134 (ii).

CAPE NEGRO ISLAND LIGHT, APPNMT. OF KEEPER: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1839 (i).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Borden. Halifax*) 1929 (i).

CHAPEL COVE, N.S., BREAKWATER, GOVT. AID: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 4345 (ii).

CHETICAMP CUSTOMS COLLECTOR: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 4180 (ii).

CONNORS, D., ANTIGONISH, FIRE CLAIMS: M. for Ret.* (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 1837 (i).

COW BAY BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 7590 (ii).

DALHOUSIE WHARF EXTENSION, IMPROVEMENTS, &c., in Com. of Sup., 7084 (ii).

DART, LYMAN, REMISSION OF DEATH SENTENCE: in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 6653 (ii).

GABARUS BREAKWATER, GRANTS, &c.; Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 4179 (ii).

GRAND NARROWS, GOVT. BLACKSMITH, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 3661 (i).

—— PREVENTIVE OFFICER, DUTIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 1781 (i).

HALIFAX DRILL SHED: in Com. of Sup., 7586 (ii).

HUBERT, MISS, PET. *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Gillies*) 7525.

INDIANTOWN BRANCH RY. CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES: in Com. of Sup., 7078 (ii).

INGONISH WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 7589 (ii).

I. C. R., ARCHIBALD, CHIEF ENGINEER, DISMISSAL: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1834 (i).

—— EASTERN EXTENSION DINING CAR: Ques. (Mr. *Bell, Pictou*) 2345 (i).

—— EMPLOYEES REINSTATED: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 3665 (i).

—— FENCING: in Com. of Sup., 6432 (ii).

—— GRAND NARROWS RESTAURANT: in Com. of Sup., 6438 (ii).

—— HALIFAX, ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 6382 (ii).

—— KIRK ESTATE, DAMAGES BY FIRE: in Com. of Sup., 7183, 7373 (ii).

—— MULGRAVE, ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 6428 (ii).

—— MURRAY, J. H., APPNMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 5318 (ii).

—— PATENT LOCOMOTIVE CYLINDER: Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 1335 (i).

—— PURCHASE OF LOCOMOTIVES IN U.S., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 476 (i).

—— REDUCTION IN NUMBER OF BRAKESMEN: Ques. (Mr. *Bell, Pictou*) 478 (i).

—— WESTVILLE STATION, IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Bell, Pictou*) 2342 (i).

IONA WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 7589 (ii).

NOVA SCOTIA—*Con.*

ISAAC'S HARBOUR, POSTMASTER GRIFFIN'S DISMISSAL: M. for Ret. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 1834 (i).

KING'S HEAD LIGHT: Ques. (Mr. *Bell, Pictou*) 1932.

——— Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 1929 (i).

KING, W. A., ANTIGONISH STATION AGENT. DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 7120 (ii).

L'ARDOISE BREAKWATER, REPAIRS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 972 (i).

——— ST. PETERS, &c., OUTPORTS, MEDICAL AID TO SICK SEAMEN: (Mr. *Gillies*) 133) (i).

——— POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Gillies*) 3666 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 1335 (i).

LINLOFF, EDWARD, APPNMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 5319 (ii).

LIVINGSTONE COVE: in Com. of Sup., 7633 (ii).

LOBSTER PACKING, &c., SIZE OF CATCH: Ques. (Mr. *Bethune*) 1340 (i).

LOCH LOVEN POSTMASTER: Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 1776 (i .

MCKAY, KENNETH, LOCKMAN ST. PETER'S CANAL, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 1070 (i).

MCKAY'S POINT WHARF, TENDERS FOR BUILDING: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 2515 (i).

MCLEOD, M. G., POSTAL MAIL CLERK: M. for O.C.'s (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 4181 (i).

MCNABB, CAMPBELL, CLAIM AGAINST GOVT.: Remarks (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 5446 (ii).

MCNAUGHTON, WM., EMPLYMT. IN INLAND REVENUE: Ques. (Mr. *McInerney*) 1931 (i).

MCNEILL, RORY. SECTION FOREMAN, I.C.R., DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 6 3 (i).

——— in Com. of Sup., 6416 (ii).

MAIL CONTRACTS, CANCELLATION SINCE 1896: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 46 9 (ii).

MARGAREE CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 4181 (ii).

——— TELEGRAPH OPERATOR ROSS, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 2815 (i).

MATHESON, JOHN D., APPNMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 7121 (ii).

MIDDLETON POST OFFICE DISTRICT, PET. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 7687 (i).

MILITIA POINT, MAIL CARRIER. AMOUNT PAID: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 3310 (i).

——— APPNMT. OF POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 3310 (ii).

NAPPAN (N.S.) DAIRY BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 7513 (ii).

NAPANEE CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, AMOUNT PAID, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 6006 (ii).

NORTH SYDNEY, EASTERN EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 6386 (ii).

NOVA SCOTIA SOUTHERN RY. SUBSIDY: Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 7818 (ii).

OAK BAY MILLS P. O., CLOSING, IMPERFECT RET.: Remarks (Mr. *McAlister*) 5324 (ii).

——— INQUIRY FOR RET. (Mr. *McAlister*) 3941, 4928.

——— in Com. of Sup., 6712 (ii).

——— Ques. (Mr. *McAlister*) 3824 (i).

OTTAWA AND TRURO MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 1575 (i).

OXFORD AND NEW GLASGOW RY., LAND DAMAGES: in Com. of Sup., 6385 (i).

OXFORD POSTMASTER, APPNMT.: M. for Cor.* (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 1838 (i).

NOVA SCOTIA—*Con.*

PICTOU POSTMASTER: Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 2619 (i).

PIRATE HARBOUR P. O., CLOSING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 7051 (ii).

PORT HILLFORD BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 7628.

PORT MORIEN, BREAKWATER, GOVT. GRANT: Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 4179 (i).

PORT MULGRAVE STATION AGENT, DISMISSAL: M. for Cor. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 1832 (i).

PORT MULGRAVE AND ST. PETER'S MAIL ROUTE: Remarks (Mr. *Gillies*) 6323 (ii).

ROSS, DAVID, FISHERY OVERSEER AT MARGAREE: M. for Ret.* (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 1837 (i).

RETURNS, INQUIRY FOR (Mr. *Gillies*) 5923 (i).

ST. PETERS CANAL, REPAIRS TO ENTRANCE: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 1339 (i).

STELLARTON CAR INSPECTOR SUTHERLAND, DISMISSAL: M. for Cor. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 1833 (i).

——— M. for Ret.* (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 2839 (i).

STORM SIGNALS, NUMBER, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bethune*) 7118 (ii).

SYDNEY AND NORTH SYDNEY QUARANTINE PHYSICIAN: Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 1781 (i).

TANNER, JOHN E., DETENTION BY SPANISH GOVT. AT PORTO RICO: Ques. (Mr. *Russell*) 6011 (ii).

TELEGRAPH LINES, GOVT. RATES: Ques. (Mr. *Bethune*) 6006 (ii).

TRACADIE (N.B.), ADDITIONAL PURCHASE; in Com. of Sup., 7635 (ii).

TROUT COVE BREAKWATER, REPAIRS: Ques. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 3824 (i).

WALSH, E. J., CLAIM AGAINST LEEWARD ISLANDS: M. for Ret.* (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 2841 (i), 6324 (ii).

WEATHERBEE, MR. JUSTICE, ABSENCE FROM PROVINCE: Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 3166 (i).

WEST INDIAN TRADE, EXTENSION: Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1339 (i).

WINDSOR DRILL SHED: in Com. of Sup., 7214 (ii).

NULTY, THOS., COMMUTATION OF DEATH SENTENCE, Pets. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 824 (i).

——— Pets. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Dugas*) 4770 (ii).

OAK BAY MILLS P. O., CLOSING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6712 (ii).

——— Ques. (Mr. *McAlister*) 3824 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *McAlister*) 3941, 4928 (ii).

——— IMPERFECT RET.: Remarks (Mr. *McAlister*) 5324 (ii).

OATHS OF OFFICE. *See* "ADMINISTRATION."

OCEAN AND RIVER SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 4947, 7731 (ii).

OGILVIE, MR., LECTURE ON THE YUKON: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 307 (i).

——— GRATUITY TO: in Com. of Sup., 7323 (ii).

——— OFFICIAL REP. ON YUKON, CONTRACT FOR PRINTING: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Foster*) 3670 (i).

——— DISTRIBUTION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 4611, 4771 (ii).

——— FRENCH TRANSLATION: Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 1078 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2529 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 604 (i).

OGILVIE, MR. : Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 604 (i).
——— AND HANSARD TRANSLATION : Remarks (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1576 (i).
——— in Com. of Sup., 7323 (ii).
——— PERSONAL EXPLANATION (Mr. *Morrison*) 2849.
——— REPS. SENT FROM YUKON, DATES, &C. ; Ques. (Mr. *McAlister*) 974 (i).
——— Mr., SERVICES SINCE 1898 : Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 3406 (i).

OLIVER MILITARY EQUIPMENT, ADOPTION BY GOVT.: Ques. (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 4345 (ii).

ONTARIO :
ALIEN LABOUR LAW, AGENT AT FORT ERIE: Ques. (Mr. *McCleary*) 4178 (ii).
——— GEORGIAN BAY : Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) 4523.
——— HAMILTON : Ques. (Mr. *MacPherson*) 6611 (ii).
——— PARRY SOUND : Remarks (Mr. *McCormick*) 6613 (ii).
——— WALLACEBURG : Remarks (Mr. *Clancy*) 6612.
——— ENFORCEMENT AT TORONTO : Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 5011, 5445 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Wallace*) 5116 (ii).
——— INSTRUCTIONS TO AGENTS : Remarks (Mr. *Montague*) 6581 (ii).
ALIEN WORKMEN, IMPORTED TO TORONTO : M. (Mr. *Clarke*) to Adjn., 4029 (ii).
ANDERSON, T. E., CUSTOMS COLLECTOR AT NAPANEE, SALARY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 6008 (ii).
ARNPRIOR P. O. INSPECTOR, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 4177 (ii).
——— in Com. of Sup., 5449 (ii).
BATH (ONT.) CUSTOMS OFFICER, APPNMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 6007 (ii)
BAXTER, WM., LIGHTHOUSE-KEEPER : Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 3657 (i).
BELLEVILLE P. O., DISMISSAL : on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Corby*) 6208 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Corby*) 6112 (ii).
BINDER TWINE, SALE OF GOVT. OUTPUT AT KINGSTON PENITENTIARY : Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3659 (i).
BODDY, A., APPNMT. AS FISHERY OVERSEER : Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3657 (i).
CATTLE SHIPMENTS TO BELFAST : Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*) 484 (i).
COBOURG POSTMASTER, ATTENDANCE AT REFORM CONVENTION : Ques. (Mr. *Guillett*) 602 (i).
CORN IMPORTATIONS SINCE 1897 TO 1898 : Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3659 ( ).
CORNWALL CANAL, CONSTRUCTION AMOUNT PAID : Ques. (Mr. *Broder*) 5391 (ii).
COURT OF APPEAL, ONTARIO, EXTRA JUDGE : Ques. (Mr. *Maclean*) 1071 (i).
CRAIGVILLE AND STROUD'S MILLS MAIL SERVICE, TENDERS ; Ques. (Mr. *Tyrwhitt*) 487 (i).
DUNDAS, MR., DISMISSAL BY GOVT.: Remarks (Mr. *Landerkin*) 6578 (ii).
FISHING LICENSES, AMOUNT PAID BY LAKE ERIE FISHERMEN : Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 601 (i).
GALBRAITH, THOS. J., CANAL OFFICER AT PORT COLBORNE, RESIGNATION : Ques. (Mr. *Montague*) 516.
GALOPS CANAL, PURCHASE OF LAND, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Broder*) 3668 (i).
GANANOQUE CUSTOM HOUSE : Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 4923 (ii).
GANANOQUE DRILL SHED, REMOVAL AND NEW SITE, LT.-GOV. PATTERSON'S LETTER : laid on Table (Mr. *Borden, King's*) 5316 (ii).

ONTARIO—*Con.*
GANANOQUE DRILL SHED, REMOVAL AND NEW SITE : Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3826, 3318 (i).
——— M. (Mr. *Taylor*) to Adjn., 5098 (ii).
——— M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Taylor*) 1837 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 457 (i).
GEORGIAN BAY TIMBER DISTRICT, OUTPUT OF LOGS TO MICHIGAN : Ques. (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 825 (i).
——— Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 826 (i)
GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS, PROHIBITION OF SWEATING : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 599 (i).
GRAND RIVER FLOODS : M. (Mr. *Montague*) to Adjn., 2526 (i).
G.T.R., OTTAWA, ARNPRIOR AND PARRY SOUND RY. AND C.P.R CONNECTIONS AT SCOTIA JUNCTION : Ques. (Mr. *Maclean*) 454 (i).
GRAVENHURST P. O., APPNMT. OF POSTMASTER : Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 5320 (ii).
HAGARSVILLE COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS, DEFALCATION : Ques. (Mr. *Somerville*) 474 (i).
HICKS, WM., APPNMT. AS FISHERY OVERSEER : Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3658 (i).
HURON WEST AND SIMCOE VACANCIES : Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 7042 (ii).
IMPERIAL ARMY SOLDIERS AT TORONTO : Remarks (Mr. *Montague*) 4523 (ii).
INFANTRY SCHOOLS, FREDERICTON AND LONDON, COST OF LIGHTING : Ques. (Mr. *Ross Robertson*) 7121.
INTEREST PAID ONTARIO AND QUEBEC DURING 1897 : Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 455 (i).
JOHNSON, J. T., FORT ERIE CUSTOMS OFFICER, DISMISSAL : Ques. (Mr. *McCleary*) 4178 (ii).
KINGSTON, HARBOUR DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 7242, 7641 (ii).
——— LOCOMOTIVE WORKS AND GANANOQUE DRILL SHED : M. (Mr. *Taylor*) to Adjn., 605 (i).
——— TELEGRAM *re* ORDER FOR LOCOMOTIVES : Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 484 (i).
——— PENITENTIARY, MEDICAL OFFICER : Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 2846 (i).
LAKEFIELD AND APSLEY MAIL ROUTE, TENDERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lang*) 4930 (ii).
LOGS, &C., EXPORT DUTY : Ques. (Mr. *Wallace*) 3085.
LONDON ELECTION TRIAL, 1897, ACCOUNTS RENDERED MR. H. H. ROBERTSON : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Calvert*) 3669 (i).
LUMBER CUT : M. (Mr. *Bennett*) to Adjn., 1843 (i).
LYNCH, PATRICK, POSTMASTER AT CHAPLEAU, DISMISSAL : Ques. (Mr. *Poupore*) 3088 (i).
MEAFORD HARBOUR : in Com. of Sup., 5927 (ii).
MIDLAND HARBOUR-MASTER, APPNMT. : Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 3662 (i).
MOHAWK INDIANS, WTHDRL. OF GRANT FOR MEDICAL SERVICES : Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 2817 (i).
MONTREAL AND LAKE ONTARIO NAVIGATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Maclean*) 6009 (ii).
MT. ELGIN INSTITUTE, ESTABLISHMENT : Ques. (Mr. *Heyd*) 672 (i).
NAPANEE PUBLIC BUILDINGS, CARETAKER : Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 6008 (ii).
NORTH BAY WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 5927 (ii).
ONTARIO COUNTY ELECTIONS, LITIGATION EXPENSES : in Com. of Sup., 7504 (ii).
ORTON, DR. INDIAN MEDICAL SUPT., DISMISSAL ; Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 3669 (i) 5393 (ii).
OTONABEE RIVER FLOODS, INVESTIGATION AS TO CAUSE : Ques. (Mr. *Lang*) 483 (i).
OTTAWA GROUNDS, REMOVAL OF SHEDS, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 5471 (ii).

ONTARIO—*Con.*

PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, ASPHALT SIDEWALKS, CONTRACTOR: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 487 (i).

PARRY SOUND HARBOUR-MASTER: Ques. (Mr. *McCormick*) 5135 (ii).

PETERBOROUGH DRILL SHED, TENDERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lang*) 5132 (ii).

PORT STANLEY HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 5926-7 (ii).

POST OFFICES CLOSED SINCE JULY, 1896; Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3936 (i).

POUND NET LICENSES, NORTH SHORE LAKE HURON: Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 3657 (i).

QUEEN VICTORIA PARK, NIAGARA FALLS: Ques. (Mr. *McCleary*) 2847 (i).

RAINY RIVER JUDICIAL DISTRICT, APPNMT. OF JUDGE: Remarks. (Mr. *Bennett*) 5011 (ii).

RAT PORTAGE PUBLIC BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 7588 (ii).

ROBERT, H. A., STRATFORD P. O. CLOCK CARETAKER, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Maclaren*) 4344 (ii).

ROCKLIFFE RIFLE RANGE, LAND VALUATOR: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 3408 (i).

ROGERS, LT. COL. R. Z., RETIREMENT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Guillet*) 5757 (ii).

ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE, STAFF AND EMPLOYEES: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Tyrwhitt*) 2824 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 5571 (ii).

ST. LAWRENCE CHANNEL, PLACING OF BUOYS, CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 4180 (ii).

ST. THOMAS MAIL SERVICE, TENDERS AND CONTRACTS: Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 453 (i).

SAULT STE. MARIE WHARFINGER, BALANCE OF SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 7096 (ii).

SEELEY'S BAY POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL OF W. W. WILLIAMS: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3407 (i).

——— M. (Mr. *Taylor*) to Adjn., 3409, 3416 (i).

SHERIDAN, JOHN, INSPECTOR OF LIVE STOCK, APPNMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 6010 (ii).

THESSALON POINT LIGHTHOUSE, TOTAL COST; Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 1932 (i).

TORONTO HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS, AMOUNTS PAID W. E. PHIN: Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 1337 (i).

——— CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 4771 (ii).

——— EXPENDITURE: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 482 (i).

——— LIABILITY INCURRED: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 971.

——— in Com. of Sup., 5891, 7231 (ii).

TORONTO OBSERVATORY: in Com. of Sup., 5002, 7284.

TORONTO PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 5448, 7217 (ii).

TRENT VALLEY CANAL, GOVT. AID: Ques. (Mr. *Corby*) 2817 (i).

VOTERS' LISTS (ONT.) REVISING OFFICERS, COST OF PRINTING, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2845 (i).

WALTON, T. M., INDIAN AGENT AT PARRY ISLAND, DISMISSAL: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *McCormack*) 3670.

WAVERLEY POSTMASTER, REMOVAL; Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 598 (i).

WELLAND CANAL, EMPLOYEES DISMISSED, NAMES, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Montague*) 2839 (i).

——— in Com. of Sup., 7652 (i).

WILLIAMS, W. W., POSTMASTER AT SEELEY'S BAY, DISMISSAL: M. (Mr. *Taylor*) to Adjn., 3409, 3416.

——— Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3407 (i).

WOODS, J. P., EX-JUDGE, RETIRING ALLOWANCE: Ques. (Mr. *Erb*) 825 (i).

WYEBRIDGE-WYEVALE POSTAL SERVICE; Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 598 (i).

Ontario and Quebec Bridge Co.'s incorp. B. No. 25 (Mr. *Belcourt*) 1°*, 744; 2°*, 824 (i).

ONTARIO AND QUEBEC, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 7243 (ii).

Ontario and Rainy River Ry. Co.'s B. No. 32 (Mr. *Tisdale*) 1°*, 903; 2°*, 1018; recom. to Com. on Rys., 1774; in Com., 2123; M. for Com., 2386, 2560, 2606; in Com., 2619; 3°, 2697 (i). Amt. (Mr. *Maclean*) Neg. (Y. 16, N. 65) 2697. (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 81.)

ORDER, QUES. OF (Mr. *Montague*): in Com. of Sup., 4891 (ii).

——— ON CHAIRMAN'S RULING (Mr. *Casey*) 71 (i).

——— W. W. WILLIAMS' DISMISSAL: Remarks (Mr. *Speaker*) 3424 (i).

ORTON, DR. GEO., INDIAN MEDICAL SUPT. IN MAN., DISMISSAL: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Sproule*) 3669 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 5393 (ii).

OTONABEE RIVER FLOODS, INVESTIGATION AS TO CAUSE: Ques (Mr. *Lang*) 483 (i).

OTTAWA, DEPTL. WESTERN BLOCK: in Com. of Sup., 5069 (ii).

——— BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 7588 (ii).

OTTAWA AND GEORGIAN BAY CANAL: M. for Sel. Com. (Mr. *Belcourt*) 3664 (i).

OTTAWA GROUNDS, REMOVAL OF SHEDS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5471 (ii).

Ottawa Interprovincial Bridge Co.'s B. No. 125 (Mr. *Belcourt*) 1°*, 4448; 2°*, 4808; in Com., and 3°*, 6647 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 112.)

Ottawa, Montreal and James Bay Ry. Co.'s B. No. 50 (Mr. *Fraser, Guysboro'*) 1°*, 1068; 2°*, 1214 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 4072 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 76.)

Ottawa and New York Ry. Co.'s B. No. 80 (Mr. *Belcourt*) 1°*, 1839; 2°*, 1949 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 4072 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 82.)

OTTAWA RIVER STEAMBOAT CHANNEL: conc., 7819 (ii).

OTTAWA SUMMER HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 7218 (ii).

OTTAWA AND TRURO (N.S.) MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 1575 (i).

OWEN SOUND HARBOUR, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 5389 (ii).

OXFORD AND NEW GLASGOW RY., LAND DAMAGES: in Com. of Sup., 6385 (ii).

OXFORD, N. S., POSTMASTER, APPNMT.: M. for Cor.* (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 1838 (i).

OYSTER FISHERIES, LEASES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Yeo*) 1775 (i).

OYSTER CULTURE: in Com. of Sup., 5314 (ii).

PACIFIC CABLE, CANADA AND AUSTRALIA: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Casey*) 5232 (ii).

——— M. (Mr. *Casey*) for Com. of Sup., 6186 (ii).

——— Deb. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 6192; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 6197; (Mr. *McNeill*) 6199; Mr. *Wallace*) 6201 (ii).

——— M. (Mr. *Casey*) to print papers, 6226 (ii).

——— Remarks (Mr. *McNeill*) 7125, 7384 (ii).

Pacific and Canadian Yukon Ry., Nav. and Mining Co.'s B. No. 33 (Mr. *Tisdale*) 1°*, 903; 2°*, 1018; wthdn., 3404 (i).

Pacific and Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 40 (Mr. *Fraser, Guysboro'*) 1°*, 970; 2°*, 1214; wthdn., 3713 (i).

Pacific and Yukon Ry., Nav., Trading and Mining Co.'s B. No. 151 (Mr. *Rosamond*) 1°*, 6227; 2°*, and ref. to Com. on Rys., 6334 (ii).

PALMER, BENJAMIN, DISMISSAL: in Com. of Sup., 4981 (ii).

PALMER'S POINT LIGHTHOUSE-KEEPER: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Foster*) 594 (i).

PARIS EXHIBITION, 1900, PREPARATION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5039 (ii).

PARLIAMENT GROUNDS, CONTRACT FOR ASPHALT SIDEWALKS: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 487 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1783 (i).

——— DISMISSAL OF LATE SUPT. ROBERTSON: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 2818 (i).

——— SIDEWALKS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5470 (ii).

"PARLIAMENTARY COMPANION," PURCHASE OF COPIES BY GOVT.: in Com. of Sup., 6975 (ii).

PARLIAMENT, OPENING: Mess. by Black Rod, 1 (i).

——— PROROGATION: 7885 (ii).

PARRY SOUND HARBOUR: Ques. (Mr. *McCormick*) 5135 (ii).

PATENTS, CANADIAN AND U.S., CLASSIFICATION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7512 (ii).

"PATENT RECORD": in Com. of Sup., 5023 (ii).

PEAKES STATION, P.E.I., DISMISSAL OF POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, King's*) 4344 (ii).

PENITENTIARIES: in Com. of Sup., 3899 (i), 6639 (ii).

——— COMMISSIONERS' REPS.: in Com. of Sup., 7490.

——— EXPENSES OF COMMISSIONS: in Com. of Sup., 7339 (ii).

——— COMMISSIONERS ACCOUNTS, STMNT.: Presented (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 7383 (ii).

PERJURY CONVICTIONS AT BATTLEFORD: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1780 (i).

PERMANENT FORCE, OFFICERS APPOINTED BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Ross Robertson*) 7122 (ii).

——— QUALIFICATIONS FOR COMMISSIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Tyrwhitt*) 6010 (ii).

PERRY, MR. S. F., LATE M.P., DECEASE: Remarks: (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 937 (i).

PERSONAL EXPLANATION *re* EXPERIMENTAL FARMS: (Mr. *McMillan*) 6113 (ii).

——— PAR. IN *Gazette re* ALASKAN AND N.W. RY. CO.'S BILL (MR. *Belcourt*) 6242 (ii).

——— PAR. IN *La Patrie*: M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 7657 (ii).

——— MISQUOTATION OF QUOTATION: Remarks (Mr. *McNeill*) 518 (i).

——— *See* "Privilege," &c.

PETERBOROUH DRILL SHED, TENDERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lang*) 5132 (ii).

PETERSEN, TATE & CO.'S CONTRACT, TELEGRAM FROM LONDON: in Com. of Sup., 7356 (ii).

PETIT DE GRAT, DREDGING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7589 (ii).

"PETREL," SS., REP. OF CAPT. MCELHINNEY: in Com. of Sup., 4967 (ii).

Petroleum Inspection Act Amt. B. No. 74 (Sir *Henri Joly de Lotbinière*) 1°, 1774; 2°*, and in Com., 2138; 3°*, 2139 (i). (61-62 *Vic., c.* 29.)

PETROLEUM (REFINED), REDUCTION OF DUTY, LEGISLATION *re*: prop. Res. (Mr. *Moore*) 1945 (i).

PHIN, MR., TORONTO HARBOUR DREDGING CONTRACT: in Com. of Sup., 5892 (ii).

——— *See* "Toronto Harbour."

PHOTOGRAPHS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4591 (ii).

PICKETT, G. B., DISMISSAL: in Com. of Sup., 4998.

PICTOU, N.S., POSTMASTER: Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 2819 (i).

PIERS AND PRIVATE WHARFS, EXPENDITURE BY GOVT.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Martin*) 3670 (ii).

PILOTAGE INVESTIGATIONS, MONTREAL DISTRICT: in Com. of Sup., 7102 (ii).

——— AT ST. JOHN, N.B.: Ques. (Mr. *Ellis*) 825 (i).

PIRATE HARBOUR P. O., CLOSING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7051 (ii).

POINT CLAIRE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 5659 (ii).

——— Construction, &c.: M. for cor.* (Mr. *Monk*) 504 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 476 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Monk*) 3941 (i).

POINT JEROME LIGHT-KEEPER, APPNMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 5320 (ii).

PORT BURWELL HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5922 (ii).

PORT COLBORNE PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 5463 (ii).

PORT HILLFORD, N.S., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 7628 (ii).

PORT JOLI WHARF, REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 5628.

PORT LATOUR BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 5628.

PORTAGE LA PRAIRIE P. O.: in Com. of Sup., 5485 (ii).

PORT MULGRAVE, &c., AND IRISH COVE MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 7723 (ii).

PORT MULGRAVE AND ST. PETER'S MAIL ROUTE: Remarks (Mr. *Gillies*) 6323 (ii).

PORT MULGRAVE STATION AGENT, DISMISSAL: M. for cor. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 1832 (i).

PORT STANLEY PIER, REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5926 (ii).

POST OFFICE:

AGNES POSTMASTER AND REMOVAL OF OFFICE: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Pope*) 1787 (i).

ASHCROFT (B.C.), MAIL SERVICE, CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Pope*) 3030 (i).

——— PRESENT OCCUPANT OF P. O.: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 1470, 3030 (i).

BEATONVILLE POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 3824 (i).

BEAUMONT, WM., CLAIMS FOR SALARY AS POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. *McInnes*) 4611 (ii).

BELLEVILLE P. O., DISMISSALS: M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Corby*) 6208 (ii).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Corby*) 6112 (ii).

COBOURG POSTMASTER, ATTENDANCE AT REFORM CONVENTION: Ques. (Mr. *Guillet*) 602 (i).

DAGNEAU, J. T., POSTMASTER AT ROSITAILLE, P.Q., CHARGES AGAINST: M. for Ret.* (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 4246 (ii).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*

DAUNAIS, C. M., EMPLMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1928 (i).

DES JOACHIMS AND MACKIE'S STATION MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Poupore*) 5135 (ii).

DOUBLE HILLS (P.E.I.) P. O., CLOSING: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 1931 (i).

ELGIN (N B.) POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL: M. for Cor. (Mr. *McInerney*) 1837 (i).

ELKHORN, MAN., POSTMASTER, APPNMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 4771 (ii).

GOLDEN (B.C.), AND ST. EUGENE MAIL CARRIER: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Foster*) 2816, 2824 (i).

GRAVENHURST (ONT.), APPNMT. OF POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 5320 (ii).

ISAAC'S HARBOUR, POSTMASTER GRIFFIN, DISMISSAL: M. for Ret. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 1834 (i).

JUBILEE STAMPS, AMOUNT RECEIVED FROM SALES: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 3405, 3938 (i).

—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Foster*) 7526 (ii)

KILDARE POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Dugas*) 1575 (i).

KINROSS (P.E.I.), POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Martin*) 5018 (ii).

KOOTENAY DISTRICT, POSTAL, FACILITIES, &C.: Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1746 (i).

LAKEFIELD AND APSLEY MAIL ROUTE, TENDERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lang*) 4939 (ii).

L'ARDOISE POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Gillies*) 3666 (i).

LOWER ARDOISE POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 1069, 1334 (i).

L'ANCIENNE-LORETTE POSTMASTER ALAIN, DISMISSAL: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2821 (i).

LAVALTRIE MAIL SERVICE, CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Dugas*) 1473 (i).

LEEDS COUNTY POSTAL SERVICE, PETS., &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 4181 (ii).

LEGRIS, NARCISSE, POSTMASTER STE. EULALIE, LETTER IN *La Patrie*: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 7688 (ii).

LYNCH, PATRICK, POSTMASTER AT CHAPLEAU, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Poupore*) 3088 (i).

LOCH LEVEN (C.B.), POSTMASTER: Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 1776 (i).

MACDONALD, A. E., PEAKE'S STATION (P.E.I.) POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, King's*) 4344 (ii).

MCLEOD, M. G., MAIL CLERK: M. for O. Cs. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 4181 (ii).

MAIL CONTRACTS (N.S.), CANCELLATION SINCE 1896: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 4609 (ii).

MIDDLETON POST OFFICE DISTRICT, PET. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 7687 (ii).

MILITIA POINT (N.S.) MAIL CARRIER, AMOUNT PAID: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 3310 (i).

—— POSTMASTER, APPNMT.: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 3310 (i).

OAK BAY MILLS P. O., CLOSING: Ques. Mr. *McAlister*) 3824 (i).

—— in Com. of Sup., 6712 (ii).

—— Imperfect Ret.: Remarks (Mr. *McAlister*) 5324 (ii).

—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *McAlister*) 3941, 4928. (ii).

OTTAWA AND TRURO (N.S.) MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 1575 (i).

OXFORD (N.S.) POSTMASTER, APPNMT.: M. for Cor.* (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 1838 (i).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*

PEAKE'S STATION (P.E.I.) POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, King's*) 4344 (ii).

PICTOU (N.S.) POSTMASTER: Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 2819 (i).

PORT MULGRAVE AND ST. PETER'S MAIL ROUTE: Remarks (Mr. *Gillies*) 6323 (ii).

POSTAL MAIL CLERKS (N.S.) REMOVAL, &C.: Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 3406 (i).

—— TRANSFER OF RESIDENCE: M. for Rep.* (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 4246 (ii).

—— RATES, BERNE CONVENTION; Papers Laid on Table (Mr. *Mulock*) 6446 (ii).

—— REDUCTION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 4345 (ii).

—— INSTRUCTIONS TO POSTMASTER: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Foster*) 6114, 6322, 6446 (ii).

POSTMASTERS, DISMISSALS SINCE 1896: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 4609 (ii).

POSTMASTER-GENERAL, DEP., PRESENT OCCUPANT OF OFFICE: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3407 (i).

—— REP.: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 2527 (i).

POST OFFICE ACT AMENDMENT, FREE TRANSMISSION OF NEWSPAPERS: Remarks (Mr. *Ross Robertson*) 4041 (ii).

POST OFFICE SAVINGS BANKS, RATE OF INTEREST: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 5318 (ii).

—— REDUCTION OF INTEREST: Amt. (Mr. *Davin*) to Com. on Ways and Means, 3714; Neg. (Y. 40, N. 76) 3754 (i).

—— WTHDRLS. FROM SAVINGS BANKS: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 6465 (ii).

—— POST OFFICES CLOSED SINCE JULY, 1896: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3936 (ii).

POST OFFICES, P.E.I.: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Martin*) 7526 (ii).

POST OFFICE DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 4857 (ii).

—— CLERICAL ASSISTANCE: in Com. of Sup., 7038.

—— CONTINGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 4915 (ii).

—— LETTER CARRIERS, SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6698, 7050, 7482, 7775 (ii).

PRINCE ALBERT MAIL SERVICE, DELAY IN TRANSMISSION: M. (M. *Davis*) to Adjn., 2517 (i).

PROVENCHER POSTMASTER, APPNMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 6006 (ii).

ROBERT, H. A., STRATFORD P. O., CLOCK CARETAKER, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Maclaren*) 4344 (ii).

ROBERT, I. A., POSTMASTER AT PRINCEVILLE, AND SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS: Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 7689 (ii).

ROULEAU, P. O., ABOLITION OF: Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 5018 (ii).

STE. ANNE DE BEAUPRE, POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1072 (i).

STE. ANNE DE LA PARADE POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 3313 (i).

ST. CYPRIEN POSTMASTER, CHARGES AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 6007 (ii).

ST. FELIX DE VALOIS, POSTMASTER, COMPLAINTS AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Dugas*) 4610 (ii).

ST. MARY'S ROAD P. O., CLOSING, &C.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Martin*) 4246 (ii).

ST. JACQUES L'ACHIGAN POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Dugas*) 1783 (i).

ST. MICHEL MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3313 (i).

ST. MICHEL DE NAPIERVILLE P. O.: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 1471 (i).

ST. THOMAS MAIL SERVICE, TENDERS AND CONTRACTS: Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 453 (i).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*

ST. TITE POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 3090 (i).

WAVERLEY POSTMASTER, REMOVAL: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 598 (i).

WHITE, MR., EX-DEP. POSTMASTER GENERAL, SUPERANNUATION: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 474 (i).

WILLIAMS, W. W., POSTMASTER AT SEELEY'S BAY, DISMISSAL: M. (Mr. *Taylor*) to Adjn., 3409, 3416.

——— Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3407 (i).

WOOD, H. W., WELSFORD POSTMASTER (N.B.) DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 7120 (ii).

WYEBRIDGE-WYEVALE POSTAL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 598 (i).

Post Office Act Amt. B. No. 110 (Mr. *Mulock*) 1°, *m.*, 2913 (i); 2°, *m.*, 5520, 5568; M. for Com., 5709; in Com., 5748, 5870, 5943; 3°, 6121 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 20.)

2° *m.*, 5520, 7579;

Deb. (Mr. *Clarke*) 5540; (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 5541; (Mr. *Ross Robertson*) 5548; (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 5553 (ii).

3° m., 6121.

Deb. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 6122; (Mr. *Ross Robertson*) 6122; (Mr. *Bertram*) 6123; (Mr. *Sproule*) 6123.

M. for Com., 5709;

Deb. (Mr. *Foster*) 5710, 5722, 5738; (Mr. *Mulock*) 5710, 5744; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 5710, 5738; (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 5711, 5743; (Mr. *Taylor*) 5712; (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 5714; (Mr. *McDougall*) 5716; (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 5719; (Mr. *McMullen*) 5731; (Mr. *Bennett*) 5734; (Mr. *Davin*) 5739 (ii).

In Com.

Deb. (Mr. *Foster*) 5750, 5880; (Mr. *Mulock*) 5748, 5870, 5885; (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 5871; (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 5750; (Mr. *McMullen*) 5779; (Mr. *Clarke*) 5748, 5768; (Mr. *Maclean*) 5749, 5759; (Mr. *Ross Robertson*) 5755; (Mr. *Ellis*) 5755, 5764; (Mr. *Wallace*) 5756, 5768, 5773, 5876; (Mr. *Powell*) 5760; (Mr. *Hughes*) 5762; (Mr. *Richardson*) 5763; (Mr. *Gillies*) 5765; (Mr. *Fielding*) 5769; (Mr. *Marcotte*) 5769, 5779; (Sir *Louis Davies*) 5772; (Mr. *Fraser, Guysboro'*) 5773; (Mr. *Rutherford*) 5776; (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 5777; (Mr. *Pope*) 5779; (Mr. *Haggart*) 5883 (ii).

——— **(Special Delivery) B. No. 167** (Mr. *Mulock*) 1°, 7498; 2°, in Com., and 3°*, 7579 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 21.)

POST OFFICE SAVINGS BANKS, REDUCTION OF INTEREST, AMT. (Mr. *Davin*) to Com. on Ways and Means, 3714 (i).

Deb. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 3715, 3736; (Mr. *Maclean*) 3719; (Mr. *Bennett*) 3720; (Mr. *Foster*) 3721; (Mr. *McDougall*) 3724; (Mr. *Fielding*) 3725; (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 3730; (Mr. *Wallace*) 3732; (Mr. *Sproule*) 3740; (Mr. *Rogers*) 3746; (Mr. *Broder*) 3748; (Mr. *Clarke*) 3751 (i).

POUND NET LICENSES, LAKE SUPERIOR: M. for cor.* (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 3670 (i)

——— NORTH SHORE OF LAKE HURON: Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 3657 (i).

PREFERENTIAL CLAUSE AND FOREIGN COUNTRIES, COMMERCIAL PRIVILEGES: M. for cor.* (Mr. *Foster*) 1837 (i).

PREFERENTIAL DUTIES, ON M. TO ADJN.: Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 505 (i).

PREFERENTIAL TRADE WITH GREAT BRITAIN: Amt. to Com. of Sup. (Mr. *McNeill*) 5808 (ii).

Deb. (Mr. *McMullen*) 5839; (Mr. *Osler*) 5846; (Mr. *Bain*) 5850 (amt.) 5853; (Mr. *Sproule*) 5853; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 5861; (Mr. *Dobell*) 5861; (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 5866 (ii).

——— Remarks (Mr. *McNeill*) 4168, 4452, 4775, 4928.

——— Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 4604 (ii).

———RESOLUTION: Remarks (Mr. *McNeill*) 4604 (ii).

PRENDERGAST, JUDGE, COMMISSION OF INQUIRY: Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 1076 (i).

PRESCOTT AND RUSSELL FIRE, RELIEF FUND: in Com. of Sup., 7089 (ii).

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND:

BELLE RIVER BREAKWATER, GOVT. CONTROL: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 1785, 2036 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Martin*) 2040 (i).

CHINA POINT WHARF, CONDITION: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 671 (i).

COLD STORAGE FOR P.E.I., PROVISION: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 828 (i).

DELEGATION TO DOM. GOVT.: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Martin*) 5117 (ii).

DOUBLE HILL P. O., CLOSING: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 1931 (i).

JUSTICE DEP., AGENT AT CHARLOTTETOWN: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 1075 (i).

KINROSS POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Martin*) 5015 (ii).

LAMBERT, MARTIN, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, King's*) 5787 (ii).

MACDONALD, A. L., PEAKES STATION POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, King's*) 4344 (ii).

MCLELLAN, B. D., MEMBER FOR WEST PRINCE, P.E.I.: introduced, 4347 (ii).

MONTAGUE CUSTOMS SUB-COLLECTOR, DISMISSAL: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Macdonald, King's*) 2822 (i).

——— DISMISSAL OF CARETAKER: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, King's*) 5787 (ii).

MURRAY RIVER, SHIPPING ACCOMMODATION: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 3823 (i).

NEUFRAGE POND SURVEY: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, King's*) 3166 (i).

OYSTER FISHERIES LEASES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Yeo*) 1775 (i).

PEAKES STATION, DISMISSAL OF POSTMASTER: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald*) 4244 (ii).

PIERS AND WHARFS, GOVT. CONTROL: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 3088 (i).

——— PRIVATE, EXPENDITURE BY GOVT.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Martin*) 3670 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Martin*) 6581, 7241, 7665.

RY. BRANCHES: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Martin*) 4622 (ii).

P.E.I. AND CANADIAN GOVT., OUTSTANDING DISPUTES: M. for O.Cs., &c.* (Mr. *Martin*) 3669 (i).

P.E.I. RY., CURVES AT NORTH WILTSHIRE: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, King's*) 2345 (i).

——— ADDITIONAL ROLLING STOCK: in Com. of Sup., 6434 (ii).

——— REMOVAL OF CURVES: in Com. of Sup., 6434.

PERRY, MR. S. F., LATE M.P., DECEASE: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 937 (i).

POST OFFICES, P.E.I.: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Martin*) 7526 (ii).

"PRINCE EDWARD" DREDGE: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Macdonald, King's*) 7526 (ii).

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND—*Con.*
RED POINT WHARF, REPAIRS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 1074 (i).
ST. MARY'S ROAD P. O., CLOSING, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Martin*) 4246 (ii).
SOUTHPORT TO MURRAY HARBOUR, P.E.I., RY. EXTENSION: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 972 (i).
SUITS BY NON-RESIDENTS: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 7410 (ii).
SUMMERSIDE HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 7637 (ii).
—— BREAKWATER, TENDERS FOR CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Powell*) 2816 (i).
TIGNISH BREAKWATER, TENDERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 1074 (i).
WEST POINT PIER, TENDERS FOR CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 1075 (i).
WEST PRINCE (P.E.I) VACANCY, APPNMT. OF RET. OFFICER: Ques. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1481 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Montague*) 2040 (i).
—— ISSUE OF WRIT: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 2241 (i).
—— ISSUE OF WRIT (Mr. *Speaker*) 1173 (i).
—— NOTIFICATION (Mr. *Macdonald, King's*) 1079.
WINTER COMMUNICATION WITH MAINLAND: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 1778 (i).
WINTER MAIL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 7284 (ii).
WOOD ISLAND BREAKWATER, DREDGING: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 2350 (i).
[*See* "POST OFFICE," "PUBLIC WORKS," &c.]
PRINCE ALBERT MAIL SERVICE, DELAY IN TRANSPORT: M. (Mr. *Davis*) to Adjn., 2517 (i).
"PRINCE EDWARD" DREDGE, CARETAKERS AND EMPLOYEES, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Macdonald, King's*) 2841 (i).
—— NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, King's*) 2345 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Macdonald, King's*) 7526.
PRINTING BUREAU EMPLOYEES, NAMES, SALARIES, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Copp*) 3669 (i).
—— H. T. SMITH'S POSITION AND DUTIES: Ques. (Mr. *Copp*) 2350 (i).
—— SUPERINTENDENT'S STATUS: Ques. (Mr. *Copp*) 2431 (i).
PRINTING, MISCELLANEOUS: conc., 7850 (ii).
—— NOTES: in Com. of Sup., 6976 (ii).
PRINTING, 1ST REP. OF COM. CONC.: M. (Mr. *Gibson*) 3713 (i).
PRINTING AND STATIONERY DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 4527, 4545 (ii).
PRIVATE BILLS, PETS., EXTENSION OF TIME: M. (Mr. *Scriver*) 970 (i).
—— M. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1839 (i).
—— LEGISLATION: M. (Mr. *Sutherland*) 7042 (ii).
—— M. (Mr. *Belcourt*) 7466 (ii).
—— ORDER OF PROCEDURE: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 7586 (ii).
PRIVATE SECRETARIES' SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 7484 (ii).
PRIVILEGE, QUES. OF, PAR. IN *La Patrie re* MAN. SCHOOLS (Mr. *Bergeron*) 7697, 7715 (ii).
—— PAR. IN MONTREAL *Witness re* PROHIBITION (Mr. *Craig*) 3503 (i).
—— PRESS REPRESENTATIVES AND MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT: M. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) to Adjn., 5118 (ii).
PRIVILEGE, REF. TO MR. MILLS' SPEECH IN *Hansard* (Mr. *McLennan, Inverness*) 4603 (ii).
—— REPRESENTATION FOR RICHELIEU: Explanation (Mr. *Speaker*) 1772 (i).
—— STIMULANTS IN CHAMBER DURING DEBATE: Explanation (Mr. *Talbot*) 3637 (i).
PRIVY COUNCIL OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 3894 (i); 4582, 7483 (ii).
—— CLASSIFICATION OF OLD RECORDS: in Com. of Sup., 7279 (ii).
—— PRIVATE SECRETARY'S ALLOWANCE: in Com. of Sup., 6978 (ii).
PROCEDURE, QUES. OF, ON 3° OF B. AFTER REPORTED FROM COM., DIVISION DEMANDED BY MEMBER: Agreed to (Y. 56, N. 35) 2649 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. *Speaker*) 2647 (i); Ruling, 2650.
—— STMNT.: READ (Mr. *Speaker*) 3095 (i).
Prohibition of Intoxicating Liquors—Plebiscite B. No. 121 (Mr. *Fisher*) 1° m., 3925; 2°, 4684; in Com., 4728; 3°, 6035 (ii). (61-62 *Vic., c.* 51.)
Deb. (Mr. *Foster*) 3928; (Mr. *McInerney*) 3929; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 3930; (Mr. *Davin*) 3930; (Mr. *Craig*) 3931; (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) 3932; (Mr. *McNeill*) 3932; (Mr. *Bergeron*) 3933; (Mr. *Maclean*) 3933; (Mr. *Ives*) 3934; (Mr. *Ingram*) 3935; (Mr. *Taylor*) 3935 (i).
2° m., 4714 (ii).
Deb. (Mr. *Casey*) 4714; (Mr. *Bergeron*) 4718; (Mr. *Davin*) 4721 (ii).
In Com.
Deb. (Mr. *Montague*) 4728; (Mr. *Blair*) 4729; (Sir *Louis Davies*) 4731; (Mr. *Clarke*) 4733, 4756; (Mr. *Ingram*) 4734, 4747; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 4735; (Mr. *Pope*) 4736; (Mr. *Somerville*) 4737; (Mr. *Britton*) 4738, 4762; (Mr. *Quinn*) 4739; (Mr. *McCleary*) 4740; (Mr. *Henderson*) 4740; (Mr. *Wallace*) 4745; (Mr. *Fisher*) 4740-4768; (Mr. *Foster*) 4692; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 4704, 4766; (Mr. *Sproule*) 4712; (Sir *Adolphe Caron*) 4748; (Mr. *Clancy*) 4748; (Mr. *Taylor*) 4750; (Mr. *McNeill*) 4751; (Mr. *Craig*) 4753; (Mr. *Mills*) 4757, 4767; (Mr. *Beattie*) 4757; (Mr. *Richardson*) 4759; (Mr. *Flint*) 4761; (Mr. *Fielding*) 4762; (Mr. *Moore*) 4763; (Mr. *Powell*) 4764; (Mr. *Ellis*) 4764 (ii).
PROHIBITION OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS, COR. OF MIN. OF JUSTICE *re* INQUIRY FOR LETTER PUBLISHED IN NEWSPAPER (Mr. *Craig*) 5321 (ii).
—— M. (Mr. *Craig*) to Adjn., 3314 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Craig*) 2441 (i).
PROROGATION, COM. FROM GOV. GEN.'S SEC.: Read (Mr. *Speaker*) 7818 (ii).
—— MESS. FROM HIS EX. (Mr. *Speaker*) 7886 (ii).
PROVENCHER POSTMASTERS, APPNMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 6006 (ii).
Prudential Life Assurance Co.'s B. No. 53 (Mr. *Bain*) 1°*, 1272; 2°*, 1509; in Com. and 3°*, 2559 (i). (61-62 *Vic., c.* 113.)
Public Officers Act Amt. B. No. 170 (Mr. *Fielding*) 1°*, 7523; 2° in Com. and 3°*, 7580 (ii). (61-62 *Vic., c.* 16.)
PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COM., ORGANIZATION: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 2517 (i).

PUBLIC MEETING: Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*) 2528 (i).
——— Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 3503 (i).
PUBLIC BUILDINGS, DOM.: in Com. of Sup., 5448, 7386 (ii).

PUBLIC WORKS:
ALLAIRE, J. P. O., CLAIM AGAINST GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 3661 (i).
ARNPRIOR P. O., INSPECTOR, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 4177 (ii).
——— in Com. of Sup., 5449 (ii).
BEAR RIVER, BRIDGE AT MOUTH, REMOVAL: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Mills*) 2840 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Russell*) 1337 (i).
——— REP. AS TO CONDITION OF PIERS: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 975 (i).
BELLE RIVER BREAKWATER, GOVT. CONTROL: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 1785 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 2036 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Martin*) 2049 (i).
BELŒIL, QUE., CARETAKER OF BOOMS, RESIGNATION; Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 2847 (i).
BERTHIER P. O., SITE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 6008 (ii).
——— PURCHASE OF SITE: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 3662 (i).
BRITISH COLUMBIA COAST SURVEYS, REP. OF MR. COSTE, Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 5323 (ii).
CAMPOBELLO ISLAND (N.B.) TELEPHONE COMMUNICATION, COST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 4177 (ii).
CHAPEL COVE (N.S.) BREAKWATER, GOVT. AID: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 4345 (ii).
CHICOUTIMI COUNTY TELEGRAPH LINE: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 2814 (i).
——— WHARF, GOVT. EXPENDITURE: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 4180 (ii).
CHINA POINT (P.E.I.) PIER: in Com. of Sup., 7636.
——— CONDITION: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 671 (i).
COLLINGWOOD HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 5886 (ii).
COTE, THOMAS, EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 4176 (ii).
DEER ISLAND TELEGRAPH CABLE, SURVEYS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 4177 (ii).
DEPTL. WEST BLOCK, REFACING WALLS: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 2528, 3319 (i).
——— FIRE: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 2347 (i).
EDMONTON RY. BRIDGE, CONTRACT, &c.; M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Davin*) 1838 (i).
——— CONTRACT FOR CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1341 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Davin*) 2528, 3827 (i).
——— in Com. of Sup., 6245, 6268 (ii).
——— PENALTIES TO CONTRACTORS: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 5316 (ii).
GABARUS (C.B.) BREAKWATER, GRANTS, &c.; Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 4179 (ii),
GISBORNE, MR., INSPECTOR OF GOVT. TELEGRAPH LINES, N.W.T., DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 5317 (ii).
GODERICH HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 6087 (ii).
GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS, PROHIBITION OF SWEATING: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 599 (i).
GRAND ETANG, DREDGING, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *McLennan, Inverness*) 5317 (ii).
GRAND NARROWS (C.B.) DISMISSAL OF GOVT., BLACKSMITH: Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 3661 (i).
GRAND RIVER FLOODS: M. (Mr. *Montague*) to Adjn., 2526 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
HALIFAX DRILL SHED: in Com. of Sup., 5071 (ii).
KAMINISTIQUIA RIVER: in Com. of Sup., 5067 (ii).
KENTVILLE P. O.: in Com. of Sup., 5071 (ii).
KINGSTON DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 5453 (ii).
L'ARDOISE BREAKWATER, REPAIRS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 872 (i).
LIVERPOOL P. O.: in Com. of Sup., 5074 (ii).
MCCALLUM, JOHN, APPNMT. AND DISMISSAL BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 7686 (ii).
MAJOR'S HILL PARK GROUNDS: in Com. of Sup., 5606 (ii).
MANITOBA PUBLIC BUILDINGS, INQUIRY FOR RET.: Remarks (Mr. *LaRivière*) 3826 (i).
MCKAY'S POINT WHARF, TENDER FOR BUILDING, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 2815 (i).
MARYSVILLE P. O.: in Com. of Sup., 5092 (ii).
MISTASSINI WHARF AND STE. METHODE, CONSTRUCTION, &c.: M. for Copy of Instructions* (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3668 (i).
——— PUBLIC WORKS: M. for Ret. (Mr, *Casgrain*) 2822 (i).
NAPANEE PUBLIC BUILDING, CARETAKER: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 6008 (ii).
NEUFRAGE POND, SURVEY: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, King's*) 3166 (i).
NEW HARBOUR (N.S.) BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 7590 (ii).
OTONABEE RIVER FLOODS, INVESTIGATION AS TO CAUSE: Ques. (Mr. *Lang*) 483 (i).
OTTAWA SUMMER HOUSE; in Com. of Sup., 7218 (ii).
OWEN SOUND HARBOUR, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 5889 (ii).
PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS, ASPHALT SIDEWALKS, CONTRACTOR: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 487 (1).
——— CONTRACT FOR ASPHALTING WALKS: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1783 (i).
——— DISMISSAL OF LATE SUPT. ROBERTSON; Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 2818 (i).
PETERBOROUGH DRILL SHED, TENDERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lang*) 5132 (ii).
POINT CLAIRE, CONSTRUCTION OF WHARF: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 476 (i).
——— M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Monk*) 504 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 3341 (ii).
PORT MORIEN, BREAKWATER, GOVT. GRANT: Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 4179 (ii).
P.E.I., PIERS AND WHARFS, GOVT. CONTROL: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 3088 (i).
PRIVATE PIERS AND WHARFS, GOVT. EXPENDITURE: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Martin*) 3670 (i).
PUBLIC WORKS DEPT., CLERKS, NUMBER DISCHARGED: M. for Ret.* (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 1838.
——— in Com of Sup., 4558, 4591, 5050, 5448, 6244, 6984, 7214; conc., 7822 (ii).
QUEBEC BRIDGE, PROP. SUBSIDY: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 7385 (i).
RAT PORTAGE PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 5470 (ii).
RED POINT WHARF, P.E.I., REPAIRS, &c.: Ques. (Mr *Martin*) 1074 (i).
RICHELIEU RIVER WORKS, ESTIMATED COST: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 484 (i).
RIVIERE STE. ANNE DE LA PÉRADE, REPAIRS TO WORKS: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 1785 (i).
RIVIERE LA PIPE WHARF, PURCHASE OF TIMBER: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1468 (i).
ROBERVAL PIER, PAYMENTS TO MEN, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2840 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

ROCHE FENDUE AND CALUMET DAMS: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Poupore*) 4612 (ii).

STE. ANNE LOCK, INVESTIGATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 4345 (ii).

——— CONTRACTOR: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 3941 (ii).

——— REP. OF W. MERCIER: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Monk*) 3667 (i).

ST. ANICETTE WHARF, COR. L. H. MASSON AND PUBLIC WORKS: M. for Copy* (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2841.

——— COST WHEN BUILT: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2818.

——— in Com. of Sup., 5301 (ii).

ST. GENEVIEVE FLOODS: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Monk*) 505 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 476 (i).

ST. PETER'S CANAL, REPAIRS TO ENTRANCE: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 1339 (i).

ST. PIERRE RIVER WORKS, TENDERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 476 (i).

ST. LAWRENCE RIVER INUNDATIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 3660 (i).

ST. MICHEL GOVT. WHARF, REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3312 (i).

SUMMERSIDE (P.E.I.) BREAKWATER, TENDERS FOR CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Powell*) 2816 (i).

TELEGRAPH LINES, NORTH SHORE, ST. LAWRENCE: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1336 (i).

——— TENDERS FOR CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 7123 (ii).

——— N.S., GOVT. RATES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bethune*) 6006 (ii).

TIGNISH BREAKWATER (P.E.I.) TENDERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 1074 (i).

TORONTO HARBOUR, DREDGING, &C., CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 4771 (ii).

——— AMOUNTS PAID W. E. PHIN: Ques (Mr. *Clancy*) 1337 (i).

——— EXPENDITURE: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 482 (i).

——— LIABILITY INCURRED: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 971.

——— in Com. of Sup., 7231 (ii).

——— MR. PHIN'S CONTRACT: in Com. of Sup., 5892.

——— EASTERN ENTRANCE: in Com. of Sup., 5891.

TROUT COVE BREAKWATER, REPAIRS: Ques. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 3824 (i).

VICTORIAVILLE PUBLIC BUILDING, ERECTION: Ques. (Mr. *Laverqne*) 7120 (ii).

WEST POINT PIER, TENDERS FOR CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 1075 (i).

WHARFS AND PIERS, GOVT. EXPENDITURE: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Martin*) 6581, 7241, 7665 (ii).

WOOD ISLAND (P.E.I.) BREAKWATER, DREDGING: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 2350 (i).

WOODSTOCK P. O.: in Com. of Sup., 5464 (ii).

Public Works Construction Aid B. No. 161 (Mr. *Blair*). 1°, 6892; M. for 2°, 7411; 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 7570 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 12.)

PULP MILL MACHINERY, ENTRY IN BOND: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 3165 (i).

QU'APPELLE, LONG LAKE AND SASKATCHEWAN RAILWAY: M. (Mr. *Davis*) to Adjn., 4248 (ii).

——— M. (Mr. *Osler*) to Adjn., 4449 (ii).

QUARANTINE (B.C.): in Com. of Sup., 7514 (ii).

——— (CATTLE): in Com. of Sup., 5998 (ii).

——— GRATUITIES TO W. McK. McLEOD: in Com. of Sup., 6995 (ii).

QUEBEC:

ABENAKIS INDIANS, ST. FRANCIS AGENCY: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 3408 (i).

AGNES POSTMASTER AND REMOVAL OF OFFICE: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Pope*) 1787 (i).

ANSE A BEAUFILS HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 5658 (ii).

BAIE ST. PAUL WHARF, REPAIRS, &C.; in Com. of Sup., 7639 (ii).

BERTHIER CHANNEL, DEEPENING: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 3085 (i).

——— POST OFFICE, PURCHASE OF SITE: Ques. (Mr. *Beausoleil*) 3662 (i); 6008 (ii).

BELŒIL, QUE., CARETAKER OF BOOMS, RESIGNATION: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 2847 (i).

BOYER, TOUISSANT, LOCKMASTER BEAUHARNOIS CANAL, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 3662 (i).

CANADIAN DEFENCES, IMPROVEMENTS: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2839 (i).

CHAMBORD JUNCTION, CUSTOM HOUSE, COST: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 4179 (ii).

——— ESTABLISHMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1469.

CHEESE FACTORIES IN QUEBEC: Remarks (Mr. *Marcotte*) 1578 (i).

CHICOUTIMI COUNTY TELEGRAPH LINE: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 2814 (i).

——— WHARF, GOVT. EXPENDITURE: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 4180 (ii).

CIVIL SERVICE EMPLOYEES IN PROV. OF QUEBEC AND COMMISSION, NAMES, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Monk*) 504 (i).

CORBEIL, FRANÇOIS, EMPLOYEE LACHINE CANAL, DISMISSAL: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 4348 (ii).

COTEAU LANDING, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 7226.

COTÉ, THOS., EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 4176 (ii).

CÔTE DE LEISSE RIFLE RANGES AND FARMERS' GRIEVANCES: Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 6322 (ii).

CÔTE ST. LUC RIFLE RANGES, ACCIDENTAL SHOOTING: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Monk*) 4678 (ii).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 6029 (ii).

——— ACTION *re* ACCIDENT: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, King's*) 5569 (ii).

COULOMBE VS. QUEEN, APPEAL QUEEN'S BENCH: M. for Copy* (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3668 (i).

DAGNAULT, MR. R., DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 4609 (ii).

DAGNEAU, J. T., POSTMASTER AT ROBITAILLE, CHARGES AGAINST: M. for Ret. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 4246 (ii).

DES JOACHIMS AND MACKIE'S STATION MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Poupore*) 5135 (ii).

DOUCET'S LANDING, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 7639.

DRUMMOND COUNTY RAILWAY, THROUGH TRAFFIC: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 472 (i).

FRIGON, A., INDEMNITY FOR INJURY: M. for Rep.* (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3668 (i).

GASPÉ, &C., STEAM COMMUNICATION WITH QUEBEC, SUBSIDY: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 7120, 7685 (ii).

GATIEN, LOUIS, DISMISSAL BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 7665 (ii).

GODBOUT, ALBERT, DISMISSAL: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3664 (i).

GRAND ETANG, DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6083.

——— Ques. (Mr. *McLennan, Inverness*) 5317 (ii).

HOUDE, CHAS. E., DISMISSAL BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 7686 (ii).

I.C.R., MADAME CHARON'S HORSE, CLAIM *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 3659 (i).

QUEBEC—*Con.*

I.C.R., Montreal Extension, Passengers carried from Lévis: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 3406 (i).

—— News Stand at Lévis Station, Lease: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1338 (i).

—— St. Michel Station: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3312 (i).

—— Ties and Lumber Supplies, Tenders, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2340 (i).

—— Trois Pistoles, Govt. Lands, Occupation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 4175 (ii).

—— Rivière du Loup, Roadmaster, Cost of Inquiry: Ques. (Mr. *Dechene*) 2820 (i).

Isle Perrault Wharf, Addition, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5659 (ii).

Judges of Province of Quebec, Rep. from Montral Bar: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Bergeron*) 505 (i).

Kildare Postmaster, Dismissal: Ques. (Mr. *Dugas*) 1575 (i).

Lachine Canal, Dismissal of Francois Corbeil: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2343 (i).

—— Dismissals: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Gillies*) 4621 (ii).

—— Storekeeper, Applicants for Position: Ques. (Mr. *Quinn*) 456 (i).

—— Wharfinger, Dismissal: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2840 (i).

L'Ancienne-Lorette, Postmaster Alain, Dismissal: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2821 (i).

Laurentian Ry. Telegraph Regulations: Ques. (Mr. *Gauthier*) 4923 (ii).

Lavaltrie Mail Service, Contract: Ques: (Mr. *Dugas*) 1473 (i).

Lavoie, Dr., Appnmt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 7119 (ii).

Lefaivre, Xavier, Lachine Canal, Lockmaster, Dismissal: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 3937 (i).

Lighthouse Supplies, Montreal West, Contract: Ques. (Mr. *Maclean*) 2846 (i).

McCallum, John, Appnmt. and Dismissal by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 7686 (ii).

Magdalen Islands Mail Service: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 1575 (i).

Maria Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 7638 (ii).

Military Camp at Beauharnois: Remarks (Mr. *Bergeron*) 6638 (ii).

Mistassini Wharf and Ste. Methode, Construction, &c.: M. for Copy of Instructions* (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3668 (i).

—— M. for Ret. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2822 (i).

Montreal Circuit Court, Extra Judge: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 598 (i).

—— Customs House, Dismissals, 1896 to 1898, Names, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Quinn*) 3669 (i).

—— Drill Shed, Repairs Executed: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Monk*) 1838 (i).

Nulty's Death Sentence, Pets. for Commutation: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 824 (i).

Petit de Grat, Dredging, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7589 (ii).

Point Claire Wharf, Construction, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5689 (ii).

—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Monk*) 3941 (ii).

—— M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Monk*) 504 (i).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 476 (i).

Point Jerome Light-keeper, Appnmt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 5320 (ii).

Quebec Bridge, prop. Subsidy: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 7385 (ii).

—— Custom House: in Com. of Sup., 7587 (ii).

QUEBEC—*Con.*

Queen vs. Coulombe, Whisky Smuggling: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1068 (i).

Reid, Wm., Bridge-keeper, Beauharnois Canal, Dismissal: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 3937 (ii).

Richelieu River Works, Estimated Cost: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 484 (i).

Rivière la Pipe Wharf, Purchase of Timber: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1468 (i).

Rivière Ste-Anne de la Pérade, Repairs to Works: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 1785 (i).

Robert, I. A., Postmaster at Princeville, and Sale of Intoxicating Liquors: Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 7689 (ii).

Roberval Pier, Payments to Men, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2840 (i).

Roche Fondue and Calumet Dams: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Poupore*) 4612 (ii).

Ste. Anne de Beaupre Postmaster, Dismissal: Ques.: (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1072 (i).

Ste. Anne de la Pérade Postmaster, Dismissal: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 3313 (i).

—— M. for O. Cs.* (Mr. *Marcotte*) 4678 (ii).

St. Anicette Wharf, Cor. L. H. Masson and Public Works: M. for Copy* (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2841.

—— Cost when Built: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2818 (i).

—— in Com. of Sup., 5656 (ii).

Ste. Anne Lock, Investigation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 4345 (ii).

—— Rep. of W. Mercier: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Monk*) 3667 (i).

Ste. Anne River Works, Continuation: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 3941 (ii).

St. Cyprien Postmaster, Charges against: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 6007 (ii).

St. Felix de Valois, Postmaster, Complaints against: Ques. (Mr. *Dugas*) 4610 (ii).

Ste. Genevieve Floods: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Monk*) 505 (i).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 476 (i).

St. Helen's Island, Allotment for Military Purposes: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 456 (i).

St. Hyacinthe Customs Office, Dues and Officials: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 600 (i).

St. Jacques L'Achigan, Postmaster: Ques. (Mr. *Dugas*) 1783 (i).

St. Jacques Model Farm, Establishment by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. *Dugas*) 7121 (ii).

St. Jean des Chaillons Harbour: in Com. of Sup., 5659 (ii).

St. Lawrence River Inundations: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 3660 (i).

—— Placing of Buoys: Remarks (Mr. *Bergeron*) 3318 (i).

—— Ship Channel: in Com. of Sup., 5050 (ii).

St. Michel de Napierville P. O., Cor., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 1471 (i).

St. Michel Govt. Wharf, Repairs: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3312 (i).

—— Mail Service: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3313 (i).

St. Pierre River, Dredging, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Monk*) 4678 (ii).

—— Tenders: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 476 (i).

St. Rochs des Aulnaies Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 5658 (ii).

St. Tite Postmaster, Dismissal: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 3090 (i).

QUEBEC—*Con.*
ST. VINCENT DE PAUL PENITENTIARY, COMMISSIONERS' CLAIMS: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 3938 (ii).
—— REP.: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 3940 (ii).
—— REVOLT OF CONVICTS: Ques. (Mr. *Chauvin*) 1069 (i).
SAGUENAY RIVER, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 7639.
SOULANGES CANAL, EXPENDITURE ON CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 5135 (ii).
STEAMSHIP SERVICE, CANADA AND FRANCE, ESTABLISHMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 456 (i).
SUPERIOR COURT, MAGDALEN ISLANDS: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 597 (i).
SUTTON, LT., INSTRUCTIONS *re* MILITARY COURSE IN ENGLAND: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1782 (i).
TELEGRAPH LINES, GODBOUT AND POINTE AUX ESQUIMAUX: in Com. of Sup., 6101 (ii).
—— NORTH SHORE, ST. LAWRENCE: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1336 (i).
—— TENDERS FOR CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 7123 (ii).
TEMISCOUATA ELECTION: Personal Explanation (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 5447 (ii).
UNITED COUNTIES RY., PAYMENTS TO: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 3658 (i).
UNITED STATES SS. "YANTIC" AND "LA CANADIENNE," COLLISION: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 4451 (ii).
VICTORIAVILLE PUBLIC BUILDING, ERECTION: Ques. (Mr. *Laverone*) 7120 (ii).
WELLINGTON BRIDGE MONTREAL, ACCIDENT: Remarks (Mr. *Quinn*) 4604 (ii).
—— Mr. MATTISON'S SERVICES: Remarks (Mr. *Quinn*) 4775 (ii).
QUEBEC BRIDGE, PROP. SUBSIDY; Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 7385 (ii).
—— CUSTOMS HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 7587 (ii).
Quebec Harbour Commissioners Loan B. No. 142 (Mr. *Dobell*). 1°*, 5568; 2° and in Com., 6229; 3°, 6444 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 48.)
QUEBEC LAND SLIDES COMMISSION, CLAIMS &C.; in Com. of Sup., 7087 (ii).
QUEEN'S PRINTER, QUALIFICATION: Ques. (Mr *Copp*) 3165 (i).
—— SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7483 (ii).
Queenston Heights Bridge Co.'s. B. No. 58 (Mr. *Clarke*) 1°*, 1389; 2°*, 1509; in Com. and 3°*, 3656 (i). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 114.)
QUEEN VICTORIA PARK, NIAGARA FALLS: Ques. (Mr. *McCleary*) 2847 (i).
QUEEN *vs.* CAMERON, INDICTMENT FOR LIBEL, DEPOSITION, &C.: M. for Copies (Mr. *Bostock*) 1827 (i).
QUEEN *vs.* COULOMBE, WHISKY SMUGGLING: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1068 (i).
QUESTIONS PUT BY MEMBERS: Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 459 (i).
—— RULED OUT OF ORDER (Mr. *Speaker*) 602 (i).
RAILWAYS:
BELŒIL LAND DAMAGES: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 3947 (i).
BOARD OF RY. COMMISSIONERS, LEGISLATION: prop. Res. (Mr. *Jameson*) 1787 (i).
CAPE BRETON RY. HARD PAN CLAIMS: Ques. (Mr. *McLennan, Inverness*) 5134 (ii).
CROW'S NEST PASS RY. AGREEMENT WITH C.P.R.: Ques. (Mr. *McInnes*) 2036 (i).
—— AMOUNTS PAID C.P.R.: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 3405 (i).
RAILWAYS—*Con.*
CROW NEST RY., CONSTRUCTION BY COMPANY: Remarks (Mr. *Richardson*) 6240 (ii).
—— J. B. CHARLESON'S CONNECTION: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 7685 (ii).
CONNORS, D., ANTIGONISH, FIRE CLAIMS: M. for Ret.* (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 1837 (i).
DRUMMOND COUNTY RY. AND G. T. R. AGREEMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 3317 (i).
—— RUMOURED NEW ARRANGEMENTS: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 2699 (i).
—— COM. OF INVESTIGATION: prop. Res. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 506 (i).
—— INQUIRY, FIRST REP. OF COM.: Presented (Mr. *Lister*) 1272 (i).
—— THROUGH TRAFFIC: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 472 (i).
EUROPEAN AND AMERICAN RY., SETTLEMENT BETWEEN GOVT. AND E. B. CHANDLER: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *McInerney*) 3341 (i).
G.T.R. AND C.P.R. CONNECTION AT NORTH BAY: Remarks (Mr. *Maclean*) 4353 (ii).
G.T.R, OTTAWA, ARNPRIOR AND PARRY SOUND RY. AND C.P.R. CONNECTIONS AT SCOTIA JUNCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Maclean*) 454 (i).
—— REGULATIONS: M. (Mr. *Wallace*) to Adjn., 6013 (ii).
GRAIN TRANSPORT BY C.P.R. AND ELEVATOR COMPANY OF MAN. AND N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. *Richardson*) 483 (i).
I.C.R. AGREEMENT WITH MR. HARRIS: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 5392 (ii).
—— ARCHIBALD, CHIEF ENGINEER, DISMISSAL; M. for Ret. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1834 (i).
—— BAIN, N., &c.: Inquiry for Ret. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 4348 (ii).
—— COAL CARRIED: Ques. (Mr. *McInerney*) 4448 (ii).
—— COLOURED PORTERS, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 3405 (i).
—— M. (Mr. *Campbell*) to Adjn., 3167 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 2852 (i).
—— DINING CARS, NUMBER, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 2812 (i).
—— DIVERSION OF ROUTE THROUGH SPRINGHILL: Ques. (Mr. *Powell*) 1929 (i).
—— EASTERN EXTENSION DINING CARS: Ques. (Mr. *Bell, Pictou*) 2345 (i).
—— EMPLOYEES, REDUCTIONS IN PASSENGER AND FREIGHT DEPARTMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 602 (i).
—— EMPLOYEES REINSTATEMENT: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 3665 (i).
—— EXPENDITURE FOR IMPROVEMENTS: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Powell*) 3677 (i).
—— FUEL EXPENDITURE: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 3689 (i).
—— GATES, &C., TENDERS FOR CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Dechene*) 2819 (i).
—— M. for Ret.* (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 2839 (i).
—— HARRIS, APPTMT. OF: M. for Cor. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 3667, 3869 (i).
—— POSITION: Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 3166.
—— HOAR, CHARLES, DISMISSAL: M. for Cor.* (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 1838 (i) 4348 (ii).
—— LOWERING SCHEDULE RATES: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 1481 (i).
—— Remarks (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 2442 (i).
—— MADAME CHARON'S HORSE, CLAIMS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 3659 (i).

RAILWAYS—*Con.*

I.C.R., Moncton Ry. Station, Construction: Ques. (Mr. *Powell*) 477 (i).

—— plumbing and heating contracts: Ques. (Mr. *Powell*) 2346 (i).

—— Montreal Extension, Arrangements with G.T.R. Co.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Blair*) 3821 (i).

—— Montreal Extension, Contract, &c.: Copies laid on table (Mr. *Blair*) 3821 (i).

—— Passengers Carried from Lévis: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 3406 (i).

—— Murray, J. H., Appnmt. by Govt.: Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 5318 (ii).

—— News Stand at Lévis Station, Lease: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1338 (i).

—— New Time Table: Remarks (Mr. *Choquette*) 6242 (ii).

—— Patent Locomotive Cylinder: Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 1335 (i).

—— Powlie, A., Car Inspector, Springhill, Dismissal: Ques. (Mr. *Powell*) 1932 (i).

—— Purchase of Locomotives in U. S., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 476 (i).

—— Reduction in Number of Brakesmen: Ques. (Mr. *Bell, Pictou*) 478 (i).

—— Rivière du Loup, Roadmaster, Cost of Inquiry: Ques. (Mr. *Dechene*) 2820 (i).

—— Simonds, R. H., Dismissal: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Powell*) 2840 (i).

—— Stewart, A., Dismissal: Ques. (Mr. *Powell*) 1933, 2342 (i).

—— St. Michel Station: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3312 (i).

—— Sutherland, Wm.: Inquiry for Ret. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 4348 (ii).

—— Tariffs, &c., since Mr. Harris' Appnmt.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Foster*) 3669 (i).

—— Thompson, R. S.: Inquiry for Ret. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 4348 (ii).

—— Ties and Lumber Supplies, Tenders: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2840 (i).

—— Ties, Tenders from 1896, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Foster*) 3669 (i).

—— Trois Pistoles, Govt. Lands, Occupation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 4175 (ii).

—— Westville, N.S., Station Improvements: Ques. (Mr. *Bell, Pictou*) 2342 (i).

Kaslo-Slocan Ry., Plans, Papers, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Haggart*) 402 (i).

Killam, A. E., Position on I. C. R.: Ques. (Mr. *McInerney*) 827 (i).

Kingston Locomotive Works and Gananoque Drill Shed: M. (Mr. *Taylor*) to Adjn., 605 (i).

—— Telegram *re* Order for Locomotives: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 484 (i).

King, W. A., Antigonish Station Agent, Dismissal: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 7120 (ii).

Lake Temiscamingue Ry. and Ry. Act: Ques. (Mr. *Poupore*) 2349 (i).

McNeill, Rory, Section Foreman, I. C. R., Dismissal: Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 603 (i).

—— in Com. of Sup., 6414 (ii).

Mercier, Wilfrid, Commissioner, Amounts Paid: Remarks (Mr. *Blair*) 4345 (ii).

Montague (P.E.I.), Dismissal of Caretaker: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, King's*) 5787 (ii).

P. E. I. Ry., Curves at North Wiltshire: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, King's*) 2345 (i).

RAILWAYS—*Con.*

Port Mulgrave Station Agent, Dismissal: M. for Cor. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 1832 (i).

Railway Commission, Appnmt.: Ques. (Mr. *McMillan*) 1784 (i).

Ry. Committee of the Privy Council, Constitution: Ques. (Mr. *Jameson*) 1472 (i).

Railway Policy of the Government: Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 2701 (i).

Railway Rates to Stikine River: Ques. (Mr. *Maclean*) 1070 (i).

Railway Rate War and Man. Settlers: M. (Mr. *Maclean*) to Adjn., 1473 (i).

—— Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 1175 (i).

Railway Regulations, Enforcement, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casey*) 7118 (ii).

—— Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 7119 (ii).

Railway Transportation: M. (Mr. *Maclean*) to Adjn., 1749 (i).

Railways and Canals: in Com. of Sup., 4558, 4597, 6381, 7643 (ii).

—— Rep.: Presented (Mr. *Blair*) 1341 (i).

Southport to Murray Harbour (P.E.I.) Ry. Extension: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 972 (i).

Stellarton, Car Inspector Sutherland, Dismissal: M. for Cor. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 1833, 2839 (i).

United Counties Ry., Payments to: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 3658 (i).

U. S. SS. "Yantic" and "La Canadienne," Collision: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 4431 (ii).

[*See* "I.C.R.", &c.]

Ry. Act Amt. B. No. 18 (Mr. *Campbell*). 1°, 405; 2° m., 2058; ref. to Sel. Com., 2059 (i).

—— **B. No. 145** (Mr. *Blair*). 1°, 5662; 2°*, 5966; 3°*, 6048 (ii). (61-62 *Vic., c.* 22.)

Ry. Employees, &c., Safety B. No. 4 (Mr. *Casey*). 1°, 185; 2° m., 2054; in Com., 2055; ref. to Sel. Com., 2056; in Com., 3673 (i) 4208, 4638, 4670, 5144; 3°*, 5175 (ii).

Ry. Freight Rates Regulation B. No. 7 (Mr. *Reid*). 1°*, 271; 2° m., 2910; wthdn., 2913.

Ry. Passenger Tickets (Sale) Act Amt. B. No. 36 (Mr. *Beattie*) 1°*, 903 (i).

Rainy River Channel: in Com. of Sup., 5888 (ii).

—— Judicial District, Appnmt. of Judge: Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) 5011 (ii).

Racine Fishery and Riparian Owner, Licenses, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 4772 (ii).

Rankin, Immigration Agent in Kansas: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1779 (i).

Rat Portage Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 5470, 7588 (ii).

Rebellion Claims, N.W.T., Appnmt. of Commissioner: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 5321 (ii).

—— Losses (1885) Documents in Possession of Govt.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Davis*) 4246 (ii).

Reciprocal Tariff Clause, 1897, Amounts, Refunds, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 4175 (ii).

Reciprocity in Wrecking, Can. and U.S.: Remarks (Mr. *Britton*) 6612 (ii).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 452 (i).

Red Point Wharf (P.E.I.) Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 1074 (i).

—— in Com. of Sup., 5633 (ii).

REGINA DISTRICT, REGISTRY OFFICE: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1931 (i) 5319 (ii).
——— INDUSTRIAL SCHOOL, EMPLYMT. OF DR. WILLOUGHBY: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 828 (i).
REGISTRY AND LAND OFFICE, REGINA: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1931 (i) 5319 (ii).
REGISTRY OF SHIPPING: in Com. of Sup., 4954 (ii).
REID, WM., BRIDGE KEEPER, BEAUHARNOIS CANAL, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 3937 (i).

REPORTS PRESENTED:
AGRICULTURE (Mr. *Fisher*) 1473 (i).
AUDITOR GENERAL (Mr. *Fielding*) 307 (i).
CIVIL SERVICE EXAMINER'S (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 4248 (ii).
——— LIST (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 184 (i).
EXPERIMENTAL FARMS (Mr. *Fisher*) 7378 (ii).
INDIAN AFFAIRS (Mr. *Sifton*) 1473 (i).
INLAND REVENUE (Sir *Henri Joly de Lotbinière*) 194.
INTERIOR (Mr. *Sifton*) 3940 (ii).
JUSTICE AND PENITENTIARIES (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 7009 (ii).
LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT, JOINT REP. (Mr. *Speaker*) 5 (i).
MARINE AND FISHERIES (Sir *Louis Davies*) 5 (i).
MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. *Borden, King's*) 2425 (i).
PUBLIC ACCOUNTS (Mr. *Fielding*) 267 (i).
RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. *Blair*) 1341 (i).
SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 2425 (i).
TRADE AND COMMERCE (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 935 (i).
TRADE AND NAVIGATION RETURNS (Mr. *Paterson*) 184 (i).

RETURNS, Inquiry for, 5931 (ii).
(Mr. *Bergeron*) 3713 (i) 4348 (ii).
(Mr. *Foster*) 6028 (ii).
(Mr. *Gillies*) 5923 (ii).
(Mr. *Martin*) 3427 (i).
(Mr. *Mills*) 5321 (i).
(Mr. *McDougall*) 5930 (ii).
(Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 4348, 6028 (ii).
REWARDS FOR SAVING LIFE: in Com. of Sup., 4952.
RICHELIEU RIVER, BELŒIL CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 5653 (ii).
——— ESTIMATED COST: Ques (Mr. *Monk*) 484 (i).
RICHIBUCTO HARBOUR, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5642.
RIDEAU CANAL, LAND DAMAGES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 7182 (ii).
RIDEAU HALL, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5598.
——— Amt. (Mr. *Monk*) to reduce Vote: Neg. (Y. 19, N. 46) 5605 (ii).
RIFLE ASSOCIATION GRANT: in Com. of Sup., 6570.
RIFLE RANGE AT OTTAWA, TARGET PRACTICE: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 6612 (ii).
RIVIÈRE LA PIPE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 5660 (ii).
——— PURCHASE OF TIMBER: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1468 (i).
RIVIERE ST. ANNE DE LA PÉRADE, REPAIRS TO WORKS: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 1785 (i).
ROADS AND BRIDGES: in Com. of Sup., 6100, 6245 (ii).
ROBERT, H. A., STRATFORD P. O, CARETAKER, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Maclaren*) 4344 (ii).
ROBERT, I. A., POSTMASTER AT PRINCEVILLE AND SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS: Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 7689 (ii).
ROBERVAL PIER, PAYMENTS TO MEN, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2840 (i).
ROCHE FENDUE AND CALUMET DAMS: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Poupore*) 4612 (ii).
ROCKLIFFE RIFLE RANGE, LAND VALUATOR: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 3408, 3660 (i).
ROCKY MOUNTAIN PARK, FENCING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 7251, 7769 (ii).
ROGERS, LT.-COL., R. Z., RETIREMENT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Guillet*) 5787 (ii).
ROSS, DAVID, DISMISSAL: in Com. of Sup., 5270 (ii).
——— FISHERY OVERSEER, MARGAREE: M. for Ret.* (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 1837 (i).
ROTHWELL'S REPORT *re* CLAIMS OF SETTLERS: Remarks (Mr. *McInnes*) 2851 (i).
ROULEAU P. O., ABOLITION OF: Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 5018 (ii).
ROYAL CANADIAN REGIMENT: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 5232 (ii).
——— REPATRIATION: Remarks (Mr. *Hughes*) 6613.
ROYAL ASSENT TO BILLS, COM. FROM GOV. GEN'S SEC.: Read (Mr. *Speaker*) 2089 (i).
ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE, AMALGAMATION OF CLASSES: Ques. (Mr. *Prior*) 973 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 5571 (ii).
——— STAFF AND EMPLOYEES: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Tyrwhitt*) 2824 (i).
RUBBER GOODS, TARIFF RESPECTING: M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Osler*) 6637 (ii).
RUSSELL, CHARLES, SOLICITOR, AMOUNT PAID, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2839 (i).

STE. ANNE DE BEAUPRE, POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1072 (i).
STE. ANNE DE LA PÈRADE, RIVER IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 5649 (ii).
——— POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL: M. for O. Cs.* (Mr. (*Marcotte*) 4678 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 3313 (i).
STE. ANNE LOCK, OTTAWA RIVER, INVESTIGATION: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 4345 (ii).
——— REP. OF W. MERCIER: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Monk*) 3667 (i).
——— RIVER WORKS, CONTINUATION: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 3941 (ii).
STE. ANNE'S WHARF AT SEYMOUR POINT: in Com. of Sup., 5616 (ii).
STE. ANICET WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 5301, 5656 (ii).
——— COR. L. H. MASSON AND PUBLIC WORKS: M. for Copy* (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2841 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 3713 (i).
——— COST WHEN BUILT: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 2818.
ST. CYPRIEN POSTMASTER, CHARGES AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 6007 (ii).
ST. FELIX DE VALOIS, POSTMASTER, COMPLAINTS AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Dugas*) 4610 (ii).
ST. FRANCIS LAKE, REMOVAL OF BOULDERS: in Com. of Sup., 6528 (ii).
STE. GENEVIEVE FLOODS: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Monk*) 505 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 476 (i).

Ste. Helen's Island, Allotment for Military Purposes: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 456 (i).

St. Hyacinthe Customs Office, Dues and Officials: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 600 (i).

Ste. Irene Wharf, Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 5656.

St. Jacques L'Achigan, Postmaster: Ques. (Mr. *Dugas*) 1783 (i).

St. Jacques Model Farm, Establishment by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. *Dugas*) 7121 (ii).

St. Jean des Chaillons Harbour: in Com. of Sup., 5659 (ii).

St. John Bridge and Railway Extension Co.'s B. No. 78 (Mr. *Ellis*) 1°*, 1839; 2°, 1950 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 4072 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 83.)

—— **B. No. 157** (Mr. *Fielding*) 1°*, 6582; 2°*, 6801; in Com. and 3°*, 7011 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 9.)

St. John, Halifax and London Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 7282 (ii).

—— W. Indies and S. America Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 6686 (ii).

St. John Harbour Co.'s B. No. 101 (Mr. *Ellis*) 1°, 2430; 2°*, 3084 (i); in Com., and 3°* 5049 (ii). (61-62 *Vic. c.* 115.)

St. John (N.B.) Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 7645 (ii).

—— Marine Cemetery: in Com. of Sup., 7481 (ii).

—— Quarantine Station: in Com. of Sup., 7586.

St. Lawrence Channel, Placing of Buoys, Contracts: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 4180 (ii).

—— Removal of Rocks: in Com. of Sup., 5656 (ii).

—— North Shore, Telegraph Lines: in Com. of Sup., 6101 (ii).

—— Placing of Buoys: Remarks (Mr. *Bergeron*) 3318 (i).

—— Inundations: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 3660 (i).

—— Ship Channel: in Com. of Sup., 5050 (ii).

St. Luc Rifle Ranges, Govt. Action *re* Accident: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, King's*) 5569 (ii).

St. Michel de Napierville P.O., Cor., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 1471 (i).

—— Govt. Wharf, Repairs: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3312 (i).

—— Mail Service: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 3313 (i).

St. Peter's Canal, Dismissals: in Com. of Sup., 7207 (ii).

—— Repairs to Entrance: Ques. (Mr. *Gillies*) 1339 (i).

St. Pierre River Works, Tenders: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 476 (ii).

—— Dredging, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Monk*) 4678 (ii).

St. Regis, River Reaches: in Com. of Sup., 6538 (ii.)

St. Roch des Aulnaies Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 5658 (ii).

St. Sulpice Seminary: in Com. of Sup., 7291 (ii).

St. Thomas Mail Service, Tenders and Contracts: Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 453 (i).

—— Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 5494 (ii).

St. Tite Postmaster, Dismissal: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 3090 (i).

St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, Commissioner's Claims: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 3938 (ii).

—— M. to Print Rep. (Mr. *Fortin*) 6607 (ii).

—— Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 3940 (ii).

—— in Com. of Sup., 6639 (ii).

—— Revolt of Convicts: Ques. (Mr. *Chauvin*) 1069 (i).

—— Report of Commissioners: in Com. of Sup., 7491 (ii).

Saguenay River, Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 7639.

Salaries Attachment B. No. 14 (Mr. *Richardson*). 1°*, 271; 2°*, 2058; M. for Com., 2852, 3689; in Com., 3706 (i) 4639; On Order, 5175 (ii).

Sanford Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 7630 (ii).

San José Scale B. No. 82 (Mr. *Fisher*) 1°, 1904; 2°, 1926; in Com. and 3°*, 1928 (i). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 23.)

Div. (Mr. *Fisher*) 1904, 1921, 1925; (Mr. *Sproule*) 1907; (Mr. *Maclean*) 1908; (Mr. *Charlton*) 1909, 1926; (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1910; (Mr. *Henderson*) 1913; (Mr. *Gibson*) 1913; (Mr. *McCleary*) 1913; (Mr. *Borden, King's*) 1914; (Mr. *McMillan*) 1915; (Mr. *Hughes*) 1916; (Mr. *Erb*) 1916; (Mr. *Bain*) 1916; (Mr. *Bostock*) 1917; (Mr. *Ellis*) 1919; (Mr. *Montague*) 1919; (Mr. *McNeil*) 1924; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1927 (i).

M. to Adjn. (Mr. *Charlton*) 2241.

Div. (Mr. *McCleary*) 2247; (Mr. *Casey*) 2249; (Mr. *Hughes*) 2249; (Mr. *McMullen*) 2249; (Mr. *Maclean*) 2250; (Mr. *Semple*) 2250; (Mr. *McNeill*) 2251; (Mr. *Sproule*) 2251; (Mr. *Henderson*) 2252; (Mr. *Fisher*) 2252; (Mr. *Ellis*) 2262; (Mr. *McGregor*) 2264; (Mr. *McMillan*) 2265; (Mr. *Foster*) 2266 (i).

Sapper's Bridge, Ottawa: in Com. of Sup., 6100 (ii).

Sarnia Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 5482, 7588 (ii).

Saskatchewan Ry. and Mining Co.'s B. No. 126 (Mr. *Landerkin*) 1°*, 4521; 2°*, 4606; in Com. and 3°*, 6647 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 85.)

Saskatchewan, Dismissals of Indian Agents: in Com. of Sup., 6854 (ii).

—— District, Appnmt. of Judge: Remarks (Mr. *Davis*) 7042 (ii).

—— Timber Berths held by Moore, McDowell & Co.: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 481 (i).

—— Pet. ref. to Standing Orders: M. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 3924 (i).

Saskatoon Bridge: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Davis*) 4774 (ii).

Sault Ste. Marie Canal, Construction: in Com. of Sup., 6550 (ii).

—— Contractor's Claims: in Com. of Sup., 7105.

—— Wharfinger, Balance of Salary: in Com. of Sup., 7096 (ii).

Savings Banks: in Com. of Sup., 3828 (i).

—— Post Office Dept.: in Com. of Sup., 4581 (ii).

School Lands in Man., Sales, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 2432 (i).

"Scientific Dairying": in Com. of Sup., 6997 (ii).

Scientific Institutions: in Com. of Sup., 7284 (ii).

SECRETARY OF STATE:

Appnmts. by late Govt. and Colonial Office, Co &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Roddick*) 7889 (ii.)

SECRETARY OF STATE—*Con.*
CIVIL SERVICE EMPLOYEES IN PROVINCE OF QUEBEC AND COMMISSION, NAMES, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Monk*) 504 (i).
—— REP.: Presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 184 (i), 4348 (ii).
FRANCHISE ACT, DISTRIBUTION OF PRINTED COPIES: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 7854 (ii).
PRINTING BUREAU EMPLOYEES, NAMES, SALARIES, &c.: M. for Ret* (Mr. *Copp*) 3669 (i).
—— H. T. SMITH'S POSITION AND DUTIES: Ques. (Mr. *Copp*) 2350 (i).
—— SUPERINTENDENT'S STATUS: Ques. (Mr. *Copp*) 2431 (i).
QUEEN'S PRINTER, QUALIFICATIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Copp*) 3165 (i).
SECRETARY OF STATE'S DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 2425 (i).
—— in Com. of Sup., 4526 (ii).
VOTERS' LIST (ONT.), REVISING OFFICERS, COST OF PRINTING, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2845 (i).
SEED GRAIN, AMOUNT OWING BY FARMERS: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 5135, 5569 (ii).
SEELEY'S BAY POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL OF W. W. WILLIAMS: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3407 (i).
—— in Com. of Sup., 6701 (ii).
Senate and House of Commons Act further Amt. B. No. 173 (Mr. *Fielding*) 1°*, 2°*, 7657; in Com. and 3°*, 7788 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 15.)
SENATE PRINTING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6994 (ii).
SENATORS, NEW, APPNMTS., REF. TO TELEGRAPHIC DESPATCH: Remarks (Mr. *Gillies*) 2606 (i).
SESSIONAL ALLOWANCE TO ABSENT MEMBERS: in Com. of Sup., 7782 (ii).
—— CLERKS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5999, 6990, 7011.
—— INDEMNITY TO MEMBERS: Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*) 7382 (ii).
SHERIDAN, JOHN, INSPECTOR OF LIVE STOCK, APPNMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 6010 (ii).
SHANNON, THOS., KILLARNEY CUSTOMS OFFICER, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 4770 (ii).
—— in Com. of Sup., 7365 (ii).
Shipment of Grain—Ry. Act Amt B. No. 21 (Mr. *Richardson*) 1°*, 671 (i).
SHIPPEGAN HARBOUR (N.B.) EXTENSION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5641 (ii).
SHIRT AND COLLAR INDUSTRY: M. for Com. of Sup., (Mr. *Monk*) 6583 (ii).
SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 6862 (ii).
SKELTON *vs.* THE QUEEN, POSTMASTER AT BATTLEFORD, APPLICATION FOR NEW TRIAL: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 5319 (ii).
—— AFFIDAVITS *re:* Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 6112, 6240, 6317, 6322 (ii).
—— M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Davin*) 6803 (ii).
—— PERSONAL EXPLANATION (Mr. *Davin*) 6890 (ii).
—— PROCEEDINGS, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 5117, 5258 (ii).
—— Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 5931 (ii).
SLADEN, MR., STATUTORY INCREASE: in Com. of Sup., 3831 (i).
SLIDES AND BOOMS: in Com. of Sup., 6099 (ii).
SMELTING SILVER LEAD IN B.C., REGULATIONS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Earle*) 6012 (ii).
SNETSINGER, J. G., CLAIMS AGAINST GOVT.: in Com. of Sup., 7650 (ii).
Sons of England Benefit Society Co.'s B. No. 122 (Mr. *Bertram*) 1°*, 4029; 2°*, 4175; M. for Com., 6042; in Com., 6266; 3°*, 6328 (ii).
SONS OF ENGLAND BENEFIT SOCIETY B. No. 122 (Mr. *Bertram*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 6061 (ii).
SOULANGES CANAL, CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 6446 (ii).
—— CONTRACTORS' CLAIMS: in Com. of Sup., 6447, 6510 (ii).
—— EXPENDITURE ON CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 5133 (ii).
—— TENDERS FOR CEMENT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 4176 (ii).
SOURIS BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 5630 (ii).
SOUTH AFRICAN TRADE WITH CANADA: in Com. of Sup., 6691 (ii).
SOUTH AMERICAN TRADE WITH CANADA: in Com. of Sup., 6688 (ii).
SOUTHPORT TO MURRAY HARBOUR (P.E.I.) RY. EXTENSION: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 972 (i).
SPADES AND SHOVELS COMBINE, &c.: M. (Mr. *Richardson*) to Adjn., 1935 (i).
SPANISH AMBASSADOR, PRESENCE IN CANADA: Remarks (Mr. *Charlton*) 5788 (ii).
SPEECH FROM THE THRONE: Rep. (Mr. *Speaker*) 3 (i).
—— CONSDN.: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 4 (i).
SPENCER, WM., MOUNTED POLICE, DISCHARGE: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Davin*) 2840 (i).
—— PENSION: Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 6325 (ii).
SPINKS, JUDGE, INVESTIGATION *re:* Remarks (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 5268 (ii).
STANDING ORDERS, SEL. COM., SUSPENSION OF RULE: M. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 5013 (ii).
"STANLEY" REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7283 (ii).
STATIONERY ENGINEERS EXAMINATION BILL, PROP. INTRODUCTION: Remarks (Mr. *Sutherland*) 2799 (i).
STATISTICS GENERAL: in Com. of Sup., 5039 (ii).
STATISTICAL BRANCH, AGRICULTURE DEPT.: Ques. (Mr. *Heyd*) 2814 (i).
—— YEAR-BOOK: in Com. of Sup., 5025 (ii).
STATUTORY INCREASES, AGRICULTURE: in Com. of Sup., 4846 (ii).
—— AUD. GENERAL'S OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 4546 (ii).
—— CUSTOMS: in Com. of Sup., 4556 (ii).
—— FINANCE: in Com. of Sup., 4554 (ii).
—— GOV. GENERAL'S SEC.'S OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 3830 (i).
—— INDIAN AFFAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 4554 (ii).
—— INLAND REVENUE: in Com. of Sup., 4556 (ii).
—— INTERIOR: in Com. of Sup., 4527, 4551 (ii).
—— JUSTICE: in Com. of Sup., 3895 (i).
—— PUBLIC WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 4559 (ii).
—— RAILWAYS AND CANALS: in Com. of Sup., 4558.
—— SECRETARY OF STATE: in Com. of Sup., 4527.

STATUTES, REVISION AND CONSOLIDATION: Ques. (Mr. *Britton*) 2343 (i).

Steamboat Inspection and Licensing of Engineers B. No. 39 (Sir *Louis Davies*) 1°, 937; 2°, and in Com., 1869, 2084, 2531: 3°*, 2532 (i) Sen. Amts., 4525 (ii). (61-62 *Vic., c.* 46.)

STEAMBOAT INSPECTION: in Com. of Sup., 5003 (ii).

—— REMISSION OF PENALTIES: Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 2344 (i).

STEAMERS FOR FISHERY PROTECTION SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 7285 (ii).

STEAMSHIP SERVICE, CANADA AND FRANCE, ESTABLISHMENT: Ques.: (Mr. *Lemieux*) 456 (i).

—— ST. JOHN, &C., TO GREAT BRITAIN: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Foster*) 504 (i).

STELLARTON, CAR INSPECTOR SUTHERLAND, DISMISSAL: M. for Cor. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 1833, 2839 (i).

STIKINE RIVER, SURVEYS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 7242.

STIKINE-TESLIN WINTER ROAD: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 1187 (i).

STORM SIGNALS (C.B.) NUMBER, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bethune*) 7118 (ii).

STREET CAR FARES: in Com. of Sup., 4582 (i).

SUGAR: in Com. of Ways and Means, 7585 (ii).

SUMMERSIDE (P. E. I.) BREAKWATER, TENDERS FOR CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Powell*) 2816 (i).

—— HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 7637 (ii).

—— WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 5634 (ii).

SUPERIOR COURT, MAGDALEN ISLANDS: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 597 (i).

SUPPLY:

[Only subjects which caused remark or discussion noted under this head.]

AMTS. AND REMARKS TO MS. FOR COM.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, King's*) Yukon Contingent, 4795; (Mr. *Montague*) Appointments by the late Government, 4797; (Mr. *Davin*) Mounted Police Pensions, 5019; (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) Judge Spinks, Charges against, 5263; (Mr. *Wallace*) Manitoba School Question—Address to the Holy Father, 5394; (Mr. *Clarke*) Alien Labour Law, Enforcement, 5445; (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) Campbell McNab, Claim of, 5446; (Mr. *Gauvreau*) Temiscouata Election, Personal Explanation, 5447; (Mr. *Davin*) North-west Settlers, indebtedness due for Seed Grain, 5569; (Sir *Charles Tupper*) Royal Military College, Imperfect Ret., 5571; (Mr. *Sifton*) Indian Reserve Crops, Assiniboia, 5571; (Mr. *LaRivière*) Manitoba University Land Grant, 5571; (Sir *Charles Tupper*) Business of the Hse., 5885; (Mr. *Casey*) Pacific Cable from Vancouver to Australia, 6186; (Mr. *Foster*) Auditor General's Powers, 6202; neg. (Y. 32, N. 49) 6207; (Mr. *Corby*) Belleville Post Office, Dismissals, 6208; (Mr. *McMullen*) Debts due the Dom., 6228; (Mr. *Davin*) Queen vs. Skelton, 6240; (Mr. *Bennett*) Alien Labour Law at Georgian Bay, 6240; (Mr. *Richardson*) Crow's Nest Pass Ry. Construction, 6240; (Mr. *Belcourt*) Yukon Ry. Bill and par in Montreal *Gazette*, 6242; (Mr. *Choquette*) I.C.R. Train Service, 6242; (Mr. *Poupore*) Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal, 6466; (Mr. *Monk*) Shirt and Collar Industry, 6582; (Mr. *Bell, Pictou*) Crow's Nest Pass Ry., Treatment of Workmen, 6593; deb. rsmd., 6613; (Mr. *Ross Robertson*) International Copyright, 6627, 6801; (Mr. *Osler*) Rubber Goods, duty on, 6637; (Mr. *Bergeron*) Beauharnois Military Camp, 6638; (Mr. *Davin*) Battleford Postmaster, Charges against, 6803; (Mr. *MacLaren*) Honey Locust Plant and San José Scale Act, 6965; (Mr. *Gibson*) Sessional Trunks, Contract, 7047; (Mr. *Davis*) Manitoba and North-western Ry., 7470; (Mr. *Marcotte*) Personal Explanation *re* Par. in *La Patrie*, 7657; (Mr. *Davin*) Appointment of Mr. Rimmer as Law Clerk, Indian Dept., 7658; (Mr. *Hughes*) N. W. Mounted Police, Reported loss of men, 7659; (Mr. *Bertram*) Anglo-American Commission, 7689; (Mr. *Bergeron*) Manitoba School Question, Par. in *La Patrie*, 7697, 7715 (ii).

MESS. FROM HIS EX.: Transmitting Estimates for 1898-99, 2698 (i); Suppl., 5663; further Suppl., 6439; further Suppl., 1899, 7378 (ii).

RES. (Mr. *Fielding*) FOR COM., 449; Ms., 3828 (i) 4526, 4795, 4947, 5019, 5268, 5394, 5569, 5885, 5972, 6064, 6186, 6238, 6381, 6446, 6466, 6582, 6613, 6801, 6965, 7242, 7470, 7657, 7689 (ii).

IN COM.: 3828 3869 (i) 4526, 4575, 4845, 4947, 5020, 5050, 5268, 5448, 5572, 5886, 5906, 5972, 6064, 6226, 6244, 6268, 6381, 6446, 6510, 6638, 6819, 6975, 7011, 7087, 7179, 7242, 7474, 7586, 7659, 7720, 7744, 7792 (ii).

COMMITTEE:

Administration of Justice. See "Justice."

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics:

Archives, 5022 (ii).
Bulletins and Reports, Distribution, 5991 (ii).
Classification of Can. Patents, 7512 (ii).
Cold Storage, 5997 (ii).
Creameries in N.W.T., 5994, 5996 (ii).
Criminal Statistics, 5025 (ii).
Dairying Service, 5994 (ii).
Experimental Farms, 5972 (ii).
General Statistics, 5039 (ii).
Nappan, N.S., Dwellings at Dairy Station, 7513 (ii).
North-west Exhibition (1894) Outstanding Accounts, 6995 (ii).
Paris Exhibition, 5039 (ii).
Patent Record, 5023 (ii).
Statistical Year-Book, 5025 (ii).

Charges of Management, 3828 (i).
Dominion Notes, Printing, &c., 6976 (ii).

Civil Government:

Agriculture, 4845 (ii).
Auditor General's Office, 4546, 7475 (ii).
Contingencies:
Agriculture, 5020 (ii).
Auditor General, 4586, 7475 (ii).
Customs, 4588 (ii).
Finance, 4587, 4598 (ii).
Governor General's Office, 4581, 6978 (ii).
High Commissioner's Office, 4561, 4575 (ii).
Indian Dept., 4585 (ii).
Inland Revenue, 4589, 6978 (ii).
Justice, 4582, 6983 (ii).
Marine and Fisheries, 4598, 6984, 7481 (ii).
Militia and Defence, 4585, 6984, 7482 (ii).
Post Office Dept., 4915, 7038, 7482 (ii).
Privy Council Office, 4582, 7483 (ii).
Public Works, 4591, 6984 (ii).
Queen's Printer, 7483 (ii).
Railways and Canals, 4597 (ii).
Trade and Commerce, 4598, 7483 (ii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Civil Government—Con.
Customs, 4555, 7475; conc., 7818, 7852 (ii).
Finance, 4554 (ii).
Geological Survey, 4559, 7477 (ii).
Governor General's Secretary's Office, 3-30 (i).
High Commissioner's Office, 4560 (ii).
Indian Dept., 4553 (ii).
Inland Revenue, 4556 (ii).
Interior, 4527, 4551 (ii).
Justice, 3894 (i) 6983 (ii).
Penitentiaries Branch, 3899 (i).
Marine and Fisheries, 4558, 6984, 7481 (ii).
Militia and Defence, 3899 (i), 6564, 6984, 7482 (ii).
Mounted Police, 4545 (ii).
Postmaster General's, 4581, 4857, 7038, 7482 (ii).
Privy Council Office, 3894 (i), 7483 (ii).
—— Private Sec.'s Salary, 6978 (ii).
Public Printing and Stationery, 4527, 4545, 7483 (ii).
Public Works, 4558, 6984 (ii).
Railways and Canals, 4558 (ii).
Secretary of State, 4526 (ii).
Sundry Depts., Private Sec.'s Salaries, 7484 (ii).
Trade and Commerce, 4560, 7483 (ii).
Collection of Revenues:
Adulteration of Food, &c., 6000 (ii).
Culling Timber, 6000, 7249 (ii).
Customs, 6000 (ii).
Chicoutimi Pulp Works, 7774, 7792; conc., 7852 (ii).
General Vote, 7356 (ii).
Laboratory, 7773 (ii).
Excise:
Contingencies, Preventive Service, &c., 7243 (ii).
Printing of Law Stamps, 7251 (ii).
Salaries, Officers, Inspectors, &c., 6000 (ii).
Post Office (Outside Service):
Letter Carriers, &c., 6698, 7775 (ii).
Miscellaneous Expenses, 6701 (ii).
Salaries, &c., 7038, 7050 (ii).
Public Works:
Slides and Booms, Dues, Salaries, &c., 7643 (ii).
Railways:
I.C.R., Damages by Fire, Payment to A. Kirk, 7373 (ii).
Customs. See "Collection of Revenues."
Dominion Lands—Capital:
Surveys, &c., 6860, 7207; conc., 7822 (ii).
Dominion Lands—Income:
General Vote, 6858 (ii).
Salaries, Extra Clerks, &c., 7323 (ii).
Dominion Police:
Bertillion System for Identification of Criminals, 7488 (ii).
Excise. See "Collection of Revenues."
Fisheries:
Behring Sea Claims Commission, 7286 (ii).
Fisheries, Reference to Privy Council, 7285 (ii).
Repairs to Fishery Protection Steamers, 7285 (ii).
Salaries, Inspectors, &c., 5004, 5268 (ii).
Geological Survey, 7754 (ii).
Govt. of North-west Territories, 6857 (ii).
Insane Asylums in Man., 7305 (ii).
Govt. of the Yukon Provisional District:
Services of North-west Mounted Police, 6858 (ii).
Steam Launches, 7769 (ii).
Immigration:
Agents and Employees in Canada, salaries, 6819, 7744 (ii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Immigration—Con.
Contingencies, 7744 (ii).
General Vote, 7287, 7733, 7744 (ii).
Indians:
General Vote, Inspectors' Salaries, 7303 (ii).
Manitoba and N.W.T., 6854, 7301 (ii).
Purveyor's salary, 7765 (ii).
New Brunswick, 7294, 7298 (ii).
Nova Scotia, 7293, 7294 (ii).
Ontario and Quebec, 7291 (ii).
Mt. Elgin, Ont., Industrial School, 7754 (ii).
Sundries:
Survey of Indian Reserves, 6848 (ii).
Inspection of Staples:
Purchase and Distribution of Flour and Grain Standards, &c., 6695 (ii).
Justice, Administration of:
Exchequer Court, Salaries, Expenses, &c., 6639 (ii).
To Chas. Morse, for furnishing Reports of Decisions, 6639 (ii).
Supreme Court, Law Library, 6638 (ii).
Mr. Justice McGuire's Salary, 6986, 7486 (ii).
Legislation:
House of Commons:
Additional amount required, 6990 (ii).
Committees, Sessional Messengers, &c., 7782 (ii).
French Translation of Experimental Farm Report, 7011 (ii).
North Ontario Elections, Litigation Costs, 7505 (ii.)
Publishing Debates, 7011 (ii).
Sessional and Extra Clerks, 5999, 7011, 7782 (ii).
Sessional Indemnities, Absent Members, 7782 (ii).
Library:
American History, Books on, 5999 (ii).
Senate:
Unforeseen Expenses, printing debates and contingencies, 6994 (ii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service:
Construction, &c., of Lights, 4999 (ii).
Maintenance and Repairs of Lights, 4998 (ii).
Repairs to Wharfs, 5000 (ii).
Salaries and Allowances to Keepers, 4981 (ii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions:
Baddeck, Grand Narrows and Iona, Big Pond and East Bay, 7723 (ii).
Can. and South Africa, 7720 (ii).
Gaspé Basin and Dalhousie, 6687 (ii).
Montreal, Quebec and Manchester, 7282, 7659 (ii).
Port Mulgrave and St. Peter's and Irish Cove, 7723.
Quebec and Gaspé Basin, 6688 (ii).
St. John and Digby, 6226 (ii).
St. John and Halifax *via* Yarmouth, 6688 (ii).
St. John, Halifax and London, 7282 (ii).
St. John and London, Liverpool, &c., 7282, 7659 (ii).
St. John or Halifax and West Indies and South America, 6686 (ii).
Victoria and San Francisco, 6687 (ii).
Marine Hospitals:
Marine Hospitals and Shipwrecked Seamen, 5003 (ii).
Militia:
Arms and Accoutrements, 7523 (ii).
Artillery Association, Entertainment of English Team, 7521 (ii).
Camping Ground at London, 7516 (ii).
Dominion Cartridge Factory, 6570, 7075 (ii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Militia—Con.
General Vote, 7056, 7515 (ii).
Gratuities to Officers, retired, &c., 6573, 7517, 7521.
Lt.-Col. Worsley, D.A.G. at Halifax, 7519 (ii).
Miscellaneous and Unforeseen, 6570 (ii).
Mounted Police Pensions, Rebellion of 1885, 6577 (ii).
Rifle Association, Grant, &c., 6570, 7521 (ii).
Thos. Moore, sen., loss of son at Batoche (1885) 7520.
Yukon Contingent, Supplies, &c., 7793.

Miscellaneous:
Alien Labour Law, Enforcement in Man. and N.W.T., 7275, 7772 (ii).
Arbitration, Dom., and Ont. and Quebec Accounts, 6861 (ii).
Banff, Rocky Mountain Park, 7769 (ii).
Boundary between Canada and U.S.A., Expenses, 6860 (ii).
Canadian Mining Institute, 7770 (ii).
Cases of the B.N.A. Act, Publication, &c., 7088 (ii).
Classification of Privy Council Records, 7279 (ii).
Contributions for Can. Law Library, England, 7088.
Crow's Nest Pass Ry., Expenses of Commission, 7251.
Deep Waterways Commission, Expenses, &c., 7282.
Expenses of Chief Justice Strong, 7089 (ii).
Gratuities, &c., Interior, 7769 (ii).
Hudson Bay Expedition, Printing reports, &c., 7094.
Legal Expenses *re* Belgian and German Treaties, 7088 (ii).
Liquor Commission, Payments to *Hansard* Reporters, 7094 (ii).
Litigation Costs, Can. Sugar Refining Co., 7770 (ii).
Man. Schools, Litigation Costs, 7770 (ii).
Parliamentary Guide, Purchase of Copies, 6975.
Pilotage Investigations at Montreal, 7102 (ii).
Printing, Miscellaneous, conc., 7850 (ii).
Quebec Land Slide, Commission, 7087 (ii).
Relief for Sufferers of the Prescott and Russell Forest Fires, 7089 (ii).
Rocky Mountain Park, Fencing, &c., 7251 (ii).
Salary to J. C. Roland, Sault Ste. Marie, 7098 (ii).

Mounted Police, 6856 (ii).

Ocean and River Service:
Biological Station, Marine, Gulf of St. Lawrence, 7733 (ii).
Can. Registry of Shipping, 4954 (ii).
Cattle Inspection, Salaries, &c., 7732 (ii).
Govt. Steamers, Maintenance and Repairs, 4947 (ii).
New Steamer to replace SS. "Stanley," 7730 (ii).
Obstructions in Navigable Rivers, 4964 (ii).
Repairs to SS. "Stanley," 7283 (ii).
Rewards for Saving Life, 4952 (ii).
Tidal Service, &c., 4955, 7732 (ii).
Winter Mail Service, 4964, 7284 (ii).

Penitentiaries:
British Columbia, 7339 (ii).
Dorchester, 6676 (ii).
Kingston, 6686, 7339 (ii).
Surgeon's Salary as Superintendent of Insane Ward, 7488 (ii).
Manitoba, 7339 (ii).
St. Vincent de Paul, 6639, 7339 (ii).

Post Office: See "Collection of Revenues."

Public Works—Capital:
Buildings:
Ottawa, Western Deptl. Block, 5069 (ii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Public Works—Capital—Con.
Harbours and Rivers:
River Kaministiquia, 5067 (ii).
St. Lawrence Ship Channel, 5050 (ii).
Public Works—Income:
Buildings:
British Columbia:
Dom. Public Buildings, 5493 (ii).
Vancouver Drill Hall, 7589 (ii).
Victoria Public Building, 5493 (ii).
General Vote, 5494 (ii).
Manitoba:
Portage la Prairie P.O., 5485 (ii).
New Brunswick:
Marysville P.O., 5092 (ii).
St. John Quarantine Station, 7586 (ii).
North-west Territories:
Dom. Public Buildings, 5489 (ii).
Medicine Hat Court House, 7589 (ii).
Nova Scotia:
Kentville and Liverpool P.O., 5072 (ii).
Halifax Dom. Building, 7214 (ii).
Halifax Drill Hall, 5071, 7586 (ii).
Windsor Drill Shed and Building, 7214 (ii).
Ontario:
Alexandria Reformatory, 5482 (ii).
Arnprior P.O., 5149 (ii).
Dom. Public Buildings, Generally, 5448 (ii).
Experimental Farm, Laboratory, 5495 (ii).
French Translators' Office, Ottawa, 7218 (ii).
Kingston Drill Hall, 5453 (ii).
Major's Hill Park (stone fence) 5453, 5572, 7588.
Ottawa Public Buildings, Sidewalks, &c., 5470, 5471, 7217 (ii).
Ottawa, Payments to Howell Estate, 7587 (ii).
—— East Block, New Elevator, 7588 (ii).
—— Langevin Block, Fire Proof Roof, 7587 (ii).
—— West Block, New Boilers, 7588 (ii).
Port Colborne Public Building, 5463 (ii).
Rat Portage Public Buildings, 5470, 7585 (ii).
Sarnia Public Building, 5482, 7588 (ii).
Summer-house, Ottawa, 7218 (ii).
Toronto, Repairs, &c., 5448, 7217 (ii).
Woodstock P.O., 5464 (ii).
Quebec:
Montmagny P.O., 5093 (ii).
Montreal P.O., 7587 (ii).
Rimouski P.O., &c., 7217 (ii).
Quebec Custom House, 7587 (ii).
Rents, Repairs, Furniture, &c.:
Dom. Buildings, Ottawa, 5598 (ii).
Dom. Immigration Buildings, 5611 (ii).
Heating, Fuel, &c., Dom. Public Buildings, 5608.
Major's Hill Park, Ottawa, 5606 (ii).
Rents, Dom. Public Buildings, 5606 (ii).
Rideau Hall Grounds and Renewals, 5598 (ii).
Salaries of Caretakers, Engineers, &c., of Dom. Pub. Buildings, 5607 (ii).
Telephone Service, Ottawa, 5605 (ii).
Dredging, 7242 (ii).
British Columbia, 6099 (ii).
Dredge Vessels, Repairs, 6081 (ii).
General Service, 6099 (ii).
Manitoba, 6099 (ii).
New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, 6082 (ii).
New Dredging Plant, 6072 (ii).
Ontario and Quebec, 6087 (ii).
Prince Edward Island, 6082 (ii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—Con.
Harbours and Rivers, Generally, 6066 (ii).
British Columbia:
Columbia River Improvements, 6064, 6065, 6066.
Fraser River Improvements, 6065 (ii).
General Repairs, &c., 6065 (ii).
Stikine River, Examination, &c., 7242 (ii).
Manitoba:
Lake Manitoba Outlets, &c., 5928 (ii).
Maritime Provinces, Generally, 5642 (ii).
New Brunswick:
Burnt Church, Wharf, 7636 (ii).
Campbellton Wharf, Repairs, 7635 (ii).
Cape Tormentine Breakwater, 5642 (ii).
Shippegan Harbour, 5641 (ii).
Tracadie, Additional Block, Repairs, &c., 7635.
Upper Tobique River, Improvements, &c., 7633.
Nova Scotia:
Advocate Harbour, Wharf, 7631 (ii).
Cow Bay, Breakwater, Repairs, 7590 (ii).
Cribbons Point, Repairs to Wharf, 5614 (ii).
Eastern Passage, Boat Harbour, 5618 (ii).
East Ragged Island, Wharf, 5618 (ii).
Ingonish, North Bay, Breakwater, 7589 (ii).
Iona Wharf, 7589 (ii).
Jordan Bay Breakwater, Repairs, 7629 (ii).
Judique Wharf, 5612, 5615 (ii).
L'Ardoise, Repairs to Breakwater, 5622 (ii).
Livingstone Cove Wharf, 7633 (ii).
Louis' Head, Repairs to Crib-work, &c., 7630 (ii).
McNutt's Island, Beach Protection, 7629 (ii).
Margaree, Extension of Pier, 5616 (ii).
Meteghan Breakwater, Repairs, 5619 (ii).
Morden, Repairs to Wharf, 5615 (ii).
New Harbour, Breakwater, 7590 (ii).
North River. St. Anne's Wharf at Seymour's Point, 5616 (ii).
Petit de Grat, Dredging, &c., 7589 (ii).
Pictou Light, Beach Protection, 7631 (ii).
Port Hillford, Breakwater, 7628 (ii).
Port Joli Wharf, 5628 (ii).
Port Latour Breakwater, 5628 (ii).
Sandford Breakwater, 7630 (ii).
Swim's Point Wharf, 7629 (ii).
Tancock Island Wharf, Repairs, 7629 (ii).
Upper Port Latour, Wharf, 7629 (ii).
Upper Woods Harbour, Wharf, 7629 (ii).
West Arichat Wharf, 7589 (ii).
Whycocomagh Wharf, 5622 (ii).
Windsor Harbour, Deepening Channel, &c., 5619.
Ontario:
Collingwood Harbour, 5886 (ii).
Kingston Harbour, 7242, 7641 (ii).
L'Original Wharf, 5922 (ii).
Meaford Harbour, 5927 (ii).
North Bay Wharf, 5927 (ii).
Owen Sound Harbour, 5889 (ii).
Port Burwell Harbour, 5922 (ii).
Port Stanley, Repairs, &c., 5926 (ii).
—— Harbour Improvements, 5927 (ii).
Rainy River Channel, 5888 (ii).
River Ottawa, Channel Improvements, conc., 7819 (ii).
Thornbury Wharf, 5926 (ii).
Toronto Harbour, 5891 (ii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—Con.
Harbours and Rivers—*Con.*
Prince Edward Island:
Belfast Pier, 5632 (ii).
Brae Breakwater, 5633 (ii).
China Point Pier, Reconstruction, 7636 (ii).
Creosoted Piles, Purchase of, 5633 (ii).
General Repairs to Piers, &c., 5630 (ii).
Red Point Wharf, 5633 (ii).
Souris Breakwater, 5630 (ii).
Summerside Harbour, 7637 (ii).
Tignish Breakwater, 5632 (ii).
West Point Wharf, 5632 (ii).
Quebec:
Anse à Beaufils Harbour, 5658 (ii).
Baie St. Paul Wharf, Repairs, &c., 7639 (ii).
Chicoutimi, Saguenay River, Dredging, 7639 (ii)
Coteau Landing, Dredging, 7226 (ii).
Doucet's Landing, Dredging, 7639 (ii).
Grand Rivière Wharf, 5648 (ii).
Isle Perrot Wharf, 5659 (ii).
Laprairie Ice Piers, &c., 5653 (ii).
Maria Wharf, 7636 (ii).
Point Claire Wharf, 5659 (ii).
Rivière la Pipe Wharf, 5660 (ii).
Rivière Richelieu, Guide Piers, 5653 (ii).
St. Anicet Wharf, 5656 (ii).
Ste. Anne de Sorel, Ice Piers, 5660 (ii).
St. Iréne Wharf, 5656 (ii).
St. Jean des Chaillons Harbour, 5659 (ii).
St. Lawrence River, Removal of Rocks, 5656 (ii).
St. Roch des Aulnaies Wharf, 5658 (ii)
Miscellaneous:
Architects, &c., payment to W. C. Harris, 7243.
Monument, late Alex. Mackenzie, 6105 (ii).
National Art Gallery, 6103 (ii).
To cover balances of Expenditure for Works for which Appropriations are insufficient, 6244.
Temporary Clerks, &c., 6104 (ii).
Roads and Bridges:
Bridge across Saskatchewan, Edmonton, 6100, 6245, 6268, conc., 7822 (ii).
Dom Traffic Bridges Throughout Canada, 6100.
Maria St. Bridge, Ottawa, 6100 (ii).
Sappers' Bridge, Ottawa, 6100 (ii).
Slides and Booms, 6099 (ii).
Telegraph Lines:
Cape Beale and Carmenah (B.C.) alternative lines, 6102 (ii).
North Shore, St. Lawrence, 6101 (ii).
North-west Territories, 6316 (ii).
Quarantine:
Cattle Quarantine, 5988 (ii).
Gratuity to Wm. McK. McLeod, 6995 (ii).
Slaughter of Hogs and Sheep, Compensation, 7003.
William's Head, B.C., Quarantine, 7514 (ii).
Railways and Canals:
Canals:
Beauharnois, Repairs, &c., 7189 (ii).
Chambly, Swing Bridge, 6553 (ii).
—— Culverts, &c., 7651 (ii).
Cornwall, Claims of J. G. Snetsinger, 7650 (ii).
—— Enlargement, 6532, 6554 (ii).
Farran's Point, Enlargement, 6532 (ii).
Galops, Straightening, &c., 6538 (ii).
General Expenses for Investigations, 7194 (ii).
Grenville, Enlargement, 6552 (ii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Railways and Canals—Con.
Canals—*Con.*
Lachine, Enlargement, 6551 (ii).
Lake St. Francis, Removal of Boulders, 6538 (ii).
Murray, Floating Landing Stage, 6554 (ii).
North Channel, Straightening, &c., 6535 (ii).
Rideau, 7182 (ii).
River Reaches, 6538 (ii).
St. Pierre River, Deepening, 6551 (ii).
Sault St. Marie, Construction, &c., 6550, 7105 (ii).
Soulanges, Construction, 6446, 6510 (ii).
Trent Valley, Construction, 6538, 6553 (ii).
Welland, 7652 (ii).
Williamsburg, Lock Gates and Stone Lifter, 6554.
—— Gratuity to Geo. Reid, 7192 (ii).
Railways:
Canadian Pacific Railroad:
Land Damages, &c., 6382 (ii).
To pay Balance for Work under Award, 6381 (ii).
Crow's Nest Pass R.R.:
Salary of Superintending Engineer, 7110 (ii).
Intercolonial Ry., 6564 (ii).
Dalhousie Wharf, Improvements, 7084 (ii).
Drummond Co. Ry. and G. T. Ry., Rental, 6553.
—— Salary of Superintending Engineer, 7181.
Extension to Deep Water, North Sydney. C.B., 6386 (ii).
Fire, Damages by, 7183, 7373 (ii).
Increased Accommodation at Halifax, 6382 (ii).
—— at Moncton, 6388, 7084 (ii).
—— at Mulgrave, 6428 (ii).
—— at St. John, 7645 (ii).
—— at Various Points, 6433 (ii).
Increased Strength of Iron Bridges, 6288, 6564.
Indiantown Branch, Land Damages, 7078 (ii).
Land Damages, Oxford and New Glasgow and Cape Breton Divisions, 6385 (ii).
Masonry Culvert and Embankments, 7085 (ii).
Original Construction, 6385 (ii).
Passenger and Freight Shed, Richmond, 6427.
Rolling Stock, 7643 (ii).
Snow Fences, Eastern Extension, &c., 6427 (ii).
To Dredge at Pictou and Landing Wharf, 6427.
Prince Edward Island Ry.:
Additional Rolling Stock, 6434 (ii).
Straightening Curves on Main Line, 6434 (ii).
Miscellaneous:
Survey of an All-Canadian Route to the Yukon, 6562 (ii).
Railway Subsidies:
Subsidy to Central Railroad of New Brunswick, 7653 (ii).
Subsidy to Halifax Banking Co., 7807 (ii).
Scientific Institutions:
Hydrographic Surveys, 5000 (ii).
Meteorological Service, 5001, 7285 (ii).
Toronto Observatory, 5002, 7284 (ii).
Steamboat Inspection, 5003 (ii).
Trade and Commerce:
Administration of Chinese Immigration Act, 6690 (ii).
Commercial Agencies, Expenses, &c., 6690 (ii).
International Customs Bureau, 6690 (ii).
Unprovided Items, as per Auditor General's Report, 7351 (ii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Yukon Provisional District:
Maintenance of Mounted Police Force, 7338, 7353 (ii).
Salaries, &c., of Administration, 7323 (ii).
[*See* "Govt. of Yukon, &c."]
CONCURRENCE;
Bridge across Saskatchewan at Edmonton, 7822 (ii).
Customs, 7818, 7852 (ii).
Dom. Lands, Surveys, &c., 7822 (ii).
Miscellaneous Printing, 7850 (ii).
Public Works, Channel at Pembroke, 7819 (ii).
Supply B. No. 174 (Mr. *Fielding*) 1°*, 7854; 2° and in Com., 7857; 3°, 7858 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 1.)
SURVEYS: in Com. of Sup., 6860 (ii).
SURVEY, INDIAN RESERVES: in Com. of Sup., 6847 (ii).
—— PRINTING PLANS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7307; conc., 7882 (ii).
SUTTON, LT., INSTRUCTIONS *re* MILITARY COURSE IN ENGLAND: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 1782 (i).
SWIM'S POINT WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 7629 (ii).
SYDNEY AND NORTH SYDNEY QUARANTINE PHYSICIAN: Ques. (Mr. *McDougall*) 1781 (i).
Tamagamingue Ry. Co.'s B. No. 62 (Mr. *McHugh*) 1°*, 1465; 2°*, 1775 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 4072 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 87.)
TANNER, JOHN E., DETENTION BY SPANISH GOVT. AT PORTO RICO. Ques. (Mr. *Russell*) 6011 (ii).
TARTE, HON. MR. AND THE SENATE, PAR. IN *Le Soleil*: Remarks (Mr. *Marcotte*) 3319 (i).
TELEGRAPH LINES, GODBOUT AND POINTE AUX ESQUIMAUX: in Com. of Sup., 6101 (ii).
—— NORTH SHORE ST. LAWRENCE, TENDERS FOR CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 7123 (ii).
—— NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES: in Com. of Sup., 6316 (ii).
—— NOVA SCOTIA, RATES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bethune*) 6006 (ii).
TELEPHONE SERVICE, OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 5605.
TÉMISCOUATA ELECTION: Personal Explanation (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 5447 (ii).
TENDERS FOR COAL ON DREDGES: in Com. of Sup., 5059 (ii).
TENNANT, J. F., CUSTOMS COLLECTOR, MAN., DISMISSAL: M. for Ret., 3670 (i) 4182 (ii).
TERREBONNE EXCISE DIVISION, MR. PREVOST'S REP. *re* COLLECTOR: M. for Copy* (Mr. *Chauvin*) 1837.
TERRITORIAL EXHIBITION (N.W.T.), ACCOUNTS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6995 (ii).
—— MISS CUMMINGS' CLAIMS: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1780 (i).
—— OUTSTANDING INDEBTEDNESS: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 486 (i).
—— PAYMENT OF PRIZES: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 976.
—— P. LAMONT'S ACCOUNT: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 2431 (i).
TESLIN LAKE WAGON ROUTE AND GOVT. POLICY: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 2700 (i).
THESSALON POINT LIGHTHOUSE, TOTAL COST: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 1932 (i).
THORNBURY WHARF, REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 5926 (ii).

TIDAL SERVICE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7732 (ii).
——— SURVEYS · in Com. of Sup., 4955 (ii).
TIDES AND CURRENTS, REPS. OF SURVEYS: M. for Copy (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 1835 (i).
TIGNISH BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 5632 (ii).
——— TENDERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 1074 (i).
TIMBER BERTHS IN N.W.T. AND YUKON: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Foster*) 504 (i).
Tobique Manufacturing Co'.s B. No. 129 (Mr. *Taylor*) 1°*, 2°*, 5050; in Com. and 3°*, 6266 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 116.)
TOBIQUE RIVER CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 7633 (ii).
Toronto and Hudson Bay Ry. incorp. B. No. 77 (Mr. *Clarke*) 1°*, 1839; 2°*, 1949 (i); M. for Com., 4562; in Com. and 3°*, 4606; Sen. Amts., 5906, 6268 (ii). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 88.)
Toronto Board of Trade B. No. 43 (Mr. *Osler*) 1°*, 970; 2°*. 1214; in Com. and 3°*, 2122 (i). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 117.)
TORONTO HARBOUR, DREDGING, &c., CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 4771 (ii).
——— in Com. of Sup., 7231 (ii).
——— LIABILITY INCURRED: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 971.
——— EASTERN ENTRANCE: in Com. of Sup., 5891.
——— IMPROVEMENTS, AMOUNTS PAID W. E. PHIN: Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 1337 (i).
——— OBSERVATORY: in Com. of Sup., 5002, 7284 (ii).
——— PUBLIC BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 5448, 7217 (ii).
TRACADIE, ADDITIONAL PURCHASE: in Com. of Sup., 7635 (ii).
TRADE AND COMMERCE:
ATLANTIC FAST SS. SERVICE, CONTRACT: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 7385 (ii).
——— NEGOTIATIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Ives*) 600 (i).
——— PETERSEN & TATE'S CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 829 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Dobell*) 3297 (i).
——— Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 3313 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 6609 (ii).
——— TELEGRAM FROM LONDON *re* CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 7356 (ii).
ANGLO-FRENCH TELEGRAPH CO. PETS., &c.: M. (Mr. *Fraser, Guysboro'*) 5143 (ii).
BADDECK, &c., AND IONA MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 7723 (ii).
CANADA AND SOUTH AFRICA MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 7720 (ii).
CANADIAN AND ENGLISH MAIL, BEAVER LINE STEAMERS: Ques. (Mr. *Ives*) 2844 (i).
COMMERCIAL AGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 4575, 6690.
FRENCH LINE OF STEAMERS, NEGOTIATIONS: Remarks (Mr. *Bergeron*) 6465 (ii).
GASPÉ BASIN AND DALHOUSIE MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 6687 (ii).
——— AND QUEBEC MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 6687 (ii).
——— LINE OF STEAMERS, SUBSIDY: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 7120 (ii).
——— STEAM COMMUNICATION WITH QUEBEC: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 7685 (ii).
HALIFAX, ST. JOHN AND YARMOUTH MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 6687 (ii).
HAWAIIAN VESSELS NAVIGATING CANADIAN WATERS: Ques. (Mr. *Domville*) 603 (i).
TRADE AND COMMERCE—*Con.*
MAGDALEN ISLAND MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 1575 (i).
MAIL SUBSIDIES AND SS. SUBVENTIONS: in Com. of Sup., 7282 (ii).
MONTREAL, QUEBEC AND MANCHESTER MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 7659 (ii).
NEWFOUNDLAND AND CAPE BRETON MAIL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 7282 (ii).
PACIFIC CABLE, CAN. AND AUSTRALIA: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Casey*) 5232 (ii).
——— IMPERIAL GOVT'S REP.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Casey*) 3668 (i).
——— on M. for Com. of Sup., 6186 (ii).
——— M. to print papers (Mr. *Casey*) 6226 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *McNeill*) 7125, 7384 (ii).
PETERSEN, TATE & CO.'S CONTRACT, TEL. FROM LONDON: Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) in Com. of Sup., 7356 (ii).
PORT MULGRAVE, &c., TO IRISH COVE MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 7723 (ii).
ST. JOHN, HALIFAX AND LONDON MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 7282 (ii).
——— W. INDIES AND S. AMERICA MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 6686 (ii).
STEAMSHIP SERVICE, CAN. AND FRANCE, ESTABLISHMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 456 (i).
STEAMSHIP SERVICE, ST. JOHN, &c., TO GREAT BRITAIN: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Foster*) 504 (i).
SOUTH AFRICAN TRADE WITH CANADA: in Com. of Sup., 6691 (ii).
SOUTH AMERICAN TRADE WITH CANADA: in Com. of Sup., 6688 (ii).
TRADE AND COMMERCE DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 4560, 4598 (ii).
——— CLERICAL ASSISTANCE: in Com. of Sup., 7483.
——— Rep.: Presented (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 935.
U.S. VESSELS IN CANADIAN WATERS, RIGHT TO EXCLUDE: Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 824 (i).
VICTORIA AND SAN FRANCISCO MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 6687 (ii).
WEST INDIAN TRADE, EXTENSION: Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1339 (i).
——— Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2844 (i).
[*See* "CUSTOMS," "WAYS AND MEANS," &c.]
Trade Mark and Design Act Amt. B. No. 61 (Mr. *Bertram*). 1°*, 1387; 2° m., 2842 (i); in Com and 3°*, 4208 (ii).
Transit of Grain in Man. and N. W. Ter. Regulation B. No. 19 (Mr. *Douglas*). 1°, 450; 2° *m.*, 2059; ref. to Com. on Rys., 2083 (i).
TRANSLATORS OFFICE, OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 7218 (ii).
TRANSPORT OF MERCHANDISE IN U. S. VESSELS: Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 1076 (i).
TREASURY VAULT (B.C.): in Com. of Sup., 5493 (ii).
TREASURY BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS, NON-PRODUCTION OF RETURNS: Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1077 (i).
TRENT VALLEY CANAL, CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 6538 (ii).
——— GOVT. AID: Ques. (Mr. *Corby*) 2817 (i).
——— REMOVAL OF ROCK: in Com. of Sup., 6553 (ii).
TROUT COVE BREAKWATER, REPAIRS: Ques. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 3824 (i).
"TRUDEAU," STR.: in Com. of Sup., 6072 (ii).

TRUNKS FOR MEMBERS: in Com. of Sup., 7035 (ii).
——— on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Gibson*) 7047 (ii).
TYANDENAGA INDIANS, MEDICAL ATTENDANCE: in Com. of Sup., 7754 (ii).
Union Bank of Canada Amt. B. No. 24 (Mr. *Belcourt*). 1°*, 743; 2°* and in Com., 824; 3°*, 2122 (i). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 118.)
UNITED COUNTIES RY., PAYMENTS TO: Ques. (Mr. *Marcotte*) 3658 (i).
UNITED STATES AND CANADA, JOINT COM., PROP. CONFERENCE: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 6609 (ii).
——— CUSTOMS IN ALASKA, BOUNDARY LINE: Remarks (Mr. *Sifton*) 407 (i).
——— TELEGRAM IN MONTREAL *Gazette*: Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 405 (i).
——— REGULATIONS AT FORT WRANGEL: Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1086 (i).
——— REGULATIONS AT SKAGWAY AND DYEA: Explanation (Mr. *Paterson*) 264 (i).
——— Ques. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 101 (i).
——— REGULATIONS ON THE STIKINE: Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 720 (i).
U. S. AND GREAT BRITAIN IMPORTS: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 3663 (i).
——— OCCUPATION OF DYEA AND SKAGWAY: Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 829 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Prior*) 619 (i).
——— RELIEF EXPEDITION TO THE YUKON: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 102 (i).
——— MILITARY ESCORT: Ques. (Mr. *McInnes*) 970.
——— SS. "FREDERICK J. GERRING," SUPREME COURT JUDGMENT: M. for Ret. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 2823 (i).
——— SS. "YANTIC" AND "LA CANADIENNE" COLLISION; Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 4451 (ii).
——— PASSAGE UP ST. LAWRENCE: Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 830 (i).
——— Ques. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1336 (i).
——— VESSELS IN CANADIAN WATERS, RIGHT TO EXCLUDE: Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 824 (i).
——— WARSHIPS IN CANADIAN CANALS: Remarks (Mr. *Wallace*) 4350 (ii).
UNIVERSITY OF MAN. AND GOVT. GRANT OF LAND: M. for O. C.* (Mr. *LaRivière*) 3670 (i).
UNPROVIDED ITEMS AS PER AUDITOR GEN.'S REP.: in Com. of Sup., 7351 (ii).
VACANCIES: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 2, 1079 (i).
Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Ry. Co.'s B. No. 64 (Mr. *Maxwell*). 1°*, 1573; 2°*, 1775 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 4387 (ii). 61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 89.)
VANCOUVER DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 7589 (ii).
VANCOUVER ISLAND RY. BELT, SETTLER'S CLAIMS, REP. OF MR. ROTHWELL: Remarks (Mr. *McInnes*) 4452 (ii).
VENNER, INDIAN AGENT AT RESTIGOUCHE, SUSPENSION: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *McAlister*) 2839 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. *McAlister*) 1786 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *McAlister*) 4611 (ii).
VERGE, J. ALBERT, FISHERY OVERSEER, DISMISSAL: in Com. of Sup., 5304 (ii).
VETERINARY INSPECTORS, APPNMTS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Montague*) 2821 (i).
Victoria Fire Insurance Co.'s B. No. 59 (Mr. *Quinn*). 1°*, 1380; 2°*, 1509; in Com. and 3°*, 2957 (i). (61-62 *Vic.*, *c.* 119.)
VICTORIA AND SAN FRANCISCO MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 6687 (ii).
VICTORIAVILLE PUBLIC BUILDING, ERECTION; Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 7120 (ii).
VOLUNTEERS OF 1866, MEDALS GRANTED: Remarks (Mr. *Heyd*) 6613 (ii).
VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS, RECORD OF VOTE, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Ellis*) 2850 (i).
VOTERS' LISTS (ONT.) REVISING OFFICERS, COST OF PRINTING, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2845 (i).

WALSH, ADMINISTRATOR IN YUKON, INSTRUCTIONS AND COMMISSIONS: Presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1174 (i).
——— NON-PRODUCTION OF INSTRUCTIONS (Mr. *Foster*) 1387 (i).
——— INSTRUCTIONS: Presented (Mr. *Sifton*) 1341 (i).
——— APPNMT. AS ADMINISTRATOR IN YUKON: Ques. (Mr. *Maclean*) 479 (i).
——— APPNMTS. TO FORCE: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 480 (i).
——— COMMISSION AND INSTRUCTIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 1777 (i).
——— M. for Ret.*, (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 2839 (i).
WALSH, E. J., CLAIM AGAINST GOVT.: Remarks (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 6324 (ii).
——— CLAIM AGAINST LEEWARD ISLANDS: M. for Ret.*, (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 2841 (i).
WALTON, T. M., INDIAN AGENT AT PARRY ISLAND, DISMISSAL: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *McCormack*) 3670.
WAVERLEY POSTMASTER, REMOVAL: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 598 (i).
WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF:
Res. for Com. (Mr. *Fielding*) 449 (i).
BUDGET, THE, Financial Stmnt. (Mr. *Fielding*) 3104 (ii).
Deb. (Mr. *Foster*) 3208; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 3242; (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 3262; (Mr. *Paterson*) 3220; (Mr. *Wallace*) 3369; (Mr. *Macdonald, Huron*) 3392; (Mr. *Craig*) 3428; (Mr. *McMullen*) 3458; (Mr. *Bennett*) 3477; (Mr. *McMillan*) 3489; (Mr. *Kloepfer*) 3499; (Mr. *Taylor*) 3505; (Mr. *Frost*) 3517; (Mr. *Sproule*) 3533, 3554; (Mr. *Tarte*) 3564; (Mr. *Lemieux*) 3569; (Mr. *Clancy*) 3574; (Mr. *Davin*) 3593; (Mr. *Roche*) 3626 (i).
PREFERENTIAL CLAUSE: In Com. (Mr. *Fielding*) 3756, 3781; (Mr. *Davin*) 3756, 3786; (Mr. *Ives*) 3757; (Mr. *Maclean*) 3758; (Mr. *Clancy*) 3759, 3791; (Mr. *Craig*) 3762; (Mr. *Bennett*) 3763, 3792; (Mr. *Wood, Hamilton*) 3765, 3783; (Mr. *Henderson*) 3765, 3782; (Mr. *MacPherson*) 3766; (Mr. *Foster*) 3767, 3794; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 3770; (Mr. *Hughes*) 3771, 3795; (Mr. *McDougall*) 3772, 3780; (Mr. *Clarke*) 3773; (Mr. *Powell*) 3775; (Mr. *Taylor*) 3785; (Mr. *Osler*) 3796; (Mr. *Maxwell*) 3796; (Mr. *McNeill*) 3797; (Mr. *Wallace*) 3804; (Mr. *Fielding*) 3804 (i).
TARIFF CHANGES: In Com. (sugar) 3805; (tobacco) 3812 (i).
WEATHERBEE, MR. JUSTICE, ABSENCE FROM PROVINCE Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 3166 (i).

Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. No. 60 (Mr. *Fortin*). 1° m., 1380, 1387; 2° m., 2842 (i). Deb. (Mr. *Fortin*) 1380; (Mr. *Ethier*) 1382; (Sir *Henri Joly de Lotbinière*) 1384; (Mr. *Penny*) 1384; (Mr. *Chauvin*) 1384; (Mr. *Wallace*) 1385; (Mr. *Monk*) 1386; (Mr. *Sproule*) 1386; (Mr. *Talbot*) 1386 (i).

—— **B. No. 71** (Sir *Henri Joly de Lotbinère*). 1°, 1737; 2°, and in Com., 2113, 2123, 3097 (i) 6582; 3°*, 6582; Sen. Amts., 7783 (ii). (61-62 *Vic., c.* 30.)

WELLAND CANAL, DISMISSALS: in Com. of Sup., 7206.

—— EMPLOYEES DISMISSED, NAMES, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Montague*) 2839 (i).

—— in Com. of Sup., 7652 (ii).

WELLINGTON BRIDGE ACCIDENT, MR. MATTISON'S SERVICES: Remarks (Mr. *Quinn*) 4775 (ii).

—— Remarks (Mr. *Quinn*) 4604 (ii).

WEST DEPTL. BLOCK, REFACING WALLS: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 3319 (i).

WEST INDIAN TRADE, EXTENSION: Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1339 (i).

WEST INDIES TRADE: Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2844 (i).

WEST POINT PIER, P.E.I., TENDERS FOR CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 1075 (i).

—— in Com. of Sup., 5632 (ii).

WEST PRINCE (P.E.I.) VACANCY, APPNMT. OF RETURNING OFFICER: Ques. (Mr. *Montague*) 2040 (i).

—— Ques. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1481 (i).

—— ISSUE OF WRIT: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 2241 (i).

—— ISSUE OF WRIT (Mr. *Speaker*) 1173 (i).

—— NOTIFICATION (Mr. *Macdonald, King's*) 1079.

WHARFS, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5000, 5633.

WHARFS AND PIERS, GOVT. EXPENDITURE: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Martin*) 6581, 7241, 7665 (ii).

WHEAT GRADED IN ELEVATORS AT FORT WILLIAM: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Richardson*) 2839 (i).

WHISKY FOR THE KLONDIKE, *Manaunse's* CARGO: Remarks (Mr. *Guillet*) 1188 (i).

WHITE, MR., EX-DEP. POSTMASTER GENERAL, SUPERANNUATION: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 474 (i).

WHYCOCOMAGH WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 5622 (ii).

WILLIAMSBURG CANAL, GRATUITY TO GEORGE REID: in Com. of Sup., 7192 (ii).

—— REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 6554 (ii).

WILLIAMS, W. W., POSTMASTER AT SEELEY'S BAY, DISMISSAL: M. (Mr. *Taylor*) to Adjn., 3409, 3416.

—— in Com. of Sup., 6701 (ii).

Windsor and Detroit Union Bridge Co.'s B. No. 79 (Mr. *Gibson*). 1°*, 1839; 2°*, 1949; 3°*, ——. (61-62 *Vic., c.* 120.)

WINDSOR HARBOUR, RIVER AVON: in Com. of Sup., 5619 (ii).

Winnipeg Great Northern Ry. Co.'s Transportation Contract B. No. 148 (Mr. *Blair*). 1°*, 5867; 2° and in Com., 6232; 3°*, 6446 (ii). (61-62 *Vic., c.* 10.)

WINSTANELY, MR., MAIL CLERK: in Com. of Sup., 4866 (ii).

WINTER MAIL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 4964, 7284.

WINDSOR, (N.S.) DRILL SHED: in Com. of Sup., 7214.

WOOD, H. W., WELFORD POSTMASTER, N.B., DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 7120 (ii).

WOOD, W. F., INDIAN AGENT, DISMISSAL: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Wallace*) 7526 (ii).

—— in Com. of Sup., 7303, 7760 (ii).

WOODS, J. P., EX-JUDGE, RETIRING ALLOWANCE: Ques. (Mr. *Erb*) 825 (i).

—— SUPERANNUATION: in Com. of Sup., 7486 (ii).

WOOD ISLAND (P.E.I.) BREAKWATER, DREDGING: Ques. (Mr. *Martin*) 2350 (i).

WOODSTOCK P. O.: in Com. of Sup., 5464 (ii).

WRITS OF ELECTION, ISSUE: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).

WYEBRIDGE, WYVALE POSTAL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 598 (i).

YALE COUNTY COURT JUDGE, INQUIRY *re* JUDGE SPINKS: M. for Copy of Rep.* (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 3668 (i).

"YANTIC" SS., CLEARANCES, ENTRIES, &C., AT CANADIAN PORTS: M. for Ret. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 1834 (i).

—— Inquiry for Ret. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 4348.

Yukon Overland Transportation Co.'s B. No. 107 (Mr. *Domville*). 1°*, 2844; 2°*, 3084 (i).

Yukon Provisional District Administration B. No. 154 (Mr. *Sifton*). 1°*, 6439; 2°, and in Com., 6727; 3°*, 6747 (ii). (61-62 *Vic., c.* 6.)

YUKON CANADIAN RAILWAY, CONTRACT, &C.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 102 (i).

—— REF. IN SPEECH FROM THRONE: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 7 (i).

YUKON PROVISIONAL DISTRICT, ACCOUNTS ASKED FOR PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COM.: Remarks (Mr. *Speaker*) 4354 (Mr. *Wallace*) 4350; (Mr. *Sifton*) 4350 (ii).

—— BANKING BUSINESS: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 1071, 1467 (ii).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Maclean*) 5311 (i).

—— CUSTOMS COLLECTION, AMOUNT: Ques. (Mr. *Wallace*) 825.

—— CUSTOMS OFFICIALS, PAR. IN OTTAWA *Citizen*: Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 4451 (ii).

—— CUSTOMS REGULATIONS: M. for Ret. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 2822 (i).

—— Ques. (Mr. *McInnes*) 453 (i).

—— Dredging Leases, Advertisement in Chicago *Record*, 409 (i).

—— GEOLOGICAL SURVEY: Ques. (Mr. *Maclean*) 3312 (i).

—— GOLD DREDGING LEASES: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 1074 (i).

—— GOVT. CLAIMS, NUMBERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 5133 (ii).

—— GOVT. SUPPLIES, CONTRACT, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 4602 (ii).

—— HOMESTEAD LAND LAWS: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 1338 (i).

—— HOMESTEAD PRIVILEGES: Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 1784 (i).

—— IMMIGRATION, MAJ. WALSH'S INSTRUCTIONS *re*: Ques. (Mr. *McInnes*) 601 (i).

YUKON PROVISIONAL DISTRICT, MAJOR WALSH'S INSTRUCTIONS: M. for Ret. (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 2839.
——— Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 1777 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Maclean*) 479 (i).
——— COMMISSION: PRESENTED (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1174 (i).
——— INSTRUCTIONS: PRESENTED (Mr. *Sifton*) 1341 (i).
——— NON-PRODUCTION OF: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 1387 (i).
——— APPNMTS. TO FORCE: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 480.
——— LIQUOR PERMITS, M. ON ORDER PAPER: Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 3092 (i).
——— PAR. IN SASKATCHEWAN *Times re* LIQUOR PERMITS; Remarks (Mr. *Davis*) 1174 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Craig*) 1781 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 2434, 3088, 3092 (i).
——— LIQUOR PERMITS GRANTED BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 473 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 2813 (i).
——— Ques. (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 2846 (i).
——— remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 2269 (i).
——— remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 745 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Richardson*) 1472 (i).
——— personal explanation (Mr. *Domville*) 2039 (i).
——— MANN AND MACKENZIE'S SLEIGH ROUTE: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 1777 (i).
——— MILITARY CONTINGENT, COST, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 4604, 4774 (ii).
——— EXPENDITURE, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, King's*) 4795 (i).
——— remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 1577 (i) 4604 (ii).
——— PURCHASE OF PROVISIONS FOR N. W. MOUNTED POLICE: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 1931 (i).
——— SUPPLIES, &C., H. N. BATE'S CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Broder*) 6009 (ii).
——— TRANSPORTATION OF SUPPLIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 7056 (ii).
——— remarks (Sir *Charles H. Tupper*) 6580 (ii).
———MINING LEASES: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 6894, 6895 (ii).
——— MINING REGULATIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Domville*) 2036 (i).
YUKON MOUNTED POLICE FORCE: in Com. of Sup., 7338, 7353 (ii).
——— MR. JENNING'S REP. *re* ROUTES: Presented (Mr. *Sifton*) 409 (i).
——— MUNICIPAL REGULATIONS: Remarks (Mr. *Davin*) 1747 (i).
——— PLACER MINING, CLAIMS ENTERED: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 6006 (ii).
——— PLACER MINING AND TIMBER LICENSES: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 460, 504 (i).
——— QUARTZ MINING REGULATIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Montague*) 1341 (i).
——— remarks (Mr. *Montague*) 2000 (i).
——— ROTHSCHILDS' AGENT: Ques. (Mr. *Ingram*) 486 (i).
——— ROUTES AND PASSES, EXPLORATIONS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 482 (i).
——— ROUTES THROUGH N.W.T. PLANS, &C.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Davin*) 5139 (ii).
——— SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 7323 (ii).
——— SERVICES OF N. W. MOUNTED POLICE: in Com. of Sup., 6858 (ii).
——— STEAMERS AND LAUNCHES, &C., PURCHASE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 7769 (ii).
——— TELEGRAPH CONNECTION WITH YUKON: Ques. (Mr. *McInnes*) 1472 (i).
——— TIMBER BERTHS, NAMES OF TENDERERS: Ques. (Mr. *Domville*) 485 (i).
——— M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Foster*) 504 (i).
——— TIMBER LIMITS GRANTED H. DOMVILLE: Ques. (Mr. *Davin*) 474 (i).
——— TIMBER SALES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Domville*) 1784 (i).
——— TROOPS SENT AS REINFORCEMENTS: Remarks (Mr. *Foster*) 1577 (i).
——— U.S. REGULATIONS, &C.: Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 6 (i).
——— WAGON ROAD CONSTRUCTION, &C.: (Mr. *Sifton*) 1341 (i).
——— Remarks (Sir *Charles Tupper*) 1184 (i).
——— *See* "Canadian Yukon." "U. S. Customs Regulations, &c."